

A Conflicted Legacy: Paul Sidney Martin as Museum Archaeologist, 1925–38

Stephen E. Nash

ABSTRACT Paul Sidney Martin excavated archaeological sites in southwestern Colorado for the State Historical Society of Colorado and the Field Museum of Natural History between 1927 and 1938, although he began working for museums in 1925. His work in three realms—research, exhibition and outreach, and collections—helped redefine the role of the museum anthropologist at a time when archaeological research, particularly that based in museums, was in transition away from the search for exhibition-quality objects and toward research-driven expeditions. With data gleaned from relevant archives, in this article I present previously unpublished details of Martin’s work to suggest that Martin leaves behind a conflicted legacy from an important era in the development of North American archaeology.

Keywords: Paul Sidney Martin, archives analysis, Southwestern archaeology, museum anthropology, Field Museum

Paul Sidney Martin (see Figure 1) played an important role in the development of North American archaeological knowledge, method, and theory during the 20th century. During a career that spanned six decades, he excavated more than 100 archaeological sites and supervised nearly a dozen surveys in Wisconsin, Illinois, Colorado, New Mexico, and Arizona. He published 21 monographs, 15 peer-reviewed articles, two textbooks, 16 book reviews, and more than 120 popular articles. He collaborated with prominent archaeologists including Fay-Cooper Cole, Sylvanus Morley, and John Rinaldo. He helped train more than 50 students who became professional archaeologists, including James Hill, William Longacre, and Fred Plog. In 1968, he received the American Anthropological Association’s Alfred Vincent Kidder Award for eminence in the field of Americanist archaeology. He amassed one of the world’s great collections of Mogollon and Ancestral Puebloan material culture, consisting of some 585,000 artifacts, at the Field Museum in Chicago. Although culture history, with a dab of cultural evolutionism, provided the theoretical underpinning for his research, Martin pioneered efforts to discern precontact social organization through the study of material culture. He became an early convert to, and advocate for, the New Archaeology, primarily by providing intellectual, logistical, and financial support under which professionals and students could test new research questions, excavation methods, and analytical techniques.

Published analyses of Martin’s career and impact on North American archaeology are few and far between. Beyond an obituary (Longacre 1976), two reflexive contributions (Martin 1971, 1974), and recent articles by Nash (2001, 2003, 2006), an undeniably important archaeologist has received scant—if not superficial—attention in the history of anthropology literature (see Browman 2002:258–261; Graves and Zubrow 2007; Kehoe 1998:93–96, 116–117; Lyman et al. 1997:128–129; Muller 2002; O’Brien et al. 2006; Smith 1992:115–117). Book-length examinations of North American archaeologists and anthropologists have been published in recent years, including scholarly biographies of museum-based archaeologists Byron Cummings (Bostwick 2006), Arthur C. Parker (Colwell-Chanthaphonh 2009), and W. C. McKern (Lyman and O’Brien 2003). These volumes offer archives-based appraisals of these scholars, providing a better-informed and less-mythologized understanding of their roles in the history of archaeology (see Kerns 2003:xiii). As part of a much-larger research effort evaluating Martin’s place in the history of North American anthropology (Nash n.d.), in this article I analyze archival and published sources from the earliest (1925–38) portion of Martin’s career to illuminate previously unexamined facets in the life of an underappreciated museum-based archaeologist.

As Don Fowler (2000:221) notes, the period from about 1850 through 1920 is sometimes referred to as the “Age of



FIGURE 1. Paul Sidney Martin as Acting Chief Curator, 1934. (Negative No. A86384; courtesy of the Field Museum)

Museums,” as many natural-history museums were founded during this period, and collecting activity by those museums often occurred at an unprecedented, if perhaps unsustainable, pace. At the Field Museum, these halcyon collecting days coincide almost exactly with George Amos Dorsey’s tenure (1894–1915) as a curator in the Department of Anthropology (Almazan and Coleman 2003). Fully one-third (101 of 309) of the Field Museum’s anthropology expeditions conducted prior to 2001 occurred during this 20-year period, which constitutes less than one-fifth of the museum’s history (Haskin et al. 2003). Dorsey’s assistant curator of archaeology was the enigmatic Charles Lorin Owen, who led collecting expeditions to Arizona, California, and Ohio between 1900 and 1913 (Almazan and Coleman 2003:93–94). Although Owen remained at the Field Museum until 1925, a decade after Dorsey’s departure, he failed to conduct an expedition after 1913 and published almost nothing during his entire 25-year career. It was Owen’s position that Martin was hired to fill in 1929, by which time the Field Museum had been absent from the American Southwest for nearly two decades.¹

To frame the analysis of Martin’s contributions, I propose that, generally speaking, museum-based archaeologists are responsible for making professional contributions in five realms: (1) research (typically, although not exclusively, in the field); (2) exhibition and outreach; (3) collections acquisition and curation; (4) administration; and (5) service, the latter to both discipline and home institution. Although

the time, effort, and resources that an archaeologist invests in any one of these realms will change in response to shifting institutional priorities, idiosyncratic historical moments and opportunities, and new personal and professional trajectories, they provide a common framework on which to analyze the career of any museum-based archaeologist. The first three domains—research, education and outreach, and collections—are salient for this article and will be used to structure a review and evaluation of Martin’s contributions from 1925 through 1938, the first phase in a long and productive career.² A controlled analysis and comparison of data from unpublished archives, Field Museum collections, and the published record, all of which were created by Martin and his immediate colleagues, will help avoid falling into a presentist trap, in which a historical figure is unfairly evaluated against modern professional standards (Stocking 1965:211). That said, archaeology is a cumulative science in which data sources (e.g., sites) are destroyed as material culture and data are recovered. Changes in excavation method must therefore be explicitly acknowledged to properly and critically evaluate the research potential of Martin’s curated collections. Table 1 summarizes the Martin-related archives consulted.

Given this framework, and the fact that in 1929 Martin was a recently minted Ph.D. and a new hire at the Field Museum, three questions come to the fore: Did museum-based archaeology, as seen through the Field Museum and Martin lens, change during the 1920s and 1930s? Did museum archaeologists, seen through the same lens, (re)negotiate their commitments to scientific research and the visiting public during this period? Why is Martin, undeniably one of the most successful archaeologists of the 20th century, still underappreciated, particularly for his work during this early period?

BIOGRAPHIC AND ACADEMIC CHRONICLE

Born in Chicago, on November 22, 1898, Martin was the fifth child of Adelaide May Martin (née Sackett) and Ellsworth C. Martin. He graduated from New Trier High School in Winnetka, Illinois, in 1918, having taken a standard curriculum with strong emphases in music, English, Latin, and French. In September, he enrolled at the University of Chicago, where he focused on history and languages before dropping out for a two-and-a-half-year hiatus after spring quarter, 1920. The record is unclear on what he did during this hiatus, but he reenrolled during the winter quarter of 1922. From then until his graduation on December 18, 1923, Martin maintained a B- average in courses ranging from history and education to sociology and English, the latter of which became his major. Martin had somehow found his scholarly calling, however, for he immediately began graduate work in the Department of Sociology, which at that time included anthropology, at Chicago (Stocking 1979).

As with many young scholars, a chronicle of Martin’s early career yields a confusing mix of fieldwork, coursework, and employment. From 1924 through 1926, Martin

TABLE 1. *Martin-Related Archives Consulted*

Archive	Contents	Comments
Field Museum Director's Office Expedition Files (FMEF)	Correspondence between curators and museum administrators and supervisors	Details of summer fieldwork; includes what Martin wanted his bosses to know
Field Museum Anthropology Correspondence Files (DACF)	Correspondence between the anthropology department and external parties	Details on departmental activities throughout the year; Martin well-represented when chief curator 1935–64
Field Museum Anthropology Expedition Files (DAEF)	Documents including excavation records, artifact tabulations, and some correspondence (see Coleman 2004)	Martin-related files strongest during Rinaldo years (1946–62); weaker before (1929–45) and after (1962–72) ^a
Arizona State Museum/Field Museum Martin Archive (ASM/FMMA)	Documents Martin took to Arizona in 1972; transferred to Field Museum archives in 1998 (see Coleman and Nash 2004)	Emphasizes Martin's activities in the 1960s and 1970s; some personal papers and details ^b
Colorado Historical Society Archives (CHSA)	Documents relating to Martin's work from 1927–29	Scant excavation records, some correspondence and memos
Illinois State Museum Archives (ISMA)	Documents from Martin's work in 1926 and 1927	Scant excavation records, some correspondence and memos
Field Museum Photograph Archives	4,503 photographs taken by Martin, 1929–72	Sometimes constitute the only excavation records available

^aMartin moved to Tucson in 1972. While working for the University of Arizona in 1973, he supervised excavations at the Connie Site, the Swannie Site, and others in east-central Arizona. The collections and their associated documentation remain at the Arizona State Museum, and are not germane to this article, so the last date listed here is 1972. ^bMartin never married and did not have children; personal data are therefore difficult to find. Paul Smith, who served as Martin's personal assistant in the late 1960s and early 1970s, has kindly provided me with what he knows.

took courses from a Chicago faculty led by ethnologist and archaeologist Fay-Cooper Cole, who had been in Chicago, but working for the Field Museum since 1904 (Nash and Feinman 2003). Cole was hired away by the University of Chicago in 1923 to create an independent anthropology program; Martin was his first Ph.D. student (Stocking 1979). It is evident but not surprising that Martin used Cole's well-established professional networks to develop and expand his own professional opportunities.

During the summer of 1925, Martin began his long career in museum-based archaeology while surveying and excavating mound sites for the Milwaukee Public Museum (Longacre 1976). The following summer, he became field director of the University of Chicago's Archaeological Survey of Illinois. In that capacity, he surveyed 450 Moundbuilder sites, excavated several, and, demonstrating an early commitment to existing collections, examined 1,200 artifacts in private hands (Browman 2002:258–261). He quickly published a report that, although short on details, set a precedent and standard for prompt publication to which he adhered for much of his career (Martin 1927a).

Martin passed his general exams on June 11, 1926, and enrolled in one final quarter of coursework that fall. During each of the next three winters (1926–27, 1927–28, and 1928–29), Martin spent several months excavating sites on

the Yucatan Peninsula with Sylvanus Morley of the Carnegie Institution (Browman and Williams in press). As a result of this work, the Temple of Two Lintels at Chichen Itza is still known to some as "Paul Martin's Temple" (Martin 1928, 1929c). Although hoping to pursue a career in Mesoamerican archaeology, Martin suffered simultaneous cases of malaria, worms, and amoebic dysentery in 1929; the ensuing doctor's orders against travel to the tropics precluded further fieldwork in the region. Thereafter, Martin published only two more contributions on Mesoamerican archaeology, both of which were book reviews (Martin 1931d, 1937b).

In June of 1927, the State Historical Society of Colorado (SHSC) hired Martin as curator of archaeology and ethnology. In August, just before moving to Denver, Martin accepted an invitation from Kidder to attend the first Pecos Conference (Woodbury 1993). He was one of the few students to attend and clearly benefitted from the experience (Martin 1927b). The time Martin spent in Colorado must have been exhilarating yet exhausting. In slightly more than two years, through October of 1929, Martin developed a new fieldwork program in southwestern Colorado and conducted two extensive field seasons there (summers of 1928 and 1929) while conducting two winter fieldwork seasons (1927–28; 1928–29) with Morley in the Yucatan. He researched and wrote his Ph.D. thesis and then defended it

in Chicago on May 28, 1929 (Martin 1929b). The thesis, entitled *The Kiva: A Survival of an Ancient House Type*, was a library-based, cross-cultural study of subterranean structures coupled with a morphological and functional analysis of Southwestern kivas. One wonders how Martin had time to conduct this research, for he was in the field in southwestern Colorado and the Yucatan, far from academic libraries, for at least seven months between July of 1928 and May of 1929. Nevertheless, and presaging conjectures for which he would later become widely recognized (e.g., Martin 1939b:467), Martin built on Mitchell Prudden's (1903) work to suggest that site-to-site regularity in room-to-kiva ratios might indicate that some common aspect of prehistoric social organization was manifest in the ruins. The degree was conferred on June 11, 1929.

In the summer of 1928, while still deeply ensconced in these research programs and while an employee of the SHSC, Martin received word, probably from Cole, that the Field Museum sought to resuscitate its long-dormant research program in Southwestern archaeology. Among other reasons, Martin applied for the position because he longed for a more intellectually stimulating environment after arriving in Denver: "There is no one here in this town with my interests and I therefore I have no one to whom I may turn for help or consultation. One needs to be rubbing against the elbows of others, and to be subjected to razz in order to improve."³³ On August 22, 1929, Martin accepted a letter of offer from the Field, writing to Sinologist and department chair Berthold Laufer, "I will try to give you and the Museum my fullest measure of effort."³⁴ He proved a man of his word and remained at the Field Museum until 1972.

Martin joined a Field Museum Anthropology department that included, in addition to Laufer, Albert Buell Lewis, assistant curator of African and Melanesian ethnology; J. Eric S. Thompson, assistant curator of Mexican and South American archaeology; Wilfrid Dyson Hambly, assistant curator of African ethnology; Henry Field, assistant curator of physical anthropology; and Thomas George Allen, assistant curator of Egyptian archaeology (Nash and Feinman 2003:259–261). Despite the fact that he was the junior member of the department, it was Martin who was promoted, after Laufer committed suicide, to acting curator of anthropology in 1934 and to chief curator in 1935 (Bronson 2003; Nash 2003). Martin's swift ascent to departmental leadership is a testament to his ambition, networking, and unmatched productivity in research, collections, and outreach (see below). Martin retired as chief curator in 1964, remained in Chicago as curator emeritus, then moved to Tucson in 1972 for a research position at the University of Arizona (see also note a in Table 1). He died of congestive heart failure and coronary artery disease on January 20, 1974.

RESEARCH

Martin's training in archaeological field methods came under Cole in Illinois and Morley in the Yucatan. From Cole, Martin learned the Chicago method of using arbitrary exca-

vation units to control archeological context and to record, if not necessarily preserve, good provenience data (see below; Browman 2002; Muller 2002). From Morley, he learned the utility of delegating projects to his staff and inherited a similar preference for comfortable, even pampered, field camps (Martin 1950; Nash 2001).

The scope of Martin's excavations in southwestern Colorado's Montezuma County between 1928 and 1938 is, by modern standards, enormous. Working with a crew of six men "digging continuously" at Cutthroat Castle in 1928, he excavated 30 rooms, four kivas, seven small towers, one large tower, and 12 refuse heaps.⁵ Unfortunately, he did not preserve excavation records for this work, but he did publish some sketch maps. The site report includes an architectural analysis affirming his interest in reconstructing prehistoric social organization (Martin 1929a:9; see also Martin 1929b).

Martin had come to recognize two types of ruins in the region: the unit-type ruins on open mesas previously described by Prudden (1903) and the rim-rock type ruins located on canyon ledges (Martin 1930a:1). In June of 1929, he returned to the field for SHSC with an eight-man crew and spent four months examining the two site types, focusing particular attention on the complex relationship between kivas, towers, and passageways that so intrigued him. He excavated Beartooth Pueblo and Little Dog Ruin, among others, and recovered a much more extensive assemblage of exhibition-quality materials for the SHSC than he had in 1928. Again, no field notes exist for these excavations, although he did publish a report and a popular account of this work (Martin 1930a, 1930b).

In the summer of 1929, Martin suffered a professional disappointment from which it would take a change in venue to recover. Through the SHSC, Martin sought Department of the Interior (DOI) permission to excavate Lowry Pueblo, a large, multistoried ruin and one of the archaeological crown jewels of the region. DOI rejected his application, arguing that SHSC did not have the financial resources to ensure successful completion of the project. Whether or not this was true is now irrelevant (and the question seems moot given the extent of Martin's SHSC-supported excavations in 1928 and 1929), but the fact remains that he was denied permission to excavate because he was based at an institution that, in actions if not words, the federal government considered second class or worse. This setback provided Martin yet another reason to jump at the chance of employment at the Field Museum when it was offered.

Six months after Martin arrived in Chicago, the Field Museum applied on his behalf for a blanket DOI permit to excavate sites in southwestern Colorado; Lowry was clearly the target. Laufer used collections and exhibition-related, but not research, goals to justify the application to the museum administration. Laufer noted that the material Martin would recover "would help considerably in filling in a gap in the Museum's Southwest collections and go far toward carrying out the new plans for the Southwest Hall."³⁶ By

the end of May, Martin secured critical endorsements from Kidder at the Carnegie Institution and Jesse Nusbaum, director of the Laboratory of Anthropology in Santa Fe, both of whom recognized the Field Museum's professional stature and financial resources, as well as the fact that it had been absent from the Southwest for so long. Nusbaum reassured Assistant Secretary of the Interior John Edwards that he and Kidder would monitor the excavations, thereby acknowledging Martin's still-junior status in the profession.⁷ DOI awarded the permit via telegram on June 6; Martin left immediately.

Just over one month later, Martin reported to Field Museum administrators that work was proceeding slowly, but that assessment is subject to interpretation.⁸ His crew had built a mining-car-and-chute apparatus that allowed them to

move up to 21 tons of overburden per day (see Figure 2). They had already exposed painted kiva murals for which Lowry would become famous (see Figure 3), submitted tree-ring specimens to the University of Arizona for dating, and filmed portions of the excavation on 16-millimeter film stock (see Figure 4).⁹ Martin nevertheless felt compelled to explicitly report that "[exhibition-quality] specimens are not yet being recovered."¹⁰ This statement underscores the different values placed on archaeological excavations by museum administrators, who wanted exhibition-quality specimens, and more scientifically minded archaeologists like Martin, who might find data in many different sources.

Martin had returned to Lowry in June of 1931 and filed his first progress report on July 1. Efforts to that point had been focused on preserving the walls that, regrettably, he



FIGURE 2. Mining chute, car, and track used to quickly remove overburden from south end of Lowry Ruin during the 1930 field season. (Negative No. CSA76312; courtesy of the Field Museum)



FIGURE 3. Kiva A, Lowry Ruin, during excavation in July 1930. Note the exposed murals, for which Lowry would become famous and for which Martin would become infamous because he did not take steps to ensure their long-term preservation. (Negative No. CSA73501; courtesy of the Field Museum)

left exposed in 1930 and that had fallen during the winter.¹¹ He reported that a tree-ring date of C.E. 985 \pm 2 had been derived for one of the beams submitted in 1930 and was pleased because the date was “earlier than any yet known for Mesa Verde, [and] bears out fairly well my guess, based on stratigraphy and pottery sequences.”¹² This is one of the few instances in which Martin’s correspondence emphasizes his research results and inferences, not object recovery.

On August 4, he celebrated the fact that he found “17 pieces of [whole] pottery . . . unlike anything in the area” and that Kidder had visited the site and was “impressed with the dig and the complexity of the problems.”¹³ He also noted that they found, off the main site and presumably on private land, an underground spring that had been timbered and cribbed in precontact times and ten pieces of pottery as well as Hopi prayer sticks at the bottom of the spring (see Martin 1931b). Martin “tried in vain to get the pottery for the Museum; some prayer sticks were obtained.”¹⁴ No record of these prayer sticks or pottery exists in Field Museum catalog or accession files.

Less than three weeks later, Martin celebrated the discovery of 24 more whole or restorable vessels and summarized his projected accomplishments: “I hope by the end of

the season to have about sixty or seventy pieces of pottery, many sherds, bone tools, minor objects, and about one hundred excellent negatives. . . . To date, exclusive of last year’s work, we have excavated seven large rooms, two kivas, and have trenched across the diameter of the Great Kiva, which has a diameter of 80 feet.”¹⁵

After a yearlong fieldwork hiatus in 1932, Martin returned to Lowry Pueblo in 1933 and 1934. In 1933, he noted that the ruin had evidence of at least five distinct periods of occupation, discernable on the basis of stratigraphic relationships and his bond-and-abutment study of the masonry walls, not to mention tree-ring data (Martin 1933a). He heralded the discovery of several bone-tool caches, three dog burials, 30 whole vessels, and the fact that he had obtained a tree-ring date of C.E. 894 for a previously submitted specimen. In 1934, he published a nearly full-page article in *Field Museum News* to announce that Federal Emergency Relief Administration labor had been used and that “greater progress was made than in any of the three previous seasons of the expedition’s work,” because the team had recovered 14 partially dismembered skeletons, 44 pieces of pottery, and 4,000 potsherds, as well as “great quantities of arrowheads, beads, axes, bone implements, and other artifacts”



FIGURE 4. *Martin demonstrating his cinematography skills on the hood of the Southwest Expedition's Pierce Arrow Touring Car in 1931. (Negative No. CSA75691; courtesy of the Field Museum)*

(Martin 1934a:3). Note again that in writing for museum members, as well as museum administrators, Martin usually emphasized recovery of archaeological "loot," not the solution of research problems.

Martin published the Lowry Pueblo report in 1936, only two years after concluding excavations there (Martin et al. 1936). The published theory behind the excavation of Lowry Pueblo is firmly grounded in cultural evolutionism and the culture history paradigm then current among North American archaeologists:

Possibly this work will contribute towards the discovery of some of the forces which caused the gradual rise of Pueblo

Indians from a low to a higher cultural state. I likewise hope that this study may perhaps . . . [help complete] the mosaic of Pueblo history which archaeologists working in the Southwest are slowly composing . . . Thus, I hoped, by exploring [Lowry Pueblo] to . . . attain a historical perspective which would permit me to solve problems, such as the mechanics of growth of a particular pueblo, the architectural skill of these Pueblo Indians, the size of the population at various periods and its changes, the length of time that the pueblo was inhabited, the pottery sequence, and the cultural and chronological relationship of this pueblo to other large villages in New Mexico and Arizona. [Martin et al. 1936:22–23]

Clearly, and at least in retrospect, Martin sought to do more than simply fill in a gap in the museum's collections.

Martin's use of the Chicago excavation method, motion-picture film, and mining technologies as well as his willingness to make conjectures about prehistoric social organization were all considered innovative at the time. A detailed reading of the Lowry Pueblo site report reveals also that Martin was tacitly interested in, or at least cognizant of, research on ancient psychology and culture pattern, perhaps because of his association with Sapir at Chicago (see Hawley 1937). Martin also reestablished an analytical precedent set by John Wesley Powell in 1881 by hiring an architect, Lawrence Roys, to analyze the construction sequence of Lowry Pueblo (Longacre 1999).

Christopher Chippendale (1989:23) warns us that “a knowing superiority from hindsight is the easiest and most pernicious attitude to fall into” when writing the history of archaeology, but it is difficult to avoid the impression that, despite these innovations, Martin's efforts amounted to little more than sophisticated specimen hunting, a point to which he basically admitted later in life: “Mostly, we dug out of curiosity, for fun, for specimens, and to write the historical details for these sites and for this time period” (Martin 1974:7). He went on:

To be honest, I fear some of [the excavations] were the result of my callow youth: the desire to make a name for myself by aping Kidder, by digging a big ruin and to run substantial stratigraphies [sic] to solve some of the ceramic problems of the area; [and] to obtain a goodly amount of loot for the Museum, for I was, at the time, very museum minded. [Martin 1974:8]

A curious footnote in his next monograph (Martin 1938a) underscores the idea that his published problem orientation for the excavations at Lowry may have developed *ex post facto*. That monograph contains a three-page section entitled “Problems,” which, Martin admits, was written “at the suggestion of Dr. A. V. Kidder and *before* fieldwork had commenced” (Martin 1938a:236 n. 1, *emphasis added*). It is admirable that Martin, already an established scholar and department chair at a major museum, remained critically aware of potential shortcomings in his own work. That he would heed Kidder's suggestion in the first place and also acknowledge that fact in print suggests that this was a new stage in Martin's research that he wished to emphasize for colleagues, administrators, and other interested parties.

Martin had returned to southwestern Colorado in 1937 and again in 1938 to examine smaller and earlier sites dating to the mid-late C.E. 800s to try to understand their developmental relationship to Lowry Pueblo. Although he did not use the term, it is clear that one of his objectives was to understand the regional settlement pattern (Martin 1938a). On July 6, 1937, he prepared a news release emphasizing their ceramic analysis: “Several nights we stayed up until midnight calculating averages, percentages, and totals for sections and quarter sections. The 4th of July was just like another day and we worked like beavers trying to keep pace with the work of the day laborers.”¹⁶ In spite of this innovative study, Martin soon communicated his disappointment with the season, thereby belying his, and certainly his super-

visors', continued emphasis on the acquisition of exhibition-quality materials. In response to a lecture request, Martin wrote to Field Museum President Clifford Gregg: “Unless more exciting materials turn up, the lecture would be a total flop”¹⁷—this in spite of the fact that he later summarized the season's work by arguing that “such [a] thorough investigation has never before been carried on in southwestern Colorado” (Martin 1937a:2).

Martin's tone changed dramatically just eight days later as the excavation of Basketmaker sites was beginning to generate results, news, and greater interest. Martin reported that the excavations were going to push the known archaeological sequence in the region back from C.E. 1000 to C.E. 400, and that he was therefore excavating the earliest sites then known in the region. Having thus baited his supervisors, Martin stated flatly that without an additional appropriation of \$500, he would have to stop digging immediately. A check for \$500 arrived less than one week later directly from the pen of Field Museum director Stanley Field.¹⁸

Despite having received a DOI permit to excavate up to 15 sites on public land, the four sites Martin excavated in 1937 were on private land.¹⁹ An unfortunate, if unintended, consequence of this is that Martin was not required to, and therefore did not, prepare and submit a year-end report to the DOI, and no such summary report exists within the archives. Our ability to understand his unpublished thoughts on the 1937 activity, beyond those above, is therefore hampered.

Under Martin's tutelage, in 1937 Carl Lloyd supervised a methodologically groundbreaking archaeological survey. His “discontinuous intensive archaeological survey” examined select quarter sections in a 16.5-square-mile area in the Ackmen-Lowry region, as well as one quarter section within Hovenweep National Monument (Lloyd 1938:284–285). His technique was decidedly modern: field crews walked transects separated by 100 feet until each quarter section was completely surveyed. For each of the 180 sites discovered, crews recorded geographical and archaeological data and collected all surface sherds. Lloyd published ceramic-type frequencies for the 80 sites from which 50 or more sherds were collected, and on that basis he offered “evidence for a hypothesis concerning the development of McElmo black-on-white from Mancos black-on-white” (Lloyd 1938:288–292). Unfortunately, Martin destroyed Lloyd's field records the following year, after the site report had been published (Lloyd 1938; Martin 1938a; see below). As a result, the collections can no longer be tied to sites on the ground (see below).

In 1938, the museum inquired of DOI whether a new permit was required; it was. By late June, and with a new permit in hand, Martin excavated four Basketmaker and early Pueblo sites in southwestern Colorado (Martin 1939a, 1939b; see Figure 5). On July 13, Martin reported the excavation of a kiva, 81 feet in diameter, as well as a pithouse that yielded 44 burned timbers suitable for dendrochronological analysis. Using a well-worn strategy, he followed with



FIGURE 5. John Rinaldo, Paul Martin, and Charles Di Peso in the Southwest Expedition field house in southwestern Colorado in July of 1938. Both Rinaldo and Di Peso went on to long and productive careers in southwestern archaeology after World War II. (Negative No. A87446; courtesy of the Field Museum)

another funding appeal: “Work going in a perfectly grand fashion . . . We are in the midst of excavating a large site which is turning out to be too good to be true, but it is much larger than estimated. It will take us another four weeks to finish the few portions which we wish to uncover.”²⁰ The museum sent an additional \$600 appropriation on August 1; Martin sent 17 boxes of artifacts back to Chicago two weeks later.

After spending nine seasons in southwestern Colorado, Martin had grown intellectually restless. In spite of recovering wonderful collections and developing new excavation and recording techniques, but arguably because he had matured as an archaeological scholar, he sought greener intellectual pastures. He knew that a new challenge lay south, in the mountainous regions of west-central New Mexico and east-central Arizona, where Emil W. Haury (1936; see Martin 1937c) had recently defined a controversial new archaeological culture: the pithouse-dwelling Mogollon. And so, in 1939, Martin began a new phase in his long career (Nash 2003, 2006).

EXHIBITION AND OUTREACH

In the 1910s and 1920s, museums were undergoing a significant transition from an “object-based epistemology,” in

which objects were displayed in exhibition cases with little or no explanation (i.e., “the facts speak for themselves”), to one in which exhibitions embodied and presented some aspect of anthropological research questions or theory, particularly those surrounding culture history and cultural evolution (see Conn 1998).

When Martin was hired in 1929, the Field Museum had been in its Grant Park location for only eight years, having spent its first 28 years in Jackson Park, on the south side, in the former Fine Arts Building of the World’s Columbian Exposition, which is now the Museum of Science and Industry (see Figure 6). When the move to Grant Park occurred in the early 1920s, the exhibition cases were moved, intact (see Figures 7 and 8). Very little exhibition development had occurred in the decade prior to the move, but in the late 1920s and early 1930s the Field Museum entered a new phase of rapid exhibition development, particularly as efforts intensified in preparation for the Century of Progress Exhibition of 1933 (Collier 2003; Yastrow and Nash 2003). Almost certainly, Martin was hired with these considerations in mind, and he spent a remarkable amount of time during his first decade at the Field Museum engaged in exhibition and outreach activities. His exhibition work emphasized interesting artifacts, dioramas, and archaeological



FIGURE 6. *The Hall of Archaeology and Ethnology of North America, East Court, Field Columbian Museum, Jackson Park, Chicago, circa 1896. Note the dioramas in center, surrounded by case upon case of objects with scant labeling and even less interpretation. (Negative No. CSA 8193; courtesy of the Field Museum)*

features; his outreach activities, primarily though not exclusively in the form of popular publications, sought to make anthropological and archaeological research digestible to the public.

An early milestone in Martin's exhibition and outreach effort is a little-known yet remarkable 122-page guide to the newly installed *Archaeology of North America* exhibition in Hall B on the ground floor of the museum (Martin 1933b). The volume provides insights into the Field Museum's exhibition philosophy as well as Martin's understanding of the state of U.S. archaeology at that time. It opens with speculation about Native American origins and the antiquity thereof, during which he incorrectly states that "no such associations [between humans and an extinct Ice Age fauna] have yet been discovered" in North America (Martin 1933b:11).²¹ Following these introductory comments, Martin summarized the known culture areas in North America and focused on the Moundbuilder cultures of the Midwest, which to that point dominated much of the Field Museum's collections and exhibitions. Separate chapters on objects of stone, bone, pottery,

and mining round out the factual aspects of the volume and mirror the structure of the exhibition as well as his later scientific monographs (e.g., Martin 1938a, 1939b; Martin et al. 1936). He then confronted some fallacies about American Indians and provided a case-by-case explanation of the material on display. A concluding paragraph in the volume is worth citing in detail, for it reveals Martin's reliance on the culture area–culture history approach to exhibitions, if not research, and offers his justification for why curators collect:

The purpose of the Hall of North American Archaeology is not merely to exhibit the handiwork of the North American Indians, but to illustrate their history as well as their methods of living as worked out under various geographical and cultural environments. The collections on display were not gathered solely because of interest in the objects themselves. They were acquired with great effort and at much expense in an attempt to save from destruction the priceless and imperishable remains [so] that the history of the Indians may be reconstructed. . . . If the specimens are worth collecting and saving, they are worth taking care of; and provision should be made to have them left



FIGURE 7. *Field Columbian Museum exhibits in Jackson Park being moved to the new Field Museum building in Grant Park, Chicago, 1921. (Negative No. CSGN 40466[1]; courtesy of the Field Museum)*

to an institution where they will be catalogued and preserved and where they will help future students and collectors. [Martin 1933b:110]

In this, Martin touched on the self-serving preservationist rhetoric, if not ethic, so common among museum personnel of the day, who felt they were saving objects “from destruction” and were preserving collections for the greater good of humanity, a justification for unrestrained museum collecting activity that persists to this day (e.g., Cuno 2008). Unfortunately, Martin did not practice what he preached: 95 percent of his collection remained uncatalogued until the late 1990s, and he knowingly destroyed field records on at least one occasion (see below).

Throughout the 1930s, Martin presented a number of small, temporary archaeological exhibitions. In June of 1931, he announced the donation and display of the Peregrine figure, a rare flourite anthropomorphic figurine found in extreme southern Illinois (Martin 1931c). In September, he announced the installation of a full-sized reproduction of an Illinois Moundbuilder grave (Martin 1931a).²²

With the display, Martin hoped to dispel the myth of the Moundbuilders and clarify a fact that archaeologists, if not the general public, already understood well: the mounds so common in the eastern and midwestern United States were built by ancestors of modern Native Americans, not a mythical race of superhumans (Silverberg 1968).

In January of 1932, Martin announced with little fanfare the reinstallation of the North American archaeology collections in Hall 3. This reinstallation did not include the Southwest culture area because “a special hall representing its important group of cultures is in preparation” (Martin 1932c:2).²³ He then announced new displays of Navajo blankets (Martin 1932b) and copper objects from the Hopewell Mounds in Ohio (Martin 1932a). In 1933, he announced the installation of Hopi Kachina Dolls (Martin 1933c). In 1934, he introduced the newly developed science of tree-ring dating to an interested public (Martin 1934d) as well a revamped diorama of the Great Serpent Mound in Ohio (Martin 1934c) and a recently acquired collection of Eskimo toys (Martin 1934e). In 1935, he announced the



FIGURE 8. *Field Columbian Museum exhibits being moved from the Jackson Park location to the new Field Museum in Grant Park, 1921. Note protective covering placed over the skeletons in the near exhibit case. (Negative No. CSGN 40496; courtesy of the Field Museum)*

installation of a Tibetan *coracle*, or yak-skin boat (Martin 1935b). It is clear that Martin published the announcement only because of Laufer's recent death, as Martin had no expertise in such material. In December, he announced the installation of a model of a Toltec pyramid (Martin 1935a). In so doing, he provided a broader anthropological context for the installation, explaining the ceremonial nature of such structures.

After 1935, Martin's contributions to *Field Museum News* began to emphasize less the installation of new, small exhibits; instead, he began to provide simply phrased explanations of anthropological research for an interested public, as he had done so ably in his guidebook to Hall B (Martin 1933b). In 1936, he summarized Sapir's linguistic work that demonstrated the Athapascan roots of Navajo language (Martin 1936c). In keeping with the difficult economic times brought on by the Great Depression, he noted that the translation of a recently discovered cuneiform tablet (an "Ancient Promissory Note") from Kish, Iraq, revealed severe usury, in which the lender charged a 100 percent interest rate (Martin 1936a). In December, Martin turned his attention to Hopi secret societies, superficially if understandably comparing them to fraternities on college campuses (Martin 1936b).

The concentration of these publications in late 1936 is perhaps not surprising, as Martin had not conducted fieldwork since 1934 and his report on the Lowry excavations had just been published (Martin et al. 1936).

In 1937, he tackled preventative medicine of Native Americans (Martin 1937d) and in 1938 the "Indians of California" (Martin 1938b). Also in 1938, he published in the *North American Review* a long-winded and peculiar essay reviewing F. Martin Brown's 1937 book *America's Yesterday*, in which Brown reviewed significant archaeological discoveries of the previous quarter century (see Martin 1938c).

The dozens of short articles published and temporary exhibitions installed by Martin during the 1930s kept the museum membership engaged in, and hopefully excited by, new developments in anthropological and archaeological research. No other Field Museum curator, in anthropology or any other department, was as visible on the exhibition floor, in *Field Museum News*, or in the Chicago newspapers during this period (Nash n.d.). This work, arguably more than his field research, may have endeared Martin to the museum administration and enabled his meteoric rise to the top of the Department of Anthropology, which he subsequently dominated for more than three decades.

COLLECTIONS

During the period in question, Martin published two contributions based exclusively on objects already in the Field Museum collections. The first is an otherwise anomalous account of the “Bow-Drill in North America,” in which he offered a cross-cultural literature review and detailed description of a bow-drill collected by Charles McLloyd and C. C. Graham in Grand Gulch, Utah, in 1890 (Martin 1934b).²⁴ He argued that the piece could not possibly be unique and that similar bow-drills would one day be found elsewhere in the Four Corners region, which they have. The second contribution, coauthored with Elizabeth Willis, is *Anasazi Painted Pottery in the Field Museum of Natural History* (Martin and Willis 1940). This impressive volume contains typologically sorted photographs of a sample of the 5,000 Ancestral Puebloan vessels collected by “cow-men, ranchers, antiquarians” in the late 19th century and subsequently acquired by the museum (Martin and Willis 1940:7).²⁵ Martin and Willis (1940) lamented the limited research potential of the collection because of a lack of provenience data, but they appreciated its aesthetic appeal and exhibition potential. Their lament rings a bit hollow in light of Martin’s failure to preserve field-research records and his failure to properly catalog portions of the collections he amassed.

In 1933, Martin publicly professed his dedication to museum collections, their associated data, and the rapid publication thereof (Martin 1933b:110). It is another matter entirely whether he practiced what he preached or if his desire to obtain a “goodly amount of loot for the Museum” dominated his developing curatorial sensibilities (Martin 1974:8). Without a doubt, Martin established a well-deserved reputation for the rapid production of excavation monographs in the museum’s *Fieldiana* series (e.g., Martin 1938a, 1939a; Martin et al. 1936). At the risk of presentism (Stocking 1965), however, the monographs and the collections on which they are based must now be considered incomplete for four reasons.

First, Martin did not screen the excavated room fill and routinely ignored entire classes of objects that today are standard components of archaeological assemblages, including faunal remains, sediment samples, lithic debitage, and plainware sherds. For this, he should not be blamed, for fill was not routinely screened until the 1970s and archaeological methods are constantly developing. Nevertheless, archaeology is a destructive science, and specific excavation units cannot be reexcavated to test a prior scholar’s conclusions. Limitations in excavation methods must therefore be explicitly recognized as they have a direct effect on the nature and integrity of the collection created and, hopefully, curated. It would be fascinating indeed to excavate Martin’s back dirt piles to determine exactly what he chose to leave behind and in what proportions.

Second, Martin violated his own decree: “If the specimens are worth collecting and saving, they are worth taking care of; and provision should be made to have them left to

an institution where they will be catalogued and preserved and where they will help future students and collectors” (Martin 1933b:110). Martin routinely published data on objects that he left in the field. Although this is better than not publishing such data at all, it is now impossible to test his published conclusions on the data set he used. As but one example, Martin and colleagues (1936) published data on 1,377 objects from floor contexts at Lowry Pueblo but catalogued only 598, or just 43 percent, of those objects.²⁶ On reflection, it appears that Martin heeded his supervisors’ call and shipped to Chicago and catalogued only the exhibition-quality whole and reconstructable vessels, formal stone and bone tools, and human remains, as well as a small sample (ca. ten percent) of the decorated sherds he excavated from Lowry Pueblo and the other southwestern sites.

Third, Martin’s southwestern Colorado collection has suffered significant losses through attrition, possible petty theft, and probable curatorial culling in amounts that are now impossible to determine. Of the 598 floor-context artifacts mentioned above, only 520 (87 percent) were found during inventory in 1998. The situation is similar for collections from nonfloor contexts at Lowry but is far worse for the 1937 and 1938 collections.²⁷

Fourth, Martin’s southwestern Colorado collection and monographs must be considered incomplete because of the lack of original excavation records beyond the photograph and correspondence collections. Rinaldo, Martin’s loyal assistant from 1938–62, noted that his first memory of Martin occurred in 1938, when Martin was shredding Lloyd’s 1937 survey notes.²⁸ Martin told Rinaldo the notes were no longer needed because the survey had been published (Lloyd 1938). If Rinaldo’s recollection was correct, and the archives suggest it is, Martin’s behavior was inexcusable, even according to professional standards of the time. He had been working in museums for over a decade and had made productive analytical use of archived field notes and data as early as 1926 in Illinois (see Browman 2002:258–259). Surely, he knew better.

Given these lacunae in Martin’s collection from southwestern Colorado, and the startling lack of excavation records, it is now impossible to test Martin’s interpretations and conclusions using the same artifact assemblages he analyzed. In short, his science is no longer replicable. Martin nevertheless recorded provenience data, sometimes simply written on the objects themselves, more completely than did many of his contemporaries. If one trusts the data on the objects and in the publications, then productive use may still be made, however cautiously, of his collections (see Rinaldo 1950).

CONCLUSION

To return to the questions outlined at the outset of this article: Did museum-based archaeology, as seen through the Field Museum and Martin lens, change during the late 1920s and 1930s? Martin’s museum-based predecessors, including Dorsey and Owen at the Field, and Cummings at the Arizona

State Museum, worried less about recording archaeological contexts than he did. Having been trained under Morley and Cole, Martin was imbued with an ethic that called for controlled excavation and detailed photographic recording—if not, oddly enough, the preservation of field notes. Martin worked for museums, however, and was under pressure to recover exhibit-quality materials: the SHSC considered his excavations “a failure” if he did not do so.²⁹ Martin’s work during these early years manifests itself as a tender balancing act between institutional-collection and exhibition-related goals and the developing disciplinary desire for problem-oriented research. By February of 1937, Martin was explicit and ex ante about this problem orientation (Martin 1938a).

Did museum archaeologists, as seen through the same lens, (re)negotiate their commitments to scientific research and the visiting public during this period? Martin’s commitment to exhibition and outreach is amply demonstrated by his extensive exhibition development activity at the Field Museum and the 40 popular articles he published between 1927 and 1938, all of which endeavored to make anthropology and archaeology available to an interested public.³⁰ Before 1935, these contributions emphasized the discovery and display of individual objects, dioramas, or features. After 1935, these contributions focused more on archaeological and anthropological research and making it understandable, and indeed relevant, to an interested public. It is not unreasonable to suppose that Martin’s exhibition and outreach activity proved critical in the museum’s decision to promote him to chief curator over five anthropological colleagues, all of whom had temporal seniority over Martin.

So why is Martin, undeniably one of the most successful archaeologists of the 20th century, still underappreciated, particularly for his work during this early period? In spite of the fact that Martin was well connected in Chicago and that he had well-established professional networks in the Yucatan and the U.S. Southwest, he did not have a regular stream of graduate students working for him, at least partially because neither of the museums at which he worked are, or were, affiliated with a university.³¹ Martin also chose to publish his research as monographs in the Field Museum’s *Fieldiana* series, not in peer-reviewed journals like *American Anthropologist*, *American Antiquity*, and *Science*. Although the field of North American archaeology was indeed small during the 1930s, this choice affected his disciplinary and, especially, his historical visibility. Finally, the early portion of Martin’s career is simply overshadowed by his work in support of the New Archaeology in Arizona from 1956 until his death in 1974, which involved large numbers of highly productive and visible students and scholars (Nash 2003, 2006).

Martin the museum-based archaeologist made significant contributions to archaeological knowledge, method, and, to a lesser degree, theory, between 1925 and 1938. He added thousands of objects to the already impressive collections at two major museums. He made these and other collections available to an interested public through extensive, if not unparalleled, exhibition, publication, and out-

reach activities. But he also compromised the future research value of these collections through poor note taking, occasional destruction and disposal of associated documentation, and failure to fully catalog and publish the collections he amassed. Had he not published such clear arguments against these practices (e.g., 1933b:110), his record and behavior might be more easily excused as a product of the times. But Martin knew better and said he knew better. He therefore leaves behind a conflicted legacy.

Stephen E. Nash *Department of Anthropology, Denver Museum of Nature and Science, Denver, CO 80205; stephen.nash@dmns.org; www.dmns.org; http://dmns.org/main/en/general/science/scientificexperts/biographies/nashsteve.htm*

NOTES

Acknowledgments. Many former Field Museum colleagues, too numerous to name, helped with or facilitated this research. I thank Jonathan Haas for hiring me on the Martin Project in 1997 and the Department of Anthropology for allowing me to continue this research while I served as Head of Collections from 1999 to 2006. Chip Colwell-Chanthaphonh, Tom Boellstorff, and four anonymous *American Anthropologist* reviewers saved me from myself; all remaining errors of fact or interpretation are mine.

1. William Duncan Strong served as curator of North American Ethnology and Archaeology from 1926–29 but conducted fieldwork in the sub-Arctic, not the Southwest (Nash and Feinman 2003).
2. Martin’s administrative and service contributions will be analyzed in Nash n.d.
3. Letter, Martin to Guthe, January 31, 1929. Colorado Historical Society Archives (CHSA) Correspondence, File Martin, Paul S., 1927–29.
4. Letter, Martin to Laufer, August 22, 1929. Department of Anthropology Correspondence Files (DACF) 1893–1935, Box Li–McP; Folder 6: Department Correspondence 1893–1935: Mar.
5. Letter, Martin to Guthe, November 28, 1928. CHSA Correspondence File Martin 1927–29.
6. Letter, Laufer to Simms, May 7, 1930. Field Museum Expedition Files (FMEF), Box 6, Folder Expedition to the Southwest (1930–34).
7. Letter, Nusbaum to Edwards, May 31, 1930. FMEF, Box 6, Folder Expedition to the Southwest (1930–34).
8. Letter, Martin to Simms, July 12, 1930. FMEF, Box 6, Folder Field Museum Archaeological Expedition to the Southwest (1930–34).
9. These films are preserved at The Field Museum Archives as Accessions 17 and 18.
10. Letter, Martin to Simms, July 21, 1930. FMEF, Box 6, Folder Expedition to the Southwest (1930–34).
11. Backfilling of archaeological excavation units did not become standard practice until later.

12. Letter, Martin to Simms, July 1, 1931. FMEF Box 6, Folder Field Museum Archaeological Expedition to the Southwest (1930–34). [Folder 2].
13. Letter, Martin to Simms, August 4, 1931. FMEF Box 6, Folder Expedition to the Southwest (1930–34).
14. Letter, Martin to Simms, August 4, 1931. FMEF Box 6, Folder Expedition to the Southwest (1930–34).
15. Letter, Martin to Simms, August 24, 1931. FMEF Box 6, Folder Expedition to the Southwest (1930–34). [Folder 2].
16. Letter, Martin to Gregg, July 6, 1937. FMEF Box 6, Folder Expedition to the Southwest (1937–38).
17. FMEF Box 6, Folder Expedition to the Southwest (1937–38). [Folder 2].
18. Letter, Gregg to Martin, August 3, 1937. FMEF Box 6, Folder Expedition to the Southwest (1937–38). [Folder 1].
19. Unfortunately, Martin used sequential numbers (i.e., Site 1, Site 2, Site 3, Site 4) to name the 1937 sites and did so again in 1938. The Field Museum, thus, curates materials from sites with identical names.
20. Letter, Martin to Gregg, July 26, 1938. FMEF Box 6, Folder Expedition to the Southwest (1937–38).
21. This is a glaring error. Researchers at the Colorado Museum of Natural History had in 1927 discovered projectile points embedded within the bones of an extinct form of bison at Folsom, New Mexico. It is unclear how Martin could have ignored these important discoveries, particularly as he was based in Denver for two years immediately after the discovery.
22. Although Martin is not listed as the author, it is so attributed here because it is listed in his self-compiled curriculum vitae, he was curator of that material, and the prose is stylistically similar to his other contributions.
23. The North American archaeology display was moved to Hall B in 1933 to make room for Malvina Hoffman's *Races of Mankind* exhibit, which was prominently featured in association with Chicago's *Century of Progress* world's fair (Yastrow and Nash 2003).
24. Martin 1934b is the only nonreview publication Martin ever published in *American Anthropologist*. Having easy access to the museum's *Fieldiana* monograph series and popular publications, Martin probably saw little reason to publish in peer-reviewed journals. This may account for the fact that he less well known outside of Southwestern archaeology than one might expect.
25. Willis was a "senior archaeologist" at the Field Museum from 1937–40, paid by the Works Progress Administration (Nash and Feinman 2003).
26. In all, Martin never cataloged 95 percent of the Field Museum collection he amassed during his 43-year career in Chicago. I cataloged the remainder under a National Science Foundation systematics grant (SBR-9710181) awarded to Jonathan Haas in 1997. A searchable database and selected finding aides are available at the Field Museum's website (www.fieldmuseum.org).
27. Descriptive finding aides evaluating the nature and integrity of Martin's collections from southwestern Colorado are on file in Field Museum Department of Anthropology accessions 1895 (Lowry Pueblo), 2159 (the 1937 sites and survey), and 2180 (the 1938 sites).
28. Personal communication with author, May 15, 1998.
29. Letter, Martin to Guthe, May 31, 1928. CHSA Correspondence File Martin 1927–29, Folder 2.
30. Even Cummings, one of the great popularizers of archaeology, did not match Martin's output in this regard (see Bostwick 2006).
31. Martin became adjunct faculty at the University of Chicago in the early 1940s, after the period in question.

REFERENCES CITED

- Almazan, Tristan, and Sarah Coleman
2003 George Amos Dorsey: A Curator and His Comrades. *In* Curators, Collections, and Contexts: Anthropology at the Field Museum, 1893–2002. Stephen E. Nash and Gary M. Feinman, eds. Pp. 87–98. *Fieldiana* (n.s.) 36. Chicago: Field Museum of Natural History.
- Bostwick, Todd W.
2006 Byron Cummings: Dean of Southwestern Archaeology. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Bronson, B.
2003 Berthold Laufer. *In* Curators, Collections, and Contexts: Anthropology at the Field Museum, 1893–2002. Stephen E. Nash and Gary M. Feinman, eds. Pp. 117–126. *Fieldiana* (n.s.) 36. Chicago: Field Museum of Natural History.
- Browman, David L.
2002 Origins of Stratigraphic Excavation in North America: The Peabody Museum Method and the Chicago Method. *In* New Perspective on the Origins of Americanist Archaeology. David L. Browman and Stephen Williams, eds. Pp. 242–264. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.
- Browman, David L., and Stephen Williams
In press Anthropology at Harvard: 1790–1940—A Biographical History. Cambridge, MA: Peabody Museum Press.
- Brown, Frederick Martin
1937 America's Yesterday. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott.
- Chippendale, Christopher
1989 "Social Archaeology" in the 19th Century: Is It Right to Look for Modern Ideas in Old Places? *In* Tracing Archaeology's Past. A. Christenson, ed. Pp. 21–33. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Coleman, Sarah
2004 Paul Sidney Martin, Southwestern United States Archaeological Expeditions, Field Museum Papers, 1930–1977, n.d. Finding aide on file, Field Museum Archives.
- Coleman, Sarah, and Stephen E. Nash.
2004 Paul Sidney Martin, Southwest Archaeological Expeditions, Arizona State Museum Papers, 1929, 1934–1974. Finding aide on file, Field Museum Archives.
- Collier, Donald
2003 My Life with Exhibits at the Field Museum, 1941–1976. *In* Curators, Collections, and Contexts: Anthropology at the Field Museum, 1893–2002. Stephen E. Nash and Gary M. Feinman, eds. Pp. 199–220. *Fieldiana* (n.s.) 36. Chicago: Field Museum of Natural History.

- Colwell-Chanthaphonh, Chip
2009 *Inheriting the Past: The Making of Arthur C. Parker and Indigenous Archaeology*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Conn, Steven
1998 *Museums and American Intellectual Life, 1876–1926*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Cuno, James
2008 *Who Owns Antiquity? Museums and the Battle over Our Ancient Heritage*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Fowler, Don D.
2000 *A Laboratory for Anthropology: Science and Romanticism in the American Southwest, 1846–1930*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
- Graves, Michael, and Ezra Zubrow
2007 *The Intellectual Legacies of an Archaeological Paradigm. In Archaeological Anthropology: Perspectives on Method and Theory*. James M. Skibo, Michael W. Graves, and Miriam T. Stark, eds. Pp. 3–20. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Haskin, Warren, Stephen E. Nash, and Sarah Coleman
2003 *A Chronicle of Field Museum Anthropology. In Curators, Collections, and Contexts: Anthropology at the Field Museum, 1893–2002*. Stephen Nash and Gary M. Feinman, eds. Pp. 65–84. *Fieldiana* (n.s.) 36. Chicago: Field Museum of Natural History.
- Haury, Emil W.
1936 *The Mogollon Culture of Southwestern New Mexico. Medallion Papers No. 20*. Globe: Gila Pueblo Archaeological Foundation.
- Hawley, Florence M.
1937 *Review of Martin (1936) Lowry Pueblo in Southwestern Colorado*. *American Anthropologist* 39(2):328–330.
- Kehoe, Alice Beck
1998 *The Land of Prehistory: A Critical History of American Archaeology*. New York: Routledge.
- Kerns, Virginia
2003 *Scenes from the High Desert: Julian Steward's Life and Theory*. Champaign: University of Illinois Press
- Lloyd, Carl
1938, *The Archaeological Survey in the Ackmen-Lowry Region. In Archaeological Work in the Ackmen-Lowry Area, Southwestern Colorado, 1937*. Paul S. Martin, ed. Pp. 282–292. *Anthropological Series* 23(2), Publication 419. Chicago: Field Museum of Natural History.
- Longacre, William A.
1976 *Paul Sidney Martin 1899 [sic 1898]–1974*. *American Anthropologist* 78(1):90–92.
1999 *Why Did the BAE Hire an Architect? Journal of the Southwest* 41(3):359–369.
- Lyman, R. Lee, and Michael J. O'Brien
2003 *W. C. McKern and the Midwestern Taxonomic Method*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.
- Lyman, R. Lee, Michael J. O'Brien, and Robert C. Dunnell
1997 *The Rise and Fall of Culture History*. New York: Plenum.
- Martin, Paul S.
1927a *Archaeological Survey of Illinois. Wisconsin Archaeologist* (n.s.) 6(2):56–58.
1927b *The Pecos Conference on Southwestern Archaeology. Colorado Magazine* 4(5):180–182.
1928 *Report of Paul S. Martin on the Temple of Two Lintels (Station 7). Carnegie Institution of Washington Annual Report* 1928:302–305.
1929a *The 1928 Archaeological Expedition of the State Historical Society. Colorado Magazine* 6(1):1–35.
1929b *The Kiva: A Survival of an Ancient House Type. University of Chicago Abstracts of Theses, Humanistic Series* 7:367–370.
1929c *The Temple of the Two Lintels. University of Chicago Magazine* 21(4):169–174.
1930a *The 1929 Archaeological Expedition of the State Historical Society of Colorado in Cooperation with the Smithsonian Institution. Excavations at Bear Tooth Pueblo, Little Dog Ruins near Ackmen, Colorado. Colorado Magazine* 7(1):1–40.
1930b *Recent Archaeological Excavations in Southwestern Colorado. Pan American Magazine* 44(3):228–236.
1931a *Grave of an Illinois Moundbuilder Reproduced in a Museum Exhibit. Field Museum News* 2(9):1.
1931b *Important Discoveries Made by Southwest Expedition. Field Museum News* 2(9):3.
1931c *Rare Idol-Like Figure from Illinois Mound. Field Museum News* 2(6):3.
1931d *Review of History of the Maya, by Gann and Thompson. American Anthropologist* 33(4):633.
1932a *Exhibit of Copper Object from Hopewell Mounds. Field Museum News* 3(6):4.
1932b *Navajo Blankets Make Interesting Exhibit. Field Museum News* 3(3):1, 4.
1932c *North American Archaeology Collections Reinstalled. Field Museum News* 3(1):2.
1933a *Expedition to the Southwest Returns with Collections. Field Museum News* 4(11):2.
1933b *Guide, Part 2: Archaeology of North America, Hall B (Ground Floor). Chicago: Field Museum of Natural History*.
1933c *Hopi Dolls. Field Museum News* 4(4):3.
1934a *Expedition Excavates One of the Largest and Oldest Kivas of Prehistoric Indians. Field Museum News* 5(12):3.
1934b *The Bow-Drill in America. American Anthropologist* 36(1):94–97.
1934c *The Great Serpent Mound. Field Museum News* 5(8):4.
1934d *The Use of Tree Rings in Dating Ruins. Field Museum News* 5(7):2.
1934e *Toys in the Eskimo Collection. Field Museum News* 5(5):1.
1935a *Ancient Votive Pyramid of Toltecs in Mexico Is Represented by Model. Field Museum News* 6(12):1.
1935b *A Tibetan Boat Made of Skins. Field Museum News* 6(11):3.
1936a *Ancient Promissory Note Reveals Severe Usury. Field Museum News* 7(11):3.
1936b *Hopi Indian Secret Societies. Field Museum News* 7(12):3.
1936c *Origin of the Navaho. Field Museum News* 7(9):2.
1937a *Report Summarizing Work of the Southwest Expedition. Field Museum News* 8(12):2.
1937b *Review of Mexico before Cortez, by J. Eric S. Thompson. American Anthropologist* 35(3):533.

- 1937c *Review of The Mogollon Culture of Southwestern New Mexico* by E. W. Haury, 1936. *American Antiquity* 3(3):233–234.
- 1937d Some Medical Practices of American Indians. *Field Museum News* 8(10):2.
- 1938a Archaeological Work in the Ackmen-Lowry Area, Southwestern Colorado, 1937. *Field Museum of Natural History Anthropological Series* 23(2), Publication, 419. Chicago: Field Museum of Natural History.
- 1938b Indians of California. *Field Museum News* 9(5):2.
- 1938c New Facts from New World Prehistory. *The North American Review* 245(1):181–191.
- 1939a Excavations of 1938: Basket Maker Sites in Southwestern Colorado. *Pan American Traveler* 1(2):38–39.
- 1939b Modified Basketmaker Sites, Ackmen-Lowry Area, Southwestern Colorado. *Field Museum of Natural History Anthropological Series* 23(3).
- 1950 Sylvanus G. Morley. In *Morleyana: A Collection of Writings in Memoriam, Sylvanus Griswold Morley, 1883–1948*. Pp. 149–150. Santa Fe: School of American Research.
- 1971 The Revolution in Archaeology. *American Antiquity* 36(1):1–8.
- 1974 Early Development in Mogollon Research. In *Archaeological Researches in Retrospect*. Gordon R. Willey, ed. Pp. 3–29. Cambridge: Winthrop.
- Martin, Paul S., Lawrence Roys, and Gerhardt von Bonin
1936 Lowry Pueblo in Southwestern Colorado. *Field Museum of Natural History Anthropological Series* 23(1).
- Martin, Paul S., and Elizabeth Willis
1940 Anasazi Painted Pottery in the Field Museum. *Field Museum of Natural History Anthropology Memoirs* 5. Chicago: Field Museum of Natural History.
- Muller, Jon
2002 Rediscovering Illinois: The Development of Archaeology in Illinois. In *Histories of Southeastern Archaeology*. S. Tushingham, J. Hill, and C. H. McNutt, eds. Pp. 99–114. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.
- Nash, Stephen E.
2001 A Gentleman Scholar: Paul Sidney Martin. *Archaeology Magazine* 54(3):60–63.
2003 Paul Sidney Martin. In *Curators, Collections, and Contexts: Anthropology at the Field Museum, 1893–2002*. Stephen E. Nash and Gary M. Feinman, eds. Pp. 165–178. *Fieldiana* (n.s.) 36. Chicago: Field Museum of Natural History.
2006 Sites Unseen: Paul Sidney Martin's Unpublished Mogollon Excavations, 1939–1972. In *Mostly Mimbres: A Collection of Papers from the 12th Biennial Mogollon Conference*. Marc Thompson, Jason Jurgena, and Lora Jackson, eds. Pp. 5–16. El Paso: El Paso Museum of Archaeology.
- N.d. Many Roads to the Truth: Paul Sidney Martin and the Development of North American Archaeology. Unpublished MS, Department of Anthropology, Denver Museum of Nature and Science.
- Nash, Stephen E., and Gary M. Feinman, eds.
2003 *Curators, Collections, and Contexts: Anthropology at the Field Museum, 1893–2002*. *Fieldiana* (n.s.) 36. Chicago: Field Museum of Natural History.
- O'Brien, Michael J., R. Lee Lyman, and Michael Brian Schiffer
2006 *Archaeology as a Process: Processualism and Its Progeny*. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press.
- Prudden, T. Mitchell
1903 *The Prehistoric Ruins of the San Juan Watershed of Utah, Arizona, Colorado, and New Mexico*. *American Anthropologist* 5(2):224–288.
- Rinaldo, John B.
1950 *An Analysis of Culture Change in the Ackmen-Lowry Area*. *Fieldiana: Anthropology*, 36. Pp. 93–106. Chicago: Field Museum of Natural History.
- Silverberg, Robert
1968 *Mound Builders of Ancient America: The Archaeology of a Myth*. New York Graphic Society, Greenwich.
- Smith, Watson
1992 *One Man's Archaeology*. *Kiva* 57(2):105–191.
- Stocking Jr., George W.
1965 On the Limits of "Presentism" and "Historicism" in the Historiography of Behavioral Science. *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences* 1(3):211–217.
1979 *Anthropology at Chicago: Tradition, Discipline, Department*. Chicago: The Joseph Regenstein Library, The University of Chicago.
- Woodbury, Richard B.
1993 *Sixty Years of Southwestern Archaeology: A History of the Pecos Conference*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
- Yastrow, Ed, and Stephen E. Nash
2003 *Henry Field, Collections, and Exhibit Development, 1926–1941*. In *Curators, Collections, and Contexts: Anthropology at the Field Museum, 1893–2002*. Stephen E. Nash and Gary M. Feinman, eds. Pp. 137–148. *Fieldiana* (n.s.) 36. Chicago: Field Museum of Natural History.

FOR FURTHER READING

(These selections were made by the American Anthropologist editorial interns as examples of research related in some way to this article. They do not necessarily reflect the views of the author.)

Anthropology News

1974 Deaths: Paul Sidney Martin, Willard Williams (NIBS) Hill. *Anthropology News* 15(3):3.

Ash-Milby, Kathleen E.

1996 *Living In Balance: The Universe of the Hopi, Zuni, Navajo and Apache*. *Museum Anthropology* 20(1):69–72.

Barker, Alex W.

In press *Exhibiting Archaeology: Archaeology and Museums*. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 39.

Graves, Michael W.

1999 *The History of Method and Theory in the Study of Prehistoric Puebloan Pottery Style in the American Southwest*. *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory* 5(4):309–343.

Hodges, David Julian

1978 *Museums, Anthropology, and Minorities: In Search of a*

New Relevance for Old Artifacts. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly* 9(2):148–157.

Jones, Anna Laura

1993 Exploding Canons: The Anthropology of Museums. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 22(1):201–220.

King, J. C. H.

2000 Clay People. *American Anthropologist* 102(2):337–344.

Lekson, Stephen H., and Catherine M. Cameron

1995 The Abandonment of Chaco Canyon, the Mesa Verde Migrations, and the Reorganization of the Pueblo World. *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* 14(2):184–202.

Longacre, W. A.

1973 Current Directions in Southwestern Archaeology. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 2(1):201–219.