questions in my mind that led me to re-read materials I hadn’t looked at for some time is indicative how engaging the authors’ presentation is.

There are a few noteworthy omissions. The authors state that the turquoise mine was apparently unguarded but don’t provide the evidence for this inference. Perhaps I missed it, but nowhere could I find the basis for dating the sites, e.g., CI4 or tree-rings. The discussion of charred beams at Chodistaas and other data presented provides the possibility that both techniques were used, as well as others. Though reference is made to Joe Ben Wheat’s 1955 synthesis (12), Wheat’s monograph (Mogollon Culture Prior to A.D. 1000) is not in the Bibliography. The discussion of Room 246, its floor “packed with tools and equipment that reflect the fabrication of special objects with ritual significance” (123) requires illustration with either a photograph or a drawing.

The argument that there was a “shift to complete dependence on agriculture” (94) is an overstatement. I doubt that any farming people in the Southwest was ever completely dependent on agriculture; hunting-gathering, though diminished in importance, still must have contributed to the subsistence base, and trade for foodstuffs might also have been a factor. I do not want to push ethnographic analogy too far, but it seems to me that the ethnographic and ethnohistoric data from the Southwest are clear on this and cannot be ignored. This is certainly the case at Hopi, the Pueblo cultural metaphor that the authors use.

These last comments are not meant to discourage anyone from buying and reading this book. Reid and Whittlesey have produced an excellent, thought-provoking work that belongs on the bookshelf of every Southwest archaeologist and Pueblo ethnographer. By today’s standards, it’s “dirt cheap” for the wealth of information provided about the culture history of Grasshopper Pueblo and the history of the project. There are valuable lessons to be learned here about the site, its people, its history, and the scientists who interpret the data to provide the story.

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.5334/bha.11206


by

Todd Bostwick
Pueblo Grande Museum, Phoenix

The Great Basin of Western North America is one of the legendary deserts of the world. This rugged, wide open, and apparently harsh landscape has long served as a backdrop for human drama. Gold seekers and immigrants of the 19th century immortalized the rigors of traveling across the Great Basin on their way to greener grass in California and Oregon. But archaeological research has shown that human occupation of the Great Basin dates back for thousands of years, and ethnographic accounts of Native Americans who lived in this desert have played an important role in the development of concepts of hunter-gatherer subsistence and settlement patterns. It is the Indians of the Great Basin that Julian Steward (1938) studied for his well-known model of socio-political organization and evolution (Steward 1955; also see Service 1975). Jesse Jennings (1957) later used Steward’s model in his development of the Desert Culture concept, which was widely adapted to other North America deserts.
This volume reports on the results of an archaeological survey and excavation in a Basin and Range wetland area in Northern Nevada in the 1980s. Contrary to the impression one gets when driving Nevada highways, a number of wetlands occur in parts of the Great Basin and these ecosystems were not included by Steward in his work among the Shoshone, Gosiute, and Paiute Indians. The absence of this important ecosystem in Steward's fieldwork has implications for his approach to hunter-gatherer subsistence and settlement decision-making. Yet, prior to the 1980s, few archaeological investigations had been undertaken in Great Basin wetland contexts. Kelly's study was designed to provide survey and excavation data from a wetlands setting in the Carson Desert, but also to examine those data in relationship to an adjacent mountain landscape (the Stillwater Mountains), which were most likely included by ancient hunter-gatherers in their annual settlement locations.

The report includes discussions of the survey and descriptions of various artifact types that were recovered from the excavations. These consist of stone tools and debitage, bone tools, clay objects, shell beads and ornaments, obsidian, and faunal and botanical remains. Kelly also examined artifacts excavated from several famous cave sites in the area (e.g., Lovelock and Hidden Caves), as well as artifacts in private collections. The results of previously published research on skeletons from the area are also included (Larsen and Kelly 1995). Kelly applies these data to specific questions about how the Carson and Stillwater Mountains were used by Native people during the last four millennium, as well as to general issues on mobility and sedentism. A generous compilation of 146 figures and 106 tables are spread throughout the report, and 18 pages of references are provided. There is no index. The American Museum of Natural History, the Nevada State Museum, the Bureau of Land Management, the University of Michigan, U.S. Fish and Wildlife, the National Science Foundation, and others contributed to the study.

A key question addressed by Kelly is how these wetland habitats were used prehistorically: by sedentary hunter-gatherers, as a stop of a family's seasonal round, or only as backup resources? Kelly then relates this to a larger theoretical question: Is resource abundance sufficient to cause sedentism? The Numic Expansion issue also is addressed by Kelly, because the Numa (Paiute, Shoshone, Ute, and others) lifeway may be a more recent adaptation to the Great Basin and therefore not necessarily sufficient as an analogue for all Great Basin prehistory. Kelly argues that the timing of the Numic Expansion is still unresolved.

Kelly develops a foraging model for the Carson Sink and Stillwater Mountain that consists of four different "situations": (1) foraging in the marsh from a residential base, (2) foraging logistically in the Stillwater Mountains from a residential base in the marsh, (3) foraging residentially in the mountains after moving from the marsh, and (4) foraging logistically in the marsh from a residential base in the mountains. Kelly concludes that people have "foraged residentially" in the wetlands for most of the last 5000 years, with periodic abandonment of the marshes when wetland resources were less attractive than other available alternatives. Materials recovered from cave sites in the region indicate a marsh focus: artifact caches containing fish hooks, duck decoys, and nets; and coprolites with bulrush seeds, fish bones, and cattail pollen. Excavations in the late-1980s and 1990s also have revealed shallow pithouses in marsh areas, although the absence of hearths suggests seasonal occupation.

A number of wetlands studies have been published since Kelly's fieldwork was undertaken (e.g.,
Aikens and Jenkins 1994; Hemphill and Larsen 1999; Janetski and Madsen 1990; Raven and Elson 1991; Zeanah and Simms 1999), and the delay in its publication lessens its impact on our current understanding of Great Basin lifeways. However, this delay also allowed Kelly to re-examine some of his previous positions on hunter-gatherer mobility strategies, and this report provides him an opportunity to express his current positions on the relationships of resource density to mobility and sedentism. Kelly concludes that linking increased residential mobility with local abundance must be considered within the context of regional scarcity. Kelly also shows how much there is still to know about ancient hunter-gatherer subsistence and settlement in the Great Basin, and his survey and excavation report is a welcome addition to the growing archaeological database.
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Casas Grandes (Paquimé) has gained prominence as the subject of books and articles since Charles C. Di Peso and his colleagues, John Rinaldo and Gloria Fenner, published their 8-volume masterwork in 1974: Casas Grandes: A Fallen Trading Center of the Gran Chichimeca. The volume reviewed here contains an introduction by the editors followed by 18 essays written by 28 scholars, and organized into 4 sections: The Core Area (7); The Outer Sphere (3); The Larger View (7); and Toward a New Synthesis (1). It is dedicated is to the memory of J. Charles Kelley and Daniel Wolfman, and the death of Clement Meighan, one of the contributors, is noted in the Acknowledgments. This volume is the product of a 1995 symposium - “The Casas Grandes Interaction Sphere: Origins, Nature, Contacts, and Legacy” - held as part of the Durango (Colorado) Conference on Southwest Archaeology.

The co-editors begin their Introduction by stating that “A number of scholars have suggested that the current conceptual framework of southwestern archaeology is deficient” (p. 3) partially due to an adherence to Kidder’s “San Juan hypothesis” coupled with the belief that all major cultural changes in the Southwest resulted from ecological adaptations. This argument is not new; several the authors whose papers appear herein have made it for decades, as did J. Charles Kelley and Charles C. Di Peso; and it must be noted that Kidder (1958:227) came to believe that certain Pueblo cultural complexes were ultimately derived from Mexico, e.g., the Tewa Awanyu (Plumed or Horned Serpent) that is also found in almost all the other Pueblos under various names, such as Ko’loowisi (Zuni) and Pa’ulukona (Hopi).

Between the Introduction by Schaafsma and Riley and the first set of essays are 21 blackand-white photographs. These are not specifically linked to any of the essays - I could find no direct citations of them - so presumably they are intended as views of the Casas Grandes world. Some are better than others; the photograph of Casas Grandes with its then new coat of plaster is striking (Plate 10). Unfortunately, Plate 20 - a turkey pen at Casas Grandes - is printed upside down.

Space does not permit in-depth discussion of all 18 essays, so the title and a brief summary are provided for each with comments, as appropriate. The first essay is by Paul and Suzanne Fish (“Reflections of the Casas Grandes Regional System from the Northwestern Periphery”) who argue that: