SEVENTY YEARS AGO, in 1923, Elsie Parsons became president of the American Ethnological Society for a two-year term. During the 1910s, in her late thirties and early forties, she had distinguished herself as a social psychologist and feminist, writing several important books during the period. Nancy Cott has argued that the birth of modern feminism coincided with the publication of Parsons’s work. By the time Parsons was forty-nine, when she assumed the AES presidency, Parsons had become part of Boasian anthropology at Columbia University, immersed in ethnological research among the Pueblos, funding the work of countless student researchers, including many women. All together, Parsons, who died in 1941, wrote more than fifty articles on the Southwest, culminating in a two-volume grand synthesis, *Pueblo Religion.* In the 1960s and 1970s the AES honored Parsons by awarding a prize each year to the best student essay in a national contest. The prize was discontinued in 1986, but the tradition was revived. Thus the 1989 AES meetings in Santa Fe, 30 miles from Española and Clara True, where Parsons stayed during her first trip to the Southwest in 1910, seemed an appropriate occasion to commemorate the work of Elsie Parsons. I particularly wanted to make a connection between Parsons’s feminist writing...
SEVENTY YEARS ago, in 1923, Elsie Clews Parsons became president of the American Ethnological Society for a two-year term. During the 1930s, in her late thirties and early forties, she had distinguished herself as a social psychologist and feminist, writing several important books during the period Nancy Cott has associated with the birth of modern feminism.¹ By the age of forty-nine, when she assumed the AES presidency, Parsons had become part of Boasian anthropology at Columbia University, immersing herself in ethnological research among the Pueblos and funding the work of countless southwestern researchers, including many women. All told, Parsons, who died in 1941, wrote more than ninety-five articles on the Southwest, culminating in her two-volume grand synthesis, Pueblo Indian Religion.² In the 1960s and 1970s the AES honored Parsons by awarding a prize each year to the best graduate-student essay in a national competition. When the prize was discontinued the last medal was given to the president and handed down from president to president as a symbol of office. Thus the 1989 AES meetings in Santa Fe, a few miles from Española and Clara True’s ranch, where Parsons stayed during her first trip to the Southwest in 1910, seemed an appropriate time to commemorate the work of Elsie Clews Parsons. I particularly wanted to make a connection between Parsons’s feminist writing and the
cultures in the Southwest—held at the request of Ester Goldfrank, Ruth Bader, and many others, and her role as a menstruitionally in my own contribution. In both, I am indebted to Babcock’s more recent and influential work on the feminist sensibility in Parsons’s research for Parsons in the 1920s and for there are crucial differences. The more work in the 1920s and 1930s contrasts in the writings of women anthropologists complex differences between the state of a period and that of the present, as well as the context of feminism of the 1920s and 1930s.

The Making of a Feminist

Before exploring this comparison further, Elsie Clews grew up in a wealthy family. Her father, James Madison, was a Wall Street broker, and her mother, Elsie’s mother put aside $10,000 each year and managed to talk her father into letting her go to Barnard, studying under Franklin H. Giddings. Parsons taught briefly at Barnard before marrying Barnard, which took an evolutionary view of ethnological data. It created a furor because of Theodore Roosevelt, Herbert’s

Elsie Clews Parsons at the San Gabriel Ranch in Alcalde, New Mexico, ca. 1923. (Photograph courtesy of the American Philosophical Society)

reemergence of feminism in anthropology in the 1970s and 1980s. Michelle Rosaldo and I were ignorant of Elsie Clews Parsons when we edited Woman, Culture and Society in the early 1970s. Instead, we turned to Margaret Mead for the quotation that begins our book. We might have written a different introduction had we read Parsons’s books.

My own interest in Parsons I owe to Barbara Babcock and Nancy Parezo, who invited me to participate in a conference on “Daughters of the Desert”—a retrospective on women anthropologists who conducted research on Native American
cultures in the Southwest—held at the University of Arizona in 1986. Parsons’s contributions were explored in a paper by Louis Hieb and have been detailed in the conference catalogue by Babcock and Parezo. Parsons’s key financial support for the research of Ester Goldfrank, Ruth Bunzel, Ruth Benedict, and others emerged from many papers, and her role as a mentor to Gladys Reichard was covered very minimally in my own contribution. In both writing and revising this paper I became indebted to Babcock’s more recent and insightful research, which uncovers and underscores the feminist sensibility in Parsons’s work. Throughout this paper I shall compare Parsons’s scholarship of the teens and 1920s to the feminist anthropology that emerged during the 1970s and 1980s. I see important similarities in the focus on cultural universals in both Parsons’s writing in the teens and the feminist anthropology some of us wrote in the 1970s. This universalizing tendency was followed by a transition to more detailed ethnographic research for Parsons in the 1920s and for feminists in the 1980s. On the other hand, there are crucial differences. The more muted feminism in Parsons’s ethnological work in the 1920s and 1930s contrasts with its more explicit and continued presence in the writings of women anthropologists today. This relates, I argue, to complex differences between the state of anthropological theory in the late Boasian period and that of the present, as well as differences between the social and political context of feminism of the 1920s and 1980s.

The Making of a Feminist

Before exploring this comparison further, a few details of Parsons’s life are in order. Elsie Clews grew up in a wealthy New York City family. Her father, Henry Clews, was a Wall Street broker, and her mother was a distant relative of President James Madison. The family summered at a mansion (“The Rocks”) in Newport, and Elsie’s mother put aside $10,000 each year for “mistakes in clothes.” Elsie managed to talk her father into letting her attend newly opened Barnard College, from which she graduated in 1896. She went on to earn her M.A. and Ph.D. at Barnard, studying under Franklin H. Giddings, an evolutionary sociologist. She taught briefly at Barnard before marrying Herbert Parsons in 1900, at the age of twenty-four. Parsons’s feminism grew out of her independent spirit and was a rejection of the confining life of a wealthy Victorian debutante and socialite. She scandalized her mother by going for an unchaperoned swim with a young man on a secluded Newport beach when she was a teenager.

Herbert Parsons tolerated his wife’s independence and feminism, even though it threatened to disrupt his political career as a reform Republican congressman, a post he held between 1905 and 1911. The publication of her book *The Family* created headlines in New York in 1906. The book was an outline of her lectures at Barnard, which took an evolutionary view of marriage and family patterns using ethnological data. It created a furor because it advocated trial marriage. Elsie sent a copy to Theodore Roosevelt, Herbert’s patron in the Republican party, hoping to
reassure the president that the book was really “very dry reading.” Roosevelt seemed pleased to receive a copy and in a teasing manner promised to read the famous book and discuss it over lunch. 6

During the first ten years of her marriage Parsons bore six children, four of whom lived to adulthood. Her wealth allowed her to raise her children with a full staff of housekeepers and child nurses and gave her the freedom to travel. She spent several years in Washington, D.C., but returned to New York in 1911 after her husband finished his third term as a congressman. Between 1913 and 1916 she wrote five feminist books, interconnected studies that focused on how marriage, the family, religion, and social etiquette constrain women. In several she emphasized the need for individual freedom and choice.

At the same time she began to abandon her brand of sociological feminism for ethnology. As Peter Hare, her grandnephew, writes in her biography, “She moved slowly from a generalizing style to rigorous empirical methods.” 11 During those years she came under the influence of Franz Boas and his graduate students, Alfred Kroeber, Robert Lowie, and Pliny Goddard. Goddard wrote to Parsons, characterizing the dual nature of her life in this transitional period when she was attracted to anthropology yet still writing feminist books: “Your winter activities are propaganda and your summer ones research.” 12 By 1916 (at forty-two) she talked about giving up generalizing. In an oft-quoted passage to Lowie, she wrote, “You [Lowie], Kroeber and Hocart make the life of a psychologist not worth living. I see plainly I shall have to keep to the straight and narrow path of kinship nomenclature and folklore collecting.” By the 1920s, when Parsons was president of the AES, her publications were almost completely ethnological.

A closer examination of these two crucial decades in Parsons’s life—the teens and the 1920s—reveals the social and intellectual forces that first shaped Parsons’s feminism and that then propelled her into an anthropological setting with little room for such concerns in an era of political quiescence and a more private feminism.

Parsons’s Early Writings and the Feminism of the Teens

The teens, particularly the years of World War I, were a time of social ferment and protest in which socialist, feminist, and other radical ideas were common in New York City, especially among the middle-class and upper-class avant-garde in Greenwich Village. Nancy Cott contrasts the Greenwich Village feminists with earlier suffragists. These college-educated, bourgeois women rejected the image of service and motherhood associated with the women’s movement of the nineteenth century. They were women who welcomed irreverent and radical behavior in art, politics, and the labor movement. According to Cott, “They considered themselves socialists or progressives leaning toward socialism and had, unlike most of the American population, a tolerance for ‘isms.’ They embedded their critique of gender hierarchy in a critique of the social system.” 13 They wanted to break with dichotomized categories of “Man” and “Woman” and to equate womanhood with humanity. As Charlotte Perkins Gilman running, out of prison and off pedestal to a woman.” 14

During the teens, after her return from the new feminism, but her relationships with social circles in New York City. The first was Parsons met Boas as early as 1907, and they had a relatively formal relationship. Lowie, Goddard, and Kroeber, inviting her to Massachusetts. Robert Lowie recalled that he was primarily an admirer, her relationship being complex. Their friendship grew a month of joint fieldwork at Zuni in Southwestern New Mexico. In later years they resumed a respectful platonic relationship. Kroeber wrote that he admired her “rigorous empiricism. Parsons made her first trips to Zuni, increased in frequency as she became more comfortable with “insistence on a rigorously empirical approach and method.” 15 In 1915 she observed a field trip to visit Zuni. 16 She made additional trips in the years, including the month with Kroeber in Laguna in 1919. 17 These short excursions produced ethnographic articles on Zuni and Laguna that were published in The American Anthropologist.

The second circle was that of the Greenwich Village salon she met Walter Lipmann, with whom she fell in love. She also came to know Max Eastman and the Masses. The magazine, a well-regarded voice of enlightened conscience, was shut down by the post office in 1918 for antiwar views. The Masses was co-founded by Max Eastman, Floyd Dell (a sexual radical with whom she had a relationship) and John Reed (whose later commitment to communism was embodied in the movie Reds). It was full of antiwar statements, poetry, and letters from Russian revolutionaries. Nevertheless, it had many cartoon critiques of male domesticity, Mabel Dodge, and articles on birth control. Parsons’s third circle included Heterodoxy, who met for Saturday lunches every third Saturday in 1912. Founded by Marie Jennie Hurst, the club included women, activists and professionals. Among the members were Mabel Dodge, Stella Coman Ballantine (Emma Goldman’s niece), and others.
The chapter begins with a discussion of the role of women in society during the early 20th century, particularly in the context of anthropological research. It highlights the work of Ruth Benedict, whose essays and correspondence with Franz Boas and Alfred Kroeber provide insights into the early days of anthropological fieldwork. The chapter also looks at the life and work of Robert Lowie, particularly his relationship with Parsons and his professional growth.

The chapter then moves on to the interwar period, focusing on the work of the American Anthropological Association and its role in shaping the field of anthropology. The chapter notes that the association was largely composed of men, and that the few women members who were present often found themselves marginalized within the society.

The chapter then discusses the impact of World War I on the field of anthropology, particularly in terms of the increasing awareness of the need for international cooperation and understanding. It notes the work of both male and female anthropologists who served in the war, and the social and political changes that resulted.

The chapter concludes with a discussion of the impact of the interwar period on the field of anthropology, particularly in terms of the rise of feminist anthropology. It notes the work of scholars such as Margaret Mead and the role of women in shaping the field during this time.

Throughout the chapter, the author highlights the importance of diverse voices and perspectives in the study of anthropology, and the need for greater inclusion and representation in the field.
Agnes deMille, and Elizabeth Gurley Flynn. At their lunches members discussed women's rights, political issues of the day, and a whole host of other topics—from how women were raising their children to revelations about their own upbringing. One of the members used Parsons's classification of family types from her book *The Family* in a published spoof on mating patterns found among the members of Heterodoxy entitled, “Marriage Customs and Taboo among the Early Heterodities.”

Parsons's writing during this period (1912–1919) was prolific—and her most explicitly feminist. She published five books and a number of scholarly articles in the *American Anthropologist*, the *Journal of American Folklore*, and the *American Journal of Sociology*. She also wrote popular pieces for *The Masses*, the *New Republic*, and *Harper's Weekly*. In her book *Beyond Separate Spheres*, Rosalind Rosenberg argues that by the teens Parsons had given up the evolutionary approach espoused by her teacher Franklin Giddings and evident in her book *The Family*. She rejected a “slavish devotion to evolutionary theory” and a set of cultural stages. Instead, she became a “de facto functionalist,” arguing that the principle motives of human behavior are unconscious and that civilized and primitive peoples are no different in their behavior.

Parsons's books of this period focus on the theme of social restraint, and they juxtapose cross-cultural examples with ones from her own society. There is a generalizing tone here—a search for universals and a focus on women's social roles. *The Old-Fashioned Woman and Religious Chastity*, both published in 1913, and *Fear and Conventionality, Social Freedom,* and *Social Rule* all reflect a concern for the universal in women's experience that is parallel to the themes emphasized by those of us who wrote for *Woman, Culture and Society* in 1974.

*The Old-Fashioned Woman*, to cite the best example, uses ethnographic evidence to demonstrate how women's lives are constrained from birth to widowhood by taboos, confinement, and exclusion from male affairs. Digging through the available ethnography of the day (for example, Spencer and Gillen on the Aborigines, Frazer's *The Golden Bough*, and George Dorsey on the Wichita), Parsons juxtaposes the experience of women in tribal groups with that of women in ancient state societies and in our own “modern time.” Each page is a pastiche of examples.

For instance, in the chapter “In Quarantine,” about menstrual taboos, she says, “But it is during menstruation that a woman is most generally considered dangerous. . . . The Bushmen think that if a glance at a menstruous woman, a man becomes at once transfixed and turned into a tree which talks. . . . If a Pueblo Indian touches a menstruous woman, or if a Chippeway uses her fire, he is bound to fall ill.” And the list continues. So-called civilized societies, she notes, also harbor such beliefs and often restrict women’s behavior. Women are banned from sugar refineries in the north of France (because a menstruous woman would blacken the sugar), and in England people believe that meat cured by a menstruous woman is tainted.

In a discussion of marriage entitled “Her Market Price,” Parsons announces that “Women are an important item in primitive trade.” In this chapter she discusses various forms of bride-price before turning her attention to prostitution and slave-ery, other examples of the exchange of women. *Exclusive Sex* Parsons tells us that “We share in public affairs. The Nagas have a live. In anti-suffrage argument a voting spot for women.” Women are often frightened or they are given “minor parts,” thus what Parsons called “The Ladies’ Gallery.”

In these and other chapters we see that the confinement and constriction of women's condition is cited (meticulously footnoted) as an example of the women's condition. European examples are juxtaposed with those from tribal peoples and ancient state societies including the American Indians, and the Samoans and African kingdoms help to amplify Parsons's arguments.

Parsons's contributions to *The Masses* and the *New Republic* are many. Her article on the exploitation of women in the Middle East, Arabs, and the Koreans that mark a change in her attitude. In the Tlingit woman changes the silver pin on her head, the woman burns her dolls, a Spartan bride in ancient Greece, a Korean, it is the man, not the bride, who is the “Society.” Parsons writes, “modern and ancient societies, insists on making of it a norm rather, through marriage thus artificial.”

In two of her later books Parsons builds on her earlier work from men, developing a theory grounded in both biological and social categories. In *Fear and Conventionality* and *Social Freedom* are ways of erecting barriers because they are novel, and dislike of the unusual. “Sexuality between its members society is a barrier to women, in its characteristically simple, uncorruptible, unselfish, unambiguous.” Thus “No Veddah man of his own age except his wife. . . . A man is born and bred at all the women in the men's part of the house. He takes the wedding dress from the bride with the cab driver since they share the same seat.”

The possibility of breaking through the barrier to sexual freedom, published in 1915. Sex, along with other social classifications that sets up rigid divide, there is some attempt to struggle against it. The reality of sex is the gift of all women.” Parsons believed that sex related to, increased freedom from rigid social cate
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(1912–1919) was prolific—and her most popular book Beyond Separate Spheres, Rosalind parsons had given up the evolutionary approach and evident in her book *The Family*. She argued that the principles of cultural stages are no different than the theme of social restraint, and they come from her own society. There is a general focus on women’s social roles. *The Chastity*, both published in 1913, and *Fear and Social Rule* all reflect a concern for the parallel to the themes emphasized by those in Society in 1974.28

The best example, uses ethnographic evi dence to construe the fact that a woman’s fire, he is bound to full parized societies, she notes, also harbor such women. Are banned from sugar refineries (a menstruous woman would blacken the sugar), and if a menstruous woman is taint ed.29 "For Market Price," Parsons announces that in this chapter she discusses her attention to prostitution and slavery, other examples of the exchange of women for goods. In the chapter on "The Exclusive Sex" Parsons tells us that "Women are quite generally excluded from a share in public affairs. The Nagas have a war stone no woman may look upon and live. In anti-suffrage argument a voting booth seems to be nearly as dangerous a spot for women." Women are often frightened away from men’s exclusive activities or they are given "minor parts," thus securing feminine devotion and becoming what Parsons called "The Ladies’ Gallery."31

In these and other chapters we see the overarching shadow of male dominance, the confinement and constriction of women, and their lack of value. Example after another is cited (meticulously footnoted), but the point is the universality of men’s condition. European examples (of so-called civilized peoples) are juxtaposed with those from tribal peoples as diverse as the Australian Aborigines, the American Indians, and the Samoans. Women’s positions in archaic states and African kingdoms help to amplify Parsons’s commentary on constraint, taboo, and exclusion.32

Parsons’s contributions to *The Masses* take on these same themes of social control and constraint. Her article on marriage cites customs among the Tlingit, the Arabs, and the Koreans that mark a change in status, conferring "a new life." A Tlingit woman changes the silver pin in her lip for a wooden one, a Javanese woman burns her dolls, a Spartan bride had to give up going to public games, but in Korea, it is the man, not the bride, who does up his hair. Why all these changes? "Society," Parsons writes, "modern and primitive, stamps marriage with extraneous features, insists on making it a novelty, because society thereby controls it, or rather, through marriage thus artificialized, it controls sex."33

In two of her later books Parsons begins to explore why women are divided from men, developing a theory grounded in the universality of social convention and social categories. In *Fear and Conventionality* she argues that social conventions are a way of erecting barriers because of a universal fear of change, dread of novelty, and dislike of the unusual. "Sex is one of the two greatest sources of difference between its members society has to apprehend. It deals with the disturbing factor in its characteristically simple, unconscious way. It separates men and women as much as possible." Thus "No Vedda may come in contact with any woman of his own age except his wife, . . . Corean boys were taught that it was shameful to set foot at all in the women’s part of the house."34 And in *New York* a woman has her escort ride with the cab driver since there is no chaperone to watch over them if they share the same seat.

The possibility of breaking through rigid social categories is explored in *Social Freedom*, published in 1915. Sex, along with age, kinship, and caste, is the major social classification that sets up rigid divisions, against which, with a "maturing culture," there is some attempt to struggle. "Freedom from the domination of personality by sex is the gift par excellence of feminism, a gift it brings to men as well as women." Parsons believed that sex relationships were beginning to change. Under increased freedom from rigid social categories, "Sex becomes a factor in the enrich-
ment of personality. . . . It is a factor, not an obsession. . . . No longer a source of distress or annoyance, it is not kept separate from life nor repressed into the obscene. It is free to express itself, developing its own tests, standards and ideas. According to these ideals, relations between men and women will be primarily personal relations, secondarily sexual.”

Parsons was also a pacifist, and she opposed U.S. participation in World War I. She was against her husband’s enlistment and refused to let anyone wearing a uniform into her home—including Herbert. She was disillusioned when many of the intellectuals associated with the New Republic began to support the war in 1917. Rosenberg argues that Parsons’s hopes for progress and reform were dashed by World War I: “At the war’s end, Parsons made a final break with public life and her own brand of feminism and escaped into anthropological fieldwork. Her friend Kroeber later suggested that she burned out on reform and that her growing understanding of culture’s power over the individual made her even less optimistic about individual action.”

The Twenties: Parsons’s Presidency of the AES and the Boasian Legacy

The twenties, as James Clifford has shown, were the years in which classic ethnography was formulated, as exemplified by Malinowski’s Argonauts of the Western Pacific and Margaret Mead’s Coming of Age in Samoa. However, Parsons’s fieldwork was much different from that of Malinowski and Mead. In the 1920s Parsons stayed with the Boasian tradition, which represented a more polyphonic description, but she framed that description in terms of culture elements, diffusion, and culture history. She remained aligned with Boas and Goddard and became a mentor to Gladys Reichard, who was almost a “daughter to Boas” and who, intellectually, remained a Boasian throughout her life. Parsons was never close to Mead, Benedict, or Sapin, the anthropologists in the Columbia milieu who were theorizing about the relationship between culture and the individual and were writing from a more humanistic point of view.

During the 1920s Parsons continued to make short trips to the Southwest, expanding her research outward from Zuni, visiting Laguna in 1919 and 1920, Hopi in 1920, Jemez in 1921, and Taos in 1922. In the mid 1920s, when she was president of AES, she conducted research on the Tewa, working out of the Spanish village of Alcalde and having informants visit her there. Given Pueblo resistance to researchers, especially those who wanted to know about religion, information was always obtained piecemeal. Anthropologists were never able to present a “seamless whole”; nor could they have “pitched their tents among the natives.” Parsons, like others of the period, relied primarily on information from one family (the host) and from a small circle of paid informants. In more secretive pueblos like Isleta, notes were made during interviews in a hotel room or at a nearby Spanish village. This relatively clandestine research (although Parsons took care never to reveal the names of her informants) gives us (in the 1990s) the sense that anthropologists were almost natives.

Few southwestern researchers engaged in authority which claimed that “I was the one who made in order to get pregnant, tabooing the child), postpartum practices and norms, these beliefs by including the accounts in an article on “Mothers and Children at Incense man’s prayer in both Keres and En hostess did have a boy child and given men.” In contrast to these articles in these range of behavior: the disciplining of child loses its first tooth. There are fewer personal informants or as observed by Elsie) gathered from various informants at unstable.

These articles contrast markedly with Fashioned Woman and Fear and Convention of the sexes, on the exclusion of convention. Gone from these texts are an idealization about human nature or even about Convention and custom are recorded, but restraining nature and no theory accounting for the Zuni masked figures that are more theme of constraint and the control of behavior. But comparisons are limited to Parsons’s own observations of an a’Doshoic in order to convey a vivid sense that the book comment on the ways in which behavior.
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circle of paid informants. In more during interviews in a hotel room or clandestine research (although Parsons informants) gives us (in the 1990s) the sense that anthropologists were almost “prying information, often secret, out of the natives.” Few southwestern researchers engaged in writing with the kind of ethnographic authority which claimed that “I was there, so you are there.” Instead, a scholarly article was often a blend of different voices—the anthropologist as observer, the native as co-observer answering the anthropologist’s questions “on the spot,” the notes of previous anthropological observations, and a narrative of a “prototypical” ceremony by a native informant. Although male anthropologists used this style, Parsons, along with Gladys Reichard and Ruth Underhill, were at the forefront in adding women’s voices, along with their own observations, to their texts.

During the 1920s Parsons continued to be interested in women, but she was committed to collecting ethnographic detail that was written up in this polyphonic Boasian mode. We see this style of writing, one that recognizes the position of the ethnographer and gives voice to her informants, most vividly in Parsons’s important series of articles on mothers and children published in *Man* between 1919 and 1924. These essays are a compendium of beliefs and practices—offerings women make in order to get pregnant, taboos surrounding birth (to avoid deformities in the child), postpartum practices and naming ceremonies—and Parsons concretizes these beliefs by including the accounts of individual women. For example, in the article on “Mothers and Children at Laguna,” Parsons gives her hostess Wana’s narrative of the naming ceremony used for her two-week-old baby (performed ten days before her visit). It includes Wana’s drawing of the altar and a text of the medicine man’s prayer in both Keres and English. The Hopi article tells what Parsons’s hostess did to have a boy child and gives a verbatim account from her Tewa informant. In contrast to these articles in which native voices emerge, several of the articles on Zuni and the Tewa are more a list of taboos or sayings that describe a range of behavior: the disciplining of children, or what a mother says when a child loses its first tooth. There are fewer personal experiences here (either as narrated by informants or as observed by Elsie) and more individual bits of information gathered from various informants at unstated times and places.

These articles contrast markedly with Parsons’s use of ethnography in *The Old-Fashioned Woman* and *Fear and Conventionality.* They do not focus on the separation of the sexes, on the exclusion of women, or even on the constraints of convention. Gone from these texts are attempts to moralize or point out a generalization about human nature or even an implicit contrast with our own culture. Convention and custom are recorded, but there is little commentary on their constraining nature and no theory accounting for adherence to tradition. In one article, on the Zuni masked figures that are used to terrifyize and control children, the theme of constraint and the control of behavior is still present in the selection of the topic. But comparisons are limited to childrearing practices at other pueblos. Parsons’s own observations of an *aDoshe* “haranguing” a little boy are described in order to convey a vivid sense that the boy was frightened, but there is no attempt to comment on the ways in which behavior is constrained by the custom. No implicit
subtext judges Zuni practice or compares it to our own. The importance of individual freedom and the artificiality of social conventions are no longer issues in this “ethnographic” description.

When she was president of the AES, Parsons published two “landmark” essays, “Tewa Kin, Clan, and Moiety” and “The Religion of the Pueblo Indians.” The works arrange data on the Pueblo cultures from west to east, contrasting the matrilineal orientation of the Hopis with the weak clans at Keres and among the Tewa and the presence of the kachina cult and prayer-feather offerings in the western pueblos—complexes that “diminish steadily” to the east and north. These essays mark her commitment to Boasian issues about cultural variation and diffusion and had a lasting impact on the field. The contrast between western and eastern pueblo social organization, for example, was more fully developed in the work of Fred Eggan.”

After Parsons’s last field trip to the Southwest, in 1932, she began to turn her attention elsewhere—to Mexico, the Caribbean, and Peru. In Mitla: Town of the Souls Parsons retains the polyphonic style she utilized in her articles during the 1920s as well as her interest in the position of women. Her chapter on family and personal life documents women’s experiences in pregnancy and childbirth. In it we read about the town’s midwives, Isadora y Señora Be’ta, their birthing techniques, the baths they give women after their children are born, and their remedies for delayed deliveries. There is an account of one of the many marriage ceremonies Parsons attended, plus a lengthy discussion of sicknesses, cures, and difficulties with witchcraft. Here and in the remainder of the book we come to recognize a “cast of characters,” many of whom recount stories of witchcraft or suggest cures that have been successful. Some are subjects of the portraits or participants in the narratives detailed in the chapter on town gossip. In that chapter Parsons relates her own experience in the earthquake of January 14, 1931, when she escaped from her room only moments before the ceiling collapsed.”

This volume, like the ethnographies, fictionalized accounts, and life histories of Reichard and Underhill, constitutes the growing body of ethnography from a woman’s point of view that blossomed during the 1930s, only to be forgotten in subsequent decades. During this period Parsons’s interest in the Southwest continued through her editing of Stephen’s Hopi Journal and her most important southwestern book, Pueblo Indian Religion, published in 1939. In the latter the informants and observations of the earlier articles have disappeared, supplanted by a homogenous “ethnographic present” and an overriding concern with Boasian issues, particularly cultural innovation and borrowing. Each group—the Hopi, the Zuni, the Tewa—becomes an “absolute subject,” to use Clifford’s phrase. Parsons’s voice becomes marginalized, relegated primarily to the footnotes. In this transformation of observation, narratives by informants, and the dialogues between ethnographer and native—in other words, data constituted in discursive, dialogical conditions—become textualized. “The data thus reformulated need no longer be understood as the communication of specific persons. An informant’s explanation or description of custom need not be cast in a form that includes the message ‘so and so said this.’ A textualized ritual or event is no longer closely linked to its participants. Instead, these texts become evidentiary of a reality.” In Pueblo Indian Religion the observer disappears, and the historical becomes more difficult to find in the footnotes.

We have come to the end of a long political and theoretical trajectory of ethnographic work. In the 1930s her prose, in which Babcock focused, on ethnographic practices and contextuized observation, informant relations, and the question/answer interaction, many of her later publications exemplified her commitment to variability and culture contact are the themes that observer and informant is erased and the text dominates.

This assessment would be incomplete without mention of financial contributions. Without Parsons’s funding the Southwest research would have been a farce. For example, she paid Ester Goldfrank’s and Linda White’s expenses in the early 1920s. She financed the research of Gladys Reichard, Margaret Mead, and many others through the Study of American Folklore, and funded numerous other research projects. Parsons’s study of cultural variability and of the influence of the modern world on traditional societies owes much to Parsons’s research.

However, Parsons, like almost all of her contemporaries, never held a position within academia or do fieldwork and fund the research of other anthropologists. Gladys Reichard had a faculty appointment at Smith College, Ruth Benedict was denied the presidential chair at the American Museum of Natural History, and Margaret Mead died. Margaret Mead was peripheral at the American Museum of Natural History, and Ruth Benedict was denied the presidency of the American Anthropological Association and did not live to see it. Margaret Mead held a full-time position in 1922 at the University of New Mexico.

Parsons touched the lives of most of her students, providing funds for their jobs or field research. Her role as a source of intellectual inspiration behind that of Boas, whose leadership eventually affirmed by historians of anthropology.
rites to our own. The importance of individual conventions are no longer issues in this

Parsons published two “landmark” essays, The Religion of the Pueblo Indians,”4 The rites from west to east, contrasting the matrilineal weak clans at Keres and among the Tewa prayer-feather offerings in the western pueblo to the east and north.4 These essays mark cultural variation and diffusion had a between western and eastern pueblo social circle developed in the work of Fred Eggan.5 Southwest, in 1932, she began to turn her Caribbean, and Peru. In Mitla: Town of the style she utilized in her articles during the of women. Her chapter on family and kin relations in pregnancy and childbirth. In it we a and Sehora Be’a, their birthing techniques and their remedies are presented. One of the many marriage ceremonies on of sicknesses, cures, and difficulties with the book we come to recognize a “cast” of witchcraft or suggest cures that have portraits or participants in the narratives. In that chapter Parsons relates her own 4, 1931, when she escaped from her room d.6 This volume, like the ethnographies, of Reichard and Underhill, constitutes the man’s point of view that blossomed during the next decades.7

In the Southwest continued through her her most important southwestern book, 8. In the latter the informants and observers, supplemented by a homogenous “ethno- with Boasian issues, particularly cultural the Hopi, the Zuni, the Tewa—becomes a base. Parsons’s voice becomes marginal. In this transformation of observation, is between ethnographer and native—in dialogical conditions—become textual—longer be understood as the communica-planation or description of custom need age ‘so and so said this.’ A textualized

ritual or event is no longer closely linked to the production of that event by specific actors. Instead, these texts become evidences of an englobing context, a ‘cultural reality.’8 In Pueblo Indian Religion the multiple voices and the person of Parsons as observer disappear, and the historical specificity of differing accounts is even more difficult to find in the footnotes.

We have come to the end of a long process. First, Parsons’s writing embodied a feminism that sought to generalize about women’s situations based on a juxtaposition of ethnographic example with Western custom. During the 1920s and into the 1930s her prose, in which Babcock sees the prefiguring of “poststructuralist” ethnography, focused on ethnographic particulars and incorporated a pastiche of contextualized observation, informant narration, descriptive vignettes concerning individuals, and the question/answer interrogation of consultants.9 And finally, many of her later publications exemplified a synthetic ethnology—one in which variability and culture contact are the theme but in which the dialogue between observer and informant is erased and the framework of Boasian culture history dominates.

This assessment would be incomplete if it did not emphasize Parsons’s important financial contributions. Without Parsons’s support, American anthropology and Southwest research would have been a much more piecemeal endeavor. For example, she paid Ester Goldfrank’s and Ruth Bunzel’s salaries as Boas’s secretaries in the early 1920s. She financed the research of Benedict, Bunzel, Reichard, Leslie White, and many others through the Southwest Society. She kept the Journal of American Folklife afloat and funded numerous other publications. Our sense of cultural variability and of the influence of the Spanish Conquest among the Pueblos owes much to Parsons’s research.

However, Parsons, like almost all of the other women in anthropology in the 1920s, never held a position within academy. Her wealth allowed her to travel and do fieldwork and fund the research of others; she remained a patron of anthropology rather than one who could shape its future through the direct training of students. Yet Parsons was hardly alone in her peripheral institutional position within anthropology. Gladys Reichard had a full-time position—but at an undergraduate college. Ruth Benedict was denied the position of chair of the Columbia University Anthropology Department and did not become a full professor until the year she died; Margaret Mead was peripheral at Columbia, shunted off to her tower office in the American Museum of Natural History. Even in the West, where there were a number of women in archaeology and in museum positions, only Florence Hawley Ellis held a full-time position in the 1920s or 1930s in the anthropology department at the University of New Mexico.

Parsons touched the lives of most of the women around Boas, whether by providing funds for their jobs or field research or by mentoring their anthropological work. Her role as a source of intellectual energy and financial support has been hidden behind that of Boas, whose leadership and institutional place have been continually affirmed by historians of anthropology. Only recently has Parsons’s role
reemerged, through the work of women scholars. Though there were cleavages (between those who remained more in the Boasian mold and those whose work fostered the emergence of the study of culture and personality), Parsons was key to the maintenance of the strong network of relations among women anthropologists at Columbia that flourished in the 1920s and 1930s. Yet for the most part Parsons's feminism remained a muted part of her ethnological writing, and the marginal positions of these women within anthropology limited their impact on the next generation of anthropologists.

The Reemergence of Feminism in the 1970s

When feminism reemerged in the 1970s as a political movement, it contained a critique of women's domestic roles that was reminiscent of the issues about which Parsons wrote: sexuality, marriage, motherhood, and the exclusion of women from the wider political sphere. Like Parsons in the teens, many of us were participating in several overlapping intellectual circles: consciousness-raising groups that probed the sexual politics of our personal lives and the history of the women's movement in America, antiwar-movement activities ranging from marches to study groups and conferences, and intellectual inquiry within the context of traditional departments and professional meetings. Many of these activities and the groups associated with them were centered on universities, but some feminists participated in women's health collectives and political organizations that had a community base.

For those of us who were instructors and assistant professors in universities it seemed important to put together our feminism and our academic interests. We set out to correct the "relative invisibility" of women and their treatment as "passive sexual objects, devoted mothers, and dutiful wives" by constructing courses on women in each of our disciplines.

Shelly Rosaldo, Jane Collier, and others taught one such course in anthropology at Stanford University in early 1971, and I taught one at Brown University in 1973. Simultaneously, women anthropologists were beginning to give scholarly papers on women's roles in areas of their own research. Our book, *Woman, Culture and Society*, emerged from the Stanford course, from papers delivered at the 1971 meeting of the American Anthropological Association in New York, and from our own network of female anthropologists.

My correspondence with Shelly Rosaldo between 1971 and 1973 reflects the way in which the framework and tone of *Woman, Culture and Society* evolved. Our initial impulse was to correct the male bias in anthropological writing by analyzing the viewpoint of women, to define the position of women in our own and other cultures, and to delineate the ways in which women are actors even in situations of subordination. The outline of our book we presented to publishers was one that examined women using a variety of topics: socialization and the family; women in the economy; women in society; politics and kinship; and beliefs, ideology, and symbolic culture.

Not until Rosaldo drafted the introduction to our book did the need for the theme of the book begin to shape the collection. Planners' articles at the front of the book, intended as an attempt to give the book a theoretical base, "Structure and Feminine Personality" and "Son, Family" section, and Ortner's article "In Praise of Pluralism," had been in the "Beliefs, Ideology and Social Structure" section, and Ortner's piece was moved forward. As a result, other projects were never completed. In the end we opted for topical and thematic organization were never completed. In the end we opted for topical and thematic organization.

Pushing forward with the universal approach to a book that would make a theoretical contribution, we were three essays that made broad ethnographic contributions. The tone of The Old-Fashioned Woman, Few It Takes, and Few It Takes documenting subordination, both Rosaldo and Ortner's pieces were moved forward. In the end we opted for topical and thematic organization.

Several passages written by Rosaldo and Ortner and constraint as Parsons's passages questioned cultural expressions of sexual asymmetry and Tchambuli (both studied by Margaret Mead). Among the Arapesh, she said,

"A wife was felt to be a "daughter" to her husband male ritual..." she was required to... women may control a good part of the economy in distant and important markets, yet must forego obedience. Even the Iroquois..." were not ruled out... be insatiate and depossess their rulers, but..."

In Rosaldo's view this asymmetry contributed to the opposition between a domestic sphere and a public sphere associated with men. This had consequences for the way in which the association of men with achievement and the association of women with achievement was mediated. Rosaldo drew parallels between Tuaregs in which they distance themselves from women and men.

"Tuaregs men have adopted the practice of..."... high status men wear their veils over their heads; women have no veils; and to assure his permit his lover to see his mouth. (In... that men wear their veil of a newspaper to protect their wives)."

LOUISE LAMPHRE
Not until Rosaldo drafted the introduction did the theme of universal subordination begin to shape the collection. Placing Nancy Chodorow's and Sherry Ortner's articles at the front of the book, immediately after her own article, was part of an attempt to give the book a theoretical coherence. Chodorow’s article “Family Structure and Feminine Personality” had initially been in the “Socialization and Family” section, and Ortner’s article “Is Female to Male as Nature Is to Culture?” had been in the “Beliefs, Ideology and Symbolic Culture” portion, at the end of the book. Ortner’s piece was moved forward partly because other articles in that section were never completed. In the end we gave up the idea of organizing the book into topical sections; instead, we grouped papers that complemented each other.

Pushing forward with the universal asymmetry theme and becoming committed to a book that would make a theoretical contribution meant that the introductory three essays made broad ethnographic comparisons. They echo the generalizing tone of The Old-Fashioned Woman, Fear and Conventionality, and Social Rule. In documenting subordination, both Rosaldo and Ortner focused on many issues cited by Parsons—exclusion, the taboos surrounding menstruation and childbirth, and sexual separation. They often juxtaposed examples from their society and cross-cultural examples.

Several passages written by Rosaldo contain the same emphasis on exclusion and constraint as Parsons’s passages quoted above. For example, in discussing cultural expressions of sexual asymmetry, Rosaldo contrasted the Arapesh and the Tchambuli (both studied by Margaret Mead) with the Yoruba and the Iroquois. Among the Arapesh, she said,

*A wife was felt to be a “daughter” to her husband, and at the time of the dominant male ritual . . . she was required to act like an ignorant child. . . Yoruba women may control a good part of the food supply, accumulate cash and trade in distant and important markets, yet when approaching their husbands, wives must ignore ignorance and obedience, kneeling to serve the men as they sit . . .

Even the Iroquois . . . were not ruled by women; there, powerful women might instate and depose their rulers, but Iroquois chiefs were men.

In Rosaldo’s view this asymmetry could best be explained by a social-structural opposition between a domestic sphere associated with women and a public sphere associated with men. This had consequences for the establishment of male authority and the association of men with achieved status. In making her point about authority Rosaldo drew parallels between Tuareg and American men in the ways in which they distance themselves from women and hence create authority:

*Tuareg men have adopted the practice of wearing a veil across the nose and mouth . . . high status men wear their veils more strictly than do slaves or vassals; women have no veils; and to assure his distance, no man is supposed to permit his lover to see his mouth. (In parts of American society, it would seem that men wear their veil of a newspaper in the subways and at breakfast with their wives).*
Ortner’s argument for universal asymmetry resorted less often to ethnographic example, but she detailed the case of the Crow to support her three criteria for subordination: explicit devaluing of women; implicit statements of inferiority, such as the attribution of defilement through symbolic devices; and social-structural arrangements that excluded women from contact with the highest powers of society.

In sum, the Crow are probably a fairly typical case. Yes, women have certain powers and rights, in this case some that place them in fairly high positions. Yet ultimately the line is drawn: menstruation is a threat to warfare, one of the most valued institutions of the tribe, one that is central to their self-definition; and the most sacred object of the tribe [the Sun Dance doll] is taboo to the direct sight and touch of women.7

Ortner’s explanation for women’s subordination was rooted in the association of men with culture that is highly valued, while women are universally seen as closer to nature and hence to be devalued.

Parsons’s writing echoes clearly in these articles. Not only am I struck by the same generalizing tone and the use of ethnographic example to bolster an argument about human universals, but Rosaldo and Ortner focus on many of the same issues—taboos, constraints, and exclusionary practices—often centering on women’s bodies, their sexuality, and their reproductive roles as mothers.

Although the first three articles of Woman, Culture and Society generated a great deal of controversy, they did represent a coherent theoretical position. Unlike Elsie Clews Parsons’s eclectic ethnological examples, underlain by a gesture toward a human propensity for boundaries, conventions, and constraints, our earlier theories assumed a framework that differentiated cultural, sociological, and psychological levels of explanation. For Rosaldo, Ortner, and Chodorow, woman’s role as mother played a central role in the explanation of universal asymmetry. Theoretical dichotomies like domestic/public and nature/culture helped to make sense of women’s roles at an analytical level absent from Parsons’s work. Those who were influenced by materialism had a clear sense of how to build a framework that suggested an economic explanation for social and cultural phenomena. Here Karen Sacks’s reworking of Engels’s theory and Rayna Reiter’s analysis of the historical creation of domestic and public spheres in France are the best examples.8 We were the inheritors of the integration of the work of Durkheim, Weber, and Marx into sociology and anthropology—an integration that had not yet shaped the sociology and anthropology of Parsons’s day.

Conclusions

The contrast between Parsons’s feminism and her ethnology and that of recent feminist anthropologists is partly an intellectual one. Boasian ethnography allowed a pastiche of observation, interrogation, and native accounts. Yet the framework into which Parsons put her data was one and to processes of diffusion and borrowing of a younger generation of anthropologists, Parsons remained in the Boasian culture.

The 1960s generation of female anthropologists had incorporated sociology—the intellectual climate, culture, social structure, and psyche—in Talcott Parsons’s synthesis, which included the work of those who taught social theory at Harvard, which social structure (derived from women) was widely read. And the implicit impact of the work, which shaped the training of graduates, was pervasive. More recently, postmodernism, particularly the work of Lacan, and Jacques Derrida, has taken on a feminist approach to feminist anthropology and has been influential in the tone set for a synthesis of these approaches.

But feminist anthropology in the 1960s was as much as just as Parsons’s views had been shared by the pacifism in the teens. Women did make great strides in higher education and had an impact on the academy, especially during the period when the need for research on women was perceived to be in the proper education of women never had to have a secure place in coeducational tenured professorships in the elite universities.

In contrast, the 1960s brought a reform of the 1970s, and the number of young female students, and the early 1970s. We were in a better position though knocking down these barriers had to be the case. The Vietnam War in shaping feminist anthropology, World War I was broken through by the Marxist and Communist scare, and rest, contributed to The Masses and to the movements in the 1920s. Finally, the United States was to a postwar era very different from the Vietnam had relatively little popular support which grew at the same time as the gay- and lesbian-rights movements increased, support from students and some academics, and material on these disenfranchised groups.
symmetry resorted less often to ethnographic data from the Crow to support her three criteria for women; implicit statements of inferiority, such as symbolic devices; and social-structural dissonance from contact with the highest powers of

"...by typical case. Yes, women have certain roles that place them in fairly high positions. Yet the role is a threat to warfare, one of the most important elements in the self-definition; and the sex Dance doll is taboo to the direct sight of the

...coordination was rooted in the association of women who are universally seen as closer than men. These articles. Not only am I struck by the ethnographic example to bolster an argument and Ortner focus on many of the same issues, but also on their reproductive roles as mothers.

...man, Culture and Society generated a great deal of theoretical position. Unlike Else's work, it is the key toward propositions, and constraints, our earlier theories of culture, sociological, and psychological, and Chodorow, woman's role as mother of universal asymmetry. Theoretical differences to culture helped to make sense of women's roles. Those who were influenced by this framework that suggested an empirical, rather than theoretical, approach. Here Karen Sacks's Reiter's analysis of the historical creation of the best example: We were the inheritors of Weber, and Marx into sociology had not yet shaped the sociology and into which Parsons put her data was one that gave primacy to the culture element and to processes of diffusion and borrowing. While Mead and Benedict—the younger generation of anthropologists—were differentiating the individual from culture, Parsons remained in the Boasian mold.

The 1960s generation of female anthropologists learned an anthropology that had incorporated sociology—the intellectual heritage of Marx, Weber, and Durkheim. Culture, social structure, and psychology were differentiated levels of analysis in Talcott Parsons's synthesis, which influenced Clifford Geertz, David Schneider, and others who taught social theory at Harvard University. British anthropology, in which social structure (derived from Durkheim) was the organizing tool, was widely read. And the implicit impact of Marx was filtered through Leslie White's work, which shaped the training of graduate students at the University of Michigan. More recently, postmodernism, particularly the work of Michel Foucault, Jacques Lacan, and Jacques Derrida, has taken us to a new stage, one in which French male theorists set the tone for a synthesis of cultural, social, and political-economic approaches.

But feminist anthropology in the 1970s was also shaped by social movements, just as Parsons's views had been shaped by progressive reform, feminism, and pacifism in the teens. Women did make inroads into the major universities as graduate students and had an impact on the way in which the social sciences dealt with some issues. However, suffrage and feminist progressive reform were peripheral to the academy, especially during the pre–World War I years. Feminist debates over the proper education of women never reformed the curriculum or focused on the need for more research on women per se. As I have emphasized, women themselves did not have a secure place in coeducational institutions, and they were not granted tenure in the elite universities.

In contrast, the 1960s brought a reformulation of anthropology graduate programs, and the number of young female Ph.D.'s on the job market had increased by the early 1970s. We were in a better position to take jobs at elite institutions, though knocking down these barriers has been a struggle, as I know from my own experience of Title VII suit against Brown University.

Equally, if not more important, are the differences between World War I and the Vietnam War in shaping feminist anthropology. The antiwar movement during World War I was broken through suppression of the Industrial Workers of the World, the Communist scare, and restrictions on immigration. The radicals who contributed to The Masses retired to private life and abandoned social-reform movements in the 1920s. Finally, the United States won World War I, contributing to a postwar era very different from the one that followed the Vietnam War. Vietnam had relatively little popular support and spawned a radical student movement which grew at the same time as participation in the minority-rights, feminist, and gay- and lesbian-rights movements increased. These movements had important support from students and some academics, who pushed to reform curricula to include material on these disenfranchised groups.
Despite the rightward movement of the United States in the 1980s, universities, much to dismay of the right wing, have remained havens for diverse scholarship. Even though students have turned to computer sciences, accounting, and engineering in many schools, women's studies and ethnic studies have survived, now with the support of sympathetic minority and female administrators.

These differences, both intellectual and political, have allowed feminist anthropology to establish a more central position within anthropology in general, as the Gender and Curriculum Project and the growing Association for Feminist Anthropology as a section within the American Anthropological Association indicate. The outpouring of scholarship on women will continue to bring feminism to the center of anthropology in a way in which Elsie Clews Parsons—given the intellectual and political constraints of her time—could not. This would reclaim the feminist heritage of Elsie Clews Parsons for anthropology—a fitting task for the next few decades of scholarship and research.
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