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ABSTRACT This article seeks to show the origins of the professionalization of anthropology by examining early doctoral dissertations in this field and their authors. The bibliography consists of citations with biographical details of the authors, when known, of doctoral dissertations in anthropology from United States educational institutions up to 1930. One hundred twenty-four citations are given in all, representing 18 institutions. Forty-one of the dissertations were not written for degrees in anthropology. Besides documenting the existence of anthropological work outside recognized graduate programs of anthropology, the bibliography provides a demographic profile of anthropology and shows the distribution of subdiscipline concentrations and regional foci, as well as patterns in the professional domination of anthropology by graduates of various programs and in the publication of doctoral research. [Keywords: dissertations, anthropology—history, anthropology—bibliography, scholarly communication, graduate education]

THE DOCTORAL DISSERTATION provides a uniquely revealing insight into the topics and approaches of primary interest to scholars as they embark on their academic careers while bearing traces of the guidance and influence of their mentors. By focusing attention on the earliest doctoral dissertations written in anthropology and their authors, it is possible to see the situation of anthropology as it became an academic discipline and profession.

I consider the characteristics of dissertations and their authors by treating them as numerical data. My methods and purposes can rightly be called "bibliometric" in that I aim to shed light on the nature and history of a discipline (anthropology) by means of assembling, counting, and analyzing the various facets of written communication. Unlike most bibliometric studies, however, this work does not depend on citation data (see Borgman 1990). Instead, I consider the universities and programs involved and the publication outlets for dissertations. I also use content analysis (which could be considered a separate methodology from bibliometrics [Rochester 1996]) to categorize dissertations by subdiscipline and regional focus, and to go beyond the few designated anthropology programs in including persons who wrote dissertations on anthropological topics regardless of the discipline in which they earned the degree. Finally, I consider the age, sex, ethnicity, and postdoctoral occupational status of the authors of the dissertations.

Although the time range I cover ends in 1930, I do not argue that a particular era or generation ended that year. My reason for stopping then is based more on practicalities than on any historical reason. With over a hundred doctoral recipients by then, it seemed a good point to stop and assess the data quantitatively. The most important development facing anthropology in the United States around 1930 was the advent of foundation funding for research and training through the Social Science Research Council and the American Council of Learned Societies, and with it, a stress on interdisciplinary area
studies (Patterson 2001:95). The year 1930 also marks another noteworthy divide in the history of U.S. anthropology: despite some ethnic and national diversity, no members of two major ethnic groups, African American and Italian, earned doctoral degrees in anthropology up to that time.

ANTHROPOLOGY'S EMERGENCE AS A MODERN DISCIPLINE IN THE UNITED STATES

Before 1876, colleges in the United States had "a largely ministerial faculty, a classical and tradition-centered curriculum, [and] a small class body highly selected for gentility and social status" (Berelson 1960:16). The "revolution in American higher education" (Metzger 1961:1), emphasizing scientific methodology, secular as opposed to sectarian education, graduate study, and research in the tradition of the German universities, occurred in the years from 1865-90, led by the foundation of several major universities such as Cornell, Johns Hopkins, and Chicago. Professors were now expected to be professional scholars and researchers. Part of the university movement was the creation of new professional societies and a profusion of research specializations. In this context, anthropology coalesced as a distinct discipline and subject matter as part of a larger disciplinary formation in the social sciences, along with geography, sociology, and psychology, as well as the older fields of economics and political science. In developing a scientific identity, anthropology also disengaged from classics in its theoretical and methodological approaches to archaeology, philology, mythology, and culture.

Anthropology, previously an isolated field of inquiry without any institutional support, self-taught and practiced as an avocation of wealthy all-around scholars and hobbyists, was now an academic discipline. Anthropological information became part of an emerging universalistic body of knowledge linking all disciplines. Standards of scholarship rose, and entry into the profession required university certification, specifically the Ph.D. (Rudolph 1962; Veysey 1965).

Natural history museums and the Bureau of American Ethnology, a federal project mapping and collecting data on Native American tribes, began absorbing self-trained anthropologists in the 1870s (Hinsley 1981). As the need for more competent workers grew, anthropologists with university backgrounds in science or medicine endeavored to build teaching programs. Their struggles and frustrations in setting up university programs have been documented by Regna Darnell (1998a). Most early programs grew out of museums that had been earmarked by philanthropists, but teaching lagged behind and was not well coordinated with curatorial or exhibition activities. In addition, many philanthropists, trustees, and other museum backers thought museum archaeology should concentrate on classical antiquities, while anthropologists wanted museum work to emphasize the collection, study, and display of materials leading to a scientific understanding of Indian tribes.

In part because they did not train a succeeding generation of staff, museums and the Bureau of American Ethnology eventually gave way to universities in determining anthropology's priorities, moving amateurs to the sidelines in the process. By combining teaching with research, professors could pass along to the next generation theories, procedures, and research traditions (with their underlying ideologies) on which to build future investigations (Shils 1997).

Anthropologists increasingly viewed their function in terms of a role in the university. Beginning in 1916, a group of leading anthropologists met at Columbia University to "discuss the objects and methods of anthropological teaching in colleges and universities" (Boas 1919:41). Subsequently, a
committee was formed consisting of the most highly placed anthropologists in the United States: Franz Boas (chairman), P. E. Goddard, E. A. Hooton, A. L. Kroeber, George Grant MacCurdy, F. G. Speck, and A. M. Tozzer. Boas's report on their summits gives a definition of anthropology that places it in the context of other advanced, academic fields of knowledge, each having its own perspectives and methodologies. This fact is noteworthy, first, because committee members mainly had a background in museums rather than universities, and, second, because it was disseminated to anthropologists in their primary professional journal, the American Anthropologist, thereby serving almost as a declaration of principles. Boas wrote:

The scientific aim of anthropology is the reconstruction of the history of mankind as a whole. This aim is pursued along biological, geological, archaeological, linguistic, and general cultural lines, and according to historical methods in the narrower sense of the term. The methods of anthropology are founded on an objective consideration of the life and activities of civilized and primitive man, both being discussed from the same fundamental point of view. [Boas 1919:42]

Boas also addressed the contribution of anthropological study to the college curriculum in broadening students' outlook on civilization and enabling them to think objectively about their own cultural attitudes. "Anthropology has the distinct task to perform in broadening-out many of the older sciences through its wider outlook upon human history and upon the range of forces that determine its course" (Boas 1919:42-43).

TRAINING OUTSIDE ANTHROPOLOGY PROGRAMS

As anthropology was carving out a separate identity for itself as an academic discipline, it is understandable that some training in anthropological subject matters occurred outside programs designated as anthropology. What is surprising is how many anthropological dissertations were written outside of the well-known foundational programs in the field. A third of all persons writing anthropological Ph.D. dissertations in the United States up to 1930 received their doctorates in disciplines other than anthropology. Some went on to have careers as anthropologists; most did not. Who were they? What role did graduate programs outside anthropology play in the development of anthropology in the United States?

The origins of the major pioneering teaching programs in anthropology have been described elsewhere (e.g., Hinsley 1992; Moore 1955; Silverman 1981; Stocking 1979), and much professional lore surrounds famous teachers and students in these programs; If the published literature is any indication, there is little realization that that the scholarly study of anthropology existed elsewhere and in other disciplines, and that some students, mostly without any surviving legacy, wrote doctoral dissertations on anthropological topics. By the same token, many early anthropologists of the first academic generation, including some of the most prominent, received their doctoral education in other fields (e.g., Earnest Albert Hooton, Truman Michelson, Elsie Clews Parsons, Peter Buck, and Clark Wissler) or not at all (e.g., Edward W. Gifford and W. Lloyd Warner).

Outside the few colleges and universities that established anthropology programs, the anthropological curriculum was covered under the umbrella of programs in other disciplines, especially sociology. A report on the teaching of sociology in the United States (Tolman 1902-03) showed that among the fields of study taught under the aegis of sociology in 1901 were social geography, encompassing (1)
physicosocial; the environment, and (2) racial demography; and genetic or comparative sociology, encompassing (a) animal and primitive human society; anthroposociology, and (b) the development of society in historic times; social history. The focus of sociology is not identical to that of anthropology; certainly most anthropologists, then and now, would take exception to the view that anthropology was a part of sociology. More likely, they would have agreed with Daniel Brinton (1892:269), who, on the contrary, considered sociology to be a branch of anthropology!

Yale University's program in Economics, Sociology, and Government included a major concentration in anthropology (Darnell 1998b). Several of its students concentrated in anthropology, writing dissertations in this area. Yale's version of anthropology was distinct from what was practiced by the mainstream of anthropology, which was dominated by Franz Boas and his followers at Columbia University and its satellites. At Yale, William Graham Sumner headed a program that emphasized the evolution of social institutions. His acolyte Albert Galloway Keller assisted Sumner in this work and carried it on after the latter's death. They and their followers considered sociology

a comparative science concerned with human behavior wherever and whenever recorded, not merely with its manifestations within our own particular historical tradition. They regard the cleavage between cultural anthropology and sociology as an essentially arbitrary one, and ignore the elaborate rationalizations evolved by certain adherents of each discipline to justify their ignorance of, or lack of interest in, the other. [Murdock 1937:xiii]

Whereas most establishment anthropologists rejected social and cultural evolution as viable anthropological topics (Patterson 2001; Stocking 1992), evolutionary theories were central to the work of the Yale group, further marginalizing them. None of its graduates contributed to the development of anthropology programs beyond Yale itself. After 1930, however, George Peter Murdock helped reorganize Yale's Department of Anthropology around a Cross-Cultural Survey (later, the Human Relations Area File), and he was enormously influential in training many of the leading anthropologists of the post-World War II generation. Also beginning in the 1930s, evolution made a comeback in establishment anthropology with the ascendancy of Leslie White and Julian Steward. Murdock's 1937 comment quoted above was both an articulation of the Yale group's brand of social science and a swipe at what he perceived as the narrow-mindedness of the Boas group.

Another graduate program in sociology with a strong anthropological component was at New York University, where sociologist Rudolph Binder taught classes in social evolution, anthropology, folklore, and eugenics, along with a standard sociological curriculum. In addition, Paul R. Radosavijevich of NYU's School of Pedagogy taught graduate courses in the anthropological study of schoolchildren. A number of students pursued research exploring both sociological and biological underpinnings of group identity and differences. As with the Yale program, the graduates of this program were little known or recognized by other anthropologists. Only Beatrice Stevenson (Stanoevich) was ever a member of the American Anthropological Association; she once published an article in the American Anthropologist, and her published dissertation received a review (a scathing one) in the same journal.

Early dissertations in anthropology were also written for degrees in sociology at Columbia University, the University of Chicago, and the University of Pennsylvania, often relying on the approaches and literature of both these disciplines. For example, the dissertation of William Carlson Smith, a student of both anthropologists and sociologists at the University of Chicago, was published as The Ao Naga Tribe
of Assam: A Study in Ethnology and Sociology. To this day, the dividing line between cultural anthropology and sociology remains rather fine and arbitrary. The same can be said about works written in archaeology, physical anthropology, and linguistics. There may be no substantive difference between research conducted in anthropology departments and that done in departments of linguistics, classical archaeology, or zoology. The overlap of anthropology with economics, psychology, geography, and botany also resulted in some dissertations in those areas having anthropological themes (see MacCurdy 1919). Finally, dissertations for degrees in philosophy and in the history of religion and of thought and culture occasionally focused on anthropological topics.

Boston University also had a program that granted doctorates in 1905 and 1906 to two authors of anthropological dissertations. The doctoral program in the School of Arts and Sciences concentrated in philosophy; however, students could combine their philosophical studies with one or more other departments, including philology, history, and "political sciences," comprising economics, social science, and law. Charles Bowen and Elihu Grant, whose works are included in this bibliography, had a previous educational background in theology.

The inclusion of persons who received doctorates outside established anthropology programs demonstrates that the history of academic anthropology in the United States goes beyond a handful of early anthropology departments. Nevertheless, of the 41 persons in this category, only 14 (34 percent) held academic positions in the field of anthropology, and only eight of these-P. E. Goddard, A. E. Jenks, Loomis Havemeyer, George Grant MacCurdy, George Peter Murdock, Morris Steggerda, Wilson Dallam Wallis, and Hutton Webster-held established, mainstream positions in the United States. In addition, two were affiliated with academic institutions overseas, making a total of 16, or 39 percent. By contrast, of the 83 who received their degrees in anthropology, 28 held established academic positions in universities (including two outside the USA), 16 in museums, and five in both, while three others had regular employment in the BAE, and two with research institutions outside the USA.

**DISSERTATIONS AND THE SCOPE OF ANTHROPOLOGY**

That academic anthropology in the United States has tied together cultural anthropology, archaeology, physical anthropology, and linguistics is the outcome of battles over different visions of anthropology's proper domain, described by Thomas Patterson (2001). Regna Darnell (2001) has analyzed the historical consequences of areal specialization in anthropology, arguing, in particular, that the concentration on the North American Indians during its incubation period has left indelible traces on the profession's sensibility. Given these assertions, it is worth considering the areal foci and subdisciplines represented in the early dissertations.

Of the dissertations that can be identified with a particular subdiscipline, 71 are in social and cultural anthropology, followed by 19 in archaeology, 15 in physical anthropology, and 9 in linguistics. An additional five combined subdisciplines of anthropology: Three combined cultural anthropology and archaeology, one cultural and physical anthropology, and one archaeology and physical anthropology. Two combined anthropology with classics.

Seventy-nine percent of the dissertations related to particular geographical regions. Seventy-one (57 percent) dealt with American topics, including 53 having with North American (United States and Canada) focus,' and 11 with a Mesoamerican, mainly Maya, focus. Twenty-seven dissertations (21
percent) addressed non-American peoples or places. All but three of these were completed in the second half of the surveyed period, from 1911 to 1930. Nine had a Mediterranean or Near Eastern focus, but only two authors (Day and Gower) earned their degree in anthropology. Five, all in anthropology, had a Polynesian focus. Another 25 had no geographical focus and were either theoretical or broadly comparative. An interesting point of contrast between the anthropology and non-anthropology dissertations is that 40 percent of dissertations not written for anthropology degrees were in this category, as compared to less than five percent of those within anthropology programs. The Yale group under Keller, who are predominant among those outside anthropology departments, were largely concerned with comparative studies at this time.

**DISSERTATIONS AND THE SPECTRUM OF COMMUNICATION MEDIA IN ANTHROPOLOGY**

Writers of doctoral dissertations in the humanities and social sciences, especially those who pursue academic careers, face considerable pressure to publish their dissertation findings. Do sections of it appear in several publications, or does the work appear in one piece? In what medium? Has it been revised? If so, is the publication based not only on rewriting but also on further research?

These are important questions because the different vehicles of dissemination have different roles in scholarly communication. There is a hierarchy of documentation in scholarly writing from dissertation to book based on degree of scale, focus, conciseness, formality, and immediacy versus permanence. Adopting the schema of Robert W. Funk (1977), journal articles, monographs, and books are part of a spectrum of media communicating research information to ever wider audiences. The first level, before the journal article, is the prepublication, including unpublished Ph.D. dissertations, working papers, and preprints. The second level is the journal article, where the cutting edge of research is reported. The third level, the monograph, is "a scholarly work too long to be considered for journal publication and yet too short to be treated as a book. It is also regularly too technical to attract readers beyond specialists and near-specialists" (Funk 1977:7). The fourth level, the scholarly book, is generally longer and less technical than the monograph, and is aimed at a broader group of readers. Book authors likely have already written some articles on the subject, have become familiar with the apparatus of scholarly publishing, and have attained some distance from the topic under investigation. "If the preceding levels may be described as levels of growth and refinement, the book is the first effort at distillation" (1977:7). The fifth and highest level is the reference work. Written with a mature understanding of the place of detailed knowledge in a larger framework, it canonizes and sums up for posterity the achievements of an era, school, or discipline. It is the kind of work a scholar might undertake after many years of experience, perhaps at the end of one's career. The doctoral dissertation, by contrast, is normally written at, or at least toward, the beginning of one's career.

Typically, the book is the longest vehicle of discourse, the journal article the shortest, and the monograph in between. The journal article is the appropriate medium in which to convey hypotheses and timely (and possibly transient) information; the book records enduring, definitive statements about a phenomenon.

Charles Bazerman (1988:81) writes of a "book-article dialectic" in science, referring to the fact that articles in scholarly journals isolate particular phenomena, treating a narrow subject or arguing a narrow
claim, while books synthesize, codify, interpret, and popularize the results of journal articles. Books and monographs expand on and connect the points and arguments made in articles.

In this article, a monograph refers to a written work published as a stand-alone item in a series established and sponsored by an institution or scientific society, regardless of the publisher, with the exception of government bureaus, whose publications are treated as a separate category. A monograph is different from an ordinary university press book or a book in an ordinary series in that it bears the imprimatur not only of the press but also of the sponsoring department, who publishes it as part of an ongoing series representing the department rather than as a one-time deal or as a specific project. In Funk's typology, at least some university press books (especially the thin ones) count as monographs, privately published or distributed works count as prepublications, and government publications are not recognized as a distinct category but are dispersed among the other categories. A. J. Meadows recognizes the government publication as occupying "the hinterland between books and journals" (1974:89) and in a later publication uses the term "gray literature" to refer to such reports (1998:164).

The question of whether and why the results of a doctoral study need to be published at all, particularly by those who do not wish to have them in print, arises from an unresolved ambiguity about whether the dissertation's primary purpose is to add to the knowledge base of a discipline or subject matter or to demonstrate academic merit and mastery over the subject matter. The range of policies or philosophies on this question may be reflected in the levels of dissertation publication in the various institutions.

In anthropology, this difference in policy can be seen most clearly by comparing the two leading producers of doctorates, Harvard and Columbia (see Table 1). At Harvard, 12 of the 29 dissertations, or 41 percent, were never published, a much higher proportion than in the combined average from all universities (see Table 1). At Columbia, by contrast, all dissertations were published in full. Columbia University required candidates to submit no fewer than 75 printed and bound copies of the dissertation to the university librarian before the degree could be awarded, presumably to enable the university to provide copies to other libraries. Those who did not secure publication through an established outlet had to have copies typeset, printed, and bound at their own expense. The Faculty of Political Science (which included the anthropology department) additionally required candidates to provide sets of printed galleys in advance of the final examination and later deposit up to 45 bound copies for distribution to faculty members.2 This requirement was lifted only in 1950, when the university belatedly offered students the option of submitting three typed copies and one microfilm copy to be produced by University Microfilms. Columbia's policy indicates that the dissertation was not regarded primarily as an exercise, as appears to have been the case at Harvard, but was expected to contribute to the growth of knowledge.

Because the various communication media are related to different levels of scale and scope, the publication patterns of the individual programs may reflect differences in the requirements for the doctoral project at each university. Variation also appears in whether the dissertation is viewed as a finished product or as one that is subsequently revised or enlarged for publication. Of 29 dissertations from Columbia, 12 were published in monograph series, one as a university press book outside any series, nine as journal articles, one as a commercially published book, four as U.S. or foreign government publications, and two as privately published works. At Harvard, by comparison, only one of the 29 dissertations was published as an article, and seven were published either retrospectively or as extracts, related, or revised works. At Yale, the number three producer of doctorates after Columbia and
Harvard, only one dissertation was published as a monograph, with none as articles; five appeared unrevised as books, and three others were later reworked as books.

Figure 1 shows the overall pattern of publication of dissertations. No single format dominates, and the entire spectrum of publication or distribution media is represented. Eighty-one dissertations (66 percent) were published or distributed in more or less complete and unrevised form, not counting three published retrospectively. The most common form of publication, in which 24 percent appears, was as monographs in series. The monographic literature is usually technical, advanced, and at least somewhat obscure. A smaller fraction, 15 percent, was published in journals, a part of the literature closer to the research front in scientific fields than either monographs or books. Of the 19 dissertations that appeared as journal articles, nine were published in the American Anthropologist, followed by four in the Journal of American Folklore. But of the 31 to appear as monographs, the American Anthropological Association published only four. Most were published in series established by the home universities and published by their university presses. In these monograph series, the professors carried great sway in editorial decisions, and it would appear that passing the Ph.D. hurdle satisfied all peer review requirements.

The medium of the book, being high in the hierarchy, appears from the above discussion to be far from the raw dissertation. Usually, a great deal of revision and reconceptualization is needed to turn a dissertation into a book. In the period from 1891 to 1930, 16 dissertations (13 percent) appeared as books, apparently without revision. This relatively high proportion might suggest that the superior level of merit and refinement required for publication in book form was required for the dissertation to be passed. However, Funk's distinction between books and monographs is qualitative, while mine is based on publication specifics. Only six dissertations appear to have been revised prior to publication: three of these were published as books and three as monographs.

The publication profile reflects the conditions of academic communication systems and in anthropology itself as it first emerged as an academic discipline. The demand for empirical anthropological information is reflected in the large number of dissertations published without revision, especially as books. In addition, the publication of dissertations as journal articles indicates the power of dissertation supervisors in editorial decisions and suggests that anthropology was in an early stage in developing formal procedures and standards.

Over time, as anthropology and other social sciences matured, different publication patterns emerged. With the advent of University Microfilms International in 1938 and reprographic technology improving the access of specialists to unpublished dissertations, there was less need for dissertations to be published simply because they contained new information. On the other hand, publication requirements on faculty for tenure and promotion have intensified, and the journal article has remained extremely important as a measure of academic productivity (Creamer 1998). With journals and contributors reinforcing each other's prestige (Bazerman 1988:138), competition for journal space increased, resulting in a rise in standards for acceptance. The narrow scope of most early dissertations, as suggested in their publication in the form of a single journal article, was no longer the standard. Dissertations have increased in length, suggesting that the dissertation came to be thought of as a monograph if not a book, at least in scope. No across-the-board standard for the dissertation has been determined, nor has the question of its ultimate purpose been settled (see Berelson 1960).
DEMOGRAPHY OF DOCTORAL RECIPIENTS

The expansion of anthropology from 1891 to 1930 as reflected in the number of doctorates is visible in Figure 2. The rate of increase was slow at first but took off in the 1920s. Increase was not steady. The whole period can be divided into four shorter periods: 1891-96, with an average of 0.33 graduates per annum; 1897-1912, averaging 1.75 per annum; 1913-24, averaging 3.67 per annum; and 1925-30, averaging 8.33 per annum. After the first five years, when only two doctorates were awarded, the numbers more than doubled in each period. Rapid, exponential growth can be seen clearly in the last seven years of the survey. The data broadly substantiate A. E. Rogge's (1976:833) assertion that the number of doctorates in anthropology "is growing exponentially, with a doubling period of about ten years."

Doctoral research in anthropology was mainly a young man's pursuit: more than 85 percent of doctorates were men, and more than 81 percent were under 35 at graduation, with half under 30.3 Only 7.2 percent were over 40. The youngest age at which any person earned the degree was 24, and the oldest was 53. The mean age was 31.3. Of the main universities involved, the University of Chicago, with a mean age of 28.3, had the youngest graduates, while Yale, with a mean of 32.7, had the oldest. Yale's mean is raised by the occurrence of several oldsters: of the 12 for whom we have age data, five were over 35, with two in their forties.

Eighteen of the 124 persons included in this survey (14.5 percent) were women. Of those, ten received their degrees from Columbia. California and Clark both produced two, while Bryn Mawr, Chicago, New York, and Yale produced one apiece. Eleven of the 18 (61 percent) received their degrees during the last five years of the period under study. (Of course, 32 percent of the men in the survey also received their degrees during this time of rapid growth.) That the bulk of the women appear at the end of the time period reflects their late start: after Sara Stites earned a degree in economics, history, and political science from Bryn Mawr in 1904, Miriam Van Waters became the first woman to receive a doctorate in anthropology in 1913 at Clark University, 22 years after A. F. Chamberlain became the first man to do so, also at Clark. It was not until 1944 that Elizabeth Colson became the first woman to earn an anthropological doctorate at Harvard University, fully half a century after George Dorsey became the first Harvard anthropology Ph.D. Three of the oldest graduates in the group are women: Lila O'Neale (44), Martha Beckwith (48), and Laura Watson Benedict (53). This helps explain the significant difference in the mean age at graduation between women (34.0) and men (30.5). The median ages at graduation also differ considerably: for men it is 29 and for women it is 32.

In their postdoctoral careers, five women were anthropology professors, although two (Bunzel and Sawtell) had itinerant employment status and one (Gower) left academia to join the Central Intelligence Agency, three were professors in subjects other than anthropology, one was a museum curator, one was both a professor and a museum director, and one was a foundation program director. In all ten, or 55.6 percent of the women with doctorates, are known to have had academic employment, with 39 percent in anthropology.

By comparison, of 106 men, 28 were professors of anthropology, 20 were museum curators, six were both, ten were professors in fields outside anthropology, three worked for the Bureau of American Ethnology, three headed foreign research institutes, and seven had itinerant employment status. This adds up to 77, or 72.6 percent, employed in academia, with 63.2 percent in anthropology.
In ethnic and national makeup, the early doctorates were heavily white Anglo-Saxon Protestant, as may be expected. Foreign nationals from Mexico (Gamio), China (Li Chi, Li Fang-Kuei, and Su), Germany (Osten), India (Guha and Mitra) and Japan (Kuki and Utsurikawa) were trained in the United States and later returned to their homelands to pursue their careers. Investigating the presence of U.S. ethnic minorities is somewhat hazardous, especially if one attempts to infer ethnicity from surnames in the absence of harder biographical data. It is particularly difficult to disambiguate persons of Irish descent from those of English or Scottish descent. Still, some observations can be made. We find five Irish surnames (Campbell, Kelly, Sullivan, O'Neale and MacCurdy), one French surname (Vaillant), one Polish surname (Ignatz), three Dutch surnames (Koppert, Steggerda, and Van Waters), one Swedish surname (Olson), two Greek surnames (Brouzas and Mylonas), and, apart from Jews, 15 with German surnames (Diller, Eckblaw, Germann, Gunther, Guthre, Haeberlin, Kroeber, Krogman, Mechling, Renner, Reichard, Speck, Spinden, and Usulin, along with Schmidt, who was born in Germany). Eleven were Jewish (not necessarily observant): Bunzel, Frachtenberg, Goldenweiser, Herskovits, Loeb, Lowie, Radin, Sapir, Shapiro, Spier, and Wolf. All but Loeb and Shapiro were Columbia graduates. One (Jones) was Native American Indian (Fox).

Noticeably absent from the list are blacks and persons with Italian surnames. The first black to earn a Ph.D. in anthropology was Laurence Foster (Pennsylvania, 1931), followed by Mark Hanna Watkins (Chicago, 1933) (see Harrison and Harrison 1999; Moses 1999; Wright 1976). From a list of anthropology doctorates worldwide up to 1955, the earliest appearance for a United States institution of an Italian surname is in 1934, when Vincenzo Petrullo earned his degree from the University of Pennsylvania (Yearbook of Anthropology 1955:748). While Columbia was a pioneer in bringing women and Jews into the profession,’4 Pennsylvania was the pioneer in bringing in blacks and Italians.

**METHODOLOGY AND CONSTRUCTION OF THE BIBLIOGRAPHY**

This bibliography consists of citations with biographical details of the authors, when known, of doctoral dissertations in anthropology from U.S. educational institutions, from 1891 to 1930. (As explained in the introduction, the 1930 cutoff was chosen for practical rather than historical reasons.) One hundred twenty-four citations are given in all, including 83 written for degrees in anthropology and 41 dissertations not written as part of such programs. In four cases, asterisks (*) follow authors' names, signifying that the dissertation is marginal to anthropology, but sufficiently close to merit inclusion in the bibliography. In questionable or borderline cases, I personally examined the work, when available, to determine whether or not it belongs in the domain of anthropology. If I thought a dissertation could legitimately have been presented to a committee for a degree in anthropology, I considered it anthropology. If I thought it dealt predominantly with an anthropological problem but could only be considered anthropology with qualifications, I included it but gave it an asterisk. Dissertations were excluded if they contained anthropological materials but clearly belonged in an identifiable field of knowledge outside anthropology. Examples of dissertations considered for inclusion but finally eliminated are Mountain Folk of Japan by Thomas Elsa Jones (Columbia, 1926) and A Contribution to the Study of the Moral Practices of Certain Social Groups in Ancient Mesopotamia by Beatrice Allard Brooks (Bryn Mawr, 1920). The former was not ethnological or totalistic in the spirit of Boas's vision, quoted above in his definition of the aims of anthropology. Rather, it posed problems clearly in the field of social psychology and used a sociological approach to investigate them, with questionnaires to survey attitude, verified through comparison to existing statistics. The latter, though relating to archaeological materials, argued within the domain of classical studies, focusing on textual materials and concentrating
on questions specific to classics. By comparison, anthropological concepts, questions, and literature were integral to George Renner's Primitive Religion in the Tropical Forests (Columbia, 1927), Arthur James's Taboo among the Early Hebrews (Pennsylvania, 1925), and Aubrey Diller's Race Mixture among the Greeks (Illinois, 1930). I was unable to inspect Christopher Brouzas's dissertation on the blond type in ancient Greece, and I include it on the basis of its title and cataloging information, even though I recognize the potential for error in doing so.

The most important bibliography on this topic to date, though incomplete, is that in the Yearbook of Anthropology (1955). All data were checked against this bibliography, with Dissertations Abstracts Online (Bell and Howell Information and Learning), and with the Online Computer Library Center (OCLC) database.

The bibliography is arranged chronologically by year of degree conferral, then alphabetically by university, and within each university alphabetically by author. The fullest known forms of names are given rather than the names used in the particular publications. Married names for women are given when bibliographically important. Following each author's name, in parentheses, are years of birth and death, when known. Below the author's name is listed the highest or most important professional positions held, or, if that is unknown, other biographical facts; however, no attempt is made to enumerate all the highlights of anyone's career. The title of professor, when not qualified, means professor of anthropology; likewise for the ranks of adjunct, assistant, and associate professor. Museum curators often had more specific titles and these are not indicated. Citation format closely follows the Chicago Manual of Style (14th edition, 1993). No publication details means that the dissertation was not published or distributed. Most dissertations are available from University Microfilms International.
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1. This includes a study of Mexicans in Texas and one on Japanese in the United States.

2. In a particularly disturbing case, Louis Eugene King was deprived of becoming the first African American to earn a Ph.D. in anthropology from Columbia University in 1932 because "he did not have funds to publish twenty-seven copies of his dissertation as required by the department of anthropology" (Harrison 1999: 72). At least partly because of this, his promising academic career was ruined, and he did not receive his doctorate until 1951, after the university had dropped the requirement to distribute printed copies. Others who appear to have had their doctorates held up for decades by Columbia University because of this stipulation were Gene Weltfish and Alexander Lesser. New York University
required dissertations to be printed after the degree was awarded, but three of the five doctoral recipients included here appear not to have complied.

3. Estimates are based on year of birth, known for 85 percent of the anthropologists, subtracted from year of graduation. No attempt was made to calculate age with precision by taking into account exact dates of birth or graduation.

4. A remarkable 32 percent of all Columbia anthropology Ph.D. graduates were Jewish, and 36 percent were women. Ruth Bunzel was the first Jewish woman to earn a Ph.D. in anthropology at Columbia or anywhere else. Had Columbia granted the degree to Louis Eugene King in 1932—which, because of a technicality, it did not (see note 2)—he would have been the second black Ph.D. in anthropology.
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APPENDIX A: DEGREES IN ANTHROPOLOGY

1891 Clark University


1894 Harvard University

Dorsey, George Amos (1868-1931), Curator, Field Museum of Natural History, "An Archaeological Study Based on a Personal Exploration of Over One Hundred Graves at the Necropolis of Ancon, Peru."

1897 University of Chicago

Miller, Merton Leland (d. 1920), Banker, A Preliminary Study of the Pueblo of Taos, New Mexico. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1898.

1898 Harvard University


1900 Harvard University


1901 Columbia University


1902 George Washington University

Day, Frank Leighton (1868-1960), Professor of Religion, Randolph-Macon College, Member, American Archaeological Institute, "Did the Semites Pass through a Totem Stage?" (Day's degree was in Anthropology, but his major was Ancient and Church History, and his minors were Sociology and English. Instruction in ancient and church history was by Prof. Edward Farquhar, who presided over Day's board of examiners. W. H. Holmes of the Bureau of American Ethnology also served on this committee. Otis T. Mason, Curator of Ethnology and of Arts and Industries at the National Museum of Natural History, held the title of Lecturer on Ethnology at George Washington University, then known as the Columbian University. See Hinsley 1981:85.)

1903 Harvard University

Gordon, George Byron (1869-1928), Curator, University Museum, University of Pennsylvania, The Serpent Motive in the Ancient Art of Mexico and Central America. Transactions of the University Museum, vol. 1, pt. 3, 1905. (Doctor of Science Degree.)

1904 Columbia University


Harvard University

Tozzer, Alfred Marston (1876-1954), Professor, Harvard University, A Comparative Study of the Maya and Lacandones. New York: Macmillan, for the Archaeological Institute, 1907. (An ethnological, not archaeological, study.)

1906 Columbia University


1908 University of California


Columbia University


University of Pennsylvania


1909 Columbia University

extract, 1912. (Sapir followed an individualized course of study, and it is unclear from administrative materials that his doctorate was awarded within the anthropology program.)

Harvard University


1910 Columbia University


1911 University of California


Columbia University


1913 Clark University


Harvard University
Merwin, Raymond Edward (1881-1928), "The Ruins of the Southern Part of the Peninsula of Yucatan, with Special Reference to Their Place in the Maya Culture."

1914 Columbia University


Waterman, Thomas Talbot (1885-1936), Associate Professor, University of California (quit and worked in various places), "The Explanatory Element in the Folk Tales of the North American Indians." Journal of American Folk-lore 27(1914):1-54.

Harvard University


1915 Columbia University

Cole, Fay-Cooper (1881-1961), Assistant Curator, Field Museum of Natural History, Professor, University of Chicago, A Study of Tinguian Folk-Lore. Chicago: (privately published), 1915.


Harvard University

Fuller, Robert Gorham (d. 1919), "Observations on a Collection of Crania from the Prehistoric Stone Graves of Tennessee."

Stems, Frederick Henderson (b. 1887), "The Archaeology of Eastern Nebraska, with Special Reference to the Culture of the Rectangular Earth Lodge."

University of Pennsylvania

1916 University of Minnesota


1917 Harvard University

Guthe, Carl Eugen (1893-1974), Professor and Museum Director, University of Michigan, "The Lunar Count of the Maya."


Utsurikawa, Nenozo, Professor, Kein University, Tokyo, Taihoku Imperial University [National Taiwan University at Taipei], Institute of Ethnology, "Some Aspects of the Decorative Art of Indonesia: A Study in Ethnographic Relation."

1918 Columbia University


1920 Columbia University


Harvard University


1921 Harvard University

Kerr, Andrew Affleck, B.A., University of Utah, 1907; sometime Professor, University of Utah, "Similarities in Material Culture between the Old and the New World."

1922 Columbia University


1923 Columbia University


Harvard University

Li, Chi (Li Ji) (1898-1979), Professor, National Taiwan University, The Formation of the Chinese People. An Anthropological Inquiry. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1928. 1924 Harvard University

Guha, Biraja Sankar (1894-1961), Director, Anthropological Survey of India, "The Racial Basis of the Caste System in India."

University of Pennsylvania


1925 Harvard University

1926 Columbia University


Harvard University


University of California


1927 Harvard University

Vaillant, George Clapp (1901-45), Associate Curator, American Museum of Natural History, Director, University Museum, University of Pennsylvania, "The Chronological Significance of Maya Ceramics."


University of Chicago


University of Michigan

1928 Columbia University


Harvard University

Coon, Carleton Stevens (1904-81), Professor, Harvard University, and Curator, University Museum. University of Pennsylvania, "A Study of the Fundamental Racial and Cultural Characteristics of the Berbers of North Africa, as Exemplified by the Riffians."

University of California


Gayton, Anna Hadwick (1900-77), Professor of Decorative Art, University of California, "The Narcotic Plant Datura in Aboriginal American Culture."

University of Chicago

Gower, Charlotte Day (Chapman) (1902-82), Assistant Professor, University of Wisconsin; Analyst, Central Intelligence Agency, "The Supernatural Patron in Sicilian Life."

Redfield, Robert (1897-1958), Professor, University of Chicago, "A Plan for the Study of Tepoztlan, Mexico." Published with minor revisions as Tepotzlan, a Mexican Village. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1930.

University of Pennsylvania

Davidson, Daniel Sutherland (1900-55), Curator, University Museum, University of Pennsylvania, Professor, University of Washington, American Consulate, Perth, Australia, The Chronological Aspects of Certain Australian Institutions: As Inferred From Geographical Distribution. Privately printed, 1928.
1929 Columbia University


Sawtell, Ruth Otis (Ruth Sawtell Wallis) (1895-1978), Professor, Amhurst College, Minnesota, "Ossification and Growth of Children from One to Eight Years of Age." American Journal or Diseases of Children 37(1929):61-87.


Harvard University

Kelly, Arthur Randolph (1900-79), Assistant Professor, University of Illinois, Professor, University of Georgia, The Physical Anthropology of a Mexican Population in Texas: A Study in Race Mixture. Middle American Research Institute publication no. 13. New Orleans: Tulane University, 1947. (Study of prison inmates.)


Wuslin, Frederick Roelker (b. 1891), Itinerant archaeologist based in Providence, Rhode Island, "Cultural Development in the Shari Basin: A Study in African Archaeology."

University of California

Olson, Ronald Leroy (1895-1981), Professor, University of California, "Unilateral Institutions in Native North America."


University of Chicago

Martin, Paul Sidney (1899-1974), Curator, Field Museum of Natural History, "The Kiva, A Survival of an Ancient House Type."

1930 Catholic University of America


University of California


University of Chicago

Bennett, Wendell Clark (1905-53), Professor, Yale University, Hawaiian Heiaus. Privately distributed, 1930.


APPENDIX B. DEGREES NOT IN ANTHROPOLOGY

1899 University of Wisconsin


1904 University of California

Bryn Mawr College


Harvard University


1905 Boston University

Bowen, Charles Ambrose, See above, "Training outside Anthropology Programs," Missionary? "Japanese Character and Christianity."

Yale University


1906 Boston University

Grant, Elihu (1873-1942), See above, "Training outside Anthropology Programs," Professor of Biblical Literature, Smith College and Haverford College, "Village Life in Palestine." Published as The Peasantry of Palestine: The Life, Manners, and Customs of the Village. Boston: The Pilgrim Press, 1907. (A study in archaeology, not ethnology).

1911 New York University

Ignatz, Saymon, Degree in Sociology, Lawyer? "A Study in the Civilization and Education of Primitive Man."

1914 Clark University

New York University

Kuki, Basil Ichizo, Degree in Pedagogy, "Anthropological Study of the Japanese in the United States" (Ped.D. degree). (Presumably a study in physical anthropology.)

University of Nebraska


1915 New York University

Lacey, Thomas James Co. 1870), Degree in Sociology, Minister, wrote about Greek Orthodox Church, A Study of Social Heredity as Illustrated in the Greek People. New York: E. S. Gorham, 1916.


University of Pennsylvania


Yale University


1918 New York University
Germann, Franklin Pierce, Jr., Degree in Sociology, "The Domestication of Animals as a Social Factor in the Life of Primitive Man."

1919 Columbia University


Yale University


1920 University of Chicago

Smith, William Carlson (1883-1976), Degree in Sociology, Professor of Sociology, University of Hawaii, University of Southern California, University of Oregon, Texas Christian University, William Jewell College (Liberty, Missouri), "Conflict and Fusion of Cultures as Typified by the Ao Nagas of India." Revised and published as The Ao Naga Tribe of Assam: A Study in Ethnology and Sociology. London: Macmillan, 1925.

1922 Columbia University


Yale University


1923 Yale University


1925 University of Pennsylvania

Yale University


1926 Clark University

Eckblaw, Walter Elmer, Degree in Geography, Geographer, Geologist, Botanist, and Archaeologist, "The Material Response of the Polar Eskimo to Their Far Arctic Environment."

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Brouzas, Christopher George* Degree in Classics, Not an anthropologist, University Librarian, West Virginia University, "Studies on the Blond Type in Ancient Greece."


1927 Columbia University

Renner, George Thomas (1900-55),* Degree in Geography, Professor of Geology and Geography, University of Washington, Primitive Religion in the Tropical Forests: A Study in Social Geography. Privately published, 1927.

1928 University of Chicago


1929 Johns Hopkins University


Yale University

Adams, Harold Edgar, Degree in Economics, Sociology, and Government, "Divorce in Primitive Society."

Brown, Esther Lucile (1898-1990), Degree in Economics, Sociology, and Government, Director of Studies of the Professions, Russell Sage Foundation, "An Interpretation of Early Scandinavian Beliefs with Supplementary Material from the Finno-Ugrians and the Lappa."

1930 University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign


Yale University


Weyer, Edward Moffat (b. 1904), Degree in Economics, Sociology, and Government, Associated with American Museum of Natural History, Director, School of American Research,