mentary, rather than as critique. The book deserves detailed
attention from anyone trying to understand site formation, ap-
proaching site analysis, or studying hunter-gatherer spatial
behaviour; and much valuable discussion has necessarily been
overlooked in this review. Yellen concluded: "...if I have done no
more than indicate some of the unsuspected limitations and
problems that confront the archaeologist, noted a few fruitful lines
for further investigation, and offered several techniques and
approaches that will further these ends, then I believe this con-
tribution to be a useful one" (p.136). If the volume still deserves
discussion after 10 years, that belief was clearly justified.

volume, and is intended as a com-
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