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course is not surprising, but it does contrast markedly with the attitude which obviously shows through in virtually all of Hudson’s work: in my view, she could not possibly have been patronizing the Indians.

Interface California Corporation now has to its credit at least three elegant pictorial volumes which include California Indian portraits, and “The Painter Lady” is the most handsome of these.

[A reproduction of one of Grace Carpenter Hudson’s paintings appeared in the previous issue of The Journal of California Anthropology (Vol. 3, No. 2., p. 320) — Editor].


Reviewed by ROBERT L. BETTINGER New York University

This volume contains, for the most part, papers and comments from a symposium given at the 1975 Annual Meetings of the Society for American Archaeology held in Dallas, Texas. In all, there are seven symposium contributions including the editor’s introductory comments, four symposium papers, and two discussant papers, as well as two papers contributed after the symposium. I shall restrict my comments to a few basic points.

In his introductory paper, Don Fowler argues that the study of Great Basin prehistory has been hindered by the failure of archaeologists to regard models from other disciplines (e.g., linguistics, geology) with the same healthy skepticism they accord archaeological models and reconstructions, by the tendency for individual investigators to judge the validity of archaeological models in terms of the specific data they themselves have generated, and by attempts to link linguistics, archaeological, and skeletal evidence without proper justification. The merit of Fowler’s comments is undeniable, but his major points are clearly intended as general guidelines rather than hard and fast rules and should be so taken.

Catherine Fowler’s “Ethnography and Great Basin Prehistory” traces the changing role of analogies and models drawn from the historic aboriginal inhabitants of the Desert West in archaeological studies. Although I do not agree with all she says, the treatment is thorough and informative, making this a useful summary.

Perhaps the most provocative paper in this collection is James Goss’ “Linguistic Tools for the Great Basin Prehistorian.” Briefly, Goss rejects Lamb’s (1958) argument for the recent Numic spread into the Great Basin from southern California and maintains that Numic groups or their ancestors have resided in situ for the last 10,000 years. In his discussion of the Goss paper, Stephen Jett appears to concur with Goss, at least in a general sense. I am not a linguist, but I find this reconstruction weaker than Lamb’s, particularly given the recency of occupation implied by Numic place names. Moreover, I am puzzled by a model that rejects Death Valley as being capable of budding populations into the Great Basin, but then turns around and argues that the Intermontane Province was the staging area for massive population movements that swamped virtually all of western North America and Mesoamerica and is the ancestral homeland of such diverse groups as the Tsimshian and Maya.

In their contribution “Time, Space, and Intensity in Great Basin Paleoecological Models,” David Weide and Margaret Weide discuss some of the parameters relevant to the formation of the archaeological record and the interpretation of past climatic events in the Great Basin in terms of their dating, severity, and impact on prehistoric human ecology. The
discussion touches on some important points but is uneven in quality, being needlessly detailed in some places and needlessly simplified in others. I am in strong disagreement with their attempt to subdivide the Basin into resource regions with the implication that these are also adaptive regions (p. 88-89), on the grounds that this is premature and that upon close inspection their regions individually display dramatic adaptive differences internally, at least insofar as we can tell from ethnographic accounts and limited archaeological evidence.

The paper by Peter J. Mehringer, Jr., “Great Basin Late Quaternary Environments and Chronology,” is clearly the high point of the volume. Originally prepared in 1973 for the Handbook of North American Indians, and presented here with only minor editorial changes to furnish proper references for cited materials unpublished at the time of its writing, this contribution summarizes the vast geological, palynological, dendrochronological, zoological, and botanical literature pertaining to paleoenvironments in the Great Basin from 12,000 B.P. to the present and outlines a simple model for the broad sequence and nature of Holocene climatic changes. Mehringer's approach is workmanlike, his comments to the point, and his conclusions appropriately cautious.

The paper by Sheilagh Brooks, Melodye Galliher, and Richard Brooks, “A Proposed Model for Paleodemography and Archaeology in the Great Basin” is not really a model but rather a technical paper describing the use of discrete morphological traits to assess the genetic relationship between skeletal populations from three Nevada localities.

In “A Mid-Archaic Subsistence and Settlement Shift in the Northeastern Great Basin,” Steven Simms offers an explanation for the apparent transition in occupation from lacustrine to upland environments around 5500 B.P. in the northeastern Great Basin. The ideas here are interesting but can be questioned on the grounds that, owing to limitations in the extant evidence, supporting data are drawn from cave sites entirely and undoubtedly represent a biased picture of eastern Great Basin adaptation.

Finally, in his discussion of the symposium papers, C. Melvin Aikens suggests that Great Basin archaeology could profit by a renewal of “normative” stylistic distribution studies to complement the environment and subsistence studies that have dominated in recent years—a point well taken.

In closing I would make three observations: (1) that the volume is, despite its title and with a few exceptions (e.g., the paper by Goss), conspicuously devoid of models; (2) that while Don Fowler and the Desert Research Institute Publications in the Social Sciences continue to provide a valuable forum for the presentation of data and ideas relevant to Great Basin anthropology, some of the contributors to this volume did not see fit to take advantage of this opportunity with their best efforts; and (3) that despite these detractions there is much in this collection that demands the attention of Great Basin specialists; indeed, Mehringer's article makes the volume a virtual necessity.


Reviewed by A. B. ELASSER
Lowie Museum of Anthropology
University of California, Berkeley

Of the four papers comprising this first volume of a new series initiated by Ballena Press, two are reprinted from volumes which are now out of print. The papers are titled: (1)