

Daniel Brinton and the Professionalization of American Anthropology¹

Regna Darnell
University of Alberta²

There has been considerable concern within anthropology in recent years about the nature of the discipline's "paradigm." The term has attained its greatest popularization through the work of Thomas Kuhn, whose book *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* has set the tone for the debate by claiming that the social sciences are "pre-paradigmatic," that is, lacking the set of "universally recognized scientific achievements that for a time provide model problems and solutions to a community of practitioners" (Kuhn 1962: x). Kuhn's own training is in the hard sciences, and his primary concern is to demonstrate that the progress of a science is not a simple cumulative process. A paradigm, in his view, provides a uniform theoretical stance for an entire field of study and contains the seeds of its own downfall with the increasing recognition of anomalies not explained by the theory. In spite of the reference to "a community of practitioners," Kuhn's stress is on the intellectual content of successive paradigms in any given discipline.

There are those in anthropology who have argued that the discipline has the intellectual unity of a paradigm in Kuhn's sense, but clearly such a position excludes a great deal of what most of us recognize as anthropology from that paradigm. If anthropology is defined, albeit somewhat tautologically, as what anthropologists do, then it is obvious that the discipline does have models for what Kuhn refers to as "normal science." There is considerably more question, however, whether all of us share the same models. To Kuhn, competing paradigms eliminate normal science. To many practicing anthropologists, the absence of a unified paradigm threatens the scientific validity of the discipline. To others, however, it is a source of pride and professional identity that multiple "paradigms" exist in the present science of anthropology. That is, they perceive the discipline according to a model of "organization of diversity" rather than one of "replication of uniformity" (Wallace 1962). Using the methods of anthropology to study its history, therefore, we are virtually forced to consider paradigms (with the emphasis on the pluralization) and to focus on the social organization and ongoing function of the discipline. It is, then, an empirical question whether the discipline at any given time possesses overall unity in its theory and practice.

Turning to the recent history of anthropology in North America, it is possible to isolate at least four successive paradigms, using the term somewhat loosely.

¹ Reprinted with permission from *American Anthropology: The Early Years*. Robert F. Spencer (Ed.) St. Paul, MN: West Publishing Company, pp. 69-85.

² Much of the material for this paper is drawn from my unpublished master's thesis at the University of Pennsylvania. I have restricted myself here to comments on Brinton's role in the institutional changes in American anthropology at the end of the last century. I have cited documents from the American Philosophical Society (APS) and Bureau of American Ethnology at the national Anthropological Archives of the Smithsonian Institution (BAE).

First, there was a period in which information about the aborigines of North America was collected by people who were not primarily anthropologists, such as traders, missionaries, and explorers. Their descriptions were often interpreted by gentlemen and philosophers who themselves had not had contact with native peoples (for example, Thomas Jefferson). This period gave way to one of incipient professionalization in which individuals labeled their work as anthropology and submitted it to evaluation by their peers, but were not themselves trained as anthropologists; the Bureau of American Ethnology dominated this period, although independent scholars such as Horatio Hale, Lewis Henry Morgan, and Daniel Brinton were also important. The third period produced true professionalization, largely through the efforts of Franz Boas and his students. During this period there was considerable intellectual and social unity within the discipline in North America. The fourth period, still in progress, is one in which a variety of theoretical and social organizational perspectives, or paradigms are identifiable.

It should, of course, be obvious that there is an overlap between each of these successive paradigms. Although Kuhn's notion recognizes that this occurs, his emphasis on the intellectual content of paradigms does not encourage examination of overlap, conflict of paradigms, and changing allegiances of individuals, particularly the establishment of a new paradigm utilizing the resources and personnel of the old. For example, Boasian anthropology began very much within the institutional framework of late-nineteenth century American anthropology which focused around the Bureau of American Ethnology (Darnell 1969). Boas's later activities were, of course, more independent as he developed his own institutional frameworks and personal networks. The relatively unified anthropology which developed around Boas provided a baseline for succeeding diversity within the discipline.

In addition to the changing theories and social organizations of anthropology, which may be visualized as a series of partially overlapping circles, there is a concurrent process, professionalization, which is essentially linear and chronological. That is, professionalization of anthropology and American science in general took place only once. The development of a *profession* rather than merely a *tradition* of anthropology, therefore, continues to influence the structure and organization of the present discipline. This linear development is cumulative, although the contents of successive paradigms, as Kuhn stresses, are not. For example, the social organizational transition between the Bureau of American Ethnology and Boasian anthropology was accompanied by an equally important theoretical transition: from cultural evolutionism to historical particularism.

The substance of this paper will examine the career of one important figure in the period of transition to professional anthropology in an effort to clarify the kinds of changes that were taking place toward the end of the nineteenth century. Daniel Garrison Brinton, although he is, for the most part, "a forefather of whom we have no memory" (Hymes 1962), was recognized in his own time as a major anthropologist. Although he himself had no formal affiliation with an anthropological institution and earned his living as a physician and publisher, Brinton had important ties to developments of anthropological activity, for example, the Bureau of American Ethnology in Washington, Boasian

anthropology in New York, the founding of the *American Anthropologist* as a journal of national scope, and the establishment of university programs for the training of anthropologists. These are the major trends which produced full professionalization during the decade following Brinton's death in 1899.

During the late nineteenth century, most anthropologists were amateurs with loose affiliations to localized scientific societies in major eastern cities. The focus of such societies was usually not restricted to a single discipline, and the members were rarely professional scientists. Some important examples were: in Boston -- The American Antiquarian Society, The Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, The Boston Society of Natural History and the Essex Institute; in New Haven -- The American Oriental Society and the Connecticut Historical Society; in New York -- the American Ethnological Society, The American Geographical Society, The American Museum of Natural History, and the Lyceum of Natural History; in Philadelphia -- the American Philosophical Society, the Academy of Natural Sciences of Philadelphia, the Numismatic and Antiquarian Society, the Museum of Archaeology, and the Oriental Club of Philadelphia; and in Washington -- the Anthropological Society of Washington, the Washington Academy of Sciences, and the United States National Museum.

The American Association for the Advancement of Science was the major organization of national scope. The appointment of Frederick Ward Putnam of the Peabody Museum as its permanent secretary in 1873 assured anthropology of an important role in that association. Section H, Anthropology, was established in 1882 as an independent unit. The *American Anthropologist*, formerly an organ of the Anthropological Society of Washington, was established as a national journal in 1898, although the American Anthropological Association was not founded until 1903. During the late nineteenth century, therefore, anthropologically-inclined scholars were virtually forced to affiliate themselves with the local learned societies.

Moreover, at this time there was no way of obtaining training specific to anthropology, because there were no academic programs. Franz Boas was trained as a geographer and physicist. John Wesley Powell, founder of the Bureau of American Ethnology, was a natural scientist turned geologist. Frederick Ward Putnam was a naturalist. Lewis Henry Morgan was a Rochester businessman. Horatio Hale did most of his anthropological research at the beginning and end of a distinguished business career. And Brinton was a Philadelphia physician, whose primary scientific affiliation was the American Philosophical Society.

Brinton was elected to the American Philosophical Society in 1869, at a time when he had done little ethnological work outside local circles to justify his election. Of his more than two hundred publications, forty-eight appeared in the various transactions of the society between 1869 and 1898, with some clustering between 1885 and 1892. These articles formed a large proportion of the anthropological research of the American Philosophical Society, as well as its being Brinton's most frequent publication outlet. Many of the papers were, of course, originally lectures delivered at meetings of the Society. It is important to compare Brinton's output with that of the American Philosophical Society during

the same period. John Freeman has estimated forty-one anthropological papers in the Proceedings between 1840 and 1880, twenty-three archeological; and sixty-five papers between 1880 and 1900, only ten of them archaeological (Freeman 1965). Brinton's contributions, therefore, must be recognized as significant in terms of magnitude alone. Most of his work (thirty-nine items) falls within Freeman's second period, with its greater emphasis on ethnology. This means that Brinton was himself responsible for well over half the anthropological contributions appearing in the publications of the Society. His role in the American Philosophical Society makes it likely that he was the active agent in the modification of interests toward ethnology, not merely its passive reflector. In addition to his publications and lectures, Brinton served as a curator from 1877 to 1897, as a secretary from 1888 to 1895, and was chairman of the publications committee at the time of his death in 1899.

Brinton's importance in Philadelphia intellectual circles is also indicated by his publications in other Philadelphia-based outlets. Five items appeared in each of the following; the Proceedings of the Academy of Natural sciences, the Bulletin of the Free Museum of Science and Art, and the Proceedings of the Numismatic and Antiquarian Society; two items appeared in the Publications of the Philadelphia Oriental Club. These, plus the American Philosophical Society publications, total sixty-five contributions, encompassing almost one-third of Brinton's total output. Since most of these were originally lectures, the tabulation indicates Brinton's considerable prominence in Philadelphia intellectual life. Brinton's own reputation was, of course, equally dependent on Philadelphia. In the period before full professionalization, there were few outlets for ethnological writings, and most of these were sponsored by local organizations and favored local talent. Brinton may have constituted Philadelphia's claim to ethnological fame, but Philadelphia publications and audiences equally constituted Brinton's medium of communication to establish wider intellectual contacts.

The second most frequent publication outlet for Brinton was *Science*, and the *Proceedings of the American Association for the Advancement of Science*. His column "Current Notes in Anthropology" ran in *Science* from 1892 until his death in 1899. Nineteen independent articles appeared in that journal and nine more in the *Proceedings*. Brinton's publications, of course, formed a much smaller percentage of the anthropological interests of this organization due to its national focus. It is interesting to note that Brinton's publications through the American Association for the Advancement of Science began only after the formation of section H in 1882, indicating that his reputation was locally established and expanded late in his lifetime as new institutions developed for anthropological activity.

If a single index of Brinton's national reputation must be sought, it is undoubtedly that he served as president of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. Although not restricted in its focus to anthropology, the association represented the trend in American science toward increasing professionalism. Only three other nineteenth-century anthropologists, Lewis Henry Morgan, John Wesley Powell, and Frederick Ward Putnam, were so honored. In the early twentieth century, only Boas held this position. Brinton's

inclusion in this company makes it clear that he stood alongside these men in the view of his contemporaries as a major figure of the period.

Brinton also served as president of the International Congress of Anthropology in Chicago in 1893. He published three papers in its *Memoirs*, their number and topics underscoring his stature at that time. A review of the state of American linguistics indicated that Brinton felt himself able to speak for the field as a whole. A discussion of the independence of the Asian and American races reiterated a personal hobbyhorse which a man of lesser reputation might have had difficulty publishing in 1893. His presidential address dealt with the concept of nation in anthropology and attempted to reach consensus in terminology and theoretical approach within the young discipline; here Brinton made no effort to be original, believing that commonality and acceptability were the issues facing anthropology as a profession.

The major institution for anthropological research in North America during the late nineteenth century was the Bureau of American Ethnology, founded by John Wesley Powell in 1879. Brinton, as the most important of the independent scholars continuing to work until near the end of the century, provides a baseline for assessing the professionalization which the Bureau was attempting to encourage. Brinton's most extensive contact with the Bureau occurred over the classification of North American Indian languages. Powell's 1891 classification, still a conservative baseline for the study of American Indian languages, postulated fifty-eight stocks in North America (later reduced to fifty-five) (Darnell 1971). The classification appeared under Powell's name, but resulted from the labours of the entire bureau staff to supplement the manuscripts already available at the Smithsonian Institution (Powell inherited 670 of these at the time he began work on the classification). In the same year, 1891, Brinton published a book called *The American Race* in which he proposed an alternative classification consisting of only thirteen units, several of them geographical catchalls. Although the total classification was patently inadequate, partly due to the limitations of a single scholar working alone in his library, Brinton did recognize some stocks that Powell had not, particularly the relationship of the Uto-Aztecan languages. Unlike Powell, Brinton consulted the original reports in German and drew his conclusions from the data directly. Also in contrast to Powell, who considered a grammar a fact of evolutionary level and classified genetic relationship of languages solely on the basis of lexicon, Brinton relied heavily on grammar in his classification. His belief in the basic similarity of all American Indian languages, of course, encouraged him to unite as many stocks as possible. Powell's classification was designed to group closely related tribes for purposes of government administration.

The Brinton classification, in spite of its limitations, is intriguing as an indicator of the developing institutional structure of American anthropology vis-à-vis unaffiliated scholars. Hodge (1931: 100) noted that the Powell classification was rushed into print because of competition with Brinton's *The American Race*. Kroeber (1960: 4-5) has contrasted the two classifications in some detail:

There was some conscious competition between Powell's classification and D. G. Brinton, whose *American Race* appeared in 1891. It was a publisher's book, and a work of quite a different sort from Powell's monograph, although it did group many languages. . . . He

gave only tiny samples of evidence on linguistic relationship, insufficient to be sure; but then Powell wisely published none.

As early as 1885, Brinton had requested the current Bureau classification of tribes, whether "by linguistic stocks or otherwise" (Brinton to Pilling, June 12, 1885: BAE). Pilling's reply made it clear that Brinton did not have access to the tentative results of the Bureau's researches (Pilling to Brinton, June 13, 1885: BAE):

I regret to have to say that the linguistic classification is still unfinished -- indeed in so unsatisfactory a condition that it would scarcely be intelligible to those who are not engaged in its compilation. It is a slow affair, as you may well imagine, and I fear it will be some time yet before it is available for use.

Actually, by 1885, the Bureau classification was substantially complete, although details were added before publication in 1891.

In 1890, just before presenting his own classification (which was written as a series of lectures to the Academy of Natural Sciences of Philadelphia between 1884 and 1890), Brinton wrote a number of letters to Henry Henshaw at the Bureau inquiring about details of linguistic classification. He requested a classification of the Pacific coast stocks, noting that he was preparing a list of linguistic families for use in his lectures (Brinton to Henshaw, August 1, 1890: BAE). Four days later, he wrote again asking about Cherokee and Iroquois, Apache and Navajo, and Kiowa: "These are my inquiries about which my authorities do not quite satisfy me." Ten days later he wanted to know about Beothukan, San Antonio, Coahuiltecan, Caronkaway, United States Shoshonean, and the Texas coast stocks.

In his published classification (Brinton 1891: xii) Henshaw's aid was acknowledged with the Northwest coast classification (reporting on Boas's fieldwork there for the Bureau) and for "various other suggestions." Brinton then stated that he had not used the Bureau's classification, with the implication that he was not permitted to do so. Correspondence in the Bureau archives indicates that this was not entirely accurate. Brinton had written to Henshaw in 1890 indicating his interest (Brinton to Henshaw, November 7, 1890: BAE):

How is the map of North American Languages getting on? Is the classification of the Bureau yet completed, and could I have a sight of the proofs, or, if not that far along, of the MS copy.

Brinton's next letter indicated that the decision was his (Brinton to Henshaw, November 19, 1890: BAE):

I am much obliged to you for the courteous offer . . . about the map, etc. At first, I was inclined to come on and look it over; but on second thought, I think I had better not. The information I wish to gain could be made public soon in my lectures, and perhaps in printed reports from them, and this, I can readily see, might not be agreeable to the Bureau. It would, for this reason, be better for me not to see the map; as even if I confined my publication to matters already in my possession, some members of the Bureau might think that I had learned them by the facilities you offer, and I had refrained from giving credit. There are, in fact, only a few points in the ethnology of the United States area about which I am in much doubt.

The interest of this correspondence lies not so much in establishing classificatory priority as in illustrating Brinton's liabilities as an independent scholar, and his realization that his own work was necessarily formulated competitively with that of the Bureau, to his disadvantage because of their greater institutional resources. Undoubtedly, Brinton's paranoia was rationally based. Of course, the 1885 manuscript classification by James Mooney and A. S. Gatschet gives clear priority to the Bureau classification.

A second important source of professional contacts for Brinton was Franz Boas and the New York anthropology which was beginning to develop at the end of Brinton's lifetime. The two men were on cordial terms personally, although there is no evidence that they were friends. Their correspondence is concerned with institutional matters rather than substantive ones. Brinton was eager for Boas to remain in the United States and encouraged him in his fieldwork and employment (mostly in the form of congratulatory letters at various turning points in Boas's career).

Of interest for this symposium is Brinton's letter of congratulation to Boas on the organization of the new American Ethnological Society (November 20, 1887: APS). Brinton asked if the old American Ethnological Society, organized in 1844,³ should not be reincorporated, with the implication that Boas might not know it had existed earlier. The effect is to reinforce Brinton's own status as an elder statesman of American anthropology. Boas replied the next day that he knew about the older organization and had the support of several of its members; although he almost certainly found Brinton's remarks officious, the reply was blandly polite. Boas continued: "Your promise that you will write for our first publication is extremely valuable to me and I am almost sure of success. . . . Your name will be of great help to me." Boas apparently solicited the collaboration of other prominent American anthropologists of the old establishment, but the inclusion of Brinton is nonetheless an interesting indication of Brinton's reputation. From Boas's point of view, full professionalism had to be built on the best of the existing amateur base and could not be brought about by antagonizing scholars like Brinton.

On the occasion of the reorganization of the *American Anthropologist*, (the official journal of the Anthropological Society of Washington) into a publication of national scope, Brinton and Boas were united in their opposition to Bureau control, although for quite different reasons. An abortive plan to establish such a journal in 1896 had conflicted with the interests of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. Brinton had reluctantly endorsed this proposal in hope that the Bureau would support it financially (Brinton to Boas, October 30, 1896: APS). Since Brinton had been president of the association in 1894, his reservations undoubtedly formed a substantial part of the conflict with Section H.

For both Brinton and Boas, conflict with the Bureau was long-standing. The primary issues were financial power, control over employment and publication outlets, and credit for research. In 1898, Brinton wrote to Boas (June 4: APS) that he could not consent to the Anthropological Society of Washington's proposal

³ Brinton was mistaken about the date of founding of the American Ethnological Society.

for the new journal if they retained four of nine members on the editorial committee and supplied the managing editor. He proposed a compromise of three members and annual election of the editor. "This is a condition so grasping in character that I shall not only decline to assent to it, but, if adopted by a majority of the committee, I shall have to enter a minority report against it." On June 13, he complained that "the new journal would be nothing but a continuation of the *American Anthropologist*, in name, management, and treatment." In spite of his objections, however, Brinton conceded financial realities and was prepared to compromise. Brinton attempted to argue that the American Association for the Advancement of Science committee, responsible for the formation of the new journal, wanted it to represent all branches of anthropology at a national level, and that he, as a past president, believed this was impossible if any local control were permitted.

In practice, of course, the Anthropological Society of Washington, closely affiliated with the Bureau, was the only organization with sufficient strength to exert such control. The numerical preponderance and superior organization of the Washington anthropologists was undeniable. Of the estimated 350 subscriptions to the new *American Anthropologist*, over two hundred were from the Washington group (Boas to Brinton, December, 1898: APS).

The initial editorial board was a compromise, consisting of Brinton, Boas, and Putnam as nonlocal members, and Baker, Dorsey, Holmes, Hodge, and Powell from Washington. Brinton complained to Boas (October 24, 1898: APS) that McGee at the Bureau was withholding information, particularly about the business arrangements. It appears that Brinton was considered a nuisance by the Bureau contingent at this time (personal communication, George Stocking). Certainly, Brinton's objection to control by Washington anthropology was personal in nature, and he did not have the practical commitment of Boas to developing alternative local frameworks and, ultimately, a national discipline of anthropology.

After the establishment of the new series, Brinton's contributions to the *American Anthropologist* became more frequent. He had published only five articles in the old series over a full decade. Between the establishment of the new journal and his death in 1899, Brinton made nine contributions. The conclusion is inescapable that the new journal, and indeed Washington anthropology itself, incorporated rather than vanquished its opponents. The *American Anthropologist* obituary of Brinton was blandly complimentary and ignored previous conflicts (although clearly associating Brinton with the old regime) (1899: 764):

Dr. Brinton was an active and versatile student of anthropology in all its aspects. His contributions to the science were many and important, his publications form a conspicuous part of the literature of American anthropology, while his editorial and professional work and his labors in the lecture field and in social organization aided materially in promoting and diffusing anthropology. . . . A frequent contributor to the *American Anthropologist* in its earlier form, Dr. Brinton was one of the foremost among the projectors and supporters of the journal in its new form and more extended scope.

There was, of course, considerable difference in the motives of Brinton and Boas in opposing the reorganization. Brinton disliked any form of control,

preferred the American Association for the Advancement of Science as a coordinating body, and was more interested in ethnology than in ethnography (the focus of the Bureau). Brinton apparently failed to recognize that the future of American anthropology depended on increasing consolidation of institutional resources. He espoused the ideal of national organization, but opposed specific actions to implement it because of the relative strength of the Washington group. Boas, in contrast, shared with Powell and McGee the vision of a unified science of anthropology in America. He was willing to work within the framework of the Bureau to promote such developments. In fact, Boas was relatively independent of the Bureau. He was settled in New York and could put forth his American Ethnological Society as an institutional alternative to Washington anthropology. As the central figure of the second-largest faction, he gained greater control over the new journal than numbers alone would have justified. He was flexible enough to use the need for support from outside Washington to justify the national aspirations of the newly organized journal and to fit these factors into his own long-range plans. Brinton, already an old man in ill health, and without institutional backing, had no such plans. The reorganization of the *American Anthropologist* makes it clear that he was, in spite of his considerable influence, the last of the old guard.

Most histories of American anthropology, if they mention Brinton at all, take as his major claim to fame that he was technically the first university professor of anthropology in North America. He was appointed professor of ethnology and archaeology at the Academy of Natural Sciences of Philadelphia in 1884, a task which involved an annual series of public lectures in his field. In 1886, he became professor of archaeology and linguistics at the University of Pennsylvania. The appointment was an honorary one and did not carry salary. It was, in fact, an offshoot of the development of the University of Pennsylvania Museum, a public rather than an academic institution under the direction of Dr. William Pepper. Again, it was Brinton's name and reputation which made him useful to these schemes. Although Brinton appeared on paper to have very close ties to the running of the museum, he was never in a position to influence its operation or long-range development.

Between 1886 and his death in 1899, Brinton listed in the University of Pennsylvania catalogue courses in American Indian philology; Algonquin, Nahuatl, Maya, and Kechua languages; linguistic families of North and South America; Maya and Aztec hieroglyphics; North American archaeology; and antiquities of the eastern United States. The catalogue noted that "The instruction in this group will be in large measure based upon the unusually rich collections of the University Museum, and will be arranged with reference to the preparation and aims of applicants." Unfortunately, this rich program existed only on paper. University listings of enrollment and student names indicate that Brinton's students consisted of a single nondegree candidate in 1894-1895.

However, Brinton did have some contact with students specializing in nonanthropological subjects. During at least the years of 1893-1894, all students seeking a Ph.D. in any language area had to attend lectures by Brinton on prehistoric picture writing and Mexican hieroglyphs and on primitive religion. After Brinton's death, he was theoretically replaced by Stewart Culin, then an

employee of the University Museum, but Culin did not develop a teaching program either; this came only after 1910 under the direction of Frank Speck, whose ties were to Boasian anthropology (Darnell 1970).

However, in spite of the abortive nature of Brinton's actual teaching, he was intensely committed to the development of an academic framework for anthropology. His presidential address to the American Association for the Advancement of Science (1895: 6) deplored the nearly universal opinion that education was unnecessary for anthropologists: "We erect stately museums, we purchase costly specimens, we send out costly expeditions; but where are the universities, the institutions of higher education, who train young men how to observe, how to collect and explore in this branch?" These were the words of a man who had watched the growth of a museum without a corresponding growth in educational facilities.

In 1892, Brinton had presented to the University of Pennsylvania a practical proposal for the teaching of anthropology which stressed his own teaching experience (at the Academy of Natural Sciences of Philadelphia and the university itself). Although the content is quite similar to the program in fact developed by Boas during the following decade, the university apparently gave no serious consideration to Brinton's proposals. He must have envisioned that this would be the case; the pamphlet was printed privately by Brinton, and his prospectus circulated to anthropologists outside Philadelphia. His message was to the future.

Boas, of course, was the first person to hold an institutional position which would enable him to develop an academic program. Indeed, his early efforts were also largely abortive; at Clark University, he granted the first American Ph.D. in anthropology to Alexander Francis Chamberlain, but did not stay to develop a teaching program there. Boasian anthropology, as we now understand it, developed only after Boas's first generation of students were practicing as anthropologists. Brinton, then, had the ideas, and went to some trouble to state them formally in an effort to encourage the development of university programs. In spite of all his efforts, however, he remained within the earlier institutional framework and his visions were left to younger men to bring into reality.

In sum, Brinton remains an isolated figure in the history of American anthropology. His theoretical work was done in the framework of an outdated evolutionism, and his presence at the end of an era of only semiprofessional anthropology kept him from having any real influence on the social organization of the twentieth century discipline. It is important to note, however, that Brinton, in spite of all the limitations enforced by his time, was closely involved in the crucial events and trends effecting the professionalization of anthropology. He stands, as it were, at a crossroads of paradigm shift, in the social organizational sense. His career, therefore, brings sharply into focus the changes which were taking place in the last years of the nineteenth century and which have done much to produce the anthropology we know today.

References Cited:

1899 Obituary of Daniel Garrison Brinton. *American Anthropologist* 1: 764.

Brinton, Daniel Garrison

- 1892 Anthropology as a Science and as a Branch of University Education. Philadelphia [pamphlet].
 1895 The Aims of Anthropology. *Proceedings of the American Association for the Advancement of Science* 44: 1-17.

Darnell, Regna

- 1967 Daniel Garrison Brinton: An Intellectual Biography. M.A. Thesis, University of Pennsylvania.
 1969 The Development of American Anthropology 1880-1920: From Franz Boas to the Bureau of American Ethnology. Ph.D. Thesis, University of Pennsylvania.
 1970 The Emergence of Academic Anthropology at the University of Pennsylvania. *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences*.
 1971 The Powell Classification of American Indian Languages. *Papers in Linguistics* 4(1).

Freeman, John Finley

- 1965 University of Anthropology: Early Departments in the United States. *Kroeber Anthropological Society Papers* 32: 78-90.

Hodge, Fredrick Webb

- 1931 Obituary of H. W. Henshaw. *American Anthropologist*. 33: 98-103.

Hymes, Dell

- 1962 On Studying the History of Anthropology. *Kroeber Anthropological Society Papers* 26: 81-86.

Kroeber, Alfred L.

- 1960 Powell and Henshaw: An Episode in the History of Ethnolinguistics. *Anthropological Linguistics* 2: 1-5.

Kuhn, Thomas

- 1962 *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago: Phoenix.

Wallace, Anthony F. C.

- 1961 *Culture and Personality*. New York: Random House.