

## **UC Merced**

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

#### **Title**

Breschini and Haversat, eds.: *Papers on Central California Prehistory*

#### **Permalink**

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/3rz938rb>

#### **Journal**

Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology, 7(2)

#### **ISSN**

0191-3557

#### **Author**

Elsasser, A. B.

#### **Publication Date**

1985-07-01

Peer reviewed

Bada's paper is an excellent review of the current status of aspartic acid racemization age determinations. Finally, Tyson and Wallace, respectively, have provided good summaries of available information about the Yuha burial and Malaga Cove early-occupation evidence from southern California.

This volume is solidly in support of the pre - 12,000 - year - ago human occupation of the New World and highlights the importance of resolving the issue of the validity of the 25,000 to 12,000 - year - old date assignments. While those seem to be accepted unquestioningly by the festschrift, this reviewer agrees with Shutler that some of the key data need more attention.

Brott, in his introduction to this volume, says that the preparers hope the readers find it "interesting, useful, and inspirational." It is all those things, like Davey, and good value for the price as well.



*Papers on Central California Prehistory: 1.*  
 Gary S. Breschini and Trudy Haversat,  
 series editors. Salinas, CA. Coyote Press  
*Archives of California Prehistory*, No. 3,  
 1984. 87 pp., figures, tables, photos,  
 \$4.95, (paper).

Reviewed by A. B. ELSASSER  
 824 Park Way  
 El Cerrito, CA 94530

The three papers included in this volume are: (1) "Preliminary Archaeological Investigations at CA-MNT-101, Monterey, California," by W. E. Pritchard; (2) "Prehistoric Hunting Patterns in Central California," by W. S. Hildebrandt *et al.*; and (3) "Archaeological Investigations at CA-SCL-78, near Morgan Hill, Santa Clara County, California," by

G. S. Breschini and T. Haversat. These papers are comparatively modest in scope, but each is a positive contribution to the archaeology of central California, particularly to the region extending from southern San Francisco Bay south to the Monterey Coast. Comments will be made here in the order in which the titles appear above, identified by author in each case.

Pritchard's paper was originally submitted as a report on excavations in 1968, thus at a time before the Monterey region had been characterized as representing a distinctive archaeological zone, only distantly related to those in the lower Sacramento Valley or northern San Francisco Bay. The site reported is located at the Presidio of Monterey and includes both prehistoric and historic deposits; termination of the prehistoric occupation seems definitely to have occurred before historic use began after A.D. 1770. While certain shell bead and ornament types suggest that the early stages of the occupation were coeval with the then accepted Middle Horizon of the central California sequence, projectile points, mostly of Monterey chert, are not clearly comparable to those from the lower Sacramento Valley, but rather are similar to those previously found at Willow Creek, about 40 miles south on the Monterey Coast. Distribution of the milling-stone artifacts suggests evidence of a shifting or changing ecological or economic base, insofar as they were mostly located below the level where heavy concentrations of molluscan remains began and continued to occur upward to the surface of the site. These latter data were undoubtedly utilized at a later date by Breschini and Haversat in their detailed descriptions of archaeological patterns in the Monterey region.

Hildebrandt *et al.* have examined a hunting pattern (intensification) model and attempted to test it against archaeofaunal data from bayshore and interior sites in the

southern San Francisco Bay, Santa Clara Valley, and Pacific Ocean coast (north of Mopterey) regions. Unfortunately, some of the faunal data presented by past researchers did not allow optimal results in the present study. Difficulties were compounded by probable earlier misidentification of certain mammalian bones (e.g., it seems likely that deer remains were sometimes confused with those of pronghorn antelope); in addition, non-inclusion of bird and fish remains (because several of the older reports utilized did not include these taxa in their analyses) tends to weaken the present investigation. Despite such limitations and other problems referring to data control, some significant agreements between the data, such as they were, and the intensification model are noted. Finally, the paper implies that with more exacting procedures, the method outlined will prove valuable to future archaeologists attempting to understand native hunting patterns through time.

The last paper, by Breschini and Haversat, summarizes the results of a limited test excavation in a part of the Santa Clara Valley which had not been investigated archaeologically until comparatively recent years. Although only one test unit (1.0 x 1.5 m. x 90 cm. deep) was involved, the excavation provided a good sample of the potential of the site, which the authors designate, on the basis of radiometric dating, as a "Late Horizon" site. Future excavations on sites such as this and others in the vicinity are needed before the southern Santa Clara Valley region can be placed in proper archaeological perspective.



*The Material Culture of the Chumash Interaction Sphere, Volume III: Clothing, Ornamentation, and Grooming.* Travis Hudson and Thomas C. Blackburn. Menlo Park: Ballena Press Anthropological Papers No. 28 (a Ballena Press/Santa Barbara Museum of Natural History Cooperative Publication), 1985, 375 pp., figures, tables, References, Index, \$24.95 (paper), \$39.95 (cloth).

Reviewed by JEANNE E. ARNOLD  
Dept. of Sociology and Anthropology  
Univ. of Northern Iowa  
Cedar Falls, IA 50614

This is the third in a five-volume series of encyclopedic quality on the material culture of the Chumash peoples and some of their nearest neighbors in southern California. The eight geographically defined tribelets, or subgroups, of the Chumash provide the primary focus, with the greatest portion of the data emanating from consultant interviews or historical observations recorded during the eighteenth, nineteenth, and early twentieth centuries. Hudson and Blackburn rely most heavily here, as in the other volumes, on the tremendous masses of notes compiled by ethnographer John Peabody Harrington during the early decades of this century.

Harrington worked, of course, with consultants who had no direct recollection of the purely aboriginal lifestyle of the Chumash. These modern Chumash were one, two, or even three generations removed from the unmodified culture of the pre-mission era. Consequently there are the inevitable gaps in the information provided to Harrington about certain aspects of material culture. This is reflected, for example, in uncertainties about how some items were manufactured, about how others were used, and of what materials still others were made. However, diverse sources fill certain of these gaps quite nicely. Notable in this regard are regional