Ethnographers have long displayed themselves and others as individuals through photographs, biography, life history and autobiography. While disclosure of intimate details of the lives of those typically under the ethnographic gaze (the informants) has long been an acceptable and expected aspect of ethnographic research and writing, self-disclosure among ethnographers themselves has been less acceptable and much less common. As Ruth Behar (1996: 26) has written, 'In anthropology, which historically exists to "give voice" to others, there is no greater taboo than self-revelation'.

Writing about the private lives of both ethnographers and their informants has been subject to debates about the humanistic versus scientific validity of a focus on individuals. In recent decades, three prominent genres of writing have influenced thinking about the relationship between ethnography and the self of both the ethnographer and the 'native' informant:

1. Native anthropology, in which people who were formerly the subjects of ethnography become authors of studies of their own groups either as professional anthropologists or indigenous ethnographers;

2. Ethnic autobiography: personal narratives in which ethnic or cultural identity is foregrounded in the life story;

3. Autobiographical ethnography, in which professional researchers incorporate their own personal narratives into their ethnographic texts.

Social theory that emphasizes social agency and practice influences this trend (Cohen, 1994; Giddens, 1991), as do approaches of social and cultural poetics (Fernandez and Herzfeld, 1998; Lavie et al., 1993). A more general trend toward 'reflexivity' in ethnographic writing (Cole, 1992), influenced by both postmodernism and feminism, also informs the increasing emphasis on self-disclosure and self-display. Anthropologists and sociologists are becoming more explicit in their exploration of the links between their own autobiographies and their ethnographic practices (Ellis and Bochner, 1996; Okely and Callaway, 1992). At the same time, the 'natives' are increasingly telling their own stories and have become ethnographers of their own cultures (Jones, 1970; Ohnuki-Tierney, 1984). Researchers as well as their informants/collaborators have become aware of the politics of representation and of the power relations inherent in ethnographic accounts (Archetti, 1994; Behar and Gordon, 1995; Clifford, 1983; Fox, 1991; Harrison, 1997; Hymes, 1974; Marcus and Fischer, 1986; Moore, 1994; Okely and Callaway, 1992; Strathern, 1987). This growing trend in ethnographic writing that foregrounds self-narratives can be characterized with the term 'autoethnography'—referring to self-inscription on the part of the ethnographer, the 'native', or both (see Reed-Danahay, 1997b).

In this chapter I will review ethnographic practices that use life writing, and the various issues of power and representation that these raise. This literature review will depend most heavily on sources in English or English translation, but will also include French sources. This reflects my own linguistic limitations and I apologize in advance for my neglect of ethnographic productions in other languages. This chapter aims to be interdisciplinary in its coverage of ethnography, drawing from qualitative studies in sociology, education and communication studies, but depends most heavily on writings in cultural
anthropology. I will first review approaches to life history, and then turn to the autobiographical practices of ethnographers themselves, before pointing to newer hybridizations in ethnographic writing.

Life History

The methods of life history have been central to ethnography, particularly in the United States, but nevertheless remain in an ambiguous relationship to participant observation fieldwork. Recent approaches to the study of lives have introduced concepts of life stories and personal narrative, as well as 'ethnographic biography' (Herzfeld, 1997b), to this tradition. While Watson and Watson-Franke (1985: 1) describe the marginal role of life history in social science methods, Peacock and Holland write that 'life histories have become standbys in American ethnography' (1993). The neglect of life history in their review article on ethnographic texts by Marcus and Cushman (1982), is perhaps most indicative of the position of this methodological approach in the wider discipline. Bertaux and Kohli (1984) remarked upon the retrenchment of autobiographical and biographical methods in anthropology, particularly during the 1970s, and attributed this to a trend toward 'scientism'. However, the same neglect by Marcus and Cushman, who can hardly be placed in the camp of 'scientism', shows the wider biases in ethnography that have worked against an emphasis on life stories.

Several essays and entire volumes discuss methods of life history and its relationship to ethnography. Recent writers such as Angrosino (1989), Atkinson (1992), Denzin (1989), Linde (1993), Peacock and Holland (1993), Rosenwald and Ochberg (1992), and Watson and Watson-Franke (1985) have identified various genres of writing and introduce typologies of terminologies in this field. An example of this would be the distinction drawn between life history – elicited by another person – and autobiography – self-initiated (Watson and Watson-Franke, 1985: 2). Watson and Watson-Franke further distinguish 'biography', which involves more rearranging of material than life history, so that it becomes a 'recorder's report of the subject's life' (1985: 3), and 'diary' – life recorded in an 'immediate perspective' (1985: 3). Angrosino (1989: 3) differentiates between genres of biography, autobiography, life history, life story and personal narrative.

Bruce Shaw (1980) suggests four elements in most definitions of anthropological approaches to life history: (1) they emphasize the importance of the teller's sociocultural milieu; (2) they focus on the perspectives of one, unique individual; (3) they have a time depth, so that a personal history reveals also matters relevant to a region's or group's local history; (4) they relate the local history from the point of view of indigenous narrators' (1980: 229). This standard view, while still prevalent among many researchers, has shifted ground somewhat in more recent approaches that focus on interactions between ethnographer/interlocutor and autobiographer, and on issues of individual creativity and emotion. These will be discussed later in the chapter.

Brandes (1982) identifies 'ethnographic autobiography' as a form of first-person narrative, recorded and edited by a professional anthropologist (or someone in a related discipline). Texts of this sort are, he writes, usually non-Western narratives, and the anthropologist generally takes an interest in the psychosocial and developmental stages of an individual's life. In advocating the use of life histories, Brandes argues that 'autobiographies, more than any other research tool, demonstrate that complex and subtle considerations motivate individuals; people are not automatons, responding blindly to the vague factors and forces that are said to compel this or that type of action' (1982: 190). Anticipating current trends, Brandes notes that 'ethnographers themselves are becoming increasingly autobiographical in their presentation of data, showing that the study of society is rooted as much in the anthropologist's personality, and the purely fortuitous circumstances into which he or she is thrust' (1982: 190). In his essay, Brandes also discusses editing choices made, and other methodological issues in ethnographic autobiography. Blauner (1987), who includes a useful literature review of methods, also comments on methodological issues of editing first-person narratives – such as those of voice and selection.

National trends in uses of life history have been identified by various scholars. Angrosino defines the American (as opposed to European) approach to life history as one continually searching for the extraordinary individual who is representative of their culture (especially Native Americans). This person's life comes to express change and to illustrate factors of acculturation. In the European study of life history, according to Angrosino, there is a more collective approach to personal narratives in order to show 'society as a whole' (intact). Angrosino attributes these differences in approach to historical factors, such as the influence of nationalism on European approaches and to the influence of psychology on American approaches (1989: 15–16). In the collective approach, there is more emphasis on the life cycle, on aging and on socialization – features not unique to the individual.1

There are several key histories and reviews of life history in ethnography to which the reader may turn. The earliest, and now classic, statement on methods of life history is Dollard (1935). This was followed by the also classic interdisciplinary 1945 collection The Use of Personal Documents in History, Anthropology, and Sociology, by L. Gottschalk, C. Kluckhohn and R. Angell. Two
decades later, Langness provided a short but dense 1965 text which contains a comprehensive review of the literature on anthropological uses of biography and methods of life history research up until the 1960s. Langness' bibliography shows that there was an impressive amount of work already produced by that time. Despite the volume of work, however, Langness criticizes its lack of focus or method (cf. Crapanzano, 1984). A later review of the life history approach was Lives: An Anthropological Approach (Langness and Franke, 1981). A more recent comprehensive bibliography of life history (Grimes, 1995) lists the major texts.

The earliest uses of life history by social scientists in the United States focused on Native Americans (Kroeber, 1908; Landes, [1938] 1997; Radin, [1926]; Simmons, [1942] 1979) and immigrants from Europe (Thomas and Znaniecki, 1918–1920; Whyte, 1943). These studies used personal narratives, diaries, autobiography and the editorial methods of life history in order to present first-person accounts of individuals in the midst of culture change. An edited collection of fictionalized Native American personal narratives written by anthropologists who used composite portraits of their informants also appeared in this earlier period (Parsons, [1922] 1967). The concerns of those ethnographers who used life history methods in the early twentieth century were connected to debates about the relationship between creativity and cultural constraints, issues of getting the native point of view, and psychological approaches to the modal personality (DuBois, 1944). Ruth Landes ([1938] 1997) collected life histories of Ojibwa women to show that generalizations about culture must be nuanced by individual life stories, in order to portray individual differences rather than to focus on lives that were representative of the culture. In later research among Native Americans in both North and Central America, life histories were used to identify and chronicle cultural change and deviance (Lewis, 1964; Sewid and Spradley, [1969] 1978; Spindler, 1962).

Such concerns can still be seen in more recent work. Several newer themes have, however, emerged. The therapeutic use of life history among the elderly and the mentally and physically ill has been advocated by Angrosino (1989), Crapanzano (1980), Church (1995), Frank (1995), Kaufman (1986) and Myerhoff (1978). Langness and Frank (1981: 107) suggest that life history can play a role in ‘repair work’ to repair identities among stigmatized populations, such as that of transsexuals. There has also been a growing emphasis on the study of women’s life histories, as a way to compensate for previous research with a male bias that ignored the ‘woman’s point of view’ (see Personal Narratives Group, 1989). Three early examples are Landes ([1938] 1997), Reichard (1934) and Underhill ([1936] 1985). Key recent texts include Margaret Shostak’s life history of a !Kung woman named Nisa ([1981] 1983), Caroline Brettell’s work among Portuguese migrant women (1982) and on her own mother’s life (1999), Lila Abu-Lughod’s work on Bedouin women’s stories (1993), Ruth Behar’s volume on a Mexican peasant woman (1993), and Sally McBeth’s collaboration with Esther Burnett Horne on the life story of a Shoshone teacher (1998).

Current theoretical debates in life history research are about issues of cultural constructions of selfhood, of truth and representation (see Bertaux, 1981; Mintz, 1979), issues of the generalizing versus particularizing nature of this research (that is, is this person ‘representative’ and does this matter?), and questions of voice. At issue, according to Watson and Watson-Franke (1985), is not so much the truth or representativeness of the individual life story, but rather the degree to which this narrative is revealing of concepts of the ‘ideal self’ in a given cultural context. They propose a method through which the individual’s comments on ‘self-appraisal’ are analysed (1985: 188–9), and in which such material can be used in a comparative cross-cultural framework.

James Peacock and Dorothy Holland (1993) draw attention to the ways in which changing concepts of the self in recent theoretical approaches influence life history research. Such approaches raise questions about the universality of the traditional Western view of the ‘unified’ self, and present a view of the self as fragmented and context-dependent. Given this changing concept of the self, Peacock and Holland prefer the term ‘life story’ to that of life history (since the latter connotes a more unified and coherent narrative). They identify two dominant approaches to life stories. The first is the ‘life-focused’ approach, which emphasizes the individual’s life and is dependent upon ‘truth’ and historical fact (1993: 369). The second is the ‘story-focused’ approach, advocated by Linde (1993), which emphasizes narrative form, techniques and the subjective experience of the narrator. In order to reconcile these two approaches, Peacock and Holland propose a synthesis – which they call a processual approach. In this method, they write, ‘the telling of life stories, whether to others or to self alone, is treated as an important, shaping event in social and psychological processes, yet the life stories themselves are considered to be developed in, and the outcomes of, the course of these and other life events’ (1993: 371). This view of life stories helps to erase the older objective vs. subjective dichotomy that has marked life history research from the beginning.

In addition to the processual approach, two other alternatives to a supposedly objective, factual approach to autobiography can be identified: a hermeneutic or phenomenological approach (Little, 1980; Watson, 1976), and an interactionist approach (Angrosino, 1989). In the hermeneutic approach, which Little traces back to Paul Radin, the focus is on interpretation and meaning – in particular, the individual’s own interpretation of his or her life
experiences. The aim is not to get at cultural patterns, but, rather, to focus on the aesthetics of the life history and the emotions it portrays. In his volume *Documents of Interaction: Biography, Autobiography and Life History in Social Science Perspectives*, Angrosino (1989) argues that autobiographical materials should be treated as part of an interaction between 'a subject recounting his or her life experiences and an audience, either the researcher recording the story or the readers of the resulting text' (1989: 1). Drawing from Catani (1981), he suggests that life history is the product of 'encounter' (1981: 17), and cites Vincent Crapanzano's work as a useful method for this approach. In his book *Tuhami*, Crapanzano (1980) explicitly shows the researcher's role in shaping the text in his discussions of his encounters with Tuhami. Elsewhere, Crapanzano (1984) critiques life history approaches for their lack of analysis. He suggests that ethnographers pay more attention to indigenous notions of rhetoric and narrative technique (1984: 957).

There is an increasing emphasis on story, on the interaction between the researcher and narrator, and on issues of narrativity in life history research. The uses of personal narratives that may not include an entire autobiography have become key tools for cultural study. Thus, Ginsburg (1987) made use of 'procreation stories' to study abortion activists; Herzfeld (1985) examined 'thieving stories' to study concepts of masculinity and self-presentation among Cretan shepherds; Rosaldo (1989) has examined 'hunting stories' among the Hlongot; Kleinman (1988) and Frank (1995) have looked at 'illness narratives' in order to understand interactions between culture and illness; and Reed-Danahay (1997b) and Luttrell (1997) have turned to 'schooling stories' to examine cultural constructions of education and literacy. Lawuji (1989) analyses Yoruba obituaries as a form of biographical expression with interest for life history research. Attention has also been drawn in recent studies to the ethnographic uses of diaries (Bunkers and Huff, 1996; West, 1992) and other forms of everyday autobiographical productions (Smith and Watson, 1996).

**Beyond the Written**

In the area of cultural studies, three recent works point to forms of self-inscription that come from popular culture, and in which the social agency of local populations is expressed. Anne Goldman (1996) shows that recipes, midwife narratives and work narratives among working-class ethnic American women constitute important sites for self-narration and self-display. In her work with the autobiographical genres of Mexicanas, Jewish and African-American women, Goldman sheds important light on everyday, autoethnographic productions. Two other studies show nicely the ways in which personal narrative is not necessarily dependent upon oral or written expression. John Dorst (1989) analyses local festival displays, including arts and crafts, in semi-rural Chester County, PA, as a form of autoethnography. Social and cultural artifacts constitute a form of self-inscription and self-referentiality, he argues. Dorst's work calls attention to everyday practices of personal narrative that may elude the ethnographer looking for oral or written forms.

In another study, Hertha Wong (1989) has contributed to the understanding of Native American autobiography by showing that Native Americans used pictographs as personal records. Previous scholars overlooked the significance of pictographs as means of individual expression, she writes, because it was assumed that notions of individualism were exclusively Western (1989: 295). Plains Indian males, she argues, described heroic feats in pictures as well as in words. Pictographs constitute visual narratives of accomplishments and of processes of cultural conversion (forced acculturation). Wong shows that we need to rethink 'autobiographical activity' through her analysis of pictographs by artists White Bull and Zo-Tom in the late nineteenth century. Zo-Tom's 'cultural conversion narrative' embodied in pictographs depicts a classroom in Fort Marion at the Indian School. 'Instead of the long-haired, brilliantly attired and ornamented Kiowa warriors of his earlier drawings, he draws seven clean-cut Indian students in blue pants and snug black coats who sit, lining a long school bench, at a long desk. Mrs. Gibbs, the teacher, stands prim and pleasant, to the left.' (Wong, 1989: 304).

Both Wong and Goldman critique anthropological methods of life history and offer their own work as corrective to its biases. Their attempts to uncover native voices depend upon two different types of critiques, however. Wong argues that anthropologists were biased in seeking the 'individual' in the Native American self-narrative that was, she suggests, more dependent upon the communal. In contrast, Goldman argues that anthropologists undertaking life histories sought the cultural representative at the expense of the individual, and she claims that her work restores the sense of individual social agency to the subjects of ethnographic research. These two contrasting critiques, coming from outside of the discipline, underscore continued debates within the discipline about the politics of representation, self-representation and self-disclosure. They also point to unresolved debates on cross-cultural studies of subjectivity. Is the 'individual' a strictly Western invention, or does it have cross-cultural validity? Can we construct life history and autobiography without recognizing issues of gender, class and culture? More recent collaborative approaches in life history research, to be
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discussed later in this chapter, attempt to address these concerns.

**The ‘Personal Approach’ in Ethnography**

Although, as Judith Okely writes, ‘the personal is often denigrated in anthropological monographs’ (1996: 30), there has been sufficient use of this mode to warrant numerous overviews and discussions of the personal approach. The conventions of self-disclosure in ethnographic writing have been discussed at length by Angrosino (1989), Atkinson (1992), Denzin (1989), Friedman (1990), Okely and Callaway (1992), Reed-Danahay (1997b), Tedlock (1991) and Van Maanen (1988).

Ethnographers intensified efforts to chronicle their fieldwork experiences in ways that foregrounded the researcher as person during the mid-twentieth century. Although many overviews of ethnographic writing propose a chronological development from realist ethnographic writing that strove for objectivity to newer forms of autoethnographic writing, there have long been modes of ethnographic writing that incorporated the self of the ethnographer (Arana, 1988; Cole, 1992; Pratt, 1986; Stivers, 1993; Tedlock, 1995). In many cases, these represented parallel worlds to the ethnographic writing products that established a scholar’s reputation through ethnographic theory and description. As Bruner (1993: 3) writes, ‘Until the past few decades ... the majority decision was to sharply segment the ethnographic self from the personal self.’ Similarly, ethnographers who used life history methods kept their own lives outside of the life history narratives they recorded (see Brandes, 1982). Mary Louise Pratt has also taken note of the parallel tropes of ethnographic writing. She writes ‘Of these pairs of books, the formal ethnography is the one that counts as professional capital and as an authoritative representation; the personal narratives are often deemed self-indulgent, trivial, or heretical in other ways. But despite such “disciplining”, they have kept appearing, kept being read and above all kept being taught within the borders of the discipline, for what one must assume are powerful reasons’ (Pratt, 1986: 31).

She argues that the persistence of personal narrative is due to the mediating role it plays between the contradictions of personal and scientific authority connected to ethnographic, participant observation research. During the late 1970s and 1980s the dichotomy between personal and scientific writing began to change, with experimental writing projects that blended the genres of ethnography, biography and autobiography. Works from this period will be discussed later in the chapter.

It is instructive to recall some key texts from the 1970s and 1980s in which debates about ‘personal’ ethnography were played out, especially in the pages of *Current Anthropology*, which published several essays (Honigmann, 1976; Mandelbaum, 1973; Nash and Wintrob, 1972; Sangren, 1988; Strathern, 1987). These articles and the responses to them dealt with the tension between what is often phrased, falsely many argue, as the ‘personal’ and the ‘objective’. AUTOBIOGRAPHY, INTIMACY AND ETHNOGRAPHY

1 an increasing personal involvement of ethnographers with their subjects;
2 the ‘democratization’ of anthropology;
3 multiple field studies of the same culture;
4 assertions of independence by native peoples.

This latter trend, they suggested, was chipping away at the self-confidence of anthropologists, associated as they were with colonial powers on the decline.

In his 1976 essay, Honigmann defended the personal approach, pointing to Kroeber’s earlier attempts to incorporate such methods, as well as Evans-Pritchard’s interest in hermeneutics. This article relied, however, on the dichotomy between objective and subjective, a dubious dichotomy, as pointed out by Charles Keil in his response to Honigmann (1976: 253). Foreshadowing critiques of the 1980s and 1990s, Keil argued for the adoption of ‘extended autobiographies before fieldwork and candid diaries during fieldwork’ and the insistence that ‘investigators work in multicultural collectivities with the people and for the people rather than on the people for us’ (1976: 253). In a more recent discussion of the ‘personal approach,’ Steven Sangren (1988) cautioned that such approaches rely narrowly upon Western notions of individualism. Sangren broadened the definition of ‘individualism,’ beyond its connections to commodity fetishism, to mean ‘the privileging of the subject or “experience” in theoretical constructions of reality’ (1988: 423). Sangren writes that ‘in short, the privileging of “experience” or the actor’s point of view reproduces a bourgeois, Western, individualistic ideology’ (p. 423). He called for closer attention to the contexts in which anthropological careers as well as texts are produced and reproduced.
Since they appeared in 1980s, critiques of ethnographic realism put forth by Clifford (1983) and Marcus and Cushman (1982) have been highly influential in thinking about the history of self-disclosure in ethnography. British anthropologists writing in the classic phase of what has come to be called 'ethnographic realism' included discussions of fieldwork, but in forms that bracketed the essential business of the ethnography itself. Marcus and Cushman identify the key features of this approach, which 'seeks to represent the reality of a whole world or form of life' (1982: 29), as 'unintrusive presence of the ethnographer in the text', combined with the use of photos to demonstrate 'having been there'. The ethnographer is thus visually portrayed as present in the work if not explicitly signified in the writing. The writing, they suggest, leaned toward a focus on 'native point of view'.

Clifford (1983) suggests, however, that the validity of ethnographic research was originally established through texts that incorporated explicit discussion of the fieldwork. He cites the examples of classic ethnographies written by Malinowski (Argonauts), Mead (Coming of Age in Samoa) and Firth's We the Tikopia. Evans-Pritchard wrote of fieldwork experiences in his introduction to The Nuer (1940). Malinowski described fieldwork in his introduction to Argonauts of the Pacific (1922), and also in his Appendix to Coral Gardens and their Magic (1935). Later, however, fieldwork accounts became less necessary, Clifford argues, as the authority of anthropology as a discipline became more established. Godfrey Lienhardt’s brief statement at the beginning of Divinity and Experience, 'this book is based upon two years' work among the Dinka, spread over the period 1947–1950' (1961: 124), is an example. There is no other discussion of the work itself. The growing prestige of the 'fieldworker-theorist' (that is, Evans-Pritchard and The Nuer), led to the eventual bifurcation of the personal and ethnographic modes. Clifford writes that 'we are increasingly familiar with the separate fieldwork account (a sub-genre that still tends to be classified as subjective, “soft”, or unscientific). But even within classic ethnographies, more or less stereotypic “fables of rapport” narrate the attainment of full participant-observer status' (Clifford, 1983: 132). Newer forms of writing about fieldwork that went beyond stereotypic accounts began to appear in the late 1970s, such as those by Dumont ([1922] 1978), Favret-Saada (1980), Rabinow (1977) and Shostak ([1981] 1983).

**Fables of Rapport**

Accounts of fieldwork have been referred to by Van Maanen (1988) as 'confessional tales' and by Clifford (1983) as 'fables of rapport'. Both critics agree that one of the most important aims of such accounts is to establish authority – to establish that the ethnographer was really there (see also Pratt, 1986). Moreover, Van Maanen suggests that they also work to establish intimacy with readers and to convince them of the human qualities of the fieldworker (1988: 75). Marcus and Cushman (1982: 26) contrast the methodological orientation of confessional fieldwork literature in the past to more recent ethnographies whose main aim is to 'demystify the process of anthropological fieldwork whose veil of published secrecy has been increasingly embarrassing to a “scientific” discipline'. Self-disclosure in ethnographic writing can serve either a confessional autobiographical approach, according to Marcus and Cushman (1982), or one more intellectual, concerned with the epistemology of knowledge. Tedlock (1991) identifies a trend of movement from the 'ethnographic memoir' to the 'narrative ethnography'. She writes that 'in contrast to memoirs, narrative ethnographies focus not on the ethnographer herself, but rather on the character and process of the ethnographic dialogue or encounter' (1991: 78). The narrative ethnography deals with the personal experiences of the ethnographer, but also incorporates cultural analysis. Bruner (1993: 6) expresses these concerns about confessional modes and memoir in his statement that 'the danger is putting the personal self so deeply back into the text that it completely dominates so that the work becomes narcissistic and egotistical.'

There are those, such as Carolyn Ellis and Susan Krieger, who would deny a dichotomy between the personal and the intellectual, between memoir and ethnography. Ellis (Ellis and Bochner, 1996) argues that personal, autobiographical modes of writing are vital for knowledge production in the social sciences. She proposes an 'evocative autoethnography' (1997), and an 'emotional sociology' (Ellis, 1991) that draws upon Denzin's emphasis on personal epiphanies to advocate the study of not only the emotional lives of those ethnographers studied but also the emotions of researchers as legitimate foci of study. In much of her work, Ellis makes use of 'introspective narrative' – revealing personal narratives written by researchers (see Ellis and Bochner, 1996) that may have less than obvious connections to conventional ethnographic concerns than have previous 'fables of rapport'. Krieger (1991: 48) similarly argues that 'inner experience' in social life should be more developed in social science writing. She writes 'it may not be best to organize an account around an intellectual idea when the subject is one’s own experience. For me, it is desirable to structure a description in terms of the emotional content of an experience' (1991: 50–1) (see also Richardson, 1994).

Another proponent of personal narrative in ethnography, Judith Okely, writes in her essay on 'The Self and Scientism' that 'there is a need for more explicit recognition of fieldwork as personal
experience instead of sacrificing it to a false notion of scientific objectivity' (1986: 27). She further suggests that 'since almost nothing about the people studied is dismissed as private, taboo or improper for investigation, the same should apply to the investigator' (p. 24). In her recent writing, Ruth Behar also illustrates the refusal to distinguish between emotional forms of knowledge and intellectual forms. In a book subtitled Anthropology that Breaks Your Heart (1996), Behar utilizes a highly intimate mode of writing in order to express personal concerns and professional issues that go much beyond those of fieldwork itself. She urges ethnographers to write 'vulnerably'. Behar cautions, however, that 'vulnerability does not mean that anything personal goes. The exposure of the self who is also a spectator has to take us somewhere we couldn't otherwise go to. It has to be essential to the argument, not a decorative flourish, not exposure for its own sake' (1996: 14), Renato Rosaldo (1989) has also written a narrative of emotion which explicitly links his own experiences of grief over the death of his wife to his understanding of the Ilongot headhunters he studied during many years of fieldwork. He draws upon his own emotions to gain ethnographic insights on the emotional life and culture of the Ilongot.

It was in American anthropology, and among female anthropologists, that the use of personal narratives of fieldwork, experiences became established as a separate genre from the ethnographic monograph (Arama, 1988; Tedlock, 1995). Observers of this trend have raised the possibilities of different subjectivities for males and females (Behar and Gordon, 1995; Cole, 1992). Reflections by Jean Jackson (1986), Judith Okely (1996) and Anne-Marie Porter (1996) make use of personal narratives of fieldwork and the role of gender in order to critique theory and writing in ethnography. Barbara Tedlock (1995) suggests a gendered division of labor in textual productions by male and female ethnographers. She argues that the 'narrative mode', with less structure, and less authority in its prose, is more often adopted by females. This issue has also been addressed by Arana (1988) and Stivers (1993). In her article 'Works and Wives' Tedlock (1995) points out that husband and wife teams in ethnography (among them Victor and Edith Turner, Elizabeth and Robert Fernea) generally reflected a gendered approach to writing. Bruner (1993: 15) suggests that 'husbands would do the ethnography and wives would tell the story of the field experiences'.

The earliest ethnographic memoirs were written by female anthropologists. One of the first deliberate attempts to describe the ethnographer's experience of fieldwork, foregrounding the 'self' of the researcher, was written in 1930 by Frederica DeLaguna, but was not published until 1977. A student of Boas, Benedict and Reichard, DeLaguna writes that she was frustrated that there were no accounts of fieldwork to which the beginning student could turn, and that this inspired her own autobiographical excursions. However, the lack of an intellectual climate in which such an account would be well received prohibited her from publishing it until many decades later. In this account of first fieldwork in Greenland during the summer of 1929, DeLaguna details her personal experiences with a combination of narrative, direct quotes from her fieldnotes and letters exchanged between herself and her family.

One of the first published accounts of fieldwork was Alice Lee Marriott's (1952) Greener Fields: Experiences among the American Indians. Another early account came in the form of a 1954 novel, Return to Laughter, written pseudonymously as Elinore Bowen by Laura Bohannan. This book chronicles an anthropologist's experiences during fieldwork in Africa, and is generally viewed as a thinly disguised autobiography, although Rosalie Wax has suggested that it 'may be a fictionalized pastiche composed of the tales of several persons and numerous trips' (1971: 37). Jean Briggs' Never in Anger: Portrait of an Eskimo Family (1970) is a similarly novelesque rendering, full of humorous self-disclosure, of a fieldwork experience among the Inuit. Two other volumes attempted to meld narratives of fieldwork with discussions of and training in fieldwork methodology. In her 1966 book Stranger and Friend, Hortense Powdermaker writes that the project 'attempts to present a case history of how an anthropologist lives, works, and learns; how he thinks, and feels, in the field. Other readers may also find it useful and interesting to go backstage with an anthropologist, and see what lies behind the finished performance' (1966: 15). Rosalie Wax (1971) used three of her own fieldwork experiences to discuss methods in her guide to fieldwork, and the bibliography usefully includes other accounts of fieldwork that had been written before 1970. A similar approach to incorporating personal experiences in ethnography for didactic purposes is taken by Peter McLaren (1989), who makes use of his early teaching journal as a way to teach about the approach of critical pedagogy.

Gerald D. Berreman's (1962) Behind Many Masks: Ethnography and Impression Management in a Himalayan Village also provided an account of fieldwork, but one that refused to present itself as a model for methods. Berreman's objective was to discuss the ways in which presentation of self by both the ethnographer and those they study comes into play, and the various forms of impression management, including secrecy and concealment, involved. This account of fieldwork in a highly stratified, caste-based Indian village underscores the complexities of fieldwork in such a setting.

There are now scores of volumes written by ethnologists that explore their fieldwork experiences
in candid accounts. These include both monographs and edited volumes of essays. A significant departure from the earlier 'realist' fieldwork accounts was taken by Jean-Paul Dumont, who attempts to blend the two genres of ethnographic monograph and personal narrative. He begins his book *The Headman and I* with the statement: 'This book is about the Panare Indians of Venezuelan Guiana and me, the investigating anthropologist' (1992: 3). Written in 1978, Dumont's book represents a significant turning point in the relationship between ethnography and autobiography. While Rabinow (1977) had, some feel, raised the fieldwork account to a new level of intellectual sophistication, Dumont's book was one of the first to gain acclaim as an ethnography that is also autobiographical. Elizabeth Fernea (1969, 1975) had earlier done much the same thing, but she received less attention. Also receiving less attention is an account of fieldwork written by Miriam Slater that aimed to be 'a cross between the personal and the objective' (1976: 1). She explicitly rejects, she writes, the tactic of writing two books (the monograph and the memoir), and hoped to intersect the two in her narrative ethnography.

The autobiographical fieldwork account persists as a separate genre from other forms of ethnographic writing. There is also a continued production of 'confessional tales' written by ethnographers, despite Tedlock's (1991) prediction that ethnographic narrative would supersede memoir. A recent book by Daniel Bradburd, *Being There, The Necessity of Fieldwork* (1998), makes use of anecdotes from fieldwork in Iran to convey, as the author writes, 'out-of-the-ordinary, unplanned elements of my field experience' (1998: xiii). Bradburd previously published another book that was 'more formal', and conforming to more conventional forms of ethnographic writing. He positions the newer personal approach as a response to what he labels the postmodern critique of fieldwork offered by James Clifford, Mary Louise Pratt and others. The defense of fieldwork as the hallmark of anthropology may also be seen in Geertz (1998: 69), who similarly criticizes what he terms the 'non-immersive, hit-and-run ethnography' of cultural studies writers such as Clifford. Geertz, however, does not advocate the 'fables of rapport' approach taken by Bradburd and others.

Autobiographical accounts of fieldwork have in recent years become too numerous to mention all of them here. Examples of books that propose to show the intimate experiences of the fieldworker 'in the field' include Anderson (1990), Barley (1986), Cesara (1982), Hayano (1990), Raybeck (1996), Turner (1987), Van den Berghe (1989), Wachtel (1994) and Ward (1989). The everyday process of fieldwork, especially the issues of domestic arrangements in an anthropological household in the field, are also illustrated by Elizabeth Fernea in her vivid accounts of fieldwork in the Middle East (1969, 1975).

Most published fieldwork stories are shorter than book-length, and collected in numerous edited volumes that have appeared since the 1960s. The relative absence of such volumes during the 1980s and abundance of them during the 1990s should be noted. Many of these edited collections are shaped around particular themes. The first, Casagrande's *1960 In the Company of Man: Twenty Portraits of Anthropological Informants*, took up the issue of relationships between informants and fieldworkers, with an emphasis on the humanity of the informant. It has been followed by the more recent volume *Bridges to Humanity: Narratives on Anthropology and Friendship* (Grindal and Salamone, 1995), in which the emphasis has turned to the humanity of the anthropologist. Several more general anthologies of discussions of fieldwork have appeared, starting with the 1964 volume *Reflections on Community Studies* (Vidich et al., 1964), and then *Anthropologists in the Field* (Jongmans and Gutkind, 1967). These have been followed, in chronological order, by Friellich (1970), Spindler (1970), Kimball (1972), Benteil and Madan (1975), Shaffir and Stebbins (1991), DeVita (1992), Hobbs and May (1993), Jackson and Ives (1996), and Lareau and Shultz (1996). Here, one can see a shift in emphasis from techniques of scientific research, with autobiography used only anecdotally, to the proliferation of a more personal mode of writing about fieldwork experiences. In Jongmans and Gutkind (1967), for example, Edmund Leach writes of fieldwork from a strictly technical perspective. An exception in that volume is the essay by Köbben (1967), who mentions his experiences of emotional stress during fieldwork in Surinam. More recent volumes of the 1990s foreground the personal experiences of the ethnographers. A similar comparison could be drawn, in sociology, between Hammond (1964) and Ellis and Bochner (1996).

Several volumes of fieldwork narratives are organized around particular themes. For example, there are edited collections, beginning with Golde's *1970 Women in the Field*, that deal with issues of gender and/or sexuality in the field. Golde's landmark volume drew attention to the particular issues facing female anthropologists, and opened discussions about feminist approaches to fieldwork. It has been followed by Whitehead and Conway (1986), Altorki and El-Solh (1988) and Bell, Caplan and Karim (1993). Behar and Gordon (1995) echo early concerns in a recent volume devoted to gender and the writing of ethnography. Sexuality in the field, which will be discussed further below, has been addressed in the edited collections by Kulick and Wilson (1995), Lewin and Leap (1996) and Markowitz and Ashkenazi (1999).

Other themes that have prompted edited collections of fieldwork accounts include issues of children and family in the field (Butler and Turner, 1987; Cassell, 1987; Fernandez and Sutton, 1998;
DeVita, Nissa's sexual experiences), but to write about them during fieldwork, despite the lack of public discourse on this subject. Paul Rabino's (1977) candid description of accompanying informants in pursuit of sexual encounters with local girls in Morocco was unusual at the time for its acknowledgment of sexual activity on the part of the anthropologist. Karl Poewe's (Cesara, 1982) fieldwork memoir was ground-breaking in its open discussion of gender and sexuality for a female anthropologist in the field (see also Weber, 1989). Several anthropologists, such as Shostak ([1981] 1983) and Herdt (1982), have written of the intimate sexual behaviors of their informants (with Shostak, in particular, alluding to her own youthful interest in the older Nissa's sexual experiences), but to write about one's own sexuality is much less common.

Two males have written in detail about their marriages to 'native' women, in books that reveal intimacies in cross-cultural encounters that raise various issues of the crossing of boundaries in anthropological fieldwork. These texts romanticize the male's erotic attractions to these women. A German scientist, who worked closely with anthropologists, detailed his own marriage to a much younger Kung woman (Heinz and Lee, 1979) in a text that blends confessional autobiographical writing with ethnographic description. Of his wife, Heinz writes 'Here was fundamental woman in a sort of simple splendor, a basic creature whose femininity bared her emotions, sometimes fierce, mostly gentle, genuine and good. And I, so worldly and corrupt, so cultured by degrees and academia, had won her heart' (1979: 99). In her foreword to this book, Margaret Mead comments that it stands as a strong counterpoint to the image of the cold, distant researcher, and 'depends upon keeping the mother-in-law taboo oneself' (1979: xii). Photos include the author, always captioned 'Dr Heinz' and always fully clothed, and his wife, usually with naked breasts exposed and always captioned simply 'Namkwa'. In a more recent text, anthropologist Kenneth Good (1991) has written an autobiographical account of his work among the Yanomama that chronicles his courtship of and subsequent marriage to a young native girl, whom he eventually tries to settle in suburban New Jersey. Pictures of his naked pubescent future wife are included in the text, as are intimate photos of the couple lounging in their hammock. As with Dr Heinz, Dr Good is always fully clothed. In both books, cross-cultural marriage is used as an entry to ethnographic observations and knowledge of the 'other'. A female counterpart to these male writers is Joana Varawa (1989), who has chronicled her experiences of marriage to a Fijian fisherman.

Several edited collections have appeared in recent years that directly explore issues of sexuality and fieldwork (Kulick and Wilson, 1995; Lewin and Leap, 1996; Markowitz and Ashkenazi, 1999). These collections are informed by the experimental ethnographic writing of the 1980s with their critiques of 'objectifying' accounts of both the anthropologist and his/her informants, and by the gender studies and feminist approaches in anthropology in the decades since the 1970s. In the first such volume to appear, Kulick and Wilson (1995) deal more explicitly with issues of sexuality than previous work, tying them to broader themes of reflexivity and subjectivity in ethnographic research (see also Probyn, 1993). Kulick and Wilson are so sensitive to previous prohibitions against disclosures of sexual intimacy in the field that Kulick makes the disclaimer in his introduction that 'this volume is not a catalogue of ethnopornography' (1995: 5). He points out that sex itself has always been a part of anthropology and that 'anthropology has always trafficked in the sexuality of the people we study' (1995: 2). Nevertheless, he continues, 'throughout all the decades of concern with the sex lives of

**Ethnographers, Intimacy and Sexuality**

In most autobiographical ethnography, there has been scant mention of the sexuality of the researcher. This taboo was famously broached when Malinowski's diaries (1967) were published, and his own struggles with sexual repression and expression were brought out of the closet. In his discussion of the publication of the diaries, George Stocking (1974) mentions that many people had informally told him that sexuality was an issue for them during fieldwork, despite the lack of public discourse on this subject. Paul Rabino's (1977) candid description of accompanying informants in pursuit of sexual encounters with local girls in Morocco was unusual at the time for its acknowledgment of sexual activity on the part of the anthropologist. Karl Poewe's (Cesara, 1982) fieldwork memoir was ground-breaking in its open discussion of gender and sexuality for a female anthropologist in the field (see also Weber, 1989). Several anthropologists, such as Shostak ([1981] 1983) and Herdt (1982), have written of the intimate sexual behaviors of their informants (with Shostak, in particular, alluding to her own youthful interest in the older Nissa's sexual experiences), but to write about one's own sexuality is much less common.

Two males have written in detail about their marriages to 'native' women, in books that reveal intimacies in cross-cultural encounters that raise various issues of the crossing of boundaries in anthropological fieldwork. These texts romanticize the male's erotic attractions to these women. A German scientist, who worked closely with anthropologists, detailed his own marriage to a much younger Kung woman (Heinz and Lee, 1979) in a text that blends confessional autobiographical writing with ethnographic description. Of his wife, Heinz writes 'Here was fundamental woman in a sort of simple splendor, a basic creature whose femininity bared her emotions, sometimes fierce, mostly gentle, genuine and good. And I, so worldly and corrupt, so cultured by degrees and academia, had won her heart' (1979: 99). In her foreword to this book, Margaret Mead comments that it stands as a strong counterpoint to the image of the cold, distant researcher, and 'depends upon keeping the mother-in-law taboo oneself' (1979: xii). Photos include the author, always captioned 'Dr Heinz' and always fully clothed, and his wife, usually with naked breasts exposed and always captioned simply 'Namkwa'. In a more recent text, anthropologist Kenneth Good (1991) has written an autobiographical account of his work among the Yanomama that chronicles his courtship of and subsequent marriage to a young native girl, whom he eventually tries to settle in suburban New Jersey. Pictures of his naked pubescent future wife are included in the text, as are intimate photos of the couple lounging in their hammock. As with Dr Heinz, Dr Good is always fully clothed. In both books, cross-cultural marriage is used as an entry to ethnographic observations and knowledge of the 'other'. A female counterpart to these male writers is Joana Varawa (1989), who has chronicled her experiences of marriage to a Fijian fisherman.

Several edited collections have appeared in recent years that directly explore issues of sexuality and fieldwork (Kulick and Wilson, 1995; Lewin and Leap, 1996; Markowitz and Ashkenazi, 1999). These collections are informed by the experimental ethnographic writing of the 1980s with their critiques of 'objectifying' accounts of both the anthropologist and his/her informants, and by the gender studies and feminist approaches in anthropology in the decades since the 1970s. In the first such volume to appear, Kulick and Wilson (1995) deal more explicitly with issues of sexuality than previous work, tying them to broader themes of reflexivity and subjectivity in ethnographic research (see also Probyn, 1993). Kulick and Wilson are so sensitive to previous prohibitions against disclosures of sexual intimacy in the field that Kulick makes the disclaimer in his introduction that 'this volume is not a catalogue of ethnopornography' (1995: 5). He points out that sex itself has always been a part of anthropology and that 'anthropology has always trafficked in the sexuality of the people we study' (1995: 2). Nevertheless, he continues, 'throughout all the decades of concern with the sex lives of
others, anthropologists have remained very tightlipped about their own sexuality' (p. 3). Kulick cites Wengle’s (1988) conclusion from his review of ethnographic reports that ethnographers have generally remained celibate during fieldwork. Silences about this topic are connected, Kulick suggests, to three features of ethnography: the absence of the ethnographer in text; disdain for personal narratives in the discipline; and general cultural taboos about discussing sex. With this volume, the editors and chapter authors hoped to open the conversation about the ‘erotic subjectivity of the ethnographer’ (Kulick and Wilson, 1995: 23).

One example from this volume is Jill Dubisch’s chapter ‘Lovers in the field’. In her acknowledgments, she thanks (with an ironic tone?) ‘various friends and lovers in Greece’ (1995: 48). As a scholar with long-term field experience in Greece, Dubisch has made numerous field trips, and has had various encounters with Greek males during different stages of her life and career. In her discussion of this, Dubisch is not explicit about the sex itself, but engages with issues of gender and sexuality, marriage, attachment, cultural and class differences in approaches to sexuality. Most interestingly, Dubisch shows that fieldwork raises issues of selfhood for the ethnographer and describes how she came to self-understanding through fieldwork in Greece. Through her encounters with many informants, friends, lovers and collaborators (not a mutually exclusive list, she lets us know), Dubisch came to see a blurring of the concept of the ‘authentic unified self’. Each time she returns to Greece, she is different, and she explores different aspects of her selfhood during each fieldtrip. On the topic of sexuality, Dubisch writes ‘Sexuality is one dimension of the self, and a dimension which may be particularly challenged in the field, whether by the felt necessity for abstinence, the sexual temptations offered to us, the fears of professional consequences of sexual indulgence, and/or the reactions of those we encounter to our perceived nature as sexual beings’ (1995: 47). Nothing in our training as ethnographers, Dubisch concludes, prepares us for this.

The next volume to follow was Lewin and Leap’s (1996) collection of essays on gay and lesbian anthropologists and sexuality in fieldwork. Some of the most candid discussions of sexuality and the field are to be found in the writings of gay and lesbian anthropologists, despite the heterosexual bias of most anthropological research on sexuality. While there has been silence about sexuality in the field, the silences about gay and lesbian anthropologists have been even more pronounced. As Lewin and Leap write, ‘Speaking openly is a step toward stripping homosexuality and lesbian and gay identity of their stigma’ (1996: xi). For gay and lesbian anthropologists who do research on gay and lesbian issues, there are additional issues about this particular form of ‘insider’ research, or autoethnography (see especially Kennedy, 1996; Weston, 1996).

The most recent volume to appear on anthropology and sexuality (Markowitz and Ashkenazi, 1999) is informed by previous contributions in this field, and works to link theory to personal narratives of experiences of sexuality in the field. As the editors write, ‘Sex and sexuality are not novel topics in anthropology, nor is a consideration of participant observation as method and epistemology. What is new is linking these two themes in the person of the anthropologist’ (Ashkenazi and Markowitz, 1999: 5). A major contribution of this recent volume is its focus on the cultural construction of sexuality and the ways in which anthropologists’ discussions of their personal and erotic relationships in the field can help in understandings of the ways in which both anthropologists and their ‘field partners’ (‘informants’) are ‘positioned’ in systems of power and meaning. One example of this is the essay by Michael Ashkenazi and Robert Rotenberg (1999) in which the authors compare their experiences of undertaking fieldwork in cultural settings (Japan and Vienna) that include public nudity during public bathing. While avoiding overly ‘confessional’ accounts of their personal encounters with nudity in various spheres, through their discussions of social discomfort, the authors convey the ways in which the erotic is socially constructed in different cultures. They also vividly address the effects of doing fieldwork in the nude on concepts of authority and intimacy. As they write, ‘Observing, participating with, and interviewing nude people of both genders while nude oneself has unexpected consequences’ (Ashkenazi and Rotenberg, 1999: 92). While anthropologists have often conducted fieldwork fully clothed in settings where the ‘natives’ were naked or partially naked (cf. Malinowski, 1967), this essay illustrates the more recent sensitivity among anthropologists to issues of power and representation in ethnography. Discussions of sexuality and fieldwork speak to issues of intimacy and their representation in ethnographic writing, to the ways in which both ethnographer and informant are constructed as individuals in ethnographic accounts, and to the ways in which sexuality is culturally constructed and informed by systems of power and authority.

**Intellectual Memoirs**

One biographical genre that is often overlooked in discussions of ethnography and autobiography is that of the intellectual autobiography and biography by the professional ethnographer. Zussman (1996) points out that anthropologists have produced much more such autobiographical writing than have sociologists, but works appear in both
disciplines. Sociologist William Foote Whyte’s (1994) Participant-Observer: An Autobiography, is a notable exception (see also Goetting and Fenselmaier, 1995; Riley, 1988; Williams, 1988). Since the theme of this chapter is ethnography, intellectual autobiographies written by social scientists who are not ethnographers fall outside of the scope; however, it is worth noting that there have been a number of such texts produced (i.e., Dews and Law, 1995).

Two of the most famous autobiographies in anthropology are Blackberry Winter, by Margaret Mead ([1972] 1995) and Tristes Tropiques, by Claude Lévi-Strauss ([1955] 1992). These two books focus on the intellectual and professional development of the scholar, and on their theoretical concerns. Fieldwork is mentioned, but not in the ‘confessional mode’ to the same degree as are ‘fables of rapport’ or narrations of fieldwork experiences per se. We learn less about the foibles and personal experiences, less explicitly about the inner life of the scholar, in such intellectual reports. There is more explicit discussion of theory in Mead and Lévi-Strauss’ memoirs, although descriptions from the field also play a role in legitimizing the authority of each anthropologist through discussions of their ‘having been there’.

Clifford Geertz’s After the Fact (1995) is his own contribution to the genre of intellectual autobiography. In these essays, Geertz refrains from the confessional mode to detail his professional experiences and the development of much of his thinking. It is in many ways an anti-‘fable of rapport’, illustrating Geertz’s famous mistrust of the anthropologist’s ability to adopt the ‘native point of view’. Geertz writes ‘field research in such times, in such places, is not a matter of working free from the cultural baggage you brought with you so as to enter, without shape and without attachment, into a foreign mode of life. It is a matter of living out your existence in two stories at once’ (1995: 94). This volume, while written in the form of personal essays, is a discussion of the directions in which anthropology has developed during Geertz’s career, and engages much more with anthropology and anthropologists than with the informants Geertz has encountered.


Illness and Self-disclosure

Another genre of personal narrative that ethnographers have written is that of the ‘illness narrative’ (Kleinman, 1988). While there has been little written about illness during fieldwork, self-disclosure associated with issues of emotion, death and illness has developed into an identifiable genre of writing by ethnographers. Anthropologists Robert Murphy (1987) and Susan DiGiacomo (1987) have written about their own chronic illnesses and the medical profession with the keen insights of an ethnographer. Murphy, who conducted decades of research in South America, compares his spinal cord disease, which left him paralysed, to an ‘extended anthropological field trip’ (1987: ix). DiGiacomo (1987) who suffers from cancer, also writes of entering a new field site: ‘the kingdom of the sick’. In sociology, Irving Zola (1982) and Arthur Frank (1991) have also written extensively of personal illness from the perspective of a social scientist. While all four of these authors applied previous ethnographic insights to their new experiences of illness, Kathryn Church (1995) moves in a different direction, making use of her own experiences of physical and mental breakdown during an ethnographic study of the professionalization of treatment for the mentally ill and psychiatric ‘survivors’. She labels her approach that of ‘critical autobiography’ (Church, 1995: 3), following David Jackson (1990). This entails a form of ethnographic narrative whereby the aim, as she says, is ‘to write myself into my own work as a major character’ (1995: 3). In her book Final Negotiations (1995), Carolyn Ellis uses a personal approach to the ethnography of illness as she details her affair and subsequent marriage to another sociologist, who suffers from a fatal illness and eventually dies. The interest in illness narratives as written by the ethnographers parallels interest in the study of ‘illness narratives’ as a mode of research noted earlier in this chapter.

Future Directions

There has been an enduring interest in the personal, intimate lives of others among those who read and write ethnography. Collaboration between researchers and informants, and convergence between the personal narratives of each, are among the prominent trends that one can notice in recent
work. As the 'natives' become increasingly literate, the need for 'life history' that speaks for the other will lessen, and the 'natives' will tell their own stories (perhaps with the aid of the ethnographer – as in the case of Horne and McBeth, 1998). The 'field' of ethnography is broadening, to include 'home', 'self', fiction and other textual productions, as well as visual culture. The construct of 'the field' as a site of ethnographic research (Gupta and Ferguson, 1997) is being questioned.

Recent attention to native forms of autobiography, biography and ethnography have led to hybrid forms and experimentations with established genres of life history and ethnography. The edited volumes by Driessen (1993) and Brettell (1993) both address the encounters, particularly through published ethnographic writing, between professional anthropologists and the subjects of their research. They also draw attention to the issues of power and representation raised in ethnographic writing. In Brettell's volume, Ginsburg (1993) discusses her work among abortion activists in order to highlight the politics of academic research and the ways in which colleagues react to certain forms of research. Elsewhere, Blackman (1992) reviews the ways in which Native American life histories have been received by Native American audiences.

The increasing production of ethnography by native anthropologists working in their own cultural milieu has also led to discussions of selfhood, voice and authority in ethnographic writing. Kondo (1990) explores these issues through a blending of ethnography and personal narrative, in a study of Japan by a Japanese-American woman who stands in an ambiguous role vis-à-vis her Japanese informants – looking Japanese but not acting or talking like a 'real' Japanese person. Ethnographic autobiography has inspired Trinh T. Minh-ha's book Women, Native, Other (1989) which deals with issues of self-presentation and displays of self (and other) through discussions of conventions of anthropological writing. Minh-ha uses photos, poems, fiction and personal narrative in her discussions of gender and 'nativism'. Her book represents an example of the blending of anthropological theory and personal narrative, in a genre form that rejects the claim that the two must be in opposition.

Michael Herzfeld (1997b) has produced an ethnographic biography that uses genres of life history, biography and ethnography to discuss the life and work of Greek novelist and left-wing political figure Andreas Nenedakis. Herzfeld explores important cultural and historical themes in Greek culture through the eye of the anthropologist (himself) and the eye of the novelist (Nenedakis). More than this, however, the book shows that the long-time friendship between these two men and their wives (Cornelia Meyer Herzfeld and Eli-Maria Keminou) has been fruitful to the anthropologist's understandings of culture and history. No contradiction is posited between friendship, intellectual intimacy and anthropological objectivity; for Herzfeld, such a dichotomy is false. Other experimentations with autobiography, biography and ethnography include the work of Brettell (1999), Brown (1991), Kendall (1988) and Narayan (1989).

An interest in the practices of ethnography and self-disclosure among those who were traditionally the subject of the ethnographic gaze has produced several important models of collaborative research and understandings of the 'practical knowledge' (Bourdieu, 1980) of both researchers and their informants. There is a growing tendency to produce texts that are presented as autobiographical, first-person accounts by the subject him or herself, rather than mediated life histories. The growth of schooling and literacy has enhanced this trend. Examples of this form of autoethnography are Laye ([1954] 1994), Roughsey (1984), Saitoti (1986) and Horne and McBeth (1998). Ethnographers increasingly view informants as collaborators and autobiographers in their own right. One example is Janet Hoskins' (1985) discussion of Maru Kaku, an Indonesian man who assisted several anthropologists, and who created an autobiography that uses his own poetic traditions. Hoskins describes this as a lament about choices made. Although Kaku's own native oral tradition does not include self-presentation, this boundary-crosser innovated, combining conventional narrative genres in his own tradition with more Western individualistic genres of autobiography. Susan Rodgers (1993) has written about an Indonesian Batak writer who, while not explicitly autobiographical in his writings, makes use of autoethnographies and autorepresentations of ethnicity and culture. This writer, suggests Rodgers, is writing his own culture through a form of self-presentation. Autoethnography of this sort is also described by Herzfeld (1997a, 1997b), Kideckel (1997), Reed-Danahay (1997a) and Warren (1997).

Among the topics for narrative ethnography and ethnographic memoir that have not yet been addressed as much as others cited in this chapter, are issues of danger in fieldwork and physical or mental illness in the field (see Howell, 1990; Lee, 1995). There has also been relatively little candid writing about ethnographer careers (mentorship, education and employment issues, family and work issues, career success and failure). Perhaps these will be the next 'taboos' broached in intimate ethnographic writing!
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NOTES

1 See also Heinritz and Rammstedt, 1991 and Morin, 1980 on the use of life history methods in France; Markiewicz-Lageau, 1976 on Poland; Rammstedt, 1995 on Italy; and Gullfalk, 1996 on Norway. Bertaux and Kohli, 1984 review what they term more generally as ‘the continental approach’. For contemporary British approaches to social science uses of autobiography, see Stanley, 1993.

2 See also Charity et al., 1995 and Edwards, 1992 on the use of photographs in ethnography.

3 For a more recent collaborative work by a husband and wife, see Stoller and Olles, 1987. See also Turner, 1987.

4 See also Gilmore, 1991 for a discussion of issues of social class, politics, and fieldwork in Spain.

5 In addition to the essays in Lewin and Leop, see also Bolton, 1995; Herdt, 1997; Lunsing, 1999; Newton, 1993.

6 See also Turner (1983) on ‘Muchona the Hornet: Interpreter of Religion’.

REFERENCES


DuBois, Cora (1944) *The People of Aor*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.


AUTBIOGRAPHY, INTIMACY AND ETHNOGRAPHY


