

are not mentioned in this history but it is worth noting that besides his well known pioneering excavation of a burial mound in 1784 he sent out a circular letter for the APS to secure information on archaeological remains, stating, "The American Philosophical Society have [sic] always considered the antiquity, changes, and present state of their own country as primary objects of their research" (quoted in Willey and Sabloff, *A History of American Archaeology*, 1980, p. 28).

Nevertheless archaeology remained a minor part of APS activities until it began its small grants program in 1933, with emphasis on the humanities and social sciences. In the next 60 years it made grants to 12,000 scholars and scientists for a total of \$15,000,000. The APS has also published in its *Transactions* the work of many archaeologists, such as Kate Peck Kent, Rene Millon, R. S. MacNeish, Luther S. Cressman, and Joffre Coe, to name only a few.

Today the library and manuscript archives of the APS are an important resource for this history of archaeology, as well as many other disciplines. Its main emphases are "Frankliniana; American Colonial and Revolutionary history; and Native American languages, archaeology, and ethnology" (p. 81). It should be noted that its library is open to all without charge and that there are few limitations on using its collections. The APS is the repository for fieldnotes, letters, records, and other documents given by scholars in every field.

This *Brief History* is, unfortunately, much less a history of the APS's scholarly activities than of its changing organizational structure, its physical facilities, its financial ups and downs, and its officers. However, anyone interested in the history of archaeology should focus on its extraordinary riches of information rather than its buildings and personnel.

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5334/bha.03215>

## VI. Activities of Various Academic Gatherings Related to the History of Archaeology

A panel discussion "Preserving the Anthropological Record" was held during the November 1993 annual meeting of the American Anthropological Association. The session, held on 19 November, was organized by Nancy J. Parezo (Arizona State Museum) and chaired by Robert V. Kemper (Southern Methodist University). The purpose of the session was to continue previous work on developing strategies to better preserve the anthropological record.

Joseph A. Tiffany (California Polytechnic-Pomona) and Patricia A. McCormack (Provincial Museum of Alberta) organized and cochaired a symposium entitled "Museum Archaeology in the '90's" at the 51st Plains Conference in Saskatoon, Saskatchewan in October 1993. The session covered new collecting initiatives, current concerns, and new directions in museum-based research and popular interpretation.

"Ape/Man/Ape/Man 1600-2000", symposium du Congrès international "Pithecanthropus Centennial (1893-1993)", Leyde, was held 26 June-1 July 1993. Information can be obtained from R. Corbey, Department of Philosophy, Tilburg University, Post Office Box 90153, 5000 Le Tilburg, Pay-Bas.

Dr. Terry A. Barnhart presented a paper "Archaeology and History: A Critical Connection at the Spring 1993 meeting of the Ohio Archaeological Council.

The symposium "Disciplinary Boundaries and the Study of Early Humans, 1860-1940" was held during the History of Science Society annual meeting (11-14 November) in Santa Fe, Mexico. Participants included Henrika Kuklick (chair, University of Pennsylvania), A. Bowdoin Van Riper (Franklin and Marshall College), "After Abbéville: Redrawing the Geology-Archaeology Boundary in Britain, 1860-1880"; David K. van Keuren (Naval Research Laboratory), "Man Culture, and Science: Disciplinary Definition and Change in Mid-to late Victorian Anthropology", Valerie Pinsky (Smithsonian), "Boundaries and Professionalization in American Archaeology Between the Wars"; comment, by Curtis M. Hinsley (Northern Arizona University).

*South Asian Archaeology 1989* has been published by Prehistory Press (1993). The volume is made up of papers from the Tenth International Conference of South Asian Archaeologists in Western Europe, Musée National de Arts Asiatiques. The volume is edited by Catherine Jarrige.

Dr. Alice B. Kehoe writes: "Carol I. Mason (University of Wisconsin-Fox Valley) read a paper, "The Archaeology of Paul Radin" at the Midwest Archaeological Conference, Milwaukee, Wisconsin on 24 October 1993. Mason contrasts Radin's early (1915-1923) ethnographic conclusions from his fieldwork with the Winnebago, with his 1945-1949 publications in which he describes an earlier matrilineal, stratified society. She accounts for the contradiction between his earlier and later conclusions by pointing out his conviction, in his *The Story of the American Indian* (1927, 1934, 1937 editions), that North American Indians were strongly influenced by the Nuclear American civilizations, and that archaeology demonstrated the influence of the Maya in the United States. Mason concludes with the irony that most archaeologists working with Oneota data, likely to represent ancestral Winnebago (among other nations), attempt to reconcile these data with Radin's late work that was itself his effort to reconcile ethnographic data with archaeology!"

Pamela Smith (Lucy Cavendish College, Cambridge, England) sends word of a gathering on "Critical Histories of British Archaeology":

### CRITICAL HISTORIES OF BRITISH ARCHAEOLOGY: SUMMARY OF JULY [1993] MEETING

#### Session Abstract

The historiography of archaeology has been a growing subject in recent years, both in this country and in the United States, evidenced by a number of brief publications on differing topics, and this publication. It is clear, from informal discussion with other archaeologists, and from more formal discussion at the one-day meeting on this subject held in Cambridge in July, that historiography - the writing of critical histories - is something which many are interested in, yet which is not recognized as a "proper" area of study. This meeting was intended to help set the development of this new area within a more coherent framework, and to start to define the important issues within it. This process will be continued at the December 1993 Theoretical Archaeology Group meeting at Durham University and hopefully will culminate in an edited volume of studies in the near future.

Here follows a brief summary of all the papers given at the meeting:

#### Christopher Evans - Model Excavations: Presentation, Textuality and Graphic Literacy

This paper explores changes in archaeological presentation in Britain during the later half of the 19th century and first half of this. Issue is taken with Hodder's 1989 Foucault-inspired paper, "Writing Archaeology: Site Reports in Context" (*Antiquity* 63:268-74), concerned with increasingly disembodied and disciplinary-codified professionalism in the later 19th century (the disappearing 'I'). Arguing that all is not 'text', this paper takes as its starting point siteplan models that were employed to illustrate excavations well before the subject's graphic language was established. A different way of seeing the past (tactile and architectonic), such modeling greatly influenced interpretation of sites. Cited in printed 'communications' of the day and an accompaniment to lectures (previous to photographic slides), they structured public performance and their appreciation is essential if early site reports are to be understood in due context.

The impact of changes in graphic media is also charted (e.g. lithography vs. engraving; photography). These practical developments/ 'knowledges' were a determining factor in the establishment of discipline's graphic style. For example, in contrast to engraving, which required the intervention of a contracted craftsman (i.e. an engraver), lithography permitted the direct access of the author/ archaeologist to the media of reproduction. In other words, lithography liberated graphics from a long-established craft tradition that had hindered the development of subject-specific conventions. Of course, lurking behind these developments are inter-disciplinary 'borrowings'. It took time for archaeology to find its voice and it drew extensively upon architectural/engineering, and even military, modes of representation.

Archaeology was not professionalised and its graphic language not codified until ca. 1930-40. To back-date these developments into the 19th century is to dismiss an important phase of exploration when a 'grammar' and framework for excavation reports was worked out. In conclusion it is argued that recent historiographic studies place far too much emphasis upon text, ignoring graphics and the media of representation: the little referred to 'practicalities' which have played such a key role in the constitution of the subject's conceptual framework.

#### Michael Morris - Reference Networks

This paper looked at the issue of "reference networks" - that body of accepted knowledge which facilitates academic discussion. It was argued that this originated in the early nineteenth century, when there was enough known archaeological evidence for the subject to be referenced in its own terms, rather than in those of literary and historical sources. Often archaeological excavations were reported orally to local and national societies, often being recorded in the minutes. Written and drawn evidence was to be found in notebooks and private communication. It was only with the increase in publication in the nineteenth century that a greater exchange of information was possible, leading to this body of shared knowledge, and the development of a common terminology.

#### Sam Lucy - The Development of "Histories" of the Migration Period

This paper is an investigation into the period in which Anglo-Saxon archaeology had its origins. Historical interpretations of the migration period were influenced by their development in various periods of English nationalism and patriotism, where historical and archaeological evidence was used freely in the philosophical and political debates of the day to further a particular cause. Anglo-Saxon history has never been objective - the close identification made between "the English" and "the Anglo-Saxons" has meant that the latter have never been studied in a detached and critical light.

The resulting "familiarity" of the Anglo-Saxons has thus resulted in their exclusion from traditional histories of archaeology, whereas, in reality, Anglo-Saxon and medieval archaeology had an immense impact on the development of theories about "our" past.

#### Martin Tingle - The Past is a Foreign Landscape. The Impact of Overseas Exploration on Perceptions of Prehistoric Britain.

When faced with the problem of describing the landscape of Prehistoric Britain with the very limited evidence at their disposal, scholars from the seventeenth century onwards sought inspiration from a variety of sources. Notable among these were distant continents that were then subject to exploration or colonization. Walter Raleigh described the waterlogged landscape immediately after the flood by comparing it with the coastal wetlands of South America. In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, the Pacific and India also figured in archaeological discussions while at the turn of this century, exploration in Africa had fostered the vision of prehistoric lowland Britain as an area of impenetrable swamps and jungles. What effect did these impressions of the past have on the interpretation of monuments and to what extent did they mould theory and practice?

#### John Carman - Lubbock's Folly: A Tale of Monumental Passion

A folly is a garden monument - a summer house or picnic place - built in the form of something else - a Greek temple or medieval tower. This image may make a suitable metaphor for understanding late nineteenth century prehistoric archaeology. This was essentially the creation of John Lubbock, and it is thus his folly, but it could equally well have been that of the Duke of Argyll, William Morris or indeed Peter Kropotkin. Lubbock's passion was for monuments, and that passion mostly political.

A review of three major works, all published in the late nineteenth century, and the social and political associations of their authors, can reveal the essentially political nature and purpose of archaeology at this time. It also serves to explain the battles that took place both within the nascent discipline of archaeology and between the victors of that battle and their opponents outside the discipline.

Recent calls for the "politicization" of archaeology may thus be misplaced. Archaeology was political from its inception - and maybe it has never been about understanding the past at all, but rather about shaping the future.

#### Marie-Louise Stig Sorensen and Marguerita Diaz-Andreu - Approaches to the Study of Women in Archaeology

This paper focused on two issues. The first was to consider and establish the reasons why we should analyze the participation of women in the development of archaeology. It was argued that, amongst other reasons, this is necessary in order to evaluate different and often contradictory statements about the contribution of women. The second issue was to evaluate the different means we have of analyzing and understanding the role of women in the discipline. This involved outlining the different possible types of evidence for such contributions, whether direct such as surveys of jobs held and publications produced, or indirect, such as pictures, popular accounts and bibliographies. The evidential value of such different media was briefly considered.

#### Linda Ebbatson - Context and Discourse: RAT Membership 1845-1942

The published texts, including membership lists of organizations such as the Royal Archaeological Institute are cultural products; as such they can be used as indicators of cultural preferences and mental constructs operating in the formation of the archaeological discourse in a relatively broad social context.

A sociological breakdown of the membership lists shows the individuals involved in the formation, promotion and dissemination of archaeological knowledge at a national level to be members of an intellectually eclectic but socially exclusive group. Apart from finite groupings such as the clergy, titled individuals, women and those based on geographical distribution, there are approximately fifteen identifiable occupational sub-groups which can be seen, through the published text, to be exercising influence in specific interest areas at different times.

Some sub-groups were more influential than others, notably the clergy, the scientists, the historians, the architects, and the politicians. Their contributions are also the most contentious. They, and their choices of discursive object, illustrate most clearly the intimate if amorphous relationship between power and knowledge as well, perhaps, as constraining our choices.

#### Eleanor Scott - Gertrude Bell (British Archaeologist in the Middle East): Writing Herself and Being Written

An important facet of British archaeology is the practice of archaeology by the British abroad. This is a huge topic, and this paper therefore briefly touches upon one particular area: the life and the biographies of Gertrude Bell (1868-1926). Biographies of Bell have concentrated on her role as diplomat, highlighting her presence within the world of male formal authority; she moved in circles which included Churchill, T. E. Lawrence and King Faisal. Also discussed at length is her love of travel and her unhappy affair with the married Lt. Col. Doughty-Wylie. The "romance" of her life, and aura she herself was keen to promote in her prolific letters and journals, is uppermost in her biographers' minds.

How Bell wrote of herself is interesting. Partly as a result of her letters and diaries (carefully selected and edited prior to publication) her biographers have concentrated on her emotional and political involvement with men and male institutions, including her desert travels. Little attention has been paid to *her work*, notably her photography and her archaeological surveys. Equally, academic accounts of early photography in the Middle East have continually excluded Bell's work from their accounts - yet her archive contains over 6,000 negatives/prints.

What are the structures which now hold *La Dame de Baghdad* in place? This paper will discuss the myth vs. the reality of Gertrude Bell, and argue that the romanticisation of her character has enabled the importance of her work to be neglected; further, the vested

interests of individuals - surviving relations, biographers who want to sell books, archivists who feel they want Bell to "be" a particular kind of person and control access to her original papers, and Gertrude Bell herself - have influenced the way in which she is perceived.

#### Julia Roberts - Women Archaeologists in the 1920s and 30s: or why were there no 'great' women archaeologists?

The twenties and thirties can be seen as the golden age of archaeology. It was a period of great discoveries and excavations, a time of new explanatory and analytical frameworks. The number of university posts increased, as did the opportunities outside academia.

The young archaeologists that capitalised on this new enthusiasm are now seen as 'great' archaeologists: Wheeler, Childe, Fox and Clark. It is noticeable that they are all male. Women were involved in archaeology, attending university courses, excavating and writing reports, yet there are no women of comparable stature. This paper seeks to address why this was so. I believe that the reasons for this lie in the social attitudes of the time: the education of women was of secondary importance, women's colleges were underfunded, with little money for research. Women were under pressure to conform, to be respectable and this also limited their archaeological activities.

The attitudes within archaeology also limited women's contribution: women in the archaeological record were barely recognized, and female archaeologists were similarly ignored. Women were expected to help, rather than initiate, and the jobs went to men, frequently with their wives as unpaid helpers. Women contributed to the grand syntheses rather than wrote them, and if they undertook excavations, these were self-funded. When all these factors are taken into account, it is unsurprising that women archaeologists neither achieved greatness nor had it thrust upon them.

#### Catherine Hills - Hidden gender bias in archaeology

This paper explored the reality of gender roles in the archaeological profession over the last thirty years from a highly personal perspective, concluding that, although there is the illusion of equality between the sexes, the reality is a gross imbalance between the numbers of men and women in teaching and lecturing posts, especially professorships. Some attempts were made to explain this. The image of Anglo-Saxon archaeology as a "female" subject was also dealt with.

#### Peter Gathercole - Writing about Childe

Writing about Childe has impressed on me certain problems concerning archaeological historiography which may be relevant to the general theme of this meeting. Firstly, writing about the history of archaeology is a craft that has to be learnt; it is not learnt in passing as one learns archaeology, or how to be an archaeologist or prehistorian. Secondly, if archaeologists and historians took the history of their subject more seriously, they would not allow their sources, especially archives, to remain in their present state of partiality, disorganization, or, in some cases, non-existence; (I refer to the situation in the UK, specifically). Thirdly, although they are obviously related, it is useful to make a working distinction between archaeological historiography and archaeological biography. The main problem with the latter at the moment (and one I find particularly difficult) is how to avoid the 'great leader' approach. Writing about X can so easily put Y and Z unjustifiably in the shade. (And archives are often concentrated on individuals, rather than issues). Finally, descriptive history is only a stage towards analytical historiography.

These four points are illustrated by some of my experiences, notably the lack of a central Childe archive, and also the fact that Childe's large published output encourages publications where he is inevitably placed centre-stage.

#### Conclusions

The importance of historiography, especially within archaeologies which claim to be self-critical, is obvious. Without tracing the development of a research area, the assumptions which are the backbone of any intellectual tradition can never be adequately challenged. These assumptions are the product of many years of research, and each of those individual pieces of research is partly influenced by the social and political background of the researcher. If this is not realized, and their conclusions seen in such a light, these assumptions are in danger of becoming "fact". Such observations clearly have significant implications for the teaching of the history of archaeology. If, as I argue, they are so important, then surely they should be fully integrated into teaching, rather than bracketed off into introductory courses.

Such an integrated approach may help the subject move away from the biographical stance usually used, whereby the work of a few "great men" are seen as the prime stimuli behind the development of archaeology. Although biographies are important, for defining and assessing the importance of individual contributions, they are by no means the "whole story". Histories of women in archaeology often make the point that the social conditions of the day did not permit the contributions of certain sectors of the archaeological community to be recognised. A revisionist historiography can therefore go some way to engendering the subject, by recognising the role that women played in its origins and development.

It is now widely accepted that the role of a gender archaeology is not to make women "visible" in the past, but to study gender relations themselves. Critical histories can contribute to this effort, not just by noting androcentric bias, but by showing how this bias

came to be incorporated in interpretations of the archaeological record. In a similar way, the impact of such ideologies as nationalism and patriotism can be traced, both in terms of the indirect impact these had on the archaeology, and in terms of the way that the archaeology itself was used to further the political ends of such ideologies.

Sam Lucy  
Department of Archaeology  
University of Cambridge, Cambridge, United Kingdom

The Fifteenth Annual Conference of the Theoretical Archaeology Group, Department of Archaeology, University of Durham, will be held on 16-16 December 1993. Of interest to researchers in the history of archaeology is a session to be held during that meeting "Critical Histories of British Archaeology 2". The session is organized by Sam Lucy and contains the following papers: "Where is the History of Roman Archaeology?" (Martin Millett), "Gertrude Bell: Writing Herself and Being Written" (Eleanor Scott), "Context and Discourse: RAI Membership 1845-1942" (Linda Ebbatson), "The Philosopher and the Field Archaeologist" (Richard Bradley), "Women Archaeologists in the 1920s and 30s: or Why Were There No 'Great' Women Anthropologists" (Julia Roberts), "Sir Grahame Clarke: A Passionate Connoisseur of Flints" (Pamela Smith), Discussant-J.D. Hill.

## VII. Announcements/Sources for the History of Archaeology

*Archaeological Dialogues* is a new publication concerned with perspectives in archaeological traditions and with new theoretical and methodological approaches to the discipline. Archaeological issues couched in the philosophical, socio-political, and historical origins of archaeology are of special interest. For further information about *Archaeological Dialogues*, write: *Archaeological Dialogues*, c/o P. van Dommelen, Department of Archaeology, Leiden University, Post Office Box 9515, 2300 RA Leiden, The Netherlands.

Ms. Pamela Smith and Dr. William E. Taylor Jr. have organized a history of Canadian archaeology session for the May 4-8, 1994 for the C.A.A.s in Edmonton. Gerald Killan will present his biographical work on the 19th century Canadian archaeologist David Boyle. Dr. William Noble will speak on Emerson's contributions to Canadian archaeology and Barnet Richling will discuss Arctic archaeology during the 1920s and 1930s at the Museum of Civilization. Olga Klimko will present her Ph.D. dissertation on the history of Western Canadian fur trade archaeology and William Burn will give a paper on the history of governmental involvement in Canadian archaeology. The session will continue with Bjorn Simonsen's paper describing the C.A.A. history. Ian Dyck will speak on the history of the Archaeological Survey of Canada and David Burley will give an overall critical view of the development of Canadian archaeology.

In conjunction with the 1995 annual meeting of the British Society for the History of Science, a meeting on "Writing Scientific Biographies" will be held in London in May/June 1995. This meeting will continue the series devoted to important biographies, focusing on the Blackwell series of scientific biographies. The aim will be to discuss the value of scientific biographies written for a wide audience, from the perspectives of both the authors and readers of such texts. Offers of papers should be sent to Frank A.J. L. James, RICHST, Royal Institution, 21 Albermarle Street, London, W1X 4BS, England.

### Tozzer Library Online - Harvard University

Most of the bibliographic records catalogued for Tozzer Library since 1981 are included in HOLLIS (Harvard OnLine Library Information System). From July 1, 1986, all of Tozzer's acquisitions have been recorded in HOLLIS.

### LOCATION OF TOZZER'S BIBLIOGRAPHIC RECORDS:

- |           |   |
|-----------|---|
| 1868-1979 | Tozzer Library card catalog or Catalogue of the Peabody Museum Library (1963—print) and its four supplements (1970-1979) or catalogues of the Tozzer Library (1988 microfiche). |
| 1979-1986 | Tozzer Library card catalog or microfiche catalog (see above). Most of these records are also in HOLLIS. The card catalog was closed June 30, 1986.                             |
| 1986-     | HOLLIS, OCLC, or the annual <i>Bibliographic Guide to Anthropology and Archaeology</i> (1987- )   |

SUBJECT ACCESS: Only Tozzer Library Subject Headings were used for those HOLLIS records created before July 1986. These subject headings may only be searched in Keyword Subject Heading (KSH) or Keyword (KW) indices. Since July 1, 1986, only LC Subject Headings have been used and they may be searched in Subject (SU), Keyword Subject Heading (KSH), or Keyword (KW) indices.