aim. A scholarly and rigorous account is helped along by many potted passages, strictly necessary from an academic point of view but beautiful to look at.

Howard’s debt to Giraud (1978 and others) is clear, both in substantive terms and in the latter’s innovative approach to the study of country-house architecture. At the same time, similar weaknesses are apparent.

The main problem with this volume is lack of integration between chapters. Each chapter is interesting and coherent, but reads like a small essay rather than as part of a larger work. Valuable and fascinating links between chapters are thus also obscured. For example, the building of houses as an expression of courtiers’ power in the early Tudor period discussed fully (chapter 2) and the development of architectural styles and plan forms (chapters 3 and 4): but the connection between the use of architectural symbols of a feudal past to legitimate the present position of the courtiers is never fully explored. Thus, the changing styles of building are exalted in no more adequate terms than “influence” and “diffusion”, while the use of architecture to display status is reduced to cross terms of sizes and splendour of buildings.

Coupled with this problem is one of lack of context. It is difficult to see how one can meaningfully discuss elite houses without reference to their vernacular counterparts, particularly in this period when both classes of architecture underwent rapid change and are closely related to one another. But it is perhaps unfair to blame Howard for a more general problem in studies of “polite” and vernacular architecture.

A minor point: the gazetteer of houses is both useless and irritating, since though purporting to include all “important domestic buildings of the period” (p. 900), the criteria of importance are not systematically outlined. The reader would be better advised to consult the relevant volumes of Pevsner.

I would strongly recommend that prehistoric archaeologists at least dink into both these books, not to ram home the tired and negative message of “see what you are missing” but in a more constructive and informal spirit of analogy. Property and Landscape shows how a heart of a long-term trend towards perceived efficiency changes in ideology and perception, in particular sets of social attitudes toward property ownership and control of the land. Howard has produced a synthesis of material relating to one group of elite buildings where the social context is well charted, at a time when the structure and composition of that elite was undergoing great change. With a little effort the reader of this book [sic] could find the development of “middle-range theory” not only of interest but useful.

The pictures in the two volumes should be coherent and convincing. The reviewer’s one regret is that they do not go far enough in relating disparate classes of evidence to one another within a developed framework and theory; one’s appetite is whetted but not satisfied. When seen in the context of previous research they represent a marked step forward in the field of post-Conquest historical archaeological studies. The main course, however, is yet to come.
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Reviewed by Ian Kinnes

Mark Patton is one of several young Jerseymen who have been anxious in recent years to revitalise and esotilise upon a rich insular archaeological heritage. This is his first book, and the first attempt at a synthesis of the island’s archaeology since that of Jaquett Hawkes rich on fifty years ago. The latter was the foundation of a distinguished, if eclectic, career. It would be good to forestall comparable success from the volume before me: I wish I could, but I can’t.

The book is avowedly written for a general readership, presumably for Cyril Connolly’s “amorous middlebrow who cares about his origins”, the readership perceived by Glyn Daniel for Ancient Peoples and Places. That particular Disney professor would have had little hesitation in defining one of the volume’s failings as “old convenes” if not, and I am wrong, he will no doubt forgive me from Elysium. But

copycat certainly, accounts of sites and circumstances, drawings of pots and plans lifted wholesale, or even cheaper from Hawkes: little evidence here that much has changed in half a century. Another failing is intriguing: Jersey is recurrently set in the context of process elsewhere thus the island is near-fall recipient of Holocene economic change, spreading all the way from Catal Huyuk: undergraduate notes (Part I, Prelims.) are to the fore, but surely mine of the early 80’s not the author’s of the post-stratigraphic 80’s.

So far, so poor, but Patton must be commendable for an attempt at communication, a raison d’être for an abstruse discipline too often forgotten, but it has failed through being boring and rather daily written. God knows what its natural constituency is, and many people in the Channel Islands buy books for title alone and others might be persuaded by the bold attempt at a Heron Books Skivertex look-a-like cover by the local publishers.

Setting aside all this, we should establish good reason for being concerned with such archaeological circumstances. The Channel Islands do have a remarkable archaeological heritage: the Lukis family are the unsung heroes of 18th century thought and practice. There are many surviving and, unquestionably, undiscovered sites and monuments of great importance. They are islands, and John Cherry has shown us what that can mean, and they are very close to France, a mainline, line, of unlimited fascination. Apart from Bob Burns’ realisation of the Iron Age of Guernsey, my own limited foray into Early Neolithic oddities at Les
Poullages and the Cambridge demonstration of notable Paleolithic circumstances at La Cotte St Brelade (now triumphantly published), this heritage and potential remains unknown, unpublished or ignored. It deserves better.

We shall take a second tack. Having accepted that Patton has disavowed the role of text-book writer, he must nevertheless be aware that the volume may well serve as such. The tentative reviewer should therefore draw attention to failings.

Chronology brings confusion: BC is used throughout, even where it must be be -- as Chalcolithic 2200-1800 BC; and its combination with typology produces a strange depart from the precedent systems -- hence the Middle Bronze Age does not exist and Iron Age inexcision varies from page to page by several centuries. On the early Neolithic the most familiar site at La Pinnacle follows Hawkes’ perceptions: my brief study of the material suggests woeful confusion of stratigraphy and assemblies by the excavators -- Neolithic coarse ware becomes EBA, EBA becomes LBA, and surely no dolerite axe-hammers with Cerny. The site is ritual from start to finish -- well worth a definitive treatment -- but not here.

On megaliths, we see much the same approach -- nominally the author’s forte but hardly so on this evidence. In Brittany passage graves are Dolmens à couloir not à gälérie. The carvings at La Hougue Bie -- snail and Acousus claimed here -- do not exist and the identifications made here are most dangerous. The entire argument for free-standing phases of complex monuments depends understanding of megalithic phenomena and the tragic mis-omnomenclature of such chambers as la Feldonais and Mont de la Ville debases a unique insular circumstance, as Hibbs and I will shortly demonstrate. La Hougue Boote, rightly perceived by Patton as a plausible contender for Early Neolithic grand tumulus status, is not disqualified by having a round mound -- Mané er Breoc was already there.

To later things: the terms Chalcolithic, Beaker and Seine-Oise-Marne are not interchangeable and, as the north French have found, such confusion breeds only confusion pro-Blanchett. The extraordinary pots and existing-in-circle monuments will not yield their places to such broad treatment. Las Hugettes (Alderney) and Jerbourg (Guernsey -- unmentioned here) are LBA sites of international importance whose implications even for Jersey are not recognised. Was the famed St Helier gold torc (not "torque", please) really a LBA import and not later loot?

On more general matters: why no decisive statement of the real status of Jersey and the rest of the archipelago, why no explanation of the processes that follow consolidation or deposition (Hibbs, at least, has shown the way for Jersey), why no declaration of insularity vs mainland as explanation, why this book? I have spent two hours of my life in reading other references and one half in writing this review: I emerge older, sadder but no wiser, but I hope Mark Patton will.


Reviewed by Nigel Wolman

This volume is the product of a conference held in New York in 1984 which was "designed to foster discussions of the intellectual assumptions and theoretical perspectives that inform historic exhibitions and site interpretations" (p. 1). The volume comprises 11 papers from North American contributors who share similar concerns based on an enthusiasm for public history as a constructive force for change in the present. It is very well produced and a delight to read and has lessons of relevance for historians and archaeologists alike.

In Jo Blatti’s introductory chapter she draws on her experience as an oral historian -- where the perceptions of informants are frequent sources of theoretical insight. She argues for historic presentations to be based on an interchange between modern and popular views. This would develop mutual understanding by the two groups without suppressing the views of one or the other, or without destroying both by attempting their fusion into a single perspective.

The paper by Pierce Lewis argues that no part of the cultural landscape is more ‘historical’ than any other. He criticises the use of "sicket fences and velvet ropes" which separate out the ‘historical’ from that which is not, arguing that such segregation leads inevitably to the belief that history is irrelevant and that it can be avoided. In a similar vein, Jane Greenfield’s paper describes her work on artefacts which feature in the fictional world of the famous novel "Moby Dick" as a work of public history. They are designed, unlike traditional public art based on historic themes, to raise questions in the minds of the public about the events and processes portrayed. While many of the papers in this volume are concerned with non-traditional contexts for the presentation of the past, Michael Ettema’s contribution is concerned with the traditional artefact-oriented museum. He compares the formalist perspectives which prevailed in museums until the last few decades -- which combined “a clear...sense of purpose, a well-articulated concept of educational message, and a...highly appropriate exhibit technique” (p. 71) -- with the modern analytical perspectives which have different goals but have presentation techniques which have barely altered. In the currently fashionable analytical perspectives, artefacts are seen as by-products of human behaviour and thus peripheral to