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depth within the site, but there is no breakdown of artifacts by materials, size, or provenience within the site, so that it is impossible to relate the artifacts to the materials used, to one another in a distributional sense, or to activity areas at Rock Camp. Illustrations provide a sampler of artifacts, but the examples shown are not identified in any way other than general typological class. The discussions of typologies and their significance, and presentation of inferences derived from the artifacts are, again, without bibliographic citation. The Rock Camp report fails as archaeological analysis, and has only minimal value as a generalized presentation of artifacts found in the Rock Camp excavations.


Reviewed by M.A. BAUMHOFF
University of California, Davis

The authors say (p. 2) that “We regard this volume as a guide in part to known primary sources about Native Californians; in part as a source of suggestions about where to look for material which may pertain to them.” I would say that they have come closer to achieving the latter than the former.

The larger part of this volume consists of county-by-county listing of organizations having or publishing material relevant to Native Californians. To these are added organizations of the same kind in other states and other countries. The organizations were then circularized with requests for confirmation and additional listings. The authors indicate that they got replies to over half their questionnaires, which means there were a large percentage of failures as well. In addition, they have a section on serials (very useful) and on audio-visual materials. The data on collections of photographs and recorded music are minute—these categories should not be in the title.

I find the volume extremely useful and I have no doubt that it will prove essential to all Californianists. Accordingly, what is said in the following should not be construed as condemnation.

To my mind the vital part of the volume is the county-by-county survey—the important out-of-state material will automatically become known to anyone knowing his local sources thoroughly. This being so, the most important thing would be an on-site survey of the counties with a personal evaluation of local resources by experts like Bean and Vane. Someone simply must go through these materials and catalog them systematically if they are to become available to scholars. Of course, something as difficult to handle as the J.P. Harrington material will have to be dealt with by a variety of experts. On the other hand, much of the manuscript material in the state could be dealt with more straightforwardly, but the bibliographers will have to examine it in order to do so. I realize this is a really extensive piece of research and that the present authors may have been justified in the procedure they followed. Nevertheless, if we are to get a real assessment of California ethnographic resources, the program will have to be as outlined.

One really bizarre aspect of this publication strikes my eye. Why did the authors include the complete listing of California Indian monographs in the University of California series in American Archaeology and Ethnology and the Anthropological Records and yet fail to list University of California Publications in Anthropology, the Southwest Museum Papers, and publications of the San Diego Museum of Man? And anyway if they wanted to
include these why didn’t they get them right? Thus there are 50 volumes in the UCPAAE, not 44 as they show; Vol. 2:3 is *Types of Indian Culture in California*, not *Basket Designs of the Indians of Northwestern California*, which is Vol. 2:4; they include Omer Stewart’s “Northern Paiute” (UC-AR 4:3) but not Julian Steward’s “Nevada Shoshone” (UC-AR 4:2), which has just as much California material; etc. This indicates that these two lists were not considered carefully but simply thrown in, so why include them at all?

Thus although the level of scholarly care in this volume could have been higher I must congratulate the authors for having done it at all.


Reviewed by HARRY W. LAWTON
University of California, Riverside

The distinguished historian of the Spanish missions, Father Maynard Geiger, and UCLA anthropologist Clement W. Meighan have collaborated to produce a well-annotated translation of the 1813-1815 original documents in the Santa Barbara Mission Archives known as *Preguntasy Respuestas*, including a brief, yet sufficient, historical introduction and anthropological commentary.

This work is an absolute must for ethno- graphers, ethnohistorians, collectors of Californiana, and all scholars working in California Indian studies. A.L. Kroeber (1908) published an annotated abstract of some of these documents, and most of us carrying out research on California Indians have made use of that review or portions of the *Respuestas* published in Father Zephyrin Engelhardt’s mission histories or elsewhere (including privately circulated versions). This complete publication with new translations by Father Geiger indeed renders the service he anticipates in his introduction.

The translated text consists of responses from eighteen existing Franciscan missions to a questionnaire sent out to Spanish colonies in the New World in 1812 by Don Ciriaco González Carvajal, Secretary of the Department of Overseas Colonies, Cádiz, Spain. Many of the responses from missionaries constitute virtually the only ethnographic information we have on various California Indian groups. The answers of the Franciscan priests range from those showing incredibly little curiosity about the native peoples with whom they lived and worked to sophisticated observations of aboriginal customs and culture. Some of the responses are extremely naive (or possibly calculated)—as when a priest reports that he knows of no superstitions among the Indians in his area (Mission Soledad). Other responses are alive with factual data—information throwing light on ritual and religion, kinship, social structure, and acculturation under mission influence.

This review could be written at great length, gratuitously commenting on the many significant issues of current relevance in California studies—as well as areas presently ignored and deserving investigation—which will benefit from careful study of this volume. Such an exercise would be indulgently superfluous: the volume is essential to any library on the California Indian, and I should like to express my gratitude to Father Geiger and Professor Meighan for making this research tool available to scholars and all who are interested in California’s Native Americans.