RECONSIDERING JOVITA GONZÁLEZ'S LIFE, LETTERS, AND PRE-1935 FOLKLORIC PRODUCTION: A Proto-Chicana's Conscious Revolt Against Anglo Academic Patriarchy Via Linguistic Performance

Díana Noreen Rivera

Jovita González has received critical praise and critical concern for her representations of South Texas Mexican culture and its people in her literary production. Critics have also questioned González's personal identity politics in light of her academic affiliation with J. Frank Dobie, University of Texas folklorist and longtime editor of the Texas Folklore Society, who controversially instructed society members to write of the folk with picturesque flavor. My essay evaluates critical interpretations that position González and her work as conflicted, contradictory, and repressed-ultimately arguing against these interpretations. I argue that González demonstrates the ability to strategically challenge dominant Anglo modes of discourse, especially in discriminatory academic climates, personally and via her work. Using a framework that includes cultural theories by Chela Sandoval and Henry Louis Gates Jr., I position González as a subversive linguistic performer capable of polyvalent speech acts in her various contacts with Anglo academics and in her earlier folkloric productions to problematize critical studies that question González's ethnic allegiance and the subversive quality of her pre-1935 folklore.

Since the publication of *Caballero* in 1994 by the recovery efforts of José E. Limón and María E. Cotera, the reintroduction of Jovita González's folklore,

historical, and novelistic works have proven to be invaluable for gaining new insight on society and culture in South Texas. Many cultural critics consider González to be a pioneer of Mexican American and Chicana literature and recognize her 1930 master's thesis, "Social Life in Cameron, Starr, and Zapata Counties," as a landmark scholarly work. María E. Cotera, John M. González, José E. Limón, and Leticia Garza-Falcón each emphasize the groundbreaking cultural significance of González's "Social Life" as a subversive work of scholarship that openly challenged, in an academic setting, Anglo-constructed Texas historiography produced during the first quarter of the twentieth century, which often portrayed people of Mexican descent negatively and as social deviants.[1]

Likewise, González's novelistic endeavors, *Dew on the Thorn* (1935)[2] and *Cabellero* (1939),[3] the latter a production of co-authorship with Margaret Eimer, have received special critical attention for their subversion of patriarchal discourses by scholars of Chicana literature such as Marci McMahon and the aforementioned Leticia Garza-Falcón and María E. Cotera. Each scholar resuscitates González's post-1935 novelistic works from past descriptions of González's "quiet political nature,"[4] as opposed to her pre-1935 folkloric productions published under the close proximity of J. Frank Dobie, her folkloric mentor and fellow Texas Folklore Society member, who spearheaded the society as its longtime publications editor. Garza-Falcón and McMahon, in particular, problematize González's works as reflections of her cultural ambivalence and negotiations made in order to be accepted by an Anglo-academic patriarchy at the University of Texas. Garza-Falcón determines González's *Dew on the Thorn* and *Caballero* as bolder responses to Walter Prescott Webb's discriminatory rhetoric of dominance[5] than her earlier folkloristic writings published by the Texas Folklore Society (1998, 76, 79). However, because Garza-Falcón expertly makes use of autobiographical information in González's memoirs, she complicates González's patriarchal resistance with González's contradictory

cultural impulses. She utilizes González's dualistic upbringing in terms of class difference (her matrilineal forebears were Spanish land-grantees in the province of Nuevo Santander who had lost most of their holdings by the time of González's birth in 1904; her patrilineal forebears were struggling educators and artisans native to Nuevo Leon, Mexico), as well as later biographical information, to emphasize that González's works, especially *Dew on the Thorn*, both challenge and resemble Webbian rhetoric. For Garza-Falcón, life imitates art and art imitates life as she profoundly states, "In her actual life and in her narratives, González remains both 'among' and removed from 'her' people" (1998, 77). That some members of the Corpus Christi community who knew González recall her as seeming "aristocratic," (1998, 97) harkens back to events in *Dew on the Thorn* like matriarchal protagonist Doña Ramona's favor and empathy for displaced former plantation owning Southerners who relocate to South Texas. As evinced by cross-racial class associations such as this, where South Texas rancheros and ex-southern plantations owners unite in empathy, those of Mexican descent who comprise the lowest class, peones, remain subdued and removed from González's cultural purview. Yet, Garza-Falcón also stresses González's passion for equal education for all Mexican Americans of every social class and how her democratic interests manifest within *Dew* when the schoolmaster, Don Alberto, successfully convinces the hegemonic-minded rancheros to have the children of the peones join the children of the masters in school (1998, 92-93). Garza-Falcón suggests that these "competing voices" found in González's work "offer insight to the author's negotiation of her 'self' and her unique presence within the academy" and notes that, for González, "a struggle is evident" (1998, 111-112).

McMahon's analysis of *Cabellero* also distinguishes González's co-authored historical South Texas border romance set during the U.S.-Mexican War from her folkloric writings. McMahon asserts, "In contrast to her folklore narratives,

Caballero explicitly reveals how patriarchal values position women as symbols of chastity and purity necessary to define a man's honor and uphold Spanishness in the region" (2007, 243). McMahon adds another element to González's dimensions of patriarchal subversion; instead of Webbian discourse, it is an overt critique of flawed Spanish-Mexican patriarchal values, which is non-existent in González's prior folklore. Furthermore, just as Garza-Falcón points out how González's bifurcated Webbian response reveals her cultural conundrum, McMahon argues that González's sociopolitical and cultural "project" (2007, 241) in *Caballero* was to "deploy domesticity to claim whiteness" (2007, 233) for herself and her culture via a "Spanishness" that simultaneously displays a racially pure and elite status from working-class Mexicans and subverts Spanish-Mexican patriarchal values that objectify women in favor of Anglo patriarchal mores (2007, 243). McMahon sees González's novelistic claims to whiteness and contestation of Spanish-Mexican patriarchy via the valorization of white masculinity as an example of how González as a Spanish-Mexican academic asserted her Spanish/white identity and culture to gain entrance to the university. That González positions herself as Spanish/white while she distances herself from people of Mexican descent, especially those of lower social standing, and that she valorizes Anglo patriarchy while she condemns Spanish-Mexican patriarchy reveals for McMahon González's "difficult navigation of Anglo racial binaries that circulated during her lifetime" (2007, 244).

Cotera, like Garza-Falcón and McMahon, uses *Dew on the Thorn* and *Caballero* to argue for the subversive power of González's fictional storytelling practices in her exceptional feminist ethnographic work *Native Speakers* (2008). Upholding the oppositional divide that positions González's novelistic works as superior to her folkloristic publications under the Texas Folklore Society, Cotera asserts that *Caballero* and *Dew on the Thorn* "move beyond [her]...ethnographic work, which after all, was still structured and

constrained [my emphasis] by the discursive norms of ethnographic meaning making" (2008, 21). For Cotera, González's post-1935 fiction writing is the literary genre, or form, of repudiation against J. Frank Dobie and other Anglo academics practicing romantic regionalism, a term coined by Texas scholar James McNutt to describe the Texas Folklore Society's superficial and picturesque ethnographic celebrations of Mexican culture as it ignored political and social determinants significant to Texas-Mexican culture.[6] And in terms of González's biography, Cotera chronologically situates González's literary resistance, with the exception of her counterdiscursive master's thesis, after González physically distanced herself from Dobie, the University of Texas, and the Texas Folklore Society, in 1935.[7] But, what differentiates Cotera's analysis is her insightful emphasis on González's status as a woman of color ethnographer. Utilizing the scholarship of Chandra Tapalde Mohanty, Cotera perceptively posits that González was an

> ...informed native woman who had come of age under the rhetoric of dominance that defined [her] community; [she] knew this rhetoric by heart, learned its language and methodologies, and deployed its discourses to challenge the very representational practices that had served to normalize colonialist relations of rule. (2008, 28)

By evaluating González as an informed native women who deployed the rhetoric of dominance's *discourses*, Cotera keenly reads González's novelistic works as manifold subversions of patriarchal discourses. For Cotera, González uses elements of Dobian romantic regionalism in *Caballero*'s historical romance to "offer a complex feminist critique of the discursive limitations of *both* Mexican and Anglo visions of history, ...by virtue of a cross-racial dialogue that deconstructs conventional notions of authorship and, by extension, patriarchal authority" (2008, 203). Because *Caballero* is the co-authored text of González

and her textual partner, Eimer, and hence "the product of at least two separate and possibly conflictual historical consciousnesses," (2007, 162) Cotera reads *Caballero* as "a larger feminist project involving dialogue between women across the divides of race, culture, and history" (2007, 161).

Cotera's, McMahon's, and Garza-Falcón's studies are representative of a decade's worth of scholarship that heed to Tey Diana Rebolledo's call in *Women Singing in the Snow* (1995) for work to be done on the life and literature of González. Resultantly, we have now in the field of Chicana literature the representation of González as a complex cultural producer who challenged, in her post-1935 novelistic work, multiple forms of patriarchal discourses, but who problematically avoided being caught in the crosshairs of racial and cultural disfavor among Anglo academics and folklorists, and had a "tendency to express...inappropriate class and racial ideologies" (Cotera 2007, 165). I believe there is no disputing the contradictory cultural discourse in González's texts or the ability to read her folkloric and novelistic works as figurative expressions of her Spanish/white cultural assertions. However, to push the bounds of scholarly discussion on González, I question whether we have done her an injustice in our inquiries concerning her problematic cultural negotiations. We have posited *why* González created cultural productions riddled with contradictory voices that at once situate her among and aristocratically above her people-the answer: to difficultly navigate and strenuously negotiate the Anglo academy and Anglo society at large. Yet, we have not considered the fuller significance of *how* González navigated and negotiated patriarchal Anglo institutions like the University of Texas and the Texas Folklore Society beyond pointing out the intracultural conflict in her narratives and life. I feel Cotera takes us in a positive direction when she astutely says that González was an informed woman who knew the rhetoric of dominance by heart, learned its language, methodologies, and deployed its discourses in her works to challenge its very representational

practices. For González's "difficult navigations," "valorization of whiteness," and cultural "struggles" in the form of "competing voices" are only seemingly conflictual if we consider González's life and letters as strategic negotiations in the form of what Chela Sandoval recognizes as an "oppositional consciousness." In *Methodology of the Oppressed*, Sandoval asserts that subjugated, postmodern subjects consciously oppose dominant ideologies by "not laying claim to any *single* 'healthy linguistic normality' from which to speak and *act*, [my emphasis] because doing so might impair one's chances for survival" (2000, 27-28). With this application of Sandoval's "oppositional consciousness" to González's life and her cultural productions, we can begin to refigure González in a new light, for her difficult navigations positively transform into purposeful negotiations in which González's ability to use multiple linguistic discourses demonstrates *how* she was able "confront," "speak to," and "act" before the Anglo patriarchal powers of her academic and folkloric circles, namely the University of Texas, the Texas Folklore Society, and J. Frank Dobie in particular. Not only does this application of Sandoval's "oppositional consciousness" speak to how González conducted her negotiations in Anglo-dominant academic circles, but I believe it also addresses possibilities for González's textual and biographical ambivalence. While critics are correct to identify González's tendency to express inappropriate class and racial ideologies and competing voices, what has not been asserted is that González did "not [lay] claim to any *single* 'linguistic normality' from which to speak and *act* [again, my emphasis] (Sandoval, 2000, 27-28).

Sandoval's earlier feminist theoretical ideologies, specifically her concept of a "differential consciousness" in "'Mestizaje as Method': Feminists-of-Color Challenge the Canon" (1998) has been aptly utilized by Cotera in *Native Speakers*. Sandoval's "differential consciousness," much like her later exegesis of an "oppositional consciousness," maintains that women of color consciously mobilize a variety of discourses to undo hegemonic discursive regimes. Cotera particularly

emphasizes a notion of "differential consciousness" in her analysis of González and other women-of-color ethnographers that illuminates how they "deploy[ed] resistant ideologies in fundamentally new ways and move[d] in and between different subject positions...to transform dominant discourse" in the form of what Sandoval calls "cruising mobilities" (2008, 17). Cotera asserts that she:

> Want[s] to claim the "cruising mobilities" of the differential practitioner [for the women of her study]...to suggest that their movement in and between differing and sometimes competing discourses (anthropology, folklore, literature, emergent discourses of cultural nationalism and feminism), their telling and retelling of the same set of stories in these different discursive modes, and their physical mobility between metropolitan institutions and locales and the places they each called home (all sites of troubling contradictions) demonstrates a form of strategic political mobility that contemporary women of color have embraced as their own. (2008, 18)

As Edén E. Torres in *Chicana Without Apology* (2003) forcefully expounds on the ways in which she and Chicana academics of the late-twentieth and early-twenty-first centuries politically traverse the social-scapes within the hegemonic/corporate-structured institution, Cotera's extension of "cruising mobilities" to González's ability to traverse and subvert academic patriarchal discourses in the earlier twentieth century is invaluable for establishing what is now nearly a century's-long strategic methodology and ideology for how women-of-color negotiate and resist forms of hegemony, especially within academic institutions. However, while Cotera emphasizes González's "cruising mobilities" in the form of her spatial "nomadic morphing" (Sandoval, 1998, 26 qtd. in Cotera, 2008) and competing multi-genre discourses, I want to assert how González utilized the subversive art of linguistic performance as a means for

challenging Anglo-patriarchal academia and the very discourses she employed in her cultural productions, especially with regard to her *pre*-1935 folkloric narratives that she produced under the watchful tutelage of J. Frank Dobie. Interestingly, Sandoval's "differential consciousness" also emphasizes strategies of resistance that involve "the activity of the trickster who practices subjectivity-as-masquerade" (1996, 355). I feel this is a precursive relation to the essential qualities of an "oppositional consciousness" in which the oppressed subject, a performative trickster in their own right, stealthily does not claim any singular linguistic discourse, in favor of speaking to and against power using multiple discourses selectively, and even embedding multiple subversive discourses within a discourse of dominance.

This type of embedded subversive discourse, what Sandoval would term "the creativity of revolt under domination" (2000, 29) can be illuminated in comparison with Henry Louis Gates Jr.'s notion of the signifying monkey, which he popularized in his work "The Blackness of Blackness" (1983). Gates describes the signifying monkey as a trickster figure who "wreaks havoc upon the signified" through a "technique of indirect argument of persuasion" by "making fun of a person or situation" through wordplay, or "speaking with the hands, eyes, and a whole complex of expressions and gestures" (689). In terms of the jungle kingdom, "the Signifying Monkey is able to signify upon the Lion because the Lion does not understand the Monkey's discourse...the Monkey speaks *figuratively*, in a symbolic code; the Lion interprets or reads *literally*, and suffers the consequences of his folly (692). In terms of making theoretical parallels, I feel it is a fruitful endeavor to bring together Sandoval's concept of the subjugated subject's use of multiple linguistic normalities and Gates' discourse to symbolically challenge, argue, and/or mock hegemony, as their theoretical unification expands the intricate undermining linguistic methodologies used by the oppressed to counter dominant culture. After all, Sandoval does claim

Gates' "signifin'" alongside Gloria E. Anzaldúa's "la facultad" as "compris[ing] one of the fundamental technologies of the methodology of the oppressed" (2000, 82). Therefore, in light of Sandoval's "oppositional consciousness" and Gates' signifying monkey, I evaluate González's life and letters as demonstrative of strategic linguistic negotiations in which she performed subversive linguistic maneuvers and manipulations through a variety of speech acts such as wordplay, multiple discourse usage, verbal role-playing, tonal subterfuge, and embedded mockery in the form of romantic regionalism in her *pre*-1935 folklore to confront and at times trick the figurative white Lions of academia.

Before I turn to a direct analysis of subversive performative discourse in the face of Anglo academia, I want to offer a couple suppositions that reveal González's affinity for linguistic performance and embedded discourses in the manner of Gates' signifying monkey and Sandoval's speaking and *acting* "oppositional consciousness." If we return to González's autobiographical memoirs and deemphasize her competing maternal and paternal class backgrounds in favor of taking into account that her father "Jacobo González Rodríguez...came from a family of educators and *artisans*," ("Memoirs I:" qtd. Garza-Falcón), then we have a new biographical, familial element to re-imagine González as the daughter of craftspeople. González's paternal grandfather, a hat maker in the nineteenth century ("Memoirs: I" qtd. in Garza-Falcón), was an artisan by definition, for he was "a worker in a skilled trade" (*OED*). The apple did not fall too far from the tree when we consider González in light of her linguistic performative abilities, which I will divulge, as an academic artisan and *cultural* worker skilled in crafting discourse to act out and against the Anglo academy. But, perhaps a more telling exemplification of González's inherent attraction for performing subversive speech acts are the material and (pop) cultural conditions surrounding and within González's short story, "Shades of the Tenth Muse."

In the spring of 1935, with the financial assistance of a Rockefeller grant to study South Texas-Mexican ranching communities, González was the guest of a prominent Starr County family.[8] Rather than occupy a room within the main house at the family's request, González asked for a more private space of her own and was given a quiet quarters removed from the house. In this room, that she decorated with antique rancho relics and Catholic figurines, she penned "Shades of the Tenth Muse," a narrative of fantastic imaginings, in which González fantasizes a female, cross-cultural dialogue of the ages, that she bears witness to, between Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz and Anne Bradstreet.

Cotera, who rightfully notes that González's titular choice "Shades of the Tenth Muse" is "historically appropriate...given that both Bradstreet and Sor Juana were celebrated as the "Tenth Muse" of the Americas, Bradstreet in England and Sor Juana in Spain," (2008, 1), reads "Shades" as operating under three discursive junctures: one, the "primary institutional context" of Dobie and Texas folklore studies where her work may be understood as the product of a repressed, disorganized intellectual; two, against the backdrop of Mexican American politics where her work challenges monocultural Anglo American history; and three, "within a tradition of Chicana feminism that traces its roots to the colonial poet Sor Juana...and stands as a critique of the limitations on female creativity by patriarchal norms in both Mexican and Anglo culture" (2000, 238-239). Cotera argues that these three "interconnected but often competing discursive domains form the terrain of influence within which a properly contextual reading of Jovita's work may take place," (2000, 239) especially with regard to the latter two. In her literary analysis, Cotera points out each Muse of the Americas, Bradstreet and Sor Juana, though from different sociocultural contexts and geographical locations, "shares a love of knowledge, a trait generally discouraged in women of both colonial cultures" (2000, 242). Yet, despite this intercultural similarity, Cotera also notices that

González imagines Sor Juana as "a foil for Anne's xenophobic Puritan ethos" because Sor Juana recognizes a historical counternarrative that deconstructs the English-invented Black Legend and de-centers American culture away from Plymouth Rock (2000, 243-244).

However, what has not been emphasized enough in Cotera's reading of "Shades of the Tenth Muse" is the significant presence of a third muse in addition to Sor Juana and Bradstreet, a muse of Hollywood's silver screen. In the closing lines of the story, as González imagines Sor Juana and Bradstreet's sociocultural and gendered conversation coming to a close, Sor Juana tells the "Puritan instinct repressed" (González 2000, 115) Bradstreet, "It's been an honor and a pleasure to know another Tenth Muse. I thought I had a monopoly to the title. *Come up and see me again* [my emphasis]." Bradstreet replies, "'come up and see me.' Where have I heard that before?" An assumptive Sor Juana responds, "Never mind, you wouldn't even recognize *her* name if I told you; but do come again" (2000, 115). González incorporates into Sor Juana's speech none other than sex-siren of the silver screen Mae West's famous one-liner and double entendre, "Why don't you come up sometime and see me?" uttered by West to male lead Cary Grant in the 1933 film *She Done Him Wrong*. Furthermore, Mae West is the "her" that a contemporary-minded Sor Juana assumes Bradstreet would not recognize. Cotera makes a note that Sor Juana quotes from West to distinguish the modern Sor Juana from her conservative counterpart and claims Sor Juana to be "clearly Jovita's model for female creativity" (2000, 244). While Sor Juana indeed holds a place of prominence in González's story and, of the two apparitional muses, is González's preferred model of female creativity, the embedded discourse of Mae West and its significance must be expanded within the context of "Shades of the Tenth Muse" and González's life. I am certain González was a fan of West and that her usage of West's famous one-liner was significantly intended. My research in one of González's archives, at

Texas A&M Corpus Christi's Mary and Jeff Bell Library, yielded a newspaper clipping from the *Corpus Christi Caller* dated June 25, 1970, about Mae West, which an elderly González saved. The title of that clipping reads as follows: "Mae West Still Queen of Double Entendres." I take this archival document as material proof that an aged González, three and a half decades after "Shades" was written, felt an affinity with West throughout her life. I believe González's affinity manifested in her admiration to replicate West's double-entendre discourse in "Shades of the Tenth Muse" and to deploy a subversive, performative linguistic politic when speaking to members of dominant society and in her folkloric cultural productions. Therefore, we must add a fourth discursive domain to the terrain of influence Cotera maps for González's story to include de facto muse Mae West and the politics of linguistic performance, for clearly West also served as González's model for female creativity. Furthermore, while West's emergence in González's 1935 narration could give credence to the post-1935 argument made by the aforementioned scholars, we have to consider that González extracted West's dialogue from the 1933 film *She Done Him Wrong*, which in all likelihood shows her interest in West's discourse was established earlier.

To return to "Shades of the Tenth Muse" and offer a brief but concise reading of the story that highlights the usage of Mae West's double-entendre, I interpret the story's closing scene as a revelation of unbounded Latina female linguistic creativity via the conscious performance of subversive speech acts. That Sor Juana is capable of knowing West and deploying her ambiguous, multivalent discourse, in this case tinged with sexual innuendo, to mock the conservative and unknowing Bradstreet upon cordially inviting her to "see [her] again," reveals a racial disparity along the lines of knowing about and having the ability to perform subversive speech acts. González heightens this racial disparity in a moment of subversive linguistic Latina acknowledgment when González

imagines that Sor Juana, shortly after using West's double entendre to deride Bradstreet, "looked at me with what I thought was a wink" (2000, 115). Sor Juana's "wink" at González functions as an act that connects González to being-in-the-know concerning Sor Juana's mocking linguistic display against Bradstreet. Therefore, at the story's end, González creates a Latina-mestiza connection, or feminist project, in which the Anglo American Bradstreet is left out of the loop and made dupe of Sor Juana and Mae West's discourse. It is a feminist project that speaks to dominance using multiple discourses and signifying wordplay and forges a triangulation of women, queens of double entendres, which includes González, Sor Juana, and Mae West, a closet mestiza by way of her Irish, English, French, and speculated black racial and cultural roots[9]. These aspects of González's heritage and pop cultural affinities allow me to postulate how González demonstrates in her life and cultural productions, especially in her pre-1935 folk-stories, the nuanced manipulation of linguistic performance necessary to subvert patriarchal structures within the system and language of the oppressor: the Anglo academy.

To assist my first evaluation of González's subversive discourse, by way of interpretative juxtaposition, I consider the somewhat disparaging remarks made against her by José E. Limón in his overall informative text *Dancing with the Devil* (1994). Limón argues that González's work is self-contradictory, though "[González] dedicates most of her work to the ethnographic rendering of the lower classes," Limón states, she distinguishes herself in correspondence to Dobie as being of a "better class" (1994, 62). Limón notes in his evaluation of the Dobie-González correspondence that she "writes of the lower classes of her people-the laboring vaqueros and peons-...with a superior, often condescending and stereotyping colonialist tone resembling Dobie's" (1994, 62). Limón's criticism, which evaluates González's work through the biographical lens of her relationship with Dobie, interests me because Limón constructs two key

arguments from a hierarchal viewpoint. First, Limón argues that González, as Dobie's protégé, "took in Dobie's ethnographic style," meaning Dobie's "romantic regionalist" treatment of folklore (1994, 61, 51). He asserts that González, true to romantic regionalist form, embellished and idealized folkloric events in her writing while stripping folk narratives of their commentary on social violence against South Texas peoples of Mexican descent (1994, 61). Limón extends this argument in his introductory essay for *Dew on the Thorn*. Although Limón claims he is open to considering González's folkloric work as a feminist response to Anglo and Mexican patriarchy, he continues to stress González's adoption of Dobie's folkloric approach. Limón says, "As can happen with protégées and protégés, González adopted Dobie's approach and style in the collection and rendering of folklore which is evident in the work she published during these years [1927-1932]" (1997, xix-xxi). Thus, he reduces potential for seeing González's earlier folkloric literary efforts as subversive.

Secondly, Limón asserts that González "took in...something of [Dobie's] cultural contradictions" to the degree that she, despite being an "intellectual won over to the side of [Anglo] domination," offers mostly "unconscious" and "repressed" "counter-competing visions on questions of race, class, and gender domination" that exhibit her "bedeviled consciousness" (1994, 61). To qualify his assertions, Limón uses Fredric Jameson's notion of the political unconscious, which Limón defines as being the "socially produced, narratively mediated, and relatively unconscious ideological responses of people to a history of race and class domination" (1994, 14). Although Limón grounds his remarks in Jameson's theory, the Freudian discourse and sexually charged word choice that Limón uses to analyze González with words like "unconscious," "repressed," and "took in" at this point in his evaluation are hard to miss and consequentially diminish González to the prostrate form of one of Freud's psychoanalytic female case histories.[10]

Armed with Jameson's notion and a statement collected from González in 1981[11] by James McNutt who quotes González as saying "You just forgot about the bitter things that happened on both sides [Anglo and Mexican]," Limón calls for his readers to envision a twenty-three-year-old González standing before "a roomful of largely male Anglos," at the 1927 Texas Folklore Society meeting reading her "benign" folklore on nature that includes small "slips" of historical violence that hint at the turbulent relations between Anglos and Mexicans in Texas (1994, 64-65, 69-70). According to Limón, only after González distanced herself from the University of Texas and Dobie, by 1935, is she able to "reveal more of her narratively unrepressed critical political unconscious" (1994, 74). To illustrate his point, Limón uses González's folk narrative, "The Bullet-Swallower," which she submitted to Dobie's *Puro Mexicano* collection in 1935, nearly half a decade after finishing her graduate work at the University of Texas (1994, 71). Limón is satisfied that González has finally written a folktale about a "male Texas-Mexican resistance fighter" named Traga-Balas who, with his pistol in his hand, shoots it out with the Texas Rangers (1994, 71). He goes on to insinuate that Traga-Balas's characterization as an upper-class landowner who by choice forgoes his "South Texas class privilege" to be a smuggler amongst the lower social orders is a narrative fissure in which González inserts her own "repressed desire" to serve as an advocate for her people, albeit through displacement "unto a man" (1994, 71). It appears Limón's post-1935 chronological situation of what he determines to be González's more critical work functions as a point of origin for the minimization of González's pre-1935 subversive stance.

From Historical Repression to Historic Linguistic Performance: Rereading Jovita González's "You Just Forgot About It"

There are several points I desire to contest in Limón's criticism, the first being his notion of González as a "repressed" subject which he largely bases on her

statement to McNutt. The problematic with González is not ambivalence but repression, as she herself put it to McNutt: "you just forgot about it" (1994, 70). Just as Limón calls his readers to imagine a young González reading her folklore before a roomful of Anglo men in 1927, I believe it is necessary to envision an elderly González who is being questioned about her academic relationship to Dobie by James McNutt, in 1981.

The full text of this conversation that Limón includes in *Dancing with the Devil*, along with his commentary, reads as follows: For it turns out that [Dobie] and González had reached an "interesting agreement." McNutt quotes González:

> You see it was an agreement that we made, that I would not go into one of his classes because I would be mad at many things. He would take the Anglo-Saxon side naturally. I would take the Spanish Mexican side. (McNutt 1982, 251)

We learn more about the war waged pedagogically at The University of Texas. Future teachers, she told McNutt,

> Couldn't afford to get involved in a controversy between Mexico and The University of Texas...but if the history of Texas were written the way it actually was...because things, some of those things that happened on both sides were very bitter. So we just didn't mention them. You just forgot about it. (McNutt 1982, 251)

In evaluating González's responses to McNutt, Limón did not take into account two significant factors before he wrongfully diagnosed her repression. First, Limón overlooked the fact that the elderly González,

in being interviewed by an Anglo male, was engaged in an ethnographic encounter where she performed the role of Chicana informant. It was Limón's mentor, Dr. Américo Paredes, who wrote in his insightful article, "On Ethnographic Work Among Minority Groups," that Chicana/o informants in intercultural ethnographic encounters are capable of verbal artistic, expressive performances where their intercultural dialogue with the ethnographer invites word play, "insinuation, and veiled language" with "double or triple levels of meaning" (1977, 84).[12] As a Chicana informant capable of verbal artistry in the ethnographic moment of conversation, González's use of polyvalent discourses in the mode of Sandoval's "oppositional consciousness" that lash out at dominance in the manner of Gates' signifying speech acts are possible. Secondly, Limón refused to acknowledge that González's statements were demonstrative of her making conscious decisions on how to traverse social and cultural sites of power as a Chicana in a racially-charged environment. Instead, Limón fixates on her short statement, "You just forgot about it," as an admittance by González of her historical repression without understanding how this statement could actually be read as a subversive speech act, a double entendre, in the form of an all-too-literal play on words that declares her and her culture's historical oppression.

Ironically, what makes Limón's evaluative judgment problematic resides in his misinterpretation of the very statement that he uses to base his argument; in the word that González chooses to begin her statement, the personal pronoun "you." It is clearly apparent in her remarks that González is engaged in a conversation with McNutt. This is evidenced in her first statement when she says, "You see," where at once she establishes that she is addressing an "other." González goes on to establish her presence by narrating her past experiences using the first-person "I," as in "I would not go into one of his classes," "I would get mad," and "I would take the Spanish Mexican side." She then describes Dobie using the

third-person singular pronoun "he," as in "He would take the Anglo-Saxon side." Lastly, she uses the third-person plural pronoun "we" to be inclusive of herself and Dobie in their decision not to mention the "bitter" history between Anglos and Mexicans to each other. Who, then, is the "you" culpable of historical repression and oppression that González makes reference to? It is none other than the person she dialogues with and addresses as "you" from the start of her conversation, James McNutt, who, in González's aged eyes, represents the collective Anglo male other, the face of dominant academic power that she in her old age had witnessed throughout the decades as having repressed and suppressed histories telling of the Mexican American perspective in order to perpetuate dominant histories that she sought to contest. In this subtle but indelicate play on words González speaks to and against Anglo academia, a hegemonic institution that, to paraphrase Edén E. Torres, has not allowed alternative ways of knowing and third space feminist texts to permeate the U.S. university (2003, 69). González's double entendre operates as a subversive linguistic act that imposes a third space feminist consciousness which, in the words of Emma Pérez, "build[s] another story, uncovering the untold to consciously remake the narrative" (1999, 127) that, for González, condemns Anglo academics of her era as the repressive forces sidelining and eliding Mexican American histories. Her clever utterance of condemnation to Anglo patriarchy of the academy is not a confession of self-imposed historical repression, but a statement of lived oppression and historical "retooling." "You just forgot about it," via its subversive discourse, "looks to the past through the present...it is a maneuvering through time to remake subjectivities neglected" (Pérez 1999, 127).

In terms of asserting that Jovita González "unconsciously" engages in political resistance, Limón's argument enters another problematic position. On the one hand, Limón's use of Fredric Jameson's notion of the political unconscious pushes Chicana/o literary scholarship to consider modernist era writers as

postmodern subjects by acknowledging that their writings and thus their psyches are fraught with "internal contradiction" resulting from living in a global culture. However, Limón, a la Jameson, also imprisons his folkloric subjects as being unable to consciously perceive, act, and defend themselves, their region, or their culture from hegemonic power. Sandoval, in her work *Methodology of the Oppressed*, calls this type of imprisonment "postmodern entrapment," a term she devises to signal Jameson's pessimistic outlook in which he claims it is impossible and "unachievable" for the postmodern subject to "break through the net of ideological lines" and consciously "construct a moral and oppositional stance" (2000, 18). Perhaps it was Limón's intention to treat González as an incapable subject; however, when Limón uses Jameson's notion to evaluate the folkloric production of his mentor, Américo Paredes, it appears from Limón's text that he is not too comfortable diagnosing his mentor as creating unconscious cultural responses. Limón, sensing the damaging effects of Jameson's notion and its wrongful application to Paredes, a groundbreaking folklorist who challenged the anti-Mexican historics of Walter Prescott Webb in his acclaimed study *With His Pistol in His Hand*, loosely applies Jameson's theory by suggesting that Paredes was "not too unconscious" of his contrary position in his studies of how the "pocho/pachuco/fuereño" causes the demise of traditional Mexicano folk genres (1994, 93).

It is evident that Limón made an effort not to entrap his mentor as an unconscious subject. Why then could Limón not gather from González's statements to McNutt that she was demonstrating herself as a subject consciously traversing social and cultural sites of power among the political playing field of The University of Texas? If any particular confession is evident from González's discourse, it is that she admits to keenly, not difficultly, negotiating with the hegemonic, educational powers-that-be. This is most revealing in her remarks, "It was an agreement we made, that I would not go

into one of his classes because I would be mad at many things" and "[Future teachers] couldn't get involved in a controversy between Mexico and the University of Texas" (González qtd. in Limón 1994, 68). Unlike Paredes, who as a man during the civil rights era was able to take a more direct approach in confronting Anglo hegemony in his writings, for González to succeed in her era, she knew that she would have to explicitly conceal her bitterness and anger from Dobie in order to avoid jeopardizing her future teaching career.[13] Thus, she consciously and strategically negotiated with Dobie "not to go into his class" to maintain cordial relations with him and to secure her survival in an Anglo patriarchal educational environment. Though Garza-Falcón sees that "a struggle is evident" (1998, 112) with regard to González's internal and external academic and cultural negotiations, she perceptively posits: "With regard to [González's] university work, one must ask if we would have any of her works today had she not made some concessions to the Anglo male patriarchy of the academy" (1998, 130). Garza-Falcón's statement calls us to consider the fact that González's literary corpus, her folkloric contributions to the Texas Folklore Society, her master's thesis, her post-collegiate novels *Caballero* and *Dew on the Thorn*, may not have existed if González "had...not made some concessions to the Anglo male patriarchy of the academy." But what concessions other than avoiding Dobie's class and looking out for her future teaching career could she have made? And, how did she make them? Allow me to posit what I believe to be a couple of strategic concessions that González made in order to survive at the University of Texas among Anglo academics.

Strategic Cultural and Academic Concessions: González's Public vs. Private Discourses

In terms of making cultural concessions to Anglo hegemony, I do not doubt González felt she had to stress her "pure" Spanish heritage and racially distinguish herself, as she did in her letters to Dobie, from the lower class

vaquero, mestizo, and peones of "Indian blood," as Garza-Falcón, McMahon, and Limón have discussed. González understood this discourse was essential in order to be accepted by an Anglo academic patriarchy that, at the time, valued wealth and European ancestry while regarding the Mexican race as a lowly people "whose blood," as Walter Prescott Webb explains in his work *The Great Plains*, "when compared to that of the Plains Indians, was ditch water" (1931, 125-26).

However, we can best appreciate the strategics of González's cultural concessions, as opposed to her seeming struggles and competing voice, when we compare two forms of her writing with very different rhetorical situations; a letter to Dobie that displays her academic persona and the aforementioned "Shades of the Tenth Muse," a work not intended for academic publication, which displays González's private persona. In one of González's earliest letters[14] to Dobie, the very same that Limón makes use of in his evaluation of her correspondence, González writes with the rhetorical aim of having Dobie assist her first folkloric contribution to the Texas Folklore Society that would eventually become her first publication, "Folklore of the Texas-Mexican Vaquero" (1926). González strategically maneuvers her cultural identity to a bifurcated position with a discourse that at once situates her among and above her people to appeal to her Anglo mentor. She claims to "know the character of the vaquero not as an outsider...but as one who understand their racial beliefs, superstitions and traditions" (1926). However, González makes it clear to Dobie that his assistance is warranted because she is not writing about her people, "the landed proprietor...who forms the better class," but rather "[she is] merely dealing with the vaquero...whose only possessions are his horse, his 'Chata,' and stories and songs" (1926). By establishing herself in her discourse as a simultaneous cultural insider and outsider, González strategically negotiates her identity to attain the most credible and racially acceptable position according to Dobie's Anglo, academic perspective. González performs a public

and academic discourse in which she culturally "understands" the vaquero but does not identify with the vaquero. Therefore, she selects a discourse appropriate for her rhetorical situation; one that racially and socially distances her self before Anglo, academic eyes.

Yet, in "Shades of the Tenth Muse," an act of writing meant for personal rather than professional consumption, González does not make any cultural concessions and freely identifies with Mexican/mestizo culture. Her rhetorical situation is one of private self-reflection and racial empowerment evident in her discourse. Before the intercultural event between Sor Juana and Bradstreet occurs, in the opening movement of her narrative, González makes a personal cultural statement that racially identifies her with several Mexican cultural mementos in her room, the most significant of which is a Virgen de Guadalupe statuette. She writes, "A Virgin de Guadalupe reminds me daily that I am a descendent of a proud and stoic race" (2000, 108). González's private discourse counters her racial academic persona in which she plays up her "pure" Spanish heritage, since she racially and culturally aligns herself with the progeny of Juan Diego[15], neophytes, and Mexican mestizos of mixed indigenous and Spanish ancestry who embrace the Virgen de Guadalupe. Moreover, González's statement exhibits that she assuredly self-identifies with a brown, Mexican Virgin rather than a Madonna of Spain, such as the fair-skinned, rosy-cheeked Virgen de Rocío or the Santa Fean La Conquistadora. At the very least, González's cultural navigations, according to rhetorical situation, reveal she consciously and strategically conceded her mestiza self-identity, most of the time, in order to perform a racial and cultural role deemed socially acceptable to the Anglo academic circles of her time. Her selective discourse dependent on rhetoric circumstance demonstrates her refusal to "lay claim to any *single* linguistic normality" as she, with calculated voices and fluidity, performed multiple discourses for academic, public and personal, private situations.

"I Hope You Like the Spanish Tone:"
Jovita González, Verbal Role Playing, and Tonal Subterfuge

González's linguistic performance, illustrated by her double entendre in her twilight years to McNutt and ability to fluidly employ selective discourses according to her rhetorical situation during her academic heyday, also includes González's ability to engage in verbal role playing and, what I would like to call "tonal subterfuge," which I define as a deceptive and conscious manipulation of one's tone to speak to and back at power. To offer a justification for my claims, I present a pre-1935 letter González wrote to Dobie illustrative of yet another linguistic performance by way of her conscious manipulation of tone and verbal role playing.

In this letter to Dobie, González informs him that she along with "two adventurous women" (Directoras Beatrice B. de Allen Hinojosa and María Suarez Alcocer listed in the letterhead) will publish a Spanish-language cultural magazine titled *Album de la Raza, Revista Cultural*. She asks Dobie, whom she refers to by his nickname, "Don Pancho," a moniker derived from the vaqueros of his childhood who translated his name Frank,[16] for a contribution to their forthcoming publication. Equally important to the content of her letter are González's manipulation of her tone and verbal role playing that accompany her solicitation. In midstream of her statement to her folkloric mentor, González seamlessly, without syntactical or psychological fumble, switches from a formal tone to what she calls a "Spanish tone," as the following excerpt discloses:

> We prepare to have a section in English, and may we have the honor, señor don Pancho, to get a legend, a tale, anything which you may want to contribute? It will help our humble start. I hope you like the Spanish tone in which I ask for your contribution.[17]

ALBUM DE LA RAZA

Revista Cultural

Directoras:
Beatriz B. de Allen Hinojosa
María Saurez de Alcocer

Secretaria de Redacción:
Srita. Jovita González

Fannin 6808 351 Thorman Place

SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS

Estimado amigo don Pancho,

Two adventurous women and I have undertaken to publish a magazine in Spanish with the above title. The first number will come out in December, the others, ¿quién sabe? We propose to have a section in English, and may we have the honor, señor don Pancho to get a legend, a tale, any thing which you may want to contribute? It will help our humble start. I hope you like the Spanish tone in which I ask for your contribution.

Frost asked me to read a paper before the Folk-Lore Society, and of course I accepted, and with pleasure as always.

Remember me to Mrs. Dobie.

Siempre su amiga y S. S.

Jovita González

St. Mary's Hall.

HRC

Figure 1

Letter to Dobie from González, circa 1934. Courtesy of the J. Frank Dobie Papers, Harry Ransom Humanities Research Center, The University of Texas at Austin.

González verbally role-plays what can more specifically be described as a peon discourse,[18] a stereotypical form of speech for "good" Mexican characters found primarily in Anglo literary discourse, which she consciously uses to solicit a literary contribution from Dobie. "I hope you like the Spanish tone in which I ask for your contribution" simultaneously illustrates González's awareness of her tonal shift and her boldness for acting out such performances in her communications to Dobie. Though some may interpret González's discourse as seeking to please her mentor through self-belittlement, when taking the full context of her letter into account, González's humble tone takes on a more subversive application. González's choice to write Dobie using the official letterhead of the *Album de la Raza*, bearing the female, Spanish-Mexican names of herself and her directoras, shows González's pride in her and her fellow Mexicanas (or perhaps I should say proto-Chicanas) "adventurous" endeavor to establish a literary space written predominantly in Spanish about "la Raza." Furthermore, González's unabashed decision to reveal the album's full title to Dobie exhibits her racial pride. There is no cultural concession on González's part in this circumstance. In early 1930s South Texas, the terms Latino (a LULAC favorite) and Mexican (Dobie's preferred literary moniker for peoples of Mexican descent regardless of nationality) dominated the literary landscape. González's use of raza before her Anglo mentor, an ethnic reference to peoples of Mexican descent that would not be popularized until the Chicano Movement in the late 1960s, to refer to her body of people, implies an affront that challenges both Dobie's Mexican referent, and LULAC's Latino referent, with raza's politicized, prideful, and even radical connotations. In this pre-1935 letter, González unwaveringly aligns herself with la Raza, not the pureblood Spanish elite. Taking this preceding context into account allows us to interpret González's self-humiliating "Spanish tone" as part of a subversive, signifying speech act

in which she superficially performs the role of a humble peon while embedded in her discourse and overall content is a deeper, secondary layer of meaning that snidely and sarcastically mocks Dobie and his cultural expectations via tonal subterfuge.

González's reference to Dobie as "don Pancho," adds to her knack for performing subtle but subversive discourse. Upon viewing the González-Dobie correspondence of the Dobie papers in the Harry Ransom Center at The University of Texas and the González de Mireles papers in the Mary and Jeff Bell Library at TAMU-CC, I have noticed, especially at this juncture, that Dobie mostly refrains from using "Pancho" to sign his letters to González, and instead opts for "J. Frank Dobie" or some similar variation. It seems to me that this nomenclature-based textual event signifies Dobie's attempt to use his Anglo name to maintain friendly but hierarchical relations with González. González, on the other hand, continually subverts Dobie's preference by consistently referring to him with the moniker of *her* choice; the moniker mostly reserved for his male, Anglo friends in academia and Texas Folklore Society, "Pancho."

Moreover, while previous scholarly studies on González primarily stress her work within the context of her relations with Dobie, González's letter demands that we need to consider her cultural production within the context of her relations with political and culturally conscious women of color in South Texas; as González, in addition to being mentored by Anglo academics, simultaneously worked alongside and was influenced by her "directoras," Beatrice de Allen Hinojosa and María Suarez Alcocer. Teresa Palomo Acosta and Ruthe Winegarten's *Las Tejanas* (2003) sheds light on one of González's directoras. According to Acosta and Winegarten, "Blanco was a journalist affiliated with the group of exiles known collectively as 'el México de Afuera,'"

a group "nationalistic in their loyalty to their home country" (282). I feel González's partnership with Blanco, a Mexicana/Tejana who deserves further study, and *Album de la Raza* strongly indicates that Dobie's mentorship and her involvement with LULAC,[19] a politically moderate organization "reflecting traditional gender roles common throughout Greater Mexico" (Border Renaissance 2009, 160), to use John M. González's words, did not provide González with a liberal literary space to overtly exercise what I would like to call her proto-Anzalduán "wild tongue" and to network with "adventurous women" supportive of her ethnic-feminist consciousness.[20]

González as *Adapter*, Not Adopter, of Dobian Romantic Regionalism

But, as I have argued throughout this essay, González was a woman-of-color in the Anglo-dominant academia with an "oppositional consciousness" that cleverly manipulated language in her textual and spoken discourse to speak to and challenge the patriarchal Anglo academy. By taking these actions, González strategically and consciously channeled her ethnic-feminist consciousness into subversive nuanced linguistic performances, and her pre-1935 folkloric productions are no exception. I argue that González strategically *adapted* rather than adopted Dobie's ethnographic style of romantic regionalist folklore, as Limón claims. As previously affirmed, Cotera takes us in a positive direction when she inquires how González and other women-of-color ethnographers contested the "centrality of the white, Western...anthropologist" (2008, 24), and asserts González, having come of age under the rhetoric of dominance learned its language and methodologies, deployed its discourses to challenge its very representational practices (2008, 28). However, because Cotera also asserts that González's ethnographic work was still "structured and constrained by the discursive norms of ethnographic meaning making" (2008, 21), this is where I depart from Cotera's thesis. I suggest González's pre-1935 folkloric productions written and relayed under the watch of Dobie and

the Anglo academy in the form of the Texas Folklore Society was structured, but not "constrained" by Dobie's methodology of discursive ethnographic norms. We must remember that González, as a subversive linguistic performer, is an academic artisan. Like a stealthy chameleon, González demonstrates throughout her academic career her capability for performing multiple discourses for different rhetorical situations along with double entendres and other speech acts to confront her Anglo oppressors. As such, González's linguistic performative ability was not developed after she physically left Dobie's side and The University of Texas. But rather, as evidenced by her tonal subterfuge and verbal role playing in her *Album de la Raza* letter to Dobie, her multiple discourse usage strategically employed upon rhetorical situation, her double entendre to McNutt, and her fascination with Mae West, González was a lifelong linguistic performer and adapter to social and rhetorical circumstance outside the academia and especially within academia. Therefore, by considering González as a lifelong performer in academic spheres, I argue that González's pre-1935 folklore repudiated as it replicated Dobie's romantic regionalist style.

The oppositional division of González's folklore and fiction can be deconstructed if we consider the full dynamics of romantic regionalism's "structure." Unlike more scientifically structured methods of ethnographic production, like Franz Boas's Boasian school,[21] Dobie desired, first and foremost, to capture the "flavor" of the folk (Dobie 1930, 6). This meant narrative liberties and authorial creative license for practitioners of romantic regional folklore in addition to ethnographic methods. These narrative liberties are coupled with the likely possibility that "some [of González's folkloric contributions to the Texas Folklore Society] may well have been culled from her personal memories of early-twentieth-century life along the border" (Cotera 2008, 114). These circumstances would have provided González with

a narrative framework akin to fiction writing where she, upon adapting to the loosely-structured and fanciful discourse of Dobie's romantic regionalism, could creatively exercise subversive performances layered with multiple and embedded meanings. That Cotera describes González's folkloric readings as "riveting public presentations in which she *artfully* [my emphasis] flavored scholarly disquisitions on the folk traditions of Mexicans in Texas with a splash of theatricality," (2008, 116) I feel, speaks to the extension of González's linguistic performative creativity in academic spheres and the folkloric genre. González's strategic adaptation of Dobie's ethnographic style of romantic regionalism, in which she simultaneously replicated and repudiated Dobie's brand of folklore, is perhaps the most profound example of Sandoval's notion of "the creativity of revolt under domination" (2000, 29). This is because as a subject with an oppositional consciousness, she demonstrates a final and most intriguing quality that Sandoval describes as the ability of the oppressed subject to "develop survival skills under subordination that revolve around the *manipulation of ideology* (2000, 29). González's ability to adapt via the manipulation of Dobie's flavor-filled folkloric ideology and methodology also evokes Gates' conceptual signifying monkey, as I stated in the introductory movements of this essay. Therefore, using one of González's pre-1935 folk stories, I will show how she mocks and criticizes Dobie and his romanticized methodology with Dobie's own discourse, which is a subversive move that reflects Gates' supposition: "You can only dismantle the master's house by using the master's tools."[22] Rather than being "won over to the side of domination" as Limón claims, by "adopt[ing] Dobie's approach and style in the collection and rendering of folklore," it is evident in some of González's pre-1935 folkloric productions that she has merely adapted Dobie's folkloric methodology as a strategic maneuver to speak to, confront, and creatively revolt against Anglo academic patriarchy. To illustrate this notion, I take as my primary text Jovita González's "Tío Pancho Malo."

Creativity of Revolt Under Domination/Signifying Using the "Master's" Tools: González's Embedded Mockery and Manipulation of Dobian Folkloric Ideology in "Tio Pancho Malo"

The year is 1932. It is a Saturday in late April. The warm daytime temperatures signaling the approaching summer heat give way to a much welcomed cooler evening, as the members of the Texas Folklore Society reconvene in the YMCA auditorium, just off campus from the University of Texas, for the closing presentations of the Eighteenth Annual Texas Folklore Society Meeting. Jovita González presides over the meeting in her second and final year as president of the society. As part of her presidential address, to open the last day of the society's presentations on folklore, she reads a collection of folklore stories from her work, "Among My People." I am sure, as González stands at the podium to deliver her address, she sees her mentor, Dobie, among the throngs of Anglo faces, academics and laymen alike. I am also sure she notices her family friend, University of Texas professor, Carlos Castañeda, who, two years earlier, unofficially supervised her research for her master's thesis and came to her defense when her thesis director, Eugene C. Barker, was dismissive of her work. Castañeda gave a presentation earlier that afternoon.[23]

One of the folklore stories that she performs before her mostly Anglo, male audience is a short piece titled "Tío Pancho Malo." In her telling, González reveals in romantic regionalist fashion the pleasingly silly little story of Tío Pancho Malo, a poor, old man who wanders about the "border country" philosophizing his "queer notions" to the "simple Mexican folk" (*The Woman Who Lost Her Soul* 2000, 44). It is from the Mexican folk that his nickname "Malo" originates, "not because he was bad," but because, in "following his own peculiar way," he "was out of wits with the world and his fellow men," to which the Mexican folk would laugh at his "idiosyncrasies" (44). After his wife's death, Tío Pancho Malo and his unkempt boys moved to Texas

where he became a "pastor of goats" and eventually, when his boys grew older, started a family band with his sons despite their lack of skill as they "did not know any music" (45). Tío Pancho Malo and his sons continued to play their cacophonous tunes "up and down the river" until "his boys married off, his band disbanded and Tío Pancho Malo was left alone" (46). The story concludes, as Dobie would have described, with "something of flavor and fancy," as Tío Pancho is tried in court for cruelty to his donkey but is let off after giving a humorous self-defense explaining: "We work together, and for each other. One of us is not any good without the other" (46).

On its surface, "Tío Pancho Malo" as it is written and orated by González appears "only inherently aesthetically/morally interesting," as Limón (1997, xxi) has noted of her early folklore; and it would be so if one is looking for no other narrative motive aside from an explicit pistol-in-his-hand response to Anglo dominance that occurs over the literal political "grounds" of a battlefield. However, if we view "Tío Pancho Malo" as an historically oppressed female intellectual's multi-layered response to Anglo patriarchal academy, particularly to the type of scholarship produced by Dobie and the Texas Folklore Society, then we see that González has cleverly engaged herself in a political retort lambasting her mentor by creatively using Dobie's preferred flavor-filled folkloric methodology against him.

First and foremost, in a fashion similar to Américo Paredes's lightly veiled mockery of J. Frank Dobie as K. Hank Harvey in his novel *George Washington Gómez*, González disguises her mentor in the form of the title character Tío Pancho Malo. She makes reference to him using the name Dobie preferred to be called by his Anglo friends and colleagues-"Pancho."[24] She proceeds to characterize Tío Pancho Malo in the manner of her mentor while simultaneously ridiculing him. In her description of Tío Pancho Malo as an

"outs with the world" "philosopher" who wandered the "border country" expelling his "queer notions," González skillfully and subversively undermines Dobie's growing reputation as a "philosopher of the unfenced country," by speaking against his ideology from an academic viewpoint. "Outs with the world" and "queer notions" can be read as references to how González really viewed Dobie's folkloric productions and methodological taste for flavor. Though a direct statement by González expressing these views is undocumented, it is not hard to imagine González and her "unofficial" mentor, Carlos Castañeda, conversing in Spanish about Dobie's absurdities.[25] A more direct statement in the story revealing of González's mockery toward her mentor reads as follows: "[Tío Pancho] could neither read nor write; yet he composed poetry and expressed himself in a most flowery language" (González 2000, 45). This statement, interpreted in light of González's awareness of the academic politics surrounding Dobie's non-doctoral status, can be viewed as an allusion to Dobie's stunted education, since Tío Pancho Malo is described as being unable to "read or write." Or, perhaps more interestingly, it could be read as an allusion to Dobie's inability to fluently speak, read, or write in Spanish.[26] Additionally, this statement mockingly parallels Tío Pancho Malo's determination to "compose poetry...in a most flowery language" with Dobie's determination to compose flavor-filled, aesthetic-driven folklore, despite, as she insinuates, lacking the proper skills.

Interestingly, González's criticism may not be solely directed at her mentor, as "Tío Pancho Malo" includes remarks that illustrate her likely revolt against the whole of Anglo patriarchy within the Texas Folklore Society. González achieves her overall retort by having Tío Pancho Malo assume two leadership roles, first as a "pastor of goats" and second as a musical director of a family band that he starts with his sons. In a witty maneuver to further allude to Dobie's ignorance and that of the Texas Folklore Society, González engages

in wordplay with the double meaning of "pastor." Pastor, a Spanish word, can either refer to a spiritual leader of souls, like its English language cognate, or a sheepherder. As we see, González chooses the less desirable of the two denotations for her Dobie-in-disguise Tío Pancho, and, as a heightened oppositional move, she dismisses any potential Christian allusion by having him be a herder of "goats." Furthermore, it is here that González figuratively compares the Texas Folklore Society to a herd of goats led by Dobie. One may ask why she would make such a comparison when she served as president for two years. To this the answer is simple; during Dobie's editorship with the society, the president had minor to moderate duties and usually held the position for no more than a year. It was Dobie who remained as editor for a little over two decades that ultimately led the society, especially in the decision to disassociate from the American Folklore Society in order to practice his romantic regionalist brand of folklore. Therefore, this is more appropriately read as González's opposition to Dobie and the members of Texas Folklore Society at large, Dobie's flock of folk who he herded toward practicing his folkloric methodology. Using a similar strategy of revolt in her depiction of Tío Pancho Malo, who directs his band of unskillful boys as they played music from "ranch to ranch," "up and down the river" (González 2000, 45-46), González confronts the Anglo patriarchy of the academy as she superimposes the event that Dobie and his "band" of male cohorts have taken to the ranches and borderlands of South Texas unskillfully extracting and reproducing the lore of her people.

And what of the ending of González's story, where Tío Pancho Malo is alone, left only with his donkey to carve out a livelihood? Seemingly, it illustrates an odd, old Mexicano's humorously pathetic end, where all he is left with is his burro. However, reading this event from the perspective of González's academic opposition against Anglo patriarchy and the folkloric methodology

of her mentor, we can see that she possibly forecasts what she believes will be the academic future and subsequent the downfall of Dobie and his romantic regionalist ideology. Using a donkey, or as I will more crudely refer to it, a jackass, González subversively connotes Dobie's stubborn folkloric method and insinuates the fact that it is his solitary, academic lifeline. She writes: "We work together, and for each other. One of us is not any good without the other" (González, 2000, 46). To this, González's prediction was not too far off the mark, since Dobie, during his leave of absence to teach in Cambridge, was politely removed from his editorship and was succeeded by Mody Boatright, who, in 1943, reestablished ties with the American Folklore Society. Moreover, a few years later Dobie was dismissed from The University of Texas faculty by the university's board of regents, upon which he spent the remaining years of his life writing folklore in his romanticized style.

By recognizing González as an academic studying at The University of Texas and a part of the Texas Folklore Society elite with her two-year presidential appointment, it must be acknowledged that she was exposed to and thus privy to internal politics concerning Dobie and the Texas Folklore Society. She would have known, either through Dobie, Castañeda, or some other source, of Dobie's falling out with the American Folklore Society, the Texas Folklore Society's official organ until Dobie, upon assuming editorship of the society, severed relations because of methodological differences in the narrativization of folklore.[27] She would have been aware of the fact that Dobie only had his master's degree and remained as faculty at the University of Texas only through a token promotion advocated by his colleagues since it was traditionally not university policy to promote non-PhD's. And, in her travels to the borderlands of South Texas to collect research for her master's thesis, she would have understood that the Mexican people of the borderlands regarded Dobie as a "fraud."[28] It is highly likely that González had these issues

in mind when she subversively wrote and read "Tío Pancho Malo," since they most certainly appear as references in the text.

When González concludes her final "riveting public performance" of her folk stories as president of the Texas Folklore Society, it is easy to imagine that she received enthusiastic applause from her fellow members of the Texas Folklore Society. But, would it be too much to imagine that perhaps, before walking off stage, as she glanced down from the podium to smile at Dobie, who in all probability was thinking about how well his protégé had come to adopt his folkloric ideology, she saw her unofficial mentor Carlos Castañeda, and winked.[29]

Jovita González as a Signifying Proto-Chicana: A Conclusion

It is necessary to acknowledge that Dobie, as González's mentor, introduced her to his folkloric methodology, which she put into practice. Armed with this information, however, it would be wrong to solely position González as troubled Spanish-Mexican, only capable of repressed, bedeviled, and unconscious rebuttals against Anglo hegemony, since she, yet again, demonstrates her opposition to Anglo hegemony and hegemonic academic discourse and reveals her allegiance to la raza in proto-Chicana fashion, by criticizing patriarchal institutions. Ironically, by acknowledging that González "took in" Dobie's ethnographic style, it must also be recognized that she, in practicing his methodology, "polished and enhanced the original narrations...according to her own fancy and taste" (Reyna 2000, xv). Therefore, as I have argued, it must be considered that González, acting with an oppositional consciousness, adapted Dobie's style for some of her folkloric renderings, cleverly manipulating his ideology along with the Anglo American ethos of the 1930s, to speak to, confront, and revolt against the Anglo patriarchal academy in the forms of Dobie and the Texas Folklore Society. Sergio Reyna, in his introduction to *The Woman*

Who Lost Her Soul, a collection of González's folk stories, aptly notes that "the charm of her tales has captivated [critics] for obvious reasons" which include her ability to write "humorous, vivid, and colorful folk narratives" by using "subtle humor and art of description to bring these characters to life" (2000, xxi). To this list of obvious reasons that make González's folklore captivating I would also add the art of deception and subversive linguistic performance. By reconsidering González's folkloric production as an artful, performative revolt against Anglo academic patriarchy achieved through her manipulation of Dobie's folkloric ideology, a worthy scholastic outcome is possible. González's folklore, especially her pre-1935 folk stories she presented before the Texas Folklore Society, often viewed as assimilationist, culturally ambivalent, and structurally confining, can be revisited, reread, and reinterpreted according to their multi-layered, subversive narrative qualities.

As a final gesture, I want to reiterate that González's lifelong linguistic performative ability and her affinity for not laying claim to a single linguistic normality allowed her to speak to and against the figurative white Lions of academia, be it McNutt, Barker, Dobie, or the Texas Folklore Society. Moreover, in light of Gates' signifying trickster figure, now would be the most appropriate moment to reassess a well known photo taken of Dobie and González at the 1930 Texas Folklore Society meeting.

Scholars of González's work have used this photo to illustrate González's refined social stature, the class similarities she shared with Dobie, and to draw attention to the closeness of their academic relationship.[29] While scholars are correct to interpret González's trendy early 1930s garb-stylish bob-like hairdo, patent leather heels, and proximity to Dobie-as symbols of her refinement and affiliation with her academic mentor, scholars overlook the potential for seeing this photo as archival and visual proof of González's investment in

Figure 2

Jovita González and J. Frank Dobie at the 1930 Texas Folklore Society Meeting. Courtesy of the San Antonio Light Collection, UTSA's Institute of Texan Cultures, #L-1498-A.

subversive performance within the academic realm. Wrapped around González's shoulders, occupying space between her and Dobie's body is a complete fox stole. Yes, furs were very much en vogue in González's era, and this accessory to her wardrobe could be superficially taken as another symbol of her elitism. However, as I have emphasized throughout my work, González was not one to express herself through monovalent linguistic performances, and it appears her outward representation here is no different. Could she, with her claw-like hand clutching her fox stole's hind paw, Mona Lisa smile, and suggestive stare, have been visually signifying? That she cloaks herself in a fox, a creature that is hunted, but also, like the signifying monkey, is a witty, historical trickster figure,[30] would have been no mere coincidence for González, a woman with an "oppositional consciousness" who mastered the art of spoken and written double entendres, performed written acts of tonal subterfuge and used multiple and embedded discourses to creatively mock and strategically engage in a nuanced but conscious revolt against Anglo academic patriarchy.

Acknowledgement

Earlier versions of this essay were presented at the Southwest Texas Popular Culture Conference (SWTX/PCA) in Albuquerque, February 2009 and at the MALCS 2009 Summer Institute held at New Mexico State University-Las Cruces. I would like to thank Genaro Padilla and Rosa Martinez of UC Berkeley, who were in attendance at the SWTX/PCA conference, for their questions and suggestions. I would also like to thank those in attendance at the MALCS presentation for advising me to contact María Cotera. I owe a special thanks to María Cotera for helping me chronologically approximate undated letters in the Dobie-González correspondence. Jesse Alemán assisted me in the earlier versions of this essay; I am grateful for his commentary and direction. Lastly, I must thank the late Héctor Torres, dearly departed Professor of Chicana/o Literature and Theory at the University of New Mexico. Thank you, Héctor, for introducing me to the theoretical works of Chela Sandoval.

Notes

[1] See María E. Cotera, "Introduction" 2006; Leticia Garza-Falcón 1998; John M. González 2009; José E. Limón 1997.

[2] María E. Cotera, in her work *Native Speakers* (2008), identifies 1935 as the production date for González's *Dew on the Thorn*. Cotera also credits José E. Limón for *Dew*'s recovery in 1994 and subsequent publication with Arte Público Press in 1997 (255).

[3] I position *Caballero*'s completion date, 1939, according to María E. Cotera's archival research at the Jovita González (Mireles) Papers held in the Southwestern Writers Collection at Texas State University, where she found a copy of the novel's contract. Cotera informs her readers: "In 1939, [González and Eimer] signed a contract with the American Artists and Authors Agency, agreeing to divide equally the proceeds of their completed novel" (255).

[4] See David Gutiérrez, "Significant to Whom? Mexican Americans and the History of the West." 1993.

[5] Walter Prescott Webb was a scholar of history at the University of Texas-Austin from 1918-1963 and served as director of the Texas State Historian Association from 1939-1946. Webb authored groundbreaking works such as *The Great Plains* in 1931, which was premised on the idea that the region's environmental landscape both affected and was affected by various peoples differently. However, Webb was a staunch racist and regarded peoples of Mexican descent, in his construction of what was and in many ways still is accepted as canonical history, with ill favor. In Ramón Saldívar's *The Borderlands of Culture: Américo Paredes and the Transnational Imaginary* (2006), Paredes recalls how his influential work *With His Pistol in His Hand* (1958) was purposefully written as a counter-response to what Webb and others had said about Mexicans as outlaws (70). Garza-Falcón's reading of González's rhetoric as engaged in a Webbian response is highly significant, as it would pre-date Paredes'.

[6] See James C. McNutt's "Beyond Regionalism: Texas Folklorists and the Emergence of a Post-Regional Consciousness." PhD dissertation, 1982.

[7] The year 1935 was one of change for González. She married her lifelong husband Edmundo E. Mireles in the summer and shortly after moved from San Antonio to Del Rio, Texas, where Mireles was principal of Del Rio High School.

[8] The chronological and biographical information mentioned here and in the following sentence is made possible by María E. Cotera's research that she has shared in her publications *Native Speakers* (2008) and "Engendering a 'Dialects of Our America': Jovita González' Pluralist Dialogue as Feminist Testimonio" (2000).

[9] In Simon Louvish's *Mae West: It Ain't No Sin*, Louvish discusses West's "complex and ambivalent" relationship with black people in terms of her art and her ancestry. He considers claims made by West biographer Jill Watts which assert West's "appropriation of African-American music, movement, dance and humor constitutes the core of her style...[and] speculate that Mae's grandfather, the seaman John Edwin West, might have been an escaped black slave who passed for white" (18).

[10] See Lisa Appignanesi and John Forrester's *Freud's Women* (1992). Also, it is interesting to note that Richard R. Flores, in his introduction to Adina De Zavala's *History and Legends of the Alamo*, makes an argument congruous to Limón's diagnosis of González. Flores states that despite De

Zavala's "colonial interests" for restoring the Alamo, there exists "a critical discourse embedded, even repressed, in her work" that deals with the "social displacement of Mexicans...." See Flores 1996.

[11] McNutt interviewed González in the summer of 1981 to assist his dissertation project, "Beyond Regionalism: Texas Folklorists and the Emergence of a Post-Regional Identity," which he completed in 1982. While researching at the Special Collections held within the Mary and Jeff Bell Library, upon reviewing González's papers, I found a letter from McNutt to González dated August 17, 1981 that thanked González for "... spending time with me this past Saturday morning. I particularly value your reminiscences about Lilia Casis, Eugene Barker, and J. Frank Dobie."

[12] Paredes's scholarship evaluating the ethnographic event between ethnographers working with Chicana/o informants is of utmost significance. I quote "On Ethnographic Work among Minority Groups" at length for optimal understanding: "When is the ethnographer's informant giving him information, and when is the informant doing something else? Ethnographers working with Chicanos sometimes fail to make this distinction between factual report and the possibility of joking or some other type of performance.... There is a lack of recognition of the artistic possibilities of language, and perhaps an underestimation of the informant, who is seen as somewhat naïve, eager to give the fieldworker all the facts he [or she] (my modification) knows once the latter has established that magic condition known as rapport. The informant is seldom seen as a competent artist in language use, who may be in fact taking the anthropologist's measure" (1977, 82).

[13] Américo Paredes was born in 1915, while González was either born in 1904 according to recent works of scholarship, or if we accept the birth date listed in the Texas Folklore Society publications, 1899. For a fascinating narration that details scholars Teresa Palomo Acosta and Cynthia Orozco's resurrection of Jovita González at the 1990 Mexican Americans in Texas History Conference and the academic/biographical comparison of González and Paredes they made at said conference see Garza-Falcón's *Gente Decente*, 268-269.

[14] Jovita González to J. Frank Dobie, January 6, 1926, J. Frank Dobie Papers, Harry Ransom Humanities Research Center, University of Texas at Austin.

[15] The indigenous Mexican who reported seeing a Marian apparition on Tepeyac Hill, in 1531, according to Mexican Catholic tradition.

[16] After J. Frank Dobie's death on September 18, 1964, Winston Bode, a longtime Austin journalist and personal friend of Dobie, wrote a tribute titled "A Portrait of Pancho" that appeared in the winter 1964 issue of *The Texas Quarterly*. Bode recalls that "Pancho" originated from the vaqueros who "affectionately translated his name in the brush country where he was born."

[17] Although the "Album de la Raza" letter is undated, textual evidence such as González's remark, "Frost asked me to read a paper before the Folklore Society, and of course I accepted," allows an estimated chronology of early 1934 or late 1933. According to www.texasfolkloresociety.org, Frost Woodhull served as president of the Texas Folklore Society from 1933-1934. At the 1934 meeting (April 19-20), TFS archives report González read "Traditional Proverbs and Ejaculations Along the

Border" under Frost's presidency. Special thanks to María E. Cotera who kindly directed me to focus on González's aforementioned remark to determine an approximate chronology for this letter.

[18] I use the term "peon discourse" to describe the humbling tone Anglo literature of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century often attributed to Mexican characters to complete their invention of the romanticized Mexican subject-ideal. One of the first extensive travel books intended to pique white tourists' interests in exploring Mexico via the Mexican Central Railway, refers to the railway as the "Si Señor Train," where servile Mexicans are more than willing to meet accommodations of American tourists. See Rogers, *Mexico? Si Señor* (1893). Dobie's character, Inocencio, a servile mozo in *Tongues of the Monte* (1935) also fits the bill.

[19] For more information regarding Jovita González's involvement with LULAC, see John M. González's *Border Renaissance*, 2009.

[20] I specifically use the term "ethnic-feminist consciousness" to describe González's and her directoras' initiative in attempting to produce the *Album de la Raza*. José E. Limón, again in *Dancing with the Devil* (1994) says González was "unsupported by the luxury of a 'growing ethnic-feminist consciousness'" (74). Her pre-1935 letter obviously proves otherwise. The *Album* itself has not been recovered. I am taking steps to locate this document.

[21] Cotera offers an illuminative discussion of Dobie's frustrations with Franz Boas's ethnographic methods. See Cotera 2008.

[22] See Jane Slaughter "Interview with Henry Louis Gates Jr., Harvard professor" (2008). http://prelectur.stanford.edu/lecturers/gates/jsinterv.html.

[23] An electronic version of the program for the Eighteenth Annual Meeting of the Texas Folklore Society is provided by http://texasfolkloresociety.org, and lists Carlos E. Castañeda presenting on the afternoon panel of April 23rd a paper titled "Bochica, Child of the Sun—A Legend of the Muisca Indians of Colombia." Jovita González is listed as delivering her "president's address" on the evening of April 23rd. J. Frank Dobie is listed as presenting a paper titled "A Song, a Novel, and a Man" on the evening of April 22nd; although, he would have been in attendance for González's address since he presided as secretary and editor of TFS Publications.

[24] I have offered proof that González called Dobie "Pancho" in her circa 1934 correspondence with Dobie. However, the reader may be wondering if González took such liberties earlier, especially during the writing of "Tío Pancho Malo," in the early 1930s. To this, the answer is yes. Based on my research at the Harry Ransom Center and Mary and Jeff Bell Library of the Dobie-González correspondence, González transitioned from referring to her mentor as Mr. Dobie to "Don Pancho" circa 1932. González calls Dobie "Don Pancho" in her congratulatory letter to Dobie on his Guggenheim Fellowship, which he received in 1932.

[25] The Carlos E. Castañeda-Jovita González correspondence (1928-1933) is largely written in Spanish. Of the twenty-six letters that make up the Castañeda-González correspondence that is housed in the Carlos E. Castañeda Papers in the Benson Latin American Collection at UT Austin, only four are entirely written in English. In a letter dated October 17, 1928, Castañeda

explains to González his reason for writing in English: "I have written in English, because I can discuss technicalities better, just as you can and the points will be clearer to you...." Castañeda's explanation is significant because it demonstrates that Castañeda had to provide González with a reason for breaking from their familiar Spanish language communication. It also demonstrates that their English communication would be used for technical matters while Spanish communication would be used for discussing personal concerns. This is evident in an earlier letter dated September 19, 1928, when Castañeda writes: "P.S. Ayer ví a Dr. Dobie y le dije que había hablado con Ud. Me dijo que tendria gusto de verla 'anytime.'"

[26] Dobie and González did not correspond in Spanish aside from the use of simple words and phrases. See the J. Frank Dobie collection, Harry Ransom Center, University of Texas Austin. Also, Américo Paredes recalls in his interview with Héctor Calderón that Dobie "never tried to talk Spanish to me." See "Interview with Américo Paredes," Calderón and López-Morín, Nepantla: Views from South 1.1 (2000, 225).

[27] María E. Cotera expertly documents these events. See Cotera 2008. Cotera writes, "When Jovita González came to folklore studies in the late 1920s, she found a congenial community of scholars who were consumed by the giddy possibilities that the revolution in regionalist writing had created. These were the boom years for Texas folklore studies;...the Texas chapter of the American Folklore Society was leading the way in the movement to popularize the study of the folk.... But the love affair between the Texas Folklore Society and its national parent, the American Folklore Society, was not long-lived. Under J. Frank Dobie's leadership (1922-1943) the style of folklore collection promoted by the Texas Folklore Society shifted away from the rigorous and standardized research methodologies practiced by anthropological folklorists to a more populist approach...."

[28] Américo Paredes, in an interview with Hector Calderon, explains that Dobie was regularly hailed in the regional newspapers of South Texas during the late 1920s and 1930s to be the prime authority on Texas and Mexican folklore. However, Paredes along with other South Texas Mexicanos, found Dobie to be fraudulent and a poor speaker in front of large crowds. See Calderón and López-Morín (2000) p. 225.

[29] Despite Limón's focus on the primary role of J. Frank Dobie's mentorship on the life and works of Jovita González in his introductions to *Caballero* and *Dew on the Thorn* as well as in *Dancing with the Devil*, Limón also suggests that "Carlos Castañeda may have been her true mentor for her [master's thesis]." See "Introduction" 1997. María E. Cotera also discusses the important role Castañeda played in González's academic career at UT Austin in her introduction to González's master's thesis in *Life Along the Border*: "While we may never know the reason she decided to get a master's degree in history as opposed to English (where she would have studied under her mentor, J. Frank Dobie) or in Spanish (under Lilia Casis), we do know that Eugene C. Barker [her thesis director] was singularly unenthusiastic about the thesis González submitted to him for approval in 1930. Indeed, he was initially reluctant to approve her thesis, and may not have done so had it not been for the intercession of her old friend Carlos Castañeda." See Cotera 2006.

[29] See Limón 1994, 62-63; see Cotera 2008, 116-117.

[30] For further reading on the literary history of the fox as a trickster figure, see *Dictionary of Folklore Mythology and Legend* (1949). The fox may also have been a suitable choice for González since it is a close cousin to the coyote, an important trickster figure to many Native American cultures and cultures in the U.S. Southwest, see Dell H. Hymes "Coyote, the Thinking (Wo)man's Trickster" in *Monsters, Tricksters, and Sacred Cows* (1996).

Works Cited

"artisan, n." 2010. *OED Online*. Oxford University Press. Accessed February 21, 2011.

Acosta, Teresa Palomo, and Ruthe Winegarten. 2003. *Las Tejanas: 300 Years of History*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Appignanesi, Lisa, and John Forrester. 2000. *Freud's Women*. 2nd ed. New York: Penguin Books Ltd.

Bode, Winston. 1964. "A Portrait of Pancho. Some Recollections of J. Frank Dobie." *The Texas Quarterly* 7, no. 4: 21-46.

Calderón, Héctor, and José Rósbel López-Morín. 2000. "Interview with Américo Paredes." *Nepantla: Views from South* 1, no. 1: 197-228.

Castañeda, Carlos E. 1928. "Letter to Jovita González." In *Carlos E. Castañeda Papers, Benson Latin American Collection*. University of Texas at Austin.

Cotera, María E. 2008. *Native Speakers: Ella Deloria, Zora Neale Hurston, Jovita González, and the Poetics of Culture*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

———. 2007. "Recovering 'Our' History: *Caballero* and the Gendered Politics of Form." *Aztlán* 32, no. 2: 157-71.

———. ed. 2006. "Introduction: A Woman of the Borderlands." In Jovita González, *Life Along the Border: A Landmark Tejana Thesis*. College Station: Texas A&M University Press.

———. 2000. "Engendering a 'Dialects of Our America:' Jovita González' Pluralist Dialogue as Feminist Testimonio." In *Las Obreras: Chicana Politics of Work and Family*, edited by Vicky L. Ruiz, 237-256. Los Angeles: UCLA Chicano Studies Research Center Publications.

Dobie, J. Frank. 1935. *Tongues of the Monte*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.

———. 1930. "Preface." In *Man, Bird, and Beast*. Austin: Texas Folklore Society.

Flores, Richard R., ed. 1996. "Introduction: Adina De Zavala and the Politics of Restoration." In Adina De Zavala, *History and Legends of the Alamo and Other Missions in and around San Antonio*. Houston: Arte Público Press.

Funk & Wagnalls Standard Dictionary of Folklore, Mythology and Legend. 1949. Edited by Maria Leach. New York: Funk & Wagnalls Co.

Garza-Falcón, Leticia M. 1998. *Gente Decente: A Borderlands Response to the Rhetoric of Dominance*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Gates, Henry Louis, Jr. 1983. "The 'Blackness of Blackness': A Critique of the Sign and the Signifying Monkey." *Critical Inquiry* 9, no. 4: 685-723.

González, John Morán. 2009. *Border Renaissance: The Texas Centennial and the Emergence of Mexican American Literature*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

González, Jovita. January 6, 1926. "Letter to J. Frank Dobie." In *J. Frank Dobie Papers, Harry Ransom Center*. University of Texas at Austin.

———. 1934. "Letter to J. Frank Dobie." In *J. Frank Dobie Papers. Harry Ransom Center*. The University of Texas at Austin.

———. 1997. *Dew on the Thorn*. Edited by José E. Limón. Houston: Arte Público Press.

———. 2000. "Shades of the Tenth Muse." In *The Woman Who Lost Her Soul and Other Stories*, edited by Sergio Reyna, 108-115. Houston: Arte Público Press.

———. 2000. "Tío Pancho Malo." In *The Woman Who Lost Her Soul and Other Stories*, edited by Sergio Reyna, 44-46. Houston: Arte Público Press.

———. 2006. *Life Along the Border: A Landmark Tejana Thesis*. Edited by María E. Cotera. College Station: Texas A&M Press.

——— and Eve Raleigh. 1996. *Caballero: A Historical Novel*. Edited by María E. Cotera and José E. Limón. College Station: Texas A&M University Press.

Gutiérrez, David. 1993. "Significant to Whom?: Mexican Americans and the History of the American West." *The Western Historical Quarterly* 24, no. 4: 519-39.

Hymes, Dell H. 1996. "Coyote, the Thinking (Wo)man's Trickster." In *Monsters, Tricksters, and Sacred Crows: Animal Tales and American Identities*, edited by A. James Arnold, 108-37. Charlottesville: The University Press of Virginia.

Limón, José, ed. 1997. "Introduction." In Jovita González, *Dew on the Thorn*, xv-xxvii. Houston: Arte Público Press.

———. 1994. *Dancing with the Devil: Society and Cultural Poetics in Mexican-American South Texas*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Louvish, Simon. 2006. *Mae West: It Ain't No Sin*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

McMahon, Marci R. 2007. "Politicizing Spanish-Mexican Domesticity, Redefining Fronteras: Jovita González's *Caballero* and Cleofas Jaramillo's *Romance of a Little Village Girl*." *Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies* 28, nos. 1/2: 232-59.

McNutt, James C. August 17, 1981. "Letter to Jovita González Mireles." *E.E. Mireles and Jovita González Mireles Papers*. Mary and Jeff Bell Library, Texas A&M Corpus Christi.

———. "Beyond Regionalism: Texas Folklorists and the Emergence of a Post-Regional Consciousness." Dissertation, American Studies, The University of Texas at Austin, 1982.

Paredes, Américo. 1993. “On Ethnographic Work among Minority Groups: A Folklorist’s Perspective [1977].” In *Folklore and Culture on the Texas-Mexican Border*, edited by Richard Bauman, 73-110. Austin: Center for Mexican American Studies.

———. 1990. *George Washington Gómez*. Houston: Arte Público Press.

———. 1958. *With His Pistol In His Hand: A Border Ballad and Its Hero*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Pérez, Emma. 1999. *The Decolonial Imaginary: Writing Chicanas into History*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Rebolledo, Tey Diana. 1995. *Women Singing in the Snow: A Cultural Analysis of Chicana Literature*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Reyna, Sergio. 2000. “Introduction.” In *The Woman Who Lost Her Soul and Other Stories*, edited by Sergio Reyna. Houston: Arte Público Press.

Rogers, Thos L. 1893. *Mexico? Si Señor*. Boston: Mexican Central Railway Co.

Saldívar, Ramón. 2006. *The Borderlands of Culture: Américo Paredes and the Transnational Imaginary*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Sandoval, Chela. 2000. *Methodology of the Oppressed*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Slaughter, Jane. 1998. “Interview with Henry Louis Gates Jr., Harvard professor.” *Progressive* 62, no. 1: 30.

Texas Folklore Society. 1932. Program of the Eighteenth Annual Meeting.

Torres, Edén E. 2003. *Chicana Without Apology*. New York: Routledge.

Webb, Walter Prescott. 1931. *The Great Plains*. Boston: Ginn and Company.