

Alfred Kroeber and the Photographic Representation of California Indians

IRA JACKNIS

Although Alfred Kroeber is universally regarded as the founder of California Indian studies,¹ his important use of the camera as an ethnographic tool is virtually unknown. In fact, Kroeber was one of the first anthropologists to photograph California native peoples.

California has never attracted as many photographers as other regions of Native America, such as the Southwest,² most likely because of the rapid depopulation and massive acculturation of California Indians. By the time of Kroeber's fieldwork at the turn of the century, there were comparatively few native people left in the state, and from a naive, Anglo perspective, they did not *look* particularly native.

Most of the earliest surviving photographs of California Indians are by a handful of professional photographers.³ In the fall of 1892, Henry W. Henshaw photographed the Pomo living near Ukiah for the Smithsonian's Bureau of American Ethnology.⁴ With these pictures, Henshaw became probably the first photographer of California Indians who made his living as an anthropologist—although his training had been in biology. Several years later, in 1899, Roland Dixon, a Harvard graduate student working for the American Museum of Natural History, began to photograph the Maidu. About the same time, Pliny Goddard, a

Ira Jacknis is associate research anthropologist at the Phoebe Hearst Museum of Anthropology, University of California, Berkeley. In addition to visual anthropology, his interests include museology, the history of anthropology, and the art and culture of the Indians of western North America.

Quaker missionary among the Hupa, was also taking pictures, which he published later, when he was an anthropologist at the University of California.⁵ Finally, in 1901, just before Kroeber joined the University of California, Dr. Philip M. Jones took a series of California Indian pictures for Phoebe Hearst, the founder of the university's Museum of Anthropology.

When Alfred Kroeber first arrived in California in the summer of 1900, he was still in the middle of research for the American Museum of Natural History in New York. Born in 1876, Kroeber had grown up in Manhattan and had attended Columbia University. While a graduate student in the late 1890s, he came under the influence of Franz Boas, who initiated him into anthropology. During the summers of 1899, 1900, and 1901, Kroeber made three collecting trips to the Arapaho and other Plains tribes, sponsored by the American Museum. We know that he used a camera on these expeditions, but the photos do not seem to have survived.⁶

In August 1900, Kroeber was appointed curator of anthropology at the California Academy of Sciences in San Francisco. After six weeks spent reviewing the collections, Kroeber set out on a collecting trip, first to the north and the Yurok, Hupa, and Karuk around the Klamath River and then south to the Mohave. Since the academy could not afford to pay for collections, which were usually donated, he ended his collecting trip by Christmas.

In late spring of the following year, Kroeber was offered a position in the new museum, then being formed under the patronage of Phoebe Apperson Hearst,⁷ and in the Department of Anthropology at the University of California. At its inception, the program's mission was collecting and research; teaching was to be postponed. At the museum, Kroeber began with an unspecified curatorial position and was officially appointed curator in 1908; he became the museum's director in 1925.⁸ His initial academic position was that of instructor (1901–1906), although he did not start teaching until spring 1902.⁹ Gradually, teaching occupied more and more time of his time.

Alfred Kroeber was overwhelmingly a literary person.¹⁰ He had been an English major in college, taking a master's degree in the subject in 1897. Accordingly, as an ethnographer his preferred subjects were language and myth, his preferred medium pencil and notebook. Working in an embracive, Boasian framework,¹¹ however, Kroeber made use of mechanical recording devices—cameras and especially phonographs—to document native life.




PHOTO 1. Alfred Kroeber photographing Ishi, a Yahi, as he binds points on a salmon harpoon, Deer Creek, Tehama County, California. Photograph by Dr. Saxton T. Pope, 14 May–2 June 1914. (Phoebe Hearst Museum of Anthropology, UC Berkeley, neg. no. 15-5835)

ETHNOGRAPHIC AIMS

Like that of all ethnographers, Alfred Kroeber's fieldwork practice stemmed from his fundamental conception of the ethnological project. Three aspects deserve attention here: the creation of an objective record, the need for survey and comparison, and the construction of an "ethnographic present."

Kroeber took from his mentor Franz Boas a multimedia approach to recording native cultures—including texts (primarily in native languages), ethnographic observations, sound recordings, artifacts, and photographs. All were discrete objects in some way, and all ultimately could be preserved in a museum or archive.¹² Commenting on Kroeber's fieldwork methodology, historian

Timothy Thoresen has noted, "A trip that began with a search for baskets among the Yurok, for example, might well result also in notebooks full of lists of names for Yurok habitation sites with estimated population, information on house types, statements of both reported and observed practices, and several myths with comments on the informants."¹³ For Kroeber, however, the visual world of photographs and artifacts was secondary to the verbal realm of linguistic notes and texts (folklore), and an examination of his fieldwork activity reveals that he spent relatively little time in artifact collecting and even less in photography.

Kroeber spent much of the first decade of his career in intensive fieldwork among the Indians of California. Though broad, this research was essentially shallow, at least during those early years. Confronted by the enormous cultural, social, and linguistic diversity of native California, Kroeber's response was survey and mapping.¹⁴ As he noted to Boas in 1903, "[V]irtually all of my field work has been essentially comparative."¹⁵ In that year, this ongoing work was formally institutionalized as the Archaeological and Ethnological Survey of California, with the financial support of Phoebe Hearst.¹⁶ Kroeber's dedication to survey explains the great diversity of native groups that he recorded in just a few short years, and it may have discouraged him from focusing on the minute and concrete aspects of culture best captured by the camera.

Ultimately, in fact, photography could not answer the ethnological questions that Kroeber asked. His research was dedicated to the reconstruction of a native past that no longer existed.¹⁷ As he explained in the preface to his summarizing *Handbook of the Indians of California*, his mission was to "reconstruct and present the scheme within which these people in ancient and more recent times lived their lives. It is concerned with their civilization—at all events the appearance they presented on discovery, and whenever possible an unraveling, from such indications as analysis and comparison now and then afford, of the changes and growth of their culture."¹⁸ Kroeber went on to explain that he was omitting "accounts of the relations of the natives with the whites and of the events befalling them after such contact was established."¹⁹ He would, he added, consider postcontact culture only when necessary to "form an estimate of an ancient vanished culture." The lives of native Californians had changed immensely since contact, especially in such crucial aspects of material culture as clothing and houses. Even their bodies had changed, with significant degrees of intermarriage. The camera could be of little use in

documenting "the appearance they presented on discovery." It could not record a vanished culture.

OVERVIEW

Since most of Kroeber's fieldwork, especially of Californian peoples, was sponsored by the University of California, it is not surprising that all of his surviving original photographs are in the collections of the Hearst Museum of Anthropology (formerly, the Lowie Museum) at the Berkeley campus. Although museum records make it difficult to determine precisely which photographs are Kroeber's, 548 images appear to have been taken by him. Especially in his early years, Kroeber employed a smaller, more portable camera (with 3-1/2-by-3-1/2-inch film), instead of the larger glass-plate devices used by many professionals.²⁰

Kroeber's photography naturally corresponds to the people, places, and dates of his more general ethnographic fieldwork. Some of his pictures were taken in 1901, but most of his early photography came in 1902, when he spent several months in the field. For the following few years, academic duties kept him close to home. The next substantial body of photographs—in fact, the bulk of his work in this medium—was produced in 1907, when he took many portraits as part of a survey of the physical anthropology of California natives. Undoubtedly, he was also impelled by the knowledge that the department's founder and benefactor, Phoebe Hearst, would be drastically reducing her funding in 1908.²¹ Kroeber's last ethnographic photographs were twenty images of the Seri of Baja California, taken in March 1930.

Although Kroeber collected artifacts from at least eighteen different groups before 1918—when he finished work on the *Handbook*—his photography was much more restricted. He documented only three groups substantially: the Yurok (188), the Yahi (122), and the Hupa (102). Four more were modestly recorded: the Karuk (37), the Cahuilla (32), the Mohave (29), and the Seri (20); and four were subjects of essentially miscellaneous photography: the Yokuts (7), the Luiseño (5), the Wintun (3), and the Southeastern Pomo (3).

The Yurok were virtually the first California group that Kroeber encountered, and they were, by far, the principal subject of his ethnography during his long career.²² In contrast to other native groups, which Kroeber usually photographed only once, the Yurok were visually documented repeatedly—in 1901, 1902, 1906,

and 1907. Of these pictures, eighty-nine depicted people and seventy-two were of scenery and sites.

The second most popular subject of Kroeber's photography was Ishi, the last Yahi Indian, who lived at the Anthropology Museum of the University of California from September 1911 until his death in March 1916. In May 1914, Kroeber took Ishi and a research team back to Ishi's homeland in the Deer Creek area of Tehama County, in northeastern California. For a month, Ishi demonstrated the now-vanished customs of his people, which Kroeber and his friends documented in about 150 images (about one-half of the Ishi photo collection at the museum).

Another relatively large body of Kroeber photographs were of the Hupa of the Trinity River area, also in northwestern California. All of his Hupa photographs were taken in 1907, nominally for the physical anthropology survey. Generally, Kroeber had left Hupa ethnography and photography to his university colleague Pliny Goddard, just as he had left recording of the Pomo to his student Samuel Barrett, and the Maidu to Roland Dixon's expeditions, sponsored by the American Museum of Natural History.

Without doubt, the major subject of Kroeber's photography was people, with most photos taken on his 1907 survey of physical anthropology. The second most common subject is scenery, with material culture (houses and artifact production/use) a distant third.

THINGS

Although not remembered today as a museum anthropologist, Kroeber actually did a fair amount of artifact collecting.²³ However, unlike other ethnographic photographers—men like James Mooney or even Franz Boas—Kroeber took very few pictures of portable objects (baskets, drums, bows, etc.). In several photos, he did record in a field setting artifacts that he subsequently collected for the museum—for example, a Yurok door and some baskets.²⁴

Architecture—family and sweat houses—was the principal subject of his material culture images. In keeping with his salvage motives, Kroeber recorded only the old-style plank houses that were rapidly becoming obsolete, instead of the Western-style milled frame houses in which most Yurok were living at the time. However, in the several important shots of house interiors, one can discern tin cans and other items of modern life.

Kroeber took very few shots of technological process, of objects being made and used. Most in this category depict fishing along



PHOTO 2. *Interior of an old Mohave home, near Needles, California. Photograph by Alfred Kroeber, 1908. (Phoebe Hearst Museum of Anthropology, UC Berkeley, neg. no. 15-4340)*

the Klamath River. Furthermore, Kroeber took few sequence shots of related stages in a given activity (e.g., pottery-making or dancing).²⁵ The principal exception occurred during the 1914 trip with Ishi to Deer Creek (see below).

PLACES

Kroeber took many pictures of scenery in native territory, especially in the Klamath River area. At first glance these images, with no sign of human occupation, appear to be devoid of ethnological

interest, but closer investigation (documented in the writing of Kroeber and his colleagues) reveals that they illustrate sites important to native mythology or ritual. Following, perhaps, the cultural emphases of a riverine people, Kroeber also linked some of his photos spatially, constructing a panorama along a river or mountain valley by taking two or three contiguous and overlapping shots.²⁶



PHOTO 3. Boulder at the edge of the Klamath River, near the Yurok village of Merip. In his Yurok Geography of 1920, T.T. Waterman writes, "This boulder was once a wo'ge or immortal, who tried to prevent death from coming into the world. Having failed, he took up his abode here, but still has an aversion to corpses. When a dead body is being taken up or down the river it has to be landed and carried behind this rock. Women also land from canoes and walk around on shore." Photograph by Alfred Kroeber, ca. 1901. (Phoebe Hearst Museum of Anthropology, UC Berkeley, neg. no. 15-1348)

Although such an approach was not unknown among ethnographic photographers of his time,²⁷ Kroeber's extensive interest in this sphere reveals an acute sensitivity to native worldview. Native peoples of northwestern California regarded their surroundings as the sites of great events during mythic times. In adopting this perspective, Kroeber recalls the native interests revealed in photographs by George Hunt, the Kwakiutl assistant of Franz Boas.²⁸ What is striking, for our argument, is that these pictures are devoid of a physical or surface meaning. That is, they derive their significance from intangibles, from what is not seen, and thus they are yet another sign of Kroeber's interest in a primarily verbal ethnography.

PEOPLE

Most of Kroeber's photographs of people were taken on his 1907 physical anthropology survey. Although many are indeed the kinds of head shots, posed in linked frontal and profile pairs, that would be suitable for such a survey, others are of groups of children, whole figures shot from a distance, which would be of little use for any scientific investigation. By Kroeber's time, such physical type photography had a long tradition in anthropology but one that would not last much longer.²⁹ Kroeber measured many of these individuals (keyed to his field notes in the museum's photo catalogue).

Generally, the people in the photos are dressed in their everyday, Western attire; a few wear ceremonial regalia. Unlike Edward Curtis or even Franz Boas, Kroeber made no effort to dress them in aboriginal clothes,³⁰ probably because he did not intend to use the photos for public consumption, and/or because it would have taken too much time and effort away from his priority of writing.

Many of the people Kroeber photographed were related; in separate shots he recorded generations of grandparents, parents, and children. At least on his 1907 survey, his photography was quite comprehensive; he was able to take pictures of 93 Hupa people (21 men, 14 women, and 58 children) out of a total population of 420.³¹

The photographs of Ishi are the largest body of Kroeber's portraits. He shared the photographic duties on the 1914 expedition with Dr. Saxton Pope, Ishi's friend and physician. Given Pope's keen interest in archery, it comes as no surprise that he took most of the pictures of Ishi using bow and arrow.

In many respects, this Ishi series is unusual in Kroeber's oeuvre. While living in San Francisco, Ishi wore Western-style clothes: typically, trousers, shirt, jacket, and shoes. Although he went up to Deer Creek in these clothes, Kroeber had him strip down for performances to be documented by the camera (sequences documenting fire-making, bow and arrow-making, hunting, fishing). In these photos, Ishi wears a loincloth that he may never have worn before coming into the white world; Yahi men formerly had worn a variety of animal skin robes, blankets, and aprons.³² In fact, although Ishi and his family had been attempting to flee from "civilization," he lived his entire life in a world formed by whites.



PHOTO 4. Three Hupa boys (left to right: Wilson Pratt, Hopi Sam, Frank Davis). Hoopa Indian Reservation, California. Photograph by Alfred Kroeber, 16 May–23 June 1907. (Phoebe Hearst Museum of Anthropology, UC Berkeley, neg. no. 15-3659)

Along with glass-bottle projectile points and metal spoons, the Yahi of Ishi's time also used cloth hats and denim bags.³³

The marked differences between the Ishi corpus and the rest of Kroeber's photographic portraits is a reflection of the special place that Ishi occupied in Kroeber's research. First, Ishi was a major public sensation, and Kroeber may have felt more of a compulsion to dress him up (or, rather, down). Perhaps significantly, he used a larger, 5-x-7-inch camera for the Ishi series, thereby ensuring a better, more detailed image. More generally, with an ethnography predicated on salvage and the vanishing Indian, Kroeber believed that Ishi was the closest he had come to an untouched California aboriginal. These would be the photographs that he could never get.

PUBLICATION OF PHOTOGRAPHS

Alfred Kroeber used relatively few photos in his publications, and when he did, they were minimally captioned. His most extensively illustrated publication is his summary reference work, the *Handbook of the Indians of California*.³⁴ In the photographs, like the text itself, he supplements his own research with the work of his students and colleagues.

Generally, Kroeber's presentation of his images is very close to how he originally photographed them, with little cropping, enlargement, or retouching. Through his captions, he constructed an "ethnographic present." Although Kroeber often knew the names of his subjects, none of the people illustrated in the *Handbook* are identified by personal name. Even the pictures of Ishi shooting a bow and drilling fire are identified as "Yahi" instead of with Ishi's name.³⁵ Nor did Kroeber date any of his photographs in the captions until after 1940, when he began to publish his research in collaboration with his students. By then, these images had achieved a kind of historical significance.

In fact, Kroeber seems to have made the most extensive use of photographs quite late in his life, when he coauthored two important monographs with younger colleagues. Both were on north-western California subjects—on World Renewal ceremonies and on fishing. The former volume contains a comparison between an 1890s photo by Augustus Ericson and a 1902 version by Kroeber of the same Yurok sweat house, with a consideration of the changes; the latter volume includes a good deal of analysis based directly on photographic evidence.³⁶ Given the marked difference




PHOTO 5. Ishi making fire with a fire drill, Deer Creek, Tehama County, California. Photograph by Alfred Kroeber, 14 May–2 June 1914. (Phoebe Hearst Museum of Anthropology, UC Berkeley, neg. no. 15-5763)




PHOTO 6. Ishi making fire with a fire drill, outside the University of California Museum of Anthropology, San Francisco, c. 1911–15. Photograph by Dr. Saxton T. Pope. (Phoebe Hearst Museum of Anthropology, UC Berkeley, neg. no. 15-6275)

between these approaches and those publications authored solely by Kroeber, one may conclude that such photographic sophistication derives from Kroeber's student colleagues.³⁷

LEGACY

Research on the visual imagery of California Indians has not progressed enough to allow us to make an adequate comparison of Alfred Kroeber's work with that of his colleagues: fellow ethnographers such as Roland Dixon, Pliny Goddard, C. Hart Merriam, and John P. Harrington; students such as Samuel A. Barrett and Edward W. Gifford; collectors John W. Hudson and Grace Nicholson; and professional photographers such as Augustus W. Ericson, who preceded Kroeber, and Edward Curtis, who came after.³⁸

However, a few comparisons are striking. Conspicuously absent in Kroeber's oeuvre are ceremonial images of the Hupa and Yurok like those taken by his predecessor, Augustus W. Ericson.³⁹ Ericson had to overcome a good bit of resistance to take these pictures; perhaps Kroeber's need to establish rapport encouraged him to respect native wishes. Another possible reason was that Kroeber's summer trips did not coincide with the usual times of these ceremonies. Compared to Edward Curtis, Kroeber seems to have recorded Indian people as he found them, not dressing them up in archaic clothing (with the notable exception of Ishi) or in ceremonial regalia, which they wore only at special occasions.

Alfred Kroeber's photographs have come to serve as some of our principal sources for the visual image of native Californians. They figure prominently in the major photographic album devoted to the subject, *Almost Ancestors*, as well as the recent magazine, *News from Native California*.⁴⁰ Perhaps the most interesting and most extensive use of his pictures was by his widow, Theodora Kroeber, in her influential biography of Ishi.⁴¹ Relying heavily on the 1914 Deer Creek series, Theodora Kroeber followed her husband's lead in situating Ishi as a precontact aborigine, further contributing to the creation of a mythical, in fact timeless, "ethnographic present."

In the last decade, however, native Californian cultures have been restored to their temporal position. The recent revitalization of these cultures has generated an intensive search for any and all records of earlier times. Native people are now the most interested and dedicated users of these ethnographic collections. Alfred

Kroeber's photographs have been given a relevance and active use that would probably have surprised but not displeased him.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

For invaluable assistance in locating and evaluating the Kroeber photographs, I would like to thank Mary Johenk, undergraduate at University of California, Berkeley. For stimulating conversations and guidance, I thank Eugene Prince, photographer, Hearst Museum, and Sally McLendon, City University of New York.

NOTES

1. Robert F. Heizer, "History of Research," in *California*, ed. Heizer, vol. 8 of *Handbook of North American Indians*, ed. William C. Sturtevant (Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution, 1978), 8; Sylvia Brakke Vane, "California Indians, Historians, and Ethnographers," *California History* 71 (1992): 335.

2. Unfortunately, there is no comprehensive review of California Indian photography; see Theodora Kroeber and Robert F. Heizer, *Almost Ancestors: The First Californians* (San Francisco: Sierra Club, 1968). For prephotographic representations in drawings, paintings, and etchings, see Theodora Kroeber, Albert B. Elsasser, and Robert F. Heizer, *Drawn from Life: California Indians in Pen and Brush* (Socorro, NM: Ballena Press, 1977).

3. Peter E. Palmquist, "Mirror of Our Conscience: Surviving Photographic Images of California Indians Produced Before 1860," *Journal of California Anthropology* 5 (1978): 163–78.

4. Sally McLendon, "Preparing Museum Collections for Use as Primary Data in Ethnographic Research," in *The Research Potential of Anthropological Museum Collections*, ed. Anne-Marie Cantwell, James B. Griffin, and Nan A. Rothschild (New York: Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences 376, 1981), 203.

5. Pliny E. Goddard, *Life and Culture of the Hupa* (University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology 1, 1903), 1–88.

6. Kroeber reported that most of his Arapaho photos had been destroyed in the San Francisco earthquake and fire of 1906. To date, the surviving prints to which he referred have not been located in the American Museum's collections. Alfred L. Kroeber to Clark Wissler, 19 October 1906, Department of Anthropology Archives, American Museum of Natural History (AMNH).

7. Timothy H.H. Thoresen, "Paying the Piper and Calling the Tune: The Beginnings of Academic Anthropology in California," *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences* 11 (1975): 257–75.

8. Kroeber retired from the museum in 1947, serving as director emeritus until his death in 1960.

9. Kroeber's academic positions were instructor (1901–1906), assistant professor (1906–11), associate professor (1911–19), full professor (1919–46), professor emeritus (1946–60).

10. Theodora Kroeber, *Alfred Kroeber: A Personal Configuration* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1970).

11. Ira Jacknis, "Franz Boas and Exhibits: On the Limitations of the Museum Method of Anthropology," in *Objects and Others: Essays on Museums and Material Culture*, ed. George W. Stocking (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1985), 75–111; "The Ethnographic Object and the Object of Ethnology in the Early Career of Franz Boas," in *Volkgeist as Method and Ethic: Essays on Boasian Ethnography and the German Anthropological Tradition*, ed. George W. Stocking (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1996), 185–214.

12. For a critical statement of Boas's "objective" and collecting orientation to ethnology, see his 1903 testimony to the Smithsonian committee investigating the Bureau of American Ethnology, in Curtis M. Hinsley, Jr., *Savages and Scientists: The Smithsonian Institution and the Development of American Anthropology, 1846–1910* (Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1981), 268; and Jacknis, "The Ethnographic Object and the Object of Ethnology."

13. Thoresen, "Kroeber and the Yurok, 1900–1908," in Alfred L. Kroeber, *Yurok Myths* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1976), xxi.

14. Regna D. Darnell, "The Development of American Anthropology, 1879–1920: From the Bureau of American Ethnology to Franz Boas" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1969), 299–318; Harner and McLendon in Eric R. Wolf, "Alfred Kroeber," in *Totems and Teachers: Perspectives on the History of Anthropology*, ed. Sydel Silverman (New York: Columbia University Press, 1981), 58–60; Thomas Buckley, "Kroeber's Theory of Culture Areas and the Ethnology of Northwestern California," *Anthropological Quarterly* 62 (1989): 15–26.

15. Alfred L. Kroeber to Franz Boas, 19 May 1903, AMNH.

16. Alfred Kroeber and Frederic W. Putnam, *The Department of Anthropology of the University of California* (Berkeley: University of California, 1905).

17. Buckley, "'The Little History of Pitiful Events': The Epistemological and Moral Contexts of Kroeber's Californian Ethnology," in *Volkgeist as Method and Ethic: Essays on Boasian Ethnography and the German Anthropological Tradition*, ed. George Stocking (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1996), 257–97.

18. Alfred L. Kroeber, *Handbook of the Indians of California* (Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin no. 78, 1925), v.

19. *Ibid.*, vi.

20. Actually Kroeber seems to have used a variety of camera formats, including 2-1/2-x-3-1/2; 3-1/4-x-3-1/4; 3-1/2-x-5-1/2; 4-x-5; 5-x-7; 6-1/2-x-8-1/2; 8-x-10 inches. Such a diversity within a few years is a little surprising; it is not clear if these were all museum cameras. He never seems to have used glass-plate negatives.

21. Thoresen, "Paying the Piper."

22. *Idem*, "Kroeber and the Yurok."

23. Ira Jacknis, "Alfred Kroeber as a Museum Anthropologist," *Museum Anthropology* 17 (1993): 27–32.

24. Yurok wooden door (1-11855), collected in May 1907 (Phoebé Hearst Museum of Anthropology, accession 288).

25. See Jacknis, "Franz Boas and Photography," *Studies in Visual Communication* 10 (1984): 2-60; idem, "James Mooney as an Ethnographic Photographer," *Visual Anthropology* 3 (1990): 179-212.

26. In June 1907, Kroeber recorded the Yurok "Medicine for the Dead" on nineteen wax cylinders (37 min., 30 sec.), translated in Kroeber, *Yurok Myths* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1976), 305-307. "The formulist here addresses 19 landmarks (rocks that embody or contain spirits) beginning upriver and ending at the mouth of the Klamath at Requa." Richard Keeling, *A Guide to Early Field Recordings (1900-1949)* at the Lowie Museum of Anthropology (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991), 81. Many of Kroeber's scenic shots were used by his student Thomas T. Waterman in his *Yurok Geography* (University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology 16, 1920), 177-314.

27. For Mooney, cf. Jacknis, "James Mooney."

28. Jacknis, "George Hunt, Kwakiutl Photographer," in *Anthropology and Photography, 1860-1920*, ed. Elizabeth Edwards (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1992), 146.

29. Idem, "Franz Boas and Photography"; Elizabeth Edwards, "Photographic 'Types': The Pursuit of Method," *Visual Anthropology* 3 (1992): 235-58.

30. Idem, "Franz Boas and Photography."

31. William J. Wallace, "Hupa, Chilula, and Whilkut," in *California*, ed. Heizer, 176.

32. Jerald Jay Johnson, "Yana," in *California*, ed. Heizer, 367.

33. Robert F. Heizer and Theodora Kroeber, eds., *Ishi, The Last Yahi: A Documentary History* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979), 154.

34. Kroeber, *Handbook*.

35. *Ibid.*, 78. Of course, "Ishi" was not his real name. He refused to divulge his real name, and the name *Ishi*, meaning "man" in Yahi, was given to him by Kroeber (Theodora Kroeber, *Ishi in Two Worlds: A Biography of the Last Wild Indian in North America* [Berkeley: University of California Press, 1961; deluxe, illustrated edition, 1976], 127-29).

36. Alfred Kroeber and Samuel A. Barrett, *Fishing among the Indians of Northwestern California* (University of California Anthropological Records 21, 1960), 152; Alfred Kroeber and Edward W. Gifford, *World Renewal: A Cult System of Native Northwest California* (University of California Anthropological Records 13, 1949), 29-30, 33-34.

37. Several of Kroeber's physical-type portraits and most of his metric data were published by Edward W. Gifford as part of his summary of *California Anthropometry* (University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology 22, 1926), 217-390. Gifford also includes a list of published portraits of Californian Indians (345-46). Interestingly, Gifford did not seem able to incorporate visual data into his analyses, using them more as confirmation and as illustrations. For a discussion of racial type photography in nineteenth-century anthropology, see Edwards, "Photographic Types."

38. As Sally McLendon points out (pers. comm.), not all of these “photographers” took their own pictures. The wonderful images associated with Grace Nicholson, for example, were probably taken by her field associate, Carroll S. Hartman (see McLendon, “Preparing Museum Collections,” 213–18). She also notes that few photographers represented Indians from all over the state. Unlike Kroeber and Curtis, most worked among the native peoples around their homes. There is still much research to be done on this subject.

39. Peter E. Palmquist with Lincoln Kilian, *A.W. Ericson*, vol. 7 of *The Photographers of the Humboldt Bay Region* (Arcata, CA: Peter E. Palmquist, 1989), 95–97; revised edition of *Fine California Views: The Photographs of A.W. Ericson* (Eureka, CA: Interface California Corporation, 1975).

40. T. Kroeber and Heizer, *Almost Ancestors*, as well as the recent magazine, *News from Native California*, edited by Malcolm Margolin (Berkeley: Heyday Books, 1987–).

41. T. Kroeber, *Ishi in Two Worlds*.