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NOTES

1. Although Warner Valley dune and slough camps superficially resemble the Surprise Valley lowland seed gathering and processing stations, they differ from them in several respects, the most important being that (1) the Warner Valley dune and slough camps are not satellites of larger, more permanent villages; (2) their assemblages are sufficiently well balanced to suggest their use as short term campsites rather than specialized activity areas; and (3) they give evidence of occupation much more dispersed than is suggested for the Surprise Valley lowland seed gathering and processing stations.

2. It should be pointed out that O'Connell has also been unable to document the social composition of lowland occupation sites in Surprise Valley. However, his reconstruction of settlement stability is based on site distributions and a functional settlement taxonomy rather than assumptions about social cohesiveness.

REFERENCES

Bettinger, Robert L.

Heizer, Robert F., and Lewis K. Napton

Jennings, Jesse D.

Lee, Richard B.

Lyneis, Margaret M.

O'Connell, James F.

Steward, Julian H.

Thomas, David Hurst

Weide, Margaret M.

Corrections to
Sea Level Article

POLLY McW. BICKEL

I have been informed of two errors of fact and one of interpretation in my article regarding changing sea levels along the California coast (Bickel 1978). Proximity of the dated hearth feature to the Sunnyvale female was 200 m. or less, not 500 m. as stated in the Appendix. West Berkeley radiocarbon dates in Table 1 do not reflect corrections made by the
University of Michigan as reported in Deevey, Rouse, and Flint (1967), and I omitted one date which pertains to the lower component of the site. The corrected series of dates appears below.

Gerow previously noted the change in this journal (1974:242) and I was at fault for not catching the error in Wallace and Lathrap (1975:58). It should be noted that this entire range of dates applies to the part of West Berkeley which Wallace and Lathrap isolated as a separate component representing older material than the upper six feet of the site. The upper component has not been radiocarbon dated.

I incorrectly characterized Gerow’s interpretation of the shift in shellfish species seen in some bayshore middens. While he does advance a cultural explanation, he does not suggest that human users depleted supplies of one type of shellfish before beginning to use other types, as I stated. Rather, he suggests that during the period of initial settlement near the bay shore, those species of shellfish (and other food sources) which were most easily obtained were used. As human use of the place intensified, there was a broadening of the spectrum of resources which were exploited, to include those requiring more effort to obtain (Gerow with Force 1968:32, 33, 124).

Neither Gerow nor I see the midden constituents as a direct reflection of species available, which in a sense is Gifford’s and Greengo’s position. But Gerow sees culture as the crucial mediator: human choice obeying the Law of Least Effort so that, universally, clinging species are taken before boring species of shellfish. I see nature as the ultimate mediator, as the indirect cause of changing availabilities of different species. To me, the evidence recorded in middens along the southern California coast and elsewhere, of shifts from clingers to borers, reflects a pattern of change seen on many estuary shores; it must relate to estuary natural history. To Gerow, the pattern, to the extent that it can be documented, might equally reflect similar cultural histories: humans everywhere first going for the species easiest to obtain, then broadening out as they intensify use of an area.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Lab Number</th>
<th>¹⁴C Age</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West Berkeley</td>
<td>M-127</td>
<td>3700±300</td>
<td>Deevey, Flint, and Rouse 1967;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Ala-307)</td>
<td>M-126</td>
<td>3140±450</td>
<td>Gerow 1974; cf. Wallace and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M-125</td>
<td>3860±450</td>
<td>Lathrap 1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M-124</td>
<td>3700±350</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M-121</td>
<td>2700±250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>