

## ANTHROPOLOGICAL ACTIVITY IN THE UNITED STATES, 1865-1879

Patricia J. Lyon  
Washington University, St. Louis

There seems to be an assumption on the part of many anthropologists that the year 1879 marks a turning point in the history of American anthropology. It was in this year that the Bureau of Ethnology of the Smithsonian Institution, the Anthropological Society of Washington (later the American Anthropological Association), and the Archaeological Institute of America were founded. In the following year Lewis Henry Morgan became the first anthropologist to be president of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. That such a burst of activity could not occur without a series of preconditions seems evident. It is the purpose of this study to discuss these conditions and to determine what factors were in operation between the end of the Civil War and the year 1879 to bring about this seemingly sudden efflorescence. The primary focus of the present study is the description of the work, communication, and organization of anthropologists prior to 1879. I do not intend to attempt a history of ideas during the period, but simply a history of the framework within which the ideas were circulating.

### GENERAL BACKGROUND

It is impossible to study a period such as this in isolation. One must first have some idea of the general trends in scholarship and science of the time, and also some background on previous trends.

Between 1830 and 1850 a notable change took place in American science. At the beginning of the period "a rage for migration to the West spread like an epidemic through the Eastern States" (Haven 1856: 105). The emigrants moved into the Territory of Wisconsin and there discovered a new and different kind of antiquities.

At that time, during half a dozen or more succeeding years, the press was prolific of Notes on the Western States, Guide Books, Sketches of Travel, Letters from Emigrants, and other publications descriptive of the country, in which a chapter was often bestowed upon mounds and other ancient remains, and the crude speculations to which the sight of them gave rise (Haven 1856:105-106).

During this period there also was an increase in scientific specialization. Whereas previously science had been primarily an avocation of physicians, merchants, planters and ministers, it now became the vocation of specialists who devoted their lives to and earned their living from its pursuit. This development was made possible by the increasing support given to the various fields of science by colleges and government. Although an interest in science continued on the part of the non-specialists, the leadership was now provided by full time professionals, and a concomitant of this new professionalism was the increasing specialization within the whole field of science (Curti 1964:316-317). The need for scientific specialization increased in the development of industry and agriculture, and the growing wealth made it perfectly feasible to patronize scientific development. To this end it was necessary to reform university curricula, and this reform was led by Harvard with the appointment in 1869 of Charles William Eliot, a chemist, as its president (Hofstadter 1955:19).

Specialization and professionalization were not the only factors in the change. There was also more attention to the organization and promotion of science. There had been no central organization that included all scientists, allowing them to associate both within their specializations and within a larger framework, and neither was there a central clearing house for receiving and distributing foreign publications (Curti 1964:318-319). The American Journal of Science founded in 1818 had provided one outlet for general communication, but it was inadequate in the rapidly expanding scientific world. The foundation of the Smithsonian Institution in 1846 and the American Association for the Advancement of Science in 1847 did much to fill the growing needs.

At about the same time there also began the formation of specialized professional organizations such as the American Ethnological Society and the American Oriental Society in 1842. Such societies were a change from those previously existing which had been either local in character or comprehensive in aim, such as the various historical and natural history societies (Curti 1964:570-571).

Another factor in operation at this time was the great increase in the diffusion of ideas and knowledge to the people. This was brought about by the advent of inexpensive magazines and books, free or inexpensive lecture series, and public libraries. There was more emphasis on formal education as well. Contributing to this movement were the concentration of the population in cities, the growth of technology which permitted the mass communication of ideas, and the increase in the members of the wealthy class with philanthropic inclinations (Curti 1964:335-336).

The onset of the Civil War brought a temporary slackening of the growing scientific impetus. The geological surveys in the seceding states were stopped as well as those in some of the northern states, and the AAAS suspended its annual meetings until 1866 (Curti 1964:451). But, as will be seen, not all scientific endeavor was halted during the period of the war.

#### ANTHROPOLOGY TO THE END OF THE CIVIL WAR

I do not intend to cover exhaustively the anthropological work done in the thirty years or so before the end of the Civil War. However it is necessary to outline briefly such activity in order to put the later material in its proper perspective.

One might begin with the questionnaire compiled by Lewis Cass "respecting the history, traditions, languages, manners, customs, religion, &c. of the Indians, living within the United States" (1823), which was sent to traders, military men and Indian agents within his jurisdiction in order to obtain information about the Indians therein (Hallowell 1960:41).

This questionnaire did, of course, have its antecedents in the United States. Probably the best known of these is Thomas Jefferson's Instructions to the Lewis and Clark expedition (Hallowell 1960:18). Another precedent was established by Benjamin Smith Barton who sent letters to missionaries and traders asking for vocabularies and phrases for his book on Indian languages which was published in 1798 (Wissler 1942:200). Nonetheless, the questionnaire sent out by Cass can still probably be considered the first attempt in the United States to obtain general anthropological information from such diverse sources on a mass scale in an organized fashion.

Samuel F. Haven (1856) and Justin Winsor (1889) in their admirable summary works leave no doubt that there was a sizeable literature of serious work regarding the origin and antiquity of man in the New World.<sup>1</sup> That not all anthropological work in the United States was directed to the solution of these problems, however, is attested to by the fact that it was also during this period that Lewis Henry Morgan began the research which would terminate in his Systems of Consanguinity and Affinity of the Human Family (1870).

The conflict which led to the Civil War also caused some activity in the field of physical anthropology, and probably attracted more attention from the public than ever before. The extensive work of Dr. Samuel Morton in physical anthropology (which led to his conclusions of the separate origin of races) served as a basis for the book Types of Mankind by Dr. Josiah C. Nott, of Mobile, with the aid of George R. Gliddon (1854), which supported the innate rightness of slavery (Curti 1964:435). The popularity of this work may be seen in the fact that it was in its tenth edition by 1871 (Hrdlička 1918:149). The argument of Nott and Gliddon was answered in 1863 by Charles Loring Brace in Races of the Old World, an interesting work of over five hundred pages in which the author utilized physical anthropology, archaeological and linguistic data in order to prove that "we do not regard the Races of men now existing

as permanent. Their lines converge into one another in the past, and they may meet again in the future or they may cease altogether" (1863: 511). Thus, the discussion of race which had previously been a rather dry academic subject became a living issue.

Government projects also gave impetus to the field of anthropology, sometimes indirectly. From the various trips of the Coast Survey and from the United States Exploring Expedition (1838-1842), important archaeological and ethnographic collections resulted, stimulating interest and also providing a considerable fund of data on areas previously unstudied (e.g., Hale, 1846).

However, in general, the war did slow down the progress of anthropology. Broca noted this fact in an address to the Anthropological Society of Paris delivered in 1869.

Scientific discussion was smothered in the midst of the tumult of arms, and after the victory of the North had decided the question of slavery, anthropology, abandoned by public attention, underwent the period of interruption which it had undergone in France after the February revolution (Broca 1869:cxv).<sup>2</sup>

That this statement is true may be seen by the small number of publications from just after the war until about 1869.

Activity was carried on in some areas throughout the war. The Smithsonian Institution continued to function, apparently without problems, and Morgan began receiving answers to his questionnaire on kinship in 1860 and continued his work through the war. It was also during the war that the Smithsonian distributed the Instructions for the collection of ethnological and philological data compiled by George Gibbs (1863).

#### INSTITUTIONS IN AMERICAN ANTHROPOLOGY, 1865-1879

Just after the end of the Civil War an event occurred which was to have extraordinary importance in the field of anthropology. This event was the establishment of the Peabody Museum of American Archaeology and Ethnology at Harvard University in 1866, which laid the foundation

"for the subsequent development of physical anthropology, archeology, and cultural anthropology in direct association with an institution of higher learning" (Hallowell 1960:68). The advent of the Peabody Museum meant that there were now two major institutions in the United States with an intense interest in anthropology, one entirely devoted to this subject. The other institution was, of course, the Smithsonian.

The Smithsonian Institution, established for the "increase and diffusion of knowledge among men", became an important factor in the field of anthropology at its inception, and has continued so up to the present day. Its influence on the young science cannot be overestimated. Not only was the first volume of the Smithsonian Contributions to Knowledge (1848) devoted to archaeology (Ancient Monuments of the Mississippi Valley by E. G. Squier and E. H. Davis), but during the first thirty-five years of the Institution's existence, there were fifty-nine publications which the Institution cataloged under the headings Anthropology and Philology (Oehser 1949:84). Among these is perhaps the most famous anthropological work published by the Smithsonian, Systems of Consanguinity and Affinity of the Human Family by L. H. Morgan (1870).

The importance of the Smithsonian as an outlet for anthropological publications can only be understood in the light of the problems of the time. For example, when Samuel Morton wished to publish his monumental Crania Americana in 1839, it was "not financed by any publisher or institution, but undertaken by the author with the assured support of only fifteen subscribers" (Hrdlička 1918:138). Even when there came to be societies with some funds for publication, they were often not in a position to undertake the expense of extremely large works with many illustrations. Thus we find that, although the American Ethnological Society had originally planned to publish the work of Squier and Davis on the Mississippi Valley, "the cost of the production of the volume exceeded the society's resources, and the transfer was made to the Smithsonian Institution" (Winsor 1889:399).

The importance of the Smithsonian did not rest on its publications alone, however. The Institution formed a locus for the exchange and diffusion of data and ideas. Tylor, in a letter to Morgan in 1873 states,

The Smithsonian Institution has set the world an example in facilitating the circulation of scientific materials. It is to be hoped that the plan will become universal so that every worker will have easy means of knowing what has been done already in his line, and start at the most advanced point (Stern 1931:87).

Tylor was referring to the central clearing house for exchange of publications which Joseph Henry, the Secretary of the Institution, had established. But the Smithsonian facilitated communication in other ways, too. Henry was a prodigious correspondent and received letters from most of the major anthropologists in the United States and Europe--in addition, he corresponded with a large number of missionaries, traders, military men, etc., who wished to know what they could do to further the purposes of the Institution. Many also wrote asking for aid and information, and it was established early in the organizational history of the Smithsonian that all letters received would be answered. To indicate the bulk of correspondence handled, the following quote referring to losses in the fire of 1865 should suffice although, of course, not all of the material dealt with anthropology.

The contents of the Secretary's office, consisting of the official, scientific, and miscellaneous correspondence, embracing 35,000 pages of copied letters which had been sent, at least 30,000 of which were the composition of the Secretary, and 50,000 pages of letters received by the institution... (Rhees 1879:237).

The Smithsonian was interested in original research, and Henry, although a physicist himself, was interested in all branches of science.

Whatever relates to the nature of man is interesting to the students of every branch of knowledge and hence ethnology affords a common ground on which the cultivators of physical science, and of literature, can all harmoniously labor (SIAR 1860:38).<sup>3</sup>

He felt that it was the duty of the Smithsonian to point out new fields for exploration and stimulate "other researches than those which are now cultivated" (Taylor 1878:291). And Henry was aware of the work going on in the various branches of anthropology. "He watched with appreciative interest the progress of comparative philology, and the ethnologic significance of its generalizations in tracing out the affiliations of European nations" (Taylor 1878:336).

With this sort of orientation, it is not surprising that Henry became interested in the researches of Morgan and procured for him the facilities of the Smithsonian for the distribution of his questionnaire on kinship. According to Hallowell, "This was the first time that the relevance of the systematic collection of comparative data on a world-wide scale had been clearly envisaged and brought to bear upon a problem in the field of ethnology" (1960:50). It is doubtful that Morgan's endeavor would have been successful without the cooperation of the Smithsonian.

The collections of data and materials belonging to the Smithsonian were also important, and every effort was made to better them. "The Smithsonian Institution is desirous of extending and completing its collections of facts and materials relative to the Ethnology, Archaeology, and Philology of the races of mankind inhabiting...the continent of America" (Henry, in Gibbs 1863:1). But Henry did not wish simply to accumulate objects.

The ethnological specimens we have mentioned are not considered as mere curiosities collected to excite the wonder of the illiterate, but as contributions to the materials from which it will be practicable to reconstruct by analogy and strict deduction, the history of the past in its relation to the present (SIAR 1868:33).

The Smithsonian also provided a small amount of financial aid for worthy projects. In this context, it aided John G. Shea in the publication of the Library of American Linguistics which consisted of grammars and vocabularies of various Indian languages (Rhees 1879:191, 207).



In addition to the work mentioned above, some of the leading names in American anthropology became interested in that field through the influence of the Smithsonian. For instance, O. T. Mason was urged by Henry to shift from the culture history of the Eastern Mediterranean to the study of the United States, and by 1872 Mason was a collaborator in ethnology of the Smithsonian (Hough 1908:661). William H. Holms also fell under the influence of the Institution when he was hired as an artist. This job brought him into contact with various scientists, and led to his employment as artist with the United States Geological Survey in 1872 and eventually to his interest in archaeology and anthropology (Hough 1933:752). It was Joseph Henry who suggested to John Wesley Powell, when Powell first went to see him in 1867, that Powell take advantage of the chance to study Indians on his western travels (Stegner 1954:134).

With the foundation of the Peabody Museum, there began a period of cooperation between these two institutions which certainly stimulated the growth of anthropology.

In 1866 George Peabody gave \$150,000 to the Board of Trustees for the purpose of establishing a Museum of American Archaeology and Ethnology "in connection with Harvard University". In the Instrument of Trust he stipulated that the income from \$45,000 was to be used for:

Forming and preserving collections of antiquities, and objects relating to the earlier races of the American Continent, or such (including such books and works as may form a good working library for the departments of science indicated) as shall be requisite for the investigation and illustration of Archaeology and Ethnology in general, in main and special reference, however to the aboriginal American races (PMAR vol. I, no. 1, 1876:26-27).

In the Letter of Gift, he added that such work should be begun as soon as possible due to the disappearance of the Indians and the destruction of archaeological remains. He also stated, "that, in the event of the discovery in America of human remains or implements of an earlier geological period than the present, especial attention be given to their

study, and their comparison with those found in other countries" (PMAR vol. I, no. 1, 1876:26).

One would expect such a gift to have been received with pleasure and enthusiasm at Harvard, but such was not the case. The general financial situation of the University was poor and the Library and the Museum of Comparative Zoology were especially needy. "Meantime, the idea of such an Institution as this had never occurred to any one, and pre-historic science was too much in its infancy to have enlisted any ardent votaries" (Winthrop 1878:178). Dr. Walker, then President of the University, decided to accept the gift in spite of the fact that it would not impress anyone and would cause disappointment in some quarters.

The branch of Science, to which this endowment is devoted, is one to which many minds in Europe are now eagerly turning, and with which not a few of the philosophical inquiries and theories of the hour are intimately associated. It will grow in interest from year to year (Winthrop 1878:179).

One might wonder, in view of the general opinion of the subject noted above, just what impelled George Peabody to endow a Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology instead of some other field. The answer may lie in a peculiar coincidence. Peabody had a nephew, Othniel Charles Marsh, later to become one of the great palaeontologists of his day (Curti 1964:458). Marsh had studied in Europe through the Civil War, and in 1866 was appointed Professor of Vertebrate Palaeontology at Yale College. However, he wrote one paper on archaeology, a report on the excavation of a burial mound in Ohio which was published in 1866. Marsh also accompanied his uncle during the negotiations with Harvard (Winthrop 1878:178). It is certainly within the realm of possibility that Marsh, impressed by anthropological activities in Europe and enthused by his own investigations, may have influenced his uncle. This suggestion is supported by the statement of Asa Gray in his memoir of Jeffries Wyman, that Peabody decided to make his gift for American archaeology and ethnology "under the advice of a relative himself distinguished in a similar department of science" (PMAR vol. I, no. 8, 1876:9).

The first curator of the Museum was Jeffries Wyman. Previous to this appointment Wyman held the position of Hersey Professor of Anatomy at the University, teaching human and comparative anatomy and physiology, and had built up a museum of comparative anatomy. After his appointment as curator of the Peabody Museum, he devoted himself to organizing and building up this institution. Most of the work on the collections he did himself, cleaning, mending, labeling, cataloging, and setting up exhibitions. Winters he went to Florida for his health and excavated shell mounds. In addition to this work, Wyman continued the work that had made him one of the foremost physical anthropologists in the country.

It is difficult to evaluate the total influence of the Peabody Museum on the field of anthropology during the period in question, but some outstanding features can be indicated. One of these was the connection of Wyman with a young zoologist working in Salem, and specializing in birds and fishes. This young man, Frederick Ward Putnam, was made Superintendent of the Museum of the Essex Institute in the same year that Wyman became curator of the Peabody. Putnam collaborated with Wyman on archaeological field trips, and on the death of the latter was appointed curator of the Peabody Museum in his stead (PMAR vol. I, no. 8, 1876:11). Putnam had become permanent secretary of the American Association for the Advancement of Science in 1873, and after he became curator of the Peabody Museum in 1875 he also became a prime mover in the organization of the Archaeological Institute of America (1879) (Hallowell 1960:83).

One major difference between the Smithsonian Institution and the Peabody Museum was the method of acquiring material. The Smithsonian bought no collections, depending on gifts, exchanges and the results of government expeditions to increase its material. Neither did it support research in the general sense of the word, although it might provide minor financial aid for equipment or other small expenses as noted above. The Peabody Museum, on the other hand, not only could buy collections,

but also supported researchers in the field in order to collect for the Museum. This support varied from \$500 to Charles F. Hartt for explorations in Brazil (PMAR vol. I, no. 5, 1876:35), to \$38.50 to Henry Gillman for excavations in Michigan (PMAR vol. I, no. 7, 1876:41). The Museum was probably one of the first sources of major financial support for anthropological research available in the United States. It should be noted that much of this support was for work outside the country. Thus we have the Peabody Museum to thank in large part for the important work of Berendt in Central America, Hartt in Brazil, and Morse in Japan. Important work within the United States supported by the Museum included that of Palmer in the Southwest and Schumacher in California. Of course the Peabody also received gifts, and some of these were to form the nucleus for the famous Peruvian collection, namely the donation of Squier (PMAR vol. I, no. 1, 1876:6-7), and that of Alexander Agassiz (PMAR vol. I, no. 9, 1876:9).

Since the Museum did not begin to publish until 1876, it is not surprising that its presence remained, to a certain extent, unknown to the field of anthropology at large.

The Museum has been open during the past year to all who have applied for admittance. We have also been honored with calls from several prominent archaeologists, who have expressed surprise at the value and importance of the Museum, which has been formed so quietly as to be beyond their expectations (PMAR vol. I, no. 9, 1876:8).

The Smithsonian treated the Peabody Museum as it did any other museum, arranging for exchange of collections and publications, and also informing the Museum of collections which had been offered for sale. The first opportunity for real collaboration between the two institutions arose as a result of preparations for the Centennial Exposition to be held in Philadelphia in 1876. Although the Peabody Museum did not itself present an exhibition, it did contribute to the National Exhibit of Archaeology and Ethnology made under the direction of the Smithsonian (PMAR no. 10, 1877:7).

The Centennial made a great impression on American anthropology and probably did much to popularize it with the general public. Special collections were made for the Exposition with the aid of agents "temporarily employed to obtain articles to illustrate the ethnology of portions of the country hitherto imperfectly known" (SIAR 1876:10). S. F. Baird was placed in charge of the exhibitions of the Smithsonian and he named Charles Rau and Frank Cushing to set up the anthropological exhibit. The collections were made by James G. Swan in Alaska and the Washington Territory, Stephen Powers in California and adjacent states, J. W. Powell in Arizona, Utah and Colorado, and by Stephen Bowers and Paul Schumacher on the coast of the Pacific and California (SIAR 1876:38ff, 64ff). The resultant collections were placed in the Smithsonian at the termination of the Exposition with the exception of those which remained in Philadelphia as part of the Permanent Exposition. Baird remarks on the very great extent to which these collections augmented those already in the National Museum (SIAR 1876:38-39).

A further result of the Centennial Exposition was the organization of the State Archaeological Association of Ohio for the purpose of exhibiting at Philadelphia (Mittra 1933:193). And the Exposition was also the site of the first meeting of the first American Anthropological Association (Anderson 1878:114).

Whether or not the Centennial was in any way responsible is difficult to determine, but following the Exposition we find the following statements made, in contrast to those expressed in 1866:

Anthropology, or what may be considered the natural history of man, is at present the most popular branch of science (SIAR 1877:300).

and

At the end of ten years since our organization, Mr. Peabody's foundation is amply justified; and nobody, I think, would now desire it to have been any other than what it was (PMAR no. 11, 1878:182).

## THE ORGANIZATION OF ANTHROPOLOGY, 1865-1879

It would be misleading to give the impression that the whole of anthropology during the period in question was represented by only two institutions. In addition to these two great centers there were many small groups, societies, academies, etc., which helped to structure the anthropological society of the day. These groups were clustered primarily about five geographical centers: Boston and vicinity, New Haven, New York, Philadelphia and Washington.<sup>4</sup> In addition to these major centers, there was considerable activity on the part of local historical societies and academies of natural science, especially throughout the mid-West (cf. Winsor 1889).

There are two points of special interest during this period which relate to the organization of anthropology. One is the adoption of the term anthropology to cover the entire field, and the other is the proliferation of anthropological and allied societies (often short-lived) after 1869.

Previous to 1870, it is normal to refer to anthropology under its various branches, i.e., ethnology, archaeology, philology, somatology or craniology, etc., and if any term is used as a cover term it is usually ethnology (cf. SIAR 1860:38). In 1870 we find Joseph Henry using the term anthropology in its general sense for the first time.

The collection of objects to illustrate anthropology now in possession of the Institution is almost unsurpassed, especially in those which relate to the present Indians and the more ancient inhabitants of the American continent (SIAR 1870:35).

In 1871 E. G. Squier established the short-lived Anthropological Institute of New York. In the preliminary Proceedings of this organization, the following statements of interest are made:

It had been proposed...that the new organization should take the name of "The Anthropological Society of New-York;" but the committee subsequently resolved on the designation of "The American Anthropological Society." After this resolution

was taken, an Association of gentlemen in Boston appropriated the name of "American Anthropological Society," as also, it was reported, another Association in New-York (Anthropological Institute of New-York 1872:19).

By the consolidation of the Ethnological Society of London with the Anthropological Society of the same capital, the designation "Ethnological" had ceased to apply to any society of importance in Europe, and the term "Anthropological" had been accepted instead, for reasons well explained by Dr. Broca, one of which is, that the new name is more appropriate and comprehensive and another, that the study of man requires the cooperation of naturalists as well as archaeologists, anatomists as well as antiquaries (Anthropological Institute of New-York 1872:20).

In 1873 Joseph Henry stated,

It is only of late years that the investigations of the tendencies and changes of the human family have been systematically studied under the general denomination of anthropology and its subdivisions of ethnology and archaeology (Henry 1873:642).

From this time on to 1879 there is an increasing use of this general term although ethnology, etc., are also used sporadically in the older sense.

It is interesting to note that Dieserud, in discussing the definition of anthropology, lists only one publication for the period 1865-79 and that does not even contain the word "anthropology" (1908:107). It is rather surprising that he has overlooked the discussion noted above, not to mention the fact that it becomes rather obvious that the period 1870-79 was the period when the term "anthropology" was becoming generally adopted in the United States.

Hallowell states, in discussing Squier's abortive attempt to organize the Anthropological Institute, "this too was abandoned, and the new name forgotten" (1960:92). However, it appears that the new name, or at least the factors causing the new name, persisted, for in September of 1876 the first meeting of the American Anthropological Association was held at Philadelphia, as noted earlier. This Association was also short-lived apparently, for I have been unable to find mention of it later than

1879 at which time Stephen D. Peet still listed himself as Corresponding Secretary of the Association (American Antiquarian, vol. II, no. 1, 1879). However, the Association did outlast its founding meeting, and a first annual meeting was held in Cincinnati on September 6, 1877, at which papers were presented (Peet 1878:47, 49). The meeting was held at that time and place "with the hope that those attending the meeting of the American Association for the advancement of science [sic], at Nashville, might return this way and attend its sessions" (Peet 1878:49). It seems obvious that the first American Anthropological Association aimed at being more than just a local group. Its name, the circumstances of its founding at Philadelphia where there were gathered a number of anthropologists from all parts of the country, and the effort made to coordinate its second meeting with another major scientific event to which many might be inclined to travel, all indicate an endeavor to form an organization with more than local interest and membership. The same indication is suggested by the fact that, at the meeting in Cincinnati, a by-law was passed "empowering the trustees to transact business of the Association by correspondence" (Peet 1878:49). That such a by-law was necessary implies that the membership of the organization was scattered and not easily gathered to transact business.

Although the original American Anthropological Association seems to have had a relatively brief existence, it did have a lasting impact on the discipline. Apparently as an outgrowth of the organization, Stephen D. Peet began the publication of his important journal, the American Antiquarian, in 1878. That there was a connection between the two events is indicated by the fact that the major portion of the first volume of the Antiquarian was dedicated to the publication of the papers presented at the Cincinnati meeting of the Association (Peet 1878:49).

I mentioned that in addition to adopting the term anthropology to cover the field, there was also a proliferation of new organizations.



This tendency can be noted in the preceding paragraphs, but in addition to these rather tentative attempts, some organizations were founded during this period which were to have permanent existence and influence. Among these were the American Philological Association (1869), and the Philosophical Society of Washington (1871). The first of these is too well known to require further comment, but the second is of peculiar interest in that it illustrates clearly one type of society very common at the time.

The Philosophical Society of Washington was founded by Joseph Henry and had as members some of the most brilliant scientists of the time. Professor Henry stated that there was need for such a society since "the astronomer, the physicist, the chemist, the biologist, and the student of descriptive natural history" need to communicate with people who understand them (i.e., each other) since they cannot do so with the average man on the street as can a student of history, literature, art or politics. He also indicated that Washington was an ideal setting for such a society because of the presence of the personnel of the various government Bureaus and Departments and also because of the excellent library resources available to facilitate research and study (Henry 1874:vii ff). Members of the Society who were anthropologists or allied to anthropology between 1871 and 1880 were: S. F. Baird, W. H. Dall, Henry, H. W. Henshaw, J. W. Powell, H. C. Yarrow, George Bancroft, O. T. Mason, J. A. Meigs, Garrick Mallery and W. H. Holmes. Non-anthropologists of note were: Asa Gray, Asaph Hall, Stephen Vincent Benét, Alexander Graham Bell, Simon Newcomb, William T. Sherman, among others. The subjects covered in the meetings ranged from astronomy and chemistry, zoology and botany, to economics, to folklore and linguistics; but the important thing to note was that everyone present took part in the discussions of the various papers. It is also interesting to note that of the anthropological group who presented papers, only one, Garrick Mallery, did not give at least one paper on some subject other than

anthropology. Thus we can see that specialization in the sciences had not yet been carried to the point where no one felt capable of commenting on something outside his own field. Also we can see that anthropology was still open to cross-fertilization from the other disciplines and to comment and criticism on the grounds of scientific method from some of the best scientists of the time.

#### PEDAGOGY, PUBLICATIONS, AND PERSONNEL, 1865-1879

In spite of the growing interest and organization of anthropology at this time, it should be noted that this was not a subject in which one could receive instruction in the institutions of higher learning. Although the George Peabody gift establishing the Peabody Museum at Harvard specified that part of the endowment should be used to support a professorship, this position was not filled for some time. The first instruction in anthropology at Harvard was offered in 1881-82, while in Philadelphia Daniel G. Brinton was appointed Professor of Ethnology at the Academy of Natural Sciences in 1884 and Professor of American Linguistics and Archaeology at the University of Pennsylvania in 1886. It is of interest to note, however, that a course on pre-historic archaeology was given at Syracuse University in 1877 taught by W. De Hass (Baird 1877: 274). Although this offering may have had no importance in itself, it is yet another symptom of the growing enthusiasm for anthropology in this period.

If our anthropologists were not teaching, however, what were they doing? Today it is generally considered that the two main occupations of anthropologists are teaching and research. Research is expressed in publications, so we must look to the publications in order to determine what research was being carried on by the non-teaching anthropologists of the post-Civil War period.

Only at the end of this period did there appear a journal devoted solely to anthropological materials. The American Antiquarian was

immensely important as a pioneer journal in the field of anthropology in the United States. For some time it was the only journal devoted entirely to subjects of anthropological interest. Although the journal was subtitled "A Quarterly Journal devoted to Early American History, Ethnology and Archaeology", in fact, its scope was considerably wider than this. On the inside of the cover of volume I, no. 1 (1878), is the following statement:

This Magazine is designed to be a medium of correspondence between Archaeologists, Ethnologists and other scientific gentlemen. It embraces in its scope the widest range of intelligent discussion on the subject of Anthropology,...

On the inside of the cover of volume I, no. 2 (1878), in a list of topics meant to indicate the scope of the journal are included,

The Descent of Man, The Rise of Society, The Origin of Writing, The Growth of Language, The History of Architecture, The Evolution of Ornament, and Ceremonial Observances, Comparative Religions, Serpent Worship and Religious Symbols, Man and the Mastodon, Man and Animals, Earth and Man, and many other topics which are connected with the Science of Anthropology, especially as they are viewed by the antiquarian.

Due to the lack of specialized publications during the major part of the period 1865-1879, anthropological articles were published in an immense variety of journals and I do not pretend to have examined them all, nor even to have examined a large number of them exhaustively. Nonetheless, a fairly extensive search of the literature of the period enables me to make certain observations with a fair degree of certainty.<sup>5</sup>

As would be expected, the greater quantity of publication was in the form of articles rather than books. The books are about evenly divided among ethnology, archaeology and linguistics, with very few dealing with physical anthropology. This last fact might be explained by the fact that there were really only two physical anthropologists of any caliber working during this period, Wyman and J. A. Meigs.

The distribution of subject matter in articles, however, is quite another thing. Archaeology quite outstrips all the other fields,

followed by linguistics and ethnology, with physical anthropology again trailing by a wide margin. In an analysis of all the anthropological articles published in the *American Naturalist* between its establishment in 1868 and the end of 1878, we find that of a total of forty-five articles, thirty-five are on archaeology, eight on ethnology, one on physical anthropology and four on a combination of two of these topics, usually archaeology and ethnology. There are no articles on linguistics. This distribution is not at all out of line with the general trend. Most of the articles on linguistics were published either by the American Philological Association or the American Philosophical Society. I have not surveyed the *Journal of the American Oriental Society* which also published many articles on linguistics, with special reference to Old World languages. The people working in physical anthropology were also publishing in other journals such as the *Proceedings of the Boston Society of Natural History* and the *Annual Reports of the Smithsonian Institution* (Hrdlička 1918). Somewhat later they began publishing in the *Popular Science Monthly*.

Another point of interest is the temporal distribution of articles. Between 1865 and 1869 there was little published in any branch of anthropology. These four years are represented by a few scattered articles and books, but in 1869 there was a sudden upsurge almost as if everyone had been saving his material to publish that year. This increase is followed by a brief slump, and there then begins a steady year by year increase in publication continuing until the end of the period under consideration, and presumably beyond. The increment is equal in all fields with the exception of physical anthropology. The latter fact may be explained by the fifty percent reduction in the number of physical anthropologists with the death of Wyman in 1874.

The same sort of trend can be seen in the activities of the Philosophical Society of Washington. Between March, 1871, and June, 1874, four papers on anthropological subjects were presented by two people. In

the period from October, 1874, to November, 1878, thirteen papers were presented by eight people, a notable increase (Bulletin of the Philosophical Society of Washington, I, 1874 and II, 1878).

In discussing the content of papers published, considerable caution is indicated since an article ostensibly on archaeology may well contain both physical anthropological and ethnological data. A prime example of this tendency is a paper by Jeffries Wyman on Human Remains in the Shell Heaps of the St. John's River, East Florida. Cannibalism. (1874). Another confusing factor when attempting to do a count of publications is the tendency of authors of the time to republish a paper several times in different places. I should also note that in the counts given above, I have included only articles written by people living and working in the United States. In addition to such articles, there were also many articles reprinted from European sources, including a number of translations from German and French. However, a discussion of this material does not fall within the scope of the present study.

The personnel of anthropology at this time helps to explain to a certain extent the skew towards archaeology in the literature. By personnel I mean the people who were publishing on anthropological subjects. Much of the publication was done in the journals of local historical or natural history societies. These societies tended to dedicate themselves, among other things, to excavating nearby archaeological sites and publishing the "results" of the excavations. These publications were often papers of a few pages illustrating the more spectacular items gleaned from the excavation with perhaps a few far-flung comparisons with the Old World or Mexico. Obviously such a paper requires far less time and effort to write and research than would almost any paper on ethnology, physical anthropology or linguistics. Admittedly, the publication of word lists is a similar sort of activity, but did not become particularly popular until the next decade. I do not mean to imply that there were not excellent papers being published in the field of archaeology, but certainly a large mass of them tend to fall into the category described above.

A further reason for the preponderance of archaeological papers is undoubtedly to be found in the great interest aroused by the problems surrounding the origin and antiquity of man in the New World. Although these problems also involved the other realms of anthropology, they tended to center interest on the field of archaeology.

Thus we find that there were many sometime anthropologists not to mention missionaries, a few traders, and some military men, especially army surgeons, contributing to the anthropological literature. There was, however, a hard core of what we might call "professional" anthropologists in existence at this time. By professional I do not mean trained. I feel that no one would deny that Franz Boas was a professional anthropologist although he had no formal training in the subject, nor did Brinton, Putnam, or any of the other pioneer teachers of the subject.

According to Webster's Unabridged Dictionary (1957), professional means "of or pertaining to a profession, especially a learned or skilled profession...", and a profession is "the occupation, if not purely commercial, mechanical, agricultural, or the like, to which one devotes oneself; a calling in which one professes to have acquired some special knowledge used by way either of instructing, guiding or advising others or of serving them in some art". In this sense, then, there were professional anthropologists, and they were specialized within the field, although most also contributed to branches outside their specialty and sometimes outside of the field of anthropology. As specialists we can include in physical anthropology the two already mentioned, Wyman and Meigs; in ethnology, Morgan, Stephen Powers and Washington Matthews; in linguistics, A. S. Gatschet and J. H. Trumbull on American Indian languages and W. D. Whitney on general linguistics; and in archaeology, E. G. Squier and F. W. Putnam. At this time Brinton was active both in the study of American Indian languages and mythology. This list is not exhaustive and many would want to include others, but I think that no one would argue about the right of these men to be included. They were men

who considered themselves specialists in their fields, who read each other's work and communicated among themselves as colleagues. They could comment upon and criticize each other's work and their criticisms would carry weight. An example of this sort of intercommunication is provided by the case of Morgan. According to his biographer, "All contemporary anthropologists wrote to him for counsel, sent him papers for criticism, or made trips to Rochester to consult him" (Stern 1931:192-193). In this, Morgan was probably not unique although we do not yet have the evidence to prove the point.

#### CONCLUSIONS

The primary conclusion that can be drawn from this study is that the supposed "breakthrough" in American anthropology in 1879 is really illusory. The events of 1879 and the years immediately succeeding were merely a continuation of a rapid but steady growth in both interest in and research on anthropology in the United States. This trend began at least in 1869, but probably before the Civil War. At least one factor in this growth was probably the great interest aroused by problems regarding the origin and antiquity of man in the New World. The appearance of sudden growth in anthropology seems to be primarily due to a lack of study of the period between the beginning of the Civil War and 1879. The purpose of the present study has been to begin to fill this void by providing a sketch of the framework within which anthropologists were working and an inventory of anthropological activity between the years of 1865 and 1879.

#### NOTES

\* This study is based on work originally done for Dr. Dell Hymes at the University of California, Berkeley. I wish to thank him for his comments and criticisms and also to acknowledge the considerable assistance given me by John H. Rowe and Marianne Y. Winton.

<sup>1</sup> Since it is outside of the scope of the present study, I have avoided the mention of specific workers during this period with the exception of the authors of a few works directly pertinent to the argument. Those readers interested in the period preceding the Civil War are directed to the two works mentioned above, the work of John F. Freeman on Schoolcraft (Freeman 1965), and also the same author's guide to manuscripts in the library of the American Philosophical Society (Freeman 1966).

<sup>2</sup> My translation.

<sup>3</sup> Throughout this paper, when referring to the business portions of the annual reports of the Smithsonian Institution and the Peabody Museum, I will use the following abbreviations:

SIAR Annual Report of the...Smithsonian Institution...for the Year ....., Washington.

PMAR Annual Report of the Trustees of the Peabody Museum of American Archaeology and Ethnology, Cambridge.

<sup>4</sup> The following is a listing by geographical area of the more important institutions associated with anthropology in the period 1865-1879.

National and unlocalized

American Association for the Advancement of Science  
American Philological Association

Boston and vicinity

American Antiquarian Society  
Boston Society of Natural History  
Essex Institute  
Massachusetts Historical Society  
Peabody Museum of American Archaeology and Ethnology

New Haven

American Oriental Society  
Connecticut Historical Society

New York

American Ethnological Society  
American Geographical Society  
American Museum of Natural History  
Lyceum of Natural History of New York

Philadelphia

Academy of Natural Sciences of Philadelphia  
American Philosophical Society

Washington

Philosophical Society of Washington  
Smithsonian Institution



<sup>5</sup> The following is a list of the journals searched to provide the material for this section:

Academy of Natural Sciences of Philadelphia; Journal and Proceedings.  
The American Antiquarian  
American Antiquarian Society; Proceedings.  
American Association for the Advancement of Science; Proceedings.  
American Geographical Society of New York; Journal.  
American Journal of Science and Arts  
The American Naturalist  
American Philological Association; Transactions.  
American Philosophical Society; Proceedings and Transactions.  
California Academy of Science; Proceedings.  
Davenport Academy of Natural Science; Proceedings.  
Harper's New Monthly Magazine  
Lyceum of Natural History of New York; Annals.  
North American Review  
Popular Science Monthly  
Smithsonian Institution: Annual Reports, Contributions to Knowledge,  
and Miscellaneous Collections.

#### REFERENCES

##### A. References cited in the text.

- Anderson, Rasmus Björn  
1878 The International Congress of Americanists. The American Antiquarian 1(2):114-117.
- Anthropological Institute of New York  
1872 Journal of the Anthropological Institute of New York. Vol. I, 1871-72.
- Baird, Spencer Fullerton (ed.)  
1872-79 Annual record of science and industry for 1871 [-1878]. New York: Harper & Brothers. 8 vols.
- Brace, Charles Loring  
1863 The races of the Old World: a manual of ethnology. New York: Charles Scribner.
- Broca, Paul  
1869 Histoire des progrès des études anthropologiques depuis la fondation de la Société. Mémoires de la Société d'Anthropologie de Paris, tome III, 1868, pp. cv-cxxv.

- Cass, Lewis  
 1823 Inquiries, respecting the history, traditions, languages, manners, customs, religion, &c. of the Indians, living within the United States. Detroit: Sheldon & Reed.
- Curti, Merle Eugene  
 1964 The growth of American thought. Third edition. New York, Evanston and London: Harper & Row.
- Dieserud, Juul  
 1908 The scope and content of the science of anthropology. Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Co.
- Freeman, John F.  
 1965 Religion and personality in the anthropology of Henry Schoolcraft. Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences 1:301-313.  
 1966 A guide to manuscripts relating to the American Indian in the library of the American Philosophical Society. Memoirs of the American Philosophical Society, vol. 65.
- Gibbs, George  
 1863 Instructions for research relative to the ethnology and philology of America. Smithsonian Miscellaneous Collections, vol. VII, art. XI, publication 160. Washington: Smithsonian Institution.
- Hale, Horation Emmons  
 1846 Ethnography and philology. United States Exploring Expedition during the years 1838, 1839, 1840, 1841, 1842, under the command of Charles Wilkes, U.S.N., vol. VI. Philadelphia: C. Sherman.
- Hallowell, Alfred Irving  
 1960 The beginnings of anthropology in America. In Frederica De Laguna, ed., Selected papers from the American Anthropologist, 1888-1920. Evanston: Row, Peterson and Co. Pp. 1-91.
- Haven, Samuel F.  
 1856 Archaeology of the United States, or, sketches, historical and bibliographical, of the progress of information and opinion respecting vestiges of antiquity in the United States. Smithsonian Contributions to Knowledge, vol. VIII. Washington: Smithsonian Institution.
- Henry, Joseph  
 1873 On the importance of the cultivation of science. Popular Science Monthly 2:641-650.

- Henry, Joseph  
 1874 Anniversary address of the President of the Philosophical Society of Washington, Prof. Joseph Henry. (Delivered November 18, 1871). Bulletin of the Philosophical Society of Washington 1:v-xiv.
- Hofstadter, Richard  
 1955 Social Darwinism in American thought. Revised edition. Boston: The Beacon Press.
- Hough, Walter  
 1908 Otis Tufton Mason. American Anthropologist 10(4):661-667.  
 1933 William Henry Holmes. American Anthropologist 35(4):752-764.
- Hrdlička, Ales  
 1918 Physical anthropology: Its scope and aims; its history and present status in America. American Journal of Physical Anthropology 1(1):3-23; 1(2):133-182; 1(3):267-304; 1(4):377-414.
- Marsh, Othniel Charles  
 1866 Description of an ancient sepulchral mound near Newark, Ohio. The American Journal of Science and Arts, vol. XCII, second series, vol. XLII, no. 124:1-11.
- Mitra, Panchanan  
 1933 A history of American anthropology. Calcutta: University of Calcutta.
- Morgan, Lewis Henry  
 1870 Systems of consanguinity and affinity of the human family. Smithsonian Contributions to Knowledge, vol. XVII, art. II, publication 218. Washington: Smithsonian Institution.
- Morton, Samuel George  
 1839 Crania Americana; or, a comparative view of the skulls of various aboriginal nations of North and South America: to which is prefixed an essay on the varieties of the human species. Philadelphia.
- Nott, Josiah Clark and George Robins Gliddon  
 1854 Types of mankind, or ethnological researches, based upon the ancient monuments, paintings, sculptures, and crania of races, and upon their natural, geographical, philological, and biblical history. Philadelphia: Lippincott, Grambo & Co.
- Peet, Stephen Denison  
 1878 Description of cabinets and earthworks visited in a trip during last summer. The American Antiquarian 1(1):47-52.

- Oehser, Paul H.  
 1949 Sons of science: The story of the Smithsonian Institution and its leaders. New York: Henry Schuman.
- Rhees, William Jones, ed.  
 1879 The Smithsonian Institution: journals of the Board of Regents, reports of committees, statistics, etc. Smithsonian Miscellaneous Collections, vol. XVIII, publication 329. Washington: Smithsonian Institution.
- Squier, Ephraim George and Edwin Hamilton Davis  
 1848 Ancient monuments of the Mississippi Valley. Smithsonian Contributions to Knowledge, vol. I. Washington: Smithsonian Institution.
- Stegner, Wallace  
 1954 Beyond the hundredth meridian: John Wesley Powell and the second opening of the west. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.
- Stern, Bernard Joseph  
 1931 Lewis Henry Morgan, social evolutionist. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Taylor, William Bower  
 1878 A memoir of Joseph Henry. A sketch of his scientific work. Bulletin of the Philosophical Society of Washington 2: 230-368.
- Winsor, Justin  
 1889 The progress of opinion respecting the origin and antiquity of man in America. In Justin Winsor, ed., Narrative and critical history of America, vol. 1:369-412. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin and Co.
- Wissler, Clark  
 1942 The American Indian and the American Philosophical Society. American Philosophical Society, Proceedings 86(1):189-204.
- Winthrop, Robert Charles  
 1878 Introductory remarks. Eleventh Annual Report of the Trustees of the Peabody Museum of American Archaeology and Ethnology 2(2):177-184.
- Wyman, Jeffries  
 1874 Human remains in the shell heaps of the St. John's River, East Florida. Cannibalism. Seventh Annual Report of the Trustees of the Peabody Museum of American Archaeology and Ethnology, pp. 26-37. Cambridge.

B. Some major American anthropological books and monographs published  
1866-1879 (omitting Morgan, 1870, listed above).

- Bancroft, Hubert Howe  
1874-75 The native races of the Pacific states of North America.  
San Francisco: A. O. Bancroft & Co. 5 vols.
- Brinton, Daniel Garrison  
1868 The myths of the New World. New York: Leypoldt & Holt.
- Foster, John Wells  
1873 Pre-historic races of the United States of America.  
Chicago: S. C. Griggs and Company.
- Gatschet, Albert Samuel  
1876 Zwölf Sprachen aus dem Südwesten Nordamerikas (Pueblos-  
und Apache-Mundarten; Tonto, Tonkawa, Digger, Utah).  
Wortverzeichnisse herausgegeben, erläutert und mit einer  
Einleitung über Bau, Begriffsbildung und locale Gruppierung  
der amerikanischen Sprachen versehen von Albert S. Gatschet.  
Weimar: H. Böhlau.
- Jones, Charles Colcock, Jr.  
1873 Antiquities of the southern Indians, particularly of the  
Georgia tribes. New York: D. Appleton and Company.
- Matthews, Washington  
1877 Ethnography and philology of the Hidatsa Indians. U.S.  
Geological and Geographical Survey of the Territories.  
Miscellaneous Publication no. 7. Washington.
- Morgan, Lewis Henry  
1877 Ancient Society. New York: Henry Holt & Company; London:  
Macmillan and Company.
- Morse, Edward Sylvester  
1879 Shell mounds of Omori. Memoirs of the Science Department,  
University of Tokyo, Japan, vol. 1, part 1. Tokyo.
- Powell, John Wesley  
1877 Introduction to the study of Indian languages. Washington:  
Government Printing Office.
- Powers, Stephen  
1877 Tribes of California. U.S. Geographical and Geological  
Survey of the Rocky Mountain Region. Contributions to  
North American Ethnology, vol. III. Washington.
- Rau, Charles  
1876 Early man in Europe. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Squier, Ephraim George

1877 Peru; incidents of travel and exploration in the land of  
the Incas. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Wyman, Jeffries

1875 Fresh-water shell mounds of the St. John's River, Florida.  
Peabody Academy of Science, fourth memoir. Salem.