

UC Merced

Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology

Title

Chartkoff: *Test Excavations at the May Site (CA-SIS-S7) in Seiad Valley, Northwestern California*

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/2h40q10x>

Journal

Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology, 11(1)

ISSN

0191-3557

Author

Rock, James T.

Publication Date

1989-07-01

Peer reviewed

corresponds with McGuire and Garfinkel's Lamont phase, the earliest known in the southern Sierra Nevada, dating from ca. 4,000 B.C. to 1,200 B.C.

REFERENCES

- Chartkoff, Joseph L., and Kerry Kona Chartkoff
1984 *The Archaeology of California*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Lathrop, Donald W., and Dick Shutler, Jr.
1955 *An Archaeological Site in the High Sierra of California*. *American Antiquity* 20:226-240.
- Moratto, Michael J.
1984 *California Archaeology*. Orlando: Academic Press.
- Payen, L. A.
1982 *The Pre-Clovis of North America: Temporal and Archaeological Evidence*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Riverside.
- Simpson, Ruth D.
1989 *An Introduction to the Calico Early Man Site Lithic Assemblage*. San Bernardino County Museum Quarterly 36(3).



Test Excavations at the May Site (CA-SIS-S7) in Seiad Valley, Northwestern California.

Joseph L. Chartkoff. Salinas: Coyote Press *Archives of California Prehistory* No. 17, 1988, vi + 80 pp., 2 maps, 12 figs., 31 tables, \$6.20 (paper).

Reviewed by:

JAMES T. ROCK

Klamath National Forest, 1312 Fairlane Rd., Yreka, CA 96097.

In 1972, Joseph Chartkoff directed a team of Michigan State University students and U. S. Forest Service trainees in test excavations at the May site (CA-SIS-S7), southeast of the town of Seiad Valley in northwestern California. Situated on a high river terrace east of Grider Creek, a tributary of the Klamath River, the May site is just 11 miles south of

the California-Oregon border.

The major findings of this investigation were: (1) the site still retains subsurface integrity; (2) it is stratified; and (3) different activities took place in different parts of the site. The report concludes that additional excavations would be needed to recover more substantive data.

This report suffers, as too many small test excavation reports do, from a lack of synthesis and interpretation. It begins with an introduction of eight pages and ends with a summary and conclusion of eight pages. The remainder of the text is a detailed description of the recovered assemblage. Only one-fifth of the report attempts any synthesis or interpretation while four-fifths deal with artifact description. There seems to be an imbalance here.

The author states that the test excavations were performed to investigate a question concerning the relationship between ecology and prehistoric settlement along the Klamath River. The site was interesting because of its potential for yielding organic materials and because it was located at an ethnographic border. Chartkoff and Chartkoff (1975) previously reported on settlement patterns along the Klamath River. However, the *Archives* report reviewed here provides no research design linking the Chartkoffs' earlier work with these test excavations. In fact, very little evidence is presented addressing the relationship between ecology and settlement patterns.

The detailed descriptions of the recovered artifacts may be quite useful to future researchers in providing baseline artifact descriptions for this little-studied region. The report also provides us with two radiocarbon dates (1045 ± 80 and 1080 ± 80) for the area. These dates apply to materials recovered from the upper of three occupation levels, known to date from A.D. 1000 to the nineteenth century.

The summary's greatest contribution is made in discussing the question of ethnic affinities and ethnic boundaries (pp. 70-73). Here the question is asked, but not answered: how can one distinguish archaeologically between Shasta and Karuk?¹ Or is it that the May site is a mixed village that may or may not have been influenced by one or the other of these tribes? The models presented by Chartkoff depicting a possible frontier or border situation are excellent, if too briefly dealt with. Both the extant tribes, Karuk and Shasta, claim this area as part of their traditional territory.

Questions of ethnic boundary identification are as interesting today as they were in 1972. Testing a site with probable mixed cultural elements does not seem logical for answering boundary questions. We must also ask how four 5 x 5-ft. test pits in one village site of "several dozen acres" relate to questions of ethnicity. Would it not be better to test a series of sites within known Karuk and Shasta territory and then use these data to compare with those found within a "boundary village"?

NOTE

1. In the late 1970s, the Karuk Tribe of California was granted federal recognition. At that time it officially changed the spelling of the tribe's name from Karok, as it is spelled throughout the May site report, to Karuk.

REFERENCE

Chartkoff, Joseph L., and Kerry K. Chartkoff
1975 Late Period Settlement of the Middle
Klamath River of Northwest California.
American Antiquity 40:172-179.



A Golden Journey: Memoirs of an Archaeologist. Luther S. Cressman. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1988, xviii + 506 pp., 44 plates, 1 figure, notes, index, \$35.00 (cloth).

Reviewed by:

JAMES D. WILDE

Office of Public Archaeology, Brigham Young Univ.,
Provo, UT 84602.

Luther Sheeleigh Cressman divided his life into four periods to describe his "Golden Journey." These form four of the five chapters of his autobiography, and explain how he developed into one of the foremost archaeologists in western North America. His story is rich in detail, often colored with poetry and snippets of letters from friends and eminent scholars. He uses remembered conversations in his long reminiscence, and offers not only his opinions on many topics, but the process of formation of those opinions. He is forthright and candid throughout.

Cressman weaves an intricate tapestry with the threads of his life, using the fabric to examine and explain the growth of his intellect and philosophy. Born in 1897, and raised in rural Pennsylvania, he incorporated curiosity and a love of the land with the ideals of intellectual freedom and moral integrity. He studied Classics at Pennsylvania State College, became an Army artillery officer during World War I, and studied concurrently at the General Theological Seminary and Columbia University in New York. He was ordained an Episcopalian priest, and earned a Master's degree in 1923. His Ph.D. in sociology from Columbia was won in 1926. This fundamental dichotomy between spiritual and secular life was not resolved until after his *Wandeljahre* through Europe in 1925-26, while his young wife Margaret Mead was in Samoa. This period of angst was punctuated by his divorce from Mead, and his growing friendship with a young Englishwoman.