

# UC Berkeley

## UC Berkeley Previously Published Works

### Title

"The Correct Way of Writing the Indian Language": Juan Dolores at the University of California

### Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/13f5s1xz>

### Author

GARRETT, Andrew

### Publication Date

2023-02-27

### Copyright Information

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives License, available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

Peer reviewed

# “The Correct Way of Writing the Indian Language”: Juan Dolores at the University of California

Andrew Garrett

Published in *Boom California*, February 27, 2023:

<https://boomcalifornia.org/2023/02/27/the-correct-way-of-writing-the-indian-language-juan-dolores-at-the-university-of-california/>

Adapted from *The Unnaming of Kroeber Hall: Language, Memory, and Indigenous California*, by Andrew Garrett, published by The MIT Press (to appear in 2023).

It rained for ten days in late February and early March 1911. “Enough Water to Last All Summer” was the *Sacramento Bee* headline.<sup>1</sup> Juan Dolores was stuck inside, unable to do the work that had brought him to the state capital. Instead, he spent 14 hours a day writing out a story in O’odham, the Indigenous language of his childhood, family, and people in southern Arizona and northern Sonora, Mexico. Writing all 2,873 words took him seven days; a precise English translation took two more. He finished at 11 pm, went to bed, and dreamed about translating O’odham.

Dolores described his dream in a letter: “I saw words appearing on the wall, like [a] moving picture show. First a word would go clear across the wall and then automatically arrange itself into two or three words. Sometimes there would be only one letter and under it, would be two or three English words. When I awoke, I said this is no dream. It is the correct way of writing the Indian language.” He emphasized the semantic complexity of O’odham: “I have to write t[w]o or three English words for one Indian word.”<sup>2</sup>

The story Juan Dolores finished writing in March 1911 was one of dozens that he wrote and rewrote in a lifetime devoted to documenting the O’odham language.<sup>3</sup> When he died in 1948, he left thousands of manuscript pages and over 60 sound recordings of his own voice and the voices of elders he recorded. Dolores was “the first writer of his people’s legends,” to quote a later romanticized formulation, and he did write many creation stories (“legends”).<sup>4</sup> He also transcribed oratory, vocabulary, the autobiographies of elders, the words of songs and what they signify, and a memoir of his Arizona childhood in the 1880s and 1890s. For four decades from 1909 to 1948, he did most of this language work as a University of California researcher and museum employee.

The University of California does not memorialize such details, but Dolores may have been its first Indigenous employee. He was almost certainly its first Indigenous researcher. Yet though he is well known to O’odham people in Arizona, in Berkeley he is almost forgotten. His career and life reveal the challenges facing an Indigenous scholar and writer within the academy in the first half of the twentieth century, as well as his profound achievements in the face of such challenges.

Dolores was born about 1880 on the Mexican side of the border dividing a transnational O’odham community. His parents moved the family to the US, where Dolores enrolled in

government schools in Arizona and Colorado.<sup>5</sup> In 1898, he entered the Hampton Institute, a primarily Black college in Virginia, graduating in 1901 and continuing for a year in a post-graduate course. In his last student years, Dolores showed his aptitude as a writer, publishing a short creation story (a “legend”) in *The Indian Advance* and a valedictory perspective, “As an Indian Sees It,” in the Hampton Institute’s monthly magazine.<sup>6</sup>

In 1901, Dolores spoke at the Nineteenth Lake Mohonk Conference of Friends of the Indian, a meeting of white philanthropists who thought they knew what was best for Indigenous people. His speech recounted the words of an O’odham elder who had asked: “What is that thought so great and so sacred that cannot be expressed in our own language, that we should seek to use the white man’s words?”<sup>7</sup> Credited to an elder rather than in his own persona, this was a polite rebuke of his hosts, who favored the assimilation of Indigenous people into Euro-American culture and the elimination of tribal authority. It was also a repudiation of language practices that brutalized children throughout the US, at schools whose students were taught Euro-American ways and severely disciplined if they spoke their languages.

Dolores had been one of those students. He did not know English when he first entered the Tucson Indian School. If students were overheard speaking an Indigenous language, he later wrote in his O’odham-language memoir, the teachers “would punish us with the mule whip, or would give us extra work, or would lock us up in the dark house.” But he channeled his linguistic commitment into subversive play. If a teacher happened to say an English word that sounded like O’odham, Dolores would whisper that to the other students. *Ita tcitcivitak hepay ha’itcu sta’a’askima o’otamkatc*, he wrote: “this was very funny in O’odham.” Sometimes one of the others “could not control herself and she would just burst out laughing. I was delighted. I was constantly listening for words that would sound funny in O’odham.”<sup>8</sup>

Dolores headed back west after his school years. Seasonal work as a teamster and skilled laborer took him to Arizona, Nevada, Oregon, and California. It was in San Francisco that he met the anthropologist Alfred Kroeber in 1909. The two men — one in his early thirties, the other a few years younger — had very different backgrounds but converging goals.

Kroeber, born in 1876 to a middle-class German-American family in New York, had come to the University of California in 1901 after finishing a Columbia University anthropology PhD. His central research mission was recording Indigenous languages and stories. Many aspects of culture interested him, but he had shifted to anthropology from literature and once said that his “actual work will always be literature.”<sup>9</sup> His main legacy a century later is the documentation of languages, speech, stories, and songs that Indigenous people in California and elsewhere shared in their work with him, his students, and his colleagues.

Like most contemporary Euro-Americans, Kroeber believed mistakenly that Native American cultures and languages were “dying” or even “extinct.” Recording them whenever possible was seen as urgent by some anthropologists and many Indigenous people themselves. Their purposes were not the same. Researchers like Kroeber thought Native languages and stories could make world culture more ecumenical and culturally tolerant, while Indigenous people understood that they were making records for their own communities.

Indigenous cultures did not die out, of course. Some languages remain vital, too, despite

policies of language oppression in government schools. Others are in peril, with just a few elders who grew up with language in the home; or dormant, without speakers but with people who want to learn. Throughout California in 2023, as communities reclaim their languages and stories from archives, what prescient ancestors shared and wrote down a hundred years ago is given new life every day.

Kroeber knew that Indigenous people themselves, with the proper tools, could transcribe their own languages better than outsiders like himself. So part of his work included teaching Indigenous people how to write their languages — in Dolores’s case, the O’odham language he had been whipped for speaking in school. Together, Dolores and Kroeber worked out a quasi-phonetic spelling system for O’odham. With this, Dolores began what would be his life’s work.

Dolores’s employment was itinerant for many years.<sup>10</sup> The University of California hired him for O’odham language work with Kroeber in 1909 and 1911-13. According to UC records, he was first a regular “employee” (rather than a consultant or contractor) in April 1912. Until 1916 he worked for the UC anthropology museum in San Francisco, where his duties included public lectures on O’odham culture.<sup>11</sup> In 1918-19, he held a UC research fellowship to engage in linguistic fieldwork, recording O’odham elders in Arizona.

In 1926, Dolores returned permanently to university work. He had worked outside academia since 1919, but he had health problems as well as a strong desire to resume O’odham linguistic research. Toward the end of 1925, he was hospitalized in Los Angeles with chest pain and an infected foot. He used a cane after he left the hospital. “My speed is about that of a snail,” Dolores wrote with his usual dark humor. “A continuous strain through these five months has now deprived me of my good looks and all that is left of me is courage.”<sup>12</sup> Bruce Bryan, an archaeologist at the Los Angeles Natural History Museum, told Dolores in February that he might be able to hire him in a month or so. Meanwhile, Dolores reported, “the pain inside of me got worse” and he used crutches for a while. He told Kroeber that he wanted to continue “that work I started with you some years ago” and that an O’odham dictionary “will give me something to do for a long time.” Otherwise, he lamented, “I shall have to sell shoestrings and chewing-gum for my living.”<sup>13</sup>

So it was that Dolores resumed full-time UC museum work for ten years beginning in 1926; in 1931, the anthropology museum moved from San Francisco to Berkeley. In 1936 and 1937, Dolores managed a government-funded research project at the University of Chicago, focusing on the lives of Mexican immigrants. He returned again to Berkeley and his museum job late in 1937, eventually retiring as a “senior preparator” a few weeks before his death in 1948.

The presence of an Indigenous scholar in conventionally white spaces fascinated newspapers and presumably their readers. In 1911, the Dolores-Kroeber collaboration occasioned a *San Francisco Examiner* article steeped in dehumanizing language ideologies.<sup>14</sup> “Gestures are a part of [Dolores’s] speech,” the writer opined. “If he broke his arm he could not talk.” The O’odham language was said to express “common English thoughts” with comically long words. Only a month later, ironically, Dolores would recount his dream showing that two or three English words may correspond to one short O’odham word — precisely inverting the *Examiner* trope.

In 1927, a reporter found it newsworthy that an Indigenous person worked in a university museum.<sup>15</sup> Why, Dolores was asked, had he chosen the job? His answer demonstrates how effectively US acculturation policies had trapped many Indigenous people:

Indian life and customs as I knew them when a boy are more faithfully represented here in show-cases than they are on the reservation. Nothing would suit me better than to live as my fathers lived, hunting and fishing and gathering fruit and berries. There is plenty of time for one to think then. But if I were to try to live that way now, I would be arrested for trespass or something.

American practices had removed Indigenous cultural heritage to museums, and kept Native people from living on their own land. Even those who had adopted new ways were subject to Euro-American whims:

I might possibly go back to Arizona and work on a piece of land I have fenced in there — my grandfather was one of the first men in our tribe to raise cattle under his own brand — but I have seen so many of my friends work for years on land and then be evicted by some court order or entanglement in titles, that I wouldn't dare improve my piece for fear some white man would decide it was worth having.

These comments were quite candid for a medium that often celebrated white benevolence.

Even in 1935, it was national news when Dolores married Sylva Beyer, a UC anthropology graduate student. It made the front page in Oakland (“U.C. Co-ed and Indian Marry”) and Tucson (“Indian and White Woman Marry”).<sup>16</sup> The story ran in Minnesota, and the *Oakland Tribune* even published a follow-up.<sup>17</sup> Kroeber was the witness at a civil ceremony that was of broader interest only because it challenged assumptions about who belonged in elite spaces.

Dolores published four academic papers on his language. Two presented information about nouns and verbs, respectively; in another, for a volume in honor of Kroeber, he wrote about nicknames.<sup>18</sup> A fourth paper, co-authored with University of California anthropologist Lila O’Neale, was a novel study of O’odham color terminology, showing how it is embedded in its cultural and environmental contexts. As a person’s hair turns white, they wrote, there is a stage when “the head looks ... like ground [saguaro] cactus seeds ... The kernel is white, but the bits of crushed black shell in the mixture give the whole an appearance of gray, or *skaima’ki*” (in Dolores’s O’odham spelling).<sup>19</sup> This was two decades before cross-cultural differences in color naming became a prominent object of anthropological and linguistic study.

Dolores also tried to publish the O’odham stories he assembled over many years. Kroeber said his “new way of writing stories” in English might attract general interest, different as it was from the style of academics and “literary people” alike. “I will try to get them placed for you as a book under your own name,” he told Dolores in 1927.<sup>20</sup> He sent some to New York publishers, but nothing came of the attempt.

By 1947, Dolores had prepared a large set of O’odham stories and translations to submit as a scholarly monograph. He was concerned to include all his stories and “not let the little ones get left behind.”<sup>21</sup> He sent the manuscript to the series editor, Charles Voegelin of Indiana University, and continued to work on issues related to spelling. It was not until the month of Dolores’s death in 1948 that Voegelin finally decided not to publish the volume; apparently it was not academically rigorous enough for him.<sup>22</sup> Dolores had returned to Arizona and never

found out.

Dolores also did not live to see the publication of an O'odham grammar based on his work. This was written by the linguist J. Alden Mason and published under Mason's name. While acknowledged in the introduction, Dolores was not named as a co-author even though the book was almost entirely based on Dolores's own collection of stories, shared with Mason in 1919. It was Dolores, too, who introduced Mason to O'odham people during the linguist's only Arizona fieldwork, a trip of "a few weeks ... to get some impression of the phonetics."<sup>23</sup> It was common at the time for the intellectual labor of Indigenous collaborators to be deprecated as service or mere data production.

Mason never learned to speak or understand O'odham; he analyzed it through Dolores's writing alone, as one might study Latin. Dolores had little respect for the man who was writing what they both assumed would be a major reference. "How does anybody know how to write a word unless he knows how that word is pronounced?" he asked in 1919.<sup>24</sup> Kroeber promised "to try to see to it that you get a crack at everything he does before publication."<sup>25</sup>

Dolores also disagreed with Mason's linguistic choices. The 1911 dream that showed Dolores "the correct way of writing" O'odham expressed a sense that its sentences had many small words. These include grammatical particles and pronouns that Mason chose to treat as parts of complex words. Partial English parallels are *I'll* and *wouldn't've*. Mason might have called each a single word; Dolores might have said they are two (*I* + *'ll*) or three (*would* + *n't* + *'ve*). "Dr. Mason takes a whole phrase and calls it a word," Dolores complained in 1920, "because he can't understand why any part of an unpronounceable collection of syllables should have any special meaning."

Most of all, Dolores was upset by Mason's long delay in finishing the grammar. It was not a high priority to Mason amid other professional obligations, but to Dolores it was absolutely essential to see it completed. His letters to Kroeber reiterate his impatience as he waited for the indirect fruit of his own intellectual labor. Whatever Mason has done, he wrote in 1921, "I am sure is good enough to all who don't know the [O'odham] language ... I wish him good luck but more speed, so I can see the work finished before I depart to some other sphere."<sup>26</sup>

A year later, he echoed this sentiment with characteristic irony: "My health is good, but my teeth are getting bad, and I suppose when I can't eat, I can't live. I must be nearing the time when I shall have to take a trip to some other planet, so hurry up Dr Mason, I want to see his work before I go."<sup>27</sup> Tragically, it was not until 1950, two years after Dolores died, that the grammar based on his work saw the light of day. He never held it in his hands.

The whimsy in Dolores's language dream and imagined interplanetary voyage was an enduring feature of his writing. In a May 1911 letter from Sacramento, he speculated about a Berkeley linguist formulating grammatical "rules" for O'odham:

Whoever makes the rules for the [O'odham] language, he or she must take into consideration the great difference in the climate of southern Ariz. and Berkeley. You see, I was thinking that many things which grow in Berkeley could not grow in southern Ariz. The climate I think could make anything grow in Berkeley, I believe, I grew some the time I was there. The hot weather has taken me back to about 150 lbs now. For this reason I am compelled to think very seriously, whether the

rules now growing on the college grounds (there among the beautiful grass, trees, and flowers, and the nice sea breeze blowing over them every day) could not be too tender, and when exposed to that hot and dry climate of Ariz., get sun burned, change its color, [d]ry up, lose its flexibility, it[s] elasticity and break.<sup>28</sup>

Dolores's fanciful comments about environment and grammar anticipated his disapproval of Mason's knowledge of O'odham from writing alone, as well as his collaboration with O'Neale on the ecological context of O'odham color terms. To understand the language, it would be best to learn to speak it in the place it truly lived.

Later that year, Ishi walked into Oroville, California. Publicity surrounded a man who was luridly called a "wild Indian."<sup>29</sup> Kroeber and his colleague T. T. Waterman both said the US should grant him land in his ancestral territory; newspapers predicted a treaty.<sup>30</sup> Dolores saw this and said he should hide in the mountains so white people could "find" him too. Then, he wrote, "tell [President] Taft or somebody, that they have to make a treaty with me. I think that will be the only way I can get some good place to stay the rest of my life."<sup>31</sup> Whimsy could not mask the need so many Indigenous people had for their land back.

Wherever he found himself, Dolores was linguistically aware. In 1914, he and his brother were working in Los Angeles together with two young O'odham men. "We have a tent by ourselves," he told Kroeber, "and in the evenings we tell to one another the funny things our people used to do, and what they used to say." One of the young men spoke the Akimel O'odham dialect, called "Pima" at the time. "When the Pima boy speaks," Dolores wrote, "I nearly always laugh at him; not because he always tells a funny story, but I laugh at the way he expresses himself. I have not heard the Pima language for a long time, and it sounds funny to me."<sup>32</sup> The pleasure that Dolores's language gave him is a recurring theme in his writing.

Dolores returned to his own land with university support during his research fellowship year, 1918-19, recording the speech (and songs) of O'odham elders. Even then, his correspondence highlights the clash between his employers' assumptions and Indigenous realities. To reimburse a researcher for expenses incurred, university procedures (then and now) require receipts. The acting museum head asked, "Will it not be possible for you to obtain the receipt for the \$3.00 you paid for the two stories, and for the \$1.50 for the saddle?"<sup>33</sup> In a letter from November 1918, Dolores explained how inappropriate this would be:

The people who came through San Xavier are some relations to me, and they let me have the saddle horse to Tucson. They charged me nothing, but I gave them the \$1.50. I thought that this was right; I might need their help again out in the desert. ... I did not ask anybody to sign a voucher, because by that act the thing freely given becomes a different thing altogether. The \$1.50 which I gave is not the value of the service to me. It only shows to my friends that I am as willing to give any help that I can. I might go on and make a longer explanation which I think will not do me any good; so charge the \$1.50 to me.<sup>34</sup>

People who insist on signatures may be "looked upon now," he added, "as we look upon a German spy." More generally, a Euro-American assumption (then and, all too often, now) was that research in Native communities is transactional — money for knowledge. Dolores knew better. Indigenous community-based research is relational, and succeeds only in the context of healthy, mutually supportive relationships.

Writing to Kroeber in 1920, Dolores spun out a fantasy of O'odham language collaboration under the stars:

Some day when we are all well, I'll build a house and then I'll send you that invitation. I am in no hurry about building that house, and if you want to come out next summer I'll find somebody to board us, and we'll sleep in the open, look at the stars, and talk [O'odham] until your tongue gets tired flying up and down trying to make that *t* [sound] ... In day times, when you are not working on the [O'odham] language, it will be a good exercise to go out and help me chop trees, dig stumps, or if it rains we'll plant corn, beans and do all kinds of stunts you never done before. While doing the above named exercises, we will at the same time puzzle out the meanings of [O'odham] phrases.<sup>35</sup>

The first sentence alludes to long-term health problems. These included tooth pain; and Dolores's 1925 hospitalization was mentioned above. In 1940, a workplace fall damaged a shoulder and caused permanent loss of vision in one eye. Worse still, in November 1947, the elderly Dolores was beaten up, robbed, and left unconscious outside his Oakland apartment. Doctors suspected traumatic brain injury, though Dolores "seemed cheerful."<sup>36</sup> From this assault he never fully recovered.

After Kroeber married Theodora Kracaw Brown in 1926, Dolores grew close to their whole family. He had a weekly dinner invitation at their Berkeley home and spent his vacation every year with them at their summer house. Their daughter, the writer Ursula K. Le Guin, recalled that "Juan — a killer croquet player — always got there in time for his birthday" at the end of June.<sup>37</sup> Dolores gave Christmas presents to the children, like a bow and arrows to four-year-old Karl in 1930. "I hope he'll not be trying to shoot his play mates," Dolores wrote. "The arrows have no points but I imagine Carl will not be hunting mountain lions and the arrows will be good enough to play with."<sup>38</sup>

Le Guin also remembered Dolores's first vacation with her family, in 1931, "the summer I learned to walk." She would "stagger" over to him and ask him to walk with her:

And whatever he was doing, writing or reading or talking or working, Juan would excuse himself and gravely accompany me across the yard and up the driveway on a great journey of a hundred yards or so, I holding on to him by one finger. . . . I know which finger it was, the first of his left hand, a strong, thick, dark finger that entirely and warmly filled my hand.

Those who knew Dolores well were aware of how important his relationship with Kroeber was. At the end of Dolores's short marriage to Silva Beyer, who lived with him in Chicago in 1935-37, she told Kroeber that "you . . . are far more significant to him than I had become."<sup>39</sup> And Dolores's niece Rosaria Vavages wrote Kroeber in April 1947 that her uncle "has told me a lot about you and your family [and] how he feels that your family is his family too."<sup>40</sup>

Juan Dolores died on July 19, 1948, in Vamori, Arizona in the Tohono O'odham Nation. He had left Berkeley for the last time when he retired at the end of June. He reached Tucson "a very sick man," his niece said. He hardly ate, but every day he "dragged himself to the park," which was cooler than the house and his room ("just like an oven").<sup>41</sup> He would not let her call a doctor, insisting instead that he be taken to Vamori, where he could be buried near his brother and sister. Dolores had lived almost all his life away from O'odham land, but wanted to be home with his family. He asked his niece to tell his Berkeley colleagues that she should

receive his pension, and to send Kroeber all the manuscripts he had brought with him in retirement.

Dolores's O'odham manuscripts record language, stories, and songs. He added many details about language and the contexts and meaning of what he recorded. One 60-page story is followed by six pages of notes like this: "The race track is that open space, under the mountain, on the west side. There are no trees on this land, and [it] is level. The distance is about 50 mi[les] or more."<sup>42</sup> A song transcript comments that a word meaning "Come along" is used "only in baby language." In the song, the earth doctor is "speaking to the earth as if it is his child, holding it by the hand [as] he pull[s] it along, saying Come along."<sup>43</sup> Dolores's writing includes histories and speeches, biography and geography. As a whole, it comprises an O'odham cultural atlas from the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

Dolores's manuscripts have been scattered over the decades and are now housed in archives in Berkeley, Tucson, and Philadelphia.<sup>44</sup> His memoir has appeared under his name; many of his stories are in a volume assembled by others who acknowledged his contributions but did not credit him as an author.<sup>45</sup> While some of his writing has been brought home, much awaits the reclamation he surely desired. Almost five decades passed from his student essays to his last work, but Juan Dolores, the "gentle, intellectual man, living in exile and poverty" that Le Guin saw in memory, never lost sight of how land and language would strengthen his people.

Andrew Garrett is a professor of linguistics and the Nadine M. Tang and Bruce L. Smith Professor of Cross-Cultural Social Sciences at the University of California, Berkeley, where he is also director of the California Language Archive.



**Figure 1.** Juan Dolores, 1911. Photo by J. Alden Mason, A. L. Kroeber Family Photographs, BANC PIC 1978.12, Box 1, Bancroft Library, UC Berkeley.

✓

kuhl hapah tci<sup>1</sup> na'anah  
 It is said that it so happened.

|| kuhl am<sup>2</sup>hub hi<sup>3</sup>paI küh  
 || That some where there a great

kih<sup>1</sup> kü<sup>4</sup>maTC kaM, || <sup>2</sup>CaM hüh  
 village of people. || There that

ütah mui<sup>5</sup>TCI<sup>7</sup> hühkaM mah<sup>2</sup>  
 in many those who

ha'ichtuh Si<sup>3</sup>maTCI<sup>4</sup> || <sup>3</sup>CiA hühmah<sup>6</sup>  
 something know. || Here one

ki<sup>7</sup> KÜ<sup>8</sup> tahl<sup>2</sup> üh<sup>9</sup>PAI ha'ichtuh  
 lived & just he too something  
 he also

2

**Figure 2.** Juan Dolores, "The Wind and the Rain," 1911 (selection). Ethnological Documents of the Department and Museum of Anthropology, 1875-1958. BANC FILM 2216, 134.1.5, p. 1, Banroft Library, UC Berkeley.



**Figure 3.** Juan Dolores considering a croquet shot in a “championship game,” St. Helena, 1932. A. L. Kroeber Family Photographs, BANC PIC 1978.12, ALB v. 4, Bancroft Library, UC Berkeley.



**Figure 4.** Juan Dolores, undated photo sent by his niece Rosaria Vavages to Alfred Kroeber in 1948. Theodora Kroeber Quinn Papers, AA-15, Arizona State Museum Library, University of Arizona.

- 
- <sup>1</sup> "Enough Water to Last All Summer," *Sacramento Bee*, March 2, 1911: 3.
- <sup>2</sup> Dolores to Alfred Kroeber, March 16, 1911, Records of the Department of Anthropology, CU-23, Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley, Box 11.
- <sup>3</sup> Like others at the time, Dolores always called his language "Papago" in English. This term is now often seen as a slur, so I have replaced it throughout with "O'odham."
- <sup>4</sup> For the quotation see Dean Saxton and Lucille Saxton, *O'othham Hoho'ok A'agitha: Legends and Lore of the Papago and Pima Indians* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1973), iii.
- <sup>5</sup> Before the Hampton Institute, Dolores spent four years at the Teller Institute in Grand Junction, Colorado: Dolores to Kroeber, December 22, 1925, Records (n. 2 above), Box 49. For brief accounts of Dolores's life, see A. L. Kroeber, "Juan Dolores, 1880-1948," *American Anthropologist* 51 (1949): 96-97, and Juan Dolores and Madeleine Mathiot, "The Reminiscences of Juan Dolores, an Early O'odham linguist," *Anthropological Linguistics* 33 (1991): 233-35.
- <sup>6</sup> J. M. Lolorias, "The Last Great War," *The Indian Advance* 2/8 (April 1, 1901): 4; John Miguel Lolorias, "As an Indian Sees It," *The Southern Workman* 31/9 (1902) 476-80. "Lolorias" was an Anglicization of the O'odham pronunciation of "Dolores."
- <sup>7</sup> John Lolorias, "Address," *Proceedings of the Nineteenth Annual Meeting of the Mohonk Conference of Friends of the Indian, 1901*, ed. Isabel C. Barrows (New York: Lake Mohonk Conference, 1902), 76-77.
- <sup>8</sup> Dolores and Mathiot, "The Reminiscences of Juan Dolores" (n. 5 above): 294, 309, 312-13.
- <sup>9</sup> Letter to Edward Sapir, November 4, 1917, in Victor Golla, ed., *The Sapir-Kroeber Correspondence: Letters Between Edward Sapir and A. L. Kroeber, 1905 - 1925* (Berkeley: Survey of California and Other Indian Languages, University of California, Berkeley), 260.
- <sup>10</sup> Documents relating to Dolores's university employment are in Records (n. 2 above), Box 16.
- <sup>11</sup> "Indian to Lecture Here," *San Francisco Examiner*, November 21, 1911: 2.
- <sup>12</sup> Dolores to Kroeber, December 22, 1925, Records (n. 2 above), Box 49.
- <sup>13</sup> Dolores to Kroeber, February 25, 1926, Records (n. 2 above), Box 49.
- <sup>14</sup> "Juan, Indian, Defies Alphabet," *San Francisco Examiner*, February 3, 1911: 3.
- <sup>15</sup> "Indian Guards U.C. Relics of Fathers," *The Ripon Record*, May 6, 1927: 5.
- <sup>16</sup> "U.C. Co-ed and Indian Marry," *Oakland Tribune*, November 20, 1935: 1; "Papago Indian and White Woman Marry," *Arizona Daily Star*, November 21, 1935: 1.
- <sup>17</sup> "Indian's Bride to Teach at Chicago," *Minneapolis Star Tribune*, November 26, 1935, p. 10; "Indian's Bride to Help Him Write Book," *Oakland Tribune*, November 21, 1935: 21.
- <sup>18</sup> Juan Dolores, "Papago Verb Stems," *University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology* 10 (1913): 241-63; Juan Dolores, "Papago Nominal Stems," *University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology* 20 (1923): 19-31; Juan Dolores, "Papago Nicknames," in *Essays in Anthropology in Honor of A. L. Kroeber in Celebration of his Sixtieth Birthday, June 11, 1936*, ed. Robert H. Lowie (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1936), 45-47.
- <sup>19</sup> Lila M. O'Neale and Juan Dolores, "Notes on Papago Color Designations," *American Anthropologist* 45 (1943): 394.
- <sup>20</sup> Kroeber to Dolores, April 16, 1927, Records (n. 2 above), Box 49.
- <sup>21</sup> Dolores to Kroeber, July 26, 1947, A. L. Kroeber Papers, BANC MSS C-B 925, Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley, Box 13:15.

- 
- <sup>22</sup> Voegelin to Kroeber, July 9, 1948, Ethnological Documents of the Department and Museum of Anthropology, BANC FILM 2216, Bancroft Library, UC Berkeley, 134.8.1.
- <sup>23</sup> J. Alden Mason, *The Language of the Papago of Arizona* (Philadelphia: University Museum, University of Pennsylvania, 1950), 3.
- <sup>24</sup> Dolores to Kroeber, December 26, 1919, Records (n. 2 above), Box 49.
- <sup>25</sup> Kroeber to Dolores, March 9, 1920, Records (n. 2 above), Box 49.
- <sup>26</sup> Dolores to Kroeber, August 23, 1921, Records (n. 2 above), Box 49.
- <sup>27</sup> Dolores to Kroeber, October 31, 1922, Records (n. 2 above), Box 49.
- <sup>28</sup> Dolores to Kroeber, May 10, 1911, Records (n. 2 above), Box 11.
- <sup>29</sup> On Ishi, see chapter 7 of Garrett, *Unnaming of Kroeber Hall* (first note above), and references cited there.
- <sup>30</sup> “First Train Ride for Nogi Indian,” *San Francisco Chronicle*, September 5, 1911: 3; “President and Senate to Make Treaty with Aborigine,” *Oroville Daily Register*, September 4, 1911: 1.
- <sup>31</sup> Dolores to Kroeber, September 10, 1911, Records (n. 2 above), Box 11.
- <sup>32</sup> Dolores to Kroeber, January 4, 1914, Records (n. 2 above), Box 16.
- <sup>33</sup> E. W. Gifford to Dolores, October 30, 1918, Records (n. 2 above), Box 16.
- <sup>34</sup> Dolores to Gifford, November 3, 1918, Records (n. 2 above), Box 16.
- <sup>35</sup> Dolores to Kroeber, August 2, 1920, Records (n. 2 above), Box 16.
- <sup>36</sup> Theodore Kroeber to Alfred Kroeber, November 15, 1947, Theodora Kroeber Quinn Papers, AA-15, Arizona State Museum Library, University of Arizona.
- <sup>37</sup> This and subsequent quotations from Ursula K. Le Guin are to *The Wave in the Mind: Talks and Essays on the Writer, the Reader, and the Imagination* (Boston: Shambala, 2004), 14-17.
- <sup>38</sup> Dolores to Kroeber, December 22, 1930, Records (n. 2 above), Box 49.
- <sup>39</sup> Beyer to Kroeber, June 15, 1937, Kroeber Papers (n. 21 above), Box 13:16.
- <sup>40</sup> Vavages to Kroeber, April 16, 1947, Kroeber Quinn Papers (n. 36 above).
- <sup>41</sup> Vavages to Kroeber, July 22, 1948, Kroeber Quinn Papers (n. 36 above).
- <sup>42</sup> Ethnological Documents (n. 22 above), 134.1.15, p. 62.
- <sup>43</sup> Ethnological Documents (n. 22 above), 134.4E.
- <sup>44</sup> In Berkeley, they are in the Ethnological Documents (n. 22 above); in Tucson, they are in the Kroeber Quinn Papers (n. 36 above); in Philadelphia, they are in the John Alden Mason Papers, Mss.B.M384, American Philosophical Society Library.
- <sup>45</sup> Dolores and Mathiot, “The Reminiscences of Juan Dolores” (n. 5 above); Saxton and Saxton, *O’othham Hoho’ok A’agitha* (n. 4 above).