Chartkoff and Chartkoff: The Archaeology of Two Northern California Sites. Excavations at the Patrick Site (4-Butte-1); and Sanburg and Mulligan: The Archaeology of the Hackney Site, Mariposa County, California

Permalink
https://escholarship.org/uc/item/01z0210j

Journal
Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology, 6(1)

ISSN
2327-9400

Author
Jackson, Thomas L

Publication Date
1984-07-01

Peer reviewed
The report by the Chartkoffs (which has all the flavor of a 1970's California piece) cites no publication more recent than 1976, and that by Sanburg and Mulligan cites none post-1975, although an addendum to the latter report clearly was written sometime after March 1978. Significant literature relevant to both of these studies has been available more recently than the most current bibliographic reference in either article. Thus, I have the choice of chastising the authors for not having done their homework (which is true in some respects in any event), or concluding that the editor has not done the reader the service of advising that the material is somewhat vintage. I suggest, influenced by the shoddy editing of the monograph, that the papers are stale.

The first report on this double bill describes the archaeology of the Patrick Site, perhaps best known in its celluloid depiction, 4-Butte-1: A Lesson in Archaeology. Excavations were carried out at the site in 1965 and 1966 by field classes from U.C.L.A. and California State University, Chico, as part of a research program which focused on diachronic human adaptive response and ethnic variability in material culture in diverse ecological settings in a three-county area near Chico, California. The Patrick Site was selected as the best available example of a late prehistoric “proto-Maidu” site in a piedmont habitat, and its large inventory of housepits offered the opportunity to study not only the construction of late prehistoric and protohistoric structures, but also to analyze inter- and intra-structural material culture distributions. This was a pioneering theoretical and methodological approach in California archaeology. Regrettably, there has been no substantive publication of the results of the regional research project.

Some 43 depressions, presumably housepits, were visible on the surface of the Patrick Site at the time of excavation. These were
distributed over some 293,000 square feet, what remained unplowed of an estimated original site area of about 650,000 square feet. Depth of the midden deposit averaged five feet. Approximately 1.5% of the site volume was excavated. Twelve structures were explored, and their varied architectural features compared with house types defined in ethnographic accounts. Eleven of the excavated houses appear to have been circular pit-house types; the twelfth was a living surface suggesting a ramada. Two-thirds of the structures had been burned, all revealed central fire hearths, and all had one or more block mortars set into the floor near the hearth. A single burial was encountered beneath a structure floor. Average house size at the site appears to have increased, perhaps as much as 50%, over time. Architectural descriptions are brief, but are accompanied by drawings for most features, and convey the essential information.

The second portion of the site report is a very abbreviated description of the artifacts from the Patrick Site. Despite the Chartkoffs’ claim to “describe the artifacts in terms that should be meaningful to California archaeologists,” (p. 27) I’m afraid many of us will be left puzzled. There are no artifact illustrations, specific artifact measurements, or provenience data. A provisional typology of generalized artifact families (ground stone, fire-modified rocks, cores and core tools, flakes and flake tools, shell and shell artifacts, bone and bone artifacts, historic artifacts, miscellaneous) is refined by descriptive or functional generic terms used to convey the basic nature of many artifact forms, (pestles, block mortars, pitted stones, cores, scrapers, etc.). It is exasperating to find no enhancement of the rude generic descriptions of such culturally sensitive artifacts as shell beads and projectile points.

Among the “more than 20,000” artifacts from the site (including 13,116 pieces of debitage, 65 fire-cracked/blackened rocks and miscellaneous floral remains) are 1,419 “small” and “large” clamshell disc beads. These, the Chartkoffs state, are made from the Pismo clam (Tivela stultorum), a species indicated to have been harvested for bead manufacture “in the San Francisco Bay region and traded inland” (p. 39). It is more probable that the beads are of Saxidomus nuttalli or Tresus nuttalli shells, since (1) these two species, especially the former, account for the vast majority of clam disc beads found in the northern Central Valley, and (2) Saxidomus particularly is indicated in the ethnographic literature as having been exploited for bead manufacture. Tivela is not native to San Francisco Bay. Also found were four “horn shell spire-lobbed beads,” which are thought to be of Cerithidia californica, and which the Chartkoffs indicate, “is known naturally from Southern [sic] California, and may have been imported from over 400 miles away” (p. 41). Cerithidia remains are common food refuse constituents in San Francisco Bay shellmounds, where many of the shells are spire-lobbed.

As to the temporal placement of the clam disc beads, the Chartkoffs state, “The large ones were most common before A.D. 1550, while the smaller ones became numerous after that date” (p. 39). The reverse is the case; larger clam disc beads were made later, especially in historic times, and most researchers would argue that the clam disc bead was introduced into the Delta ca. A.D. 1500, reaching the northern Sacramento Valley perhaps slightly later.

The final portions of the report are interpretive discussions of “Trade,” “Subsistence,” “Social Structure,” and “The Patrick Site in Time and Space.” Imports to the Patrick Site include marine shell artifacts, obsidian, chert, agate, and steatite. Suffice to say that this section should be revised in light of modern studies. Subsistence activities at
the site are believed to have focused on the seasonal exploitation of nearby floodplain, alluvial fan, foothill, and riverine/riparian habitats, with supplemental foods obtained through trade, and storage of surplus. None of the recovered floral remains and only a miniscule part of the faunal remains have been analyzed. The Chartkoffs perceive an "egalitarian, sedentary community" organized around nuclear family households, not unlike that described for the ethnographic Maidu. They conclude that the Patrick Site was occupied between A.D. 1400-1500 and A.D. 1800-1840. After a very brief survey of archaeological assemblages from other regional sites, they propose that the Patrick Site assemblage warrants a distinctive taxonomic position, termed the "Chico Complex," an assemblage "produced by the immediate predecessors of the Northwest Valley Maidu at their major base camps..." (p. 47).

The second report, *The Archaeology of the Hackney Site*, follows a brief introduction by C. W. Meighan which seems designed to endear neither Meighan nor the subsequent essay to other Sierran researchers. According to Meighan, no significant archaeology has been completed in this portion of the Sierra Nevada since U.C.L.A.'s activity in Yosemite ca. 1959; indeed, the Sierra Nevada has been left to the plunder of "ignorant relic collectors"! Meighan and the authors seem unaware of the scores of excavation and survey reports completed for projects in the central Sierra Nevada since 1960. What follows is your basic, economy-model site report.

Excavations at the Hackney Site (CA-MRP-283), located on the East Fork of the Chowchilla River, were undertaken in 1972 by California State University, Los Angeles. There is no stated research problem. A total of eight units (seven 5 ft. x 5 ft., one 3 ft. x 3 ft.) was completed in arbitrary six-inch levels, with soils screened through ¼-in. mesh. Maximum midden depth is indicated to have been 72 inches. Dimensions of the site are not given. Investigators recovered a nominal number of floral and faunal remains, no structural elements other than occasional chunks of daub, two burials without grave furnishings, and 922 artifacts (other than debitage), a third of which are whole or fragmentary projectile points. The remainder of the artifact inventory is comprised of various scraper forms, knives, drills, gravers, a scraper plane, hammerstones, metates, manos, 19 bedrock mortars, one portable mortar, a pestle, steatite vessel fragments, steatite beads, steatite "ear plugs or labrets," worked bone, a single *Olivella* bead, three sherds of Brown Ware, three glass beads (inadequately described) and miscellaneous other chipped, ground or polished stone items. Significantly, the site produced 19 clay figurine fragments, an artifact form rare in the area. Basic measurements and provenience are given for all artifacts, with comprehensive measurements for appropriate projectile points. Some osteological data are provided for the human remains. Debitage from the site is virtually all of obsidian, with count/weight data nicely tabulated. A nominal number of projectile points are illustrated by good line drawings, as are a few other artifacts.

Discussion of artifact forms is minimal, except as regards projectile point typologies. The authors remark at length on the difficulty in distinguishing between Eastgate and Rose Spring types, a narrative which is somewhat passé, although the authors are correct in pointing up the need for more consistent typological approaches to projectile point classification. The authors create a simple typology for reporting purposes and then suggest comparisons with illustrations in other published reports. Projectile point types recognizable from the report drawings include Desert Side-notched, Cottonwood Triangular, Sierra Concave-Base, Eared Concave-Base, "Rosegate," and Elko forms.
There is no significant comparative or interpretive analysis of the materials from the site. The authors suggest that the Hackney Site was occupied on a semi-permanent basis “primarily during the later prehistoric into the protohistoric times. . . . as far back as AD [sic] 1200 until perhaps 1825” (p. 80). Earlier occupation, as indicated by projectile point types is acknowledged, but not defined. Their inclusion of clay figurines among the hallmarks of late period occupation is debatable. Important reports of archaeological work at nearby Buchanan and Hidden reservoirs, and Yosemite National Park are neglected.

The most remarkable thing about Monograph 22 is the incredible number of typographical, grammatical, and syntactical errors, not to mention stylistic inconsistencies. Typographical errors in picture and figure captions and references, and bibliographic citations are particularly annoying. Inexplicably, of the 41 references in the bibliography of the second paper 16 (39%) are not cited in the text! Many other examples could be listed.


Reviewed by PETER D. SCHULZ
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The hide and tallow trade, which flourished during the second quarter of the last century, brought to California a number of Americans who left detailed records of their experiences with, and observations of, Californios and native peoples. Though filtered through a variety of biases, these records are often of anthropological as well as historical interest. The recently published journal of Captain William Dane Phelps is no exception.

The Alert, representing the Boston firm of Bryant, Sturgis & Co., was stationed in California, under the command of Phelps, from June 1840 to December 1842. In that time Phelps visited all the ports in the province and made two trips up the Sacramento Valley. The journal’s unusually detailed record of these travels reflects Phelps’ intention that it provide his family a full account of his experiences in a then-foreign land.

Phelps by no means escaped the ethnocentrism common to such accounts. He provides detailed descriptions of his elk hunts (with American settlers) and of the mechanics of the hide and tallow trade, but his observations on Californio society, with whose representatives he dealt almost daily, are meager. Indeed, except for tales of alcoholic priests, individual Californios find little place in this record. Phelps admired their hospitality and horsemanship, but little else.

In spite of this, the journal occasionally yields interesting insights. Phelps’ testimony, for example, accords with that of other foreigners and Californios alike in depicting the subservient role of Californio women. Yet while in San Diego in May, 1842, he notes that Tomasa Pico de Alvarado (here rendered by Busch as “Tomala” Pico), was responsible for supplying beef to the ships, and had organized an uprising among the local women in opposition to the bishop’s intention of removing his headquarters from San Diego to Santa Barbara. References in her brother’s reminiscences (Pico 1973: 25, 27), further document Tomasa Pico’s activities and indicate the at least occasional involvement of intelligent and strong-willed women in the