

and local logistics, while the foreign archaeological director retains complete control of the archaeological component of the project. The different agendas of foreign as contrasted to national archaeologists clearly impacts the pattern of development of archaeology in the country.

Perhaps most unfamiliar to United States scholars is the strong feeling that archaeology has to play a critical part in creating an identity for the national psyche. In Canada and the United States, the bulk of the current scholars are not First Americans. Hence, while scholars associated with museums and universities feel it is part of their mission to inform the local populations of the prehistory of their areas, for the most part this prehistory is not envisioned as playing any kind of significant role in the definition of what it means to be a Yankee or a Canadian. We define our national identities mainly on events occurring after the immigrants displaced the indigenous First Americans. In countries like Mexico, with the Maya and Aztec, or Peru, with the Inca, prehistory becomes an integral part of the national identity, and the researches of archaeologists thus take on a political agenda unfamiliar to most of us in northern North America.

The archaeology of Peru is seen as being shaped by an important early twentieth century turf battle between two giants of Peruvian archaeology: Julio C. Tello and Larco Hoyle. Hoyle was a rich landowner from the north coast, while Tello was a mestizo from the central highlands. Thus the apparent academic archaeological argument about whether Cupisnique on the coast, or Chavin de Huantar in the sierra, was the loci of early political complexity, in fact pitted class against class, in one sense a working-class sierra individual with native roots again a landed coastal elite intruder. In this early mid-century conflict, Tello won, and Higuera sees the resulting archaeology as one designed for primarily political purposes. Rather than acknowledging the plethora of different Peruvian states and kingdoms, Tello's chronology emphasized a linear, monolithic Andean heritage, dominated sequentially by three highland polities, one which seemed most fitted to helping to identify a national sense of "Peruvian" culture. Higuera sees this political agenda as retarding our appreciation of the diversity and variation of Peruvian cultures, that national and foreign archaeologists alike have for many years had their archaeological thinking and research guided by a model cobbled together to maximize an identity of a unified "Peruvian" past, rather than one directed at truly seeking to define what Higuera perceives as the "balkanization" that might be more apt as a characterization of several periods of Peruvian prehistory. In Higuera's reconstruction, it has only been in the very recent past that we have finally escaped from the domination of Tello's model, and begun to come to a more dispassionate understanding of the wealth of variations of the Peruvian archaeological record.

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5334/bha.06202>

Bandelier: Behind and Beyond the Journals

by

Jonathan E. Reyman
Illinois State Museum
Springfield, Illinois

Bandelier: The Life and Adventures of Adolph Bandelier, by Charles H. Lange and Carroll L. Riley, 1996, University of Utah Press, Salt Lake City, \$34.95, xii + 263 pages, 3 maps, 28 figures, appendix, index.

A surge in publication has accompanied the recent, renewed interest in the history of American anthropology, and the *Bulletin* is one manifestation of this. Another notable aspect is the publication of biographies and collections of biographical essays of late-19th through mid-20th century archaeologists and other anthropologists.

One interesting and sometimes surprising aspect of this output of new biography is how much more we learn about those whom we thought we knew well. For example, I have read two, book-length biographies of Ruth Benedict and Alfred Kidder as well as several biographical essays. Nevertheless, new publications about these anthropologists, and others, continue to provide additional insights and greater understanding, even though they cover much the same basic data as earlier works. Different perspectives often yield novel ideas and conclusions, and the discovery of new, biographical and other historical data frequently requires a major reassessment and revision of both the biography and general history. Furthermore, my own experience (Reyman n.d.) suggests that, when we write biography, we also learn much about ourselves and provide readers with insights about us (often unintentionally), as well as about our subjects.

The same applies to autobiography, though here writers may severely limit, or attempt to limit, what they are willing to let readers learn about them. Yet, as noted with regard to biography, I suspect that when we write autobiographically (Reyman 1994), we may learn as much about ourselves as do our readers, and sometimes more.

A good biography should provide readers with the important facts and chronology of the subject's life, a discussion of the major factors that both effected and affected the course of that life, an evaluation of the individual's contributions within the context of history, and new insights regarding the person. Charles H. Lange and Carroll L. Riley, two of the three co-editors and annotators of *The Southwestern Journals of Adolph F. Bandelier* (four volumes; the late Elizabeth M. Lange was also a co-editor/annotator on volumes 3 and 4) have met these requirements of good biography with a fine, highly readable, succinct biography of Bandelier that complements his journals and rounds out our picture of him. I have read Bandelier's southwestern journals, many of his other publications, and also a number of papers about him. Nevertheless, this volume provided a wealth of new information and insights about the man, his spirit as well as his accomplishments. Moreover, the narrative flows so smoothly and cohesively that, to the casual reader, the book seems to cover quickly the 168 years of history from "Papa" Bandelier's birth/death (1812/1897) through Adolph's first wife's (Joe; short for Josephine) death (1892), Bandelier's death (1914), his second wife's (Fanny) death (1936), to the final disposition of Bandelier's remains at Bandelier National Monument (1980).

This is deceptive. There is a great deal here to reflect upon and to ponder, especially in the context of the development of the archaeology and ethnology of the American Southwest, and as such, one needs to take more time than seems necessary at first. Furthermore, though the book stands alone, the experience of reading it is made immeasurably richer if one has read, or then reads, Bandelier's southwestern journals, histories, and other writings.

Adolph F. Bandelier (1840-1914), the Swiss-born "Archaeologist Archivist Historian ... A Great American Scholar" (to quote his commemorative plaque at Bandelier National Monument), was unquestionably one of the most important scholars in late 19th and early 20th century American archaeology. Born in Bern, Switzerland into a bourgeois family with military and political connections (his father, Adolphe Eugene Bandelier - "Papa" - was a lawyer and member of the city's military tribunal), young Adolph had little formal education. In the typical pattern of the Swiss middle class, he was first tutored at home; later, even while he attended school, his family immersed him at home in the natural sciences, humanities, literature, and arts. The same pattern continued in the United States, to which the family finally emigrated, settling in Highland, Illinois in 1848 (Papa Bandelier had first traveled to Brazil [1847] but became quickly disillusioned and left for the United States). Bandelier attended school in Highland but was also privately tutored at home.

Bandelier's native language was French, though he was never comfortable writing it (p. 23) and preferred to write in German, English or Spanish; he learned the latter two languages after his arrival in the United States. However, as a consequence of his lack of formal training, Bandelier never fully mastered the grammar or syntax of any language except, perhaps, German.

This merits further discussion. Bandelier is usually considered to be one of those late nineteenth century, multilingual scholars who laid the foundation for modern American anthropology and Spanish and French colonial history in the Southwest. He certainly deserves his reputation, but as the authors note, "Over the past half-century there has been considerable discussion regarding Bandelier's linguistic abilities" (p. 22). They cite Bandelier's own letters that reflect his awareness of his initial limitations. Nevertheless, "It is clear that by the early 1880s, Bandelier could use not only his three childhood languages but Spanish as well. He made good use of these abilities in preparing himself for the great intellectual adventures of the decades to come" (p. 23).

I am somewhat less certain in this matter, and I have wondered, at times, about the accuracy of some of Bandelier's translations and especially whether he caught the "spirit" as well as the "letter" of the writers' words. I also find it curious that given his willingness to learn additional languages and all the years he spent in the Southwest and in South America, he never seems to have acquired even minimal competence in any Indian language. Although he conversed with the Pueblos in Spanish or English, he would have obtained a great deal more information had he spoken Keres or Tewa. That he did not learn, or even attempt to learn (as far as we know) an Indian language can, perhaps, be attributed to one or two specific factors. First, the authors make it clear that Bandelier disliked the Indians he studied and was insensitive toward them, especially during his years in Peru and Bolivia. In this, however, he was not unlike many of his contemporaries, including Frank Hamilton Cushing (see below); yet Cushing, by contrast, made a concerted and more-or-less successful effort to learn Zuni. Second, given Bandelier's emphasis in his archaeological fieldwork on drawing and describing ruins, he may have decided that it was not worth his effort to learn Indian languages in the belief that such knowledge would add little to his work. In retrospect, and on the basis of my own fieldwork in the Southwest in the company of Pueblo men, I think it is fair to say that as good as Bandelier's architectural plans are (and they are often superb, as is indicated in the book), the written descriptions and historical notes would have been enhanced significantly by discussions with Indian informants. In his work at Pecos Pueblo, for example, Bandelier had access to informants only one generation removed from those who had abandoned the town but made only limited use of them (p. 47). That he did not work more with them, or with Pueblo people in general in conjunction with his work at other Pueblo sites, represents a major, lost opportunity.

Life in Highland, Illinois, about 30 miles east of St. Louis, was alternately pleasant and difficult. The family prospered financially, but Bandelier was a sickly child. The cholera epidemics of 1848-1849 and 1852 exacted a heavy toll on the population and must have caused great worry to Bandelier's parents. Bandelier's mother died in 1855 from unknown causes, an event that profoundly affected the 15 year-old Adolph. He was also affected by his difficult relationship with his father, a relationship that only worsened as the years passed. By age 14, Bandelier had begun to work in the family's merchant and banking businesses, as well as continuing his education. Papa Bandelier was a typical *pater familias* of the day — demanding, often to the point of domestic tyranny. Yet he was almost as often a childish, petulant, spoiled brat, and when the family's foundry burned and their bank collapsed in 1885, Papa Bandelier reacted by running away and disappearing for over a year (pp. 107-11, 124-125). Adolph's reaction is understandable: "... a letter came from Papa stating that he would never return!! This is infamous and settles him with us. Hereafter, he ceases to exist for us. We have sacrificed ourselves for him in every way, and now he betrays and forsakes us. This is the result of 25 years of slavery!" (p. 109). Yet, more than a year later, Adolph is overjoyed to hear from him: "Got a letter from Papa! He is safe and well, thank God a thousand times for it" (p. 125).

This “love-hate” relationship with his father had developed and then festered for years, and it probably was a major factor in Bandelier’s decision, at age 40, finally to shift his life’s interests from the family businesses to scholarly pursuits such as history and archaeological fieldwork. As the authors indicate, both directly and indirectly, Bandelier fairly jumped at the chance to travel to the Southwest and Mexico, not only for the opportunity to conduct research, but also to escape from Papa! In so doing, he left his wife, Joe, whom he had married in 1861, to cope with the daily trial of life with the elder Bandelier. This escape behavior continued throughout Bandelier’s life as long as Papa was alive.

Unfortunately for Bandelier, escape from Papa did not mean escape from problems, and some of these continued long after his father’s death in 1897. From the time the bank collapsed until his death in 1914, Bandelier suffered frequent financial problems and setbacks verging, at times, on severe hardship and deprivation. Indeed, the last 30 years of his life were often a hand-to-mouth existence (pp. 121-122). Some of these problems were due to his failure to obtain permanent, long-term support from any of the many institutions or individuals for whom he worked; some to broken promises or contracts; some to his numerous failed schemes to obtain positions or to sell his work, such as his fine watercolors of ruins and other subjects; but, as the authors note, much of the hardship was due to his tendency to live beyond his means, a not uncommon trait among the upper economic classes. Even when his income was \$150-200 per month or more, a substantial amount in the 1880s and 1890s (I lived more-or-less comfortably on the same amount as a graduate student in the late 1960s), Bandelier seems to have spent every penny and then some. One consequence was that, at his death, his second wife, Fanny, was left in serious financial straits (pp. 209-210).

Bandelier was also frequently ill. When I originally read his *Southwestern Journals*, he appeared to be a hypochondriac on a grand scale. He may have been, though I am no longer as sure of this as I was. Unquestionably, Bandelier was a sickly child; equally certain is that a large number and variety of ailments continued to plague him throughout his life. Bandelier, however, was *uno hombre duro*, and it is a measure of his toughness, as well as his love for and dedication to his work, that although he was laid up in bed from time to time, he never stopped working nor withdrew from the field. He was an indefatigable scholar and fieldworker whose stamina and determination were matched by few, then or now.

This biography provides a fair and balanced treatment of the man. Lange and Riley have a great deal of respect, admiration, and even affection for their subject and for many of those around him, especially his two wives, Joe and Fanny (see also Riley 1988). Nevertheless, they do not hesitate to describe and to discuss his shortcomings, e.g., his interest in facts at the expense of theory so that there was never an overall organizational framework for his research other than historical narrative; his adherence to Morgan’s evolutionary framework long after it had been discredited; his lack of sensitivity toward those he studied and his carelessness as a consequence, especially in his earlier days at Santo Domingo, but also elsewhere throughout his career; and his dramatic, often violent mood swings combined with his penchant for liking someone one day and despising him the next (most notably, perhaps, Charles Lummis [see also Lange and Lange 1992], but many others as well). It is always risky to speculate about the psychological condition of a subject in the absence of reliable, medical data, but Bandelier seems to have suffered from what is now termed “Bipolar Disorder” and, perhaps, more than a mild case of paranoia, albeit a somewhat selective paranoia.

Indeed, some of the more fascinating segments of the book concern Bandelier, both as an individual and as a psychological subject, e.g., his secret conversion to Catholicism (though he later told his family); Bandelier’s intensely personal relationship with God and his belief that God chose to intervene in his life on a daily basis and sometimes several times a day, apparently often to Bandelier’s misfortune (especially in the later years); his notion that an angel’s influence seemingly has physical or territorial limits; his racism and sometime hatred of Indians (especially in South America); and his personal charisma coupled, paradoxically,

cally, with his shortcomings as an effective classroom teacher.

A few comments are in order. In reading about Bandelier's relationship with God, one is immediately struck, as are the authors (Lange: personal communication) with the similarity between Bandelier and the character, Tevya, in "Fiddler on the Roof." Bandelier writes in his journals of his relationship with God, and one has the impression that he had extensive conversations with Him. Perhaps these exchanges were carried out in silence, or perhaps, like Tevya, they were spoken monologues (and dialogues?). Whichever, they occurred daily and often several times a day. Through time, however, Bandelier's words took on an increasingly negative tone and content, and over the last two decades of his life, as his professional, financial, health, and other personal problems increased, Bandelier complained more and more frequently to God about them. Bandelier's paranoia was sometimes directed toward God, Whom Bandelier saw taking an active hand in his misfortune for reasons that Bandelier was at a loss to explain, either to himself or others.

Bandelier's apparent perception of the spatial or territorial limit to an angel's influence is inferred from the context of his writings rather than from any direct by him. The angel in question is his first wife, Joe, who died in Peru on December 11, 1892. Remarkably, on Christmas morning, 1892, two weeks after Joe's death, Bandelier proposed marriage to 23 year-old Fanny Ritter, who, along with her family, Bandelier and Joe had met in Lima, Peru. Bandelier apparently believed that this union was Joe's wish because she had joined his and Fanny's hands together on her deathbed (p. 158). Fanny and Adolph were married on December 30, 1893. Thereafter, as long as he and Fanny remained in South America (until 1903), Bandelier made frequent supplications to Joe, as his personal angel, to intercede with God on their behalf in matters both large and small. Fanny, for her part, did not believe that Joe was a "powerful spirit" (Riley 1988:18) and may have resented Bandelier's continuing connection with and reliance upon his deceased first wife (Riley 1988:22). After they left South America, however, returned to the United States, and then eventually moved to Seville, Spain (where Bandelier died), Joe was apparently forgotten; she was rarely, if ever, mentioned again despite the continuation of Bandelier's various problems for which he had previously appealed to her for heavenly intervention.

With regard to the issue of Bandelier's dislike of Indians and his racism, the authors write, "It is true that most nineteenth-century ethnologists felt innately superior to the groups they studied, but they generally acted with a certain appreciation and tact, something that, at Santo Domingo [Pueblo, New Mexico] at least, seemed to be beyond Bandelier's capabilities" (p. 50). I agree that they felt innately superior, but I disagree that they generally acted more appreciatively and tactfully than Bandelier. Indeed, Frank Hamilton Cushing at Zuni (at least for the first two years), and Matilda Coxe Stevenson, at Zuni, Hopi, and elsewhere, were usually just as arrogant, insensitive, and tactless as Bandelier; in some cases they were even more so. Cushing, for instance, continued to sketch Zuni ceremonies after the Zuni first warned him not to do so and then threatened him. On one occasion, Cushing unsheathed his knife to confirm his intention to sketch, then boasted of this in print (Cushing 1882:204-205). Similarly, Stevenson made photographs despite being told not to take them, including one admonition by Cushing! (It is difficult to determine in this instance whether Cushing was acting in the Zuni's interests or his own; he and Stevenson had developed a strong, proprietary rivalry at Zuni). These and other instances of inappropriate behavior, (by today's standards, though common at the time) have been satirized in a recent (1994) book by the Zuni artist, Phil Hughte. Many later fieldworkers were as arrogant and insensitive, if a bit more secretive about their activities; Elsie Clews Parsons and Leslie White, for example, often interviewed their informants about religious matters and other "taboo" subjects in a house or in town, away from the pueblo, per se. Their subsequent publication of information that non-Pueblo (and even some Pueblo) members had no right to know left a legacy of distrust that continues to this day: it is difficult to conduct research among most Pueblos and virtually impossible at several. NAGPRA has further complicated the situation, especially at Hopi and Zuni.

“To the end of his career, Adolph’s main talents lay in measurement and description of architecture” (p. 71). This is a curious assessment. Bandelier was a fine sketch artist, and his architectural descriptions are superb, but I do not think that these talents surpass his ability to synthesize enormous bodies of written materials to produce historical narrative. My own research and, I suspect, the author’s as well, have benefited more from Bandelier’s written materials than from his architectural studies.

It is always interesting when scholars who are intimately familiar with their subject are surprised by new discoveries. This apparently occurred quite a few times during the course of their research in terms of Bandelier’s relationships with God, the angel, Joe, and various other people, and it also occurred with Fanny Bandelier.

Fanny was a remarkable woman, seemingly as tough and as hardworking as Adolph. Fanny, too, had a mystical side, and this manifested itself, in one form, through her interest in and practice of “spirit” or “automatic” writing (pp. 227-231). Such writing is presumably done while one’s hand is under the influence of a supernatural, often a deceased, beloved individual. The principle is similar to that of a Ouija Board and is equally reliable. Fanny’s interest in spirit writing was a late and surprising discovery, as was the fact of Fanny’s second, but very short-lived marriage to the artist, Charles Wilson, who died on January 3, 1920; the marriage lasted less than six months (pp. 222-223; see also Riley 1988:19). Why Fanny remarried is unknown (loneliness? the hope of financial security?), and the marriage, itself, remains something of a mystery: “It is even possible that some of her friends never knew of the second marriage” (p. 224).

The book has few production errors, but there are two glaring mistakes: Bandelier’s first name is misspelled “Adolf” on the dust jacket; and the caption for the next-to-last photograph in the group following page 50 reads “Adolph F. Bandelier and Adelaido Montoya at Frijoles Canyon” when, in fact, it is a posed, studio photograph of only Bandelier.

There is a time-honored show business expression: “Always leave ‘em wanting more.” It is appropriate here. This is a fine biography, but I finished the book wanting more and regretting that much of the original manuscript was cut from the final draft. Riley (personal communication) thinks the published volume is generally better for the cutting. But in the case of an individual such as Bandelier, because we are unlikely to find much more new biographical data, I think we would have been better served by a longer work. I do not fault the authors for this but rather today’s publishing business where the “less is more” philosophy seems to prevail. This view never worked for me with regard to modern architecture, and I am unsatisfied with it here. To the extent that a book can be likened to an architecture of words, more words on Bandelier would have been welcome, at least to this reader.

References Cited

Cushing, Frank Hamilton

1882 “My Adventures at Zuni” (Part I), *Century Illustrated Monthly Magazine*, 25:191-207.

Hughte, Phil

1994 *A Zuni Artist Looks at Frank Hamilton Cushing*, Pueblo of Zuni Arts & Crafts, Zuni, NM.

Lange, Charles H., Carroll L. Riley, and Elizabeth M. Lange

1975 *The Southwestern Journals of Adolph F. Bandelier, 1885-1888*, University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque.

1984 *The Southwestern Journals of Adolph F. Bandelier, 1889-1892*, University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque.

_____ and Patricia Fogelman Lange
1992 "Adolph F. Bandelier and Charles F. Loomis," in *Archaeology, Art, and Anthropology: Papers in Honor of J. J. Brody*, edited by M. S. Duran and D. T. Kirkpatrick, Papers of the Archaeological Society of Albuquerque, 18:99-109.

Reyman, Jonathan E.

1994 "Gender and Class in Archeology: Then and Now," in *Equity Issues for Women in Archeology*, edited by M. C. Nelson, S. M. Nelson, and A. Wylie, Archeological Papers of the American Anthropological Association, #5. American Anthropological Association, Washington, D. C., pp. 83-90.

n.d. "Walter W. Taylor," in *Archaeologists: A Biographical Encyclopedia*, edited by T. Murray. Garland Publishing, New York, in press.

Riley, Carroll L.

1988 "Joe and Fanny: The Wives of Adolph F. Bandelier," in *Reflections: Papers on Southwestern Culture History in Honor of Charles H. Lange*, , edited by A. V. Poore, Papers of the Archaeological Society of New Mexico: 14, pp. 10-24.

The Southwestern Journals of Adolph F. Bandelier, 1880-1882

1966 Charles H. Lange and Carroll L. Riley (editors and annotators), University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque.

The Southwestern Journals of Adolph F. Bandelier, 1883-1884

1970 Charles F. Lange and Carroll L. Riley (editors and annotators), University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque.

Editors Note: We are indeed fortunate in this issue to have two pieces concerning the life and career of Adolph F. Bandelier. The editor asked Dr. Jonathan Reyman to provide an expanded discussion of Bandelier's contribution to Americanist archaeology for the short article section of this issue while Dr. Richard B. Woodbury has provided a careful analysis *Bandelier: The Life and Adventures of Adolph Bandelier* (by Lange and Riley) in the book review section of this issue.

II. Bibliographic/Archival Material Relating to the History of Archaeology

A. Recent Work by Subscribers

Barnhart, Terry A.

1994 "James McBride: Archaeologist and Historian of the Miami Valley," *Ohio History*, 103:23-40.

1996 "The Iroquois As Mound Builders: Ephraim George Squier and the Archaeology of Western New York," *New York History*, Spring 1996.