How the lore laid down by teachers maintains who belongs as folk: That’s just the way it’s done around here!
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Abstract

The verbal lore of teaching has not yet received any significant attention within the education research literature, particularly in Australia. Everyday expressions about teaching practices such as “Don’t smile before Easter!” are often referred to as the folklore of teaching but are generally treated by teachers, teacher educators and educational researchers as nothing more than clichés. In this paper I write as a folklorist to take seriously such expressive forms and their performance. These oral traditions establish community boundaries and tacit knowledge when they are enacted in particular contexts. Folkloristic analysis of these artistic forms and performances reveals the values which are shared by group members as well as how group membership is secured or denied. I present ways by which the teaching community responds, through its folklore, to outside pressure that challenges its collective worldview and the ways by which pre-service and beginning teachers are instructed about the shared values of teacher life and practice.

Introduction

I first read Erica McWilliam’s (1994) book, In Broken Images: Feminist Tales for a Different Teacher Education, as a beginning teacher educator looking to critical pedagogy (Darder, Torres, & Baltodano, 2003; Freire, 1979; Freire & Freire, 1994; Freire & Ramos, 1972; hooks, 1994, 2003; McLaren, 1998) for guidance and as an education postgraduate student who was struggling to grasp feminist poststructuralist theories (Davies, 1989, 1993; St. Pierre, 2000; St. Pierre & Pillow, 2000). Her book was really helpful for understanding how ‘the voices of the participants as presented, and re-presented, tell different tales’ (Fox, 1996, p. 619), feminist tales. The book is derived from her doctoral thesis and engages what Nancy Fraser (1989; Fraser, 1990) calls oppositional needs talk. This project is about establishing interpretations of needs that work
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in opposition to expert discourses used as interventions to regulate individuals, as late capitalism’s consumerist subjects. It gave me a new way of thinking about teacher education and a ‘different take’ that is not so kind on some of the work of critical pedagogy.

My biggest problem with her book, however, was not her scathing comments towards the assumptions she calls ‘folkloric’ (McWilliam, 1994, p. 51), the ‘different way of doing research, and… different way of collecting data’ (Fox, 1996, p. 618), nor the conclusions she reaches. It was something more personally relevant and much less glamorous than any of this. To illustrate this I tell a personal story:

I graduated from the University of Pennsylvania in Philadelphia with a Bachelor of Arts, majored in biology with a concentration in molecular and double-minored in chemistry, folklore and folklife. Many people I have found, particularly here in Australia, consider this an odd combination but a liberal-arts undergraduate education, I often explain, allows one to indulge in learning outside of a singular professional knowledge such as a biomedical science. I loved anthropology and folklore and took enough classes to get the minor. I was friends with all the folklore and folklife majors in my year, all three of them. Sadly, they were the last three people to graduate from the University of Pennsylvania with this degree because the administration decided to ‘restructure’ the Department of Folklore and Folklife and it is now a graduate program alone. In any case, the minor appears on my transcript and gives me the liberty to sometimes refer to myself as a folklorist.

This is where I take issue with Erica McWilliam’s book. The third chapter is titled Quick and Dull: The Folkloric Discourses of Teacher Education (McWilliam, 1994, pp. 48-69). My concern is with the way in which folklore is used in such a way that it means nothing but the ‘vocabularies’ (McWilliam, 1994, p. 49) of a particular group. From my own experience with teachers, teacher educators and the general public, this is a widely accepted, popular use of the term ‘folklore’. Neither does McWilliam claim to be a folklorist, nor does her work claim to contribute to the discipline of folklore so I want to be extremely clear that my intention is to inform this work, not undermine it. This is particularly important to mention since I do not take issue with all other aspects of the work; I consider it exemplary and have used it to inform my own work in teacher education. So, what is folklore?

Folklore, folklife and studying with folkloristics: I adore to soak life and everything that sticks

I situate my account of the history of folklore studies in Regina Bendix’s (1997) examination of the field as it evolved in German-speaking Europe and the United States. Using a comparative approach, she suggests that ‘German Volkskunde is arguably the oldest version of folklore studies, while American
folkloristics reached disciplinary coherence only in the middle of the twentieth century' (Bendix, 1997, p. 5). Her central argument (Bendix, 1997, pp. 5-6) points toward folklore’s co-implication with other cultural disciplines and the complexity of the field itself.²

If McWilliam had looked up ‘folklore’ in Funk and Wagnalls Standard Dictionary of Folklore, Mythology and Legend, rather than in her thesaurus, she would have found an overwhelming twenty-one definitions (Leach & Fried, 1949). This alone gives some idea about how, even over fifty years ago ‘[folklore]’s broad subject defies definition’ (Bendix, 1997, p. 5). I will attempt to provide an unfinished collage of some of the ways (mostly American) in which folklore has been variously understood with no intention of presenting it as an exhaustive review. There are numerous ‘camps’ across various borders that each have numerous approaches of their own. National distinctions, for example the German Volkskunde, the Swedish folkminne, and the Indian lok sahitya vary slightly from the English term ‘folklore’ (Ben-Amos, 1972, p. 3).

Disciplinary influences have been evident such that ‘anthropologists regarded folklore as literature, scholars of literature defined it as culture’ (Ben-Amos, 1972, p. 3). According to Dan Ben-Amos, in a quest to define folklore enumerative, intuitive and operational definitions were suggested by folklorists. He later succinctly defined it himself (1982) as ‘artistic communication in small groups’; this is a definition that some folklorists find useful. Alan Dundes, who recently passed away, was a much-loved (Bendix, 2005), central figure in folklore studies. Consider what Rosemary Lévy Zumwalt (1995, p. 1) says in her introduction to a collection of essays printed in Dundes’ honour:

The vital element missing from Kuhn’s discussion is the central, charismatic figure who teaches, both in the classroom and through published works, and thus has the impact of spreading the approach. For folklore, this central figure is Alan Dundes.

Throughout his work he resisted the temptation to define folklore, instead suggesting that it ‘will never be adequately defined unless or until all the various genres or forms of folklore are rigorously described’ (Dundes, 1964). In this essay and others (Dundes & Arewa, 1964), Dundes insisted upon ‘the importance of context for understanding folkloric expression’ (Hansen, 2005, p. 246). He attempted to contribute to such a project as ‘an interpreter who employed structuralist, psychoanalytic, contextual and other tools to uncover the meanings of folklore and thereby gain insight into human nature and behaviour’ (Hansen, 2005, pp. 246-247). His famous list of expressive genres (Dundes, 1965, p. 3) eludes definitions.³ The distinction he makes between the objects and the process of inquiring about them clarifies how folklorists ‘use the term folklore for the materials and the term folkloristics for the study of the materials’ (Dundes, 1965, p. 3). This distinction was made as early back as the nineteenth century and has been revisited in a number of ways (Dundes, 2005; Köhler, 1887).
Richard Bauman (1977, p. 3) suggests that verbal art is performance, therefore we should consider ‘performance as a mode of speaking’. This performance-centred approach to folklore (initiated by the collection of essays in Paredes & Bauman, 1972) was a response to the restricted nature (Ben-Amos, 1972, p. 14) of previously employed text-centred approaches to folklore that focused solely on text. These texts, Bauman (1977, p. 47) suggests are what Raymond Williams (1973) calls ‘residual culture’. Temporality of both the discipline as well as the relations between subject and object are foregrounded:

If the subject matter of the discipline is restricted to the residue of a specific cultural or historical period, then folklore anticipates its own demise, for when the traditions are fully gone, the discipline loses its raison d’être… folklore as the discipline of residual culture looks backward to the past for its frame of reference, disqualifying itself from the study of the creations of contemporary culture until they too may become residual.

Furthermore, Dell Hymes (1962, p. 677) suggests that understanding continuity is about transcending ‘the common dichotomy between oral and written transmission’. The task for the anthropological disciplines, including folklore’, according to Hymes (1962, p. 678) is to lay bare the ‘many relatively unsuspected continuities in form and function from the societies of “lore” to those of science’. In so doing, performance ‘constitutes… a point of departure, the nexus of tradition, practice, and emergence of verbal art… [and] may thus be the cornerstone of a new folkloristics, liberated from its backward-facing perspective and able to comprehend much more of the totality of human experience’ (Bauman, 1977, p. 48). Roger Abrahams (1980, p. 371), incorporates this notion of performance alongside the typology of stories. He also suggests that in the United States:

... a distinction is often made between folklore and folklife. The former refers primarily to traditional ways of performing and playing, and the latter to the means and manner of work.

A special issue of Western Folklore, titled ‘Theorizing Folklore: Toward New Perspectives on the Politics of Culture’ (Shuman & Briggs, 1993) was aimed at turning the discipline’s gaze toward issues of power that the authors felt had remained previously, relatively unexamined. A number of texts were produced by folklorists (for example, Abrahams, 1993; Stewart, 1991a, 1991b) who engaged so-called postmodern discussions about ‘the ways in which [folklorists] have participated in their own marginalization by failing to see how their work has contributed centrally to creating not only the folk but also the non-folk, for example, the dominant classes of Western societies’ (Shuman & Briggs, 1993, pp. 109-110). This is the point where ‘authenticity’, ‘tradition’ and ‘folk culture’ became conceptually problematic. It was no longer adequate to assume that the ‘folk’ were a bounded group (traditional, peasant, working class, rural, poor, etc…), and that the project of researching ‘the folk’
was free of national (Abrahams, 1993; Herzfeld, 1982), or other, interests. The changing conditions of mobility, particularly because of the rise of new media, pushed folklorists to consider expressive cultures that were not necessarily interactional in the way they had been considered previously (Kirchenblatt-Gimblett, 1992).

Bendix (1997, p. 231) suggests that the ‘profound interdisciplinarity of approaches to the subject’ of folklore is best demonstrated in Barry Toelken’s (1996, p. 1) comment:

Indeed, the famous story of the blind men describing the elephant provides a valid analogy for the field of folklore: The historian may see in folklore the common person’s version of a sequence of grand events already charted; the anthropologist sees the oral expression of social systems, cultural meaning, and sacred relationships; the literary scholar looks for genres of oral literature, the psychologist for universal imprints, the art historian for primitive art, the linguist for folk speech and worldview, and so on. The field of folklore as we know it today has been formed and defined by the very variety of its approaches.

The influence of this earlier work can be seen in more recent, public-sphere-centred approaches to folklore which ‘[add] the issue of how the performances and performers interact with the larger societies around them, including people beyond the performers’ social groups’ (Miller, 2002, pp. 13-14). After wondering about its invisibility as a discipline within the academy (Roberts, 1999), folklore looked forward from the present (Radner, 2001), backward for the future (Bulger, 2003), and then went public. On the website for the American Folklore Society (2006) there is a section titled ‘What Do Folklorists Do?’ providing personal narratives which position the folklorist as: academic administrator, archivist, bibliographer, biographer, community organizer, cultural critic, curator, dramatist, editor, filmmaker, performer, public servant, publicist, publisher, record producer, and teacher.

The allure of folklore and other stories it tells

Other than allowing for the production of narratives that are ineffable to other disciplines, the allure of folklore is deeply personal. I am drawn to folklore for many reasons and some might be (Bendix, 1997, pp. 11-12):

... a social commitment, an infatuation with some of expressive culture’s beauty, or, conversely, amazement, shock, or outrage at the deep-seated hatred and ugliness packed into some forms of expressive culture. It is in such personal involvements with expressive culture that we may experience an immediate link to our object of study.

How interesting it is to see an emergence in educational research of suggestions that perhaps ‘postmodernism is one manifestation of the spectre that has stalked modernity as its impensé: the trace of its ineffable, uncanny Other’ (MacLure, 2006, p. 732) when ‘[f]olklore has long served as a vehicle in
the search for the authentic, satisfying a longing for an escape from modernity’ (Bendix, 1997, p. 7).

Created as a silent Other of modernism, it inherited modernism’s binary oppositions between aesthetics and ethics, objectivity and subjectivity, authenticity and the inauthentic, dominant and minority, and global and local (Shuman & Briggs, 1993, p. 109).

But folklorists, unlike researchers of education, are all characterised in one way or another as scholars of narrative. They have collectively made particular reflexive moves that put into doubt the narratives their own discipline produces so that this desire for authenticity, as Bendix suggests, can be removed and along with it, ‘its deceptive promises of transcendence’ (Bendix, 1997, p. 7) that are so deeply desired in much reflexive educational scholarship.

To my knowledge, there are but two journal articles that focus specifically on the meeting of folklore and teaching, one of which is in a folklore journal (Grider, 1995) and the other in an education journal (Morgan-Fleming, 1999). Both authors are writing from universities in the United States. Sylvia Grider (1995, p. 179) makes the point that ‘folklorists are compulsive teachers’. Not only do they teach in university classrooms and lecture theatres but they also conduct workshops for various professionals. She suggests that ‘teaching is not always valued by the power structure of our society’ which is why ‘bumper stickers, coffee mugs, and such express our collective angst and frustration’ through ‘cynical aphorisms’ (Grider, 1995, p. 180). Her essay is a call for folklorists to practice teaching, ‘the art and the craft at which we excel’ (Grider, 1995, p. 183), as a way of keeping the discipline from dying. Although her arguments are wrought with stereotypical metaphors of teaching, she (Grider, 1995, p. 184) finishes by alluding quite nicely to how similar the goals of constructivist teachers are with those of folklorists who teach:

Our role as teachers essentially is to organize and make sense of what our students already know, putting them in a position to integrate experiences from their own lives and pasts into the larger concepts of our shared humanity.

In a more theoretically rigorous paper, Barbara Morgan-Fleming (1999) discusses the relevance, and neglect in the education research community of, orality. Almost a decade after publishing this article, it is still mostly the case in educational research that ‘oral forms are studied as transcribed text, leaving out key elements of performance’ (Morgan-Fleming, 1999, p. 274). Drawing on her own personal experience she positions her teacher self as oppositional to her folklorist self, although the latter is informing the former (Morgan-Fleming, 1999, p. 274):
I was caught occasionally between my past as a folklorist and my present as a teacher, as I admired the beautiful speech strategies students sometimes used to completely destroy my well planned lessons... I grew to realize that in teaching, the type of knowledge and the ways in which that knowledge was shared were similar to those found in traditional crafts that I had investigated as a graduate student in folklore. Story and experience seemed much more informative than discrete recommendations couched in general theory and statistics.

Drawing on the performance-centred approach to folklore, she develops five concepts that can be used to study enacted curriculum. These are about linguistic competence, texts emerging out of the context in which they are told, the locality of rules, the role of tradition and innovation, as well as the feminist critique of the discipline itself. This leads her to conclude with four points about the necessity to research oral performance, to include communicative competence, to provide opportunities for preservice teachers to engage in oral performances and to insure that teachers are assessed on oral interaction. Consider a personal narrative, however, that indicates how some of the earlier work of folklore can also be incorporated into teaching.

I teach in subjects on pedagogy, curriculum and assessment for a graduate course called the Graduate Diploma in Education, in the Faculty of Education, at my university. I like to stay in touch, during their teaching practicum, with students I teach who will often contact me to tell me stories and sometimes ask for support. Just this year, one of these students who was completing her second of three ‘teaching rounds’ at the time, sent me an email asking if I knew of any good movies to do with urban and modern myths or legends. This, of course, is where many folklorists have expertise and where much of folklore, in all its early disciplinary ignorance, has built an incredible repertoire of artefacts. I recalled a book I had read titled *The Trials & Tribulations of Little Red Riding Hood* (Zipes, 1993) which contains thirty-eight different versions of this tale. I also have found that people are often amazed to find out how many variations of this tale—with different characters, endings, plots, etc—are already known amongst themselves. So I wrote back an email to this student and here is what I said:

_Not a bother at all, I’m happy to hear from you._

_I think it’s hard to make the separation between modern and classic when it comes to folklore because themes are recurrent and most of what goes on is (re)interpretation and performance._

_I think a great way to begin any of this kind of work is using the Brother’s Grimm with Little Red Riding Hood. You get everyone to recall the version of the story that they know (if you have students from non-AngloGermanic cultures then just ask them to imagine what it might be about or to recall a similar folk story about making choices, prostitution, sexual awakening, being in the woods, etc). It’s always interesting to_
hear the different variations because the activity is after all a performance (or re-telling), even if it is written.

In any case then there are numerous ways to demonstrate the reappearance of Little Red Riding Hood as a folk narrative in one form or another. For example, there’s a bugs bunny cartoon called Little Red Riding Rabbit which mocks the classic tale. Check the Little Red Riding Hood narrative here: http://www.dirtydollcreations.com/animations.html for a really interesting twist (make sure you watch it before showing it to kids). There’s a film with Kiefer Sutherland and Reese Witherspoon called Freeway that draws on the theme.

This is an awesome website with all kinds of urban legends: http://www.snopes.com/ Its goal is kind of like a mythbusters thing.

Everyone knows stories like the kidney removed and waking up in a bath of ice, the guy who woke up with lipstick on his mirror saying ‘welcome to the world of AIDS’, the alligators in the subway, etc... These all have various variations. I think the internet and hoax emails are definitely the most interesting ‘texts’ to study but you can find numerous variations of these themes within Hollywood.

Ultimately, I think in a short amount of time it’s easier to do fun things with legends other than those of the urban variety. So Robin Hood, King Arthur, Beowolf, etc... As a folklorist I [might] make my goal for the students to be able to identify whether or not something is in fact a myth, epic, legend, proverb, fable, etc...

How about the X-files?

Anyway, I hope this helps and that all is going well. Let me know if you need more material.

Much to her surprise, this kind of work was successful in engaging the students she was teaching. There are much more interesting contributions that folklore can have towards our understanding of schools in the twenty-first century. At the Congress of Nordic Ethnologists in 2003 where the theme was about Europe and a globalizing world, Regina Bendix (2003, p. 34) suggested that we look at ‘the role of schools in biography and network formation, the material culture and sensory experience of schools present and past, and inter- and multicultural encounter in schools from the experiential perspective of children themselves’. There is still so much that needs to be done.

Myths about teaching or folk communicative performances?

With almost certainty, the majority of people when asked about folklore in teaching will tell some variation or another of what I believe is George Bernard Shaw’s comment about the perceived incompetence of teachers. Those who can do, and those who can’t teach. Consider the following story,
told to me by a close friend who eavesdropped on two girls (Year 11 or 12, their final years of schooling) sitting opposite her on the tram in Melbourne where I currently live:

The girls were discussing a friend of theirs and how she had not been studying enough. She’s going to fail if she doesn’t get her act together, one said. The other responded by claiming just how many hours she, herself, spends studying and how few this friend of theirs does. After a few minutes going back and forth and criticizing the girl, one of them said, yes, but even if she fails out of everything and can’t get into any other university courses, she could always do teaching.

It is assumed that a teacher’s job is simple and that learning to become a teacher, as it is commonly understood, is just about jumping hurdles that anyone can jump. Amongst other things, all variations of this belief undermine the possibility of teaching being perceived as a profession, hints toward the technical nature of teaching and hence the further assumption that teaching is only about ‘experience’ (to be read similar to ‘years on the job’). This short-circuits the possibility that there may be many knowledges to teaching (Kincheloe, 2004). I have heard extensions that build on other perceptions of groups, including, those who can’t do, teach, those who can’t teach, teach PE (or gym) and the further addition of those who can’t teach PE, become principals. These beliefs are pervasive.

Bill Ayers (1993; Ayers & Schubert, 1999) invokes some of the popular language of what is understood to be the ‘lore of teaching’ to describe what it means to teach and to learn to teach in his heartfelt work. One of the myths suggests that the job of teachers is to ‘manage’ people (Ayers, 1993, p. 10). Without getting into too much detail, this ties into a system of control where discipline and punishment are the only imaginable alternatives to ‘gold stars, incentive plans, A’s, praise, and other bribes’ (Kohn, 1993). Don’t smile before Easter, or it’s northern hemisphere equivalent ‘don’t smile before Christmas’, suggest that teachers who do anything other than starting the year by disciplining their students are destined to be ‘walked all over’. This year a student of mine told me that one of his supervisor’s went so far as to tell him that he needs to ‘break one student down so that the others can see and learn that they can’t walk all over you’. As Ayers contends, however, the ‘classroom management myth represents, in a sense, the triumph of narrow behaviorism and manipulation over teaching as a moral craft’ (Ayers, 1993).

Text-based approaches to folklore, consider, as I have above, these utterances in isolation from the context in which they have arisen. The ‘turn’ toward performance urged folklorists to consider the performance aspects of verbal lore. For example, one might begin by asking, under what conditions would these utterances be performed, for what audience and for what purposes? Consider what Abrahams (1980, p. 371) has to say about the relationship between such questions and group life:
To the extent that verbal lore both instructs and entertains, it puts into words the most important shared values of group life; folklore in this way reveals attitudes that remind us of how life ought to be lived, conditioning us about the consequences of not following these precepts. Thus, folklore often provides the main patterns for the expression and enactment of group values and ideals.

Abrahams (1980, p. 371) also says, this is a description of the instructive properties of texts such as don’t smile before Easter and that it is also important to consider how these texts and their performances ‘may address their ways of playing, joking, and testing the boundaries of the community from within’. Evidence that they are context-bound is not so difficult to discern. For example, one might imagine that when a so-called experienced teacher says to another experienced teacher to not smile before Easter, it is like they share an old joke, reminiscing about the times when they did smile before Easter and the students walked all over them. They re-affirm their own belonging to this group called ‘experienced teacher’ with many ‘coming of age’ stories to tell. Just this week I attended a valedictory address for a group of student-teachers at the end of their course where a principal, a teacher educator and a beginning teacher all told stories that they considered ‘kernels of wisdom’ about how they have become ‘experienced teachers’. By considering these performances as nothing more than clichés and analysing their textual features alone (form and function) we foreclose the possibility of considering this verbal art as a way of articulating cultural boundaries in order to ‘include members and exclude nonmembers’ or as a ‘means of distinguishing separate and even antagonistic segments within the community’ (Abrahams, 1980, p. 372). A friend and colleague of mine who works in small, remote communities in the Northern Territory told me about some local variations of similar verbal art that serve to maintain such boundaries. Take, as an example, advice that was given to him by an old Irish brother when he first arrived in the Northern Territory: ‘Up here it’s not the temperature that gets you its the humility! So learn to be humble’. Similarly, communicative competence is conferred through folklore to beginning teachers in this context: ‘There is only one other person in this community, if you open your soul to them everyone will know it!’

The turn towards performance, however, has not been unproblematic. Cross-disciplinary debates have challenged folklore and other disciplines to engage in contemporary conversations about reflexivity (Bauman, 2002; Berger & Negro, 2002) and gendered subjectivity (Sawin, 2002). There has been much talk about the demise of folklore as academic departments in the discipline are being downsized and its faculty dispersed across other departments; this was the case at the University of Pennsylvania when I graduated. In Australia, folklore never developed as a discipline, the largest single project in the academy being the Australian Folklore Research Unit at Curtin University. Folklorists, however rare in Australia, are doing interesting work here (for example, Darian-Smith & Factor, 2005). And, as Alan Dundes
said ‘folklore is not vanishing; on the contrary, folklore continues to be alive and well in the modern world, due in part to increased transmission via e-mail and the Internet’ (Dundes, 2005, p. 406).

Conclusion

It has been my intention in this paper to disrupt the stereotypical use, or misuse, of the word ‘folklore’ to mean fallacy or error (Dundes, 2005). From its earlier, more antiquated forms, through its performance-centred approach (and its challenges), to the more recent attention towards discourse and the public, folklore has been interested in the artistic expressions of people in their everyday lives. This has flown in the face of the project of modernity to hierarchically secure its ordered, specialised knowledges above the complexities of the politics and poetics of life; by doing so it has also participated in it. Fully aware of this complicity, the discipline turned its gaze inward and some folklorists that experienced ‘discomfort with received categories of language, aesthetics, culture, tradition, and other truths that generally seemed to be held to be self-evident’ made this their object of study (Bauman, 2003, p. viii). As a now forgetful folklorist, amongst other things immersed in educational research, I have suggested how the objects of study in folklore and its ways of inquiring about them have much to offer to this community. Very briefly looking at some verbal lore, performed by teachers in and out, I hope I have shown how folklorists would consider it anathema to think of these everyday, artistic expression as clichés.
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Notes

1 For another example and a review of oppositional needs talk refer to Uttley (2000).

2 She (Bendix, 1997, pp. 5-6) says: ‘Despite the field’s heterogeneity, the effort to invoke disciplinary contours has been a constant—necessitated in part because clearly defined disciplines are institutionally privileged. The study details why and how facets of culture were isolated and reined in to constitute a disciplinary subject—a process that occurs in all fields claiming parts of culture as their core, from early anthropology and philology to the present plethora of area and ethnic studies. Authenticity... was variously used as an agent to define this subject, differentiate it from other cultural manifestations, develop methods of analysis, critique competing theories, or create new paradigms. Cultural scholarship and inquiry, furthermore, fuelled societal interest in cultural fragments and cultural wholes, becoming one
force in the “artifactualization” of facets of culture (Stewart, 1991b). In doing so, scholarship prepared the way for the vibrant market and politics in commodified cultural authenticities, which, in turn, are becoming the new disciplinary subject. Dismantling the role of authenticity in this process explains the emergence during recent years of reflexivity in scholarly habitus’.

3 He (Dundes, 1965, p. 3) says, making clear that this is only a sampling, not an exhaustive list of all the forms: ‘Folklore includes, myths, legends, folktales, jokes, proverbs, riddles, chants, charms, blessings, curses, oaths, insults, retorts, taunts, teases, toasts, tongue-twisters, and greeting and leave-taking formulas (e.g., See you later, alligator). It also includes folk costume, folk dance, folk drama (and mime), folk art, folk belief (or superstition), folk medicine, folk instrumental music (e.g., fiddle tunes), folksongs (e.g., lullabies, ballads), folk speech (e.g., slang), folk similes (e.g., as blind as a bat), folk metaphors (e.g., to paint the town red), and names (e.g., nicknames and place names). Folk poetry ranges from oral epics to autograph-book verse, epitaphs, latrinalia (writings on the walls of public bathrooms), limericks, ball-bouncing rhymes, jump-robe rhymes, finger and toe rhymes, dandling rhymes (To bounce children on the knee), counting-out rhymes (to determine who will be “it” in games), and nursery rhymes. The list of folklore forms also contains games; gestures; symbols; prayers (e.g., graces); practical jokes; folk etymologies; food recipes; quilt and embroidery designs; house, barn, and fence types; street vendor’s cries; and even the conventional sounds used to summon animals or to give them commands. There are such minor forms as mnemonic devices (e.g., the name Roy G. Biv to remember the colors of the spectrum in order), envelope sealers (e.g., SWAK—Sealed With A Kiss), and the traditional comments made after body emissions (e.g., after burps and sneezes). There are such major forms as festivals and special day (or holiday) customs (e.g., Christmas, Halloween, and birthday).’

4 Bauman (1977, p. 47) cites the following to explain residual culture: ‘experiences, meanings and values which cannot be verified or cannot be expressed in terms of the dominant culture, [but] are nevertheless lived and practiced on the basis of the residue—cultural as well as social—of some previous social formation’ (Williams, 1973 as cited in Bauman, 1977).

5 Abrahams (1980, pp. 370-371) says: ‘The term folklore commonly refers to ways of talking, interacting, and performing, including traditional types of everyday expression such as proverbs, prayers, curses, jokes, riddles, superstitions (or, to use the more neutral term, statements of belief), tales, and songs. The term also embraces the numerous types of story—anecdotes, testimonies, reminiscences—that emerge on both casual and ceremonial occasions. Folklore forms thus range from the short and economical devices employed in everyday interactions to the larger expressive genres, like songs and sermons, which are commonly called forth on special occasions. However, folklore refers also to games, rituals, festivals, foods, health practices and beliefs, traditional crafts, and occupations. It encompasses work forms, serious as well as recreational, and draws from material as well as expressive culture’. 
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