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cooking pots and bowls. Griset concluded her section with a discussion and comparison of ceramic assemblages from other nearby sites.

The technical aspects of the monograph generally are excellent. A few typographical and editorial errors are present but do not detract from the presentation. The photography, illustrations, binding, and general appearance of the work enhance the already good quality of the text.

Pinto must be congratulated on her effort. She has produced a record of the work undertaken at the caverns and has provided a complete description of the materials recovered. The Archeology of Mitchell Caverns stands as a major contribution to the archaeology of the eastern Mojave Desert.


Reviewed by:
DIANE EVERET BARBOLLA
Dept, of Anthropology, Mesa College, San Diego, CA 92111.

Initiated by the Society of American Archaeology to anticipate the Columbian Quincentenary, Volume I is the first installment of a projected three-volume series designed to assess the impacts of human interaction in the New World. Thirty papers presented at Columbian Consequences seminars are included. The goals of the seminars and of the first volume are to emphasize the diversity of encounters and the interpretation of those encounters between native Americans and Spanish-speaking immigrants in primarily mission contexts.

The first volume is divided into three parts, each of which begins with a regional overview:

1. "The Southwestern Heartland" (Durango, Colorado, to East Texas) contains eleven papers (171 pages).
2. "Texas and Northeastern Mexico" has six papers (108 pages).
3. "The Californias" is the longest section with twelve papers (194 pages).

Charles Merbs initiates the recurring theme of health and longevity among precontact peoples. Using archaeological evidence from three precontact sites, Merbs presents a well-supported case for the state of native American health, a concise statement about the differences between European and Indian patterns of illness, and emphasizes the absence of contagious Old World infections from the inventory of New World diseases. He illustrates the high precontact rate of infant and childhood mortality (84% at Grasshopper Pueblo). The results of the introduction of European crowd infections, the effects of settlement relocation and missionization, and subsequent social, political, and demographic collapse among aboriginals are addressed by Upham and Reed, and Lycett.

James Corbin reaches beyond health and settlement pattern to attribute Spanish lack of success in eastern Texas to their conservative and rigid ideology, and says that, contrary to the documents, socially the Spanish were becoming like the native Adaeasños.

Five papers address issues of health, demography, and missionization in the Californias. It is interesting to contrast the tone of these researchers with that of the others. The Californians are alternately reasonable (Walker et al.), resigned (Johnson), militant and angry (Castillo), conciliatory (Hoover), and regretful (Mathes). The Californians address moral issues attendant to the controversial efforts to canonize Father Junipero.
Serra. The viability of the argument can be seen in Costo and Costo (1987) and in the essay by Lothrop in the current issue of The Californians (1989). Lothrop is a defender in the Father Francis Guest mode; the Costos are Indian activists and critics of the mission system. Editor Thomas notes the radical differences in evidence cited and interpretations reached by native American oral historians, osteological-archaeological researchers, and the documentary and ecclesiastical historians. The Southwest papers emphasize native American continuity and solidarity; the California papers are tentative. The Texans are assertive; the Californians are cautious.

In Part 1, ethnographical and archaeological reports document Hopi resistance (Adams), and cultural preservation (Lomawaima); the transformation of the Plains-Pueblo economic system (Spielmann); Pueblo-Spanish accommodation (Kessell), and Sonoran transition from prehistory to history (McGuire and Villalpando). The section concludes with the maverick observations of Father Charles Polzer who criticizes the use of the term “borderlands,” the assertion that California missions are prototypical of the mission system, and the overuse of the descriptor “Southwest.” He advocates a rewriting of history using new techniques to deal with documents.

A similar format follows in Part 2. Hester examines material culture of native Americans intruded on by both Apache and Spanish, particularly the lithic and ceramic technologies. Gilmore follows Polzer’s suggestion and rewrites the history of the Karankawan Indians of Mission Rosario in Texas. It is an interesting effort flawed only by her acceptance of cannibalistic practices among them. For a discussion of cannibalism see Arens (1979), Harris (1985), and Shipman (1987). There is also some confusion raised by her conversion of varas to meters (p. 239). Eaton’s summary of the archaeology and history of the Gateway Missions of the Rio Grande is outstanding, and Fox’s discussion of the Indians at the rarely studied mission ranches is a welcome addition to the literature.

The impact of contact on Indian art is addressed by Solveig Turpin. The paper contains several wonderful drawings that testify to dark feelings about the priests. Similarly, Lee and Neuerburg look at art among the California Indians but do not reach for evocative interpretations as does Turpin.

In addition to exploring the moral issues of missionization mentioned above, the California papers introduce the subject of botanical “colonization” (West). The subject is dry as a California desert, but important in adding the dimension of environmental changes that accompanied cultural ones. Both Hornbeck and Costello look at economic systems at the California missions. Both are excellent papers and they complement each other. Hornbeck’s is the larger view, emphasizing change in the allocation of mission labor from 1769 to the secularization of the missions and their final sale by the California government in 1846. It shows how the missions changed from institutions of acculturation to commercial capitalist ventures. Costello presents the hard data on mission agricultural production through roughly the same time period. The missions are arranged by Presidio districts, but the missions of the Santa Barbara district are studied in particular detail. Greenwood explodes some of the mythology surrounding the California ranchero, and Farris discusses the Russian impact on Spanish colonization efforts in California.

The secularization of missions is treated similarly in the different geographic regions. Doyel is matter-of-fact in stating that the Jesuits and the ranchers were in an economic battle in which Indian labor was valued essentially the same, a commodity to be obtained
at the lowest price possible. Hester similarly notes that secularization orders issued in 1793 in Texas came as no surprise to colonists. Eaton notes that the effect of secularization on the Rio Grande missions was not only abandonment but dismantlement as well. In California, secularization began in 1833, and Greenwood points out that the Indians did not benefit from the process. There are contrasting views of secularization and the impact it had on Indians (see Shipek 1987).

The volume has some problems. The exact difference between secular and mendicant clergy is unclear. Eaton includes the Jesuits as mendicants, whereas Mathes separates the Jesuits from the mendicants. Matson and Fontana (1977) also noted that Jesuits are not a mendicant order. The distinction is an important one because the volume has no mendicant point of view. With much of the text and introduction given to the Serra question in California and the effects of missionization on native Americans in general, it would have been appropriate to have a Franciscan point of view.

The missions receive most of the research attention. Ranchos are mentioned briefly, but there is no analysis of those other Spanish frontier institutions, the pueblo and the presidio. It is a serious omission which may point out a lack of available research undertaken about these two institutions. The overview of California (Costello and Hornbeck) identifies the San Diego Presidio as the first to be established in Alta California in 1769. Monterey was the first founded in 1770. San Diego did not become a presidio until 1773, after the mission had been relocated to its present site. The founding date of the Monterey Presidio is omitted from the otherwise complete chronological chart. These minor errors indicate the need to augment the mission-centric view of colonization consequences to include residents of presidios and pueblos.

The printing quality and binding are excellent. One uncoupled parenthesis (p. 482) is the only typographical error noted. The illustrations are clear and enhance the textual material. Walker et al. might have added a chronology chart to clarify the divisions among the horizons discussed. The citation format is arranged alphabetically rather than historically, which is disconcerting when reading about historical progressions. Editorial introductions to each part would have been helpful and would have enhanced the otherwise excellent collection of papers.

Volume I is an outstanding beginning. The high cost may even be justified because proceeds are to go to support educational scholarship for native Americans. Every researcher into issues certain to be raised by the Columbian Quincentenary will want to refer to the book.
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**Obsidian Dates IV: A Compendium of the Obsidian Hydration Determinations Made at the UCLA Obsidian Hydration Laboratory.**

Reviewed by:
**THOMAS L. JACKSON**
BioSystems Analysis, Inc., 303 Potrero St., Suite 203, Santa Cruz, CA 95060.

With this volume the Obsidian Hydration Laboratory at UCLA continues its distinguished and unique history of publishing the hydration determinations made by that laboratory. Part I of the volume contains two introductory papers by C. W. Meighan: “Progress in Obsidian Dating Studies,” and “Information for Prospective Collaborators in Obsidian Dating.” In the initial article, Meighan pens a brief history of obsidian dating studies and the operations of the UCLA laboratory, offering a perspective that understandably is personal and colloquial given his long and intimate association with the laboratory and research in hydration dating.

The development of the obsidian hydration dating method has not been without its difficulties, and fundamental research questions remain unresolved. Environmental factors (e.g., temperature, soil chemistry, and humidity) and the chemical and physical properties of the obsidian itself affect the rate at which hydration rinds develop on artifacts, but how each variable determines the hydration process is not clear. There also is a theoretical and methodical rift among hydration dating specialists regarding the chronological interpretation of hydration rind measurements; between those that consider obsidian hydration as primarily a relative dating method, and those that interpret hydration readings for absolute chronometric determinations. These issues notwithstanding, and perhaps because of the interest in resolving them, the future of obsidian hydration dating has never been more promising.

Part II of the compendium offers 23 “Discussion Papers” and a comprehensive bibliography compiled for these contributions. It is not possible to comment on each paper in this brief review. Indeed, given the length of most of the titles, it is not practical even to list the contributions and their authors. The editors appropriately have termed these “discussion” papers; not all can be regarded as serious research papers. Some are brief technical reports, others document the archaeological context for hydration dates, and several argue for one hydration rate model or another to calculate absolute dates from hydration rind measurements. The emphasis on deriving calendric dates from hydration measurements is a conspicuous bias in many of these papers.

Remarks on several example papers will illustrate the diversity of topics covered. M. Q. Sutton’s “Obsidian Analyses in the Mojave Desert, California: Results, Cautions, and Comments” is a coherent discussion of the methodical variables that must be considered in the collection and interpretation of obsidian hydration data. In “Obsidian Source Heterogeneity and Uniqueness: An Example in Western Mexico,” G. Mahood emphasizes the importance of comprehensive sampling and chemical analysis of obsidian sources to determine variability in major- and trace-element abundances within each source area before relying on chemical indices to distinguish among different obsidian sources.