ALFRED LOUIS KROEBER

June 11, 1876–October 5, 1960

BY JULIAN H. STEWARD

THE LAST DAY

On October 5, 1960, Alfred Kroeber died in Paris in his eighty-fifth year, ending six decades of continuous and brilliant productivity. His professional reputation was second to none, and he was warmly respected by his colleagues as the dean of anthropology. Kroeber’s insatiable curiosity had not been curtailed, his scientific writing had not slackened, and his zest for living was undiminished. His last illness, resulting from a heart condition which had been incurred during the Second World War, came less than an hour before his death.

The fullness of Kroeber’s life was manifest in many ways.¹ He

¹For much of the personal information, I have drawn upon several unpublished manuscripts written by Kroeber in 1958 and 1959 for the Bancroft Library: “Early Anthropology at Columbia,” “Teaching Staff (at California),” and the typescript of an interview. Mrs. Kroeber has filled me in on many details of his personal life, especially before 1925 when I first knew him, and Professor Robert Heizer has helped round out the picture in many ways. Important insights into Kroeber’s childhood and youth are provided by the late Dr. Carl Alsberg, his lifelong friend, in “Alfred L. Kroeber” in Essays in Anthropology Presented to A. L. Kroeber in Celebration of His Sixtieth Birthday, University of California Press, 1936, and by Kroeber’s reminiscences of Alsberg in “The Making of the Man” in Carl Alsberg, Scientist at Large, edited by Joseph S. Davis, Stanford University Press, 1948. I am also indebted to members of the Department of Anthropology, University of California, for placing records and other materials at my disposal, and to Robert Heizer, John Rowe, Edward Bruner, Dell Hymes, Thomas Sebeok, and Rushton Colbourne for reading the manuscript.

Ann Judith Gibson and John Rowe have kindly provided me with Kroeber’s bibliography, which is far more complete than any previously published and which was a task of many months.
played a major role in developing American anthropology from the rather random endeavors of amateurs and self-trained men to a coherent, scientific, and academic discipline. His contributions to knowledge included extensive ethnographic investigations in California and the Great Plains; archaeological studies in Mexico and Peru; linguistic research, especially in California; theory of communications in the animal world generally; historical syntheses which often had world scope; and a large number of papers on the nature of culture.

Kroeber developed one of the world's great research museums and teaching departments of anthropology. As the impact of his influence was felt, kudos accrued to him. He was the recipient of five honorary degrees (Yale, California, Harvard, Columbia, Chicago), two gold medals, and honorary membership in sixteen scientific societies, and he held offices in innumerable professional organizations.

**FORMATIVE YEARS**

Kroeber left no autobiographical materials, except occasional notes and interviews on phases of his professional career, and he made no assessment of the major factors in his life. His life is best viewed in terms of his own deep conviction that living and growing things—organisms, individual persons and their minds, and cultures—are indivisible wholes which must be understood in terms of developmental tendencies without dissection into components or search for particular causes. Kroeber's childhood and youth, his emergence as

The excellent photograph was taken by Paul Bishop of 2125 Durant Ave., Berkeley, California.


3 Dell H. Hymes has written on Kroeber's linguistic studies for *Language*, 37:1–28, 1961. I have felt incompetent to deal with this highly important aspect of his work.
a scholar, and his adult years of professional endeavor exhibit a rare continuity. There are no discernible intellectual dislocations and doubts, no dramatic discoveries, and no sharp turning points. The childhood background led naturally into the professional career, which consisted of a continuous amplification of a lifelong purpose.

The background of the man and scholar was a German upper middle-class society of New York in which intellectual, aesthetic, and scientific interests and professional aspirations were a matter of course. This society of New York German families was a fairly tightly knit and extensively intermarried group, it shared a very special culture (though none of them thought of it as non-American), and it produced a disproportionate number of eminent scientists, writers, lawyers, and other professional persons. Family life and child training followed the German pattern.

Kroeber’s parents were both upper middle-class Protestants of German ancestry. Grandfather Kroeber had come to the United States when his son, Florence Kroeber, was ten years old. The date is unclear, but it was early enough so that the grandfather fought in the Civil War. Alfred Kroeber’s mother, Johanna Muller, was American-born in a German family which produced many distinguished persons.

Florence and Johanna had four children, all of whom acquired a scholarly interest, especially in natural history. Alfred, the oldest, was born in Hoboken, New Jersey, June 11, 1876, but his family moved to New York City when he was very young. His family was bilingual, but German was the household language. During childhood he was introduced to Latin and Greek. This early experience in four languages stirred an enduring interest in linguistics. He later remarked that, as a school boy, he had been intrigued by the forms, or grammars, of languages, but had preferred Greek and Latin because English was too simple.

At seven or eight, after having been taught at home, Alfred was placed under a private tutor, Dr. Bamberger, whom he shared with six other children. This vigorous German not only taught the three
R's, but also made geography lessons vivid through views from Brooklyn Bridge, stimulated interest in natural history by means of collecting expeditions in Central Park, and so excited his students about classical history that, during summers on Long Island, they erected forts to fight ancient battles, such as the siege of Troy.

Kroeber's formal schooling continued in the German pattern. He was sent to Sachs' Collegiate Institute, a grammar and high school, modeled on the French lycée or German gymnasium, which prepared boys for college. Except for a year, he continued here until he entered Columbia University in 1892 at the age of sixteen.

These formative years established the fundamental characteristics of the man: a vast range of interests with special emphasis on natural history, a love of languages, an extraordinary aesthetic perceptiveness, and a strong sense of workmanship, or willingness to do thoroughly all the grubby little chores required of first-rate scholarship. Carl Alsberg described the young Kroeber as shy and reserved but always an independent thinker and a dissenter. While an undergraduate at Columbia College, he and a small circle of friends founded a magazine which, though mainly literary, barred no holds on criticism of any subject, including the university.

THE MAN

During the thirty-five years that I knew Kroeber he always seemed a miraculously well-integrated, smoothly functioning man. It is hard to imagine a person who showed fewer internal conflicts, worked with less lost motion, and managed more felicitously to combine an extremely happy family life with monumental professional accomplishments. His economy of effort was manifest in his ability to read at high speed and absorb essentials, and to write with an extraordinary cogency, conciseness, and choice of words.

Kroeber's adult life was a continuation of the childhood and teenage pattern, which had created a rare singleness of purpose. He always had boundless curiosity, and would discuss new ideas for hours. He had an uncanny grasp of the essential qualities of poetry, art,
music, and religious and philosophical ideas, which were of major importance in his characterization of cultural styles. And he had little time for the trivia of modern life. His basic interests were at once the substance and spice of life. He was always earnest and dedicated, but not solemn; intensely purposeful but not oppressively or domineeringly so. In fact, he always accepted life exuberantly, and enjoyed people and gossip enormously. Another facet of the same character was a slowness to anger.

CHOOSING A PROFESSION

When Kroeber was an undergraduate, anthropology did not exist as a distinct, unified academic discipline at Columbia University. Prior to Franz Boas' appointment to the faculty in 1896, Livingston Farrand (later to become President of Cornell University) was Lecturer in physical psychology and gave a course on primitive culture, and W. V. Ripley, a specialist on railroad economics (known for his *Races of Europe*), taught a course on physical geography and anthropology. Boas, trained as a physicist and later a geographer, had been employed as an anthropologist at Clark University, the Field Museum in Chicago, and at the American Museum of Natural History before his appointment to Columbia University. Columbia was not very different from other universities of that era, when anthropology—which had earlier been represented only in museums, and largely by amateurs—was being introduced into universities by diverse expediencies and had not yet achieved the unity we know today.

Kroeber entered Columbia College with an interest in English and literature, and he went on to take an M.A. degree in English in 1897 (thesis: "The English Heroic Play"), served as Teaching Assistant for two years (1897-99), and taught a course in eighteenth-century English literature. His conversion to anthropology was in part a gradual intellectual seduction. He had not taken Farrand's or Ripley's courses as an undergraduate. Sheer curiosity led him to take Boas' language seminar in 1896, but this flamed into enthusiasm when
the students worked with Eskimo and Chinook informants in New York City. Kroeber went on to take other courses in anthropology, and, in 1899 and 1900, did field work among the Arapaho, Ute, Shoshone, and Bannock tribes. In 1899-1900, he accepted a fellowship in anthropology and elected psychology as his minor. He prepared and defended his Ph.D. dissertation in the spring of 1901.\footnote{Kroeber presents some of this information in \textit{Franz Boas: The Man}, Mem. Am. Anthropol. Assoc., 61:5-26, 1943. There are other reminiscences in his unpublished "Anthropology at Columbia."}

Kroeber's gradual immersion in anthropology via his linguistic and natural history interests has something of the inevitable. But Alsberg, his closest friend at this time, discloses another motivation for his choosing anthropology and thereby an important, although largely covert, idealism. Alsberg, a chemist, argued against Kroeber's going into research in a subject so "vague, inchoate and intangible," to which Kroeber replied that "a result in chemistry or physics . . . was not likely to affect men's thinking and to make for progress in the only way that was worth while . . . to free men intellectually. The confused thinking about religion was perhaps the most important bar to man's progress and freedom." Kroeber's interest in cultural values many years later was more than a humanist's view of styles or contexts. He treated the questions of objective or scientific criteria of progress quite explicitly in several papers, and yet he eschewed programs of research aimed at social reform. Apparently he wished to create a perspective and to destroy ethnocentric thinking without committing himself to problems of human welfare.

\textbf{BUILDING ANTHROPOLOGY AT CALIFORNIA}

Kroeber began his professional career at the University of California in Berkeley in 1901, a time when anthropology was marked by fundamental trends to which Kroeber repeatedly called attention. Rather parallel in different institutions, it deeply affected the employment of anthropologists and the nature of their work. At first everywhere a museum subject, anthropology had acquired two compo-
nants: one, natural science, concerned with collections, classification, and natural history; the other, humanistic, concerned especially with aesthetic features that lent themselves to exhibits. The third component, social science, was added later, after anthropology became associated with economics, sociology, political science, psychology, and geography in the universities. These three components were to make anthropology unique in its threefold affiliation with research councils: the National Research Council, owing especially to physical anthropology and archaeology; the Social Science Research Council, owing to ethnography and ethnomology; and the American Council of Learned Societies, owing to its interests in linguistics, art, history, values, and other humanistic studies. Kroeber was always aware of these aspects of anthropology, and he played a major role in establishing the identity of anthropology and its foundation affiliations. At the same time, his own interests were explicitly in natural history and the humanities. He never really embraced the social science component of anthropology.

The initial impetus to anthropology at California was given by Mrs. Phoebe Hearst, a regent of the university and mother of William Randolph Hearst. Interested in art and cultural objects, she planned to build a museum for the university. In 1899, she undertook to obtain collections for it through personal contracts to bring specimens from Peru (much of this material was published later by Kroeber and his students, and led to Kroeber's field trips to Peru in the 1920's), Egypt, Greece and Rome, and California. Mrs. Hearst's interest encouraged President B. I. Wheeler of the University of California to create a Museum and Department of Anthropology in 1901.

In 1901, Kroeber and P. E. Goddard were appointed university instructors, and Mrs. Hearst paid their salaries for five years at $1200 per annum. Each taught one semester, but their principal jobs were to investigate the diversified and little-known languages and cultures of native California. Some five or six years later they taught both semesters, and Kroeber was appointed Assistant Professor and paid
from university funds. Teaching accumulated such momentum that they were able to award Samuel Barrett a Ph.D. in anthropology in 1908.

An important achievement during these early years was the establishment of the University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology, which issued monographs on California Indians and on a wide variety of subjects. This series is perhaps second in volume only to the publications of the Bureau of American Ethnology, which was begun some thirty years earlier.

The story of the museum and departmental facilities was to be one of heartbreak and delay. Mrs. Hearst encountered financial difficulties, and the museum could not be constructed. Anthropology was housed in a "temporary" building which was a corrugated iron warehouse, constructed in 1902 to store Mrs. Hearst’s collections. In 1903, the anthropology collections were moved to the unused law building of the Affiliated Colleges in San Francisco, then, in 1931, to a former engineering building on the Berkeley campus.

The hope for a new building was finally realized after six decades in 1960 when the departmental offices, library, teaching facilities, and museum—The Robert H. Lowie Museum—were housed in Kroeber Hall, which also included the Department of Art. Happily, Kroeber was present at the dedication on May 5 of that year.

After joining the university staff in 1901, Kroeber had divided his time between Berkeley and San Francisco. He became Secretary of Anthropology and eventually Head of the Department. In 1909, he became Curator of the Museum. His principal activities, however, centered in San Francisco, where he lived until 1917.

The San Francisco period was productive in research and in building museum collections from the Indians of California, but it was a time of personal tragedy. Kroeber married Henrietta Rothschild in 1906, but she contracted tuberculosis and died in 1913 after five years of lingering illness. His meager salary had barely sufficed to meet doctors’ bills.

Kroeber moved to the Faculty Club on the Berkeley campus in
1917, when the teaching department had so grown as to demand more attention. Various people came and went before the permanent staff was established. Robert H. Lowie, who had been visiting lecturer in 1917-18, was appointed permanently in 1921, the year that Kroeber sets as California’s serious advent into graduate teaching. The third member of anthropology’s teaching threesome throughout the 1920’s was Edward W. Gifford, an ornithologist who had come to the Department and Museum in 1912.

In 1925, the increasing number of graduate students included Theodora Krakow Brown, or Krakie, an attractive widow with two young sons, Clifton and Theodore. The spring semester of 1926 brought the marriage of Kroeber and Krakie. This marriage was one of the happiest I have ever seen. Krakie, whose warmth and constant good nature endears her to everyone, was the ideal anthropologist’s wife and perfect complement for Kroeber. They were rarely separated, even while their four children, Karl and Ursula who were their own, together with Ted and Clifton, were growing up. Marriage in no way slowed Kroeber’s professional output, nor did his productivity interfere with a warm family life or preclude a happy social life with their innumerable friends.

Prior to 1926, California had given two Ph.D.’s in anthropology. During the 1930’s, the number of students at Berkeley, including candidates for higher degrees, increased rapidly and the faculty expanded. Previously, the Department had taught basic fact and theory, but offered little specialized training for graduate students. Kroeber liked especially to deal with civilizations in which archaeology and ethnology were not distinguished. Despite his tremendous interest in linguistics, he offered no formal courses in the subject. His reason for not giving special courses was that of Boas, whom he quoted, “If they have shown that they are good men, they should be given their degrees, after which they will learn what they need.” Despite the absence of specialized training in such subjects as archaeology, linguistics, and physical anthropology, Kroeber’s students acquired a basic knowledge of culture which enabled many of them to achieve
eminence. The need for more specialized skills was remedied in the 1930's, when the Department began to fill out with additional appointments.

Its program continued to attract graduate students. Between 1926 and 1930, California awarded seven Ph.D.'s in anthropology, and between 1931 and Kroeber's retirement in 1946, it gave twenty-five. Since 1946, it has given fifty-seven.

In 1936, when Kroeber's sixtieth birthday was celebrated with a *festschrift* volume (see footnote 1), his professional accomplishments were more than sufficient to insure a lasting reputation. But twenty-five more productive years lay ahead. During the Second World War, a heart attack was nearly fatal, but meticulous care of his health thereafter enabled him to carry on with his usual efficiency and much the same vigor. Retirement from the University of California in 1946 at the age of seventy brought teaching offers from all parts of the country. First, however, in the spring of 1946 the Kroebers went to England, where he received the Huxley Medal. After spending the next year in Berkeley, they visited Columbia University for summer school, then spent a year at Harvard in 1947-48. From 1948 to 1952, he was Visiting Professor at Columbia University, and in early summer, 1952, he organized the Wenner-Gren World Conference on Anthropology held in New York. (This was published in *Anthropology Today*, University of Chicago Press, 1953.) In 1954, he was Visiting Professor at Brandeis University, in 1955-56, he was a Fellow of the Center for Advanced Studies in the Behavioral Sciences at Stanford, California, and in the fall of 1956 he gave the Messenger Lectures (on "Style and Civilization") at Cornell University. He visited the Center at Stanford again in the spring of 1957, was Visiting Professor at Yale University in 1958, and in the fall of 1959 had a major role in the Darwin Centennial symposium and conference at the University of Chicago. The Kroebers returned to Berkeley, and then attended the summer conference in Austria in 1960. He had planned a seminar at Berkeley on the Indians of California for the fall of 1960.
If one accepts Kroeber's date of 1860 for the beginning of "organized anthropology," his own professional activities covered six-tenths of the history of such anthropology. They expectably reflect trends begun a half century ago, but they were especially characterized by his bent for natural history and pervasively colored by his intuition and aesthetic perceptiveness. Kroeber insistently viewed phenomena of all kinds in contexts, matrices, or wholes. His lifelong endeavor or goal was to understand the nature of the contexts of cultural phenomena. He described himself as primarily—"congenitally"—a humanist and a natural historian, or natural scientist, and he expressly repudiated any contention that cultural analysis could employ the method of the physical sciences; that is, a method which isolates phenomena in order to discover particular causes and effects. Any studies he made of parts of culture always had the "adhering context" in mind.

Kroeber also disclaimed a social science orientation: "It is clear that I am not by temperament a social scientist" (1952). This statement, however, seems to reflect partly a disinclination to deal with problems of human welfare, which strongly oriented much social science, and partly his own strong intellectual roots in the humanistic and natural science components of anthropology, which were put down during his youth. Kroeber's lack of social science orientation also derived from a disinclination to deal with the microscopic analyses and correlations involved in structural and functional studies.

Kroeber's early interest in languages, natural history, and contexts predisposed him to accept those precepts of Boas' teaching that have become basic in American anthropology: first, unrelenting empiricism, which repudiated the earlier deductive systematizers and theoreticians who had arranged cultural data in various a priori categories and developmental schemes; second, stress upon the primary importance of intensive first-hand ethnographic field work.
Probably no anthropologist has spent as many years as Kroeber collecting and dealing with original cultural data or furthering field research programs.

Kroeber also followed Boas in the cultural relativistic view: the concept that each cultural pattern or configuration is unique, different from all others, and comprehensible only in terms of itself. This led to a lifetime of inquiry about the "nature of culture"—about how to characterize cultures and diagnose their distinguishing stylistic features. A classificatory scheme which has a special category for each culture does not, of course, lend itself to generalizations, to abstractions of form and function, or to deductions or inferences concerning causality, processes, or regularities. Hence, Kroeber's repudiation of cultural laws or scientific generalizations.

Kroeber differed from Boas in several crucial respects. Deeply interested from childhood in history, he added time depth to the essentially synchronic ethnology of Boas and most of Boas' students, who were less opposed to than uninterested in utilizing historical data. Kroeber observed that Americans tended to view the past "not as a receding stereoscopic continuum but as a uniform non-present" (1950).

He was also uncompromising in his insistence that culture should be conceptualized in Herbert Spencer's terms as phenomena of a superorganic level: that culture derives from culture, and that conceptualizations or explanations—"reductionism"—which introduce psychological, organic, or environmental factors are indefensible. Kroeber's history was superorganic and supra-individual; it was deterministic and had no place for the great man theory. Kroeber's conviction that culture is superorganic influenced his views on psychology and anthropology. As an anthropologist, he was no more interested in the effect of culture upon the individual (the culture and personality approach) than in the effect of the individual upon culture (the great man theory of history). During the 1930's, the cultural and personality approach began to offer a means of placing the characterization of cultural contexts upon a psychological rather
than stylistic basis. These studies, which at first were based strongly upon psychoanalysis, assumed that cultural personality types were formed during childhood, owing to specific socializing processes, and were later projected into cultural patterns of adult life. Despite having taken a graduate minor in psychology, having been psychoanalyzed for three months in 1920, having maintained an office and practiced psychoanalysis successfully in San Francisco between 1921 and 1923, Kroeber remained uncompromisingly opposed to reductionism. Personality problems at a psychological level, which he regarded as directed toward personality betterment (The Nature of Culture, 1952, p. 108), were a different matter from cultural problems at a superorganic or sociocultural level.

One of his greatest works, Configurations of Culture Growth (1944), deals with the superorganic nature of culture, especially with respect to individual geniuses, who cluster at climaxes or culminations in human history. The book undertakes to show that individual achievements express but do not explain cultural climaxes. Inherent ability was given scope by high points of civilization, and obversely the scarcity of great men during periods of cultural decline or dark ages was the function of contexts that caused genius to remain latent. Like his studies of women's fashions, the intent was to show that culture changes according to its own tendencies. He was not concerned, as some have thought, with any inherent periodicity or regularity in rhythms of particular phenomena.

Kroeber's lifelong position that cultural phenomena must be viewed in their context was clearly set forth in his doctoral dissertation on Arapaho art published in 1901. Just as any art simultaneously manifests tendencies of geometric forms to become symbols of realism and realistic forms to become conventionalized or geometric designs, so any culture consists of many interrelated and often indistinguishable tendencies. These tendencies "are both eternally living and everlastingly changing. They flow into one another; they transform themselves; they are indistinguishably combined where they coexist."

Kroeber's approach to the nature of culture was twofold. On the
one hand, he characterized cultures by means of culture element lists, that is, in terms of the minutia of their content. On the other hand, he sought major styles, philosophies, and values. The first concept is that a society, or several contiguous societies, have an agglomeration of culture elements which have no other necessary connection than the historical, or diffusional, fact of clustering territorially. Much of Kroeber's work dealt with element distributions, especially the University of California Element List Surveys during the 1930's. Areas defined by elements were given time depth by construing the distributions as historical adhesions, layered as in a cake. The most widely spread elements represented the oldest layer, which had been supplemented, or supplanted, by increments which introduced greater complexity and which modified patterns in more restricted areas, or more recent historical layers. This approach is well exemplified in *The Peoples of the Philippines* (1919) and *The Handbook of the Indians of California* (1925).

Intermediate between dealing with element content at one extreme and predominant styles at the other was attention to clusters or categories of elements, such as ceremonialism in central California, which seemed to indicate cultural emphasis.

Kroeber's treatment of styles, however, presented certain difficulties, because, like all relativistic approaches, it is essentially subjective and intuitive. Each scholar can devise his own terms and view culture according to his own interests. Boas had written of "style," of "fundamental psychic attitudes," and of the influence of cultural practices upon "man's mental life." All-pervasive attitudes are glimpsed in some of Boas' ethnographies, but they are far from explicit. Ruth Benedict, in *Patterns of Culture*, was more satisfyingly explicit in her use of analogies drawn from Greek mythology, such as using "Dionysian" for the pervading frenzy alleged to have characterized Plains Indian behavior and "Apollonian" as descriptive of the serenity of the Pueblo, and her book continues to be a best seller. Kroeber sympathized with Benedict's humanistic characterization of wholes, but denied that "pattern" so conceived was a factor that in-
tegrated—was the binding force of—the whole culture. He not only conceived style as more than aesthetic or literary characterizations, but also eventually, if incidentally, introduced some structural characteristics.

In 1951 he described style as “a self-consistent way of behaving . . . selected out from among alternatively possible ways . . . And it is selective with reference to values”; that is, culture ascribes special value to particular themes or interests (The Nature of Culture, 1952, p. 402). He distinguished styles from “reality culture,” that is, ways of living, including technology, and from “social structure and relations” (see below). “The style [also called cultural style pattern (p. 407)] successively forms, develops, matures, decays, and either dissolves or atrophies into a dead petrification” (p. 403), or it may disintegrate and reconstitute itself as a new style. Its history is irreversible. This approach to style is one of descriptive analysis. “The causes of qualities and values are . . . difficult to find. We can do little more than describe the circumstances amid which a style forms” (p. 403, italics mine). Kroeber stated that the styles—pattern values or directions—of the High Middle Ages of Europe after A.D. 900 included: total commitment to Christianity, a sense of nationalism, Romanesque-Gothic architecture, stained glass, sculpture, revival of learning, Scholastic philosophy. This was followed by the beginning of the Modern Western Civilization: wider geographic knowledge, trade, civilian architecture, painting, weakening of the Church, development of science, new kinds of philosophy, and printing (pp. 405-7).

Kroeber's conception of culture was thus inseparably part of his sense of history, and his erudition made him uniquely competent to take the grand view. He constantly saw changes in styles as flows and continua, pulses, culminations and diminutions, convergences and divergences, divisions, blends and cross-currents by which cultures develop and mutually influence one another. He dealt with culture history in all parts of the world and in all periods from the Palaeolithic to the present day.
It is as a social scientist that Kroeber is most difficult to assess. In 1940 he explained that by “natural science,” in contrast to social science, he meant an approach that was “empirical, inductive, and free of any motivation of applicability or social control.” This was really a repudiation of interest in human welfare problems. He concluded that standard ethnography, archaeology, and culture history in terms both of disparate traits or culture elements and of wholes follows the methodology of language studies, whereas, “in contrast, consciously functional anthropology, social anthropology, and sociology tend to be non-historical, reductionist, and interested in cause” (The Nature of Culture, 1952, p. 107). Frequently he cited linguistic studies as the model of his superorganic and historical view of culture. Parts of speech would lose meaning if isolated from the grammars or structures of language; language forms cannot be explained by psychological processes operating through particular individuals; they are significant essentially in their historicity (see “Causes in Culture,” 1952, pp. 107-9).

This dichotomy between natural science and social science is more a declaration of Kroeber’s personal interests than of inherent logic. A functional-historical approach is conceivable, and some of us have used it. Reductionism may be necessary if one is interested in breaking out of the culture-comes-from-culture formulation and in seeking causes or processes, such as the effects of demographic trends or ecological adaptations upon culture; but regularities may also be formulated in purely culturological terms. While I cannot agree that functionalism need be concerned with “timeless process,” as Kroeber contends, it is true that process is normally an abstraction, whether of synchronic or diachronic relationships, that is derived from more than one culture and therefore partly removed from the reality of particulars. Kroeber, in short, was concerned more with style than with structure, more with the particulars of individual histories than with generalized process and more with wholes than with parts.

Characterizations of culture, including Kroeber’s, used ethos, styles,
values, patterns, and other relativistic diagnostics, which were inherently ill-adapted for a comparative or developmental taxonomy that would disclose processes of change. Until the 1930's, folklore, religion, art, and other humanistic aspects of culture had, in fact, a far more central place than structure in cultural studies. Kroeber was aware that cultural taxonomy was pre-Linnaean, but this did not lead him to postulate abstract, cross-cultural categories based primarily upon structure. Characteristically, he approached problems of structures via cultural wholes, but he did suggest crucial hypotheses in several papers. These contributions have received far too little attention. Early in his career he had dealt with the problem of structure as it was then phrased: the relationship between kinship terms, marriage rules, and descent groups. This problem was derived from the nineteenth-century theories, which postulated that kinship terms reflected marriage systems that had existed in the past if not in the present. None really dealt with whole societies, such as bands, hordes, communities, tribes, or other total units of interpersonal relationships.

In 1909, Kroeber's "Classificatory Systems of Relationship" had warned against regarding kinship terms as reflections of sociological systems—especially marriage systems—when several different relatives were designated by the same term, and suggested that the terms had linguistic rather than sociological connotation and that they were psychological extensions of terms to several categories of people. In 1917, his "Zuñi Kin and Clan," one of the first major field studies directed toward kinship problems, emphasized the error of supposing that a strong clan system necessarily precluded a nuclear family system or indicated that the matrilineal clan developed before the family. He also questioned the inference that a high correlation between certain kinds of exogamous organizations and classificatory systems proved a causal connection between these isolated phenomena. Skeptical that a single sociological factor could explain a particular phenomenon, he suggested that both exogamy and kinship terms more broadly express descent systems and tendencies of the total context. He used to make a similar point in an introductory
course when he pointed out that beer drinking, eating of sauerkraut, and love of certain kinds of music had a high correlation in Germany, but were related only within the historical context and not conceivably by direct causal effect of one upon another.

His "Basic and Secondary Patterns of Social Structure" (1938, re-published in *The Nature of Culture*, 1952) relates problems of kinship systems to the larger question of what is basic or primary and what is secondary in a total culture. It offers an hypothesis for cultural taxonomy that ascribes major importance to structural features and their transformations. Starting with Radcliffe-Brown's Australian data, he uses a distributional or age-area method to infer sequential change from distributions of marriage and kinship systems, and then postulates that, in the social organization of primitive people generally, patterns of group residence and subsistence associations may be primary, or invariant, whereas clans, moieties, marriage classes, totems, and other elaborations may be secondary or "unstable embroideries on the primary patterns" (*The Nature of Culture*, 1952, p. 308).

The central question of what is basic and stable and what is secondary ran through several other works which bear crucially on the problem of cultural taxonomy. Earlier, he had found that so emotion-laden a custom as the method of disposing of the dead changed with surprising ease. His several studies of changes in women's fashions also had the central theme of relative changeability. He finally postulated a general dichotomy: first, "relatively primary and stable patterns and constituents of cultures"; and second, features which are "relatively secondary, unstable, within the field of innovation from internal cultural causes and perhaps more readily invested with conscious group emotions" (p. 309).

This problem is amenable to scientific method rather than mere intuitive insights, but it is especially difficult because it involves whole cultures rather than social structures. "I submit," he said "that, in addition to unilateral descent reckoning, much of the formalized social organization of primitive peoples is in the nature of uncon-
scious experiment and play of fashions rather than the core or substance of their culture. In certain cases, as in Australia, it may well represent the pinnacle of their achievement, just as experimentation and play with abstractions, words and plastic forms resulted in the pinnacles of Greek civilization, while science, technology, or exploitation of nature are those of our own. But the pinnacles are end products, not bases" (The Nature of Culture, 1952, p. 309).

He came at the problem of differential stability again in “Reality Culture and Value Culture” (1951, included in The Nature of Culture) wherein he noted that at least four components of culture change in their own distinctive ways. He stated, “there seems to be a certain importance in the conceptual distinction between . . . reality culture” and “value culture.” The former includes science, technology, and on occasion other aspects of culture. The latter includes ethos, morality, art, and other expressions of value. Reality culture is “largely diffusional and accumulative”; value culture is “ever re-creative.” “A third major segment, the societal, seems to be neither specifically accumulative nor specifically creative” (p. 165). Language is a fourth segment. In the 1959 Darwin Centennial he also suggested disimilarity in the history of components of culture—e.g., technology which is cumulative, art which pulses, society which is somewhat indeterminant.

An earlier essay, “Societies of Primitive Man” (1942, included in The Nature of Culture), had suggested causality in rather basic social transformations from the primitive emphasis upon kinship ties to the civilized emphasis upon political organization. “A rather vital nexus of political organization through economics with technological development can be inferred. Primitives, being weak in the latter, remained weak in the former” (p. 225). His essay on “Reality Culture and Value Culture,” however, seems to relegate the distinction between kinship-based and politically organized societies, which are categories representing a major transformation, to minor taxonomic importance, and the question of basic and secondary features is ignored.
Kroeber always remained a relativist if not a holist. In the final analysis he saw in each culture an unique emphasis upon one or several bands in the total spectrum of possible human behavior, wherein kinship systems, types of sculpture, science, and philosophy could be equally important diagnostic criteria. Since different components of culture, however, changed in their own ways and emphasis on style constantly shifted, his cultures could not flow through time as integrated wholes.

While Kroeber's substantive works are only partly separable from his theoretical contributions, the former are perhaps best known, though not necessarily of greatest importance. In total number, the ethnology of California naturally ranks first with more than seventy papers. The peak was in the 1920's and 1930's, but the interest continued throughout his life. Essays on languages, especially of California, are a close second, and eventually they exceeded ethnology. During his last decade he acquired a renewed interest in language. Articles and monographs essentially on theory, although always massively substantive, exceed the previous categories, and if general works are included, they number more than eighty. Interestingly, these show two peaks: one in the 1910's, with the first probings; the other, between 1940 and 1960, after Kroeber was sixty-four years old. Science is clearly indebted to his longevity, for most of the incisive delineations and elaborations of his views were written after an age when most persons have passed their productive years, and many were presented after his retirement. Writings on American Indian cultures were also interpretative and theoretical, and these acquired momentum after 1920. They reached a peak in the 1930's, except that Peru, one of his special fields, was the subject of some twenty-five articles between 1920 and 1960.

Kroeber was never a physical anthropologist, and, although he summarized basic information in his *Anthropology* (1923, 1948), his publications on the subject were negligible. He was active in archaeological field work, though less so than in ethnography.
This distribution of effort indicates first a substantive interest directed initially toward California cultures and languages, later toward the Western Hemisphere and Peru in particular, and eventually toward world culture history and major civilizations; and second, the unfolding of a point of view, which he might express in a discussion of arrow-release distributions, changes in burial customs, practices concerning dogs, salt and tobacco in California, fashions in women’s dress, the novel in Asia and Europe, or in terms of major historic trends, which dealt not only with world phenomena but with such interpreters as Spengler, Toynbee, and other historians. These bolder efforts came mainly within the last three decades of his life.

One of Kroeber’s greatest works was the *Handbook of the Indians of California* published in 1925. This thousand-page volume, which has long been a collector’s item, is not only a compendium of everything known about the Indians at that time, but also sets forth culture areas and subareas and their historic implications. Such ordering of data had been anticipated in several previous papers. Whereas his contemporary, Clark Wissler, delineated native New World culture areas about this same time mainly in terms of technological adaptations to distinctive environments, Kroeber tended to emphasize religious organization and belief.

By the 1930’s Kroeber and his associates undertook a four-year Element List Survey which was carried out by thirteen field workers among 254 tribes and tribal subdivisions west of the Rocky Mountains. The lists ranged from 3000 to more than 6000 elements, the presence and absence of which were recorded for each local group. The element lists were useful for distribution studies and comparisons, but they could only suggest the cultural emphases, styles, or configurations, which interested Kroeber so much; they could not record social structures, for these had not been conceptualized or broken down into significant elements so as to be amenable to such recording.

Kroeber always kept abreast of all Americanist research, but Peru
became his special interest. His aesthetic perceptiveness was especially important in sensing the stylistic relationships in Peruvian ceramics and other art manifestations that helped establish a stylistic chronology—a skeletal framework for determining time and place relationships of associated materials—upon which other understandings, e.g., social and political, depended. Kroeber's enlarged interests in cultural areas and cultural continuities led to another of his major works, *Cultural and Natural Areas in Native North America* (1939). By this time, so much was known about American Indians that no one but Kroeber, now the leading Americanist, would presume to synthesize the knowledge in a single work. Moreover, when major cooperative works were written on special areas, such as Meso-America (e.g., *The Maya and the Neighbors*), Kroeber was usually asked to write the summary, interpretative chapter. *Cultural and Natural Areas* not only delineated cultural areas, but also related them to natural areas and, more important, introduced the concept of cultural climax. Earlier element distribution studies had employed the concept of culture centers within areas, which were more complex and therefore presumed to be more inventive, and of margins, which were the simple, uninventive peripheral recipients of cultural achievements. Kroeber's concept of cultural climax avoided the implication that greatest complexity meant the locus of inventiveness, and called attention instead to cultural intensification.

Kroeber expanded the culture area concept to even larger territories of element distributions which were explainable by cultural diffusion. He enlarged his historical interpretations, and interpreted cultural development in the Western Hemisphere much as he had done in California. Later, in his Huxley lecture, "The Oikoumene" (1946), he delineated the cultural particulars, such as the arch, wheel, and alphabet, that distinguished the Old World from the New World. Underlying such global interpretations was vast knowledge of cultural history during all periods and a lifelong tendency to organize the data in terms of diffusion and distributions. A similar method of organizing data was given his students, as when we made
distributional studies of Indian games, and it underlay the element list surveys.

Finally, Kroeber's *Anthropology* (edition of 1948) is probably the most important single work ever written in anthropology. It was first published in 1923 as a modest introductory textbook because there had been no general summary since E. B. Tylor's *Anthropology* of 1881. For many years, it was the principal textbook for introductory courses in the United States. The new edition of 1948 became something else. This 850-page book gives a basic résumé of nearly all recent fields of anthropology, incisive appraisals of new trends, and statements of Kroeber's own views on subjects previously published elsewhere together with many points not made before. Its notable omission is the social science and structural components of anthropology. While the 1948 edition offers freshmen and sophomores solid fodder, it is not now the principal introductory text. But, perhaps more important, it constitutes a basic survey of modern anthropology which well serves Ph.D. candidates and all others wishing a sophisticated view.

**CONCLUDING COMMENTS**

It is impossible in a brief memorial article to do justice to a great scientist whose works are still a very living part of anthropology and related disciplines. Kroeber's place in history will be determined more by the scholars who continue to be influenced by his writings in the future than by those of us who now undertake so myopically to assess his achievements.

In histories of social science, appraisals of the great minds tend strongly to show the interests and preoccupations of the historians. The present article is a very humble attempt to suggest some of Kroeber's main achievements, but it cannot claim objectivity. The comments on Kroeber's achievements are made in the light of my own view that causes, explanations, or processes which are not peculiar to each relativistically unique culture can be identified. In spite of my differences with Kroeber, I am deeply convinced that his five-
hundred-odd publications are, and will be for many decades, an almost inexhaustible mine not only of information, but also of problems, concepts, and hypotheses which have not yet made sufficient impact upon the world of scholarship. I have tried to indicate that Kroeber frequently touched with deep insights many problems that searchers for causes might well heed. Some of his syntheses and interpretations could readily be classed as “hard science.” For example, his unpretentious summary of the parallel developments of the early Old World and New World civilization in *Anthropology* (1948), comes as near to a first-level formulation of causality, or process that operated cross-culturally, as can be made even while disavowing such intent.

Foremost among the basic scientific problems raised by Kroeber is that of classifying whole cultures. Parts of culture, such as social systems or categories of religious concepts, are amenable to cross-cultural classification. A taxonomy of whole cultures has proved to be extremely difficult; perhaps it is impossible. While Kroeber was not especially interested in taxonomy for its own sake, his constant preoccupation with the nature of culture took him vastly farther than anyone else attempting it.
**KEY TO ABBREVIATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Am. Anthropologist</td>
<td>American Anthropologist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am. Antiquity</td>
<td>American Antiquity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am. J. Physical Anthropology</td>
<td>American Journal of Physical Anthropology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am. J. Sociology</td>
<td>The American Journal of Sociology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am. Mercury</td>
<td>The American Mercury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am. Naturalist</td>
<td>The American Naturalist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am. Scholar</td>
<td>The American Scholar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am. Sociological Rev.</td>
<td>American Sociological Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology Mem. Field Mus. Natural Hist.</td>
<td>Anthropology Memoirs of the Field Museum of Natural History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian School J.</td>
<td>The Indian School Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Abnormal and Social Psych.</td>
<td>Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Am. Folk-Lore</td>
<td>Journal of American Folk-Lore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. General Educ.</td>
<td>Journal of General Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Hist. Ideas</td>
<td>Journal of the History of Ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Social Phil.</td>
<td>Journal of Social Philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menorah J.</td>
<td>The Menorah Journal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Compiled by Ann Judith Gibson and John Howland Rowe

Kroeber maintained a partial record of his own publications which served as the basis of the two bibliographies of his work which have been published:

1936


1948


* This bibliography has now been published by Gibson and Rowe in the Am. Anthropologist, 63(5)pt. 1:1060-87.
The 1936 bibliography comprises 175 entries and extends from 1898 (i.e., 1899) to 1935. The 1948 bibliography comprises 237 entries, the latest being for 1946. Mrs. Kroeber kindly made available to us her husband's notes for a continuation of his own listing to 1960.

In 1955 Chérie Ninon Gregoire prepared a bibliography of Kroeber's writings as part of a graduate research project for J. H. Rowe. It was dittoed for local circulation under the title Bibliography. A. L. Kroeber. Gregoire's list comprises 413 entries, the latest of which are for 1953. It includes some additions to the published bibliographies for the years prior to 1946.

Kroeber's own record and Gregoire's bibliography are both incomplete and contain many errors. We have, therefore, attempted to check every entry ourselves and done much searching for additional titles. The present bibliography is probably still not complete, but we hope we have not missed any major books and articles. We have probably failed to find between twenty and forty book reviews, short notes, reprints, and translations.

It is too soon, in any case, to attempt a definitive bibliography of Kroeber's writings, since he left a number of manuscripts ready or nearly ready for publication, and these will be appearing in the next few years. We have not attempted to include unpublished work in this list.

We are deeply grateful to Mrs. A. L. Kroeber, Clifton B. Kroeber, Dell H. Hymes, Robert F. Heizer, and Junius B. Bird for help in finding and checking references which we might otherwise have missed. Thomas C. Patterson corrected some of our errors and omissions.
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1899


1900

1901

1902
The Arapaho. I. General Discussion. II. Decorative Art and Symbolism.
Preliminary Sketch of the Mohave Indians. Am. Anthropologist, n. s.,
Review of The Decorative Art of the Amur Tribes, by Berthold Laufer.

1903
With Roland Burrage Dixon. The Native Languages of California. Am.
With George Amos Dorsey. Traditions of the Arapaho. Pub. Field Colum-

1904
The Languages of the Coast of California South of San Francisco. Univ.
and Ethnology, 2(3): 81-103.

1905
With Frederic Ward Putnam. The Department of Anthropology of the
Notes [to accompany] “The Obsidian Blades of California,” by Horatio

1906
The Dialectic Divisions of the Moquelumnan Family in Relation to the Imperial Differentiation of Other Linguistic Families of California. Am. Anthropologist, n. s., 8(4) 652-63.
Recent Researches by the University of California. Am. Anthropologist, n. s., 8(3) 606.
The Yokuts and Yuki Languages. In: Boas Anniversary Volume. Anthro-

1907


Aiapai, p. 31.
Altinin, p. 47.
Amaikara, p. 47.
Amen, p. 48.
Apyu, p. 70.
Aranimokw, p. 72.
Arekw, p. 82.
Ashegen, p. 100.
Bankalachi, p. 128.
Bidamarek, p. 146.
Boalkea, p. 155.
Bokninuwad, p. 158.
Bolbone, p. 158.
California, Indians of, pp. 190–91.
Chamkhai, p. 234.
Chimalakwe, pp. 269–70.
Chimariko, p. 270.
Chititiknewas, p. 286.
Chukhansi, p. 295.
Chunut, p. 298.
Chupcan, p. 298.
Costanos, p. 351.
Erner, p. 432.
Ertlerger, p. 432.
Eshpeu, p. 433.
Gidanemuk, p. 492.
Huititnom, p. 577.
Inam, p. 604.
Karakuka, p. 657.
Kilikunom, p. 688.
Kochevali, p. 720.
Lilshiknom, p. 766.
With Alexander F. Chamberlain.
Mahala Mats, p. 786.
Merip, p. 845.

The following unsigned articles are attributed to Kroeber in the 1935 bibliography:

Esselen, p. 438.
Gabrieleño, p. 480.
Karok, p. 659.
Kawia, pp. 668–69.

Luiseño, pp. 777–78.
Mariposan Family, pp. 807–8.
Mono-Paviotso, p. 932.


1908


1909

The Bannock and Shoshoni Languages. Am. Anthropologist, n. s., 11(2) :266-77.
California Basketry and the Pomo. Am. Anthropologist, n. s., 11(2) 233-49.

1910

At the Bedrock of History. Sunset, 25(3) :255-60.

Oketo, p. 114.
Olegel, p. 118.
Oler, p. 118.
Olhon, pp. 118-19.
Pohallintinleh, p. 272.
Rekwoi, p. 365.
Rumsen, p. 397.
Tachi, p. 667.
Tanom, p. 687.
Taxlipu, p. 712.
Tsahpekw, p. 821.
Tsano, p. 821.
Tuhukmache, p. 833.
Tui, p. 833.
Ukohtontilka, p. 865. Yokol, p. 999.

The following unsigned articles are attributed to Kroeber in the 1935 bibliography:

Wiyat, p. 967.


1911


1912
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1913


1914


1915


1916

What an American Saw in Germany. The Outlook, 112(2):92-95.

1917


1918


1919


Selected Readings in Anthropology, prepared by the Department of Anthropology, University of California, and the Department of Sociology,


1920
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1921


1922


1923


1924


Reviews of Los principios de la civilizacion en la sierra peruana, by Max Uhle; Origenes centroamericanos, by Max Uhle; Influencias mayas en el alto Ecuador, by Max Uhle; Los principios de las antiguas civilizaciones peruanas, by Max Uhle; Fundamentos etnicos y arqueologia de Arica y Tacna, by Max Uhle; and Civilizaciones mayoides de la costa pacifica de Sudamerica, by Max Uhle. Am. Anthropologist, n. s., 26(1):100-2.


1926


The Uhle Pottery Collections from Chancay. With appendix by Max Uhle.

1927


1928


Contributions to The Encyclopaedia Britannica; 14th ed. (London and N. Y., Encyclopaedia Britannica), 24 vols.:

Aztec, vol. 2, pp. 831-32.
Cree, vol. 6, p. 656.
Creek, vol. 6, p. 663.
Dakota, vol. 6, p. 985.
Flathead, vol. 9, p. 360.
Hokan, vol. 11, p. 634.
Iroquois, vol. 12, pp. 683-84.
Kootenay or Kutenai, vol. 13, p. 483.
Ojibwa, vol. 16, p. 753.
Pueblo, vol. 18, pp. 753-54.
Uto-Aztecan family, vol. 22, p. 915.


1930


Cultural Relations between North and South America. Proc. 23rd Internat. Congress Americanists, held at New York, pp. 5-22.


1931


The Seri. Southwest Museum Papers, no. 6. 60 pp.


1932

Arapaho, North American Plains Indian Elements of Beaded and Quill Work Designs. (American Indian color key chart adaptable to textile and novelty design, by Appolonia H. Cassidy.) N. Y., American Indian Art Series.


1933


A Supplement to Anthropology, 1923-33. N. Y., Harcourt, Brace. 32 pp.

1934


1935

Editor's Preface. In: Walapai Ethnography, by Fred Kniffen, Gordon MacGregor, Robert McKennan, Scudder Mekeel, and Maurice Mook, ed.


1936


1937


1938


1939


**1940**


1941


1942


On “An Interpretation of the Prehistory of the Eastern United States.” Am. Antiquity, 7(3) :326.


1943


1944


1945


1946


1947


Review of The Meeting of East and West: An Inquiry Concerning World
1948


1949


“La arqueología peruana en 1942.” Traducción del inglés de los primeros capítulos del libro de igual título, hecha por el Dr. Manuel G. Suárez Polar, catedrático del curso de Arqueología. Revista, órgano de la Universidad Nacional de San Agustín de Arequipa, año XXI, no. 29, primer semestre de 1949, pp. 48-66.


With Lea Van P. Miller, Barbara Armstrong, and Hope M. Gladding.

1950


1951

Great Art Styles of Ancient South America. In: The Civilizations of An-


Elements of Culture in Native California, pp. 3-67 (1922).


The History of Native Culture in California, pp. 104-20 (1923).


California Basketry and the Pomo, pp. 251-63 (1909).

Mission Indian Basketry Designs, pp. 269-75 (1932).


A Kato War, pp. 397-403 (1928).

The World Renewal Cult of North West California, pp. 404-11 (1949, pp. 1-5).

Principal Local Types of the Kuksu Cult, pp. 412-22 (The Patwin and their neighbors, 1932, pp. 396-402, 408, 411, 417-20).


The Viking Fund and Anthropology. The First Ten Years, 1941-1951, including a report on the Fund's activities for the year ending January 31, 1951 (N. Y., The Viking Fund, Inc.), pp. 4-12.
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1952


1953

Le concept de culture au point de vue scientifique. Profils, no. 4, pp. 131–60. Brooklyn, N. Y., Intercultural Publications, Inc. Traduction de P. N. The Concept of Culture in Science. Perspectives USA, no. 4, pp. 126–54. Brooklyn, N. Y., Intercultural Publications, Inc. (Also in British, French, German, and Italian editions.)


The Delimitation of Civilizations. J. Hist. Ideas, 14(2) :264–75.


Handbook of the Indians of California. Berkeley, California Book Com-
pany, Ltd., [4], xviii + 995 pp. Photolithographic facsimile with an additional foreword by the author.


1954


1955


Integration of the Knowledge of Man. In: *The Unity of Knowledge*, ed. by Lewis Leary (Garden City, N. Y., Doubleday), pp. 125–49.


1956

Las colecciones cerámicas de Uhle de la región de Ica por Kroeber y Strong. Revista del Museo Regional de Ica, 7(8):10–38. Translated by Ernesto Tabío.


1957
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1959


1960


Selections in: *Selected Papers from the American Anthropologist*, 1888-

1961

