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ABSTRACT

The following thesis concerns itself with a collection of 64 stone sculptures commonly known as seated human figure bowls. This prehistoric stone carving tradition from the Strait of Georgia/Puget Sound and Fraser/Thompson river regions was reviewed with an eye towards addressing three fundamental issues. These were: i) to provide a thorough, up to date overview of the subject, including a history of the research conducted, descriptive information and a current catalogue of the collection; ii) to construct a bowl typology in an attempt to bring some spatio-temporal order to the data, and; iii) to investigate elements of meaning/function in the seated human figure bowl form using morphological, archaeological and ethnographic information.

Through library research and the study of museum collections, the goals of this thesis were successfully achieved. A current and complete catalogue now exists for these carvings. The typological analysis establishes three bowl types as well as a hypothetical evolutionary sequence for the tradition. Many issues of temporal and spatial dynamics are highlighted for further research. The hypothesis that these objects were generalised objects of shamanistic power or, "medicine bowls", is offered and justified through various lines of morphological, archaeological and ethnographic evidence.
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Throughout the Strait of Georgia/Puget Sound region of British Columbia and Washington, and into the interior along the Fraser and Thompson rivers, there have been found approximately sixty enigmatic stone carvings known as "seated human figure bowls." It is these carvings that are the focus of this thesis. As this prosaic name implies, seated human figure bowls depict, in three-dimensional stone sculpture, human forms in seated or squatting positions embracing a bowl excavated into the body of the figure. Although considered a part of the "Lower Fraser/Strait of Georgia stone sculpture tradition", seated human figure bowls are distinct from other anthropomorphic stone sculptures by being the most numerous and the most elaborately conceived. A detailed head, a massive, pillar-like neck, an often fully rendered body with arms, legs, and skeletal features and the incorporation of many additional zoomorphic or anthropomorphic elements distinguishes these figures from other sculptures such as "head mortars" or anthropomorphic bowls. They are also quite unlike the flat and un-detailed historic wood carvings from the Salish territories. Other aspects that define this
category are their idiosyncratic form and their depositional pattern.

The carving techniques, many of the details and the structure of the bodies of these figures fit into the "frontal Salish style" of sculptural forms described by Holm (1983: 36) but the handling of the faces of many of them seems oddly out of place. Holm (1983: 37) describes these seemingly aberrant characteristics:

"...their deeply rounded sculptural form, heavy, arched eyebrows over eyes on a full orb, distinct eyelid lines, flaring nostrils, modeled cheek structure and projecting mouth with full lips, are unlike other Salish carved objects."

While the distribution of seated human figure bowls corresponds to that territory occupied by post-contact Salish groups, these characteristics described by Holm are more reminiscent of art styles of the Central or Northern parts of the coast and may allude to some influences from these areas or perhaps the reverse. It should be noted, however, that there is a significant range of stylistic variation within the seated human figure bowl collection and general descriptions such as those above do not always apply to specific cases. These issues will be discussed further in chapter four.

The depositional pattern is also considered an important characteristic of this collection. The vast majority of seated human figure bowls have been found without
the benefit of proper archaeological controls and most have been found without any associated archaeological remains in "remote spots." It is unlikely, then, that these art objects served that role most common for all Northwest Coast art, i.e. as public displays of group membership. Their "non-associational" depositional pattern seems to suggest a more covert role.

This so-called lack of contextual information, that is, the fact that the vast majority of these bowls have been found without benefit of archaeological controls and without associated archaeological evidence, far from being a dead-end, represents, in fact, an opportunity. Their lack of association with the usual archaeological contexts implies that they were originally used and disposed of in "unusual" settings. The following study shows that, through a systematic investigation of the relevant information, these contexts can be at least partially determined, providing the basic distributional information required for further inquiry. It will be the focus of this thesis to conduct such a study; to first answer some basic questions regarding the spatio-temporal distributions of seated human figure bowls and to follow this by addressing elements of meaning. It is my intention not to "de-mystify" these objects, but to highlight them as objects of inquiry rather than objects of simple admiration. The components of this thesis, then, are as follows:
CHAPTER TWO: A general overview of the subject matter including a history of research previously done.

CHAPTER THREE: A brief outline of the theoretical framework within which subsequent discussions are confined.

CHAPTER FOUR: A typological analysis conducted in an attempt to establish some basic spatial and temporal controls.

CHAPTER FIVE: A discussion of meanings/functions using ethnographic, morphological and archaeological data.

CHAPTER SIX: Previous discussions are summarized.

As becomes apparent, firm conclusions regarding chronology and meanings are elusive. However, by compiling the information into a logical whole and by drawing from relevant sources, this thesis answers certain basic questions and infers some broad generalizations regarding seated human figure bowls. At the very least, this thesis should serve as a valuable source of material for other researchers. At the very most, it begins to address some basic questions regarding the spatio-temporal distributions and possible meanings of seated human figure bowls.

To date, most archaeological references to seated human figure bowls have been parenthetic, conclusions about them tentative, and much of their meaning remains locked up with them behind the glass of museum displays. Even without the testimony of their ancient makers and users, however, it is still possible to reconstruct part of their story.
More specifically, my research has achieved three goals: i) the gathering of as much of the relevant data as was possible to acquire and its presentation in an up to date and coherent manner; ii) construction of a seated human figure bowl typology which helps establish chronological, spatial and stylistic controls, and; iii) the investigation of elements of function and meaning inherent in these figures through a systematic study of their archaeology and of their morphological and artistic content.

Though much of their meaning was lost with their makers, the art remains as living testimony to a prehistoric social phenomenon; a code, the full grammar of which may be partially translatable through an investigation of individual communicative gestures. Unfortunately the archaeological interest in these sculptures has been, in most cases, casual at best. This is primarily due to the aforementioned lack of contextual information for these figures. Such information has, in recent years and for good reason, been viewed as of utmost importance to archaeologists when reconstructing prehistoric artifact uses and meanings. Thus, in the absence of such information most archaeologists have been reluctant to venture into what is seen as a path of open-ended speculation. Therefore, the less than ideal archaeological circumstances surrounding the discovery of most seated human figure bowls has jeopardized the apparent utility of their systematic study. This thesis shows, however, that through a
compilation of other relevant information at least part of the story can be told. A reluctance to address such intangible aspects of the archaeological record has left gaping holes in our knowledge of prehistory. While the study of such esoteric subject matter may not yield the iron-clad conclusions so prized by positivists, it may begin to illuminate these dark sections of our knowledge and prompt further inquiry.
2.1 HISTORY OF RESEARCH

The allure of the "seated human figure bowl phenomenon" has attracted the attention of anthropologists and archaeologists for many years. It is possible that the earliest known reference to a seated human figure bowl comes from Franz Boas (1890: 90) who, in an ethnographic report on the Shuswap, described a female puberty ritual in which a peculiar type of stone (steatite) vessel called "tsuqt'a'n" was used by the shaman conducting the ritual. He described the dish as representing "a woman giving birth to a child, along whose back a snake crawls." This is the most convincing direct reference to a seated human figure bowl in use and it suggests that such bowls were in use during the ethnographic period. However, it is likely that Boas was referring to what is now known as the Kamloops bowl (Bowl # 55, Fig. 65) which is conceptually a somewhat different image than that seen in most seated human figure bowls. It is interesting to note that Boas interprets the figure as a "woman giving birth to a child" as opposed to simply a bowl and one wonders whether the ritual itself led to this interpretation.
While the ethnographic records seem to be vague and unhelpful in this respect, there were, during this period of increasing anthropological interest in the Northwest Coast around the turn of the century, more definite archaeological references to seated human figure bowls. These references come from two pioneering researchers; Charles Hill-Tout and Harlan Ingersoll Smith. In 1907, as part of the Jesup North Pacific Expedition, H.I. Smith published his *Archaeology of the Gulf of Georgia and Puget Sound*. In this work we see the first treatment of seated human figure bowls as a distinct class of stone sculpture from the area. Smith calls them "Seated Human Figures Holding a Dish" and begins to allude both to the distinctiveness of this type of sculpture and to the variation inherent within. His musings are strictly descriptive and he offers no explanation regarding their use. It may be worth noting that Smith's earlier 1899 work *The Archaeology of Lytton, B.C.* contains no references at all to seated human figure bowls even though this has turned out to be an area that has produced many of the known specimens (see Map 1).

In his 1899 work, *The Prehistoric Races of British Columbia and Their Monuments*, Charles Hill-Tout wrote about a stone bowl being used in a female puberty ritual. His descriptions were very similar to those of Boas in 1890 and the two may well have been talking about the same bowl. Again, this particular stone bowl, (Bowl # 55, Fig. 65),
while it normally would be included within the seated human figure bowl class, is significantly different in style and contains a seemingly different image than that seen in seated human figure bowls. The delicate features on the very rounded face are unlike those on other seated human figure bowls. Also, the figure does not embrace a bowl but sits atop a very large, bulbous head into which a candlestick-holder like depression is excavated. This reinforces the idea that, while Boas and Hill-Tout may have been right about a certain stone bowl being used in a female puberty ritual, they were referring to a figure that may lie outside the seated human figure bowl class or, at least, represents an extreme in the overall range of variation seen within that class. However, Hill-Tout certainly was familiar with what we now call seated human figure bowls. Indeed, at the famous Marpole midden site, the discovery of which is in part due to Hill-Tout, a seated human figure bowl was found apparently perched on top of a stone cairn described as a "shaman's altar". This figure is the well known "Marpole Image" (Bowl # 5, Fig. 16). Strangely, one of the accompanying illustrations of this cairn depicts, not the Marpole Image bowl but another one from Cowichan Bay (Bowl # 43, Fig. 54).

Thus, by the early 1900's the seated human figure bowl had been described and recognized, albeit rather vaguely, as a distinct class of stone sculpture on the South Coast of B.C. Very little, however, had been said about
possible meanings or functions. For the next 50 years there was a relative dearth of information on the subject until a general resurgence of interest in Northwest Coast art around the 1950's. In 1952 Paul Wingert wrote Prehistoric Stone Sculpture of the Pacific Northwest which, although it now seems rather cursory, represented one of the first detailed studies of Northwest Coast prehistoric stone sculpture. In that study Wingert began to investigate ideas of sculptural form as it related to possible messages and imagery inherent within the figures. Thus, he began to tap into the "deeper meanings" of seated human figure bowls, which he described as "The most common and important kind of carving typical of the northern area" (ibid: 22), (by this he meant the Strait of Georgia/Puget Sound region). This work paved the way for subsequent more detailed studies on the subject as archaeological work in the area intensified and brought to light more extensive material culture collections. Also, by this time (early 1950's) more rigorous methodologies were being applied to Northwest Coast archaeology which had an effect on how artifacts were classified.

In 1956 stone sculpture traditions were investigated in even larger terms in John C. Galloway's Doctoral dissertation entitled Prehistoric Stone Sculpture of the Western United States. The scope of this study did not allow for a very thorough investigation of any particular tradition but did point to the importance of early Northwest
Coast sculptural traditions. Galloway's treatment of seated human figure bowls in particular was very vague and confined solely to form.

Several other studies focused on Strait of Georgia stone sculpture traditions in general and used this evidence as a means of better understanding cultural practices and movements. Philip Drucker (1955a), Charles Borden (1950) and Marian Smith (1950), for example, each postulated centres from which Northwest Coast cultural traits were originally derived, based, in part, on the stone sculptural traditions of the Fraser River and South Coast region. Smith (1950: 39) believed that the "carving complex" of this region pointed to the Lower Fraser drainage as "...a main, if not the main, early cultural focus of the Northwest Coast" (ibid: 39). Drucker and Borden argued for an interior origin for many so-called Northwest Coast cultural traits, based on the distribution of "massive stone carving."

It was not until 1956 that the first and only definitive work on seated human figure bowls was completed, when Wilson Duff published his Prehistoric Stone Sculpture of the Fraser River and Gulf of Georgia. This work, for the first time, gathered all relevant information regarding such sculptures and organized it in a coherent way. Duff included very detailed descriptions of the general form of seated human figure bowls as well as separate descriptions of individual finds (complete with as much contextual and
distributional information as was available). He also included photos of each of the bowls for which he had information, representing a much larger collection than previously thought. Duff helped to establish various classes of stone sculpture from the area and suggested relationships among them. He worked out a hypothetical sequence of stone sculpture development which he saw culminating in the seated human figure bowl form. Duff, also for the first time, pursued questions of function and helped establish the idea that these bowls were likely associated with shamanism, with the guardian spirit complex and with various ritualistic purposes.

Although the world's museums continued to have an avid interest in Northwest Coast art, archaeological concern on the Northwest Coast during the 1960's and 70's turned away from cultural movements and towards matters of adaptation and economics so that investigations of "non-utilitarian" artifacts waned. Art objects such as seated human figure bowls took a back seat to harpoon heads and more "functional" objects. Of course it is worth mentioning that in 1965 Bill Holm published his work *Northwest Coast Indian Art: An Analysis of Form* which established a vocabulary pertaining to ethnographic artistic forms of the Northwest Coast still in usage today.

A resurgent interest in things artistic occurred by the late 1970's and 80's and mention of seated human figure
bowls began to re-appear in the archaeological literature. That coincided with a renewed interest in non-economic aspects of the prehistoric cultures of the Northwest Coast, including ceremonialism and shamanism. Carlson's (editor) Indian Art Traditions of the Northwest Coast was published in 1983 and helped to bring together some of the current thinking on aspects of Northwest Coast Art. In that work several authors (Borden, Carlson, Duff, Holm) mention seated human figure bowls, with Borden and Holm expressing uncertainty about their exact placement within the art traditions of the area. Their concern lay in the fact that the general form of these sculptures, while reminiscent of Salish art forms, also exhibited more northerly traits. Carlson, interested in the meaning and functions of these bowls, attempted to tie them more closely to shamanism, based largely on what he saw as indications of shamanistic motifs (reptilian forms, for example). Wilson Duff had always been interested in the meaning of these objects and his long standing interest had, by the time of this publication, pushed him into deeper levels of investigation. Duff was now interested in going beyond the mere iconographic content of such sculptures and pursuing issues of symbolic and structural relationships. His ideas, as expressed in his Images: Stone: B.C. (1975) have been an inspiration to many.

Finally, the most recent studies relevant to this topic are those that have approached the subject in more
"contemporary" ways. Two such works include Aldona Jonaitis' (1984) *Style as Meaning in the Shamanic Art of the Northern Northwest Coast* and Margaret Holm's (1990) *Prehistoric Northwest Coast Art: A Stylistic Analysis of the Archaeological Record*. These works have helped to open up new avenues of investigation for those interested in Northwest Coast art.

2.2 DESCRIPTION

As stated earlier, seated human figure bowls represent a seated or squatting figure, into the lap of which a small bowl or depression is excavated (see Fig. 1 for examples). The rendering of the "seated" human form itself is not unlike other human representations seen on art works from the Northwest Coast. Totem poles from the Central and Northern Coasts, for example, often depict semi-seated or squatting human forms with arms and legs wrapped around the core of the pole in similar fashion to that seen on seated human figure bowls. Many of the figures are adorned with additional animal and human like forms, as well as revealing parts of the skeleton in the X-ray style. The figures range in height from about 9cm to as much as 53 cm. Typically, they sit upright on a flat base and, in many cases, lean slightly backwards, giving the effect of an upward gaze. A disproportionately large and detailed head rests upon a
massive neck separating it from the often rudimentary body and the bowl itself seems best conceived as an integral element of the body and not as a separate entity (Borden 1983: 154; Wingert 1952: 23). As Wilson Duff (1956: 50) points out, however, these descriptions must only be considered generalizations as exceptions do exist. These issues will be addressed in greater detail in subsequent sections.
FIGURE 1

Seated Human Figure Bowl Examples
(from Smith 1907: 142)
Although there is some range of material type within the collection, including vesicular lava, pumice, sandstone and other coarse grained rocks, the most preferred material by far was steatite. Considering that the physical properties of steatite make it an ideal carving medium (softness, colour variety, ease of polishing) it is not surprising that this is the case. Indeed, steatite may have been in use as a carving medium within this study area as early as the Milliken Phase on the Coast (ca. 9000 BP) (Borden 1975: 67), and as early as the middle of the Plateau Horizon (ca. 2000 BP) (Richards & Rousseau 1987: 36) in the B.C. Southern Interior.

For prehistoric carvers of seated human figure bowls, finding steatite was probably not difficult. Steatite deposits in B.C. and the Northwestern United States occur along fault lines where serpentine rock come into contact with siliceous sedimentary rock (Learning 1979: 6; Coleman 1989: 170). Since this area of the world consists of a network of fault systems, in situ deposits of steatite, though scattered, are relatively abundant, especially in the Fraser canyon.
TECHNIQUES OF MANUFACTURE

Steatite, unlike wood, is very soft and generally lacks a dominant grain that may impose structural limitations on a carver's cuts. For this reason, steatite is more easily rendered into three dimensional forms than wood and different techniques and skills would necessarily be applied to these different media. Nevertheless, it is possible that the same range of tool types used in wood carving were applied to steatite. Typical wood carving tools such as choppers, adzes and chisels would be effective at initially "roughing out" large blocks of steatite. Seated human figure bowls, then, were most likely rendered through the use of a variety of carving implements, including gouging and cutting tools (chisels and knives) to establish basic shape, and incising and scraping tools such as saws, knives and engravers to render the finer details. It has been argued that sharpened beaver teeth would also work very well in this capacity (Duff 1956: 49; Borden 1983: 154). Many bowls also include perforations, depressions and holes made with some type of borer or drill. The final finishing stage, in many cases, was to create a fine polish through the use of fine grit abraders and leather buffers. Repeated handling and rubbing by human hands also worked in this capacity. Figures made of other, more coarse grained rocks were generally done in less detail through the use of simple pecking techniques (Duff 1956: 49;
Borden 1983: 154). Such materials, including sandstone or vesicular lava, do not lend themselves as well to the detailed incising work seen on many of the figures.

**FORM**

Discussing form in prehistoric art objects is always problematic since the vocabularies used are primarily those established for ethnographic art. Although certain artistic traditions and conventions seen in ethnographic art of the Northwest Coast can be traced back well into prehistory, a great range of variability according to local conventions, stretching across several thousand years of "artistic history" makes it difficult to fit all prehistoric artistic traditions into the same neat categories established for ethnographic art.

Seated human figure bowls present a particularly curious problem in terms of form since the range of variability within the collection seems to include examples of both Northern and Southern Northwest Coast ethnographic art styles. The Southern variant of Northwest Coast art is dominated by "flat" three dimensional sculpture with only single figures represented on the field of design and very little surface embellishment. The Northern variant, by contrast, is dominated by carefully structured combinations of essentially two-dimensional curvilinear design elements.
(ovoids, U-forms, S-forms, crescents etc.) to form continuous "formline" compositions consisting of a complex inter-weaving of various animal and human forms. Of course, this is a vastly simplified account of some of the basic differences between Northern and Southern Northwest Coast art, not taking into account the various intricacies that are involved, but it does illustrate the merging of these two stylistic variants in the seated human figure bowl form.

The bodies of the figures, with their rudimentary, incised representations of legs and arms conform to what Holm (1983: 37) would describe as the "frontal Salish style." By this, he means essentially that the three dimensional figure is conceived from two dimensional carving traditions. In that case, negative elements that create positive relief on a two dimensional surface have been applied more deeply to a curved surface creating an effectively sculptural form (Holm 1983: 33). Arms, legs, skeletal features, and other bodily structures are essentially raised, positive elements, given form by the sensitive creation of negative space and ground areas. Again, in adherence to basic Salish sculpting conventions, the head of the figures are rendered in far greater detail and are disproportionately large relative to the rest of the figure (Duff 1956: 50; Borden 1983: 154). Certainly, because of their distribution in space (ie. corresponding to Salish territories), a conformity to
Southern artistic traditions would be expected, assuming no intervening changes in ethnicity in late prehistory.

The faces of many of the figures, however, seem strangely out of context as they conform more closely to artistic conventions of the Central and Northern Coasts (see, for eg, Fig. 2). In the words of Bill Holm (1983: 37),

"...the faces of many of them, with their deeply rounded sculptural form, heavy, arched eyebrows over eyes on a full orb, distinct eyelid lines, flaring nostrils, modelled cheek structure and projecting mouth with full lips, are unlike other carved Salish objects. I don't know just where they fit in."

Wilson Duff (1956: 51) puzzled over this issue as well and noted that the facial characteristics on seated human figure bowls bore a striking stylistic resemblance to those facial styles seen on wood carvings of the Central and Northern Northwest Coast. There are, however, some Salish sculptures that do exhibit some or all of these apparently aberrant characteristics described by Holm (eg. Suttles 1983, Fig. 4:12 and Fig.4:13b). One wonders if this apparent "Northern" idiosyncracy seen on the seated human figure bowl form has been overstated. This and other issues of form will be the subject of more detailed discussion in subsequent sections.
FIGURE 2

Bowl # 38. Note Northern Stylings. (Photo by Author).
The completed composition of the seated human figure bowl form is made up of separate elements that interweave to create a singular image. The three essential elements as I see it are: the head, the body, and embellishing signatures. Detailed descriptions of individual seated human figure bowl elements already exist in Duff's 1956 work *Prehistoric stone sculpture of the Fraser River and Gulf of Georgia* and need not be repeated here. (Several bowls have been discovered since that work was published but none so idiosyncratic as to render Duff's descriptions invalid). Instead, I will formulate more generalized comments based on these descriptions.

Judging by the disproportionate size and detail, the head might be considered to be the central element in the image. It most certainly depicts a human form, but whether this refers to different individuals or to some central mythological figure is difficult to determine. As the subsequent typological analysis will show, categories of bowl types can be established based largely on different styles of facial renderings and this may imply that different seated human figure bowl types depict different individuals based on local mythological traditions.

The body of the figure is relatively un-detailed, with the bowl forming the central element. It is not unusual
in Northwest Coast depictions of human forms to neglect the body in favour of the head in this way, nor is it uncommon throughout the world's traditional cultures to incorporate a vessel into a human or animal form in works of art. The union of a vessel and a human form may carry with it a complexity of varied meanings ranging possibly from ideas of sexuality, fertility and, of course, consumption. That it occurs so universally is grounds for asserting that this image might be a human mental archetype of some kind, but this is an issue best left to art historians and social psychologists.

On seated human figure bowls the vessel excavation is inextricably bound up with the human body; ie. it forms an integral element as opposed to a separate entity. This, and the fact that the bowl itself usually holds little utilitarian value as a receptacle because of its small size, (few hold more than a cupful of water) implies that it is more symbolic than practical. The bowls also may have had practical value as a mortar for preparing small amounts of medicinal plant material, tobacco or paint. Some evidence of polishing perhaps caused by this grinding action is present in some cases. Unfortunately, residue analysis is impractical because of poor preservation conditions and contamination. As a symbolic receptacle of some kind it makes most sense that such a bowl held some small offering more symbolic itself than substantive.
What I have called "embellishing signatures" are those additional motifs around the bowl and main figure, such as revealed skeletal forms, additional animal and human figures and various holes and depressions (see, for eg, Figs. 3-9). They seem best explained as bits of extra meaning added to the central image according to, not only some shared artistic conventions, but to the personal whims of the artist. They may be personal communicative gestures in accordance with the guardian spirit complex (which will be discussed at greater length in chapter five). Also, many of these motifs (x-ray style, lizard-like creatures, and snakes which are the most frequently recurring themes) are suggestive of shamanistic practices (Carlson 1983: 200). An intermingling of human and animal forms often expresses a power relationship between a person and his spirit helpers.

The drilled holes may have once held feathers or burning twigs as an incense holder though this is pure speculation. Like any religious icon (if, in fact, this is what seated human figure bowls were) it is very difficult to unravel their meanings within traditional ritual. The problem is to work backwards from these motifs and overall form to attempt to reconstruct the bowl's role within its ritual context.
FIGURE 3

Bowl # 37. Note ribs and backbone in the x-ray style. (photo by M. Wollstonecroft).
FIGURE 4

Bowl # 18. Note snake motif.
(photo by M. Wollstonecroft).
FIGURE 5

Bowl # 18. Note double-headed lizard (?) motif. (photo by M. Wollstonecroft).
Bowl # 40. Note frog motif.
(photo by M. Wollstonecroft).
Bowl # 47. Note additional human face motif. (photo by author).
FIGURE 9

Bowls # 33 & 31
Note blowing or sucking mouth motif.
(enlarged from Duff 1956: 140).
METAPHOR

The role of metaphor; that is, the expressions of individual creative processes through coded, universal gestures, in ethnographic Northwest Coast art is a rich and varied topic. Seated human figure bowls seem to make use of this well developed sense of metaphor, although it may be impossible to reconstruct. Bowl # 2 (Fig 10), for example, seems designed to sit in one of two ways, either upright on its base or face down thus resembling a turtle. Wilson Duff (1983) urged examiners of Northwest Coast art to penetrate beyond the pre-iconographical and the descriptive to deeper levels of meaning inherent in the art. In addition to its more mundane role within social and religious systems, Duff saw, in Northwest Coast art, deeper more general meanings expressed through a logic of symbol, image and metaphor. Elements of this logic may be deeply encoded within the seated human figure bowl form as latent expressions of sexuality, male-female relations or consumption. However, in the interests of avoiding the potentially speculative nature of such inquiries these issues are treated only cursorily in this thesis.
Bowl # 2. Note double image or use of metaphor. (photo by M. Wollstonecroft).
As mentioned, the lack of contextual information has made age determination of these objects a difficult task. Three of the bowls have been found at the well known Marpole site (although perhaps under questionable circumstances) at the mouth of the Fraser river. That suggests that at least some seated human figure bowls were in use during the Marpole Phase of the south coast of British Columbia, between 2500 and 1500 BP. In addition, the sculptural styles and motifs of many seated human figure bowls seem to fit within larger stone sculpture traditions known to begin around Marpole times (although with some notable differences). Thus most references to these figures have assigned them to the Marpole period (eg. Borden 1983: 155; Duff 1956: 48; Fladmark 1986: 92).

That age assignment seems also to agree with evidence from the Mid-Fraser-Thompson river region of the Interior Plateau, where at least fourteen seated human figure bowls have also been found. Carved steatite objects exhibiting certain stylistic attributes similar to those on seated human figure bowls have been dated tentatively to the Plateau Horizon (2400 - 1200 BP) and more definitely to the Kamloops Horizon (1200 - 200 BP) (see Richards & Rousseau 1987 figure 20). The Plateau Horizon also seems to mark the beginnings of more widespread systems of exchange connecting
the South Coast and Plateau. Among other things steatite, nephrite and obsidian from the interior were being traded for coastal slate, whalebone and shell (Richards & Rousseau 1987: 49). Seated human figure bowls, either in completed form or in concept only, were seemingly a part of this increasing association between the south coast and the interior during this critical period between 2500 and 1200 BP.

**DISTRIBUTION AND CONTEXTS**

As stated previously, almost all known seated human figure bowls have been found without the benefit of proper archaeological procedures, dug up by accident in farmers' fields, in private gardens and, in one case, unearthed by a mischievous pig. However, a fairly clear picture of their geographic distribution can still be seen. Corresponding to the post-contact Salishan territories, the geographical distribution of seated human figure bowls ranges from the south-east coast of Vancouver Island and the Strait of Georgia/Puget Sound region in the west, throughout the mainland South Coast area and eastward into the interior along the Fraser and Thompson rivers, as far as Shuswap Lake. The heaviest concentrations centre around Lytton and Lillooet and the Lower Fraser Valley.

Again, only three bowls have been found under proper archaeological conditions, all at the Marpole site and
for the rest there are only sketchy descriptions of discovery contexts. Nevertheless, certain depositional patterns have been noticed. Wilson Duff (1956: 47) concluded that,

"...the figures have some association with grave burials in the Interior, with "remote spots" in the Lower Fraser, and with habitation sites on the Gulf of Georgia."

It is certain that the depositional pattern of seated human figure bowls currently poses many questions. Again, it was my hope that a typological analysis would reveal a more detailed pattern to this distribution. More specifically, my hope was that a typological analysis would reveal locational preferences and discrete distributions of certain bowl types according to area.
Map 1. Seated Human Figure Bowl Distribution.
Although there is significant variation among the 64 specimens dealt with in this study, each figure representing a unique and individual vision, a definite uniformity of concept and design unites them as a distinct category of stone sculpture. Recurring themes and motifs that form a recognizable shared pattern are: a stone medium, general adherence to a Southern Northwest Coast carving paradigm often mixed with traits known from the Central and Northern Northwest Coast, a merging of three themes: a seated human form (seemingly asexual, or bisexual), animal forms and a vessel. The merging of human and animal forms is an image not uncommon among many of the world's peoples past and present, and represents a basic duality between those two types of consciousness. This is consistent with Salish transformation myths and Guardian Spirit complexes. The end result is a vessel seemingly more symbolic than practical, found in a depositional pattern that suggests some "covert" purpose.

Each figure is a unique variation on a given theme, the messages and meanings of which were, presumably, shared by the makers, users, and seers alike. It is this exciting interplay between uniformity and uniqueness as well as the rich, almost mystical content of these objects, that has attracted the interest of Northwest Coast archaeologists.
through the years. Whether or not this category had meaning prehistorically is an issue that will be discussed later but, from a purely morphological perspective, the distinctness of the seated human figure bowl form is self-evident. (see Fig. 11 for other examples of anthropomorphic bowl carvings).
Other examples of human figures with bowl.
(photo by M. Wollstonecroft).
Various theories have been postulated regarding the function and/or meaning of the figures. Some (eg. Duff 1956: 56) have suggested that some were used as divining vessels to foresee important events. Others (eg. Boas 1890: 90) feel that they were used in female puberty rites or in cleansing rituals. Perhaps, say others, (eg. Carlson 1983: 201) they were used as mortars to prepare medicines or tobacco. None of these speculations have been satisfactorily verified, although there does seem to be general agreement about the shamanic nature of these artifacts. The "mysterious" contexts, the x-ray style, and the depiction of reptilian forms, are all aspects suggestive of shamanism. As for any deeper symbolic content inherent in the seated human figure bowl image, less has been said. Wilson Duff (1983: 58) suggested that these figures have a symbolic structure and can be subjected to a structural analysis to decipher the deep meanings of the image.

Typically, investigators of seated human figure bowls have suggested singular functions for them, such as, divining vessels or puberty rite objects. It is my contention that seated human figure bowls were generalized objects of shamanistic power, whose utility was not confined to a singular function. This hypothesis is argued in chapter five.
2.3 SUMMARY

Some of the groundwork, then, for the study of seated human figure bowls has been laid and we can now make some fairly broad and general statements regarding certain aspects:

1. Seated human figure bowls represent a unique prehistoric artistic tradition from the Fraser River and Strait of Georgia/Puget Sound region.

2. They were made using traditional carving techniques on local and imported lithic materials, with a preference for Fraser River steatite.

3. Their form, though puzzling in certain regards, adhere most closely to Marpole Phase carving styles.

4. Though difficult to determine with any precision, their age lies most likely within the range of 2500 to 1200BP with some possibility of persistence into the early post-contact era.

5. Their geographical distribution corresponds to the core Salish territories of the South Coast of British Columbia and the Fraser Valley.

6. The precise functions and meanings of these objects are difficult to determine although it does seem likely that they played some part within the shamanistic ideologies of their makers.
CHAPTER THREE
METHOD AND THEORY

3.1 EPISTEMOLOGICAL ISSUES

The main body of this thesis consists of two parts: 1. "distributions" and; 2. "meanings." In the interests of clarity, some theoretical foundations should be laid for each. Let me begin with "distributions."

In any thorough analysis of a set of artifacts, such as seated human figure bowls, an essential preliminary step is to establish some spatial and chronological controls. A common and relatively non-controversial method is through the construction of a typology, as done in chapter four. Two epistemological issues are raised in such a pursuit: i) the appropriateness of the typological approach, and; ii) the legitimacy of the basic concept of "seated human figure bowls" as a distinct category of stone sculpture. In defense of my typological approach, I will attempt to address each of these issues in turn.

"Typologies" occupy the lower levels of the theory building hierarchy, meaning that they are generalizations based on strictly empirical data, the dimensions of which, "...are the classical ones of space, time, and form" (Trigger 1989: 21). Conclusions based upon typological analyses will
be directly referrable to accessible archaeological data and, for this reason, should be easily defended. They will not refer to human behaviour but only to observed regularities in the archaeological record.

Because of this strictly empirical foundation and because of the relatively non-controversial conclusions that they arouse, typological analyses are relatively unscathed by the slings and arrows of academic complaint. Most archaeologists wholeheartedly agree on the fact that typological constructions are, "...an essential preliminary to any behavioral interpretation of prehistory" (Trigger 1989: 385). However, the concept of "type" as an analytically defined "model-form" is filled with potential problems. One typical and legitimate complaint about typological analyses is the fact that artifact classifications reflect the subjective biases of the investigator and not necessarily any prehistoric reality. Furthermore, artifacts can be viewed through many different lenses, meaning that classifications done by different individuals may vary considerably. These complaints, however, do not render typological analysis an ineffective tool for bringing order to disparate bits of archaeological data provided that the investigator understands and articulates his or her own biases. In the case of seated human figure bowls, the intention of my typological analysis was simply to determine distributions in
time and space. Any conclusions will be testable and refutable through the appearance of contrary cases.

Since many typological analyses have endured the test of time, it seems to me that the discovery of objective, non-random patterns is possible through such analyses. Since a portion of this thesis concerns itself with a behavioral interpretation of the manifest phenomenon of seated human figure bowls I feel justified in a typological approach as a necessary preliminary.

The second and potentially more problematic issue is whether or not "seated human figure bowls" can be legitimately considered a distinct artifact category to which a typological analysis can be applied. While these forms may, occupy a portion of a stone sculpture continuum from the Fraser river and Gulf of Georgia region (Duff 1975: 43), it is also true that they are sufficiently like one another and sufficiently unlike other sculptural products that a distinct category is warranted.

A difficulty comes in trying to define where exactly within this sculptural continuum one form ends and another begins. What demarcates the boundary between seated human figure bowls and, say, zoomorphic bowls? Does such a definite boundary even exist? Such questions apply to any attempt at classification. It is an imprecise tool whose effectiveness is only enabled by some a priori assumptions. Based on self evident features of form and deposition, the
hypothesis that the seated human figure bowl form represents a distinct category of stone sculpture from the Fraser River and Gulf of Georgia region has been established. This hypothesis has been tested by attempting to isolate variables which pertain only to the seated human figure bowl form. Only by making such assumptions can investigations proceed to the main task of classifying the variations within this category. It must be stressed that, in the first instance, the classifications presented here (although, in some cases, based on objective measurement) are the constructs of my own subjective "etic" biases and may not reflect any prehistoric "emic" perspectives. However, the typological analysis serves as a "first order" tool that helps answer some basic distributional questions.

The second part of this paper concerns itself with elements of function and meaning within the seated human figure bowl form. It is here that I leave the relative safety of an empirical foundation and begin to make theoretical extensions. This brings me to an investigative crossroads described by Glassie (1975: 185) in this way:

"Once the artifact, whether document or house, has been analyzed, the student has a choice. He may stop; from the angle of scientific method he cannot go further. Or, he may adopt the risky sort of explanation traditional to history and move from assembled facts to hypothetical causes, thus eschewing methodological purity for understanding."
Since I believe that seated human figure bowls represent much more than simply the sum of their observable parts; that they are "representations of ideas" (Leach 1973: 763), to stop my investigations according to the dictates of the scientific method as Glassie understands would be a mistake. Furthermore, the implication in the above quote, that to continue investigations at this point is to engage in non-scientific speculations, arises out of an outdated and flawed view of science. In her 1982 (42) work Epistemological Issues Raised by a Structuralist Archaeology, Alison Wylie eloquently reminds us that,

"...the theoretical principles that make explanatory sense of a field of perceptually constituted facts generally do this by specifying connections among facts which are not themselves observable, that is, by referring them to underlying productive mechanisms or causal relations which are assumed to have generated them."

And that,

"...it is just this extension beyond observables, this attempt to bring into view the mechanisms and processes responsible for manifest phenomena, that characterises science and gives scientific theory its unique explanatory power."

Because my hope is to bring into view at least some of the invisible mechanisms that generated the manifest phenomena of seated human figure bowls, I feel justified in proceeding forward at Glassie's crossroads. There still remains, however, the task of demonstrating that my
investigations carry the epistemological weight of more than mere guesswork.

My epistemological approach follows what has been called in the philosophy of knowledge "the coherence theory of knowledge" which, as Laurence Bonjour (1985: 97) states,

"....requires that the entire system of beliefs form a unified structure, that there be laws and principles which underly the various subsystems of beliefs and provide a significant degree of inferential connection between them."

Although this theory is normally applied within the field of epistemology, it also lays a solid foundation for the pursuit of any empirical knowledge. Thus, regarding the functions and meanings of seated human figure bowls, the value of my conclusions are judged on how well they 'hang together' or cohere with the various bits of evidence presented. The aim is to investigate many different lines of evidence and to formulate unifying hypotheses. Conclusions, then, unlike mere guesses, are subject to constraints of plausibility, of empirical evidence, and of general coherence. Like all archaeological enquiry, I am dealing, not in proofs, but in probabilities.
3.2 ART AND MEANING

Because this thesis has, as its focus, works of art, it is appropriate for me to articulate some of the perspectives from the anthropological study of art that have influenced me. First, let me deal with the issue of why seated human figure bowls should be treated as "objects of art." This, of course, is an issue of rather large philosophical proportions and a very "slippery" subject since the boundary between art and non-art is always imprecise. Simply put, however, seated human figure bowls satisfy two general criteria that begin to define this boundary (from Layton 1981): one, they were done with the intention that they be aesthetically pleasing and not just pragmatically functional and; two, they are devices of communication using as its media, images and metaphors.

Aesthetics is a subject that does not enter into this thesis in any central way for the simple reason that aesthetic values may not be universally expressed (it is irrelevant that I personally believe that they are). It may well be that the value of seated human figure bowls to their makers and users was based not on a sense of aesthetics (although it could have been) but on how well they communicated their message. If the intended metaphors and images are understood then the carving has carried out its artistic function. I should mention that an aesthetic sense
of form and craftsmanship seems abundantly apparent in many of the figures but I argue that this arose out of individual desires "to create" and was not required for the ultimate message to be articulated. Certainly, these individual gestures and expressions are messages in themselves but, as an anthropologist, it is the shared messages expressed collectively by all of these figures that interests me most.

It is the second criterion, then, that of the use of images and metaphors as means of communication that is the main focus of attention in this study. The recurring motifs and characters, the artistic and material forms, the relationships of the parts to the whole, are all translatable devices of communication. Each seated human figure bowl may be a successive representation of the same ideas, what Wollheim (1980: 172) might have described as "...many tokens of one type." This visual means of communication is, of course, very common in non-literate societies. There are constraints and rules to these types of directly communicative art forms and the varied forms that are to be found within these rules are products of style (personal, regional and temporal).

When investigating artifacts of such obvious artistic value one cannot simply discuss function without discussing meaning. In this light I follow the words of E. Leach (1973: 763) when he says that,
"Archaeologists must appreciate that the material objects revealed by their excavations are not things in themselves, nor are they just artifacts – things made by men – they are representations of ideas."

My hope was to discover the 'ideas' that lie behind and are responsible for the creation of such unique artifacts; that is, to understand their meaning.

To understand the messages within, then, we must first understand the "rules" of seated human figure bowls. In the words of Robert Layton (1981 24),

"To understand the artist's aims we must first understand the symbolism he utilized. The art object one observes is merely the tangible expression of a cultural, and therefore a mental construct, expressed according to that culture's conventions of visual representation."

In other words, we must be able to understand the formal and symbolic conventions at work during the production of seated human figure bowls in order to begin translating the messages held there.

As a means of penetrating these rules I have considered a scheme worked out by Thomas Munro (1949) in which he delineated three levels of artistic intentionality: "the Presented" (colours, shapes) which is the domain of form, "the Suggested" (symbolic information) and "the Structural" (relationships of parts), representing the domain of meaning at different levels. An equally useful and
corresponding scheme is Panofsky's (1955) in which he delineates three progressively deeper aspects of subject matter; the Formal, the Iconographical, and the Iconological.

In terms of artistic form, I have at my disposal a Northwest Coast vocabulary previously worked out by others (notably Holm 1965, Stewart 1979, Lundy 1983), but am also faced with the peculiar formal characteristics of seated human figure bowls that have puzzled other investigators. By investigating the purely formal characteristics (materials, techniques of manufacture, motifs etc) the task is to define a vocabulary of form that applies to seated human figure bowls in general and to particular types specifically, and to fit these definitions into the larger prehistoric art traditions of the area. While this is no simple task, it does not raise any significant theoretical issues apart from my own observational biases.

One should try, however, to move beyond the purely formal to deeper levels of meaning. "What" questions should be bound up with "why" questions. The choices made by the artist regarding the formal characteristics of his or her work may combine with the symbolic and structural information presented there to produce a representation of many ideas. This brings us then to Munro's second and third levels of artistic intentionality, "the Suggested and the Structural" (Panofsky's Iconographical and Iconological). To penetrate these levels of meaning the investigator must have a ...
progressively more detailed knowledge of the artist's cultural background" (Layton 1981: 30). To penetrate the "suggested" (iconographical) information presented in seated human figure bowls one must decipher the imagery, which requires a certain knowledge of the artistic vocabularies at work. Here we are interested in determining "who" and "what" is being portrayed in these figures. Deeper still, is the "Structural" (iconological) information, wherein lie the cultural premises that inform the artist's choices. This distinction is summed up nicely by Robert Layton (1981: 31) when he writes:

"In art, iconography is concerned with the identification of the characteristic motifs employed in particular art traditions: the recognition that certain figures portray the Holy Family, or particular saints; whereas iconology is taken up with assessing the underlying cultural premises from out of which the artist's work was drawn, and which he may quite unconsciously express in what he produces."

As I penetrate deeper and deeper into the meanings of seated human figure bowls I draw on a progressively more complex set of assumptions regarding the cultures that produced them, and conclusions are correspondingly less and less definite. The structural level of meaning is not pursued in any central way within this thesis.
Let me conclude this section with a brief and more specific discussion on different levels of meaning in ethnographic Northwest Coast art. Combined with Munro's three tiered scheme, that may provide a coherent framework with which to study meaning in the seated human figure bowl form. It should be noted that across the many spatial boundaries and 5000 years of "artistic history" on the Northwest Coast, there was a great range of artistic variability. Issues of meaning in the ethnographic art of the Northwest Coast, however, can be discussed, on a general level, as a whole. On a specific, or personal level, art served different roles according to time and place but, on a general, or social level, art served similar functions as devices of communication throughout the Northwest Coast area. Since my focus is on the art of the Strait of Georgia/Puget Sound region, the generalizations made herein will refer, unless otherwise stated, to that area and to the ethnographic period.

Three progressively deeper levels of meaning manifest in the ethnographic art of this region are what I call, social meaning, sacred meaning and psychic meaning. I do not mean to suggest that there are clear and easily understood rules about where, when, and how art operated at one level or another. Clearly the boundaries between these
three levels and "rules" about what objects operated at what level and when, are blurred at best. However, it is probable that certain generalizations can be made and this helps to focus the direction of investigation of specific classes of art objects.

Perhaps the most common interpretive avenue pursued by students of Northwest Coast art in general, focuses on the ways in which art operated within and reinforced Northwest Coast social systems (marriage, kinship, ownership etc.). Although differing in kind according to area, art objects with those intended social functions comprise perhaps the largest and most visible class of ethnographic art objects from the area to study. This may allude to the relative importance of the social function of Northwest Coast art.

This perspective also focuses on the ways in which art communicates social messages and many hypotheses regarding the function of art on the Northwest Coast are based on more general theories from this school (see for eg. Naumberg 1955, Wolff 1981, Wolfe 1969). Two ideas regarding Northwest Coast art have focused on an active role in communicating group membership and societal power structures. Of course, there is much overlap and mutual reinforcement within these conceptual frameworks. Put simply, group membership was articulated through art since many of the figures portrayed were owned and inherited by specific groups.
and art objects also acted as symbols of power by virtue of their central role in elaborate displays of wealth.

However, it does not seem likely that seated human figure bowls operated in this way. The seemingly ambiguous content of their motifs, the discreetness of their forms and the inconspicuousness of their depositional pattern suggest a more covert function. This brings us to the second and, for our purposes, more important level of meaning - sacred meaning.

The effectiveness of ethnographic Northwest Coast art at its various social functions may have been made possible by the resonance given to it by its perceived spiritual power. The messages were taken seriously because of their strong association with the spirit world, a world integral to the lives of Northwest Coast people past and present. One need only consider the metaphorical nature of the artistic content to understand this. Immediate social messages about, say, group membership or demonstrations of power were couched in spiritual terms, thus giving those messages their necessary tangibility and strength (ie. group membership is seen in terms of mythical ancestry and symbols of wealth are associated with spirit power (Carlson 1983).

I believe, however, that sacred functions of art can stand alone, apart from their relationship to more immediate social ends. It seems more reasonable to believe that Northwest Coast art developed originally out of
spiritual needs and only later took on a supporting social role (the various powers of art having been realized). The pervasiveness of spirituality in the lives of Northwest Coast Natives of the ethnographic era attests to its depth. Also, the earliest art objects uncovered on the Northwest Coast are most often small and subtle with no apparent value as a means of public communication. A problem with this hypothesis is, of course, the question of why Southern Northwest Coast art developed when it did. Surely the people of the early, "pre-artistic" cultures here lived lives which included a spiritual dimension. Perhaps song and dance, which do not survive archaeologically, have a greater time depth than art objects and perhaps the social and sacred functions of art developed in tandem. Of course, issues of preservation make it difficult to determine the time depth of wooden sculpture and this may skew our interpretations.

In any event, the autonomous sacred meanings of Northwest Coast art (that were probably more purely sacred in ancient times) have been considered ethnographically and these observations abstracted to the past. Although, as mentioned, spirituality pervaded all aspects of life (and art) for ethnographic Northwest Coast Aboriginal cultures (Gunther 1971: 324), as I have understood it, there were two spiritual dimensions within these cultures in which art played a critical role: ceremonialism and shamanism.
The great importance of ceremonialism among Northwest Coast Native cultures is well documented from the ethnographic era. Ceremonialism on the south coast has mainly to do with an intimate personal relationship with the supernatural as manifest in spirits of various kinds. Ceremonies included initiation rituals, vision quests, secret society rituals, spirit dances, feasts, "potlatches" and marriages. Aside from the social and economic value of these ceremonies lay vital spiritual functions whose common theme was the act of entering into communion with the spirit world and bridging the gap between the world of the profane and the world of the sacred. There is, perhaps, no more powerful bridging mechanism in this regard than art and, perhaps partially for that reason, art was a central part of these ceremonies.

There are three main ways in which art could have functioned within these varied ceremonial contexts: 1. art added "resonance" or tangibility to important events (initiation rites, marriages, etc.), 2. art revealed, at least in part, what has been encountered in visions (personal vision quests), and 3. art made visible the elaborate and all important mythologies that informed the lives of the people. What these three spiritual dimensions shared was a desire to open a clear line of communication with the spirit world and to define human relationships with that world.
Within ethnographic Northwest Coast cultures, social roles were relatively well defined and we have discussed ways in which art helped in these definitions. Relationships with the supernatural world, which were considered just as real and in need of definition, were perhaps more tenuous and vague. For this reason, elaborate and directed ritual was regularly called upon to aid in the continuing definition and re-definition of these relationships. Ideas about the power of symbols (art) as a means to add resonance to such rituals and reinforce the relationships defined by them are neither new nor confined to the Northwest Coast. Indeed the act of symbolic representation in this regard is considered one of the more universal of human endeavour (see, for eg. Jung 1964, Eliade 1987, Campbell 1988, Dissanyake 1988, Gale 1993). Almost certainly, some art works acted in this way on the ethnographic Northwest Coast, where the maintenance of good relations with the spirit world was considered essential to the well being of the people (Gunther 1971: 32).

Perhaps more importantly than this accentuating role, the arts were able to bring the spirit world into visual and emotional contact with the people, thus facilitating closer relationships (ibid: 327). Art as seen in dance, music, masks and all ritual regalia makes visible the spirit world and allows people to participate in their own mythologies. In the words of Joseph Campbell (1988: 85),
"Myth must be kept alive. The people who can keep it alive are the artists of one kind or another. The function of the artist is the mythologization of the environment and the world."

This keeping alive of myth is clearly seen in Northwest Coast secret society ceremonies such as those of the Kwakiutl described by Drucker (1940: 227) as,

"A dramatic re-enactment of the legendary encounter of the novices' ancestor with a spirit and a display of gifts (names, songs, masks, carvings and other 'privileges') bestowed by the supernatural benefactor."

Art objects such as masks, headdresses, carvings etc. act as props to give visible form to important mythologies during such ceremonies. They link people to the spirit world.

This function is also played out in more individual fashion whereby encounters with guardian spirits in visions are revealed through art (Suttles 1983: 87, Carlson 1983: 198). Relationships with guardian spirits are defined on an individual basis and are made visible, at least in part, by personal ornamentations as well as representations on utilitarian items to assist in everyday tasks (Carlson 1983: 198). More esoteric and less stylized representations on some examples of rock art may also allude to this relationship.

The role of art on the Northwest Coast in the realm of shamanism is much the same as that described for ceremonialism; that is, as a means of communicating with the
spirit world, but it comprises a class of rather distinct representations. The role of a shaman in traditional societies has been explored deeply by various investigators. His or her essential and privileged role was to enter into direct contact with the spirit world (through visions, ecstatic experiences etc.) and to acquire spiritual knowledge that gave him or her special healing powers (Campbell 1988: 75). The potency of that knowledge was given form through art objects which revealed the visions, represented the spirit power acquired there and facilitated its incorporation into curative practices. On the Northwest Coast, art objects that bespeak of shamanistic visions and practices are fairly distinct in form and content. Certain motifs strongly suggestive of shamanism are, reptilian forms, shown ribs, or protruding tongues (Carlson 1983: 200).

Shamanistic art objects from the ethnographic Northwest Coast functioned as a means to give tangible form to what had been encountered in powerful visions, thus retaining, in a permanent way, aspects of that knowledge. (It is worth noting that many ethnographic shamanistic objects are in stone, the most permanent of all materials).

These ideas are rather speculative, but are borne out by ethnographic work whereby art is seen to be inextricably bound up with dramatic ritual, with re-enactments of mythologies, and with revealing visions. Art operated as a means to give power to special occasions and to
make visible the spirit world in order to facilitate the definition of relationships with that world. Theoretical ideas about art as a bridging mechanism between the sacred and the profane are clearly substantiated by particular ethnographic observations on the Northwest Coast.

It is likely that seated human figure bowls operated within the context of ceremonialism or shamanism. Again, this includes the apparent shamanistic motifs and the mysterious contexts, and the following discussions argue that it is within these contexts that seated human figure bowls need to be seen.

A third and perhaps less tangible level of meaning is what I call "psychic meaning." This is rooted in the unconscious minds of the artists and in the collective unconscious of his or her audience. Certain structures in the art works can be seen as representing or reflecting cognitive or societal structures present at the time of production. The highly structured nature of much Northwest Coast art can provide ripe subject matter for such perspectives.

Such approaches focus not so much on the explicit content of the art but on the latent content of what Boas (1955: 12) described as, "...ideas associated with form." It is believed that a "deep" level of meaning, revealed only to a "select" few, is inherent in the structural relationships of the parts that make up the whole of an art work. The
artist unconsciously perceives certain hidden realities of his or her social situation and art becomes a way to express, perhaps accidentally, this repressed knowledge. Artistic representations can be accurate reflections of societal structures, or even expressions of a desire for social change (Fischer 1971: 148-150). Investigators of such themes focus on the artistic choices made as reflections of cognitive biases. Structural themes inherent within the seated human figure bowl form that can be investigated in this light include: bilateral symmetry, themes of opposition, themes of transformation, and, as Wilson Duff (1983: 66) suggested, the "human body self."

As mentioned, the boundaries within and between these three levels of meaning are blurred at best. A work of art may operate within one realm exclusively, or within all three simultaneously. This scheme is meant as an avenue for discourse on meaning in the art, without implying that the complexities of Northwest Coast art can be reduced to such simplicity. Using this avenue of investigation, combined with that of Munro, I will explore levels of meaning inherent in the seated human figure bowl form. Although sacred objects used for ceremonial or shamanistic purposes played some sort of "social" role (i.e. rites in which these objects participated were often attended by many people), it seems self evident that these figures did not operate in any central way within a realm of public display as described
above. The focus, therefore, is on the second level of meaning which potentially holds the most answers; sacred meaning.

3.4 GOALS AND METHODOLOGY

As an initial attempt to tell part of the "seated human figure bowl story" the goals of this thesis are modest. I have tried to discover significant depositional, distributional and conceptual patterns inherent in these objects and to use these patterns as sources of information about their prehistoric uses and meanings. Put even more simply, my hope was to first answer 'when' and 'where' questions and then to answer 'why' questions.

Regarding the first of these endeavour, the 'when' and 'where' questions, as stated earlier my methodology is the rather traditional one of constructing a typology and dating the types relative to each other. The focus here, then, is on what Munro (1949) calls the "Presented Information", or on the purely formal characteristics of the figures. The steps involved in this process are as follows:

**Step 1: Reconnaissance:**

This involves locating as many of the figures as possible through museum visits, phone calls, checking data bases etc.
Step 2: **Data gathering and cataloguing:**

Information for each bowl is catalogued according to a list of set criteria. This information comes from my own observations of actual specimens (or casts), from photographs, from written descriptions and, where possible, from all three. This step also involves photographing the figures where possible.

Step 3: **Typology construction:**

This catalogue data is searched in an attempt to isolate stylistically sensitive attributes. By noting their presence or absence in each bowl non-random patterns or clusters of these attributes were revealed and allow delineation of types or classes.

Step 4: **Cross referencing:**

Once morphological types have been established the final step is to cross reference them to independent archaeological data and to styles on other art objects of known date. This helps determine whether or not the morphological types have any temporal associations.

The second and more interesting and potentially controversial task is to speculate on the possible prehistoric uses and meaning of these objects. Since there is little or no direct archaeological evidence linking seated human figure bowls to a specific use it is necessary to work backwards from the motifs and the overall forms of the sculptures to reconstruct ritual contexts in which these elements may have had meaning.
Following this, I try to identify what (or whom) the figure represents (i.e. a man, a woman, a child, etc.), and, also, to identify the various additional figures on the bowls. The answers to these questions may be found in the formal characteristics of the bowls and their archaeological and ethnographic referents. The next task is to search the relevant data for other references to them. For example, if a snake is identified as one of the recurring representations on seated human figure bowls, then it is necessary to search the archaeological and ethnographic records for references to snakes in an attempt to acquire a better understanding of the possible prehistoric meanings of such images. The aim, then, is to determine the "social and community arena" in which the various representations on seated human figure bowls had meaning and to formulate unified conclusions regarding their meaning that correspond to their unification in the seated human figure bowl form. As a means to enter into this discourse, the hypothesis that seated human figure bowls were generalized objects of shamanistic power is tested against other data. Following now is a list of the steps that are involved in this process:

**STEP 1: FORMULATING HYPOTHESES:**

Based on previously published remarks and my own personal readings and observations the hypothesis that seated human figure bowls were generalized objects of shamanistic power is formulated.
STEP 2: SHAMANISM

Since the above hypothesis postulates that these figures operated in some way within the realm of shamanism, it is necessary to summarize the key aspects of shamanism in general and Salish shamanism in particular to inform our discussions.

STEP 3: BOWL MORPHOLOGIES

The presented information of the bowls themselves (colours, shapes, materials, wear, etc.) offer the only directly tangible data on this subject and are therefore, an essential aspect of study. The typological investigations have acquainted us with these formal characteristics and allow us to make some preliminary conclusions regarding their use and, at the very least, eliminate certain possibilities.

STEP 4: ARCHAEOLOGY

Although not found under controlled circumstances in most cases, certain depositional patterns are deciphered from what little information there is. Indeed, the fact that most specimens have been found away from larger sites is a pattern in itself. The archaeological information that is available for these objects is investigated thoroughly for patterns of distribution.

STEP 5: ETHNOGRAPHY

As mentioned, it is necessary to identify certain features and representations on the figures (insofar as this is possible) and to acquire a better understanding of what these representations mean. This is done through the use of ethnographic analogy to Salish groups. Once these forms and the prehistoric ideas which they represent are identified (insofar as this is possible), it is necessary to search the ethnographic literature in order to fill in the social contexts in which these representations had meaning. Since a continuity between prehistoric Strait of Georgia/Fraser river cultures to at least 1500 BP and historic Salish cultures has been amply demonstrated, the application of ethnographic
analogy is warranted. Direct references to such figures are difficult to find, but through an investigation of mythologies and ethnographies of the area, a greater knowledge of spiritual beliefs and practices strengthen the plausibility and coherence of any conclusions about seated human figure bowl uses and meanings.

STEP 6: DRAWING CONCLUSIONS

The final step is to gather the above information into unified and coherent conclusions regarding the uses and meanings of seated human figure bowls. The essential goal, then, is to review the plausibility of seated human figure bowls as generalized objects of shamanistic power based on morphological, archaeological, and ethnographic information.
CHAPTER FOUR

TYPOLOGICAL ANALYSIS

4.1 PURPOSE

In what is still the most comprehensive work to date on seated human figure bowls, *Prehistoric Stone Sculpture of the Fraser River and Gulf of Georgia*, Wilson Duff (1956: 41) wrote:

"Although the seated human figure bowls show much variation in size, material, and complexity, it is difficult to divide them into types that have anything more than descriptive significance."

My preliminary work in this regard has given me reason to be more optimistic and I believe that seated human figure bowls do in fact lend themselves to a meaningful typological analysis. The goal of the following analysis is to examine seated human figure bowls for patterns in their spatio-temporal distribution. In so doing, because of the lack of good datable contexts mentioned earlier, one is forced to determine what the varied physical forms themselves might reveal about these patterns. With this in mind, the goal is to investigate closely the physical attributes of the bowls in an attempt to isolate potential stylistically sensitive
variables and to delineate types according to common sets of these variables. Once these morphological types have been established, a hypothetical series of stylistic changes over time can be postulated. By comparing attributes and styles depicted on the bowls to those on other art objects of known context and by applying what little contextual information there is for the bowls, the temporal validity of this typological "series" can be tested.

4.2 METHOD

In constructing this typology, only bowls for which there was a reasonable amount of information were included. By this I mean written accounts, photographs, sketches, personal communications and observations and, where possible, some combination of these. In addition, those bowls considered to be significantly incomplete were also excluded. A sample of 45 bowls were selected for the typological analysis based on these criteria. All of the incomplete figures, along with a few distinctly anomalous examples are treated separately.

Fortunately, much of the descriptive leg work had already been done by Wilson Duff in his comprehensive 1956 work. Duff described, in great detail, 50 seated human figure bowls, as well as devising a chart in which 27 different variables are qualified for each bowl (see Duff 1956: 42-45).
Using this information, as well as personal observations, I have isolated thirteen variables which might have stylistic significance and sensitivity. These are as follows:

(Note: * = Author's category; ** = Duff's category.)

**LOCATION:** Two areas that roughly correspond to Coast and Interior Salish ethnographic areas are delineated. These are: a) the Mid Fraser-Thompson River area, which extends along the Fraser and Thompson river valleys from Yale to Shuswap Lake, centring around Lytton and Lillooet, and b) the coastal region, which includes the Lower Fraser valley and delta, Strait of Georgia and Puget Sound and the south-east portion of Vancouver Island. *

**PROVENIENCE:** The three depositional categories into which seated human figure bowls fit are: a) Grave, b) Midden, c) Remote spot (with no immediate association to other remains). In some cases any such information is lacking. **

**MATERIAL:** Bowls are categorised according to three material types: a) Steatite, b) Gritstone, c) Other. Because there are many varieties within each of these groups, it should be noted that these are rather broad and loosely defined categories. Undoubtedly, many varieties of steatite were used in the construction of seated human figure bowls, but exact information in this regard is very difficult to obtain since many of the figures examined were casts of the original. This holds true for the "Gritstone" category as well, which includes sandstone and other coarse grained rock, while the "Other" category includes pumice, schists and other poorly identified materials. **
HEIGHT: There is significant size variation present within the collection and the dimension that best characterises this variation is height (from base of figure to head of figure). Three arbitrary categories will be used: a) Under 15cm, b) 15 - 25cm, c) Over 25cm. *

NOSE SHAPE: Facial features on seated human figure bowls were done in greater detail than other bowl characteristics and, hence, are likely to have greater stylistic sensitivity. The nose was treated in one of two ways: a) Beaked (pronounced), or b) Flat (unpronounced). *

MOUTH: The mouth can be characterised as either: a) Open, or b) Closed. **

BOWL SHAPE: From personal observations it was determined that the manner in which the bowl was excavated into the figure could be characterised in one of two ways: a) Hinged (bowl is excavated into both the lap and the chest of the figure with a distinct hinging or elbow effect), b) Vertical (bowl is excavated vertically into the lap of the figure with no hinging effect). *

BROWLINE: On the face of the main figure a distinct browline that most often frames the face is either: a) Present, or b) Absent. **

SKELETON: Ribs and/or backbone revealed as in the X-Ray style are either: a) Present, or b) Absent. **

TOPKNOT: A nipple like protrusion most likely representing a topknot on the head of the main figure is either: a) Present, or b) Absent. **

ADDITIONAL FIGURES: Any other anthropomorphic or zoomorphic figures depicted are either: a) Present, or b) Absent. **

EAR PERFORATIONS: Drilled holes at ear level are either: a) Present, or b) Absent. **
HOLES/DEPRESSIONS: In many cases there are additional drilled holes, grooves or carved depressions placed randomly around the figure. These gestures seem to have something other than an aesthetic function and, while they may be unrelated to each other, they are treated here as a single category. These are either: a) Present, or b) Absent.*

Though remarkably uniform in basic concept and design, the present collection of seated human figure bowls reveals a fairly significant degree of variation in stylistic detail. This variation is presumably due, at least in part, to spatial and temporal distributions, as well as the personal idiosyncrasies of the artists and the materials they worked with. Since there is much overlap of these stylistic variations and differences are often subtle, typological analysis is not as straightforward a task as one might hope, leading Wilson Duff (1956: 41) to conclude that,

"The only division which seems meaningful in terms of distribution and evolution is as follows:

A. Figure reclines on back with bowl in chest.
B. Figure sits upright with bowl held in front."

Duff was interested in demonstrating a link between the reclining zoomorphic bowls and the seated human figure bowls and, to this end, this simple typology was fitting. I approached the subject of internal variation with more
optimism believing that deeper probing would reveal more sensitive stylistic patterns and that these patterns could be used as spatio-temporal markers. These beliefs were justified when, upon combing through the data, patterns of clustering attributes emerged, allowing a rather clear delineation of three bowl types (as well as an anomalous category) yielding both distributional and evolutionary information. I call these types, The Coastal Type, The Lower Fraser Type and the Mid-Fraser Type. A table was then devised attempting to show the degree of significant correspondence between each attribute and each bowl type where frequencies of 0 or 100% would indicate perfect correspondence (see Table 1). Each of these types will be discussed below.

4.3 FIGURE TYPES

The Coastal Type: (Bowls # 1 to 9)

As a preliminary step in this typological analysis, the bowls were categorised according to immediately observable similarities (size, colour, material, overall style). These broad categories were then defined further through an intensive investigation of particular sets of attributes. Interestingly, though, one of the bowl groups as it was originally defined remained almost entirely unchanged
upon further investigations. I call this rather distinctive set (9 examples) of seated human figure bowls the Coastal Type, since its distribution is limited to the coastal areas. I hypothesise that this type represents the earliest examples of the seated human figure bowl form for the following reasons: (a) Although perhaps not statistically significant, this group is comprised of the smallest number of bowls suggesting that it lies on the margins of the complex (either the beginnings or the end). (b) There is the suggestion in at least one of these figures (Bowl # 4, Fig. 15) of ear spools. These are known from the area mostly around 3000 to 2500 BP (Carlson 1992: 8) although several have been found in slightly younger Marpole Phase deposits (Burley 1980: 24). It seems reasonable to conclude that this date represents the early extreme of the seated human figure bowl phenomenon since most other evidence points towards a later date. (c) Two of the type specimens (bowls # 5 and 7) were found at the Marpole site. Borden (1983: 150) claimed that these had been found at depths of 1 to 1.5 m, so a more definite age bracket of 2500 - 2000 BP can be established. (d) Almost all of the bowls of this type are made of some coarse-grained rock. This is an aberrant trend in this sculptural tradition dominated by steatite, and may have temporal significance. (e) Many bowls of this type lack certain stylistic attributes such as, shown ribs and backbone, and additional zoomorphic or anthropomorphic elements. These are attributes that, once
developed during the Climax Period of Southern Northwest Coast prehistory (Borden 1983: 135), persisted into later periods and are common on many other seated human figure bowls. Their absence in Coastal Type bowls may suggest an early date (ca. 2500 BP) for this type.

To summarize, these specimens of the so called "Coastal Type" are thought to represent the beginnings of the seated human figure bowl phenomenon in the Lower Fraser region between about 2500 and 2000 BP. This period coincides with a generally increasing level of artistic activity and apparent ceremonialism that was also occurring in that area. (Carlson 1983: 25; Borden 1983: 137).

Defining characteristics of the Coastal Type that, when taken together, distinguish it from the other types are as follows:

- concentration in the Coastal Region (none from the Interior)
- dominance of midden provenience
- predominance of local sandstone as carving medium
- large size (height usually over 25cm)
- relative lack of detail and embellishment in both the facial and bodily aspects.
- Early Climax Period style (as Defined by Borden 1983).
Bowl # 1   Departure Bay Bowl # 3
Coastal Type
(photo by M. Wollstonecroft).
FIGURE 13

Bowl # 2  Departure Bay Bowl # 1
Coastal Type
(photo by M. wollstonecroft).
FIGURE 14

Bowl # 3  Departure Bay Bowl # 2  Coastal Type  
(photo by M. Wollstonecroft).
FIGURE 15

Bowl # 4 The Nooksack Bowl Coastal Type
(from Duff 1956: 131).
FIGURE 16

Bowl # 5  The Marpole Image
Coastal Type
(photo by M. Wollstonecroft).
Bowl # 6  The Kilberg Bowl
Coastal Type
(photo by author).
FIGURE 18

dowl # 7  The Martin Bowl # 1
Coastal Type
(from Duff 1975: 66).
FIGURE 19

Bowl # 8  Departure Bay Bowl # 4
Coastal Type
(enlarged from Duff 1956: 136).
FIGURE 20

Bowl # 9  The Mount Newton Bowl 
Coastal Type 
(photo by R. Carlson).
The other two primary classes established in this typological analysis were more difficult to define, encompassing a more subtle range of internal variation. One attribute that seemed to form an important element of style and, therefore a potentially useful starting point, was bowl shape. Thus, I divided the bowls into two groups according to whether their bowls were formed by either an upright excavation, or a hinged excavation (as described on page 59).

Upon testing the distribution of other attributes according to this division, clustering was apparent. Bowl shape, then, proved to be a very useful stylistic attribute. It formed one of the central defining characteristics of the other two bowl types, the Lower Fraser Type, with an upright bowl shape and the Mid-Fraser Type (to be discussed below), with a hinged bowl shape.

The Lower Fraser Type is so called because of their predominant distribution in the Lower Fraser area. It is likely that the bowls of this type are firmly a part of the Marpole sculpting tradition as described, for example, by Borden (1983). While the Coastal Type represents the beginnings of this tradition slightly before or at the early stages of Marpole, Lower Fraser Type specimens seem to represent a flourishing and expansion of the tradition coinciding with the Marpole artistic climax.
The reasons for this are as follows:

(a) Although perhaps discovered under questionable circumstances, one of the Lower Fraser Type (Bowl # 20, Fig. 31) specimens was found at the Marpole site (Borden 1983: 150). (b) While exhibiting a fair amount of variation, certain aspects are shared among the bowls of this type. These include a high degree of artistic craftsmanship, the presence of varied techniques of manufacture, and an almost complete dominance of steatite as the medium. (c) The styles inherent within this type are thought to most closely resemble the styles of the "Fraser River stone sculpture complex" as defined by Smith (1950), Wingert (1952), and Borden (1951). (d) Like those of the Coastal Type, all of these specimens come from the Lower Fraser or South Coastal region where the Marpole Phase applies. However, a wider distribution than the Coastal Type suggests an artistic expansion consistent with the Marpole Phase.

It is thought, then, that this type represents a developmental flourishing of the seated human figure bowl sculptural form, spreading its influence farther and farther afield over time. This type is generally defined by the following characteristics:

- variability in provenience
- a clear predominance of steatite as the preferred medium
- variability in size, but generally smaller than the Coastal Types
- generally more detail in facial features as compared to the Coastal Type (prominent nose, eyes, and mouth, presence of ear perforations)
- variability in bowl form
- variability in manufacturing techniques
- generally more detail in the body of the sculpture as compared to the Coastal Type (presence of skeleton, topknots, and many additional figures)

Since artistic traditions develop as a continuum it would be difficult to define exactly when the Coastal Type ends and the Lower Fraser Type begins. However, it might be useful to consider certain bowls as possible illustrations of this transition (bowls # 10, 11, 12). These bowls are large and relatively undetailed, yet they show signs of additional motifs that become common in the other specimens.
Bowl # 10  The Porlier Pass Bowl
Lower Fraser Type (transitional ?)
(from Duff 1956: 136).
FIGURE 22

Bowl # 11  The Courtenay Bowl
Lower Fraser Type
(photo by M. Wollstonecroft).
FIGURE 23

Bowl # 12   The Ruby Creek Bowl
Lower Fraser Type
(photo by author).
FIGURE 24

Bowl # 13  The Lummi Island Bowl
Lower Fraser Type
(enlarged from Duff 1975: 67).
FIGURE 25

Bowl # 14  The Langdale Bowl
Lower Fraser Type
(photo by P. Hobler).
FIGURE 26

Bowl # 15 The Webster's Corners Bowl
Lower Fraser Type

(photo by M. Wollstonecroft).
Bowl # 16  Yoshioka Bowl # 1:  Lower Fraser Type  
(photo by author).
FIGURE 28

Bowl # 17  Yoshioka Bowl # 2 (found with bowl # 16)  
Lower Fraser Type  
(photo by author).
Bowl # 18    The Yale Creek Bowl
        Lower Fraser Type
    (photo by M. Wollstonecroft).
FIGURE 30

Bowl # 19  · The Bossom Saanich Bowl
Lower Fraser Type
(enlarged from Duff 1956: 140).
FIGURE 31

Bowl # 20  The Marpole Bowl
Lower Fraser Type
(photo by M. Wollstonecroft).
FIGURE 32

Bowl # 21 The Alouette Bowl
Lower Fraser Type
(photo by author).
Bowl # 22  The Skytte Bowl
Lower Fraser Type
(photo by M. Wollstonecroft).
FIGURE 34

Bowl # 23   The Hope Bowl
Lower Fraser Type
(photo by M. Wollstonecroft).
Like the Lower Fraser Type this type was first defined according to bowl shape, in this case, a "hinged" shape (as described on p. 59). Again, a certain amount of variability exists within this type, especially since it comprises the largest number of bowls, yet there are commonalities which unite them. I hypothesise that the bowls of this type represent a stylistic culmination in the development of the seated human figure bowl concept. This type, unlike the other two, was an interior or Mid-Fraser River Valley development, centering around what is now Lytton and Lillooet between approximately 1200 BP and proto-historic times. These conclusions are based on the following lines of evidence:

(a) These bowls exhibit the highest degree of detail and workmanship of any of the seated human figure bowls. Since my hypothesis is that the trend, in the case of seated human figure bowls, seems to go from large, undetailed specimens to small, detailed ones, this type is proposed as the culmination of the phenomenon. 

(b) At least half of these types have been found in the Southern Interior regions of British Columbia along the Fraser and Thompson Rivers.

(c) Although difficult to date because of the lack of in situ discovery, these bowls can be tentatively assigned to between the middle of the Plateau Horizon and the end of the Kamloops
Horizon (circa 1200 - 200 BP) (Richards & Rousseau 1987: 45), based on stylistic similarities to dated bone stone and antler artifacts (see ibid: Fig. 20). Also, a general increase in the production of portable art objects of steatite (and other materials) begins around this time (ibid: 38). (d) Many of these bowls are carved of a dark grey or black variety of steatite, for which the only documented source is in the Lytton area of the Fraser Valley (Dahm 1994: 18). (e) Techniques of manufacture (sawing, cutting and polishing) resemble the known interior techniques used on nephrite and steatite. (f) Some examples reveal animal species known only from the interior (rattlesnakes for example). (g) As mentioned in chapter two, a few vague references to objects that sound like the seated human figure bowl form exist in the ethnographic literature which may suggest a continuance into post-contact times (eg. Boas 1890: 90 & Hill-Tout 1899:: 18).

A variant which I call the Lytton Sub-Type can also be defined within this larger Interior category. The bowls of this category (Bowls # 33 to 40) share remarkable similarities and may have been carved by the same artist, or at least by artists sharing a common mental template. I call it the Lytton Sub-Type because the Lytton area seems to have been the centre for its production and all seem to have been made of the Lytton area black steatite. It is within this sub-group that we see the most prominent illustrations of the
so called "Northern" or "Central" coast influences upon the seated human figure bowl form.

Characteristics of this type are:

- found throughout the distribution area with heaviest concentrations in the Mid-Fraser Region.
- some emphasis on grave provenience
- predominance of steatite as carving medium
- smallest in size
- greatest degree of detail on the face (well defined eyes, nose, mouth, cheek, brow)
- carved using a variety of cutting and sawing techniques
- bowl exhibits characteristic hinged effect
- greatest degree of detail in the body of the sculpture (clearly defined arms, legs and neck)
- common presence of nipple shaped topknot
- common presence of shown ribs and backbone
- common presence of additional zoomorphic figures

Again, it is meaningless to define an exact boundary between the Lower Fraser Type and the Mid-Fraser Type since such likely did not exist in reality. It is more likely that an interior incarnation of the seated human figure bowl form merged with or was derived from a coastal one during a time of increasing trade and contact between the two areas around 1500 BP. Sometime after this, perhaps due to shifting artistic and spiritual paradigms, the tradition disappears.
FIGURE 35

Bowl # 24  The Chicago Saanich Bowl
Mid Fraser Type (transitional ?)
(photo by M. Wollstonecroft).
FIGURE 36

Bowl # 25. The Free Museum Bowl
Mid Fraser Type
(enlarged from Duff 1975: 67).
FIGURE 37

Bowl # 26  The Victoria Bowl # 1
Mid Fraser Type
(found in association with bowl # 27)
(from Duff 1975: 54).
FIGURE 38

Bowl # 27  The Victoria Bowl # 2
Mid Fraser Type
(found in association with bowl # 26).
(photo by M. Wollstonecroft).
FIGURE 39

Bowl #28 The Shoal Harbour Bowl
Mid Fraser Type
(from Duff 1975: 63).
FIGURE 40

Bowl # 29  The Kuper Island Bowl
Mid Fraser Type
(from Duff 1975: 64).
FIGURE 41

Bowl # 30  The Royston Bowl
Mid Fraser Type
(photo by M. Wollstonecroft).
Bowl # 31  The Martin Bowl # 2
Mid Fraser Type
(enlarged from Smith 1907: 422).
FIGURE 43

Bowl # 32  The North Saanich Bowl
Mid Fraser Type
(from Duff 1975: 78).
FIGURE 44

Bowl # 33  The Bossom Lytton Bowl
MidFraser Type
(enlarged from Duff 1956: 140).
FIGURE 45

Bowl # 34 The Shuswap Lake Bowl
Mid Fraser Type (Lytton sub-type)
(enlarged from Duff 1956: 129).
FIGURE 46

Bowl # 35  The Copper Kettle Bowl
Mid Fraser Type (Lytton sub-type)
(photo by R. Carlson).
FIGURE 47

Bowl # 36   The Seward Bowl
Mid Fraser Type (Lytton sub-type)
(photo by M. Wollstonecroft).
Bowl # 37  The Lillooet Bowl # 2
Mid Fraser Type (Lytton sub-type)
(photo by M. Wollstonecroft).
**FIGURE 49**

*Bowl # 38* The Bridge River Bowl Mid Fraser Type (Lytton sub-type) (photo by author).
FIGURE 50

Bowl # 39  The Carmichael Bowl
Mid Fraser Type (Lytton sub-type)
(photo by author).
FIGURE 51

Bowl # 40  The Karholm Bowl
Mid Fraser Type (Lytton sub-type)
(photo by author).
FIGURE 52

Bowl # 41  The Penn Cove Bowl
Mid Fraser Type
(enlarged from Duff 1956: 140).
FIGURE 53

Bowl # 42  The Heye Bowl
Mid Fraser Type
(from Duff 1975: 77).
FIGURE 54

Bowl # 43  The Cowichan Bay Bowl
Mid Fraser Type
(reduced from Inverarity 1950: pl. 41).
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FIGURE 55

Bowl # 44  The Berlin Bowl
Mid Fraser Type
(enlarged from Smith 1907: 423).
Incomplete or Anomalous Examples: (Bowls # 45 to 64)
(no picture available for # 63)

Also included within the present collection of seated human figure bowls are ten incomplete specimens, nine anomalous figures whose peculiar forms place them on the very margins of the seated human figure bowl category, and one addendum. For the purposes of accuracy and clarity these figures were not included in the main body of the typological analysis. Since each of these examples has its very own peculiarities they will be treated individually rather than as a common group.

**BOWL # 46:** Figure 56.
Named the Yale Bowl, this figure was found on south side of the Fraser River near Yale. Carved of coarse steatite it is a crude rendering somewhat unlike other seated human figure bowls because of its unusual treatment of the body. Aside from the main bowl excavation, which is small, several hollows and depressions are created within the bends of the arms and legs. The head of this figure is missing.

**BOWL # 47:** Figure 57.
This seated human figure bowl body, found at Bazan Bay on the Saanich Peninsula, fits rather neatly into the Lower Fraser Type. It is missing the head but includes two human heads in relief on the front and back of the bowl.

**BOWL # 48:** Figure 58.
In *Images: Stone: B.C.* (1975: 71) Wilson Duff claimed that he had re-united a seated human figure bowl body with its missing head. This
may or may not be true but the stylistic features of both pieces resemble the Marpole Type.

**BOWL # 49:** Figure 59.
Named the Brooks Figure, this specimen consists of only the head but is considered part of the seated human figure bowl category because of its stylistic features. Made of sandstone and quite large, this figure most likely fits within the Coastal Type.

**BOWL # 50:** Figure 60.
Little information exists for this stone head. It is missing the body completely but resembles the styles seen on the seated human figure bowls particularly the Coastal Type. This bowl comes from Gabriola Island.

**BOWL # 51:** Figure 61.
This bowl, from Whidbey Island, is missing its main body but, judging from its face, is most likely part of the Lower Fraser Type.

**BOWL # 52:** Figure 62.
Dug up by a pig on a property in Langley, BC., this specimen is broken across the top of the head and on parts of the bowl. It is a rather awkward rendering of a seated human figure bowl most closely resembling the Coastal Types. Large ribs are depicted on the back of the figure.

**BOWL # 53:** Figure 63.
This bowl, apparently found in Chilliwack, is part of the Oliver Wells collection. The head of the figure is complete and closely resembles other bowls of the Mid-Fraser type. It features large circular eyes, a pronounced nose and thick, grinning lips. A pronounced browline frames the face and large topknot rests on top of the head. The body of the figure is broken but partially shows a fish-like face on the front. This figure is of grey steatite.

**BOWL # 54:** Figure 64.
Though a fairly typical example in many ways, the horizontally excavated bowl persuaded me to include this in the anomalous category. This bowl was found near Albert Head, Victoria. (It should be noted that some of these decisions may be based partly on the fact that the drawings in
Duff's 1956 work *Prehistoric Stone Sculpture of the Fraser River and the Gulf of Georgia* which, in some cases was the only source, are quite undetailed).

**BOWL # 55:** Figure 65.
This rather well known specimen known as the Kamloops bowl, is an exquisite rendering by an artist with a unique vision. A human figure squats on top of a large globular head into which is excavated a small hole. (It resembles a candle-stick holder). The gentle facial features are quite uncharacteristic, as is the bowl type. I wonder whether this bowl was carved after European contact as it resembles, in many ways, a Christian icon.

**BOWL # 56:** Figure 66.
This crude rendering in pumice from Harrison Lake is certainly a marginal seated human figure bowl at best. The central seated human figure bowl image is expressed analogously by an artist who was either untalented or was working expediently. It can only be considered an anomalous type. This is called the Harrison Lake Bowl.

**BOWL # 57:** Figure 67.
This unusual figure carved of a coarse grained rock is considered anomalous because of the placement of the bowl on the back of the figure rather than in the lap. In other respects, this figure resembles the Coastal Type.

**BOWL # 58:** Figure 68.
This bowl, named the Johnstone Bowl, is one of Duff's "reclining" types. The figure lies on its back and, to my mind, is a rather different expression than the classic seated human figure bowl design. It does, however, include the theme of a human figure with a bowl and is, therefore included in the collection as an anomalous type.

**BOWL # 59:** Figure 69.
Another of Duff's reclining types this atypical example, named the Burnaby Bowl, features a human figure holding a bowl but whose shape is uncharacteristic enough to place it outside of the main category.
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**BOWL # 60:** Figure 70. Another reclining type in the same category as bowls 58 and 59. This bowl is named the Lillooet Bowl.

**BOWL # 61:** Figure 71. Another reclining type, the so-called Melver Bowl can also stand upright. Its bowl, however, is much more effective in a reclining position.

**BOWL # 62:** Figure 72. Duff considered this bowl, named the Langley Bowl, a link between the seated human figure bowls and the zoomorphic bowls. While this may be true, it is here simply considered an anomalous type.

**BOWL # 63:** No Picture. Although no precise data exists on this bowl, Duff (1956: 32) described it as a "...very crude figure of granite or similar stone." Although the head is missing it is described as depicting a human figure with a bowl in its arms. It is named the Bellingham Museum Bowl.

**BOWL # 64:** Figure 73. Although a complete and typical specimen, this figure is included as an addendum only because it was brought to my attention after final analyses had been completed. Known as the Shaw Island Bowl, this large figure (39 cm) shows a seated human figure with a bowl in its lap and chest. A snake runs across the top of the forehead. The face is protruded, featuring rounded eyes, a large nose and an open mouth. There is a small topknot on the back of the head. The knees are bent and there is a round face between the knees on the front of the bowl.
FIGURE 56

Bowl # 46  The Yale Bowl
Incomplete
(photo by M. Wollstonecroft).
FIGURE 57

Bowl # 47  The Bazan Bay Bowl
Incomplete
(photo by author).
FIGURE 58

Bowl # 48  The Chilliwack Pair
Incomplete
(from Duff 1975: 71).
FIGURE 59

Bowl # 49  The Brooks Figure
Incomplete
(enlarged from Duff 1956: 141).
FIGURE 60

Bowl # 50  Un-named
Incomplete
(photo by M. Wollstonecroft).
Bowl # 51  The Whidbey Island Bowl
Incomplete
(enlarged from Duff 1956: 140).
Bowl # 52  The Petunia Bowl
Incomplete
(photo by R. Carlson).

FIGURE 62
FIGURE 63

Bowl # 53  The Wells Bowl
Incomplete
(photo by R. Carlson).
FIGURE 64

Bowl # 54  The Albert Head Bowl
Anomalous
(photo by M. Wollstonecroft).

140
Bowl # 55 The Kamloops Bowl
Anomalous
(photo by author).
FIGURE 66

Bowl # 56  The Harrison Lake Bowl Anomalous (enlarged from Duff 1956: 141).
FIGURE 67

Bowl # 57  The Grey Bowl
Anomalous
(photo by M. Wollstonecroft).
FIGURE 68

Bowl # 58 The Johnstone Bowl Anomalous (enlarged from Duff 1956: 141).
Bowl # 59 The Burnaby Bowl
Anomalous
(enlarged from Duff 1956: 141).
FIGURE 70

Bowl # 60  The Lillooet Bowl
Anomalous
(enlarged from Duff 1956: 140).
Bowl # 61  The Melver Bowl
Anomalous
(photo by M. Wollstonecroft).
Bowl # 62  The Langley Bowl
Anomalous
(from Duff 1956: 135).
FIGURE 73

Bowl # 64  The Shaw Island Bowl Addendum
(enlarged from Carlson 1954: plate 12).
4.4 CONCLUSIONS

Having hopefully brought some order to a rather chaotic set of data, a general sequence of developmental stages regarding the seated human figure bowl phenomenon can be tentatively hypothesised:

It is generally agreed that it was during the Developmental or Middle period of Northwest Coast prehistory (5500 – 1500 BP), that the well known artistic traditions of that area began to emerge in earnest. The oldest known art objects from the Strait of Georgia/Puget Sound region date to the early part of this period (ca. 4500 – 4000 BP). While this may be due in part to factors of preservation, it is also true that stabilizing ecosystems, population growth, trade, and food surpluses at this time fostered a more settled way of life, in which artistic endeavour could flourish (Carlson 1983: 22). By 3000 years ago a stone sculptural tradition was being developed in this area (Fladmark 1986: 76) and the techniques of manufacture as well as the artistic motifs to be used in the seated human figure bowl form were being established. At least two social values were being expressed by this artistic production: 1. Concerns of personal status and wealth and; 2. Concerns with spirituality, the latter being the domain of the seated human figure bowl tradition.

Amidst this atmosphere of artistic productivity sometime around 2500 BP the first seated human figure bowl
carving began. Generally speaking the earliest bowls were massive, roughly fashioned specimens pecked mainly of sandstone or other coarse grained materials. It seems to have been a fairly local phenomenon centred on the South Coast and Gulf of Georgia Region, before the onset of more widespread inter-regional trade. The concept persisted into Marpole times when it joined a wave of artistic expansion. Between 2500 and 1500 BP the figures began to exhibit greater variation in form and style. They were now being carved more delicately from steatite, both locally and regionally obtained, into smaller and smaller forms. Embellishments of additional animal and human motifs developed, perhaps in tandem with an increasing emphasis on guardian spirit concepts. During this time the concept spread further afield to trading partners in the Interior Plateau region. During late Marpole times (Late Plateau Horizon in the Interior) those interior people borrowed the concept and incorporated it into their own well established steatite carving traditions. It may or may not be true that the seated human figure bowl concept carried rather different meanings to the Interior groups than it did to Coastal groups, but it does seem that, during this final phase of the tradition, Interior styles became preferred by coastal groups, as many Mid-Fraser types have been found in Coastal areas. Historical references may suggest that the tradition continued into the
ethnographic era, although the actual carving may have ceased some time before European contact for unknown reasons.

The "northern" style seen on certain seated human figure bowls, particularly those of the Mid-Fraser type, remains difficult to explain. It may allude to, among other things, an artistic influence from the north at this time (or vise versa), the antiquity of the seated human figure bowl tradition, or a tendency to submerge local artistic traditions when creating objects of "special" significance.

Another issue that deserves some mention is the fact that several examples of what I call the "Mid-Fraser Type" have been found in Coastal areas. There are three ways to adequately explain these occurrences. First, it is possible that Coastal shamans commissioned the making of seated human figure bowls by Interior artisans. Second, Coastal shamans, influenced by the steatite carving traditions of the Interior, borrowed and imitated the styles seen there. Third, seated human figure bowls were part of a developing trade network between the Coastal groups and the Interior groups. It will be argued in chapter five that it is the second of these possibilities that is the most likely.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATTRIBUTE</th>
<th>COASTAL TYPE</th>
<th>LOWER FRASER TYPE</th>
<th>MID FRASER TYPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%+ve</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL NUMBER</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCATION:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid Fraser</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROVENIENCE:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grave</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midden/Habit.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remote Spot</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATERIAL:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steatite</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gritstone</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEIGHT:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 15 cm</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 25 cm</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 25 cm</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOSE SHAPE:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaked</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOUTH:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOWL SHAPE:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinged</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upright</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BROWLINE PRESENT:</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SKELETON PRESENT:</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOPKNOT PRESENT:</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADDITIONAL FIGURES:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAR PERFORATIONS:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOLES/DEPRESSIONS:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.1 PURPOSE

A set of artifacts so artistically complex and archaeologically mysterious as seated human figure bowls does not give up its secrets easily. They are multi-faceted, multi-dimensional objects originally involved, no doubt, in a rich tapestry of meaning the full extent of which may now be impossible to understand. This should not deter us, however, from attempting to tell at least part of their story. Failure to do so would be a failure to address an important aspect of prehistoric spiritual life on the Northwest Coast.

With that in mind, my purpose in the following section is to make an attempt at deciphering meaning in the seated human figure bowl complex. My expectations, to be reasonable, must confine themselves to telling only part of the story and, in this way, my hope is to at least narrow the range of possibilities and to revive the interest in these objects by offering a fresh approach.
5.2 METHOD

I have hopefully demonstrated earlier that I will not be operating within a theoretical vacuum during my inquiries about meaning. The theoretical positions outlined in chapter three can now be put into practice.

An obvious starting point in the search for meaning is to determine function; what were these bowls used for? Of course, function, as a dimension, is not separate from meaning; the two dimensions must be considered in tandem. Many possible functions can be postulated for the seated human figure bowl. These include: a religious font (as in puberty ceremonies for example), paint dishes, mortuary stones, family owned totemic icons, oil (whale?) containers or lamps, tobacco mortars and others. Many of these suggestions are based on ethnographic information that may refer to the other types of stone bowls known from the area. While it is probably true that all of the above activities can be attributed to stone bowls in general, it is unlikely that seated human figure bowls alone served in all of these capacities. However, it is my contention that to attribute a singular function to seated human figure bowls is to proceed on an erroneous assumption derived, perhaps from the study of utilitarian artifacts where singular functions are commonly presumed.
With that in mind, and without disregarding completely the less likely hypotheses, I will consider the hypothesis regarding bowl function that I feel offers the greatest potential. As mentioned, it postulates that seated human figure bowls were generalized objects of shamanistic power or "medicine bowls." By this I mean that seated human figure bowls were not only tangible representations of shamanistic power, but also actual manifestations and containers of that power. They would have been the central object of shamanistic paraphernalia used in a variety of shamanistic practices during which these powers were activated. This hypothesis subsumes many of those ideas postulated by others and certain of these will be highlighted within this larger category in order to narrow the focus somewhat. This hypotheses will be tested against morphological, archaeological and ethnographic data in order to determine its coherency. It will be necessary to demonstrate, a) that the objects were shamanistic and; b) that they, themselves, were considered to have inherent power giving them a range of shamanistic utility.

It should be stressed that this is merely a working hypothesis designed to provide a coherent, logical framework with which to investigate the relevant information. Based on the little available data regarding the use of seated human figure bowls it is unlikely that any firm answers can be reached. It may be possible, however, to narrow the range of
possibilities and to highlight those options that best fit the available information.

Chapter five, then, consists of the following five sections:

1) **Elements of Shamanism:**
   Since it is within the realm of shamanism that I believe seated human figure bowls operated it is necessary to begin this discussion with a brief synopsis of some relevant aspects of shamanistic beliefs. I focus on the shamanic practices of the ethnographic Salish people (whom we believe to be direct descendants of those who made and used seated human figure bowls).

2) **Bowl Morphology:**
   This section investigates the hypothesis in light of actual bowl morphology. The vessel itself will be investigated for clues as to overall function.

3) **Archaeology:**
   The hypothesis is considered in the light of depositional patterns.

4) **Ethnography:**
   The hypothesis is considered in the light of ethnographic information. I draw primarily on what has already been discussed in the section on shamanism as well as on references to the meaning of certain motifs represented on seated human figure bowls. Where possible, direct references to the use of objects resembling the seated human figure bowl form are also highlighted.

5) **Discussion:**
   The above information is summarised and conclusions drawn.
5.3 ELEMENTS OF SHAMANISM

General Overview:

Originally from the Tungus of North Central Asia and coming to English via Russian, the word "shamanism" has come to mean many things to many people. In essence, from an anthropological perspective, the word simply designates the experience and practices of the shaman, whose usage has grown to include similar cultural experiences and practices outside of the Siberian cultures from which it originated (Edward 1994: 1). Many different perspectives can be brought to bear on such a subject. Some have focused on shamanism as a religious technique of ecstasy (eg. Eliade 1964). Others have concentrated on shamanism as a mental attitude, or the psychological aspects of these practices (eg. Lommel 1967) and still others have focused on the supernatural healing abilities of the shaman (eg. Hultkrantz 1992). Shamanism taken as a magico-religious phenomenon clearly embraces such rich and complex elements of human experience as cosmology, religion, the supernatural, psychology and healing.

There are certainly many regional variants of shamanistic beliefs and practices but these specific variants arise out of a larger shared cosmological theme. The hunting and gathering societies in which shamanism is practised share certain religious notions and it is these notions that inform
modes of religious behaviour. Not only, then, can we encounter similar cosmological elements between shamanistic societies but also similar religious behaviours as logical outcomes of those cosmologies. Indeed the strikingly similar shamanistic elements shared by so many contemporaneous societies isolated from one another for so long, is testimony to the antiquity and success of shamanism as a spiritual ideal. Let me now turn to a review of the essential elements of shamanism and of the hunting and gathering cosmologies out of which these elements arise.

Perhaps the most basic element of the world view underlying shamanism is the blurred division between the spiritual world and the mundane world. In the world view of hunting and gathering societies in which shamanism is practised there is a constant interplay between those worlds and, in order for there to be success in the many aspects of everyday life, a harmony must be maintained between them. Forgetting, for the moment, the myriad ways in which different groups achieve this harmony, we can note the common belief that,

"...the ordinary business of living could not be conceived of as carried on successfully without some means by which the spirits could be induced or compelled to work in man's favour, or without magic formulae and paraphernalia" (Leh 1934: 199).

A reasonable response to such a belief in this great
influence of the spirit world on everyday life is to include in the community a person trained in the ways of the spirit world; a person able to transcend the worldly divisions and acquire the spiritual knowledge needed to maintain harmony between them. Enter the shaman.

Before discussing various aspects of the shaman's abilities it is important to note the ways in which these abilities are acquired. Obviously, the service that the shaman provides the community is a sacred trust. The shaman is a link between this world and the spirit world and must be able to bridge that gap effectively through an intensive mastery of the techniques involved. This colossal responsibility is called upon in three possible ways (Edward 1994: 3): First, there is hereditary transmission, whereupon the death of a shaman initiates the passing of his responsibilities to the next in line. Secondly, there is spontaneous selection in the form of a calling. Often this calling manifests itself through specific and intense visions. Thirdly, there is personal choice and quest which is less common, since the position of shaman is not always an enviable one.

To be called to the position of a shaman, however is not enough. To achieve legitimacy the initiate must undergo intensive training. This training is of two types (Eliade 1987: 202). First, the initiate must acquire absolute mastery over the techniques of ecstasy. These are the
techniques of vision questing, dreaming, and trancing and are the ways of transcendence to the spirit world. The second type of training is traditional and provides the initiate with the proper knowledge of the spirit world and its ways. This includes shamanic techniques, the names and functions of the spirits, mythology, genealogy, secret languages etc. This second type of training is culturally specific and need not be discussed further here, but the training in the ways of ecstasy shows striking cross cultural parallels and could be expanded upon.

The word ecstasy is from the Greek 'ekstasis' meaning 'to be placed outside' so, to achieve mastery over ecstasy, is to enable oneself to transcend one's body; to be placed outside of one's body. For the shaman this most often means the ability to visit the various planes of the spiritual world and to elicit the help of certain spirits encountered there. Without getting into the various important psychological and physiological elements of this technique, we can note that the shamanic experience of ecstasy involves a direct and active experience of transcendent realities by the shaman him/herself (Edward 1994: 4).

The means by which this shamanic flight can take place are various but some of the more common include: lucid dreaming, vision questing, use of hallucinogens, conjuring, sleep and food deprivation, the use of monotonous effects, and entering into spontaneous trance. Some of the re-curring
perceptive manifestations of these flights of ecstasy are involuntary nervous responses and frenzy, feelings of overwhelming awe and intuitive feelings of spiritual understanding (ibid).

One other re-curring shamanic element in this regard is worth mentioning because of its ubiquity. This is the experience of personally overcoming a great illness signifying a re-birth or resurrection, as a prerequisite of true shamanic abilities (eg, Edward 1994, Eliade 1964, Hutkrantz 1992, Lommel 1967, Leh 1934). This period of illness or crisis of which the victim eventually cures him/herself is a significant episode in the development of the shaman.

To become a shaman requires more than having a single transcendental experience. A shaman must become a master of those experiences and of ecstatic techniques; a task obviously requiring extensive training by the appropriately receptive person. But, as was previously mentioned, the training does not end there. Training that is culturally specific in the spiritual traditions of his/her people must also be included in the initiate's program. The shaman must be able to bravely face experiencing the other world, to properly interpret what is encountered there and to effectively employ that new knowledge in the mundane world through the use of appropriate ceremonial and ritual practices.
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The purposes and functions of this mediation between the mundane and spirit world through shamanism are culturally varied and complex. Again, however, we can review some of the essential and more common shamanistic roles. As mentioned, in many shamanistic societies a harmony must be maintained between this and the next world for there to be a general sense of well-being and success in life. The absence of well being and harmony most clearly manifests itself as illness and one of the most clearly defined shamanistic roles is that of healer. Of course volumes have been written on this subject and will continue to be. Suffice it to say that illness is seen as a result of some disharmony with the spirit world, or of negative magic (eg. Hoppal & Sadovszky 1989: 42) and the shaman is responsible for either re-establishing spiritual harmony or negating the effects of that magic. Local mythologies and traditions inform the shaman on the ways in which this should be accomplished and ceremony and ritual enacts them.

Healing is accomplished in many different ways but often involves journeying to other worlds to discover the nature of the illness or to chase down the lost soul of the victim. It may also include the execution of specific magical spells, the preparation and administering of medicines and the performance of elaborate rituals that give validity and resonance to all of those proceedings.
The shaman also plays a key role in promoting individual and group success in other spheres of life, particularly hunting and warfare (Lommel 1967: 12). The shaman, being able to enter into direct communication with the spirit world, is privy to information that may be critical to the success of a hunt or a battle. The shaman can inform his people of such things and also give spiritual sanction and blessing to those events.

Finally, the shaman is essential to the community as the one who maintains the spiritual traditions of his/her people. He keeps these traditions alive through ceremony and ritual and educates his people on the ways of the supernatural.

One must keep in mind that this has been a fairly cursory view of some common shamanistic elements and that myriad other ways are manifested around the world. Let me now turn to a more specific discussion of one of these areas; the part of the Pacific Northwest occupied by Salishan groups.

**SALISH SHAMANISM**

First, allow me to dispense with the usual academic niceties regarding an exhaustive delineation of study area and of ethnic nomenclature. I am well aware that, although the Salishan groups of southern British Columbia and northern
Puget Sound, treated here as a whole in terms of commonalities in shamanistic beliefs and practices, are also characterised by their own distinct local variations on that cultural theme. The term "Salish" will be used to describe these groups collectively. Also, while the shamanic roles and functions among Salish groups can be varied and numerous, the focus of this paper will be on that most important aspect of Salish shamanism, healing.

**THE SETTING**

The social and cosmological setting in which Salish shamanism proceeds is highlighted by the "guardian spirit complex", variations of which can be found in many aboriginal groups in North America and elsewhere. Although complicated in its cosmological intricacies the essential nature of this belief system is rather simple. In the words of Ruth Benedict (1934: 39),

"Up and down the continent in every culture area except that of the Pueblos of the Southwest, supernatural power was obtained in a dream or vision. Success in life, according to their beliefs, was due to personal contact with the supernatural.....Whatever he saw, an animal or a star, a plant or a supernatural being, adopted him as a personal protege, and he could call upon him in need. He had duties to perform for his visionary patron, gifts to give him and obligations of all kinds. In return the spirit gave him the specific powers he promised him in his vision."

On the Northwest coast there are unique Salish
manifestations of this complex which have ramifications for the shamanistic beliefs and practices found there. As Wolfgang Jilek (1982: 10) put it, "In Salish culture the most intimate relationship existed between shamanism and guardian spirit doctrine." Salish forms of shamanism have been described as intermediary between those forms found in the Plateau cultures to the east and those of the more "classic" Northwest Coast cultures to the north (Hultkrantz 1992: 61). As in the Plateau cultures, the Salish shaman pursued his power through visions and as in the Northern Northwest Coast cultures, his power was given sanction through winter spirit ceremonies. Ceremonial complexes among coastal groups differed substantially from those of the Interior peoples. On the coast, ceremonialism was often a way to publicize ranked social statuses while, in the Interior, winter-spirit dances, the main ceremonial phenomenon, were based on individual vision quests and were not associated with rank (Jorgensen 1980: 269). One might argue that ceremonialism on the coast was designed to display and validate political power while, in the Interior, the power sought was spiritual in nature.

The shaman in Salish cultures enjoyed a certain status as a powerful and essential member of the community (Leh 1934: 223). His or her functions and abilities have been variously described in the literature and included such things as overseeing war campaigns (ibid), prophesizing
salmon runs (Duff 1952: 101), and performing funerary ceremonies (Hill-Tout 1978 Vol. II: 116). He or she also provided spiritual blessing to various events and generally dealt with anything concerning the spirit world or the dead. What the literature is describing, however, is more likely the collective activities performed by several different types of religious people or ritualists. The Salish shaman proper, as distinct from these other ritualists, was the person who, by virtue of his or her visionary experience, could heal the sick. More specifically the shaman was the healer of ailing souls (Hultkrantz 1992: 65). It is this healing power and the means by which the Salish shaman achieved and employed this power that will now be discussed.

THE CALL

First, unlike their coastal neighbours to the north where ranking was more palpable, it was uncommon for Salish shamans to inherit their position (Hultkrantz 1992: 54). Instead, like the egalitarian cultures of the Plateau, the Salish shaman pursued his guardian spirit power through visions (Jilek 1982: 10; Jorgensen 1980: 287).

In Salish groups this quest for guardian spirit power was pursued and achieved by shamans and lay people alike (Haeberlin 1930: 46). Indeed, the seeking of spirit power through visions was an essential element of all Salish
cosmology (Smith 1969: 56) and a person's identity was, in large part, defined by the nature of his or her visions. But these visions were informed, in part, by natural sensibilities noticed in childhood and what distinguished the prospective shaman from lay people were certain supernatural sensibilities.

"Although shamanistic power could theoretically be achieved at any age as a result of a quest or a supernatural experience, there were certain times at which a quest was more likely to bring success. One such time was just after the death of a spouse, at which time the widow or widower was felt to be different from other people.....But by far the most favourable time to train was in childhood..." (Duff 1952: 98).

Speaking of the Upper Stalo Indians, these words of Wilson Duff regarding the beginnings of a shamanistic sensibility seem to hold true for the Salish area in general, although information about this is difficult to find in the literature. He goes on to say that,

"The children were watched carefully for evidence of interest [in supernatural power] and good character, and those who showed interest were encouraged" (98).

This is in agreement with Smith's remark (1969: 56) regarding the Puyallup Nisqually, that,

"....childhood was viewed as a period of preparation for the reception of power....The greatest rewards came not to persons who made terrific efforts to receive it but to those naturally equipped."
Again, in agreement with Duff's statement are the words of Old Pierre, a Katzie shaman informant of Diamond Jenness (1955: 65) who spoke of "feeling different" from the other children in some mysterious way.

Less commonly the shaman candidate could inherit his or her position, or could be hand chosen by the acting shaman in the community, but "Only those whose psychical make-up fitted them for the office ever became siwin (Hill-Tout 1978 Vol IV: 100). It would seem then that the destiny of a prospective shaman was established early in life, based largely on a belief in his or her innate spiritual qualities. However, this was but a preliminary stage in shamanistic development. The true test and confirmation of a shamanistic aptitude came through vision questing. What truly distinguished the shaman from other people in the community was the nature and the content of his or her visionary experience (Jorgensen 1980: 293). The true shamanistic vision rarely occurred spontaneously or arbitrarily (although it could), but was cultivated through intense training of those with the initial innate shamanistic qualities.

THE CULTIVATION

While others pursued their "common" guardian spirits prospective shamans underwent intense training in
preparation for the powerful visions awaiting them. This training, most often conducted under the tutelage of an initiated shaman, was essentially a rite of purification. In order to receive the gifts of healing from the unseen world, the shaman initiate needed to open him or herself and seek purification through fasting, purging and constant bathing (Duff 1952: 98, Elmendorf 1974: 492, Hultkrantz 1992, Jenness 1955: 65). The details of these purification rituals are numerous and sundry and need not be discussed here. What is important is the fact that, by undergoing these rigorous and intense rituals of purification, the shaman initiate prepared him or herself for a different kind of vision experience than those received by others. This purging and psychic cleansing was thought to open the soul to the spirit world. Describing his purification experience, the Katzie shaman Old Pierre says, "Then at last my mind and body became clean. My eyes were opened, and I beheld the whole Universe" (from Jenness 1955: 67).

The shaman initiate, then, was clearly distinguished from a lay person by the intensity of his or her questing experience. Others underwent similar activities in order to receive their guardian spirits, but not to the same degree as the prospective shaman (Hultkrantz 1992: 62, Jilek 1982: 10). Perhaps more importantly, in terms of defining the shaman in society, was the content of his or her vision. Over and over again in the literature we hear of
different spirits within Salish cosmology conferring different powers to their owners. A person's power in adult life was a direct result of their guardian spirit relationships (see Elmendorf 19741; Smith 1969). Spirit power was conferred differentially. This is summed up nicely by Wolfgang Jilek (1982: 10) who writes:

"Shaman's and laymen's guardian spirits were, as a rule, of the same type or even identical, conferring shamanic powers to one and non-shamanic powers to another seeker. Shamans usually obtained powers not from one or two, but from several spirits, and often from spirits considered to be especially potent or to have predilection for shamanic powers. A notable exception was presented by Puget Sound groups (Haeberlin 1930; Wike 1941; Elmendorf 1960) having two distinct classes of spirits for shaman and layman; and by the Nanaimo of Vancouver Island (Robinson 1963) whose shamans-to-be claimed mythical monsters as tutelaries while lay seekers had to resort to animal spirits."

This differential conferring of power explains the varied types of religious people in Salish society described earlier. The true shaman, though as mentioned previously, was the one who had received the gifts of healing; the most powerful vision of all.

Once confirmed as a true shaman candidate, an initiate needed to continually re-affirm his or her status by on-going vigilance over his or her spiritual traditions, by rigorous training in the ways of shamanism, and by continued inter-action with his or her guardian spirits and the un-seen
world through visions. The shaman also needed to learn how to put his or her powers into practice.

THE PRACTICE

Shamanic training culminated in the ultimate possession of the candidate by his or her guardian spirits, manifesting itself in bouts of frenzy and altered states of consciousness. This episode was kept secret until it re-manifested itself at the winter spirit dance ceremonies in the form of serious illness. This is a good example of what Eliade (1964: 33) calls the "initiatory sickness", which needed to be cured by the shaman candidate himself, alone and in private. Only then had this person achieved a full merging with the spirit world and was considered worthy of the status of a shaman, able to cure others. The Salish shaman, then, can appropriately be called "the healed healer" (Hultkrantz 1992: 64).

Through all of this training the shaman received his powerful gifts of healing. There were many varieties, or "specialties", corresponding to the many varieties of "disease" seen within Salish belief systems. Different types of disease required different treatments, some of which could be administered successfully by the patient himself, or by less powerful medicine people (see Elmendorf 1974: 506; Smith 1969: 78 for details). Diseases whose treatment were the
domain of shamans only were of two types: those caused by malignant witchcraft or untamed spirit power and those caused by the loss of one's soul or of one's guardian spirit. The initial step, then, in shamanic healing was a diagnostic one. That has been described, in Salish cultures, as "seeing into" the patient's body (Elmendorf 1972: 504) in order to determine the nature of the illness and the appropriate course of treatment. Such "diagnoses" invariably involved singing, dancing, and drumming, in order to invoke the spirits into close contact with the healing event (ibid: 504; Hultkrantz 1992: 66; Smith 1969: 77). That ceremony often involved the participation of the community (friends and relatives of the patient) which helped to facilitate shamanic visions and add a psychological "resonance" or spiritual "amplification" to the event.

Once the shaman had "seen into" the patient's body and determined the nature of the illness, he could prescribe a course of treatment. Depending on the type of illness, the shaman either advised "self-cure", or enlisted the help of a medicine specialist. A recently initiated shaman might have been expected to deal with more minor cases to validate his or her powers (Smith 1969: 76). If the shaman suspected witchcraft, or the loss of soul (a much more serious diagnosis), then the course of treatment would be a shamanic one.
In the case of a diagnosis of malignant witchcraft, the illness was seen as caused by the presence of a foreign object in the patient's body. The intricacies surrounding these beliefs in Salish culture were complex and need not be elaborated upon here. Suffice it to say that treatment involved the removal of such an object. Methods for this varied from group to group, (sucking the object from the body was most typical), but in all cases it involved a power struggle between healing and malignant shamanic powers (ibid: 79). Again, such events involved community participation, singing, dancing and drumming, to suffuse the settings with spirit presence, while the shaman once again entered a trance. Essentially the objective was to summon the appropriate spirit power, and to locate and overcome the malignant power. Once removed, the malignant power was most often destroyed and justice sought on the sender. Thus, the patient was cured.

Perhaps the most well documented and important shamanic event in Salish cultures was the "spirit canoe ceremony" (see, for example, Barnett 1955; Duff 1952; Elmendorf 1972; Gunther 1927; Haeberlin 1930; Hill-Tout (Maud ed.) 1978; Hultkrantz 1992; Jenness 1955; Jilek 1982; Miller 1988; Smith 1969). This event took place when a patient was diagnosed with a lost soul and was the most potent manifestation of shamanic power. It was believed that a person who had lost his soul would die and retrieval of a
lost soul was the strict domain of the shaman (Hultkrantz 1992: 66). A person could lose his soul in a number of ways. Often a frightening experience might result in the loss of one's soul, while physical trauma, severe illness or powerful witchcraft could also result in such a loss. A soul could even be dislodged during a sneeze. From what I can gather, the soul then either roamed the vicinity in which it had been lost or made its way to the "land of the dead" (almost always across a mythological river). In both cases the course of curing involved the seeking out and retrieval of the lost soul (often by singing the song of that soul), but it is for the latter case that the spirit canoe ceremony was enacted. It involved several shamans paddling a mythical canoe across a mythical river to the land of the dead; a perilous journey always. Again that event was surrounded by much ceremony and spiritual presence. Once they reached that mythical realm, it was the job of the shamans to find the lost soul, to fight off the spirit powers who meant to keep it, to retrieve the lost soul and to make their return journey home to restore the patient to full spiritual health.

The fact that ceremonies of many sorts always played a strong role in shamanic events, as facilitators of a spirit presence, has been stressed. Singing, dancing and drumming always accompanied the shaman in his activities. It is interesting, then, to note that there is very little information in the literature on Salish cultures pertaining
to shamanic paraphernalia and art. Aside from the ever-present drums and water basins (in which the shaman washed his hands) the implication seems to be that little paraphernalia was used in Salish shamanic rituals. Referring to the Puyallup-Nisqually shaman during his curing ritual, Smith (1969: 79) writes, "He used no paraphernalia of any sort, except a basin of water." Speaking of the "sulia" or spirit power of the Upper Stalo, Duff (1952: 101) wrote, "It was not a usual practice to carve or paint representations of the sulia on poles or other belongings..." Again, speaking of the acquisition of spirit power by a shaman among the Sechelt and Southeastern groups of Vancouver Island Hill-Tout (1978 Vol IV: 102) notes, "No carving, painting or other marks were employed to symbolize such objects or possessions or to commemorate their acquisition." Nevertheless, the connection between shamanic practices and artistic production was strong cross-culturally (see Lommel 1967 for a discussion of this) and shamanic art represented one of the most celebrated, and important genres within the domain of "primitive" art. Indeed, in other areas of the Northwest Coast, shamanic art is widely known and celebrated. Why, then, the apparent absence of a developed tradition of shamanic art in Salish cultures? Perhaps the literature is biased. Teit (1900: 360) mentioned in his early ethnography of the Thompson Indians that some shamans used staffs and pipes carved or painted to symbolically represent their
guardian spirits. He stressed that this is especially true of the older shamans which may allude to a decreasing emphasis on shamanic paraphernalia in post-contact times. Perhaps the apparent absence of shamanic paraphernalia alludes to the largely secretive nature of shamanic beliefs and practices among Salish groups. Also, it must be remembered that strong, albeit less tangible, artistic traditions of song and dance which do not survive exist within the shamanistic and ceremonial complexes of many Salish groups It certainly does not imply a poorly developed shamanic tradition among Salish groups, as this is certainly not the case.

5.4 SHAMANISM AND SEATED HUMAN FIGURE BOWLS

The idea that seated human figure bowls were associated with ritual is an old one. Most investigators, considering the "remote" contexts and the rich content of the bowls, typically labelled them "ritual bowls." This is an apt label but several lines of evidence can be illustrated that link them, more specifically, to shamanic ritual.

Early investigators, where possible, described the depositional context of seated human figure bowls as shamanic. Bowl # 5 (the Marpole Image) was said to have been perched atop a "shaman's altar" (Leisk 1934). Bowls # 26 and # 27, according to the catalogue information at the Royal British Columbia Museum, were found in a pit in which
Shaman's belongings were burned. These references are vague and, perhaps, subjective but they do begin to illustrate the shamanic nature of these objects.

The most compelling evidence that seated human figure bowls were associated with shamanism is their artistic content. As mentioned previously, the x-ray style, as seen on many (at least 16) seated human figure bowls, is a motif expressed in many shamanistic societies around the world, past and present. Indeed, the motif is considered, by many, to be an archetype of shamanistic expression (e.g. Halifax 1982: 76-78, Lommel 1967: 129-133). It is a motif expressing, among other things, notions of death and re-birth and is undoubtedly bound up with shamanistic ideas.

Another archetype of shamanistic expression is the intermingling of human and animal forms. In the words of Ralph Metzner (1987: 248),

"The cultivation of balance and right relationship between human and animal consciousness....is most important in shamanism."

To the First Peoples of the Northwest Coast, this relationship between human and animal consciousness was a vital aspect of life for many reasons. As mentioned previously, the acquisition of spirit power was an integral aspect of life for all people. Shamans were those people who, among other things, acquired special kinds of spirit helpers.
For the Southern and Central Salish people these "special spirit helpers" included reptilian forms (Carlson 1983: 200, Elmendorf 1974: 501, Suttles & Lane 1990: 497), the two-headed snake (Suttles & Lane 1990: 497) and fishers (Holm 1990: 619). Reptilian forms, snakes (including two-headed versions) and what might be considered fishers are common on the seated human figure bowl form. Other animal forms considered to be universally associated with shamanism are frogs and birds (Blodgett 1978: 89; Halifax 1982: 79, 86). The frog's amphibious nature represents transformation while the bird represents flight, both central elements to the life of a shaman. Certain bowls (eg. nos. 4, 32, & 36) have elements suggestive of birds, while others (eg. no. 40) reveal frog-like motifs.

These and other issues will be discussed further in the following sections in order to strengthen the argument that seated human figure bowls were special objects of shamanistic power.

5.5 BOWL MORPHOLOGY

In this section I hope to demonstrate the viability of my hypothesis in terms of basic bowl morphology. The bowl is not necessarily the most "meaningful" element to the sculptures but it is the most "functional" one. For that reason it is an obvious starting point.
In almost all cases, the actual vessel on the seated human figure bowl form is small and ineffective at holding any significant amount of material. Whatever such vessels were designed to contain (if anything) was either potent in small doses or was more symbolic than substantive. My hypothesis, then, conforms to this morphological feature. The most obvious possibility is that the bowls were used to prepare small amounts of medicine. The preparation and use of medicinal plants, roots, herbs, bark etc. was widely practiced by historic Salish groups and similar activities were likely carried out by their pre-contact ancestors. A small bowl or mortar, perhaps of stone, would be necessary for such preparation. Such activity may result in two morphological lines of evidence of interest to the archaeologist: a) remnant plant material still adhering to the bowl surface, and; b) a ground and polished effect on the bowl surface resulting from pestle action. The first of these lines of evidence can only be thoroughly explored through a residue analysis which, due to contamination and poor preservation techniques, is no longer a viable option. The second line of evidence, however, can be explored through simple observation. Indeed, many of the seated human figure bowls in this collection, in particular those of the Mid-Fraser type, show signs of a grinding action like that possibly required when mixing medicinal plants (or tobacco). This polishing effect may, however, be a deliberate stylistic
feature and without a firm residue analysis these conclusions must be viewed with caution. This is especially true since steatite, the most common stone used for these figures, would not be as effective, in such a capacity, as harder materials.

There is no evidence of pigment or paint on any of the bowls and without a residue analysis it is impossible to determine what other materials may have been there. It is the fact that the bowls are so small (Wilson Duff estimates that none could hold more than a cupful of water) that leads me to believe that the bowl was more a symbolic vessel than a practical one. A symbol, to be effective, need only be a small suggestion of what it actually represents. As a vessel for a symbolic substance a small bowl is just as effective as a large one.

Water is used throughout the world's cultures as a symbolic substance. In ethnographic notes for the various Salish groups of southern British Columbia references to water being used during shamanistic ceremonies are frequent, (see, for example, Eels 1985: 413; Kew & Kew 1981: 31; Hill-Tout 1978 (vol.II): 43; Hill-Tout 1978 (vol III): 54-55; Ashwell 1978: 71; Elmendorf 1974: 505; Duff 1956: 58; Lane 1953: 134; Marian Smith 1940: 79; Teit 1900: 362). Indeed, while most ethnographic notes report an apparent lack of paraphernalia in shamanic ritual, a basin of water, for cleansing, or to provide a "reflective" surface, is commonly cited as being involved in such activities. There seem to be
three principal contexts for this symbolic use of water: cleansing, curing, and clairvoyance. During various cleansing and curing rites a small basin of water was often on hand and it is not difficult to conceive of a seated human figure bowl acting in this capacity in the prehistoric past. Other references (see, for example, Barnett 1955: 150; Duff 1956: 56-58)) to water emphasize its ability to show the future to those versed in the arts of reading it (i.e. shamans). A small vessel of water, for example, can act as a "crystal ball" and by gazing into it, a shaman can foretell important upcoming events (Fladmork 1986: 78). Kew & Kew's (1981: 33) recounting of Peter the shaman's musings on the power of water during his curing rite help illustrate the spiritual importance of this substance to the Coast Salish;

"You know I have great faith in this water. It can do a lot. It can work miracles. You know, everything needs water - the plants, and all living things, they all need it. I always use it when I'm doing this kind of work. It's cooling and I know what it can do."

Again, it is possible to conceive of a seated human figure bowl acting in this way. Thus, seated human figure bowls as vessels for magical waters, seems a potentially viable hypothesis at this point. It also agrees with Duff's assertion (1956: 58), when speaking of various informant's accounts of stone bowls, that, "All accounts agree that they were used to hold water."
It is also possible that seated human figure bowls were designed to contain something even less tangible; a soul, or a malignant spirit perhaps (ibid: 57). As mentioned previously, among many Salishan and other Northwest Coast groups, a common cause of illness was believed to be the loss of one's soul and it was the duty of a healing shaman, with the help of a particular kind of spirit power, to retrieve it. Once retrieved, the soul had to be contained and restored to its rightful owner. Gunther (1966: 158) mentions "soul catchers" as an important piece of shamanistic paraphernalia on the Northern Northwest coast for this purpose. Another cause of illness was believed to be the intrusion of some malignant force, which a healing shaman would attempt to locate, contain and dispose of. In each of these cases there was the need for containment of an intangible force and, although such containment could be achieved in various ways by the shaman, one obvious method was to trap the force in a stone bowl, or to drown it in a bowl of water (Duff 1956: 57), or urine (Teit 1906: 287).

A bowl carved into the body of a human figure may also symbolically represent the idea of the shaman's body as receptacle. Teit (1900: 362), speaking of the Thompson Indians, declares that certain shamans could not perform a proper curing rite until his guardian spirit had entered his body, usually through the chest. The excavation seen on many seated human figure bowls exposes the chest of the figure.
Another possible use for a small vessel would be as a receptacle for symbolic offerings of some sort. The notion of offering "gifts" to the spirit world was well developed among ethnographic Salishan groups and was practiced in various ways for various reasons. There were, for example, fish parts offered during first salmon ceremonies (Stittles 1990: 468), offerings of food to the dead (Kew 1990: 479), and offerings of a more personal nature by initiates on spirit quests to their guardian spirits (Gilbert Solomon: pers. comm.). Though that is a difficult hypothesis to test without the possibility of effective residue analysis, it cannot be ruled out as a viable option.

While they may be purely stylistic in nature, there are other morphological features found on some seated human figure bowls, such as drilled holes and depressions, that deserve some mention here. For the small drilled holes found mainly on the tops of some figures and which do not fully perforate the figures, the most obvious explanation is that they were designed to hold some slender objects like feathers or twigs. "Fetishes" or adornments such as these have figured in various kinds of ceremony on the Northwest Coast. Other drilled holes perforate the figures and could have been used for suspension purposes. The depressions and grooves occasionally found on the base of some figures present more of a mystery. It is not immediately apparent
what purpose(s) those features served. It is possible that they were a part of some composite stand apparatus, though almost all of the bowls stand upright on their own bases. It is also possible that they served some symbolic function though all of these hypotheses are difficult to test.

Based on the morphology of the actual vessels themselves, several functions, each falling within the realm of shamanistic practices, are possible. Small containers, for water, lost souls, herbs and plants, or malignant forces were prominent within shamanic rituals of various kinds and a seated human figure bowl can be seen as acting in all of these capacities. "The bowl" is a powerful image on the Northwest Coast and it makes perfect sense that this image would be incorporated in a powerful shamanic object in which it has both symbolic and practical significance. Based on a range of shamanic activities where a small bowl or vessel might have utility, there is potential in the idea that the seated human figure bowl was an "all-purpose" shamanic device.

5.6 archaeology:

As mentioned previously, almost all known seated human figure bowls have been recovered without the benefit of properly controlled archaeological procedures. This, unfortunately, limits the amount of contextual information
that we can glean from these findings. However, this non-
associational pattern suggests specific locational
circumstances for such bowls. In the following section I
address the depositional patterns of seated human figure
bowls and what they may suggest about the uses of such
objects. I generally agree with Wilson Duff (1956: 46) when
he writes that,

"It seems obvious that valued objects such as these
would not likely be lost or abandoned by their
owners. Their provenience, then, is apt to reveal
more about where the figures were disposed of than
where they were used."

I also believe, however, that, while their depositional
pattern may not tell us where seated human figure bowls were
used (although it may), it can help to reveal what they were
used for, or the kinds of associations attached to those
objects in the minds of their original users.

With that in mind I will begin with a list of basic
facts regarding the archaeology of seated human figure bowls
that form the foundation of subsequent discussions and
conclusions regarding their use and meaning:

a) Their distribution in space corresponds to core
ethnographic Salish groups.

b) Their trade (most likely in the form of finished
products) is evidenced by the occurrence of steatite
figures in regions where this rock is much more rare.
c) there is a non-associational context to the depositional pattern of seated human figure bowls; that is, the majority have been found away from habitation sites, in remote places.

d) based on those few examples for which there is some association with other remains, the pattern is with graves in the Interior, with remote spots along the Lower Fraser and with habitation sites on the coast (Duff 1956: 47).

e) all of the very large examples have been recovered from the coast.

f) in several cases, bowls have been found in pairs.

I have concluded that seated human figure bowls were in use over a wide area extending from eastern Vancouver Island and up the Fraser and Thompson rivers as far as Shuswap Lake, between about 2500 and 1000 BP. By that time the stage had been set for the development of most central elements of Northwest Coast culture as it was seen in post-contact times (Fladmark 1986: 66). Sure signs of differentiated wealth and status, warfare, increased productivity and sedentism, all point towards a culture of developing complexity. Artistic production also greatly expanded during this period, particularly in stone, to which new techniques of manufacture, like those seen on certain seated human figure bowls, were applied. Along with an elaboration of artistic production came an apparent increase in concepts of spirituality and ceremonialism. Evidence of winter ceremonies, feasts, gift giving, personal adornment, ritual regalia and rock art, at this time, all suggest that
shamanism and the guardian spirit complex had already taken root. It is within this context of increasing spirituality that we see the appearance of seated human figure bowls and it is within that context that they most probably played out their role.

In post-contact times the groups occupying the distribution area of seated human figure bowls were all Salishan speakers and shared many cultural elements. Of course, local cultural distinctions were present, the most pronounced being between those groups considered to be coastal and those groups considered to be interior. Frequent contact between all those groups, however, through trade, exogamy, subsistence movements and a shared language family, made for a relatively culturally homogenous sub-area on the Southern Northwest Coast and southwestern Fraser drainage area. Archaeological evidence suggests that this pattern of relative cultural homogeneity had been established by the Middle Developmental Stage between 3500 and 1500 BP. The distribution pattern of seated human figure bowls, then, is not an unusual one. It simply corresponds to these culture areas at that time. Nor is it surprising to see evidence of trade between the interior and the coast within the seated human figure bowl phenomenon in areas where a flourishing trade relationship had already been established.

The typological analysis suggests that the preferred type of seated human figure bowl came from the
Interior, probably from centres around Lytton and Lillooet. These areas are rich in steatite (as opposed to coastal areas where steatite is rare) and local interior carving traditions in this medium were becoming developed by the middle or end of the Plateau Horizon (ca. 2000 BP). As seated human figure bowls gained popularity throughout the distribution area those preferred types naturally became part of the trade network and reached the coastal areas. A shared world view, in a general sense, between the various groups within this area allowed for a shared understanding of the general meanings of the seated human figure bowl while it was incorporated in slightly different ways into local ceremonial and spiritual traditions. That is analogous to the myths and legends which differ in detail from group to group while sharing certain essential core elements.

The "remote" discovery contexts of the vast majority of seated human figure bowls are highly suggestive of a spiritual purpose. The secretive nature of the spiritual aspects of life among Salishan groups was expressed in many ways. First, although ceremonial life was often a public affair, certain special rites occurred covertly, as in secret societies, vision questing or various shamanistic rituals. Secondly, personal spirit power and the stories behind its acquisition only remained effective if kept secret (Smith 1940: 56); that is, guardian spirit acquisition is an intensely personal affair. Thirdly, objects considered to be
manifestations of guardian spirit power, or infused with "medicine", were thought to be potentially dangerous and volatile in the wrong hands (Duff 1952: 101 as told by informant H.J.). For this reason, they were often hidden away. A depositional pattern of non-association for seated human figure bowls seems to suggest quite strongly that they were seen in this way.

As mentioned, however, in some cases seated human figure bowls have had some associations with graves in the interior, remote spots along the Lower Fraser and middens on the coast. There are different ways to explain that pattern. First, seated human figure bowls may have been used for different purposes in different areas, resulting in a varied depositional pattern. It is true that in ethnographic times the ritual and ceremonial life of Salish groups, though having general features in common, took on distinct manifestations according to sub-area. The coastal groups, for example, generally held ceremonies of a more public nature with more elaborate regalia than their neighbours to the east. Female puberty seclusion, for example, took place behind curtains within the house among coastal groups, while among the Upper Stalo and Thompson and Lillooet people separate huts were built away from the villages for such purposes (Duff 1952: 50). If seated human figure bowls were associated with female puberty rituals, as some have suggested, the pattern that places the bowls within
habitation sites on the coast and away from habitation sites further inland would make some sense.

Another line of evidence suggesting a more public use of seated human figure bowls on the coast is the fact that almost all of the very large examples have been recovered from coastal locations. It would be difficult and impractical to use these large, very heavy figures for secluded, covert purposes. So, while the general functions and meanings of seated human figure bowls may have been the same for the entire area, the suggestion is that their role was more public on the coast than it was up-river.

Another intriguing aspect of the depositional pattern is a possible relationship to burial practices. In the Interior, several bowls have been found associated with burials, while this is not the case in our other two sub-areas. The "remote spots" that characterize the pattern along the Lower Fraser, however, may, in fact, have been burial sites. Unlike areas up-river where large burial grounds are common (Smith 1900: 403), the Lower Fraser region has yielded far fewer elaborate grave or burial sites. Ethnographically, we know that groups along the Lower Fraser often disposed of their dead in the open air, in trees (Hill-Tout 1978: 106). Shamans were also often buried in "special" remote spots. These "open air" burial spots may, in fact, be the "remote spots" where seated human figure bowls have been found, the human remains having long disintegrated (Duff 1956: 47). Of
course, "remote spots" may also have been just that; remote, out of the way areas where secret rites took place, or hiding places for these powerful objects.

Again, however, a distinct pattern on the coast, where few or no bowls have been found associated with burials, suggests a slightly different conception of the seated human figure bowl in comparison to the interior. While inclusion in graves in other areas suggests a sense of strong personal ownership, the inclusion in habitation sites on the coast may be suggestive of a strong sense of family ownership and inheritance. This, of course, coheres with the fact that these concepts were generally more well developed on the coast than they were elsewhere.

While the depositional pattern may not tell us unequivocally about the functions of seated human figure bowls, it can suggest links with a larger ceremonial or cosmological framework. That the bowls seem to be associated in some cases, (at least within non-coastal areas), with personal, remote graves suggests two things: a) a strong sense of personal ownership along the lines of a guardian spirit and/or, b) that the bowls belonged to a special class of people, most likely shamans. On the coast, the suggestion is of a strong sense of family ownership and inheritance. Again, then, according to the archaeological evidence, the hypothesis that seated human figure bowls were multi-purpose devices remains viable. The hypothesis of seated human figure
bowls as fortune telling devices fits within a depositional pattern that places them in remote locations (up-river), or within habitation sites (on the coast), where divining ceremonies may have taken place. Since only a certain class of shaman had the power of divination, the grave of such a person might have included his or her personal power objects.

The idea of seated human figure bowls as "offering dishes" accords with the depositional pattern only in-so-far as "remote spots" may represent areas where offerings took place. If offerings were made within those stone bowls, then, since most people in the community might have had reason to make offerings (to their own personal guardian spirits, for example), it would follow that each person would own a stone bowl for such a purpose. This is clearly not the case. However, given the importance of wood in many aspects of ethnographic Northwest Coast material culture, it is quite possible that wooden versions of seated human figure bowls existed in the past and simply have not survived. Although the two media may have carried different symbolic significance, functionally there is no apparent difference between a wooden bowl and a stone bowl apart from their reaction to fire and the ease with which they can be carved.

The evidence seems to point towards seated human figure bowls as highly prized objects (being disposed of upon the owner's death or passed on through family lines) possessing a special, perhaps dangerous potency and belonging
to a special class of person. The shamanic nature of the bowl motifs and the "remote" depositional pattern point to the shaman as the most obvious candidate. Since the most powerful shaman in ethnographic times, whose paraphernalia was in the greatest need of protection, was a specialist in curing, we can hypothesize that seated human figure bowls operated somehow within the realm of shamanistic curing. Again, a depositional pattern that shows a predominance of non-associational contexts suggests that these objects were not part of everyday life and that their presence in public was either feared or frowned upon. A shamanistic object infused with the guardian spirit power of a special kind of shaman would be such an object whose efficacy depended on secrecy, and which would be viewed as very dangerous to the average person.

5.7 ETHNOGRAPHY:

This section concerns itself mainly with identification of the figure itself, its additional motifs and the meanings which these elements may represent. This is done in an attempt to bring together the various elements of the carvings into a coherent whole, each part a piece of the puzzle. Through a study of relevant spiritual aspects of Coast and Interior Salishan ethnography certain aspects of the seated human figure bowl phenomenon may become more
clear. I will begin with a brief overview of the general Coast and Interior Salishan view of object power and then discuss the various design elements of seated human figure bowls in light of this view. These discussions will often converge with previously mentioned aspects of Coast and Interior Salishan shamanism, which was an aspect of their life inextricably bound up with concepts of power.

Since the post-contact wood carvings of the Coast and Interior Salish often bear little resemblance to the earlier stone carving traditions of these areas, comparisons refer to overall significance and meaning rather than to artistic styles. Though some specific messages surely have changed with the medium (and, naturally, over time) there are, as in all incarnations of evolution, certain common denominators. It is my contention that one of these is the belief system surrounding the notion of object power. That notion is so well developed among Salish groups that it is very likely that it is an ancient cosmology with which changing art styles have interacted over time. Analogies can be strengthened by drawing from other areas of the Northwest Coast.
THE CONCEPT OF OBJECT POWER

As stated previously, a general and central feature of the animistic world view of most Salishan groups was the concept of power (often referred to as the Guardian Spirit Complex or as "Tamahnous"). To quote Marian Smith (1940: 56) from her work on the Puyallup-Nisqually:

"Every individual characteristic and every cultural complex, except those related to sexual life, was understood and was thought to operate through power. Adult life without power was inconceivable and childhood was viewed as a period of preparation for the reception of power."

Again, though regional characterisations of this concept varied, the essential idea that adult life was governed and overseen by some manifestation of power was uniform. These powers and the ways in which they were obtained were as varied as the individual personalities that obtained them and, for the most part, it was a secretive aspect of life difficult for ethnographers to penetrate. Certain powers, though, were recognized as being more rare, more difficult to obtain and, therefore, more potent. These were reserved for great warriors, leaders and people of medicine. Other more mundane powers occupied a continuum, each differing in kind and degree and each going a long way towards defining the individual possessor. Many of the general features of this complex were discussed previously in the section on shamanism.
and, though volumes more could be written on this subject, my
concern here is that form of power that manifests itself in
objects.

As noted by Smith (1940: 113) "...objects used
during ceremonies were accessories to individual power
manipulation." Smith's words regarding the Puyallup-Nisqually
apply throughout all of the Coast and Interior Salish groups
(and, in fact, throughout the entire Northwest Coast), where
certain objects were seen to be imbued with the owner's power
and acted as media through which this power could be
activated. Most commonly, these objects were involved in
curing ceremonies, particularly the so called "Spirit-Canoe
Ceremony" during which certain shamans visited the Land of
the Dead to retrieve lost souls or lost power (for detailed
discussions of this ceremony see, for example, Eels 1985;
Elmendorf 1935; Haeberlin 1918; Smith 1940; Miller 1988).
During this and other ceremonies, certain objects, such as
cedar boards depicting guardian spirits, painted house posts,
canoe prows, carved wooden human effigies and long wooden
poles, were imbued with the special power of shamans required
for such journeys. Other, less potent objects were used by
community participants to aid in the rhythmic drumming that
accompanied the obligatory singing. In describing a Coast
Salish curing rite, Michael and Della Kew (1981: 30) explain
the spirit power of Peter the Shaman;
"This is a power which enables him to own and supervise the use of a pair of implements which may embody his power, divine sickness or harmful materials, and remove them from people or places. Peter uses these often during winter dances..."

Though no mention of anything resembling a seated human figure bowl could be found in any descriptions of these particular ceremonies, the morphologies and depositional patterns of these bowls seem to fit rather neatly into this special category of "power objects". The most telling evidence comes from the fact that these power objects were considered dangerous to those whose power they did not contain and, for this reason, were often hidden away when not in use "....in hollow cedars some distance from the village, their exact location being known only to the owner or to the song leader" (Smith 1940: 116). This seems a very viable answer to the "remote" depositional pattern of seated human figure bowls. Seated human figure bowls, then, seem to fit within this category of "power object." Their remote depositional pattern and their apparently highly charged symbolic content are both features indicative of this. To further explore these ideas it is necessary to look more closely again at some of the bowl motifs and characters for clues.
MOTIFS AND CHARACTERS

Again, the seated human figure bowl form involves three central design elements: i) the main figure; ii) the bowl, and; iii) additional figures. Who and what these elements represent and the relationship between them is most certainly the key to a full understanding of the meaning inherent in this sculptural form. Of course, without the testimony of the makers and users of these figures the precise meaning of the specific design elements and how they relate to the meaning of the overall composition may remain out of reach. However, we can add ideas gleaned from these artistic elements to our overall picture. Since I have previously discussed the possible relevance of the actual bowl in the section on morphology I will leave that out of the following discussion and focus on the other main sculptural elements.

THE MAIN FIGURE:

A considerable degree of formal variability exists among all seated human figure bowls, regarding the treatment of the central face. There are two possible explanations for this variability: i) all figures depict the same individual, with local and personal artistic interpretations accounting for the variability, or; ii) many different individuals were
being represented on the bowls. Let me consider each of these interpretations in turn beginning with the "same individual" hypothesis.

The most likely candidate for such a role would seem to be some form of deity or commonly revered "God." The fact that styles differ most significantly between the Coast and the Interior may suggest that different "deities" were worshipped according to sub-area. This is not an idea to which I strongly subscribe since, in ethnographic times at least, the idea of commonly revered deities was not at all developed among Salishan groups. Spirituality was expressed on a more personal level and spiritual representations were done according to personal and family visions (Wingert 1949: 7). Objects of power in ethnographic times such as house posts, figurines, effigies, wooden poles, charms etc. did not portray a common deity. They portrayed individual "powers" or guardian spirits. In the words of Paul Wingert (1949: 8),

"The carved figures therefore were not representations of a God, and no sacrifices were ever made to them....Their existence and activity were among the tangible expressions of a cooperation already established between the supernatural and the individual."

Since it was also common for shamans to have objects representing themselves as media for their power (Gunther 1966: 152), the likely scenario is that the seated human figure bowls represent different individuals; namely, the owners whose power was contained within. Since it is
unlikely, however, that the seated human figure bowl acted in a realm of purely public display (like, for example, grave posts) they are best considered adhering to a consistent type, rather than individual portraits or likenesses. One fairly consistent element in this regard (though not occurring on all bowls) is the depiction of the skeleton in x-ray style. As mentioned previously, this archetypal motif occurs in traditional hunting and gathering societies throughout the world and is considered by most to be associated with shamanism. The human skeleton is associated with the dead and it is transcendence to the "land of the dead" that is the special privilege of the shaman on the Northwest Coast. To reveal the skeleton on his art is to reveal his ability to transcend worldly things and to commune with the spirit world. The skeleton might also have been considered a physical manifestation of the enduring nature of the human spirit and, therefore, a powerfully spiritual motif. An essential element to the ascendency of a potential shaman is the ability to be "broken into pieces" and to reconstitute oneself, from what Joan Halifax (1982: 46) calls the "boneseed." As mentioned previously, skeletonization reveals the potential for re-birth and also the potential for transformation, both important themes in Northwest Coast shamanism (see also, Lommel 1967: 129; Metzner 1988: 246).

Another fairly consistent element in this regard is the noticeably open mouth on many of the figures, often in a
puckered pose. Though it is difficult to say with any degree of certainty what the significance of this pose is, it does cohere with the shamanistic theme in two intriguing ways. First, one might argue that this pose signifies singing, which very often accompanied shamanistic curing rituals (Eels 1985: 413; Elmendorf 1974: 505; Smith 1940: 79; Haeberlin 1918: 254; Teit 1900: 362). Songs are another manifestation of power. Secondly, and perhaps even more compelling, is the notion that the puckered pose signifies blowing or sucking. Both of these gestures figure prominently in shamanistic curing rites during which the shaman either sucks out malignant forces from an ill person or blows lost powers or lost souls back into the person who had lost them (Eels 1985: 414; Elmendorf 1974: 505; Duff 1952: 113; Smith 1940: 79; Teit 1900: 362). In bowl no. 18, an object, perhaps representing a malignant force of some kind, is being sucked into the mouth.

Since all discussions have pointed towards seated human figure bowls as shamanistic objects it is likely, in light of these present ideas, that the figure being portrayed is the shaman himself.
ADDITIONAL ELEMENTS

Intermingling with the main seated figure and the bowl are additional elements, usually in the form of zoomorphic figures. This, of course, is consistent with most forms of Northwest Coast art (indeed, with most forms of hunter-gatherer art where relationships between the human and animal world are well defined). Within the realm of social art, "totemic" animal characters are meant to display group membership and common ancestry and to give tangible form to oral mythologies that described those relationships (Gunther 1966: 9). Certain characters, then, occur over and over again, characters such as Coyote, Wolf, Bear, Owl, Raven, Whale, Otter, Eagle, and many others, who play a central role within the oral mythologies.

Few of these central mythological characters are clearly depicted on the seated human figure bowls, suggesting once again, that these figures did not operate within the social realm of displaying crests. The characters seen on these figures conform to a more spiritual form of representation; that is, to a personal and private realm. Again, the most common forms of animal representation on the seated human figure bowls are, frogs, lizards (salamanders?), snakes, birds, turtles and several that are unidentifiable. It is possible that the common "lizard-like" or "snake" motifs represent the "land otter", or the Northwest Coast
equivalent of the mythical serpent always associated with
spirit powers. Most investigators agree that the purpose of
many objects of Salish art was to help define personal power
relationships between the animal-spirit world and the human
world, (see, for example, Duff 1952: 101; 1956: 53; Eels 1985:
376; Gunther 1966: 114; Smith 1940: 116; Wingert 1949: 13).
It is certainly not unusual in any society that undertakes
spirit questing to include artistic depictions of the
relationships formed during these quests. However, because,
in most Salishan societies, those relationships were
intensely personal and effective only if kept secret,
artistic representations of this sort were relatively
infrequent. Objects of art that were created for such reasons
were those that belonged to people of great "power" and used
to help define, contain and control this power, as in those
objects created for the "spirit canoe" ceremony. Evidence
previously addressed has pointed towards seated human figure
bowls as being such "power" objects. Furthermore, as
mentioned previously, the bird and reptilian motifs on these
figures are commonly thought to be associated with shamanism
(Carlson 1983: 200). Speaking of the Coast Salish of Western
Washington, Elmendorf (1974: 501) writes,

"Thus... a shaman spirit appeared as a group of
large alligatorlike reptiles sliding down talus
slopes in the high mountains."

In this case, the reptilian creatures were thought to give
curing power to the shaman initiate and is a further suggestion that objects depicting reptilian forms, such as seated human figure bowls, are associated with shamanistic curing.

It is interesting to note that these additional animal elements occur much less frequently on the Coastal Type specimens, suggesting, perhaps, that at the time of their production, the ethnographic style "guardian spirit complex" had not yet been fully established. The most detailed specimens, in terms of additional elements, seem to originate from the Interior around Lytton and Lillooet, suggesting that perhaps it was here that such "power" relationships saw their fullest expression.

The additional elements, then, seem best viewed as visual expressions of an especially potent power relationship between the shaman and his or her spirit helpers. In light of this, the most likely conclusion regarding the meaning/function of seated human figure bowls seems to be that they were "power" objects representing a special relationship between a shaman and his or her spirit helpers. Speaking generally of carvings depicting an intermingling of human and animal forms, Wingert (1949: 13) writes,

"...the entire carving is a dramatic demonstration of the potency of a man's power."
There is, of course, the question of whether the user of the bowl made it him or herself, or whether an artisan was commissioned for such a purpose. There is no way to answer this question unequivocally but the evidence points towards the former scenario. While there are some striking stylistic similarities shared by certain bowls (particularly among the Lytton sub-type), that may be indicative of a single artist, there is also a great range of variability among the entire collection. It is more likely that stylistic similarities are a result of shared artistic templates. While it is true that a shaman may have possessed the wealth necessary to commission such works of art, it is unlikely that he would do so. As mentioned, the seated human figure bowl was most likely a personal representation of a special relationship between a shaman and his spirit helpers. They were "power objects." The implications of a commissioned art work are in direct opposition to what we know about the concept of power and its manifestation in certain objects. The "visions", or relationships, represented on seated human figure bowls were most likely highly personal ones, the "purity" of which would have been compromised had they been expressed by an "outsider." Furthermore, it is quite common for shamans in any shamanistic society to possess the talent (and the time) required for the production of fine pieces of art. Indeed, artistic talent is often a prerequisite of shamanistic pursuits. This, however, raises another important
issue. The talent required to produce some of the finer seated human figure bowls could only be achieved through constant practice. This implies a substantial number of carvings produced by each shaman. Successive attempts by a single artist at creating the desired seated human figure bowl form may be represented archaeologically within the present collection.

The presence of Mid-Fraser Type specimens in Coastal areas, an issue brought up in chapter four, is best explained, then, by the borrowing of Interior artistic styles by Coastal shamans and not by commissioning or trade. Neither of these latter activities makes sense in light of the personalized nature of the seated human figure bowl form.
5.8 DISCUSSION

Several conclusions can now be tentatively reached regarding the meanings/functions of seated human figure bowls. These are as follows:

a) Seated human figure bowls (SHFB) operated within the spiritual realm (as opposed to the social or purely aesthetic realm) and, more specifically within the realm of shamanism.

b) SHFB's most likely acted as receptacles for something symbolic rather than substantive. Possibilities include: water, spirits (souls), "power", offerings. Substantive possibilities, it should be noted, include, paint, tobacco, or medicinal substances.

c) SHFB's generally have a non-associational depositional pattern. Though this may be explained in various ways, the most likely answer to this pattern seems to be that SHFB's were objects of power that were potentially dangerous to those unfamiliar with their potency and were hidden away when not in use.

d) Where associations are present, they seem to be with graves in the interior, remote spots along the Lower Fraser, and habitations on the Coast. This generally conforms to the typological groupings as I have presented them and may be explained in terms of different uses and meanings according to time and place. The suggestion seems to be that SHFB's were considered personal property in the Interior and not transferrable while, on the Coast, they were considered family property and inherited. Ceremonies in which SHFB's were involved may have been a more public affair on the Coast while, in the Interior, they were bound up with a more highly developed personal spiritual life.

e) The development of the SHFB complex corresponds with a developing trend towards cultural and ceremonial elaboration between ca. 2500 and 1500 BP on the Coast and a little later in the Interior.

f) A general feature of Salish life was the acquisition and use of spirit power. Certain objects were seen to be visual manifestations of this power and media through which
shamans could exercise this power. SHFB's were probably such objects for the ancestors of the ethnographic Salish.

**g)** The design of the SHFB form presents an intermingling of a central human figure with additional animal forms. This, again, is suggestive of power relationships between a shaman and his spirit "helpers." This design pattern is most elaborate and detailed on the Interior specimens where, perhaps, this concept saw its fullest expression.

**h)** SHFB's, then, are best viewed as power objects manifesting and expressing a power relationship between a shaman and his spirit powers. They were most likely used during various curing and other shamanic ceremonies and hidden away when not in use.

Distinctions of design and depositional patterns seen among the seated human figure bowl collection represent spatio-temporal patterns and suggest that these figures may have been conceived slightly differently at different times and places. However, the overall uniformity of design and concept within the collection is even more apparent. In ethnographic times, the various Salishan groups, while expressing their world view with local distinction, all shared a basic cosmology. The same can probably be said to be true of their prehistoric ancestors and, though local distinctions allowed for some variability of design and specific meaning, the seated human figure bowl complex most likely was a uniformly meaningful one. It may be seen as loosely analogous to various Christian denominational conceptions of the Cross, though not associated with "religion" in the usual sense.
The preceding thesis is essentially comprised of three components: i) an overview of the subject; ii) a typology, and; iii) an attempt at deciphering meaning. The first component (Chapters one and two) highlights a long standing interest in the seated human figure bowl artistic tradition as well as a need for on-going study in order to penetrate the many questions that this interest has aroused. The following two components of the thesis were an attempt at penetrating, at least partially, some of the more fundamental aspects of these questions.

The second component (Chapter four) offered a typological analysis as an initial attempt at establishing some basic spatio-temporal controls for the seated human figure bowl tradition. Using the formal characteristics of the bowls as well as depositional patterns as criteria, three bowl types were established. These types correspond to the three sub-areas of the seated human figure bowl distribution; the Coast, the Lower Fraser and, the Mid-Fraser and were named accordingly. It can now be argued that different morphological bowl types are derived from different sub-areas, the large, un-detailed, non-steatite types coming from the Coast, the small, detailed steatite types coming from the
Mid-Fraser, and the conglomerate types coming from the Lower Fraser. Some might argue that this typology could be simplified to include only two types; the Coastal Type and the Mid-Fraser or Interior Type, while others might choose to further sub-divide the category into finer classes. Either way, the typology presented here serves as a useful starting point.

The bowl's formal characteristics and their corresponding spatial patterning also helped to establish some temporal controls for the seated human figure bowl tradition. Typically most age assessments have placed seated human figure bowls around 2000 BP. While this assessment has general validity, indications from the typological analysis are that Coastal Type specimens may be 500 to 1000 years older than this, while Mid-Fraser Types may be 500 to 1000 years younger. Age determination continues, however, to be a problem with this particular collection of artifacts. What does seem clear is that the tradition had great longevity.

The third component of this thesis (chapter five) addressed elements of function and meaning in the seated human figure bowl tradition. This was an attempt at demonstrating that seated human figure bowls were generalized objects of shamanistic power. It was my contention that the pursuit of specific or singular functions for the seated human figure bowl form is a misguided one that misses the real significance of these sculptures. Their significance
lay, in my opinion, not in a specific function that they carried out, but in the power that they contained. The object could have had varied utility within a shamanistic arena as ritual water basins, medicine or tobacco mortars, soul catchers, or "crystal balls", but it is the image that captures the real significance. Seated human figure bowls were more than just "shamanic paraphernalia." They also were more than just representations of a power relationship between a shaman and his or her spirit helpers, although they were both of these. They were tangible manifestations of shamanic power and media through which this power could be enacted. In chapter five I explored elements of shamanism in an attempt to link seated human figure bowls with the shamanistic realm and investigated elements of bowl morphology, bowl archaeology, and relevant ethnographies in hopes of strengthening the above ideas.

An issue that continues to loom large in my mind is the apparent differences between the Coastal and the Interior Types of seated human figure bowls. What are some of these differences and what are the implications? Coastal types may have been used by successive generations as their association (if any) seems to be with habitation sites and never with graves. Those specimens are large and very heavy and probably had a more "public" role than their Interior counterparts. The relative absence of additional animal motifs on these bowls may also suggest a less personalized
significance. For these reasons, it may be argued that the Coastal Types, while still involved in shamanistic practices, were the domain of families or households.

The Interior types, on the other hand, were more likely highly personalized objects, whose usage ended with the death of their maker. Their association (if any) seems to have been with remote graves. Mostly, however, they have been found with no apparent association in remote spots. This depositional pattern suggests that, upon the death of the shaman, his paraphernalia was either buried with him, or remained in a sacred spot that only he knew about. For this reason, and because of the highly personalized detail on these specimens, it seems likely that the Interior specimens were not used through successive generations, but were the strict domain of the shaman who carved and used them.

These ideas may have implications for our interpretations of the different views and manifestations of shamanistic practices between the Southern Coast and the Southern Interior in prehistoric times. Did the Coastal type of seated human figure bowls exist prior to a well developed shamanistic tradition on the Coast? Did Coastal communities have "household shamans" at this time? Did the shamanistic and guardian spirit cosmologies typical of the ethnographic Southern Northwest Coast originate in the Interior? How exactly did the shamanistic cosmologies differ in prehistoric times between the Southern Coast and the Southern Interior?
These are questions that have been raised by this thesis, but still need to be addressed.

In many ways, the seated human figure bowl collection occupies a relatively un-attended corner of Northwest Coast archaeological thought and represents a dark area of our knowledge of prehistory. While some might consider such subject matter an impenetrable "black box," others conduct studies such as this one in order to at least partially illuminate these dark areas. Subject matter so esoteric and nebulous as this must, by definition, remain partially impenetrable by the archaeologist. This thesis, however, does demonstrate that, through an analysis of the relevant data, certain unknowns can be fleshed out and new and interesting questions posed.
APPENDIX

BOWL CATALOGUE INFORMATION

BOWL NUMBER----------------------------- 1
BOWL NAME--------------------------- Departure Bay # 3
BOWL TYPE------------------------- Coastal

PERMANENT LOCATION
  ORIGINAL----------------------------- RBCM
  CAST(S)----------------------------- RBCM

ARCHAEOLOGY
  LOCATION OF FIND--------------------- Departure Bay Midden
  BORDEN NUMBER----------------------- DhRx-y: 3
  DATE--------------------------------- 1890
  EXCAVATION TECHNIQUE---------------- Uncontrolled
  SITE TYPE-------------------------- Midden

DESCRIPTION
  MATERIAL----------------------------- Sandstone
  COLOUR----------------------------- Brown
  HEIGHT----------------------------- 18.5 cm

GENERAL DESCRIPTION/PROVENIENCE

Figure # 12
(see Duff 1956: 33 for full description).
Figure # 13
(see Duff 1956: 33 for full description).

It should be added to Wilson Duff's description that this figure is an example of exceptional workmanship and singularity of vision and is quite unlike the other figures of the Early Type. Also, when placed face down on its front, this figure is transformed into quite another being, the drilled holes on top acting as eyes. A truly masterful work of illusion and metaphor.
BOWL CATALOGUE INFORMATION (con't)

BOWL NUMBER------------------------------------------ 3
BOWL NAME-------------------------------------------- Departure Bay # 2
BOWL TYPE-------------------------------------------- Coastal

PERMANENT LOCATION
ORIGINAL--------------------------------------------- RBCM
CAST(S)---------------------------------------------- ?

ARCHAEOLOGY
LOCATION OF FIND-------------------------------------- Departure Bay
BORDEN NUMBER---------------------------------------- DhRx-Y: 7
DATE----------------------------------------------- 1921 (?)
EXCAVATION TECHNIQUE-------------------------------- Uncontrolled
SITE TYPE--------------------------------------------- ?

DESCRIPTION
MATERIAL--------------------------------------------- Pumice
COLOUR---------------------------------------------- Grey
HEIGHT---------------------------------------------- 26 cm

GENERAL DESCRIPTION/PROVENIENCE

Figure # 14
(see Duff 1956: 33 for full description).
BOWL CATALOGUE INFORMATION (con't)

BOWL NUMBER--------------------------------- 4
BOWL NAME----------------------------------- The Nooksack Bowl
BOWL TYPE----------------------------------- Coastal

PERMANENT LOCATION
ORIGINAL-------------------------------------- Western WA College (?)
CAST(S)-------------------------------------- ?

ARCHAEOLOGY
LOCATION OF FIND-------------------------------- Ten Mile Creek
BORDEN NUMBER--------------------------------- ?
DATE------------------------------------------ ?
EXCAVATION TECHNIQUE------------------------- Uncontrolled
SITE TYPE------------------------------------- Cache

DESCRIPTION
MATERIAL-------------------------------------- Vesicular Lava
COLOUR--------------------------------------- Black
HEIGHT--------------------------------------- 26 cm

GENERAL DESCRIPTION/PROVENIENCE

Figure # 15
(see Duff 1956: 32 for full description).
GENERAL DESCRIPTION/PROVENIENCE

Figure # 16
(see Duff 1956: 31 for full description).

The exact provenience for this figure remains obscured by conflicting reports and the curious fact that the figure portrayed perched on top of a cairn in The Great Fraser Midden is, in fact, not the Marpole Image but the Cowichan Bay Bowl. However, the fact that this bowl was found during controlled excavations at the Marpole site makes it perhaps the best recorded in the collection.
BOWL CATALOGUE INFORMATION

BOWL NUMBER----------------------- 6
BOWL NAME-------------------------- The Kilberg Bowl
BOWL TYPE-------------------------- Coastal

PERMANENT LOCATION

ORIGINAL--------------------------Archaeology Lab Collection, UBC.
CAST(S)---------------------------?

ARCHAEOLOGY

LOCATION OF FIND------------------- Near Deroche, BC.
BORDEN NUMBER---------------------- DhR1-17: 82
DATE-----------------------------?  
EXCAVATION TECHNIQUE---------------- Uncontrolled
SITE TYPE-------------------------- Habitation

DESCRIPTION

MATERIAL--------------------------- Sandstone (?)
COLOUR---------------------------- Light brown
HEIGHT----------------------------- ca. 30 cm

GENERAL DESCRIPTION/PROVENIENCE

Figure # 17

This somewhat unusual figure was found on private property 3 miles east of Deroche near the confluence of the Fraser and Harrison rivers. The site (the Kilberg site) included 14 housepits. This is published in Duff 1949: 18).

This large figure made of coarse stone was carved by pecking and incising. It depicts a human figure with a bowl in its chest and lap. The disproportionately large head is the most detailed element. A ridged head-dress (?) runs across the top of the head surmounting a thick brow-line that sweeps across the forehead. A vaguely modelled nose runs between two circular and bulging eyes. Incised lines demarcate cheeks as well as a mouth. Though details of the body may be obscured by erosion, it is quite plain. Vague outlines of bent arms can be seen wrapped around the large bowl. Incised lines mark the wrists. The figure stands upright but is most effective at holding liquid lying on its back.
Although Duff (1956: 39) claims that the information surrounding the discovery of this bowl is unclear, Borden (1976: 150) claims that it was found at the Marpole site "among the roots of a tree three feet (ca. 1 m) below the surface."
BOWL CATALOGUE INFORMATION (con't)

BOWL NUMBER----------------------------- 8
BOWL NAME----------------------------- Departure Bay # 4
BOWL TYPE----------------------------- Coastal

PERMANENT LOCATION
ORIGINAL------------------------------- Nat. Museum of Canada
CAST(S)------------------------------- ?

ARCHAEOLOGY
LOCATION OF FIND---------------------- Departure Bay
BORDEN NUMBER------------------------ DhRx-Y: (?)
DATE------------------------------- 1939 (?)
EXCAVATION TECHNIQUE---------------- Uncontrolled
SITE TYPE----------------------------- Midden (?)

DESCRIPTION
MATERIAL----------------------------- Sandstone
COLOUR----------------------------- Light Grey
HEIGHT------------------------------- 26 cm

GENERAL DESCRIPTION/PROVENIENCE

Figure # 19
(see Duff 1956: 33 for full description).
GENERAL DESCRIPTION/PROVENIENCE

Figure # 20
(see Duff 1956: 36-37 for full description).

Duff fails to mention the fish-like character of the head-dress feature running down the back of the head when looked at from above.
BOWL CATALOGUE INFORMATION (con't)

BOWL NUMBER--------------------------------- 10

BOWL NAME--------------------------------- The Porlier Pass Bowl

BOWL TYPE--------------------------------- Lower Fraser

PERMANENT LOCATION

ORIGINAL------------------------------------- Washington State Museum

CAST(S)------------------------------------- ?

ARCHAEOLOGY

LOCATION OF FIND-------------------------- Galiano Island

BORDEN NUMBER----------------------------- ?

DATE--------------------------------------- 1947 (?)

EXCAVATION TECHNIQUE---------------------- Uncontrolled

SITE TYPE----------------------------------- Remote Spot

DESCRIPTION

MATERIAL----------------------------------- Sandstone

COLOUR------------------------------------- Brown

HEIGHT------------------------------------- 20 cm

GENERAL DESCRIPTION/PROVENIENCE

Figure # 21
(see Duff 1956: 34 for full description).
BOWL CATALOGUE INFORMATION (con't)

BOWL NUMBER---------------------------------- 11

BOWL NAME---------------------------------- The Courtenay Bowl

BOWL TYPE---------------------------------- Lower Fraser

PERMANENT LOCATION

ORIGINAL---------------------------------- RBCM
CAST(S)---------------------------------- ?

ARCHAEOLOGY

LOCATION OF FIND---------------------------------- Comox Harbour
BORDEN NUMBER---------------------------------- DkSf-Y: 47
DATE---------------------------------- 1945 (?)
EXCAVATION TECHNIQUE---------------------------------- Uncontrolled
SITE TYPE---------------------------------- Remote Spot

DESCRIPTION

MATERIAL---------------------------------- Soapstone
COLOUR---------------------------------- Greenish-grey
HEIGHT---------------------------------- 19 cm

GENERAL DESCRIPTION/PROVENIENCE

Figure # 22
(see Duff 1956: 38 for full description).
BOWL CATALOGUE INFORMATION (con't)

BOWL NUMBER--------------------------------------- 12
BOWL NAME------------------------------------------ Ruby Creek Bowl
BOWL TYPE------------------------------------------ Lower Fraser

PERMANENT LOCATION
ORIGINAL------------------------------------------ RBCM
CAST(S)------------------------------------------ Vancouver Museum

ARCHAEOLOGY
LOCATION OF FIND---------------------------- Ruby Creek
BORDEN NUMBER---------------------------- DiRj-Y: 3
DATE------------------------------------------ ?
EXCAVATION TECHNIQUE------------------------- ?
SITE TYPE--------------------------------? 

DESCRIPTION
MATERIAL----------------------------------------- Soapstone
COLOUR----------------------------------------- Dark Grey/black
HEIGHT----------------------------------------- 21 cm

GENERAL DESCRIPTION/PROVENIENCE

Figure # 23
(see Duff 1956: 27-28 for full description).
Figure # 24  
(from photograph)  
Little information could be obtained for this bowl which is apparently housed in the Museum of the American Indian, New York, beyond the fact that it was found on Lummi Island in Puget Sound.  
Judging by the smoothness and degree of detail it is very likely that this specimen was carved of soapstone. It is a rather large figure depicting in typical style a seated human figure embracing a bowl. The head, as usual, is done in far greater detail than the body and looks slightly upward. Large, round eyes frame a prominent nose. The mouth is full lipped and seemingly closed. A small nipple shaped topknot is perched on the top of the head.  
A constriction indicates the neck immediately below which is the bowl rimmed by prominent arms meeting in front. The body of the figure is done in low detail and does not appear to depict any additional motifs.
Figure # 25

(From Photograph). Similar in overall conception to bowls No. 13 and 15, this bowl depicts a seated human figure into whose lap and chest a bowl is excavated. It is done in soft grey soapstone buffed smooth.

The bowl was found near the ferry terminal in Langdale, B.C. on a beach underneath a rocky cliff. The bowl probably eroded out of the bluffs with big tides.

The face of this figure is typical. Large, round eyes are deeply incised and bulging on either side of a fairly prominent nose bridge. The large mouth is partly open in a wide grin. The head looks slightly upward.

The body of the figure is undetailed and smooth. It is difficult to tell from the photograph whether or not legs or arms are depicted. On the front of the bowl, however, is a detailed face somewhat dissimilar to that on the main figure. A heavy brow line (also forming the front rim of the bowl) sweeps around very large, round bulging eyes. A small nose is very realistically defined and thick fish-like lips in a sombre frown define the mouth. The two faces seem to be in opposition to one another.
Figure # 26

Similar in many ways to bowls No. 13 and 14, this sculpture depicts a seated human figure with outstretched arms and legs encircling a bowl. As in many cases, the figure leans slightly backwards and looks slightly upward.

A heavy brow curves above circular eyes to ear level where protrusions depict ears. The nose is broad and flat and a realistic mouth is open an grinning. On the top of the head are two drilled holes of unknown function.

A massive neck separates the head from a fairly undetailed body. Simple arms rim the bowl and seem not to meet in front. No hands are shown. Legs, in similar fashion, outstretch with slightly bent knees around each side. Shoulder blades are depicted by incising and a backbone is shown with a shallow incised ridge running up the back of the figure.

On the front of the bowl there appears to be a snake's head with eyes, mouth and jaw and an incised scale pattern above which is a fairly deep cleft and a horizontal cut under it.
Figure # 27
(see Duff 1956: 28 for full description).

Provenience is the same as bowl # 17
BOWL CATALOGUE INFORMATION (con't)

BOWL NUMBER------------------------------------- 17
BOWL NAME-------------------------------------- Yoshioka Bowl No. 2
BOWL TYPE-------------------------------------- Lower Fraser

PERMANENT LOCATION
ORIGINAL------------------------------------------ UBC Museum of Anthropology
CAST(S)----------------------------------------- RBCM

ARCHAEOLOGY
LOCATION OF FIND------------------------------- Near Aldergrove, BC
BORDEN NUMBER-------------------------------- DgRo-Y
DATE-------------------------------------------- 1952
EXCAVATION TECHNIQUE--------------------------- Uncontrolled
SITE TYPE---------------------------------------- Remote Spot

DESCRIPTION
MATERIAL----------------------------------------- Soapstone
COLOUR------------------------------------------ Grey
HEIGHT------------------------------------------ 15 cm

GENERAL DESCRIPTION/PROVENIENCE

Figure # 28
(see Duff 1956: 28-29 for full description).

Provenience is the same as bowl # 16.
BOWL CATALOGUE INFORMATION (con't)

BOWL NUMBER------------------------------------------ 18
BOWL NAME-------------------------------------------- Yale Creek Bowl
BOWL TYPE--------------------------------------------- Lower Fraser

PERMANENT LOCATION
ORIGINAL----------------------------------------------- ?
CAST(S)----------------------------------------------- RBCM, Vancouver Museum

ARCHAEOLOGY
LOCATION OF FIND-------------------------------------- Yale Creek
BORDEN NUMBER------------------------------------------ DjRi-Y
DATE---------------------------------------------------- ?
EXCAVATION TECHNIQUE--------------------------------- ?
SITE TYPE--------------------------------------------- ?

DESCRIPTION
MATERIAL----------------------------------------------- Soapstone
COLOUR----------------------------------------------- Grey
HEIGHT----------------------------------------------- 20 cm

GENERAL DESCRIPTION/PROVENIENCE

Figure # 29
(see Duff 1956: 26-27 for full description).
**BOWL CATALOGUE INFORMATION (con't)**

**BOWL NUMBER**------------------------------- 19

**BOWL NAME**------------------------------ Bossom Saanich Bowl

**BOWL TYPE**------------------------------- Lower Fraser

**PERMANENT LOCATION**

**ORIGINAL**------------------------------- ?

**CAST(S)**------------------------------- ?

**ARCHAEOLOGY**

**LOCATION OF FIND**---------------------- Patricia Bay

**BORDEN NUMBER**-------------------------- ?

**DATE**------------------------------- ?

**EXCAVATION TECHNIQUE**--------------------- ?

**SITE TYPE**------------------------------- ?

**DESCRIPTION**

**MATERIAL**------------------------------- Soapstone

**COLOUR**------------------------------- Black

**HEIGHT**------------------------------- 21 cm

**GENERAL DESCRIPTION/PROVENIENCE**

Figure # 30
(see Duff 1956: 36 for full description).
BOWL CATALOGUE INFORMATION (con't)

BOWL NUMBER----------------------------- 20
BOWL NAME----------------------------- The Marpole Bowl
BOWL TYPE----------------------------- Lower Fraser

PERMANENT LOCATION
ORIGINAL----------------------------- UBC
CAST(S)----------------------------- ?

ARCHAEOLOGY
LOCATION OF FIND----------------------------- Marpole Midden
BORDEN NUMBER-----------------------------
DATE----------------------------- 1949
EXCAVATION TECHNIQUE----------------------------- Controlled
SITE TYPE----------------------------- Midden

DESCRIPTION
MATERIAL----------------------------- Soapstone
COLOUR----------------------------- Dark Grey
HEIGHT----------------------------- 10 cm

GENERAL DESCRIPTION/PROVENIENCE

Figure # 31
(see Duff 1956: 31 for full description).
BOWL CATALOGUE INFORMATION (con't)

BOWL NUMBER----------------------------- 21
BOWL NAME--------------------------------- Alouette Bowl
BOWL TYPE--------------------------------- Lower Fraser

PERMANENT LOCATION
ORIGINAL------------------------------- Canadian Museum of Civilization, Ottawa
CAST(S)----------------------------- RBCM

ARCHAEOLOGY
LOCATION OF FIND----------------------- South Alouette River, near Haney
BORDEN NUMBER--------------------------- DhRp-Y: 78
DATE--------------------------------- 1938 (?)
EXCAVATION TECHNIQUE------------------- Uncontrolled
SITE TYPE------------------------------ Remote Spot

DESCRIPTION
MATERIAL------------------------------- Soapstone
COLOUR----------------------------- Light Grey
HEIGHT----------------------------- 20 cm

GENERAL DESCRIPTION/PROVENIENCE

Figure # 32
(see Duff 1956: 30 for full description).
GENERAL DESCRIPTION/PROVENIENCE

Figure # 33
(see Duff 1956: 29 for full description).
BOWL CATALOGUE INFORMATION (con't)

BOWL NUMBER-------------------- 23
BOWL NAME---------------------- Hope Bowl
BOWL TYPE---------------------- Lower Fraser

PERMANENT LOCATION
ORIGINAL---------------------- RBCM
CAST(S)---------------------- ?

ARCHAEOLOGY
LOCATION OF FIND------------- Near Hope
BORDEN NUMBER--------------- DiRi-Y: 1
DATE------------------------- ?
EXCAVATION TECHNIQUE--------- uncontrolled
SITE TYPE--------------------- Remote Spot

DESCRIPTION
MATERIAL---------------------- Related to Soapstone
COLOUR----------------------- Grey
HEIGHT----------------------- 28 cm

GENERAL DESCRIPTION/PROVENIENCE

Figure # 34
(see Duff 1956: 27 for full description).
BOWL CATALOGUE INFORMATION (con't)

BOWL NUMBER--------------------------------------------------- 24

BOWL NAME------------------------------------------------------ Chicago Saanich Bowl

BOWL TYPE------------------------------------------------------ Mid-Fraser

PERMANENT LOCATION
ORIGINAL------------------------------------------------------ Chicago Natural History Museum
CAST(S)-------------------------------------------------------- Vancouver Museum

ARCHAEOLOGY
LOCATION OF FIND--------------------------------------------- Saanich
BORDEN NUMBER----------------------------------------------- ?
DATE----------------------------------------------------------- 1902
EXCAVATION TECHNIQUE------------------------------------------ Uncontrolled
SITE TYPE------------------------------------------------------ Midden

DESCRIPTION
MATERIAL-------------------------------------------------------- Soapstone
COLOUR---------------------------------------------------------- ?
HEIGHT---------------------------------------------------------- 25 cm

GENERAL DESCRIPTION/PROVENIENCE

Figure # 35
(see Duff 1956:35 for full description).
BOWL CATALOGUE INFORMATION (con't)

BOWL NUMBER-------------------------------------- 25

BOWL NAME---------------------------------------- Free Museum Bowl

BOWL TYPE---------------------------------------- Mid-Fraser

PERMANENT LOCATION

ORIGINAL------------------------------------------ Free Museum, University of Pennsylvania (?)

CAST(S)------------------------------------------ ?

ARCHAEOLOGY

LOCATION OF FIND--------------------------------- ?

BORDEN NUMBER----------------------------------- ?

DATE--------------------------------------------- ?

EXCAVATION TECHNIQUE----------------------------- ?

SITE TYPE----------------------------------------- ?

DESCRIPTION

MATERIAL------------------------------------------ Soapstone

COLOUR-------------------------------------------- ?

HEIGHT------------------------------------------- about 17 cm

GENERAL DESCRIPTION/PROVENIENCE

Figure # 36
(see Duff 1956: 39 for full description).
This and bowl No. 27 were found together on the property of F. Alexander in Victoria B.C. in 1960. There was, apparently, evidence of fire and the site was interpreted as a pit in which shaman's belongings were burned. This bowl was exported to the U.S.

This rather large bowl (height is an approximate measurement taken from Duff, 1975), though typical in overall conception, is quite unique in its complexity and detail. It was obviously conceived by a talented artist. The face is framed by a very pronounced brow-line that sweeps around the eyes and converges at a puckered mouth which may symbolize a sucking or blowing action. Eyes are deep set and oval on either side of a very well defined nose which appears to be perforated at the upper end of the bridge. A head-dress? is defined by several vertically incised lines and a very pronounced maul-like topknot rests on top of the flattened head. The chin juts forward and the neck is large and piller-like.

Well defined arms rim the bowl and fingered hands do not meet in front.
Equally well defined flexed legs wrap on either side of the bowl. Incised lines represent ribs and shoulder blades.

Running along the back is a very well executed snake, almost definitely a rattle snake. On the front of the bowl is the face of a snake-like creature.
Found in association with bowl # 26 near the Gorge in Victoria, B.C, this bowl was also exported to the U.S. This sculpture depicts a seated human figure holding a bowl. Legs are carved in the round with tightly flexed knees. Arms in relief rest on the knees. The face is typical. It looks slightly upwards with a grin. A small topknot rests on top of the head. Ribs are shown and a lizard-like creature crawls up the back of the figure.
Bowls Catalogue Information (con't)

Bowl Number----------------------------- 28

Bowl Name-------------------------------- The Shoal Harbour Bowl

Bowl Type-------------------------------- Mid-Fraser

Permanent Location
ORIGINAL----------------------------- Mrs. J. Clements
CAST(S)-------------------------------- ?

Archaeology
LOCATION OF FIND---------------- Shoal Harbour, Saanich
BORDEN NUMBER------------------------- ?
DATE-------------------------------- ?
EXCAVATION TECHNIQUE---------------- Uncontrolled
SITE TYPE------------------------------- Midden

Description
MATERIAL----------------------------- Steatite
COLOUR-------------------------------- ?
HEIGHT----------------------------- 35 cm

General Description/Provenience

Figure # 39
(see Duff 1956: 34 for full description).
GENERAL DESCRIPTION/PROVENIENCE

According to Duff (1975: 173) this figure was found at the south end of Kuper Island in the 1950's eroding out of a bank.

A well detailed face looks upward and is dominated by deeply set eyes with deep incisions leading from their corner's down the cheeks. A large topknot rests on top of the head. A heavy neck rises out of the top of the bowl excavation. One side of the figure has been broken away but judging from the existing side it would seem that arms wrap around the bowl in relief with fingers meeting at the front.

The human figure merges with an animal form (frog?) that dominates the bottom portion of the sculpture and is shown lying on its back.
BOWL CATALOGUE INFORMATION (con't)

BOWL NUMBER----------------------------- 30

BOWL NAME-------------------------------- The Royston Bowl

BOWL TYPE----------------------------- Mid-Fraser

PERMANENT LOCATION

ORIGINAL----------------------------- RBCM

CAST(S)----------------------------- ?

ARCHAEOLOGY

LOCATION OF FIND----------------------------- Near Royston, B.C.

BORDEN NUMBER----------------------------- DjSf-Y: 9

DATE----------------------------- ?

EXCAVATION TECHNIQUE----------------------------- Uncontrolled

SITE TYPE----------------------------- Remote Spot

DESCRIPTION

MATERIAL----------------------------- Steatite

COLOUR----------------------------- Green

HEIGHT----------------------------- 12 cm

GENERAL DESCRIPTION/PROVENIENCE

Figure # 41
(see Duff 1956: 38 for full description.)
BOWL CATALOGUE INFORMATION (con't)

BOWL NUMBER---------------------------------- 31
BOWL NAME------------------------------------ The Martin Bowl # 2
BOWL TYPE------------------------------------ Mid-Fraser

PERMANENT LOCATION
ORIGINAL-------------------------------------- ?
CAST(S)-------------------------------------- ?

ARCHAEOLOGY
LOCATION OF FIND------------------------------- ?
BORDEN NUMBER-------------------------------- ?
DATE------------------------------------------ ?
EXCAVATION TECHNIQUE-------------------------- ?
SITE TYPE------------------------------------- ?

DESCRIPTION
MATERIAL-------------------------------------- Steatite
COLOUR---------------------------------------- ?
HEIGHT---------------------------------------- 14 cm

GENERAL DESCRIPTION/PROVENIENCE

Figure # 42
(see Duff 1956: 39 for full description).
BOWL CATALOGUE INFORMATION (con’t)

BOWL NUMBER------------------------------- 32

BOWL NAME------------------------------- North Saanich Bowl

BOWL TYPE------------------------------- Mid-Fraser

PERMANENT LOCATION
  ORIGINAL------------------------------- Unknown
  CAST(S)------------------------------- ?

ARCHAEOLOGY
  LOCATION OF FIND----------------------- North Saanich
  BORDEN NUMBER--------------------------------
  DATE------------------------------------- ?
  EXCAVATION TECHNIQUE--------------------- Uncontrolled
  SITE TYPE------------------------------- Midden

DESCRIPTION
  MATERIAL------------------------------- Soapstone
  COLOUR--------------------------------- ?
  HEIGHT------------------------------- 17 cm

GENERAL DESCRIPTION/PROVENIENCE

  Figure # 43
  (see Duff 1956: 34 for full description).
BOWL CATALOGUE INFORMATION (con't)

BOWL NUMBER---------------------------------- 33
BOWL NAME---------------------------------- The Bossom Lytton Bowl
BOWL TYPE---------------------------------- Mid-Fraser

PERMANENT LOCATION
ORIGINAL---------------------------------- A. Bossom Collection
CAST(S)---------------------------------- ?

ARCHAEOLOGY
LOCATION OF FIND---------------------------------- Lytton (?)
BORDEN NUMBER---------------------------------- ?
DATE---------------------------------- ?
EXCAVATION TECHNIQUE---------------------------------- ?
SITE TYPE---------------------------------- ?

DESCRIPTION
MATERIAL---------------------------------- Steatite (?)
COLOUR---------------------------------- ?
HEIGHT---------------------------------- 18 cm

GENERAL DESCRIPTION/PROVENIENCE

Figure # 44
(see Duff 1956: 25-26 for full description).
BOWL CATALOGUE INFORMATION (con't)

BOWL NUMBER----------------------------- 34
BOWL NAME------------------------------- Shuswap Lake Bowl
BOWL TYPE------------------------------- Mid-Fraser

PERMANENT LOCATION
ORIGINAL----------------------------- Percy Ruth collection
CAST(S)----------------------------- ?

ARCHAEOLOGY
LOCATION OF FIND---------------------- Shuswap Lake
BORDEN NUMBER------------------------ ?
DATE------------------------ ?
EXCAVATION TECHNIQUE---------------- Uncontrolled
SITE TYPE---------------------------- Remote Spot

DESCRIPTION
MATERIAL----------------------------- Steatite
COLOUR----------------------------- Black
HEIGHT----------------------------- 14 cm

GENERAL DESCRIPTION/PROVENIENCE

Figure # 45
(see Duff 1956: 23 for full description).
GENERAL DESCRIPTION/PROVENIENCE

Figure # 46
(see Duff 1956: 25 for full description).
BOWL CATALOGUE INFORMATION (con't)

BOWL NUMBER----------------------------------- 36
BOWL NAME-------------------------------------- The Seward Bowl
BOWL TYPE-------------------------------------- Mid-Fraser

PERMANENT LOCATION
ORIGINAL------------------------------------------ Vancouver Museum
CAST(S)------------------------------------------ RBCM

ARCHAEOLOGY
LOCATION OF FIND--------------------------------- Candle Creek, Alaska
BORDEN NUMBER----------------------------------- none
DATE--------------------------------------------- ?
EXCAVATION TECHNIQUE---------------------------- Uncontrolled
SITE TYPE----------------------------------------- Remote Spot

DESCRIPTION
MATERIAL----------------------------------------- Steatite
COLOUR------------------------------------------ Dark-grey
HEIGHT------------------------------------------ 23 cm

GENERAL DESCRIPTION/PROVENIENCE

Figure # 47.
(see Duff 1956: 40 for a full description).
BOWL CATALOGUE INFORMATION (con't)

BOWL NUMBER--------------------------------------- 37
BOWL NAME------------------------------------------ Lillooet Bowl # 2
BOWL TYPE------------------------------------------ Mid-Fraser

PERMANENT LOCATION
ORIGINAL--------------------------------------------- Vancouver Museum
CAST(S)--------------------------------------------- ?

ARCHAEOLOGY
LOCATION OF FIND------------------------------------ Near Lillooet
BORDEN NUMBER-------------------------------------- ?
DATE----------------------------------------------- 1956
EXCAVATION TECHNIQUE------------------------------ Uncontrolled
SITE TYPE-------------------------------------------- Remote Spot

DESCRIPTION
MATERIAL-------------------------------------------- Steatite
COLOUR--------------------------------------------- Grey
HEIGHT--------------------------------------------- 25 cm

GENERAL DESCRIPTION/PROVENIENCE

Figure # 48
(see Duff 1956: 41 for full description).
BOWL CATALOGUE INFORMATION (con't)

BOWL NUMBER-------------------------- 38
BOWL NAME----------------------------- Bridge River Bowl
BOWL TYPE----------------------------- Mid-Fraser

PERMANENT LOCATION
ORIGINAL----------------------------- RBCM
CAST(S)----------------------------- RBCM

ARCHAEOLOGY
LOCATION OF FIND--------------------- Near Lillooet
BORDEN NUMBER---------------------- EeRl 46: 1
DATE------------------------------- ca. 1922
EXCAVATION TECHNIQUE------------- Uncontrolled
SITE TYPE----------------------------- Grave

DESCRIPTION
MATERIAL----------------------------- Steatite
COLOUR----------------------------- Dark-grey
HEIGHT------------------------------- 10 cm

GENERAL DESCRIPTION/PROVENIENCE

Figure # 49

Found during construction of old Lytton-Lillooet road ca. 1922 across the Fraser from the mouth of the Bridge River. It was said to have been found in shale deposits in association with burial remains and other stone figures.

This small figure is a classic example of the Lytton sub-type. It is a small carving of an upright seated figure holding a bowl. Large eyes done in the typical "Northwest Coast eye" style dominate the angular face. A brow-ridge frames the face converging above the nose in a V-shaped point. A beak-like nose has shallow pits indicating nostrils which are connected to the corners of the mouth by incised lines. The mouth is wide and partly open.

A thick, columnar neck separates the head from the rest of the body. Arms and legs are shown in relief along the sides of the bowl and meet with hands and feet meeting in front. Ribs and backbone are clearly shown with incised lines. The bowl itself holds little more than a teaspoon of liquid. The entire figure is polished and to a smooth finish.
BOWL CATALOGUE INFORMATION (con't)

BOWL NUMBER------------------------- 39

BOWL NAME-------------------------------- The Carmichael Bowl

BOWL TYPE-------------------------------- Mid-Fraser

PERMANENT LOCATION
ORIGINAL----------------------------- RBCM
CAST(S)----------------------------- ?

ARCHAEOLOGY
LOCATION OF FIND---------------------- Near Lytton
BORDEN NUMBER------------------------ EbRj 22: 4
DATE--------------------------- ?
EXCAVATION TECHNIQUE---------------- Uncontrolled
SITE TYPE-------------------------- Grave

DESCRIPTION
MATERIAL----------------------------- Steatite
COLOUR----------------------------- Greenish-black
HEIGHT----------------------------- 13 cm

GENERAL DESCRIPTION/PROVENIENCE

Figure # 50.
(see Duff 1956: 24 for full description).
BOWL CATALOGUE INFORMATION (cont)

BOWL NUMBER----------------------------- 40
BOWL NAME----------------------------- The Karholm Bowl
BOWL TYPE----------------------------- Mid-Fraser

PERMANENT LOCATION
ORIGINAL----------------------------- RBCM
CAST(S)----------------------------- ?

ARCHAEOLOGY
LOCATION OF FIND----------------------------- Near Lytton
BORDEN NUMBER----------------------------- EbRj 22: 1
DATE----------------------------- 1937
EXCAVATION TECHNIQUE----------------------------- Uncontrolled
SITE TYPE----------------------------- Grave

DESCRIPTION
MATERIAL----------------------------- Steatite
COLOUR----------------------------- Black
HEIGHT----------------------------- 15 cm

GENERAL DESCRIPTION/PROVENIENCE

Figure # 51.
(see Duff 1956: 24 for full description).
BOWL CATALOGUE INFORMATION (con't)

BOWL NUMBER-------------------------------------- 41

BOWL NAME---------------------------------------- The Penn Cove Bowl

BOWL TYPE---------------------------------------- Mid-Fraser

PERMANENT LOCATION
ORIGINAL--------------------------------------------- Washington State Museum
CAST(S)---------------------------------------------?

ARCHAEOLOGY
LOCATION OF FIND---------------------------------whidbey Island
BORDEN NUMBER-------------------------------------- None
DATE---------------------------------------------?
EXCAVATION TECHNIQUE----------------------------- Uncontrolled
SITE TYPE---------------------------------------- Midden

DESCRIPTION
MATERIAL---------------------------------------- Steatite
COLOUR-------------------------------------------?
HEIGHT------------------------------------------ 18 cm

GENERAL DESCRIPTION/PROVENIENCE

Figure # 52.
(see Duff 1956: 37 for full description).
BOWL CATALOGUE INFORMATION (con't)

BOWL NUMBER--------------------------- 42
BOWL NAME----------------------------- The Heye Bowl
BOWL TYPE----------------------------- Mid-Fraser

PERMANENT LOCATION
ORIGINAL------------------------------- M. of the Amer. Indian
CAST(S)------------------------------- ?

ARCHAEOLOGY
LOCATION OF FIND---------------------- Near Lytton
BORDEN NUMBER------------------------ ?
DATE------------------------------- ?
EXCAVATION TECHNIQUE---------------- Uncontrolled
SITE TYPE----------------------------- ?

DESCRIPTION
MATERIAL----------------------------- Steatite
COLOUR----------------------------- ?
HEIGHT----------------------------- 19 cm

GENERAL DESCRIPTION/PROVENIENCE

Figure # 53.
(see Duff 1956: 23 for full description).
### BOWL CATALOGUE INFORMATION (con't)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>BOWL NUMBER</strong></th>
<th>43</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BOWL NAME</strong></td>
<td>The Cowichan Bay Bowl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BOWL TYPE</strong></td>
<td>Mid-Fraser</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### PERMANENT LOCATION
- **ORIGINAL** - British Museum
- **CAST(S)** - ?

#### ARCHAEOLOGY
- **LOCATION OF FIND** - Cowichan Bay
- **BORDEN NUMBER** - ?
- **DATE** - ?
- **EXCAVATION TECHNIQUE** - ?
- **SITE TYPE** - ?

#### DESCRIPTION
- **MATERIAL** - Steatite
- **COLOUR** - ?
- **HEIGHT** - 21 cm

#### GENERAL DESCRIPTION/PROVENIENCE

Figure # 54.
(see Duff 1956: 34 for full description).
BOWL CATALOGUE INFORMATION

BOWL NUMBER-------------------------- 44

BOWL NAME----------------------------- The Berlin Bowl

BOWL TYPE------------------------------- Mid-Fraser

PERMANENT LOCATION
ORIGINAL----------------------------- Royal Ethnographical Museum, Berlin
CAST(S)------------------------------- ?

ARCHAEOLOGY
LOCATION OF FIND--------------------- Near Yale
BORDEN NUMBER------------------------ ?
DATE---------------------------------- ?
EXCAVATION TECHNIQUE------------------ ?
SITE TYPE----------------------------- Remote spot

DESCRIPTION
MATERIAL----------------------------- Steatite
COLOUR----------------------------- Dark green
HEIGHT----------------------------- 23 cm

GENERAL DESCRIPTION/PROVENIENCE

Figure # 55.
(see Duff 1956: 26 for full description).
BOWL CATALOGUE INFORMATION (con't)

BOWL NUMBER----------------------------- 45

BOWL NAME----------------------------- Inverarity Bowl

BOWL TYPE----------------------------- Mid-Fraser

PERMANENT LOCATION
ORIGINAL----------------------------- R.B Inverarity
CAST(S)----------------------------- ?

ARCHAEOLOGY
LOCATION OF FIND----------------------------- ?
BORDEN NUMBER---------------------------- ?
DATE---------------------------- ?
EXCAVATION TECHNIQUE----------------------------- ?
SITE TYPE---------------------------- ?

DESCRIPTION
MATERIAL---------------------------- Steatite
COLOUR---------------------------- ?
HEIGHT---------------------------- ca. 15 cm

GENERAL DESCRIPTION/PROVENIENCE

No picture available.
(see Duff 1956: 40 for full description).
GENERAL DESCRIPTION/PROVENIENCE

Figure # 56.
(see Duff 1956: 26 for full description).
BOWL CATALOGUE INFORMATION (con't)

BOWL NUMBER-------------------------------- 47
BOWL NAME--------------------------------- The Bazan Bay Bowl
BOWL TYPE--------------------------------- Incomplete

PERMANENT LOCATION
ORIGINAL--------------------------------- Museum of Anthropology, UBC.
CAST(S)--------------------------------- ?

ARCHAEOLOGY
LOCATION OF FIND------------------------ Bazan Bay, Saanich
BORDEN NUMBER------------------------- ?
DATE--------------------------------- ?
EXCAVATION TECHNIQUE------------------- Uncontrolled
SITE TYPE-------------------------------- ?

DESCRIPTION
MATERIAL--------------------------------- Steatite
COLOUR--------------------------------- Grey
HEIGHT--------------------------------- 18 cm (head missing)

GENERAL DESCRIPTION/PROVENIENCE

Figure # 57.
(see Duff 1956: 36 for full description).
BOWL CATALOGUE INFORMATION (con't)

BOWL NUMBER----------------------------------------------- 48

BOWL NAME----------------------------------------------- The Chilliwack Pair

BOWL TYPE----------------------------------------------- Incomplete

PERMANENT LOCATION
ORIGINAL----------------------------------------------- ?
CAST(S)----------------------------------------------- ?

ARCHAEOLOGY
LOCATION OF FIND----------------------------------------------- Chilliwack
BORDEN NUMBER----------------------------------------------- DhRL8: 43
DATE----------------------------------------------- Head-1972, body-1960's
EXCAVATION TECHNIQUE----------------------------------------------- Uncontrolled
SITE TYPE----------------------------------------------- ?

DESCRIPTION
MATERIAL----------------------------------------------- Steatite
COLOUR----------------------------------------------- Light grey
HEIGHT----------------------------------------------- Head-10cm, body-14cm

GENERAL DESCRIPTION/PROVENIENCE

Figure # 58.
(see Duff 1975: 175 for full description).
BOWL CATALOGUE INFORMATION (con't)

BOWL NUMBER--------------------------------- 49
BOWL NAME----------------------------------- The Brooks Figure
BOWL TYPE----------------------------------- Incomplete

PERMANENT LOCATION
ORIGINAL-------------------------------------- Museum of Anthropology, UBC
CAST(S)-------------------------------------- ?

ARCHAEOLOGY
LOCATION OF FIND--------------------------- "Brooks Mound, Fraser River." (?)
BORDEN NUMBER------------------------------- ?
DATE----------------------------------------- ?
EXCAVATION TECHNIQUE------------------------ ?
SITE TYPE------------------------------------ ?

DESCRIPTION
MATERIAL------------------------------------- Sandstone
COLOUR-------------------------------------- Light-brown
HEIGHT--------------------------------------- 16 cm (head only)

GENERAL DESCRIPTION/PROVENIENCE

Figure # 59.
(see Duff 1956: 41 for full description).
BOWL CATALOGUE INFORMATION (con't)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BOWL NUMBER</th>
<th>Un-named</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BOWL NAME</td>
<td>Incomplete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOWL TYPE</td>
<td>RBCM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERMANENT LOCATION</td>
<td>Gabriola Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORIGINAL(S)</td>
<td>DgRw: 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAST(S)</td>
<td>1966</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ARCHAEOLOGY

| LOCATION OF FIND | Uncontrolled |
| LOCATION OF FIND | 1966 |
| BORDEN NUMBER   | Sandstone |
| DATE            | Light-brown |
| SITE TYPE       | ? |

DESCRIPTION

| MATERIAL | Light-brown |
| COLOUR   | ? |

GENERAL DESCRIPTION/PROVENIENCE

Figure # 60. This "effigy figure" was excavated at the False Narrows site Gabriola Island in 1966. It could have been the head of a seated figure bowl. The facial features most closely resemble those seen on the Coastal type specimens. It features small, round eyes with incised eyebrows above, a small nose, and thick lips. Separating the nose and mouth are deeply incised lines running down to chin level on either side of the face. There is a sloping chin and a receding forehead. The figure is probably sandstone.
BOWL CATALOGUE INFORMATION (con't)

BOWL NUMBER------------------------------- 51

BOWL NAME-------------------------------- Whidbey Island Bowl

BOWL TYPE-------------------------------- Incomplete

PERMANENT LOCATION
ORIGINAL-------------------------------------- Washington State Museum
CAST(S)-------------------------------------- ?

ARCHAEOLOGY
LOCATION OF FIND---------------------------- Whidbey Island
BORDEN NUMBER------------------------------- ?
DATE---------------------------------------- ?
EXCAVATION TECHNIQUE------------------------ ?
SITE TYPE------------------------------------ ?

DESCRIPTION
MATERIAL------------------------------------ Steatite
COLOUR------------------------------------- Black
HEIGHT------------------------------------- 15 cm (incomplete)

GENERAL DESCRIPTION/PROVENIENCE

Figure # 61.
(see Duff 1956: 37 for full description).
GENERAL DESCRIPTION/PROVENIENCE

Figure 62
This unusual bowl was dug up by a pig in Langley B.C. Although irregularly shaped, it shows a seated human figure holding a bowl. The face is dominated by large, round eyes shown in concentric circles. The nose appears to have been broken off and the mouth is vaguely indicated. The asymmetrical body shows arms wrapped around a shallow bowl. Flexed legs wrap around the figure underneath the bowl. Protruding ribs are shown at least on one side of the figure. The front of the bowl has been broken and the top of the head appears to have been broken as well, creating a flat surface.
Figure # 63.
Apparently found in Chilliwack, this bowl has pieces broken off in front. Carved of grey steatite, the complete head closely resembles other bowls of the Mid-Fraser type. The face features large, round eyes, a prominent nose and thick, grinning lips. A topknot rests on top of the head. The body of the figure is broken but does partially reveal a fish-like face on the front.
GENERAL DESCRIPTION/PROVENIENCE

Figure # 64.
(see Duff 1956: 37 for full description).
BOWL CATALOGUE INFORMATION (con't)

BOWL NUMBER----------------------------- 55
BOWL NAME------------------------------- Kamloops Bowl
BOWL TYPE----------------------------- Anomalous

PERMANENT LOCATION
ORIGINAL------------------------------- RBCM
CAST(S)------------------------------- ?

ARCHAEOLOGY
LOCATION OF FIND-------------------- Kamloops, BC
BORDEN NUMBER---------------------- EeRb-Y: 33
DATE------------------------------- ?
EXCAVATION TECHNIQUE--------------- Uncontrolled
SITE TYPE--------------------------- Burial

DESCRIPTION
MATERIAL----------------------------- Steatite
COLOUR----------------------------- Grey
HEIGHT------------------------------- 18 cm

GENERAL DESCRIPTION/PROVENIENCE

Figure # 65.
(see Duff 1956: 23 for full description).
BOWL CATALOGUE INFORMATION (con't)

BOWL NUMBER------------------------------------- 56
BOWL NAME---------------------------------------- The Harrison Lake Bowl
BOWL TYPE---------------------------------------- Anomalous

PERMANENT LOCATION
ORIGINAL------------------------------------------- Vancouver Museum (?)
CAST(S)------------------------------------------- ?

ARCHAEOLOGY
LOCATION OF FIND-------------------------------- Harrison Lake (?)
BORDEN NUMBER----------------------------------- ?
DATE---------------------------------------------- ?
EXCAVATION TECHNIQUE----------------------------- ?
SITE TYPE----------------------------------------- ?

DESCRIPTION
MATERIAL------------------------------------------ Pumice
COLOUR------------------------------------------- Grey
HEIGHT-------------------------------------------- 18 cm

GENERAL DESCRIPTION/PROVENIENCE

Figure # 66.
(see Duff 1956: 32 for full description).
GENERAL DESCRIPTION/PROVENIENCE

This figure is atypical in that it is not bilaterally symmetrical and the bowl is placed on the back of the figure rather than in the lap. Pecked from a coarse material (sandstone?) this figure is less detailed than many seated human figure bowls. It depicts a seated human figure with a bowl on its back. Legs are outstretched in front. The right arm is bent at the elbow with its hand resting on the chest of the figure. The left arm hangs down from an exaggerated shoulder. Fingers are indicated on both hands by incised lines and the left wrist is marked by additional incised lines. Clearly defined ribs are shown on the sides of the figure, though not symmetrically. The face is framed by a sweeping brow-line which begins at the top of the head and terminates at the chin. A second ridge curves around the cheeks framing the lightly defined eyes. A pronounced nose with two nostrils is well defined. A faint outline of an open mouth is seen.
GENERAL DESCRIPTION/PROVENIENCE

Figure # 68.
(see Duff 1956: 29 for full description).
BOWL CATALOGUE INFORMATION (con't)

BOWL NUMBER------------------------------------- 59

BOWL NAME--------------------------------------- The Burnaby Bowl

BOWL TYPE--------------------------------------- Anomalous

PERMANENT LOCATION
ORIGINAL------------------------------------------ RBCM
CAST(S)------------------------------------------ ?

ARCHAEOLOGY
LOCATION OF FIND------------------------------- Burnaby, BC
BORDEN NUMBER--------------------------------- DhRr-Y: 30
DATE-------------------------------------------- 1936
EXCAVATION TECHNIQUE--------------------------- Uncontrolled
SITE TYPE---------------------------------------- Remote Spot

DESCRIPTION
MATERIAL----------------------------------------- Vesicular Lava
COLOUR------------------------------------------ ?
HEIGHT------------------------------------------ 15 cm (length)

GENERAL DESCRIPTION/PROVENIENCE

Figure # 69.
(see Duff 1956: 31 for full description).
BOWL CATALOGUE INFORMATION (con't)

BOWL NUMBER--------------------------- 60

BOWL NAME--------------------------------- The Lillooet Bowl

BOWL TYPE--------------------------------- Anomalous

PERMANENT LOCATION
ORIGINAL------------------------------------- Vancouver Museum (?)
CAST(S)------------------------------------- ?

ARCHAEOLOGY
LOCATION OF FIND------------------------ Lillooet, BC
BORDEN NUMBER--------------------------- ?
DATE---------------------------------------- 1949
EXCAVATION TECHNIQUE---------------------- Uncontrolled
SITE TYPE----------------------------------- Remote Spot

DESCRIPTION
MATERIAL----------------------------------- Steatite
COLOUR------------------------------------- ?
HEIGHT------------------------------------- 6 cm (length)

GENERAL DESCRIPTION/PROVENIENCE

Figure # 70.
(see Duff 1956: 23 for full description).
BOWL CATALOGUE INFORMATION (con't)

BOWL NUMBER------------------------------- 61
BOWL NAME------------------------------- The Melver Bowl
BOWL TYPE------------------------------- Anomalous

PERMANENT LOCATION
ORIGINAL------------------------------- Vancouver Museum
CAST(S)------------------------------- ?

ARCHAEOLOGY
LOCATION OF FIND------------------------------- Hammond, BC
BORDEN NUMBER------------------------------- ?
DATE------------------------------- 1928
EXCAVATION TECHNIQUE------------------------------- Uncontrolled
SITE TYPE------------------------------- Remote Spot

DESCRIPTION
MATERIAL------------------------------- Steatite
COLOUR------------------------------- Dark-grey
HEIGHT------------------------------- 16 cm (length)

GENERAL DESCRIPTION/PROVENIENCE

Figure # 71.
(see Duff 1956: 30 for full description).
Bowl Catalogue Information (con't)

Bowl Number------------------------ 62
Bowl Name-------------------------- The Langley Bowl
Bowl Type-------------------------- Anomalous

Permanent Location
ORIGINAL-------------------------- Privately owned
CAST(S)--------------------------- ?

Archaeology
Location of Find------------------- Langley Prairie, BC
Borden Number---------------------- ?
Date------------------------------- 1898
Excavation Technique-------------- Uncontrolled
Site Type-------------------------- Remote Spot

Description
Material--------------------------- Steatite
Colour----------------------------- Greenish-black
Height----------------------------- 23 cm (length)

General Description/Provenience

Figure # 72.
(see Duff 1956: 30 for full description).
BOWL CATALOGUE INFORMATION (con't)

BOWL NUMBER--------------------------------- 63
BOWL NAME---------------------------------- Bellingham Museum Bowl
BOWL TYPE---------------------------------- Incomplete

PERMANENT LOCATION
    ORIGINAL--------------------------------- Bellingham Museum
    CAST(S)--------------------------------?  

ARCHAEOLOGY
    LOCATION OF FIND------------------------? 
    BORDEN NUMBER--------------------------? 
    DATE-----------------------------------? 
    EXCAVATION TECHNIQUE--------------------? 
    SITE TYPE-------------------------------? 

DESCRIPTION
    MATERIAL------------------------------- Granite (?)  
    COLOUR--------------------------------?  
    HEIGHT----------------------------- 28 cm (head missing) 

GENERAL DESCRIPTION/PROVENIENCE

No picture available.
(see Duff 1956: 32 for full description).
Figure 73
This bowl was found on private property on Shaw Island, San Juan County protruding from the surface in the floor of an old chicken coop.
The figure is carved of vesicular lava and depicts a seated human figure holding a bowl. The face is typical of the Coastal type and features small, round eyes, a flat nose and an open mouth. Draped across the forehead and running down to ear level is a snake. There is a small topknot on the back of the head. The body is undetailed.
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