REVIEWS

The Material Culture of the Chumash Interaction Sphere, Vol. IV: Ceremonial Paraphernalia, Games, and Amusements. *Travis Hudson and Thomas C. Blackburn.* Los Altos: Ballena Press *Anthropological Papers* No. 30 (Ballena Press/Santa Barbara Museum of Natural History Cooperative Publication), 1986, 457 pp., 310 figs., 3 tables, 1 map, index, $29.95 (paper), $47.95 (cloth).

Reviewed by:
MICHAEL A. GLASSOW
Dept. of Anthropology, Univ. of California, Santa Barbara, CA 93106.

Volume IV of the five-volume set inventorying the material culture of the Chumash and neighboring tribes to the south and east contains descriptions of over 100 items related to ritual (including ritual structures), medicine, warfare, music, games and sports, and amusements. As in earlier volumes, each item is described, references to the item in the historical and ethnographic literature are cited and frequently quoted, distribution among the tribes is noted, and examples are illustrated. In essence, this volume and the others in the set are reference books serving those with an interest in the material culture of the tribes covered. The authors include no analysis of material culture; indeed, analysis was not their intent.

Although the majority of references to the items were extracted from J. P. Harrington's ethnographic notes, it is surprising that many of them come from earlier ethnographic documents and ethnohistorical accounts. This is fortunate, for the presence of several independent corroborative references to an item tends to increase confidence in its existence and characteristics.

Illustrations of the material culture items are often crucial to understanding their distinctive characteristics, and the authors have endeavored to include any kind of illustration available. Some illustrations are only crude sketches copied from Harrington's ethnographic notes, while others are sketches derived from photographs showing Harrington demonstrating the use of a particular item. Also included are photographs of examples in museum collections. A substantial number of the latter are problematic in that they are archaeological rather than ethnographic, and their attribution to ethnohistorically or ethnographically documented cultures is frequently unknown.

The inclusion of archaeological specimens as illustrated examples opens some dangers to the unwary user of this volume (see King's [1984] review of the first two volumes for a similar cautionary note). In some instances, the examples may not have been manufactured by the Chumash or the other groups included in the study. Certain of the illustrated plummet stones, for example, may actually have been manufactured in Yokuts territory to the north and traded to the Chumash or their neighbors. Similarly, many of the plummet stones may actually date to periods hundreds or thousands of years earlier than the time of European contact. While there is little question that plummet stones were used by the tribes in question during protohistoric times, it is unlikely that all illustrated forms were. One should also take note of those illustrated items that have been identified only tentatively by the authors as examples of a particular category.

For instance, no warming stones could be identified positively as such, but a number of the illustrated museum specimens may very well be. On the one hand, then, Hudson and Blackburn took greater liberties than they should have in attributing archaeological items to the tribes under study, while on the other, they have proposed likely uses of otherwise enigmatic archaeological specimens.

These issues aside, Hudson and Blackburn should be commended for their considerable efforts at compiling all this diverse information into a readily usable form. Of all the categories of material culture described in the five volumes, those covered by this volume must have been more difficult to deal with because many of the formal attributes of these items are purely symbolic, thus causing a number of problems in linking classes of material objects with specific documentary descriptions.

REFERENCE

King, Chester
1984 *Review of* The Material Culture of the Chumash Interaction Sphere, Vols. I and II. Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology 6:285-287.

Pottery of the Great Basin and Adjacent Areas. *Suzanne Griset*, ed. University of Utah *Anthropological Papers* No. 111, 1986, 170 pp., 34 figs., 5 tables, annotated and indexed bibliography, $17.50 (paper).

Reviewed by:
DONALD W. FORSYTH
Dept. of Anthropology, Brigham Young Univ., Provo, UT 84602.

The papers in this volume represent the results of a pottery workshop held in April, 1983, in Bishop, California, to discuss the "plain wares" of the Great Basin and adjacent areas. In contrast to many other regions of North America, pottery analysis has not received the kind of attention that it perhaps deserves. The ceramics of the Great Basin consist, for the most part, of undecorated "utility" pottery manufactured in relatively simple vessel forms that lack the diagnostic characteristics of decorated ceramics so useful in other regions for establishing chronological control or assigning cultural affiliation. As the editor of this volume points out, the plain ware pottery of the Great Basin is "understudied, often neglected, and largely misunderstood." The present volume is an attempt to remedy this situation by determining the status of ceramic analysis in the region, and the direction that future studies should take. The 12 papers making up the volume are presented under three major headings: (1) Overviews of Great Basin Ceramic Analysis; (2) Areal Reports; and (3) Analytic Approaches.

The "Overview" section contains two papers originally written in 1959 and 1983 respectively. Interestingly, although written over 20 years apart, both make a similar argument about the "brown ware" pottery of the Great Basin: that although there is considerable variability in the plain wares of the region, the definition of three distinct "wares" (Southern Paiute Utility Ware, Owens Valley Brown Ware, and Shoshoni Ware) previously defined for various Great Basin regions, is premature. However, the reasons for this conclusion are somewhat different. Prince's article, representing a period when relatively little had been published on Great Basin ceramics, argued that, in contrast to surrounding regions, Great Basin plain wares resembled one another fairly closely, and that they represented "local variations within a single pottery-making tradition."