REVIEWS

Prehistoric Settlement Along the Eastern Margin of Rogers Dry Lake, Western Mojave Desert, California. Brian F. Byrd, Drew Pallette, and Carol Serr, with contributions by Susan Smith and R. Scott Anderson (Pollen Analysis), Jean Hudson (Vertebrate Remains), Margaret Newman (Immunological Analysis), Thomas Origer and M. Steven Shackley (Obsidian Studies), Lisa Klug and Virginia S. Popper (Paleoethnobotanical Analysis). San Diego: Brian F. Mooney Associates Anthropological Technical Series 2, 1994, ix + 192 pp., 58 figs., 66 tables, $25.00 (paper).

Reviewed by:

JOAN S. SCHNEIDER

Dept. of Anthropology, Univ. of California, Riverside, CA 92521.

This "in house" publication reports the data acquired from the archaeological testing of six sites along the eastern margin of Rogers Dry Lake at Edwards Air Force Base, California. One site, CA-KER-526, is interpreted as an early Gypsum Period base camp, probably repeatedly occupied. There are two occupational phases, separated by at least one hiatus. Both the Gypsum occupation and the documentation of a stratified deposit are unusual for the western Mojave Desert.

The other sites on the eastern margin of the playa are the results of short-term, nonrepetitious occupations. The extended period of time (from Gypsum times through ethnohistoric times) represented by both CA-KER-526 and the other sites is significant in that the intermittent use of this playa-side locale over a long period of time is well documented in this study. The authors have considered both intra- and inter-site relationships and are able to make some interesting interpretations about distributions of artifacts and faunal remains.

Brian F. Mooney Associates are to be congratulated on this, their second publication. Making data available to the archaeological community is an important scientific goal and this goal can be met through cultural resource management (CRM) publications of this type, in the absence of the economic feasibility and time-consuming process that is represented by refereed publications. Access to the data resulting from CRM studies is greatly enhanced by a real effort, on the part of investigators, to disseminate reports of work-in-progress or completed. Too often, the archaeological community has limited knowledge of or accessibility to the "gray literature" outside a very restricted geographical area (cf. Chartkoff 1987).

The "References Cited" in this volume is an excellent example of the "gray literature" problem. I counted 48 of the 243 citations in this volume (almost 20%) as being "gray literature," e.g., papers presented at professional meetings, unpublished CRM reports, or drafts of articles or reports that are not readily accessible to the scientific community. This calculation does not include the Ph.D. dissertations and Master's theses that are cited. If, indeed, the volume made no other contribution (which it does), the listing of the unpublished data available alone makes a contribution to the regional study of the Antelope Valley and the Mojave Desert.

The major strong points in this publication are well-represented by the cover figures; i.e., computerized map presentations of the sites and the faunal analysis. Indeed, these are some of the finest maps that I have seen and present the studied sites both clearly and concisely. I particularly liked the artifact symbols used and the depiction of deposit densities. The vertebrate faunal analysis by Hudson is quite extraordinary in its presentation of the data and its discussion and interpretation.

The majority of the faults in the publication are confined to the Project Background section (Part 2). Two major weak points include: (1) the ab-

sence of certain important key citations for Mojave Desert archaeology; and (2) citations that refer to drafts or manuscripts that have already entered the published literature. This situation infers that the authors are unfamiliar with the region and/or that whatever references were handy on the office bookshelf were used in the absence of performing an adequate and up-to-date literature search. For example, there is no mention of Newberry Cave, a very important Gypsum Period site in the central Mojave Desert (Davis and Smith 1981); the published *Archaeology of the Afton Canyon Site* is also missing (Schneider 1989), along with its very important faunal analysis (Sutton and Yohe 1989), while an unpublished CRM report on the same area is cited (York 1988). The discussion of Pinto does not mention recent articles on this subject that have appeared in the published literature (Jenkins 1987; Vaughan and Warren 1987; Meighan 1989). Also overlooked is Leonard and Drover's (1980) article on the exploitation of turquoise in the Mojave Desert, but misinformation about the geographical location of the turquoise mines is included (p. 13). The authors cite Sutton's (1981) manuscript, apparently unaware that it was greatly expanded and published in 1988 (Sutton 1988).

A third major weakness is editorial. The writing is uneven and inconsistent; there is a great deal of extraneous verbiage, as well as unnecessary and undefined modifiers. Some examples of these problems include inconsistency in form (e.g., "micro-crystalline" versus "microcrystalline") and overuse of modifying terms without definition (e.g., "significant," "large," "small," "modest," "formidable," "quite satisfactory"). Sometimes statements are made that appear to have no purpose and are simply there to fill space. For example, it is stated (p. 95) that "The surface distribution of artifacts is well patterned both in terms of the overall distribution of artifacts and the location of particular artifact categories." This sentence is presented accompanying an excellent map of the distribution of archaeological materials.

The fourth category of major weakness includes errors or gaps in background information. There is no information on the paleoenvironmental aspects of the origin and longevity of ephemeral lakestands in the Mojave Desert, information that would likely have a direct bearing on this site complex, and which has been published in regional geomorphological literature. Tortoise is included under a list of economically important "mammals" (p. 6). The statement that "Warren (1984:423) argues that shell beads from Afton Canyon . . . are evidence of trade . . ." (p. 14) is incorrect; Warren was talking about the Oro Grande site, Afton Canyon was not excavated until 1985 (Schneider 1989). There is no mention of what the relationship was between the Vanyume and the Serrano, that there were no Vanyume remaining when ethnographies were written, and that almost all Vanyume information is based on Serrano ethnographic information. One gets the idea that the background portion of this report was written only from secondary sources and that errors from other reports were carried over to this one.

Overlooking the above weaknesses, this is a valuable publication. Research Orientation and Objectives (Section 3) and Field and Analysis Methods (Section 4) are well-presented. Resulting Data (Section 5) are clearly presented in readable and usable format by individual site (CA-KER-526, -533, -1180, -1765, -3377, -3379). Subsections for each site include Site Structure and Stratigraphy, Features, Artifact and Ecofact Assemblages, Intra-Site Spatial Variability, and Conclusions. Section 6 includes a series of Ecological and Economic Studies: Pollen Analysis of Sediment Samples from CA-KER-526 (the major stratified Gypsum Period site), by Susan Smith and R. Scott Anderson; Paleoethnobotanical Analysis of Sediment Samples from CA-KER-533 and CA-KER-3379, by Lisa Klug and Virginia Popper; Immunological Analysis of Lithic Artifacts from CA-KER-526 and CA-KER-1180, by Margaret Newman; and Vertebrate Remains from CA-KER-526, CA-KER-533, CA-KER-1180, CA-KER-1765, CA-KER-3377, and CA-KER-3379, by Jean Hudson. In Section 7, Inter-Site Comparison and Interpretation, all the data are drawn together in a well-organized discus-

sion of site structure and site formation processes, chronological placement of each site and the entire site complex, settlement organization and site function, and resource procurement, regional interaction, and trade. Included in this final section are the findings from radiocarbon determinations, obsidian sourcing, and obsidian hydration analysis.

One particular portion of the interpretation of the sites is problematic, admittedly from my own interest-centered viewpoint. Paleobotanical remains from the site were limited to wood charcoal fragments; almost no seeds were recovered. Apparently rabbits and hares were important and were processed in quantity. Yet, the authors do not consider the possibility that the milling/grinding equipment at the site was used for other than seed/plant processing, although there is good evidence (both archaeological and ethnographical) that other materials, including animals, were processed using these tools (e.g., Yohe et al. 1991).

It would be preferable to call attention to errors and omissions (at least in the background information) before publication rather than after; this is one of the reasons why manuscripts are subject to a review process. The background and bibliographic sections of "in-house" publications could be presented for a brief prepublication peer review by a scholar with a certain amount of regional expertise. This would benefit the authors, the readers, and the client. More importantly, it would greatly enhance the scholarly value of this type of publication without creating an undue hardship on either the sponsoring CRM company or the authors. In the case of the Rogers Dry Lake monograph, although the errors of omission and commission do not detract from the value of the data, there is detraction from the view of the work as a whole.

REFERENCES

Chartkoff, Joseph L.
1987 The Bleak and the Gray: Critical Issues of Publication and Scholarship in California Archaeology. Society for California Archaeology Newsletter 21(3):10-14.

Davis, C. Alan, and Gerald A. Smith
1981 Newberry Cave. Redlands: San Bernardino County Museum Association.

Jenkins, Dennis L.
1987 Dating the Pinto Occupation at Rogers Ridge: A Fossil Spring Site in the Mojave Desert, California. Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology 9(2):214-231.

Leonard, N. Nelson III, and Christopher E. Drover
1980 Prehistoric Turquoise Mining in the Halloran Springs District, San Bernardino County, California. Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology 2(2):245-256.

Meighan, Clement W.
1989 Further Comments on Pinto Points and Their Dating. Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology 11(1):113-118.

Schneider, Joan S.
1989 The Archaeology of the Afton Canyon Site. San Bernardino County Museum Quarterly 36(1).

Sutton, Mark Q.
1981 Archaeology of the Antelope Valley, Western Mojave Desert, California. Manuscript in possession of the author.

1988 An Introduction to the Archaeology of the Western Mojave Desert, California. Coyote Press Archives of California Prehistory No. 14.

Sutton, Mark Q., and Robert M. Yohe II
1989 An Analysis of the Vertebrate Faunal Remains from the Afton Canyon Site (CA-SBR-85). In: The Archaeology of the Afton Canyon Site, by Joan S. Schneider, pp. 143-158. San Bernardino County Museum Association Quarterly 36(1).

Vaughan, Sheila, and Claude N. Warren
1987 Toward a Definition of Pinto Points. Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology 9(2):199-213.

Yohe, Robert M. II, Margaret M. Newman, and Joan S. Schneider
1991 Immunological Identification of Small Mammal Proteins in Aboriginal Milling Equipment. American Antiquity 56(4):659-666.

York, Andrew L.
1988 Preliminary Report on Archaeological Data Recovery Excavations at CA-SBr-6017 and CA-SBr-6018 in the East Cronise Lake

Basin, San Bernardino County, California. Report on file at the Archaeological Information Center, San Bernardino County Museum, Redlands.

Multi-Component Archaic and Late Prehistoric Residential Camps Along the Sweetwater River, Rancho San Diego, California. Brian F. Byrd and Carol Serr, with contributions from John Beezley, Lynne Christenson, Margaret Newman, Thomas Origer, M. Steven Shackley, and Beta Analytic. San Diego: Brian F. Mooney Associates Anthropological Technical Series 1, 1993, xiii + 431 pp., 40 figs., 213 tables, 9 appendices, $25.00 (paper).

Reviewed by:

PAUL G. CHACE
The Keith Companies, 2955 Red Hill Ave., Costa Mesa, CA 92626.

Recorded archaeological sites in San Diego County now number over 14,000, and the vast majority has been documented during environmental planning law studies in the last two decades. An immense gray literature has been produced on the regional prehistory. Despite the many important contributions officially filed, only a modest few studies have been formally published. Brian F. Mooney Associates, one of the premier environmental planning businesses in the San Diego region, is to be commended for launching a new anthropological publication series in late 1993 with this volume. (The second in the series was announced in late 1994, *Prehistoric Settlement Along the Eastern Margin of Rogers Dry Lake, Western Mojave Desert, California.*)

The authors acknowledge the many parties involved with this new publication. The book is a synthesis of a series of site evaluation and data recovery studies for the Rancho San Diego land development project. Home Capital Development Group, the project owners, funded the 1991-1992 field work and write-up. These studies were overseen by the County of San Diego, as part of the development's environmental planning law requirements. John Cook and Jerry Schaefer, archaeologists at Brian F. Mooney Associates, plus numerous other staff specialists, had key roles in these investigations. Now the firm moves boldly forward with a new operation—publishing and distributing major anthropological works.

This synthesis describes and interprets sites situated on four low knolls along the valley flood plain of the Sweetwater River. This foothill region is about 15 miles inland, east of the city of San Diego. With a multiphased field program of increasingly intensive sampling, the four sites were redefined and interpreted as 12 discrete residential areas discernable by strong horizontal patterning of artifact classes, often associated with bedrock processing features. Although differing in extent, the loci typically covered about 30 by 50 meters.

The report describes the area of each residential locus, noting any bedrock features present, as well as the lithic debitage, stone and bone artifacts, ceramics, and ecofacts recovered, along with their frequencies. Debitage is described in detail, as is the flaking technology represented in the artifacts. Lithic debitage at most loci composed over 90% of the artifact assemblages, with discarded or broken tools being infrequent. The categorized lithic assemblages included flaked, percussing, and ground stone tools and preforms. Shell beads were recovered at only one locus. Specialists' studies were made of the faunal bone, which was dominated by rabbit, hare, and pond turtle. Studies also are presented on modified bone, protein residue analysis, obsidian sourcing, obsidian hydration, and radiocarbon dating. Seven of the 12 loci demon-