the non-missionized tribe which we now know as the Cahuilla. Under the mission system, the extensions of meaning to "something of little value," or alternatively to something as dangerous as black hornets, would be natural. Finally, in terms of this argument, the derivation of Cahuilla from *qáwiy?a* 'master' is probably to be taken as a folk-etymology.

In attempts to discover the origins of words, we can never go back beyond a certain point. In the present case, since it is unlikely that we will ever have full data on the Cochimí language, we may never know what the original Cochimí meaning of the word "Cahuilla" may have been. But I believe we may accept the data assembled by Harrington as showing that—unlike other tribal names such as Serrano or Luiseño—the term "Cahuilla" did have an Indian origin, and that it was used by Spanish speakers in Baja California to mean "a non-missionized Indian." In that sense, it was apparently applied to the Southern California tribe that we call the Cahuilla today.

University of California, Los Angeles

REFERENCES

Barrows, David P.
1900 The Ethno-botany of the Coahuilla Indians of Southern California. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. (Reprinted 1967, Malki Museum Press, Banning.)

Diguet, Léon
1912 Territorio de la Baja California: Reseña Geográfica y Estadística. Paris & México: Librería de la Vda. de Ch. Bouret.

Gudde, Erwin G.
1969 California Place Names (rev. ed.). Berkeley: University of California Press.

Heizer, Robert F.
1968 The Indians of Los Angeles County: Hugo Reid's Letters of 1852. Los Angeles: Southwest Museum Papers 21.

Kroeber, A.L.
1905 Supposed Shoshoneans in Lower California. American Anthropologist 7: 570-572.
1925 Handbook of the Indians of California. Washington: Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin 78.

León, Nicolás
1903 Los Comanches y el dialecto cahuillo de la Baja California. Anales del Museo Nacional de México, 1a época 7:263-278.

North, Arthur W.
1908 The Native Tribes of Lower California. American Anthropologist 10:236-250.

Santamaría, Francisco J.
1942 Diccionario General de Americanismos (3 vols.). México: Robredo.

Whipple, A.W.
1850 Extract from a Journal of an Expedition from San Diego, California, to the Rio Colorado. Washington: Report of the Secretary of War, pp. 2-28.

A Chumash Pottery Jar

ROBERT H. CRABTREE
CLAUDE N. WARREN

This note describes a pottery jar associated with a burial in a proto-historic Chumash cemetery (CA-SBa-60) and places it in a regional and historical context.

Aboriginal Southern California represents an important cultural frontier, providing considerable information for cultural historical studies, in their broadest meaning, which we take to include cultural processes. That part of southern California consisting of the Mojave and Colorado deserts and the coastal strip south of the San Luis Rey River was a region in which native cultures were in part influenced by the Meso-American frontier cultures of

Northern Mexico and the American Southwest. This influence has been noted and in part analyzed by several writers (cf. Ellis 1968; Kroeber 1925; Schroeder 1965, 1966), and pottery typologies from prehistoric contexts have proliferated (Riddell 1951; Meighan 1958; Euler 1958; Schroeder 1958; Hunt 1960). Beyond this frontier, specifically in the Santa Barbara-Los Angeles coastal area, the occurrence of pottery in archaeological deposits is sporadic, and, except for a paper summarizing the occurrence of southwestern pottery types in the Los Angeles area (Ruby and Blackburn 1964), has received scant attention. This reflects the relative rarity of pottery here, although there have been references to its occurrence going back to the last century (Ford 1887).

The site 4-SBa-60 is located at Goleta, California, and was once on the shores of an open water slough which emptied nearby into the Pacific Ocean. This location has been identified with an historically known Chumash village, *Saspilil*, first recorded by members of the Portolá expedition in 1769, when it was described as the largest village on Goleta Slough (Brown 1967:30-32).

Excavations at 4-SBa-60 have been limited to two salvage operations.[1] The earlier of these was done by the University of California, Los Angeles, in 1959 (McKusick 1960) and was confined to midden and activity areas, plus some areas suggestive of Spanish mission presence. The second salvage effort at *Saspilil* was initiated in early 1968 by the Santa Barbara County Archaeological Society, and eventually involved an archaeological field class under C.N. Warren then at the University of California, Santa Barbara, and volunteer crews under Janet Karen and Roger Desautels. These excavations revealed a concentration of 99 graves, which was clearly a part of a major cemetery of unknown extent. The bulk of artifactual associations with these burials were aboriginal, and include steatite bowls, jars, *comales*, and pipes; sandstone mortars and pestles; chert micro-drills, cores, and projectile points; shell beads, necklaces, and pendants in considerable numbers; *Haliotis* shell bowls, quartz crystals, red ochre, and asphaltum; fiber brushes with cord-wrapped, asphaltum-coated handles; and whale bone and sandstone slab grave markers, all suggesting the developed Southern California maritime culture noted by earlier explorers and missionaries. Some items of European derivation also were present in association with some of the burials. These are largely glass beads, but also include metal, bottle glass, and a fragment of tile. The particular burial we are concerned with here was Burial #53(U8) in Pit 8E. This burial was of a typical late type, located at the edge of the burial cluster in the stratigraphically latest context. Such burials were placed face down, with arms and legs fully flexed alongside and/or under the body.[2] For purposes of dating this burial, the glass trade beads are crucial, and have been identified as being associated with the Mission period (1790 to 1820); notably lacking are bead types associated with the terminal Mission period (1830's) (Clement Meighan, personal communication).

The pottery jar with which this note is primarily concerned contained 32 glass trade beads, a red shell disc (*Haliotis*) bead and an *Olivella* half-shell bead. The vessel is globular with a restricted plain-rimmed mouth (Fig. 1). In form, it most closely resembles the southwestern "seed" jar or the large steatite *ollas* of the Santa Barbara coastal area. The jar apparently was made by coiling and modeling flat ribbons or slabs of moist clay, which were pinched and smoothed together while the clay was still plastic. Subsequently, the surfaces and coil junctions were further smoothed with an instrument which left some striations and scraping marks on the surface of the semi-hardened (leathery stage) clay. After complete drying, the vessel was fired in an uncontrolled oxidizing atmosphere, probably somewhat below 900° C. The resulting ware is generally

Fig. 1. Photo of Chumash ceramic jar (diameter 16.3 cm.).

Table 1
DESCRIPTION OF THE VESSEL (#1-179)

Height—121 mm.
Diameter—minimum - 157 mm.
maximum - 163 mm.
mouth - 95 mm.
Surface color—variable light red (Munsell 7.5 YR 5/6-8, 7.5 YR 6/6-8, 7.5 YR 7/6-8)
Surface finish—unevenly smoothed, some scraping marks
Surface texture—smooth or fine grain
Construction—modeled or slab-coiled and scraped
Firing—uncontrolled (oxydizing)
Firing clouds—present
Decoration—none, unslipped
Vessel form—globular, restricted mouth jar
Base—rounded, unevenly

Sherd Characteristics
Fracture—medium to crumbly
Hardness—4.0-4.5 (MOH)
Thickness—4 mm. - 8 mm.
Core color—7.5 YR 5/6 (Munsell) light red
Paste texture — temper size is medium (.20 to .50 mm.) to very coarse (2 mm.) (Wentworth), evenly dispersed, vugs (from rootlets) are present
Temper — angular quartz particles, clear and opaque, with occasional mica and obsidian(?) particles
Rim form—IA3 (Colton)

similar to the several varieties of pottery native to the area from Owens Valley to the San Diego coast (Table 1). This is, however, only a general resemblance and does not hold for details of temper and paste and the association of attributes.

As noted above, pottery, while not common, does occur in archaeological sites in this coastal area (cf. Pilling 1952; Harrison 1965); however, descriptions are not always adequate or standardized, and comparisons are somewhat subjective. Sherds from Avila, near Point Sal in San Luis Obispo County, have been tentatively identified as being similar to Southern Paiute utility ware (Pilling 1952:171). Harrison describes three sherd types from *Mikiw*, eight miles west of Goleta, all made by the paddle and anvil technique. He suggests (1965:106) that the most common "plainware" is similar to Owens Valley Brown Ware, but Owens Valley Brown Ware is not a paddle and anvil pottery, or at least the several hundred sherds we have examined from Owens Valley were not made by the paddle and anvil technique. In short, rarity of occurrence coupled with inadequate analysis does not lead to delineation of any local "types." The jar from *Saspilil* most definitely does not resemble any Paiute pottery we have examined from southern Nevada, and is even less like pottery of the Lower Colorado or the San Diego County area (Lower Colorado Buff Ware and Tizon Brown Ware). It is, then, a unique phenomenon.

Association with glass trade beads might suggest that the jar was brought in by European explorers. However, the shape of this vessel resembles either a seed jar of the southwestern type, or the local steatite *olla*, the latter being the most immediately available model for vessel form with an innovative technological medium. We therefore believe that this was a locally made item; and this raises the question of why this apparent innovation took place, and what caused it. These questions are not easily resolved. However, it is

apparent from the occurrence of sherds in a number of sites in Southern California, that pottery was not an unfamiliar item in the Chumash area, and contacts with neighbors both to the south and the east would have broadened this knowledge. It is apparent that these coastal peoples occasionally acquired enough technical knowledge to attempt to make pottery, although it did not replace vessels made of other materials. The association of this particular ceramic vessel with a burial suggests that whatever its functional and technological aspects might be, it was something more than an item used for cooking and storage: it was an item of social value as well.

University of Nevada, Las Vegas

University of Nevada, Las Vegas

NOTES

1. This site has been largely destroyed by the construction of downtown Goleta. The only archaeological salvage undertaken was in conjunction with the construction of the freeway and an offramp in 1959 and the removal of trees and leveling of the ground in construction of a brickyard in 1968. The archaeological excavations in both cases were limited to that portion being destroyed or endangered by the construction. Portions of the site of *Saspilil* are still intact beneath the concrete, asphalt, and turf of downtown Goleta.

2. The data resulting from these excavations are housed in part at the Santa Barbara Mission Archives, where they are stored for the Quabajai Chumash Association, and in part at the University of California, Santa Barbara, and the University of California, Los Angeles. Field notes, maps, catalogues, and descriptions of artifacts are also on file with the junior author at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas.

REFERENCES

Anderson, E.N.
1964 A Bibliography of the Chumash and Their Predecessors. Berkeley: University of California Archaeological Survey Reports 61:25-74.

Brown, Alan K.
1967 The Aboriginal Population of the Santa Barbara Channel. Berkeley: University of California Archaeological Survey Reports 69.

Ellis, Florence Hawley
1968 What Utaztecan Ethnology Suggests of Utaztecan Prehistory. Pocatello: Occasional Papers of the Idaho State University Museum 22:53-105.

Euler, Robert C.
1959 Comparative Comments on California Pottery. Los Angeles: University of California Archaeological Survey Annual Report 1:41-42.

Ford, H.C.
1887 Notes on Excavations Made in Indian Burial Places in Carpinteria. Santa Barbara: Santa Barbara Society of Natural History Bulletin 1(1):16.

Gayton, A.H.
1929 Yokuts and Western Mono Pottery Making. University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology 24(3).

Harrison, William M.
1965 Mikiw: A Coastal Chumash Village. Los Angeles: University of California Archaeological Survey Annual Report 7:91-178.

Hunt, Alice
1960 Archaeology of the Death Valley Salt Pan. University of Utah Anthropological Papers 47.

Kroeber, A.L.
1925 Handbook of the Indians of California. Washington: Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin 78.

Kroeber, A.L., and Michael J. Harner
1955 Mohave Pottery Making. University of California Anthropological Records 16(1).

McKusick, M.B., et. al.
1961 Excavations at Goleta. Los Angeles: Uni-

versity of California Archaeological Survey Annual Report 3:339-446.

Pilling, Arnold
1952 The British Museum Collection from Near Avila, California. American Antiquity 18:169-172.

Riddell, Harry S.
1951 The Archaeology of a Paiute Village Site in Owens Valley. Berkeley: University of California Archaeological Survey Reports 12:14-28.

Rogers, Malcolm J.
1936 Yuman Pottery Making. San Diego Museum of Man Papers 2.

Ruby, Jay, and Thomas Blackburn
1964 Occurrence of Southwestern Pottery in Los Angeles County, California. American Antiquity 30:209-210.

Santa Barbara County Archaeological Society
1969 Newsletter 6(1). Santa Barbara. (Mimeographed).

Schroeder, Albert
1958 Lower Colorado Buff Ware. Flagstaff: Museum of Northern Arizona Ceramic Series 3D.

1965 Unregulated Diffusion from Mexico into the Southwest Prior to A.D. 700. American Antiquity 30:297-309.

1966 Pattern Diffusion from Mexico into the Southwest After A.D. 600. American Antiquity 31:683-704.