

UC Merced

The Journal of California Anthropology

Title

A Note on Harrington and Kroeber

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/5fk0m0hg>

Journal

The Journal of California Anthropology, 2(2)

Author

Heizer, Robert F

Publication Date

1975-12-01

Peer reviewed

times in the text is that human development in the lower Sacramento Valley and the Southern Coast appears to represent two distinct continua for a period of several thousand years and that populational (somatic) and cultural differences or contrasts between the two regions were greater at an earlier date. It is suggested that Windmill people were Penutian speakers (contra statement 3), who entered the lower Sacramento Valley about 4000 years ago with a superior technology, and that gene flow and cultural exchange with surrounding Hokan speakers led to considerable convergence over time. Consequently, historical factors would have played a greater role than evolutionary factors during the last four thousand years of much of California prehistory.

The reference to "selected material items and burial practices" is misleading. A serious attempt was made to review all data published prior to 1970 which were susceptible to some sort of controlled comparison. The primary unit of analysis was the individual grave lot. Equally important to the analysis was the relative frequency of shared items in the two regions at different time levels. Any selection of the data was predicated on the basis of available data and these two factors.

Wallace's criticism that "the title is misleading since the work does not cover the whole state" may or may not be justified, depending on one's frame of reference. The closing sentence of the study reads: "Although we have focused on the two main traditions in prehistoric California, the possibility of other traditions co-existing is not ruled out" (p. 48).

Finally, the statement that "Often, too, the argument seems one-sided and the facts as presented susceptible to other interpretations," would seem to have called for an example or two of such. In view of the brevity of the review, such an addition would have been most constructive.

*Stanford University
Stanford*

A Note on Harrington and Kroeber

ROBERT F. HEIZER

John Peabody Harrington is, in 1975, described on the dust cover of Carobeth Laird's book *Encounter With an Angry God* by Tom Wolfe, author of *The Electric Kool-Aid Acid Test*, as a "genius anthropologist." There is a tendency to equate idiosyncrasy and paranoia, when it is combined with brilliance, with genius. I do not think that Harrington was a genius, but rather that he was highly intelligent, obviously devoted to his work, and surely erratic. These qualities may exist in geniuses, but by themselves they do not define that term.

Harrington wrote some first-rate things, but he never demonstrated in print the heavenly flash of vaticinal projection which characterizes the insight of a genius. It is true that he was intensely motivated to save the information on native language and culture but was, at the same time, extraordinarily chary of sharing this information with others. There is good evidence of this selfishness in the letters which he addressed to C. Hart Merriam. Harrington felt a strong antipathy towards Kroeber, presumably because he was a competitor, and because he thought he was a Jew. The latter is simply not true, but aside from the error in fact, it is significant in the light of the possible course which California linguistics might have taken if there had not been this irrational and secretive person with strong proprietary feelings about "his" data.

I met and talked with Harrington as a beginning student of anthropology in the summer of 1933 when I was invited by A. Hrdlička to come to the Smithsonian and learn what I could. I thought Harrington to be an interesting person. I recall specifically his spending an hour or so showing me the details of a huge

typewriter which he had devised with keys for both English and Cyrillic letters. Harrington seemed to think that this would represent a big breakthrough in linguistics.

When the Culture Element Distribution Survey was being organized by Kroeber, the Costanoan and Chumash tribes were a problem. Kroeber, as he told me directly, was reluctant to send ethnographers to search out and interview the few surviving Costanoan and Chumash informants to fill out the element lists because Harrington had long preempted them as "his." According to Kroeber, he simply informed Harrington that if he refused the invitation to provide the Central California Coast elements lists people would be sent out to secure these. And Harrington agreed and did provide the filled-in questionnaire list. This must have been something of a pill for Harrington to swallow, not only because he felt such an antipathy toward Kroeber, but also because he was forced to disgorge some of the treasured facts of Costanoan and Chumash ethnography which he had secured. I would guess that the whole affair was as galling to Harrington as it was satisfactory to Kroeber. One keeps hearing that when Harrington's Costanoan and Chumash notes are published that we will finally know a great deal about the languages and cultures of these tribes. Let us hope that this is true. I have also heard it said, by people who neither knew Kroeber nor what they were talking about, that Kroeber really fell down on the job by failing to work with these Central California groups. It is true that Kroeber and his students neglected the Chumash and Costanoans, but this was done

because Harrington made it quite clear that he would resent Kroeber's "muscling in," and since there was plenty else to be done, Kroeber did not press the issue. Harrington may have felt that he had Kroeber bluffed, but when the issue was finally raised it was Harrington who backed down.

So, in 1975 Kroeber has been dead for 15 years and Harrington for 14. Kroeber was motivated to publish and communicate as much of what he could learn, as witness the extraordinary number and range of papers and books published during his life. Harrington was quite different; perhaps he was always waiting to secure the last bit of information before he put anything into print, or perhaps he did not really care about making the information he possessed available to the world.

In my opinion, Harrington was an able linguist, and he had the potential of contributing importantly to California ethnography, but he did not realize this because he was so screwed up. Much of what Harrington recorded, and which still exists in notes, will be consulted by present-day and still-to-come scholars to further the study of Native Californian peoples. When these studies are published it would seem only proper that Harrington's name should appear in the title or as author or perhaps co-author. There is a precedent for this in the considerable amount of C. Hart Merriam's posthumous publications which appear under his name.

*University of California
Berkeley*

