

proximity and size of associated pastures; it catalogues also a wide range of portable domestic utensils; it plots the patterning of domestic activities within dwellings; and records the architecture of the dwellings themselves and notes how they vary seasonally. All potentially useful for an archaeologist, but what about that particularly valuable kind of observation, the way in which objects are discarded — and perhaps relocated later by site maintenance activities? Here ethnographic information is lacking. Although plans of settlements show middens and ash heaps, and there are photographs of discarded pot sherds, these observations are entirely archaeological.

An example of this approach may be seen in the treatment of Ali's Camp, a temporarily abandoned single dwelling and its surrounds chosen for detailed investigation. A year previously the author had seen this site occupied by Ali and his family who had since moved to a new location. Some 'on-site activities' and the general pattern of spatial organisation had been observed during occupation of the site. However, the detailed patterning of site usage is adduced entirely by archaeological methods, specifically the plotting and spatial analysis of various classes of discarded object at the abandoned site. Emerging from this analysis is a spatial pattern consisting of a series of concentric arcs around an external hearth, each arc containing different types of discarded material to suggest specialised activity zones.

It seems to me that the author lost a golden opportunity in failing to check the validity of his archaeological interpretations with some of 'ethnographic archaeology' (using Iain Davidson's definition), that is testing them against the memory of informants. After all, why bother to investigate archaeological patterning at a site seen in occupation only a year previously unless to elucidate an ethnoarchaeological methodology? A possible reason for this perceived lapse emerges later in the book: in commenting on the Nemrut Dag site the author notes that although ethnographic archaeology is the usual practice it was not used by him because of difficulties in locating and interviewing those who had used the site recently and, even if this had been possible, 'the memory of the occupation ... would most likely have been hazy'. This is a weak excuse for not having tried. In my experience people who are taken back to a site and shown the physical evidence usually have a prodigious memory of events, a view supported by a number of other successful studies of this kind.

The main failing of this study generally is that it tends to be ethnography plus archaeology, each done well in its own right, but leaving some of the potentially more rewarding linkages between the two unexplored. This leaves the archaeological investigation of recently occupied sites rather without purpose apart from showing that material evidence for the habitation of pastoral nomads does survive, at least for a few seasons, and can have a patterned distribution. In a project claimed

as being ethnoarchaeological this disassociation between the two kinds of evidence seems surprising but can be traced back to definitions given in the opening chapter. Under the heading 'Ethnoarchaeology' the author is more concerned to damn the overuse of ethnographic analogy and laud the advantages of middle range theory (also loosely defined and not used to any discernible advantage in this book) than to display his ideas on what ethnoarchaeology is and how it might be used with regard to pastoral nomads. I suspect that he would find Meehan and Jones' excellent book, *Archaeology with Ethnography: an Australian Perspective*, Department of Prehistory, RSPacS, Australian National University: Canberra, 1988, salutary reading.

The strength of the book lies in its extensive catalogue of ethnographic observations slanted at future archaeological studies — or at least one presumes that the observations will be useful for this purpose even though

THE DOMESTICATION OF EUROPE, by **Ian Hodder**. Basil Blackwell: Oxford and Cambridge, MA (1990). ix + 331 pp., 61 figures, 2 tables. ISBN 0 631 17769 8 (paperback). Price \$49.95.

Reviewed by Paul Rainbird

Department of Prehistory and Historical Archaeology, University of Sydney, NSW 2006

This is one of Blackwell's excellent series of social archaeology texts and perhaps the most exciting and controversial to date.

Hodder begins by taking a basic structural stance in an attempt to identify underlying oppositions in the early Neolithic of the Near East and of south east Europe. The main focus is on Europe and we are told that a volume dealing exclusively with the Near East can be expected in the future.

His starting point, although Hodder denies having one (p.1), is the symbolism associated with the well known sites of Lepenski Vir, Catal Huyak and Hacilar. But this volume is much more than a simple structural analysis of these data. An initial identification of binary oppositions leads on to a post-structural discussion of the Neolithic in not only south east Europe, but also central, north and west Europe.

In the first four chapters Hodder identifies and explains the primary opposition of domus-agrios (that is, house, nurturing, female, culture, etc versus outside, wild, male, etc), as identified in the archaeological record of south east Europe.

The following two chapters discuss these underlying structures in relation to the central European evidence. With the introduction of a new structural concept of the foris, which is expressed by doorways, entrances and boundaries, central Europe for me has the 'best fit' scenario. Hodder updates his 1984 paper with the realisation that tombs are not merely copying houses but rather that the similarities (eight are noted) are actually products of a continuity of principles derived from the deeper structures (p.153).

Domus-Foris-Agrios are words with Indo-European roots chosen by Hodder as unfamiliar to the majority of readers and therefore not already loaded with meaning. But, he also notes that they are words with a long history themselves possibly dating from the Neolithic (pp.302-5).

Chapters 7, 8 and 9 discuss and explain the poor fit in southern Scandinavia, the good fit in northern France and the climax of these concepts as seen in the monumentality and division of the landscape in lowland Britain (p.271).

The final chapter introduces a long term perspective for the identified underlying structures. Hodder suggests that the roots can be observed in the scant evidence of the Palaeolithic in Europe. Furthermore, that the historical unfolding of these structures can be witnessed in the postglacial, the Neolithic and beyond. It should be noted that Hodder is not advocating structural determinism, but that structures have tendencies, which leaves plenty of scope for action and contingency (p.278).

For an Australian audience the interest of this book is probably in the practical application of post-processualism in many of its forms, including gender, contextualism, landscape, performance, domination, deconstruction and self-analysis. Also worth noting is the fact that warfare has re-emerged as a popular theme in European prehistory. Hodder does give consideration to the possibility that these underlying structures are not unique to Europe and may indeed be a worldwide phenomenon (p.300).

Although borrowing much from Bender's (1978) social competition approach and the undoubted criticisms of misuse of poor data by those who like to be scientific, this broad and brave synthesis will surely sit alongside the economic, environmental and demographic explanations for the domestication of Europe.

References

- Bender, B. 1978 Gatherer-hunter to farmer: a social perspective. *World Archaeology* 10:204-22
- Hodder, I. 1984 Burials, houses, women and men in the European Neolithic. In D. Miller and C. Tilley (eds), *Ideology, Power and Prehistory*. Cambridge.

LAPITA DESIGN, FORM AND COMPOSITION: PROCEEDINGS OF THE LAPITA DESIGN WORKSHOP, CANBERRA, AUSTRALIA DECEMBER 1988, by **Matthew Spriggs** (ed.). Occasional Papers in Prehistory, Number 19. Department of Prehistory, Research School of Pacific Studies, The Australian National University: Canberra (1990). 142 pp. ISBN 0 7315 1150 6 (paperback). Price A\$18.00.

Reviewed by Jim Specht

Division of Anthropology, Australian Museum, PO Box A285, Sydney South, NSW 2000

The sub-title of this volume is misleading as only about one-third of the papers presented at the Workshop is included. The reader (buyer) is not being short-changed, however, for most of the omitted papers had little to do with the major theme, though it is particularly disappointing not to have Pat Kirch's contribution. As a set of papers, the volume conveys little of the essence of the workshop experience, for the organising of which Spriggs was awarded his department's Lady Godiva Award for Shamelessness.

As Spriggs notes in his Introduction (p.1), this is not a review volume — summary or otherwise — of 'Lapita archaeology', but a collection of papers **mostly** dealing with Lapita design and form. The volume divides into four parts: chronology (Spriggs); how to study decoration and form (Forge, Green, Anson, Siorat and Spriggs); how to study physical composition (Galipaud); and how to put some of this altogether (Sands).

Spriggs on chronology attempts to apply 'chronometric hygiene' (cf Spriggs 1989) to the western Pacific sites relevant to 'Lapita archaeology'. The tabulation is more comprehensive than that of Kirch and Hunt (1988) and uses the $\Delta R = 0$ value for marine shell samples, yielding calibrated ages up to 120-140 years older than those of Kirch and Hunt. On both lists, however, few age results for materials associated with Lapita pottery are older than CAL 3500 BP, and most of these are on marine shell samples. This fits surprisingly well with data obtained from central New Britain since the Workshop was held. In that area Lapita pottery post-dates a massive volcanic event, the WK-2 event, of Mount Witori on the Hoskins Peninsula of the north coast, that devastated thousands of square kilometres of the island, including Talasea to the north and Kandrian to the south. A best estimate for the WK-2 event is about 3600 years ago, which would allow roughly a century for the recovery of the biota and stabilisation of the landscape prior to human recolonisation and the introduction of Lapita pottery. Earlier dates for Lapita pottery and evidence for its origins must be sought beyond the area seriously affected by the Wk-2 event (eg Manus, Mussau group, northern New Ireland and its eastern islands).