Introduction

By training, I am firmly in the historical tradition of Kroeber and Heizer. An early seminar by Heizer on Petrie’s *Diospolis Parva*, using Reissner’s pre-dynastic Egyptian collection at Berkeley, introduced me to the intricacies of seriation. This ability was further refined following a seminar by Rowe on the Mochica I-V seriation. I applied these principles in my intended dissertation. (Heizer felt that he had covered the Early Horizon in his 1949 publication [although not one table therein is accurate!]; Frank Fenenga was to do the Middle Horizon; and Heizer assigned the Late Horizon to me.) I was to focus on Sac-6, with the largest collection from the Delta. Unfortunately, this is the one large site for which Elmer Dawson (Schenck and Dawson 1929), the brilliant high school amateur archaeologist, failed to record individual grave lots. The material was generally so similar that he lumped his daily unit collections as “group finds”, mixing material from the Sutter period cemetery with prehistoric Phase 2 and Phase 1 artifacts.

I therefore turned to CCo-138 where E. N. Johnson (another amateur) and Heizer had obtained an excellent stratified sequence of burials spanning all of Phase 1 of the Late Horizon. I first seriated the Olivella Thin Rectangles by depth, and found that the deepest grave lots had only centrally perforated beads (type M1; cf. Bennyhoff and Hughes 1987:140-41, figure 8), while the shallowest graves had only end-perforated (type M2) beads. Graves at intermediate depths had a mixture of types M1 and M2. When all the grave lots were plotted by depth, a marvelous series of changes was evident. Abalone ornaments with scored incision were early, classic Banjo ornaments were late; collared pipes were early, while flanged pipes were late (cf. Bennyhoff 1978). I was thus able to divide Beardsley’s (1948, 1954) Phase 1 into three phases (designated 1aa, 1b, and 1c). Subsequent analysis of the Sac-21, Sac-6 controlled burials, Ala-309, and similar collections confirmed this sequence as general throughout the Bay and Delta regions.

Although I have retained Beardsley’s Phase 1 and Phase 2 distinctions, I have assigned individual names to the Phase 1 divisions because these are *phases*, not subphases. The atlatl is still the dominant weapon in Phase 1a, not replaced by the bow and arrow in Phase 1b. Differences in the effigy ornaments must represent quite different religious concepts, while dance costumes were not the same throughout (only Phase 1b dancers wore the clacking girdles of heavy abalone ornaments), and significant fashion changes in shell and stone beads mark the passage of the 200 year phases. Since Phase 2b is only 100 years long, I do regard Phase 2a and 2b as subphases and...
designate them as early and late Mosher (in the Cosumnes District) or Fernandez (in the Alameda District).

To understand the beginning of the Late Horizon I had to familiarize myself with the Middle Horizon and, again, fishspears, beads, and ornaments suggested a temporal sequence instead of the contemporaneous facies defined by Beardsley. By this time I had an enormous mass of data, and needed some system with which to organize it. (Heizer was on sabbatical, and Rowe agreed to accept my first chapter on ethnogeography as my dissertation in 1961. Heizer was not pleased and refused to publish it.) It had become very clear by this time that Beardsley's provinces were meaningless.

David Fredrickson and I (chapter 2 herein) collaborated on a taxonomy some years ago that has gained a certain acceptance in California archaeology, and what follows are some of my current thoughts on areas where Fredrickson and I agree and disagree (cf. chapter 9).

The Importance of Grave Lots and the Mortuary Complex

A major difference between Fredrickson and myself from the very beginning has been over the significance of the mortuary complex (cf. chapter 9, p. 101). In large part this is because he has not had to deal with scores of grave lots and, in later years, he was committed to honor the Indian opposition to disturbance of the dead. I have the highest regard for his pioneering success with midden constituent analysis and obsidian hydration, but I cannot agree that this negates the value of mortuary research. One has only to compare my Bay/Delta phase contents with those of the North Coast Ranges (seldom more than a projectile point and ground stone sequence). I am able to place beads, ornaments, bone artifacts, chipped and ground stone in a detailed sequence based on firm stratigraphy (in contrast to the chaotic mixture of unassociated midden finds). Even if graves contain no artifacts, they provide evidence for significant changes in position, orientation, wealth, sex differences, disease, and life span. The grave lot provides our closest view of a moment in time, far more reliable than a multi-used house floor or an arbitrary level. The mixture of diagnostic Middle and Late period artifacts in the same grave indicates that we are dealing with a transition phase in which new traits are being diffused to a resident population. Absence of such mixing, along with site abandonments and new settlements, can indicate population movement (especially if skeletal differences can be detected). In the historic period, for example, I can identify Foothill Nisenan intrusion into Plains Foothill Nisenan territory. Regrettably, the poor quality of the early excavation notes (and an overloaded teaching commitment) has delayed my publication—along with an extreme perfectionist bent. Nonetheless, future enlightened Native California children and grandchildren will rue the day that burial repatriation destroyed their ancestral heritage.

Pattern and Tradition

Fredrickson has covered this topic adequately. It is encouraging to see that others are attempting to deal with the need for traditions in addition to patterns. However, I cannot accept Borax Lake Tradition—this pattern at present is little more than a widespread assemblage of projectile points, ground stone, and burial away from the village. Numerous traditions will someday be defined which include Borax Lake aspect as the earliest manifestation. I earlier proposed the Micos Tradition in the Alameda District (see chapter 6 herein). Jerald Johnson has a Dry Creek/Yana Tradition and, if grave lots can ever be found, I feel that a Martis/Kings Beach/Washo Tradition will be validated. This does not negate the need for 'patterns' which cut across these traditions, marking the spread of new traits.

The Locality and District

Our data from the Bay/Delta region is so detailed that we are able to distinguish different localities within the same district, and equate them with triblets in the Historic and Late periods. The abalone ornament percentage frequencies by type are not the same at Sac-6A and Sac-56A or at Sac-21. SJo-43 reveals influence from the Stockton District which is not found on the Cosumnes or American rivers. Middle Period components are more of a problem, because our data are often sparse and we cannot apply the direct historical approach. However, at present, I am
impressed by the significant number of artifact types found only at single sites: the double-lined facial incision on abalone ornaments found only at Ala-309 (Bennyhoff 1978:figure 2); the shield ornaments limited to Ala-328 (Bennyhoff 1978:figure 3); and a host of unusual bone artifacts limited to these two sites. I am certain that we are dealing with different localities/tribelets, while the phase differences and proximity will support the hypothesis that Ala-12, Ala-13, Ala-328, and Ala-329 represent a single tribelet through time. These minor differences prompted the addition of the district to the Willey and Phillips (1958) scheme.

It is with regret that I see that Fredrickson (chapter 9 p. 96) wishes to make the district a mere geographic unit. As documented in my dissertation (Bennyhoff 1977:41-51), I found a definite correlation between a culturally defined district and a language group. The Delta is a classic example. Using Fredrickson’s ecological boundaries, CCo-138 (Bay Miwok), Sac-6 (Plains Miwok), and SJo-82 (Yokuts) are in one district, yet three very different adaptations to this stoneless environment are represented—hence the Diablo, Cosumnes, and Stockton districts. Mission registers and ethnographic data prove that, despite bilingualism and intermarriage, most Moquelumne spoke Plains Miwok, and the Chilamne Yokuts claimed to be different from the Moquelumne. The closest cultural and linguistic relationships of CCo-138 are with the Walnut Creek/San Ramon locality—not with their Delta neighbors. As documented earlier, my inductive analysis of the differences between CCo-138 and Sac-21, between Sac-43 and Sac-29, and between CCo-138 and SJo-141 led to the cultural district; the linguistic correspondence emerged later. Beardsley’s (1948, 1954) “province” and Willey and Phillips’s (1958) “locality” also combined culture and geography in their definition.