

character of postmodernism. He shows that the criticisms of scientific approaches often rely on misconceptions of the nature of science and an almost total blindness to their lack of relativism in regard to their own program and beliefs. Yet one suspects, Kuznar, too, has exempted his own normative views on reality. One gets the distinct impression that for him, as for many, science is exempted by virtue of 'objectivity' rather than explicit bias (theory). Indeed, his own Part 1 discussions exemplify some of the faults (e.g., an inductivist view of science) he finds in the postmodernist program. What he seems to miss is the one central and positive postmodernist contribution, namely the notion that science is not objective. In this he sounds very much like the old 'new archaeology'. Still, one cannot help but appreciate the anti-moralist, anti-activist tone and the delightful detail with which the anti-science arguments are dissected and dismantled.

Part 3, 'Analysis of the Debate', is made up of three chapters, the first two of which refocus the criticisms previously developed around his own agenda and the last of which is a forward-looking programmatic statement. Although one might have hoped for something different, even led to believe it might be forthcoming in passages in Part 2, the sad conclusion is that we should make nice and steer a middle course. But compromise is a political, not scientific solution. It would seem that even Kuznar cannot get it through his head, despite the falsification rhetoric, that science is really the business of being wrong, not trying to convince others you are right. That is why it is different than all the other sense-making systems. Kuznar has tried to step outside (above?) the science wars in anthropology, and for this he is to be lauded, but alas, tradition, his own cultural background, and academia prove too much for him to succeed. Incredibly, in view of the recent archaeological literature at least, there is no apparent room for evolution in Kuznar's science. Still the effort is a worthy one; the book definitely worth reading, but it is still far from the place Kuznar wanted to get and that anthropology and archaeology need to get if they are not vanish as totally irrelevant.

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5334/bha.13204>

F. Gracia, J.M. Fullola Pericot & F. Vilanova (eds) *58 anys i 7 dies. Correspondència de Pere Bosch Gimpera a Lluís Pericot (1919–1974)*, Barcelona: Universitat de Barcelona.

Margarita Díaz-Andreu, University of Durham

Histories of archaeology remind us of the debates that have guided archaeological interpretation to the present. They also allow us to understand the social context in which theories and interpretations were developed. This is particularly true in the case of external historiographical analysis, a recent trend in historiographical studies in the field of archaeology which is unveiling a wealth of information on past practices in the discipline. In this type of studies the emphasis is not on the actual theories, on the internal dynamics of archaeological thought, but on the interaction between practitioners and the personal and professional framework in which their studies took place. Yet, access to this data are not easy to obtain, especially when most of the protagonists and the people who knew them are no longer alive. It is in this context that research in archives and epistolary correspondence is proving an extremely valuable source of information. Letters and other documents such as minutes of meetings and photographs are providing revealing information about the transmission of ideas between scholars, the existence of academic networks, and the influence that particular non-scientific events may have had in the formation of scientific knowledge.

In the last ten-odd years Spain has developed a tradition in the history of archaeology. From an initial impetus using the internalist approach (Ayarzaguena Sanz 1992; Cortadella i Morral 1992; Martínez Navarrete 1989; Pereira González 2001) together with some biographies

(Maier 1999; Ripoll Perelló 1994) and the study of particular institutions (Marcos Pous 1993; Peiró Martín & Pasamar Alzuria 1996), the weight of research has moved to the external analysis, especially since the celebration of the two first conferences on the history of archaeology in Spain during the 18th to 20th centuries (Arce & Olmos 1991; Mora & Díaz-Andreu 1997). In the last few years researchers have recovered a wealth of documentation from archives. In the light of the pioneering research by the historians Gonzalo Pasamar and Ignacio Peiró (Peiró Martín & Pasamar Alzuria 1989–90, see also Pasamar Alzuria & Peiró Martín 2002), researchers have started to look into archives. The recent books on the development of archaeology in the early (Mora 1998) and late modern period (Díaz-Andreu 2002), the works based on information gathered at the Royal Academy of History, mainly relating to the nineteenth century (among others Almagro Gorbea 1999; Maier & Alvarez Sanchís 1999), the analysis of the documentation on funding for excavations and archaeological management in the first decades of the Franco Regime (Díaz-Andreu & Ramírez Sánchez forthcoming 2003), have been followed by Gracia, Fullola and Vilanova's revealing book on the correspondence between two of the major prehistorians of 20th century Catalonia and Spain, Pere Bosch Gimpera and Lluís Pericot. This book stands out because of the volume of documentation, surpassing that obtained in similar undertakings on letters written by the future key archaeologists – including Bosch – during their training period in Germany at the start of the twentieth century (Díaz-Andreu 1995; Díaz-Andreu 1996), or even that of other books published on the correspondence of Bosch Gimpera with political figures of the time (Olivar-Bertrand 1978; Vilanova i Vila-Abadal 1998).

Most of the letters transcribed and discussed in the book by Gracia, Fullola and Vilanova come from an until now untouched archive stored at the Central University of Barcelona. The rest are from the Pericot archive, given to the Biblioteca de Catalunya. They reveal data never explicit in publications such as the practice of clientelism. Already in the second letter transcribed in the book, dated in 1918, there is a case worth mentioning. Professor Bosch Gimpera writes to Pericot, who had graduated that same year but was now in Madrid attending the course necessary in order to undertake postdoctoral studies: 'I would imagine that Obermaier [the professor of prehistory in Madrid] has already asked you not to explain anything to the student of Gómez Moreno [the head of archaeology at the JAE, the Council for the Enhancement of Studies also based in Madrid] about what you do on megaliths' (p. 92). This letter reveals not only the existence of different interest groups, each led by a patron, but also the alliances established between some of them, in this case between Obermaier's and Bosch Gimpera's groups. The influence of German archaeology in Bosch Gimpera is also apparent, not only through the wealth of German archaeologists mentioned in the letters, but also because of an apparent Germano-filia, most apparent in his 1921 visit to Germany. This pro-German stance contrasts with Bosch's political ideology which led him into exile after the Spanish Civil War (for further discussion on this see Díaz-Andreu forthcoming). Yet, the correspondence also shows that political ideology was not a barrier in his relationship with many of his disciples, some of them of marked right-wing tendencies and from 1939 collaborators with the Franco regime. One of the other aspects of this book worth mentioning refers to information revealed by the photographs that illustrate the book. These come from the archive of the family Fullola-Pericot, and, as shown in the volumes recently published from an exhibition on historical photographs of Iberian archaeology (Blánquez Pérez & Roldán Pérez 1999a; Blánquez Pérez & Roldán Pérez 1999b; Blánquez Pérez & Roldán Pérez 2000), they count a story in their own right, which, although not explained in this book, will hopefully be told in a future publication. The correspondence between Bosch Gimpera and Pericot is preceded by extremely useful introductions on Bosch Gimpera, Pericot and the Barcelona School, each written by one of the book's editors.

References

- Almagro Gorbea, M. (ed.) (1999) *El Gabinete de Antigüedades de la Real Academia de la Historia*. Madrid: Real Academia de la Historia.
- Arce, J. & R. Olmos (eds.) (1991) *Historiografía de la Arqueología y de la Historia Antigua en España (siglos XVIII-XX)*. Madrid: Ministerio de Cultura.
- Ayarzaguena Sanz, M. (1992) *La arqueología prehistórica y protohistórica española en el siglo XIX*. Madrid: Universidad Nacional de Educación a Distancia.
- Blánquez Pérez, J. & L. Roldán Pérez (eds.) (1999a) *La cultura ibérica a través de la fotografía de principios de siglo (I). Las colecciones madrileñas*. Madrid: Universidad Autónoma de Madrid; Real Academia de la Historia; Comunidad de Madrid; Caja de Ahorros.
- Blánquez Pérez, J. & L. Roldán Pérez (eds.) (1999b) *La cultura ibérica a través de la fotografía de principios de siglo (II). Un homenaje a la memoria*. Madrid: Librería Portico.
- Blánquez Pérez, J. & L. Roldán Pérez (eds.) (2000) *La cultura ibérica a través de la fotografía de principios de siglo (III). El litoral mediterráneo*. Madrid: Caja de Ahorros del Mediterráneo; Universidad Autónoma de Madrid.
- Cortadella i Morral, J. (1992) *Història antiga en la historiografia catalana*. Publicacions de la Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona. Edició microfotogràfica. Barcelona: Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.
- Díaz-Andreu, M. (1995) 'Arqueólogos españoles en Alemania en el primer tercio del siglo XX. Los becarios de la Junta para la Ampliación Estudios (I) Pedro Bosch Gimpera', *Madridener Mitteilungen*, 36: 79–89.
- Díaz-Andreu, M. (1996) 'Arqueólogos españoles en Alemania en el primer tercio del siglo XX. Los becarios de la Junta para la Ampliación Estudios e Investigaciones Científicas', *Madridener Mitteilungen*, 37: 205–224.
- Díaz-Andreu, M. (2002) *Historia de la Arqueología. Estudios*. Madrid: Ediciones Clásicas.
- Díaz-Andreu, M. & J. Cortadella (forthcoming) 'Success and failure: alternatives in the Institutionalisation of pre- and proto-history in Spain (Hernández-Pacheco, Obermaier, Bosch Gimpera)', in J. Callmer, M. Meyer, R. Struwe & C. Theune-Vogt (eds.) *The beginnings of academic pre- and protohistoric archaeology (1830–1930) in a European perspective*. Berliner Archäologische Forschungen. Berlin: Verlag Marie Leidorf.
- Díaz-Andreu, M. & M. Ramírez Sánchez (forthcoming 2003) 'Archaeological Resource Management under Franco's Spain: the Comisaría General de Excavaciones Arqueológicas', in M. Galaty & C. Watkinson (eds.) *Archaeology under dictatorship. Critical Perspectives on Identity, Memory and the Built Environment*. Hingham, MA: Kluwer/Plenum.
- Maier, J. (1999) *Jorge Bonsor (1855–1930). Un académico correspondiente de la Real Academia de la Historia y de la Arqueología española*. Madrid: Real Academia de la Historia.
- Maier, J. & J. Alvarez Sanchís (1999) *Comisión de Antigüedades. Aragón. Catálogo e índices*. Madrid; Zaragoza: Real Academia de la Historia; Institución Fernando el Católico.
- Marcos Pous, A. (ed.) (1993) *De gabinete a museo: tres siglos de historia*. Madrid: Ministerio de Cultura.
- Martínez Navarrete, M.I. (1989) *Una revisión crítica de la prehistoria española: la Edad del Bronce como paradigma*. Madrid: Siglo XXI.
- Mora, G. (1998) 'Historias de mármol'. *La arqueología clásica española en el siglo XVIII*. Anejos de Archivo Español de Arqueología 18. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, Polifemo.
- Mora, G. & M. Díaz-Andreu (eds.) (1997) *La cristalización del pasado. Génesis y desarrollo del marco institucional de la arqueología en España. Actas del II Congreso Internacional de Historiografía de la Arqueología en España (siglos XVIII–XX)*. Madrid, Málaga: Ministerio de Cultura, Universidad de Málaga.
- Olivar-Bertrand, R. (1978) *Correspondència 1969–1974*. Barcelona: Barcelona.
- Pasamar Alzuria, G. & I. Peiró Martín (2002) *Diccionario Akal de historiadores españoles contemporáneos (1840–1980)*. Madrid: Akal.
- Peiró Martín, I. & G. Pasamar Alzuria (1989–90) 'El nacimiento en España de la arqueología y la prehistoria (academicismo y profesionalización, 1856–1936)', *Kalathos*, 9–10: 9–30.
- Peiró Martín, I. & G. Pasamar Alzuria (1996) *La Escuela Superior de Diplomática (los archiveros en la historiografía española contemporánea)*. Madrid: Asociación Española de Archiveros, Bibliotecarios, Museólogos y Documentalistas (ANABAD).

- Pereira González, F. (2001) *Raza e alteridade. A reflexión sobre a diversidade humana na Galicia do século XIX*. A Coruña: Diputación Provincial de A Coruña.
- Ripoll Perelló, E. (1994) *El abate Henri Breuil (1877–1961)*. Madrid: Universidad Nacional de Educación a Distancia.
- Vilanova i Vila-Abadal, F. (ed.) (1998) *Viure el primer exili. Cartes britàniques de Pere Bosch i Gimpera 1939–1940*. Quaderns de l'Arxiu Pi i Sunyer, núm. 2. Barcelona: Fundació Carles Pi i Sunyer d'Estudis Autonòmics i Locals.

Virginia Kerns *Scenes from the High Desert: Julian Steward's Life and Theory*. University of Illinois Press, 2003. 414pp., biblio, index. \$45.00, cloth. ISBN 0-2252-02790-6.

Alice B. Kehoe, University of Wisconsin - Milwaukee

Kerns, of the College of William and Mary (Williamsburg, VA, USA), has written an ethnography of American anthropology by chronicling the life and work of one of its eminent twentieth-century practitioners, Julian Steward (1902–1972). Her book has considerable relevance to archaeology, not only because Steward dabbled in archaeology early in his career and used archaeological data to create his 'Cultural Causality and Law' (1949), expanded into his 1955 *Theory of Culture Change*. His development of the concept of cultural ecology, the focus of all his work, is basic to contemporary archaeology, and his postulate of the primordial patrilineal band bedevils us yet. Kerns tells us that Steward encountered great difficulty in 'selling' the concept of cultural ecology; she shows how it differs from Kroeber's cultural areas, and that Kroeber did not like Steward's concept. A fascinating and historically important component of Kerns' book is her attention to the career aspects of Steward's work, how Kroeber counseled him on career strategy; how his first marriage to a fellow academic imperiled his career and his second, to an adoring helpmate, advantaged him; how his friendship with Duncan Strong influenced him, both in working up cultural ecology (Strong had considerable background in ecology) and in career moves. Kerns is also sensitive to the near invisibility of women in Steward's thinking, whether acknowledging his first wife's collaboration, or using Indian women as informants, or recognizing women colleagues, or realizing that his data on women's major roles in Basin-Plateau subsistence invalidate his postulate of patrilineal bands with male dominance as the primitive form of human society.

Steward carried out archaeological survey and testing of Puebloan sites in western Utah, along the Colorado River in the Glen Canyon area, in California around Santa Barbara, along the Columbia River at the Dalles, and excavated Promontory and Black Rock Caves in Utah. Ethnography interested him far more. Kerns highlights his disinterest in religion and ritual, which, combined with his lack of interest in women's work – he collected baskets for museums but not the craft – let him look upon Paiutes and Shoshones as among the simplest of human groups, with 'low,' 'primitive' technology. In Kerns' view, Steward was deeply marked by his adolescent years in the unique Deep Valley School, where boys from upper-middle-class families spent half days working on the ranch on the eastern slope of the California Sierras, as well as obtaining a prep-school education. The ranch used irrigation, and Steward's familiarity with near-by Owens Valley before and after Los Angeles took all its water, and with Mormon irrigation in Utah, led him to emphasize irrigation as the casual factor in the development of early civilization.

Kerns claims (page 274) that Steward's use of the term 'multilineal evolution' in his 1955 Theory book reflected an assignment by Kroeber to prepare a paper on cultural evolution for the 1952 Wenner-Gren *Anthropology Today* symposium and publication. Steward wanted to distinguish what he considered valid evolutionary concepts from nineteenth-century