Two Hunting-Related Archaic Sites in Elko County, Nevada. Frederic F. Petersen and Steven M. Stearns. Sparks, NV: Falcon Hill Press, 1992, 147 pp., 32 figs., 11 tables, 7 plates, 5 appendices, $18.00 (paper).

Reviewed by:
CHARLOTTE BECK
Dept. of Anthropology, Hamilton College, Clinton, NY 13323.

This volume presents the results of analyses of lithic material collected from two sites in Elko County, Nevada, both discovered in 1986 during cultural resource surveys for the Nevada Department of Transportation. The Clover Valley Site is located at the southern end of Clover Valley while the Town Creek Site is located in the Town Creek Flat region of the Humboldt River Basin. The assemblages from both sites are primarily surficial, although limited subsurface testing revealed a shallow deposit at each. The Clover Valley Site was collected in its entirety but, because of time limitations, the Town Creek Site was not collected; analyses at the latter were conducted in the field.

The most remarkable aspect of both assemblages—and the focus of the volume—is their technological composition: both have extraordinarily large numbers of projectile points while other classes of artifacts are rare. In the Clover Valley assemblage, 256 points and point fragments were collected, of which 97 are classifiable; 72 are of the Humboldt series while 25 are shouldered, representing Elko (n = 7), Gatecliff Contracting Stem (n = 1), and Rosegate (n = 5) series. The remaining 12 are unclassified. At Town Creek, 94 of 150 points and point fragments are classifiable; of these 80 represent the Gatecliff Split Stemmed type and seven the Gatecliff Contracting Stem type. Four were identified simply as Gatecliff.

Analyses of the Clover Valley artifacts are thorough and are presented clearly. Projectile points are measured according to Thomas' (1981) Monitor Valley criteria and classified to type. They are examined further for damage and/or breakage as well as material type. Finally, their spatial distribution is examined with respect to type and material. Several technological attributes of debitage and other artifact types are examined as well.

Although projectile points are classified in a manner similar to those from Clover Valley, analyses of the Town Creek artifacts are less thorough, primarily because they were conducted in the field. Owing to the disparity in analyses, comparisons between the two assemblages are often difficult. Even so, Petersen and Stearns present some very interesting results.

Most of the Clover Valley points are smashed into fragments; although a large percentage (35%) of the fragments are basal, an even greater percentage (55%) are nonbasal. The authors suggest that end shock caused this breakage, resulting in snap fractures, transverse segments, crushed or splintered tips, and various forms of basal damage, indicating that points were used and discarded at or very near the site.

Analyses of debitage and other artifact types, although not necessarily supporting this conclusion, do not contradict it. Most of the 109 flakes collected are decortication flakes, with none exhibiting use-wear. Three early-stage bifaces and two hammerstones also were found, which the authors identify as workshop debris. Eight other tools, including several late-stage bifaces, were found as well. Late-stage reduction debitage, however, is rare, although a

large number of points exhibits resharpening. Thus, projectile points do not appear to have been the focus of manufacturing activities at the Clover Valley Site.

Turning to the Town Creek assemblage, once again there is a good deal of evidence of impact damage, although at this site 71% of the points retain their hafting element; tips and midsections are much less common than at Clover Valley. This suggests to the authors that the points were not used at this site but simply discarded there. The debitage, although not analyzed in detail, supports this argument. Counts were not taken of flakes, but the authors suggest that the overall number was in the thousands and that average size was small. This is supported by artifacts from the three test units; 203 flakes were collected, the majority of them small (6-10 mm.) pressure or platform-preparation flakes. Since, however, the detailed analytic results available for the Clover Valley assemblage are unavailable for the Town Creek debitage, nothing further can be said.

The final discussion is an interpretation of the activities that produced the two assemblages. The authors suggest that the Town Creek assemblage resulted from the repair and replacement of damaged and broken projectile points. This conclusion is sound, given the evidence. They go on, however, to make statements concerning the size of the human population(s) that produced the assemblage, as well as the length of occupation; these inferences are far less well supported.

Most of the discussion focuses on the Clover Valley Site, which the authors conclude was the scene of a prehistoric pronghorn antelope drive. The site is located on a knoll top, with neither natural nor cultural features that could serve as blinds. Comparisons with ethnographic traps, however, suggest that this is not unusual, and that brush or other perishable material often was used to establish blinds. The authors make a good case considering that most of the argument is based on analogy with ethnographic situations of the 19th and 20th centuries. I have problems with such comparisons, since the authors themselves discuss the difficulty in dating the site; the artifactual material could have accumulated anywhere from 8,000 to 1,250 B.P. There certainly is no reason whatsoever to assume blanketly such similarity between a practice of thousands of years ago and one of 100 years ago. To the credit of the authors, they recognize this and examine a number of possible scenarios. Further, they base part of their argument on the results of spatial distributions and loose clustering of artifacts, an analytic approach for which they are to be commended. Finally, the manner in which the points are broken suggests strongly that they were used on or near the site; what other activity might account for the use of so many points at such a location? Perhaps it is my own bias against relying so heavily on ethnographic analogy, but until we know considerably more about factors such as the introduction and spread of European diseases and their effects on Great Basin populations and cultures, I will remain somewhat a skeptic.

The strong points of this volume are not, in my mind, the conclusions concerning the pronghorn antelope drive (although this probably is as good an explanation as any), but instead the systematic and thorough way in which Petersen and Stearns proceed in their analyses and discussions. They examine many different avenues, revealing a number of interesting sidelines, such as the differences in raw material representation and manner of utilization. The data, as well as keys to the analytic schemes, are all presented in appendices and thus are available to anyone who would like to use them. Further, all the artifacts except debitage are drawn to scale. The authors also present a good discussion of Great Basin projectile point chronology, as well as a very thoughtful evaluation of the Flenniken and Wilke (1989) hypothesis. Overall, I enjoyed reading the volume, and believe it to be an

important contribution to Great Basin archaeology.

REFERENCES

Flenniken, J. Jeffrey, and Philip J. Wilke
1989 Typology, Technology, and Chronology of Great Basin Dart Points. American Anthropologist 19(1):149-158.

Thomas, David Hurst
1981 How to Classify the Projectile Points from Monitor Valley, Nevada. Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology 3(1):7-43.

Essays on the Prehistory of Maritime California. Terry L. Jones, ed. Center for Archaeological Research at Davis, Publication No. 11, 1992, vii + 277 pp., 72 figs, 56 tables, $22.00 (paper).

Reviewed by:
JULIA E. HAMMETT and **LAURA JONES**
Campus Archaeology, 855 Serra Street, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305-6115.

Terry Jones has assembled an attractive, well-illustrated collection of papers representing two recent symposia on prehistoric adaptations along the California coast. This is the first such anthology to include contributions from northern, central, southern, and Baja California. Sixteen papers are organized geographically from north to south. Jones' useful introduction defines four coastal environments (subregions) according to paleo- and current environmental regimes, outlines settlement, mobility, and subsistence trends over time, and highlights current interpretive models.

Lightfoot covers coastal hunter-gatherer settlement systems in the southern North Coast Range (Mendocino and Sonoma counties). From the northern central coast Schwaderer reports test excavations at Duncans Point Cave (CA-SON-348/H). Simons deciphers prehistoric mammal exploitation in the San Francisco Bay region. D. Jones examines a Binfordian forager-collector model for the prehistoric Monterey Bay area.

The southern California coast dominates the volume, beginning with Glassow's consideration of the relative dietary importance of marine and terrestrial mammal foods through time in western Santa Barbara County. Arnold reprises her model of Channel Islands prehistory. Martz finds status distinctions reflected in Chumash mortuary populations in the Santa Monica Mountains. Salls questions whether subsistence changes on the Channel Islands are due to environmental or cultural factors. Raab and Yatsko attempt to explain maritime adaptations on San Clemente Island.

Three contributions from San Diego County and two from the Baja peninsula round out the volume. Gross describes site formation and transformation processes in coastal shell middens and shell-rich sites. Gallegos presents some patterns and implications of coastal settlement in San Diego County between 9,000 and 1,300 years ago. Christensen investigates late prehistoric coastal Yuman settlements and subsistence systems. Laylander overviews the development of Baja California prehistory. Ritter and Payen provide information regarding archaeological discoveries along Laguna Ojo del Liebre, Baja California. The concluding essay by Erlandson and Yesner provides an overview of the papers and puts current endeavors in California prehistory into the larger context of North American coastal archaeology.

Several theoretical threads run through this volume. Various authors combine intriguing hybrid models related to settlement patterns, the origins of cultural complexity, and several popular themes derived from foraging theory, including mobility, optimization, scarcity, and