

In conclusion, this is a useful, thought-provoking book, but all-too-short and imbalanced. More fully developed examples from remote prehistory and from other world regions would have been useful. At any rate, one hopes that this and other works will help effectuate a rapprochement between anthropological archeology and socioeconomic history.

Oral History Index: An International Directory of Oral History Interviews, Meckler Corporation, 1990. \$75.00 (Cloth)

by

Douglas R. Givens
Department of Behavioral Sciences
Saint Louis Community College-Meramec
Saint Louis, Missouri

Meckler Corporation has done a great service to those of us interested in using the vehicle of oral history of aid in the writing of the history of archaeology. There are close to 2000 entries in the volume. Among the entries there are a few archaeologists listed from North America.

The listings of oral histories are alphabetically arranged in the volume. There is also a very handy and informative listing Oral History Centers in the back of the volume that researchers interest in the history of archaeology might find valuable. The Meckler Corporation has not indicated whether this volume will be continually updated. If it is in the future, the volume would be better used in a computerized database format for easy access. If the current effort is indeed continually updated it will be a great source of information to those of us doing work in the history of archaeology in the future.

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5334/bha.02206>

Recovering the Tracks. The Story of Australian Archaeology, by David Horton, Aboriginal Studies Press, Canberra, xviii + 360pp., illustrations, ISBN 0-85575-1, 1991, (Paper Only)

by

Timothy Murray
Clare Hall, Cambridge/
Department of Archaeology
LaTrobe University,
Bundoora, Victoria 3083, Australia

This history of archaeology in Australia has been pretty well served since Mulvaney's highly influential survey of three hundred years of opinion about the nature of Australian Aboriginal people (1958). Indeed, the long-running debate about the identity of Australian archaeology, particularly about the extent to which it has developed a distinctive style, or whether its fundamental precepts and orientations remain essentially undeveloped derivations from English and North American influences, has tended to provide a ready market for research into the history of Australian archaeology (see e.g. Golson 1986; McBryde 1986; Meehand and Jones 1988; Murray and White 1981, Murray *in press* (a) *in press* (b)).

Other spurs to research such as the need to monitor the development of heritage legislation (McBryde 1985, Mulvaney 1979, 1989;) of major institutions such as the Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies (Mulvaney 1986; Peterson 1990) or of various of the other Museums or Departments of Anthropology or Archaeology around the country (have created a situation where practitioners seek a more comprehensive understanding of the nature and context of archaeology as a social and cultural institution, as well as a discipline.

On a slightly more abstract level Australian historians of archaeology have focused their attention on the professionalisation of their discipline, on parallel (but sometimes divergent) histories of Aboriginal anthropology and history, and of course on the role of postcolonial science in the building of postcolonial cultures (see Mulvaney 1988; Murray *in press* (c)). To put the matter bluntly, the history of Australian archaeology is also a sociology of Australian archaeologists, as well as a context within which observers of the Australian cultural scene can help to study the genesis and development of Australianess. Naturally these concerns are shared by many historians of archaeology in other parts of the world (see e.g. the contributions of Pinsky and Wylie 1990), and I raise them here because *Recovering the Tracks* pursues a very different course, one that would have seemed mainstream as recently as five years ago. This feeling that we have something out of time, if not out of place, makes reviewing the present work a difficult task.

I say out of time, because the approach used by Horton is reminiscent of that used by Glyn Daniel in *The Origins and Growth of Archaeology* (1964), which entails short overview-type introductions to groups of extracted culled from the relevant primary sources - usually statements made by contemporary observers during some important passage in the history of archaeology. Beginning with William Dampier in 1699 (with excerpt partnered by a nice picture of the gentleman, and some brief biographical details) Horton moves us through the early explorers of Australia to early systematic "amateurs" on to early work done on Australian archaeology, new synthesis, and (finally) a special section on the important paleoanthropological sites of Kow Swamp and Lake Mungo.

The lineup of characters is fairly predictable, as is the choice of material excerpted - some of which are the raw material of countless undergraduate essays on the history of Australian archaeology. Although I have little sympathy with the idea of "edited highlights" the worst examples are what Horton did to a series of papers by Etheridge (1890), Edgeworth David (1923), and Pilleine (1928), the collection probably has some worth as a sampler. This kind of approach can only work if the overview-type introductions are meaty enough on matters of context and direction. This has not happened in the case of the present volume. Although Horton gives us a fair sample of what archaeology, either internal to archaeology itself (such as the influence of Lubbock, Tylor, Radcliffe-Brown, J.G.D. Clark, Gordon Childe, or even Lewis Binford), or nominally external to it, such as heritage legislation, the significance of relationships between Aboriginal people and archaeologists, the development of the institutional framework of the discipline, etc., etc.,. Thus the archaeology changes for reasons more to do with the personalities of the archaeologists and the material they recovered than with anything else.

Horton is probably right in his view that the volume may well serve to alert students and others of the existence of a complex (and sometimes complicated) history of Australian archaeology. It is also true that there are occasions when Horton can produce effective and interesting syntheses, such as in the general introduction to the volume. But these virtues are dimmed by the general flatness of what follows. It seems to me that we all might have been better served if Horton had written a history of Australian archaeology himself, and argued the points he has made very superficially in the introductory sections at greater length. Nonetheless for those outside Australia who might have difficulty in obtaining some of the more arcane references Horton's sampler should make life easier if not particularly richer.

References Cited

Critical Traditions in Contemporary Archaeology

1990 edited by Valerie Pinsky and Alison Wylie, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

David, Sir T.W.E.

1923 "Geological Evidence for the Antiquity of man in the Common Wealth with Special Reference to the Tasmanian Aborigines", *Papers and Proceedings of the Royal Society of Tasmania*, 1923:109:150.

Etheridge, R.

1890 "Has Man a Geological History in Australia?", *Proceedings of the Linnean Society of New South Wales*, 15:259-266.).

Golson, J.

1986 "Old Guards and New Waves: Reflections on Antipodean Archaeology 1954-1975", *Archaeology in Oceania*, 21(1):13-28.

McBryde, I.

1986 "Australia's Once And Future Archaeology", *Archaeology in Oceania*, 21(1): 13-28.

Meehan, B. and R. Jones

1988 "Preface", in *Archaeology With Ethnography: An Australian Perspective*, edited by B. Meehan and R. Jones, Research School of Pacific Studies: Canberra.

Mulvaney, D.J.

1958 "The Australian Aborigines 1606-1929: Opinion and Fieldwork, Parts I and II", *Historical Studies Australia and New Zealand*, 8:131-151 and 297-314.

1979 "Blood from Stones and Bones", *Aboriginal Australians, Australian Prehistory*, *Search*, 10:214-218.

1986 "A Sense of Making History": Australian Aboriginal Studies, 1961-1986", *Australian Aboriginal Studies* 2:48-65.

1988 "Australiasian Anthropology and ANSAAS "Strictly Scientific and Critical"", in *The Commonwealth of Science*, pp. 196-221, Oxford University Press, Melbourne.

1989 "Aboriginal Australia: Custodianship or Ownership?" *Heritage News*, 11(4):11-12.

Murray, Tim

In Press (a) *Aboriginal Australia. Diversity, Survival, Continuity (Re)Creation, Volume One of the Oxford History of Australia*, Oxford University Press, Melbourne.

In Press (b) "History and Australian Archaeology: The Discourse of Australian Prehistoric Archaeology", in *Power, Knowledge and Aborigines: A Special Issue of the Journal of Australian Studies*, Melbourne.

In Press (c) "Tasmania and the Constitution of 'The Dawn of Humanity'", *Antiquity*, 66.

and J.P. White

1981 "Cambridge in the Bush?", *World Archaeology*, 13(2): 255-263.

Peterson, N.

1990 "Studying Man and Man's Nature': The History of Institutionalization of Aboriginal Anthropology", *Australian Aboriginal Studies*, 1990 (2):3-19.

Paulleine, R.

1928 "The Tasmanians and Their Stone Culture", *Australian Association for The Advancement of Sciences* 19:294-314.

Who Owns the Past?

1985 edited by I. McBryde, Oxford University Press, Melbourne.

Howard Carter and the Discovery of Tutankhamun, H.V.F. Winstone, Constable, London, 1991, 333 pages. 20.00 pounds sterling (Cloth).

by

Alexander C. Niven
Department of History
Saint Louis Community College-Meramec

This is a fascinating book dealing with a memorable character. To really understand all the trials and tribulations associated with the discover of Tutankhamun's tomb in 1922, one must read this book more than once.

This book should be read first as a character study of a complex individual who rose from humble beginnings in Norfolk, England, to perhaps the most famous archaeologist of this century. Howard Carter was a gifted child whose drawings of antiquities attracted the attention of Lord and Lady Amberst who sponsored his first trip to Egypt as an assistant draughtsman under the supervision of Flinders Petrie. Petrie had already established a reputation for himself as an Egyptologist and, unless one had the eye and skills as exhibited by Carter, there would have been little or no chance for such a job or assignment.

Carter had the eye as well as the feel for detail and color. A stickler for minutiae, he quickly earned the respect and admiration of those who relied upon him to supply what others may have considered chores and bores. The stress here is on "admiration" and "respect." rather than feelings of friendship and personal likes. Carter was not a man one could love - he was first and foremost a curmudgeon who, as time passed, became more and more conscious of his importance.