

UC Merced

Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology

Title

Bickel: *San Francisco Bay Archaeology: Sites Ala-328, Ala-13, and Ala-12*

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/2dq1z0q2>

Journal

Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology, 5(2)

ISSN

0191-3557

Author

Hildebrandt, William R.

Publication Date

1983-07-01

Peer reviewed

186	1881	Sarah hired by Gen. Howard to teach Shoshone prisoners at the Dalles, Vancouver Barracks.
192-4	1881	Sarah and Lieutenant Lewis H. Hopkins married in San Francisco then moved to Pyramid Lake.
199	1882	Sarah visiting sister at Henry's Lake, Idaho, when Old Winnemucca died.
199-209	1883	Sarah to Boston; lectured in New York, Connecticut, Rhode Island, Maryland, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and Washington, D.C.; book published.
214	1884	Sarah presented to U. S. Congress; returned to Pyramid Lake.
222	1885	Sarah lecturing in San Francisco.
232	1885	Sarah's private school for Indians, Lovelock, Nevada.
249	1887	Children from Sarah's school taken by Bureau of Indian Affairs to school in Grand Junction, Colorado.
259	1891	Sarah died at home of sister at Henry's Lake, Idaho.

REFERENCES

- Lowie, R. H.
 1924 Notes on Shoshonean Ethnography. American Museum of Natural History Anthropological Papers 20:185-314.
- Stewart, O. C.
 1941 Culture Element Distributions XIV: Northern Paiute. Berkeley: University of California Anthropological Records 4(3):361-446.



San Francisco Bay Archaeology: Sites Ala-328, Ala-13, and Ala-12. Polly McW. Bickel. Berkeley: University of California Archaeological Research Facility Contributions No. 43, 1981, 375 pp., 12 plates, 11 maps, 112 tables (paper).

Reviewed by WILLIAM R. HILDEBRANDT
 Dept. of Anthropology
 San Jose State Univ.
 San Jose, CA 95192

This paper is a revised version of Polly McW. Bickel's 1976 Ph.D. dissertation. The goal of the research is to resolve a major interpretive conflict that has developed in the study of central California prehistory. The conflict is between a model of "Parallel Change" forwarded by Lillard, Heizer, and Fenenga (1939) and Beardsley (1954), and a model of "Convergent Change" forwarded by

Gerow (Gerow with Force 1968; Gerow 1974). More specifically, the parallel change model argues that the central California cultural horizon concept, developed largely on the basis of data from the lower Sacramento Valley, is applicable to a wide range of places including the San Francisco Bay area. Furthermore, the Bay area is considered, at least early on, to be culturally marginal and backward relative to the Central Valley and that changes initiated in the Valley were followed by inhabitants of the Bay in parallel fashion.

Bay area excavations at the University Village site (SMA-77) and the West Berkeley Shellmound (ALA-307), indicate to Gerow that the shell artifact typology utilized by the horizon concept, when used outside the Delta area, predicts time and not type of complex. Rather, he argues that during Early Horizon times, the Bay area was occupied by a different cultural tradition than what was present in the Central Valley. Based on his observations that Bay and Valley assemblages become more similar through time, he proposes the model of convergence.

In order to deal with the above differences, Bickel analyzes materials from three Bay sites: ALA-328, ALA-12, and ALA-13. The materials were generated through excavations by various Bay area institutions. Due to this fact, there are several areas of confusion

regarding provenience. Bickel does an excellent job of sorting these problems out.

The implications of her analysis are stated (p. 333) as follows:

To the degree that general characteristics of these Bay area site assemblages and trends of change within them are shared with Valley sites, the parallel model embodied in the work of Lillard, Heizer, Fenenga, and Beardsley is supported. To the degree that general characteristics differ, particularly early in the sequence, and trends are opposite, the convergent model by Gerow is supported.

Bickel's presentation is divided into five chapters. The first provides a discussion of the basic focus of the paper. Chapter 2 describes the sites, environment, ethnography, history, history and methods of excavation, and the general chronological placement of the deposits.

Chapter 3 is an exhaustive description of the artifacts. Each artifact is ordered according to its relative frequency of occurrence with burials, its raw material, and its depth in the deposit. These descriptions span 223 single-spaced pages.

Chapter 4 describes the burials and features. Over 500 burials are dealt with. Variables considered include age, sex, posture, orientation, depth, and presence/absence of grave goods. Individual grave lots are not used as a unit of analysis.

Chapter 5 provides the conclusions to the study. The first section presents a summary description of the artifacts present on a site-by-site basis. The next section breaks ALA-328 into components on the basis of depth and provides artifact lists for each. These trait lists are then compared in narrative form to the Central Valley and early Bay materials. The narrative format, given the complexity of traits, is difficult to follow without further data organization and analysis on the part of the reader. Although it is not

clearly stated, it appears that there is a greater similarity in traits between Bay and Valley late in time than early in time.

The burial data are then summarized. It is concluded that differences between the two areas are not found so much in the number of graves with goods but in the content of the individual graves. However, since these data are not explicitly presented, significant patterns are not easily observable.

Although there are significant differences early in the sequence and several traits that co-occur later in time, other traits that remain regionally discrete through time lead Bickel (p. 338) to the following conclusion:

An examination of central California archaeology from these two perspectives leaves strong impressions of change in both areas and separate traditions in each, interwoven with evidence of interplay between them—a complex picture which cannot be portrayed in simple models of parallel or convergent change.

Overall, the report is an excellent compilation of raw data. However, the complex and descriptive style of presentation, and the fact that the grave lot is not used as the unit of analysis result in a document that is difficult to promptly apply to current problems of central California prehistory. On the other hand, for researchers interested in taking the data an additional analytical step, the report is invaluable.

REFERENCES

- Beardsley, R. K.
1954 Temporal and Areal Relationships in Central California Archaeology. Berkeley: University of California Archaeological Survey Reports Nos. 24 and 25.
- Gerow, B. A., with R. W. Force
1968 An Analysis of the University Village Complex with a Reappraisal of Central California Archaeology. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Gerow, B. A.

1974 Co-Traditions and Convergent Trends in Prehistoric California. San Luis Obispo County Archaeological Society Occasional Papers No. 8.

Lillard, J. B., R. F. Heizer, and F. Fenenga

1939 An Introduction to the Archaeology of Central California. Sacramento Junior College Department of Anthropology Bulletin 2.



Rock Art Treasures of Ancient America: The California Collection. Dave Caldwell, producer. Hayward: Dave Caldwell Productions, Inc. Videotape, 25 min., \$495.00 plus tax and shipping.

Reviewed by PHILIP J. WILKE
Dept. of Anthropology
Univ. of California
Riverside, CA 92521

"The California Collection" of American Indian rock art, as described in this film, includes three media in three separate regions: the pecked petroglyphs of the Coso Range, the giant ground figures or intaglios of the Colorado River lowland, and the painted cave art of the Santa Barbara coast. Quality photography portrays the rock drawings and ground figures in their natural settings in each of these regions. Lay persons and beginning students of rock art will therefore benefit from an excellent visual presentation.

The narrative of the film centers on symbolic aspects of the art with references to mythology. The case might be strongest for the Chumash region, where the ethnography of that tribe is documented in greater detail than perhaps that of any other North American Indian group. Moreover, studies of the rock art of the Santa Barbara coast and of Chumash astronomy and cosmology have resulted in what appears to be a very convincing argument of the link between the natural

and supernatural worlds of the Chumash. Although the paintings are not dated, they are probably not of great antiquity, and the prehistoric record does suggest a long tradition of cultural continuity in the region.

The same cannot be said for east-central California, however, and considerations of time are all but ignored in the presentation on the Coso Range. A case is made for the Coso rock art symbolically representing the exploits of mythic Coyote, whose conquest of toothed vaginas with a mountain sheep neck bone as a penis sheath is ultimately responsible for the origin of all Shoshonis (see Whitley 1982). The myth is recounted by a Shoshoni, but to my knowledge it was actually recorded only in other regions occupied in historic time by other Shoshoni groups. And at least half of all scholars interested in the linguistic prehistory of the Great Basin would argue that the Numic (Shoshoni, Northern Paiute, Southern Paiute) groups have not occupied that area for more than about a thousand years, while much of the rock art may be a great deal older than that, maybe several times as old. If those linguistic prehistorians are correct about the length of Numic occupation in the Basin, the rock art might have been there before they ever arrived, unless of course the Coso Range is the true Numic homeland and the proto-Shoshoni would also have spread the Coso style of rock art elsewhere as they swarmed over the Basin. This notion is not supported by an inventory of the rock art styles and motifs in other parts of Shoshoni territory.

This illustrates an important problem with the text of the film: not enough time is given to the possibility that rock art may have served several, or many, separate functions in any given region over time, and that the ethnographic present and interpretations linked to it may not apply to all of the time represented by the archaeological record. Simple explanations are seldom adequate, unfor-