

UC Merced

The Journal of California Anthropology

Title

Comment on Wallace's Review of Gerow's "Co-Traditions and Convergent Trends in Prehistoric California"

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/23s5x91v>

Journal

The Journal of California Anthropology, 2(2)

Author

Gerow, Bert A

Publication Date

1975-12-01

Peer reviewed

Kuyuidokata territory (Pyramid and Winnemucca Lakes), and died in Wadadokata territory (eastern Oregon), but was never known to have resided for any length of time in the Owens Valley. He may, however, have visited Owens Valley in the capacity of Indian policeman, or as a prominent Indian leader, and it may have been during one of these visits that Forbes photographed him there.

This minor point in no way detracts from the overall value of Mr. Bosak's article, and future publication of American Indian photographs would indeed be a welcomed addition to our knowledge of their lifeways.

*University of California
Berkeley*

REFERENCES

- Angel, Myron
1881 History of Nevada. Oakland: Thompson and West.
- Bosak, Jon
1975 Andrew A. Forbes — Photographs of the Owens Valley Paiute. *The Journal of California Anthropology* 2(1):38-59.
- Harner, Nellie S.
1974 Indians of Coo-yu-ee Pah. Sparks, Nevada: Dave's Printing and Publishing.
- Hermann, Ruth
1972 The Paiutes of Pyramid Lake. San Jose: Harlan-Young Press.
- Hopkins, Sara Winnemucca
1883 Life Among the Paiutes: Their Wrongs and Claims. Boston: Cupples, Upham and Co.
- Wihr, William S.
1974 A Northern Paiute Account of an Early Great Basin Exploring Expedition. Berkeley: University of California Archaeological Research Facility, Contributions 21:45-49.

Comment on Wallace's Review of Gerow's "Co-Traditions and Convergent Trends in Prehistoric California"

BERT A. GEROW

William J. Wallace's brief review in the preceding issue of this journal calls for comment. Several statements are questionable representations of the position set forth in the monograph under review:

1. "What emerges from the discussion is a hypothesis of initial heterogeneity in the two regions followed by a trend toward more homogeneity."

2. "... biological variability between the lower Sacramento Valley and Southern Coast peoples, as reflected in measurements and indices, is seen as being greater at an earlier date than in later times."

3. "The entry and expansion of Penutian speakers is suggested as a possible explanation for hybridization in the Delta."

4. "A comparison of selected material items and burial practices leads to the parallel conclusion that in the two regions the cultural diversification was greater and more fundamental on an earlier time level."

Statements 1, 2, and 4 may lead incorrectly to the conclusion that the study under review posits that Windmiller type assemblages in the Delta region and Early Island assemblages on Santa Cruz Island were characterized by greater somatic and cultural heterogeneity or variability some three to four thousand years ago than that exhibited by their respective successors in later times. Such terms or phrases as heterogeneity, homogeneity, biological variability and cultural diversification are those of the reviewer. What is actually stated several

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

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

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

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

Stanford University
Stanford

A Note on Harrington and Kroeber

ROBERT F. HEIZER

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

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

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