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Statement of Problem

The Zallio Collection of Native North American basketry is an old and poorly documented collection comprising 106 specimens. Part of a much larger corpus of material amassed by Italian immigrant Anthony Giuseppe Zallio, it represents a late 19th and early 20th century era of anthropology that was largely on the decline during Zallio’s academic encounter with the discipline. Zallio taught anthropology at Sacramento Junior College from 1929 to 1940, when the college served as the city and region’s only institution of higher learning. The Zallio Collection includes both archaeological and ethnographic material and was donated to the Department of Anthropology at California State University, Sacramento (CSUS) by Maria Zallio Brugge in 1951, following her father’s death. This thesis examines the Zallio corpus of North American basketry as a reflection of the academic milieu and unrealized aspirations of a self-trained anthropologist working on the geographic and professional margins of anthropology during a period characterized by the emergence of sub-disciplinary specialization and the vigilant gate-keeping of the discipline’s increasingly professionalized ranks.
Sources of Data

In addition to the basket specimens, themselves, several other sources of data were consulted. These include the Museum accession files, inventories, and catalogs, as well as primary source materials related to Zallio’s family, professional life and relationship with professional and amateur anthropologists and collectors. This latter material was drawn from archival repositories in Berkeley, north central California, and Washington, D.C.

Conclusions Reached

Data shows that while Anthony Zallio aspired to join the ranks of professional anthropology, he was unable to achieve this status. His motivations for collecting Native North American materials were complex, but were clearly intended to support his classroom instruction and development of the Lillard Museum at Sacramento Junior College. His basketry collection serves as an important reflection of the contexts in which anthropology, as an academic field no longer dominated by four-field generalists and salvage ethnography, began to emerge in the Sacramento region.

_______________________, Committee Chair
Terri A. Castaneda, Ph.D.

_______________________
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Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

During the late 19th and early 20th centuries, many people collected Native American artifacts. The reasons they collected were as varied as the collectors themselves. The earliest collectors viewed Native American artifacts as items to catalog and categorize as any other natural history specimen (Barber 1980, Henare, 2005, Stocking 1985). Later, Native American objects were collected as a means of cultural exchange (Cole 1985, Glass 2002, Henare 2005), with the intention of developing private museums and educating others about the plight of Native Americans (Graburn, Lee and Rousselot 1996, Kidwell 1999, Krech 1999, Parezo and Hoerig 1999), for purposes of assimilation and religious conversion (Hinckley 1964, Lee 1999), for resale to private collectors and curio shops (Duncan 2000), for the advancement of science (Hinsley 1981, Rydell 1984), and to preserve evidence of cultural lifeways believed destined to disappear under the pressures of colonization and assimilation (Jacknis 1993a).

During this time, Native Americans were romanticized as “noble savages,” as an example of humanity’s original relationship with the natural world, and as members of an otherwise “vanishing race” (Beck 2010, Glass 2002, Gordon 2002, Jacknis 1993a, Moses 1996). Whether compelled by interest in Native American culture or simply by the desire to own a souvenir of something that once was, late 19th and early 20th century collectors were driven, by a sense of urgency, to amass as much evidence of Native American existence as possible before its presumed extinction (Beck 2010, Gruber 1970). Anthony
G. Zallio (1874-1951), a professor at Sacramento Junior College from 1929 to 1940, was one such collector (Towne 1976).

STATEMENT OF PROBLEM

The Zallio Collection was donated to the Sacramento State University, then known as Sacramento State College, in 1951. This early acquisition includes a wide array of materials, including archaeological and ethnographic artifacts numbering in the thousands, and comprises one of the Anthropology Department’s core collections. Although accessioned and catalogued, this activity occurred almost a quarter-century after its donation, and inaccuracies were introduced due to haphazard record-keeping. Furthermore, the collection suffers from a dearth of biographical and contextual information. This lack of detailed documentation raises a number of critical questions about Zallio and his collecting practices. Why did he amass such a broad and varied collection? Did he admire Native American art and technology? Is his collection a casual reflection of romantic stereotypes or a more systematic effort to document diverse cultural traditions he thought were doomed to disappear? While much has been written about collections of Native American material culture, little scholarly attention has been

---

1 I first became aware of the Zallio Collection as an undergraduate student enrolled in ANTH 196M, now ANTH 177: Museum Methods. During this class, brief references were made about this collection concerning the number and types of baskets attributed to him. I also learned a little about his professional career as a Sacramento Junior College professor. Prior to enrolling in ANTH 196M, my only other knowledge of Zallio was in reference to his archaeological collection housed in the Archaeological Repository. It had been described as messy and disorganized. The inconsistencies in care, housing and museum registration methods used over the years in relation to the Zallio Collection inspired me to switch my focus of graduate study to that of museum anthropology.

2 CSUS Anthropology Museum Accession File 74-29.
dedicated to the historical contextualization and analysis of those who generated these collections (Krech 1999). Recent efforts to correct this gap in the scholarly literature have revealed some trends. For instance, some collectors concentrated their efforts on a particular time period or geographic region, while yet others specialized in the acquisition of a particular artifact type, such as basketry or pottery (Griset 1993, McLendon 1993). My thesis examines Zallio’s extensive American Indian basketry collection as a window into his collecting practices and goals. My aim is to situate these practices and goals within the broader historical context of early, museum-based anthropology, and to demonstrate that Zallio’s collection offers important insight into the geographic context and academic milieu that shaped his teaching career and anthropological ambitions of professionalization.

While the Zallio Collection represents an important corpus of archaeological and ethnographic material, it is plagued by problems of insufficient documentation that pre- and post-dates its donation to the Anthropology Department and Museum. Many museum and university collections include anthropological material acquired through late 19th and early 20th-century fieldwork. During this time prior to the professionalization of anthropology, fieldwork ethics and methodologies were largely idiosyncratic, as guidelines, rules and regulations were yet to be codified by disciplinary organizations. Museum practices also varied. Parezo (1987) notes that at the Smithsonian Institution, collections were accessioned and cataloged based on the methods of natural science classification. However, there is a dearth of scholarly literature regarding the earliest registration procedures for museums of any type. Given that anthropology grew in part
out of natural history, it is reasonable to assume that cataloging was typically based on
the methodologies and systems of nomenclature that informed the cataloging of natural
history specimens.

Private collectors like Zallio often aspired to professional cataloging practices but, as
often happens in museums, their efforts to document collections failed to keep pace
with their enthusiasm to collect. Many collections enter museums with numbering
systems devised by collectors to catalog their acquisitions, which represents one concern
faced by museums today. Professional museum registration techniques typically involve
an effort to bring all collections under one cohesive museum numbering system (Reibel
1997). Accession records are a fundamental component of museum documentation. In
their most elementary state, they should offer a chronological list of acquisitions that
comprise the museum’s collections, whether acquired through donation, trade, purchase
or field collecting (Burns 1941, Reibel 1997). At their best, accession records become
part of the consciousness of the museum, part of the life of the institution. Good record
keeping allows the museum to preserve more than just specimens and objects. The social
biographies of individual objects and donated collections are witnesses to changing
cultural traditions and the socio-historical processes that led to their production.

A second dilemma associated with early collections is inconsistency in the
amount of accompanying documentation deemed necessary to rendering a potential
donation acceptable or of scientific value. Generally, some sort of documentation should

3 An accession record refers to any documents relevant to a specific collection. Accession files should
include a deed of gift giving the museum ownership of the items in the collection. Other relevant data to
include are any documents which provide a paper trail of how the collector came to acquire the pieces in
the collection.
be associated with the collection or, better yet, with each object it contains. The amount and type of documentation desired has changed over the years, as standards of data collection and museum management practices have advanced (Parezo 1987). As early as the 1940s, museum standards favored collections with significant documentation. According to Ned Burns, the Chief of the United States National Park Service’s Museum Division, “material itself and the information regarding it should be carefully studied….specimens about which little or no information is available frequently are offered. Such specimens are usually worthless” (1941:104). Comparing museum collections to libraries, he notes that collections have value when one knows “what they contain and can locate what is wanted” (1941:110). Some examples of necessary documentation are dates of acquisition, tribal affiliations, object name and uses. The name of makers was not considered to be as important (Parezo 2006). Fortunately, some collectors meticulously kept track of where and from whom a purchase or trade was made, the approximate age of the item at the time of transfer, and any history known about the object itself (Bucko and Koppedrayer 2007). Unfortunately, this type of attention to detail was not universal and many amateur archaeologists excavated or purchased items with very little to no record keeping at all. A critical part of my research aims to establish that the Zallio Collection holds value as a museum collection despite the rather poor documentation practices to which it fell victim, both during its development and after its acquisition by the University.

George Heye, whose personal collection formed the foundation for the Smithsonian Institution’s National Museum of the American Indian, is infamous for his
deceptive cataloging practices. Heye often left un-cataloged items whose cultural or historical origin was questioned (Carpenter 2005). He routinely purchased poorly documented collections and if it suited him, discarded any documentation that may have accompanied a collection. He was obsessed with amassing the largest Native American collection in existence and was less concerned with its scientific value. Many contemporaries of Heye recoiled at his practices, as do museum professionals today (Carpenter 2005). Nonetheless, his collection continues to garner worldwide attention, both positive and negative.

A third issue with which museums must deal is the ethical legacy posed by the immoral or illegal practices that were prevalent during the early days of anthropology (Buck and Gilmore 1998, Burcaw 1997, National Park Service 2006). A great many of archaeological and ethnographic collections amassed during the late 19th and early 20th centuries were created through less than savory means (Carpenter 2005, Cole 1999, Erickson 2002, Platt 2011). As the times dictated, early anthropology was conducted under a scientific paradigm that legitimated the acquisition of data in whatever manner deemed necessary. This often included the theft of Native American remains and associated funerary objects. While today this type of activity is recognized as both immoral and illegal according to NAGPRA and a host of other cultural resource management laws, one hundred years ago this was common practice (National Park Service 2006). Digging up graves and selling human remains to scientists or museums was an accepted way to make money among practicing anthropologists and hobbyists alike. In fact, Franz Boas, commonly known as the “Father of American Anthropology,”
supported himself financially by digging up and selling Native American remains (Cole 1985, Platt 2011).

In addition to the Native American grave-robbing promulgated by early anthropologists in search of clues to the past, early amateur collectors, or pot hunters, were also guilty of this activity. Anyone who excavates a site simply for the thrill of digging, the surprise of what artifacts may or may not be found, and with the ultimate aim of selling those artifacts for a profit, is a pot hunter (Armour 1969). This type of amateur may learn a bit about the culture from which the site originated, but overall his goal is to collect as many artifacts as possible. These objects are typically hoarded and privately stored with little to no historical or cultural context known or preserved (Armour 1969). The legacy of pot hunting is one that has hurt not only the professions of archaeology and museum anthropology, but also created a category in which to lump individuals who seem, by today’s anthropological and museum standards, to have fallen short of a minimal level of academic rigor. While there is no defense for the illegal and immoral act of pot hunting, it has become too easy to categorize many of the early archaeologists as pot hunters without fully understanding their work, the larger context of which may not have comprised actual pot-hunting by intention or practice. My thesis aims to round out the wider world in which Zallio worked by providing a finer-grained portrait of the context in which he engaged in archaeological excavations and ethnographic collecting.

Anthony Zallio’s collection of Native American basketry, as well as his archaeological collection, has not been immune to the mishandlings, oversights, and poor documentation seen in other old museum and university collections. Early collections
were often segmented based on type of artifact and often distributed to affiliate institutions, ultimately breaking the cohesion of the collection (McVicker 2004). These early, divided and disconnected collections are uniquely problematic for the institutions that house them.

The Zallio Collection is one such divided and disconnected collection. Housed since 1992 within two distinct areas of Mendocino Hall, the Zallio Collection is intellectually perceived to comprise two umbrella collections, those of archaeological and ethnographic material, with the majority of the archaeological items housed in the Archaeological Repository, MND 1010, and most of the ethnographic materials housed in the Museum Repository, MND 1000B.4 This division of the collection by subdiscipline and location is incomplete due in part to storage limitations of each facility and also due to the inevitable ambiguities surrounding the proper classification of some materials.5 Further complicating matters is the fact that much of the accession paperwork and therefore knowledge of the two different collections is scattered across this intellectual and physical divide.

---

4 Prior to 1992, the collections of the Department were housed in various buildings on campus without the benefit of a secure environment. Many people outside of the Department, such as facilities maintenance crews, had unobstructed access to these collections. The move to Mendocino Hall provided more security for the collections. Personal communication Jerry Johnson as guest lecturer in ANTH 196 M, Spring 2010.
5 When the Museum’s laboratory and gallery space was formally created in the early 1990s, faculty members devised a plan to store scientifically dug archaeological materials in the Archaeological Repository and the ethnographic and privately acquired archaeological materials in the Museum Repository. The Zallio Collection having not been taken in as an archaeological curation collection became subject to a variety of issues relating to its mixed contents. It appears that some effort was made to house some of the Zallio archaeological contents in the Archaeological Repository, but prehistoric shell beads and archaeological materials were retained on the Museum side. Furthermore, scientifically excavated archaeological materials overflowed the designated space and were thus moved to the Museum lab and repository. In the early 2000s, the Museum Director discovered that some ethnographic material from the Zallio Collection had been retained in the Archaeological Repository.
Zallio himself did not keep the kind of detailed records required to make full use of his collection. He maintained a specimen catalog, but missing from his entries are the locations of trade or purchase for the vast majority of the pieces in his ethnographic collection. Also missing from much of his specimen catalog are dates of acquisition. It is not until the entry for item number 237, out of 277 anthropological items, that he began to note the month, day and year of acquisition. Other missing pieces of data include the person from whom and/or context in which the object was acquired. Notably absent from his basket entries are weaver names. In all probability, the latter would not have been known to him, particularly if he bought or traded for most of his baskets. Thus it remains unclear whether Zallio acquired any of his baskets directly from Native people.

In terms of the archaeological material noted in his specimen catalog, Zallio seemed to have recorded slightly more data for these items than for his ethnographic entries; however he did not see the point in keeping track of the location within a site from which a particular artifact was removed (Towne 1976). For most of his artifacts excavated locally, Zallio provides a site name, but no further information as to location within that particular site, until page 24. It was on this page that Zallio began to note the depth at which some artifacts were found, occasionally including notes such as “shows clearly the use of bamboo before flint and obsidian” in reference to a bamboo arrowhead.
found on May 25, 1929 in Knights Landing, CA.  

The Zallio Collection embodies decades of neglect and inconsistencies in care and documentation that extend well beyond Zallio’s own record-keeping failures. As with many museums, university or otherwise, a concise records management system was not introduced until 1974, when the teaching collections began to be formally accessioned using a standard binomial system. The Zallio Collection was donated to the University and Department as a teaching collection, which may explain why it was not properly inventoried or cataloged. Instead it was inventoried simply at the box or crate level. For this reason, we may never know exactly what items are attributable to Zallio versus other donors, or which ones may have been mixed with other collections over the years.

In order to fully grasp the significance of any collection, an understanding of how it developed, from the time the various objects were crafted until they entered the context of the museum is essential. Without this life history, objects are bereft of significant meaning and value. My research seeks to ameliorate some of this loss with respect to the Anthony G. Zallio Collection.

METHODOLOGY

The 1976 Master’s thesis written for the Department of Social Science by Arlean Towne provides invaluable insight into Zallio’s professional career as a local

---

6 CSUS Accession File 74-29. Specimen catalog not accessioned. This seemingly sudden change in the importance of data entry could have been a result of influence from Jeremiah Lillard and his intense desire to professionalize the archaeological work sanctioned by Sacramento Junior College. Although Lillard began his presidency in 1923, six years before the change in notation style in his personal specimen catalog, it seems logical that Zallio was inspired by the new professional standards, perhaps the likes of which he had heretofore not been exposed.
anthropologist and archaeologist. While the topic of the thesis was a broader history of archaeology in the Central California region, and Zallio figures into this portrait as a colleague of Sacramento Junior College (SJC) president Jeremiah Lillard, she limits her discussion of him to his role as a professor, paraprofessional archaeologist and collector. Readers learn little about Zallio outside of this limited context.

Archival Research

The Museum accession records include a letter written by Anthony Zallio’s daughter, Maria Brugge, to Dr. Richard Reeve, chair of the Anthropology Department at the time the entire collection was donated to Sacramento State College in 1951. In this letter, Brugge offers an overview of her father’s life, such as his birth in Italy, a brief outline of his work history and anecdotes regarding his love of anthropology. She also notes his educational experiences and achievements, such as his Master’s Degree in Italian from the University of California, Berkeley (UC Berkeley), a summer session at Stanford, and an Alaskan educational cruise taken through the University of Oregon. Brugge’s portrait of her father served as a valuable roadmap for further archival investigation.7

Archival research at local and regional repositories was necessary to round out the limited portrait of Zallio provided by his daughter and Towne. The Center for Sacramento History (CSH) holds one box of Zallio archival materials donated by family members. While it had not been fully processed at the time of my visit, I was allowed

---

7 CSUS Anthropology Museum Accession File 74-29.
access to this box containing several family photographs representing Zallio at different stages of his life (see Figures 4 and 5) along with several documents and sets of correspondence in Italian. Among these is one photograph clearly taken during an archaeological excavation and others that were taken while he was a professor at SJC (Figure 6). Other important archival documents are certifications qualifying him to teach in California, including a life diploma issued by the California State Board of Education that features seals from the Italian consulate. These were necessary for the validation of Zallio’s claims to having obtained educational credentials in Italy.

A portion of the CSH collection includes documentation related to his employment as a SJC professor, including an undated honeymoon photograph of Mr. and Mrs. William K. Purves, SJC faculty member and curator of the Lillard Museum, sent to Zallio. Also included is a Christmas postcard (Figure 1), featuring President Lillard (seated opposite Sacramento mayor Belle Coolidge) in a stage coach. Zallio, who is holding a faunal specimen, leads the team of horses. The card is signed by many of the Junior College faculty, including Belle Coolidge, College President J.B. Lillard, Anthony Zallio and Richard Reeve, who later became the first Anthropology Department Chair at Sacramento State College.

The Sacramento Room at the Sacramento Public Library provided a wealth of employment information for Zallio. Extensive use was made of the Sacramento City directories in order to create a broader picture of his occupational timeline. Zallio first

---

8 A life diploma is a credentialing document issued to the applicant upon the completion of paperwork detailing achievements that meet specified requirements. www.cde.ca.gov
appears in the city directories in 1908, the year he moved to Sacramento. He is a constant in the city directories until 1949, the last published directory preceding his death in 1951. It was from these directories that his employment in the canning industry, career with the Sacramento Unified School District, tenure as a newspaper man, and professional life post-retirement were reconstructed.

Research was also conducted at two distinct repositories on the UC Berkeley campus. The Phoebe A. Hearst Museum of Anthropology currently houses one item, a set of five tiny Pomo baskets, listing Zallio as the primary collector. Catalog card data includes the original dates of collection (1935). The original catalog number, L-11701, is indicative of an association with Jeremiah Lillard and the Sacramento Junior College’s Lillard Museum and signifies these items as being associated with a burial. There are also 12 additional items listing Zallio as a secondary collector, with Lillard as the primary collector. These items, all obsidian arrow points, also include original catalog numbers with a letter “L” prefix.

The Bancroft Library at UC Berkeley holds year’s worth of correspondence between Zallio and Alfred Kroeber, a prominent California anthropologist; Robert Lowie, former professor of anthropology at UC Berkeley; and Edward Gifford, a former professor of anthropology and Museum Director at UC Berkeley. Correspondence consists of course outlines and letters providing evidence of Zallio’s desire to further his
Figure 1. Sacramento Junior College Christmas Postcard. Photo courtesy of the Center for Sacramento History.
knowledge of anthropology and to develop a wider network of colleagues. The archives at UC Berkeley were effective in creating an image of Zallio as someone who not only pursued education, but also worked to bridge a gap between local and regional anthropology and the metropolitan centers of the discipline.

The CSUS Anthropology Museum director acquired an important corpus of correspondence between Zallio and Aleš Hrdlička, then curator of physical anthropology at the U.S. National Museum—now the Smithsonian Institution National Museum of Natural History—in 2002. This correspondence reveals that Zallio was seeking advice from Hrdlička regarding his own studies within physical anthropology.

The University of Oregon archives were contacted about a 1930 summer cruise to Alaska that Zallio joined as a means by which to further his anthropological education. According to the archivist, University Archives were not kept until the 1940s, so it is likely that there are no extant official records for that cruise. Significantly, there are archival records related to the cruise’s director, William G. Beattie, whose collections of Native North American artifacts are owned by the Sacramento State Anthropology Museum. Papers do not list Zallio as a correspondent, although a more comprehensive search might yield other clues about the nature of Zallio’s experience on the cruise.

A thorough internet and library database search of Anthony G. Zallio produced information regarding three published articles and an advertisement placed in Natural History Magazine in 1943 (see Figure 20). In addition, the Sacramento State Library’s

---

9 Letters from Zallio to Hrdlička, Box 69, Aleš Hrdlička Papers, National Anthropological Archives, Smithsonian Institution. Copies are included in the Museum Accession Files.
media room houses newspaper microfilm that was searched for information about Zallio, such as his obituary\textsuperscript{10} and various anthropological course offerings that Zallio taught at Sacramento Junior College.\textsuperscript{11}

*Museum Research*

The basketry collections of two anthropology museums served as primary source data. The C. Hart Merriam Collection of Native American Basketry, housed at the University of California, Davis, was referenced for its variety of California and Northwest Coast basketry as well as for the copious detail Merriam recorded for his collection.\textsuperscript{12} Indeed, this collection serves as an exemplar in terms of extensive data accompanying a collection and excellence in museum housing techniques and conservation efforts.

The Anthropology Department at California State University, Sacramento houses a global collection of objects serving the four fields of anthropology.\textsuperscript{13} There are ten privately-developed basket collections primarily drawn from California and Northwest Coast societies; each one representing the idiosyncratic collecting goals and experiences of the collector. The details of each collection, such as number of baskets, cultural

\textsuperscript{10} Sacramento Bee, April 3, 1951.
\textsuperscript{11} Sacramento Bee, January 28, 1931. Many of these archival documents along with baskets from the Zallio Collection were exhibited in the University’s Library Gallery for the “Object Lessons” exhibition which was open in September 2011.
\textsuperscript{12} The Anthropology Department at the University of California, Davis, offers ANTH 198, Directed Study, which focuses on teaching the technical features of Native American basketry. This course, taught by California basketry scholar Ralph Shanks, utilizes the C. Hart Merriam Collection of Native American Basketry, along with Merriam’s extensive notes, for teaching purposes. I have audited all three quarter-long courses offered in the series.
\textsuperscript{13} Some of the earliest donated collections include the Hawley Collection, Accession File 74-5; donated in 1957; the Geary Collection, Accession File 74-10, donated in 1956; and the Harvey Collection, Accession File 74-11, donated in 1960. Each of the early collections was donated and accepted by the University and Anthropology Department as a classroom teaching aid.
attribution and condition of basketry, differ among the collections. The Zallio Collection of Native American basketry comprises one of the core collections of the Museum, as well as its largest. While the focus of my research is Zallio’s basketry, other collections held by the Museum were consulted for comparison.

The Zallio Accession File, No. 74-29, holds a wide variety of items pertinent to the collection. There are copies of many archival documents including pages from his handwritten specimen catalog, early typewritten catalogs of the collection, correspondence between then President of the University, Guy West, and Zallio’s daughter Maria, and hand-written inventories of the archaeological collection dating back to 1965.

Included in the Zallio Collection is his specimen catalog. This catalog, handwritten in a bound journal, lists the various items he collected, many of which he used in his Junior College classroom. While providing a wealth of information regarding the types of items he collected, for many of the items it is lacking in details such as date and mode of acquisition, cost, as well as detailed descriptions for many of the items. The basketry items listed in this catalog do not match any of the other collection inventories of Zallio materials.

During the process of researching this collection, each basket currently attributed to Anthony Zallio, based on the database created in the 1980s or early 1990s, was closely examined, both in its physical form and through the various documenting events. The full extent of the confusion surrounding this collection cannot be fully realized or appreciated until one makes an attempt at rectifying it. Of the 106 baskets thought to be
Zallio’s, only 13 baskets have handwritten tags attached to them. Of these 13 basket tags, 10 provide evidence that they did, in fact, belong to Anthony Zallio.

The prospect of conducting a complete inventory on a large Native American basketry collection, known to be disorganized, initially seemed a daunting a task. Achieving a clear picture of the details of Anthony Zallio’s basketry collection would require breaking the overall inventory process into many smaller pieces. The catalog database, created in the 1980s or early 1990s and transferred to MS-Access in 2006, was examined first. This catalog lists all the baskets currently held in the museum. This database also serves as a concordance of all the baskets listing the various numbers assigned, the donor, function, cultural attribution and location in the Museum’s repository. This was the most logical place to start in order to get a sense of the most current knowledge available about Zallio’s basket collection. This database listed 104 baskets attributable to Zallio and two additional baskets with Zallio as the questionable donor.

Confirming the donor attributions proved to be difficult. Over the course of the 61 years since Zallio’s collection was donated to the University, there have been at least six partial or complete inventories conducted on the collection. Only a portion of this information is found within the Zallio accession file. The earliest listing of Zallio’s collection comes from his handwritten specimen catalog wherein he catalogued many of the items in his collection. For many of the archaeological entries, Zallio recorded the
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site name and dates of excavation. For most items of material culture, he did not record a date, location or method of acquisition. There are two exceptions. On page three, Zallio noted “The above 3 tablets were obtained through Edgar Banks of Eustis, Florida spring of 1928 and were donated by President Lillard.” On page four, he notes “The 4 above beads were bought at Berkeley during 1928 summer session.” This acquisition appears to have been made during one of the summer sessions Zallio spent taking anthropology courses at UC Berkeley. Zallio’s rather generic descriptions are reproduced in Table 1.

Table 1: Listing of baskets in specimen catalog.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page #</th>
<th>Entry #</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>A136</td>
<td>Strainer for Manzanita Cider - Tuolumne Indians Yosemite N. Cal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A137</td>
<td>Fraser Basket, very old, from Fraser River Indians of Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A138</td>
<td>Apache Basket of Arizona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A139</td>
<td>Calif. Basket showing geometrical design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A140</td>
<td>Spiral Basket Simple design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A141</td>
<td>Pomo Indian Basket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>A142</td>
<td>Pomo Indian Basket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A143</td>
<td>Spiral Basket closed mouth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A144</td>
<td>Calif. Basket showing interesting design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A150</td>
<td>Papoos cradle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the basket data recorded in his specimen catalog, there are also 13 basket tags associated with this collection. Of these 13 tags, seven are written in Zallio’s hand, one tag is of typed script reading “AGZALLIO,” and two of the tags are faint and difficult to read and therefore inconclusive at this time. Three of the tags are not of Zallio’s hand, and one of those three cryptically reads “AXE.”
Included in the specimen catalog are two detached tags, handwritten by Zallio, which represent two different Maidu baskets (Figure 2). Since the donation, the numbers 1-140 and 8-1 have been added, one number per tag, to represent individual baskets in the Anthropology Museum Collection. The first tag, 1-140, seems to represent BAS 302, noted on the Department catalog card as unknown donor, and possible Pomo attribution. This attribution was likely changed to Maidu after the tags were found. The second tag, 8-1, has been provenienced to BAS 94, a Maidu basket attributed to “M.S.C.,” Marshall on the BAS card. The accession number for this basket is 75-4-7; however, there is no accession file for 75-4. Presumably this basket was not previously attributed to Zallio due to a lack of familiarization with his handwriting. These tags are important because they state in his hand that the two baskets were purchased at an auction. The tags read “Auction Sale – 1171 4th Avenue Jan 4, 1933” on one side, and “Maidu Oroville” on the other. While a city is not listed, there is a matching Sacramento address. Although residential property, its location downtown suggests it might well be the auction location.

Figure 2. Basket tags showing purchase at auction. Courtesy of Carolyn Dean.
The accession file contains several different inventories of the Zallio Collection, at least one of which was conducted prior to its donation to Sacramento State. A typewritten “Catalogue of Mr. Anthony G. Zallio’s Anthropological Material (Sacramento Junior College)” is dated July 15, 1930. A total of 346 items are listed, and only two of those are baskets; #Z51 is listed as a “Uintah basket, very small,” while Z137 is a sample of a “perfectly charred basket” from the Maidu Tribe. Two different, undated and typewritten, lists of Zallio items are also included in the accession file. One is a list titled “Zallio’s Collection,” in which 98 baskets and two cradleboards are recorded with no further descriptions. This undated inventory of the Zallio Collection also lists archaeological items, such as 363 short spears, 76 projectiles, and 82 stone pestles, osteological and other items of material culture. In total, 3,653 items are listed, plus another four items described as lots versus individual specimens (“several jars of shell beads,” “several jars of charred food,” “various fossilized homes of prehistoric animals,” and “small specimens are in over one hundred mounds”) [sic].

The other itemization, “List of Items in the Zallio Collection to be Stored” shows most items in this collection at container, rather than item level. For example, there are many entries noting a carton or box of a certain type of artifact, but not the number of artifacts in that carton or box. In terms of basketry materials, four individual baskets, one large carton of baskets, one large wooden box of baskets, and one carton containing
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16 This Catalogue is also reflected in a series of typed catalog cards reflecting each item on this list. Two of these catalog cards include Zallio’s handwritten notation of having traded for them. These cards are not included in the Anthropology Museum’s accession file, but instead are housed in the Archaeological Repository. They were likely part of the original accession.
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baskets and beads are enumerated. Each entry is numbered in chronological order with each number preceded by a “Z.” However, these “Z” numbers do not correspond to the “Z” numbers used in the 1930 Catalogue. The carton containing baskets and beads is the very first entry on the list, labeled Z-1, and, according to this list, was intended to be sent to the office of Dr. Reeve, Department Chair. The catalog numbers from this list that reference basketry material are shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Basketry material listed in undated inventory.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue Number</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Z-1</td>
<td>Carton containing baskets and beads (To go to Dr. Reeve's office)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z48</td>
<td>Large wooden box of baskets, crated top</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z49</td>
<td>Large carton of baskets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z64</td>
<td>Large Maidu storage basket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z65</td>
<td>Paiute gathering basket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z67</td>
<td>Wicker basket containing Aleutian material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z69</td>
<td>Large record, ledger, book (catalogue listings)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the earliest University inventory records, 1962 appears to be the first formalized attempt at cataloging the department’s teaching collections. In that year, Professor Jay Crain, then an undergraduate student at CSUS, cataloged some collections using 3x5 pre-printed white index cards. These cards contain archaeologically-relevant information, such as site name, pit, depth at which artifact was found, number of item, found by, date found and name of data-recorder. A pencil drawing of each item appears of the back of the cards. These catalog cards were pre-printed for use during archaeological field collection and are adapted to some, but not all collections. For
instance, there are no white 3x5 department catalogue cards representing any part of the
Zallio Collection.

In 1964, 5x7 Catalog Cards were created by Patti Jo Palumbo, then a graduate
student (Figure 3). These cards were created as part of a binomial numbering system
based on donor. Numbers using the BAS prefix, which identify individual baskets as part
of that “type” collection, were added later.\(^\text{18}\) Of the BAS cards for the Zallio collection,
only five BAS cards list Zallio as the donor. One card lists Zallio as the donor, but with a
question mark attached. The creation of this binomial system for the basketry collection
aids in identifying the donor of a particular basket. For the Zallio baskets, the number 1
comprises the first part of the binomial. The baskets numbered “1-5” through “1-150,” in
theory should all be Zallio baskets, despite skips and gaps in the numbering sequence.
Discrepancies between the binomial and other donor attributions are found in Table 3.

Table 3: Discrepancies in the binomial identification system for the Zallio
Collection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BAS #</th>
<th>Accession #</th>
<th>Binomial</th>
<th>Donor Listed in Database</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>323</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>1-74</td>
<td>unk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>75-2-53</td>
<td>1-53</td>
<td>Thompson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221</td>
<td>75-2-63</td>
<td>1-63</td>
<td>Thompson (H.L.X.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219</td>
<td>75-2-57</td>
<td>1-57</td>
<td>C.E.X.-N.S.X.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>75-2-72</td>
<td>1-72</td>
<td>A.X.E.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^\text{18}\) Information obtained from the 2010 Inventory Report for the Joel S. Cotton Collection, CSUS
Anthropology Museum. The BAS prefix was part of a larger identification system based on “type”
collections such as FIB (fiber), WEA (weapon), CER (ceramic), and GWS (glass, wood, and shell).
The accession numbering system in place in the museum today was not initiated until 1974 (Martineau 1984). Today, the use of a binomial is the standard method for accessioning museum collections. The year of acquisition comprises the first part of this number, which is then followed by a hyphen and a number that represents the chronological order in which it was received relative to other acquisitions donated or otherwise logged that year. The addition of yet a third number assigned at the item level often serves as a trinomial catalog number. The accession number assigned to the Zallio Collection is 74-29, meaning it was the twenty-ninth collection accessioned in 1974, the year that items in the ethnographic collection were first accessioned. Many of the objects in what was once considered the Exhibit Collections, of which some of the Zallio
Collection was a part, were not accessioned using the same system.\textsuperscript{19} To further complicate each object’s identification and potential for mistakes, the collections records had previously been largely maintained without the benefit of a professionalized record keeping system or any sort of consistency. In addition to deficient record keeping, many of the collections were not stored in a secure storage area, making the potential for objects to turn up missing quite easy (Martineau 1984).

For the 1974-1976 inventory event, a binder was compiled for all accession numbers beginning with 74-XX. The index lists the accession number and the donor. For most donors, only a last name is listed. For Zallio, there is a notation to “check all material.”\textsuperscript{20} A total of nine entries list the donor as “unknown.” Two of those entries note that they “may contain material from other collections,” while one lists Zallio, along with Beardsley, as potential contributors. There is also a donor list for 1974 which includes a brief list of the general contents of that accession. The Zallio donor entry reads “Calif. (?): worked shell, clay, points, ground stone.” No baskets or other ethnographic material were listed. Turning to the first page in this binder for the Zallio records, there is a handwritten note which reads:

\begin{quotation}
Zallio Collection to be Re-accessioned in 80-7 ck last pp. There are apparently artifacts belonging to this collection that have no acc #’s. If found, pls. ck w/Kay or D. Heidecker. Items from Zallio may be been included in other collections: 1) basket file 2) N.W. Coast 3) Unknown. Check carefully.
\end{quotation}

\textsuperscript{19} According to Martineau (1984), the items in the Exhibit Collections were displayed in the Anthropology cases located in buildings where anthropology courses were taught. Had the Zallio Collection been properly accessioned it would bear an accession number that begins with 1951.

\textsuperscript{20} See the 1974-1976 Inventory Binder, CSUS Anthropology Museum.
There are a total of 14 pages of accession/catalog worksheets for accession number 74-29. The field for “date received” reads July 28, 1975. This is clearly not the date of receipt, but rather the date of this retroactive accessioning and cataloging event. Readers encountering these records for the first time, without benefit of knowledge of the history of the early department collections management practices or access to the accession file would have no way of knowing this is not an accurate year of receipt. Each worksheet seems to be filled out with slightly different data fields and standards. Some are typed, some hand-written, and some a combination of the two; this is probably a reflection of changing administrative personnel and student intern labor. What is consistent, however, is the complete absence of any mention of basketry. The focus of the entries in this inventory event was the archaeological, not the ethnographic, material.

Within the accession worksheet binder, the number that follows that of the Zallio Collection is No. 74-30. It lists an unknown donor/collector with an unknown context. A note is attached to page one of this entry, which reads “CHECK ZALLIO (in bold, red letters). Some material in this collection definitely out of Zallio from J. Johnson 6/1/81 and signed M.K.M.” A small number of the items listed for 74-30 do match what is currently known to be Zallio ethnographic material based on his specimen catalog, such as a coconut fiber raincoat and an Apache saddle bag, but again there is no mention of Native American baskets as the majority of items listed are archaeological. At the very back of the 1974-1976 accession binder is a handwritten note entitled “Accession Book Problems,” with notations for three different accessions, one of which is Zallio’s, 74-29.
The note for this accession reads “Needs Reaccessioning. Some things apparently not numbered. Inconsistent numbering.”

Not all the objects in the Zallio Collection were assigned to accession number 74-29. Of the baskets currently attributed to Zallio, only one is consistent with the 74-29 accession number. In 1984, a complete inventory was taken of the holdings of the Department collections. This inventory included all items, not just items of material culture. The blank form to be filled out during the process of this inventory includes a “Zallio” column heading. According to Martineau, this heading was added for three reasons: As noted earlier, the Zallio Collection was not thoroughly inventoried upon receipt at the University, the Zallio Collection had not been inventoried in its entirety or accessioned by 1984, and objects labeled as “Zallio” objects were recorded under at least four different donors in the Accession Book. She also noted that control of Zallio’s “burial materials” was assigned to the Archaeology Storage System, now referred to as the Archaeological Repository (1984:26). Based on her research, Martineau suggested conducting a thorough comparison of all of the collections records against the original Zallio records to enable corrections to the accession records (Martineau 1984). Until now this has not been attempted with any consistency. The breakdown of accession numbers for Zallio’s basketry collection is shown in Table 4.

---

21 See the 1984 Inventory, CSUS Anthropology Museum.
Table 4: Accession numbers used to identify baskets in the Zallio Collection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accession #</th>
<th># of baskets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>74-29</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74-30</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-2</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no accession #</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>missing accession #</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is also a separate binder containing inventory records for what was by now formally called an “Anthropology Department Museum.” This inventory was conducted in April of 1993. Of the 106 baskets currently attributed to Anthony Zallio, he is mentioned as the donor only nine times, two of those are noted with a question mark. This inventory is a computer-generated printout with fields such as catalog number (using the BAS number), accession number, storage location, use of item, donor and any comments. The location for each basket has a single line drawn through in pencil with a new location added. The predominant accession number related to Zallio baskets in this inventory is also 75-2 and not 74-29. The museum registration records are confusing, and the baskets themselves serve as the primary data for my thesis. My analysis of Zallio and his basket collection is a first step toward understanding the collector and the legacy his collection represents to Anthropology in the local area, region, the Department and Museum, and the wider field of museum anthropology.
OVERVIEW OF THESIS

In this thesis, I discuss Zallio’s weaknesses as an anthropologist as well as his strengths. It was my goal to present as broad a picture as possible instead of simply focusing on the highlights of his career. Even with imperfections, his work still offers us important data. The thesis is divided into five chapters. Chapter Two offers a review of the current literature on the history of collecting and the institutionalization of the discipline of anthropology. Chapter Three provides both a personal and professional profile of Anthony Zallio. This chapter will focus on his work as a professor at Sacramento Junior College and touch upon his inclusion in both the Junior College’s archaeological program and as his role in the Lillard Museum. Chapter Four offers an analysis of the Zallio Collection of Native American basketry. This includes the inventory methods as well as findings, an analysis of the overall collection, and an in-depth highlight of ten, randomly selected baskets from the collection. Chapter Five establishes Zallio’s place as a collector in the early 20th century on local, regional, and national levels. The Conclusion, Chapter Six, summarizes my research and analysis and discusses the place of old and undocumented collections, such as Zallio’s, in contemporary museums. Appendix A offers a concordance of the Zallio Collection of basketry, including those from areas outside of North America.
Chapter 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

Collecting is an ancient and seemingly universal human pursuit. Archaeology reveals that humans have retained heirlooms and traded for exotic materials for thousands of years (Sutton and Yohee 2006). However, the collecting tradition from which Zallio is descended began in the 15th and 16th centuries, with the age of exploration and discovery (Fernández-Armesto 2006). European discovery exploded in the late 15th century, as shipbuilding technology, achievements in astronomy and navigation, and merchant economies fostered extensive exploration of previously uncharted geographic territories and societies (Allen 1992).

EXPLORATION, CONQUEST AND COLLECTING

Such explorations were not simply about economic gain, but were also critical mechanisms for advancing knowledge about the world. Excursions for this purpose typically employed many specialists. There were always naturalists on board charged with collecting of plants, minerals and animal specimens for scientific study, as well as artists who were employed to sketch the landscape and native inhabitants of these newly found lands (Rauschenberg 1968). The twin goals of scientific collecting and the opening of new trade routes led to the development of shared histories based on colonialism, imperialism and settlement (Henare 2005). Among the countless sea
voyages from Europe to unchartered lands, the voyage of the *Endeavor* and James Cook provides a clear picture of the circumstances under which many expeditions were made.

In the late 18th century, Captain James Cook and the rest of the *Endeavor* crew were sailing in the South Pacific. They anchored off the island that would become known as New Zealand. They engaged in some skirmishes with the native inhabitants, but Banks, a young English scholar and fellow of the Royal Society of London managed to gather no less than 40 species of plant before continuing the voyage (Henare 2005). Cook learned early on that offering Maori people small tokens as evidence of his friendly intentions would reduce violence and allow the crew to continue in their scientific pursuits. In return, the Maori inhabitants offered the men of the *Endeavor* their possessions. Many of these Maori objects found their way not only back to Scotland, but around the world, housed in museums far removed from their place of origin (Henare 2005).

Modern museums were created by scholarly societies during the latter part of the 18th century, for the purpose of disseminating knowledge (Henare 2005). Much of the scholarly knowledge that emerged from these institutions was based upon collections amassed and analyzed by generalists. During the early part of the 19th century, the term *naturalist* described someone who studied the three “kingdoms of Nature”: animal, vegetable and mineral. Naturalists of this era were not bound by scientific rigor or disciplinary specialization, which made natural history accessible to the educated and uneducated, alike (Barber 1980). It enjoyed significant social appeal, as a popular manifestation and appropriation of more scholarly, post-Enlightenment concerns (Barber...
1980, Naylor 2002). Victorians carved out spaces in their homes for insect and botanical collections, took trips to the zoological gardens, gathered for evenings under the microscope, and created several natural history societies that met to discuss new finds (Barber 1980, Barrow 2000, Naylor 2002).

NATURAL HISTORY AND SCHOLARLY SOCIETIES

It was not until the latter half of the 19th century that natural history became more scientific in purpose. Practitioners began to specialize, as botanists or geologists, for example, and to develop systematic collections in those fields. Natural history, as a pursuit, was open to all since there were few, if any, university courses on the subject and no degree offered. Anyone could become a naturalist (Barber 1980). While it is true that only the wealthy could afford excursions to distant lands, even the poorest of the poor and most uneducated could observe nature and collect specimens for further study where they lived. Naturalists would gather in small groups or in more formalized “societies” to share information. These formalized groups typically charged a fee to join, thus excluding all but the middle and upper-classes. Groups like the Royal Society and the Penzance Natural History and Antiquarian Society, both of nineteenth century Britain, were two such formalized organizations that met on a regular basis (da Costa 2002, Naylor 2002). As da Costa explains, the “exhibition of natural and artificial curiosities, among which monstrous births were also generally considered to be included,” was an integral part of the agenda at the meetings of The Royal Society during the eighteenth
century (2002:148). The common denominator between all of these societies was the advancement of science.

Many 19th century naturalists provided the foundation from which anthropology grew (Ames 1992). Charles Darwin’s theory of natural selection provided anthropology with an early paradigm for making sense of the growing awareness of social and human biological variation (Stocking 1968). Georges Cuvier was a French comparative anatomist who focused on the physical inherited differences seen between races (Stocking 1968, Barber 1980). Cuvier even suggested that explorers who found themselves engaged in battles with “savages” should look for the place in which they bury their dead and then procure some skulls for scientific analysis (Stocking 1968). Louis Agassiz was a comparative anatomist and central figure in the race debates of the 19th century. While teaching at Harvard, Agassiz founded the Museum of Comparative Zoology (Aylesworth 1965, Barber 1980). Darwin, Cuvier, and Agassiz represent just a few examples of 19th century naturalists who not only had a hand in providing the framework for the future discipline of anthropology, but also amassed systematic collections in order to produce scholarly knowledge. Because knowledge was object and collection-based, it is no surprise that many disciplines first emerged in the context of museums, before becoming institutionalized in academic settings. In the 16th century, well before full-fledged museums existed, curiosity cabinets served as private repositories (Ames 1992, Asma 2001, Thomson 1996). These “cabinets,” which might actually involve entire galleries and rooms, were used to display findings that were out of the ordinary and would inspire amazement. The initial function of curiosity cabinets was

As these early collections outgrew their cabinets, and more collectors organized themselves into learned societies, museums were founded as permanent repositories for private collections (Ames 1992, Asma 2001, Duncan 2000, Krech 1999, Lee 1999, McCaffrey 2002, Naylor 2002, Stocking 1985). Over time, the establishment of museums allowed for items to be systematically categorized, analyzed and displayed. It would not be long before ethnographic material would emerge from within natural history as a distinctive category of object and study (Ames 1992, Stocking 1985). Items made and used by the diverse peoples of the world, such as tools, utensils, ceremonial items and clothing, began to flow out of the generalist field of natural history, and into collections and exhibits sponsored by the newly specialized field of anthropology (Boas 1907). “Defined, segmented, detached, and carried away by ethnographers” artifacts came to stand for the societies that had produced and used them (Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 1998:18).
The 19th century was a period of dramatic growth, both for museum collections and the discipline of anthropology. Heavily influenced by natural history, museums became the center of anthropological study (Ames 1992, Jacknis 2002, O’Hanlon 2001, Stocking 1985). But what were the origins of these anthropological collections? From 1876 to 1916, close to one hundred million people visited world fairs held in the United States (Rydell 1984). These expositions, held internationally, were meant to offer the host country a place to display progress in all areas, including the achievement of imperial ambitions. To drive home the success of technological and political hegemony, live people were also exhibited (Armstrong 1992, Bradford and Blume 1992, Corby 1993, Moses 1996, Rydell 1984). The first international exposition was held in London in 1851, and was hugely successful (Corbey 1993, Rydell 1984). Subsequent fairs were held in Paris and the United States, throughout the 19th and early 20th centuries. These fairs were inextricably tied to museums and anthropology.

WORLD FAIRS AND ANTHROPOLOGY

In 1876, Philadelphia hosted the Centennial Exhibition to celebrate one hundred years of nationhood (Rydell 1984). The Smithsonian Institution and its scientists, including Frank Hamilton Cushing—a pioneer in the anthropological study of Native American societies, had a hand in helping to create exhibits for this exposition. Among many other exhibits intended to demonstrate progress, the Centennial Exhibition featured a North American Indian exhibit. The purpose of this Indian exhibit was to show that “Native American cultures and people belonged to the interminable wasteland of
humanity’s dark and stormy beginnings” (Rydell 1984:24). Artifacts, including a sixty-five foot Haida canoe and Tsimshian totem pole, were displayed alongside wax figures of Indians in unilinear evolutionary sequence (Cole 1985, Rydell 1984).

In 1893, the Columbian Exposition opened in Chicago. This fair had its own anthropology building, dedicated to housing ethnological materials. The anthropology exhibits featured in this building were created by Frederick Ward Putnam, curator of the Peabody Museum of American Archaeology and Ethnology (Hinsley 1991, Moses 1996, Rydell 1984). The Fair’s Department of Ethnology was also tasked with creating the “amusements” on the Midway, which succeeded all too well in providing visitors with “ethnological scientific sanction for the American view of the nonwhite world as barbaric and childlike and gave scientific basis to the racial blueprint for building a utopia” (Rydell 1984:40). This nonwhite world included Native Americans.

Native Americans were participants in Wild West Shows held during the Columbian Exposition and many other World Fairs in the United States and abroad (Castaneda 1993, Moses 1996). These shows competed with ethnological exhibitions along the midways of fairs for attention and profits, blurring the tenuous boundaries between entertainment and ethnology as a field of scientific study, the latter of which was situated most prominently within the Smithsonian’s Bureau of American Ethnology (Moses 1996). Native Americans, along with peoples representing colonial outposts around the world, were also exhibited in ethnological “villages,” alongside artifacts collected by naturalists and anthropologists. These Indian villages provided a place for amateur and professional anthropologists alike to study a culture that had not yet
“progressed” to the stage of “civilization” (Rydell 1984). While those with a serious interest in anthropology may have learned something, the average fairgoer visiting the midway had little context for learning. This category of visitor merely strolled by “window-shopping in the department store of exotic cultures” (Hinsley 1991:355).

Franz Boas was Putnam’s second-in-command at the Fair, and had supervised field collecting in both physical anthropology and ethnology. Boas helped to develop exhibits for the fair, and once it closed, moved all of the artifact collections to the Field Columbian Museum, created specifically to house materials from the Exposition (Browman 2002, Rydell 1984, Stocking 1985). Boas was also heavily involved in the Anthropology Department of the 1904 Louisiana Purchase Exposition held in St. Louis. Along with Aleš Hrdlička, he provided enough legitimacy to the Department that it was considered an educational undertaking (Rydell 1984). The anthropology exhibits at the St. Louis fair were used as a field school for University of Chicago students. Each three-week session made use of both living and inanimate exhibitions, supplemented by daily lectures on such topics as “cannibalism” and “physical characteristics of race” (Rydell 1984:166).

INSTITUTIONALIZING THE NEW DISCIPLINE IN THE ACADEMY

Not only were world fairs helpful in creating and augmenting museums of the day, they were also instrumental in teaching anthropology to both students and the public at large. These fairs paved the way for anthropology to become a legitimate field of study. Following the Columbian Exposition, Boas was hired into a temporary position at
the Field Museum in Chicago. He also conducted fieldwork for the Bureau of American Ethnology and created life group exhibits for the National Museum, which were then shown at the Cotton States Exposition in Atlanta in 1895 (Stocking 1985). Because of his professional relationship with Putnam, Boas was hired in 1895 as assistant curator at the American Museum of Natural History in New York, and as a professor at Columbia University the next year (Jacknis 2002, Stocking 1985). Boas was the first professor to be hired to teach anthropology as an undergraduate field of study and recognized as the central figure in professionalizing the discipline (Jacknis 1993a, Jacknis 2002). This did not mean that the discipline was without problems. Early on, there were disagreements about the role of anthropology, about how to conduct fieldwork, and about the meaning and arrangement of objects (Ames 1992, Griset 1993, Jacknis 1993b, Stocking 1968, Stocking 1974). Nevertheless, Boas went on to mentor students such as Alfred Kroeber, Robert Lowie, Margaret Mead, Ruth Benedict, and Edward Sapir, each an important figure in the history of anthropology (Lewis 2001).

COLLECTORS ON THE MARGINS OF ANTHROPOLOGY

Much like his mentor, Boas, who quickly became frustrated with the confines and entertainment orientation of world fairs and retreated to his position at Columbia in order to build an academic department, Alfred Kroeber – by now leading the program at UC Berkeley - wanted to command and control the study of California Indians. He sought to extinguish the work and influence of non-academic anthropologists like John Hudson and C. Hart Merriam due to their lack of formal training (Jacknis 1993b). In so doing, he
suppressed important fieldwork being carried out in the western United States. Some of the most detailed fieldwork and significant collections of Native American material culture were amassed by non-professionals (Griset 1993, Herold 1999, Kidwell 1999, Lee 1999, McLendon 1993). Many of these individuals and collections provide an important historical and comparative perspective on the social and historical context in which Zallio collected, and in which his collection should be understood to embody anthropological value.

Sheldon Jackson was a Christian missionary working in Sitka, Alaska during the late 19th century (Hinckley 1964, Lee 1999). As a boy, he collected botanical specimens, travelled when he could, and took notes on different ethnic groups and their surroundings (Hinckley 1964, Lee 1999). As a missionary, he turned his attention to Native Alaskan artifacts. Jackson used these objects as a means to raise funds to further his missionizing efforts, by juxtaposing before congregations back home, the Alaskan Natives and their primitive past (as embodied in “pagan” artifacts) in comparison to their Christian present and future (Lee 1999). His large collection is now housed in the Sheldon Jackson Museum, in Sitka, Alaska. During his lifetime, Jackson wanted to open a museum where Native students could learn about their own artistic heritage, but he also wanted to continue using those artifacts as a means to further his missionary goals. He helped found a local industrial school and had students make replicas of traditional items for sale to tourists (Lee 1999). Because Jackson sold some artifacts in an effort to raise funds, many were shipped to the lower forty-eight states. Through his efforts, Alaskan art and artifacts travelled the country, inspiring others to appreciate their beauty (Lee 1999).
John W. Hudson is another avocational anthropologist who became an important figure in Native American Studies. Hudson came to know California Indians after he married his wife, Grace, who grew up around Pomo people (McLendon 1993). By 1892, Hudson, a physician by training, amassed such a large collection of Pomo baskets that the Bureau of American Ethnology contacted him in hopes of buying the collection for the Smithsonian’s exhibition at the Columbian Exposition in Chicago in 1893. Instead of selling his collection at this point, Hudson published an article about Pomo basket makers in *The Overland Monthly* magazine (Smith-Ferri 1998). Hudson’s article is deemed the “first extensive article on the subject” (McLendon 1993:51). Hudson’s extraordinary knowledge of the Pomo and their weaving traditions not only influenced the market for Pomo baskets, but also made Hudson himself a commodity. Hudson was hired as a consultant to the Brooklyn Institute for their exhibition on California, which included Pomo basketry (McLendon 1993).

C. Hart Merriam offers a third example of naturalist turned anthropologist, who also worked outside of academia. Merriam, who primarily collected baskets, left behind detailed field journals, vocabulary lists, photographs and correspondence (Griset 1993). Once Merriam became serious about collecting baskets, he collected from the women who wove them. He was beginning to incorporate Native context and values given to baskets. He also recognized Natives as fellow “naturalists” (Griset 1993:34). Merriam sought to work with Native elders who had firsthand experience of life before contact with Europeans, and he was the only one completing work with these informants (Griset 1993). Merriam, who was trained as a naturalist, worked outside the boundaries of
anthropology, both criticizing, and being criticized by, those within the discipline. Merriam’s work continues to provide valuable documentation and insight into the lives of California’s Native peoples (Griset 1993).

These collectors offer just a glimpse into the extensive world of amateur anthropologists and collectors. While they did not have formal academic training in the discipline, their works and collections are still valuable scholarly and teaching tools. My thesis seeks to understand Anthony G. Zallio, and his collection as one that reflects the history of anthropology and collecting in north-central California and the Sacramento region. Zallio was an educated man, he was a published author on topics ranging from Italian language dialects to physical anthropology; he also spoke at scientific conferences (Towne 1976, Zallio 1927, 1935). Accession records, registration documentation and catalogs reveal that he amassed a large and varied collection. I propose that Zallio can best be understood as a contemporary of avocational men like Jackson, Hudson and Merriam, but one who collected to further his own, and his students, knowledge of the discipline and its early-20th century focus on Native peoples. These collectors made contributions to Native American ethnology and material culture, but because they were not trained as professional anthropologists, their works have largely been overlooked or intentionally ignored.

Collection documentation suggests that Zallio was an extensive and indiscriminate collector. He excavated, purchased and traded for the items he acquired. The collection housed in the Anthropology Museum and the Archaeological Repository at Sacramento State University includes a wide array of objects, including charm stones,
baskets, spear heads, stone pipes, shells, human remains, mortars and pestles, and clothing. Object origins span the globe, ranging from Arkansas to the Philippines, China, California and South America. Much like the classic naturalist of an earlier era, he collected animal, mineral and vegetable. But given the transitional nature of the early museum and Smithsonian ethnology in the late 19th and 20th centuries, it may well be that Zallio was informed by, and engaging in a distinctively American, four-field anthropology of Native America (Hinsley 1981). A central aim of my analysis is to determine the extent to which he and his collecting practices can be seen to embody this latter tradition.
Chapter 3
BIOGRAPHICAL PORTRAIT

In the early part of the 20th century, anthropology was still a new discipline and struggling to create its own professional identity. It was also becoming more visible in colleges and university museums, which were typically created to bolster an academic program (Collier and Tschopik 1954, Kroeber 1954). While this transition was happening in the metropolitan centers of the discipline, many anthropologists, whether formally trained or not, were continuing the practices of an earlier paradigm. Anthony Zallio, having been born and raised in Italy, came to the United States with a distinctly European worldview that would have been informed by a more classical archaeology, with roots in ancient history and oriented toward European scholarship (Chartkoff and Chartkoff 1984). Zallio would eventually adopt an American, four-field approach to anthropology, but he would stop short of embracing the reigning paradigm of the era in which he taught anthropology, one that was increasingly scientific and typically required academic specialization in one of the four fields.

PERSONAL BIOGRAPHY

Antonio Guiseppe Zallio was born on January 26, 1874 in the province of Piedmont, Italy. Based on photographic evidence, he was born into a relatively affluent family (Figure 4). He spent some time in the Italian Cavalry before eventually immigrating to the United States via Canada. Zallio traveled as a second-class passenger
on the SS Lake Manitoba from Liverpool to Quebec and arrived in Canada on November 7, 1905. From there he rode the Canadian Pacific Railroad to arrive in the western United States, where he initially settled in the San Francisco Bay Area. In 1908, Zallio moved from Berkeley to Sacramento, where he took a job as a foreman for the California Fruit Canners Association. He stayed on with the Fruit Canners Association until 1914, when he went to work for Libby, McNeil and Libby as a warehouseman. According to directories published by the City of Sacramento, he kept this latter job for only one year.

In 1915, Zallio became a partner in La Capitale, the weekly Italian language newspaper in Sacramento. La Capitale was in publication from 1907 through 1945, with Victor Panattoni listed as publisher (chroniclingamerica.loc.gov). In the registry of Italian professionals in California, Professionisti Italiani e Funzionari Pubblici Italio-Americani, Giovacchino V. Panattoni is listed as a royal consular agent of Italy in Sacramento. He was obviously a man of wealth and connections, and a man with whom Zallio would benefit from partnering. He was also the first president of the Dante Club, a social club serving the local Italian community (www.danteclub.com). Together, they published La Capitale and partnered as Sacramento-based steamship and real estate agents. This professional relationship lasted until 1919 or 1920. By 1920, Zallio’s name was no longer affiliated in the city directory with La Capitale, but it is reasonable to assume that he continued to be involved with the local Italian community. Perhaps his teaching career, which had begun in 1918, was starting to interfere with his work at the newspaper.

22 Center for Sacramento History 2001/093.
Based on the Sacramento City directories, Zallio’s career as an educator continues until 1947, when he is listed as a Grant Union High School teacher. He retired from Sacramento Junior College in 1940, and between 1942 through 1945 worked as an insurance agent for New York Life. Little is known about his personal life after his

23 Zallio is listed in the Sacramento City Directory as having been a teacher at Grant Union High School in Sacramento, but there is no mention of him in the yearbooks dated 1946, 1947 or 1948.
retirement from the Junior College. It is reasonable to assume that he continued to study
anthropology in his spare time, although he is also diagnosed with leukemia around this
time. What is not clear is whether or not he continued to excavate and collect after his
SJC retirement and diagnosis. Anthony Guiseppe Zallio passed away from complications
of leukemia at Alhambra Hospital in Sacramento, on April 1, 1951, at the age of 76
years. He is buried in the East Lawn Cemetery in Sacramento.

Zallio spent virtually his entire adult life as an educator in the Sacramento area.
He devoted his time to the study of anthropology, often dedicating “not less than 6 to 8
hours every day, Sunday included, to the study of Anthropology and its collateral
studies.” He began first as a teacher of adults seeking to gain U.S. citizenship. He
would later focus his attention on the education of young adults at SJC.

PROFESSIONAL BIOGRAPHY

Sacramento City directories, meeting minutes from the Sacramento City Unified
School District (SCUSD), and census records reveal that Anthony Zallio held a variety of
teaching positions from 1918 through April 22, 1940, when his services were terminated
due to the 65-Year Age Law. He started out as a teacher of naturalization courses
(Figure 5), but within a few years was promoted to the position of Principal for the

---

24 Information about Zallio’s death from leukemia at Alhambra Hospital was obtained through East Lawn
Record Number 31, 105. His funeral was held at the George L. Klumpp Chapel of Flowers on Riverside
Boulevard in Sacramento, CA. There are no known records of his services other than the date and time
shown in his obituary.
25 Letter, 16 August 1928, from Anthony Zallio to Alfred Kroeber, Department of Anthropology Archives,
CU-23, Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.
Lincoln Night School for Naturalization. In 1922, SCUSD lists Zallio as working one-third time for the Junior College as an instructor of both Italian and Fencing, employment he maintained until at least 1939 (Figure 6). He continued to work as the principal of the Night School until 1922, when he was released due to the discontinuance of the classes. While he was teaching for the Sacramento public school system, Zallio began taking courses at UC Berkeley. In 1926 he earned a Master of Arts in Italian.27 Beginning in 1929, Zallio’s primary entry in the City directories is as an instructor for SJC. However, SCUSD meeting minutes show he was also elected to teach naturalization courses in the Evening School from 1929 to 1931. From 1931 through 1940, only his employment as a professor at the Junior College is listed. It was during this time period that his relationship with anthropology in the Sacramento region emerged.

Sacramento Junior College saw its inaugural school year in the fall of 1916. The college occupied the top floor of Sacramento High School, then located at 18th and K. Due to World War I, the college temporarily closed its doors in 1918, reopening again at Sacramento High School’s new location at 34th and Y Streets. Six years later, in 1926, SJC moved to its own campus, opening its doors at the corner of Sutterville Road and Freeport Boulevard, where it remains today (Towne 1976).

---

27 CSUS Anthropology Museum Accession File 74-29.
Figure 5. Photo of Zallio teaching a naturalization course. Courtesy of the Center for Sacramento History.

Figure 6. Photo of the 1939 Sacramento Junior College Fencing Class. Zallio is seated first row center. Courtesy of the Center for Sacramento History.
Zallio began teaching at the Junior College, one-third time, in 1922. His initial appointments were in Fencing and Italian. Because he taught several subjects, Zallio was able to meet a wide range of students, and participate in many extra-curricular activities. In 1936, he made Sacramento Bee headlines for his role as a judge for a beard-growing contest (Figure 7). However, the subject of anthropology was clearly his primary passion on both a personal and professional level. Zallio taught a general anthropology and California Indian course for the first time in 1929, and continued to do so through 1931.

Figure 7. Newspaper photo of Junior College beard growing contest. Sacramento Bee March 27, 1936.
The following catalog year, 1932-1933, California Indian courses were less generically-oriented. While still broad in scope, Zallio focused on more specialized topics associated with California Indians, such as art, shell mounds, customs and tribal political systems (Towne 1976). In an effort to teach the most current anthropological information to his students, Zallio corresponded with Alfred Kroeber28 and Robert Lowie, both from UC Berkeley, regarding the topics taught as part of that institution’s California Indian curriculum.29 Zallio taught his courses in a general lecture format without a field work component. However, he did take his students on field trips to the Museum of Anthropology at UC Berkeley, and presumably to local sites for the purpose of solidifying the information taught in his lectures (Towne 1976).30

Until this point, anthropology was taught only in a classroom format despite the fact that both Zallio and Jeremiah Lillard, SJC president from 1923-1940, were conducting their own avocational excavations in the Sacramento region (Towne 1976). However, in 1933, this changed. In the fall of that year, the first archaeological field class was offered at SJC, funded in part by Federal Emergency Relief Act and National Youth Administration funds (Means 2011). Unbeknownst to the SJC Anthropology Department, their nascent archaeological program, the first of its kind in the state, would

28 Letter, 4 September 1928, from Alfred Kroeber to Anthony Zallio, Kroeber expressed that “Your program looks good to us and I should judge your prospects to be favorable.” Department of Anthropology Archives, CU-23, Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.
29 Letter, 17 November 1930, from Anthony Zallio to Edward Gifford, Curator at the U.C. Museum of Anthropology, Department of Anthropology Archives, CU-23, Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.
30 Letter, 13 November 1929, from Anthony Zallio to Edward Gifford, from Anthony Zallio to Edward Gifford, Curator at the U.C. Museum of Anthropology, Department of Anthropology Archives, CU-23, Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.
cement the importance of Sacramento Junior College in the field of California archaeology (Towne 1976, Watanabe 2002). The goal of this archaeology program, under the guidance of President Lillard, was to gain a “general insight into the archaeology of their area, and not a specific search for cultural sequence” (Heizer and Fenenga 1939:378). It is worth noting here that, according to Towne, although Lillard “was not an academically trained anthropologist or archaeologist, he had a deep respect for and interest in the American Indian” (1976:20). This was a pre-professional era of anthropology in the Sacramento region, since the only place in Northern California employing or formally-training professionals in the discipline was UC Berkeley. Nonetheless, Lillard was able to leverage his position as College President and his background as an educated person, having obtained both a Bachelor’s and Master’s degree from Stanford, to elevate the archaeological program at SJC to a somewhat professional status for that time period, as well as give impetus to the Lillard Museum (Towne 1976).

Beginning in 1934, Anthropology 2, the archaeology field class, was added to the catalog as a Saturday activity (Towne 1976). The field course was taught by Lillard and William K. Purves, a music teacher at the Junior College. Like Lillard, Purves had no formal training in archaeology, but was a hobbyist. Zallio continued to teach the general anthropology and California Indian courses (Towne 1976). In a contribution to a report outlining North American archaeological fieldwork conducted in 1934, Lillard noted that the Sacramento Junior College Anthropology Department was under the general direction
of himself and William K. Purves, curator of the archaeological museum and instructor in archaeology. No mention of Zallio appears in the report (Guthe 1935).

In 1936, Richard Reeve, who had taken some graduate work in anthropology while earning his doctorate in English, began to take a limited role in overseeing the Anthropology program at the Junior College. Dr. Reeve turned Anthropology 1A, “The Origin, Antiquity, and Races of Men,” into an interdisciplinary course taught by multiple professors including Zallio. This marks the first time a professor other than Zallio would have taught any of the anthropology lectures (Towne 1976). In 1937, a published study of course and degree offerings in Anthropology concluded that Sacramento Junior College offered between eight and 18 hours of anthropology courses and employed two members of teaching staff, both without rank in anthropology (Brand 1937). Dr. Reeve stayed at the Junior College until World War II, when archaeological excavations took a back seat to the war efforts. Dr. Reeve would eventually find his way to Sacramento State College, where he served as founding Chair of the Anthropology Department, teaching English and Anthropology until his retirement in 1964 (Towne 1976). As Chair of the Anthropology Department, Dr. Reeve would later oversee the donation of Zallio’s archaeological and material culture collections in July of 1951.31

By the late 1930s, the relationship between President Lillard and Zallio was strained. According to personal interviews conducted by Towne, Zallio was known for his poor record keeping skills and lack of respect for scientific practices. Zallio was quoted by former student Charles McKee as saying “Artifacts move around from level to

31 CSUS Anthropology Museum Accession File 74-29. Also see James (1956).
level in wet weather so record keeping is of little use” (Towne 1976:32). Lillard, on the other hand, knew the importance of diligent record keeping and wanted Sacramento Junior College to practice professional archaeology. This difference in view eventually led to tension between the two (Towne 1976). Zallio continued to teach anthropology courses and participate in excavations, but had no leadership role in the field classes. Because of Lillard’s desire for professionalism and high academic standards, in 1934 SJC won an award from the National Research Council for “their notable work in archaeology” (Towne 1976). Zallio’s failure to earn formal recognition as part of the College’s field research team did not deter his passion for excavation; he simply continued to dig on his own. In 1938, Zallio apparently authored a paper entitled “Origin of the Indians of America,”32 which he read at the convention of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, in San Diego. It was Zallio’s claim of finding a human cranium older than Cro Magnon man (approximately 30,000 years before present), that incited Lillard to sever all professional and personal ties with Zallio (Towne 1976).33

According to personal interviews conducted by Towne with former Sacramento Junior College students during the early 1930s, the relationship between Zallio and Lillard was visibly tense. Initially they had dug together as hobbyists, but Zallio’s apparent “lack of scientific practices” ultimately drove an impenetrable wedge between

32 CSUS Anthropology Museum Accession File 74-29.
33 Letter 13 January 1941, letter from Anthony Zallio to Leon J. Richardson, Director of University Extension. Here Zallio references his attempt to demonstrate that the Indians of America were not originally from Asia[sic], which is what he outlined in his “Origins of the Indians of America” Paper. University Extension Archives, CU-18, Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.
the two men (1976:19). Lillard wished to take the archaeological field program to a more
credible level that required the use of professional excavation techniques. However
professionally disappointing this turn-of-events may have been to Zallio, his collections
bear witness to the fact that he continued to collect objects of Native American culture,
amassing a collection that includes a significant cross-section of California Indian
materials.
Chapter 4

THE ZALLIO NATIVE AMERICAN BASKET COLLECTION

Throughout his tenure as a Junior College professor and affiliate of the Lillard Museum, Zallio had amassed a collection of numerous ethnographic and archaeological objects. In 1943, Zallio place an advertisement for his collection in Natural History Magazine, referring to it as being ideal for educational use. This along with a self-professed passion for learning makes it clear that Zallio used his collection in the classroom.\textsuperscript{34} If this were his motivation for acquiring objects, Zallio likely made his selections based on their teaching potential and pedagogic, versus artistic or commercial, value. His collection of Native American basketry is representative of both traditionally-made and used baskets and those produced for sale in the tourist and art markets. This component of his collection represents the second-largest basketry collection in the Anthropology Museum. It also represents the most varied in terms of cultural attributions, condition, and function or types of baskets represented.

As someone with such a varied collection, Zallio would have understood the value in baskets made for aboriginal use and collected for comparative purposes, but he also seems to have appreciated the significance of those baskets made for the tourist market. This is not to say that he taught comparative basketry or that he fully understood

\textsuperscript{34} Sacramento Bee 23 April 1932:5. This article discusses Zallio’s use of his collection in the classroom as well as for exhibit in the Lillard Museum.
the implications of a commercial market, but the broad scope of his collection indicates an ability to see beyond any single dimension of a basket’s production and value.

The tourist market for Native American baskets grew out of what has been referred to as the “basket craze” of the 19th century. This basket craze was an extension of the Arts and Crafts movement of the late 19th and early 20th centuries. This anti-modernist movement was particularly appealing to affluent individuals, although anyone who sought to renounce the increasingly commercialized sphere of production could participate in hobbies and related practices designed to valorize craft traditions as the antithesis of industrialization. Many Victorian women turned their attention to Native-made basketry as a means to preserve preindustrial hand-made items (Cohodas 1997). As more and more people sought to purchase these baskets to decorate their homes, the supply of Native-made baskets for traditional use was dwindling.

The market for American Indian baskets spurred Native women to weave, but instead of weaving for traditional needs, they wove as commodities for the art and tourist markets (Cohodas 1997, Washburn 1984). The most proficient of weavers were able to make a decent living with their skill; often securing enough to hand-pick their weaving obligations. Many of these weavers rose to prominence amongst crafters and had their wares exhibited for tourists in well-known store fronts, as well as in fairs and expositions (Smith-Ferri 1993).

While these baskets, and the women who wove them, were being sought out by white collectors, this newly-created market filled with baskets woven for non-traditional use began to influence the construction and designs of the “traditionally” made basket.
Native women began to combine aboriginal features, such as weaving techniques and colors, to innovate entirely new elements, such as commercially-popular designs or vivid colors achieved through the use of commercially-made dyes (Washburn 1984). Some collectors deemed these made-for-sale items less traditional and authentic, while others embraced them for either their affordability or their artistic appeal (Cohodas 1997). Zallio began collecting during this transitional period in the history of American Indian basket production.

INTRODUCTION TO THE BASKET COLLECTION

The Anthropology Museum’s entire basketry collection is housed in a locked, limited access museum repository within the space of the museum. This repository is climate controlled with an average, year-round temperature of 55° to 60° Fahrenheit. The lights in the repository remain off at all times unless there is research or work being conducted in this room. Each basket in the Museum’s collection is housed in locking steel storage cabinets manufactured specifically for museum use. Many of the shelves in these cabinets are lined with a cushioning layer of acid-free foam to protect against further deterioration of the baskets.

Each storage case is equipped with an inventory of the baskets shelf-by-shelf. In addition to this method of location, each BAS card also lists the location for individual baskets. The baskets are arranged in the cabinets loosely by culture area, although culture areas may overlap due to the need for oversize storage and other arrangement issues. For example, based on available shelf height of various cabinets, large burden
baskets from the Northwest Coast are stored in the same cabinet with baskets from California. This method of storage organization means that the Zallio Collection baskets are found throughout all of the eight storage cabinets in the repository. Because the location of each basket is written on the BAS cards and the door of each cabinet, locating baskets according to collector and/or donor is not particularly difficult.

The scope of the Museum’s overall basket collection is varied, but focuses mainly on the western United States. Most of the collections were generated in the early part of the 20th century. The collection methodology was as varied as were the collectors, themselves. The same holds true for the accompanying documentation and basket conditions. Each basket displays at least one handwritten archival tag, added in 2012, for the purpose of supplying all three identification numbers given to baskets by various museum staff and students throughout the years. Each tag represents, when applicable, the BAS number, the accession number and donor binomial. In instances where a basket also has an historic or otherwise valuable tag associated with it, such as a handwritten tag identifying a dealer, those tags remain. All other tags and labels (applied after museum acquisition) were removed to allow for one tag consolidating all identifying numbers.35

THE ZALLIO BASKETS

The Zallio Collection of Native American basketry is comprised of baskets from around the United States, but the bulk of these are from the California and Northwest

35 The author completed this work in 2011 as part of the inventory process. This work involved replacing a metal and wire tagging system introduced by P. Palumbo in 1964.
Coast culture areas. The Collection also represents an amalgam of traditionally-made and used baskets, as well as those made for sale to non-Natives. The condition of each basket in the collection is likewise varied, ranging from badly damaged to excellent. During the 1984 inventory, the condition of many, but not all, of the Zallio baskets were noted as ranging from “excellent” to “poor,” with occasional notations detailing types or areas of damage. The inventory conducted in 1993 does not record the condition for baskets, but does note whether or not they were cleaned during the early part of 1988. However, without a detailed description or photograph of each basket upon intake, it is impossible to tell if a basket was acquired and then donated in a particular condition or if the condition deteriorated after donation.

INVENTORY METHODOLOGY

The approach used to conduct the inventory upon which the present study is based was to begin with the most recent compiled data. Nonetheless, there are very few paper trails documenting earlier attributions, inventories, and cataloging events. For this inventory, each of the dated (1930, 1984 and 1993) and undated inventories, Zallio’s specimen catalog, all associated basket tags, as well as the various cataloging events for most collections in the Anthropology Museum were used. This comprehensive approach made it clear that information gleaned or recorded from one event was not necessarily carried over into the next inventory or numbering event, but rather each event seems to have occurred in near isolation from the others. A lack of continuation or cohesion
between events is apparent. Furthermore, there is often no indication as to why certain baskets, and not others, are attributed to Zallio.

In addition to the lack of continuity between inventories and numbering events throughout the years, the accession file also appears to be incomplete in terms of what information is stored in the museum registration files, versus documentation held in files in the Archaeological Repository. During the early 1980s, when the collection was divided between ethnographic and archaeological materials, so too was the associated documentation. For example, information regarding Zallio’s Master’s degree in Italian was housed in the Archaeological Repository and thus entirely unknown to Museum personnel, as no copy was placed in the accession file. Currently, both the museum and archaeological repository staff willingly share information about any given collection potentially divided between locations or intellectual categories. Nonetheless, one side must know there is information to be gathered on the other side, in order to request copies of it. What the splitting of the collection and its associated documentation has ultimately done is to create two separate sets of collections, leaving the original bereft of its singular history. To be sure, space, or lack thereof, plays a large part in maintaining the collection’s separation. However, one complete set of valid information about the entire collection is necessary for continuity, for the integrity of the collection as a whole, and for exhibition purposes. After delving into the records of the Zallio Collection, it became clear that for decades this collection has fallen victim to a propensity to discount the importance of objects of material culture not associated with an archaeological site.
Some of the earlier characterizations of this collection, such as its complete lack of scientific value, premised, in turn, on the assumption that Zallio had no intellectual ambition or academic training, could in part, have resulted from the disorganized nature of the paperwork associated with the collection. In addition to the lack of organization seen in the documentation, there is also a deficiency in the recordings that date to the donation. Because no detailed inventory was ever recorded for this collection, it is not surprising that there has been ongoing confusion surrounding it. The failure of department personnel to conduct a thorough inventory in 1951 has made it difficult to work backward to identify what objects truly belong in the Zallio Collection and which do not. The inadequate documentation of this collection over time has become the primary discourse surrounding its current disposition and valuation as limited and idiosyncratic.

The process of conducting a Zallio basket collection inventory began under the influence of this discourse. The assumptions of disorder and lack of any relevant information initially seemed to outweigh the prospects of uncovering new and germane data that could inform the larger research question. However, once the inventory was underway, it became apparent that applicable data was everywhere. By examining these baskets in detail, Zallio’s intentions in amassing such a collection became clear. The inventory was not easy to conduct, and there are still loose ends that may never be fully resolved, but what was learned along the way is that thorough and abundant documentation is not necessarily a prerequisite to determining collection value, significance and context.
FINDINGS OF INVENTORY

Appendix A details the quantitative and descriptive data generated by the Zallio basket inventory, but this process also led me to several related conclusions about both Zallio and his collection. First, a complete inventory of the collection did not perpetuate the earlier assumptions that the collection was haphazardly formed. Rather, the inventory process revealed that Zallio likely collected baskets based on guidelines set forth by his intense interest in scholarship. Instead of collecting anything he could get his hands on simply to develop a basket collection, he appears to have made his decisions based on what he thought comprised a good teaching tool. The inventory also revealed a man who had a generalized appreciation for basketry and was not focused on one culture area, basket function or context of production. His interests seem to have encompassed many aspects of basketry ultimately allowing him to offer his students a broader spectrum of related social and cultural knowledge.

A second outcome of the inventory process is the realization that Zallio was very much a product of his academic training. Although he was collecting during an era in which the driving forces behind most acquisitions was changing, his collecting practices were very much based on those of a previous generation, and informed by a four-field orientation to early anthropology. He had little formal anthropological training, unlike many anthropology instructors contemporary to him. Instead, he maintained a generalist’s approach to the discipline more characteristic of the era in which anthropology was institutionalized in museums. This generalist’s view of anthropology
is seen through the basketry collection in the high level of variability present in all its aspects.

A third outcome of this inventory process is the recognition that detailed information about each object’s acquisition is not necessarily required in order to draw relevant socio-historical conclusions about a collection. While detailed collector notes would seem critical to any analysis, they might also—as in the case of George Heye—reflect intentional deceptions and accidental errors. From this perspective, an absence of records can be seen as offering a cleaner slate. A thoughtful look into Zallio’s career in anthropology, and his life prior to becoming a professor, was instrumental in shedding light on his collecting motivations and practices. These insights would not have been achieved without a thorough investigation of the collection itself.

In addition to these realizations about the Zallio Collection, light was also shed on departmental collecting and record-keeping practices, both before and after the formation of a museum in the early 1990s. Accession records have not always been based on diligent record keeping and note taking. In fact, many acquisition records contain little to no information. The Zallio accession file, along with various numbering events and inventories, represent a time in museum practice when the focus was not on diligently gathering donor and related contextual information, but rather, on acquiring the objects, themselves. The concern was quantitative, not qualitative. Just as Anthony Zallio represents an era of anthropology long gone, the methods of record-keeping also represent a different era of museum goals and practices.
ANALYSIS OF THE ZALLIO BASKET COLLECTION

A full assessment of the Zallio Collection of Native American basketry cannot be accomplished without a detailed analysis of the baskets themselves. Individual examination of each basket within the collection generates details about cultural origin, function, condition, and possible identification markers that are critical to re-creating the context in which the collection was assembled. For this in-depth analysis, ten baskets were selected to demonstrate the variety of culture areas, functional forms and condition of Zallio collection baskets. Unassailable attribution to the Zallio Collection was not a criterion considered when choosing what baskets to feature, as there are very few baskets credited to his collection that are also documented in his specimen catalog. This level of certainty is impossible to achieve. In addition, baskets from the western United States were chosen due to my superior knowledge-base in basketry from this area. The specimens featured in the following analysis are listed in no particular order.

POMO MORTAR HOPPER

BAS 145 is a closed twined Pomo mortar hopper (Figure 8). There is one small, handwritten tag attached to this basket. One side reads “Pomo,” while the other side appears to read “Zallio,” but the writing is extremely faint. This tag could have been written by Zallio, but the word “Pomo” is printed and the only available examples of his

---

36 In 2008, prior to beginning the analysis of this collection, I began a mentorship with Ralph Shanks, noted California basketry scholar. This mentorship, as well as the three quarters of coursework taken at UC Davis, prepared me to begin the analysis process. While becoming an expert in Native American basketry analysis can take years, at a minimum, these courses and Ralph’s guidance allowed me to look more closely at the Zallio baskets in order to confirm any existing cultural attributions and to add more detailed information as well.
writing are all cursive (Figure 9). Additionally, the faintness of the writing leaves the origin inconclusive. There are two entries in the specimen catalog that might represent this basket, A141 and A142. Both read “Pomo Indian Basket,” which might also be in reference to this Pomo mortar hopper. In addition, there are only two Pomo baskets currently attributed to Zallio, so it is quite possible that one of these two entries represents this particular basket. However, Zallio is not listed as the donor in any of the past inventories or the BAS card. Nonetheless, the assigned binomial, 1-108, is another indication this would indeed part of the original Zallio Basketry Collection. The object identification number, 75-2-108, is from an accession file reserved for unknown donors.

The function of a mortar hopper is to keep acorn flour in the mortar as it is being pounded. Its center hole is unevenly cut and evidence of food residue is visible, showing that this was a traditionally used basket. Just above the center hole are approximately eight rows of lattice twining, fewer in some areas where the twining was worn away by use. Above the lattice twining are approximately 35 or 36 rows of plain twining, followed by another eight rows of lattice twining. This is followed by approximately 30 more rows of plain twining. The number of rows varies based on proximity to the start of the next section of lattice twining. Next is another six rows of lattice twining followed by three rows of plain twining. This is followed by four rows of plain twining over two weft rows, followed by three row of diagonal twining.

The slant of weft throughout the basket is down-to-the-right. The workface of the basket, the part of the basket facing the weaver as she worked, is the exterior with a rightward work direction. There are three distinct areas with geometric design elements.
Based on several areas along the rim that have been worn down, it appears as though the warps were trimmed at the rim and covered with a wrapped reinforcing rod, a feature typically crafted from wild grape. Background material is sedge root, while the red design is made using redbud. The lighter colored design element is likely made from split, baked pine root. Rim wrapping is typically made from wild grape (Shanks 2006). Based on the materials used and the multiple weaving techniques seen throughout the basket, this mortar hopper can be attributed to the Pomo. For having been used, this basket appears to be in good condition. There are several places where wefts or rim wrappings have been worn away, but overall the structure of the basket is intact, and outside of the wear around the rim, the overall condition of the basket is fair.

PLAINS MIWOK STORAGE BASKET

BAS 100 is a very large, coiled Plains Miwok food storage basket (Figure 10) which currently has no associated documentation to accompany this basket. Additionally, there are no references to a basket of this type in the specimen catalog or the three earliest inventories conducted on the collection (the first in 1930 and 2 undated listings). The object identification number, 75-2-88, indicates that the donor of this basket is unknown, as does the fact that Zallio is not listed as donor in any other inventory where this object appears. Only the binomial, 1-88, is indicative of this basket belonging to the Zallio Collection.

This type of basket would most likely have been used to store acorns prior to processing or for serving acorn mush. There is lack of food residue evidence; however
there are several dark spots on the very bottom interior of the basket, often indicative of burn marks created during the cooking process. The basket start is a tight spiral while the rim finish is herringbone with the coil end tapered and no backstitching. There are split stitches on the interior, or backface, of this basket, a trait commonly seen in Plains Miwok coiled baskets (Shanks 2006). The basket was woven in a leftward work direction also indicative of Miwok coiled basketry. The fag ends are concealed, while the moving ends are bound under subsequent weft stitches. One geometrical design is repeated both diagonally and concentrically throughout the basket, for a total of three design elements. The foundation is a three-rod type of willow, while the background material is sedge root and the design made from dyed bracken fern root and weft substitution. The cultural attribution, based on materials and weaving techniques, was confirmed by Ralph Shanks in 2010. Overall, this basket is in excellent condition and considered one of the highlights of the Zallio Basketry Collection.

HUPA BASKETRY CAP

BAS 39 is a closed twined, Hupa basketry cap (Figure 11). At this time, there is no known documentation to tie this basketry cap to the Zallio Collection. There are no entries in either the earliest inventories or the specimen catalog which specify any Hupa materials or basketry caps. There are, however, four entries in the specimen catalog that have not yet been linked to any particular basket. Two of those entries point to California

---

37 Ralph Shanks was a guest lecturer for Anthropology 196M, Museum Methods, during the spring semester of 2010. At this time, Mr. Shanks analyzed several baskets in the Museum’s total collection to help students in the class determine cultural attributions.
baskets with either an interesting or geometric design, but nothing specifying the northwestern part of the state. The object identification number, 75-2-49, indicates an unknown donor, while the binomial, 1-49, references Zallio.

The weaving on this cap is highly decorative, suggesting it is not a work cap, but rather a cap used in ceremonies or woven for sale. There is no evidence that it was worn (i.e. no hairs found in the weaving and no other use-wear), so it seems plausible it was in fact made for the tourist market. The rim finish is clipped very closely to the last weft row of the basket. This basket has an exterior workface and shows an up-to-the-right slant of weft, with a rightward work direction. The end of the last weft row appears to be missing, making this the only damaged area of the basket cap. This basket has a crossed warp start with no indentation. The weaving consists of alternating rows of three strand and plain twining from the base to the rim. The foundation is hazel or willow shoots and additional shoots were added into pre-existing weft crossings in order to enlarge the overall size of the cap. The weft background material is beargrass, while the designs are red-dyed woodwardia fern and maidenhair fern strands. This basket was woven using an irregular overlay, a characteristic of Hupa twined baskets. There are three areas along the rim with small breaks in both the warps and the wefts, but overall the structure and colors of this basketry cap have remained in excellent condition.

PAIUTE WATER BOTTLE

BAS 118 is a flat-bottomed, twined Paiute water bottle covered in pine pitch (Figure 12). There is very little documentation that accompanies this woven water bottle.
Attached to one handle of the bottle is a handwritten tag which reads “75 Piute water bottle.” The handwriting does not match any of the examples of Zallio’s script, and the items listed as number 75 in any of the early inventories do not match the description of a Paiute water bottle. While the bottle is listed in each of the Anthropology Museum inventories, Zallio is not listed as the donor for any of them nor on the BAS catalog card for this bottle. The object identification number, 75-2-91, indicates an unknown donor, but the assigned binomial, 1-91, ties this basket to Zallio.

This water bottle has two woven handles and what appears to be a leather carrying strap. Both the rim finish and the treatment of the end of the last weft row are extremely difficult to analyze due to the pitch cover. The twining technique is diagonal, with an up-to-the-right slant of weft twist and a rightward work direction. Due to the pitch cover, the type of start is also unidentifiable, but there is an obvious indentation in the location of the start. There are no design elements visible. The pitch is well worn in several areas around the basket but most prominently around the shoulder of the bottle. This is an indication of having been handled significantly through the years as the shoulder of the bottle is the most likely place for picking up this bottle. This potentially indicates significant use prior to Zallio’s acquisition. Although dirty and worn, the handle strap, which appears to be leather, is intact as are the two woven handles. The spout is also intact. Although the pitch is well worn, the overall condition of the basket is very good.
TWINED ALASKAN STORAGE BASKET

BAS 193 is a plaited and twined storage basket from Metlakahtla, Alaska (Figure 13). This twined storage basket has no associated tags or other documentation. Additionally, there are no references to a basket of this type in the specimen catalog or any of the early inventories. The inventories, as well as the BAS card, do not list Zallio as the donor for this basket. The object identification number, 75-2-47, attributes the basket to an accession file for unknown donors, while the binomial, 1-47 attributes it to Zallio.

The majority of the basket is plaited from the base until approximately 1.5” from the top, at which point there are nine rows of plain twining. After this plain twining there are two additional rows of plaiting followed by one additional row of plain twining and the rim finish. Within the nine rows of plain twining are two distinct decorative elements. The first is a 4.25” geometric design, while the second is the word “METLAKAHTLA” woven into the plain twining using a false embroidery technique. The rim finish appears to be bound down on the interior of the basket while the last weft row is bound down on itself. The slant of weft stitch for the plain twined section is down-to-the-right. The workface is the exterior of the basket and the work direction is rightward. The basket is woven entirely of dyed and undyed cedar bark. Typically, when weavers use place names as part of the design motif, it is a clear indication the basket was produced for the tourist market.

The top of this basket is misshapen, exhibiting an oval rather than circular shape which is more than likely due to improper storage techniques. There is one small tear in
the weft material at the rim, and a dime-sized spot of either an adhesive remnant or perhaps lacquer. Otherwise this basket remains in good condition. It seems probable that Zallio collected this basket, along with other Alaskan baskets in his collection, during his 1930 University of Oregon summer session cruise to Alaska, where he studied the art of Alaskan Indians with W.G. Beattie.38

KLAMATH LAKE BASKET

BAS 75 is a semi-open weave basket from the Klamath Lake area (Figure 14). Attached to this basket is a handwritten tag noting this is a “Klamath Lake Type.” The writing does not appear to be that of Zallio. On the reverse side the tag reads “unidentified.” Zallio is not listed as the donor on either of the Museum inventories or on the BAS card for this basket. In addition, there are no mentions of a Klamath Lake basket in any of the earlier inventories. The object identification number, 75-2-101, again indicates it is part of the unknown donor accession file, while the binomial, 1-101, attributes the basket to Zallio.

This basket stands 2” from base to rim, with a 2” diameter. The start is crossed warp with no indentation, and flexible warps here and throughout the basket. The rim finish appears to have been created by binding down the warp sticks on the exterior of the...

38 W.G. Beattie was well known in Alaska for the work he was doing in education. He served as the Superintendent of Indian schools for the Southeast Alaska region working under the U.S. Bureau of Education. He was the industrial director at the village of Metlakatla and worked for the Sitka Industrial School for the Presbyterian Board of Home Missions. In 1955 Beattie also published a book about Edward Marsden, a Tsimshian man who migrated from British Columbia to the Metlakatla colony and worked to become the first Alaska Native to be ordained a Minister. The CSUS Anthropology Museum houses at least part of the Beattie Collection of baskets and moccasins, Accession File 74-38.
basket. The last weft row is tied off with a strand of weft material. The slant of weft is
down-to-the-right with a rightward work direction and exterior workface. The fag ends
were added by laying them into existing weft strands while the moving ends were bound
down. Starting at the base, this basket consists of plain twining and cross warp twining
techniques. There are no design elements or signs of use. Materials remain unknown at
this time.

Based on the small size of this basket, it was likely woven for the tourist market.
The weaving on the open work portion of the basket tends to be uneven while the plain
twining tends to be more uniform. There is a small cordage handle at the very top of the
basket, which has been broken on one side. Otherwise, the overall condition of this
basket is good. The overall structure of the basket is flexible, which could be the sole
reason why its current cultural attribution is the Klamath Lake area.

SALISH BURDEN BASKET

BAS 169 is a coiled Salish burden basket from British Columbia (Figure 15). In
addition to the current identification tag displaying the BAS, object identification and
binomial numbers, there is one handwritten tag that accompanies this basket. It reads
“HLE” and is written on fabric adhered to the basket interior with adhesive. There is no
other mention of HLE in the records, but it is possible that these initials reference another
collector or broker. Zallio is not listed as the donor of this basket in any of the Museum
inventories, nor is a Salish basket noted in any of the earlier inventories. The object
identification number, 75-2-116, is again indicative of an unknown source, while the assigned binomial, 1-116, references Zallio Collection baskets.

The rim finish on this basket is plain wrapped, but the actual coil ending appears either broken or missing. The work face is exterior, with the work direction unclear due to the missing coil ending, but the Salish typically coiled rightward (Weltfish 1930). The basket is started with an oval start and no indentation is present. The stitches are non-interlocking and not widely spaced. There are split stitches on both the interior and exterior of the basket. Design elements consist of equally spaced vertical lines on the lower half of the basket and a horizontal band of geometric shapes on the upper half. The designs are made using a technique known as imbrication. Imbrication involves folding the decorative material under each sewing stitch on the exterior of the basket (Lee 2006). This basket and catalog card data was analyzed by Lawrence Dawson of UC Berkeley on March 4, 1983. Notes from this consultation indicate that the tribal group and culture area noted on the catalog card as “Salish from British Columbia,” were correctly attributed.

The interior of the basket has darkened considerably and appears to have some sort of residue making this a good candidate for having been used. In addition to the current identification tag, there are six areas on the basket that have small amounts of twine attached. These pieces of twine may have been added as a method of hanging the basket for display. In each case a small hole was punched into the side of the basket in order to push the twine through. Although the holes do diminish the overall quality of the basket, they have remained their original size and do not appear to have stretched.
addition to the holes, there are many areas on the basket where the imbrication material has worn away. Structurally this basket is in good condition, although much of the weft material is not in as good of condition.

POMO COILED BASKET

BAS 155 is a small Pomo coiled basket (Figure 16). There are no handwritten tags associated with this basket other than the current identification tag. In addition to the lack of tags, Zallio is not listed as source donor in any of the Anthropology Museum inventories nor on the BAS card. The object identification number, 75-2-112, would indicate an unknown source donor. However, the binomial, 1-112, reflects the Zallio Collection. There are currently two Pomo baskets attributed to Zallio and two Pomo baskets mentioned in his specimen catalog. It is possible that this basket is one of those two, making this one of the few baskets he recorded.

This is a bowl-shaped basket whose function is storage for small items. The rim finish is plain wrapped with a tapered coil ending with no backstitching. The majority of the background material stitches are split on the interior, while the design material appears to have very few split stitches. The slant of weft stitch is up-to-the-right, with an exterior workface and leftward work direction. The fag ends on this basket are concealed, while the moving ends appear to be bound under. The start is a tight spiral with no indentation. The relatively closely spaced stitches are non-interlocking. There is one flower design, made with a weft substitution technique that starts across the bottom of the basket with four petals extending to the rim. There are no signs of use seen in this
basket, which may be an indication that it was made for sale. This basket appears to have a single rod foundation of peeled shoots, most likely willow (Shanks 2006). The weft background material is sedge root, while the weft design material is dyed bulrush, which is the more common material used to create black designs. Based on the materials used, the fact that there is only one color employed to create the design, and the excellence in coiling technique suggest this is a Pomo basket.

Overall, this basket is in excellent condition and, regardless of its smaller size, another highlight of the Zallio Collection. While the Pomo made exquisite twined basketry, they are known more for their coiled baskets. BAS 155 provides a wonderful example of a Pomo weaver’s ability to create beautifully coiled baskets regardless of size.

MAIDU STORAGE BASKET

BAS 92 is a coiled Maidu storage basket (Figure 17). There are no associated tags for this basket. However, Zallio is listed as the donor in the 1984 and 1993 inventories as well as on the BAS card. The object identification number, 75-2-27, places this basket in the “unknown source” category, but the binomial, 1-27 signifies that this basket is part of the Zallio Collection. In one of the two early, undated inventories of the Zallio material, there is mention of a large Maidu storage basket, Z64. While this basket is not necessarily large, standing eight inches tall, it could have been the largest Maidu basket in this grouping of items. There is no specific mention of a Maidu basket in the specimen catalog, but there are four baskets that remain unidentified, with notations about geometric or interesting designs.
This basket is bowl-shaped with flared sides, meaning it was most likely used for food storage or serving. The rim is plain wrapped and the coiled ending is tapered with no backstitching. Both the rim and the rim wrapping are broken in several places. The majority of stitches are split on the interior with just a few split stitches on the exterior of the basket. The slant of weft is variable throughout the basket. The workface is exterior with a leftward work direction. The fag ends are concealed while the moving ends are bound under. The start is made up of a small bundle of shredded material that forms somewhat of a spiral, but not a tight spiral as seen in other coiled baskets. There are two rows of geometric shapes forming bands around the basket. These appear to be a variation of the millipede design (Dixon 1900). The foundation is likely 3 rods of willow shoots. Although both the basket interior and exterior are quite dirty, the weft background materials appear to be maple with redbud used for the design element. In several places along the design at the top of the basket, the typical redbud bloom is present. The design method on this basket is weft substitution. Lawrence Dawson analyzed this basket on March 4, 1983 and determined it to be a Maidu basket. The interior of the basket is covered in a residue that has darkened the weft materials considerably. The basket feels slightly heavy and the interior base of the basket is also worn in several places, further indicating that this basket has been used. There is a small piece of monofilament, approximately 7 inches long, secured to one of the exposed pieces of rim material. This addition most likely came after its donation in 1951 and was used as a method of securing this basket in a display setting.
This basket provides another example of a used basket in the Zallio collection. Sacramento falls within the larger Maidu territory; given Zallio’s proximity to local Native populations, he would have had many opportunities to be in contact with Maidu peoples and to purchase traditionally made and used items.

**SEED BEATER**

BAS 200 is a small, open work twined seed beater which remains unattributed (Figure 18).\(^{39}\) Except for the current identification tag, there are no known tags associated with this basket. Likewise, Zallio is not listed as the donor in either of the Museum inventories or on the BAS card. In fact, the only recorded information for this basket is that it is a seed beater, it is open twined, and from a California culture area. Additionally, there are no baskets in the specimen catalog described as seed beaters.

The warp sticks of this basket are trimmed at the tip of the handle with the very last weft stitch bound down on the inside of the handle. The workface is the interior, with an up-to-the-right slant of weft stitch and a rightward work direction. The basket is woven with plain twining and what appears to be willow for both warp and weft stitches. There are no designs or decorative materials. There are no obvious signs of use, such as left over seeds or wearing on one side or the other. There is, however, one hair embedded in a weft twist, although this is not necessarily indicative of traditional use.

Currently there is no cultural attribution for this basket. The BAS catalog card suggestion that this is from a California culture area should remain conditional until

\(^{39}\) While I have made every effort to fully utilize my training as well as course notes and books written by Mr. Shanks, occasionally a basket will remain unattributed until such time as it is examined by an expert.
analysis by a basketry expert yields a more specific attribution. This basket provides an excellent opportunity for students of Native American basketry to conduct further research.

NEW PERSPECTIVES ON ZALLIO

Based on my inventory and analysis, the Zallio Collection of Native American basketry exhibits both strengths and weaknesses. As a teaching tool, this collection is excellent. Because it includes baskets from many different culture areas, there are many opportunities for comparison in terms of materials, design and weaving techniques. This type of comparison is invaluable to students of Native American basketry, for whom the opportunity to see variations in technical details, materials, and forms is imperative.

In addition to the comparative value of the baskets, this collection also offers important lessons related to basket conditions and preservation. The baskets have largely been stored in the same way since the date of donation, but there are varying levels of condition, ranging from very poor to very good. While in just a few instances the damage is irreparable, these differences ultimately provide an opportunity for discussion relating to care and prospects for conservation protocols. Because these baskets have not yet been targeted for any conservation measures, it may be worthwhile to investigate grant opportunities.40

40 During his lecture in spring of 2010, Ralph Shanks discussed damaged baskets as providing an opportunity to inspect technical elements and construction of baskets that would not otherwise be available.
Overall, the baskets in the collection provide strong examples of the classic basketry forms found in the western United States. Although Zallio’s collection includes baskets from other areas of the U.S., the majority are drawn from the western states, including Alaska. Although central and northern California is represented, the Southern California region is not. The baskets from the Northwest Coast are also representative of the archetypal basketry from that region, including both traditionally made and used baskets, as well as those made for sale.

It is the variety of basket types and conditions that make this collection useful for exhibition as well. Museum personnel working with this collection can exhibit this collection, either whole or in part, based on a wide variety of themes. For example, in the fall of 2011, many of these baskets were exhibited in the University’s Library Gallery, in “Object Lessons: The Basket Collections of Joel S. Cotton and Anthony G. Zallio,” curated by myself and Terri Castaneda. Specimens from the Zallio Collection were shown alongside examples from the Joel S. Cotton Collection as a context for comparison of collecting motives. In this exhibition, the baskets were used as a means by which to discuss basket collecting and were not the focus of the show per se. Given the varied nature of this collection, there are many other contexts in which to exhibit these baskets.

Perhaps the biggest weakness of this collection is not the lack of documentation that accompanied it upon donation, but the lack of adequate record-keeping related to its legal and physical transfer to the Department in 1951, and about its disposition thereafter. The lack of continuity seen in the Department and Museum documentation, from the
moment it was accepted by Richard Reeve as a teaching collection, is actually a bigger culprit in the unrealized value of this collection.

Further conservation procedures are necessary for some of these baskets in order to bring them back to a handle-able state. This type of undertaking will be difficult for a few reasons. First, basketry conservation is a specialized skill and the number of people with this expertise is small. Additionally, the cost of such measures is typically prohibitive for smaller facilities, such as the Anthropology Museum, working on a tight budget. A long term plan for conservation and preservation, including funding sources, must be planned and implemented in order for the small number of damaged baskets to have their lives extended and be of greater use to the Department.
Figure 8. Pomo mortar hopper. H: 6", W at rim: 17.5". Courtesy of Carolyn Dean.
Figure 9. Handwritten tag fastened to Pomo mortar hopper. Courtesy of Carolyn Dean.

Figure 10. Plains Miwok storage basket. H: 14.5”, W at rim: 23”. Courtesy of Carolyn Dean.
Figure 11. Hupa basketry cap. H: 4”, W at rim: 7”. Courtesy of Carolyn Dean.

Figure 12. Paiute water bottle. H: 8”, W at rim: 1.5”. Courtesy of Carolyn Dean.
Figure 13. Twined Alaskan storage basket. H: 4.25", W at rim: 7". Courtesy of Carolyn Dean.

Figure 14. Klamath Lake basket. H: 1.5", W at rim: 2". Courtesy of Carolyn Dean.
Figure 15. *Salish burden basket. H: 7.75", W at rim: 13.5". Courtesy of Carolyn Dean.*

Figure 16. *Pomo coiled basket. H: 1.75", W at rim: 3.5". Courtesy of Carolyn Dean.*
**Figure 17.** Maidu storage basket. *H: 8", W at rim: 14". Courtesy of Carolyn Dean.*

**Figure 18.** Seed Beater. *H: 2.5", L: 14", W at widest part: 6.25". Courtesy of Carolyn Dean.*
Chapter 5
COLLECTING AT THE MARGINS OF PROFESSIONAL ANTHROPOLOGY

Documenting their acquisitions was not always first and foremost on the minds of private collectors (Krech 1999). Many did keep detailed records of their transactions, but most did not. Variations in degree of record-keeping seem to be related to the individual collector’s motivations in acquiring Native American baskets. For example, those collectors who were hoping to contribute to a larger body of knowledge, such as C. Hart Merriam, tended to record more data than those who were expecting to sell or trade their baskets (Griset 1993). During the last few decades of the 19th century and into the early part of the 20th century, North America was experiencing what Otis T. Mason dubbed “canastromania” (Usner 2012). This was in reference to the allure of American Indian basketry seen across the country, and particularly in California, where collectors could not seem to acquire baskets fast enough.

The methods by which people procured baskets varied, not only among individuals, but by decade as well. By the early 20th century, the role and professional standards of anthropology changed in such a way as to establish boundaries for what acceptable collecting practices were and what were not. Many collectors who had been successful up to that point were now excluded from the new, more professionalized form of anthropology. In some cases, we have fairly detailed accounts of the collecting practices and impacts, either positive or negative, that collectors had on Native
communities and the artifact market. For most, however, much less is known about the types of information collectors sought to obtain with the artifacts they collected (Krech 1999).

Despite the lack of extensive documentation, a thorough investigation into the Zallio Collection did reveal important information about how this collection of Native American baskets was assembled. In particular, some data was gleaned about the ways in which Zallio acquired some of his baskets. While it would be helpful to have a full range of notes to accompany the collection, enough clues were left behind to enable the creation of a broader picture of Zallio as a basketry collector, allowing for the juxtaposition of his motivations and practices, with those of other collectors of his day.

ZALLIO AS BASKET COLLECTOR

During the height of the basket craze, or canastromania, collectors seemed to be willing to do whatever it took to acquire Native American baskets, particularly since many collectors viewed baskets as a means to other ends, such as income, in the case of dealers like John Hudson (McLendon 1993) and Grace Nicholson (Usner 2012), or starting a museum (Kidwell 1999, Krech 1999), or educating the public about Native American culture (Parezo and Hoerig 1999), or for the purpose of data collection, as in the cases of C. Hart Merriam (Griset 1993) and Alfred Kroeber (Towne 1976, Heizer 1978). In many ways, Zallio was quite similar to other collectors who came before him and were contemporary to him. What seems to have set Zallio apart from most other collectors was the end result he sought to accomplish by collecting.
**Mode of Acquisition**

There were many modes by which collectors acquired Native American basketry, but the most common was to purchase it, either from a dealer or directly from a Native weaver. In fact, most of the largest and best known collections were amassed via purchases from auctions, through dealers or from local Native weavers (Jones 1978, Moser 1986, Slater, 2000). Individuals such as Dr. John Hudson and P.L. Young sometimes offered their services in exchange for payment in baskets (Mendelsohn 1985, McLendon 1993), but most baskets were acquired through purchase.

Because the Zallio Collection consists of a variety of culture areas, conditions and functions, his modes of acquisition would also have been varied. Two handwritten tags for Maidu baskets show that Zallio took advantage of local or regional auctions (Figure 2). In addition to buying from auctions, Zallio also made purchases from dealers, often inquiring about prices and stock.\(^4\) Noted in the specimen catalog are instances of purchases from dealers, such as Babylonian beads acquired in Berkeley during the summer session of 1928, and three ancient cuneiforms purchased from a man in Florida during the spring of 1928.\(^5\) For one basket attributed to Zallio (BAS 101), a Miwok cooking basket, there is a handwritten tag indicating the sale price for this basket was $5.00 (Figure 19).

\(^4\) Letter, 7 May 1933, from Anthony Zallio to Edward Gifford of UC Berkeley. Zallio had explained a desire to obtain a spear thrower, but without success. He inquired if Gifford knew the names of any dealers who might have a spear thrower for sale. In the absence of a spear thrower, Zallio was willing to settle for a reproduction of the spear thrower owned by Gifford, with funds for this purchase seemingly provided for by Lillard. (Letter, 10 May 1933, from Edward Gifford to Anthony Zallio) Zallio was informed of two different dealers in the San Francisco area who should be contacted concerning the spear thrower. Department of Anthropology Archives, CU-23, Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.

\(^5\) CSUS Anthropology Museum Accession File 74-29.
Close proximity to Native weavers allowed collectors to more easily acquire American Indian baskets. For example, many baskets were purchased directly from weavers when dealers or anthropological field workers were either living with, or nearby to, Native people. As did other anthropologists during the 1920s and 1930s, Zallio conducted his own field work, at least among the Patwin and Maidu tribes of central California. He was carrying out excavations in the Patwin area when he first saw a young Mexican girl with dark hair on her right arm, a condition he wrote about in “Curious Skin Anomaly” (Zallio 1935). It is reasonable to assume that since he questioned her extended Mexican family, that he also had interactions with the local Patwin people and possibly obtained artifacts directly from them, although there are no Patwin baskets currently attributed to Zallio.

---

43 This is the same young girl about whom Zallio wrote to Hrdlička about on November 17, 1930. National Anthropology Archives Washington, D.C.
The fieldwork Zallio conducted with the Maidu is evidenced by two jars of ground acorn flour that he obtained from “Chief Alex Blue of the Nishinan Tribe.” 44 It is possible that at least a few of the baskets from the Maidu, and perhaps the Miwok due to their close geographic proximity, were purchases made possible by the interactions offered to him during this fieldwork. Purchasing baskets during ethnographic field study was quite common during the early days of anthropology. C. Hart Merriam, for example, obtained many of his baskets through interactions with Native people whom he sought out for linguistic data (Griset 1993). These close interactions afforded Merriam the opportunity to record details about the baskets most other collectors did not.

Unlike Zallio, however, Merriam kept extensive records regarding his acquisitions. A catalog card was prepared for each basket in the collection, totaling some 1,300 specimens. These cards include information such as date, place and source of acquisition, Native terms for the basket form, any information known about the designs and materials present in each basket, as well as the maker’s name when known.45 Merriam also maintained extensive vocabulary lists of Native California languages, photographs and field journals (Griset 1993), certainly making his ethnographic field notes some one of the most detailed available.

44 The original tag is found in the CSUS Anthropology Museum Accession File 74-29. These jars of acorn flour are often used in outreach programs which teach about Native Californian lifeways. For this reason, the original tag is replaced by a reproduction on one of the jar lids.
45 This collection of baskets is currently used as the teaching collection for Anthropology 198 taught at UC Davis. This collection is also made available for research to the Native Community and non-Native researchers as well. The documentation that accompanies this basket collection is exceptional, although the same pieces of information, such as materials used, are not available for each and every basket. It should be noted that the baskets and copies of the catalog cards are housed at UC Davis while the original documentation is at UC Berkeley.
Sheldon Jackson, a Presbyterian missionary sent to Alaska in the 1870s, was another amateur anthropologist who amassed a large collection of Native American artifacts during the course of his missionizing and ethnographic fieldwork among Alaska Natives. As with Zallio and Merriam, Jackson was not formally trained in anthropology. As part of his missionary duties Jackson travelled the country, often settling in Native American communities, which gave him the opportunity to purchase Native made items. He saw these items as a means by which to make any additional money needed to further fund his missionary work. He also encouraged other missionary workers to acquire unique Native made pieces which could be used as a source of funding (Hinckley 1964).

Jackson acquired much of his collection directly from the local Alaska Natives, beginning his collection as soon as he arrived (Gunther 1976). Jackson gave paid speeches at which he sold many of these items, including baskets, to help fund his missionary work in Alaska (Lee 1999). Jackson’s collection eventually became so large that, in 1890, he founded the Sheldon Jackson Museum for the purpose of storing his growing collection (Hinckley 1964). Jackson also founded the Sitka Industrial and Training School, where local Native children could get a formal education while learning how to make traditional crafts, such as weaving and carving. Students often made replica artifacts that were sold to tourists, providing further funds for the maintenance of Jackson’s collection (Hinckley 1964, Lee 1999).

Trading services for Native made baskets was also a means by which to build a basketry collection (Mendelsohn 1985, McLendon 1993). John Hudson, M.D., was another early collector whose work is now considered part of the foundation of
anthropological knowledge about Native California. Hudson was a physician who settled in the area of Ukiah, California, in 1889. Soon after, Hudson began collecting Pomo baskets, perhaps inspired by his wife Grace’s existing collection. As a physician, Hudson often treated members of the local Indian population which gave him a unique opportunity to learn about their culture. In 1893, Hudson wrote an article entitled “Pomo Basket Makers” which was published in The Overland Monthly. At this time, Hudson’s article was the most comprehensive work on the subject of Pomo baskets (McLendon 1993).

Over the years, Hudson amassed a collection of over 320 Pomo baskets, as well as expertise on the subject. Hudson’s knowledge was so well known that he was approached by people such as the head of the Bureau of American Ethnology for information (McLendon 1993). By buying baskets, writing on the subject of Pomo baskets, and offering his knowledge to national figures, Hudson helped create a market for Pomo baskets. Hudson’s goal was to parlay this expertise into an opportunity to sell his extensive collection, which he eventually did, in 1899. The U. S. National Museum (now the Smithsonian Institution) purchased the Hudson collection for $3,200. This caused a rise in the monetary value of Pomo baskets and also a rush among other collectors to purchase such baskets, further contributing to “canastromania” (McLendon 1993, Usner 2012). Despite the fact that Hudson was not active in publishing and little has been written on his collecting and documentation practices, he has become well known for his knowledge of the Pomo baskets and culture of his time.
While many of these early basketry collectors predated Zallio’s years of activity by decades, they are still worthy of discussion. Each of these collectors was trained in the natural sciences, a commonality among collectors of the 19th century (O’Hanlon 2001). It was the natural sciences, botany, geology and zoology that informed their interest and collection methodology. This influence for Zallio is evidenced by the method in which he organized and catalogued his specimen catalog (see Table 5). This type of organizational schema was clearly the product of a background in the natural sciences, a background that was rooted in some combination of formal training and intensive self-study. Zallio shares in common many aspects of his anthropological and acquisition modalities with his predecessors. From his interest in Native American culture to his belief that human remains could lead him to unravel the mysteries of ancient culture, Zallio was a product of those who came before him. And because he worked on the temporal cusp of professional anthropology, perhaps he did not recognize the need to adopt a more contemporary method of collecting that would enhance the scientific value of his acquisitions.

*Motivations for Collecting*

It is not simply how baskets are acquired, but the desired goal of the acquisition process that often defines both the collection and collector. For Zallio, it is clear that the motivating force behind the amassing of such a large collection of Native American basketry was derived from his passion for education. While he helped to create the Lillard Museum, evidence shows he was devoted to the pursuit of education and not
simply to the development of a museum. While in operation, the Lillard Museum was well known for having an educational focus for both students and the general public. In fact, Tyler (1938) refers to this museum as being both a library and laboratory representing “the ideal of educational procedure” (p. 415).

For collectors intent on educating the public about Native American culture, value is often based not only in the knowledge embodied by the objects, but in the preservation and dissemination of that knowledge as well. Parezo and Hoerig refer to this type of collector as an educational collector (1999:204). In addition to Zallio, Ernest Thompson Seton provides another example of such a collector. Born in England in the 1860s, Seton came of age in the era of natural history as both an academic endeavor and social outlet. He studied art and eventually became a well-known natural history illustrator. Seton also published natural history articles in popular magazines of the day such as the *Auk* and *Forest and Stream* (Parezo and Hoerig 1999). Interested in the outdoors and the skills required to be successful there, Seton established a youth club aimed at adolescent boys. Integrated into this youth club was the “Woodcraft Indians,” a fictitious tribe of Indians who excelled at living off the land. The Woodcraft Indians were an invention Seton hoped youthful participants would learn from and emulate. Seton was also heavily involved in the debut of the Boy Scouts of the United States, in 1910, often integrating his love of Native culture into their programs (Parezo and Hoerig 1999).

During this time, Seton collected Native American materials in order to better teach the boys in his adventure club about Indian culture. Seton also created the Seton Village and founded the Seton Institute, which offered courses in subjects ranging from
natural history studies to “Indian crafts” taught by local Native craftspeople in association with a white instructor. The Seton Institute closed in 1940 due to a shortage of available instructors, most of whom were participating in the war effort. Seton Village, however, was maintained and became the home for his collection (Parezo and Hoerig 1999).

Although Seton saw value in diligent record keeping for his natural history collections, he did not carry that sentiment over to his ethnographic collections; there are no field or fiscal records that accompany his collection (Parezo and Hoerig 1999). As with the Zallio Collection, the Seton Collection was not properly inventoried during its inception or at any time it changed hands. It is probable that various pieces were either sold or given away after Seton’s death and those transactions never recorded. Also similar to the Zallio collection, the Seton collection is comprised of artifacts from diverse Native American cultures and not limited by a particular culture, geographic area or area of specialty, such as lithics or religious items. Seton was driven not by a desire to fully understand one Indian society, but rather by a need to collect and understand THE Indian (Parezo and Hoerig 1999). These educational and seemingly haphazard collectors were not anomalies but rather, plentiful enough in numbers to be considered by the newly professionalized anthropologists as somewhat of a threat to their own livelihoods and reputations.

As someone who used objects from his collection in the classroom, as hands-on learning tools, Zallio was clearly motivated in large part by an educational mission. Because there is an absence of evidence regarding a large-scale sale or trade of the objects in his collection, it is clear that Anthony Zallio recognized a greater value in these
objects than simple monetary worth. He saw the cultural and educational value in not only keeping this material, but in using it to educate others as well. In this way he had dedicated much of his adult life to attempting to augment society’s knowledge of Native American societies by continuing to excavate, collect, and contribute information to the pool of anthropological knowledge. Zallio was not required to amass a collection of Native American objects as a condition of his employment at SJC. He was not required to contribute even one artifact to the formation of the Lillard Museum. But he did understand the educational value of such objects, and by demonstrating their worth as educational tools, he disclosed larger motivations for collecting.

The collections of Dr. John Hudson, C. Hart Merriam and Sheldon Jackson served much different purposes than those of Zallio. These collections were ultimately secondary to other ends, be they raising funds, proselytizing, or functions of anthropological work, as in the case of Merriam. The Hudson Collection served as a means to generate capital, to fund the basket craze and to educate other scholars on the technical and cultural aspects of Pomo baskets. The Jackson Collection, when it was in the process of being created, managed to further Jackson’s goal of converting Alaska Natives to Presbyterianism.\(^\text{46}\) The Merriam Collection has served as research tool for Native California basketry and culture. In the long-run however, Jackson’s collection may be the one that offers us the richest glimpse into the often complex interconnections between Native peoples and white collectors (Usner 2012).

\(^{46}\) This was accomplished by simultaneously breaking down the existing value system and replacing it with 19th century Christian values. Missionaries often used Native artifacts to contemplate any distance put between Native peoples and their traditional ways.
Another area in which Zallio differs from other collectors, both before and after him, is in the types of baskets he collected. Many collectors, like Merriam and Jackson, preferred Native made, functional baskets over made-for-sale baskets (Griset 1993, Lee 1999). It should be noted that Jackson encouraged the Alaska Natives he lived and worked with to create reproductions of traditional-use baskets to sell directly to tourists, but the majority of baskets he collected were old and used traditionally (Lee 1999). Zallio’s collection reveals no preference with regard to tourist baskets or the more traditional basket. While a variety of basket types do make for great teaching collections, the lack of preference could also be indicative of a scarcity of opportunities to deal directly with Native people. Zallio did conduct ethnographic as well as archaeological fieldwork, but he may not have come into contact with many weavers. Furthermore, because baskets were typically woven by women, it may have been difficult for him to gain their confidence and not only to make direct purchases, but also to obtain cultural information about the baskets (Usner 2012).

While the preferences of some collectors are known, it remains unclear whether or not others were particular in their standards of acquisition, or just happened to have a large number of traditionally made baskets available to them. Collectors such as Mamie Reynolds and P.L. and Elsie Young were in a position to trade and barter for their services directly with weavers in exchange for baskets (Mendelsohn 1985, Slater 2000). This type of acquisition would have a direct affect on the sorts of baskets collected. These collections, comprised of most or all traditionally-made baskets, would have
ultimately been seen as having more monetary value than those comprised of made-for
sale baskets, and later seen as more valuable in the realm of anthropology (Cohodas
1997). It was not until relatively recently that tourist baskets were recognized for their
value as embodiments of changing basket design and construction, of cultural
intersections, and of the effects of a market economy on Native peoples (Cohodas 1997,
Shanks 2006, Usner 2012). Given that Zallio collected a wide range of baskets, quite in
line with the methodology of a generalist, he was not really practicing the anthropology
of his contemporaries. However, this divergence from a more specialized approach
during a time when many anthropologists were beginning to refine their focus, adds to
the appeal and value of the Zallio Collection.

ZALLIO AS COLLECTOR OF NATIVE AMERICA

Zallio was interested in all facets of Native American culture, from evidence of
the past to contemporary cultures. This continuum is seen in not only his collection, but
in his continuing educational efforts, as well as his publications. He collected to teach,
but also with the understanding that teaching does not happen only in the classroom but
in museums as well. His collecting practices were a product of an earlier generation of
anthropologists, and when examined more closely, it becomes clear that there was no one
else in the Sacramento region who shared his deep passion for material culture and
carried it into the classroom setting.
The Lillard Museum

Towne (1976) notes that while it seems that Zallio was increasingly excluded from the archaeological excavations sponsored by the Junior College, he was perhaps finding his niche as a museum professional. SJC opened its multi-disciplinary museum in January of 1935 with the official dedication on March 17, 1937. This museum was housed within the Junior College Library, built using Federal Emergency Relief Act funds (Tyler 1938, Towne 1976). Early on, Lillard, Purves and Zallio were seen as the driving forces behind the success of the museum (Towne 1976). The museum collections, formed mainly through field school excavations, and with the personal collections of Lillard and Zallio, were “carefully cataloged” and made available to Junior College students for further study (Tyler 1938). At the time, the museum was seen as a “library where students may see the evolution of civilization in California and the world,” and as a “laboratory where students may see and work with the materials of ancient civilizations and….draw conclusions regarding the trends of our own historical picture” (Tyler 1938:415). The collections exhibited for students to see and learn from were not simply a grouping of items, but rather an amalgamation of ideas arranged for their educational possibilities (Rae 2008). Tyler sets Lillard apart from other collectors of his day by painting Lillard as one who did not collect to sell or hoard, but with the intention of donating his excavated material in order for others to learn from it. In Lillard’s view,

47 According to a Sacramento Bee article, 23 April 1932, the Lillard Museum benefitted from the inclusion of the Zallio Collection, valued at the time to be worth $5,000 and consisting of thousands of pieces from around the world.
objects had value only when they became instruments of education, whether for Junior College students or the casual museum visitor (Tyler 1938).

As with most museums of the early 20th century, the multi-disciplinary Lillard Museum did not just house anthropological materials. Professors from other departments, such as Botany, Geology, and Zoology, also contributed specimens for study and exhibition. This was a well-rounded, scientifically-minded facility (Tyler 1938). This type of museum, which aligned anthropological collections with those of natural science, was not only common, but stayed true to the origins of museums both in its attachment to a place of higher education and in its interdisciplinary nature (Kroeber 1954). During this period, it was commonplace for the teaching collections of college departments to serve as the basis for campus museums. Also at this time, the field of anthropology was still largely classified within the ranks of science, so it is no surprise that the Lillard Museum shared its space with other campus departments (Coleman 1939).

Both Zallio and Lillard retired from Sacramento Junior College. Anthony Zallio’s services to the Junior College were terminated on July 1, 1940, as a result of the “65 year age law” in place at the time.48 One month later, Jeremiah Lillard stepped down as President of Sacramento Junior College, most likely due to failing health (Towne 1976). The Lillard Museum was dismantled sometime after July 1, 1940, the date of Lillard’s retirement. The incoming College President did not share Lillard’s vision for the anthropology program, and ultimately converted the museum space into classrooms

(Towne 1976). If Zallio had been on better terms professionally with Lillard at the time of their retirement, perhaps his collection might have been donated to UC Berkeley in 1942, along with Lillard’s collection. Lillard’s collection was donated by the Board of Education with arrangements being made by Robert Heizer and Franklin Fenenga (Towne 1976).

A few years after his retirement, Anthony Zallio placed an ad in the September 1943 edition of Natural History magazine (Figure 20). He sought a buyer for his California Indian material, which he touted as being “ideal for a museum exhibit or for educational purposes” (page 51). The fact that Zallio was aware of the educational and exhibition value of his collections aligns his intentions with those of Lillard. Zallio could have easily found buyers in the Sacramento or Bay areas of California to purchase it piecemeal or as an entire collection. Dealers were plentiful and he had been in contact with at least a few.49 He chose, however, to seek out the right type of buyer who would continue with and build from the importance of his collection as an educational tool. Ultimately, he did sell off individual items from his vast collection to various people and dealers (Towne 1976). However, the bulk of his collection has come to rest at the Sacramento State Anthropology Museum, where it has a life as an educational resource in the classroom and museum exhibits, and holds much still untapped research potential.

49 Letter, 7 May 1933, from Anthony Zallio to Edward Gifford, and Letter, 10 May 1933, from Edward Gifford to Anthony Zallio. Department of Anthropology Archives, CU-23, Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.
Museum Collections as Institutional Resources

Collecting objects is a timeless tradition that spans all geopolitical, ethnic and religious boundaries (Baudrillard 1994). What ultimately distinguishes one collector from another are the items for which they demonstrate passion and the manner in which they obtain and care for them. While many collectors may focus on the same class of objects, such as Native American artifacts, no two collections are ever exactly the same. What motivates people not only to collect objects, but to amass so many that entire rooms or buildings must be devoted to their treasures?

Collecting is a pastime that enters our consciousness during childhood. Collecting, and collections, are used as a means by which to explore and establish control over the world that exists outside of ourselves and to discover our own place in that world. Collecting offers opportunities to physically handle, sort, and learn from objects
(Baudrillard 1994, Pearce 1993, Potvin and Myzelev 2009). Anthony Zallio would have been in his mid-thirties when he moved to the Sacramento area and in his mid-fifties by the time he began teaching anthropology. The earliest recorded date for an item collected by Zallio was the summer of 1928, when he was 54 years old. Because Zallio did not write detailed notes about every item obtained, we have no proof that his first recorded acquisition was his first collected object. He may have been collecting for years prior.

As someone who was informed by natural history and the scientific realm, the act of establishing a collection would have afforded Zallio the opportunity to instantiate his sense of belonging to scientific and scholarly worlds. Collecting offers many contexts for negotiating identity, whether based on economic status, social position, or residence in the metropole or periphery, i.e. the Bay Area versus Sacramento Valley (O’Hanlon 2001, Potvin and Myzelev 2009). Given that Zallio was not only a local educator, but also a businessman, it is reasonable to assume that his desire to demonstrate a metropolitan identity was at least a partial motivator for his collecting habit. At the same time, the organization of his handwritten specimen catalog clearly exhibits a need to classify objects. This act and system of classification, both particular and personal, allowed Zallio to assign spatial and temporal meaning to the world around him, something that often happens at the subconscious level (Stewart 1994). But this recognition calls for an

---

50 After the age of twelve (i.e. around puberty) or so, the urge to collect dissipates and collections often fall by the wayside until adulthood when an interesting pattern emerges for men in their forties, which Baudrillard (1994) suggests is a projection of erotic passion that during earlier life stages would be satisfied through other kinds of “possession.”
analysis of Zallio’s collection as a broader corpus of North American materials, wherein basketry represents only a numeric and typological fraction.

O’Hanlon has identified three categories of collecting: primary, secondary and concomitant (2001:12). Primary collecting involves working within a specific and well-designed plan for object acquisition. An example of this type of collection would be C. Hart Merriam’s collection. Merriam sought out only functional and traditionally-made, California Indian baskets, preferring not to purchase made-for-sale baskets. This type of biased collecting was surely based on careful considerations and a well-thought-out methodology. Secondary collections are the result of collecting as a goal, but one that is ancillary to a larger, more primary purpose. The Sheldon Jackson collection of Alaskan artifacts serves as an example of a secondary collection, since his primary goal was the conversion of Native Alaskans to Presbyterianism. Collecting their sacred artifacts (which he labeled as examples of “paganism”) and other items of material culture was a means by which to support his proselytizing (Hinckley 1964, Lee 1999). The final type of collecting practice is concomitant collecting, those collections that are formed as a consequence of other unrelated activities (O’Hanlon 2001). Many of the objects collected during scientific expeditions to new and unchartered territories were concomitant creations. Objects were often traded with the Native populations as a means of assuaging hostilities and potential violence between the white explorers and the people native to these uncharted lands. Both explorers and Native peoples collected and created concomitant collections (Henare 2005). Concomitant collectors are less invested in objects as pure or exemplary. However, it is this category of collected object that has the
most potential to embody an authentic record, by instantiating the complexities of the
moment at which they were created or collected. Any given collection can be a product
of more than one category of collecting practice; they are not mutually exclusive
(O’Hanlon 2001).

Because interviews with Zallio about his collecting practices were never
conducted or published, we can never say with absolute certainty what his motivations
were. However, we do know that he collected Native American objects, taught
anthropology, and used much of his collection in the classroom. Based on this evidence,
his collection would fall into the category of secondary collecting. He collected objects
to support his larger goal of educating students about Native American lifeways.51 He
could have taught his students by using text books and lectures alone, but he chose to
collect ethnographic and archaeological material as a means to teach by example.

Zallio’s collecting methodology followed the 19th century mode of collecting to
demonstrate and explain diverse social and culture traditions. This era of anthropology
would undoubtedly have been the one that informed Zallio’s vision of the anthropological
enterprise. The tradition of collecting and categorization practiced by Zallio is a direct
extension of the natural history methodology that initially informed anthropological study
(Pearce 1993). But even the most prodigious collectors and adept ethnographers or
archaeologists, backed by the largest and leading anthropological institutions of the day,
did not gather contextualizing information in quantities equal to the artifacts they

51 This claim is supported by an article that appeared in the Sacramento Bee on 23 April 1932. This article,
written about Zallio’s collection, states that Zallio supplemented his text book teaching with pieces from
his collection.
collected (O’Hanlon 2001, Parezo 2006). For a great many of these early anthropologists, the very same ones who would later inform Zallio’s anthropological methodology, artifacts were viewed simply as “self-sufficient scientific specimens” that needed no further mention of the “political and economic circumstances in which they had been gathered” (O’Hanlon 2001:2).

This is not to say that robust documentation was not encouraged by museum directors and heads of government agencies who oversaw the collection of artifacts. Collections amassed without appropriate documentation, the standards for which often differed from one institution to the next, were seen as delegitimized and having not much more value than an amalgamation of pot hunting expeditions (O’Hanlon 2001). But to the anthropologists of the late 19th and early 20th centuries, artifacts and objects of material culture were perceived as carrying with them a fundamental representation of the culture from which they were drawn. In other words, that these objects were the embodiment of a culture in its entirety, a part standing in for the whole; the object served as a metonym for the culture of origin (Lee 1999, O’Hanlon 2001, McVicker 2004, Stewart 1994). Under such a paradigm as this, anything more than basic documentation must have seemed excessive to the collector.

In 1929, when he began adding more data to his specimen catalog entries, Zallio seemed to turned a corner in his professional understanding of the role of material culture and archaeological artifacts. Perhaps beginning with his correspondences with faculty and staff at UC Berkeley in 1928, two years prior to developing a similar relationship with Hrdlička, Zallio would have begun to feel the influence of these professionalized
institutions and anthropologists, and attempted to emulate the standards of work emanating from the scholarly metropoles. Prior to this, Zallio’s catalog entries included a bare minimum of information, which seems to follow a logic that sees objects as self-sufficient and cultural metonyms. But once Zallio began a professional relationship with the leading anthropologists of the day, he clearly began to realize that material culture could embody a more complicated set of data. Statements such as “Because I understand their art, I can better understand them, and with them, their ideas and ideals” prove that Zallio not only had an understanding of the multiplicitous meaning that objects held in a culture, but he understood that importance of furthering his education in his chosen field of study and instruction.52

What was not recognized by anthropologists and collectors at this time is that the very act of acquiring these objects stripped them of any original meaning they may have once possessed (Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 1998). The very act of possession deprives objects of their original function (Baudrillard 1994). Once collected, an object becomes defined by the possessor, who ultimately creates a collection in which all objects become analogous. Instead of bearing original meaning, collected objects become representative of the collector’s acquisitive accomplishment (Baudrillard 1994). That accomplishment serves as the justification and logic for travel or costly purchases, the development of relationships with Native peoples, and the rationale for conducting one’s own archaeological excavations.

52 See the Zallio 1930 term paper in Accession File 74-29.
These accomplishments or experiences are authenticated by the objects that are souvenirs of these experiences. Whether for private collectors or those working on behalf of institutions, souvenirs come to represent a singular event the circumstances of which cannot be duplicated and, therefore, exist only through personal, scholarly or historical narrative (Stewart 1994). Both the acquisition event and the very encounter of “others” with Native American societies serve as examples of “events” from which souvenirs must be collected. These souvenirs then acquire value based upon their removal from a place of origin and upon the collector’s nostalgia for the context of removal (Stewart 1994).

Just as anthropologists developed new techniques for conducting research and applying meaning to their work, the meanings associated with collections change over time as well. At its inception, the Zallio Collection provided “evidence” of Native American societies and traditions. The collection had meaning as a teaching tool, museum specimen and corpus of academic activity. Following its donation to Sacramento State College, the Collection took on new meaning. No longer was it the collection of the professor/collector, but rather the collection of a former professor and by-gone era in local and regional anthropology. By the early 21st century, the meaning of this collection had largely (and simplistically) come to represent only poor collecting practices. In this way, the Zallio Collection, like all collections, has become a palimpsest, wherein meaning is erased over time and re-written with each successive registration method, exhibit concept and idiosyncratic curatorial view (Erikson 2002).

Compelled by a strong desire to educate the public, Zallio collected as a means to provide illustrative material in the classroom and to better understand the leading theories
of the day (Parezo and Hoerig 1999). This is evidenced by the multiple images, in Zallio’s photograph album, of Ualda Luna, whose skin anomaly he wrote to Hrdlička about and documented in the American Journal of Physical Anthropology in 1935. Zallio not only took copious notes about her condition, but acquired photos of her as empirical evidence. While his interpretation of the skin condition was rooted in 19th century science, the methodology and empirical evidence Zallio deployed to pursue that science demonstrates his efforts to participate in the production of scholarly knowledge.

Using collections as pedagogic tools was common to anthropology and museums during Zallio’s era. In fact, even the earliest museums, whether affiliated or not with a university, recognized their important role in educating the public; a goal accomplished, in part, by providing the public with academic lectures that utilized collections as hands-on learning tools (Collier and Tschopik 1954, Forbes 2008, Peabody 2008). University museums, in particular, felt an obligation to share their collections in ways that would demonstrate the findings and value of anthropology to the public. Prominent American universities and anthropology departments were shaped by museums and the collections they housed, and these museums were regularly staffed by trained anthropologists who held curatorial positions (Collier and Tschopik 1954, Kroeber 1954).

In addition to educating the public on a larger scale, museums were also able to teach individuals regardless of academic training, or experience. Collections brought the researcher’s life and world closer to the public. Even incomplete collections gave students and the wider public a means by which to encounter worlds to which they would

---

53 See object 74-29-12, CSUS Museum of Anthropology.
not otherwise “travel” (Peabody 2008). Through such virtual journeys, students learn to recognize meaning and value in objects, raising even the most mundane of them up from the category of insignificant (Forbes 2008). This understanding of museum collections as pedagogic aids and embodiments of scholarly activity is what set many of the early museum anthropologists apart from pothunters of the same era.

The handwritten Zallio specimen catalog provides an overview of the artifacts likely used to augment classroom lesson plans. This catalog, divided into sections based on a natural history approach, shows a wide range of objects, such as “anthropological,” “flora and fauna,” as well as “minerals” and “cast models,” each of which was featured in the Lillard Museum (Table 5) (Tyler 1938).

Zallio in Disciplinary Perspective

Zallio began his excavations, collecting and exhibition practices during a transitional time within the discipline of anthropology. His practices are reflected not only in his personal collection, but in that of the Lillard Museum as well, and are paralleled in late 19th and early 20th century disciplinary era in which Zallio would have learned a rationale and methodology for conducting fieldwork among Native Americans.

At the time, anthropology was a burgeoning field of study. Born out of various fields of the natural sciences with far deeper historical traditions, anthropology was

---

54 The recorded entry dates for this catalog are between 1928 and 1929. There are many entries which are not dated. The artifacts entered into this catalog could have been the foundational materials needed to start the Lillard Museum. Because the Lillard Museum did not open its doors until 1935, it is unlikely this catalog is a strict reflection of the collections housed there. More likely, the artifacts in the catalog provided much of what was used for initial exhibitions. The notations regarding purchases by Lillard do demonstrate the more friendly relationship between Lillard and Zallio.
without a unifying protocol and methodology (Cole 1985). Disparate views of how objects of material culture should be classified and exhibited created roadblocks for even the earliest attempts at museum formation. This lack of unification regarding methodologies ultimately created an intense competition in America over the acquisition of Native American and Canadian First Nations artifacts and cultural specimens (Cole 1985). While there may have been an absence of structure and boundaries, the study of Native Americans was, initially, an untapped resource in terms of data collection (Hinsley 1981).

Nonetheless, early anthropology in the United States had roots planted firmly in the study of Native Americans (Conn 1998). From language studies to craniometry, the scientific community was fascinated by and appropriated Native peoples and cultures as national and scholarly patrimony (Hinsley 1981). It was not until after the turn of the twentieth century that some American anthropologists began to direct their attention toward other cultures and potential research subjects. It was hoped that this expansion of field locations would propel the fledgling discipline into a more mature realm of inquiry (Conn 1998), but many kept their attention trained on the “Other” that was figuratively and literally in their own backyard.

It comes as no surprise that Native Americans represented such an intense area of interest for early anthropologists. It was Franz Boas, himself, who claimed that within the first few decades of the 20th century, Native American tribes would completely disappear. He felt so strongly about this that one of his research ventures was named “The Vanishing Tribes” project (Cole 1999). The anticipated extinction of Native
Americans made ethnology not only extremely important, but also a potentially short-lived field of study (Hinsley 1981). While archaeologists, especially those from the Old World, assumed a mission of collecting evidence of a buried human past, ethnologists saw themselves as the rescuers of evidence of cultures that were sure to perish under the pressures of colonization and assimilation (Cole 1985, Jacknis 1993a, 2002, Krech 1999, Sturtevant 1999). In this way, anthropology retained a critical concept from its origins in natural history: extinction (Conn 1998).

In the late 19th century and very early 20th century, science-oriented museums were seen as critical features of major metropolitan regions. Many of these museums featured anthropological exhibits incorporated under the rubric of natural history (Asma 2001, Cole 1985, Rydell 1984, 2006). World fairs helped propel anthropological research and exhibitions into their own disciplinary museum departments, enabling a measure of scholarly autonomy. The 1893 World’s Columbian Exposition in Chicago housed both indoor and outdoor exhibits of Native American artifacts and living people; each component’s development was managed by Franz Boas (Thoreson 1975). These exhibits comprised hundreds of objects from many collections, both private and public (Cole 1985, Rydell 1984, 2006). By the time the fair opened, anthropology had already begun to emerge as a distinct scholarly realm, and although world fairs were important vehicles for anthropologists to engage in scholarly research, because the discipline was introduced to the wider populace through the material culture and artifacts of the exotic “Other,” anthropology became institutionalized in the public consciousness as an object-based discipline (Conn 1998).
At the close of the Chicago fair, many of the artifacts and objects of material culture came to rest at the newly formed Field Museum, helping to set in motion a collecting frenzy and competition among major museums (Cole 1985, Rydell 1984, 2006). Large scale expeditions were launched to collect artifacts and cultural information for new and established museums. During this era of anthropology, a chief objective of the discipline was material accumulation (Thoreson 1975). During the Jesup Expedition to the Pacific Northwest Coast, Boas directed the acquisition of more than 6,000 ethnographic items and close to 2,000 physical anthropology specimens (Cole 1985). Boas focused much of his own attention on collecting skeletal material, much of which he obtained from local graves. Boas found that digging up graves and taking bones was on some level contradictory to the type of work he preferred to do, but felt that ultimately it had to be done, since skeletons were valuable both monetarily and scientifically (Cole 1985, Platt 2011).

Physical anthropology was as important to Boas as the material culture, language and mythology of Native Americans (Hinsley 1981) and he was not above pilfering Native American grave sites in order to collect it. In instances where he was trying to gain the trust of a local Native population, he would refrain from taking cranial measurements of the living, and dig graves instead (Cole 1999, Platt 2011). He also contracted with others to do this excavation work and to purchase existing collections of crania and complete skeletons (Cole 1999). Boas, who is well known for his theory of cultural relativity, put his research and the results he was looking for ahead of any distaste for grave-robbing and knowledge that respect was due the deceased. But Boas
was not alone. This type of data collection was common, especially during the 19th and early 20th centuries.

One reason for the regularity by which such practices were promulgated was that premier anthropological organizations such as the Smithsonian Institution, through official publications, directed their fieldworkers to collect human crania as a means to study the physical difference between supposed races of people. The Smithsonian, like most other scientific establishments of the day, was concerned about “vanishing races,” and sought to collect as much data as possible before Native Americans disappeared (Erikson 2002). The Smithsonian was not interested solely in human remains, but instructed its agents to acquire a wide range of manufactured items, such as weapons, clothing and baskets. Field workers were encouraged to be creative if necessary in order to obtain these items (Erikson 2002).

Trained anthropologists were not the only people, educated or otherwise, who collected Native American objects during this period. One of the best known collectors of Native American specimens was George Gustav Heye. Born in 1874, in New York, he collected nearly 700,000 items of Native American origin, referring to this collection as “The Heye Museum” long before such a place existed (Carpenter 2005, Duncan 2000). Heye’s first purchase occurred while he was stationed in Kingman, Arizona, as a construction supervisor for a mining company. Trained in electrical engineering, he became one of the most active collectors of Native American objects. He was as well known for under-cutting the asking price of objects and for overcharging those who purchased his own pieces (Carpenter 2005, Duncan 2000).
Heye eventually opened a private museum, The Museum of the American Indian (MAI), so that his massive collection would have a permanent place of storage. During the museum’s inception, Heye was often at odds with Franz Boas over a lack of scientific procedure on Heye’s part and the damage Boas felt Heye would do to anthropology, especially at Columbia, where Boas had established a collegial relationship with the American Museum of Natural History. Boas felt Heye’s collection should go there (Carpenter 2005). Heye was not interested in what Boas, or anyone else, felt about how he conducted anthropology or business. Born into a wealthy family, he was used to getting what he wanted. George Heye’s private collection was opened to the public in 1922 (Carpenter 2005).

Although Heye was not a trained anthropologist, he hired some of the best anthropologists of the day, including Lt. George T. Emmons, Junius Bird, Frederick Hodge and Frederick Dockstader (Carpenter 2005, Duncan 2000). Nonetheless, Heye was not known for consistently-honest business dealings, and regardless of the quality of work his anthropologists did, Heye altered paperwork to suit his needs, frequently adding or deleting information about individual pieces after a sale was complete (Carpenter 2005, Duncan 2000). While Heye may not have had a direct effect on anthropology, he did affect how Native people viewed those who desired to purchase their works. Heye’s private collection became the property of the Smithsonian Institution, in 1989, and forms the core collection of the National Museum of the American Indian. During this period of institutional transition, many discrepancies between material culture and associated
documentation came to the forefront. Many of these disparities have yet to be resolved (Carpenter 2005).

Although Zallio’s collecting seems to coincide with his move to Sacramento, his methodology parallels that of early collecting traditions in the U.S. Based on his handwritten specimen catalog, Zallio collected lithics, animal bone tools, skeletal material, cast models, stones and fossilized fauna. 55 These specimen categories are shown in Table 5.

Table 5: Categories of entries reflected in specimen catalog

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Number of entries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anthropological</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flora Fossils</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fauna Fossils</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mineral</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cast Models</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Zallio notes that many of the lithics, animal bone tools and skeletal material were collected in or near the Sacramento area between 1928 and 1929. Jacknis argues that “all the collectors who aspired to the status of ethnologist documented their collections” (2002:48). While he maintained a specimen catalog, Zallio neglected the contextual information that, by anthropological standards, was associated with each object. Boas, on the other hand, knew the importance of specimen documentation and was adamant that each object in his collection have its own “story” recorded. For Boas, the value of an

55 CSUS Anthropology Museum Accession File 74-29. Specimen catalog not accessioned.
artifact was determined by accompanying documentation (Jacknis 2002:49). The vast majority of objects in Zallio’s collection are storyless.

Instead of recording “stories” or texts associated with his objects, Zallio followed a more generic scientific practice in terms of the information entered in his catalog. For most entries, Zallio recorded the name and materials of the object, and the location from which it was extracted. This might include an archaeological site, county, city, state or simply the culture area from which the object was removed from. For example, for entry number A 97 on page 12 of his catalog, Zallio writes “Charred Bone. Freemont Mound. Aug. 28-28. NB. This mound is no longer in existence, being washed away by the Feather River at its mouth.” While there are a few entries with just one or two descriptive words (i.e. “blade” or “obsidian spear head”), most entries include, at a minimum, the state in which the object originated.

This type of catalog entry does, however, make sense for the type of archaeology in which Zallio seems to have been engaged, one that was coming to a close within the discipline, but still reigned in provincial arenas and the popular consciousness. Known as the Classificatory-Descriptive Period in American archaeology, this period lasted from 1840 until roughly 1914 (Willey and Sabloff 1980). As the name suggests, archaeology during this period was focused on the discovery, description and classification of artifacts and cultures. It was during this time that a connection between American archaeology and anthropology was forged, both academically and in the field (Willey and Sabloff 1980).
Sacramento Junior College’s archaeology was in full swing during the Classificatory-Historical Period, which spanned 1914-1940. Based on his specimen catalog and the years he was known to be active in the field, Zallio’s archaeological forays should have reflected this period’s concern with the newly recognized importance of chronology, as reflected in the continued effort to improve field methods employed in stratigraphic excavations (Willey and Sabloff 1974). While Zallio’s work eschewed such concerns, the work of his colleague Jeremiah Lillard does just the opposite. Lillard is well known for his 1939 publication “An Introduction to the Archaeology of Central California,” co-authored with Robert Heizer and Franklin Fenenga. This publication was pivotal in the development of the first prominent Central California sequence, the Central California Taxonomic System (Wallace 1999), which defined three generalized culture periods, the Early, Middle and Late Horizons (Lillard, Heizer, Fenenga 1939). This California sequence was indicative of the paradigm shift in California anthropology that separated avocationally-oriented and self-trained anthropologists like Zallio from those who sought to institutionalize and gate-keep anthropology as a scientific discipline.

Zallio and the California Scene

According to Heizer, anthropological endeavors began in California in the 1870s in the form of occasional small-scale excavations for museums (1978:12). This occurred once the intensity of the gold rush had dissipated (Heizer 1978, Towne 1976). By this  

56 By understanding these paradigms, a context is created that exposes the impetus behind Zallio’s collecting practices and promoted the notion that his collection was not indiscriminate, but somewhat systematic in nature.
time, only an estimated sixteen percent of the Native Californian population at contact remained. Genocide and disease had dramatically reduced the Native Californian population. This population destruction ignited a sense of urgency to collect as much ethnographic data and proof of Native existence as possible, in the form of artifacts and material culture (Heizer 1978). This need propelled the discipline’s growth in an unprecedented capacity.

Archaeology, as well as anthropology, is distinct in that nonprofessionals have long played an important role in undertaking the early research credited with establishing the foundations of the discipline (Chartkoff and Chartkoff 1984). And while the terms amateur, paraprofessional or avocational may seem to indicate not only an untrained, but an unskilled person, many of these early anthropological researchers maintained scientific practices that were the norm during an era of pre-professional anthropology. These largely self-trained avocational anthropologists contributed an important corpus of knowledge by virtue of active interest rather than paid profession. By the turn of the 20th century, California had more amateur and avocational archaeologists than any other state (Chartkoff and Chartkoff 1984). It was also during this time that academically-sponsored archaeological activity began in California (Towne 1976).

In 1901, an anthropology museum and department was established at UC Berkeley, under the direction and patronage of Phoebe Apperson Hearst (Putnam 1905, Thoresen 1975, Heizer 1978). According to Putnam, the purpose of the newly formed anthropology department and museum was to conduct both field and museum research in the various subdisciplines of anthropology, the preservation of materials and data
obtained, the formation of a museum, and the dissemination of knowledge, not only by the establishment of courses to be taught at the University, but also through publications and lectures (1905:1). The Anthropology Department at UC Berkeley, the second anthropology department to be established in the United States (Chartkoff and Chartkoff 1984), immediately undertook archaeological research, beginning with excavations in Shasta County, in 1901 (Towne 1976). Many of those involved in this work had been conducting digs since the 1890s (Putnam 1905, Towne 1976).

As one of the instructors of anthropology at UC Berkeley, and the director of its anthropology museum, Kroeber was in a position to direct the anthropological research for much of the western United States, and certainly for California. Kroeber believed that the subject matter and goals of ethnology and archaeology were the same, differing only in methods. Despite Kroeber’s interests in both fields, he felt archaeological evidence, essentially hidden under ground, could wait. The acquisition of ethnological data, to the contrary, was much more urgent given the precarious state of the Native Californian population (Heizer 1978, Towne 1976). Kroeber’s privileging of ethnology was also driven, in part, by finances, since the department budget could not support both types of research in full (Heizer 1978, Towne 1976). In hindsight, this turned out to be a regretful mistake. Kroeber failed to recognize that many contact sites in California were actually just as vulnerable as the Native elders whom he sought out for information about pre-gold rush lifeways and languages. By the time large scale excavations began in the 1940s, early sites had already been lost (Heizer 1978).
Kroeber’s primary institutional and ethnological ambition was to secure and ultimately publish the most complete account of California anthropology as possible. As a means by which to accomplish this task, he directed his students to establish relationships with as many trustworthy and willing California Native informants as possible. Students were instructed to sit down with these informants with a written list of “culture traits” and record the absence or presence of each, document languages and traditions, and eventually analyze the internal organization of Native societies (Heizer 1978, Towne 1976).

Towne (1976) argues that by promoting the Department’s interests and reputation in the field of ethnology to the near exclusion of all archaeology, Kroeber left the field wide open for amateur archaeologists to undertake their own research projects. This was certainly the case in Sacramento, where archaeological endeavors, both academic and amateur, bore the imprimatur of a pre-professional era of anthropology well into the third decade of the 20th century, when the “metropolitan” standards for practicing anthropology required academic training in a department of anthropology. Sacramento, however, was hardly a metropolitan center, academic or otherwise, and it is from this location on the periphery of a professionalizing discipline that men like Zallio, Lillard, and Purves were able to practice and represent anthropology in an academic context.

*Zallio in the Local Collecting Milieu*

Although the newly formed Anthropology Department at UC Berkeley was active and interested in California archaeology, it was not a research priority (Putnam 1905,
Towne 1976, Warren 1973). This void created by a lack of academic prominence in California archaeology was lessened by the amateur and avocational archaeologists in California, and particularly in the Sacramento Valley region (Towne 1976), many of whom were accorded the same degree of respect as their professional colleagues (Chartkoff and Chartkoff 1984). For this reason, Central California may be unparalleled in the near professional quality in “excavations, record keeping, and preservation of artifacts” seen among the region’s amateur anthropologists (Towne 1976:25).

Local and regional interest in anthropology was also abundantly evidenced by the collectors and dealers in the Sacramento region, all of whom were happy to buy, sell and trade items acquired through excavation. Very little has been written about the lives and careers of the collectors in and around the Sacramento Valley. Although Towne (1976) principally focuses on the early history of central California archaeology, we gain some perspective on local collectors because she interviewed several of Zallio’s contemporaries. Louis Payen is one of the better known local collectors highlighted in Towne’s work. According to Towne, Payen was born in eastern Sacramento County in 1911. He began collecting when he was approximately four years old because “the ground was literally covered with projectile points” (1976:114). Payen went on to become a veterinarian, working for a time as the State Veterinarian for the California Bureau of Livestock Disease Control in Sacramento. This occupation afforded Payen access to secluded and expansive ranch lands throughout California (Towne 1976). As with many collectors, artifacts were given to Payen by people who knew of his interests. Payen was active in local archaeological surveys and attended professional meetings. He
was also involved with excavations conducted by the faculty and students of Sacramento Junior College, including Anthony Zallio (Towne 1976). The Anthropology Museum at Sacramento State holds a small collection donated by Payen. This accession includes gunflints, potsherds, an Easter Island mortar, clamshell disc beads and a Pomo baby basket.57

Benjamin W. Hathaway was another local collector who belonged to this early confederation of anthropologically-oriented Sacramentans. Hathaway began working in his father’s small museum at the age of seven; the collecting tradition was firmly rooted in his family life (California State Parks 2010). Hathaway collected items from dealers and Native craftspeople alike, particularly Indian basket weavers. By 1926, Hathaway had amassed such a large collection that it was displayed during that year’s California State Fair. In 1933, Hathaway was appointed the first curator of the State’s Indian Exhibit. Due to the ever-growing size of his private collection, eventually totaling 37,536 recorded items, he was forced to move to larger locations on a few different occasions, before his collection finally came to rest at the California State Indian Museum, in 1940 (California State Parks 2010).

Hathaway kept a detailed collection ledger, including notes and correspondence, which show purchases from commercial dealers, private collectors, as well as Native weavers (California State Parks 2010). Nonetheless, Towne asserts that Hathaway’s collection holds no scientific value due to a lack of record keeping and an insufficient knowledge of archaeological excavation techniques. She further states that his collection

57 CSUS Anthropology Museum Accession File 74-19.
is one of artistic, rather than scientific merit, and that this type of artifact-for-display’s-sake collection is quite typical of the “classic pothunter” operating in the Sacramento Valley in the first half of the 20th century (1976:33). Zallio and Hathaway had known each other and shared information regarding dealer inventories and potential purchases.  

The Sacramento region was also home to a number of individuals who conducted archaeological excavations without the benefit of any formal training or academic support. Elmer Dawson was one of these untrained archaeologists, who surely must have traveled in the same circles as Anthony Zallio. He excavated from 1913 through 1930, with the early 1920s representing his most active period (Towne 1976). What sets Dawson apart from the other local amateurs was his detailed record keeping. His journal totaled 500 pages with entries for not only the grave lots from which he obtained materials, but also a concordance of relevant catalog numbers in his collection, which totaled 8,000. He also carefully dug and screened materials, meticulously cleaned and numbered specimens, and entered each item into his journal (Towne 1976).

Like Zallio, Dawson communicated with scientifically-oriented associations such as the Smithsonian Institution and UC Berkeley. Dawson’s theory of a three part cultural sequence eventually became an official manuscript at UC Berkeley’s Archaeological Research Facility (Towne 1976). Unlike Zallio, his notes were apparently so thoroughly recorded that they can still be used today to review and interpret most areas he excavated.

---

58 Letter, 24 July 1924, from Anthony Zallio to Benjamin Hathaway, Department of Anthropology Archives, CU-23, Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.
He was also known to have gone back to reexamine sites he had excavated years earlier to record any observable changes (Towne 1976).

By the early 1930s, amateur archaeology, once so commonplace in the Sacramento region, was slowly becoming professionalized, due in large part to Jeremiah Lillard’s realization of California’s first field archaeology program (Towne 1976). Not only did the members of this field program conduct several successful excavations in the region, their work is credited with establishing the cultural chronology for the Sacramento Valley (Chartkoff and Chartkoff 1984, Heizer 1978, Towne 1976, Warren 1973). This chronology was first published by Lillard and Purves, and later expanded and refined by Lillard, Robert Heizer and Franklin Fenenga, the latter two of which were students in the Junior College archaeology field school (Heizer 1978, Towne 1976, Warren 1973). Cooperation was established with other institutions, like UC Berkeley, in order to avoid duplication of work and to increase the opportunity to create a more uniform methodology (Putnam 1905). This collaboration also benefited Sacramento Junior College, in that attention was given not only to the school, but to the students as well, some of whom went on to study at UC Berkeley and become well known California archaeologists.

It was at this time of professionalization that Sacramento Junior College was developing excavation techniques largely through trial and error. According to James Bennyhoff, a Sacramento Junior College student during this period, emphasis was initially given to quantity of artifact rather than quality of excavation. Typically middens and burials were carelessly dug due to a lack of planning on the part of the archaeology
teams. Excavations tended to be as much about recreation as they were about excavation (Fieldnotes 1992). But this type of work, now considered to be sloppy, was not unique to Sacramento Junior College. It was the sort of disciplinary growing pains felt by many institutions around the country.

Locally, there was very little collecting for the purpose of education or museum development. By and large, local collectors were gathering material for private collections for sale and trade. Only Lillard, Zallio and Hathaway seemed to have a broader educational vision behind their collecting practices.

ZALLIO AS A FIRST-GENERATION, SELF-TRAINED ANTHROPOLOGIST

During the 1920s and 1930s in the Sacramento region, the center of academic anthropology – to the extent that such applies – was at Sacramento Junior College. It is true that Hathaway’s collection was acknowledged as an important cultural resource on both the state and local levels, but Hathaway had no aspirations to make scholarly contributions to the anthropological discipline. Throughout the late 1920s and most of the 1930s, Zallio and Lillard held title to such aspirations, although both demonstrated full cognizance of the fact that Kroeber and the Department of Anthropology at UC Berkeley represented the leading edge of the field. It was this type of academic and professional environment that Zallio sought guidance from and membership in.

During his career as a professor at Sacramento Junior College, Anthony Zallio sought to improve his anthropological education and scholarship through long-term correspondences with leading anthropology professionals. Among these professionals
was Aleš Hrdlička, the curator of physical anthropology at the National Museum of
Natural History. In November of 1930, Zallio corresponded with Hrdlička about a young
girl of Mexican descent “born with one arm somewhat black, minutely wrinkled and
covered with reddish hair.” 59 He asked Hrdlička’s advice on whether or not to publish
“such an anomaly in the local newspapers.” Zallio also asked Hrdlička about a skull
fragment he had found “having characteristics of the Neanderthalensis” and about other
bone fragments in his possession. Zallio expressed an interest in meeting with Hrdlička
should he ever find his way near Sacramento. Hrdlička’s response was to not contact
local newspapers about this condition, but rather to gather further relevant information,
review literature regarding hair in the Index Medicus and the Catalogue of the Library of
the Surgeon General, and to supply photographs of said anomaly. He urged Zallio to
“prepare an account of the case,” along with the literature and three slides so that Dr.
Morton, the Secretary of the American Association of Physical Anthropologists, could
present this information at that association’s annual meeting. 60 According to a follow-up
letter from Hrdlička, Zallio’s account of the Mexican girl was in fact read “before our
Association and aroused a good deal of interest.” Hrdlička goes on to offer Zallio more
guidance as to how to take this case further, and also an opinion about the skull
fragment. 61 Zallio responds with an inquiry about whether there was a “certain method”
he ought to utilize in the future when presenting material of a scientific nature.

59 Zallio to Hrdlička, November 17, 1930, National Anthropological Archives, Washington, D.C.
60 Hrdlička to Zallio, November 24, 1930, National Anthropological Archives, Washington, DC.
61 Hrdlička to Zallio, January 24, 1931, National Anthropological Archives, Washington, D.C.
Zallio and Hrdlička maintained their correspondence for almost a full decade, until December of 1939. Initially Hrdlička was receptive to and seemingly interested in Zallio’s inquiries regarding physical anthropology and methodology. However, on November 11, 1931, Zallio sent Hrdlička a letter, and apparently a copy of a paper he had written, in which he tried to “prove that alcoolic [sic] beverage effects human growth.” Zallio had wanted to know “the most convenient publication in which to have it published.” 62 Hrdlička advised against the publication of this paper in its current form and went on to outline two reasons. The first reason was that Zallio did not offer enough details of the experiment. The second weakness of the paper was the inclusion of generalization which Hrdlička felt undermined Zallio’s efforts. 63 After this letter, two years would pass before Zallio sent another. This time he was asking about inheritance of acquired traits, “both physical and social.” He also offered to send bones showing some form of pathology. 64 Hrdlička sent a terse response, 65 and communications stopped until December of 1939, when Zallio sent what appears to be his final letter inquiring as to “what fact” Hrdlička attributed “the dark skin of the Indians, not necessarily those living in the tropics but in the temperate zone.” 66 On December 20 of that year, Hrdlička wrote his shortest response to Zallio: “Dear Mr. Zallio: The brown skin of the Indians is

---

62 Zallio to Hrdlička, November 11, 1931, National Anthropological Archives, Washington, DC.
63 Hrdlička to Zallio, November 28, 1931, National Anthropological Archives, Washington, D.C.
64 Zallio to Hrdlička, January 29, 1933, National Anthropological Archives, Washington, D.C.
65 Hrdlička to Zallio, February 7, 1933, National Anthropological Archives, Washington, D.C.
66 Zallio to Hrdlička, December 4, 1939, National Anthropological Archives, Washington, D.C.
hereditary. How it was acquired originally is a moot question.”67 There are no records of other letters sent between the two men.

The fact that Zallio had maintained a somewhat regular correspondence with the leading physical anthropologist of the time, however frustrating and naive his inquiries had appeared, indicates a desire on his part to play a role in scientific discovery. These letters, coupled with his published papers (Zallio 1927, 1935), show that Zallio took the act of disseminating scientific information seriously, however much he failed to practice scientific record-keeping.

During his tenure as an anthropology professor, Zallio also wrote to Alfred Kroeber, professor of anthropology at UC Berkeley, beginning in 1928. In this initial letter, Zallio states that “I succeeded in establishing a Department of Anthropology in this Sacramento Junior College [sic].”68 Based on a reference Zallio makes to their conversation “last Friday,” this letter was not of an introductory nature. Rather, it appears to have been a way for Zallio to identify himself as a “professor of anthropology,” and perhaps aspiring colleague. Zallio offers Kroeber details about how he conducts his classes at Sacramento Junior College and asks for suggestions from not only Kroeber, but also from “other professors that you may delegate.” Zallio concludes this letter by expressing his interest in taking either “graduate or undergraduate courses” in anthropology at the University or taking courses in “Absentia under your direction and report.”

67 Hrdlička to Zallio, December 20, 1939, National Anthropological Archives, Washington, D.C.
68 Zallio to Kroeber, 16 August 1928, Department of Anthropology Archives, CU-23, Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.
The remainder of letters that passed between Zallio and Kroeber were about the teaching of anthropology and course design, or about Zallio’s interest in earning a doctorate degree in Anthropology under the guidance of Kroeber. In a letter dated November 16, 1928, Zallio first broaches the topic of obtaining an advanced degree in Anthropology. Zallio states: “I am anxious to know what I have to do so as to be entitled to apply for the Ph.D. degree in Anthropology. I know that is is [sic] up to you, and I also know that you never discourage an ambitious man who asks only to obtain a higher degree”. Kroeber advises Zallio to “secure an appointment with Dean Lipman of the Graduate Division. Your case would obviously be somewhat out of the ordinary run and the Dean likes to judge every such case on its individual merits.” Zallio followed up with a separate letter assuring Kroeber he would take the advice, but also noted that “a good word from you as head of the department will accomplish a great deal.”

These letters fly back and forth, and on April 11, 1929, Zallio responds to Kroeber expressing appreciation for encouragement received. Zallio goes on to list the courses he had taken during the three summer sessions of 1926, 1927 and 1928, and explains that:
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69 Letter, 15 August 1934, from Anthony Zallio to Alfred Kroeber. In this letter, Zallio informs Kroeber of four students who will be registering at Berkeley as anthropology majors. Three entries are complete with Zallio’s impression of the student ranging from good to mediocre. The only student to not have an opinion next to his name is Robert Heizer. Department of Anthropology Archives, CU-23, Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.
70 Letter, 16 November 1928, from Anthony Zallio to Alfred Kroeber, Department of Anthropology Archives, CU-23, Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.
71 Letter, 23 November 1928, from Alfred Kroeber to Anthony Zallio, Department of Anthropology Archives, CU-23, Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.
72 Letter, 5 December 1928, from Anthony Zallio to Alfred Kroeber, Department of Anthropology Archives, CU-23, Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.
for the last three years, I have dedicated not less than six hours a day to the study of Anthropology. I have visited all the mounds and all the collections in this district. My long residence in Europe enables me to have a clear conception of the European races not only physically but also mentally. As you once said, my case, being a special one, must be handled accordingly. I am willing to do whatever you advise me to do.

Kroeber’s response made it clear that Zallio would not be able to meet the course requirements needed to obtain a graduate degree. Kroeber explains that Zallio’s real problem would come in the matter of residence since we ordinarily offer no graduate work at all in summer session… Until you feel that you are in a position to meet these demands on your time it seems to me that all other questions are incidental.

This would be the last mention of Zallio’s aspirations of obtaining a graduate degree.

During this time, Zallio also conferred with Edward W. Gifford and Robert Lowie, both associated with the Department and Museum. While still academic in nature, these letters focused on Zallio’s request that others read drafts of papers he had written to offer commentary and guidance. While Gifford and Lowie were cordial, their responses are either too brief to be helpful, or pointed out the flaws of Zallio’s insufficient sample size, as Hrdlička had.

These correspondences, beginning in 1928 and continuing for more than a decade, show that Zallio was not only influenced by the presence and work of Kroeber, but was also motivated to elevate his status within the discipline of Anthropology, at least regionally. Hindsight allows us to recognize that Zallio, along with other avocational
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74 Letter, 15 April 1929, from Alfred Kroeber to Anthony Zallio, Department of Anthropology Archives, CU-23, Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.
anthropologists, represented to Kroeber a pre-scientific era of anthropology and exactly the type of individual he sought to marginalize (Griset 1993).

It is clear that Zallio was genuinely interested in and sought to become professionally credentialed. In addition to his personal and professional study, Zallio also published two separate articles in national journals. The first, “The Piedmontese Dialects in the United States” was published in American Speech in 1927 and signed “A.G. Zallio, Sacramento Junior College” (Zallio 1927). His second publication appeared in 1935 when the American Journal of Physical Anthropology ran his one page report titled “Curious Skin Anomaly” (Zallio 1935). This is the same skin anomaly he had discussed with Hrdlička. A final, but unpublished written work was “Origin of the Indians of America,” dated 1938.

The lack of a graduate degree in anthropology or an invitation to earn one at UC Berkeley did not stop Zallio from pursuing an education in the field. According to his daughter, Zallio completed one summer session at Stanford University. In addition, during this 1930 summer session, Zallio enrolled in a summer course at the University of Oregon entitled Art of Alaska Indians. This course involved a cruise to Alaska directed by W.G. Beattie. During the course, students took special classes in subjects such as landscape sketching, botany, geography and the art of Alaska Indians (University of Oregon). Zallio was required to submit a term paper outlining knowledge he had

---

75 CSUS Anthropology Museum Accession File 74-29. This summer session at Stanford University as well as the summer cruise to Alaska are briefly mentioned in Maria Brugge’s letter regarding her father’s life.
acquired during the course of the cruise. In this paper, Zallio highlighted six objects used to teach the students about Alaska Indian art, providing historical and spiritual context, as well as his overall impressions of the items. This document serves to substantiate Zallio’s knowledge of the relationship between artifacts, such as those he collected, and the social aspects of the societies that produced and used them. By taking on the role of student as a 56-year-old man, Zallio showed a great passion for and interest in all aspects of Native American material culture and artifacts as more than “curios” and “relics.”

Zallio’s published papers, the scope of courses he taught at the Junior College, the courses he took at other universities, as well as the archival record of his correspondence with other anthropologists all serve to demonstrate that Anthony Zallio was a disciple of four-field anthropology. His four-field orientation and use of collections to educate is visible in all aspects of Zallio’s work. Not only did he teach courses about “The Origin, Antiquity and Races of Men” (Anthropology 1A) and “The Origin and Growth of Civilization” (Anthropology 1B), he also taught general courses focusing on California Indians. In seeking guidance from Edward Gifford regarding course content at UC Berkeley, Zallio was given a list of topics covered in their Indians of California course. This extensive list surveys such topics as marriage and kinship, language and literature, material culture of various California tribes, physical types and central California archaeology. Most of these topics were demonstrated research interests of Zallio, who
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was in his fifties by the time that disciplinary growth began to demand specialization in one of the four subfields. By this age, he was doubtless set in his interests and anthropological ways.
Chapter 6
CONCLUSION

Zallio’s career and collection of Native American basketry, as with other old collections having only the sketchiest of documentation, offers a glimpse into how anthropology entered both the local academy and public consciousness more than a century ago (Usner 2012). Such collections serve as a record of the “field,” both literally and figuratively. Old and undocumented collections also serve to expose the consequences of settler society’s interest in Native goods. Zallio’s baskets, and others like, them shed light on the collision of cultures and worlds (Usner 2012). Collectors and dealers played an important role in furthering public interest in anthropology and creating markets for archaeological and ethnographic items. These interests also had real world impacts on the federal government’s Indian policies (Usner 2012). Old basketry collections held in museums and universities offer windows into both the past and present.

FINDINGS

Anthony Zallio was not entirely uneducated in the field of anthropology. Like many men of his generation, he spent the last half of his life pursuing the academic side of the field, striving to emulate the leading anthropologists in the country during the 1920s through the 1940s. While this pursuit did not translate directly into contemporary field practices, it did demonstrate a desire to better his understanding and instruction of
the subject. In this respect, he practiced his anthropology the way his predecessors and would-be mentors, men like Beattie, Boas, Hrdlička and Kroeber had, with scientific ends trumping what descendent communities and contemporary anthropologists now recognize as unethical means (Erickson 2002, Hinsley 1981, Platt 2011).

Throughout his career as an anthropologist, Zallio continually sought to join the ranks of the professionally-trained anthropologists from whom he sought guidance. One of the ways he attempted to accomplish his own professionalization was through correspondence with leading anthropologists of the day, including Hrdlička, as well as Kroeber, Lowie and Gifford. Not only did he ask for and receive their guidance where possible, he also eagerly implemented their recommendations.

A second way Zallio sought to professionalize within the discipline of anthropology was to publish articles based on his personal research. Not only was Zallio conducting his own research in physical anthropology and linguistics, outside of any requirements imposed on him by Sacramento Junior College, he was diligently attempting to disseminate his findings.

Zallio also continued his anthropological education throughout his adult life. Most men in their fifties would not continually seek to be burdened with college level coursework. Zallio, on the other hand, not only sought it out, but did so during his breaks from teaching college courses. This coursework was in addition to the self study in which he engaged in all year long. Zallio was clearly dedicated to the subject as demonstrated by the amount of time he spent pursuing anthropological knowledge.
This continual pursuit of professionalization could not have been easy for him considering that the four field generalist tradition of anthropology and the paradigm of salvage ethnography were being left behind by the discipline at large, in favor of a more specialized field of study. Kroeber had successfully established himself as the gatekeeper of California anthropology. He sought to exploit the work of untrained anthropologists, while simultaneously erasing their presence in the official disciplinary ranks. It is unclear whether or not Zallio understood himself to be one of these untrained anthropologists whom Kroeber sought to gate-keep. If he did, this certainly did not deter him from pursuing his goal of being a better anthropologist.

This realization adds to our understanding of his collecting motives and practices. Zallio’s collection of material culture is the eclectic reflection of a generalist and an educator. Focusing on one type of basket, such as winnowers or trinket baskets, would not have afforded him a scientific perspective on the broader cultural timeline of Native American society. A collection of only one type of basket would have allowed Zallio to see any changes made to that basket type over time, but would not necessarily have illuminated a larger portrait of cultural change or stability. Furthermore, a specialized collection would have limited his ability to teach students the kind of generalized information about Native Americans he was expected to disseminate to in the classroom.

Other early collectors seeking scientific clues to Native American culture, such as Boas and Merriam, all had seemingly eclectic collections. However, upon a closer examination of their work, they too had their own agendas and desired outcomes that required them to collect a wide spectrum of objects, instead of focusing on one or two
types. Today, collectors contemporaneous to, and preceding, Zallio’s era are appreciated for having been well-rounded and thorough in their attempts to collect Native American culture. My research and analysis suggests that Zallio was no different in his efforts.

Following the same lines of comparison, Zallio was not some mere pothunter unaware of the scientific value of that which he excavated. A lack of scientifically-oriented documentation does not, in every instance or era, equal a lack of scientific interest, pot-hunting or an uncaring individual. Just as Boas reconciled his part in Pacific Northwest grave-robbing, Zallio may also have reached the same sorts of conclusions about the type of material he was excavating and the scientific potential embodied in his possession of it. If the Smithsonian Institution was directing its anthropologists to collect from graves in order to amass enough skeletal material to document and hypothesize the origins of human biological diversity, why would Zallio not follow that lead in his efforts to become a “better” anthropologist (Erikson 2002). His correspondence with Hrdlička, Kroeber, Lowie and Gifford, along with his continuing educational coursework, speaks volumes on his behalf.

Just as Zallio took cues from other scientific collectors, he took cues from educational collectors, as well. Collectors like Seton were interested in acquiring objects that would lead to conclusions about a generalized Indian culture rather than one society in particular (Parezo and Hoerig 1999). By collecting across a wide sweep of culture areas, functions and degrees of so-called “authenticity,” Zallio was better able to teach his students, than had he collected only one basket type or culture area. During Zallio’s time, most anthropologists were still generalists, with very few people specializing in a
single cultural tradition. While some were focusing their efforts on religion or textiles, these studies were still conducted within a generalized framework. In this way, too, Zallio was practicing his anthropology in a manner similar to trained and untrained anthropologists, alike.

Perhaps the one area in which Zallio was not in line with his colleagues was in his excavation practices. Early archaeologists were object- and not context-focused. They did not concern themselves with the fact that they were potentially destroying other pieces to a puzzle of which they were not yet aware. Beginning with Lillard in the early 1930s, Sacramento Junior College sought to change the techniques of excavation and raise the practice to a much more professional standard. While his colleagues were adopting these new standards, limited only by the science and technology available at the time, Zallio was still excavating in the same fashion as his predecessors, with little to no regard for detailed field recording or attempts at minimal disturbances to potential surrounding data. Nevertheless, it is important to remember that Zallio was conducting excavations both for “things,” as well as to contribute to a greater body of knowledge, and not simply to collect or sell “relics” like a pothunter.

Based on this evidence, it becomes clear that it was not what Zallio was excavating that held him back professionally, but rather how he excavated that failed to earn him more credit for the work he did accomplish. This is seen in his marginal mention as having provided “material assistance” in the acknowledgements section of Lillard’s published work on the Deer Creek-Cosumnes Area excavations (Lillard, Purves, Jenkins 1936). This 1936 publication appeared two years prior to Zallio’s purported
presentation outlining his theories of the origins of Indians in America at a scientific 
conference held in San Diego. By the time Lillard published his introductory work on 
central California archaeology in 1939, Zallio was entirely absent from the 
acknowledgements (Lillard, Heizer and Fenenga 1939). It seems as though Lillard was 
taking cues from Kroeber, and deciding for himself whose work would be sanctioned and 
whose would be dismissed. If Zallio was not willing to or capable of adopting new 
excavation techniques, it stands to reason that Lillard would have worked hard to ensure 
Zallio’s name was not associated with the ground-breaking archaeological work being 
conducted by Sacramento Junior College.

This research also revealed the relationship between the anthropology conducted 
in the Sacramento region and that taking shape at UC Berkeley. These two institutions of 
higher education, which differed dramatically in their histories and educational mandates, 
eventually developed a sort of symbiotic relationship, at least in terms of archaeology. 
While Sacramento Junior College was finding its footing in the realm of professionalized 
archaeology, the Anthropology Department at UC Berkeley offered support and 
guidance. In return, Sacramento Junior College sent some of their best and brightest, 
such as Robert Heizer, to study with Kroeber. Archival correspondence shows the back 
and forth exchange of information regarding pedagogy, as well as the activity of other 
collectors.

Through this research, Zallio has been shown to have conducted himself and his 
work in a manner consistent with the anthropologists who came before him. Collectors 
like Jackson, Hudson, Merriam and Heye all share histories and practices in common
with Zallio, and these other collectors have all become part of the dominant museum anthropology discourse, gate-kept or not. What sets Zallio apart from the rest is the fact that while he collected and conducted excavations, he also taught anthropology at the college level. George Heye was scarcely interested in education, but rather in making a profit from his dealings. Jackson was indeed interested in education, but only to the extent that educating others either raised more money for his cause or converted more Native Alaskans to Christianity. Hudson’s aim, although he had a deep and sincere respect for Native culture, was in part to create an excitement over Pomo baskets in order to make his extensive collection more valuable for sale. Merriam aimed to make a scholarly contribution to anthropology through his studies, but was not engaged in reproducing the discipline in a college or university setting.

Of these collectors, only Zallio was actively teaching anthropology and taking college courses to continue his own expertise. Perhaps he felt as though his time to teach was in the present, and rather than filling catalog card after catalog card with information that would serve to make his specimens objects of later research and scholarly interest, he dedicated himself to the pursuit of “knowledge as material culture” that could supplement his lectures. Ultimately, he took it upon himself to provide that material for himself and his students.

To hold Anthony Zallio to contemporary anthropological standards is to commit a disservice not only to the man, but also to the work he accomplished. In the context of late 19th and early 20th century anthropology, Zallio’s actions would not seem shocking or lacking. His work was on par with the work of others at the time. Just as all
collections serve as palimpsests, so too does the Zallio Collection in its entirety. It is time to give it due recognition as the work of a dedicated anthropologist/collector whose efforts to amass a corpus of scientifically-meaningful objects offer us important insight into the disciplinary, local and regional past.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

Researching and writing about an inconsistently managed collection of Native American baskets and the man who collected them proved to be a difficult task, exposing several limitations to this study. I began this project underestimating not only the amount of time required to piece together this puzzle, but also the ease with which relevant information could be found. While I have attempted to account for unexpected bumps in the road, there are still a number of restrictions that deserve attention.

The first obstacle to become very apparent was the fact that not much was known about Anthony Zallio prior to this research project short of Arlean Towne’s 1976 thesis. No central location houses Zallio’s personal papers, as is the case where many other collectors and anthropologists are concerned. Instead I have searched finding aids and repositories at places like UC Berkeley and the National Anthropological Archives. His archival presence seems to piggy back on the archival records kept by better known anthropologists. This required research about and knowledge of his colleagues and other
key players of his era.  

A second limitation of this study stems from Sacramento State’s treatment of this collection at the time of and following its donation in 1951. From the time the Department began accepting donations, accessioning procedures and overall records management failed to keep pace with professional standards or guidelines. This is not to say that those in charge of these procedures did not do what they thought was best at the time. It is to say that the work previously done is utterly confusing and sometimes without explanation. There is no paper trail that accounts for the differences in Zallio basket attributions among the various inventories conducted over the intervening years. How were conclusions regarding Zallio donor attributions reached?

Also leading to the confusing nature of the total Zallio collection is the fact that this single donation was conceptually and physically (though not completely, in the latter instance) split into two different collections: archaeological and ethnographic. Along with the actual objects, much of the documentation associated with this donation was also strewn between offices and laboratories. It is now standard practice to keep single accessions intact; however this splitting of the accession was undertaken by non-museum professionals well before even a minimal standard was institutionalized as a “best practice.” Just as we have seen the methodologies of archaeological excavations improve over time, so too have museum standards and procedures been refined. Without a prior
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78 In addition to archives visited, I also contacted several archives via email to obtain further information. This was done as a preliminary search to determine whether or not information was in fact located at these facilities. Places such as the Sutter Club and Dante Club, both in Sacramento, as well as the Sacramento Italian American Club were contacted to confirm Zallio’s membership in these organizations. I was unable to establish these memberships.
knowledge of the history of the Anthropology Museum, this obstacle could have proved too difficult to overcome. With the help of the Museum’s director, who is familiar with the history of the Museum and its various cataloging events, a better understanding of the confusing nature of the paperwork was achieved and this component of the project was put into proper perspective. This project acknowledges that every basket currently attributed to Zallio may not actually be one he collected, and that baskets he collected may not be included in the most current inventories. This does not change the analysis of his place in local or regional anthropology. The baskets that can be attributed to him with certainty support my characterization of the larger collection as eclectic.

Zallio’s poor archaeological methodology has been the only point of reference for his legacy and career for quite some time. Clearly, there had to be more to his story and collection. This thesis has focused on situating Zallio within the local Sacramento and regional milieu of academic anthropology.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

This research has demonstrated Anthony Zallio’s relevance to local and regional anthropology during the first half of the 20th century. However, the process of this research has revealed several opportunities for future study. This section details recommendations for research in the areas of archival inquiry, as well as further work to define the baskets attributed to Zallio.

In order to achieve a fuller portrait of Anthony Zallio, archives need to be visited or revisited. Further inquiry into Zallio’s employment as a teacher at Grant Union High
School would require a written request sent to the Human Resources department at the Sacramento Unified School District main office. Although this piece of the puzzle is not crucial to creating or maintaining Zallio’s relevance to anthropology, it is a way to tie up what could be considered a small loose end. Obtaining the details of his employment there, if indeed he was, would further support Zallio’s drive to educate, even in his post-retirement years.

Preliminary contact with the archives at the University of Oregon suggests there are no records of a student named Anthony Zallio on the 1930 summer cruise to Alaska. However, in her letter to Dr. Richard Reeve, Anthropology Department Chair at the time of the donation, Zallio’s daughter mentions Zallio may have attended one summer session at Stanford University. It is possible that Zallio joined the summer cruise as a student at Stanford, through the University of Oregon Extension program. The connection between the Zallio and Beattie is known, but the degree to which they had a collegial relationship remains unclear. It is also known that the woman who was responsible for the donation of the Beattie material to Sacramento State lived near Zallio’s daughter, but the importance of this connection remains ambiguous. While confirming this piece of the puzzle may not be critical to the overall outcome of the study, it would further demonstrate Zallio’s determination to further his anthropological connections and education. Examining the professional careers of Zallio’s colleagues at Sacramento Junior College may also yield new data about Zallio’s life history and tenure as a professor of anthropology. Likewise, research into Zallio’s birth, family history and
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period of residence in Italy may offer valuable clues about his affinity for anthropology and collecting.

Another suggestion for future research to add to the corpus of information about the Zallio collection is to examine the five tiny Pomo baskets currently part of the Phoebe Hearst Museum of Anthropology collections. While these are not likely to be combined with Sacramento State’s collection of Zallio material, accompanying documentation, if any exists, may prove relevant to his collecting and documentation procedures. He is listed as secondary collector on several other baskets housed at the Hearst, with Lillard listed as primary collector. These baskets could also offer further insight into the relationship between Zallio and Lillard in order to get a better sense of the academic and departmental atmosphere during their joint tenure at Sacramento Junior College.

Lastly, a thorough examination of the other donations of Native American baskets housed at Sacramento State’s Museum of Anthropology needs to be undertaken in order to definitively determine, by process of elimination, which baskets belong to the Zallio collection. Performing an audit of the other basket collections is the only way to positively identify which baskets are not Zallio’s baskets.  

In addition to this type of basketry research, the Zallio Collection is a great resource for learning about the technical features of baskets. While I conducted an in-depth examination of ten Zallio baskets, looking closely at the technical features of each, I did not do so for every basket in the collection. With such a varied grouping of baskets,
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80 Even this would prove to be difficult work, given that it is known, but not documented, that some baskets on loan were stolen and the lender was compensated with replacement baskets from other collections. These replacement baskets may well have been from the Zallio Collection. Personal communication between Terri Castaneda and Jerry Johnson.
serious students of basketry research can hone their skills in identifying type of weave, materials used, function and cultural attribution.

THE ZALLIO COLLECTION IN THE 21ST CENTURY

The Zallio Collection of Native American basketry, assembled during the first half of the 20th century, is a product of its era in terms of the means by which it was collected and originally utilized. Given the absence of recorded data, such as date, location and cost of acquisition, the accepted viewpoint of the past has been to discount the collection as having little or no educational value. However, research has proven otherwise. Through this collection, we see Zallio as a local manifestation of wider anthropological patterns in the local and regional Sacramento area. Zallio both mirrors and diverges from the locally-practiced anthropology of the day, and sets himself apart by virtue of the professional use of his collection. This collection is a prime example of the inherent value embodied in old and often idiosyncratic collections. Early anthropological collections often served many purposes concurrently, scientific, historical and educational. Even with this level of importance, the data that accompanies these collections is rarely as detailed as current museum professionals and anthropologists would like it to be, nor is this data consistently transferred into the museum’s catalog (Sturtevant 1999). It is rare, indeed, that a collector kept a detailed record of not just the things collected, but the reasons behind such acquisitions. Information about the goals of the collectors, object documentation and modes of acquisition is required in order to fully understand the context in which these collections were created, and for these collections
to be utilized to their fullest extent. The educational and exhibition value of each object depends upon what can be learned of its past. Unfortunately, collections similar to Zallio’s have been scattered through the art or antiques market during the past twenty-five years rather than being donated to museums. This dispersion is partly due to the increased monetary value of Native American baskets (Sturtevant 1999). But, as in the case of the Zallio Collection, many old collections are maintained in museums, but woefully misunderstood or underutilized. Because these collections often lack documentation or the authority provided by a more standardized collecting methodology, their research value is often rejected. However, even the most seemingly erratic collecting practices are systematic to a greater or lesser degree (Brown 1981). These collections, regardless of the level of accompanying documentation, ultimately create a context through which local events can be better understood. This type of insight might otherwise be achieved only through participant observation (McLendon 1981).

Collections thus offer a glimpse into many facets of the past that newly created collections cannot offer (Newton 1981). Moreover, many of these old, undocumented collections do retain a level of wholeness despite the fact that their inception is so murky as to make them seem scarcely worth the trouble of study (Brown 1981). However, collections remain a meaningful factor in our attempt to construct the world around us. Therefore, efforts to understand old collections are one way of analyzing ourselves and our society (Baudrillard 1994, Brown 1981, Pearce 1993, Potvin and Myzelev 2009).

Basket collecting techniques had to have been systematic at least to some degree (Brown 1981).
While the Anthony Zallio Collection of Native American basketry is largely undocumented, it is not devoid of information. To the contrary, this basketry collection offers much more than a means to research the technical features of Native American baskets. It contributes a glimpse into the anthropology being practiced in and around Sacramento during the first half of the 20th century. As this was a time of great transition for the discipline, the Zallio Collection tells us a great deal about anthropology and collecting of a man who practiced anthropology on the margins of a professionalizing discipline.
## APPENDIX A

### CONCORDANCE OF THE ZALLIO COLLECTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BAS #</th>
<th>ACC_NO</th>
<th>Metal Tag</th>
<th>Culture Area</th>
<th>BAS card</th>
<th>1984 Inventory</th>
<th>1993 Inventory</th>
<th>BAS</th>
<th>1984</th>
<th>1993</th>
<th>Reviewed By</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BAS0001</td>
<td>75-2-124</td>
<td>1-124</td>
<td></td>
<td>no culture listed on card</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0002</td>
<td>75-2-84</td>
<td>1-84</td>
<td></td>
<td>no culture listed, bamboo plaited</td>
<td></td>
<td>basket</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0003</td>
<td>75-2-52</td>
<td>1-52</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>no BAS or acc#</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Dawson 3/4/1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0004</td>
<td>75-2-80</td>
<td>1-80</td>
<td>West Africa</td>
<td>Fang Gabon culture area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Dawson 3/4/1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0005</td>
<td>75-2-106</td>
<td>1-106</td>
<td>West Africa</td>
<td>Fang Gabon culture area</td>
<td>no BAS or acc#</td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Dawson 3/4/1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0007</td>
<td>75-2-128</td>
<td>1-128</td>
<td>Samoa, Oceania</td>
<td>Samoa</td>
<td>no BAS or acc#</td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0008</td>
<td>75-2-33</td>
<td>1-33</td>
<td>West Africa</td>
<td>Fang Gabon</td>
<td>no BAS or acc#</td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Dawson 3/4/1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0009</td>
<td>75-2-65</td>
<td>1-65</td>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>probably Aleut</td>
<td>no BAS #</td>
<td>burden basket</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Theodoratus 8/1959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0010</td>
<td>75-2-75</td>
<td>1-75</td>
<td>Southwest U.S.</td>
<td>Apache SW U.S.</td>
<td>jar</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0011</td>
<td>MISSING</td>
<td>1-79</td>
<td>Bristol Bay, Alaska</td>
<td>Theo '59/Dawson '83</td>
<td>no BAS or acc#</td>
<td>missing/bag</td>
<td>unknown crossed out then Zallio</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Theodoratus 8/1959 &amp; Dawson 3/4/1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0014</td>
<td>75-2-100</td>
<td>1-130</td>
<td>Cree, Chippewa N. Athabascan</td>
<td>no BAS or acc#, lists N. Canada Athabascan birch bark</td>
<td>gathering basket</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Theodoratus 8/1959</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0016</td>
<td>MISSING</td>
<td>1-104</td>
<td>Eskimo Eskimo Alaska</td>
<td>no BAS or acc#</td>
<td>household basket</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Dawson 3/4/1983</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0017</td>
<td>75-2-50</td>
<td>1-50</td>
<td>Eskimo Eskimo /Trade basket</td>
<td>BAS listed is 166 - for 1-51?, also on p 119 of inventory w/no BAS or acc#</td>
<td>trade basket</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0018</td>
<td>75-2-64</td>
<td>1-64</td>
<td>Eskimo Eskimo /Alaska</td>
<td>no BAS or acc#</td>
<td>tray</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0020</td>
<td>75-2-111</td>
<td>1-111</td>
<td>Eskimo Eskimo /Alaska</td>
<td>states AK, not Eskimo</td>
<td>basket</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0022</td>
<td>75-2-153</td>
<td>1-153</td>
<td>Gulah - Middle Atlantic Gulah, S Carolina Coast</td>
<td>no BAS or acc#</td>
<td>household basket</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Dawson 3/4/1983</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0039</td>
<td>75-2-49</td>
<td>1-49</td>
<td>Hupa Hupa/NW Coast color wrong for #</td>
<td>no BAS or acc#</td>
<td>hat</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0041</td>
<td>75-4-6</td>
<td>1-34</td>
<td>Karuk, Yurok</td>
<td>Yurok-Karok type</td>
<td>no BAS or acc#</td>
<td>ornamental basket</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0071</td>
<td>75-2-119</td>
<td>1-119</td>
<td>Klamath Lake</td>
<td>Klamath Lake</td>
<td>no BAS or acc#</td>
<td>household basket</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Dawson 3/4/1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0072</td>
<td>75-2-21</td>
<td>1-21</td>
<td>Klamath Lake</td>
<td>Klamath Lake, northern ca</td>
<td>no BAS or acc#</td>
<td>household basket</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0073</td>
<td>75-2-23</td>
<td>1-23</td>
<td>Klamath Lake</td>
<td>Klamath Lake</td>
<td>no BAS or acc#</td>
<td>gathering basket</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Riddell 1959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0075</td>
<td>75-2-101</td>
<td>1-101</td>
<td>Klamath Lake</td>
<td>Klamath Lake type</td>
<td>household basket</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0077</td>
<td>75-2-37</td>
<td>1-37</td>
<td>Card indicates duplicate w/ BAS #334, Klamath Lake</td>
<td>Klamath Lake, So. OR</td>
<td>household basket</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Riddell 1959</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0079</td>
<td>75-2-8</td>
<td>1-8</td>
<td>Klamath Lake</td>
<td>Klamath Lake</td>
<td>&quot;tag says Yurok&quot;</td>
<td>tray</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Riddell 1959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0081</td>
<td>MISSING</td>
<td>1-115</td>
<td>Klamath Lake</td>
<td>Klamath River type</td>
<td>cradle</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0085</td>
<td>75-2-69</td>
<td>1-69</td>
<td>Klamath Lake</td>
<td>Klamath type?</td>
<td>no BAS or acc#</td>
<td>tray</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0090</td>
<td>75-2-83</td>
<td>1-83</td>
<td>Mackenzie, Northern Canada</td>
<td>culture area = Mackenzie</td>
<td>no BAS #</td>
<td>household basket</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0091</td>
<td>75-2-118</td>
<td>1-118</td>
<td>Maidu</td>
<td>Maidu</td>
<td>no BAS or acc #</td>
<td>burden basket</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Dawson 3/4/1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0092</td>
<td>75-2-27</td>
<td>1-27</td>
<td>Maidu</td>
<td>Maidu</td>
<td>no BAS or acc#</td>
<td>burden basket</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Dawson 3/4/1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Basket</td>
<td>BAS or acc?</td>
<td>Household</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0093</td>
<td>75-2-89</td>
<td>1-89</td>
<td>Maidu</td>
<td>Maidu</td>
<td>gathering basket</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Dawson 3/4/1983</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0095</td>
<td>75-2-137*</td>
<td>1-137</td>
<td>DISCREP IN ACC#</td>
<td>Makah? 75-2-137</td>
<td>household basket</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Dawson 3/4/1983</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0099</td>
<td>75-2-2</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>Miwok</td>
<td>Miwok</td>
<td>household basket</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Dawson 3/4/1983</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0100</td>
<td>75-2-88</td>
<td>1-88</td>
<td>Miwok</td>
<td>Plains Miwok</td>
<td>burden basket</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Shanks spring 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0101</td>
<td>75-2-40</td>
<td>1-40</td>
<td>Miwok</td>
<td>Miwok Ione check basket: wilcox, cotton</td>
<td>cooking basket</td>
<td>cooking $5.00</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Dawson 3/4/1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0103</td>
<td>75-2-76</td>
<td>1-76</td>
<td>Miwok - Calaveras</td>
<td>Miwok Calaveras Co.</td>
<td>burden basket</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Dawson 3/4/1983</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0104</td>
<td>75-2-35</td>
<td>1-35</td>
<td>Modoc</td>
<td>Modoc N.E. CA</td>
<td>household basket</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Dawson 3/4/1983</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>1-9</td>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>No BAS</td>
<td>No Acc</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0109</td>
<td>75-1-9</td>
<td>1-9</td>
<td>Nootka</td>
<td>Nootka no BAS or acc#, very fragile 100+ yrs old</td>
<td>hat</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Dawson 3/4/1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0111</td>
<td>75-2-132</td>
<td>1-132</td>
<td>Northern Paiute</td>
<td>Northern Paiute no BAS or acc#</td>
<td>water bottle</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Dawson 3/4/1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0112</td>
<td>75-2-134</td>
<td>1-134</td>
<td>Northern Paiute</td>
<td>Northern Paiute no BAS # states rim is broken</td>
<td>seed bottle</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0113</td>
<td>75-2-73</td>
<td>1-73</td>
<td>Northern Paiute</td>
<td>Northern Paiute seed bottle</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0114</td>
<td>75-2-26</td>
<td>1-26</td>
<td>Dup for BAS 328?, Northern Paiute</td>
<td>Northern Paiute see #328</td>
<td>cradleboard unknown</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0118</td>
<td>75-2-91</td>
<td>1-91</td>
<td>Paiute</td>
<td>Paiute water jar</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0119</td>
<td>75-2-92</td>
<td>1-92</td>
<td>Paiute - jute handles</td>
<td>Paiute seed jar</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0134</td>
<td>75-4-9</td>
<td>1-38</td>
<td>Papago</td>
<td>Papago unknown</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0136</td>
<td>75-2-43</td>
<td>1-43</td>
<td>Pima</td>
<td>Pima type household basket</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0145</td>
<td>75-2-108</td>
<td>1-108</td>
<td>Pomo</td>
<td>Pomo no BAS or acc#, mortar hopper</td>
<td>hopper, mortar</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0155</td>
<td>75-2-112</td>
<td>1-112</td>
<td>Pomo</td>
<td>Pomo has no BAS or acc# household basket</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0166</td>
<td>75-2-51</td>
<td>1-51 /1-150</td>
<td>LID IS 1-150, Puget Sound NWC</td>
<td>Puget Sound</td>
<td>see 1-50</td>
<td>household w/lid</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Dawson 3/4/1983</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0167</td>
<td>75-2-113</td>
<td>1-113</td>
<td>Quinault NWC</td>
<td>probably Quinalt</td>
<td>no BAS or acc#</td>
<td>household basket</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Dawson 5/18/1962</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0168</td>
<td>75-2-87</td>
<td>1-87</td>
<td>Salish</td>
<td>Salish</td>
<td>no BAS #</td>
<td>tray</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0169</td>
<td>75-2-116</td>
<td>1-116</td>
<td>Salish</td>
<td>Salish B.C.</td>
<td>no BAS #</td>
<td>burden basket</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Dawson 3/4/83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0170</td>
<td>75-2-62</td>
<td>1-62</td>
<td>Salishan type</td>
<td>no BAS # references #87</td>
<td>household</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Riddell 12/59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0171</td>
<td>75-2-122</td>
<td>1-122</td>
<td>Santa Cruz, Mexico</td>
<td>Santa Cruz; handwritten note, possibly Zallio's writing</td>
<td>no BAS or acc#</td>
<td>bag</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0179</td>
<td>75-2-55</td>
<td>1-55</td>
<td>Thompson River, B.C.</td>
<td>B.C. Thompson River</td>
<td>no BAS or acc#, basket tray B.C.</td>
<td>tray</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Dawson 3/4/1983</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0180</td>
<td>75-2-48</td>
<td>1-48</td>
<td>Tlingit</td>
<td>Tlingit NW coast</td>
<td>no BAS or acc#; top torn slightly</td>
<td>gathering basket</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0181</td>
<td>75-2-51</td>
<td>1-151</td>
<td>Tlingit</td>
<td>Tlingit NW Coast</td>
<td>match p 98B/C;D has no BAS #</td>
<td>household basket</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0185</td>
<td>75-2-99</td>
<td>1-99</td>
<td>Tlingit</td>
<td>Tlingit type</td>
<td>gathering basket</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Theordoratus nd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Tlingit</td>
<td>Tlingit</td>
<td>household basket</td>
<td>BAS or acc#</td>
<td>notes # discr.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0191</td>
<td>75-2-138</td>
<td>1-138</td>
<td>Tlingit</td>
<td>Tlingit</td>
<td>no BAS or acc#</td>
<td>household basket; notes # discr.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Dawson 3/4/1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0193</td>
<td>75-2-47</td>
<td>1-47</td>
<td>Tsimshian</td>
<td>Tsimshian Metlakatla</td>
<td>no BAS or acc#</td>
<td>burden basket; notes # discr.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0196</td>
<td>75-2-91</td>
<td>1-90</td>
<td>Aleutian Islands</td>
<td>Aleutian Islands</td>
<td>no BAS or acc#</td>
<td>basket; notes # discr</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Dawson 3/4/1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0200</td>
<td>75-2-45</td>
<td>1-145</td>
<td>ID card lists ACC# as 75-2-45, California</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>no BAS</td>
<td>seed beater; notes # discr</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0201</td>
<td>75-2-10</td>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>Persia</td>
<td>listed as Persia</td>
<td>household basket; notes # discr</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0203</td>
<td>75-2-13</td>
<td>1-13</td>
<td>NEED LOCATION, Philippines</td>
<td>Luzon Philippines</td>
<td>hat; notes # discrp</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Dawson 3/4/1983</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0215</td>
<td>75-2-143</td>
<td>1-143</td>
<td>Northwest Coast</td>
<td>western WA/CA</td>
<td>need to check BAS card for description</td>
<td>not sure; notes # discr</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Dawson 3/4/1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0223</td>
<td>75-2-67</td>
<td>1-67</td>
<td>Northwest Coast</td>
<td>NW Coast</td>
<td>no BAS or acc#</td>
<td>burden basket; notes # discr.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0227</td>
<td>75-2-59</td>
<td>1-59</td>
<td>Northwest Coast or plateau?</td>
<td>NW Coast or Plateau</td>
<td>no BAS #</td>
<td>gathering; notes # discr</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Theodoratus 11/1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0229</td>
<td>75-2-133</td>
<td>1-133</td>
<td>Oceania</td>
<td>Oceania</td>
<td>no BAS or acc#</td>
<td>white woman's; notes acc # discr</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Riddell 12/1959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0230</td>
<td>75-2-86</td>
<td>1-86</td>
<td>Oceania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>household; notes acc# discr</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Riddell 12/1959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0231</td>
<td>75-2-46</td>
<td>1-46</td>
<td>Persia</td>
<td>Persia</td>
<td>no BAS or acc#</td>
<td>household; notes acc# discr</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0232</td>
<td>75-2-77</td>
<td>1-77</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>possibly Philippines</td>
<td>no BAS or acc# Check Tag #</td>
<td>household; notes acc# discr</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Riddell nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0233</td>
<td>75-2-22</td>
<td>1-22</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>no BAS or acc#</td>
<td>trade; notes acc# discr</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Dawson 3/4/1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0234</td>
<td>75-2-110</td>
<td>1-110</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td></td>
<td>hat;acc# discr</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0235</td>
<td>1-105</td>
<td>needs ACC#, Samoa, Oceania</td>
<td>only some info matches</td>
<td>household</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no, Riddell</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0239</td>
<td>75-2-94</td>
<td>1-94</td>
<td>UNK</td>
<td>no culture/tribal info</td>
<td>no BAS or acc#, listed as pine needle</td>
<td>white woman's; acc # discr</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0241</td>
<td>75-2-68</td>
<td>1-68</td>
<td>UNK</td>
<td>no culture/tribal info</td>
<td>no BAS or acc#, listed as pine needle + cones</td>
<td>open hopper; acc# discr</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0242</td>
<td>75-2-41</td>
<td>1-41</td>
<td>UNK</td>
<td>no tribal/culture info</td>
<td>no BAS or acc#, listed as coiled grassbundle</td>
<td>household; acc# discr</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0243</td>
<td>75-2-14</td>
<td>1-14</td>
<td>UNK - oceania? Asiatic?</td>
<td>oceanic? Asiatic?</td>
<td>no BAS or acc#</td>
<td>household; acc# discr</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0245</td>
<td>75-2-12</td>
<td>1-12</td>
<td>UNK</td>
<td>no tribal /culture info</td>
<td>grass, coiled no donor info</td>
<td>household; acc# discr</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0247</td>
<td>75-2-147</td>
<td>1-147</td>
<td>UNK</td>
<td>no culture /tribal info</td>
<td>no description or cultural info</td>
<td>white lady's; acc#discr</td>
<td>a name written very lightly, 1933</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Dawson 3/4/1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0255</td>
<td>75-2-97</td>
<td>1-146 /1-97(lid)</td>
<td>UNK</td>
<td>no culture /tribal info</td>
<td>no BAS #</td>
<td>household; acc# discr</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0258</td>
<td>75-2-144</td>
<td>1-144</td>
<td>UNK, California; PAIUTE, GRP UNK</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>seedbeater</td>
<td>seedbeater; acc#discr</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Dawson 3/4/1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0259</td>
<td>75-2-56</td>
<td>1-56</td>
<td>UNK, northwest coast</td>
<td>probably &quot;lill&quot; NW Coast</td>
<td>no BAS or acc#</td>
<td>burden; acc#discr</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0263</td>
<td>75-2-20</td>
<td>1-20</td>
<td>BAG TAG READ 329, DOESN'T MATCH CARD, Wasco</td>
<td>Wasco</td>
<td>inventory location on BAS card doesn't match inventory</td>
<td>household; acc# discr</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0264</td>
<td>75-2-5</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>Wasco, central OR</td>
<td>Wasco</td>
<td>no BAS or acc#</td>
<td>household; acc# discr</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0265</td>
<td></td>
<td>1-30</td>
<td>Wasco</td>
<td>Wasco</td>
<td>no BAS or acc#</td>
<td>household; no #s to match</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0266</td>
<td>75-2-42*</td>
<td>1-42</td>
<td>Wasco</td>
<td>Wasco</td>
<td>no BAS or acc# Check ACC #</td>
<td>acc#discr</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0267</td>
<td>75-2-44</td>
<td>1-44</td>
<td>Wasco, Plateau</td>
<td>Wasco</td>
<td>no BAS or acc#</td>
<td>non food; acc# discr</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Theodoratus 11/1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0268</td>
<td>75-8-7</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>Wasco, Columbia River</td>
<td>Wasco</td>
<td>no BAS or acc#</td>
<td>household</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Theodoratus nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0269</td>
<td>75-2-114</td>
<td>1-114</td>
<td>Washoe, CA</td>
<td>Washoe, Great Basin</td>
<td>no BAS or acc#</td>
<td>sifting; acc#discr</td>
<td>Zallio (1/31/83)?</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Zallio?</td>
<td>Dawson 3/4/1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0270</td>
<td>75-2-70</td>
<td>1-70</td>
<td>Washoe, CA</td>
<td>Washoe, central CA</td>
<td>no BAS or acc#</td>
<td>cradleboard; acc#discr</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Dawson 3/4/1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0271</td>
<td>75-2-100</td>
<td>1-100</td>
<td>Washoe, great basin</td>
<td>Washoe, Great Basin?</td>
<td>no BAS or acc#</td>
<td>burden; acc#discr</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0273</td>
<td>75-4-8</td>
<td>1-139</td>
<td>Washoe</td>
<td>no culture info for this basket</td>
<td>p 80 inv states Oroville, Maidu; p 120 has no info.</td>
<td>basket; acc# discr 1933</td>
<td>Jan-33</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0274</td>
<td>75-4-9</td>
<td>1-141</td>
<td>#3 IN PHOTO FOR 1-139/1-140, Washo</td>
<td>Maidu prehistoric?</td>
<td>no BAS or acc#</td>
<td>basket; missing; collected</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0276</td>
<td>75-2-85</td>
<td>1-85</td>
<td>Washoe</td>
<td>Washoe - other loc info crossed out</td>
<td>no BAS or acc#</td>
<td>household; acc#discr</td>
<td>Zallio, 1932</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Zallio, 1932</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0277</td>
<td>75-2-123</td>
<td>1-123</td>
<td>Washoe</td>
<td>Washoe, Great Basin</td>
<td>inv states Paiute leather straps</td>
<td>burden; acc#discr</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0279</td>
<td>75-2-129</td>
<td>1-129</td>
<td>Yokut</td>
<td>Yokuts, central CA</td>
<td>no BAS or acc#</td>
<td>household; acc#discr</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0284</td>
<td>75-2-95</td>
<td>1-95</td>
<td>Yuki</td>
<td>Yuki? Scotts Valley</td>
<td>no BAS # references 89, Yuki?</td>
<td>household; acc#discr</td>
<td>no, $4.00</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no $4.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0302</td>
<td>MISSING</td>
<td>1-140</td>
<td>ORIGINALLY LABELED AS UNK DONOR, Pomo?</td>
<td>Maidu-Orovile</td>
<td>listed with 303</td>
<td>basket</td>
<td>Jan-33</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0315</td>
<td>75-2-136</td>
<td>1-136</td>
<td>no info</td>
<td>Oceania</td>
<td>Phillipines p 82 lists BAS 135, not 315</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Riddell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0322</td>
<td>74-30-126</td>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>match to page 96</td>
<td></td>
<td>fan fragment</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zallio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0323</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>1-74</td>
<td>Great Basin mini burden basket</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0324</td>
<td>MISSING</td>
<td>1-93</td>
<td>Northeastern U.S.</td>
<td>north east US</td>
<td>match to page 96</td>
<td>basket; no card</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Dawson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0328</td>
<td>75-2-26</td>
<td>1-26</td>
<td>No ID card found. Dup for BAS 114?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>doll cradleboard; acc#discr, dupe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0330</td>
<td>MISSING</td>
<td>1-15</td>
<td>PROB UTE</td>
<td>prob Ute</td>
<td>no BAS or acc#</td>
<td>mat; dupe - see BAS 261</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Dawson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS0335</td>
<td>74-29-10F</td>
<td>Ute</td>
<td>info avail matches p 96D</td>
<td></td>
<td>fan congo; acc# discr</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zallio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Green highlight denotes basketry analysis in Chapter 4
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