

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 Glyn Daniel was a member. The archaeology of this period is characterised just as much by 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.

\* \* \*

PHILIPPA LEVINE, Antiquarians, Historians and Archaeologists in Victorian England 1838-1886. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge. 1986. 210pp. £25 (Hard) ISBN 0-521-30635-3.

Reviewed by John Moss-Eccardt.

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 does not add anything new to 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 any professional archaeology at all in the period reviewed: the Victorian intellectual world was full of amateurs, often in several fields, most of whom were proud, as gentlemen, of their amateurism. Adventurous British diplomats abroad dabbling in a little treasure hunting would not have 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 men of wide-ranging 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 natural 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, a very 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 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; this study makes it seem as unruffled as a mill pond. It is astounding that there should be no adequate treatment of the shattering effect that the French connection had on the contemporary study of the antiquity of Man. It is true that there is some passing reference to a change in the 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 Metrology" 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, perhaps 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 Boucher de Perthes in the Somme gravels 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 classification 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 antiquary, in which case Colt Hoare, Pitt Rivers, Franks and many others stand condemned.

It is possible that the book by Morrell and Thackray (1981) on the British Association for the Advancement of Science inspired Levine's approach to the whole business and that she proceeded, in Procrustean fashion, to force her subject matter 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 were 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 19 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 would have been just as useful to know how many

clerics there were in the whole country, so that the numerical significance of their membership could be tested. It might be worth noticing that in societies interested in archaeology there were more than a few soldier members. Incidentally, the sale and purchase of commissions in the Army was abolished in the Cardwell reforms of 1871, not as early as Levine states.

If the book's implication is that common interests bred social equality wherever savants gathered, the author's own evidence shows that there was, within national and county societies, a strong hierarchy in which the scrutiny of candidates' social suitability for membership only went to emphasise its structured nature: it was the same in the field. Pitt Rivers was the owner of Cranborne Chase first, and a 'scientist' second. When visiting his excavations he was driven in his landau accompanied by assistants riding penny-farthing bicycles, not sharing his own mode of transport.

The study is of a national trend, and surely social history must be so, yet many pieces of evidence are too trivial to be of use on a national scale. The text is padded out by the repetition of full names, when space could have been devoted to better exposition. In the case of history and antiquarianism proper the subject is dealt with satisfactorily by the use of varied and authoritative quotations. When it comes to archaeology, however, it is not possible to feel the same way. It is annoying to find that British archaeology is represented by a handful of selected figures, seemingly unconnected with workers in other countries. There is no

mention of the international exchange of ideas that went on in meetings, such as that of the Congress of Prehistoric Archaeology held at Norwich in 1868. For some reason the first Disney Professor of Archaeology at Cambridge merits special attention whereas later, more archaeologically eminent figures are not mentioned at all. It is "inconceivable", the author thinks, that Marsden could have got the Chair at the end of the century, but we are not told why! At an early stage in the book we are told that archaeology became identified with excavation. The fundamental argument of the book is that the study of the past developed progressively, getting better and better as more posts were created and societies flourished. Yet standards of excavation throughout the nineteenth century did not rise. Pitt Rivers' technical skill as an excavator was emulated by none of his contemporaries in Britain and so cannot be represented as a datum in the development of excavation. Nor can he be seen as the beginning of a continuous line of skilful excavators. His death was followed by a return to poor digging standards, with the exception of certain notable excavators abroad. Things remained that way until the emergence, in the next century, of Mortimer Wheeler, who followed the Pitt Rivers lead assiduously.

Levine's traditional approach is most disappointing; an opportunity to lay positivist historiography to rest has been missed. The book can be a useful tool for the non-archaeologist and merits a place in the library of the student of the Victorian period. It is a monument of industry, patently doctoral in thesis, which leaves an authoritative account of nineteenth-

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 dimen-

sion" 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.