

## **UC Merced**

### **The Journal of California Anthropology**

#### **Title**

Heizer: *A Collection of Ethnographical Articles on the California Indians*

#### **Permalink**

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/71v562k0>

#### **Journal**

The Journal of California Anthropology, 3(2)

#### **Author**

Baumhoff, M. A.

#### **Publication Date**

1976-12-01

Peer reviewed

various districts and sites on the mountain belong. There is a list of plants and their aboriginal uses which is tantalizingly brief—one wishes for more detail on plant uses, but such data are seldom found in archaeological reports, and the list alone is a significant contribution to Luiseño ethnobotany. It is in the plant list, however, that one of the editorial problems of the book is most evident: numerous plant names are misspelled, a common problem in any publication dealing with botanical terminology, which always should be closely checked. There are other typographical errors scattered throughout the text.

Luiseño informants were able to offer specific interpretations of artifacts and features within the site, such as a ceremonial wand insert chipped from basalt, or rock paintings on one boulder face. There is a curious discrepancy in the use of ethnographic interpretation. The ceremonial wand insert, to outward appearances a knife or point, is unhesitatingly identified on the basis of informant statements. A unique tripod-support ceramic pot, identified as a shaman's vessel, is discussed with the comment that the interpretation cannot be verified at this time. Raymond White (1963:132-134) has published a detailed discussion of this ceramic vessel and its reported shamanistic function, yet his paper is not cited, while a personal communication obtained from him in 1956 is referenced. In this instance, we have the unique possibility of ethnographic interpretation of a specific artifact, and hence of the site in which it was found, yet the major source was overlooked in discussion of the artifact. As it turns out, the informant for the tripod pot was the same informant who provided the interpretation of the wand insert.

*Archaeological Investigations at Molpa* is the only published report on a major archaeological site in the San Luis Rey drainage. The archaeological data, in light of the circumstances under which they were gathered, and

the time which has passed since the excavation, are adequately presented, but the sample is entirely too small to allow any comprehensive interpretation of the site. The correlation of survey data with ethnographic information both in the river valley and on Palomar Mountain to provide new insights into Luiseño cultural geography is the most exciting aspect of the book, and it is hoped that this volume will encourage others to do the same. The fact that so much can be gained from so little archaeological data should encourage all of us to apply the technique in other areas. The book has already proved its usefulness in the archaeological studies in San Diego County. Its shortcomings should not cause us to overlook the valuable store of archaeological and ethnographic data which it contains.

#### REFERENCES

- Meighan, C. W.  
1954 A Late Complex in Southern California Prehistory. *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology* 10:215-227.
- White, Raymond  
1963 Luiseño Social Organization. *University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology* 48(2): 91-194.



*A Collection of Ethnographical Articles on the California Indians.* Robert F. Heizer, ed. Ramona, California: Ballena Press Publications in Archaeology, Ethnology, and History 7. 1976. 103 pp. \$4.95 (paper).

Reviewed by M.A. BAUMHOFF  
*University of California, Davis*

For the past several years, both in this series and in publications of the Berkeley

Archaeological Research Facility, R.F. Heizer has been republishing California ethnographic material otherwise unavailable except in places like the Bancroft Library, which are outside the everyday range of most of us. This activity can be regarded as a real contribution to the ethnographic literature. Most of the items included here have the advantage of being eye-witness accounts rather than descriptions from the memory of an informant. Naturally, a

group of papers like this must be described as uneven. For myself the anonymous description of Tulare Lake published in 1851 seems first rate, while the amateur anthropologising of W.S. Fry in 1904 is perhaps otiose. Taken altogether, I find the volume useful factually about particular places as well as revealing about the attitudes of the nineteenth century writers.

