



“Half Bacchanalian, Half Devout”: White Intellectuals, Black Folk Culture, and the “Negro Problem”

David G. Cox

To cite this article: David G. Cox (2015) “Half Bacchanalian, Half Devout”: White Intellectuals, Black Folk Culture, and the “Negro Problem”, American Nineteenth Century History, 16:3, 241-267, DOI: [10.1080/14664658.2015.1095441](https://doi.org/10.1080/14664658.2015.1095441)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/14664658.2015.1095441>



Published online: 20 Nov 2015.



Submit your article to this journal 



Article views: 370



View related articles 



View Crossmark data 

“Half Bacchanalian, Half Devout”: White Intellectuals, Black Folk Culture, and the “Negro Problem”

David G. Cox*

Department of History, University of Sheffield, Sheffield, UK

(Received 21 August 2014; accepted 7 September 2015)

In the wake of the Civil War, white Americans generated an unprecedented amount of writing about the songs, stories, and “superstitions” of black southerners. This interest was not purely esthetic. In the late nineteenth century, folk culture was commonly conceptualized as a gauge of racial character and potential; in consequence, discourse on black folklore was entangled with the debate on the social and political place of African Americans. A number of scholars have noted the ways in which white supremacy was bulwarked by the work of folklorists, ethnologists, local color writers, and other intellectuals. The variety and contingency of this discourse on race, however, has sometimes been obscured, giving the impression of a static and monolithic racial ideology. Ideas about black folk culture shifted over time, shaped by a range of racial attitudes encompassing a liberal emphasis on uplift, a conservative commitment to stasis, and a radical insistence on regression. Moreover, the racial politics of intellectuals determined not only the ways in which they represented black folk culture, but also the particular cultural forms about which they wrote. Thus, while the Christian content of the “spirituals” suited the agenda of liberal reformers, the supposedly sinister figure of the conjure doctor complemented radical discourse on dangerous racial degeneration.

Keywords: race; ideology; folklore; reform

In 1890 an article entitled “Notes on Negro Folk-Lore and Witchcraft in the South” appeared in the *Journal of American Folk-Lore*. Penned by Louis Pendleton of Virginia, it included a new version of the Tar-Baby tale made famous a decade earlier by the Georgian journalist and author, Joel Chandler Harris, who had included it in his first Uncle Remus collection. Whereas Harris had excised all that was “frightful, retaining only the humorous,” in Pendleton’s hands the Tar-Baby metamorphosed into a “living creature whose body, through some mysterious freak of nature, was composed of tar, and whose black lips were ever parted in an ugly grin.” In his experience, Pendleton insisted, this “monster tar-baby which haunted the woods and lonely places of the plantation, was represented as wholly vicious in character, ever bent upon ensnaring little folks into its yielding, though vice-like, embrace.”¹ A few years after Pendleton’s

*Email: david.cox@sheffield.ac.uk

article was published, Frederick Hoffman reprinted, in his pseudoscientific study *Race Traits and Tendencies of the American Negro*, an *Atlanta Constitution* article complaining that “women and girls of the whole countryside” lived in “practically a state of siege,” afraid “to venture to a neighbor’s or a school house lest some black beast leap from the bushes and give them over to a fate worse than death.”² The linguistic propinquity of Pendleton’s piece and newspaper accounts like this were more than mere coincidence: in the late nineteenth century, discussion of black folklore was rarely divorced from the debate on the racial character of African Americans, or, the “negro problem.” If, as has been argued, there was “something about freedom that endangered the Southern black man,” there was also something about it which made black folklore fascinating to whites.³ In both cases, this something was the need to “place” the four million former slaves within the reconstructed body politic. In postbellum America, discussion of folklore became a means of constructing and contesting notions of race. It would, of course, be reductive to claim that this was all it was: Americans engaged with black folklore for myriad reasons. However, while aesthetic attraction to the exotic and a desire to escape monotonous modernity certainly contributed to its appeal, the frequency with which explicit political lessons were drawn from black folklore suggests that in the Gilded Age questions of culture were never far from questions of power.

As these different versions of the Tar Baby suggest, white discourse on black folklore was far from monolithic. Here, it is still useful to bear in mind the categories of racial thought employed by Joel Williamson in *The Crucible of Race*. Nuancing previous conceptions of a single, southern “mind,” Williamson delineated three postbellum racial attitudes: “liberal,” “conservative,” and “radical.” Although most whites were certain of the current inferiority of African Americans, they disagreed over their future. Whereas liberals sought to “uplift” blacks, attributing supposed racial shortcomings to environmental factors, conservatives saw African-American subordination as consonant with the natural order of things. During the 1890s, a harsher, radical racism emerged, the exponents of which saw everywhere signs of black degeneration and imminent extinction.⁴ As Williamson suggested, these attitudes were not static: free from rigid internal logic, they responded to the vicissitudes of historical context. Accordingly, as racial attitudes hardened at the end of the century, so too did representations of black folklore. If Harris’s sanguine vision of African-American culture chimed with the conservatism of the 1870s and early 1880s, then Pendleton’s sanguinary Tar-Baby, with its echo of the black beast-rapist, sat equally well with *fin de siècle* radicalism.

As well as shaping representations of black culture, racial politics also helped to determine the *kinds* of cultural forms whites wrote about. Intellectuals at different points along the political spectrum focused on those elements of black culture that best gave voice to their own position. Thus, abolitionist reformers during the 1860s were drawn to the sacred music of the formerly enslaved because it seemed to support their argument that blacks were capable of assimilation into civilized, Christian society. Conservatives like Harris were attracted to black folktales as vehicles for vernacular writing, receptacles for the paternalist mythology that was emollient to sectional reconciliation. Finally, the radical architects of Jim Crow saw the practice of

“conjure” as irrefutable evidence of a dangerous unreason disqualifying blacks from political responsibility. Of course, because racial attitudes were not discrete, the work of individual writers defies easy categorization. Certain ideas about black culture flowed across the permeable boundaries of these attitudes: if conservatives agreed with liberals on the childlike racial character evinced by black folklore, conservatives and radicals concurred that this character rendered uplift chimerical, and virtually all assented to the image of Africa as benighted Dark Continent.⁵

As the folklorist Anand Prahlad notes, to discuss the relationship between race and the representation of black folklore is to engage with a body of scholarship so diffuse that individual works can appear hermetic.⁶ Social and cultural historians of the 1960s and 1970s approached the concept of the “folk” uncritically, portraying it as a source of subaltern resistance to hegemonic mass culture. This approach found its apotheosis in Lawrence Levine’s *Black Culture and Black Consciousness*. Using folklore as a lens through which black thought might be desried, Levine drew a rigid distinction between form and content, glossing the disparate political agendas of those who collected and discussed black cultural forms.⁷ However, during the 1980s, in the wake of the cultural turn, scholars, recognizing identity as a “central object of political struggle,” began to deconstruct images of the “folk” as part of a wider project to denaturalize intersecting identities of class, race, and gender.⁸ Employing Gramsci’s conception of cultural hegemony, historians began to investigate the relationship between race and ideology, arguing that nineteenth-century American “culture makers,” in order to justify white supremacy and bulwark industrial capitalism, constructed a racialized hierarchy of culture, with black savagery as counterpoint to white civilization.⁹

Building upon the work of George Stocking, historians of anthropology have demonstrated the discipline’s pivotal role in this culture-making project. Nineteenth-century anthropologists elaborated an evolutionary paradigm within which all peoples were placed upon the same path from savagery to civilization. In the early twentieth century this paradigm collapsed under the weight of intellectual and social pressures, to be replaced by Franz Boas’s pluralist conception of cultures as discrete sets of understandings and practices. Although Boas began formulating his ideas during the 1880s, Gilded Age anthropologists were “evolutionists almost to a man.”¹⁰ Ethnologists (as anthropologists were more commonly known) were convinced of the “psychical unity of man, the parallelism of his development everywhere in all time,” setting out to map the mental growth of different peoples, and viewing folklore as an outward indication of this internal process.¹¹ For African Americans, the political implications of evolutionism were as obvious as they were injurious: as the anthropologist Lee Baker has argued, evolutionism legitimized Jim Crow.¹² Because most American ethnologists were preoccupied with Native Americans, they gave less thought than semi-professional folklorists to black culture.¹³ However, self-reflexive folklorists have paid more attention to the role that invented notions of “authenticity” and “tradition” played in the definition of modern America than they have to the relationship between folklore and the equally constructed concept of race.¹⁴ The notable exception is Simon Bronner, who, like Baker, has drawn upon the work of cultural historians in order to elucidate the racial politics of those folklorists to whom

African-American folk culture was a “measure of how far blacks had come or could go.”¹⁵ More recently, revisionist works emerging from literature departments have sought to complicate the idea of a hegemonic evolutionism allied to white supremacy. Parsing the intersections of ethnology and literature, both of which were energized by the possibilities of representing difference, these works have engaged in a “prehistory of the culture concept,” considering the ways in which cultural pluralism, although unarticulated, permeated late-nineteenth-century writing.¹⁶ Reading this discourse “against the grain,” Michael Elliott has argued that some white intellectuals wrote about difference in order to circumnavigate the “blatant chauvinism of white supremacy.”¹⁷

Surveying this scattered body of literature, much of which has originated outside of history departments, it is sometimes possible to discern a certain insensitivity to change over time. In this respect, the work of George Fredrickson is a valuable corrective. In *The Black Image in the White Mind*, Fredrickson historicized nineteenth-century racial stereotypes, emphasizing their protean, contingent nature in order to refute the ahistorical view of racism as innate psychological reflex. As Fredrickson argued, at the heart of this imagery lay the dichotomy of child and savage. When blacks were comfortably under foot, whites were content to portray them as dependent children; when, however, whites felt the racial power structure creak at the joints, they rushed to depict blacks as dangerous.¹⁸ This is not to deny the importance of intellectual heritage, concepts divorced from the material considerations of the present. Late-nineteenth-century intellectuals built upon a body of thought on the black diaspora stretching back at least as far as the fifteenth century.¹⁹ But, although ideas about blacks did not appear *ex nihilo*, what is significant, as Barbara Fields has argued, is the specific “reshuffling” of these views at specific historical moments.²⁰

Of course, it is important to remember that black intellectuals were particularly keen to contest hegemonic assumptions of racial hierarchy. Recently, various scholars have rightly emphasized an “oppositional yet fecund subaltern tradition” of thought: a “counter-narrative” of “oppositional and liberatory possibilities.”²¹ As Mia Bay argues, Fredrickson failed to pay due attention to African-American “agency, commentary, and influence.”²² Thus, scholarly treatments of “white” or “black” thought risk further entrenching imagined binaries of race and culture.²³ In the wake of World War I, African-American intellectuals conversant with Boasian anthropology generated a flood of discourse on black folklore. Many white scholars were receptive to this work; between 1917 and 1937, for instance, 14 issues of the *Journal of American Folk-Lore* were devoted to the work of black folklorists.²⁴ And yet, in the late nineteenth century, black influence was circumscribed. As Walter Johnson has reminded us, recognizing limits to African-American agency is not the same as dehumanizing African Americans.²⁵ Black agency in the political and social spheres certainly impacted upon the work of white intellectuals; as Bay notes, radical racism was, in large part, a reaction to black political assertiveness.²⁶ However, white discourse on black folklore was rarely generated *in conversation* with African Americans. For the most part, black postbellum intellectuals were marginalized. Indeed, there is a danger, as Patrick Rael argues, that “stories of success” might efface “larger, potent, and malevolent contexts of power relations.”²⁷ Studies of countervailing discourse

also risk presenting hegemonic thought as flat and static. Any analysis of hegemony must remain sensitive to its nuances in order to avoid portraying dominant ideology as the monolithic expression of a unitary ruling-class consciousness.²⁸ In short, the recognition of a black counter-narrative should obscure neither the pernicious power of white-supremacist ideology nor its complexity.

Before the Civil War, because few white Americans were interested in the enslaved as social agents in their own right, most had little interest in black folk culture. Indeed, aside from a few glimpses in the memoirs of Fanny Kemble and others, the most revealing discussions of folk belief are to be found in the narratives of former slaves. As the folklorist Bruce Jackson noted, a “Southern slaveholder would no more have thought of publishing his slaves’ songs than he would have considered paying them a salary or acknowledging his mixed progeny.”²⁹ It was only when emancipation shattered the status quo, leaving the place of blacks uncertain, that a significant number of literate whites began to discuss black folklore. During the Civil War, abolitionist reformers from the North flocked to the Sea Islands of Georgia and South Carolina in the hope of inculcating the freedmen with the prerequisites of republican citizenship: “civilization and Christianity.”³⁰ These reformers, imbued with the romantic racialism of abolitionism, imagined in black sacred music a spiritual authenticity absent from modern, industrialized life, and, crucially, discerned in the Christian content and Western form of the “spirituals” evidence that blacks were capable of civilization.³¹ As the author of one of the earliest discussions of this music put it: “Who shall dare say that these fellow-inheritors with us of the image of the Father and the love of the Son are fit only to be slaves?”³²

The first printed collections and discussions of black folk culture emerged from this cultural encounter, appearing in publications committed to the middle-class ethos of the reformers.³³ Indeed, the first anthology of black sacred music, 1867’s *Slave Songs of the United States*, was partly conceived as a demonstration, as its introduction made clear, that the freed slaves were a “teachable” people, an assertion not without political significance at a time when Congress was locked in debate over the Reconstruction Acts.³⁴ A number of those who began writing about black sacred music hailed from the elite “Cambridge circle,” centering on Harvard professor James Francis Child, author of the *urtext* of American folklore, *English and Scottish Popular Ballads*, and were thus primed to capitalize upon the historical moment.³⁵ While this group may have turned their attention to black southerners in order to escape ethnic discord in New England (as Regina Bendix argues), they were also spurred by the abolitionist idealism saturating a town in which, as the Cambridge reformer and Union army officer, Thomas Wentworth Higginson put it, “every man had a draft of the new community in his waistcoat pocket.”³⁶

Recent analyses of the racial politics of postbellum folklorists have drawn upon the work of musicologist Jon Cruz. Employing Foucault’s notion of the “cultural sphere” as “key terrain upon which politics, power, and domination were mediated,” Cruz identified a shift in the representation of black culture from abolitionist accounts, which recognized the spirituals as testimony to oppression, to the work of late-nineteenth-century folklorists who viewed black folklore as apolitical artifact.³⁷ Yet, as Cruz himself recognizes, the transition from testimony to artifact was not a clean

break. As the work of abolitionist reformers demonstrates, the liberal approach to black culture was always marked by a tension between testimony and artifact.³⁸ In the eyes of white reformers, black culture, “half bacchanalian, half devout,” sat uneasily in the liminal space between assimilation and difference.³⁹ Consequently, Higginson could insist, in an echo of the abolitionist and former slave Frederick Douglass, that black sacred music was “commentary on the life of the race,” while recalling how he carried it back to his tent “like some captured bird or insect.”⁴⁰ As Higginson’s language suggests, this ambivalence was partly a legacy of ethnology’s origins in natural science, a provenance that helps explain the tendency of ethnologists to frame their explanations of difference in biological as well as cultural terms.⁴¹ It was also suggestive of a preoccupation with physical difference, which, both before and after the war, permeated the writing of even the most liberal whites. This preoccupation is evident in the diaries of Fanny Kemble, written between 1838 and 1839 and including one of the earliest white accounts of black music: a discussion of the songs sung by boatmen ferrying her upriver between her husband’s plantations. Such was the dissonance at the heart of abolitionist racial attitudes that Kemble was able to decry as “intolerable” the “desperate tendency to despise and undervalue their own race and color, which is one of the very worst results of their abject condition” just a few lines after reflecting on the appearance of a singer name Issac: “I could not, I confess, have conceived it possible that the presence of articulate sounds, and the absence of an articulate tail, should make, externally at least, so completely the only appreciable difference between a man and a monkey, as they appear to do in this individual ‘black brother.’” While Kemble certainly saw some merit in the music she heard, reflecting that “one or two barbaric chants and choruses might be evoked from them that would make the fortune of an opera,” she was two decades too early to hear these songs as testimony to black potential.⁴²

This discordance, however, goes beyond race and touches a paradox at the heart of liberal reform: the need to first define as separate those one seeks to assimilate. As soon as whites turned their attention to black folk culture, this ambivalence manifested itself in the distinction drawn between the “spirituals” – the acceptable face of black belief – and other, less palatable forms of culture, especially “conjunction.”⁴³ The easiest way for Victorians to signify the insuperable otherness of a cultural form was to identify it as African in origin. Thus, while Allen declared that the “chief part of negro music” was “civilized in character – partly composed under the influence of association with whites, partly actually imitated from their music,” he also decried elements of an “intrinsically barbarous character,” which “may well be purely African in origin.”⁴⁴ Indeed, it was no coincidence that, while John Sullivan Dwight was happy to publish black sacred music in *Dwight’s Journal of Music*, he had been horrified earlier in the century by the composer Louis Gottschalk’s use of Afro-Caribbean musical forms.⁴⁵ Whatever their racial attitude, most whites were convinced that cultural influence should run in only one direction: white to black. This rejection of reciprocity reflected another, related, facet of reform: the denial of power to its supposed beneficiaries. Recent historians have emphasized the inclusivity of liberal reform, revising the conclusions of those who saw it as a “marker of class distinction or a tool of social control.”⁴⁶ However, even Daniel Walker Howe, among those most

sympathetic to the reformers, recognizes a certain irony in the act of directing another toward autonomy.⁴⁷ To women and men like Edward Pierce, a Boston attorney dispatched by the Treasury to study the inhabitants of the Sea Islands, the formerly enslaved were little more than “children [...] unprepared for the full privileges of citizens.”⁴⁸

During the 1870s and 1880s, as enthusiasm for uplift waned, most northerners encountered black folk culture in southern, “local color” literature rather than the writings of reformers. Framing regional difference in a form unthreatening to national unity, this literature soothed sectional animosities. Local color reinvigorated the antebellum myth of the servile, placid slave, legitimizing white supremacy and appeasing the conscience of northerners increasingly uninterested in black southerners.⁴⁹ Racism, nationalism, and an increasing faith in *laissez-faire* political economy led growing numbers of northerners to the conclusion that, as the *Nation* editor, Edwin Godkin put it, the freedman should be left to “work his own way and fight his own battles.”⁵⁰ Thus, southern writers satisfied the appetite of northern publishers.⁵¹ In 1873 the new editor of *Scribner’s Monthly*, Richard Gilder, hoping to encourage reconciliation, commissioned a series of articles on “The Great South.” In order to procure suitable material, he dispatched the journalist Edward King south. In February 1873, King met the Louisianan author George Washington Cable and, impressed, encouraged him to pen the first of six New Orleans-based vignettes compiled in 1879 as *Old Creole Days*, sparking the vogue for local color.⁵² Among those to benefit most from this enthusiasm was the *Atlanta Constitution* journalist Joel Chandler Harris, who, in 1880, published the first of his of black folktale collections, *Uncle Remus: His Songs and His Sayings*, garnering national acclaim and presidential encomium.⁵³ Harris’s success encouraged other southern writers to turn their attention to black culture; indeed, Charles Colcock Jones, Jr, the Georgian lawyer and amateur anthropologist, began gathering material for his own collection of Gullah folktales after being asked by Harris in 1883 to collect any Sea Island stories suitable for the second Remus volume.⁵⁴

Harris shared the conservative racial politics of his editor and friend, Henry Grady, the apostle of the New South, who viewed blacks as socially inferior and politically unfit. As many have noted, Harris’s conservative agenda can be clearly discerned in the literary devices used to frame his tales.⁵⁵ Remus himself, an elderly freedman narrating the stories to a spellbound white boy, ventriloquized Harris’s conservative racial proscriptions, epitomizing the loyal, unthreatening slave of southern mythology. The symbolism of Remus’s parity with the white child was clear: blacks were a childlike people, not to be entrusted with political responsibility. As Harris insisted, during Reconstruction the “responsibility of the negro was no more than that of a little child, who had wandered quite by accident into the halls of legislation.”⁵⁶ Moreover, in an intellectual context within which language and intelligence were wed, Remus’s dialect, more literary creation than phonetic transcription, further reinforced notions of racial inferiority: here was a minstrelsy of the page to complement the minstrelsy of the stage.⁵⁷ Harris, characteristically, minimized his literary contribution, claiming in an 1881 letter to Mark Twain that it was “the matter and not the manner” of the tales which drew the public to them; Twain, however, demurred,

insisting in a letter to Harris that the tales were “only alligator pears – one eats them merely for the sake of the dressing.”⁵⁸ Another local colorist using black folklore to denigrate uplift was the Virginian, Thomas Nelson Page. In “Zekyl’s Infidelity,” one of his poems, a black woman chastises her husband who “don’t believe in sperits / ‘Skusin’ ‘tis outa jug!” The irony of the poem lies in the space between the author’s and narrator’s view of Zekyl: while his wife clearly considers Zekyl foolish, it is he who articulates Page’s worldview: “tain no goodin preachin’; / niggers is such fools – / Don’t know mo’ ‘bout teachin’ / ‘N white folks does ‘bout mules.”⁵⁹

Not all local colorists, however, shared the conservative racial mentality of writers like Harris and Page: Cable, famously, was forced to leave the South in 1885 after writing two *Century* essays which, although dismissing social equality as a “fool’s dream,” espoused political and civil equality for black Southerners.⁶⁰ A year later, *Century* published a pair of Cable articles discussing black folk culture in Louisiana. Again suggesting that a tension between assimilation and difference lay at the heart of liberal reform, Cable’s analysis, if more perspicacious than most, vacillated between culture as testimony and culture as artifact. In the first of these articles, a description of the music and dance that enlivened New Orleans’s Congo Square during the rest period of the city’s slaves, Cable appeared particularly preoccupied with exotic spectacle. This was partly a matter of source material: the Louisianan lifted his account almost entirely from a 1789 discussion of Saint-Domingo written by the French historian, Médéric Moreau de Saint-Méry.⁶¹ Setting the scene at Congo Square, Cable’s description evinced the pervasive prejudice of reformism: “The hour was the slave’s term of momentary liberty, and his simple, savage, musical and superstitious nature dedicated it to amatory song and dance tinctured with rude notions of supernatural influences.” If Cable the polemicist sought assimilation, Cable the author was fascinated by ideas of cultural alterity, shading easily into notions of racial difference. Like so many white accounts of black culture, his description of “the true African dance” seethed with eroticism and danger. Fueled by “the dark inspiration of African drums,” it was, he wrote, “a sensual, devilish thing.” Like the reformers of the 1860s, Cable viewed this African “frenzy” – a “triumph of body over mind” – as antithetical to civilization. Yet, even here, Cable was too astute to conceive of the world in purely binary terms: although the passing of such amusements was “nothing to be regretted,” there remained a “pathos of slavery, a poetry of the weak oppressed by the strong, and of limbs that danced after toil, and of barbaric love-making.”⁶² Again echoing abolitionist reformers, Cable found it easier to discern meaning in music than in dance, noting in his second article the “mingled humor and outrage” surfacing in “satirical songs of double meaning,” and concluding wryly, “What is so innocent as music!”⁶³

Paternalistic in racial outlook as both were and drawing heavily upon black folk culture as both did, local color and the embryonic discipline of folklore studies overlapped. It was thus unsurprising that in 1888 both Harris and Cable became charter members of the American Folk-Lore Society. The AFLS was established largely as a result of the efforts of Cambridge’s William Wells Newell, a former minister, Harvard tutor, and schoolmaster, emerging from much the same intellectual milieu as Allen and Higginson.⁶⁴ Newell, who edited the society’s *Journal of American*

Folk-Lore, was very much a liberal reformer; yet, in the journal itself, liberal, conservative, and, even, radical attitudes intermingled. It was not uncommon for supposedly scholarly articles on black folklore to appear in fanciful literary frames, echoing Lost Cause depictions of antebellum plantations populated by loyal, amiable slaves. The catholic composition of the *JAFL* reflected not only the still largely amateur complexion of folklore, but also the imbricated pattern of nineteenth-century racial attitudes: even the most liberal interpreters of black folklore, in their need to legitimize reform, reinforced notions of black cultural inferiority.⁶⁵ By the time the AFSL appeared, over a decade had elapsed since Reconstruction and few northerners dissented from the racial conservatism of the New South. Charles Dudley Warner's account of voodoo in New Orleans was typical; drawing an explicitly political lesson from the supposed fact that "very few of the colored people" were "free from superstition," the travel writer denounced the "hazardous experiment" of universal black male suffrage, rued the "magnitude of the negro problem," and insisted, "Society cannot be made or unmade by legislation."⁶⁶ However, because the study of folklore had roots in liberal reform, its relationship with local color was never entirely straightforward. While Bronner's assessment that Cable was "too late as a postbellum abolitionist" accurately represents the retrogressive racial politics of the Gilded Age, it obscures the persistency, in some quarters, of liberal attitudes.⁶⁷ Just as Reconstruction-era reformers did not represent black sacred music entirely as testimony, Gilded Age folklorists did not portray black folk culture exclusively as artifact.

As the century drew to a close and southerners rolled back the rights of blacks, debate on the "negro problem" intensified. Northerners were keen to discover the extent to which freedom, the "prime essential of manhood," had "borne fruit" in the "material, intellectual, and moral well-being" of the formerly enslaved.⁶⁸ Gilded Age intellectuals exhibited a marked interest in black folklore because it was widely viewed as "an index of the intelligence and environment of the race."⁶⁹ The absence of an indigenous American peasantry may have been, as Bronner asserts, one of the factors compelling Newell to include black folklore within the remit of the AFSL, but, as he made explicit in the society's manifesto, Newell was also motivated by the political concerns of the present:

the great mass of beliefs and superstitions which exist among this people need attention, and present interesting and important psychological problems, connected with the history of a race who, for good or ill, are henceforth an indissoluble part of the body politic of the United States.⁷⁰

Later, Newell declared that the "admission of civic rights to descendants of African barbarians," a "step without parallel," made "ethnological problems of the most practical concern" to American citizens and "light from whatever source on the essential mental and moral qualities of Africans [...] most welcome."⁷¹ Newell certainly did not view this culture as apolitical artifact; indeed, his claim that the "true character of the plantation negro, a mystery to his former masters, who viewed him only from the outside," was "to be found in his folklore" indicated his proximity to abolitionists who had heard sacred music as testimony.⁷²

Although some preferred to see folklore as a branch of literature, and although Newell was unaffiliated with any anthropological institution, the AFSL aligned itself squarely with anthropology, sharing both membership and evolutionary outlook with John Wesley Powell's Bureau of American Ethnology, established in 1879. To Powell, the BAE existed to chart the "origin and development of human opinions," thus continuing the work begun by the American ethnologist Henry Lewis Morgan in 1877's *Ancient Society*.⁷³ Alongside 1871's *Primitive Culture*, written by the English anthropologist Edward Tylor, Morgan's work underpinned Gilded Age ethnology. For African Americans, evolutionism was a double-edged sword: on the one hand, its universalism blunted the force of mid-century polygenesim; on the other, it legitimized white supremacy, allowing Victorians to compare contemporary "savagery" to prehistoric European culture.⁷⁴ It was, then, unfortunate that, just as southerners began to codify Jim Crow, northern folklorists began to regularly depict black cultural forms as remnants of a savage past.⁷⁵ It was also somewhat unpropitious that evolutionists frequently employed the analogy of individual human growth, comparing "savages" to children and "civilized" Westerners to adults.⁷⁶ This analogy conferred intellectual credibility to paternalist political proscriptions and a degree of scientific legitimacy to the equivalency of Uncle Remus and his young interlocutor.

In 1894, Newell discussed black folk culture at length in a speech delivered at Virginia's Hampton Institute, an African-American teacher-training college, during the inaugural meeting of the Hampton Folk-Lore Society. Established the previous year, the HFLS was the most significant locus of African-American scholarship on black folk culture. Making his assimilationist agenda explicit, Newell informed his audience that the institute inspired him with "hope, comfort, trust in the future, faith in the ultimate position of the Negro race."⁷⁷ Like his abolitionist predecessors, Newell believed that before blacks could be assimilated into American society, their folk culture would have to be deracinated. The "best way to correct superstitious notions," he wrote,

is to collect and study them [...] in order to get rid of a disgraceful custom, or of ancient credulity, the best way is not to try to ignore its existence, but to face and find out what it is.⁷⁸

In this light, it seems as if the common assertion made by folklorists that they were preserving soon-to-be-extinct cultural forms was a form of prolepsis: Newell and others declared that black folklore was on the verge of extinction because they hoped to see it so.⁷⁹ As Newell told the Hampton students, folklore, belonging "to the past," was "vanishing in proportion to the progress of Negro education," being "superseded by more advanced ideas, habits, morals, and theology."⁸⁰

These ideas would have resonated particularly strongly with Newell's audience: uplift was, after all, Hampton's *raison d'être*. Established in 1868 under the auspices of the American Missionary Association, Hampton soon became the demesne of its principal, former Union general and resolute assimilationist, Samuel Armstrong. Conceiving Hampton as a "tabula rasa as far as real culture is concerned," Armstrong wanted his students to identify vestiges of black southern folk culture and root them out.⁸¹ It was for this reason that he devoted an 1878 issue of Hampton's

monthly publication, *Southern Workman*, to four student papers on conjuring. Armstrong wanted his students to “throw light upon the mental condition of the masses” in order to identify the “kind of work that must be done among them if they are to be raised to civilization or even saved from extinction.” The principal was closed to dialogue with his students about the veracity of black folk belief; noting that one of them professed a belief in conjure (in fact, two did), he proclaimed, “Two years more in school will change his ideas.”⁸² This unreceptive attitude was further illustrated by an exchange of letters in the subsequent issue of *Southern Workman*. “Experience,” wrote the African-American teacher W. I. Lewis, “teaches that unless we are reminded of excellencies, we will ourselves hardly become excellent.” It was doubtful, Lewis continued, that Armstrong would “find a very considerable degree of gratitude” among his readers “for such publications.” Appropriating the language of evolutionism, Lewis declared, “Our days of childhood are (if not, they should be) fast taking their flight, and the advent of manhood is at hand.” This protest, however, served only to strengthen Armstrong’s resolve: a “height of ignorance and deadly superstition,” he insisted, still weighed “upon the race, holding it down to a state of helpless childhood, or, worse far, a manhood crippled, dwarfed and dangerous, soon to sink into age and death.” Clearly, African Americans recognized that liberal discourse might serve conservative ends; however, in postbellum America, their public voice was muted. Indeed, in light of the ensuing 20 years of discourse, Lewis’s hope that “the world” would “not have to shriek again” at such “ghastly” scenes assumes a certain irony.⁸³

The degree to which the HFLS countered such grim scenes is a matter of debate. In the work of the 20-strong society, Daphne Lamothe and Sarah Moody-Turner have discerned the first buds of the cultural pride that bloomed during the Harlem Renaissance. The founder of the HFLS, Alice Bacon, a white teacher, certainly saw the collection of folklore as a field for black agency: here was work which “must be done by the intelligent and educated colored people,” to whom the culture of “the more ignorant people” was “no occasion for scorn.”⁸⁴ In Bacon’s eyes, folklore was a serious business, but this does not mean that she anticipated the Harlem Renaissance celebration of black folk art.⁸⁵ On the contrary, as Baker has noted, Bacon shared the ethos of Armstrong and Newell, lauding Hampton for “eradicating the old and planting the seeds of the new.”⁸⁶ In Bacon’s eyes, her students’ discussions of folklore threw their own “civilized” status into sharper relief. After his speech at Hampton, Newell remained in contact with Bacon, inviting an HFLS delegation to the 1895 AFLS meeting, at which its paper, read by Robert Moton, the future Tuskegee principal, was enthusiastically received.⁸⁷ It would, however, be possible to exaggerate the depth of this inter-racial dialogue, making a teleological connection between the AFLS of the early twentieth century and its nineteenth-century antecedent. If the white folklorists who heard Moton were keen to engage in discussion with the HFLS delegates, they were also eager to record their renditions of black folksongs, blurring the line, as Baker also argues, between ethnologist and exhibit.⁸⁸

Certainly, the African-American members and correspondents of the HFLS approached black folklore with a greater sensitivity than their white counterparts. As Lamothe notes, the black educator Alice J. Cooper came closest to articulating an ethos of cultural celebration. It was, she wrote in a letter of support for the fledgling

society, “the worst possibility yet” that the black middle class “under the shadow of this overpowering Anglo-Saxon civilization” would “become ashamed” of their “own distinctive features,” aspiring only to imitate and losing “all originality, all sincerity, all self-assertion.” Prefiguring the Harlem Renaissance, Cooper saw in black folklore the kernel of a truly original “national literature.”⁸⁹ For the most part, however, black intellectuals took a resolutely evolutionist approach to culture; as Professor W. H. Scarborough declared in an 1896 address to the HFLS, folklore was an “old lingering relic of barbarous nature” being “completely obliterated by the tide of intelligence.” Like Bacon, Scarborough saw the collection of folklore as a means to “best illustrate the evolution of a race.”⁹⁰ In 1898, HFLS-member Daniel Webster Davis made explicit the society’s political agenda: “This glance at the past,” he wrote in an article on conjure, “serves to emphasize the magnificent present, and to point to a still more glorious future.” With such evidence of progress, he continued, “who will dare say that the Negro’s education and enfranchisement is a failure?”⁹¹

As black intellectuals were well aware, humorous portrayals of black culture went hand-in-hand with conservative racial politics. In his AFLS paper, Moton castigated “white ‘nigger minstrels’” for “making the religious experience of the Negro a joke for white audiences,” thus bringing “the whole subject of Negro music into contempt and derision.”⁹² However, in the JAFL, as a result of folklore’s association with local color, serious discussion sometimes sat awkwardly alongside less sober discourse. Because, to Newell, folklore was anything but absurd, he was never entirely easy with vernacular literature.⁹³ Although the JAFL published a slew of black songs and stories rendered in vernacular by the North Carolinian Emma Backus, in a lengthy addendum to one of her articles, Newell complained that a “serious fault” with such literature was

that the meaning and real interest of the tale is disguised; a dialect story is apt to be a mere piece of jargon, in which the lack of deep human interest is atoned for by a spelling which is usually mere affectation.

Because it was “impossible by means of the regular alphabet to reproduce negro dialect with any accuracy,” he argued, the best course of action was to “follow the expression of the reciters word for word, to observe elisions and contradictions, but otherwise to use ordinary English orthography.”⁹⁴

As Newell’s criticisms suggest, in the world of folklore, different racial attitudes did not always coexist harmoniously. Discord was particularly evident when it came to questions of cultural origin. For instance, in a review of *Negro Myths from the Georgia Coast*, Newell disagreed with the conclusion of its author, Charles Colcock Jones, Jr., that the folktales of Gullah blacks were African in origin. To the JAFL editor, the stories had none of the “mythological furniture” belonging to the “savage mind”: absent were the “cruelty,” the “cannibalism” and the “dwarfs and monsters of savage fancy.” Nowhere “in the history of the world,” Newell concluded, had there been “such another example of the complete obliteration of ancestral faith.”⁹⁵ If Jones’s insistence that blacks could not “lift themselves entirely above the superstitious fears born in Africa” was an implicit refutation of liberal uplift, Newell’s analysis

was an apologia for assimilation.⁹⁶ This commitment to assimilation explains certain contradictions in Newell's thought. For instance, he was never entirely able to disavow the increasingly unpopular concept of cultural diffusion, the idea that cultural forms might become detached from their moorings and traverse the barriers of race and language. Newell's insistence on diffusion in his address to the 1891 London Folklore Congress left him in hot water with the prominent evolutionist Andrew Lang: "As far as I understood Mr. Newell's ideas," Lang puffed after Newell's paper, "I do not think I can sufficiently express how much I disagree with them all round."⁹⁷ Although Newell's sensitivity to diffusion made the mantle of evolutionism less comfortable, he was too indebted to the "genius of Edward B. Tylor" to shed it entirely.⁹⁸ In his writings, Newell remained an evolutionist. However, his commitment to uplift meant that he could never fully accept the ultimate implication of the doctrine: if humans were psychologically alike, less-developed peoples would progress without the influence of their more civilized neighbors. To Newell, diffusion remained a rigidly top-down process because, although there was "always something barbarous" in the legends of a "primitive tribe" repelling "educated taste," and making "borrowing difficult," it was "easy for the ruder people to adapt the clearer and simpler narrative of their intellectual superiors."⁹⁹

Joel Chandler Harris's relationship with anthropology was always a difficult one. According to Brad Evans, his fractious relationship with Powell, in particular, was occasioned by the fact that, in ascribing African origins to his tales, Harris appeared to recognize diffusion.¹⁰⁰ Any such acknowledgment would certainly displease the doctrinaire Powell, who stretched evolutionism "almost to the point of self-parody."¹⁰¹ Harris's relationship with the discipline, however, was troubled not only by questions of origin, but also by considerations of content. Flattered by the attentions of ethnologists, Harris subscribed to *Folk-Lore*, the journal of the English Folk-Lore Society, and, demonstrating an awareness of cultural evolutionism, discussed the origins and analogues of his tales in the introduction to the second Remus volume, 1883's *Nights with Uncle Remus*.¹⁰² Yet Harris swiftly recanted, scribbling in one copy of *Nights*:

The introduction is a gem. It should be read with eyes half closed in order to get the full effect of the vast learning it contains. The reader will naturally think it represents some knowledge of comparative folk-lore on the part of the author. He is willing to make an affidavit that he knows no more on the subject than a blind horse knows about Sunday.¹⁰³

By the summer of 1883, Harris had disavowed any ethnological intent: the Remus tales, he told his English publishers, "were not written with an eye to their importance as folk-lore stories," of which he "had no more conception" than the "man on the moon." Two years earlier, in his letter to Twain, Harris had placed content before form; he now insisted, however, that his first Remus story had been "written out almost by accident, and as a study in dialect."¹⁰⁴

Because, as Lawrence Levine suggested, folktales seem to have acted as a psychological pressure-valve for the enslaved, allowing them to imagine violent retribution

against their masters, any serious approach to black folktales raised questions of meaning, needling the conservative Harris and threatening to confound his paternalist picture of racial rapport. Thus, although in the introduction to *Songs and Sayings* he observed that it needed “no scientific investigation” to explain why black southerners should select as their hero the rabbit – the “weakest and most harmless of all animals” – and have him repeatedly triumph over stronger creatures, he sought immediately to emasculate this message, insisting that it was “not *malice*, but *mischievousness*” which won the day.¹⁰⁵ Harris disavowed any knowledge of the stories’ meaning, claiming that he could not answer letters from folklorists eager to know “why the negro makes Brer Rabbit so cunning and masterful.”¹⁰⁶ “First let us have the folk-tales as they were intended to be told,” he insisted,

for the sake of amusement – as a part of the art of literary entertainment. Then, if the folk-lorists find in them anything of value to their pretensions let it be picked out and preserved with as little cackling as possible.¹⁰⁷

In 1892, Abigail Holmes Christensen did just this. “It must be remembered,” she noted in the introduction to her collection of black folktales, “that the Rabbit represents the colored man,” who, although “not as large nor as strong, as swift, as wise, nor as handsome” as the other animals in the tales, succeeded by “cunning,” just as “the negro, without education or wealth, could only hope to succeed by stratagem.”¹⁰⁸ Christensen, like Newell, was committed to racial uplift, and the *JAFL* editor’s review of her collection certainly suggests the recognition of a kindred spirit: the “ethical character of the tales,” he reflected, served to give a “very curious illustration of the mental condition in which the wiles of the rabbit are considered praiseworthy.”¹⁰⁹ Always sensitive to the social import of black folklore, Newell wrote to Christensen post-haste in an unsuccessful attempt to have her address the AFLS on her book’s bearing on the “ethics, the original and improved, or changed character of these negroes”¹¹⁰

Acutely aware of the reactionary uses to which even the most liberal treatments of black folklore might be put, the black author Frances Harper, echoing Lewis’s letter to Armstrong, warned Christian that her book, testimony to a “sad past” that she and other African Americans would rather forget, would find few black readers.¹¹¹ By 1892, state legislatures across the South had begun to strip blacks of their political and civil rights, rendering such admonitions especially urgent. Abandoning the paternalist posturing of the Redeemers, more and more writers began to portray blacks as a violent, libidinous threat to the social fabric, whose autonomy would lead only to extinction, whether as a result of race war or physical degeneration. Employing the language of science, radicals insisted on innate and hereditary black inferiority.¹¹² If Darwinism rendered mid-century notions of polygenesis untenable, its vast extension of history left questions of racial origin moot, allowing radicals to posit racial differences so engrained that blacks and whites were, as good as, if not actually, separate species. Blacks were, “almost certainly nearer,” in the words of Harvard scientist Nathaniel Shaler, “to the anthropoid or pre-human ancestry of men than the other marked varieties of our species.”¹¹³ Chiming with those older notions of physical difference glimpsed in Kemble’s diaries, this new pseudoscience

infused the writing of even liberal reformers like Christensen, as her account of a black story-teller named Prince Baskin demonstrated: “to see him once in animated conversation,” she wrote, “would [...] send a true disciple of Darwin into ecstacies,” for nobody could deny that he looked “much less of a man than a monkey.”¹¹⁴

Scientific racism precluded the possibility of progress; as the Virginian historian and brother-in-law of Thomas Nelson Page, Philip Bruce, opined in 1889’s *The Plantation Negro as Freeman*, blacks shared certain “fundamental qualities” which appeared “to be incapable of alteration, however favorable [the] circumstances.” The “principle element of doubt” in radical predictions of the future, was “not so much” whether dangerous racial “tendencies” would “be modified by any alteration” in the “fundamental character” of black Southerners, as whether they would “be held in check” by whites.¹¹⁵ Using Africa and the Caribbean as a lens through which might be descried a future America in which blacks exercised power, Shaler insisted, “Where the blood predominated,” and was “not firmly held in the control of civilization of European origin, the blacks [...] show no tendency to advance in social culture, but tend rather to lose whatever elevation they may have gained under the control of civilized peoples.”¹¹⁶ Discourse on regression obscured the reality of racial oppression; to radicals, black poverty was not the result of sharecropping and lynching, but the fact that the “negroes as a mass” were “gradually but surely reverting to the African type.”¹¹⁷

Reformers saw in sacred music testimony to black potential, and conservatives found in folktales a medium for paternalist ideology. Radicals, however, concerned themselves with conjure and “superstition,” seeking to demonstrate the inescapable downwards pull of African heredity and complement contemporary images of dangerous blacks. Conjure was paraded as proof that racial uplift was chimerical. For instance, an 1899 *Arena* article related an incident in which a black woman “sent for an ignorant old ‘hoodooer,’ or witchdoctor” to care for her ailing infant, which died in consequence of the conjure doctor’s “barbarous treatment.” To the author, the political lesson was clear: the education of black Southerners was “fruitless,” because “to expect a man whose grandfather was a naked fetish-worshipping savage to have the same grasp of affairs, the same mental capacity as the ‘heir of all ages,’ the Anglo-Saxon,” was “not only ridiculous, but most unfair to the negro.”¹¹⁸ Bruce devoted an entire chapter of *The Plantation Negro* to superstition, dismissing the significance attached to black sacred music by reformers. If Moton heard in the spirituals “the length and depth of the American slave’s religious and historical experiences laid bare,” Bruce heard only “mere sound,” the expression of a Christianity that was the “hollowest of mockeries,” satisfying “passions and appetites” but providing no moral compass. If there was melancholy in the spirituals, it stemmed not from racial injustice, but from awe in the face of death. According to Bruce, “an unquestioning faith in the art of witchcraft” prevailed “universally” among black southerners. This faith, he argued, differed “very little in character and exhibition from the variety of superstition that flourishes on the west coast of Africa to-day among the descendants of ancestors who are common to the American negro also.” The “retention of this superstition after the lapse of such a great length of time, passed in the midst of different local surroundings and amid the most modifying influences” was, to Bruce, one of the strongest proofs of the “inherent

tenacity of the fundamental qualities of his race.” Radicals could invoke superstition to discredit the most legitimate black aspirations. Discussing education, Bruce declared, “the negro attaches an almost superstitious value to such instruction; he exalts the idea as if it were that of a fetish; it calls up a vague conception to his mind that is pregnant with manifold but ill-defined benefits.”¹¹⁹

It is illustrative of the tangled nature of Gilded Age racial thought that this kind of interpretation was able to make its way, without criticism, into the pages of the *JAFL*, most obviously in the aforementioned 1890 article written by Louis Pendleton, an aspiring novelist from Georgia. Betraying his racial mentality, Pendleton cited Bruce’s “thoughtful and interesting book” in support of his contention that “Virginia tobacco plantation negroes, living at a convenient distance from churches, schools, and railroads,” could be “found to have as firm a belief in witchcraft as those savages of the African bush who file their teeth and perforate the cartilage of their noses.”¹²⁰ Perhaps Pendleton’s piece escaped editorial comment because it chimed with liberal assumptions of black cultural inferiority. As Newell’s review of Charles C. Jones’s *Negro Myths* demonstrated, even the most liberal Americans did not dispute the myth of the Dark Continent: the “negro problem” was a debate on the future of blacks, not their past. Certainly, not all AFLS members shared Newell’s liberalism; after all, the Philadelphian ethnologist Daniel Brinton, president of the society in 1889 and one of the most important anthropologists in the country, was a vociferous white supremacist. Convinced that ethnology should guide racial politics (on which hung the “fate of man”), Brinton insisted in 1890’s *Races and Peoples* that white women had

no holier duty, no more sacred mission, than that of transmitting in its integrity the heritage of ethnic endowment gained by the race through thousands of generations of struggle. That philanthropy is false, that religion is rotten, which would sanction a white woman enduring the embrace of a colored man.¹²¹

As Pendleton’s writing demonstrated, radicals sought to overturn the unthreatening imagery peddled by conservatives.

According to Bruce, there was “no touch of poetry, or element of tenderness or benignity in the general character of this superstitiousness.” On the contrary, he insisted, “the forces which it calls into play are callous and sinister; all cheerfulness is banished from the atmosphere in which it flourishes.” Only “malice, hatred, mischief, and calamity” remained.¹²²

Conjure doctors, it was argued, aroused the passions of blacks, which only white authority could restrain, to a dangerous pitch. If, as Kipling put it, blacks were “half-devil and half-child,” the conjurer appealed directly to the diabolic. As Bruce wrote, in a passage quoted at length in Pendleton’s *JAFL* article:

A neighborhood in which a trick doctor may happen to be, is sometimes thrown into a state of general turmoil by his presence [. . .] It is one of the most remarkable traits of the negroes that they have no compunction about inflicting injury when they can do so slyly, and safely; the presence of a trick doctor affords them an

ample opportunity for the display of this characteristic, for witchcraft is as furtive a means of doing harm as poison or the torch.¹²³

Of course, as this comparison illustrates, the root of radical disapprobation was a profound hostility toward sources of autonomous black authority that might become loci for resistance and rebellion. Conjure, as southerners had long been aware, was a weapon of the weak. As the Reverend Charles Colcock Jones complained five decades earlier:

They have been known to be so perfectly and fearfully under the influence of some leader or conjurer or minister, that they have dared not disobey him in the least particular; nor to disclose their own intended or perpetrated crimes, in view of inevitable death itself.¹²⁴

HFLS members more were sensitive to the social context of conjure, and more likely to discuss it in the past tense. As Leonara Herron noted, it was unsurprising that the slave, denied legal restitution, “brought up in ignorance, and trained in superstition [...] should invoke secret and supernatural powers to redress his wrongs.”¹²⁵ However, they too reinforced the popular image of conjure doctors as charlatans working “evil among the credulous people with whom they were surrounded.”¹²⁶ In 1898’s Reconstruction romance, *Red Rock*, Thomas Nelson Page dramatized conjure’s threat to racial hierarchy, having the villain of the piece, a conjurer named Dr Moses, proclaim, “I’m jest as good as any white man, and I’m goin’ to show ‘em so. I’m goin’ to marry a white ‘ooman and meck white folks wait on me.”¹²⁷ Dr Moses demonstrated the extent to which by the end of the century Page had abandoned the paternalism of his earlier writing, replacing the faithful “old negro” of conservative fancy with the execrable “new negro,” cultivated by Republican politics and bent upon the inversion of the social order. Later, Page made his views more explicit, contrasting obedient “old-time Negroes” with the “new issue” who were “insolent, dishonest, and without the most rudimentary elements of morality.”¹²⁸ As W. E. B. Du Bois recognized, radicalism masked the reality of African-American achievement, it was thus was no coincidence that radical discourse intensified as black intellectuals began to make their presence felt.¹²⁹ Indeed, Page evinced a particular distaste for Du Bois, a towering intellect, Atlanta professor, and the first black postgraduate to receive a PhD from Harvard, dismissing him as the epitome of those “afro-Americans,” with the veneer of so-called education.¹³⁰

Whereas abolitionist reformers had vacillated between cultural and biological explanations of difference, in much of the discourse of the 1890s, the two were fused. Moses’s degeneracy might be read on an “evil face” abounding with the marks of racial inferiority: protruding jaw, “ground down” teeth, receding forehead, and “unusually wide” nostrils.¹³¹ In order to denote atavism, these physiognomic signifiers were frequently employed alongside references to the conjurers’ African provenance.¹³² One such conjurer, familiar to Gilded Age folklorists and perhaps to Page, was King Alexander, who appeared in the Missourian Mary Owen’s 1892 collection of black folklore, *Old Rabbit, The Voodoo, and Other Sorcerers*. This “king” of occult ‘cussedness’ was apparently possessed of a “narrow forehead [...] full at the

eyebrows but shockingly depressed above,” as well as a broad nose “with a flatness of nostrils emphasized to the perception of the beholder by the high, bony ridge that divided them.” Yet the

time to fully realise that he was a self-chosen disciple of his Satanic Majesty was when he unclosed his great rolling lips in a silent laugh. The yawning cavern thereby disclosed, with its double-guard of yellow, broken, ‘snaggy’ teeth set in gums unwholesomely red, and its ugly, wriggling tenant, a serpent-like tongue, were, in themselves, more awe-inspiring than any charm or curse that issued therefrom.¹³³

Here, Owen made explicit the common conflation of conjure and the occult, a confusion made easier by the significance attached to snakes in both West African religion and Haitian voodoo.¹³⁴ The sinister imagery of the 1890s is thrown into greater relief by Harris’s earlier treatment of the conjurer Daddy Jack in *Nights*. Daddy Jack, “a wizard, a conjurer, [...] a snake-charmer,” and a “genuine African,” may well have reminded white southerners of another conjurer, Denmark Vesey’s co-conspirator Gullah Jack, whose plan to poison every well in Charleston so disturbed the authorities that it was struck from official records. But, Harris, characteristically, minimized the troubling elements later foregrounded by radicals: his Jack was a “little dried-up old man, whose weazened dwarfish appearance, while it was calculated to inspire awe in the minds of the superstitious, was not without its pathetic suggestions.”¹³⁵

In the late nineteenth century, intellectuals engaged with black folklore for a multitude of reasons. However, the frequency with which these writers made explicit their political agenda suggests that the postbellum fascination with black folklore was primarily engendered by emancipation and the consequent need for whites to define the social and political place of the formerly enslaved. Whites did not respond uniformly to this question: discourse on the songs, stories, and religious beliefs of black southerners was less a monolithic expression of hegemony than an arena for debate, a contested terrain within which disparate visions of hegemony competed. Visions of the future of blacks differed according to the racial attitudes of whites, attitudes that were contingent and permeable rather than static and discrete. Although whites shared many ideas on black culture, drawing from a common pool of racial discourse, the specific arrangement of these ideas varied over time. Encountering black sacred music on the Sea Islands, northern reformers were quick to appropriate it for their own cause: assimilation of the formerly enslaved into the reconstructed nation. Of course, this missionary ethos hinged upon an assumption of white cultural supremacy shading easily into ideas of racial difference. This tension between assimilation and difference surfaced in interpretations of black culture which placed Christian “spirituals” and other, supposedly savage, cultural forms in a binary opposition divorced from the lived experience of black southerners. Southern local color literature, with its unthreatening depictions of regional difference might, at first glance, appear apolitical, but, by situating black folklore within a literary frame of paternalistic racial harmony, it helped make white-supremacist home rule palatable to northerners who were, in any case, tiring of their commitment to black southerners. The paternalism of southern conservatives chimed with that of northern reformers, blurring the

boundary between local color and the nascent discipline of folklore studies. This relationship, however, was not entirely harmonious: tensions between liberal and conservative racial attitudes surfaced when questions arose about the origin or meaning of folklore. These differences paled, however, when set against the increasingly radical racism of the 1890s. With their sundry accounts of superstition and conjure, radicals upended the sentimental racial images of local color, replacing them with alarming accounts of black malevolence more congruent with a South rushing headlong toward black disenfranchisement and *de jure* racial segregation.¹³⁶

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author.

Notes on contributors

Having completed his PhD at Cambridge, David Cox teaches courses on nineteenth-century American history at the University of Sheffield. He is currently working on a monograph exploring the racial politics of representation, provisionally entitled *American Intellectuals and African-American Folk Culture, 1862–1914*, as well as another project examining postbellum American discourse on Haiti.

Notes

1. Pendleton, “Notes on Folk-Lore,” 201.
2. Hoffman, *Race Traits*, 232.
3. Tolnay and Beck, *Festival of Violence*, 70.
4. See Williamson, *Crucible of Race*. For the homogenizing approach, see Cash, *Mind of the South*.
5. See Brantlinger, “Victorians and Africans.”
6. Prahlad, “Afrikana Folklore,” 253.
7. See Levine, *Black Culture*.
8. Cook and Glickman, “Twelve Propositions,” 32. As Robin Kelley writes, “A cultural studies approach would insist that terms like ‘folk,’ ‘authentic,’ and ‘tradition’ are socially constructed categories that have something to do with the reproduction of race, class, and gender hierarchies and the policing of the boundaries of modernism.” Kelley, “Notes on Deconstructing the Folk,” 1402.
9. Takaki, *Iron Cages*, 125. See also Rydell, *All the World’s a Fair*; Lears, *No Place of Grace*; Jacobson, *Barbarian Virtues*.
10. Stocking, *Race, Culture, and Evolution*, 112.
11. Brinton, “Aims of Anthropology,” 247.
12. Baker, *Savage to Negro*, 22.
13. For the history of nineteenth-century U.S. anthropology, see Hinsley, Jr, *Savages and Scientists*; Darnell, *Along Came Boas*.
14. The major works of folklore studies historiography include Bronner, *American Folklore Studies*; Zumwalt, *American Folklore Scholarship*; Bendix, *In Search of Authenticity*; Simon Bronner, *Following Tradition*.
15. Bronner, *Following Tradition*, 100. Bronner cites both Rydell’s *All the World’s a Fair* and Lears’s *No Place of Grace*. See also Wiggins, Jr, “Afro Americans as Folk”; Jordan and De Caro, “In this Folk-Lore Land.” David Murray has taken a similar approach, noting that, when racial hierarchy seemed threatened, the collection of black folklore acted as a

- “rehearsal of inferiority.” Murray, *Matter, Magic, and Spirit*, 49. For a more recent work focusing on the twentieth century, see Mullen, *The Man Who Adores the Negro*.
16. Evans, *Before Cultures*, 3.
 17. Elliott, *Culture Concept*, xiv, 10.
 18. See Fredrickson, *Black Image*. See also, Fredrickson, *Arrogance of Race*, 215. For the pioneering work upon which Fredrickson built, see Jordan, *White Over Black*.
 19. See Pieterse, *White On Black*.
 20. Fields, “Ideology and Race,” 154.
 21. Williams, *Theories of Race*, xxii. Moody-Turner, *Black Folklore*, 6. See also, Lamothe, *Inventing the New Negro*.
 22. Bay, “Remembering Racism,” 648. See also, Bay, *White Image in the Black Mind*.
 23. For a critique of these categories, see Appiah, “Race, Culture, Identity.”
 24. Baker, “Research, Reform, and Racial Uplift,” 43.
 25. See Johnson, “On Agency.”
 26. Bay, “Remembering Racism,” 655.
 27. Rael, “New Black Intellectual History,” 360. See also Williams, *Theories of Race*, 4.
 28. See Lears, “Concept of Cultural Hegemony.” As Mary Louise Pratt and John MacKenzie recognize, the irony of much post-colonial literature is that, in dismantling the image of a homogenous Orient, scholars risk creating an equally monolithic Occident. See Pratt, *Imperial Eyes*, 5; Pratt “Scratches on the Face of the Country,” 121; MacKenzie, *Orientalism*, 5.
 29. Jackson, *The Negro and His Folklore*, xviii.
 30. William A. White to Edward Atkinson, February 21, 1862, Edward Atkinson Manuscripts, Massachusetts Historical Society, quoted in Rose, *Rehearsal for Reconstruction*, 41.
 31. See Bendix, *Authenticity*, 93.
 32. C. W. D., “Contraband Singing,” 56.
 33. For a representative selection of these articles, see McKim, “Negro Songs”; McKim “Songs of the Port Royal Contrabands”; Allen, “Negro Dialect”; Higginson “Negro Spirituals.”
 34. Allen, Ware, and Garrison, *Slave Songs of the United States*, viii.
 35. See Child, *English and Scottish Popular Ballads*.
 36. Higginson, *Army Life in a Black Regiment*, 90.
 37. Cruz and Lewis, *Viewing, Reading, Listening*, 5. See also Cruz, *Culture on the Margins*. For recent discussion of this transition from testimony to artifact see Moody-Turner, *Black Folklore* and Murray, *Matter, Magic, and Spirit*.
 38. For an extended discussion of this tension, see Radano, “Denoting Difference.”
 39. Higginson, *Army Life in a Black Regiment*, 41.
 40. Higginson, “Negro Spirituals,” 87. For Douglass’s discussion of this music, see Douglass, *Narrative*.
 41. For anthropology’s debt to natural science, see Hinsley, *Savages and Scientists*, 88.
 42. Kemble, *Journal of Residence*, 260–261, 260.
 43. See Jones, *Soldiers of Light and Love*, 142–143.
 44. Allen, *Slave Songs*, v, v–vi.
 45. For a discussion of Dwight’s hostility toward Gottschalk, see Starr, *Bamboula!*, 159–69.
 46. Butler, *Critical Americans*, 7.
 47. Howe, *American Self*, 265. For the older interpretation, stressing the hegemonic character of reform, see Katz, *Irony of Early School Reform*; Sproat, “The Best Men”; Levine, *Highbrow/Lowbrow*.
 48. Quoted in McPherson, *Abolitionist Legacy*, 29.
 49. Like antebellum minstrelsy, this literature was an early form of mass culture, depoliticizing and making a commodity of black culture. See Lott, *Love and Theft*.
 50. Godkin, “The Republican Party and the Negro,” 246.

51. For more on these northern “fiction factories” see Denning, *Mechanic Accents*.
52. Mixon, *Southern Writers*, 98.
53. Although Harris’s tales first appeared in the *Atlanta Constitution*, Northern publishers facilitated his Uncle Remus books. For more, see Morrow, “Joel Chandler Harris Talks of Himself and Uncle Remus,” 5; Joel Chandler Harris to the editors of the *Evening Post*, May 19, 1880, in Harris, *Life and Letters*, 147.
54. Bickley, Jr., *Joel Chandler Harris*, 39.
55. See Wolfe, “Malevolent Rabbit,” 40.
56. Harris, *Editor and Essayist*, 144.
57. See Pederson, “Language in the Uncle Remus Tales.”
58. Harris, *Life and Letters*, 169–70.
59. Gordon and Page, *Befo’ de War*, 17, 19.
60. George Washington Cable, “The Silent South,” *Together with “The Freedman’s Case in Equity” and “The Convict Lease System,”* (1885; repr., New York: Columbia University Press, 1959), 54, quoted in Mixon, *Southern Writers*, 99.
61. See Starr, *Bamboula!*, 41.
62. Cable, “Dance in Place Congo,” 191, 199, 206, 207, 208.
63. Cable, “Creole Slave Songs,” 214.
64. Higginson chaired the first meeting of the AFS, held in Boston during 1889. See “Meeting of the Members,” 157.
65. Franz Boas, who helped found the AFLS and edited the *JAFL* after Newell’s death, might have taken the society in a more progressive direction; before 1905, however, he wrote virtually nothing about African Americans, publishing his most significant work outside of the *JAFL*. See Baker, “Research, Reform, and Racial Uplift,” 66.
66. Warner, *Studies in the South and West*, 67, 8, 30, 12.
67. Bronner, *Following Tradition*, 106.
68. Spahr, “Negro as a Citizen,” 491.
69. Edwards, “Bahama Folk-Lore,” 47.
70. Newell, “Field and Work,” 5.
71. Newell, “Folk-Tales of Angola,” 61.
72. Newell, “Folk-Lore Study,” 233.
73. Powell, “Interpretation of Folk-Lore,” 97. For an extended discussion of the rift between the anthropological and literary camps, see Zumwalt, *Dialogue of Dissent*. For Powell’s debt to Morgan, see Hinsley, *Savages and Scientists*.
74. Johannes Fabian labeled this process “diachronic relegation.” Fabian, *Time and the Other*, x.
75. See Newell, “Field and Work.”
76. As Newell put it, “in past centuries all the world [...] seems to have been a little childish.” Newell, *Games and Songs*, 5.
77. Newell, “Collection of Negro Folk-Lore,” in Waters, *Strange Ways*, 186.
78. Newell, “Negro Folk-Lore,” 189.
79. For more on the concept of prolepsis see Brantlinger, *Dark Vanishings*.
80. Newell, “Negro Folk-Lore,” 186. As Newell put it elsewhere, in the “Southern States of the Union the negro presents a great body of beliefs, tales, and habits, rapidly giving way to the culture of the white race, to whom he is becoming mentally assimilated.” Newell, “Folk-Lore Study,” 233. Newell epitomized nineteenth-century “Anglo-conformity.” See Gordon, “Assimilation in America.”
81. Samuel Armstrong, “Address before the 1877 Anniversary Meeting of the American Missionary Association,” Hampton Institute Archives, quoted in Anderson, *Education of Blacks*, 45.
82. “Conjure Doctors in the South,” 132.
83. Armstrong and Lewis, “Letter and Editorial Reply,” 140.
84. Bacon, “Circular Letter,” 151.

85. See Locke, ed., *The New Negro*.
86. Bacon, "Circular Letter," 150. See Baker, *Savage to Negro*, 56.
87. See "American Folk-Lore Society."
88. See Baker, "Mission of the Hampton Folk-Lore Society," 63–6; Lamothe, *Inventing the New Negro*, 30.
89. "More Letters Concerning the 'Folk-Lore Movement' at Hampton," 156. See Lamothe, *Inventing the New Negro*, 27.
90. Scarborough, "Folk-Lore," 257, 258.
91. Daniel Webster Davis, "Conjuration," 312.
92. "American Folk-Lore Society," 209.
93. For Newell's views on the importance of taking folklore seriously, see Newell, review of *Current Superstitions*.
94. Backus, "Animal Tales," 292, 298.
95. Newell, review of *Negro Myths*, 170.
96. Jones, Jr, *Gullah Folktales*, 169.
97. Newell, "Lady Featherlight," 65.
98. Newell, "Folk-Lore Study," 235. See Bell, "American Folklore Scholarship." After his mauling at the hands of Lang, Newell was more vociferous in his espousal of the comparative method. See Newell, review of *Current Superstitions*, 64.
99. Newell, "Lady Featherlight," 56.
100. See Evans, *Before Cultures*.
101. Stocking, *Race, Culture, and Evolution*, 129.
102. Harris, *Life and Letters*, 154. See Harris, *Nights*, 8–21.
103. Harris, *Life and Letters*, 186.
104. Joel Chandler Harris to David Bogue, June 28, 1883, in *Ibid.*, 156.
105. See also Joel Chandler Harris to George Lawrence Gomme, June 9, 1883, in *Ibid.*, 158.
106. *Ibid.*, 162.
107. *Ibid.*, 153.
108. Christensen, *Afro-American Folklore*, xi–xii.
109. Newell, review of *Afro-American Folk-Lore*, 259.
110. William Wells Newell to Abbie Holmes Christensen, 24 Nov. 1892, Christensen Family Papers, South Carolina Library, quoted in Tetzlaff, *Cultivating the New South*, 131.
111. F[rancis] E[llen] W[atkins] to Abbie Holmes Christensen, ca. 1892, Christensen Family Papers, South Carolina Library, quoted in *Ibid.*, 134.
112. See Gould, *Mismeasure of Man*.
113. Shaler, "Nature of the Negro," 25. For a discussion of Shaler, see Livingstone, *Nathaniel Southgate Shaler*.
114. Christensen, *Afro-American Folklore*, 1–2.
115. Bruce, *Plantation Negro*, 241.
116. Shaler, "African Element in America," 671.
117. Bruce, *Plantation Negro*, 53.
118. McGovern, "Disenfranchisement as a Remedy," 441.
119. "American Folk-Lore Society," 209. Bruce, *Plantation Negro*, 154, 101, 99, 114, 7.
120. Pendleton, "Notes on Folk-Lore," 204. Pendleton made his racial attitude explicit five years later in his novel, *Sons of Ham*: "What public and private disasters are to come through the negro's easily cajoled and venal vote through his rapid increase and future numerical supremacy, through the fires of race hate, now carefully smothered on his – the weaker – side, and only now and then bursting forth to remind the world of what watches and waits behind the screen of servility and circumspection, – no human mind can foresee." Pendleton, *Sons of Ham*, 328.
121. Brinton, *Races and Peoples*, 278, 287. The JAFL review of Brinton's work, however, was not uncritical, as its author wrote: "On the whole, we might wish that some still very

- doubtful theories to which the author adheres were not presented with quite as much assurance as finally settled." B[ergen], review of *Races and Peoples*, 276.
122. Bruce, *Plantation Negro*, 111.
 123. Ibid., 118–19.
 124. Jones, *Religious Instruction of the Negroes*, 128. Jones, Jr echoed these remarks, see Jones, Jr, *Gullah Folktales*, 171. For the relationship between conjure and rebellion, see Raboteau, *Slave Religion*; Suttle, Jr, "African Religious Survivals"; Rucker, "Conjure, Magic, and Power"; Anderson, *Conjure and Magic*.
 125. Herron, "Conjuring and Conjure Doctors," 227.
 126. Bacon, "Conjuring and Conjure Doctors," 239.
 127. Page, *Red Rock*, 291.
 128. Page, *The Negro*, 80.
 129. See Williams, *Theories of Race*, 35.
 130. Page, *The Negro*, 163.
 131. Page, *Red Rock*, 357, 292.
 132. See Raboteau, *Slave Religion*, 284; Murray, *Matter, Magic, and Spirit*, 58; Anderson, *Conjure*, 1–2.
 133. Owen, *Old Rabbit*, 173, 176.
 134. Again, the Reverend Jones prefigured these views, equating "superstitions brought from Africa" with "a kind of irresistible Satanic influence." Jones, *Religious Instruction*, 127.
 135. Harris, *Nights*, 137.
 136. For a classic discussion of this process of segregation, see Woodward, *Strange Career of Jim Crow*.

References

- "American Folk-Lore Society." In *Waters, Strange Ways*, 208–215. Previously published in *Southern Workman* 24 no. 2 (1895): 30–32.
- Allen, William Francis. "The Negro Dialect." *Nation* 1 (Dec. 14, 1865): 744–745.
- Allen, William Francis, Charles Prichard Ware, and Lucy McKim Garrison, eds. *Slave Songs of the United States*. New York: Peter Smith, 1951. Facsimile of the first edition. New York: A. Simpson, 1867.
- Anderson, Jeffrey E. *Conjure and Magic in African American Society*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2005.
- Anderson, James D. *The Education of Blacks in the South, 1860–1935*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1988.
- Appiah, K. Anthony. "Race, Culture, Identity: Misunderstood Connections." In *Color Conscious: The Political Morality of Race*, edited by K. Anthony Appiah, and Amy Gutmann, 30–105. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996.
- Armstrong, Samuel Chapman and W. I. Lewis. "Letter and Editorial Reply." In *Waters, Strange Ways*, 139–142. Previously published in *Southern Workman* 7, no. 5 (1878): 35.
- Backus, Mrs. E. M. "Animal Tales from North Carolina." *Journal of American Folklore* 11, no. 43 (1898): 284–292.
- Bacon, A. M. "Circular Letter." In *Waters, Strange Ways*, 150–154. Previously published in *Southern Workman* 22, no. 12 (1893): 180–181.
- Bacon, A. M. "Conjuring and Conjure Doctors." In *Waters, Strange Ways*, 238–242. Previously published in *Southern Workman* 24, no. 12 (1895): 209–211.
- Baker, Lee. "Research, Reform, and Racial Uplift: The Mission of the Hampton Folk-Lore Society." In *Excluded Ancestors, Invisible Traditions: Essays Toward a More Inclusive Anthropology*, edited by Richard Handler, 42–80. Madison: University of Wisconsin, 2000.
- Bay, Mia. "Remembering Racism: Rereading the Black Image in the White Mind." *Reviews in American History* 27, no. 4 (1999): 646–656.

- Bay, Mia. *The White Image in the Black Mind: African-American Ideas about White People, 1830–1925*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Bell, Michael. “William Wells Newell and the Foundation of American Folklore Scholarship.” In *American Folklore Historiography*, edited by Richard M. Dorson. Special issue, *Journal of the Folklore Institute* 10, no. 1/2 (1973): 7–21.
- B[ergen], F[anny]. Review of *Races and Peoples* by Daniel G. Brinton. *Journal of American Folklore* 4, no. 2 (1891): 87–88.
- Bickley, Jr, Bruce R. *Joel Chandler Harris*. Boston: Twayne, 1978.
- Brantlinger, Patrick. *Dark Vanishings: Discourse on the Extinction of Primitive Races, 1800–1930*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2003.
- Brantlinger, Patrick. “Victorians and Africans: The Genealogy of the Myth of the Dark Continent.” In *Race, Writing, and Difference*, edited by Henry Louis Gates Jr. Special issue, *Critical Inquiry* 12, no. 1 (1985): 166–204.
- Brinton, Daniel G. *Races and Peoples: Lectures on the Science of Ethnology*. New York: N. D. C. Hodges, 1890.
- Butler, Leslie. *Critical Americans: Victorian Intellectuals and Transatlantic Liberal Reform*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2007.
- Cable, George Washington. “Creole Slave Songs.” In *Jackson, The Negro and His Folklore*, 211–246. Originally published in *Century Magazine* 31 (April, 1886): 807–828.
- Cable, George Washington. “The Dance in Place Congo.” In *Jackson, The Negro and His Folklore*, 189–210. Previously published in *Century Magazine* 31 (February, 1886): 517–532.
- Cash, Wilbur J. *The Mind of the South*. New York: Random House, 1941.
- Child, James Francis. *English and Scottish Popular Ballads*. Boston: Little, Brown, and Co., 1857–1858.
- Christensen, Abigail Holmes. *Afro-American Folklore: Told Round Cabin Fires on the Sea Islands of South Carolina*. Boston: J. G. Cupples, 1892.
- “Conjure Doctors in the South.” In *Waters, Strange Ways*, 131–139. Previously published in *Southern Workman* 7, no. 4 (1878): 30–31.
- Cook, James W. and Lawrence B. Glickman. “Twelve Propositions for a History of U.S. Cultural History.” In *The Cultural Turn in U.S. History: Past, Present, and Future*, edited by James W. Cook, Lawrence B. Glickman, and Michael O’Maley, 3–57. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2008.
- Cruz, Jon. *Culture on the Margins: The Black Spiritual and the Rise of American Cultural Interpretation*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999.
- Cruz, Jon, and Justin Lewis. *Viewing, Reading, Listening: Audiences and Critical Reception*. Boulder: Westview Press, 1994.
- C. W. D. “Contraband Singing.” In *Jackson, The Negro and His Folklore*, 55–56. Previously published in *Dwight’s Journal of Music* 19 (September 7, 1861): 182.
- Davis, Daniel Webster. “Conjuration.” In *Waters, Strange Ways*, 308–312. Previously published in *Southern Workman* 27, no. 12 (1898): 251–252.
- Denning, Michael. *Mechanic Accents*. London: Verso, 1987.
- Douglass, Frederick. *Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass, An American Slave*. Boston: Anti-Slavery Office, 1845.
- Edwards, Charles L. “Some Tales from Bahama Folk-Lore.” *Journal of American Folklore* 4, no. 12 (1891): 47–54.
- Elliott, Michael A. *The Culture Concept: Writing and Difference in the Age of Realism*. London: University of Minnesota Press, 2002.
- Evans, Brad. *Before Cultures: The Ethnographic Imagination and American Literature, 1865–1920*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005.
- Fabian, Johannes. *Time and the Other: How Anthropology Makes its Object*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1983.
- Fields, Barbara J. “Ideology and Race in American History.” In *Region, Race, and Reconstruction: Essays in Honor of C. Vann Woodward*, edited by J. Morgan Kousser and James M. McPherson, 144–168. New York: Oxford University Press, 1982.

- Fredrickson, George. *The Arrogance of Race: Historical Perspectives on Slavery, Racism, and Social Equality*. Middletown: Wesleyan University Press, 1988.
- Fredrickson, George. *The Black Image in the White Mind: The Debate over Afro-American Character and Destiny, 1817–1914*. New York: Harper and Row, 1971.
- Godkin, E. L. “The Republican Party and the Negro.” *The Forum* 7 (April, 1889): 246–257.
- Gordon, Milton M. “Assimilation in America: Theory and Reality.” *Daedalus* 90, no. 2 (1962): 263–285.
- Gordon, Armistead Churchill, and Thomas Nelson Page. *Befo’ de War: Echoes in Negro Dialect*. New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1888.
- Gould, Stephen Jay. *The Mismeasure of Man*. New York: Norton, 1981.
- Harris, Julia Collier, ed. *Joel Chandler Harris, Editor and Essayist: Miscellaneous Literary, Political and Social Writings*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1931.
- Harris, Julia Collier, ed. *The Life and Letters of Joel Chandler Harris*. London: Constable, 1919.
- Harris, Joel Chandler. *Nights with Uncle Remus: Myths and Legends of the Old Plantation*. 1883. Reprint, London: Penguin Books, 2003.
- Herron, Leonora. “Conjuring and Conjure Doctors.” In *Waters, Strange Ways*, 227–229. Previously published in *Southern Workman* 24, no. 7 (1895): 117–118.
- Higginson, Thomas Wentworth. *Army Life in a Black Regiment*. Boston: Fields, Osgood, 1869. Reprinted with an introduction by Howard N. Meyer. New York: W. W. Norton, 1984.
- Higginson, Thomas Wentworth. “Negro Spirituals.” In *Jackson, The Negro and His Folklore*, 82–102. Previously published in *Atlantic Monthly* 19 (June, 1867): 685–694.
- Hoffman, Frederick. *Race Traits and Tendencies of the American Negro*. New York: Macmillan, 1896.
- Howe, Daniel Walker. *Making the American Self: Jonathan Edwards to Abraham Lincoln*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1997.
- Jackson, Bruce, ed. *The Negro and His Folklore in Nineteenth-Century Periodicals*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1967.
- Jacobson, Matthew Frye. *Barbarian Virtues: The United States Encounters Foreign Peoples at Home and Abroad, 1876–1917*. New York: Hill and Wang, 2000.
- Johnson, Walter. “On Agency.” *Journal of Social History* 37, no. 1 (2003): 113–124.
- Jones, Jr., Charles Colcock. *Gullah Folktales from the Georgia Coast. Originally published as Negro Myths from the Georgia Coast as Told in the Vernacular*. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1888. Reprinted with a foreword by Susan Millar Williams. Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 2000.
- Jones, Charles Colcock. *Religious Instruction of the Negroes. In the United States*. Savannah: Thomas Purse, 1842.
- Jones, Jacqueline. *Soldiers of Light and Love: Northern Teachers and Georgia Blacks, 1865–1873*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1980.
- Jordan, Winthrop. *White Over Black: American Attitudes Toward the Negro, 1550–1812*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1968.
- Jordan, Rosan Augusta and Frank De Caro. “In this Folk-Lore Land’: Race, Class, Identity, and Folklore Studies in Louisiana.” *Journal of American Folklore* 109, no. 431 (1996): 31–59.
- Katz, Michael. *The Irony of Early School Reform: Educational Innovation in Mid-Nineteenth-Century Massachusetts*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1968.
- Kelley, Robin D. G. “Notes on Deconstructing the Folk.” *American Historical Review* 97, no. 5 (1992): 1400–1408.
- Kemble, Frances Anne. *Journal of Residence on a Georgian Plantation in 1838–1839*. 1863. Reprint, Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1984.
- Lamothe, Daphne. *Inventing the New Negro: Narrative, Culture, and Ethnography*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 2008.
- Lears, T. J. Jackson. “The Concept of Cultural Hegemony: Problems and Possibilities.” *The American Historical Review* 90, no. 3 (1985): 567–593.
- Lears, T. J. Jackson. *No Place of Grace: Antimodernism and the Transformation of American Culture, 1880–1920*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981.

- Levine, Lawrence W. *Black Culture and Black Consciousness: Afro-American Folk Thought from Slavery to Freedom*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977.
- Levine, Lawrence W. *Highbrow/Lowbrow: The Emergence of Cultural Hierarchy in America*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1988.
- Livingstone, David N. *Nathaniel Southgate Shaler and the Culture of American Science*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1987.
- Lott, Eric. *Love and Theft: Blackface Minstrelsy and the American Working Class*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- MacKenzie, John M. *Orientalism: History, Theory and the Arts*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1995.
- McGovern, Montgomery. "Disenfranchisement as a Remedy." *The Arena* 21, no. 4 (1899): 438–446.
- McKim, J. M. "Negro Songs." In Jackson, *The Negro and His Folklore*, 57–60. Previously published in *Dwight's Journal of Music* 19 (Aug. 9, 1862): 148–149.
- McKim, Lucy. "Songs of the Port Royal Contrabands." In Jackson, *The Negro and His Folklore*, 61–63. Previously published in *Dwight's Journal of Music* 21 (Nov. 8, 1862): 254–255.
- McPherson, James M. *The Abolitionist Legacy: From Reconstruction to the NAACP*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1975.
- "Meeting of the Members of the American Folk-Lore Association in the Vicinity of Boston." *Journal of American Folklore* 2, no. 5 (1889): 157.
- Mixon, Wayne. *Southern Writers and the New South Movement, 1865–1913*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1980.
- Moody-Turner, Shirley. *Black Folklore and the Politics of Racial Representation*. Jackson: University of Mississippi Press, 2013.
- "More Letters Concerning the 'Folk-Lore Movement' at Hampton." In Waters, *Strange Ways*, 154–157. Previously published in *Southern Workman* 23, no. 1 (1894): 5.
- Morrow, James B. "Joel Chandler Harris Talks of Himself and Uncle Remus." *Boston Daily Globe*, November 3, 1907.
- Newell, William Wells. "Folk-Lore Study and Folk-Lore Societies." *Journal of American Folklore* 8, no. 30 (1895): 231–242.
- Newell, William Wells. "Folk-Tales of Angola." *Journal of American Folklore* 7, no. 24 (1894): 61–65.
- Newell, William Wells. *Games and Songs of American Children*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1883. Reprinted with an introduction and index by Carl Withers. New York: Dover, 1963.
- Newell, William Wells. "The Importance and the Utility of the Collection of Negro Folk-Lore." In Waters, *Strange Ways*, 185–190. Originally published in *Southern Workman*, 23, no. 7 (1894): 131–133.
- Newell, William Wells. "Lady Featherlight: An Inedited Folk-Tale. With Remarks by William Wells Newell." In *The International Folk-Lore Congress, 1891: Papers and Transactions*, edited by Joseph Jacobs and Alfred Trübner Nut, 40–66. London: D. Nutt, 1892.
- Newell, William Wells. "On the Field and Work of the Journal of American Folk-Lore." *Journal of American Folklore* 1, no. 1 (1888): 3–7.
- Newell, William Wells. Review of *Afro-American Folk-Lore*, by Abigail Mary Holmes Christensen. *Journal of American Folklore* 5, no. 18 (1892): 258–260.
- Newell, William Wells. Review of *Memoirs of the American Folk-Lore Society*, Vol. IV. Current Superstitions, by Fanny D. Bergen. *Journal of American Folklore* 9, no. 32 (1896): 55–66.
- Newell, William Wells. Review of *Negro Myths from the Georgia Coast as Told in the Vernacular*, by Charles Colcock Jones Jr. *Journal of American Folklore* 1, no. 2 (1888): 169–170.
- Owen, Mary Alicia. *Old Rabbit, the Voodoo, and Other Sorcerers*. With an introduction by Charles Godfrey Leland. London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1893.
- Page, Thomas Nelson. *The Negro: The Southerner's Problem*. New York: Scribner's, 1904.
- Page, Thomas Nelson. *Red Rock*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1898.
- Pederson, Lee. "Language in the Uncle Remus Tales." *Modern Philology* 82, no. 3 (1985): 292–298.
- Pendleton, Louis. "Notes on Folk-Lore and Witchcraft in the South." *Journal of American Folklore* 3, no. 10 (1890): 201–207.

- Pendleton, Louis. *Sons of Ham: A Tale of the New South*. London: Sampson, Low, Marston, 1895.
- Pieterse, Jan. *White On Black: Images of Africa and Blacks in Western Popular Culture*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992.
- Powell, John W. "The Interpretation of Folk-Lore." *Journal of American Folklore* 8, no. 29 (1895): 97–105.
- Prahlad, Anand. "Afrikana Folklore: History and Challenges." *Journal of American Folklore* 118, no. 469 (2005): 253–270.
- Pratt, Mary Louise. *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation*. London: Routledge, 1992.
- Pratt, Mary Louise. "Scratches on the Face of the Country; or, what Mr. Barrow Saw in the Land of the Bushmen." In "Race," *Writing, and Difference*, edited by Henry Louis Gates, Jr, special issue, *Critical Inquiry* 12, no. 1 (1985): 119–144.
- Raboteau, Albert J. *Slave Religion: The "Invisible Institution" in the Antebellum South*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978.
- Radano, Ronald. "Denoting Difference: The Writing of Slave Spirituals." *Critical Inquiry* 22, no. 3 (1996): 506–544.
- Rael, Patrick. "The New Black Intellectual History." *Reviews in American History* 29, no. 3 (2001): 357–367.
- Rose, Willie Lee. *Rehearsal for Reconstruction: The Port Royal Experiment*. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1964.
- Rucker, Walter. "Conjure, Magic, and Power: The Influence of Afro-American Religious Practices on Slave Resistance and Rebellion." *Journal of Black Studies* 32, no. 1 (2001): 84–103.
- Rydell, Robert W. *All the World's a Fair: Visions of Empire at American International Expositions, 1876–1916*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984.
- Scarborough, W. H. "Folk-Lore." In *Waters, Sweet Dreams*, 256–261. Previously published in *Southern Workman* 25, no. 7 (1896): 144–146.
- Shaler, N. S. "The African Element in America." *The Arena* 2, no. 12 (1890): 660–673.
- Shaler, N. S. "The Nature of the Negro." *The Arena* 3, no. 13 (1891): 23–35.
- Spahr, Charles B. "The Negro as a Citizen." *The Outlook* 62, no. 9 (1899): 490–499.
- Sproat, John G. "*The Best Men*": Liberal Reformers in the Gilded Age. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1968.
- Starr, S. Frederick. *Bamboula! The Life and Times of Louis Moreau Gottschalk*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.
- Suttles Jr., William C. "African Religious Survivals as Factors in American Slave Revolts." *Journal of Negro History* 56 (1971): 97–104.
- Takaki, Ronald T. *Iron Cages: Race and Culture in Nineteenth-Century America*. New York: Knopf, 1979.
- Tetzlaff, Monica Maria. *Cultivating the New South: Abbie Holmes Christensen and the Politics of Race and Gender, 1852–1938*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2002.
- Tolnay, Stewart E. and E. M. Beck. *A Festival of Violence: An Analysis of Southern Lynchings, 1882–1930*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1995.
- Warner, Charles Dudley. *Studies in the South and West, with Comments on Canada*. London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1890.
- Waters, Donald J. *Strange Ways and Sweet Dreams: Afro-American Folklore from the Hampton Institute*. Boston: G. K. Hall, 1983.
- Williams, Vernon J. *The Social Sciences and Theories of Race*. Urbana: University of Illinois, 2006.
- Williamson, Joel. *The Crucible of Race: Black/White Relations in the American South since Emancipation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984.
- Wolfe, Bernard. "Uncle Remus and the Malevolent Rabbit." In *Mother Wit from the Laughing Barrel: Readings and Interpretations of Afro-American Folklore*, edited by Alan Dundes, 524–540. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1972.
- Woodward, C. Vann. *The Strange Career of Jim Crow*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1955.