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vast extent of the Lake China shoreline.

Reviewing the chronological arguments for antiquity, given that stone tools of respectable age were found in conjunction with an extinct fauna, both the palynological data of Mehringer and the $^{14}$C and stratigraphic data of Smith combine to place a reasonable time bracket of 7 to 14 thousand years on the Lake China activity. Arguments for greater antiquity, no matter how enticing they may be, are, in my opinion, purely speculative. This is acceptable. The recurring theme, however, reflects the author's desires rather than the facts and, combined with her esteem for the very human characteristics of her "People of the Lakes" that gives The Ancient Californians a distinct charm, allows (perhaps forces) her to infer more from the data than the data warrant.


Reviewed by VERA-MAE FREDRICKSON Berkeley, California

These two stories of Kumeyaay (Southern Diegueño) life in the foothills of southern California were originally published in 1937. The author, the Founder-Director of the Indian Arts League of San Diego, had spent many years with the Kumeyaay as they moved from one seasonal site to another practicing the remnants of their traditional life.

The main fictional characters in the two stories are, respectively, a ten-year-old White boy who lives with the Indians and the young daughter of a Kumeyaay herbwoman. Accounts of their day-to-day adventures in the San Diego County of a hundred years ago comprise an entertaining adventure book for young readers. An engrossing focus of the book for students of Indian culture, however, is the wealth of detail on technology, food gathering and preparation, journeys, and other aspects of Kumeyaay life.

Perceptions by the author of Kumeyaay values and philosophy are presented in the context of daily activities and interaction between people as well as in recounts of the traditional myths.

An introduction by the Education Coordinator of the San Diego Museum of Man provides information on the author and the context in which the book was originally written. The book includes "A Note on the Pronunciation of the Indian Names." Each new Indian word is also pronounced in a footnote on the page in which it first occurs. A brief list of herbs used by the Kumeyaay for food and medicine and the way they are prepared is illustrated with a page of plant drawings. Other illustrations are also scattered throughout the book: drawings of objects and scenes mentioned in the stories. The work concludes with a "Little Dictionary" of Indian words.

The writing style is very readable, with short sentences and clear language, marred only by occasional coyness. This book is highly recommended as supplementary reading for any course concerned with California Indians in elementary and high schools.


Reviewed by CHRISTOPHER E. DROVER University of California, Riverside

The title of this work leads the reader to expect the long awaited publication of
Malcolm Rogers' ceramic notes pertaining to southeastern California. The author's introduction suggests an orientation other than a presentation of a period piece of anthropological literature.

The monograph is divided between an introduction and a description of thirty-two ceramic types. The introduction includes five sections entitled "The Problem," "The Theory," "The Literature," "Cultural Structure," and "Ware Structure."

May identifies some of the basic problems recognized by Rogers and shared by contemporary researchers regarding California ceramics. The section dealing with "Theory" should more aptly be labeled "Assumptions" since it describes how clay sources and cultural traditions may result in ceramic types. Several hypotheses are presented, none of which is clearly stated, nor are their attendant test implications mentioned. May's discussion of the literature is limited and focuses on his own work in the western periphery of the southern California ceramic tradition(s).

The section devoted to "Cultural Structure" borrows heavily from Schroeder's (1957) suggestion of a Hakataya Tradition for western Arizona and portions of southeastern California. Aside from the reluctance of Southwestern archaeologists (Martin and Plog 1973:98, 141; Waters n.d.) to accept the utility of such nomenclature, May proceeds to suggest a new Hakataya Branch "Salada," an unfortunate choice of terms in light of the existing Southwestern concept of Salado (cf. Steen et al. 1962).

The discussion of "Ware Structures" both names and describes "Series" within Tizon Brown Ware and Lower Colorado Buff Ware. Several of these "Series" appear to be May's creations (cf. Rogers n.d.). No discussion is made of the problems inherent in the typology of plain ware ceramics nor of the suggestions of typological conservatism by other local researchers (Euler 1959:42; Donnan 1964:12; Koerper and Flint 1978; Koerper et al. 1978:54), including Rogers (1945:192) himself.

The second two-thirds of the issue is devoted to a mixed description of Rogers' and May's ceramic types. At least some of the descriptions of Rogers' types are in discrepancy with Rogers' actual notes (Rogers n.d.). The confusing mixture of May's and Rogers' types result in a "Hakataya Ceramic Typology" including six series of Tizon Brown Ware and two series of Lower Colorado Buff Ware. As both Tizon Brown and Lower Colorado Buff wares were developed without Rogers' direct input, an appropriate question would be on what basis May categorizes Rogers' types into these series? There are no indications that Rogers would have accepted the concept of a Hakataya Tradition much less a "Hakataya Ceramic Typology."

The title of this publication is misleading because May appears to manipulate Rogers' types into his own research problems based on Schroeder's (1957) concept of Hakataya. While Rogers may not have been in agreement with the taxonomy of series and wares presented here, a less biased and more comprehensive version of Rogers' ceramic typology is in preparation for the San Diego Museum of Man Papers (Waters n.d.). Unfortunately, the organizational liabilities of May's present work are compounded by typographical and spelling errors. References in text but missing from the bibliography are Hargrave (1938), Schroeder (1952), and True, Meighan, and Crew (1974).
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Reviewed by WILLIAM SHIPLEY
University of California, Santa Cruz

This is a collection of twenty Coyote stories from a wide range of culture areas—the Pacific Northwest, the Plateau, Central California, the Yuman area of Western Arizona, the Southwestern Pueblo area, Northern Mexico, and Mayan Guatemala. Although there is considerable variety in the technique of presentation from tale to tale, a basic format is adhered to throughout. Each text is given in some phonological version of the original language with interlinear translation, followed by a free translation into English. Phonological and grammatical information is supplied for some texts in considerable detail by means of introductory remarks, interlinear tags, and footnotes. In other cases, where published information is available elsewhere, such information is minimal or absent. Most, though not all, of the stories are placed by their contributors in the appropriate cultural setting. Bright’s general introduction is apposite, witty, and sensitive to the literary and cultural aspects of the Coyote genre.

There are at least five salient points of view from which texts such as these may be examined: the linguistic, the cultural, the folkloristic, the literary, and, faute de mieux, what might be called the “psychoanalytic.” I should like to comment on these points in relation to the present collection.

A text presentation that would give satisfaction in all these categories—particularly the “psychoanalytic”—would be difficult or impossible, perhaps in any cultural context, certainly in those cases where the cultural matrix is moribund or extinct. We simply cannot know what symbolic connections to the unconscious these stories had for the