5. Brunvand, p. 4.
6. Elvira Adorno, "The Use of Folklore and Other Materials in the Motivation or Presentation of a Lesson," Italica 28 (June, 1951): 138.
7. Philip D. Jordan, "Folklore for the School," Social Education 15 (February, 1951): 59-63.
8. John F. Putnam, "Folklore: A Key to Cultural Understanding," Educational Leadership 21 (March, 1964): 364.
9. Elsa R. Berner and Julia Eriksen, "American Folklore: Good Reading in Lake Junior High," Clearing House 23 (October, 1948): 98.
10. Gerald Haslam, "America's Oral Literature: Our Forgotten Heritage," English Journal 60 (September, 1971): 709-723. Haslam's discussion of the value of oral narrative is excellent.
11. Note: A verbatim text from the tape would read like this: Ah, ah, my grandmother, ah, told us-er me the story about, etc. All the slips and false starts, etc. would be included. This has been cleaned up for the sake of clarity.

Carol Clark, teacher
Jordan High School
Sandy, Utah.

ON SUGG'S REVIEW OF BIRDWHISTELL'S KINESICS AND CONTEXT

Richard P. Sugg (Vol. VI, p. 55-56) does Folklore Forum readers a service by outlining the major, and certainly obvious, faults of Kinesics and Context as a book of Birdwhistell as a writer. Mr. Sugg also correctly surmises that the book does not provide a blueprint for the novice who would study body motion. He even demonstrates this point by inaccurately, and irrelevantly, criticizing Birdwhistell's "Sample Conversation with Description." Birdwhistell could describe a message such as 'this is pretending' in an exhaustive analysis. But the example cited by Mr. Sugg was written in 1952 prior to the kinesic frame-by-frame analysis of film, before the discovery of parakinesic markers, and was not intended to be complete. In kinesics, as in structural linguistics, one carefully specifies and maintains a level of analysis; appropriately, Birdwhistell did not consider every level in his illustration. Mr. Sugg's conclusions thus show his unfamiliarity with kinesics assumptions about meta-typing and the hierarchical structure of messages. He completely overlooks the kinesics approach to the question "why." But surely the essentials of discriminational meaning, free variation, and exhaustive analysis may sound like meaningless jargon to a reader fresh from Fast's Body Language. Others would do well to read Kinesics and Context chapters 26, 27, and 2--in that order--while remembering the lesson urged by Dorson in 1961: "Because the word 'folklore' is used so widely, all kinds of people pass judgment on folklore, when they would not dream of commenting on more recondited fields of learning." The same holds true for "body motion" and kinesics.

Thomas D. Blakely
Department of Anthropology
Northwestern University
Evanston, Illinois 60201