Over more than two decades, Dr. Emma Louise Davis has made significant scientific contributions to the study of human adaptations to the California deserts, especially during the late Pleistocene and early Holocene. This set of essays, focused "primarily on Early Man in the New World," especially from a California desert perspective, is an inspirational tribute to "Davey." It is also a major scientific contribution useful to regional specialists as well as to broader scholars of early New World human occupation.

The festschrift includes an introduction and 13 papers, which vary in focus, depth and breadth, and craftsmanship, though all are generally consistent in archaeological perspective. They are generally well written, carefully edited, well proofed, and accompanied by useful tables and illustrations of high quality. They are arranged in alphabetical order by author’s name, but could be read following a more thematic order.

Budinger and Simpson have provided a thorough review of the early archaeology of the Mojave Valley, California, summarizing their basis for ascribing artifact status to the subsurface Calico site (geologically dated at 200,000 to 20,000 years ago) and for ascribing Late Pleistocene age (20,000 to 15,000 years ago) to the surface Lake Manix lithic assemblage.

Reeves’ paper is an excellent review of the Asian and New World evidence for the first colonization of the Americas, supplementing his other recent publications. His evaluation that the “probable” date of first entry is between 50,000 and 30,000 years ago is supported by Rogers’ evaluation of the linguistic data. Minshall’s paper is additionally supportive of a pre-Holocene human New World entry, but is weakened by his overemphasis on the importance of the ubiquitous bipolar lithic technology. Chartkoff’s circum-Pacific perspective on early colonization lifestyles unfortunately does not reflect 1985 state of archaeological publications and is less well written. Shutler provides a brief perspective, identifying the Meadowcroft, Wilson Butte, and Pikimachay sites as critical arguments to breaking the Holocene entry threshold. Tuohy provides another brief but important review of the Western Lithic Co-tradition concept, which unfortunately is not adequately backed up by Smith’s review of Pleistocene basin lacustrine chronologies. Miller’s paper on shamanism and power is light.

Four of these papers provide important new data. Bonnichsen and Bolen’s description of False Cougar Cave is outside of the California - Great Basin area, but their identification of pre-10,000 - year - old human hair is methodologically important, as well as intriguing, new information about occupation of the southern end of the “ice-free corridor.”
Bada’s paper is an excellent review of the current status of aspartic acid racemization age determinations. Finally, Tyson and Wallace, respectively, have provided good summaries of available information about the Yuha burial and Malaga Cove early-occupation evidence from southern California.

This volume is solidly in support of the pre-12,000-year-old human occupation of the New World and highlights the importance of resolving the issue of the validity of the 25,000 to 12,000-year-old date assignments. While those seem to be accepted unquestioningly by the festchrift, this reviewer agrees with Shutler that some of the key data need more attention.

Brott, in his introduction to this volume, says that the preparers hope the readers find it “interesting, useful, and inspirational.” It is all those things, like Davey, and good value for the price as well.

Papers on Central California Prehistory: I.

Reviewed by A. B. ELSASSE 824 Park Way El Cerrito, CA 94530

The three papers included in this volume are: (1) “Preliminary Archaeological Investigations at CA-MNT-101, Monterey, California,” by W. E. Pritchard; (2) “Prehistoric Hunting Patterns in Central California,” by W. S. Hildebrandt et al; and (3) “Archaeological Investigations at CA-SCL-78, near Morgan Hill, Santa Clara County, California,” by G. S. Breschini and T. Haversat. These papers are comparatively modest in scope, but each is a positive contribution to the archaeology of central California, particularly to the region extending from southern San Francisco Bay south to the Monterey Coast. Comments will be made here in the order in which the titles appear above, identified by author in each case.

Pritchard’s paper was originally submitted as a report on excavations in 1968, thus at a time before the Monterey region had been characterized as representing a distinctive archaeological zone, only distantly related to those in the lower Sacramento Valley or northern San Francisco Bay. The site reported is located at the Presidio of Monterey and includes both prehistoric and historic deposits; termination of the prehistoric occupation seems definitely to have occurred before historic use began after A.D. 1770. While certain shell bead and ornament types suggest that the early stages of the occupation were coeval with the then accepted Middle Horizon of the central California sequence, projectile points, mostly of Monterey chert, are not clearly comparable to those from the lower Sacramento Valley, but rather are similar to those previously found at Willow Creek, about 40 miles south on the Monterey Coast. Distribution of the milling-stone artifacts suggests evidence of a shifting or changing ecological or economic base, insofar as they were mostly located below the level where heavy concentrations of molluscan remains began and continued to occur upward to the surface of the site. These latter data were undoubtedly utilized at a later date by Breschini and Haversat in their detailed descriptions of archaeological patterns in the Monterey region.

Hildebrandt et al. have examined a hunting pattern (intensification) model and attempted to test it against archaeofaunal data from bayshore and interior sites in the