influential in England in the 1870s.

The record in the preservation of monuments and finds is even more remarkable. The 17th-century legislation for all standing monuments and finds is even more enforced - than British monuments and portable antiquities have now. A powerful, centralised antiquities service has its dangers, of course: as I have pointed in an ARC article (Vol. 2(1), pp.59-65), it was only a few years ago that the capricious obstinacy of its private owner that prevented the archaeology of Stonehenge being quarried away by 19th-century "experts" like General Pitt-Rivers.

Today, responsible people in Sweden have to hide rock-engraving sites from the official policy of painting over the figures with bituminous red paint.

Klindt-Jensen does not explore why the climate for the development of archaeology in Scandinavia was so favourable. I wonder if the special circumstances of nationalism were a key, specifically in the pursuit of a Danish identity to resist Prussian expansion, and generally in the long rivalry between the Scandinavian states. There was also an ethnic continuity, from medieval times back through the heroic age of the sagas and into prehistory, without a Roman occupation to make a break. The British concern with identifying racial incursions, such an obstacle to archaeological progress in the 19th century, was the corresponding response here to an early history known to include repeated invasions. Again, their lack of overseas empires (beyond fragments like half of the Virgin Islands) may have focussed attention on the Scandinavian homelands, whilst the world role of Britain pushed its domestic remains very much into the second class of antiquities.

Although Judith Rodden's History of British Archaeology has been promised almost since prehistoric times, nothing like this yet exists for Britain. Will someone please write - soon - a good, scholarly analytical history of archaeology in the British Isles?


Reviewed by Valerie Pinsky

Despite the diversity of issues they raise, the fifteen contributions to this edited volume constitute a unified, and unqualified, departure from traditional archaeology. If a major premise of processual archaeology was that the past is knowable given appropriate theoretical and methodological tools, the overriding assumption of Hodder's proposed "contextual" archaeology is that it is knowable primarily in culturally meaningful, symbolic and ideological terms. An important implication of this view is, moreover, that particular methodological approaches have inhibited rather than enhanced our ability to produce such knowledge; the new archaeology's emphasis on ecological functionalism, and on deriving and testing law-like propositions within a hypothetico-deductive framework are seen to stem from an apotheosised and impoverished conception of science, and therefore to preclude precisely the sort of particular historical and contextual understanding which any concern with these matters requires. Consequently, it is in a symbolic and "structural" (generative) approach that a viable alternative is sought.

The core of the book is devoted to an exploration of a wide range of notions of symbolism, 'structure', and their implications for an emerging archaeological theory of material culture. The four papers in Part II develop the theoretical basis of a structural and symbolic perspective, considering its departure from both functionalist and 'high' structuralist theories, as well as its epistemological premises. The introductory paper by Hodder is a sweeping review of the limitations of existing approaches in archaeology: both functionalism and structuralism proper are held to share many of the same crucial weaknesses, specifically, a failure to develop an adequate theory of social action which acknowledges the central role of individual actors in the process of social change, a consideration of historical context, and a static view of material culture patterning which fails to consider the rules and codes by which such patterning is generated (p. 8). For Hodder, adaptive "systems" are opposed to meaningful "structures"; the former are simply externally observable patterns of association, while the latter are the internal rules and codes which generate those patterns. Material culture patterning is thus held to be "a structured set of differences" (p. 7) having non-arbitrary, symbolic meaning which is relative to specific historical and cultural contexts, and which plays an "active" part in the ideological legitimation of social relations (p. 10). The remaining papers in this section consider in fuller detail various theories of social philosophy relevant to these issues: Miller reviews an extensive body of psychological and linguistic literature pertaining to processes of human categorisation and suggests its value for archaeological studies of material culture, arguing that these processes "mediate and organise the social construction of reality, and may be
our best means for understanding and interpreting the remains of material culture. Parker Pearson sketches a theory of social change based on a dialectical model which stresses the reflexive inter-relationships among individuals and social structures through the Marxist conception of praxis; in this context, material culture is seen both to embody and generate social action. The final paper by Wylie explores the epistemological implications of an overarching structuralist perspective, and rejects the sceptical assumption that the study of unobservables necessarily entails the rejection of scientific method. Arguing from a realist position, she focuses on the crucial role of causal explanation through analogical model construction. Much of the discussion in these papers is helpful in articulating points of dissatisfaction with established archaeology and goes far towards outlining exciting alternatives. However, a good deal of it is polemical, and in places, irrelevant; this is true of the extensive literature reviews which might have been more successfully incorporated into case studies, and especially of the unfortunate inclusion of the frontispiece cartoon mocking Binford and middle range theory (there are only two references to Binford in the entire volume!).

The following two sections are devoted to empirical analyses which demonstrate the potential of symbolic and structural principles for understanding specific bodies of material culture. Part 2, consisting of six case studies based on an investigation of ethnoarchaeological data and on ethnographic field work, results largely in a set of models which illustrate specific propositions concerning the ideological significance of material objects. These studies are relatively homogeneous; with the exception of one contribution by Parker Pearson which analyses contemporary and Victorian mortuary practice in Britain, all of the examples are drawn from non-western, and mainly African, societies. The papers by Kus, Donley and Moore look at spatial organisation in material from Madagascar and Kenya, Brathwaite considers decoration and gender relations in the Sudan, and Miller builds on his earlier discussion of categorisation in an analysis of emulation of material objects and its role in creating and maintaining status among social classes in an Indian context. This paper also considers briefly the implications of the study for understanding the Indian Iron Age. Finally, the four papers in Part 3 take up specific archaeological analyses of European material, mainly elaborating on the problem of ideological legitimation of social relations and its implications for interpreting material culture patterning. Contributions by Shanks and Tilley, Shennan, and Hodder, build on a particular notion of social construction developed by Giddens which emphasises its function in establishing and preserving the "sectional interests of hegemonic groups" (p. 135; 135), and Conkey considers the ways in which material culture patterning may create and maintain social boundaries through an analysis of French and Spanish Upper Palaeolithic art style and form.

The specific strengths and weaknesses of individual case studies can be judged best by specialists in the areas concerned, although many of the papers clearly represent novel and expandable approaches to the material under consideration. Taken as a whole, however, the volume is most appealing for the theoretical perspectives it develops and the questions it raises, particularly those concerning archaeology's status among contemporary disciplines. Whether or not these contributions are properly the legacy of Childe, as Leone maintains in his final commentary paper (p. 180) situated squarely with developments in social and political theory, and implications for any use of archaeology as a human
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Reviewed by Robert H. Bewley

This volume of collected papers (20 in all) is dedicated to Professor J.K.S St. Joseph, who has "advanced the technique of taking and interpreting air photographs towards its rightful status as a serious academic discipline." (Webster p.viii). The volume is the result of a conference held in Nottingham in December 1980; the delay in publication, "due to production and financial con-

straints is a cause for regret, as current work in aerial photography is moving along rapidly. Unlike many conference volumes this one is a pleasure to read as the papers are short, concise, (usually) stimulating and well-written, for which the editor and the individual authors should take credit.

The purpose of the conference (and therefore these proceedings), was threefold; i) to discuss the achievements and failures of current aerial survey and their effect on archaeology; ii) to examine techniques for plotting and interpretation, and iii) to discuss means of publication of archaeological evidence derived from air photography. The editor himself states that "many papers concentrated on the limitations and disadvantages of aerial survey" (p.ix) but I would argue that the papers do achieve (to varying degrees) the aims of the con-

ference. However, the questions of publication and plotting still remain to be solved and fully discussed.

There seem to be two main trends of thought regarding aerial photography and archaeology. One is to say that it is superfluous and not the great answer it is 'cracked up to be', and the other is to say that it is a complementary technique in the 'whole' of archaeology. This latter view can include specialist interpretations and studies such as Rog Palmer's Analysis of settlement features in the landscape of prehistoric Wessex (pp.41-53), where only aerial photographic evidence is presented.

It is done so in such a way that it can be incorporated into a 'Total Archaeology' scheme as espoused by C.C. Taylor (pp. 54-59 Towards Total Archaeology? Aerial Photography in Northamptonshire.) The former sobering view of air photo-
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