

dings nicht gut handhabbar. Allein schon das acht Seiten lange Inhaltsverzeichnis, das wenig benutzerfreundlich gestaltet ist, verwirrt. Buchteile, Kapitel, Unterkapitel und deren Unterpunkte sind alle optisch gleich gestellt. Manche nur wenige Seiten umfassende Unterpunkte haben mehrzeilige Überschriften. Auf Seite 174 zum Beispiel ist Teil I, Kapitel III, Unterkapitel I, Unterunterkapitel C, Unterunterunterkapitel 1., Unterunterunterunterkapitel b) folgendermaßen überschrieben: *Le caractère préjudiciable des clauses facultatives et de réciprocité pour les droits de la victime dans le cadre des communications étatiques*. Dieser Unterpunkt umfasst nur eine einzige Seite. Die Überschriften sind ganz und gar vom Juristenjargon geprägt. Laien haben kaum eine Chance, in diesem Sammelsurium eine Antwort auf ihre Fragen zu finden.

Ihre Schlussfolgerungen fasst Nga Beyeme auf einer Seite zusammen. Sie argumentiert: Die Gesetze, die die Frauen eigentlich befreien sollen, tragen in Wirklichkeit zu einer noch größeren Unterdrückung bei. Denn die Traditionen werden durch sie nicht aufgebrochen, sondern die MGF-Praxis wird durch Verbote nur in den Untergrund gedrängt (295). Dennoch hält sie fest, dass die internationalen Menschenrechte einen entscheidenden Rahmen bilden, innerhalb dessen sich die nationale Gesetzgebung etablieren kann, auch wenn ihre Funktion weitgehend auf der symbolischen Ebene anzuordnen ist. Sie schließt mit dem Satz eines Kommentators des Artikels 2 der von den Vereinten Nationen verabschiedeten Allgemeinen Menschenrechte, da wo es nämlich um die Gleichstellung aller, auch der Frauen, geht: "Der Kampf um die Verminderung sozialer Ungleichheit ... ist nicht in erster Linie auf juristischer Ebene anzugehen. Er ist vielmehr im Wesentlichen ein politisches Problem. Das internationale Recht kann die Welt nicht ändern. Es kann nur die Mittel liefern, um wirksamer für die Verringerung der Ungleichheit zu kämpfen". Dieser Kampf kann allerdings nur an der Basis geführt werden. Von daher erkennt Nga Beyeme den Nichtregierungsorganisationen eine Schlüsselrolle zu, die mit ihrer Aufklärungsarbeit den Hebel am richtigen Platz ansetzen.

Godula Kosack

O'Connor, Anne: *Finding Time for the Old Stone Age. A History of Palaeolithic Archaeology and Quaternary Geology in Britain, 1860–1960*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007. 423 pp. ISBN 978-0-19-921547-8. Price: \$ 185.00

From its inception, prehistoric archaeology has been closely connected to the natural sciences, particularly geology and paleontology. Historians of archaeology, however, have all too often failed to fully acknowledge or investigate this interaction between the natural sciences and archaeology. There are notable exceptions to this and Anne O'Connor's examination of the history of Palaeolithic archaeology during the late nineteenth and early twentieth century is a superb example. This is a critical part of the history of prehistoric archaeology and remarkably little has been written about this subject. But

O'Connor also brings a unique recognition of the significance of geological debates to the efforts of archaeologists to understand and chronologically organize Palaeolithic artifacts.

O'Connor captures the excitement and upheaval caused by the acceptance of a geological antiquity for the human species, as evidenced by the coexistence of stone artifacts with extinct Ice Age mammals. She outlines how this not only spurred people to search for further artifacts but also sparked considerable debate over the geological age of the different deposits containing stone implements, and particularly their relationship to the glacial epoch that had only recently been accepted by geologists. Quaternary geology, and particularly the efforts to correlate deposits of glacial drift, river gravels, and extinct animal fossils became an important point of contention for prehistoric archaeologists since the consequences of these debates would profoundly affect their interpretation of the relative ages of Palaeolithic artifacts found in various kinds of Quaternary deposits and among different species of extinct animals.

O'Connor devotes considerable attention to the theory proposed by James Geikie that the glacial epoch actually consisted of a series of glaciations and interglacial periods, as well as the opposition it faced. The same is true of the archaeological sequence proposed by Gabriel de Mortillet in France, who identified several Palaeolithic tool industries that he arranged in chronological order. These two problems, identifying and organizing glacial deposits and archaeological industries, remained interrelated and central problems for prehistorians investigating the Palaeolithic period. While O'Connor focuses on research in Britain it is impossible for her to ignore the many influential developments taking place elsewhere in Europe since these ideas affected British prehistorians. It can be a difficult task to retain this focus and yet to adequately discuss the Continental discoveries and theories that are necessary for a thorough understanding of British researches, but O'Connor admirably maintains this balance. Thus, she examines the influence that the scheme of successive glaciations and warmer interglacial periods, proposed by German geologists Albrecht Penck and Eduard Brückner during the first decade of the twentieth century, had on British Palaeolithic research. Equally, she devotes considerable time to discussing the ideas of French archaeologists Victor Commont and Henri Breuil, both of whom proposed important chronologies for Palaeolithic artifacts that not only influenced British archaeologists but also integrated the discoveries made by them.

One of the more remarkable episodes in Palaeolithic research was the debate around the turn of the century over so-called eoliths, crude flint flakes that were thought by some to be the earliest stone tools made by humans, but which others thought were merely naturally fractured bits of flint. O'Connor explores in some detail the nature of this debate and the way evidence and arguments were deployed by both sides to make their case. Utilizing recent scholarship from the sociology and history of science, she looks at the role of rhetoric, professional

status, and scientific institutions in the British debates over the legitimacy of eoliths. Unlike other historians who have discussed the subject, O'Connor also makes an important distinction between arguments over eoliths and subsequent studies of primitive artifacts called pre-palaeoliths that were treated differently and more warmly received than the more frequently discussed eoliths. She also makes a strong argument that while geological debates over stratigraphy, successive glaciations, and the paleontological record formed a framework for developing chronological sequences of Palaeolithic artifacts, it was also true that archaeological sequences of Palaeolithic artifacts were also used by geologists as a means of organizing confusing Quaternary geological deposits. Thus, the relationship between geologists, paleontologists, and prehistoric archaeologists was not only close but also flowed in both directions.

While O'Connor acknowledges that the archaeological debates over Palaeolithic artifacts were not unrelated to contemporary research in human paleontology and theories of human evolution, her allusions to these connections are limited to brief statements and references to recent scholarship in the history of paleoanthropology. Given the scope and focus of her book this is not a major problem in itself. However, it does perpetuate a long-standing problem in the way scholars approach the history of anthropology and archaeology. Because of the disciplinary boundaries that exist between these fields of research today, many historians write the history of anthropology and paleoanthropology with little reference to research in archaeology, while historians examining the history of prehistoric archaeology devote far too little attention to developments in anthropology. O'Connor not only recognized the close relationship between Palaeolithic archaeology and the geological sciences, but also that a similar relationship existed between Palaeolithic archaeology and paleoanthropological research. Yet, we need more research that examines these relationships in greater detail. Paleoanthropologists and archaeologists will find in O'Connor's book an interesting account of how Palaeolithic archaeology emerged as a science and will discover the complex exchange of ideas between archaeologists and geologists that shapes current thinking. Historians of science will find an innovative and useful investigation of archaeological research and a work that highlights the connections between the history of archaeology and the history of the natural sciences.

Matthew R. Goodrum

Paddayya, K., Richa Jhaldiyal, and Sushama G. Deo (eds.): *Formation Processes and Indian Archaeology*. Pune: Deccan College Post-Graduate and Research Institute, 2007. 294 pp. Price: Rs 500.00

Walimbe, S. R., P. P. Joglekar, and Kishor K. Basa (eds.): *Anthropology for Archaeology*. Proceedings of the Professor Irawati Karve Birth Centenary Seminar. Pune: Deccan College Post-Graduate and Research Institute, 2007. 215 pp. Price: Rs 500.00

The "introductory" part of the first volume under re-

view contains three articles, the first two (successively by M. B. Schiffer and L. R. Binford) on the history and nature of the concept of "formation processes," and the third one, by K. Paddayya, on the role this concept occupies in Indian archaeology. This concept springs from the notion that archaeology cannot ignore the processes by which the cultural deposits got buried and were affected after they got buried. Both cultural and natural processes are at play, but on the whole, to understand the postdepositional context of the excavated artefacts, more importance is given to the factors related to the formation of the soil burying the deposits of the site. From this point of view, site formation studies are based on a wide range of soil and experimental ethnoarchaeological studies revealing the forces and processes the site has been subject to.

The problem is that such studies are still very rare in Indian archaeology, and from this point of view, the articles of the present volume have to be considered tentative in nature.

The first of the articles in the Indian prehistoric context is by B. Basak on the "Formation Processes of the Archaeological Record of the Chotanagpur Plateau with Special Reference to the Tarafeni Valley," where "an attempt has been made to understand past human behaviour from lithic assemblages and the distribution of sites across the landscape" (47). In the second article, V. Jayaswal discusses the "Archaeological Record of Eastern India with Special Reference to Paisra Valley, Bihar. A Formation Processes Perspective," offering a summary of her excavation work in that valley. The third article by J. N. Pal dealing with "Formation Processes of the Stone Age Archaeological Record of the Northern Vindhya and Ganga Basin" is a clear and straightforward account of the field-studies conducted by him and his colleagues in that region. In the fourth article of this section, P. Ajithprasad discusses the "Formation Processes of the Acheulian Sites of the Orsang Valley, Gujarat," summarising the results of his field-work. Richa Jhaldiyal's study of the Acheulian occurrences of the Hunsgi and Baichbal basins in Karnataka specifically focuses on the details of the surface occurrences and offers a categorisation of sites. P. Vijaya Prakash studies the Stone Age sites of northeastern Andhra Pradesh, dividing them into a number of geographical zones.

The articles in the protohistoric section begin with B. Khrisat's study of the settlement site of Budihal where he dwells on the sediments associated with stratigraphy, without letting us know if this sediment study was based on actual laboratory analyses. G. L. Possehl adds a brief note on the disappearance of one of his sites, Chosla, in Gujarat. V. Shinde and R. Mehrotra study Balathal, but mercifully without the tag of "formation processes." In the historical section, C. M. Sinopoli discusses site distributions of the Vijayanagara and post-Vijayanagara contexts in the survey of the metropolitan region around Hampi in Karnataka. L. Wandsnider studies the archaeological consequences of the Kurumba nomadism in the Tungabhadra valley, while L. Rainville studies the cultural debris in a Karnataka village. M. D. Petraglia and