

# H. Otley Beyer

*Received 16 February 1968*

## WILHELM G. SOLHEIM II

### INTRODUCTION

THE history of the beginning of any field of study is probably more understandable through an examination of the lives of the men and women who were the first students in that field than it is through a direct examination of the field. The history of archaeological research of prehistoric Southeast Asia would very likely be more logical if it were organized around the lives and works of such people as H. Otley Beyer, P. V. van Stein Callenfels, Madeleine Colani, Ivor H. N. Evans, and Robert Heine-Geldern. Although such a procedure is not faithfully followed in this review of the history of Southeast Asian archaeology, by looking briefly at the life of Beyer, perhaps we can understand the development of Philippine prehistory studies a little better and appreciate the weak interrelationships between them and other prehistoric studies of several Southeast Asian countries.

Two polar approaches to a biography are possible: a purely factual presentation of dates and events, or an impressionistic view that attempts to project a human being. The latter study must include facts, but only at a minimum. Biographies are usually neither extreme, but preferably somewhere in the middle. This brief biography of Beyer will lean toward the impressionistic side of the continuum for two reasons: first, Philippine archaeology up to 1950 was almost completely a monopoly of Beyer, thus reflecting one facet of his personality; and second, most of the necessary documents to establish facts are in the Philippines, and thus unavailable to me at present.

Two sources of data are available to me in Portugal, from where I am writing. The "factual" data is from several obituary notes and articles that appeared primarily in Philippine publications, together with some of Beyer's publications. It is obvious from comparing these obituaries that a number of the "facts" included are in error. I can correct some of the errors; others, I cannot. A factual biography will have to await the research of a biographer doing a professional job. The impressionistic data is from my own memory, from three and one-half years of close, virtually daily, association with Beyer and from less close communication over about twenty years. I did not make notes or keep a diary, so these impressions come from a very fallible, human memory. I think, however, these memories have something to tell that is valuable to Philippine and Southeast Asian archaeology.

## H. OTLEY BEYER

Beyer was born in Edgewood, Iowa, into a pioneer family. His ancestors had come to America well before the Revolutionary War. He was the youngest in the family, with several brothers and a sister. His sister told me during my two visits with her that even as a boy Beyer had the interests of a naturalist and enjoyed being alone. He would often disappear into a nearby forest and be gone all day. He discovered that mandrake grew in the woods, and before he was ten years old he was in business selling mandrake roots to a wholesale drug dealer.

Beyer went to the University of Denver, from which he graduated in 1904 having majored in chemistry and geology. During one of his summer vacations, he took part in a United States government exploration and mapping expedition into the Four Corners area of Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, and Utah. There he saw many of the great Pueblo Indian ruins discovered by this expedition, and he helped with the collection of the marvelous organic artifacts that were found. The same year that he graduated, he visited the St. Louis Exposition and saw there the unusual exhibit on the Philippine Islands that was organized by the United States government. Twelve villages representing twelve Philippine ethnic groups were set up with complete houses, and their Philippine occupants wore the traditional dress. It was an exhibit that attracted much attention, the exotic peoples of the Philippines not being slighted. This was apparently Beyer's first acquaintance with the Philippines.

Beyer once told me how he had happened to go to the Philippines. According to him, under the first American civil government, with William Howard Taft (later to become U.S. President) as governor general, an Ethnological Survey was organized. *The Bontok Igorot* by A. E. Jenks was one of the results of this Survey. In 1904, Alfred Kroeber and one other person (an anthropologist, presumably) were hired by this bureau to work in the Philippines. Before Kroeber could leave for the Philippines there was a change in the bureau, and a man hostile to the former director took over. The new director summarily fired Kroeber and his associate on the eve of their departure, leaving the two positions for anthropologists open. Through A. E. Jenks, the director of the Philippine exhibition at the St. Louis fair, Beyer heard about the opening, applied, and was accepted for the job held so briefly by Kroeber.

Beyer left for the Philippines in 1905. When he reached Manila he found that he no longer had a job, though he had a contract. With the rapidly evolving organization of the American civil government, the Ethnological Survey had ceased to exist. Luckily, the head of the Philippine Bureau of Education, David P. Barrows (whose department had previously handled the survey) held a Ph.D in anthropology, and he kept Beyer and Smith, the other young man sent in the same capacity as Beyer. The two were directed to proceed as they would have under the old Ethnological Survey, but they were required to operate in the guise of teachers. It was decided that one would go to Mindanao and the other to the Mountain Province. With the flip of a coin, Beyer found himself working in Ifugao, and Smith went to Mindanao, where he met with accidental death a year or two later.

Beyer had earned his master's degree in chemistry in 1905 from the University of Denver and had little background in anthropology. After nearly three years in Ifugao, he was transferred to the Bureau of Science and sent back to the United States for graduate training in anthropology. On leaving the Philippines, he took with him a young man who had never been outside Ifugao. They sailed west from Manila and, among other stops, spent a few days in Egypt visiting the pyramids and other ancient remains. The two were in the United

States for one year while Beyer worked under Roland Dixon at Harvard. When they returned to the Philippines, they had been away almost two years.

In 1910, Beyer married Lingayu Gambuk, the fifteen-year-old daughter of one of the most powerful Ifugao chiefs. According to one source, Beyer had made the preliminary arrangements with both Lingayu and her father for this marriage before his return to the United States. At the time of his death, Beyer was survived by Lingayu and their only living child, William Beyer, along with many grandchildren.

Ethnographic studies of mountain tribes continued to be the center of Beyer's life until he came down from the mountains and started a study of Christian groups in Ilocos and the central plains. In 1914, another governmental reorganization made him again a man without a department. In the meantime, however, he had made many influential friends, and a chair in anthropology was created for him at the University of the Philippines. He continued there until his retirement in 1954, becoming the first chairman of the Department of Anthropology when it was established in 1925.

Beyer loved to reminisce about the old days when he traversed the Philippines with the great and small. When distinguished or renowned guests of the Philippines had some leisure time, the governor general would turn them over to Beyer for some education on the Philippines. Many of these people kept in touch with Beyer even after World War II. Around Christmastime, without any remark or unusual expression, he would hand me a Christmas card that was signed, under a short note, by a Rockefeller or a Du Pont.

It was often frustrating for me to work with Beyer. I knew that he had a tremendous quantity of data available in his library or in his collection, but he would not let me touch anything unless he got it himself, opened the book to the proper page, and then stood over me while I read the passage. When I was finished, he would immediately take the book and put it away again. His reminiscences, however compensated for this habit. He loved a small and interested audience, and his collections made me forget any pain—at least for a time.

The archaeology and tektite phase of his life began in 1926. This was a story that he particularly liked to tell. In 1925, he had received an offer from Harvard University (for himself and his library) to join the Department of Anthropology. It was an extremely generous offer, though he never told me that he was invited to be the head of the department, as several notes and obituaries in Philippine newspapers stated. He had decided to accept the offer, and was in the process of packing and getting ready to go late in 1925 when he fell and hurt one leg so badly that he was incapacitated for several weeks. During this period, work began at Novaliches, a dam and reservoir for Manila water, about 25 km northeast of Manila. The first movement of soil in connection with the work at the dam site turned up potsherds and other artifacts, and a few tektites. In February 1926, a second small excavation in the same area turned up further similar artifacts, and these were brought to Beyer's attention (Beyer 1926: 475–476). As soon as he was able to move around, he went out to take a look and immediately realized that what was being turned up was a previously unknown kind of sophisticated pottery, and that this was a site of major importance to Philippine prehistory. According to Beyer, he decided then to stay in the Philippines, went home, unpacked, and started to organize an "excavation" at Novaliches.

Prehistory of the Philippines was not a new interest for Beyer. In 1919 and 1920 he traveled extensively in Java, Celebes, and Borneo and became fascinated with the obvious interconnections of Southeast Asian peoples. He was further stimulated by the first systematic archaeological exploration in the Philippines begun about 1920 by Dean C. Worcester in the Visayan

Islands. In 1921, Beyer began “. . . a study of the known data of Philippine archaeology and began a compilation of all available existing source material . . .” (Beyer 1926: 472). Thus, he was prepared for the Novaliches finds when they came.

Archaeological method was unknown to Beyer when he started work at Novaliches, as it apparently continued to be throughout his field career. Common sense was his method and this, combined with his very systematic mind, led to the success that he achieved. Typological and distributional studies are the basis of his reconstructions of Philippine prehistory, not stratigraphy or comparisons of artifacts and complexes from carefully excavated sites. The closest that Beyer ever came to a site report was his first archaeological publication, “Recent Discoveries in Philippine Archaeology” (1926). He presented the report at the Third Pan-Pacific Science Congress in Tokyo in 1926. The paper summarized the first season’s work at Novaliches and other sites that came to his attention in the first half of 1926. From this report, one can get a fairly good idea of his work at Novaliches and a general idea of what was found. No illustrations were included. His publications that followed are summaries of his data, in typological form, with conclusions. The data on which these are based are unavailable.

A visit to Beyer’s Museum and Institute of Archaeology and Ethnology, on the second floor of the old Watson Building in Manila, would convince an uninformed person that Beyer was a human pack rat and an antiquarian. Olov R. T. Janse, one of the best “dirt archaeologists” to excavate in Southeast Asia during the thirties, came away from his work in the Philippines convinced of this, and mentioned it in his publications. Beyer was naturally irritated and answered Janse’s statements in his *Supplementary Illustrations to the “Outline Review of Philippine Archaeology by Islands and Provinces”* (1949*b*). Beyer says that “. . . Janse states substantially that no original archaeological work had been carried out in the Philippines prior to his visit—and that the few collections of ‘pre-Spanish antiquities’ in existence there consisted mostly of Chinese ceramics, and that they were mostly without proper records and ‘are partly to be regarded as curiosities.’” (1949*b*: 13). Beyer refuted the charge, but his denial came nine years after Janse’s work in 1939 and 1940.

Beyer was a quiet person who didn’t like publicity. He was never well known outside the Philippines, other than to people who had met him there and to Philippine specialists the world over. Also, because he published in few journals circulated outside the islands, his archaeological work was not well known internationally, except to established Southeast Asian specialists. Only after his two major publications in 1948 and 1949 (1948*a*, 1949*a*) did he begin to be known to a somewhat wider audience.

Janse’s interest in working in the Philippines was to see if there actually was evidence there for the “Dong-son culture.” In his preliminary report (1941), one short section is called “Traces of a Supposed Dong-son Culture, Luzon” (p. 11 in reprint). Referring to several bronzes, he states in the report that “Dr. Beyer has built up an attractive theory on these Philippine findings. . . .” He notes that these objects were purchased by Beyer and were “. . . said to have been found in . . .” (p. 12 in reprint). Janse wished to investigate the find places. “In spite of investigations made at the above places with the cooperation of the Philippine authorities, no trace of a dwelling-site or a grave could be revealed. For the present, and until scientifically controlled excavations can be carried out, the problem of the existence of a Dong-son culture in the Philippines may still be considered unsolved” (p. 12 in reprint). Beyer’s reply to this and similar statements in other of Janse’s reports explained, in effect, that because Janse didn’t work with and through Beyer, he wasn’t able to find anything; and within limits, Beyer was correct.

Concerning one very limited joint excursion to the spot where one of the bronze axes was found, Beyer says that he told Janse, after looking the area over, that it would not be worthwhile testing in the area of the find. "Despite my advice he arranged with the provincial and municipal officials to conduct test excavations there—and spent about a week in January, 1940, in fruitless exploration." He goes on to say:

We have full records concerning the finding of all of our bronze celts—and none of them were "purchased from unknown parties" as Dr. Janse states. . . . I later learned that he had persuaded the local officials to "investigate" my local foreman (not a mere "purchasing agent" as Dr. Janse calls him), and to question him in detail concerning our previous work. As I know Esteban Rosales to be a wise old owl, with his own ideas of propriety, I do not think that the "questioning" brought out much reliable information. (Beyer 1949b: 14)

Beyer had many a good chuckle in telling us about Esteban and in surmising the "wild goose chases" that he must have taken Janse on in concealing from the archaeologist the true localities of the various finds that had been made.

The preceding interaction between Beyer and Janse presents in context two very important elements of early Philippine archaeological research that are equally elements of Beyer's personality. Beyer worked alone and was extremely independent. He would not share his data. His "Outline Review" (1949a), which is a systematic recording of all finds that had come to his attention from all over the Philippines, looks like a field guide of where to look for what—but one probably would not find a single site using the information contained there. Beyer had the information, in many cases, but didn't want anyone else bothering "his" sites. If Beyer sent a person out to a particular area, he provided further information that usually made it possible for the site to be located. If Beyer didn't want a person working in a particular area, he didn't provide the further information. The rule applied to his library, as well. It was of use to him, or through sufferance—and how one had to suffer for it—to those whom Beyer favored, and who were willing to wait until Beyer himself got the particular book. The common procedure was for a student or a scholar to come in around two in the afternoon and ask for a particular book. Freshmen and internationally renowned scholars were treated with equal deference. If Beyer wasn't busy, the book might be available in three minutes. More often, Beyer was busy and then one might wait for half an hour, or all afternoon, and then not get the work because Beyer said that it was too late. It was virtually impossible to follow up a second reference in one day. It was not uncommon to see one or two of Beyer's students forlornly sitting or standing—most of the chairs were piled high with newspapers or letters and reprints—in the room next to the kitchen waiting for a book while Beyer would be napping or otherwise busy in the inner recesses of his "Museum and Institute." I found there were two ways to get data or a needed reference from Beyer: one was to wait until it was forthcoming and the other was to have something that Beyer wanted and "work him" for a trade. As long as I procrastinated about my end of the bargain I would get what I wanted from him much more rapidly than usual, but as soon as he had what he wanted (and eventually I had to give it to him) his speed returned to normal.

The other element in the Janse-Beyer exchange was Beyer's method of gathering archaeological data. Beyer had "collectors" all over the Philippines. No doubt many of these men were reliable and their information on the source of the artifacts that they delivered to Beyer was trustworthy. But how could one tell? There was no attempt made, to my knowledge, to

check on the collectors. For the use to which Beyer put the data collected in this manner, its questionable provenience probably did no harm. For a Philippine-wide distribution or typological study, whether a particular bark cloth beater or bronze celt came from valley A or the third valley over really didn't matter. Every week or so, in the early 1950s, when I was there, a small package would come in from one of Beyer's collectors with two or three stone tools, or a small, porcelain bowl, and within a few days the payment would be in the hands of the collector. I cannot think of a better way to accumulate the kind of data Beyer used and needed from all over the Philippines, considering that he was the only person interested in doing this sort of work. I do not mean that he did not have valuable collaborators in many portions of his work; I mean that he was the only "professional" for all of the Philippines.

Several times in the 1950s I went out on small collecting trips with Beyer. Near Novaliches one afternoon, where Beyer hadn't ventured since before the war, we were met with considerable enthusiasm. Within minutes after we were out of the car, several children had come to Beyer with small cans containing a few tektites and one or two stone adzes. Most of these children were so young they obviously never had seen Beyer before, but he was so well known in the area that as soon as word spread that he was there, the children knew what it meant. Beyer had a standard rate for tektites and artifacts and would proceed to pay each child, regardless of size, age, or sex, according to that rate, with a smile and a complimentary word or two. A few old men came up and greeted him, and it was obvious from the expressions on Beyer's and the men's faces that each was happy to see that the other had come through the war, and I could see that there was respect between them. Before the war, Beyer must have gotten around to these nearby areas in Batangas, Bulacan, and Rizal provinces fairly regularly, but after the war he didn't move about much. (Until 1953 he was inhibited chiefly by a tremendous scrotal hernia, but after his surgery, I suspect less travel had just become a habit. His habits were as systematic as everything else about him.)

Beyer's "collectors" were only one source of data for him, though certainly a major source and possibly *the* major source. Two other sources were important to him also. Beyer had a number of what might best be called collaborators. These were men, mostly in private life in the Philippines, who, on occasion, worked with Beyer in exploring, collecting, and excavating. Just a few of their names are: Boston, Brown, Busick, Hartendorp, Lednický, Manuel, and Mitkiewicz; there were many others. These names can be seen appearing again and again in Beyer's "Outline Review" (1949*a*) where he lists the archaeological finds known to him from the Philippines and, when known, the finders. Beyer believed very strongly in acknowledging other people's work. The final source of data was, of course, himself, and here, naturally, is where a professional's reputation rests.

We do not have the data we need to judge Beyer as an archaeologist. Hopefully, these data are in the typescript volumes on Philippine archaeology to which Beyer often refers (1949*a*: 208–209). We can see a little of his field technique, however, in his report on Novaliches (1926). Here it appears that most of the work was turned over to W. S. Boston, an engineer. Beyer states:

During the month of March considerable miscellaneous exploration was carried on by the writer, assisted by Dr. Brown and Mr. Hartendorp—whenever we were able to find time to visit the site—with a view of determining the extent of the remains and to making plans for a systematic excavation.

The best work, however, was done by Mr. Boston, who had become greatly interested

in the finds, and who—through his constant presence on the site—had a better opportunity for carrying on a consistent program of exploration along suggested lines. . . . [Later] Mr. Boston and the writer . . . [began] a joint exploration of the Novaliches site to be carried on at private expense—and to be as thorough and complete as circumstances would permit. (Beyer 1926: 476–477)

Novaliches was Beyer's first excavation, so we cannot blame him for not knowing what to do there. However, there is little indication that Beyer's field techniques advanced much beyond that beginning. One evening in the 1950s when a group of us were having dinner with Beyer in the Keg Room at Jai Alai, Bob Fox asked Beyer whether he had ever really excavated a site. Beyer replied that he had excavated a number of sites and that, for an example, we should look at his reports on the Laguna de Bay sites. Unfortunately, to my knowledge, no one has ever been able to work with Beyer's several volumes of his own reports or the records of any of his surveys or excavations.

Beyer gives an indication of his field technique, however, in a reaction to an indirect reference by van Stein Callenfels to the Batangas collections as being mainly surface finds (van Stein Callenfels 1951). Beyer replies:

This statement of Stein Callenfels concerning the nature of the Philippines and Hong Kong finds is not justified by the facts. . . . Most of our type specimens were excavated from specific sites and their cultural associations are well known.

Stein was a stickler for controlled excavations in which levels were determined with a surveyor's transit . . . and the location of each specimen carefully measured by means of a steel tape or a graduated rod, and recorded on appropriate vertical and horizontal maps. He had a strong tendency to classify the results of all excavations and "pot-holing" done without this meticulous care as "surface finds." However, in the case of many of our Philippine sites when the stratification was already well-known (having been predetermined through small cross-sectional excavations or controlled pot-holing), I am quite convinced that the resulting specimens are classified as accurately as if the whole of the work had been done in the painstaking and time-consuming way that Stein invariably advocated. (Beyer 1951*b*: 95, note 7)

Thus, it would appear that when Beyer excavated a site, he would test for the stratigraphy ". . . through small cross-sectional excavations or controlled pot-holing . . ." and extrapolate from these small known(?) localities to the rest of the site. Such a method is just not sufficiently careful for archaeological excavation and could not result in a trustworthy detailed site report, nor certain associations. This method, however, combined with Beyer's systematic thinking, should indicate that Beyer's typologies were tested by stratigraphy and that his bringing together of artifacts into a culture was also stratigraphically tested. Thus, his generalizations should be reasonably accurate. The only problem was that Beyer did not (possibly could not) present the data to support his stratigraphy and associations, so it was necessary to take his summaries and conclusions on faith.

Prehistory was the next step above archaeology for Beyer, and in this field, he published considerably more. Rather than cite all or a large number of his publications, I name only one work that I feel is his best and his most important contribution to Philippine prehistory: *Philippine and East Asian Archaeology, and its Relation to the Origin of the Pacific Islands Population* (Beyer 1948*a*). However, as soon as one looks at this source in any detail, the

unavailability of the primary data on which Beyer's thesis is based is obvious. His references to comparative material outside the Philippines are properly done, though not exhaustive. His references for the Philippine material are to his own unpublished materials, for example, "see records of the Rizal Province Archaeological Survey, etc." (p. 84); or "For further data on this subject, see my special papers on the origin and distribution of the Luzon terraces, and the character and significance of the Philippine Copper-Bronze Age remains so far found" (p. 55); or he referred to illustrations in *Philippine and East Asian Archaeology* or the "Outline Review." The captions of these illustrated artifacts, besides being general descriptive titles, tell only the province in which they were found and occasionally the site as well. This is not a satisfactory procedure. The data on which an argument is based must be available (published) for anyone to see, so that he can agree with the argument or disagree and present a counterargument using the same data. On this basis alone, one could say that Beyer was not a good prehistorian, and there are those who do. I consider Beyer's secretive disposition an undesirable personality trait, the trait of a fanatic collector, who did not wish to share his collection—his data being as much a part of his collection as a Sung bowl or tektite; but I am willing to withhold my opinion until some of his data are published, or have been examined by an authority and declared of little value and not worth publishing. I personally feel that *Philippine and East Asian Archaeology* is a valuable work, and I believe its commendable appearance is backed up with trustworthy data.

Do we have sufficient data to judge Beyer on any of his professional interests having to do with prehistory? To a certain extent, I believe we do. In the special field of Chinese and Siamese porcelains and stoneware, Beyer was regarded as an expert. His few publications in this field are known primarily to specialists, but are of considerable importance for dating a number of types first reported from the Philippines. The major paper on these wares is titled "New Data on Chinese and Siamese Ceramic Wares of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries; Summarized by Walter Robb from the Field and Laboratory Notes of Professor H. Beyer." Most bibliographies list the title up to the semicolon and have Robb as the sole author, as is logical. This article appeared in Volume 27 of the *Philippine Magazine* (1930), but an extra two hundred illustrated copies were published separately and circulated. Beyer was working on a major two-volume report on these ceramic wares the last few years of his life with the intention of finally publishing them. The chief factor that prevented him from completing his volumes on porcelain before he died was his renewed work on a second, very specialized field, his beloved tektites. Beyer's son, Bill, is completing the volumes on ceramics, and they will probably be published in the Philippines in the near future. I do not know the field of Chinese and Siamese porcelains and stoneware, but I am willing to believe the specialists with whom I have talked, who considered Beyer an expert. For example, Fox says, "Professor Beyer's familiarity with the types of Chinese and other Asian potteries which reached the Philippines and Southeast Asia during the proto-historic period was probably unrivaled . . ." (Fox 1967: 44).

As I mentioned above, Beyer's second, very specialized, field was the study of tektites. Tektites are small, surface-sculptured, black objects that look much like obsidian when broken or worked, but apparently come from outer space. Beyer became interested in tektites when he started finding them at Novaliches. Up until the late 1950s he was one of a half-dozen people in the world who was studying them. Beyer had carried on a considerable correspondence with tektite pioneers and had brought together by far the largest collection in the world. With the birth of the Space Age, interest in tektites grew very rapidly, and



Beyer was included in the research mainly because the scientists needed tektites to analyze and Beyer had them. He was not very cooperative in sharing his tektites. He was not a physicist and did not have a good understanding of the new methods of analysis. The most productive area in which tektites have been found is in the Philippines, and Beyer, with forty years of collecting, had kept detailed records of all his finds. He was probably the world expert on the micro-distribution of tektites, but the new specialists were not very concerned with the details. With the new international interest in tektites, Beyer started to put most of his time into completing his work on his collections and had two parts of the first volume in print before his final sickness stopped his work. The first part contains much of the early history of tektite research and for this, if for no other, reason it is important to the history of science. Should micro-distribution of tektite falls ever become important, his work will be the primary source.

There may be some question as to why I consider tektite research related to prehistoric research. Tektites have been and are considered by many people in Southeast Asia and elsewhere as of supernatural origin. As such, they are often valued as talismans. I have found two tektites *in situ* in archaeological sites in the Philippines and in Thailand. Occasionally, tektites were worked and made into small tools. These examples are just a sampling of tektites' association with prehistoric peoples; for further information, read Beyer's "The Relation of Tektites to Archaeology" (1955a)

Correspondence was not one of Beyer's strong points, at least not after the second world war. I took it for granted that I would not receive a reply when I wrote to him, though once in a while he would surprise me and reply. When I did get a reply, it was apt to be four or more pages, typewritten, single-spaced, and loaded with valuable information. I recall one time in the early 1960s when I stopped over in Manila for a few days' visit with Beyer. After several hours' visit the first day, and just before he started to get ready to go to Jai Alai, he handed me a letter that he was in the process of writing to me, but had never completed. It had been written at three different times over the previous two years and was at that point over six single-spaced, typewritten pages, but still unfinished. I think he must have been a somewhat better correspondent before the war, as he appears to have been in close contact by mail with the major Southeast Asian archaeologists. Ivor Evans, in the Federated Malay States, went so far as to publish portions of a letter from Beyer in the *Journal of the Federated Malay States Museums*. He titled this paper "Notes on the Relationship between Philippine Iron-Age Antiquities and Some from Perak" (Evans 1929). My very subjective impression is that Beyer's favorites in correspondence, as well as face to face, besides Evans, were Madeleine Colani and van Stein Callenfels.

A small group of Southeast Asian prehistoric archaeologists was interested in the prehistory of Southeast Asia as a whole. The core of this group was probably Beyer, van Stein Callenfels, and Heine-Geldern. The others' interests were primarily in their own areas. Beyer was mainly concerned with the Philippines, but nonetheless, he had reasonably broad interests. A good example of how far his knowledge extended beyond the Philippines was his information on the site of Sa-huynh in Annam. He was acquainted with the site, as evidenced by his comparison of the *lingling-o* (the Ifugao name for a special type of earring), found in Philippine late neolithic sites, to those found at Sa-huynh (1948a: 68, and Fig. 27). Yet, when I brought in the first and second collections from the Kalanay Cave Site in Masbate (in 1951 and 1953) with some unusual pottery that excited Beyer, he did not recognize the obvious relationship of the pottery to Sa-huynh finds. It was not until sometime in 1956 that he discovered the relationship, at about the same time I did, and wrote me about it. In other

words, he recognized material that had direct relevance to the Philippines when he saw it, but he did not recall that which was not directly involved in his hypothesizing about the Philippines in its relationship with the rest of Southeast Asia.

The Far-Eastern Prehistory Congresses, held in Hanoi in 1932, Manila in 1935, and Singapore in 1938, no doubt helped considerably to broaden the outlook of the Southeast Asian specialists, as they were intended, but still the programs of individual countries were not expanded to include Southeast Asian-wide problems. Beyer traveled fairly extensively in Southeast Asia before the war, much of the time in connection with the congresses in Hanoi and Singapore, but van Stein Callenfels actually worked in several different countries and wrote more generally of Southeast Asian problems than did Beyer, as can be noted in the two congress proceedings that were published (*Praehistorica Asiae Orientalis* 1932, and *Proceedings of the Third Congress of Prehistorians of the Far East* 1940). Beyer, who was responsible for the second congress, never did get around to publishing other than a few scattered papers. Heine-Geldern, working from a distance, was the researcher most concerned with the area as a whole.

A portion of a letter from van Stein Callenfels to Beyer, written in August 1933, illustrates the interaction of these three men:

. . . Your excavations in Batangas look most interesting. A copy of that part of your letter is immediately sent to Heine-Geldern in Vienna by airmail . . . Heine-Geldern proposes to call the adze or axe "Stufen-Beil," or something like "stepped axe," a name which suits it very well. Please give me your idea about generally accepting that name [the name is now standard]. The axe with the ridge we could call Luzon-type, as it is in modern times only known in New Zealand, and, as you write me, with you only in the Manila neighborhood. I wrote to Heine-Geldern to accept that name also [now called the Luzon ridged adze]. Will let you know his answer as soon as I get it. We three being the only men in the world writing about these things can fix the names.

(Beyer 1951a: 77)

Van Stein Callenfels and Beyer, along with Colani and Evans, had made up an ad hoc committee during the First Congress of Prehistorians of the Far East in 1932 to decide on terminology for certain Southeast Asian periods and artifacts. These terms, on approval by the Congress delegates, were to be presented by van Stein Callenfels to the First International Congress of Pre- and Protohistory in London.

Van Stein Callenfels visited Beyer four times during the 1930s, and Beyer had some charming stories from these various visits. Callenfels was an unusually large man, about six feet, four inches tall, weighing 300 pounds. He had an international reputation for his hearty eating and drinking. Beyer's favorite stories about Callenfels's visits to Manila concerned his first trip. It was his first meeting with Callenfels, who stayed at the Manila Hotel. On the Saturday afternoon that he arrived, shortly after he left the ship, Beyer and Callenfels settled down in the hotel lobby for their first talk. Callenfels called for the "boy" and asked to see the largest beer glass in the house. When the glass, a full liter, was produced, Callenfels ordered twelve of them and drank the lot during his conversation. Manila Hotel was famous for its Sunday dinners. The dinner had a set price and with several choices for each course. Beyer joined Callenfels the next day for Sunday dinner. When they sat down, Callenfels called for the menu, looked it over carefully for some time, remarked that it looked good,

and then proceeded to eat his way through the entire menu, ordering every dish. Beyer, who was a small, slight man, and not noted for the size of his meals, was impressed.

During the war, Beyer was, for the most part, rather lucky. The Japanese were very concerned about all museums in Southeast Asia and with their first occupying forces sent a high-ranking civilian to take charge of the local museums and see that they were not harmed. The Japanese assigned to Manila with this job was Tadao Kano. Beyer's Museum and Institute of Archaeology and Ethnology, University of the Philippines, was not known to the Japanese, and Kano was very surprised when he found out about it. He included this museum under his protection, and he and Beyer became close friends. Through the intercession of Kano with Japanese military authorities, Beyer was only put under conditional internment and did not have to move into Santo Thomas Internment Camp until the last six months of the war.

Beyer strongly believed in always making several copies of every document important to him, then keeping them in different places, so that if one copy was destroyed or lost, there would still be copies available. For example, whenever an article on the Philippines was published, Beyer asked the author for ten copies, and much of his library before the war included duplicates of most volumes. Beyer had a house on Nebraska Street in Ermita, near the University. Sometime in the thirties, the house became so loaded with his collections that he bought and moved into a second house just around the corner, and while keeping the first house, he started filling the second. Before the end of the decade, the second house began to get crowded, and Beyer prevailed on the University to take over the second floor of the Watson Building for a place in which to expand. Almost everyone in the Philippines saw the war coming, as did Beyer. Hoping to save at least some of his treasures, he divided up his collection. He thought that Ermita, being a purely residential district, would probably not be harmed, while the Watson Building, close to the river, was more likely to be damaged or destroyed. He therefore kept the rarest and most valuable portions of his collections in his two houses and kept just the triplicates and less important materials in the Watson Building. Furthermore, the Japanese used the Watson Building for its Embassy during the war (possibly because it was close to Malacanan, the Philippine presidential home and offices), and Beyer felt that when the Americans returned there would be fighting in this area. He also felt that representative collections should be sent outside the Philippines for safekeeping and, according to Beyer, he was instrumental in having the Hester Collection sent back to Chicago and in seeing to it that the collections made by Janse were also sent back to the United States.

Shortly before the American invasion of Leyte, Kano received orders to go to Borneo. He told Beyer that he would never reach Borneo alive; he was correct. His ship was sunk, and Kano was never heard from again. With the invasion of Leyte, the few Americans who had managed to stay out of Santo Thomas were interned, including Beyer. He was included on a list of prominent Americans who were considered hostages. After one American air attack on Manila, about half of the people on the list were taken out and shot. Those left were informed that the rest of them would be shot on the next provocation.

The camp was liberated before the Battle of Manila began, and Beyer, being in better physical condition than most, was able to get to the Watson Building, which was nearby, by the time the battle started. He found the building whole, though somewhat disheveled because of the rapid departure of the Japanese Embassy staff. In the rush, the staff had neglected to burn the files, and Beyer quickly stored all the materials in a back corner room. When the Japanese first came in they had taken a number of ceramic pieces, but Kano had

managed to locate most of them and to return them to Beyer. Only a very few pieces of gold and a few beads were missing from the many display cases in Bayer's collection, taken by the Japanese after Kano left.

Much of the Battle of Manila was fought in Ermita and neighboring sections of Manila. Beyer had gotten word to two or three of his old employees, and with them he went into the battle area by the University, where no civilians were allowed. He found that his two houses were nothing but rubble. He went to check the National Museum in the old Bureau of Science building and found that, miraculously, most of the ethnographic collection had not been damaged, though there was a large hole in the roof, and the artillery barrage was still going on, with shells flying overhead. Beyer and his boys moved all of the collection from the open room into a small, closed room nearby and thus saved the pieces from destruction by rain and souvenir-hunting soldiers following the battle. The next day he came back to the museum again to check; this time the battle had subsided to only sporadic sniper fire. He went up to check the Bureau of Science Library and thought, upon entering the door, that the collection was intact; but when he went over to take up a book, the objects in the room collapsed in ashes. No doors had been open and no artillery had broken the building's walls or roof, but everything inside had been baked in the fire. With no movement of air until Beyer came in, the remains of the books and wooden furniture had continued to stand undisturbed. With much of this part of Manila in flames, Beyer somehow organized transportation and saved a considerable number of office desks and chairs from the University, which he took and stored in the Watson Building.

In the Watson Building, one of the few large buildings left undamaged in Manila, the ground floor had been converted into a field hospital by the American army. During the first two days as a hospital, Beyer's remaining collections were ransacked by American soldiers. While Beyer was risking life and limb on the battle ground on the other side of town, cases were overturned, books were pulled out from the shelves and thrown on the floor, then tramped on with hobnailed boots. Luckily, the men did not find much of interest to them and took only Beyer's irreplaceable collection of Moro Krises and other weapons. When Beyer informed the commanding officer of the hospital of the damage, the officer put guards on the second floor and did his best to find the stolen weapons, but to no avail. The desks were not bothered; when I left Manila in 1954, they were still there, piled to the roof in one of the rooms and in the attic. They had become part of Beyer's collections.

Beyer never became as active after the war as he had been before. Though he was invited to attend several international meetings with all expenses paid, he did not leave the Philippines. Gradually, after his operation in 1953, he started moving around the Philippines a bit more, but he didn't visit Ifugao or check any of his old sites around Laguna de Bay until after I had left the Philippines in May 1954. His major activity, other than his usual daily schedule, was hosting the Fourth Far-Eastern Prehistory Congress jointly with the Anthropology and Social Science section of the Eighth Pacific Science Congress in November 1953. The Fourth Congress was to have been held in Hong Kong in 1941, but had been postponed because of the tense political situation. The Prehistory Congress was a distinct success, though the Anthropology and Social Science meetings held at the same time were not so fruitful. Beyer was also the organizer for the Social Science meetings, but he put all his efforts into the prehistory sessions without asking anyone else to take charge of the other meetings. Beyer was unable to delegate authority. If he was responsible for a task, he either did it himself or it didn't get done. He would never think of having someone else do his work.

I came to the Philippines in November 1949. Beyer and Miss Grace Woods were at the small landing stage to meet me when I arrived. Miss Woods was an advanced anthropology graduate student who had a Fulbright grant and was working with Beyer. We went back to the Watson Building on what was then Aviles Street and had a visit before Miss Woods took me out to the University of the Philippines where she and Beyer had made arrangements for me. I then was integrated into Beyer's schedule, virtually every day for the next year.

Beyer would rise between 9:00 and 11:00 a.m., depending on whether he had an errand to run that morning or not. He would wander around in his pajamas with a bath towel around his neck unless he was expecting a visitor. He might dress before brunch or he might not. If I came to work there in the morning, I might be able to start at once, or he might tell me to wait until he was dressed, which would take anywhere from fifteen minutes to several hours. Sometime during the morning one of his boys would bring in three or four different newspapers. After being around for a day, the papers were put on top of the current pile, and no one could look at them. Usually the three-foot high display-storage cases that ran for forty feet down the center of the first room would be nearly covered with these piles of papers. Every four or five months, when about all the space was used up, and it was a dry day, Beyer would bring in two of his boys to store the lot of them in one of the innumerable high closets in the building. Most of the chairs near the kitchen would be piled high. I might ask him a question about something and he would stand quietly thinking for a bit, then shuffle over to one of the chairs, run his finger down the side of the pile, pick up the top 25 or 30 cm of papers, and tell me to take out the top reprint or letter. There, published from one month to several years or more before, would be the specific answer to my question.

After brunch Beyer would often take a nap, though he usually denied that habit. He had three different bedrooms. He would use one for a few years. In his current bedroom there would be a central wooden table with a neat pile of cigar bands on one corner (what he saved them for I do not know) that would be as much as 40 cm high and more in base diameter. On one-quarter of the table were neat stacks of empty match boxes. He smoked about three to five cigars a day, but they were always going out and being relit, so he accumulated match boxes quickly. They were fine for storing tektites, beads, or the small Batangas jade tools. When he opened a drawer or box to find some particular artifact I would see numerous cardboard boxes and cigarette cartons filled with match boxes. Finally, there were several large piles of Jai Alai stubs from his bets. These, like the trolley tickets from the Manila trolley lines before the war, made good paper for labels for the collection, as they had been chemically treated against the *anai* (termites) and would last for a long time.

In the afternoons Beyer might have a visitor or two. If a visitor had any interest in Philippine prehistory, Beyer would put us in the library, disappear for a bit, and then return with his treasures. Though I had seen the pieces several times, I always enjoyed seeing them again. Among these objects were some of the best Batangas jade tools and a big, polished rectangular adze of jade, which had been dredged from the Pasig River in Manila. The tiny jade adzes, chisels, gouges, and the long (ca. 20 cm) cylinder of a beautiful green jade that had the beginnings of longitudinal boring (someone began making it into a bead) were Beyer's joy. He simply glowed when he showed these specimens. After showing the small treasures, he would take the visitor on a tour of the two major display rooms, pointing out to them the more interesting and impressive artifacts. Among these artifacts was a large, unbroken burial jar that Arsenio Manuel and I had excavated in southern Tayabas Province. Inside were three skulls, and below these in the remaining soil in the bottom of the jar, no

one knew what, as when I had cleaned the soil far enough to expose the three skulls Beyer had stopped me, saying that I might accidentally damage one of the skulls, or what was below it. This was a unique jar, not only because of the multiple skulls, but because there had been hundreds of the smallest beads (red paste), smaller than Beyer or I had ever seen, in the soil inside the top of the jar. To this day, we do not know whether there were three burials in the jar or one, plus two extra skulls; or whether there was anything else in the bottom.

About 4:30 in the afternoon, Beyer would retire to his room to get ready to go to Jai Alai; he had to assemble his charts to help him in the night's betting. Around 5:30 he would be ready to leave, and we would go out on the street to catch a taxi. As this was the rush hour, there was usually some difficulty, and on the way to the fronton, there were always traffic jams. He never told the driver the final destination, but would say to turn right or left at the next corner, just as we got to the corner. Manila drivers are always jockeying for position. If the driver did not manage to move back and forth so that he was always in the moving lane, Beyer would shout at him, in unpleasant terms, to get over into the moving lane. Beyer would shout at anything the driver did or didn't do that prevented the taxi from moving. The drivers must have been wrecks by the time they stopped in front of Jai Alai, but I never heard one talk back or argue with him. Once inside, if it was nearly six or after, Beyer would check the odds and possibly place a few bets before coming in to his usual table in the back corner of the Keg Room. There he would be almost every evening, by himself or with guests or friends, but always going in and out to the betting area to collect his winnings, or to check the odds and place more bets. The charts he had with him told him the winning combinations for each game for the last week, month, and year, and he bet partially on the basis of the record, always grumbling, as he watched the electric board on the Keg Room wall. When the wrong person won a point, he exclaimed "The skunk, he shouldn't have won that," or "The skunk, he should have won that. He's not trying." He hardly ever watched the game being played and operated on the assumption that every game had been decided by the management before it was played. He had no realization of the complexity of the game itself and the virtual impossibility of arranging ahead of time the winner and place of any game. The rumor was that Beyer won considerable sums in the long run. He would not leave until the last game was over at around 11:00 p.m. If he were invited out to dinner, he would usually go to Jai Alai first and then go on to supper from there. On Sundays, when Jai Alai was not playing, he would go to the Swiss Inn or the Taza de Oro and was always happy to have a friend join him. Before the war, he ate regularly at the Plaza Lunch with a regular group of cronies. He enjoyed the movies and often went to the cinema on Sunday evenings after supper.

He would be back at the Watson Building shortly after 11:00 p.m., and it was then that he did his work, until 3:00 or 4:00 in the morning. He had a good shortwave radio, and he said that he tuned into European stations for symphony music if he worked in his bedroom, under a single, rather dim lamp (on the quarter of his table that was not piled high). During the day, he sometimes dictated letters to his secretary Natty (Natividad) Noriega, or watched over her shoulder as she typed something out for him, in quintuplicate. Miss Noriega did much more for him than any ordinary secretary would. She cooked his lunch, bought the ordinary items of his diet (he himself on a Sunday evening would do a bit of shopping for some fruit and a bottle or two of peanuts or pickles, the latter two being staples for him), and kept his clothes in order. After the war I doubt that he ever bought any new clothes. He

always wore a rather tattered white suit and a shirt and a black tie. He had a slightly better white suit that he wore on special occasions.

I think that I was his second American archaeology student at the University, and I believe that this gave him considerable satisfaction. Frank Lynch had worked for a master's degree with Beyer before I came. Even though I had a master's from the University of California, he didn't feel that he could trust me to work in any of his old sites, and it took much pressure from me and my wife, and some support from Fred Eggan, before he finally, regretfully sent me off for a month's work with Arsenio Manuel to San Narciso on the Bondoc Peninsula of southern Tayabas. This small expedition lasted for about one month and was paid for completely out of Beyer's pocket. As I recall, we went with \$600 from him and were able to return a bit when we came back.

The second dry season, he felt more confident with me and I took a small class of students for a field trip that was jointly sponsored by the University of the Philippines and the University of the East, where I had been teaching anthropology. Even though the trip was sponsored by two universities, Beyer still paid half the expenses for this trip. This time we went to western Masbate and worked on Batungan Mountain and in the Kalanay Cave Site. Among other students with me were Alfredo Evangelista, on his first dig, and Walter Miles, who was working for a master's degree under Beyer. None of the sites that we worked or visited were sites that Beyer had worked. They were all sites about which he had learned from various of his friends and informants, or, in the case of Batungan Mountain, an area that had been explored archaeologically before Beyer had become interested in archaeology.

Much of the dry season of 1952 was spent excavating the basement of the old Bureau of Science, where many of Beyer's collections had been stored. The government had started to renovate the building, and Beyer was informed that if he wanted any of the materials in the basement, he would have to have them out by the middle of 1952. Here was a midden of solid artifacts, in some places up to 2 m deep against the walls. Most of it was earthenware pottery. There must have been at least 5 tons of potsherds there, and we sifted over everything while Beyer kept an eye on our work and picked out type specimens. This material could only have been of typological value, since whatever information Beyer may have had on it before could no longer be matched with the material. Yet, it was Beyer's collection, and thus virtually a part of him, and it had to be saved. Manuel and I, plus one or two of Beyer's boys, worked over there six days a week for about six weeks. Beyer would get there between nine and ten every morning and putter around while we worked. Pressure on him to let Manuel and me go out in the field just did not work this time. To him, this excavation was the most important thing that could be done; and it had to be done. When the end of the work, vacation from my teaching job, and the dry season were in sight, I finally broke away, with assistance from my wife who knew how to handle Beyer much better than I, and we went up to Fuga Island, in the Babuyan group north of Luzon, for about two weeks. When we left, Beyer had been very irritated and I feared that my relationship with him had been permanently ruptured. On our return, however, he was most happy to welcome me back into the institute, and was very interested in the explorations and excavations I made.

Fox, Charles O. Houston, and I had urged Beyer a number of times to apply to any one of several foundations which had indicated interest in supporting work under Beyer's direction. We could have started a major program. Beyer would see none of this and always dismissed the foundations with "I have never begged a penny in my life and I never will."

Beyer was a lonely man, and the last few years of his life were lonelier than usual. Some-

time in the 1960s, a small combo and a singer began entertaining in the Keg Room. He continued to brave the loud noise for a time by sitting at a table near the front door, but this addition to his "den" was impossible for him to bear. He was finally driven away. His money was giving out. He had invested a fair amount of the money he had received as war damages, but a considerable amount of it was in small gold mines which became less and less valuable. His retirement pay was minuscule. His eyes began to weaken, so that he could no longer read. His hearing became steadily worse, so that even Miss Noriega's reading to him became difficult. Worst of all calamities, his memory began to fail him. He was no longer able to cope with his filing system, and he did not recall recent happenings. His loss of memory was the one thing that I heard him complain about; the other difficulties he never mentioned. His memory was so poor the last two times I visited him, before his final sickness, that he often forgot what he was talking about before he finished a sentence.

His last years were not all bad; he was certainly not deserted. The president of the university assigned a university car to him for three afternoons a week, and his visitors continued to come. He even mellowed considerably. For instance, in 1962, when I stopped to see him briefly, I asked him whether I might have all the archaeology papers that had not been published from the Fourth Far-Eastern Prehistory Congress to make up a special issue of *Asian Perspectives*. He said that he would think about it, and I felt that he meant it. When I was there in 1963, Beyer actually got the papers out, and we were settled on the back porch to start going over them when a visitor came. I thought that this would be the end of my project, but instead of gathering everything together and putting it away for some other time, he simply said, "You know what you want. Go ahead and pick them out," and turned and went into the other room. I picked out most of the papers that seemed to retain importance both for archaeology and ethnology, and put them in a box. When his visitor left, it was late. I asked him if I could take the papers to my hotel room for further reading that night, and he agreed, telling me only to make out a list of those that I kept. This episode would not have happened in his younger days. (Eventually the papers became *Asian and Pacific Archaeology Series No. 2: Solheim 1968*.)

Beyer received a number of honors of which he was quietly very proud. He received honorary doctorate degrees from Silliman University (1959), the Ateneo de Manila (1961), and the University of the Philippines (1964). In 1949, he had received a special award from President Quirino, and he had been publicly commended by President Quezon before the war. He was an *Officier d'Academie* of the French Academy. In 1925, he was appointed to an important commission by the governor general of the Philippines to go to Hawaii and investigate conditions of Filipino laborers there. In 1965, a symposium was held in his honor at the University of the Philippines and one result of this meeting was the publication of the book: *Studies in Philippine Anthropology (In Honor of H. Otley Beyer)* (Zamora 1967). After Beyer's death the January 1967 issue of *Philippine Studies*, devoted to this scholar, was called the "Beyer Memorial Issue on the Prehistory of the Philippines" (*Philippine Studies* 15, 1967). The many laudatory obituaries, editorials, and news articles written about him in the Philippines and elsewhere (an article appeared in one of the Honolulu papers) were further evidence of the stature Beyer had achieved.

The old man was sick (physically healthy but with virtually complete loss of memory) for more than a year before he died. The president of the University of the Philippines, Carlos P. Romulo (a former student of Beyer's), made personal efforts to insure that he was well taken care of at the university infirmary. I joined him in a small birthday party there in July



1967. Also at the party were two NASA scientists who were in Manila doing some research on Beyer's tektites, and a few others. Beyer looked reasonably well and enjoyed the ice cream and cake, but recognized no one, though he said that he recognized me. I was glad that he did not remain longer in this living death. Beyer was placed in an Ifugao death house in Banaue, Ifugao, following Catholic and Lutheran rites, and a typical Ifugao death ceremony (with pigs and water buffalo sacrificed and with the chanting of the *hudhud*).

Beyer will not be remembered as a great anthropologist, archaeologist, or prehistorian. He will be remembered in the Philippines for his single-minded devotion to the Philippines and things Filipino, and to the world as the founder of Philippine archaeological research.

## REFERENCES

- CHASEN, F. N., AND M. W. F. TWEDE, eds.  
1940 *Proceedings of the Third Congress of Prehistorians of the Far East*. Singapore: Government Printing Office.
- EVANS, IVOR H. N.  
1929 Notes on the relationship between Philippine Iron Age antiquities and some from Perak. *JFMSM* 12: 189-196.
- FOX, ROBERT B.  
1967 The archaeological record of Chinese influences in the Philippines. *Philippine Studies* 15: 41-62.
- JANSE, OLOV R. T.  
1941 An archaeological expedition to Indo-China and the Philippines (Preliminary report). *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 6: 247-268.
- SOLHEIM, WILHELM G., II  
1968 *Anthropology at the Eighth Pacific Science Congress*. Asian and Pacific Archaeology Series, No. 2. Honolulu: Social Science Research Institute.
- VAN STEIN CALLENFELS, P. V.  
1951 Prehistoric sites on the Karama River (West Torajaland, central Celebes). *JEAS* I, 1: 82-93.
- ZAMORA, MARIO D., ed.  
1967 *Studies in Philippine Anthropology*. Quezon City, Philippines: Allemar Phoenix Publishers.

## PARTIAL BIBLIOGRAPHY OF BEYER'S PUBLICATIONS

- BEYER, H. OTLEY  
1921 The Philippines before Magellan. I. The Hindus in Malaysia. *Asia* 21, 10: 861-892.  
1926 Recent discoveries in Philippine archaeology. *Proceedings, Third Pan-Pacific Science Congress, October 30-November 11, 1926, Tokyo* 2, 2: 469-491.  
1928 A prehistoric Iron Age in the Philippines. *The Philippine Magazine* 25, Oct.: 253-255.  
1930 *Ceramic wares found in the Philippines*. Manila. (20 typewritten copies distributed.)  
1931 Many Chinese ceramics have found their way into the Philippine Islands. *The Manila Daily Bulletin*, Jan. 17: 6-7.  
1932a A tabular history of the Philippine population; types of archaeological remains in the Philippines; table of Philippine racial ancestry. *Praehistorica Asiae Orientalis* [Hanoi] 1, 129-135.  
1932b Archaeological finds made on the "Nakpil site." *The Manila Daily Bulletin*, Dec. 31: 1, 3.  
1935a Luzon hace diez mil años. *La Vanguardia* 26, 103: 24.  
1935b The Philippine people of pre-Spanish times. *The Philippine Magazine* 32, Oct.: 476-477, 482, 515-517.  
1939 Cradle of the human race—Philippine and Oriental archaeology. *Graphic* Nov. 17: 16.  
1940a The Stone Age in the history of Luzon. *Proceedings of the Sixth Pacific Science Congress* 4: 153-156. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.  
1940b Philippine archaeology and its relation to the origin of the Pacific Islands population. *Proceedings of the Sixth Pacific Science Congress* 4: 157-164. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

- 1943 Philippine tektites and the tektite problem in general. Smithsonian Institution, *Annual Report for 1942*: 253-260. Washington, D.C.
- 1948a *Philippine and East Asian archaeology, and its relation to the origin of the Pacific Islands population*. National Research Council of the Philippines, Bull. No. 29.
- 1948b Early history of Philippine relations with foreign countries, especially China. In E. A. Manuel, *Introduction to Chinese Elements in the Tagalog Language*, ix-xxv. Manila: Filipiniana Publications.
- 1949a Outline review of Philippine archaeology by islands and provinces. *PJS* 77, 3-4: 205-390. (First published in 1947 but all except ten copies were destroyed by a fire at the press; republished in 1949).
- 1949b *Supplementary illustrations to the "Outline review of Philippine archaeology by islands and provinces."* Manila: privately printed.
- 1950 Earliest people of the Philippines. *Manila Bulletin*, Fiftieth Anniversary Edition, March 27.
- 1951a A tribute to van Stein Callenfels. *JEAS* 1, 1: 94-97.
- 1951b Additional notes by H. Otley Beyer. *JEAS* 1, 1: 94-97.
- 1952 Notes on the archaeological work of H. R. van Heekeren in Celebes and elsewhere (1937-1950). *JEAS*, 1, 3: 15-31.
- 1954 Anthropology at the Manila Congresses, 1953. *JPS* 63, 3-4: 247-250.
- 1955a The relation of tektites to archaeology, Quezon City, National Research Council of the Philippines (a reprint from a *Proceedings of the Fourth Far-Eastern Prehistory Congress* volume that was never published).
- 1955b The origin and history of the Philippine rice terraces. *Proceedings of the Eighth Pacific Science Congress* I: 387-398. Quezon City: National Research Council of the Philippines.
- 1956a New finds of fossil mammals from the Pleistocene strata of the Philippines. National Research Council of the Philippines, Bull. No. 41.
- 1956b Preliminary note on nine papers on the paleontology, prehistory and early history of the Philippines. *Proceedings of the Fourth Far-Eastern Prehistory Congress and the Anthropology Division of the Eighth Pacific Science Congresses Combined*, Part I (Second fascicle: section I): 335-337.
- 1961-1962 *Philippine tektites*: a contribution to the study of the tektite problem in general, in the light of both past and recent discoveries I. Manila and Quezon City.
- BEYER, H. OTLEY, and JAIME C. DEVEYRA
- 1947 *Philippine saga*. Manila: The Evening News.
- 1953 "Philippine saga." Reprinted in *Pictorial History of the Philippines*, by Pedrito Reyes and Mercedes Grau-Santamaria. Quezon City: Capitol Publishing House.