testing a hypothesis, the first opportunity to study a unique and unknown coast would have been sadly compromised. Was the fieldwork to ignore—or the report to omit—any of the information which subsequent investigators will need to orient their own research goals, then the primary inquiry would have been deficient in technique, method, and theory. This study proves the existence of an Early Milling Stone tradition in coastal San Luis Obispo County (sic). Future endeavors will evaluate the concept that a convergence of Hunting and Canaliño elements was to produce the Chumash climax along the Channel coast. The project provides evidence that these traditions met early at Diablo Canyon, and built upon an antecedent cultural base already long established in place.

The report is a welcomed addition to the archaeological literature on a little-known segment of the California coast.


Reviewed by ALBERT B. ELSASSER
Lowie Museum of Anthropology
University of California, Berkeley

This is the second book published by Dawson’s Book Shop (California Travel Series) which deals almost exclusively with rock art in Baja California. The first, by C. W. Meighan, covered only a limited area and was intended more as a report on Meighan’s work in connection with an expedition sponsored by Erle Stanley Gardner in 1962. Grant’s book is almost twice as large as Meighan’s and sets out to review practically everything known to date on the rock art of the entire peninsula. Anyone familiar with Grant’s work on North American Indian petrography may well expect another competent, excellently illustrated presentation in his Baja California work, and will not be disappointed.

The older literature containing references to archaeological work in any part of the peninsula is scant, and Grant has chosen to reprint as a sort of introduction to his own efforts an important article which appeared in the journal L’Anthropologie in 1895 by Diguet, a French chemist and amateur naturalist. Although the Jesuit missionaries were the first Europeans to become aware of the splendid rock art in the central part of the peninsula in the 18th century, it was Diguet who initially attempted to describe about 30 of the painting sites in any detail. Subsequent investigators like Meighan and Grant both refer to Diguet’s descriptions repeatedly in their writings. It has been possible for Grant to include 102 sites (26 of them identified as Diguet’s) in his inventory of the entire peninsula, and these are indicated in a summary end map in the volume.

That the history of these sites is complex is suggested by Grant’s framework of six main stylistic areas of rock art, from north to south: Diegueño Representational, Great Basin Abstract, Cochimí Abstract, Cochimí Representational, Cape Representational, and Cape Abstract. Associations of these distinctive styles, both with known ethnic groups or with other rock art styles in native North America are not conclusively demonstrated, for while the so-called Great Basin Abstract style, for example, may readily be explained as an extension from the north, Grant feels that the spectacular Cochimí Representational style was possibly a unique artistic flowering in the central arroyo oasis area of Baja California itself. This Cochimí style includes the “giant figures” made so well-known by
Gardner and Meighan in the 1960s and is the style most extensively treated in the volume under review.

Various reasons are suggested for the production of the Baja California rock art, none of them essentially different from those referring to other parts of North America, e.g., hunting magic, warfare, and sorcery. Dating for the art almost certainly is variable from style to style, with on the one hand, the Great Basin Abstract (engraving) style probably extending back more than 5,000 years ago. On the other hand, Grant suggests that the "giant figures" style (painting) may be less than 1,000 years old and that the traditional style of painting may have continued until the arrival of the Jesuits in the late 17th century. A radiocarbon date of around A.D. 1432, obtained by Meighan for one of the rock painting sites, may be offered speculatively to confirm the dating of the painting style itself.

There is little doubt that a great deal more work is needed both in location of new sites, and in further examination of those already known before additional information on origin and meaning of the presently recognized styles can be forthcoming. Grant has hardly touched upon element analyses, although the major features, identifiable animals and various expressions of the human form, many possibly representing shamans, have been outlined in the representational styles. Only token samples of the abstract styles are given. The end map, especially for the Cochimí (central) styles, does not clearly distinguish sites where paintings, engravings, or both, are present. In sum, Grant is to be congratulated for giving some kind of order, in an attractive form, to a mass of scattered data, in a field which is almost certainly bound to grow steadily in coming years.