

Ethnohistory

Pauline Turner Strong, The University of Texas at Austin

Abstract

Ethnohistory is an interdisciplinary approach to indigenous, colonial, and postcolonial culture and history. Combining the approaches of history, cultural anthropology, and archaeology, ethnohistory has most often focused on the cultures and histories of the indigenous peoples of settler societies in the Americas, Australia, New Zealand, the Pacific, and South Asia. Ethnohistory encompasses both particularistic and comparative scholarship, and embodies productive tensions among historical, anthropological, and indigenous perspectives on cultural and historical processes.

Keywords:

Ethnohistory, Indigenous studies, Colonial studies, Settler colonialism, Culture change, Interdisciplinary scholarship, Cultural anthropology, Historical anthropology, Historical archaeology, Feminist scholarship, Gender studies, Applied anthropology

Introduction

Ethnohistory is an interdisciplinary approach to indigenous, colonial, and postcolonial culture and history that developed as a coherent scholarly field in the United States in the 1950s. Combining the approaches of history, cultural anthropology, and archaeology, ethnohistory centers on reconstructing the history of non-European peoples, including their experiences of colonization and resistance. Ethnohistory began as an applied field, as historians and anthropologists collaborated on U.S. tribal land claims cases, and it soon became institutionalized in an organization now known as the American Society for Ethnohistory (ASE). Ethnohistory expanded unevenly into other regional contexts, especially in South Asia and the Pacific, but the Americas has remained its center of gravity. Although there are programs in ethnohistory in university, museum, and governmental contexts, most ethnohistorians are trained primarily as anthropologists, historians, or archaeologists, such that ethnohistory remains an interdisciplinary pursuit rather than a discipline in itself.

There are strong connections between ethnohistory and other forms of interdisciplinary inquiry such as historical anthropology, historical archaeology, social history, oral history, subaltern studies, colonial studies, and indigenous studies, but ethnohistory is a fairly coherent scholarly formation that remains true to its particularistic and empirical roots. This article surveys the history of the field, some of its contributions to knowledge, and some of the ways in which ethnohistory has integrated and revealed tensions among historical, anthropological, and indigenous perspectives on cultural and historical processes. Such tensions have led to a productive reflexivity among some ethnohistorians.

The Development of Ethnohistory

Following the enactment in the United States of the Indian Claims Commission Act of 1946, anthropologists and historians were asked to serve as expert witnesses in court cases adjudicating tribal claims to territory. As legal historian Christian McMillen (2007) shows in *Making Indian Law: The Hualapai Land Case and the Birth of Ethnohistory*, this development was influenced by a landmark Supreme Court decision, *United States v. Santa Fe Pacific Railroad Company* (1941), that defined the basis of indigenous land claims as evidence of occupancy from “time immemorial.” Conducting research for both sides (Indian tribes on the one hand and the Justice Department on the other), expert witnesses relied on colonial documents, oral histories, and ethnographic research to delineate indigenous concepts of rights to territory and resources; indigenous patterns of land use; indigenous and colonial understandings of treaty rights; the history of appropriation of land and resources from indigenous communities; and cultural continuities and discontinuities among indigenous populations. After 1978, when the Indian Claims Commission issued its final report, ethnohistorians continued to serve as expert witnesses in other contexts, including tribal recognition cases.

By 1978, however, ethnohistorians were conducting research that went well beyond the testimonial. The pursuit of ethnohistory consolidated a previously marginalized focus on Indian history within the field of history; in anthropology it brought a historical lens to culture change within indigenous cultures. The diachronic emphasis of ethnohistorical research provided a corrective to the synchronic nature of traditional ethnographic research, in which indigenous people were largely treated as static and timeless. Ethnography’s focus on the “ethnographic present” developed as a corrective to the speculative history of nineteenth-century historical evolutionism, but erroneously treated indigenous people as if they were “without history,” in anthropologist Eric Wolf’s (1982) memorable phrase. The neglect of history among anthropologists should not be overemphasized, however: the work of James Mooney on the Ghost Dance, published in

the late nineteenth century, is an important exception to the rule. In the early twentieth century, John Swanton, Frank Speck, William Duncan Strong, Julian Steward, and William Fenton used historical methods in reconstructing indigenous culture; the latter became important in the development of ethnohistory. The acculturation studies carried out by Robert Redfield, Melville Herskovits, Robert Redfield, Oscar Lewis, and others in the 1930s also constituted a move towards understanding cultural change. And in Britain, Evans-Pritchard's account of structural change among the Bedouins of Cyrenaica launched an interest in structural change and cultural conceptions of time that moved the discipline away from the synchronicity of structural-functionalism.

Research on the politics, economics, ideologies, and social relations of what Georges Balandier called the "colonial situation" (Cohn 1980) became central to the development of ethnohistory as a field. Ethnohistorians have productively analyzed the political economy of colonial empires, the impact of epidemics on indigenous populations, the nature of imperial bureaucracies, indigenous strategies of survival and resistance, and Christian evangelization and indigenous responses, among other topics. Studies of the gendered nature of the colonial situation, and especially changes in gender roles under colonialism and Christian evangelization, led to the development of feminist ethnohistory. Anthropologist Eleanor Leacock conducted important early work in this area, researching Innu (Naskapi) hunting territories and the impact of the fur trade on gender roles. In *Women and Colonization* (Etienne and Leacock 1980), Leacock offered an historical materialist explanation of gender inequality that maintained that the allied forces of capitalism, colonialism, and Christianity led to the degradation of women's status among Native Americans, though not without resistance. Other studies inspired by Leacock have shown that the impact of capitalism and Christianity on gender roles has been extremely complex, varying according to indigenous gender relations as well as the manner in which indigenous economies articulated with the capitalist economy.

More recently what might be called the ethnohistory of sexuality has emerged in the work of scholars such as Ramón Gutierrez, Will Roscoe, and Ann Stoler interested in the dynamics of race, class, and sexuality in colonial systems of inequality. But this scholarship is associated less with ethnohistory than with an efflorescence of work in historical anthropology that emerged in the 1980s and 1990s. Historical anthropology, more a subfield of anthropology than an interdisciplinary field, is mainly outside the scope of this article (but see History and Anthropology).

The American Society for Ethnohistory, founded in 1954, awards the Erminie Wheeler-Voegelin Book Award annually to the author of the best book in the field. This award and the companion Robert F. Heizer Article Award offer an excellent way to keep abreast of developments in ethnohistory. The Society publishes the journal *Ethnohistory*; other venues in which ethnohistorical works frequently appear are

Comparative Studies in Society and History and *History and Anthropology*. The ASE presidential address is published each year in *Ethnohistory* and often expresses current theoretical or methodological issues in the field.

Contributions to Knowledge

Ethnohistorians have compiled numerous collections of primary documents, including documents in indigenous languages, and cultural histories of particular indigenous peoples. These are important for providing fine-grained, diachronic perspectives on indigenous experiences and perspectives. Of those ethnohistories that go beyond the particular to establish or exemplify significant strands of ethnohistorical scholarship, we will only be able to consider a representative sample.

One of the most influential ethnohistorical monographs ever published anthropologist Anthony Wallace's *The Death and Rebirth of the Seneca*. In this ethnohistory Wallace draws on both archival and ethnographic research to reveal the development of the Handsome Lake religion among the Seneca Indians in the eighteenth century, which he analyzes as an example of a revitalization movement. This book has been influential on subsequent analyses of cultural revitalization, including *Reassessing Revitalization Movements: Perspectives from North America and the Pacific Islands*, edited by Michael Harkin. This collection looks comparatively at Pacific cargo cults, the Ghost Dance movement on the U.S. Plains, and contemporary social movements, showing the comparative power and contemporary significance of Wallace's approach to cultural revitalization. Ethnohistorians have also looked at revitalization in the context of indigenous schools, cultural centers, language programs, and economic development efforts.

In the area of political economy the work of environmental historian Richard White has been particularly significant. Beginning with a monograph on the colonial production of political and economic dependency among the Choctaws, Pawnees, and Navajos, White has developed an approach to ethnohistory that focuses on changing modes of production, social relationships, and relationships to the environment. He and other scholars have chronicled the impact of the fur trade, farming, mining and other European interventions on indigenous ecologies and economies, analyzing the forms of dependency and innovation that these interventions have engendered. Another approach to political economy is featured in *Captives and Cousins: Slavery, Kinship and Community in the Southwest Borderlands*, by historian James Brooks. This book analyzes the significance of indigenous forms of captivity, servitude, and adoption as forms of intercultural exchange, and the significant changes to these patterns that occurred under colonialism.

Richard White is also known for the important concept of the “middle ground.” First developed in *The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires, and Republics in the Great Lakes Region*, the concept refers to common patterns of social relationships and meaning that develop in situations of culture contact. Structural anthropologist Marshall Sahlins offers a somewhat similar concept, “structures of the conjuncture,” in *Historical Metaphors and Mythical Realities: Structure in the Early History of the Sandwich Islands Kingdom*. While ethnohistorians trained in history, like White, are more likely to employ the more informal framework of “the middle ground,” the approaches of Sahlins and White both offer ways of conceptualizing the hybrid social and cultural forms that develop in the course of intercultural encounters. Sahlins’s earlier work on hunting and gathering economies has also been influential on ethnohistories like Robert Brightman’s *Grateful Prey: Rock Cree Human-Animal Relationships*, that focus on indigenous economies and cultural logics. Like many anthropologists, Brightman is concerned with delineating the culturally specific concepts of the person that form a central part of indigenous cultural beliefs and practices.

Relations between indigenous peoples and the colonizing state have been a recurring concern of ethnohistory. Bringing the time-depth of archaeology to the question, Bruce Trigger, Samuel Wilson, and others have shown that societies with higher degrees of political and economic integration tended to adapt more successfully to European conquest (Rogers and Wilson 1993). In an extensive set of ethnohistorical works on India, anthropologist Bernard Cohn developed the concept of “rule by records,” which has inspired numerous other important studies of colonial rule as a form of knowledge and power. Anthropologist Nicholas Dirks’ *Castes of Mind: Colonialism and the Making of Modern India*, for example, historicizes the notion of “caste,” analyzing it neither as an essential cultural attribute nor as a colonial “invention,” but as a complex product of indigenous culture, colonialism, and resistance.

One of the most productive arenas of ethnohistorical research is the study of colonial missions and indigenous responses. In *Ambivalent Conquests: Maya and Spaniard in Yucatan*, historian Inga Clendinnen considers missionary work and resistance among the Mayas in the Yucatan peninsula in the sixteenth century. Several influential accounts of conversion and resistance have been offered by anthropologists John and Jean Comaroff, including the latter’s *Body of Power, Spirit of Resistance: The Culture and History of an African People*, which analyzes the Church of Zion among the Tshidi as a form of indigenous agency. Among the many studies of religious conversion, resistance, and syncretism in North America, anthropologist Edward Spicer’s *Cycles of Conquest: The Impact of Spain, Mexico, and the United States on the Indians of the Southwest* stands out for its scope, while the many works of historian James Axtell are important for contrasting the conversion strategies of the French, English, and Iroquois.

Anthropologist Sergei Kan has expanded the range of ethnohistorical comparison in his accounts of Tlingit religion and the impact of the Russian Orthodox Church.

Ethnohistorians have offered important contributions to the understanding of 'ethnogenesis', or the formation of cultural groups through historical processes of culture contact and mixture. Studies of the Métis of Canada, the Seminoles of the U.S. Southeast, the Garifuna of the Caribbean, and the Yoruba of Africa, among others, have employed this concept productively. *History, Power, and Identity: Ethnogenesis in the Americas*, a collection edited by anthropologist Thomas Hill, considers the development of new cultural identities among indigenous and African American groups, tying the emergence of new identities to global processes of domination, resistance, and exchange.

The linguistic anthropologist Michael Silverstein (1997) has called for, and demonstrated, an ethnohistory of communication, specifically, an ethnohistory of "languages of encounter." This ethnohistory concerns the reciprocal transformation of linguistic forms as well as the linguistic communities in which they are embedded. While Silverstein focuses on North America, his argument is relevant anywhere a "contact community" has formed in which certain kinds of communication (pidginized forms used in trade or diplomacy, for example) occur among people who otherwise belong to distinct language communities. He emphasizes that the "languages of encounter" used in trade or evangelization (Chinook Jargon, for example) differ significantly from the creole languages that developed on plantations. A monograph exemplifying the ethnohistory of communication, which is also an "ethno-ethnographic" inquiry into indigenous conceptions of history, is *Understanding Tolowa Histories: Western Hegemonies and Native American Responses*, by linguistic anthropologist James Collins. Among other things, this book looks at the relationship between discourses of place and the expropriation of land.

Fortunately, ethnohistory has not been immune to the critique of ethnographic authority and the move to reflexive and collaborative scholarship that is characteristic of anthropology as a whole. An example of the new collaborative ethnohistory is *History is in the Land: Multivocal Tribal Traditions in Arizona's San Pedro Valley*, by archeologists Thomas Ferguson and John Colwell-Chanthaphonh. This ethnohistory is polyphonic, directly incorporating perspectives from representatives of the Tohono-O'odham, Hopi, Zuni, and San Carlos Apache tribal peoples. Reflexive scholarship in ethnohistory often concerns methodological issues, as discussed below, but there is also an important body of reflexive works on the representation of indigenous peoples. These include a critical examination of the role of history and anthropology in producing and circulating such representations. In *Land Filled With Flies: A Political Economy of the Kalahari*, anthropologist Edwin Wilmsen examines the ideological construction of the

San (Bushmen) of southwestern Africa as “primitive” rather than as a displaced and excluded underclass. Similarly, historian Jean O’Brien’s *Firsting and Lasting: Writing Indians Out of Existence in New England*, analyzes how local histories contributed to the discursive extinction of Indian peoples in New England, an extinction made familiar in the “last of his tribe” trope. Coming full circle to the beginnings of ethnohistory, anthropologist Jack Campisi’s *Tribe On Trial* reflects on Campisi’s experience as an expert witness in the Mashpee tribal recognition case, showing the problematic nature of the concept of ‘tribe’.

Methodological Issues

A recurrent theme in ethnohistory has been the tension between the methodologies of anthropology and those of history, tensions aptly captured in historian Jennifer Brown’s metaphor of “strange bedfellows, kindred spirits.” Historians have tended to rely on the critical analysis of colonial documents, while anthropologists have put more credence in oral history, sometimes also “upstreaming,” as William Fenton called it, from contemporary cultural practices to engage in informed speculation about the past. Anthropologists have also emphasized comparative analysis and indigenous conceptions of history, leading Raymond Fogelson to advocate for “ethno-ethnohistory.”

As Fogelson’s ironic reduplication suggests, there has been some tension over the name of the field itself. To what does the ‘ethno’ in ‘ethnohistory’ refer? For some scholars it refers substantively to indigenous and other ethnic groups, making ethnohistory the history of these groups. For others, it has methodological significance, and refers to an ethnological or ethnographic approach to history. For still others, using an analogy to terms such as ‘ethnobotany’ or ‘ethnoastronomy’, the name of the field refers to ethnic and indigenous groups’ conceptions of their own pasts. All of these endeavors have taken place under the rubric of “ethnohistory,” sometimes in the very same works. In light of these difficulties some scholars, especially those conducting research outside of the Americas, prefer to avoid the term altogether, referring instead to “historical anthropology” or “anthropological history.” Yet the term ‘ethnohistory’ persists, likely because a scholarly tradition and community has grown up around it, and because it privileges one discipline less than the alternative terms.

Ethnohistorians typically rely on multiple forms of data, all of which must be utilized with considerable care. These include:

- Colonial and other institutional documents, including travel journals, missionary records, administrative records, judicial records, treaty records, memoirs, policy statements, and published narratives. In interpreting these primary documents the ethnohistorian must sort out (as much as possible)

- official categories, prejudices, and misapprehensions from indigenous beliefs and practices, putting the documents within the larger contexts of colonialism, capitalist expansion, evangelization, and indigenous and nationalist social movements. Like any historian, the ethnohistorian must also be aware of the selective and contingent nature of archiving (Galloway 2006).
- Written records in indigenous languages. These are particularly significant for literate cultures, but may exist for oral cultures in translated form. They also may exist in written form for indigenous peoples like the Cherokee who developed a written form of their language after contact, or those, like the Lakota, who learned to read and write in their native language from missionaries. Regarding his work with Euro-American and Lakota documents, Raymond DeMallie writes, “in a fundamental sense they represent conflicting realities, rooted in radically different epistemologies. The challenge of ethnohistory is to bring these two types of historical data together to construct a fuller picture of the past” (1993, 516).
 - Archaeological evidence, which may offer a significantly longer diachronic dimension than historical and ethnographic evidence. Daniel Rogers and Samuel Wilson describe ethnohistorical and archaeological sources as “complementary investigative routes” into postcontact cultural change (1993, 7), with archaeology particularly valuable for information on demography and geography, settlement and land use patterns, travel routes, and ethnic relationships.
 - Collections, including maps, illustrations, photographs, and artifacts. Much ethnohistorical research occurs in museum collections, and these must be understood as subject to the same processes of selection, appropriation, misinterpretation, reinterpretation, and loss as historical archives (Galloway 2006).
 - Oral traditions, including oral histories, genealogies, folk tales, and place names. Like institutional documents, oral traditions must be contextualized within contemporary social structures and projects. As Africanist Jan Vansina has emphasized, oral traditions represent the viewpoints of particularly situated actors and may shift over time.
 - Ethnographic research, including systematic participant-observation, aimed at finding traces of, or attitudes toward, the past in the present. For some, ethnographic fieldwork is what differentiates the ethnohistorian from the conventional historian; for others, it is a more general “anthropological orientation” towards culture (Cohn 1968). In either case, the results of ethnographic research must always be understood as situated within a particular moment and particular ethnographic encounter. Ethnographic research produces its own archive, and ethnohistorians typically rely on the ethnographic research of previous generations as well as their own. A fine

example of an ethnohistorian working through an ethnographic archive are Jennifer Brown's ethnohistorical works on the Berens River Ojibwa, using materials from A.I. Hallowell's fieldwork there in the 1930s.

Given this range of data, and the different forms of training that historians, anthropologists, and archeologists bring to their research, it is not surprising that methodological issues arise frequently in the field of ethnohistory. Among these issues are:

- The problem of what Samuel Wilson calls “mixed epistemologies,” with history, cultural anthropology, and archaeology each relying on different modes of explanation and validation. Wilson contrasts a neoevolutionary approach focused on long-term and large-scale processes with historical approaches more concerned with small-scale, shorter-term processes. He compares this to the contrast Braudel draws between process-oriented history (the *longue durée*) and event-oriented history. This difference in scale poses “the challenge of integrating macroprocesses and microprocesses of culture change into a coherent analysis” (Rogers and Wilson 1993, 21; 23).
- The contingency and partiality (in both senses) of documentary sources. Patricia Galloway (2006) notes the significance of material not noticed or not available to European observers; material misinterpreted by European observers; and material that has been lost. This requires a methodology of suspicion and convergence, in which documentary sources are viewed as compromised and explanations may be strengthened by the convergence of several lines of evidence, including archaeological, linguistic, and geographic evidence.
- The role of oral history, tribal history, and/or living memory as a supplement or corrective to written documents, which largely represent the perspective of colonial institutions. Jan Vansina (1985) has offered a methodology for the interpretation of oral history, including a way of distinguishing among ecological time, genealogical time, the sociological (recurring) calendar, and the time of extraordinary events. Anthropologists such as Julie Cruikshank have emphasized the importance of indigenous orientations to time, such as prophecy, that contrast sharply with linear time.
- The ability of ethnohistory to deal adequately with plural interpretations, including tensions or contradictions between (and within) archaeological, documentary, and oral histories. Historian Fred Hoxie has argued eloquently for an ethnohistory that aims “to describe community lives in their own terms,” producing “stories that allow for an open vision—one that is coherent but attends to several layers of meaning and many co-existing interpretations” (1997, 606; 610). Anthropologist Raymond Fogelson agrees with this vision, while enumerating the difficulties posed to the ethnohistorian by “bi- or

- multicultural frames of reference..., by different modes of discourse, by documentation that cannot always be limited to written manuscripts, and by recognition of different conceptions of reality” (1989: 141).
- The role of theoretical concepts in the field, for example Michel Foucault’s notion of bodily practice (as employed by Jean Comaroff, for example), the structuralism of Marshall Sahlins, or Eric Wolf’s use of world systems theory. Many ethnohistorians of a historical bent are inclined to prefer highly particularistic analyses, and are suspicious of the comparative analysis and theoretical framing characteristic of many the ethnohistories produced by anthropologists. Hoxie (1997), for example, counterposes the pluralistic ethnohistory he advocates to Eric Wolf’s attempt, in *Europe and the People Without History*, to locate tribal histories within a global system. Many anthropologists, on the other hand, have lauded and tried to emulate Wolf’s systematic vision.

Anthropologist Bernard Cohn (1980) offered a wise mediation between what he calls “anthropologyland” and “historyland,” noting that history and anthropology have a common subject matter, “otherness”; a common project, translation; and a common interest in studying social transformation. He called for an “anthropological history” in which the colonial situation is a privileged, unified analytic field for the study of the construction and representation of culture—indigenous culture, colonial culture, and postcolonial culture alike. Such an endeavor, he insisted, requires a working experience of both the field and the archive. This endeavor also needs to be highly reflexive, he insisted, and attuned to the ways in which current scholarly concepts are often remnants of colonial forms of rule. These include such basic concepts as ‘culture’, ‘race’, ‘tribe’, and ‘ethnic group.’ Even the division between history and anthropology is a remnant of colonial notions of the timeless nature of ‘primitive’ people.

Emerging Directions in Ethnohistorical Research

In a provocative review of “The State of Ethnohistory,” Shepard Krech asked, “should ethnohistory cease to exist?” (1991: 346). Given the convergence or interpenetration of anthropological and historical methods since 1980—in which scholars in both disciplines have been influenced by the Annales School of social history, world-systems theory, the interpretive turn, and practice theory--is the field a legitimate one? Or does ethnohistory reproduce a colonialist practice in which “history” refers to knowledge of the past in Western, literate societies, while “ethnohistory” refers to all who are outside of that category? Was Eric Wolf correct in arguing that “The more ethnohistory we know, the more clearly ‘their’ history and ‘our’ history emerge as part of the same history” (19)?

The importance of this question has only increased in the decades since 1991, as the field of indigenous studies has grown in significance. Some argue that the conditions that gave rise to the interdisciplinary formation of ethnohistory have changed enough that it is no longer a viable field. Others, such as Jennifer Brown (1991), argue that ethnohistory has brought historians, anthropologists, archeologists, and indigenous people together in a fruitful enterprise that will always be changing but should not be scuttled.

Krech's position can be reversed, as Patricia Galloway (2006) does in *Practicing Ethnohistory: Mining Archives, Hearing Testimony, Constructing Narrative*. "If we are to go on practicing 'ethnohistory' at all," she writes, "and if by that we mean trying to write something we call history on the basis of incomplete and biased testimonies that we only partially understand, then we need to recognize that there is really no history that is *not* ethnohistory for a species whose daily personal communication is a clash of idiolects" (27). Perhaps the same argument can be made for anthropology: is there really no anthropology that is not ethnohistory for a species that lives in time?

The future of ethnohistory most likely lies between these two extremes. Ethnohistory will probably neither disappear nor subsume all of history, not in the foreseeable future anyway. It will likely continue to develop its strengths: being a "middle ground," as Brown (1991) puts it, between history and anthropology, between archive and field, between colonialist and indigenous perspectives. It will be strongest when practiced by scholars with experience in both the archive and the field, and when indigenous and non-indigenous scholars are collaborating side by side. It will be strongest when practiced by scholars with expertise in indigenous languages. It will be strongest when it is broadly comparative, and when local practices and meanings are tied to global processes and power relations. It will be strongest when multiple, often conflicting worldviews and perspectives are taken into account. And it will be strongest when it proceeds in a reflexive manner, subjecting its own practices to critique and revision. It may not be called ethnohistory in the future, but it will reject the artificial, colonialist distinction between culture, prehistory, and history that is institutionalized in the academy's distinction between the fields of anthropology, archaeology, and history.

See also Anthropology and History; Anthropology of Colonialism; Historical Archaeology; Colonization and Colonialism, History of; Subaltern History.

References

Brightman, R. (1993). *Grateful Prey: Rock Cree Human-Animal Relationships*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Brooks, J.F. (2002). *Captives and Cousins: Slavery, Kinship and Community in the Southwest Borderlands*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Brown, Jennifer S.H. (1991). Ethnohistorians: Strange Bedfellows, Kindred Spirits. *Ethnohistory* 38 (2), 113-23.

Campisi, J. (1991). *The Mashpee Indians: Tribe on Trial*. Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University Press.

Clendinnen, I. (2003). *Ambivalent Conquests: Maya and Spaniard in Yucatan, 1517-1570*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cohn, B.S. (1968). Ethnohistory. In D.L. Sills (Ed.), *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, vol. 6 (pp. 441-448). New York: The Macmillan Company and The Free Press.

Cohn, B.S. (1980). History and Anthropology: The State of Play. *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 22 (2), 198-221.

Collins, J. (1998). *Understanding Tolowa Histories: Western Hegemonies and Native American Responses*. New York: Routledge.

Comaroff, J. (1985). *Body of Power, Spirits of Resistance: The Culture and History of a South African People*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

DeMallie, R.J. "These Have No Ears": Narrative and the Ethnohistorical Method. *Ethnohistory* 40 (4), 515-538.

Dirks, N.B. (2001). *Castes of Mind: Colonialism and the Making of Modern India*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Etienne, M. and Leacock, E. (1980). *Women and Colonization: Anthropological Perspectives*. New York: Praeger Publishers.

Ferguson, T.J . & Colwell-Chanthaphonh, J.S. (2006). *History is in the Land: Multivocal Tribal Traditions in Arizona's San Pedro Valley*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Fogelson, R.D. (1988) The Ethnohistory of Events and Nonevents. *Ethnohistory* 36 (2), 133-147.

- Galloway, P. (2006). *Practicing Ethnohistory: Mining Archives, Hearing Testimony, Constructing Narratives*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Harkin, M.E. (Ed.). (2004). *Reassessing Revitalization Movements: Perspectives from North America and the Pacific Islands*. Norman: University of Nebraska Press.
- Hill, J.E. (Ed.). (1996). *History, Power, and Identity: Ethnogenesis in the Americas, 1492-1992*. Iowa City: University of Iowa Press.
- Hoxie, F. (1997). Ethnohistory for a Tribal World. *Ethnohistory* 44 (4), 595-615.
- Krech, S., III. (1999). The State of Ethnohistory. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 20, 345-375.
- McMillen, C. (2007). *Making Indian Law: The Hualapai Land Case and the Birth of Ethnohistory*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- O'Brien, J. (2010). *Firsting and Lasting: Writing Indians Out of Existence in New England*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Rogers, J.D & Wilson, S.M. (Eds). (1993.) *Ethnohistory and Archaeology: Approaches to Postcontact Change in the Americas*. New York and London: Plenum Press.
- Sahlins, M. (1981). *Historical Metaphors and Mythical Realities: Structure and Early History of the Sandwich Islands Kingdom*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Silverstein, M. (1997). Encountering Language and Languages of Encounter in North American Ethnohistory. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 6(2), 126-144.
- Spicer, E. (1962). *Cycles of Conquest: The Impact of Spain, Mexico, and the United States on the Indians of the Southwest, 1533-1960*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Vansina, J. (1985). *Oral Tradition as History*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Wallace, A.F.C. (1969). *The Death and Rebirth of the Seneca*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- White, R. (1991). *The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires, and Republics in the Great Lakes Region, 1650-1815*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Wilmsen, E.N. (1989) *A Political Economy of the Kalahari*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Wolf, E. (1982). *Europe and the People Without History*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Relevant Websites

'American Society for Ethnohistory' <http://www.ethnohistory.org/>

'Comparative Studies in Society and History' <http://cssh.lsa.umich.edu/>

'Native American and Indigenous Studies Association' <http://www.naisa.org/>