

UC Merced

Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology

Title

Moore and Imwalle: *Archaeological Investigations at CA-SBA-1809, A Protohistoric Settlement, Goleta, Santa Barbara County, California*

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/6v302273>

Journal

Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology, 14(2)

ISSN

0191-3557

Author

Gamble, Lynn H

Publication Date

1992-07-01

Peer reviewed

Archaeological Investigations at CA-SBA-1809, A Protohistoric Settlement, Goleta, Santa Barbara County, California. Jerry D. Moore and Michael H. Imwalle. Salinas, CA: Coyote Press *Archives of California Prehistory* No. 19, 1988, vi + 69 pp., 7 figs., 13 tables, \$6.20 (paper).

Reviewed by:

LYNN H. GAMBLE

Institute of Archaeology, Univ. of California, Los Angeles, CA 90024-1510.

Extensive archaeological investigations have been conducted in California over the past ten years as a consequence of cultural resource management (CRM) work. The results of these investigations can be found in documents filed in Archaeological Information Centers throughout the state. To access the data available in these reports, archaeologists usually obtain them through personal contacts or from the Information Centers. If researchers need information on a subject such as archaeological examples of California Indian houses, then they would probably need to travel to the different Information Centers to access the information in reports. Because of the inefficiency of conducting research in this manner, published versions of documents produced for environmental review or mitigation are useful to researchers and other interested people. In this respect, the publication of archaeological reports such as the one on CA-SBA-1809 is a significant step in facilitating access to information that has traditionally been difficult to obtain.

Coyote Press should be recognized for its effort in publishing a wide variety of site reports and other CRM documents, particularly in its

series "*Archives of California Prehistory.*" As archaeologists, however, we need to provide publishers such as Coyote Press with site reports that are worthy of publication. These reports should contain a research design, a careful description of techniques,¹ documentation of the information recovered from the archaeological site,² useful analyses,³ and conclusions.

Moore and Imwalle state in the beginning of the report on CA-SBA-1809 that the project was designed to retrieve scientific data from the site and to mitigate impacts that would result from the construction of a parking lot on top of the site. They also maintain that the primary element of their research was to understand the nature of a burned feature observed during previous excavations at the site. Nevertheless, the authors do not reference any attempt to recover a flotation sample of the burned remains observed in the feature. A cursory examination of the burned remains may have indicated whether most of the charcoal was burned timber, twigs, seeds, thatching, or another type of plant remains. Charcoal was recovered in the screens and is briefly discussed in the chapter on data recovery methods (p. 14). Charcoal was apparently differentiated from noncharcoal in the greater than 1/4-in. screen sizes, but not in the 1/8-in. size mesh (p. 14). The authors (pp. 13-14 and Table 1) note that charcoal is not exclusively associated with the feature and suggest that some of the charcoal in the upper 20 cm. is from historic/modern agricultural projects. There is no further discussion presented in the report after this brief analysis of the charcoal. If the objective of the Phase III excavations was to determine the functions of the burned feature at the site (as stated on p. 4), then at least a sample of the charcoal observed

in the feature should have been collected and examined in greater detail.

Another shortcoming of the report was the manner in which the information on the feature was collected. There is no indication whether or not the soil within the boundaries of the feature was processed separately from the soil in the surrounding matrix. In fact, there is no clear description of the feature, nor documentation such as the levels in which it was recovered, its appearance in cross-section, nor the types of constituents associated with it (as compared to constituents found in the surrounding matrix). Without basic documentation such as this, it is difficult for Moore and Imwalle (or anyone else) to reach the basic goal of understanding the nature of the burned feature.

In a more positive light, the chapter on ethnohistoric background is well-written and quite readable. The authors present a brief overview of the Chumash during the protohistoric and historic periods in the Santa Barbara Chumash region. The chapter on faunal remains also offers useful information in the respect that most of the data on bones recovered from the excavations are clearly presented in Table 2. Even the counts and weights of burned versus unburned bone are listed, offering sufficient data to conduct further analyses.

The authors describe some of the artifact types, such as the asphaltum basketry impression and cloth, in detail. The asphaltum basketry fragment is interpreted as the remains of a twined water bottle, and the authors give numerous references indicating the grounds for their interpretation. This analysis is impressive and provides references to twined water bottles in ethnohistoric, ethnographic, and archaeological contexts. If all the other artifact analyses were as thorough as this one, then the report would be more worthy of publication. For example, the beads are allegedly described according to King's typology; however, no measurements of the beads are presented,

making it difficult to assess their typology. There is also a confusing discussion of *Dentalium neohexogonum* in which the authors correlate this type of bead with the Historic Period, noting that "they were simply not in the collections available to C. King" (p. 37). They do not recognize that it is more logical to interpret the *Dentalium neohexogonum* as occurring in Phase 1 of the Late period (King 1990:Table 10), since the other shell beads found at the site are types used commonly during Phase 1 of the Late Period.

The authors devote an entire chapter to the chipped stone assemblage, which was analyzed and classified according to raw material for the flakes observed in all the size meshes. Flakes also were classified as primary, secondary, and tertiary. The information on these categories can be used by future researchers. References to other chipped stone analyses, however, are rare throughout the chapter. For example, the authors claim that "fused shale is a metamorphosed chert transformed via the subsurface combustion of sulphur and shale" (p. 27), yet no reference is given to support this statement. According to Singer (1986:3), fused shale is probably a fused sand. There is no indication that fused shale is a metamorphosed chert, particularly since chert does not occur in the formation where fused shale is found. A more thorough discussion of the metamorphic origins of fused shale can be found in Arnold and Anderson (1907) and Benter and Kastner (1976).

Another problem with the chapter on chipped stone is the discussion of utilized and retouched flakes. Ten utilized and retouched flakes (from the Phase III excavations) were identified on the basis of retouch or edge damage seen macroscopically. One of these was described in detail and microwear analysis indicated it was probably used as a scraper on soft material (p. 31). The authors do not describe the other nine utilized and retouched flakes. There is no information on their appearance (i.e., edge angle and morph-

ology) or a discussion of whether magnification was used to investigate this class of tools. The imbalance between the analysis of the utilized and retouched flakes compared with the more thorough analysis of the debitage is unfortunate because it is difficult to assess the relationship between the debitage and utilized flakes.

The discovery of cloth and cloth impressions is unusual in the region; however, the discussion of these artifacts makes it difficult to assess their significance at the site. Fine single-ply, S-twist thread impressions were recovered in several of the units; however, the authors fail to mention in what material these impressions were found. Possibly they were recovered in asphaltum or clay or some other material. This basic information is left up to the imagination of the reader. The lack of careful descriptions becomes increasingly frustrating as the reader attempts to make an independent assessment of the data.

The title of Chapter 8, "The Burned Feature: Evidence and Interpretations," leads one to believe that information on the burned feature will be presented, but documentation of the burned feature does not appear in this chapter. Instead, the authors discuss a variety of Chumash structures and facilities based on the ethnographic accounts published in two (1983 and 1986) of the volumes on Chumash Material Culture by Hudson and Blackburn. They do not refer to any archaeological excavations of structural remains in the Chumash area, despite publications on the subject (summarized in Gamble 1991:83-173). Moore and Imwalle develop archaeological correlates for each type of structure or facility by using only the ethnographic accounts.

A researcher attempting to acquire information on the burned feature has to hunt for brief descriptions of the feature in other chapters. In Chapter 1, entitled "Overview to the Project," the burned feature is mentioned and a radiocarbon date is presented indicating that the burned level dates to the protohistoric or early historic

period. In Chapter 3, entitled "Data Collection Methods," the feature is again briefly mentioned under the heading of "Field Methods" (pp. 13-14). It is this section that provides information on the size of the burned feature (2.5 m. long and 1.25 m. wide) and a map indicating the extent of the feature. In the following three chapters (covering faunal, lithic, and miscellaneous artifacts), only passing remarks are made about the feature. In Chapter 7, entitled "Post-Depositional Processes," the authors indicate that the feature was slightly disturbed due to root activity, but not heavily affected by rodent burrows. Three strata are described in this chapter, but not in relationship to the feature, and the feature is not described further. The only stratigraphic profile drawings in the report are found in this chapter: cross-section views of three walls of Unit J. None of these profiles includes any information on the feature. This discussion completes the descriptions of the feature, except for the remarks in Chapter 8 and the following two chapters, in which, as discussed above, no additional evidence or information on the feature is presented. At this point in the report, the reader does not know at what depth the feature was observed, what its appearance was in cross-section, its thickness, if the burned area was intermittent in cross-section or a solid lenticular surface, or what types of constituents were associated with the feature. Based on the "evidence" presented in this report, Moore and Imwalle conclude that the feature at CA-SBA-1809 was a residence that burned down at a small, isolated homestead (p. 53).

In an article entitled "A Late Prehistoric Homestead on the Santa Barbara Coast," Moore (1987) focused on the feature at CA-SBA-1809. (Unfortunately, there are no references to that article either in its published or unpublished form in this report.) Most of the information in Moore's article overlap with that found in this report, although there is some additional information on the burned feature, including a

brief description of it in cross-section and the depth in which it was found (Moore 1987:101). The size of the feature is given as 2.65 x 1.25 m. (Moore 1987:101), which is slightly larger than the size given in the report (2.5 x 1.25 m.). There is no explanation for the differences in size of the feature nor are any additional profiles presented. Even with the additional information given in the article, there are too few data to document that the burned feature was the remains of a residential structure. No clear depressions, post holes, or floor are noted, and the size of the burned area is smaller than known ethnographic, ethnohistoric, and archaeological examples of domestic structures.

In the final two chapters, Moore and Imwalle present a stimulating discussion of Late Period settlement systems in the Chumash area. They hypothesize that during the Late Period there was a class of settlements (small, isolated homesteads) previously unidentified in the region (pp. 56-57). In these two chapters, they present significant hypotheses on settlement pattern analyses that should be addressed by all archaeologists working in the region. In addition, they recognize that small sites, such as the one identified at CA-SBA-1809, contain scientific data that must be recognized to understand prehistoric patterns (p. 61).

Many archaeologists, especially those less familiar with California and ephemeral sites, could have dismissed this site as a temporary camp or lithic scatter and not recognized the significance of the feature and the artifacts in the site. Moore and Imwalle should be commended for their recognition of the importance of the feature and the site of CA-SBA-1809; however, more rigorous documentation is needed to demonstrate that they have recovered the burned remains of a Chumash residence.

NOTES

1. These techniques should meet the current standards used for archaeological data recovery in the

region and be relevant to the problems raised in the research design.

2. This documentation might include maps of the site, cross-sections of significant stratigraphic profiles with soil descriptions, and plan views and cross-sections of features. This record should be as thorough as possible and might also include photographs, catalogues, notes, artifact drawings, and other archaeological information documenting the site.

3. The types of analyses commonly conducted at Chumash and other California Indian sites usually include faunal studies, lithic analysis, and bead analyses. In some reports, an effort to conduct analyses on floral remains, asphaltum, shell and bone artifacts, ground stone, pottery, baked clay, and fire-altered rock is pursued (if these types of remains are recovered), and significant information is often obtained.

REFERENCES

- Arnold, Ralph, and Robert Anderson
1907 Metamorphism by Combustion of the Hydrocarbons in the Oil-Bearing Shale of California. *Journal of Geology* 15:750-758.
- Bentor, Y. K., and M. Kastner
1976 Combustion Metamorphism in Southern California. *Science* 193:486-488.
- Gamble, Lynn
1991 Organization of Activities at the Historic Settlement of Helo': A Chumash Political, Economic, and Religious Center. Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Santa Barbara.
- Hudson, Travis, and Thomas C. Blackburn
1983 Food Preparation and Shelter: The Material Culture of the Chumash Interaction Sphere, Vol. II, Ballena Press Anthropological Papers No. 27, Thomas C. Blackburn, ed. Los Altos and Santa Barbara: Ballena Press/Santa Barbara Museum of Natural History Cooperative Publication.
- 1986 Ceremonial Paraphernalia, Games, and Amusements: The Material Culture of the Chumash Interaction Sphere, Vol. IV, Ballena Press Anthropological Papers No. 30, Thomas C. Blackburn, ed. Los Altos and Santa Barbara: Ballena Press/Santa Barbara Museum of Natural History Cooperative Publication.

- King, Chester
 1990 *Evolution of Chumash Society: A Comparative Study of Artifacts Used for Social System Maintenance in the Santa Barbara Channel Region before A.D. 1804*. New York: Garland Publishing.
- Moore, Jerry D.
 1987 A Late Prehistoric Homestead on the Santa Barbara Coast. *Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology* 9:100-109.
- Singer, Clay A.
 1986 Prehistory of Fused Shale in Southern California. The Social and Economic Contexts of Technological Change, Proceedings of the World Archaeological Congress. Southampton: Allen & Unwin.



The Ute of Utah Lake. Joel Janetski. University of Utah *Anthropological Papers* No. 116, 1991, 81 pp., 18 figs., \$20.00 (paper).

Reviewed by:

DEMITRI B. SHIMKIN

Univ. of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, IL 61801.

This modest study undertakes to develop an ecologically oriented ethnography of early-contact Ute groups in the vicinity of Utah Lake, central Utah. It places primary importance upon the use of water resources, particularly fish. The work is based on published sources. It is, in part, an expansion of an earlier sketch of Ute ethnography, by Donald G. Callaway, Joel C. Janetski, and Omer C. Stewart, in the *Handbook of North American Indians* (Vol. 11). In general, the work is a critique (esp. pp. 11-16), of Julian Steward's uniform formulation of human ecology and adaptation in the Great Basin.

Joel Janetski should be congratulated on a thoughtful, well-organized, and well-written

ethnography, useful not only to anthropologists but also to Ute and lay people. At the same time, the limits of the work need to be emphasized. There is no treatment of kinship, a cultural dimension of crucial importance for all Numic peoples. The author should have used, as a basic guide, Fred Eggan's "Shoshone Kinship Structures and Their Significance for Anthropological Theory" (1980). At the same time, the discussion of religious phenomena (pp. 52-58), while concise, is meritorious.

Beyond this monograph, much research is needed on a number of basic issues. I would like to discuss four.

1. To this day, the Spanish reports on Great Basin peoples have been used very inadequately. Twitchell (1914) summarized literally hundreds of seventeenth and eighteenth century reports on the Ute, Comanche, and other Southwestern peoples. The full originals have yet to be used, to my knowledge. And the probability of major holdings in Mexico City and Madrid is very high. The need for such research is great.

2. Natural and cultural areas coincide only in part. The Great Basin as shown by Janetski (his Fig. 1) does not correspond closely to Numic territory. In fact, human subsistence strategies are strongly oriented toward the exploitation of complementary resources—desert and upland, upland and plains, etc. In the nineteenth century

Provo (on Utah Lake) was the great annual gathering place for all the Ute bands of the valleys for two hundred miles, east and south, on account of the wonderful supply of fish, moving up the stream from the lake to their spawning grounds every spring.

. . . their bands had been accustomed to meet at Provo, and have a great good time, horse racing, trading, gambling and eating fish, for several weeks each year [Gottfredson 1919:20].

That such extensive travels and interactions were to be found in pre-horse days is suggested, not only by general Numic patterns of mobile network formation, but by archaeological evi-