

UNIVERSITY ANTHROPOLOGY: EARLY DEPARTMENTS  
IN THE UNITED STATES<sup>1</sup>

John F. Freeman

Paper read before the Kroeber Anthropological Society

April 25, 1964, Berkeley, California

I. The Conventional View

Unlike other social sciences, anthropology prides itself on its youth, seeking its paternity in Morgan, Tylor, Broca, and Ratzel, its childhood in the museum and its maturity in the university. While the decades after 1850 do indeed suggest that a hasty marriage took place between Ethnology, or the study of the races of mankind conceived as divinely created, and Anthropology, or the study of man as part of the zoological world; the marriage only symbolized the joining of a few of the tendencies in anthropology and took place much too late to give the child an honest name. When George Grant MacCurdy claimed in 1899 that "Anthropology has matured late," he was in fact only echoing the sentiments of the founders of the Anthropological Societies of Paris (Paul Broca) and London (James Hunt), who in fostering the very name, anthropology, were urging that a science of man depended upon prior developments of other sciences. MacCurdy stated it in evolutionary terms as "man is last and highest in the geological succession, so the science of man is the last and highest branch of human knowledge" (MacCurdy 1899:917).

Several disciples of Franz Boas have further shortened the history of American anthropology, arguing that about 1900 anthropology underwent a major conversion. Before that date, Frederica de Laguna tells us, "anthropologists [were] serious-minded amateurs or professionals in other disciplines who delighted in communicating across the boundaries of the several natural sciences and the humanities, [because] museums, not universities, were the centers of anthropological activities, sponsoring field work, research and publication, and making the major contributions to the education of professional anthropologists, as well as serving the general public" (de Laguna 1960:91, 101). All this changed when Franz Boas came to Columbia and began turning out "anthropologists." In 1900 began the "Classical Period" when Boas "built a science of man in America," the time when "anthropology" became "firmly established at several leading universities" (Mead and Bunzel 1960: 399-402), the time when the "American Anthropologist has lost most of its old-fashioned flavor and has become the journal with which we are all familiar" (de Laguna 1960:102).

Granting the oversimplification of these chroniclers, it is nevertheless important that anthropology was absorbed into the university curriculum and it is also worth examining how this came about. The present study is preliminary: it confines itself to institutions offering a graduate degree in anthropology; and it examines three different types of institutions, the old-line university, the new-style graduate university, and the state institution. Although MacCurdy lists eleven institutions offering anthropology in 1899 and thirty-one in 1902, my remarks will be confined to Harvard, Clark, Columbia and California, since these were the institutions actually granting Ph.D.'s. (MacCurdy 1899, 1902).

## II. Higher Education in Postwar America

That the first American Ph.D. in anthropology was granted only in 1892 is no testimony to the novelty of anthropology, since the first award of this German degree was at Yale in 1861 (Pierson 1952:50-52). Harvard followed Yale's example in 1872 and in that year discontinued the award of the master's degree to its alumni who had successfully stayed out of jail for three years and who could pay five dollars for the degree. Only in 1877-1878 did Harvard institute special courses for graduate students, thus recognizing graduate study as different in kind from undergraduate study as well as in degree, and the motive in doing so was not rivalry with Yale, but the existence of a new institution of higher learning, the Johns Hopkins (Ryan 1939:3-8).

It was the Johns Hopkins that revolutionized graduate education. Headed by Daniel Coit Gilman, a Yale man, physical geographer, and the recent survivor of a three year stint as second president of the new University of California, Johns Hopkins initiated a graduate institution characterized by a faculty devoted to research as well as instruction, emphasizing scholarship and academic excellence (Ryan 1939:15-46; Hawkins 1960). It was to Johns Hopkins that young Franz Boas applied for a fellowship upon completion of his doctorate at Kiel in 1881, however without success.<sup>2</sup> In addition to training a number of celebrated scholars, Johns Hopkins stimulated graduate training at other institutions and made it no longer necessary for Americans to go to Germany for advanced, specialized instruction.

That Gilman did not initiate anthropology at Johns Hopkins is not difficult to explain. His pedagogical visits to Germany in 1855 and 1875 did not expose him to anthropology, although he had indicated in 1874 that were he to quit the academic world, he would start a monthly magazine to be called "Earth and Man: a journal of anthropology, not of man's body only, but of all his social progress."<sup>3</sup> Gilman was an innovator, but not an experimenter, and there was no precedent in German universities for a chair of anthropology.<sup>4</sup>

## III. Anthropology in Postwar America

While it is customary to look upon the Civil War as the great watershed in American history, there is little evidence that the war actually disturbed anthropology much more than removing the proslavery polygenists from an active role. Gallatin, Morton, and Schoolcraft were all dead and the inactivity of the American Ethnological Society was as much a product of this loss, as the emergence of the Smithsonian Institution during the 1850's and 1860's, as the most important anthropological institution, was a result of the direct interest of Joseph Henry. Here were encouraged the same philological, antiquarian or archaeological, and historical traditions which had made the Ethnological Society seem so promising. The Smithsonian sponsored research and published the studies of Riggs, Squier and Davis, Lapham, Gibbs and Morgan. J. Wesley Powell took up the work of Gibbs as the protégé of Henry in the 1870's, and became the dominant figure in Washington anthropology during the next two decades (Hallowell 1960, Gore 1889). A simultaneous but independent development was the United States National Museum, an expression of the Smithsonian which Joseph Henry had opposed from the beginning and which Spencer F. Baird had carried in his mind from his first connection with the Institution in 1851 (Goode 1901, DuPree 1957:85-86). Both the National Museum and the Bureau of Ethnology were created in 1879, and Otis T. Mason

and George Brown Goode supervised the former while Powell controlled the latter, with the Anthropological Society of Washington serving as the intellectual forum and collector for both. Here, barring the momentary appearance of an Anthropological Institute in New York in 1871 under Squier, for the first time appeared the use of "anthropology" as an inclusive term for the study of man including "ethnology, archaeology, somatology, and philology."<sup>5</sup>

In summarizing the discussions of that Society in 1881, President Powell could observe that "Anthropology needs trained devotees with philosophic methods and keen observation to study every tribe and nation of the globe almost *de novo*; and from the materials thus collected a science may be established" (Powell 1881:136). Powell did not seem to mean that the training should take place in a university, nor did he even mean that the training should be in anthropology; he was rather praising the efforts of men trained in such sciences as medicine and natural history, who might become skilled observers in the new science. In this he was perfectly consistent with the general assumption of nineteenth century science, explicit in the numerous questionnaires, handbooks, and Notes and Queries, that anthropology began its work after the collection of accurate information. Anthropology was not only the highest of the sciences, it was in a real sense beyond the university and any single specialization. Only in the learned society, or the museum display, or the anthropological journal, could sufficient knowledge be brought to bear on the great questions of the subject.

The situation was not without parallel elsewhere in the country. George Peabody had given \$150,000 for a museum, professorship, and collections in 1866 at Harvard; but neither the Board of Trustees of the Museum, nor the Board of Overseers of the University saw any reason to introduce anthropology into the university curriculum. The completion of the new building in 1877, the active solicitation of the third curator, Frederic Ward Putnam, in 1882, started the Museum on a career of archaeological exploration and publication even as Harvard classicists were organizing the Archaeological Institute (1879) to further investigations in the Old World and the New. Even though the Trustees of the Peabody decided to award Putnam the professorship of American archaeology and ethnology in 1885, the Board of Overseers held up the appointment until 1887 and even then no courses of instruction or degree granting privileges went with the appointment (Dixon 1930, Dorsey 1896).

Putnam's professorship was analogous to that of Daniel G. Brinton at the Academy of Natural Sciences in Philadelphia where he was professor of general ethnology and where he had given "regular courses on Physical Anthropology and Ethnology" (Brinton 1892:5), but his appointment as Professor of Archaeology and Linguistics at the University of Pennsylvania in 1886 did not mean the introduction of similar "courses" in that University, and was instead indicative of Provost William H. Pepper's intent to establish an archaeological museum in Philadelphia, a premature effort which flourished between 1889 and 1893, culminating in the University Museum opening in 1899 (Nitzsche 1914:165, 18; Cheyney 1940:349-353). The American Museum of Natural History in New York, which, after the fact, claimed an original interest in "anthropology," announced a division of archaeology and ethnology in 1889, appointing Frederick W. Starr to classify the various collections which had come to that museum in the two decades since its founding. However, no connection with Columbia University was anticipated for Starr, nor was there any curator for the

division until 1894 when Frederic Ward Putnam created the Department of Anthropology out of the earlier Archaeological and Ethnological Section.

Until 1890, then, Anthropology in America was quite content with its existing institutional framework. No one called for anthropology as a graduate specialty from within anthropology, not even Franz Boas, who had given up a docentship in geography at the University of Berlin in order to come to America in 1887, where he welcomed his employment as an editor of Science and his summer trips to British Columbia for Horatio Hale and the British Association for the Advancement of Science.<sup>7</sup> Boas moved in the world of Powell, Putnam, and Brinton. When he became dissatisfied with the Science task, he sought a curatorship at the American Museum of Natural History (1888 and 1889). When he quarrelled with Hale, he sought similar sponsorship from the Smithsonian, both Museum and Bureau; and when he sought to further anthropology he went to Section H of the American Association and tried to found a new ethnological society in New York (1889).<sup>8</sup>

Clearly then only museum archaeology and ethnology had any connection with universities, and neither museum curators nor anthropologists looked to the graduate school as the proper place for anthropological research, training, and publication.

#### IV. Anthropology in the Graduate School

The efforts of Yale, Harvard, and Johns Hopkins in instituting graduate training did bear fruit. G. Stanley Hall earned his Ph.D. at Harvard in 1878, within the first dozen such granted by Harvard. Actually Hall spent two years in Germany, at Leipzig, studying under Wundt, Helmholtz, and Fechner (acquaint), immediately prior to taking his doctorate in philosophy, and it was for Hall's acquaintance with laboratory psychology, rather than his general interests in pedagogy, that Gilman hired him as lecturer in psychology at Johns Hopkins. By 1884 Hall had branched out into pedagogy, ethics, physiology, and philosophy, but had established laboratory psychology at Johns Hopkins meanwhile.

In 1888 Hall was called to the presidency of the new university at Worcester, Mass., founded by Jonas C. Clark. Hall persuaded Clark not to establish the New England college he had in mind, but to finance a second graduate institution; to do so necessitated postponing the opening of the institution for a year while Hall traveled Europe to study universities and to gather faculty. This was to be a pedagogic tour "entirely . . . without precedent in the history of education," in its scale. Hall left Worcester in August 1888 and returned in May of 1889, full of plans, but without any faculty, since Clark had changed his mind and ordered Hall not to hire any foreign professors (Hall 1923:258-278).

Sometime in October while in Berlin, Hall received a letter from Franz Boas, together with several of Boas' publications on the mythology of Northwest Coast tribes and suggesting that it was time ethnological studies were placed upon a sound psychological foundation. He himself was working on problems of differential threshold, and hoped to interest Section H in utilization of experimental psychology in anthropology. Did Hall know anyone who could help sponsor such a move? Boas let Hall know that his contract with

Science was expiring (which was true), that he had no immediate plans, except for working up a series of geographical publications for school use, and made some comments on the teaching of geography.<sup>10</sup> Here, indeed, was the universal man for Hall's new university: ethnology, psychology, geography, and pedagogy.

The effort was not lost on Hall, who was enthusiastic about the proposal for Section H. He agreed wholeheartedly with Boas about the teaching of geography; and he sought Boas' help on where to turn in Europe for advice on anthropology for his new university. The problem was difficult, since Hall felt that physical anthropology had become stagnant, and the systematic study of custom and belief was next to grow.<sup>11</sup> Indeed Hall knew something of anthropology; he had listened to Bastian and Virchow in his student days at Berlin; and in Baltimore he prided himself as the intimate friend of Otis T. Mason, by then Curator of Ethnology for the U.S. National Museum, and incidentally the chief American commentator on Gustav Klemm. Moreover, Hall had been a corresponding member of the Anthropological Society of Washington in 1885 (Hall 1923:189, 243; Mason 1873, 1883).

Boas responded with a list of names, and perhaps deciding that he had a better chance for a position in geography, sent Hall a copy of his 1888 paper on the Study of Geography. Hall responded with interest and told Boas, "The more I see and hear--and I have seen many of the anthropologists you were kind enough to name to me, and many more--the harder I see it is likely to be to organize that department in an American University."<sup>12</sup> In August of 1889 Hall offered Boas the position of docent to develop a department of anthropology, "an experiment not yet tried in this country."<sup>13</sup> Hall regarded the whole matter as tentative, but the appointment as docent suggested Hall's willingness to try something new. The docentship was a matter of particular importance. As Hall put it, "In Germany, almost any young Ph.D., two years, more or less, after receiving his degree, if he has done any signal work in his academic aspirations, is allowed to give lectures in a university. . . . True, he receives no compensation whatever save the fees from the students he may attract. . ." but Hall felt the competition which followed was beneficial to the students. At Clark the docents were to be paid a stipend to support them, they were to be directly responsible to the president. "They were not members of the faculty and were therefore not supposed to interest themselves in academic politics but to illustrate in the most eminent degree the liberty of both investigation and teaching" (Hall 1923:319-321). In particular Hall told Boas that he could do as he pleased in the field, use his own methods (although Hall personally believed that psychological aspects of ethnology were of greater importance than craniology and of more interest than prehistoric remains), but above all else "do not burden yourself with lectures, or instruction. Condense the matter and save yourself for your own work."<sup>14</sup>

Boas shipped off a list of books, his credentials, and a collection of crania and skeletons gathered on his field trips, beginning anthropology at Clark at the end of October 1889. Boas secured his first graduate student in the late spring of 1890, gaining him both a fellowship at Clark and a field appointment for the summer with the British Association Northwest Tribes program, and in October of 1892 Alexander F. Chamberlain was granted the first Ph.D. resulting from graduate instruction in anthropology with a dissertation on the Language of the Mississauga.<sup>15</sup>

It was thus G. Stanley Hall in an experimental mood who was responsible for instituting anthropology in the graduate curriculum of the United States. It is ironic that Boas was among that group of Clark faculty members who tendered their resignations in January 1892, effective September 1, out of dissatisfaction with Hall, Worcester, and Jonas Clark. Chamberlain stayed on as Boas' successor.<sup>10</sup>

#### V. Archaeology at Harvard

The appointment of Putnam to the Peabody Professorship of American Archaeology and Ethnology in 1887, as I have said, did not mean initially that Harvard had begun graduate training in either subject. Reorganization of the university in 1890 not only set up the graduate school as a separate entity, but also established the Division of American Archaeology and Ethnology (Dixon 1930:211), which meant that there was now a department which could grant degrees. Although individuals like Alice Fletcher, Zelia Nuttall, Marshall Saville, and Edward Thompson had been active learners at the museum in earlier years, none of them became candidates for the degree, although Miss Fletcher took advantage of the valuable fellowship offered by Mary Copley Thaw in 1890 (a personal sponsorship of Miss Fletcher's activities). The first graduate students, George A. Dorsey and John G. Owens, entered the department candidates for the Ph.D. in the fall of 1890; their interests and training were largely in archaeology. Owens died in 1891 on the first Peabody Museum expedition to Copan, while Dorsey survived to get the degree in 1894, having meanwhile spent the academic year of 1891-1892 in archaeological work in South America and 1892-1893 as head of the archaeological division of the World's Columbian Exposition in the Ethnological Section chaired by Putnam (Dorsey 1896).

Dorsey returned to Harvard in the fall of 1894 as an assistant to Putnam who for the first time was to give a course in "General anthropology with special reference to American Archaeology and Ethnology." Putnam, however, had just arranged to take on a quarter time appointment as curator for the Department of Anthropology at the American Museum of Natural History in New York, and commutation made it impossible for him to teach. Dorsey offered this course, primarily for graduate students, and beginning in 1895 as an instructor, he offered a research course, supposedly lasting three years. However, in 1896 Dorsey resigned to accept the curatorship of anthropology at the Field Columbian Museum. Instruction at Harvard fell into the hands of Frank Russell and Roland B. Dixon, who earned his Ph.D. in 1900, and upon Russell's death in 1902, William C. Farabee, at which point the curriculum included 7 courses. In 1903 the name of the department was changed to Anthropology, in 1905 Alfred M. Tozzer, still another Harvard Ph.D., joined the staff, and Putnam retired in 1908 (Dorsey 1896, Dixon 1930:211-212).

#### VI. Interlude

Franz Boas left Clark University for the temporary post as head of the physical anthropology section for the World's Columbian Exposition and served as chief assistant to Putnam. There is no reason to reiterate here Boas' activities in connection with the Exposition, but it should be remembered that Boas was practically the only member of the Clark faculty who resigned, but did not make the "hegira" to the new University of Chicago. President William Rainey Harper, a Yale Ph.D. in philology and Hebrew scholar,

had had difficulty in gathering a faculty with Rockefeller money and was willing to take advantage of the distress at Clark, making offers to most of the dissident faculty members, and even making an offer to G. Stanley Hall himself. But he apparently made no offer to Boas; nor did he have any reason to. Earlier in 1892 he had already appointed Frederick Starr as assistant professor of anthropology, Starr having had some experience in teaching natural history in addition to his recent stint at the American Museum (Hall 1923:295-297; Ryan 1939:117-121; Goodspeed 1916:208-209).

Henry H. Donaldson, the neurologist and colleague of Boas at Clark, made several efforts during 1893-1894 to talk Harper into hiring Boas, to no purpose. Boas meanwhile made the acquaintance of Mrs. Sara Y. Stevenson, the Egyptologist who with Provost Pepper had helped begin a museum in the library at the University of Pennsylvania, and she worked hard to arrange for Boas to come to Philadelphia as a member of the Wistar Institute Staff and as part of the Pennsylvania Department. This fell through in December, and Boas hesitantly accepted an offer to stay as acting curator of anthropology at the new Field's Columbian Museum which was to house the collections of the exposition.<sup>17</sup>

Museum politics turned out to be worse than academic politics, and Boas resigned when William Henry Holmes was appointed to be Curator of Ethnology. Boas spent a year and a half without employment, from June 1894 to December 1895. While Putnam had half promised him a post at the American Museum, Boas negotiated with the bureau for a position, and spent part of the winter of 1894-1895 in California where he studied Indians in southern California and lectured briefly at Stanford. His suggestion to David Starr Jordan that Stanford hire him to teach while he conducted anthropological and anthropometric studies of the Pacific met with sympathy, but no offer. In December 1895 Boas accepted the post of assistant curator for ethnology at the American Museum, and in May 1896, he was appointed part-time as lecturer in physical anthropology in Columbia, Faculty of Pure Science, a committee of anthropology chaired by Cattell, Giddings, Woodward, and Peck being established to bring together the diverse work in anthropology in faculties of political science and of philosophy given by William Z. Ripley and Livingston Farrand since 1892 and 1894. Boas' subsequent activities and the development of anthropology at Columbia are sufficiently well-known to require no further comment.<sup>18</sup>

## VII. California

The University of California, having survived Granger attacks, California politics, and a series of short-tenured presidents, settled down in 1899 to a period of steady growth under Benjamin Ide Wheeler, a classicist educated at Brown, Leipzig and Heidelberg, and one-time instructor at Harvard and head of the Department of Greek at Cornell. Also in 1899 Phoebe Apperson Hearst, widow of George Hearst and Regent of the University, began to concentrate her previously diffused sponsorship of archaeological explorations upon a program which would benefit California. Formerly a benefactor of the Central American Pepper-Hearst Expedition of the University of Pennsylvania and of Egyptologist Sara Y. Stevenson's American Exploration Society, in 1899 Mrs. Hearst hired George Reisner, Alfred Emerson, Max Uhlo, and Philip Mills Jones to gather a private collection of antiquities from Egypt, Greece and Rome, South and Central America, as well as California and the Southwest. In the fall of 1901 Mrs. Hearst transferred to the University of California both her



collections and her staff of collectors, agreeing at the same time to continue her patronage of those activities under a newly established Department of Anthropology.<sup>19</sup>

Mrs. Hearst clearly envisioned and endeavored to provide a museum for California similar to the American Museum of Natural History, the Field's Columbian Museum, the Peabody Museum at Harvard, or the University Museum at Pennsylvania, for she hired Frederic Ward Putnam to head the Department of Anthropology and led him to believe that she would give to the university a "vast museum, with a corps of professors, instructors and assistants."<sup>20</sup> Her collections were housed in a "temporary" tin building in Berkeley until their bulk threatened its foundations, after which they were housed in a vacant building of the Affiliated Colleges in San Francisco. This became the Museum of the University of California, and long after Mrs. Hearst had withdrawn her support of departmental activities, she continued to pay for maintenance of the museum.

The development of an instructional program in the Department of Anthropology depended upon the initiative of Alfred L. Kroeber rather than Mrs. Hearst. Kroeber, Boas' first doctoral candidate at Columbia, and Pliny Earle Goddard, Earlham College graduate, former lay missionary to the Hupa Indians and graduate student in philology under President Wheeler, were both hired by Mrs. Hearst to conduct ethnological investigations of the Indians of California, even as she agreed to subsidize the field researches of geologist John C. Merriam in the auriferous gravels of California, seeking evidence of the antiquity of man. Merriam, a faculty member, had been giving a course in the Geological History of Man within the Department of Geology, but Kroeber secured permission from President Wheeler to teach a course in anthropology for the spring term of 1901-1902. The spring of the following year saw Kroeber and Goddard teaching a total of four courses in anthropology, and in succeeding years the number of courses, graduate and undergraduate, increased, with the first Ph.D. granted to Samuel A. Barrett in 1908.<sup>21</sup>

Privately subsidized, the Department of Anthropology at the University of California represents a merger within the state university of the museum and academic traditions. Yet neither of these traditions was strongly enough established to have withstood the withdrawal of Mrs. Hearst's support upon the retirement of Putnam in 1909. The success of Kroeber in building a great academic department of anthropology after that date, although beyond the scope of this paper, owes something to the emergence after 1900 of a supra-institutional commitment to research on the part of the academic discipline itself. This commitment was largely due to the efforts of Franz Boas.

When Mrs. Hearst was considering the establishment of a museum as a department in the University of California she sought advice from several quarters, including Zelia Nuttall, Alice Fletcher, Frederic Ward Putnam, and Franz Boas. This group, together with Mrs. Hearst, John C. Merriam, and Benjamin Ide Wheeler, formed the Advisory Committee for the new department upon its inception in September 1901.<sup>22</sup> Several months earlier Zelia Nuttall had asked Boas if he would consider leaving New York for California in order to create an anthropological center at the University of California.<sup>23</sup> Boas had declined the invitation in a revealing letter in which he had explained his intention to establish a well-organized school of anthropology in New



York, developing museum collections as the basis of university instruction in all fields of anthropology. His objective in working for close cooperation between the American Museum of Natural History and Columbia University was to provide scholars with systematic training in field work methods and linguistic techniques. In order to supply trained observers he had allowed control of a considerable amount of the ethnological work on the North American continent to concentrate in his hands. Were he to leave Columbia, it would mean starting all over again in California what he had nearly accomplished in New York. Moreover, there was no one yet fully qualified to direct ethnological research in California: either Kroeber or Dixon might be able to do it in another five years. In the meantime, Boas recommended that Mrs. Hearst establish four fellowships in ethnology at Columbia and two in archaeology at Harvard in order to train people for independent work, with the fellowships to be transferred to the University of California after five years. "Give me the opportunity to direct the operations and . . . a strong department in the University of California could be formed without any further cooperation."<sup>24</sup>

Boas made similar recommendations to the Advisory Committee in November 1901, urging:

1. That the Committee recommend to the University of California that it prepare a number of graduates of that institution for ethnological field work, preferably in New York, the number to be determined by the probable extension of the work in the near future.

2. That the Committee lay out its plans of operation in cooperation with the various private and government expeditions (i.e. the linguistic field work of the Bureau of American Ethnology, the ethnological activities sponsored by C. P. Huntington, Archer M. Huntington, and Henry Villard).

He made no comment on the "establishment of an anthropological department at the University of California," although he did recommend that ethnological work be given precedence over archaeological research in California: "I am of course aware that with the progressing cultivation of the soil material is lost, but the amount of it is small as compared to the mass of archaeological material that will remain available for years to come."<sup>25</sup> Clearly Boas conceived of "anthropological investigation" as the primary task of anthropology. The university, the museum, the government bureau, the professional society were all means to further anthropological investigation, and California was an important field of study.

The advisory committee did not accept Boas' recommendations. Boas, in a letter never sent, complained to Putnam that the action at California had upset all that Boas had tried to build over the years. Putnam intuited Boas' opposition, and in the fall of 1902 Boas was dropped from the advisory committee as Putnam became more closely connected with departmental activities.<sup>26</sup> California was to duplicate existing institutions rather than to cooperate in Boas' grand scheme. Even though Boas' national ambitions were hurt further by the death of Major Powell and by Boas' own resignation from the American Museum, he nevertheless welcomed his former student Kroeber as a contributor to the Handbook of American Indian Languages and as a collaborator in the work of anthropology beyond the limits of individual universities. Consequently when the "museum" phase of anthropology at the University of California concluded with the ending of Mrs. Hearst's subsidy, Kroeber was

able to seek state support for a department which had already graduated a Ph.D. candidate, and which was engaged in research of national importance.

That this venture succeeded is mostly a tribute to Kroeber; that it was likely to succeed depended upon Boas' willingness to include Kroeber in his masterplan for anthropological research; that it was possible at all depended upon the acceptance of departments of anthropology within the graduate schools of American universities.

#### NOTES

<sup>1</sup>The author is grateful to the Library of the American Philosophical Society for permission to quote from the Franz Boas Correspondence and to the Department of Anthropology, University of California, Berkeley, for permission to quote from department archives. The author also wishes to acknowledge the assistance given by his colleagues at the latter institution, particularly John H. Rowe, Theodore C. McCown, and George W. Stocking, Jr.

<sup>2</sup>Letters of F. Boas to Abraham Jacobi, Jan. 2 and Nov. 26, 1882; letters of Theobald Fischer to F. Boas, March 31 and April 3, 1882, Boas Correspondence, Library of the American Philosophical Society. See Herskovits 1957.

<sup>3</sup>Letter of D. C. Gilman to Andrew D. White April 5, 1874, quoted in Franklin 1910:155-157.

<sup>4</sup>For a discussion of anthropology in Germany and Europe in the 1880's see Chamberlain (1894) and Brinton (1892). It was possible in the 1870's and 1880's to hear anthropological material discussed in lectures in geography, anatomy, and philosophy, however.

<sup>5</sup>"Historical Notice" 1882; "Proceedings Preliminary to the Organization of the Anthropological Institute of New York" 1871-1872. The name of the latter was adopted from that of the Anthropological Institute of Great Britain, the result of a merger of the Ethnological and Anthropological Societies of London.

<sup>6</sup>22nd Annual Report for the year 1890-1891:11, 31-32; 26th Annual Report for the year 1894-1895:14; 27th Annual Report for the year 1895-1896:17-18. Abraham Jacobi to Franz Boas, Oct. 2, 1885, Boas Correspondence, indicates that the American Museum did not plan to have a curator of anthropology for several years.

<sup>7</sup>Theobald Fischer to Boas, Feb. 27, May 30, and Oct. 3, 1886; N. D. C. Hodges to Boas, Jan. 27, 1887; Horatio Hale to Boas, March 21, 1887; Boas to Hale, March 28, 1887; Horatio Hale to Boas, March 1, 1888 and April 30, 1888; Boas to E. B. Tylor, Aug. 17, 1888. Boas Correspondence.

<sup>8</sup>Boas to \_\_\_\_\_, 1888?; N. D. C. Hodges to Boas, Aug. 1, 1888; Boas to J. W. Powell, Nov. 18, 1888. Cf. Horatio Hale to Boas, Feb. 25, 1889 for suggestion of position with government or college professorship as ultimate career goals for Boas.

<sup>9</sup>Hall 1923:186-256, passim. Cf., however, Hawkins 1960:193-204, for more critical appraisal of Hall at Johns Hopkins.

<sup>10</sup>Boas to G. Stanley Hall, Sept.-Oct. 1888? Boas Correspondence. Hall and Boas had apparently met at a meeting of Section H during the summer of 1888 according to tradition (see Herskovits 1953). While the letter does not mention such a meeting, yet the reference to Section H (which included psychology as well as anthropology) makes it more than likely. However, Hall did not offer Boas a position at that time. Hall 1923:264 places the dates of his trip as August 1888 to April 1889.

<sup>11</sup>Hall to Boas, Oct. 19, 1888. Boas Correspondence. Hall writes from Berlin.

<sup>12</sup>Hall to Boas, March 31, 1888. Boas Correspondence.

<sup>13</sup>Hall to Boas, Aug. 8, 1889. Boas Correspondence.

<sup>14</sup>Hall to Boas, Aug. 30, 1889. Boas Correspondence.

<sup>15</sup>Boas to Hall, Aug. 20, 1889 and Oct. 11, 1889. A. F. Chamberlain to Boas, Nov. 8, 1889; Horatio Hale to Boas, April 25, 1890; A. F. Chamberlain to Boas, June 9, 1890. Boas Correspondence. Typescript copy of diploma of A. F. Chamberlain, Oct. 1, 1892, in possession of John H. Rowe.

<sup>16</sup>Minutes of meetings, January-April 1892, Boas Correspondence; Hall 1923:291-300; Ryan 1939:57-59.

<sup>17</sup>Sara Yorke Stevenson to Boas, Oct. 31, Nov. 18, Dec. 4, and Dec. 25, 1893; Boas to Stevenson, ca. Dec. 15, 1893; G. W. Pepper to Boas, Dec. 2, 1893. Boas Correspondence.

<sup>18</sup>John Winsor to Abraham Jacobi, March 3, 1894; David Starr Jordan to Boas, Sept. 4 and Nov. 19, 1894; Boas to Jordan, June 19, 1895; Jordan to Boas July 16, 1895; Boas to \_\_\_\_\_, Dec. 9, 1895; Seth Low to Boas, May 7, 1896; also Frederick W. Putnam to Boas, March 7, 1894; Boas to Putnam, July 6, 1895; Putnam to Boas, July 19 and Aug. 9, 1895; and several letters of Boas and Putnam, December, 1895. Boas Correspondence. For a history of the department of anthropology at Columbia, see Boas 1908 and Moore 1955.

<sup>19</sup>Reisner 1930; Jones 1901:106-108, 149, 210-218, especially 215 for reference to plans for museums of archaeology and art, 227-232, 281-282; Archives, Department of Anthropology, University of California, Berkeley.

<sup>20</sup>Department Archives, passim, in Letterbooks for 1901-1902; Kroeber 1923:ix-xiv; Steward 1961:1042-1048.

<sup>21</sup>Department Archives, passim, in Letterbooks for 1901-1902; Kroeber 1923:ix-xiv; Steward 1961:1042-1048. Photostatic copy of catalog offerings in anthropology in possession of Theodore C. McCown.

<sup>22</sup>Department Archives, *passim*, in Letterbooks for 1901-1902. See especially the several "Statements of Advisory Committee" and "Quarterly Reports of the Secretary."

<sup>23</sup>Zelia Nuttall to Franz Boas, May 14, 1901. Boas Correspondence.

<sup>24</sup>Boas to Nuttall, May 16, 1901. Boas Correspondence.

<sup>25</sup>Boas to John C. Merriam, Nov. 19, 1901. Department Archives.

<sup>26</sup>Boas to Frederick Ward Putnam, April 4, 1902, never sent. Boas Correspondence; Letterbooks for 1902-1903, Department Archives.

#### REFERENCES

##### BOAS, FRANZ

1908 Anthropology. New York, Columbia University Press.

##### BRINTON, D. G.

1892 Anthropology: as a science and as a branch of university education in the United States. Anthropology Pamphlets Vol. 54, No. 2.

##### CHEYNEY, E. P.

1940 History of the University of Pennsylvania, 1740-1940. Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press.

##### DE LAGUNA, FREDERICA

1960 Selected papers from the American anthropologist, 1888-1920. Evanston, Row-Peterson.

##### DIXON, R. B.

1930 Anthropology, 1866-1929. In *The Development of Harvard University Since the Inauguration of President Eliot, 1869-1929*, Samuel Eliot Morrison, ed. Vol. 4, Chap. 10, pp. 202-215.

##### DORSEY, G. A.

1896 History of the study of anthropology at Harvard university. Reprinted from *Denison Quarterly* IV, No. 2. Granville, Ohio.

##### DUPREE, A. H.

1957 Science in the Federal government: a history of policies and activities to 1940. Cambridge, Mass.

##### GOODE, G. B.

1901 Report of the U.S. National Museum, Part II.

##### GOODSPEED, T. W.

1916 A history of the University of Chicago. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

##### HALL, G. S.

1923 Life and confessions of a psychologist. New York, Appleton and Co.

##### HALLOWELL, A. I.

1960 The beginnings of anthropology in America. Selected Papers from the *American Anthropologist*, 1888-1920, de Laguna, ed.

##### HAWKINS, HUGH

1960 Pioneer: a history of the Johns Hopkins University, 1874-1889.

- KROEBER, A. L.  
 1923 Historical introduction. Phoebe Apperson Hearst Memorial Volume. University of California Publications in Archaeology and Ethnology 20:ix-xiv.
- MacCURDY, G. G.  
 1889 Extent of instruction in anthropology in Europe and the United States. Science n.s., 10:910-917.  
 1902 The teaching of anthropology in the United States. Science n.s., 15:211-216.
- MASON, O. T.  
 1873 Miscellaneous Papers Relating to Anthropology. Washington.  
 1883 Abstracts from anthropological correspondence. Miscellaneous Papers Relating to Anthropology. Washington.
- MEAD, MARGARET and RUTH BUNZEL, eds.  
 1960 The Golden Age of American anthropology. New York, G. Braziller.
- NITZSCHE, G. E.  
 1914 University of Pennsylvania: its history, traditions, buildings, and memorials. Philadelphia, Winston.
- PIERSON, G. W.  
 1952 Yale college, and educational history, 1871-1921. New Haven, Conn.
- POWELL, J. W.  
 1881 Abstracts. Transactions Anthropological Society of Washington 1st and 2nd years, pp. 113-136.
- REISNER, E. H.  
 1930 The evolution of the common school. New York, Macmillan.
- RYAN, W. C.  
 1939 Studies in early graduate education, the Johns Hopkins, Clark University, the University of Chicago. New York.
- STEWART, J. H.  
 1961 Alfred Lewis Kroeber (obituary). American Anthropologist 63:1038-1060.