***Tom-Kav: A Late Village Site in Northern San Diego County, California, and Its Place in the San Luis Rey Complex.*** D. L. True, Rosemary Pankey, and C. N. Warren. University of California *Anthropological Records* 30, 1991, xi + 240 pp., 152 tables, 73 figures, $40.00 (paper).

*Reviewed by:*
**M. STEVEN SHACKLEY**
Phoebe Hearst Museum of Anthropology, 103 Kroeber Hall, Univ. of California, Berkeley, CA 94720.

This volume apparently is the first of four that will present a synthesis of not only the site (Tom-Kav; CA-SDi-682), but the San Luis Rey Complex set within regional prehistory (p. 2). The stated goal of this volume is only to describe the results of excavations from 1958 through the late 1970s rather than provide a synthesis. The authors have certainly succeeded in this venture with only 51 pages of text, but 152 tables and 73 figures. This is surely beyond the descriptive capabilities apparent in most recent reports on the same time period in San Diego County. Whether this actually provides information archaeologists can use on a regional level must await the next three volumes, for as the authors state, this "is by no means a state-of-the-art document" (p. ix). As a descriptive treatise it is difficult to review. What follows is a synopsis of the written text, some comments on the interpretation, and a summary that includes some comments on what I think many regional archaeologists would hope to see in the future volumes.

The format of the volume is rather typical of site reports and that, coupled with its relatively short text, allows for easy access to important data. After a rather well-written introduction (Chapter 1) summarizing some of the older published work in the region and discussing the history of research at the site, the second chapter is devoted to the physical setting. True's long-term personal history in the region serves to provide some information few others could provide, such as the history of stream development within the San Luis Rey River region and rainfall data. Based on this experience, the authors feel strongly that the local flora was not responsible for site placement (p. 4).

Chapter 3 provides a description of the site proper. Three probable components were evident at Tom-Kav: Pauma Complex, San Luis Rey I, and San Luis Rey II. Because of limited sampling and stratigraphic mixing, the extent of the first two components is difficult to determine according to the authors. This honesty is refreshing. The later and better represented San Luis Rey II component is subdivided into seven concentrations or features "believed to represent activity areas" (p. 7). These loci are dominated by milling features and one pictograph. Activity area determinations are based on this mix of milling features (mortars, metates, slicks), and midden color, and less on the mix of associated artifacts. Why artifactual association is not considered a more important factor is not well-explained. In this section, one of the first of a number of statements is made that requires quite a bit of faith on the part of the reader. Speaking of a pitted rock form, the authors assert that "Similar features are quite common on sites in Diegueño territory, but have not yet been reported as common on San Luis Rey sites." (p. 10). It is interesting that the authors feel so strongly here since it appears, based on their references, that they have not read much of the gray literature in the region that might indicate a contrary pattern. This is a weakness that I will return to later. The discussion of "rock rings" and enclosures at the site and in the region is quite thorough and stimulating.

Chapter 4 is a detailed descriptive treatment of the excavations at Tom-Kav. As the authors state, there was no real research design formulated for the excavations consistent with the then-current paradigm. The excavation strategy

was a well-considered judgmental design, however, and certainly served to locate important features and areas of higher artifact density. Some of the earlier excavations by Warren identified the presence of a San Luis Rey II component and the probability of a San Luis Rey I component, and the certain presence of "Pauma Complex" material (pp. 2, 12). These excavations consisted of a series of trenches in what appeared to be the less damaged portion of the site (p. 12). A caliche deposit was encountered at about 12 inches (30 cm.) to as deep as 50 to 60 cm. Most of the Archaic (Pauma) material was recovered well below this layer. Excavations in 1960-62 were conducted by UCLA to determine the boundaries of the caliche deposit 12 inches below the surface, and "look for evidence of an underlying Pauma Complex component" (p. 13). At the 60 to 66-inch level a basin metate was found overlying a poorly preserved burial, apparently rather typical of Archaic Period burials in western North America and certainly of the local archaic manifestation, "Pauma and La Jollan." The five "Pankey test pits" excavated between 1962 and 1965 were the final reported excavations at the site (pp. 13-14).

Four ash lenses were encountered in the excavations, but no definite artifactual associations were apparent. Aggregates of cobbles that could have been features were considered to "mostly represent fortuitous clusters with no real cultural significance" (p. 16).

Chapters 5 and 6 are devoted to a descriptive summary of the artifact categories and defined artifact "types," and while complete, present a rather outmoded typology. Excluding potsherds (n = 1,183) and debitage (1,373.7 g.), 452 artifacts were collected from the site. Of these, 315 are flaked stone, 59 are ground stone, and 13 are nonutilitarian ground stone (p. 26). This certainly is not a large sample by current data recovery standards. Technological variables of rejuvenation and production stages are ignored in an effort to place an arbitrary type system on the bifaces. Subtypes of projectile points appear to be a result of idiosyncratic variability, raw material constraints, production stages, or any combination of these variables. For example, projectile point types 2a, 2b, and 3 could be merely late-stage preforms for finished triangular concave-based points. The side-notched points are divided into six or seven categories that are probably a result of the variables mentioned above. The authors are still looking for "spokeshaves" in a culture that certainly did not possess the wheel (p. 27). "Scraper planes, core scraper, keeled scraper, cobble choppers, hammers, domed scrapers" are all morphological categories used in the typology, with little justification based on utilization (pp. 26-27). These anachronisms, while forgivable given the wealth of descriptive data and the stated goals, are dangerous in light of the stature of the authors in regional archaeology. I will return to this in the summary.

The analysis of raw material classes is perhaps the most useful and important and shows the long-term familiarity of the authors (especially True) with the region. The authors note that quartz and "silicified tuff" are both "local" materials. The silicified tuff probably is the Piedra del Lumbre Canyon material from Camp Pendleton to the north and west (see Pigniolo 1992). The authors consider that the "basalt" cobbles used for large stone tools in the site are from the Poway Conglomerate to the south and west, but could also be from the north and west (San Onofre Breccia) in the same direction as the Piedra del Lumbre material (p. 36; see Gross et al. 1989). This seems more rational given that the other material would be procured in "Diegueño territory" rather than in a Luiseño procurement range (p. 36).

The summary for Chapter 6 is a discussion of the artifacts plus the chronological implications that includes a substantial ethnographic element, partly derived from living or recently deceased informants. Vexing at this juncture is

why, after a thorough discussion of the certain Archaic presence at the site including a date of 3,010 ± 80 radiocarbon years B.P. (Beta-13038) on the burial remains, that the Archaic projectile points are still considered "intrusive" (p. 41). This is merely a matter of semantics but serves to muddy the interpretations for the reader. Other radiocarbon dates on *Pecten* sp. (6,050 ± 80 RCYBP; Beta-13717, adjusted by $^{13}C$) and *Chione* sp. (5,530 ± 100 RCYBP; Beta-12765) strongly indicate an Archaic component at the site and to the authors suggest "an age of at least 5,000 years for the Pauma Complex component, with circumstantial evidence supporting a prehistoric San Luis Rey I occupancy followed by a late prehistoric-early historic San Luis Rey II occupation." (p. 41).

The final chapter (7), which attempts to hedge on the synthesis the authors said they would not do, is titled "Tom-Kav as an Element in the San Luis Rey Complex" (p. 42). Here the authors cite data from other sites in the region (SDi-674, -5589, Frey Creek sites, -308, -217, and -539) to buoy their conclusions. This chapter is certainly worth the price of the book, particularly for the sections on settlement and subsistence and raw materials. The authors admit that a full discussion of settlement is in process, but they do give us a peek at their position. The "bipolar" upland-lowland model of subsistence proposed for the upper San Luis Rey is not supported for the lower San Luis Rey Basin and "is not likely to have been a factor in the lowland settlement-subsistence systems" even though they admit that coastal "contact is clearly indicated" (pp. 47-48). They also feel that small processing sites are more likely San Luis Rey I rather than San Luis Rey II since most activities apparently occurred at the larger residential bases (my vernacular). I question this model that seems to assume that logistic activity did not occur beyond a small range in the late period. This is apparently based on the absence of ceramics at these processing sites. This is certainly not sufficient evidence to formulate these conclusions since the shorter the term of processing, the less likely pots would be broken. As the authors state, however, there is a lack of fined-grained chronological control to deal with this issue. It would be interesting to see how they would have addressed these issues if they had had access to either the models in Christenson (1990) for the region to the south or those of Pigniolo (1992) based on an extensive raw-material study of this region.

The lack of truly "exotic" raw materials in the inventories (i.e., low frequencies of obsidian), the authors conclude, is a result of access problems rather than desire. They further conclude from this that the "San Luis Rey people . . . minimize[d] contact with outside groups at least until late proto-historic times." (p. 51; cf. Pigniolo 1992).

The concluding statement is both a defense and a paradigmatic poke at processual and post-processual archaeology with a wonderful run-on sentence steeped in the wisdom of the Cultural Historical Model.

> While it is less tedious and much more exciting to develop scenarios which represent complicated and ingenious interpretations of small (and mostly meaningless) data bases, in the long haul the delineation and interpretation of local and regional prehistory, as well as any understanding of relevant developmental processes, will stand or fall on the basis of much more substantial aggregates of mundane data [p. 51].

It is difficult to determine exactly what the authors are calling for here. The Tom-Kav assemblage, consisting of only about 1,100 sherds, 1,300 grams of debitage, and 452 artifacts, certainly could be considered a "small (and mostly meaningless) data base" even if collected over a decade and finally making it into print a generation later. This perhaps is a poor commentary on the status of archaeology in the minds of the authors. While I concede that not all regional archaeologists would agree it is important to provide descriptions of site

contexts and contents, most would agree that this volume will be useful to all regional archaeologists. I would hope that all generations of archaeologists value the descriptive treatise as a foundation for interpretation. But it is not much more than that. We look forward to the following three more synthetic papers on the authors' views of process and change in the San Luis Rey "Complex." Many of us would like to benefit from the long-term knowledge acquired by the authors, and hope that this knowledge will not only be shared, but discussed within the framework of archaeology that has changed substantially and, for the most part, positively since the first shovel entered the ground at Tom-Kav in 1958. Our concept of hunter-gatherer mobility, settlement, and regional interaction has changed much, and the future papers on this time period, as well as this volume, will certainly be useful for years to come.

I think this book belongs on the shelves of all southern California archaeologists, not as an icon to be worshiped as gospel, but as a solid reference with excellent descriptive data on a multi-component site in northern San Diego County. I think the authors would agree.

## REFERENCES

Christenson, Lynne E.
1990 The Late Prehistoric Yuman People of San Diego County California: Their Settlement and Subsistence System. Ph.D. dissertation, Arizona State University.

Gross, G. Timothy, M. Steven Shackley, and Constance Cameron
1989 Archaeological Investigations at CA-Ora-910A: A Late Prehistoric Hunting Field Camp in Southern Orange County, California. Report on file at Archaeological Information Center, University of California, Los Angeles.

Pigniolo, Andrew
1992 Piedra del Lumbre "Chert" and Hunter-Gatherer Mobility and Exchange in Southern California. Master's Thesis, San Diego State University.

***Ute Tales,*** Collected by Anne M. Smith, assisted by Alden Hayes, forward by Joseph Jorgensen. University of Utah Press, 1992, 175 pp., 20 photos, $24.95 (cloth).

*Reviewed by:*

**JOEL C. JANETSKI**
Dept. of Anthropology, Brigham Young Univ., Provo, UT 84602.

*Ute Tales* publishes, most for the first time, 102 of the stories gathered by Anne M. (Cooke) Smith among the Northern Ute during 1936 and 1937 for her doctoral dissertation while a student at Yale (Cooke 1939). In a very useful forward, Joseph Jorgensen crafts an insightful context for Smith's work among the Ute of the Uinta Basin, including the influence of Smith's mentors at Yale (Sapir and Spier) and a brief, backward glance down the difficult road traveled by the Ute people prior to Smith's research. Jorgensen relates his personal relationship with Smith and modestly notes his role in bringing these tales to press. His discussion of the importance of Smith's work and characterizations of Ute lore are valuable tools for the reader.

The body of the text presents 11 tales from the Uinta Ute, 27 from the Uncompahgre, and 64 from the White River people. The Uinta Ute were those who traditionally had lived in the Uinta Basin or along the Wasatch Front of central Utah while the Uncompahgre and White River people were displaced Colorado Utes from the Gunnison River/Uncompahgre River area east of Grand Junction and the Yampa River/White River country respectively. This geographical sorting of Ute lore reflects Smith's interest in analyzing variation in myths over the Great Basin.

The tales are wonderfully diverse in topics and length. By far the majority of the stories take place in a mythical world inhabited by animals with very human tendencies and abilities, but where anything is possible (dogs can