2009

The Dawn of the "Chaotic Account": Horatio Hale's Australia Notebook and the Development of Anthropologists' Field Notes

Tom Belton
University of Western Ontario, tbelton@uwo.ca

The Dawn of the 'Chaotic Account': Horatio Hale's Australia Notebook and the Development of Anthropologists' Field Notes

Tom Belton

The University of Western Ontario

London, Ontario, Canada

N6A 7V8

Tel.: 519-661-2111 ext. 81343

Fax: 519-850-2979

tbelton@uwo.ca

Abstract: This paper proposes an archival analysis of notebooks, and their relationships to other parts of personal archives (e.g. journals or diaries). The bulk of the paper is an analysis of the historical development of a particular genre of notebooks: anthropological field notes, “chaotic accounts”, as Branislaw Manilnowski called them, based largely on observation. It provides a review of anthropologists’ own recent literature on the subject, and a short case study of a mid nineteenth century notebook of the American explorer/ethnographer Horatio Hale that serves as an example of one seed out of which anthropological field notes grew.

1. Introduction

In her influential 1996 article "Evidence of Me", Sue McKemmish proposed a research brief for personal record keeping and its relationship to identity[1]. Inspired by McKemmish’s call, this paper is a study of the huge and largely unmapped territory of personal note taking and keeping by investigating the ancestry and development of a particular genre: the notes of field working anthropologists and one of their explorer forebears, Horatio Hale. This paper begins with a review of some of the recent literature on note taking, notebooks, and field notes, and relates it to archival and record keeping knowledge. It goes on to offer a starting point for further analysis of the genesis of the form and purpose of field notes through a case study of one of Hale’s own field notebooks. My premise is that field notes merit historical investigation as important parts of record keeping systems that provide evidence of professional and personal identities and not just as vehicles for the transmission of knowledge such as scientific data.

2. Note Taking

There is an ambiguity about the terms “note” and “notebook” that reflects their informality and flexibility, and moreover their ubiquity and banality. A note can be analogous to a record but it can also be less fixed (e.g. a mental note). A note can stand on its own as an informal record, or be affixed to a formal record, as an annotation[2].

A note is most often a brief reference intended for the self; such notes serve as aids to, or surrogates for, memory. Gathered together into notebooks and indexed, they may remain useful to their creator and others over time. They may also serve as limited evidence of methods of personal data gathering, selection, and transmission.

However, a note can also be a brief communication, in either a personal or organizational context. Such a note can serve as informal evidence of transactions or decisions. However, these notes are usually seen as temporary or personal documents that do not form part of an official record keeping system because they record unimportant or private transactions and don’t require capture, or because they document discussions but have been superseded by formal records that record consequent decisions. Consider the classic example of the less detailed set of minutes that replaces the handwritten notes, or audio/visual recording, of a meeting. Both the creation of the notes in the first instance, and their transformation into minutes entail selection. This practice of selection is common to all note taking.

The vast majority of personal notes are taken and kept by an individual for the purpose of knowledge transmission over time. Such notes are also selective, based on things read, thought, seen, or heard. In addition, notes may create texts out of thoughts, images and sounds; moreover, even extracts that are combined in new ways make new texts. Accumulations of such notes are often found in “notebooks”. This apparently simple documentary form is strongly related to, and sometimes overlaps with, other forms of records, such as diaries or journals, which come in different varieties, some genuinely personal or private, others shared or public. Is it possible that the personal notebook not only transmits knowledge through time but is also, as Sue McKemmish has said about the journal[3], evidence of an identity, and a narrative of the self?

The creation of notes is an almost involuntary human need to support our imperfect memories in transmitting knowledge across time. Most personal note taking is informal, immediate and ephemeral. What is more, because there is an enormous flexibility to pen (or pencil) and paper, note taking is one of the few areas of writing and recording that has resisted complete computerization[4].

In spite of the ubiquity of note taking, its banality and informality mean that note taking knowledge is often tacit or mysterious unless our memory and knowledge needs become paramount. For example, universities provide instruction to students on the methods of good note taking to help their memories cope with the intensity of knowledge transmission.

Regardless, note keeping is often seen as unimportant, troublesome, or tedious. Not everyone takes or keeps notes, even those who select and transmit knowledge on a regular basis and whose memories might not otherwise cope. How did we arrive at such a state? Is it possible to study the development of note taking practice under such circumstances? If so, what would be the raw material for such a study?

3. History of Note Taking

Cultural historian Ann Blair's 2004 article "Note Taking as an Art of Transmission" traces the history of note taking from the Renaissance to the Enlightenment, focusing on the scholarly taking of notes from written texts in order to support memory. She does not deal at length with notes that must have been taken from other sources (e.g. sermons or scientific observations), and largely passes over the related issues of note keeping, notebooks or notes as records or archives. Her focus is squarely on methods relating to the selection, capture and transmission of knowledge through reading and writing. However, to the extent that writing and transmission are concepts that are significant to the studies of archival science and related disciplines, her analysis is useful.

Her central thrust is that note taking remains a "…central but often hidden phase in the transmission of knowledge"[5]. This transmission usually operates within an individual's own experience, and over a brief period. She maintains that there are different stages in note taking, messier notes usually being replaced by more polished ones that are often sorted, integrated into existing notes, and saved. Most notes are "…designed for short-term use and do not survive at all, for lack of any desire to preserve them"[6]. However, knowledge transmission can also occur after the note taker's lifetime. What is transmitted can be knowledge, but also evidence of "…the thought processes of famous thinkers or writers"[7].

Blair argues that note taking involves four "basic maneuvers...storing, sorting, summarizing, and selecting"[8]. These maneuvers and her analysis of them will be familiar to any archivist. Storing entails fixing the note on some medium. Sorting notes requires that they be arranged in some alphabetic or otherwise systematic, order "…for ease of retention and retrieval"[9]. Notes arranged miscellaneously require a "finding aid", either a search function or index[10].

Blair goes on to discuss summarizing and selecting notes. Early modern notes were not entire texts but rather abstracts of them. In 1599, Francis Bacon identified two different types of note taking, the first, by epitome, or abridgement (summarizing a text), and the second, by common places (selection of passages from a source, sorted under topical or thematic headings)[11]. The former would normally be paraphrased, and the latter, transcribed.

Blair asserts that these two methods became the basis of European note taking tradition in genres as varied as textbooks, encyclopedias, and anthologies[12]. After introducing possible criteria for the typology of note taking (i.e. by field, by source, by intended audience, by purpose), she draws links between medieval and early modern merchants' daybooks (organizing transactions chronologically) and notebooks (sorting them by category) as important models for general-purpose note taking. This explicit link between note taking and recording transactions is enlightening for the archivist attempting to understand the record qualities of notebooks[13]. While what is recorded (extracting references, or recording observations, for personal use) are not transactions, the sorting and organizing techniques are identical. Later in her study, she makes a similar connection between notebooks and the daybook's cousin, the personal diary[14].

Early modern manuals on the method continued to emphasize the pre-eminence of transcriptions or paraphrases taken from reading, rather than notes taken from observation or reflection. By the eighteenth century, this had shifted to the more personal, reflective, and occasionally critical style of the diary[15]. More importantly, Blair argues, between the eighteenth and early twentieth centuries, the earlier modern tradition of note taking as a means of aiding or triggering memory had been replaced by a new purpose, that of relieving the memory of an unnecessary burden[16]. Note taking could conceivably be delegated, allowing notes to serve as substitutes for personal memory that might eventually be used by others, assuming they were kept.

4. Note Keeping – Personal and Professional

In spite of the existence of an analysis like Blair's, there has been little investigation of the notebook as a form. One exception is Earle Havens' study of commonplace books. These books of everyday references were precursors to modern personal notebooks but were also known as "table books", "memorandum books", and "notebooks"[17]. Consequently, Havens identifies for us some familiar ambiguities within the commonplace book form, while clearly distinguishing between them and diaries.

What about notebooks as personal records? Investigations have been proposed and, in some cases, begun, for other personal records, such as diaries. In his paper "Towards the History of the Australian Diary", the archivist Michael Piggott suggests a focus not only on the writing of the diary and its documentary forms, but also on diary *keeping*, on an exploration of the diary as a record keeping system. This entails study of the activities and relationships that are performed and documented in a diary, and its multiples uses and users "…long after the ink has faded"[18].

In that spirit, archivists might analyze the documentary form of the notebook and its relationship to other personal documentary forms (the diary being the most obvious example), just as Havens does. Going further, we might supplement that with a contextual analysis of the purposes (e.g. knowledge transmission or evidence) of note taking and note keeping, the personae and roles of the note taker and note keeper (e.g. the professional), the methods (e.g. by abridgement or transcription), sources (e.g. from reading, listening or observing), and the intended audience (e.g. the self, professional colleagues).

The archivist Ann Pederson states that record keeping is the “world’s best kept secret” because it constrains freedom of action, provides an unwanted conscience, and is autonomic, boring, inward facing, and confusing[19]. Of course, much of her argument has to do with organizational record keeping, but a good deal could also apply to the personal variety. It could be easily applied to the related field of note taking and keeping. The common placing or abridgement of texts can be tedious for all but the most patient and thorough, and thus benefits from automation[20]. What is more, selectivity in note taking for purposes of knowledge transmission (e.g. via a published paper) can provide evidence of thought processes and decisions about inclusion and exclusion. Like records, one’s notes could contradict a public position or stated argument on a matter. At the very least, depending on their purpose, notes might call into question one’s methodological rigor, or professionalism. Might either sloppy (or excessively fastidious) note taking reflect badly on one’s humanity?

Humans make and keep notes and records in a variety of contexts. In a recent article on the topic, Michael Piggott argues, “The human factor within organizational record keeping cannot be ignored, anymore than it can be in personnel management, recruitment, work group formation and so on.”[21] As employees or professionals, our note taking and keeping forms part of larger, but sometimes only implied, juridical and record keeping contexts. Physicians take notes to record observations of, and encounters with, patients. This is done to aid memory, but also to communicate with others. These notes usually form part of the clinical records of patients. Police officers do the same and their notes inform more official records drawn up at a later time. These notes are definitely records of transactions and relationships and will likely form part of the record keeping systems and archives of organizations. In addition, such notes can serve as evidence of claims to expertise or intellectual property. For instance, scientists keep laboratory notebooks that are crucial evidence in the establishment of patent claims[22]. For this reason, the Collaborative Electronic Notebook Systems Association (CENSA) sets standards for the integrity of electronic shared lab notebooks[23].

The common quality of all these human-made notes in organizational contexts is that they are so clearly records. They are called "notes" because of their handwritten form, incompleteness, or informal procedure of creation. However, whether or not formal records supersede them, they may yet serve as vital evidence. They merit further study, but doing so is beyond the scope of this paper, which is concerned with the record qualities of personal notes of individuals operating within a broad framework of professional practice.

5. Literature Review, Part 1: Field Work and Notes

What follows is a literature review focused on a particular genre of notes: anthropologists' field notes based largely on observation and intended for the self. Anthropologists have recently turned their attention to their note taking and notes; having said that, much of the knowledge and practice is still unstated, engendering a kind of mystique. The truisms of personal note taking and keeping, that notes are personal and informal, but possibly contentious and troublesome, apply no less to anthropologists in their professional work.

Anthropologists know the context of their note taking but only some have tried to analyze it carefully. Field notes arise out of the activity of participant observation that has been at the heart of anthropological field research since the early twentieth century. Field research and participant observation evolved out of earlier traditions of exploration and informal study that will be summarized later in the paper. Participant observation emphasized the (arguably contradictory) goals of detached scientific study of, through interaction with, the world's peoples.

One of the pioneers of participant observation, the Polish-British anthropologist Bronislaw Malinowski, identified field notes as a "chaotic account in which everything is written down as it observed or told"[24]. At first blush, these accounts might seem like diaries. However, running through the anthropological literature about field notes is the conviction that field notes are chaotic because they contain both raw data (e.g. faithful transcriptions of interviews, or genealogies) but also evidence of interaction or personal reflection. Could it be these latter qualities that make the notebooks archives? As we shall see, some anthropologists have tried to overcome the chaos by creating relatively elaborate personal record keeping systems that separate the (putatively more significant and potentially public) data from the (supposedly less significant, and private) evidence.

Anthropological historian James Clifford argues that there are three basic operations involved in field note taking. They are inscription, transcription, and description, all terms that resonate with archivists. Inscription is the "writing down" or "jotting" of a mnemonic word or phrase to fix an observation[25]. Inscription is situated close to the discourse and events of the observed, although it is still selective. Because the observer must also participate, these notes are often inscribed covertly. They may also have an untidy aspect that makes them difficult for others to use.

Clifford goes on to define "transcription" as the recording of texts that may already be inscribed elsewhere, a process somewhat more removed from the action. For anthropologists, transcription is an older model of data recording, dependent on a network of informants. We shall see that explorers used it as early as the first half of the nineteenth century; we can also speculate that its origins lie in the early modern traditions described by Blair. However, in spite of its apparent objectivity, transcription, like all note taking, actually involves hidden elements of translation and selection[26]. Consequently, even transcribed notes could be carefully analyzed as evidence of these actions.

"Description" is the most removed, yet coherent stage of note taking, which takes the inscriptive jottings and fills them in with remembered or re-imagined details and analysis. Descriptive field notes are "written up" or "typed up"[27]. Description entails a further selection, and cleaning up, of information and thereby represents the anthropologist's turn away from the self and to the other, the audience or reader. Descriptive field notes are likely to be indexed under topical headings, like specialized commonplace books. They are more coherent, and useful to others, as data or knowledge but may also have value as evidence of the selection, and the shift from data gathering to dissemination. They become part of a relationship between the sometimes-conflicting purposes of the two activities. The conscience of the descriptive field notes is the inscriptive field notes.

According to Clifford, the inscriptive stance is the one in which the anthropologist registers "…the circumstantial situations of perceiving, interpreting subject, noting events and statements as part of a passing sojourn of research"[28]. For archivists, Clifford thus implicitly identifies the activity based, and functionally grounded, nature of inscriptive field notes. As personal records of professional activity, inscribed field notes are not just raw data. They have an "I was there" quality that bespeaks authenticity and professional authority[29]. They are thus evidence of the anthropologist's claim to expertise[30]. Perhaps that is why most keep them, whether or not they ever use them.

Not surprisingly, Clifford does not outline a rigid type or form of record resulting from fieldwork, arguing that it is too personal and informal. However, ethnographer Rena Lederman provides an instructive case study of her own personal records. Clearly, she tries to render systematic the various chaotic accounts by outlining three types of field notes: journals, logs, and typed files. Interestingly, her system of "notes" actually resembles one of diaries. Journals contain long and reflective entries. These are diverse and personal notes that she "…would never want to make public"[31].

By contrast, Lederman's daily logs are a "public" record, a copy being sent home for safekeeping. They contain reports of conversations, descriptions of events, and responses to questions. They may be written up somewhat later, based on inscriptive notes. Logs contain a series of unrelated items arranged chronologically, with no effort to index them by topic[32]. These resemble public diaries. Where conversation became interview, there would be a link to "typed files" of extended, log-style accounts[33].

Lederman's circumstance is personal, yet instructive for archivists. She argues that field notes are ambiguous in form, content and intention, part of both doing and writing, neither a diary nor "…a public archive"[34]. They are dangerous because, when they are read, they "…challenge memory" and can "…return one to uncertainty".[35] This sounds remarkably like Ann Pederson's "unwanted conscience". As with other record creators and keepers, this is what makes anthropologists feel ambivalent about their field notes.

6. <u>Literature Review, Part 2: Field Note Keeping and Sharing</u>

In what other ways do anthropologists express this ambivalence? Nancy J. Parezo states: "For some, field records are sacrosanct; for others, all but worthless"[36]. David W. Plath expresses a conviction that echoes Pederson's argument about the marginality of record keeping: field note keeping (what he calls "file work") is boring, offering "…all the dramatic tension of watching paint dry" compared to "fieldwork…the spectator sport that holds the viewer's eye"[37]. Parezo cites Margaret Mead's comment that her colleague Clark Wissler felt that filing and record keeping "fitted women" because it was like housekeeping. She goes on to say that he felt it kept him "…from the more productive activities of lecturing and writing"[38].

Simon Ottenberg asserts that field notes are less important than "headnotes", or mental notes, until their author has died. Until that time, the field notes can only correct the head notes[39]. Regardless, Ottenberg implies that field notes will be kept and used beyond a lifetime. Moreover, Roger Sanjek argues, "destruction or loss of field notes is the worst thing that can happen to an anthropologist[40]. Even though they may never be used again, keeping one's field notes helps ensure preservation of personal and professional identity. Margery Wolf considers whether or not field notes are "ephemera" or "documents" and eventually settles on the latter, which "…must be part of the public record"[41].

On the subject of field notes as "pluralized" (a term I borrow from the Australian records continuum model)[42] archives, there is also a recent literature by anthropologists. Most notable are the two 1990s editions of "Preserving the Anthropological Record", edited by Sydel Silverman and Nancy J. Parezo and Parezo's 1998 *American Archivist* article "Preserving Anthropology's Heritage: CoPAR, Anthropological Records and the Archival Community"[43].

These are concerned with long-term preservation and use of anthropological field notes and other records.

Perhaps consciously referring to the concept of the life cycle, Parezo argues, "'old' field observations are always 'active' data"[44]. They may be re-used by their creator and by others, provided that they are given context through the use of diaries or correspondence. In other words, field notes are also evidence. She goes on to argue that field records have archival (i.e. research) value only when they are shared in this pluralized fashion[45].

Largely missing from this burgeoning anthropological literature on field note taking and keeping practice is a historical perspective. Roger Sanjek provides one exception in his article "The Secret Life of Fieldnotes", although he agrees with Clifford that most of the practice is unrecorded. He argues that any history of field notes would have to consider notes created by nineteenth century explorers, administrators and missionaries, but declines to do so[46]. One such explorer was the American ethnographer Horatio Hale, some of whose scarce notes I have examined. This notebook is one seed out of which anthropological field notes grew.

7. Case Study: Horatio Hale's Field Notes

The American ethnographer and explorer Horatio Hale was born in Newport, New Hampshire in 1817. At Harvard in the early 1830s, he showed promise in linguistics. He was asked to serve on the United States Navy's Exploring Expedition (a.k.a. the Wilkes Expedition) to the South Pacific between 1838 and 1842. Charles Wilkes instructed his officers and scientists to keep "…full and complete memoranda of all observations" and to take special note of "…the habits, manners, customs, etc., of the natives, and the positions, descriptions, and character of such places as we may visit"[47]. Hale later went on to study law, and in 1855, he moved to what is now Clinton, Ontario, Canada. However, he returned to the study of aboriginal languages in the 1870s and 1880s. Hale died at Clinton in 1896.

Very few of Hale's original notebooks or other personal records are extant in collecting archives or manuscript libraries[48]. One anthropologist advised me that there is evidence that most were sold at auction in Philadelphia in 1911[49]. One of his few notebooks resides at the University of Western Ontario Archives in London, Canada, along with a few other remains of his papers.

This notebook is entitled "Notes on the Natives of Australia and their Dialects". Clearly he used them to write the chapter on Australian vocabularies and dialects in his 1846 volume, *Ethnography and Philology*[50]. It begins with a title page that identifies the volume, and seemingly fixes it in a place (New South Wales) and time (December and January 1839-1840). After the title page, the volume has another apparent chronological start in January 1840, Wellington, New South Wales; however, it quickly breaks down into the unstructured form of the conventional miscellaneous notebook (e.g. lists of data (vocabularies) and descriptions arranged in no clear order).

Much of the content is transcription or selection of texts from other written sources. Hale copied these from the written manuscripts of the Australian missionaries L.E. Threlkeld, William Watson, and others, whom he acknowledges in his notes. Hale's use of the term "memoranda" reflects Charles Wilkes' instructions, but also terminology that Earle Havens recently described as being in general use. Moreover, one of Watson's transcribed grammars is entitled an "epitome", clearly imitating what must have been classic note taking practice of the sort recently described by Ann Blair.

Others were based on his interview of informants. For this reason, there is little inscription of observed events. In accordance with the Wilkes' instructions, there is extensive description of traits of the "natives", but Hale does not describe places visited in any sort of detail. There are only a few non-textual records (a few sketches of artifacts) among the notes. While this may be expected for a document of its time, it also reflects the primarily descriptive and textual concerns of the philologist and ethnographer.

Hale seems to have "re-activated" his notebook by making at least one extended entry much later, probably in the 1880s. This entry clearly related to his 1887 article, "Language as a Test of Mental Capacity", in which Hale referred to his experience in the Pacific (including Australia) and wrote plainly of his method of borrowing from missionaries

He did not throw the notebook away upon publication of his 1846 work; he either kept it or retrieved it from his other notebooks that he probably left with his mother in Philadelphia[51]. These notes may have aided and relieved Hale's memory over many years, especially during the long period when he turned away from ethnology to his law practice. In this way, they served the purpose described by Ann Blair above, to aid knowledge transmission over an individual's lifetime.

From the anthropological perspective, the notebook's value is its content, especially some of the raw linguistic data. Indeed, the value of this volume as a databank of Australian dialects has recently been re-discovered, partly because there are gaps in Hale's published volume that it may fill[52]. In this fashion, the notes continue to serve the purpose of knowledge transmission beyond an individual's lifetime.

From the archival perspective, we can surmise that Hale's purpose in creating and keeping his Australia notebook reflected his identity as ethnographer/explorer, the methods largely being transcription or abridgement of written sources sorted randomly (as opposed to a clearly chronological recording, such as a diary).

However, the notebook only hints at evidence of activity, of the interaction and sharing among a number of individuals, the explorer/ethnographer, his colleagues and informants. It is no substitute for a personal archive[53]. The relationships that may have been explicit elsewhere in Hale's correspondence and other transactional records are mentioned only in passing references in the notebook itself. Nor does this notebook document a conversation with the self in the way that a Hale diary might have. Only when used carefully with Hale's published work do these notes provide insight into the identity of a notable linguist, how he returned near the end of his life to the experience that fired his youth.

Over the half-century that Hale kept this notebook, a transition in the field of anthropology began to occur, most of it beyond the scope of this paper. Ethnology focused on "…the reconstruction of non-recorded histories" through the use of informants and transcription became anthropology, eventually dependent on participant observation and description[54]. Anthropologists and linguists had firmer professional identities and self-consciousness. At the same time, by the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, they (like others) had new tools at their disposal for record making, including the typewriter, the camera, and the tape recorder.

Hale's notebook for the 1839-1840 period is an excellent example of ethnology and transcription, but its secondary focus in the 1880s does not yield enough evidence of a transition in Hale's thinking. Indeed, Jacob Gruber asserts that Hale's thinking in the 1880s remained largely unchanged from that of the 1840s due to his self-imposed career change and isolation[55].

8. Conclusion

Anthropological field notes began largely as data gathered by the ethnographer/explorer. The anthropologist David Plath called these nineteenth century scientists “fact-knappers” occupied with collecting and disbursing “real data” to correct the errors of custom[56]. Charles Wilkes instructed Horatio Hale and the others on the Exploring Expedition to do just that. His Australia notebook is evidence of his explorations, but more importantly, his method of transcribing his informants’ texts. This method was likely inspired by epitomizing and common placing traditions that were well developed by the early nineteenth century. Clearly, Hale kept this notebook to recall linguistic data much later in his career. More compelling, but harder to prove, is the possibility that he may have also kept it to help him re-claim an earlier identity. What we don’t know is whether or not he eventually “re-purposed” all his notebooks in the same fashion.

Within a generation or two of Hale’s death, field notes had become the heart of the anthropological participant observer’s record keeping toolkit, the most immediate, yet discreet, “chaotic account” of things observed. In this way, they made putatively authoritative records out of human discourse and interaction, a far different purpose than mere fact gathering[57]. They had become evidence of the anthropologist’s expertise and identity, both as professional participant observers and academic analysts. Along with this came a less comfortable purpose as conscience.

Modern field notes also reflected the advent of new technologies in record storage adopted elsewhere (e.g. cards or slips that are easily sorted by topic) but also the shift of the anthropologist’s role to authoritative participant observer (inscriber of observations) and social scientist (describer and analyst). New technologies and roles have led to more complex record systems[58].

The growth of anthropological fieldwork and the development of media and technologies allowed for a greater refinement and articulation of the forms of field notes. The implicit segmentation of primitive field notes had become explicit forms: temporary "scratch" notes, transcribed texts, and polished (often typed) descriptive notes. Anthropologists such as Rena Lederman have tried to distinguish between the data or observations themselves, and their reflections about them, by adopting more complex systems. These field record-keeping systems included photographs, and audio/visual recordings. However, they were also part of a parallel knowledge transmission system, which favoured the most refined information products, the academic publication.

Anthropologists have intensely personal but ambivalent feelings about keeping all these records. Having published their authoritative work, they might not refer to the notes again. Nevertheless, they clearly see their field notes both as raw knowledge and as evidence of their claims to intertwined professional expertise and personal identity.

Alongside notes remain the records of personal and professional experience such as diaries and blogs, with which the notes still overlap. At present, internet based software such as EthnoNotes enhances data capture and manipulation, and more significantly, collaboration. These trends may combine to make "personal" field notes a thing of the past.

Endnotes

[1] Sue McKemmish, "Evidence of Me…" *Archives and Manuscripts* 24, no. 1, (1996): 41.

[2] In this paper, I do not consider notes as brief information products (e.g. as in the legal profession), or brief annotations to information products (e.g. this endnote).

[3] McKemmish, "Evidence of Me…,": 31.
[4] Nevertheless, some computer scientists have taken up the challenge. For instance, see Min Lin, Wayne G. Lutters, and Tina S. Kim, "Understanding the Micronote Lifecycle: Improving Mobile Support for Informal Note Taking," *Computers in Human Behaviour*, 20, no. 2, (2004): 185-199. The authors analyze several individuals' "micronotes", sketch out their life cycle, and argue for improved computer hardware and software to support their creation and use.
[5] Ann Blair, "Note Taking as an Art of Transmission", *Critical Inquiry*, 31 (2004), http://criticalinquiry.uchicago.edu/features/artsstatements/arts.blair.htm , (accessed May 1, 2007).
[6] Ibid., p. 5.
[7] Ibid., p. 3.
[8] Ibid., p. 1.
[9] Ibid.
[10] Ibid. Interestingly, Blair does not identify chronological order as a method of arranging one's notes. Do notes arranged in chronological order, by definition, constitute a journal or diary?
[11] Ibid., p. 2.
[12] Ibid.
[13] Ibid., p. 4.
[14] Ibid., p. 6.
[15] Ibid., p. 9.
[16] Ibid., p. 11.
[17] Earle Havens, *Commonplace Books: A History of Manuscripts and Printed Books from Antiquity to the Twentieth Century*, (New Haven: Yale University, 2001), 72.
[18] Michael Piggott, "Towards a History of the Australian Diary", *Conference Programme and Participants' Papers, I-CHORA, October 2-4, 2003*, 69.
[19] Ann Pederson, *Understanding Society Through its Records*, 2001, http://john.curtin.edu.au/society/overview/index.html (accessed June 30, 2007).
[20] Witness the success of software programs such as RefWorks.
[21] Michael Piggott, "Human Behaviour and the making of Records and Archives," *Archives and Social Sciences: A Journal of Interdisciplinary Research*, 1, no. 0 (2007), 239. http://socialstudies.cartagena.es/images/PDF/no0/piggott_human.pdf (accessed June 29, 2007).
[22] See http://www.bio-itworld.com/newsitems/2006/july/07-11-06-evidentiary-data (accessed July 31, 2006)
[23] Collaborative Electronic Notebook Systems Association, http://www.censa.org/ (accessed May 29, 2007).
[24] Roger Sanjek, "A Vocabulary for Fieldnotes," in *Fieldnotes: The Makings of Anthropology*, ed. Roger Sanjek (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1990), 99.
[25] James Clifford, "Notes on (Field)notes," in *Fieldnotes:*, 51-52. One might call these the anthropologist's "micronotes" (see endnote 2).
[26] Ibid., 58.
[27] Ibid., 66-67.
[28] Ibid., 66.
[29] Ibid., 61.
[30] Regna Darnell, "Documenting Disciplinary History" in *Preserving the Anthropological Record*, 2nd ed., pp. 73-84, quoted in Nancy J. Parezo, "Preserving Anthropology's Heritage: CoPAR, Anthropological Records and the Archival Community", *American Archivist*, 62, no. 2 (1999), 284.
[31] Rena Lederman, "Pretexts for Ethnography: On Reading Fieldnotes" in *Fieldnotes:*, 75.
[32] Ibid., 77.
[33] Ibid., 74-75.
[34] Ibid., 72.
[35] Ibid., 73.
[36] Parezo, "Preserving Anthropology's Heritage", 284.
[37] David W. Plath "Fieldnotes, Filed Notes, and the Conferring of Note", in *Fieldnotes:*, 375.
[38] Parezo, "Preserving Anthropology's Heritage", 274.
[39] Simon Ottenberg, "Thirty Years of Fieldnotes: Changing Relationships to the Text" in *Fieldnotes:*, 147.
[40] Roger Sanjek, "Fire, Loss, and the Sorcerer's Apprentice", in *Fieldnotes:*, 34.
[41] Margery Wolf, "Chinanotes: Engendering Anthropology" in *Fieldnotes:*, 353-4.
[42] See, for example, Frank Upward, "The Records Continuum," in *Archives: Recordkeeping in Society* (Wagga Wagga: Centre for Information Studies, Charles Sturt University, 2005), 197-222.

[43] See also the Guide to Preserving Anthropological Records at http://www.nmnh.si.edu/naa/copar/bulletins.htm.
[44] Parezo, "Preserving Anthropology's Heritage:", 278.
[45] Ibid., p. 283.
[46] Roger Sanjek, "The Secret Life of Fieldnotes", in *Fieldnotes:*, 188.
[47] Barry Alan Joyce, *The Shaping of American Ethnography: The Wilkes Exploring Expedition, 1838-1842*, (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2001), 26. The Expedition's sailing logs reside at the National Archives in Washington in Record Group 37.
[48] There are several other notebooks of Hale's at the California Historical Society, which I have not been able to examine.
[49] E-mail from Victor Golla to the author, 22 August, 2005.
[50] Entire passages of notes appear *verbatim* in the manuscript of his report, also located at the University of Western Ontario Archives.
[51] Victor Golla to the author *op. cit*.
[52] David Nash of the Australian National University told me that this volume likely has "notes not previously known here…for instance, 'Vocabulary of the Bathurst or Kandanura dialect' is presumably of the language Gundungurra…of which only fragments were recorded in the 19th century, and will be of particular interest". Nash to the author, 25 August, 2005. One of the results of this dialogue was that the Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies in Canberra obtained a microfilmed copy for its holdings.
[53] Intriguingly, it could also be defined as a fragment of the Wilkes Expedition record keeping system or archive.
[54] Jacob W. Gruber, "Horatio Hale and the Development of American Anthropology", *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, 111, no. 1 (1967), 12-13, http://www.jstor.org/ (accessed May 18, 2007)
[55] ibid., p. 18.
[56] Plath, "Fieldnotes, Filed Notes, and the Conferring of Note", in *Fieldnotes:*, 373.
[57] Nigel Rapport, "Writing Fieldnotes: The Conventionalities of Note-Taking and Taking Note in the Field", *Anthropology Today*, 7, no. 1 (1991), 12, http://www.jstor.org/ (accessed May 17, 2007).
[58] For example, the mid twentieth century records of linguist Roy Rappaport (held at the University of California, San Diego) include note cards, note books, diaries, audio recordings, photographs and typescript summaries. See description at the Online Archive of California at http://www.oac.cdlib.org/.

Bibliography

Blair, Ann. "Note Taking as an Art of Transmission", *Critical Inquiry*, 31 (2004), http://criticalinquiry.uchicago.edu/features/artsstatements/arts.blair.htm (accessed May 1, 2007).

Clifford, James. "Notes on (Field)notes," in *Fieldnotes: The Makings of Anthropology*, ed. Roger Sanjek, 47-70. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1990.

Joyce, Barry Alan. *The Shaping of American Ethnography: The Wilkes Exploring Expedition, 1838-1842*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2001.

Gruber, Jacob W. "Horatio Hale and the Development of American Anthropology", *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, 111, no. 1 (1967), http://www.jstor.org/ (accessed May 18, 2007).

Hale, Horatio. "Notes on the Natives of Australia and their Dialects". University of Western Ontario Archives.

Havens, Earle. *Commonplace Books: A History of Manuscripts and Printed Books from Antiquity to the Twentieth Century*. New Haven: Yale University, 2001.

Lederman, Rena. "Pretexts for Ethnography: On Reading Fieldnotes" in *Fieldnotes: The Makings of Anthropology*, ed. Roger Sanjek, 71-91. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1990.

Lin, Min, Lutters, Wayne G., and Kim, Tina S. "Understanding the Micronote Lifecycle: Improving Mobile Support for Informal Note Taking," *Computers in Human Behaviour*, 20, no. 2, (2004): 185-199.

McKemmish, Sue. "Evidence of Me…," *Archives and Manuscripts* 24, no. 1, (1996): 28-45.

Ottenberg, Simon. "Thirty Years of Fieldnotes: Changing Relationships to the Text" in *Fieldnotes: The Makings of Anthropology*, ed. Roger Sanjek, 139-160. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1990.

Parezo, Nancy J. "Preserving Anthropology's Heritage: CoPAR, Anthropological Records and the Archival Community", *American Archivist*, 62, no. 2 (1999), 271-306.

Pederson, Ann. *Understanding Society Through its Records*, 2001, http://john.curtin.edu.au/society/overview/index.html (accessed June 30, 2007).

Piggott, Michael. "Towards a History of the Australian Diary", in *Conference Programme and Participants' Papers, I-CHORA, October 2-4, 2003*, 68-75.

Piggott, Michael. "Human Behaviour and the making of Records and Archives," *Archives and Social Sciences: A Journal of Interdisciplinary Research*, 1, no. 0 (2007), http://socialstudies.cartagena.es/images/PDF/no0/piggott_human.pdf (accessed June 29, 2007).

Plath, David W. "Fieldnotes, Filed Notes, and the Conferring of Note", in *Fieldnotes: The Makings of Anthropology*, ed. Roger Sanjek, 271-284. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1990.

Rapport, Nigel. "Writing Fieldnotes: The Conventionalities of Note-Taking and Taking Note in the Field", *Anthropology Today*, 7, no. 1 (1991), http://www.jstor.org/ (accessed May 17, 2007).

Sanjek, Roger. "Fire, Loss, and the Sorcerer's Apprentice", in *Fieldnotes: The Makings of Anthropology*, ed. Roger Sanjek, 34-46. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1990.

Sanjek, Roger. "A Vocabulary for Fieldnotes," in *Fieldnotes: The Makings of Anthropology*, ed. Roger Sanjek, 92-138. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1990.

Sanjek, Roger. "The Secret Life of Fieldnotes", in *Fieldnotes: The Makings of Anthropology*, ed. Roger Sanjek, 187-272. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1990.

Wolf, Margery. "Chinanotes: Engendering Anthropology" in *Fieldnotes: The Makings of Anthropology*, ed. Roger Sanjek, 343-355. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1990.