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Radiocarbon Determinations from the Frey Creek Drainage in Northern San Diego County
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Recent radiocarbon age determinations (see Fig. 1) allow a reexamination of the suggested age of the San Luis Rey assemblages. When C. W. Meighan defined the San Luis Rey Complex as a local manifestation of the late prehistoric occupancy in northern San Diego County, neither the geographic (territorial) nor the temporal boundaries of this tentative cultural unit were clear (Meighan 1954). Based on the condition of the midden and a number of artifactual traits, a temporal span of A.D. 1400 to 1750 was proposed for the non-pottery component (San Luis Rey I), and since pottery was conspicuous by its absence in the "type site" excavations, it was suggested that this complex also dated the arrival of ceramics into this particular region. A tentative date of A.D. 1750 for the terminal end of the pre-pottery phase, of course, meant that San Luis Rey II (whatever that represented) had to be fitted into the very limited temporal slot extending from A.D. 1750 to somewhat before 1850. Using mission secularization as the approximate time for the demise of a functional prehistoric lifeway, San Luis Rey II would indeed have had a short duration.

Even though Meighan's suggested dating seemed very recent to some of us, there was no immediate concern at the time, because it was not at all that clear what San Luis Rey II represented. The differences between San Luis Rey II and San Luis Rey I were seemingly limited to the presence or absence of pottery in conjunction with several seemingly less important supplementary traits, and as long as absence of pottery was the principal definitional criterion, no violation of the other extant archaeological data was indicated.

In the years following the Meighan definition, however, two factors tended to cast doubt on his proposed San Luis Rey I dating. The first was the apparent temporal hiatus between the local Pauma Complex (Milling Stone) occupancy and the San Luis Rey Complex—if the Meighan estimates were accepted. A second factor was what appeared to be increasing evidence for meaningful differences between San Luis Rey I and San Luis Rey II other than the presence or absence of pottery. The nature and existence of these differences seemingly would require a more complex process of development, and as a
consequence a lot more time than had been implied by Meighan’s hypothesis.

For a number of years, the senior author worked in the area with this set of differences in mind and with the idea that ongoing investigation of other San Luis Rey I (non-pottery) sites in the same general area would eventually document a San Luis Rey I presence extending back in time some 1000 years or so, with a terminal date somewhere in the range of A.D. 1400 to 1500. Moreover, the idea was entertained that the initial San Luis Rey presence might well have been coeval with the commonly postulated Shoshonean intrusion. Based on the data available at the time, this was not a completely illogical construct, and was in part reinforced by a series of nonpottery sites along Frey Creek that easily could have represented a chronological sequence with that much time depth. This notion was supported by the apparently poorly developed midden at Rincon 73 (SDI-731), and the increasingly obvious differences in the midden features at the aggregate of Frey Creek sites when compared with those found at a fully developed San Luis Rey II village such as Molpa. The evidence seemed to suggest some meaningful differences in settlement patterns, possible differences in population density, and a probable increasing concern with territoriality. (For additional discussion of these latter possibilities, see True and Waugh [1981, 1982] and True [n.d.].)

In sum, all the overt evidence until quite recently suggested an apparent developmental process from San Luis Rey I to San Luis Rey II that easily could have been spread over a period of 800 to 1000 years. Such a temporal duration was not only logical given our estimates of the apparent length of the local Pauma Complex occupancy, but appeared to be the best fit assuming our overall understanding of the developing local and regional cultural sequence.

Investigations on Frey Creek (Rincon 73) in 1968, and again in 1981 and 1982, resulted in the recovery of a small amount of charcoal and other organic material from several excavated contexts. Radiocarbon age determinations so far made on six of these samples tend to support Meighan’s original temporal estimates for San Luis Rey I, and put most of the development of site Rincon 73 well within the three centuries immediately preceding significant European contact in this part of North America.

Even recognizing the vagaries of the $^{14}$C method, and the plus or minus factors which in this time period are meaningful, the integrity of the site is such that the resulting numbers have to be given serious consideration. Thus, although the conclusions drawn at this point in time are obviously still tentative, it seems reasonable to suggest that the development of the San Luis Rey midden at Rincon 73 took place during the last 500 to 800 years, and that the earlier end of this continuum may or may not represent San Luis Rey I as it is presently defined. This leaves unaddressed the relationship between the earliest San Luis Rey manifestations and the terminal end of the Pauma Complex occupancy for this part of the county. It does, however, mesh fairly well with the available San Luis Rey II data for the Frey Creek drainage. The only site in the Frey Creek Complex that is clearly San Luis Rey II is Rincon 18 (SDI-715). For all practical purposes, Rincon 18 was destroyed several decades ago, and is essentially useless for further research. There is, however, a small flat overlooking Frey Creek immediately adjacent to the site that is characterized by a jumble of large boulders that form several small crevice-like caves, one of which contained cultural material (Rincon 44, SDI-722). These crevices are too small to be habitation areas, but would have provided an excellent place for storage, and the proximity to Rincon 18 suggests a close relationship
between the loci. An examination of Rincon 44 at the time of the original Frey Creek surveys resulted in the recovery of a partially reconstructable ceramic olla, several pieces of bone, at least one piece of worked wood, and several other pieces of wood which probably were culturally modified. The olla was accessioned at the Anthropology Museum at UCLA (accession # 280), and the remaining artifacts have been curated for the past 15 years in the Department of Anthropology Research Facility, University of California, Davis. The association between the olla and the other artifacts appears reasonably good, and it is at least possible that the indicated artifacts were at one time within the olla prior to its disintegration.

A radiocarbon age determination from one piece of the wooden implement resulted in an approximate date of A.D. 1570 (plus or minus 50 years). This does not, of course, actually date the pottery nor does it necessarily date the advent of what we are calling San Luis Rey II. In conjunction with the suite of determinations from the nearby Rincon 73 midden, however, the radiocarbon date suggests that at least pottery was still rare in San Luis Rey contexts well into the 1500s and may have not been common until the 18th century.

The quite limited sample of radiometric dates so far available requires that caution be exercised in any conclusions drawn, but it seems likely that the San Luis Rey Complex as it is presently recognized was indeed late in time, that Meighan’s 1954 guess-estimate was impressively accurate, and that the San Luis Rey II elaboration took place almost entirely within the two centuries immediately preceding the Mission period.
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A Note Concerning the Archaeology of Annadel State Park

EDWARD BRECK PARKMAN

Archaeologists have been aware of the Annadel obsidian source for over sixty years, and the local Southern Pomo have known of it for an even longer time. The surrounding area, however, is somewhat less well known. Today, this area is part of the 2,000 ha. Annadel State Park, located several km. east of Santa Rosa in northern California’s Sonoma County (Fig. 1). Recently, the Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) initiated an inventory of the park’s archaeological resources (Parkman and Hood 1982; Parkman and McGuire 1981). To date, 67 cultural resources have been recorded within the park. These consist of 18 historic EuroAmerican and 49 prehistoric native American archaeo-
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