INTRODUCTION

The Basketmaker II period is important. The archaeological remains of this period document the emergence of the Anasazi cultural tradition and a consolidation of the dependence on farming that shaped the tradition from then on. The Anasazi experience is a unique and valuable strand in human history, one worth studying and understanding for its own sake. It also can stand as one example of the general kinds of economic, demographic, and social changes that swept through most of the world after the end of the last Ice Age, as ancestral patterns of food collecting were replaced by food producing, and as populations grew, became more sedentary, and developed more complex social organizations. Because the archaeological record from the Four Corners area is so good, the Basketmaker II period can serve as a case study, or series of case studies, that can inform us about general issues in human prehistory, as well as about the roots of the Anasazi culture.

On a more regional level, this conference makes an important contribution to Southwestern archaeology for a number of reasons. First, it provides an opportunity to discuss and digest some of the exciting new work on the Basketmaker period that has taken place in the Southwest over the last few years—and presents some additional new research, which will be reported here for the first time. Second, it recognizes the importance of the Basketmakers in the history of Southwestern and American archaeology, and provides important new data regarding this history. Third, the conference shows how much can be learned from systematic study of the older museum collections, photographs, and records, and hence justifies the effort and expense that has gone into maintaining these materials over the years. (Some of the papers also show how much work it is to glean new information from this kind of material.) Finally, it shows that amateur archaeologists (amateurs in the best sense) can take a leadership role in an important study such as the Wetherill–Grand Gulch Project, and can come up with new, invaluable information that is important and of interest to the general public, to amateur or avocational archaeological groups, and to the professional archaeological community.

The symposium paper by Julia Johnson chronicles the fascinating history of this unique project. The Wetherill–Grand Gulch Project in turn provides the backdrop for this unique symposium, which has brought together people from different backgrounds and types of interest, but who are united by their love for the study of the past, and by their concern for the fragile archaeological sites and materials upon which this study is based. The Wetherill Project and this conference may well be the model for similar efforts in the future, in the Southwest and elsewhere.
NEW DEVELOPMENTS IN BASKETMAKER STUDIES

I would like to review some recent developments and trends in research that are providing new perspectives on the Basketmaker Period, and that are stimulating new interest in Basketmaker studies. Not all these new developments are represented in the papers delivered here, but many are. As I briefly summarize these developments, and note a few of the recent contributors to them, I shall also try to draw attention to the

Table 1.1: Chronology, Greater Four Corners Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Periods</th>
<th>Distinctive Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.D. 1350–1600</td>
<td>Pueblo IV</td>
<td>Large plaza-oriented pueblos in Rio Grande and Western Pueblo areas; low kiva to room ratio; kachina cult widespread; corrugated replaced by plain utility types; B/W pottery declines relative to red, orange or yellow types.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.D. 1150–1350</td>
<td>Pueblo III</td>
<td>Large pueblos and/or “revisionist great houses” in some areas, dispersed pattern in others; high kiva to room ratios; cliff dwellings; towers; triwalls; corrugated gray and elaborate B/W pottery, plus red or orange pottery in some areas; abandonment of the Four Corners by 1300.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.D. 900–1150</td>
<td>Pueblo II</td>
<td>Chacoan florescence; “Great Houses”, great kivas, roads, etc. in many but not all regions; strong differences between Great Houses and surrounding “unit pueblos” composed of a kiva and small surface masonry roomblock; corrugated gray and elaborate B/W pottery, plus decorated red or orange types in some areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.D. 750–900</td>
<td>Pueblo I</td>
<td>Large villages in some areas; unit pueblos of “proto-kiva” plus surface roomblock of jacal or crude masonry; great kivas; plain and neckbanded gray pottery with low frequencies of B/W and decorated red ware.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.D. 500–750</td>
<td>Basketmaker III</td>
<td>Habitation is deep pithouse plus surface storage pits, cists, or rooms; dispersed settlement with occasional small villages and occasional great kivas; plain gray pottery, small frequencies of B/W pottery; bow and arrow replaces atlatl; beans added to cultigens.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.D. 50–500</td>
<td>Basketmaker II (late)</td>
<td>Habitation is shallow pithouse plus storage pits or cists; dispersed settlement with small low density villages in some areas; campsites important as well (?); no pottery; atlatl and dart; corn and squash but no beans; upland dry-farming in addition to floodplain farming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.D.50–B.C.1500</td>
<td>Basketmaker II (early)</td>
<td>Long-term seasonal (?) use of caves for camping, storage, burial, rock art; San Juan Anthropomorphic style pictographs and petroglyphs; camp and limited activity sites in open; no pottery; atlatl and dart; corn and squash but no beans; cultivation primarily floodplain or runoff based (?).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.C. 6500–1500</td>
<td>Archaic</td>
<td>Subsistence based on wild foods; high mobility; low population density; shelters and open sites; atlatl and dart; no pottery.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
contributions that the symposium participants are making in these areas. This is by no means intended to be a thorough review of the recent literature on the Basketmaker II period in the Four Corners area—only a brief and subjective selection of what seem to me to be important and active categories of research.

Perhaps the most striking development in the past few years is the emergence of a new "long chronology" for Basketmaker II. This is covered by Kim Smiley in his paper. Largely as a result of work done by Kim (see also Smiley 1984, 1992), we have more dates and better interpreted dates than we did a few years ago. Instead of a relatively brief Basketmaker II period that occupies the first 450 or 500 years of the Christian era, we now have evidence that BM II complexes in the northern Southwest, with substantial dependence on maize farming, extend back to between 1000 and 1500 B.C. In my chronology (Table 1.1) I placed the late Archaic-BM II boundary at 1500 B.C. We now have early or "rockshelter" BM II, dating largely to B.C. times, and late or "pithouse" BM II, dating to the early centuries A.D.—I've placed it at A.D. 50 to 500. That means that many of the perishable items such as basketry, etc. that we think of as typical Basketmaker II actually come from the earlier part of a rather long period—one as long as or longer than the rest of the Anasazi sequence put together.

If any of you are wondering what became of Basketmaker I (a hypothetical pre-agricultural stage proposed at the Pecos Conference of 1927 [Kidder 1927]), it became the Late Archaic. That is, by the time archaeologists began recognizing pre-agricultural sites in the Southwest, the terms "Archaic" and "Paleoindian" had come into wide use in American archaeology. The latter refers to the early Holocene period cultures that are characterized by large lanceolate spear points (e.g., Clovis, Folsom, Plano). "Archaic" refers to hunting-gathering cultures that depended on a considerable variety of wild plants and animals, usually exploiting them by seasonal movement; they also employed a varied technology, usually including stemmed projectile points and ground stone tools; and they evidently occupied smaller territories than did the earlier Paleoindians.

On the other end of the time period, the dates for the Basketmaker II to Basketmaker III transition appear to be holding firm at about A.D. 450 or 500, which we have recognized as the "starting point" for BM III for many years. In many parts of the Four Corners area, Basketmaker III sites don't actually become common until about A.D. 600. Whether this was because there was a hiatus in occupation between Basketmaker II and III in many areas (see Matson et al. 1988) or whether non-ceramic late Basketmaker II occupations continued later in some areas than in others is not clear.

In order to clearly distinguish Basketmaker III from Basketmaker II, I will digress here with a few comments on what makes Basketmaker III distinctive as a culture-historical period. The clearest marker the start of Basketmaker III, of course, is the appearance of plain gray ceramics, ordinarily in considerable abundance. There are some occurrences of brown wares in what appear to be very late Basketmaker II and very early Basketmaker III contexts in the eastern part of the Four Corners area, but it is well-made plain gray jars, accompanied by black-on-gray decorated bowls and other forms, that characterize Four Corners Basketmaker III in general. This period also has deeper, more substantially built pithouses, often with antechambers; surface storage structures are more common and larger than previously; beans are added to the agricultural complex; the bow and arrow replaces the atlatl and dart; the community pattern includes hamlets and villages of closely-spaced houses in some areas as well as loose clusters of very widely dispersed houses in others; and great kivas make their appearance, probably serving as the locations for rituals that drew membership from more than one social segment in the community.
Returning to the recent research developments relating to the Basketmaker II period: One of the trends in Basketmaker II studies is an increase in recognition and in the well-designed excavation, testing, and survey of late Archaic and early Basketmaker II sites. Much of this work result form contracted research required under federal or state law in advance of land-altering development projects. These projects might not be making such a strong contribution to our understanding of these periods had not this generation of Southwestern archaeologists learned better than their predecessors how to recognize and investigate the often subtle expressions of these early occupations. In addition to providing additional dates to flesh out the chronology of the emergence of Anasazi culture, these new field studies are providing new evidence on how, when, and where the transition from late Archaic occurred, and what the range of variability is across time and space in Basketmaker II culture. In this volume, the paper by Janetski synthesizes new field information.

There is new evidence that Basketmaker II people were heavily dependent on maize as a source of calories. The original framers of the Pecos Classification appeared to recognize this, but over the years a number of archaeologists have tended to treat BM II as a variant of the late Archaic, primarily dependent on hunting and gathering, with maize farming playing a fairly minor role in subsistence. Strong recent evidence to the contrary comes from several sources. Recent analyses of stable carbon isotopes in human bone (Matson and Chisholm 1991; Chisholm and Matson 1992; Decker and Tieszen 1989) indicate that the carbon isotope ratios in both BM II and BM III skeletons closely resemble those from later pueblos, and contrast strongly with those from the Archaic period. The ratios are consistent with a heavy contribution of maize to the diet of the Four Corners Anasazi from Basketmaker II through Pueblo periods. This work is based on a very small number of examples, however. The results are very striking, but need to be checked on larger samples. Coprolite analyses carried out by Kate Aasen (1984) also indicate that maize was the most common dietary component from BM II through Pueblo II-III, although there is a relatively greater representation of wild foods such as pinyon in the Basketmaker samples. Settlement pattern studies by Matson on Cedar Mesa (Matson et al. 1988) indicate that late BM II habitation sites are located in the same situations as are later BM III and Pueblo habitations—in proximity to land arable by dry-farming methods. Basketmaker II villages on Black Mesa (Bearden 1984) and in the Navajo Reservoir area (Eddy 1961, 1972) also appear to be located to take advantage of agricultural soils.

Recent studies by Karen Dohm (1988, 1992) of the spatial organization of late BM II and BM III household facilities on Cedar Mesa indicate that there are substantial similarities, though the differences are in the direction of greater sedentism and subsistence intensification for the BM III settlements. Surface surveys by Dohm (1992) also indicate that the Basketmaker II houses on Cedar Mesa do occur in clusters, and that it is reasonable to think of these as dispersed villages, perhaps not too unlike those of the Los Pinos phase in the upper San Juan drainage (Eddy 1961, 1972).

Investment of effort in Basketmaker rock art studies is beginning to bear fruit. Polly Schaafsma, taking the whole Southwest as her study area (Schaafsma 1980) has recognized a series of styles—San Juan anthropomorphic, Chinle Representational, etc. that provide a basic time-space framework for the Four Corners area. Sally Cole has been conducting rock art surveys in a number of parts of the Four Corners area, and is developing a more detailed understanding of the temporal and spatial distribution of styles, and of the relationships among styles in this area (Cole 1989, 1990, 1992). Cole, Schaafsma, Jane Young (1988), Hartley (1992) and other workers are beginning the tantalizing but difficult task of figuring out how Anasazi rock functioned as part of the lives of the people in
various times and places. Positive trends here include more systematic comparisons between archaeologically recovered material culture and elements depicted in the rock art, and a more intensive examination and more critical use of ethnographic evidence and of the oral traditions of the Pueblo people. Cole's paper here is an example of what can be achieved in contemporary rock art studies.

Turner's contribution to the paper by Hurst and Turner in this symposium shows the potential for new physical anthropological studies of Basketmaker skeletons that are in museum collections. The previously mentioned studies of stable carbon isotopes also relied on existing collections. A veritable explosion of new techniques in physical anthropology—including the possibility of obtaining samples of ancient DNA—provide the possibility for major advances in understanding Basketmaker genetic relationships, nutrition, pathologies, and causes of death. These studies could all be done using existing collections.

Some of the key radiocarbon dates in Smiley's new chronology came from Basketmaker maize samples that had long been curated in museums. The ability to obtain direct measurements of carbon-14 with a nuclear accelerator opens up many new possibilities. Because only a tiny amount of carbon is required in this dating technique, we can now obtain dates from artifacts and other organic remains with very little damage to the material. Hurst's contribution to the Turner-Hurst paper also shows the potential for new findings from studies of museum collections of lithic artifacts, and other workers are recognizing the value of restudy of some of the irreplaceable older collections of perishable artifacts.

By locating and providing a history and context for some of these important collections, the Wetherill-Grand Gulch Project has helped remove some of the barriers to successful re-studies. The papers by Hayes, Phillips, Knipmeyer, and Blackburn and Atkins should encourage future research on the Basketmaker II materials from the Grand Gulch area, because they help clear away the prevailing confusion about when particular archaeological collections and records were made, by whom, and under what conditions.

The history of American archaeology is also emerging nationwide as a scholarly specialty (e.g., Christenson 1989; Reyman 1992). Archaeologists are recognizing that the history of research helps them understand why the early workers chose certain research problems and how they arrived at their interpretations. Concepts and research approaches developed in the early days of the field also exerted a powerful influence on the work that followed, and in some cases continue to underlie present-day thinking, often in unrecognized ways. Wetherill's demonstration of a stratigraphic sequence from Basketmaker to Cliff-dweller and the later testing of this sequence by Kidder and Guernsey (1919; Guernsey and Kidder 1921) represents an early success story in American archaeology. The discovery of the Basketmakers made clear that American archaeology had the potential to inform us about varieties of past culture that were not represented in the ethnographic and historical record. By placing the discovery of the Basketmaker culture in much better historical context, the papers noted above make an important contribution to the emerging field of the history of archaeology.

New syntheses are being developed that make connections in both time and space, and place the Basketmakers of the Four Corners area in a Southwest-wide perspective. Prominent here is the work of W.H. Wills (1988), F.E. Smiley (this volume and 1992), and R.G. Matson (1991). These syntheses bring together and provide new understandings of previous work, and will also serve to orient future research.

This symposium also draws attention to the fragility of the archaeological record of the Basketmakers (and of their early students), and to the desperate need for protective and management strategies that take the importance and fragility of this resource into
account as concluded in Williamson and Carnet's paper. The papers by Davidson and Parker are also welcome because they show that the Bureau of Land Management is becoming aware of these needs. This agency is responsible for protecting and managing a large proportion of the Basketmaker II sites remaining in the Four Corners area.

A SUMMARY OF BASKETMAKER II CULTURE IN THE FOUR CORNERS AREA

Origins

On the basis of a review of research on the Late Archaic and Basketmaker II periods, Matson (1991) argues that the early Four Corners Basketmaker culture probably developed in several ways. Some populations—for example, the users of the Marsh Pass rockshelters of northeastern Arizona—may represent migrant groups that had roots in the San Pedro Cochise culture of the Desert and Mogollon upland regions to the south. The San Pedro populations of these areas obtained maize from Mexican groups and when they began to make heavy use of it, their populations grew and expanded geographically. Some of these people appear to have moved into the San Juan drainage to become the earliest Basketmaker II. In addition, there may have been small populations of Archaic-stage hunters and gatherers already in the Four Corners area. These groups may have adopted agriculture and some of the other traits that characterize Basketmaker II culture after contact with incoming San Pedro people, or through interaction with similar groups further south. Matson thinks the Durango and Navajo Reservoir BM II populations are the best candidates for "acculturated BM II."

Subsistence and Settlement Patterns

Compared to the preceding Archaic period, there is a substantial increase in Four Corners area population in Basketmaker II. Relative to later Basketmaker III and Puebloan periods, however, Basketmaker II regional populations were probably low. There appear to be many areas that were heavily settled in later times that have little or no evidence of BM II population. In general, concentrations of BM II habitation sites tend to be found in high diversity areas with good access to wild foods that also have reasonably good farming resources (arable soil, sufficient moisture).

Matson (1991) argues that in early Basketmaker II times (ca. 1000 to 1 B.C.), farming was predominantly based on floodwater and runoff techniques, utilizing alluvial soils in canyons or valleys. He believes that the earliest Basketmaker maize, derived from southern stock, was not well adapted to the short growing seasons, dry climate, and long summer days of the northern Southwest. Through time, this adaptation occurred, leading to an expansion of farming into the drier mesa-tops and uplands. The shift to upland dry-farming, in locations such as Cedar Mesa, was accompanied by an overall increase in regional population and by the development or adoption of the pithouse as the principal residence for nuclear or small extended families.

As previously noted, maize appears to have been the single most important source of calories for Basketmaker II populations. By late Basketmaker II times, and perhaps even earlier, maize was probably as important in the diet as it was in later Basketmaker III and Pueblo periods. Squash was present throughout the BM II period, and was important both as a source of food and of containers. Beans appear to have been lacking in Basketmaker II, but appear in BM III. Weedy plants that grow well in disturbed soils such as are found in cultivated or abandoned fields were a regular part of the diet in BM II and in later Anasazi periods. A good example is Chenopodium, known commonly today as lambs quarters or goosefoot. This plant was used as a source of greens in the spring and early summer, and for its abundant small but nutritious seeds later. Wild foods such as grass seeds and pinyon nuts were relatively
more important than in BM III or Pueblo times. The domesticated turkey probably was not yet present, but appears in Basketmaker III or Pueblo I.

The Basketmaker II people do not seem to have placed as much dependence as the later Anasazi on storing maize as a hedge against crop failure. At least, their storage facilities were smaller than those in later periods. With lower regional populations, it may be that they were able to rely on gathered wild foods if crops failed. In the absence of beans and turkeys as sources of protein, the Basketmaker II people may also have done more hunting for wild game than did their successors in the area; this has not been demonstrated by systematic comparative studies, however. In general, we still have much to learn about if and how Basketmaker II subsistence varied through time, in different geographic settings, and with differing local population densities.

Community Organization and Household Architecture

We don't know much about the community pattern of early Basketmaker II—most evidence is from rock shelters, which clearly were used for storage, burials, rock art, and sometimes, for habitation. Whether houses were built in shelters at this time is an item for debate (but see Janetski’s paper in this volume). Both jar-shaped subterranean cists and above-ground slab-based cists were used for storage. Although some shelters clearly were used for habitations as well, we don't know whether this was seasonal or year around. Some open limited activity sites can be dated to this period. Houses may have been built in the open during early Basketmaker times as well. Recent compliance-related work by Dennis Gilpin (1992) in northeastern Arizona has revealed several possible early Basketmaker II pithouses in profile. There are several associated radiocarbon dates from the first millennium B.C.

In late BM II, shallow pithouses are widely used. They vary in form from cribbed log construction in Durango (Morris and Burgh 1954) and Navajo Reservoir area (Eddy 1961) to small irregular forms on Black Mesa (Bearden 1984) to circular with slab-lined southern entries on Cedar Mesa (Berry 1982; Dohm 1988). In these latter houses, there is some evidence that a superstructure (probably of poles, small branches, and mud) was supported by a four-post framework like that used in later Basketmaker III and Pueblo I pit structures. Some of the Cedar Mesa houses also have slab wingwalls which foreshadow this architectural element that is common in later San Juan area pit structures.

Clusters of Basketmaker II pithouses are evident in some areas (though we don't know whether all the structures were occupied at the same time), while in other areas, single houses are encountered in apparent isolation. Recent intensive surveys on Cedar Mesa is providing evidence that many, and perhaps most late BM II houses are part of loose clusters with wide spacing between houses (Matson et al. 1988; Dohm 1988; 1992).

Within late Basketmaker II houses, storage pits and cists often occur inside the house, and sometimes are numerous and/or large. Storage features also occur outside the house, and consist of slab-based surface cists or small rooms, as well as storage pits. On Cedar Mesa, the late Basketmaker II pithouses generally show a spatial configuration that resembles that of later San Juan Anasazi “habitation units” (Dohm 1988). The pithouse entryway is oriented south or southeast, and there sometimes is a slab deflector between the entryway opening and the central firepit. Storage structures generally occur north of the house, and there usually is a thin midden or sheet trash area to the south or southeast of the house, marked by ash, burned stone, and flaking debris.

Late BM II houses are generally shallower and less substantially built than later BM III and Pueblo houses. Large BM II campsites are known in some areas—these may
represent seasonal alternatives to house-dwelling, or may actually represent early BM II occupations, when houses were less used.

There is no clear evidence of community-level facilities such as great kivas. In Navajo Reservoir area, Eddy (1972) notes slightly larger pit structures that he thinks may have served as the locus for community rituals.

Social and Ceremonial Organization

To my knowledge, no archaeological evidence has been presented that there were special leadership or ceremonial statuses in Basketmaker society. This does not mean that they did not exist. With the possible exception of the larger Los Pinos phase houses cited by Eddy, the community pattern and architecture do not indicate social differentiation. This line of evidence suggests that the Basketmaker II people lived in small egalitarian communities. These settlements appear to lack formal spatial structure—e.g., there do not appear to be central plazas, great kivas, or other elements of “public architecture” and the houses often are widely spaced. The houses themselves do not appear to represent a large investment of labor, and storage facilities are not large. The evidence of relatively informal community and architectural patterning may indicate that community social organization was not very elaborate or formal. In some locations, however, the evidence that houses were repeatedly rebuilt in the same locations (e.g., Morris and Burgh 1954) suggests that some communities were not short-lived, but remained in place for several generations.

Basketmaker II burials often have substantial amounts of grave goods, and analysis of variation in materials associated with interments is a standard source of evidence for social differentiation. Such analyses have not been done systematically for Basketmaker II burials from the Four Corners area, but the work that the Wetherill–Grand Gulch Project has done to locate and provide better contexts for early collections will facilitate this kind of study in the future.

Trade in shell and exotic minerals seems better developed in BM II in general than it does later. At least, these kinds of materials seem much more abundant in Basketmaker II museum collections than they do in collections from later periods. Subjectively, this appears to hold even if the comparison is confined just to burial associations. Systematic studies of this topic are needed, however. Perhaps the importance of these exotic materials in Basketmaker II social organization implies a dependence on maintaining relationships with people in other communities and regions to allow relocation to be employed as a backup strategy in case crops failed. Individuals might have acquired shell, ornaments, and exotic materials for use in developing stable reciprocal trading relationships with partners in a variety of areas. Relationships established and maintained in this way could have then served as a basis for other types of reciprocal assistance (cf. Weissner 1977). This type of “insurance” against crop failure or other subsistence-related problems might have been an alternative to a dependence on long-term household-level, food storage, which seems better developed in later periods.

In this symposium, the studies by Hurst and Turner, and by Cole present some fascinating information that must be taken into account as we try to understand Basketmaker II social organization. The evidence of large-scale violence reported here by Hurst and Turner implies that inter-community or inter-regional hostilities at least occasionally escalated beyond the level of small-scale feuds or raids, and that relatively large groups were being mobilized for warfare. The evidence that facial scalps were kept by Basketmaker II groups (see Cole's paper in this symposium; also Cole 1984, 1985) may be related to inter-group violence, but could also have to do with keeping and venerating remains of ancestors.
Rock art studies in the Four Corners area are undergoing a florescence, and the potential of Basketmaker II rock art to provide information about social and ceremonial aspects of this period is beginning to be tapped, as noted above. A considerable amount of interpretive work (e.g., Schaafsma 1980; Cole 1989, 1990, 1992) has focused on the possible shamanic aspects of large Basketmaker II anthropomorphs and other rock art elements. Given the accumulating evidence of the dependence on agriculture in this period, I wonder if some of these figures and elements may not instead indicate a focus on commemoration and veneration of ancestors and lineage, and the promotion of fertility. Cross-culturally, these emphases would seem to be more characteristic of growing agricultural communities. A recent paper by Cole (1992) emphasizes rock art evidence of continuities in religious symbolism from Basketmaker II to historic Western Pueblo, a position that does not seem to me to be entirely consistent with the "shamanic" interpretation of Basketmaker II rock art. It does indicate, however, that Cole is developing new contexts for interpreting Anasazi rock art, and that this area of research is a dynamic and rapidly developing one.

Material Culture

In surveying material culture, we need to keep in mind that the majority of the Basketmaker II perishable artifacts that have been studied (baskets, sandals, etc.) are probably from earlier contexts than is the architectural and settlement pattern data. Most large collections of lithic artifacts also come from relatively late open sites. Consequently, any attempts to make a single reconstruction of material culture (or other aspects of culture, for that matter) for the Basketmaker II period are suspect. There probably was substantial temporal and spatial variation within this period, and we do not yet have a very good understanding of this variation. Having said this, I will go on to attempt a very generalized summary of Basketmaker II material culture.

The atlatl and composite dart seem to have been the principal Basketmaker II weapons. Projectile points are relatively large and are almost universally corner or side-notched. Geib and Bungert (1989) present evidence that arrow points appear in contexts contemporary with late BM II in Glen Canyon and in central Utah, and Reed and Kainer (1978) report probable BM II arrow points from the Tamarron Site north of Durango. Eddy (1961) also reports several arrow points from late BM II contexts in Navajo Reservoir area, though Matson (1991:54) suggests that they may be intrusive. The standard interpretation that the bow and arrow did not make its appearance until Basketmaker III may have to be modified.

The Basketmaker II people did not use fired pottery, except for small amounts in late BM II contexts in the eastern part of the Four Corners area. As with the bow and arrow evidence, this makes the boundary between Basketmaker II and III a bit fuzzier, but that is to be expected as we obtain more and better data. The Basketmaker II people were certainly familiar with the properties of clay, as attested by well-made storage structures, and by their use of unfired clay containers and figurines (Morris 1927). The late Basketmaker II—earliest Basketmaker III ceramics appear to result from trade or diffusion from the Mogollon area, rather than being an indigenous development, as Morris (1927) originally thought.

The Basketmaker II people are famous and were in fact named for their well-made coiled baskets, twined sandals, and twined bags. The inventory includes large conical collecting baskets and winnowing trays that become less common and then disappear in later periods. These seem likely to represent equipment primarily used in seed gathering and processing. The winnowing trays may have been used in parching corn as well—a practice that may have become less important after pottery began to be used for cooking maize. Sandals made of fine twined cordage are present, as well as coarser wicker-work varieties made of yucca leaves or other fibers.
There do not appear to be any loom-woven fabrics. Blankets made of strips of rabbit fur caught in the twines of cordage were widely used.

Equipment for grinding maize and other hard seeds is common in BM II sites. Grinding slabs with an oval basin grinding surface, and accompanying one-handed cobble manos are common throughout—a link with the late Archaic. In late (pithouse) BM II contexts, troughed metates and larger manos begin to appear, and are quite common at some sites. These tools appear to be more specialized for maize grinding than are the basin grinding slabs and one-hand manos.

As noted early on, the Basketmaker II and III populations generally have longer crania than do the later Pueblo period populations. This initially led some archaeologists to infer that the Basketmakers had been replaced by physically different populations. It was also recognized that the crania of the later peoples had in most cases been artificially flattened in infancy, and that this contributed to the apparent difference in head length. Over time, the latter view won out, and relevant archaeological evidence was found. Both the Basketmakers and their Puebloan successors commonly used cradleboards, which have been found archaeologically. In Pueblo times, however, a flat piece of wood was placed behind the infant's head, resulting in the artificial flattening. These wood “pillows” have been found in dry sites.

Conclusions

In conclusion, the Basketmaker II period was a formative one for the Anasazi tradition. Older conceptions of this period, many of them based on work done in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, are being modified as the period again becomes an active and dynamic area of research. A number of currently active areas of Basketmaker II research are represented at this conference. Its most distinctive and striking contributions, however, are the demonstration 1) that important new evidence on the Basketmaker culture and the history of its archaeology can be gained from careful and persistent investigation of scattered archives, museum records, diaries, photos, graffiti, old artifact labels, and the like and 2) that exciting and important work of this sort can be designed and successfully carried out by people who do not make a living as professional archaeologists or historians, but who are willing to devote their intelligence and endless amounts of energy and time to the task.