related to each other or at least knew the occupants even of the most isolated sectors of the ranges. In any case, it is difficult to imagine how any such survey could have been carried out without a great deal of personal (and infectious) enthusiasm as well as sheer two-legged hiking beyond horse or mule trails. The maps accompanying each section are presented without kilometer scales, but such devices would be almost superfluous anyway, judging from the incredible roughness of the terrain pictured and described. There are no formal scales shown in the photographs either, although enough living human beings are pictured in many of them to make tape measures or the like unnecessary. In all, one gets a clear picture of the routes of the survey and what was encountered in the way of rock paintings and engravings along the way.

Crosby’s engaging narrative style plus the illustrations are surely adequate in establishing his main point, that the Great Mural art seems to have centered upon the Sierra San Francisco and then to have lessened in intensity and presentation of characteristic motifs in the sierras to the north and south.

Considerations of rock engravings, both representative and abstract, and their temporal or other relationships to painted works are given little space, and no statistical analyses are essayed throughout the book. Probably if the latter were ever attempted, they would need months of further investigation, including the tremendous chore of interpreting the outlines of faded or almost obliterated drawings, as well as the forms of many original drawings which have been painted over again and again.

If this staggering task is ever carried to completion, possibly additional sites will be discovered (though I really doubt that the number of such will be impressive). Perhaps even stylistic interpretations different from Crosby’s, along with expanded data for estimating the age of this art, will be forthcoming. None of these will reduce the importance of Crosby’s present magnificent overview. He has forcefully put on record one of the great attainments of pre-Contact New World peoples— in his own words, “Much of what we see and feel in the lofty aspirations and esthetic accomplishments of the Painters’ art seems at odds with the poverty of their other material remains. No doubt this is due in part to our own technical bias. Western man has always tended to evaluate cultures on the basis of their material achievements. The Great Murals perhaps remind us that man at his simplest is a complex proposition.”


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

These accounts from various journalistic sources or government documents all refer to conditions of groups like the Cahuilla, on or off the reservations, mostly in the last decade of the nineteenth century. There are good glimpses of government agents or bureaucrats in actions concerning the acquiring of land, and in shifting of Indians from one reservation to another in such a way as to satisfy both the Indians and the land-greedy White farmers. Needless to say, the latter were more satisfied than the former.

A gossipy article (with anonymous author) from the S.F. Chronicle in 1892 about the questionable way in which the U.S. Indian Agent H.N. Rust acquired a large collection of Indian artifacts from his charges is of great
interest for those following the annals of private collections made in the late 1900's in the United States and Europe.

Obviously this assemblage of articles will have value to those students of California Indians who do not have specialized libraries available to them.


Reviewed by KEN HEDGES
San Diego Museum of Man

Molpa is an ethnographically defined Luiseño village site in the San Luis Rey River drainage in the northern San Diego County. The site is presented in this volume as the type site for San Luis Rey II, the latest of two phases of the San Luis Rey Complex first defined by C. W. Meighan in 1954. Archaeological Investigations at Molpa presents the results of field investigations conducted by classes from the University of California, Los Angeles, from 1955 through 1957 under the direction of C. W. Meighan. While the authors recognize the shortcomings involved in presenting field class data so many years after excavation, they prepared this report in order to make the data available. We are fortunate that they elected to do so, for this volume contains a body of important information for the San Luis Rey drainage and adjacent Palomar Mountain. Whether the data presented in this report are adequate for the proper interpretation of the site or for the definition of San Luis Rey II is open to question.

Two trenches comprising 17 five-foot by five-foot units for a total volume of 45.8 cubic yards of midden were excavated at Molpa. In the report, the authors estimate this as 3 to 5 per cent of the midden. However, by their own estimate, the midden area covers most 40,000 square yards with depths from 12 to 60 inches, and with a minimum depth of 6 inches adjacent to bedrock outcrops. Taking the minimum depth of 6 inches, the minimal estimate for total site volume is 6666.7 cubic yards, and the excavated sample represents less than 7 tenths of one per cent of the midden. A 3 to 5 per cent sample is minimal; less than one per cent is very small indeed. In addition, the locations of the excavated trenches and the lack of test units in many areas of the site preclude the gathering of any data on in-site variation, or on artifact types associated with specific site features. For example, two pictograph panels, one petroglyph feature, and one “rain rock” occur on the site, but units were not excavated in their vicinity. It appears that a great amount of potential data remains to be examined, and that the definition of San Luis Rey II based on this sample may be incomplete. Users of the report should be aware of these limitations; this is a very valuable presentation of available data, and contains supplementary survey data and interpretive material which render the book a valuable contribution to southern California archaeology.

The book makes an admirable contribution to interpretation of archaeological data through ethnographic information. Luiseño informants worked closely with the archaeologists, and it was possible to relate the archaeological sites specifically to known villages and to provide valuable data on the reconstruction of the cultural geography of the Luiseño. The appendices provide our first real archaeological information on Palomar Mountain, and delineate village territories to which