

References Cited

The First Americans: Search and Research.

1991 edited by Tom D. Dillehay and David J. Meltzer CRC Press, Boca Raton.

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5334/bha.04104>

Hidden Scholars: Woman Anthropologists and the Native American Southwest, edited by Nancy J. Parezo. Foreword by Nathalie F. S. Woodbury and Richard B. Woodbury. University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque. 1993. \$47.50. xxii + 429pp., references cited, index (Cloth).

by

Jonathan E. Reyman

University of Illinois, Urbana

A public conference followed by a scholarly symposium was held at Tucson, AZ in March 1986. Co-sponsored by the Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research, The Southwest Institute for Research on Women, the Arizona State Museum, and the Department of Anthropology and the Southwest Center at the University of Arizona, "Daughters of the Desert" brought together more than 20 scholars to discuss the history of women in southwestern anthropology. The conference included an exhibit with an illustrated catalogue: *Daughters of the Desert* (Babcock and Parezo 1988). Now, with the publication of *Hidden Scholars: Woman Anthropologists and the Native American Southwest*, we have, as the Woodburys state in their Foreword, "a comprehensive survey of southwestern anthropology" (ix) with an expanded history and biographical profiles of some 50-60 of the most important of the more than 1,600 women who have worked in southwestern anthropology.

This volume appears when there is renewed interest in the history of anthropology, the history of women within anthropology (especially American anthropology), and the issue of gender in archaeological research. Recent symposia and conferences have focused on these topics, e.g., "Women in Archaeology: The Second Annual Symposium on the History of American Archaeology" held at the 54th Annual Meeting of the Society for American Archaeology (April 1989), and the entire 22nd Annual Chaco Conference (November 1989).

Hidden Scholars is a welcome addition to the growing literature on the history of anthropology. It contains a long Preface by Parezo, 16 essays by various authors, and a lengthy concluding essay, also by Parezo. This is a big book - almost 375 double-column pages of text - and yet one wishes it were even bigger: so much is left unsaid, so many important women and their contributions are not discussed (the book focuses on the 1880-1945 period, with some discussion of post-World War II scholars) that at least another 375 pages would be needed for adequate coverage of the subject matter.

Nancy Parezo asks in her Preface (xiii), "Who can work in the Southwest and not refer to at least one site report or ethnography by a woman anthropologist?" The question is rhetorical, but the answer is, unfortunately, that some can and have done so, e.g., McGregor 1941, and others hardly consider women at all, e.g., Taylor 1948; Willey and Sabloff 1974, 1980 (see Reyman 1992 for a fuller discussion of this issue). Parezo's point, however, is well taken: it ought not be possible; that it has been, and all too frequently, validates the book's title, *Hidden Scholars*. Women in the Southwest, as elsewhere, have not received the recognition and attendant rewards (faculty positions, promotions, tenure, financial equity) that they deserve based on their accomplishments.

Parezo's essay, "Anthropology: The Welcoming Science," in many ways defines the framework for the papers that follow it. Although anthropology was receptive to women (3), women's participation was still limited. Parezo (17-29) cites seven specific barriers that prevented the full participation of women in anthropology: The Structure of Anthropology and the Academy; Education; Finding a Job; Low Status and Nontenured Positions; Jobs in Nonprestigious Departments and Institutions; Teaching Assignments; and Publishing, Obtaining Resources, and Pay. All relegated women to marginal positions and lessened the affects of their contributions.

Parezo's, "Matilda Coxe Stevenson: Pioneer Ethnologist," is the first of six biographical essays in this volume; Stevenson's career is also discussed in several of the other essays. Parezo writes, "Stevenson was a pioneer and explorer, scholar, activist, organizer, and wife ... the first, and for a long time the only, woman to be paid as a staff government anthropologist" (39, 43). She soon exceeded her assigned role at Zuni and collected data on crafts, agriculture, economics, religion, and more than a dozen other topics, her shrewd choice of which allowed her to avoid intellectual censorship by the Smithsonian's male-dominated bureaucracy (41).

Her report on Zia was "the first major ethnography of a Rio Grande Pueblo" (43). Stevenson's aggressive personality and personal eccentricities provoked strong reactions among her colleagues and supervisors, but it seems to me that she was no more of an "oddball" than Cushing or other Smithsonian/BAE anthropologists. This leads to the inevitable conclusion that the enemies she made there and the personal attacks on her were consequences more of her sex than of her behavior: "She suffered from her incursion into the male world of nineteenth-century science and for her vocal and unceasing demands to be treated seriously and equally" (39). Parezo and Hardin (citing Rossiter 1982) note in their essay, "In the Realm of the Muses," that some of the reaction to Stevenson was later used to deny women employment in anthropology and to limit them to low status positions (280).

Parezo has written the biographical essay, to date, on Stevenson. It is required reading for anyone interested in southwestern ethnology, along with Roscoe's (1991) discussion of Stevenson's work at Zuni. I take issue with only one point made by Parezo: that since World War II Stevenson "has become invisible" (58). She may be overshadowed by Cushing and ignored by some, but she never has been nor ever will become invisible, and Parezo's essay does much to ensure this.

Louis Hieb's, "Elsie Clews Parsons in the Southwest," is a fine, concise summary of the career of a first-rate scholar and the person most responsible, financially, for the careers of many women and men in the Southwest, e.g., Ruth Benedict, Franz Boas, Ruth Bunzel, Esther Goldfrank, Bernard Haile, Dorothy Keur, Morris Opler, Gladys Reichard, Ruth Underhill, Charles Wagley, Leslie White, and the Laboratory of Anthropology field schools (68). I disagree, somewhat, with the tone and substance of a few of Hieb's remarks though, to be fair, he is not alone in these. There is no question that women's achievements have been systematically ignored and undervalued (Reyman 1992). Hieb's comments with regard to Parsons, however, strike me as overstated, as did the remark about Stevenson's "invisibility."

He writes, "Most of us today find Parsons' work a source of frustration. We go to her for answers to our questions only to find that her answers - for all their scientific rigor and concern for accuracy - were shaped by very different questions (73). I don't think this is entirely true, but even if it were, so what? Parsons provides the primary data that allow us to answer our questions, to reanalyze issues, and to develop new questions. Furthermore, most of the research questions she lists at the end of *Pueblo Indian Religion* still await proper investigation. Rather than a source of frustration she is an inspiration, and her work is a model for data collection. She is a source of frustration only in that few of us, if any, will ever match her scholarly output. I also question Hieb's statement that Parsons' monograph on Jemez Pueblo (1925) "was the first full ethnography of a single Puebloan village ever written" (69). The catchword is "full," but Stevenson's 1894 monograph on Zia would seem to be the first, as noted by Parezo. Nevertheless, Hieb's essay is must reading for southwestern scholars.

Susan Brown McGreevy discusses the efforts of eight women who were instrumental in founding southwestern museums. "Daughters of Affluence: Wealth, Collecting, and Southwestern Institutions," highlights the lives of Maie Bartlett Heard (The Heard Museum, Phoenix), her younger sister, Florence Dibble Bartlett (Museum of International Folk Art, Santa Fe), Sharlot Madbrith Hall (The Sharlot Hall Museum, Prescott), Mary Cabot Wheelwright (Wheelwright Museum of the American Indian, Santa Fe, formerly the Museum of Navajo Ceremonial Art), Amelia Elizabeth White (School of American Research, Laboratory of Anthropology, and Museum of Navajo Ceremonial Art, Santa Fe), Mary-Russell Ferrell Colton (Museum of Northern Arizona, Flagstaff), Millicent Rogers (Millicent Rogers Museum, Taos), and Florence Hawley Ellis (The Florence Hawley Ellis Museum, Abiquiu). The essay title is a bit misleading: neither Hall (as McGreevy notes) nor Ellis was independently wealthy, and like Hall (80), Ellis was a native Southwesterner and not an eastern transplant; Ellis was born in Sonora, Mexico, as Linda Cordell notes in her essay (211). Finally, Millicent Rogers did not found the museum that bears her name; her son Paul Peralta-Ramos built it in her memory (97), though her collections are the basis for it. These are minor criticisms, however, and McGreevy provides an excellent historical overview of these important institutions; it serves as a powerful reminder of the debt owed to the women who made them possible.

Barbara Babcock's essay, "Not in the Absolute Singular: Rereading Ruth Benedict," is the most detailed discussion in the volume of Benedict's life and contributions, though Benedict figures prominently in a number of the other essays. It is fitting that Babcock, a professor of English and comparative literature, discusses Benedict because Benedict was a writer and a poet whose literary skills shaped and enhanced her anthropological writing. That Babcock writes about Benedict also reminds us just how much non-anthropologists have contributed to the discipline.

Babcock makes it clear that Benedict was heavily influenced in her thinking and writing by a number of European scholars, e.g., Dilthey, Spengler, Pater, and Nietzsche, but that Margaret Mead, Benedict's literary executor, suppressed this fact to a significant extent. This has led to a distortion of our understanding of Benedict (120-121) which Babcock means to begin to correct; thus she provides a series of topics for future research on Benedict's work. "Benedict wrote both as a woman and as a poet" (126), in contrast with Parsons who, citing Hare (1985), Babcock states, "gave up speaking as a woman" (126). Hieb's essay, however, seems to refute this point: Parsons may have lowered her feminist voice, but she never gave up speaking as a woman.

Deborah Gordon, "Among Women: Gender and Ethnographic Authority of the Southwest, 1930-1980," focuses mainly on the work of Gladys Reichard, Alice Marriott, and Mary Shepardson to examine, among other things, "the power relations among white and Native American women" (130). Gordon does this within "the reconstruction [it's actually a new construct] of the history of anthropology" (130) in which she suggests that anthropologists, in their "search for difference ... constrained by authoritative social relations ... came to know Native American women as the embodiment of the their desires. The Other, which they sought in order to change themselves, was eclipsed by their own general cultural understanding of white gender relations throughout most of their history" (129). In so doing, these "white women tried to relinquish certain privileges and powers on the condition that Native American women love and care about them" (133). This is a fascinating argument, and it may well be true, though that it was "not innocent" (133), as Gordon contends, is debatable. Regardless, this is one of the more provocative essays in the volume. I'm a bit surprised that Gordon does not refer to Fabian (1983) who has much to say that is relevant to her argument. Similarly, it's unfortunate that when she discusses Lassos-a-warrior, Gordon makes no reference to Roscoe's (1991) argument that so-called "androgynous males" may constitute a third gender rather than exemplify gender bending.

Kathleen Mullen Sands, "Women Researchers and the Yaqui in Arizona and Sonora," considers the work of seven women and herself: Phebe M. Bogan, Muriel Thayer Painter, Rosamond Brown Spicer, Jane Holden Kelley (whose archaeological contributions are discussed by Cordell), Ruth Warner Giddings, Lynn Scoggins Crumrine, and a Yaqui woman, Mini Valenzuela Kaczurkin. The combined efforts of these women, including

Sands, have made the Yaqui (especially in Pascua Village), along with the Navajo, the best documented non-Puebloan people in the Southwest. Sands' discussion of their work, especially that of Kelley who is seen by her Yaqui informants as a *patrona* (154), supports Gordon's argument about white - Indian power relations.

Louise Lamphere contributes another biographical essay, "Gladys Reichard Among the Navajo." This complements and expands upon Gordon's paper. The issue of undervaluation is again raised: "Why did the quality of Reichard's work remain undervalued during her lifetime and until 15 years after her death?" (158). Lamphere notes that Reichard's personality contributed to her "intellectual, and even social, isolation within the profession ... [so that] Perhaps because she was a woman, her personality could become more of an issue in the acceptance of her intellectual work, more so than for her contemporary male colleagues" (158). Lamphere is probably right; men often do not accept in women what they accept in men. Lamphere's discussion of the conflict between Reichard and Kluckhohn also raises the question of just how supportive Kluckhohn was of women anthropologists. Others note that he was (e.g., 177-178, 347), but was such support generally limited to those who were in agreement with him? (A nice feature of this volume is the occasional interplay between and among the authors; one wishes there were more of this. An entire section devoted to the discussions that took place would have been a most welcome addition. For example, Lamphere argues that Gordon's analysis of Reichard's work among the Navajo "misses Reichard's attempt to describe the internal dynamics of extended family life in a matrilineal society and her range of male and female characters" [170]).

Lamphere's essay is marred by several factual errors which a bit of judicious editing should have corrected: she states that Parsons, Benedict, and Mead received their Ph.D.s from Columbia between 1920 and 1940 (160). Hieb correctly notes (64) that Parsons received her degree in 1899; Lamphere states (180/note 11) that Earl Morris is best known for his work at Betatakin and Keet Seel. Morris is actually best known for his work at Aztec Ruin and better known for his work in the San Juan and La Plata river drainages, at Canyon de Chelly - Canyon del Muerto, and at Chichen Itzá than for Betatakin and Keet Seel; and she states that following the practice of mother-in-law avoidance, a "man always left his own hogan when his wife's mother arrived for a visit" (167). The Navajo are matrilineal and matrilocal; thus a man leaves his wife's hogan when his mother-in-law arrives.

Katherine Spencer Halpern examines a less well-known area of southwestern anthropology in "Women in Applied Anthropology in the Southwest: The Early Years." Applied anthropology is often seen as a weak stepchild of anthropology, both theoretically and methodologically. This is unfair and reflects gender bias in that many more women than men are applied anthropologists. As Halpern demonstrates, these women had an enormous impact on the Southwest: Ruth Underhill and Gladys Reichard trained BIA teachers; Sophie Aberle was Superintendent of the United Pueblos Agency (1935-1944); Rosalie Wax, Elizabeth Colson, Alice Joseph, Laura Thompson, and Cara Richards worked in community development and Indian health programs; and Florence Hawley Ellis was probably the archaeologist and ethnographer who did the most to help the Pueblos in their efforts to have their land and water rights restored. Ellis also helped to establish ethnohistory as a field of study within anthropology (196). Such work, however, was, and still is, often short-term and precariously funded; thus the women who do it are marginalized within the profession and especially with regard to academic status (199-200).

Linda Cordell's essay, "Women Archaeologists in the Southwest," highlights the work of eight women: Anna O Shepard, Jean M. Pinkley, Bertha P. Dutton, Florence Hawley Ellis, Marjorie F. Lambert, H. Marie Wormington, Jane H. Kelley, and Cynthia Irwin-Williams. Cordell notes that many other deserving women were excluded because of space limitations. A few comments are in order regarding this excellent review. In her discussion of Dutton's published work, no mention is made of *Leyit Kin* (Dutton 1938), one of the better reports from the 1930s Chaco field schools. It is also worth noting that Dutton, Lambert, and Ellis trained many prominent male archaeologists; J. Charles Kelley most readily comes to mind. Cordell states (219) that female archaeologists in the Southwest "devoted many more years of their lives to fieldwork" than did women ethnolo-

gists. Some hard data are needed to support this assertion. Hard data do exist in this volume and elsewhere to support Cordell's statement that male southwestern archaeologists are better rewarded financially and hold more prestigious academic positions than do their female counterparts (220). She is also correct in noting that men "seem to establish themselves earlier on the basis of one or two projects" (220). Discrimination is pervasive.

Charles Lange's, "The Contributions of Esther S. Goldfrank," is a highly personal memoir and biographical essay. Like Reichard, Bunzel, and to a lesser extent, Benedict, Mead, and others, Goldfrank was an anthropological "child" of Boas (231), apparently the first to call him "Papa Franz." Unlike Reichard, and more like the others, Goldfrank was her own woman intellectually, giving "her material her own distinctive flavor" (231).

Goldfrank was the only one of this group who did not complete her Ph.D. This seems not to have bothered her (232). She felt secure that her work at Cochiti, Isleta, and among the Blackfoot, and the resultant publications, were sufficient: "I did just what I wanted: I wrote what I wanted, I went for research where I wanted, and I took exception where I wanted" (232). Yet, as Lange writes, "one can only regret that Goldfrank has not ... [accepted] even a temporary, or visiting, teaching position despite a number of such opportunities ... students ... have certainly been the losers" (230-231).

Leanne Hinton ("Women in Southwestern Linguistic Studies") reviews the contributions of ethnomusicologists (Frances Densmore, Natalie Curtis Burlin, Gertrude Kurath) and four generations of linguists beginning with Barbara Freire-Marreco Aitken and continuing through the work of Mary Haas, Margaret Langdon, Pamela Munro, Leanne Hinton, Birgitte Bendixon, Susan Norwood, Lynn Gordon, Heather Hardy, Judy Joel, Martha Kendall, and Lucille Watahomigie.

Southwestern linguistics is a small field and at this point is quite inbred, e.g., Langdon is Haas' student; Munro, Hinton, Bendixon, and Norwood are Langdon's students; and Gordon and Hardy are Munro's. Furthermore, the focus has been overwhelmingly on Yuman-speaking peoples. Hinton explains this: "As women become prominent in a field, they tend to attract and encourage the entry of other women ... men tend not to work under female mentors, often feeling that women do not have the power to propel them on their careers ... One reason for the dominance of women in Yuman linguistic studies has been the presence of a few strong female teachers/mentors who have attracted female students to the field" (243).

Margaret Hardin's provides the last biographical essay, "Zuni Potters and *The Pueblo Potter: The Contributions of Ruth Bunzel*." In assessing Bunzel's work, Hardin notes that Bunzel's research at Zuni in the 1920s foreshadowed the development of ethnoscienc in the 1960s (262-263); Bunzel tried to see Zuni culture through the Zunis' eyes (Lamphere notes that Reichard did much the same thing when working among the Navajo). Bunzel, however, also defined design rules and described pottery-making behavior apart from what the potters told her (264-267), thus anticipating the later structural analysis of Levi-Strauss and his students. Hardin reassesses Bunzel's conclusions to point out alternative explanations; it is one of the enduring values of Bunzel's work that, as is the case with Elsie Clews Parsons, Bunzel provides the primary data that allow one to do this. Finally, in viewing Bunzel's work from Bunzel's perspective, Hardin writes, "She would have been pleased to know that the Zuni still use and discuss her work" (269).

Parezo and Hardin combine to review the work of women in museums ("In the Realm of the Muses"). Although Edgar Lee Hewett said, "I approve of lady curators because they are such good housekeepers" (271), the fact is that relatively few women became curators; curatorships went mostly to men while women were confined largely to support positions where they organized collections, served as docents, worked on exhibits, and were assigned other tasks that provided few resources and allowed little time for research, fieldwork, teaching, and publishing. They were also more poorly paid than the men and had less chance for professional advancement. In time, many women, even those with advanced degrees, disappeared from view or left anthropology

(289). They did have a some job security and academic freedom though the latter was more often “wishful thinking” (282). Therefore, museum work further marginalized women in anthropology and this marginalization increased as museums, themselves, became more marginalized relative to academic departments (274, 291). Much of anthropological research, however, especially archaeological and physical, depends upon access to well-organized collections, and so women again contributed to the success of others without receiving the recognition or rewards due them.

Jennifer Fox (“The Women Who Opened Doors: Interviewing Southwestern Anthropologists”) provides an insider’s perspective on the “Daughters of the Desert Oral History Project. Fox interviewed 18 senior women anthropologists who appear in this volume and in the earlier catalogue (Babcock and Parezo 1988). She describes the open-ended interview format and the responses to her questions. This essay is most valuable for the various women’s comments on their lives and professional careers. Through their words we get a sense of their joy, triumphs, frustration, anger, and other reactions to the problems they faced; we also get some good data and insight about their coping strategies, e.g., with regard to fieldwork, Ellis says, “if you take a child into a Pueblo with you, you are ahead of the game” (309). I plan to do this during my next ethnographic field session.

“Women on the Periphery of the Ivory Tower” by Shelby Tisdale again deals with the problem of marginalization, in this case as a consequence of popularizing anthropology, teaching undergraduate courses, educating the public, and working for Native American rights. Many women are discussed, including a large number of those discussed in other essays in this volume, e.g., Marjorie Lambert, Bertha Dutton, Florence Hawley Ellis, Ruth Benedict, Gladys Reichard, Dorothy Keur, Kate Peck Kent, and Clara Lee Tanner. Tisdale’s essay is the most polemical in the book, which is not to say that her tone is unjustified. To denigrate those who mostly teach is to betray a primary function of universities and museums. Indeed, at the present time, there is a great need to popularize anthropology and to do it well. We are not doing a very good job of communicating with the public (332), and we need more anthropologists like Lambert, Dutton, Benedict, et al. if anthropology is to survive and flourish.

Parezo’s closing essay, “Conclusion: The Beginning of the Quest,” draws together the various lines of inquiry, arguments, and issues discussed in the book. It is not a reassuring story, but through it all the women have remained remarkably upbeat. This is clear from their comments cited throughout the book. As Cynthia Irwin-Williams and Marjorie Lambert, respectively, said, “This is the most fun a person can possibly have and still get paid for it” (202); “I don’t see how you could regret a career in anthropology, no matter where it leads you” (293). A cynical reader might dismiss such comments as defensive rationalizations. I don’t think they are, despite the pain, bitterness, anger, frustration, and disappointment that these women felt at various times. Their success in the face of the barriers and obstacles discussed herein is a reaffirmation of their humanity and confirms that they are very special individuals. This book is one of several recent publications that give them the belated recognition they deserve for their accomplishments.

The volume is marred by a number of typos and other production errors, as well as some factual mistakes. None is terribly serious, but the sum of them becomes annoying to the serious reader. They should be corrected in future printings so that the physical product matches the quality of the intellectual achievements of these women, as documented by Parezo and her contributors. In the current economic climate this volume is a Best Buy, and The University of New Mexico Press is to be commended, again, for making its recent publications on the history of American archaeology so affordable.

References Cited

- Babcock, Barbara A. and Nancy J. Parezo
1988 *Daughters of the Desert: Women Anthropologists and the Native American Southwest, 1880-1980: An Illustrated Catalogue*, University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque.
- Dutton, Bertha P.
1938 *Leyit Kin, A Small House Ruin, Chaco Canyon, New Mexico. Monograph No. 7.*, Santa Fe: School of American Research, Santa Fe.
- Fabian, Johannes
1983 *Time and the Other: How Anthropology Makes Its Object*, Columbia University Press, New York.
- Hare, Peter H.
1985 *A Woman's Quest for Science: A Portrait of Anthropologist Elsie Clews Parsons*, Prometheus Books, Buffalo.
- McGregor, John C.
1941 *Southwestern Archaeology*, John Wiley & Sons, New York.
- Parsons, Elsie Clews
1925 "The Pueblo of Jemez", *Papers of the Southwestern Expedition No. 3*, Phillips Academy, Andover.
-
- 1939 *Pueblo Indian Religion*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Reyman, Jonathan E.
1992 "Women in American Archaeology: Some Historical Notes and Comments", in *Rediscovering Our Past: Essays on the History of American Archaeology*, edited by J. E. Reyman, pp. 69-80. Aldershot, Avebury, Great Britain.
- Roscoe, Will
1991 *The Zuni Man-Woman*, University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque.
- Rossiter, Margaret W.
1982 *Women Scientists in America: Struggles and Strategies to 1940*, The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore.
- Stevenson, Matilda Coxe
1894 *The Sia*, 11th Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology for 1889, Government Printing Office, Washington, pp. 3-157.
- Taylor, Walter W.
1948 "Study of Archaeology", *American Anthropological Association Memoir 69*, American Anthropological Association, Menasha.

Willey, Gordon R. and Jeremy A. Sabloff

1974 *A History of American Archaeology*, Thames and Hudson, London.

1980 *A History of American Archaeology* (2nd edition), W. H. Freeman, San Francisco.

Western and Russian Historiography: Recent Views, edited by Henry Kozicki, St. Martin's Press, New York, 1993. 218 pp. \$49.95.

Andrew L. Christenson
Prescott, Arizona

This collection illustrates the transition occurring in Russian historiography from a government-directed monolith to a more diverse discipline looking to internationalize and gain new directions. Although focused upon a Russian perspective, the volume includes discussions of issues such as history as science and history as narrative that are of major concern to many Western historians. Readers interested in a more Western focus on these and related topics should see another volume by the same editor and publisher, *Developments in Modern Historiography* (1993).

Although neither the history of archaeology or even the history of science is a topic in this volume, a reader interested in these areas is led to wonder how this great political/intellectual change will effect archaeology. The history of Soviet archaeology is virtually unknown in the West and I am uncertain if the topic was pursued very much in the former Soviet Union. A brief, politically-correct, post-Stalinist summary is provided by Mongait (1961), but the book by Miller (1956) provides a more likely and more distressing view of Stalinist archaeology, including the observation that Soviet archaeologists had life-spans one-half that of their bourgeois counterparts (p. 161)!

This volume provides many examples of Soviet historians forced into limited paths of interpretation and we should expect that such pressures were placed upon archaeologists and historians of archaeology as well. We can only hope than now that such pressures have been reduced, that we will see more publications on the history of Soviet/Russian archaeology available for non-Russian reading audiences.

References Cited

Miller, Mikhail
1956 *Archaeology in the U.S.S.R.*, Praeger, New York

Mongait, A. L.
1961 *Archaeology in the U.S.S.R.* Penguin, Baltimore (published in Russian in 1955).