book and I have always believed that the reverse is true.

Some of the writers have been concerned with placing their sites in the Great Basin Abstract category rather than Cochimi Abstract (Grant 1974). The business of style areas has gotten a bit out-of-hand and is now quite confusing to investigators as so many people have been working on their own and devising their own stylistic names. Wellmann (1979) lists 148 style designations in North America! They vary from Mississippi Stylized to Riverside Maze Style. Doubtless many of these could be combined, but it would be an Herculean job.

When Heizer and Baumhoff (1962) established their Great Basin categories, they had a formula that is difficult to improve on. 1. Location; 2. Style; 3. Technique—Great Basin/Abstract/Painted. However, they only applied this formula to the Great Basin and immediately adjacent areas. But in areas far removed from the Great Basin, it seems proper and reasonable to use a regional heading. That is why the term Cochimi Abstract was coined. It is undeniable that many Great Basin design elements were shared by the Great Basin people and those living in the central desert region of Baja California, but it seems appropriate that the name “Great Basin” should only apply to the Basin and some contiguous regions and not be stretched beyond its already gigantic scope.

The Meighan and Pontoni book is a must for anyone interested in rock art of Baja California. The lack of such studies has made it most difficult to piece together relationships between stylistic areas. The work in that rough country is grueling and often boring, but it will be done bit by bit. I understand that preparations are under way for a second such book and look forward to it.
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This monograph is a product of a University of Utah research program conducted during the 1960's and early 1970's which was designed to gather data on the poorly understood Fremont culture of the eastern Great Basin and the western Colorado Plateau. Fremont culture is so variable in subsistence orientation, settlement pattern, artifacts, and architecture over its geographic range that archeologists still disagree over the definition of Fremont regional cultural variants and their relationships with each other and externally with the Southwest and Plains areas. There is even a reasonable doubt that a unitary Fremont culture can be distinguished at all. Complicating the problem of Fremont is the fact that beginning and ending dates for the “culture,” its derivation, and its ultimate fate
are all still questionable, and internal cultural chronology has been worked out for only a few localities.

Fry and Dalley present us with a descriptive account of the excavation in 1969 of two small sites located on the lower Bear River in northern Utah. Both are culturally affiliated with the Great Salt Lake regional variant of Fremont culture. Brief appendices by R. T. Shuey, J. Andrews, and P. W. Parmalee report, respectively, on archeomagnetic dating at the Levee site, two human burials, and avifauna.

The Levee site consists of two small villages, about 300 yards apart, which are assigned by the authors to two distinct occupational phases. The early component village is identified as a temporary hunting camp with three brush or skin-covered structures 10-15 ft. in diameter, and a variety of trash/storage pits. Radiocarbon age determinations of 1170±140 B.P. (RL-34) and 1250±140 A.D. (RL-35) date this component and also the Bear River phase (A.D. 400-1000) to which it is assigned on the basis of architectural and artifactual similarities to the temporally coeval Bear River No. 1, No. 2, and No. 3 sites, all of which are located nearby.

The late component village includes three shallow, roughly rectangular pit dwellings, trash/storage pits, two outdoor use areas, fire basins, and a trench of unknown function. The structures are larger and more substantial than those at the early component village and have long trenches that may have served as crawlway entrances or ventilator shafts. Four radiocarbon dates for the late component village range from 860±110 B.P. (RL-20) to 710±100 B.P. (RL-33).

Excavations at the Knoll site, which was badly damaged by bulldozing, uncovered a single oval structure with a crawlway or ventilator shaft, several trash/storage pits, and two refuse deposits. Charcoal from this structure, interpreted as a dwelling, was radiocarbon dated at 640±110 B.P. (RL-19).

Fry and Dalley assign both the Levee site late component village and the Knoll site to the Levee phase (A.D. 1000-1350) based on similar architecture, a preponderance of Desert Side-notched points (as opposed to the Rose Spring Side-notched variety which is characteristic of the earlier Bear River phase), and overlapping radiocarbon dates. The radiocarbon dates are supported by archeomagnetic measurements from two late component Levee site dwellings, which indicate that the sampled hearths were last fired at about A.D. 1150.

Stone, bone, and ceramic artifacts from both sites are typical of the Great Salt Lake regional variant of Fremont, but small amounts of Ivie Creek Black-on-white and Snake Valley Black-on-gray pottery attest to contact with related Fremont peoples to the south. Cultural relations with the Uinta Basin of northeastern Utah appear to have been especially close, as evidenced by a relatively high percentage of the Uinta Gray ceramics (diagnostic of the Uinta Fremont variant) and flaked stone collections from both sites which closely parallel materials from the Uinta Fremont area.

This site report is well-organized and well-written, with numerous high quality and informative photographs and line drawings. A major defect, which greatly detracts from its usefulness, is that except for the birds discussed in an appendix, the faunal material is neither tabulated nor discussed. This is particularly irksome and unexpected in a report dealing with northern Utah, where Fremont economy is generally assumed to have been oriented around the exploitation of bison, waterfowl, and various other marsh species, in contrast to the maize horticulture which played an important part in Fremont subsistence to the south and east. This important omission is particularly difficult to explain or defend when it is noted that the fieldwork was done ten years ago and the Preface mentions that the faunal material was identified.