to anyone attempting to follow the development of the case which was finally decided on July 31, 1959 in favor of the Indians of California.

Brevity allows only a listing of contents of the volumes. Vol. I (actually comprising 3 volumes totaling 1155 pp.) is a lengthy land use and occupancy review organized by ecological types prepared by R.L. Beals and J.A. Hester. Vol. II contains a collection of 95 pages of tribal distribution maps; a paper on changes in patterns of land tenure among the Luiseño; and a reprint of a publication of 1963 on division of labor among California Indians. Vol. III has a valuable ethnohistory of the Pit River (Achumawi-Atsugewi) Indians and a historical survey (also previously published) of Fall River Valley in Achumawi territory. Vol. IV holds Kroeber’s important paper on the nature of the land-holding unit (also published earlier), extracts from Kroeber’s earlier writings on land use and political organization, and a useful survey of Mexican land grants. Vol. V is a historical sketch of northwestern California from the time of discovery to the late 1870’s. Vol. VI contains two important documents: Beals and Hester’s 264-page summary of occupancy, subsistence, and land use patterns, which can serve as an encyclopaedic ecological reference work, and the findings of the Indian Claims Commission. Of the 8 volumes, I rate VI first, to be followed by the 3 volumes called Vol. I.

The cost of the volumes may prevent many from purchasing the entire set, but for serious students of California Indians Vol. I (Parts 1-3) and VI are essential. It is hoped that enough California libraries will stock this set to make it available to scholars.


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

This is a collection of sixteen articles, mostly concerning social or spiritual aspects of California Indian life. It is almost inconceivable that anyone could pick up a substantial book on this subject which does not include even one section by A.L. Kroeber, but that is here the case. Nonetheless it is reassuring to find Kroeber cited more than any other author in the cumulative terminal bibliography. Also comforting is the realization that some of the older authors, e.g. B.W. Aginsky, George Devereux, Thomas Garth, Anna Gayton, Walter Goldschmidt, and Katharine Luomala were either Kroeber’s students or at least partly influenced by him and other early California ethnographers like S. A. Barrett and E.W. Gifford. The remaining authors in the present work, Lowell Bean, Thomas Blackburn, Richard Gould, Donald Handelman, Chester King, Peter Kunkel, Harry Lawton, and Raymond White may thus loosely be classified as “post-Kroeberian.”

Immediately following the authors’ (editors’) introduction are short paragraphs presenting a sort of explanation or rationale for the appearance of each of the articles. This seems a good device for indicating the spirit or intent of the collection as a whole. Unfortunately, the editors have neglected to give much specific information about original sources and dates of the articles, although this information is included in a second printing.

Obviously the only way to evaluate the wisdom of the editors’ choices in such a work is to read the articles—they cannot be reviewed here briefly one by one. In summary, then, at
least one indirect or adverse comment may be made: Before finishing the book, the reader will probably realize that the “older” authors named seem to have exercised a great deal more modesty and restraint in their analyses and interpretations of the aspects of California they were concerned with than some of the “younger” ones. This appears slightly paradoxical when we know that the elders for the most part had access to more and perhaps better informed respondents, even though they worked largely in that not-so-remote but somehow yet ancient period called pre-World War II.

One gets the feeling, for example, after imbibing some dreary technical dicta from Lewis Binford (cf. article by Blackburn) that Kroeber, Goldschmidt, or Gayton (“anyone over fifty”, so to speak) were little better than “normative” innocents, perhaps at times not fully capable of appreciating the deeper implications of what they were writing about. Can one seriously believe that the “non-systemists” of the twenties, thirties, or even the forties were unaware of any glamor or excitement inherent in California studies, or that they did not nor would not understand, for instance, the adaptive qualities of native ritual events?

In the same vein, in Peter Kunkel’s article the question is asked why California scholars have “failed to come forward with data relevant to the nature of food-collecting peoples.” Perhaps Kroeber and others, lacking modern enlightenment, were remiss in gathering certain key information, preoccupied as they were with jogging the memories of old informants about what the Indian societies were like before the holocaust of White intrusion. A greater question, it would seem, is whether late-coming ethnologists, working with these apparently imperfect old data and such new data as can be elicited from younger informants living under drastically changed social conditions, can actually develop a viable new analytical system concerning, among other matters, Native Californian social organization.

Even though some readers may choose to regard certain features in this volume as perhaps too speculative and even optimistic as to the future of California ethnology, the collection does bring together much valuable information, old and new. This mix, or balance, of older substantive articles with those suggesting new directions and possibilities at this late date, often makes for exciting reading. If a companion volume (promised?), including other elements of California studies like archaeology and linguistics is ever presented, the two (or more?) volumes would constitute excellent alternate reading sources for academic courses on California Indians.


Reviewed by CRISTINA KESSLER
University of California, Berkeley

"Give not, give not the yawning graves their plunder . . .
Lore that tomorrow to the grave goes down . . ."
—J. P. Harrington

John Peabody Harrington (1884-1961) was a man whose life was consumed by the drive to rescue what fragments remained of California’s native languages and cultures. It is