Folklore, Kinesiological Folklore, and the Macro-Folklore Complex

Gerald Cashion
Indiana University

For most folklorists basic concepts like folk, folklore, folk culture, folk society, and folklife serve as the guide for teaching and research. These concepts provide the focus for who and what the folklorist studies. It has been shown many times over that there is little agreement among us on such concepts which determine what the discipline consists of.[1] The goals of such study are a different matter. Broadly speaking we can say that, like all humanists, we seek to increase our knowledge and understaning of man. More specifically, we do different kinds of analyses, in search perhaps of the broader goal. These analyses may be functional, historical, sociological, structural, literary, psychological, artistic or aesthetic, maybe linguistic, occasionally economic, or a combination of one or more of these and others. But one thing is certain. There is nothing uniquely folkloristic about any of our analyses because we have not yet agreed on what constitutes folkloristic analysis. Even the Finnish method of reconstructing narative ur forms, now largely out of fashion among us, is a exercise in diffusionism known to many disciplines, not just folklore. While history used to be our guide, the role of tradition being our paramount interest, contemporary folklorists seem to be moving in different directions. Dan Ben-Amos not long ago suggested that we concern ourselves less with tradition and more with artistic communication, for him the real essence of folklore. Th e traditionality of folklore, he said, is an analytical construct of the scholar because people are not always conscious of the traditional aspects of their behavior. The communicative process is posited as what we should be directing our attention to.[2] There seems to be much agreement with this view.

It's clear, however, that there are two problems we have yet to solve: first, the who, what, when, where, why, and how of folklore--what it is, who uses it, bears its, transmits it, discards it, conserves it, when and where and why these processes occur, and how they occur; and secondly, determining what kinds of analyses may be suitably applied to the content and processes of folklore which are uniquely folkloristic. I may be accused here of disciplinary chauvinism, but I'm in no way proposing that there be no transdisciplinary communication or collaboration. I'm merely suggesting that folklorists formulate their field of endeavor so that nothing they think is important may be academically ignored. The study of folklore is gaining institutional acceptance and to be able to claim such bases from which to operate we need to counter such arguments as: If folk architecture is to be studied, why shouldn't the architectural historian do it? Isn't folk art the realm of the art historian, if not now, perhaps in the future? Shouldn't folk narrative be the specialty of the literary scholar? Wouldn't folk music be a particular forte of the specialized musicologist? In the past we have responded, correctly, that the subjects of our study have been ignored by other established disciplines. This is no longer the case. Linguists now study many of the oral forms that only folklorists used to bother with. Historians, especially in Africa, are using oral narratives to write histories. Musicologists study jazz and blues. And so the inevitable question arises: What is it that folklorists do that is different from what other scholars do with the same materials?

Within the limitations of the next few pages, I'm going to be concerned with the first problem that I have posed, leaving the second for future consideration. Mind you, my comments here are legitimately labeled preliminary. I invite enlightenment and criticism to help me refine my thinking. A review of some of our current constructs is now in order.

Folk is probably the most critical concept that we use. Folklorists formerly held that folk referred to a simple, rural, homogeneous, uneducated people. This is an old view which we trace to Herder for its authenticity and to substantiate our own scholarly pedigree as well. This idea of folk was solidified in the nineteenth century evolutionary thinking of Comte and Tylor, wherein the folk became a stage in the development of mankind, a societal and cultural plateau. This kind of thinking, which I regret to say has not entirely died out, allowed twentieth century folklorists, anthropologists, and sociologists to delineate the focus of their scholarly interest--their human subjects--by level of development. Thus folklorists took the folk, anthropologists in the service of imperialism turned to the less-developed primitive peoples, and sociologists studied the more developed modern peoples. For us, the idea of folk was probably best expressed by Robert Redfield's article "The Folk Society" which comprehensively outlines such attributes as I have mentioned earlier.[3] Today most folklorists explicitly reject such limitations of folk, embracing instead Alan Dundes' notion of folk as "any group of people whatsoever who share at least one common factor," no matter what the linking factor might be and even if the group is comprised of only two people.[4]

Folklore, another important concept, is what the folk have that we are interested in. While there are likely some dissenters, most folklorists think that folklore is something transmitted orally in a stylized form which is known to have existed at some prior time in a similar but variant form. Some folklorists, it is true, accept other than oral forms as constituting folklore, but the majority study only oral forms, embracing Francis Utley's definition of folklore as folk literature which is itself only an elaboration of Bascom's verbal art.[5] If you question this, look at the journals. How often does an essay treat a non-oral form? Yet even Thoms in his 1846 statement, though acknowledging the oral transmission of much folklore, wrote that it (folklore) is "more a Lore than a Literature."[6] And it is easy enough to determine what he meant by "Lore" by looking at the dictionaries then current.

Folklore among folk in a folk society has begun to present a problem for folklorists. There are few homogeneous societies left. Henry Glassie has noted that although folk societies, in the Redfieldian sense, are slowly being eradicated, folk culture is not dying. He suggests that we turn our attention to the individual bearer of folk culture.[7] Folk culture is a concept that seems to be gaining adherents among folklorists who want to study more than oral forms (usually considered synonymous with folklore). They would justifiably study any part of culture which can be labeled with an adjectival folk. Folk in this adjectival case, readily apparent by a space between the adjective folk and the noun it modifies, is seemingly intended to mean traditional--those aspects of culture, for Glassie, which are considered old or old-timey by their bearers. These traits of folk culture cannot be part of the popular ("mass, normative") or the academic ("elite, progressive") cultures.[8] Using such a concept as folk culture, we could engage in studies of folk crafts, folk architecture, folk poetry, folk cookery, folk drama--indeed, folk anything as long as by folk we mean traditional. But this breaks down when scholars begin to use the term "folk traditions" indicating that the focus is not on conservative people in society, but toward a relatively less educated, more homogeneous, less monied, particular niche.[9] We come right back to the old

concept of folk as a level of society or culture, but in neo-evolutionary terms--folk, popular, elite, the primitive of course always being below the folk.

What of folklife? This is a concept put forth mainly by European scholars. In recent years it has begun to take hold among American folklorists. We can point to the Scandanavians as the originators of organized folklife study, beginning formally with the opening of the Skansen museum in 1891.[10] The archives at Uppsala serve as the model for those of the Irish Folklore Commission. Sigurd Erixson founded the journal FolkLiv in 1937, incorporating in its pages his idea of regional European ethnology--the study of peasant life. German-speaking scholars had long been studying all aspects of peasant life under the conceptual umbrella of volkskunde. In the 1960s Richard Weiss, in his introduction to Volkskunde der Schweiz, explained that European scholars have now abandoned the two-level idea of society (the folk and the elite) and today operate according to the theory that folk cultural traits exist in varying degrees in every member of society.[11]

In Britain the notion of folklife arose as a response, similar to the adoption of folk culture as a central concept by folklorists in the United States. People interested in studying material forms were dissatisfied with the exclusive preoccupation of the members of the Folk-Lore Society with oral forms. At a time when the idea of folklife was gaining adherents, in the mid-fifties, the outgoing president of the Folk-Lore Society, Sona Rosa Burstein, remarked in her presidential address, "...if I were examining a candidate for a diploma in folklore, I should unhesitatingly fail one who included material objects in the definition" of folklore . She stated further that she could not "subscribe to calling furniture and agricultural instruments lore, however rich a fund of lore may attach to them," proclaiming that "lore may be attached to material things but it is not iself a material thing."[12] She is precisely right but for the the wrong reasons. The very same statement can be made in regard to oral forms. Folklore may attach to them but folklore is not itself oral.

The most prominent practitioners of folklife study in the British Isles are geographers who are usually connected with open air museums, called folk museums, modeled after Skansen. The rationale for the involvement of the geographer is the study of the landscape and man's alteration of it--with structures, tools, and machines and their traditional uses. Lip service is paid to the idea that folklife is a macro-discipline which includes folklore, but the emphasis is decidedly on material things.[13] As J. Geraint Jenkins puts it, "Folklife studies seek to trace the personality of the various regions of the world expressed in material culture."[14] And he explains that the folk museum, which has been the real medium for folklife studies, is supposed "to take the visitor out of his present-day environment and straight to the people that lived in some by-gone age." Jenkins also considered the problem of folk and its relation to folklife. Folklife, he wrote, overcomes the doubtful overtones of folk because of its new view. The folk are no longer simply hewers of wood who cling to antiquated customs and live in thatched houses. Instead, "folk" now refers to "all levels of society" and "signifies the complete way of life of a community," incorporating every stratum.[15]

Folklife as it relates to Americans has been defined by the writers of the American Folklife Bill (SB 1844), now pending in the Senate:

> As used in this Act--the term "American Folklife" means the traditional customs, beliefs, dances, songs, tales, sayings, arts, crafts, and other expressions of the spirit common to a group of people within any area of the United States, and includes music (vocal and instrumental), dance, drama, lore, beliefs, language, humor, handicraft, painting, sculpture, architecture, other forms of creative or artistic expressions, and skills related to the preservation, presentation, performance, and exhibition of the cultural heritage of any family, ethnic, religious, occupational racial, regional, or other grouping of American people.[16]

It's clear in this definition that the professional folklorists who assisted in its formulation considered lore to be oral. It is also apparent that they were not able to define the essence of what they call folklife. They had to resort to a Dundes-like enumerative definition. Folklife in this case seems to be just about the same thing as the folk culture I mentioned earlier. I would hazard the guess that, as Bascom has pointed out,[17] since anthropologists use the term "folk culture" differently and since "culture" has historically been the unifying concept for socio-cultural anthropology, folklorists thought they had to come up with a new term--thus folklife.

There are thus several problems inherent in our conceptual guides. "Folk" can be an adjective meaning traditional, or a noun meaning people in the Jenkins sense, or any group sharing a common linking factor in the Dorson-Dundes-Brunvard sense. Any one of these usages would be fine, but few folklorists are at all consistent in their usage. I maintain that "folk" always returns to the common pejorative usage--that is, to a poor, less educated, so-called backward level of society or culture exemplified by a particular group of people chosen by the folklorist for his research intent. And what is more, Albert Lord has noted that outside the folklorists' circle, the term almost always has a derogatory connotation.[18]

Beyond the problem of folk, we have to deal with folklore and folklife. Does the one refer to oral forms and the other material forms? Does one incorporate the other? And if so, which should we use?

Sona Burstein was on the mark when she said that folklore might be attached to material things but is not itself a material thing. Neither, however, is it oral. It seems that we are forever confusing folklore with the forms by which it is manifested. An early definition describes folklore as "the total mass of traditional matter present in the mind of a given people at any given time."[19] This notion of folklore has been equated with the body of non-biological inherited material that determines the behavior of people--in effect, with culture.[20] An African scholar, S. A. Babalola of the University of Lagos, has recently described folklore as "the sum total of the traditional knowledge of a people," noting also that "oral literature is just part of folklore."[21] Herbert Halpert has suggested that folklore is everything we learn that we don't get out of books.[22] William Bascom, explaining that to him folklore is much more than simply verbal art, has defined folklore as "folk learning" which includes "all knowledge that is transmitted by word of mouth and all crafts and other techniques that are learned by imitation or example, as well as the products of these crafts."[23] He casts a wide net indeed. And of course, we have Ben-Amos' characterization of folklore as artistic communication in face to face interaction.

There are several difficulties with all these statements. What is traditional is an ever present problem, as is what constitutes "folk" learning. Distinguishing the single experiences of individual persons from folklore is a problem. For Bascom to include all orally-transmitted knowledge without many other qualifying factors is not defensible. He would thus include the relation of an individual experience under this rubric, though not the untransmitted idiosyncratic experience, and Halpert would seem to include any non-academic learning experience, even learning the next door neighbor's address, for example. Folklife remains inadequately defined, as evidenced by its conceptual connection with the study of material things and its possible confusion with folk culture as used by anthropologists. Further, nobody in our field calls himself a folklifist.

Ken Ketner, in a paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Folklore Society, noted the many pejorative usages the word folklore suffers from--most commonly synonymous with "untruth"--at the hands of the public, academics and professional people, sometimes even folklorists.[24] Ketner suggests that we drop the word folklore from our academic vocabularies, rather than have our discipline's subject characterized by such bad connotations.

My position is the complete opposite. For 120 years "folklore" has been the word that covers everything we are interested in. Unlike Ketner, I find that most people I ask describe folklore as a special kind of knowledge, not necessarily true or false. Rather than drop "folklore" from our academic vocabulary, I would rejuvenate it, make it the focal point of all our studies, and instead drop such terms as folk, folk culture, and folklife in spite of their current popularity. Such a rejuvenation is a kind of "back to the roots" movement, I believe, and must begin with continued attempts at defining folklore and its related concepts. Folklore would again mean knowledge, not of the folk or a folk but of people (meaning more than one) of any class or culture. To be sure, we need to qualify this further because folklore is indeed a special kind of knowledge.[25] A simple definition is this: Folklore is knowledge that is transmitted by an essentially unwritten means across at least one generation. This arbitrarily defines the temporal depth of what is traditional as a minimum span of at least one generation. It eliminates the problem of group because transmission assumes at least two people--a sender and a receiver. Group has always been an accidental construct of folklorists. Areal distribution is thus mainly important because we demand that at least two people share folklore across a generation, as a father might pass his knowledge on to his son. Take note that "essentially unwritten" does not means "essentially oral." This is a problem that has long plagued us. What is oral, in many instances but not in every case, is one means of transmission. This definition of folklore thus overcomes the problem of such an example as autograph verse which is encapsulated in the written form, because in this case the texture of the verse is not what the folklore is all about. What is folkloric is the entire scene--trading the books, writing neat things about one's peers, chuckling over a friend's remarks about you, and years later being able to recall the entire event as a sort of rite of passage. What is important then is not the texture of the text but the entire context, not the written verse but the event.[26] Considering folklore to be transmitted by an essentially unwritten means allows us to admit that certain folkloric events, like those involving autograph verse or grafitti, culminate in but include much more than just the written word. Would the oral transmission of a fashionable joke, say a Watergate joke, qualify as folklore under this scheme? If we consider content only, the answer might be negative. But the

structure of the joke, the style of telling, the traditional idioms or metaphors, the setting, the intent of the teller, and the response of the listener could all be aspects of folklore. The same might hold true for a bluegrass or rock performance. While the music itself might be a recent creation, there are many other aspects of the event that can be scrutinized by the folklorists and this is true whether the performance be live or media-transmitted. Obviously the media-transmitted performance, broadcast or recorded, eliminates the important fact of performer-audience interaction. The point here is that we can pick out aspects of folklore in probably every instance of human behavior. We will stop trying to classify either content or process as entirely folkloric or non-folkloric and look instead at the components that constitute the instant or occasion when transmission or reception takes place.

This final note about the definition of folklore is needed. While I'm not concerned here with the necessary and precise terminology of communication theory, the fact remains that if folklore is transmitted there is a concomitant apprehension, or reception. Though I might speak figuratively of artifacts as transmitters, the senders and receivers are people. If, for example, a person in West Africa apprehends a mask which transmits in its visage symbols and values understood by the viewer, then the mask itself is a material transmitter of folklore even though the existence of the mask depends on its maker, and by extension on its users and on the society which generates its meanings. The focus of our folklore study must thus be two-fold: on content, the stuff of transmission, and on process which is transmission and apprehension.

If folklore is mental--ideational--how can we study it? My feeling is that we can study it only through its manifestations, that is, through transmission and apprehension. Folklore can only be transmitted by means of one or more of three possible forms: orally, materially, or by motor habit or other body motion or control. For the purpose of this discussion I'm considering speech as an oral means and not as body motion. Orally-transmitted folklore, which I will hereafter shorten to the less cumbersome "oral folklore," is received aurally. Material folklore (i.e., materially-transmitted folklore) is constituted of perhaps any material object, from handtool to house, and can be apprehended visually, tactily in the case of a sculpture, gustatorily or olfactorily in the case of cuisine. Folklore that is transmitted through body motion or control I am going to henceforth refer to as kinesiological folklore (that is, the short form for kinesiologically-transmitted folklore). Specifically, this refers to the folklore we can study through "motion which is characterized by the movements of human beings and those objects which are influenced directly by human motivation."[27] You may be asking yourself, why not simply kinesic instead of kinesiological? The reason is this. Kinesics, especially in the work of Ray Birdwhistell, has usually referred to non-verbal body communication, called body language in the popular press.[28] "Kinesiological" subsumes "kinesic" in that is covers not only such non-verbal body communication, but also includes the motion exhibited by the technique of a craftsman, the playing style (notmusical style) of a musician, dance, and audience reaction as well. Additionally, kinesiological folklore would include the fluid but not the fixed proxemic dimension of body motion or control--man's use of space--that regulates, for example, the distance we keep ourselves from each other.[29] Bear in mind, however, that for motion to be considered as transmitting or apprehending kinesiological folklore the general requirements that I set forth in the definition of folklore must be met.

The realm of material folklore incorporates the fixed proxemic dimension. The material form is indeed a transmitter of folklore whether the form be a house or other kind of structure, a piece of sculpture like the African mask, a tool, a musical instrument, a field layout, a fence, a boat, or culinary creation. A home laid out in an architect's blueprints would not ordinarily fit

the definition of folklore, but if the majority of rooms turned out to be 16' x 16' in size and the use and arrangement appeared quite traditional, we might have to conclude that many elements of the design incorporate aspects of folklore. When we record such material examples and arrange them by type or style, we also need to investigate the oral and kinesiological folklore that goes with them.

Let me illustrate. If we focus on a musical event there is much that we need to include. The vocal aspect of the music would obviously fall into the realm of folklore trasnmitted orally and received aurally. The same holds true for oral audience response of any kind, which indicates the interaction of performars and audience. The instrument, the manner of dress, the physical arrangement of performer and audience, other equipment, even perhaps the building in which the performance takes place, or the outdoor setting, might be considered to be transmitting folklore materially. The performance itself, say the style of bowing, blowing, beating, picking or strumming, bodily posture, and audience response by clapping, dancing, or throwing things are all aspects of folklore transmitted kinesiologically. We have to be aware of all of this. I think of the entire scene as a macro-folklore complex toward which the folklorist has to fashion a holistic approach. Although the folklorist's primary interest might in this case be in the music, he should be investigating musical folklore--in all its varied transmissions and receptions during the event--rather than simply folk music.

Another example which will help illustrate involves a house. As in the prior example where the folklorist's main interest is in the music, in this one the main interest is in the house as the focal point of an explanation of human behavior. All the pertinent features of the house must be recorded--height, floor plan, construction materials, apertures, appendages, decoration, and furniture arrangement. We can consider decoration and furniture arrangement as constituting the fluid proxemic dimension of the house, and the other more permanent features as part of the fixed proxemic dimension. Besides these features we also need to know the technique of construction--how the house was built. In the case of a very old house we might not be able to determine the exact technique used. The best way, of course, to record technique is to view it. Such technique exhibits kinesiological folklore. In addition, folklore is transmitted orally in instructions passed from master to apprentice or from foreman to laborer. Most of us know that there is a proper way to hold a hammer, that there is an efficient way to use a shovel, and that there is a particular technique to pacing oneself while doing heavy work. We normally learn these things from other people and not through idiosyncratic experience. Other sources of folklore connected with a house are its residents, past and present, and the people and other homes nearby. Here again, we can use the three-way approach. Oral folklore will come from interviews, kinesiological folklore from a demonstration of remembered technique, and material folklore from other dwellings. Archival and library research will yield further insight, providing perhaps the diachronic connections that are a necessary part of folklore study.

One last example should help explain the macro-folklore complex. Robert Jerome Smith, describing affective response as the meaningful apprehension of a particular folklore genre, uses the Peruvian festival to show the intricacy of traditional behavior.[30] Dancing between people of different ages and sexes, shooting skyrockets, playing reeds and flutepipes, singing, parading, describing miracles, and penances and past fiestas, and explaining the importance of the patron saint are some of the many acts that constitute the fiesta. Let me hypothetically pick out one person to illustrate the simultaneous transmission of oral, kinesiological,

and material folklore. Bear in mind that anyone participating in the face to face interaction that constitutes the festival, the kind of interaction that characterizes Ben-Amos' thinking, is both a sender and a receiver. My choice is a costumed individual who is both singing and dancing. Materially-transmitted folklore is embodied in the costume, surely traditional in design and adornment. Orally-transmitted folklore is apparent in the song. Kinesiologically-transmitted folklore can be seen in the dance. The viewer-listener is likely reinforcing the traditionality of the occasion by being appropriately dressed for the occasion, by responding vocally, and by swaying or clapping or even dancing. There are a multitude of other things happening and it is probably impossible to account for everything. What folklore we can account for is only what is manifested. This includes what we can ask about retrospectvely. As Smith points out, we cannot measure response if it never leaves the mind, if it does not result in some act.

What I am calling for is a consideration of folklore as knowledge which we can only study through a complex of manifestations.[31] I suggest that folklore, the subject of our study, is the core concept of our discipline. As a key concept it is no less inclusive than is creative writing for literature, language for linguistics, culture for anthropology, society for sociology, or polity for political science. Folklore is thus the macro-discipline which allows each of us, according to our inclinations, to specialize, not in folk literature but in literary folklore, not in folk architecture but in architectural folklore, not in folk music but in musical folklore, approaching whatever interests we have in a macro-fashion which seeks to account for all the folkloric manifestations that constitute a complex whole. While we may pick out single aspects of a macro-folklore complex for special consideration, such as narrative structure or singing style or house type, we should record the entire complex whenever it is possible to do so. Admittedly, the scheme that I have described is a construct, but if it helps us understand and explain human behavior a little better than our current approaches do, it may be worth refining. I invite your commentary in future issues of the Forum.

NOTES

1. For example, consult the twenty-one definitions of folklore offered in the Funk and Wagnall's Standard Dictionary of Folklore, Mythology, and Legend, ed., Maria Leach and Jerome Fried (New York, 1949-50, 2 vols.), albeit several of these were posited by writers interested in folklore but whose first loyalties were to other disciplines. It seems to me that Melville Herskovits confronted the problem and initiated the modern controversy over folklore's scope in his 1946 presidential address to the American Folklore Society. In it he exhorted folklorists to henceforth concentrate on oral data so as not to confuse their field of study with that of anthropologists. See "Folklore After a Hundred Years: A Problem in Redefinition," Journal of American Folklore 59 (1946): 283-90; Herskovits' students at Northwestern, Richard Waterman and William Bascom, followed the Herskovits line in their contributions to the Leach dictionary in which they introduced the term "verbal art." One of the first respondents to this narrow idea of the scope of folklore was Samuel Bayard in "The Materials of Folklore," Journal of American Folklore 66 (1953): 1-15; Bascom further explained his idea is "Verbal Art," Journal of American Folklore 68 (1955): 245-52; compare this with his recently published "Folklore, Verbal Art, and Culture," Journal of American Folklore 86 (1973): 374-81, although this was an oral address to the American Folklore Society originally given in 1965. More recently, Dan

Ben-Amos' attempt at definition, "Toward a Definition of Folklore in Context," in Americo Paredes and Richard Bauman, ed., Toward New Perspectives in Folklore (Austin: University of Texas Press for the American Folklore Society, 1972), originally delivered in an earlier version to the 1967 meeting of the American Folklore Society, brought forth disagreement from Roger Welsh in "A Note on Definitions," Journal of American Folklore 81 (1968): 262-64. This generated Richard Bauman's "Toward a Behavioral Theory of Folklore: A Reply to Roger Welsh," Journal of American Folklore 82 (1969): 167-70.

2. Ben-Amos, "Toward a Definition," pp. 12-14; also his "Toward a Componential Model of Folklore Communication," pp. 309-11 in Proceedings of the VII International Congress of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences Vol. II, Ethnology (Tokyo: Science Council of Japan, 1968).

3. Robert Redfield, "The Folk Society," American Journal of Sociology 52 (1947): 293-308.

4. Alan Dundes, The Study of Folklore (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall 1965), p. 2; see also his "The Devolutionary Premise in Folklore Theory," Journal of the Folklore Institute 6 (1969): 5-19, especially n. 34.

5. Compare Utley's "Folk Literature: An Operational Definition," Journal of American Folklore 74 (1961): 193-206, reprinted in Dundes, The Study of Folklore, with Bascom's "Verbal Art" and Herskovits' "Folklore After a Hundred Years."

6. William Thoms, reprinted in Dundes, The Study of Folklore, pp. 4-6.

7. Henry Glassie, Pattern in the Material Folk Culture of the Eastern United States (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, paper edition, 1971), pp. 4-5.

8. Glassie, Pattern, pp. 5-7.

9. This applies to folklorists, but also to geographers and anthropologists who study "folk" things. Their use of "folk" is almost always indicative of a level of culture of society. For example, dealing with architectural traditions, Charles Gritzner, a geographer, discusses "folk tradition" as it relates to "folk architecture." In this case it's mostly poor people using whatever materials they can get their hands on. See "Construction Materials in a Folk Housing Tradition: Considerations Governing Their Selection in New Mexico," Pioneer America 6 (1974): 25-39; John Greenway characterizes folk culture as "an unsophisticated homogeneous group" in a work whose title betrays his prejudices, Literature Among the Primitives (Hatboro, Penna.: Folklore Associates, 1964), p. xii; Norbert Reidl describes folk culture as the "unconscious, unreflective, traditional behavior, yet an integral part of the life way of a people." See his "folklore vs. 'Volkskunde'," Tennessee Folklore Society Bulletin 21 (1965): 47-53; see also Reidl's "Folklore and the Study of Material Aspects of Folk Culture," Journal of American Folklore 79 (1966): 557-63.

10. See J. Geraint Jenkins, "The Use of Artifacts and Folk Art in the Folk Museum," pp. 497-516 in Folklore and Folklife: An Introduction, ed. Richard M. Dorson (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1972).

11. Cited in Norbert Reidl, "Folklore and the Study of Material Aspects," p. 557.

12. Sona Rosa Burstein, "George Lawrence Gomme and the Science of Folklore," Folk-Lore 68 (1957): 321-38, especially 334-35.

13. E. Estyn Evans, "The Cultural Geographer and Folklife Research," in Dorson, Folklore and Folklife. Ronald H. Buchanan in "Geography and Folk Life," Folk Life 1 (1963): 5-15 never even mentions folklore. See also Karl A. Sinnhuber, "On the Relations of Folklore and Geography," Folk-Lore 68 (1957): 385-404; and for an earlier discussion Henry Balfour, "The Geographical Study of Folklore," Folk-Lore 35 (1924): 16-25.

14. Jenkins, "The Use of Artifacts," p. 505; in an earlier essay, "Field-Work and Documentation in Folk-Life Studies," Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland 90 (1960): 259-271, Jenkins quoted Iowerth Peate's definition of folklife as the "study of the way of life of communities and of nations which are comparatively unaffected by a high degree of industrialization; Alexander Fenton in an article entitled "An Approach to Folklife Studies,"Keystone Folklore Quarterly 12 (1967): 5-21, writes, 'Folklife is a particular approach to historical studies, and detailed research into material culture, which is basic to the subject, can provide a concrete gauge against which the varied patterns of human activity, in time and in place, can be measured.' Also see Don Yoder, "The Folklife Studies Movement," Pennsylvania Folklife 13 (1963): 43-56; Dorson, in his introduction to Folklore and Folklife, opposes "oral folklore" with "physical folklife."

15. Jenkins, "The Use of Artifacts," pp. 497-98, 510.

16. A copy of the proposal is readily obtainable from your congressmen and senators. Every folklorist should examine the bill himself but for a published appraisal see Thomas Adler, "The American Folklife Center: A Personal Examination and Appraisal of the Idea," Folklore Forum 6 (1973): 242-45.

17. William Bascom, "Folklore, Verbal Art, and Culture," p. 379. Bascom writes: "Unfortunately, however, the term 'folk culture' has already been pre-empted by social scientists to refer to the cultures of the peasant folk of Europe and of American Indian enclaves in Latin American societies. Some folklorists with a penchant for defining folklore in terms of peasant folk may find this congenial, but I do not. For one thing, in some ways folklore is narrower than folk culture, because the culture of peasant groups is at least partially transmitted by writing and formal education now and will become increasingly so in the future. In other ways folklore is far broader, as it refers to all features of culture, in nonliterate as well as literate societies, which are transmitted verbally or by example."

18. Albert Lord, The Singer of Tales, (New York: Atheneum, Paper edition, 1971), pp. 6-7.

19. Franz Boas, "The Mind of Primitive Man," Journal of American Folklore 14 (1901): 1-11, see especially, pp. 2-3.

20. George W. Stocking interprets the Boas definition this way. See "Franz Boas and the Culture Concept in Historical Perspective," in Race, Culture, and Evolution: Essays in the History of Anthropology (New York: The Free Press, 1968), pp. 224-25.

21. Gerald Cashion, "A Conversation with S. A. Babalola," pp. 63-69 in Studies in Yoruba Folklore, ed. John M. Vlach (Bloomington: Folklore Forum Bibliographical and Special Series No. 11, 1973).

22. Herbert Halpert, "Folklore and Newfoundland: An Informal Introduction to the Materials and Methods of Folklore," Papers of the Bibliographical Society of Canada 8 (1969): 10-22; compare this characterization of folklore with Roger Abraham's definition of folklore as "all traditional expressions and implementations of knowledge operating within a community," in "Personal Power and Social Restraint in the Definition of Folklore," pp. 16-30, Americo Paredes and Richard Bauman, ed., Toward New Perspectives in Folklore.

23. William Bascom, "Folklore, Verbal Art, and Culture," p. 376.

24. Kenneth L. Ketner, "A Preliminary Survey of the Grammar of 'Folklore': An Introduction to Hominology," published in the Folklore Students Association Preprint Series, No. 5. Editor's Note: The version included in this volume has been revised by the author.

25. For a discussion of knowledge that has relevance for folklorists, see Georges Gurvitch, The Social Frameworks of Knowledge (New York: Harper & Row Torchback edition, 1971), Chapter 4 of the Introduction, "Types and Forms of Knowledge"; also The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge by Peter L. Berger and Thomas Luckmann (New York: Doubleday, Anchor Books edition, 1967), especially pp. 1-46.

26. Alan Dundes discusses this problem in "Texture, Text, and Context," Southern Folklore Quarterly 28 (1964): 251-265; Dan Ben-Amos also considers it in "Toward a Definition," pp. 10-11; also see Robert Georges' handling of event in "Toward an Understaning of Storytelling Events," Journal of American Folklore 82 (1969): 313-28.

27. Kinesiology is a term used mostly by biomechanicists and physiologists. Notwithstanding, Brunvand's objections to borrowing words from other disciplines (See "New Directions for the Study of American Folklore," Folk-Lore 82 (1971): 25-35), kinesiological folklore seems to be the term needed to characterize folklore we can study through motion. The quotation I have cited in defining kinesiological folklore is from David L. Kelley, Kinesiology: Fundamentals of Motion Description (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1971), p. 6. See also Alice L. O'Connell and Elizabeth B. Gardner, Understanding the Scientific Bases of Human Movement (Baltimore: The Williams and Wolkins Co., 1972), especially pp. vii and 1 in which they distinguish between kinetics and kinematics, the latter being simply the description of motion. There is no doubt that kinesiological folklore is transmitted and I should mention here, by way of example, John Messenger's slide and motion picture presentation of the Black Irish of Montserrat to social scientists in Dublin who expressed amazement at the distinctively Irish movements displayed by the Black Irish. See "The Influence of the Irish in Montserrat," Caribbean Quarterly 13 (1967): 3-26.

28. See Ray L. Birdwhistell, Kinesics and Context: Essays on Body Motion Communication (New York: Ballantine Books edition, 1972), especially chapter 26, "Body motion," pp. 217-88.

29. Edward T. Hall is the expert in the field of proxemics. See his distinguished work, The Hidden Dimension (New York: Doubleday & Co., Anchor edition, 1969).

30. Robert Jerome Smith, "The Structure of Esthetic Response," pp. 68-79 in Americo Paredes and Richard Bauman, eds., Toward New Perspectives in Folklore.

31. Robert Farris Thompson, it seems to me, has attempted a study quite similar to what I have in mind. In an important new work African Art in Motion (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1974), Thompson seeks to integrate the study of the icon, the sculptural art form, with attitudes expressed in other forms--dance, music, costume, posture--to arrive at an understanding of the aesthetics that generate the shaping of the sculptural form. We would do well to emulate Thompson's methods, whether or not we agree with his conclusions.