both ritual and secular, in this class. But this morphological attribute does not distinguish this kind of pottery on its own -- there are other formal attributes that must be considered. These are of food, caste and gender, each adding a different dimension to the context by which each category is determined in practice.

This "dimensioning" of a category, this contextualization, Dr. Miller calls "framing". Framing is defined as "the process by which contextual clues are used to decide which of the various possible interpretations should be given to the object on any specific occasion" (p. 9). It is with the idea of framing that this work should come into its own. Unfortunately we are left here wondering what we missed. Though in the final three chapters of the book we are provided with what we hope will be a clarification of this polysyllabic, dynamic network of formal attributes and information, we find only further reification and examole. We wait for the promise of artefacts not as "facts" but as "constructs" (p. 13) -- but the clarification never comes.

There is a great deal of rehashing of the original points under the slightly more generalized guise of ceramics as codes, or pragmatics and one gets the feeling that this has all been said a few chapters ago. The informal in these three chapters is never given any firm grounding, nothing is clarified. Even when discussing the pottery as a medium for social strategy, manipulation of form and context is reduced to simplistic mechanisms, validated by equation with "framing", "emulation", "fear of content", etc. None of these strategies is ever developed, and framing as an active social structure is never really defined. We are left with the 'informal', potentially the most interesting aspect of this work, represented only through the example or, what is worse, reduced to a formalism.

This unfortunate retreat from the implications of the study leaves the reader wondering about the application of the "informal" in archaeological categorization. Here too Miller does not help his cause. He offers hope, as I think there is, when he states that "...in the present work it is the complex categorization represented by the pots themselves that has formed the central part of the evidence, and this is often equally available to the archaeologist." (p. 198). We are, however, offered no clear path to these informal aspects of an objects frame, so central to its categorization. We are even told a few pages later that "...it is not clear that the variability in forms...represented only a part of the actual variability of ceramic categories, which also encompassed the heterogeneity of the social context and the variety of contexts in which interpretation occurs" (p. 202). However, we are never sure what constitutes a social context, how to determine its relationship with material form, or even what constitutes the informal within a frame.

Many of us believe that much can be done with this kind of evidence, and with an understanding and openness to informal criteria and the dynamics of material categories in social strategies. There is much concern with the existence of a link between material form and social strategy. Such a study as this, therefore, which furthers the understanding of the use of material form in everyday social interaction, is always welcomed. I would highly recommend artefacts as categories for anyone interested in categorization studies, material culture studies or contextual archaeology, for here is an excellent work with much to say about the dynamic relationship between material variability and active social categorization. Although this study does not fulfill what I consider its inherent potential, it does go much further in developing the study of material culture as a dynamic social medium.

* * *


Reviewed by Nigel Holman

Autobiographical accounts are invaluable companions to formal histories for anyone interested in the development of archaeology. Having written the most comprehensive and popular accounts of the history of archaeology during his career, Glyn Daniel has now given us Some Small Harvest, a personal account of his life, his career and the last fifty years of British archaeology.

During his lifetime, Glyn Daniel has witnessed a great many changes in archaeology -- a discipline which he has now been created where one did not previously exist (as an aside, if we accept that an important character of a discipline is its self-recognition as a coherent field of inquiry, then the histories in themselves are important landmarks). Having said this, archaeology in the 1930s, 1940s and 50s has little in common with the archaeology of the 1980s. Similarly, the sort of person who was attracted to the discipline then is very different from a society that entered it nowadays. The differences involved go far beyond the bland distinctions ("history" vs. "process" etc.) which are frequently cited today, deriving ultimately from a society with different values and concerns -- and a discipline with different organizing principles -- from those of today.

Thus Glyn Daniel has literary skills, humanist qualities and a wide circle of talented acquaintances from diverse fields, all three of which are extremely rare in the milieu of modern academic archaeology, which tends to discourage such attentions.

All of these qualities are illustrated in Some Small Harvest. Firstly, it is a splendidly written book with a comfortably personal style honed by a lifetime of writing and editing for both academic and popular audiences. Secondly, it is written with affection for the most important people and things in his life: his wife Ruth, his close friends, his College, his archaeology and last, but not necessarily least, his appetite for good food and wine. Thirdly, the text is liberally scattered with references to a vast number of famous individuals from the world of archaeology and beyond.

For almost every individual mentioned, Glyn Daniel offers an anecdote, many of which seem to come straight from the plot of a Tom Sharpe or Malcolm Bradbury novel. His retelling of incidents such as H.M. Chedwick's encounter
with a set of false teeth, his own pulling of the communication cord of the Karachi to Delhi train and the explosive cure for a constipated Army colleague, are all priceless.

On a more serious side, we are able to gain an insight, however coloured it assuredly is, into the workings of the small group of professional archaeologists of which Olyn Daniel was a member. The archaeology of this period is characterized by the absence of any real professional interest on the part of the personalities of this group as by the discoveries of their fieldwork, and in this respect, this book is a valuable account of an era of British archaeology which is rapidly receding.

For all these reasons, and for many others, I wholeheartedly recommend Some Small Harvest.


Reviewed by John Moss-Beecar.

The subject matter of this book is arranged in six main chapters: "Community and consensus", "Individuals in concert", "Past history and present politics", "The role of government", "The contribution of the universities" and "Consolidation and division". The text is set in rather small type, so older readers might find some difficulty in deciphering the spidery footnote numbers.

It is difficult to decide at whom this book is aimed. The inclusion of "archaeology" in the title leads one to hope for enlightenment on the subject in relation to Victorian society. Unfortunately, it is anything but what is already available in the current literature. While antiquarianism and history appear to have been researched adequately, the author's understanding of her third strand seems to be slight. This is shown, firstly, by her suggestion that there was only one professional archaeologist at all in the period reviewed: the Victorian intellectual was a careful observer of the world's wealth of amateurs, often in several fields, most of whom were proud, as gentlemen, of their amateurism. Adventurous British diplomats abroad dabbling in little treasure hunting would have been expected to be regarded in any way as professional. It is a twentieth century concept that because a person produces work of professional standard, he may drop his or her amateur status. Secondly, to suggest that artificial divisions between disciplines were appropriate at such a time is to go against the author's own statements concerning the need for wider-rangings' interests, such as Sir John Evans and Sir John Lubbock, to name but two. Most of the argument is based on the nature of learned societies but, because of Levine's premature division of disciplines, some serious difficulties arise. The author overlooks the many important contributions made to archaeology in the proceedings of the Anthropological Institute, the Ethnological Society of London, and various national history societies, not forgetting the British Association for the Advancement of Science; these are scarcely noted. A notable omission in her list of societies, for example, is the Torquay Natural History Society which, in 1846, set up a sub-committee specifically for the excavation of Kent's Cavern, an important and significant archaeological undertaking.

There are some errors of fact and emphasis which must undermine the credibility of the publishers' claim that the book creates "a new and exciting view of the social history of ideas". It is on the subject of new ideas that the book is weak. The period under discussion was a boiling sea of new and exciting views on Man and his place in nature and society, though this study makes it seem as unruffled as a mill pond. It is astounding that there should be no adequate treatment of the shifting effect that the French connection had on the contemporary study of the antiquity of Man. It is true that there are some passing references to a change in time-scale available to students of the past after 1859, but this is made to seem like a by-product of Darwinism, which it certainly was not. There can be no doubt that this breakthrough, including the concept of the association of finds within specific deposits, should take precedence over "Inductive Metrolology" as the "most significant change to affect nineteenth-century archaeological technique". Without the contributions of the "men of 1859", Petrie could never have formulated his dating techniques. On the other hand, it is overstating the case to claim that Evans and Prestwich had "established the antiquity of the human race...".

Sir Joseph Prestwich, Future Professor of Geology and Mineralogy at Oxford, is, on at least two occasions, as well as in the index, referred to as "John Prestwich". He certainly should not be described as an archaeologist at all. He was a self-taught geologist and former wine merchant whose work was the one in Levine's statistical analysis. His contribution to archaeology was that he, together with Evans, Lubbock and Lyell, visited Abbeville and authenticated the finds made by Bouyer during his time in the Somme Valley and read reports on their findings to the Royal Society and the Geological Society. In connection with this it should be pointed out that most of Evans' work was concerned with aspects of the physical antiquity of coins and stone and bronze implements. The author gives the impression from her quotations that the meticulous collection and classification of artefacts was the hallmark of the worst kind of antiquity, in which case Colt Hoare, Pitt Rivers, Franks and many others stand condemned.

It is possible that the book by Morrell and Theakray (1981) on the British Association for the Advancement of Science inspired Levine's approach to the whole business of what she proceeded, in Procrustean fashion, to turn into one subject, the one subject, into a structure which it does not fit. Three ill-defined subjects like history, antiquarianism and archaeology make most uncomfortable bedfellows, especially when practitioners of the last two are more inclined to look to geology, ethnography, anthropology and even natural history for community of interest.

In the list of societies shown in an appendix, no less than 10 out of 55 have the words 'natural history' in their titles, while only five have 'history'. Much is made of the clerical element in societies, both in the text and in the appendix. It could have been just as useful to know how many