

## **UC Merced**

### **Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology**

#### **Title**

Teixeira: *The Costanoan/Ohlone Indians of the San Francisco and Monterey Bay Area: A Research Guide*

#### **Permalink**

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/811315n5>

#### **Journal**

Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology, 20(1)

#### **ISSN**

0191-3557

#### **Author**

Hylkema, Mark G

#### **Publication Date**

1998-07-01

Peer reviewed

the immunological studies presented in Appendix B, the authors note that the finding of protein residues of deer on the projectile point may have resulted from hunting, butchering, or be due to the use of sinew for hafting (p. 46). A number of studies conducted over the past few years has been unable to convincingly demonstrate that protein residue analyses of ancient specimens are reliable (Downs and Lowenstein 1995; Feidel 1996). The identification of deer and yucca in this context, while not implausible, should perhaps be considered merely a working hypothesis until further studies are conducted.

Few stylistic or production errors were noted in the monograph. Catalog numbers are sometimes inconsistent between appendices, the main body of the report, and in figure captions. For example, Appendix B states that catalog number 1-023 was tested for protein residues; but this artifact is listed as catalog number 1-002 in Figure 38. The report also suffers from poor reproduction of many of the photographs, some of which are so dark as to be virtually indecipherable. Many of the line drawings fared much better, however, and the artist is to be commended for the detailed renditions of historical and prehistoric artifacts from the site. The tape binding of the volume will not last long, and was no doubt chosen to keep costs to a very affordable \$8.00.

This slim volume documents an important facet of late prehistoric and contact period archaeology from Death Valley. It is good to see results of contract archaeology being published; such "grey literature" deserves to be read by a wider audience than it has been in the past.

#### REFERENCES

- Downs, E. F., and J. Lowenstein  
1995 Identification of Archaeological Blood Proteins: A Cautionary Note. *Journal of Archaeological Science* 22:11-16.
- Feidel, Stuart J.  
1996 Blood from Stones? Some Methodological and Interpretive Problems in Blood Residue Analysis. *Journal of Archaeological Science* 23:139-147.
- Fowler, Catherine S.  
1996 Historical Perspectives on Timbisha Land Management Practices, Death Valley, California. In: *Case Studies in Environmental Archaeology*, Elizabeth J. Reitz, L. A. Newsom, and S. J. Scudder, eds., pp. 87-101. New York: Plenum Press.
- Hunt, Alice P.  
1960 *Archaeology of the Death Valley Salt Pan, California*. University of Utah Anthropological Papers No. 47.
- Knack, Martha  
1996 Nineteenth Century Great Basin Indian Wage Labor. In: *Native Americans and Wage Labor: Ethnohistorical Perspectives*, A. Littlefield and Martha Knack, eds., pp. 144-176. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Steward, Julian H.  
1938 Basin-Plateau Aboriginal Sociopolitical Groups. *Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin* 120.



*The Costanoan/Ohlone Indians of the San Francisco and Monterey Bay Area: A Research Guide*. Lauren S. Teixeira. Ballena Press Anthropological Papers No. 46, 1997, 130 pp., 1 map, 5 photographs, \$25.00 (hard cover), \$12.95 (paper).

Reviewed by:

**MARK G. HYLKEMA**

Calif. Dept. of Transportation, 111 Grand Ave., District 4, Oakland, CA 94623-0660.

Prior to 1990, very little published information about the native cultures of the San Francisco and Monterey Bay regions was available to

the public. Not that information is lacking; on the contrary, there exist an enormous volume and range of documentary resources—but it requires diligent research through a myriad of obscure historical accounts and anthropological literature, much of which is not available to regular folks. In fact, many scholars also find it difficult to access various archives or locate rare texts which might contain scattered bits of knowledge about the people we collectively refer to as the Costanoan and/or Ohlone. Many are not prepared to invest the amount of time needed to become familiar with the range of literary resources, especially when informative passages can only be obtained after sifting through massive amounts of historical texts. Without a “road map,” there is frequently little return for the time expended doing the research. Fortunately, Lauren Teixeira has provided such a map in her recently published *Research Guide*. This book is the third in a series of publications by Ballena Press (Bean 1994; Milliken 1995) that focuses on the native lifeways comprising the Ohlonean cultural sphere.

Since the mid-1960s, increased public awareness of archaeology and Native American culture has led to legislative actions resulting in programmatic approaches to managing archaeological resources, as well as improving educational goals in public schools. In California, curricula for the third and fourth grades require that subjects focusing on local Native American culture and early California history be taught. Together, institutionalized archaeology and public education, along with an explosion in the urban population of the central California region, have fueled the need for a better understanding of the local native lifeways.

Conveniently, two texts became available just at a time when such information was needed most, and they quickly became the mainstay sources of local ethnographic knowledge: Richard Levy's *Costanoan* chapter in Volume 8 of the *Handbook of North American Indians*

(1978), and *The Ohlone Way* by Malcolm Margolin (1978). The former article, encyclopedic in nature, filled an ethnographic void and served as a tonic for archaeologists thirsting for quick summaries to complete required, standard sections of reports identifying the ethnographic setting of a given site (regardless of chronological considerations and the applicability of this information to artifact assemblages being described). In contrast, the latter publication presented a personal insight as to what precontact Ohlonean society *might* have been like, which satisfied the public sector where it was embraced, and is still perceived as the definitive standard for learning about local native culture. And yet, neither Levy's brief chapter nor Margolin's interpretive view addressed many of the more detailed questions for which researchers and other people wanted answers. Researchers in both the private and public sector have found it easier to note that there is a paucity of information about the tribal lifeways rather than to actively seek original information, and so passages paraphrasing Levy and Margolin abound.

In 1983, Randy Milliken's Master's thesis, *The Spatial Organization of Human Population on Central California's San Francisco Peninsula at the Spanish Arrival*, began to circulate among some professionals, and it became apparent that, contrary to common belief, there was a vast sum of information contained in the historical accounts of the early Spanish explorers and missionaries. Milliken's work provided an extensive list of citations that could be accessed by others. Concurrently, ethnographic notes from the J. P. Harrington collection became available on microfilm through the San Jose State University library, opening up another complex avenue of archival resources. Ironically, while Harrington's notes were stored at the university, descendants of his informants were meeting on campus and elsewhere in an effort to reorganize into revitalized contemporary Ohlone communities.

Collectively and individually, the Ohlone

voiced concerns that archaeology and the quality of technical reports (with their standard, cursory ethnographic sections) left them empty and dissatisfied in their quest for cultural information relevant to their modern standing. After all, they were working as consultants to archaeologists, who described only their contact period relationship with the Hispanic mission system. Since the 1990s, such concerns served to gradually change archaeological report formats, and several large projects have recently sponsored extensive ethnographic investigations in consultation with the descendants (Field et al. 1992; Milliken et al. 1993; Kehl and Yamane 1995; Cambra et al. 1996). Indeed, some of the descendants are either doing the research themselves as contributing authors, or assisting ethnographers in their efforts. This has resulted in another wave of important literature, most of which is still difficult to access, unless you have the proverbial archival road map.

In response to the cumbersome nature of locating useful data regarding the Costanoan/Ohlonc, Teixeira has provided an excellent, concise inventory of primary resource references. However, it should be pointed out that this inventory does not represent the sum total of all available material, nor does it evaluate the quality or accuracy of the information. Of course, this additional level of detail would require a much greater effort on the part of the author than can reasonably be expected. Another point of concern is that there is a tendency for scholars and the public to view the San Francisco and Monterey Bay region as a homogeneous ethnographic unit, encapsulated under the nomenclature of Costanoan or Ohlonc. Both the archaeological record and ethnohistoric data point to a greater complexity of sociopolitical interaction, as diverse as the range of environments that supported the fifty or so autonomous tribelets known to exist at the time of European contact. Consequently, broad brush approaches towards describing the native people of this area can lead

to misconceptions about the nature of intergroup relationships (for example, the coastal people maintained a much different economy and vocabulary than the interior folks). Perhaps it would be better to think in terms of an interaction sphere instead of an ethnographic unit. Certainly this kind of reasoning can be extrapolated from the other two books comprising the Ohlonc trilogy which Teixeira identifies as "core resources." Interestingly, Teixeira does not provide an inventory of topical information contained within the two core texts, which would otherwise prove to be of great utility for those pursuing specific kinds of information contained therein.

In summary, Teixeira's *The Costanoan/Ohlonc Indians of the San Francisco and Monterey Bay Area: A Research Guide*, is a monumental contribution to the study of local native lifeways.

#### REFERENCES

- Bean, Lowell John (comp. and ed.)  
1994 *The Ohlonc Past and Present: Native Americans of the San Francisco Bay Region*. Ballena Press Anthropological Papers No. 42.
- Cambra, Rosemary, Alan Leventhal, Laura Jones, Julia Hammett, Les Field, and Norma Sanchez  
1996 *Archaeological Investigations at Kaphan Umux (Three Wolves) Site, CA-SCL-732: A Middle Period Prehistoric Cemetery on Coyote Creek in Southern San Jose, Santa Clara County, California*. Report on file at the Northwest Information Center, Sonoma State University.
- Field, Les, Alan Leventhal, Dolores Sanchez, and Rosemary Cambra  
1992 *A Contemporary Ohlonc Tribal Revitalization Movement: A Perspective from the Muwekma Costanoan/Ohlonc Indians of the San Francisco Bay Area*. *California History* 71(13):413-431.
- Kehl, Jacqueline Jenson, and Linda Yamane  
1995 *Ethnohistoric Genealogy Study*. Manuscript prepared for the Santa Clara County Transportation Agency, San Jose. Report on file at the Northwest Information Center, Sonoma State University.

- Levy, Richard  
 1978 Costanoan. In: Handbook of North American Indians, Vol. 8, California, Robert F. Heizer, ed., pp. 485-495. Washington: Smithsonian Institution.
- Margolin, Malcolm  
 1978 *The Ohlone Way*. Berkeley: Heyday Books.
- Milliken, Randall T.  
 1983 *The Spatial Organization of Human Population on Central California's San Francisco Peninsula at the Spanish Arrival*. Master's thesis, Sonoma State University.  
 1995 *A Time of Little Choice: The Disintegration of Tribal Culture in the San Francisco Bay Area, 1769-1810*. Ballena Press Anthropological Papers No. 43.
- Milliken, Randall T., Julia Costello, Carina Johnson, Glory Anne Laffey, Ann-Marie Sayers, and Patrick Orozco  
 1993 *Archaeological Test Excavations at Fourteen Sites Along Highways 101 and 152, Santa Clara and San Benito Counties, California, Vol. 2: History, Ethnohistory, and Historic Archaeology*. Report on file at the Northwest Information Center, Sonoma State University.



*The Archaeology of the Donner Party*. Donald L. Hardesty. Reno: University of Nevada Press, 1997, xii + 156 pp., 38 figs., 4 maps, 15 tables, 3 appendices, bibliography, index, \$27.95 (hard cover).

Reviewed by:

**DOUGLAS D. SCOTT**

Midwest Archeological Center, National Park Service,  
 Federal Building, Room 474, Lincoln, NE 68508.

Don Hardesty and his contributors have given us a new perspective on the Donner Party trag-

edy of 1846-1847. *The Archaeology of the Donner Party* is a concise and well-written account of the history, archaeological investigations, and reinterpretation of the events. This slim volume is a model of multidisciplinary research and a team approach to producing a publicly oriented archaeological interpretation of interesting events of our recent past.

The book's six chapters and appendices give the reader the story of the Donner Party both in historical and archaeological context. The introduction sets the stage for this contextual placement in both time and space, as well as stressing the multidisciplinary nature of today's historical archaeological investigations. Chapter 1 gives us the details of the Donner Party and the tragedy resulting from being snowbound with limited resources. The second chapter, by Michael Brodhead, places the Donner Party trek in a holistic context of the entire overland emigration era, 1840 to 1860. In a well developed style, Brodhead provides the reader with a neat encapsulation of the emigrant experience on the trail, and places the Donner Party in a comparative context.

In the third chapter, Hardesty and Susan Lindstrom delve into the archaeological investigations of the Murphy Cabin site. They effectively use the historical sources to place the cabin in context. They also build to the story of the modern excavations by recounting the early efforts made to document and locate the cabin site for various memorialization purposes. In a pleasant prose style, Hardesty and Lindstrom then recount their excavations at Murphy Cabin and the finding of the remains. This chapter alone is a good example of how the application of modern investigation techniques can squeeze just a bit more data from a previously excavated or impacted site.

Chapter 4 relates the investigations of Alder Creek Camp. Here Hardesty demonstrates the value of combining traditional excavation and sampling strategies with metal detecting to