

century archaeology still to be written.

### Reference

Morrell, J. and Thackray, A. 1981. Gentlemen of Science: Early Years of the British Association for the Advancement of Science. Oxford, Clarendon Press.

\* \* \*

G.N. BAILEY and P. CALLOW, Stone Age Prehistory. Studies in Memory of Charles McBurney. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge. 1986. 265pp. £45.00 (Hard) ISBN 0-521-25773-5.

Reviewed by Tim Reynolds

This volume is a well presented collection of fourteen papers generally by former students of the late Professor McBurney, including an appreciation by two of his contemporaries, Clark and Williamson. It was originally intended as a tribute for his retirement, but was sadly overtaken by his death in 1979. The contents are somewhat disparate, although mainly on a Palaeolithic theme, and do not mirror the original research projects of McBurney. Rather, there is an intention to focus on the fundamental issues which inspired him (p. xv). This intention is attempted through a concentration on the nature and significance of archaeological classification and, in particular, artefact classification. The introduction provides a justification for the linkage of diverse studies by grouping them into four parts, the first concentrating on "components of artefact variation" and comprising papers by Bradley and Sampson, White and Dibble, and Clegg. The second

focuses on the "geographical dimension" and has papers by Mellars and Haynes, McBryde and Davidson. The third part comprises papers examining "inter-assemblage variation" with papers by Rolland, Allsworth-Jones, Close and Parkinson whilst the final part is a series of three papers by Bilsborough, Isaac and Gowlett on "Early Man in Africa". The introduction is an interesting and thought-provoking preview of the contents and their place in current Palaeolithic research, but it tries hard to stress the coherence of what are clearly distinct studies.

It is difficult to comment on the appreciation of McBurney's work except to note the remarkable diversity of his interests and regret the passing of the days when the archaeological world was so open to international exchanges and cooperation.

The replication of artefact assemblages by Bradley and Sampson follows a major trend for technological studies of lithic reduction and as such is unremarkable. It is extremely arrogant for modern knappers to presume to "test" prehistoric knapping skills when nothing is known of the context of lithic reduction and when "skill" is an undefined value judgement related to post-hoc assumptions of prehistoric intent. This is a fault, however, of many such works and not this paper alone. The conceptual framework of levallois technique is totally inadequate in operation and needs urgent review. The paper does, however, provide a means of inter-assemblage comparison beyond the constraints of formal typologies, and provides an opportunity to investigate handedness and suggest a relationship between form of raw material and handaxe shape.

The paper by White and Dibble is extremely brief and uses ethnographic evidence to isolate "micro-traditions" among artefact makers. The authors suggest, however, that such units are not necessarily recognised by the workers themselves, nor are they particularly stable through time. The final conclusion that "some of the variation between any two stone-tool assemblages depends simply on who made each of them" (p. 51) may hardly be regarded as revolutionary.

Clegg's paper on prehistoric rock art in Australia aims to measure and explain variability independently of knowledge of the original culture of its production. In doing so it treats art as any other element of an archaeological assemblage, subjecting it to typological assessment and using the individual, the medium, function and "culture" as dimensions within which to discuss variability. Clegg stresses both the need for comparability within such dimensions before effective study can be made and the need for including as many types of evidence as possible in an archaeological assessment in prehistory.

Beginning the "geographical dimension" section is a paper by Mellars and Haynes which develops a more detailed examination of Mesolithic artefact distribution from a previous paper by Mellars and Reinhardt (1978). The distribution of microliths and tranchet axes over the south-east of England is studied in an attempt to explain the concentration of such finds on the Lower Greensand. As such this paper is isolated and more studies of this kind would be useful. It would also be interesting to include other lithic forms and to

compare data from excavated assemblages to develop this study; until such work is undertaken explanations of the observed distribution must remain general with ecology as an assumed major factor.

McBryde's paper examines the distribution of greenstone artefacts in relation to linguistic data and discusses correlations between these two data-sets in terms of exchange networks in South East Australia. The assumption is that the distribution of related languages is a function of long-term social relations with which archaeological distributional data may be compared. Whilst being an interesting case study, the time-depth of ethnic and linguistic units may be overestimated by such comparison, and correlation between two sets of data is not the same thing as explanation.

Eastern Spain is the area of geographical study examined in Davidson's paper, which takes time and space as dimensions with which to explore developments in the Late Palaeolithic. As might be expected, environmental change is seen as being a major factor in explaining the patterns which Davidson documents. There is a full presentation of relevant data, which may be a useful reference source although, as a footnote states, further data have become available in the time taken for publication. This paper continues the important regional study which Davidson has been conducting in Spain (Davidson 1983).

The paper by Rolland on Middle Palaeolithic emergence in South West France is important in highlighting the many problems arising from the historical taxonomy of lithic industries. The consequences

of this for explaining lithic variability are still far too poorly understood and so this paper, although not developing the theoretical implications arising from such problems, is timely. The work itself concentrates on a quantitative analysis of assemblage technologies and sees the Tayacian as a "technique" between the Clacton-Abbevillian and the prepared-core techniques.

The paper on the MSA and Middle Palaeolithic in Nigeria and Cameroon by Allsworth-Jones is an extremely interesting piece of work for students wishing to put this part of West Africa into the sub-Saharan African picture, and it also provides an important comparison with material from North Africa.

Close focuses her piece on one of McBurney's excavation sites, the Haua Fteah, and its place in the Late Palaeolithic in North Africa. To date, no similarly important site has been excavated in the region, so this paper provides a useful study of the Haua material. Indeed, it is also an important development from the original publication and McBurney's general work on the Palaeolithic of North Africa (McBurney 1960 and 1967), placing the material into a more contemporary sequence for further study.

Parkington's argument for the need to review the utility of cultural labels and terminology, in the light of current requirements in archaeology, concentrates on an example from the LSA in South Africa, but is equally applicable in other areas of Palaeolithic research.

The fourth part of the book,

which focuses on Early Man in Africa, begins with a paper by Bilsborough which examines the diversity, evolution and adaptation of early hominids. As such, it is a concise and detailed presentation of data by hominid species and site. The sketchy nature of the evidence is rightly stressed, as is the argument over phylogenetic relationships.

The papers by Isaac and Gowlett focus on the question of our abilities to reconstruct the behavioural capacities of Early Man from the archaeological record. Isaac begins with the position that stone-tool use need not imply a human mentality in the mind of the user. He reviews the nature of the data, the hominid fossils, the lithics and the associations between these two and geography. Complexity and function in lithic technology are taken as significant, and he suggests early tool-making was not comparable with that of modern Man. This paper is interesting and challenging, and leaves the reader with many more questions than answers.

Gowlett's paper again picks up the problems caused by technology and the history of archaeological research whilst reviewing the status of the Acheulean and Oldowan cultural division in Africa. He too focuses on the mental abilities of Early Man and suggests greater coherence and regularity for Oldowan tools than is generally recognised. This regularity of tool form is used as evidence to suggest a complexity of human abilities across a wide range of activities.

Overall, this volume contains a series of useful reviews and an interesting stress upon the problems caused by archaeological

history. The price limits it to a reference volume, but the contents are sufficiently wide-ranging and up to date to ensure it a place on a variety of different subjects' reading lists for students of the Palaeolithic.

### References

- Davidson, I. 1983. Site variability and prehistoric economy in Levante. In Bailey, G.N. (ed.) Hunter-gatherer Economy in Prehistory: A European Perspective. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- McBurney, C.B.M. 1960. The Stone Age of Northern Africa. Harmondsworth, Penguin.
- McBurney, C.B.M. 1967. The Haua Fteah (Cyrenaica) and the Stone Age of the South-East Mediterranean. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Mellars, P.M. and Reinhardt, S.C. 1978. Patterns of Mesolithic landuse in southern England: a geological perspective. In Mellars, P.M. (ed.) The Early Postglacial Settlement of Northern Europe. Duckworth, London.

\* \* \*

Haliksa'i. UNM Contributions to Anthropology. Published by the University of New Mexico Anthropology Society. Annual Subscription 10 US Dollars.

Reviewed by Nigel Holman

It seems apparent that one of the most important factors in the rapid development of the field of anthropology during the last quarter of a century has been the increase in the number of opportunities for publication. Of course, we all have our pet-hates

-- expensive publications which we feel have little or nothing to offer. It is clear, however, that a return to the situation where 'down-the-line exchange' of ideas and concepts was the restricting norm, and where 'long-distance exchange' was a rare and privileged occurrence granted only to the 'Big Men' of anthropology in receipt of travel grants, would be to the great detriment of the discipline.

Similarly, the opportunity for young researchers to promulgate their ideas has tended to be limited. One means to overcome their deficiency is for a body of students to establish their own journal. The students of the Department of Anthropology at the University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, took such a decision in 1980 and since then have published five annual volumes of Haliksa'i. The title is taken from the language of the Hopi and is a word used at the beginning of a narrative (something akin to "Listen, this is how it is...").

Each volume comprises between ten and twelve papers, each of between 5,000 and 10,000 words in length. Recent volumes have also contained a short book reviews section. The text throughout is presented in a neat and easy to read two-column format. Most authors are drawn from the Department itself.

Contributions to Haliksa'i come from all the sub-disciplines of anthropology. There is a numerical bias towards archaeology, which seemingly reflects the strengths of the UNM Department, although there are papers of interest to all anthropologists in each volume. Papers often cross-cut commonly accepted sub-disciplinary boun-