

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 Pairsa 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