nation of mimesis and empathy. Paradoxically, it implies that one has to close one's eyes to look at movement, ignoring its visual effects and concentrating instead on feeling oneself to be in the other's body, moving.[4] Whereas visual perception implies an "object" to be perceived from a distance with the eyes alone, empathic kinesthetic perception implies a bridging between subjectivities. This kind of "connected knowing" produces a very intimate kind of knowledge, a taste of those ineffable movement experiences that can't be easily put into words. Paradoxically, as feminist psychologist Judith Jordan points out, the kind of temporary joining that occurs in empathy produces not a blurry merger but an articulated perception of differences.

At the same time that I perceived empathically and kinesthetically, however, I also relied on words. I asked dancers what their experience had been and also how they interpreted their experiences. Talking served as a check against the dangers of projection. My research went back and forth between mimesis, observation, and conceptualization, combining the empathic kinesthetic techniques I'd developed with more traditional research methods.

In summary, based on the premise that movement embodies cultural knowledge, I am advocating an approach that considers movement performance not just as visual spectacle but as kinesthetic, conceptual, and emotional experience that depends upon cultural learning. Since we all inevitably embody our own very particular cultural perspectives, we must do more than look at movement when we write about dance.

Notes

1. Deidre Sklar, "Enacting Religious Belief: A Movement Ethnography of the Annual Fiesta of Tortugas, New Mexico" (Ph.D. diss., New York University, 1991).

2. Allegra Fuller Snyder, "The Dance Symbol," in *CORD Research Annual VI: New Dimensions in Dance Research: Anthropology and Dance–The American Indian,* ed. Tamara Comstock (New York: CORD, 1974), 213–224.

3. Joann Kealiinohomoku, "An Anthropologist Looks at Ballet as a Form of Ethnic Dance," *Impulse* (1970): 24–33.

4. Judith Jordan, "Empathy and Self Boundaries," *Work in Progress* 16. (Wellesley, Mass.: Stone Center for Developmental Services and Studies, 1984).

An Anthropologist Looks at Ballet as a Form of Ethnic Dance

JOANN KEALIINOHOMOKU

It is good anthropology to think of ballet as a form of ethnic dance. Currently, that idea is unacceptable to most Western dance scholars. This lack of agreement shows clearly that something is amiss in the communication of ideas between the scholars of dance and those of anthropology, and this paper is an attempt to bridge that communication gap.

The faults and errors of anthropologists in their approach to dance are many, but they are largely due to their hesitation to deal with something which seems esoteric and out of their field of competence. However, a handful of dance anthropologists are trying to rectify this by publishing in the social science journals and by participating in formal and informal meetings with other anthropologists.

By ethnic dance, anthropologists mean to convey the idea that all forms of dance reflect the cultural traditions within which they developed. Dancers and dance scholars, as this paper will show, use this term, and the related terms *ethnologic, primitive,* and *folk dance,* differently and, in fact, in a way which reveals their limited knowledge of non-Western dance forms.

In preparing to formulate this paper, I reread in an intense period pertinent writings by DeMille, Haskell, Holt, the Kinneys, Kirstein, La Meri, Martin, Sachs, Sorell, and Terry. In addition I carefully reread the definitions pertaining to dance in *Webster's New International Dictionary,* the second edition definitions which were written by Humphrey, and the third edition definitions which were written by Kurath. Although these and other sources are listed in the endnotes, I name these scholars here to focus my frame of reference.[1]

The experience of this intense rereading as an anthropologist rather than as a dancer, was both instructive and disturbing. The readings are rife with unsubstantiated deductive reasoning, poorly documented "proofs," a plethora of half-truths, many out-and-out errors, and a pervasive ethnocentric bias. Where the writers championed non-Western dance they were either apologists or patronistic. Most discouraging of all, these authors saw fit to change only the pictures and not the text when they reissued their books after as many as seventeen years later; they only updated the Euro-American dance scene.

This survey of the literature reveals an amazing divergence of opinions. We are able to read that the origin of dance was in play and that it was not in play, that it was for magical and religious purposes, and that it was not for those things; that it was for courtship and that it was not for courtship; that it was the first form of communication and that communication did not enter into dance until it became an "art." In addition we can read that it was serious and purposeful and that at the same time it was an outgrowth of exuberance, was totally spontaneous, and originated in the spirit of fun. Moreover, we can read that it was only a group activity for tribal solidarity and that it was strictly for the pleasure and self-expression of the one dancing. We can learn also, that animals danced before man did, and yet that dance is a human activity!

nart has been a long time since anthropologists concerned themselves with unknowable origins, and I will not add another origin theory for dance, because I don't know anyone who was there. Our dance writers, however, suggest evidence for origins from archeological finds, and from models exemplified by contemporary primitive groups. For the first, one must remember that man had been on this earth for a long time before he made cave paintings and statuary, so that archeological finds can hardly tell us about the beginnings of dance. For the second set of evidence, that of using models from contemporary primitives, one must not confuse the word "primitive" with "primeval," even though one author actually does equate these two terms.[2] About the dance of primeval man we really know nothing. About primitive dance, on the other hand, we know a great deal. The first thing that we know is that there is no such thing as *a* primitive dance. There *are* dances performed by primitives, and they are too varied to fit any stereotype.

It is a gross error to think of groups of peoples or their dances as being monolithic wholes. "The African dance" never existed; there are, however, Dahomean dances, Hausa dances, Masai dances, and so forth. "The American Indian" is a fiction and so is a prototype of "Indian dance." There are, however, Iroquois, Kwakiutl, and Hopis, to name a few, and they have dances.

Despite all anthropological evidence to the contrary, however, Western dance scholars set themselves up as authorities on the characteristics of primitive dance. Sorell combines most of these so-called characteristics of the primitive stereotype. He tells us that primitive dancers have no technique, and no artistry, but that they are "unfailing masters of their bodies"! He states that their dances are disorganized and frenzied, but that they are able to translate all their feelings and emotions into movement! He claims the dances are spontaneous but also purposeful! Primitive dances, he tells us, are serious but social! He claims that they have "complete freedom" but that men and women can't dance together. He qualifies that last statement by saying that men and women dance together after the dance degenerates into an orgy! Sorell also asserts that primitives cannot distinguish between the concrete and the symbolic, that they dance for every occasion, and that they stamp around a lot! Further, Sorell asserts that dance in primitive societies is a special prerogative of males, especially chieftains, shamans, and witch doctors.[3] Kirstein also characterizes the dances of "natural, unfettered societies" (whatever that means). Although the whole body participates according to Kirstein, he claims that the emphasis of movement is with the lower half of the torso. He concludes that primitive dance is repetitious, limited, unconscious, and with "retardative and closed expression"! Still, though it may be unconscious, Kirstein tells his readers that dance is useful to the tribe and that it is based on the seasons. Primitive dance, or as he phrases it, "earlier manifestations of human activity," is everywhere found to be "almost identically formulated." He never really tells us what these formulations are except that they have little to offer in methodology or structure, and that they are examples of "instinctive exuberance."[4]

Terry describes the functions of primitive dance, and he uses American Indians as his model. In his book *The Dance in America* he writes sympathetically towards American Indians and "his primitive brothers." However, his paternalistic feelings on the one hand, and his sense of ethnocentricity on the other, prompt him to set aside any thought that people with whom he identifies could share contemporarily those same dance characteristics, because he states "the white man's dance heritage, except for the most ancient of days, was wholly different."[5]

With the rejection of the so-called primitive characteristics for the white man, it is common to ascribe these characteristics to groups existing among African tribes, Indians of North and South America, and Pacific peoples. These are the same peoples who are labeled by these authors as "ethnic." No wonder that balletomanes reject the idea that ballet is a form of ethnic dance! But Africans, North and South Amerindians, and Pacific peoples would be just as horrified to be called ethnic under the terms of the stereotype. Those so-called characteristics-as-a-group do not prevail anywhere!

Another significant obstacle to the identification of Western dancers with non-Western dance forms, be they primitive or "ethnologic" in the sense that Sorell uses the latter term as "the art expression of a race" which is "executed for the enjoyment and edification of the audience" is the double myth that the dance grew out of some spontaneous mob action and that once formed, became frozen.[6] American anthropologists and many folklorists have been most distressed about the popularity of these widespread misconceptions. Apparently it satisfies our own ethnocentric needs to believe in the uniqueness of our dance forms, and it is much more convenient to believe that primitive dances, like Topsy, just "growed," and that "ethnological" dances are part of an unchanging tradition. Even books and articles which purport to be about the dances of the *world* devote three-quarters of the text and photos to Western dance. We explicate our historic eras, our royal patrons, dancing masters, choreographers, and performers. The rest of the world is condensed diachronically and synchronically to the remaining quarter of the book. This smaller portion, which must cover all the rest of the world, is usually divided up so that the portions at the beginning imply that the ethnic forms fit on some kind of an evolutionary continuum, and the remaining portions at the end of the book for, say, American Negro dance, give the appearance of a post-script, as if they too "also ran." In short we treat Western dance, ballet particularly, as if it was the one great divinely ordained apogee of the performing arts. This notion is exemplified, and reinforced, by the way dance photos are published. Unless the non-Western performer has made a "hit" on our stages, we seldom bother to give him a name in the captions, even though he might be considered a fine artist among his peers (Martin is the exception). For example, see Claire Holt's article "Two Dance Worlds."[7] The captions under the photos of Javanese dancers list no names, but you may be sure that we are always told when Martha Graham appears in a photo. A scholar friend of mine was looking over the books by our dance historians, and he observed that they were not interested in the whole world of dance; they were really only interested in *their* world of dance. Can anyone deny this allegation?

Let it be noted, once and for all, that within the various "ethnologic" dance worlds there are also patrons, dancing masters, choreographers, and performers with names woven into a very real historical fabric. The bias which those dancers have toward their own dance and artists is just as strong as ours. The difference is that they usually don't pretend to be scholars of other dance forms, nor even very much interested in them. It is instructive, however, to remind ourselves that all dances are subject to change and development no matter how convenient we may find it to dismiss some form as practically unchanged for 2,000 years.[8] It is convenient to us, of course, because once having said that, we feel that our job is finished.

As for the presumed lack of creators of dance among primitive and folk groups, let us reconsider that assumption after reading Martin's statement:

> In simpler cultures than ours we find a mass of art actually treated and practiced by the people as a whole.[9]

The first question which such a statement raises is what is a "mass of art"? Martin never really defines art, but if he means art as a refined aesthetic expression, then it can be asked how such could ever be a collective product. Does he mean that it appeared spontaneously? Does he really think there can be art without artists? And if he believes that there must be artists, does he mean to imply that a "people as a whole" are artists? If so, what a wonderful group of people they must be. Let us learn from them!

Doubtless, Martin probably will say that I have taken his statement to an absurd extension of his meaning, but I believe that such thoughtless statements deserve to be pushed to their extreme.

It is true that some cultures do not place the same

value on preserving the names of their innovators as we do. That is a matter of tradition also. But we must not be deceived into believing that a few hundred people all got together and with one unanimous surge created a dance tradition which, having once been created, never changed from that day forward.

Among the Hopi Indians of Northern Arizona, for example, there is no tradition of naming a choreographer. Nevertheless they definitely know who, within a Kiva group or a society, made certain innovations and why. A dramatic example of the variety permitted in what is otherwise considered to be a static dance tradition is to see, as I have, the "same" dance ceremonies performed in several different villages at several different times. To illustrate, I observed the important Hopi "bean dances" which are held every February, in five different villages during the winters of 1965 and 1968. There were the distinguishing differences between villages which are predictable differences, once one becomes familiar with a village "style." But, in addition, there were creative and not necessarily predictable differences which occurred from one time to the next. The Hopis know clearly what the predictable differences are, and they also know who and what circumstances led to the timely innovations. Not only do they know these things, but they are quite free in their evaluation of the merits and demerits of those differences, with their "own" usually (but not always) coming out as being aesthetically more satisfying.

In Martin's *Introduction to the Dance* (1939) the first plate contains two reproductions of drawings of Hopi kachinas. Judging from its position among the plates, this must be Martin's single example of dances from a primitive group. DeMille also shows Hopis as examples of primitive dancers.[10] Let us see how well the Hopis compare to the generalities attributed to primitive dancers.

Paradigm

Hopi dances are immaculately organized, are never frenzied (not even, in fact especially, in their famous snake dance), nor is there a desire to translate feelings and emotions into movement. The dances are indeed serious, if this is synonymous with purposeful, but many dances are not serious if that word negates the fact that many dances are humorous, use clowns as personnel, and contain both derision and satire. Hopi dance is also social if one is speaking as a sociologist, but they have only one prescribed genre of dance which the Hopis themselves consider "social" in the sense that they can be performed by uninitiated members of the society. Hopis would find the idea of "complete freedom" in their dance to be an alien idea, because much of the form and behavior is rigidly prescribed. Certainly they would never lapse into an orgy! Nor do they "hurl themselves on the ground and roll in the mud" after the rains begin.[11]

Hopis would be offended if you told them that they could not distinguish between the concrete and the symbolic. They are not children, after all. They certainly understand natural causes. But does it make them primitive, by definition, if they ask their gods to help their crops grow by bringing rain? Don't farmers within the mainstream of America and Europe frequently pray to a Judeo-Christian God for the same thing? Are the Hopis more illogical than we are when they dance their prayers instead of attending religious services with responsive readings, and a variety of motor activities such as rising, sitting, folding hands, and the like?

Once again assessing the Hopis in the light of the characteristics presumably found for primitive dancers, we find that Hopis don't dance for the three specific life events which supposedly are "always" recognized in dance. That is, Hopis don't dance at births, marriages, or deaths.

Obviously, it cannot be said that they dance on "every" occasion. Furthermore, the Hopi stamping would surely be a disappointment to Sorell if he expected the Hopis to "make the earth tremble under his feet."[12] DeMille might also be surprised that there is no "state of exaltation" or "ecstasy" in Hopi dance.[13]

It is true that more Hopi dances are performed by

males than by females, but females also dance under certain circumstances and for certain rituals which are the sole prerogative of females. What is more important is that women participate a great deal if one thinks of them as non-dancer participants, and one must, because it is the entire dance *event* which is important to the Hopis rather than just the actual rhythmic movement.

For the Hopis, it is meaningless to say that the primary dancers are the chieftains, witch doctors, and shamans. Traditionally they have no real "government" as such, and every clan has its own rituals and societies which are further divided according to the village in which they live. Thus everyone will participate to some degree or another in a variety of roles. There is no shaman as such, so of course there cannot be shamanistic dances. As for witch doctors, they do not dance in that role although they dance to fulfill some of their other roles in their clan and residence groups.

I do not know what is meant by a "natural, unfettered society," but whatever it is I am sure that description does not fit the Hopis. In their dance movements the whole body does not participate, and there is no pelvic movement as such. The dances are indeed repetitious, but that does not interfere in the least with the real dramatic impact of the performance. Within the "limitations" of the dance culture, Hopi dance still has an enormous range of variations, and this is especially true because the dance "event" is so richly orchestrated.

Far from being an "unconscious" dance form, Hopi dancing is a very conscious activity. And I cannot believe that it is any more "retardative" or closed within its own framework than any other dance form, bar none. Finally, I find nothing in Hopi dance that can be called "instinctively exuberant," but perhaps that is because I don't know what "instinctive exuberance" is. If it is what I think it is, such a description is inappropriate for Hopi dances.

Lest someone say that perhaps the Hopis are the exception to prove the rule, or, perhaps, that they are not really "primitive," let me make two points. First, if they are not "primitive" they do not fit into any other category offered by the dance scholars discussed in this article. Their dances are not "folk dance" as described, nor do they have "ethnologic dances," nor "art dances," nor "theatre dance" as these terms are used in the writings under consideration. Clearly, in the light of these writers' descriptions, they are a "primitive," "ethnic" group with dances in kind. Secondly, I know of no group anywhere which fits the descriptions for primitive dance such as given by DeMille, Sorell, Terry, and Martin. Certainly I know of no justification for Haskell's statement that "many dances of primitive tribes still living are said to be identical with those of birds and apes."[14] Unfortunately, Haskell does not document any of his statements and we cannot trace the source of such a blatant piece of misinformation.

It is necessary to hammer home the idea that there is no such thing as a "primitive dance" form. Those who teach courses called "primitive dance" are perpetuating a dangerous myth. As a corollary to this let it be noted that no living primitive group will reveal to us the way our European ancestors behaved. Every group has had its own unique history and has been subject to both internal and external modifications. Contemporary primitives are not children in fact, nor can they be pigeonholed into some convenient slot on an evolutionary scale.

I suggest that one cause for so much inaccurate and shocking misunderstanding on the subject of primitive groups is due to an overdependence on the words of Sir James Frazer and Curt Sachs whose works have been outdated as source material for better than three decades.[15] In their stead I would suggest that they read some of the works of Gertrude P. Kurath, whose bibliography appeared in the January, 1970 issue of *Ethnomusicology*. This and other suggested readings are given at the end of this article.

Definitions

It is disconcerting to discover that writers tend to use key words without attempting real definitions which are neither too exclusive nor too inclusive. Even the word *dance*, itself, is never adequately defined to apply cross-

culturally through time and space. Instead of definitions we are given descriptions, which are a different matter altogether. I have been closely questioned as to the need for definitions "as long as we all mean the same thing anyway," and I have even been asked what difference it makes what we call something as long as we all understand how some term is being used. The answers are twofold: without the discipline of attempting to define specific terms we are not sure we do all mean the same thing or that we understand how a term is being used. On the other hand, the tacit agreement about frames of reference can distort the focus of emphasis rather than giving the broadly based objectivity which comes from using a term denotatively.

For seven years I pondered over a definition of dance, and in 1965 I tentatively set out the following definition which has since undergone some slight modifications. In its current form it reads:

> Dance is a transient mode of expression, performed in a given form and style by the human body moving in space. Dance occurs through purposefully selected and controlled rhythmic movements; the resulting phenomenon is recognized as dance both by the performer and the observing members of a given group.[16]

The two crucial points which distinguish this definition from others are the limiting of dance to that of human behavior since there is no reason to believe that birds or apes perform with the *intent* to dance. Intent to dance and acknowledgment of the activity as dance by a given group is the second distinguishing feature of my definition. This is the crucial point for applying the definition cross-culturally as well as setting dance apart from other activities which might appear to be dance to the outsider but which are considered, say, sports or ritual to the participants. *Webster's International Dictionary* shows much contrast in the definitions of dance between the second and third editions. The reason for the contrasts is clear when it is understood that a performer-choreographer of Western dance wrote the dance entries for the second edition (Doris Humphrey), while an ethnochoreologist (Gertrude P. Kurath) wrote the entries for the third edition.

We cannot accept Kirstein's contention that "it is apparent . . . that the idea of tension, from the very beginning, has been foremost in people's minds when they have thought about dancing seriously enough to invent or adapt word-sounds for it."[17] Alber (Charles J. Alber 1970, personal communication) assures me that both Japanese and Mandarin Chinese have time-honored words for dance and related activities and that the idea of tension does not occur at all in these words. Clearly Kirstein's statement indicates that he has not looked beyond the models set out in Indo-European languages. Can we really believe that only white Europeans are "advanced" enough to speak about dance?

The notion of tension through the etymology of European words for dance does reveal something about the Western aesthetic of dance which is apparent from the Western dance ideals of pull-up, body lift, and bodily extensions. Elsewhere these things are not highly valued. Indeed my "good" Western-trained body alignment and resultant tension is a handicap in performing dances from other cultures. Martin seems to have the greatest insight in the relativity of dance aesthetics when he describes dance as a universal urge but without a universal form.[18] Further he states:

> It is impossible to say that any of these approaches is exclusively right or wrong, better or worse than any other. . . . They are all absolutely right, therefore, for the specific circumstances under which they have been created.[19]

Indeed Martin comes the closest to the kind of relativity which most American anthropologists feel is necessary for observing and analyzing any aspect of culture and human behavior.[20] It is true that Sorell and others speak of differences caused by environment and other pertinent circumstances, but Sorell also ascribes much of the difference to "race," to "racial memory," and to "innate" differences which are "in the blood."[21] These ideas are so outdated in current anthropology, that I might believe his book was written at the end of the nineteenth century rather than in 1967.

It is true that many cross-cultural differences in dance style and dance aesthetics are due to both genetically determined physical differences and learned cultural patterns. In some cases the differences are clear. For example, a heavy Mohave Indian woman could not, and would not perform the jumps of the Masai people of East Africa. Other differences are not clear because they are part of a chicken/egg argument until further research is done and until more of the right questions are asked. We do not know, for example, whether people who squat easily with both feet flat on the ground do so because their leg tendons are genetically different from non-squatters, or if anyone could have the same tendon configuration if they habitually assumed such postures.[22] As for "innate" qualities, we have almost no real evidence. There is nothing to support claims such as "barefoot savages have an ear for rhythms most Europeans lack."[23] There is much we do not know about bodies and genetics and cultural dynamics, and in addition, we are especially ignorant about systems of aesthetics. It would be wiser for Western dance scholars to leave qualifying remarks and openendedness in their discussions of these things, or else these scholars may have a lot of recanting to do.

Two terms which now require discussion are "primitive dance" and "folk dance." These comments are to be understood against the framework of my definition of dance which I have already given.

British, and especially American, folklorists are concerned with defining the "folk" in order to know what "folk dances" are. Our dance scholars, on the other hand, usually use "folk dance" as a kind of catch-all term. For example, DeMille lists Azuma Kabuki under her chapter on folk dance companies.[24] To call this highly refined theatrical form "folk dance" doesn't agree with Sorell's argument that folk dance is dance that has not gone "through a process of refinement"; that has not been "tamed."[25] Perhaps such discrepancies help to show why definitions are so important and what a state of confusion can exist when we presume we all "mean the same thing."

Rather than following Sachs's contention that the "folk" or the "peasant" is an evolutionary stage between primitive and civilized man, I shall follow the more anthropologically sophisticated distinctions which are discussed by the anthropologist Redfield in his book *Peasant Society and Culture*.[26] In brief, a primitive society is an autonomous and self-contained system with its own set of customs and institutions. It may be isolated or it may have more or less contact with other systems. It is usually economically independent and the people are often, if not always, nonliterate. (Notice that the term nonliterate refers to a group which has never had a written language of their own devising. This is quite different from the term illiterate which means that there is a written language, but an illiterate is not sufficiently educated to know the written form. Thus DeMille's statement that the primitives are illiterate is a contradiction of terms.)[27] In contrast, peasant or folk societies are not autonomous. Economically and culturally such a community is in a symbiotic relationship with a larger society with which it constantly interacts. It is the "little tradition of the largely unreflective many" which is incomplete without the "great tradition of the reflective few." Often the people in peasant societies are more or less illiterate. If one adds the word dance to the above descriptions of primitive and folk (or peasant) there might be a more objective agreement on what is meant by "primitive dance" and by "folk dance."

Another troublesome term is that of "ethnic dance," as I have already indicated. In the generally accepted anthropological view, ethnic means a group which holds in common genetic, linguistic, and cultural ties, with special emphasis on cultural tradition. By definition, therefore, every dance form must be an ethnic form. Although claims have been made for universal dance forms (such as Wisnoe Wardhana has been attempting to develop in Java: personal communication 1960), or international forms (such has been claimed for ballet by Terry), in actuality neither a universal

form nor a truly international form of dance is in existence and it is doubtful whether any such dance form can ever exist except in theory.[28] DeMille says this, in effect, when she writes that "theatre always reflects the culture that produces it."[29] However, others insist on some special properties for ballet. La Meri insists that "the ballet is not an ethnic dance because it is the product of the social customs and artistic reflections of several widely-differing national cultures."[30] Nevertheless, ballet is a product of the Western world, and it is a dance form developed by Caucasians who speak Indo-European languages and who share a common European tradition. Granted that ballet is international in that it "belongs" to European countries plus groups of European descendants in the Americas. But, when ballet appears in such countries as Japan or Korea it becomes a borrowed and alien form. Granted also that ballet has had a complex history of influences, this does not undermine its effectiveness as an ethnic form. Martin tells us this, although he probably could not guess that his statement would be used for such a proof:

> The great spectacular dance form of the Western world is, of course, the ballet. . . . Properly, the term ballet refers to a particular form of theater dance, which came into being in the Renaissance and which has a tradition, technic and an aesthetic basis all its own.[31]

Further quotations could be made to show the ethnicity of ballet, such as Kirstein's opening remarks in his 1935 book, *Dance.*

Ethnicity of Ballet

I have made listings of the themes and other characteristics of ballet and ballet performances, and these lists show over and over again just how "ethnic" ballet is. Consider, for example, how Western is the tradition of the proscenium stage, the usual three part performance which lasts for about two hours, our star system, our use of curtain calls and applause, and our usage of French terminology. Think how culturally revealing it is to see the stylized Western customs enacted on the stage, such as the mannerisms from the age of chivalry, courting, weddings, christenings, burial, and mourning customs. Think how our world view is revealed in the oft recurring themes of unrequited love, sorcery, self-sacrifice through long suffering, mistaken identity, and misunderstandings which have tragic consequences. Think how our religious heritage is revealed through pre-Christian customs such as Walpurgisnacht, through the use of biblical themes, Christian holidays such as Christmas, and the beliefs in life after death. Our cultural heritage is revealed also in the roles which appear repeatedly in our ballets such as humans transformed into animals, fairies, witches, gnomes, performers of evil magic, villains and seductresses in black, evil stepparents, royalty and peasants, and especially, beautiful pure young women and their consorts.

Our aesthetic values are shown in the long line of lifted, extended bodies, in the total revealing of legs, of small heads and tiny feet for women, in slender bodies for both sexes, and in the coveted airy quality which is best shown in the lifts and carryings of the female. To us this is tremendously pleasing aesthetically, but there are societies whose members would be shocked at the public display of the male touching the female's thighs! So distinctive is the "look" of ballet, that it is probably safe to say that ballet dances graphically rendered by silhouettes would never be mistaken for anything else. An interesting proof of this is the ballet *Koshare* which was based on a Hopi Indian story. In silhouettes of even still photos, the dance looked like ballet and not like a Hopi dance.

The ethnicity of ballet is revealed also in the kinds of flora and fauna which appear regularly. Horses and swans are esteemed fauna. In contrast we have no tradition of esteeming for theatrical purposes pigs, sharks, eagles, buffalo, or crocodiles even though these are indeed highly esteemed animals used in dance themes elsewhere in the world. In ballet, grains, roses, and lilies are suitable flora, but we would not likely find much call for taro, yams, coconuts, acorns, or squash blossoms.

Many economic pursuits are reflected in the roles played in ballet such as spinners, foresters, soldiers, even factory workers, sailors, and filling station attendants. However, we would not expect to find pottery makers, canoe builders, grain pounders, llama herders, giraffe stalkers, or slash and burn agriculturists!

The question is not whether ballet reflects its own heritage. The question is why we seem to need to believe that ballet has somehow become acultural. Why are we afraid to call it an ethnic form?

The answer, I believe, is that Western dance scholars have not used the word *ethnic* in its objective sense; they have used it as a euphemism for such old-fashioned terms as "heathen," "pagan," "savage," or the more recent term "exotic." When the term ethnic began to be used widely in the thirties, there apparently arose a problem in trying to refer to dance forms which came from "high" cultures such as India and Japan, and the term "ethnologic" gained its current meaning for dance scholars such as Sorell, Terry, and La Meri.[32] (An interesting article by Bunzell on the "Sociology of Dance" in the 1949 edition of *Dance Encyclopedia* rejects the use of the word "art" for these dance forms, however. In the context of his criticism, his point is well taken.)[33] I do not know why La Meri chose to discard this usage and substituted the word "ethnic" for "ethnologic" in her 1967 version of the *Dance Encyclopedia* article. She did not otherwise change her article, and since it was originally written with the above mentioned dichotomy implicit in her discussion, her 1967 version becomes illogical. (For a critical review of the *Dance Encyclopedia* and especially of La Meri's entries see Renouf.)[34]

It is not clear to me who first created the dichotomy between "ethnic dance" and "ethnologic dance." Certainly this dichotomy is meaningless to anthropologists. As a matter of fact, European cultural anthropologists often prefer to call themselves ethnologists, and for them the term "ethnologic" refers to the objects of their study.[35] The term "ethnological" does not have much currency among American cultural anthropologists although they understand the term to mean "of or relating to ethnology," and "ethnology" deals with the comparative and analytical study of cultures (see entries in *Webster's New International Dictionary,* third edition). Because "culture," in a simplified anthropological sense, includes all of the learned behavior and customs of any given group of people, there is no such thing as a cultureless people. Therefore, "ethnologic dances" should refer to a variety of dance cultures subject to comparison and analysis. Ethnic dance should mean a dance form of a given group of people who share common genetic, linguistic, and cultural ties, as mentioned before. In the most precise usage it is a redundancy to speak of "an ethnic dance," since any dance could fit that description. The term is most valid when used in a collective and contrastive way.[36]

Apparently one pan-human trait is to divide the world into "we" and "they." The Greeks did this when "they" were called *barbarians.* Similarly, the Romans called the "they" *pagans,* Hawaiians call "they" *kanaka'e,* and Hopis call the "they" *bahana.* All of these terms imply not only foreign, but creatures who are uncouth, unnatural, ignorant and, in short, less than human. The yardstick for measuring humanity, of course, is the "we." "We" are always good, civilized, superior; in short, "we" are the only creatures worthy of being considered fully human. This phenomenon reveals the world view of the speakers in every language, so far as I know. Often the phenomenon is very dramatic. According to a scholar of Mandarin and Japanese languages, in Mandarin the "they" are truly "foreign devils," and in Japanese the "they" are "outsiders" (Charles Alber, personal communication, 1970).

I suggest that, due to the social climate which rejects the connotations with which our former words for "they" were invested, and because of a certain sophistication assumed by the apologists for the "they," English-speaking scholars were hard pressed to find designators for the kinds of non-Western dance which they wished to discuss. Hence the euphemistic terms "ethnic" and "ethnologic" seemed to serve that purpose.

It is perfectly legitimate to use "ethnic" and "ethnologic" as long as we don't let those terms become con-

notative of the very things which caused us to abandon the other terms. We should indeed speak of ethnic dance forms, and we should not believe that this term is derisive when it includes ballet since ballet reflects the cultural traditions from which it developed.

I must make it clear that I am critical of our foremost Western dance scholars only where they have stepped outside their fields of authority. Within their fields they command my great respect, and I would not want to argue their relative merits. Scholars that they are, they will agree with me, I feel confident, that whatever are the rewards of scholarship, comfortable complacency cannot be one of them.

Notes

1. References not cited in other notes include Doris Humphrey, "Dance," and related entries, *Webster's New International Dictionary,* 2d ed., unabridged (Springfield, Mass.: Merriam, 1950); Troy and Margaret West Kinney, *The Dance,* New York: Frederick A. Stokes, 1924); Gertrude Prokosch Kurath, "Dance" and related entries, *Webster's New International Dictionary,* 3d ed., unabridged (Springfield, Mass.: Merriam, 1966); La Meri, "Ethnic Dance," in *The Dance Encyclopedia,* comp. and ed. Anatole Chujoy (New York: A. S. Barnes, 1949), 177–178; John Martin (*John Martin's Book of*) *The Dance* (New York: Tudor Publishing, 1963); Walter Terry, "Dance, History of," in *The Dance Encyclopedia,* comp. and ed. Anatole Chujoy and P. W. Manchester (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1967), 255–259; Walter Terry, "History of Dance," in *The Dance Encyclopedia,* comp. and ed. Anatole Chujoy (New York: A. S. Barnes, 1949), 238–243.

2. Walter Sorell, *The Dance through the Ages* (New York: Grosset & Dunlap, 1967), 14.

3. Ibid., 10–11.

4. Lincoln Kirstein, *The Book of Dance* (Garden City, N.Y.: Garden City Publishing, 1942), 3–5.

5. Walter Terry, *The Dance in America* (New York: Harper, 1956), 3–4, 195–198.

6. Sorell, *The Dance through the Ages,* 76.

7. Claire Holt, "Two Dance Worlds," in *Anthology of Impulse,* ed. Marian Van Tuyl (New York: Dance Horizons, 1969), 116–131.

8. Agnes DeMille, *The Book of the Dance* (New York: Golden Press, 1963), 48.

9. John Martin, *Introduction to the Dance* (New York: Norton, 1939), 15.

10. DeMille, *The Book of the Dance,* 33, 35.

11. Ibid., 35.

12. Sorell, *The Dance through the Ages,* 15.

13. DeMille, *The Book of the Dance,* 34, 67.

14. Arnold Haskell, *The Wonderful World of Dance* (New York: Garden City Books, 1960), 9.

15. Sir James Frazer, *The Golden Bough* (New York: Macmillan, 1947); Curt Sachs, *World History of the Dance,* trans. Bessie Schönberg (New York: Bonanza Books, 1937).

16. Joann Wheeler Kealiinohomoku, "A Comparative Study of Dance as a Constellation of Motor Behaviors among African and United States Negroes" (master's thesis, Northwestern University, 1965), 6 (revised 1970).

17. Lincoln Kirstein, *Dance* (New York: Putnam's Sons, 1935), 1.

18. John Martin, *The Dance* (New York: Tudor Publishing, 1946), 12.

19. Ibid, 17.

20. Martin, *Introduction to the Dance,* 92–93, 108.

21. Sorell, *The Dance through the Ages,* 75–76, 275, 282, 283.

22. See Martin, *Introduction to the Dance,* 97.

23. DeMille, *The Book of the Dance,* 48.

24. Ibid., 74.

25. Sorell, *The Dance through the Ages,* 73.

26. Sachs, *World History of the Dance,* 216; Robert Redfield, *The Little Community* and *Peasant Society and Culture* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969), 23, 40–41.

27. DeMille, *The Book of the Dance,* 23.

28. Terry, *The Dance in America,* 187.

29. DeMille, *The Book of the Dance,* 74.

30. La Meri, "Ethnic Dance," in *The Dance Encyclopedia,* ed. Anatole Chujoy and P. W. Manchester (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1967), 339.

31. Martin, *Introduction to the Dance,* 173.

32. Sorell, *The Dance through the Ages,* 72; Terry, *The Dance in America,* 87, 196; and La Meri, "Ethnic Dance," 177–178.

33. Joseph Bunzel, "Sociology of the Dance," in *The Dance Encyclopedia* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1967), 437.

34. Renée Renouf, "Review of *The Dance Encyclopedia,*" *Ethnomusicology* 13, no. 2 (May 1969): 383–384.

35. See Herta Haselberger, "Method of Studying Ethnological Art," *Current Anthropology* 2, no. 4 (October 1961): 341.

36. Peggy Harper, "Dance in a Changing Society," *African Arts/Arts d'Afrique* 1, no. 1 (autumn 1967): 10–13, 76–77, 78–80. Harper (10) distinguishes between ethnic and theatrical dance on the basis of "integral function of a society" and dance which is "deliberately organized" to be performed for a general, impersonal audience. This dichotomy, which is based on genre rather than the society, provides a good working classification. However, the distinction fails when the terms are tested. Thus one can have ethnic dances of an ethnic society, but not theatrical dance of a theatrical society. It seems clear that "ethnic" is a more embracing category under which "traditional" and "theatrical" might be convenient subdivisions. In any case, Harper's discussion is thought-provoking.

To further investigate anthropological approaches and issues in dance research, see Adriann G. H. Claerhout, "The Concept of Primitive Applied to Art," *Current Anthropology* 6, no. 4 (October 1965); Adrienne L. Kaeppler, "Folklore as Expressed in the Dance in Tonga," *Journal of American Folklore* 80 (April –June 1967): 316; Adrienne L. Kaeppler, "The Structure of Tongan Dance" (Ph.D. diss., University of Hawaii, 1967); Joann W. Kealiinohomoku and Frank J. Gillis, "Special Bibliography: Gertrude Prokosch Kurath," *Ethnomusicology* 14, no. 1 (January 1970); Gertrude Prokosch Kurath, "Panorama of Dance Ethnology," *Current Anthropology,* 1, no. 3 (May 1960); Armistead P. Rood, "Bete Masked Dance: A View from Within," *African Arts/Arts d'Afrique* 2, no. 3 (spring 1969).