

# UCLA

## American Indian Culture and Research Journal

### Title

Historical Dictionary of North American Archaeology. Edited by Edward B. Jelks and Juliet C. Jelks.

### Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/3s30x521>

### Journal

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 12(1)

### ISSN

0161-6463

### Author

Evans, G. Edward

### Publication Date

1988

### DOI

10.17953

### Copyright Information

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License, available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

dispute was enacted. Landsman carefully articulates, for example, a classification for several events, such as breach, crisis, redressive, etc., and also provides specific incidents that relate to symbols—e.g., the takeover at Moss Lake, the shooting incidents, the barricade of Stark Road (to demonstrate sovereignty), etc. She then analyzes these phases from both viewpoints. It was apparent throughout that white opposition had been strong; local residents had felt disenfranchised, for their views did little to influence state negotiations.

Landsman reviews her methodology critically as part of her conclusions. She found that Mohawk 'actors' were neither carrying out the norms of the white society nor merely enacting traditional norms. "Rather Mohawk and white actors alike consciously manipulated symbols in the media they controlled, often changing both symbols and meanings for their own purposes. These purposes . . . were constrained by a consistent framework. . . ." (pages 178-79). She reminds us too that the history of Iroquois political activism is long and Ganieneh is but a phase, yet Ganieneh represents a symbol not just of land but of sovereignty. In this context, her findings have wide application in the struggle, for example, to gain some land restoration within aboriginal territory, especially incident to the American Indian Religious Freedom Act. Despite the grant of land to these Mohawk people, the underlying issue of sovereignty, however, remains unresolved. While the Turtle Island Trust is both symbolic and legal, the Indians by assenting to it never disclaimed sovereignty over much of New York nor did the state and federal governments officially acknowledge a tribal claim to such area.

*Imre Sutton*

California State University, Fullerton

**Historical Dictionary of North American Archaeology.** Edited by Edward B. Jelks and Juliet C. Jelks. Westport, CN: Greenwood Press, 1988. 736pp. \$95.00

Unless you are a lexicologist, a request such as, "Would you review a dictionary for us?" is not likely to generate a positive

answer. I'm not a lexicologist, but I quickly said yes, because I know something about the book and wanted a copy for my personal collection.

Finding the proper title for this publication probably was a problem for Greenwood Press. The book goes far beyond being a source for "What does this word mean?" However, to call it an encyclopedia would raise expectation too high. It is, however, closer to an encyclopedia than it is a dictionary. According to its editor it "is intended as a source of basic information on the major prehistoric culture, archaeological sites, and artifact types of North America" (page xv). The editor does not claim every site and artifact described in the professional literature has an entry in this book. Rather he states, "one will find here, however, an entry for every site that, in the opinion of regional consultants who selected the topics, has contributed uniquely to the essential body of information upon which the current major classifications and interpretations of North American prehistory are based. One will also find entries for major artifact types and for major cultures and their phases or other subdivisions" (page xv).

Given the above intent the editors faced the enormous task of reducing the content of millions of pages of published text to a manuscript size that a publisher would accept. The publisher's need to at least break even, if not make a small profit, imposes strong page limits on a single volume publishing project. The Jelks employed thirteen regional consultants to assist in the process of selecting what to include and what to leave out. Eventually, they put together a manuscript containing over 1,800 entries. They had the assistance of 159 United States and Canadian archaeologists who wrote and reviewed most of the entries.

Site and culture entries represent most of the material in the book. Site entries include information about location, excavator, date of excavation, finds, cultural affiliation, and its contribution to archeological knowledge. Some Greenland sites with cultural relationships to sites in North America are included. Entries for a culture or subdivision include information on geographic and temporal distribution, distinctive traits, relationship to other cultural units, the name of the person who defined it in the literature, and when that occurred. All entries have one or more citations to further information. The basic arrangement is alphabetical with cross references both in entries and from a name not used as an entry, for example, "CHIRICAHUA STAGE. See

Cochise Culture'' (page 95). A detailed index provides further access to the material contained within each entry. Length of the entries range from 75 to over 1,000 words. The longer entries are usually cultural units or regional classification systems. The 135 page list of sources/references provides a sense of the depth of information used to create this ''dictionary.'' When a reviewer finds his unpublished master's thesis and one very old journal article listed in the references, the impression is the contributors dug out fairly obscure material.

Very few books are perfect, and this book is no exception. There are a few minor but annoying problems. One is there are inconsistencies in the coverage of culture entities and sites. For example, there are no entries for sites at Mesa Verde. There are entries for Chaco and Chuska Province, but none for Mesa Verde Province. There is no way of determining why Chaco and Chuska have both a full entry in the text as well as index access while Mesa Verde is only an indexing term. A related problem is with a few of the ''see'' and ''see also'' references. As an example, if you look up Basketmaker, you find ''BASKET-MAKER. See Pecos Classification System'' (page 33). Following up on the reference, you find on page 365, ''PECOS CLASSIFICATION. See Southwestern Classification Systems.'' Your search ends, at last, on page 459 with a two page discussion of the six major classification systems used for describing and grouping prehistoric cultures in the Southwestern United States.

Inconsistencies also exist in artifact coverage. Using ceramics for example, there are index entries for Mesa Verde black on white, Piedra black on white, and Mancos black on white, but none for Mesa Verde corrugated, or Mancos corrugated. Also, there are main entries for bannerstones, birdstones, Bitterroot side-notched point, and burin, but none for metates, manos, or sipapu. There is, however, an index entry for sipapu. Again, one wonders why there is an entry for Bayport chert and none for Minnesota pipestone.

*The Macmillan Dictionary of Archaeology* (R. Whitehouse, editor, London/New York: Macmillan, 1983) bears only minor similarity to this book. Because of the world coverage of the *Macmillan Dictionary* only a small percentage of the entries relate to North America and those that are present are for very general subjects. Also that *Dictionary* is for the non-specialist while the Jelks prepared a book for the serious student and scholar. W. Bray's and

D. H. Trump's *Penguin Dictionary of Archaeology* (2nd rev. ed., Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1982) is even more general in treatment and entries are all very brief and is also global in coverage. *Dictionnaire Archeologique des Techniques* (Paris: Editions de l'Accueil, 1963-64, 2 vols.) is scholarly but focuses on methodology, however, it does contain a solid section on Pre-Columbian America. Again world wide coverage limits the quantity of North American material. Finally, *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Archaeology* (A. Sherratt, editor, New York: Crown Publisher, 1980) is for the student and well informed lay person. Its coverage is world wide but there are extensive sound sections on North America. As a way of checking coverage of the *Historical Dictionary* I selected 28 terms I found in the North American sections of the *Encyclopedia*. They were all there.

When the last volume of the *Handbook of North American Indians* (W. C. Sturtevant, ed. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution, 1978-) appears, the set will surpass *Historical Dictionary* in depth of coverage but not in ease of use for quick reference. To date six of the eleven area volumes are available. They contain a total of over 820 pages of "summary" material on archaeology; *Volume 5 Arctic*—130 pages, *Volume 6 Subarctic*—51 pages, *Volume 8 California*—80 pages, *Volume 9 Southwest*—177 pages, *Volume 10 Southwest* contains no articles on archaeology but each of the chapters on tribes have at least two paragraphs on prehistory, *Volume 11 Great Basin*—260 pages, and *Volume 15 Northeast*—122 pages. A spot check of terms in the *Handbook* against the *Dictionary* shows the Jelks' sound judgment in selecting terms to include. Of 26 sites selected at random in the *Handbook* 19 were in the *Dictionary*. For artifacts the results are not as good, 11 of 24 items, and for cultures and related terms the coverage was better, 16 of 28.

Despite the above nit-picking, overall this is an excellent publication. It is a must purchase for most college and university reference collections. Individuals may also want a copy in their working collections, despite the steep price.

G. Edward Evans  
Loyola Marymount University