sate for the terminological and conceptual difficulties which may be suffered by an uninitiated reader. It is a pity that this edition has so many typographical and editorial errors (*e.g.*, the fifth word of the first line of the last paragraph on p. 94 should read "objectivity" if the sentence is to make sense; with reference to the definition of the fifth item on p. 100, "paternal-parallel cousins" and "paternal-parallel nephew and nieces" are defined *below* not *above*, while "paternal-parallel uncles" are not defined anywhere contrary to the parenthetical insert). But these are minor quibbles for an excellent book.

Fumiko IKAWA
Toronto

*
* *

The Old Stone Age. A Study of Palaeolithic Times. Miles BURKITT. 1st Atheneum edition, New York, 1963. 270 pp., 30 ill. $ 1.45.

This is the paperback version of the fourth edition of a book originally published in 1933 and subsequently reissued in second and third editions in 1949 and 1956. In his preface the author states that it is intended for beginners.

It is one of the curious features of Old World prehistory that no one any longer writes those meaty volumes introducing students in detail to the subject which were so prevalent and useful to an earlier generation. Perhaps the field has now become too complex for the production of such grand old English-language classics as Lubbock's *Prehistoric Times*, McCurdy's *Human Origins*, Osborn's *Men of the Old Stone Age*, Obermaier's *Fossil Man in Spain*, Sollas' *Ancient Hunters* or Macalister's *Textbook of European Archaeology;* but complexity does not seem to have daunted writers in other branches of archaeology and anthropology. Whatever the reason, Professor Burkitt's book, which occupied an honourable place among these classics when it first came out as a good introduction to the Palaeolithic, no longer can be considered in that light and fails to fill the present need for such an introductory work.

The author states in advance that he has made "one or two major changes in this edition and some minor additions and alterations to bring the volume as far as possible up to date." The trouble is that one or two major changes are not enough; what is needed today is a wholly new book and the present one, as even a glance at the table of contents shows, is very little changed in treatment from the previous three editions. The book carries on in the tradition of thinking in Palaeolithic archaeology which was understandable perhaps before World War II but which is far behind the times today. It is a pity, because few prehistorians living today have the wide range of experience of Professor Burkitt who was trained in Palaeolithic studies by the Abbé Breuil over half a century ago.

Perhaps the greatest fault in the book is that although it purports to introduce the reader to the Old Stone Age, it in fact restricts this introduction

almost entirely to the Palaeolithic of Western Europe and particularly of England and France. Africa and Asia are barely mentioned, yet four of the fifteen chapters are devoted to the Upper Palaeolithic art of Western Europe. This attitude might have been justified thirty years ago, but it seems dreadfully parochial today when it is apparent that for most of Palaeolithic times Europe was of relatively little consequence in world cultural or physical evolution. (Yet Professor Burkitt has himself published important works on areas outside Europe; one has only to think of his *South Africa's Past in Stone and Paint,* a most valuable contribution when it appeared in 1928.) Indeed, one has a certain feeling of timelessness in reading this edition, as if the subject had remained nearly stationary for the past three decades. The Kanam and Kanjera fossils are suggested as evidence of very early *Homo sapiens* (p. 135); only with the greatest reluctance, one feels, is Piltdown man put aside, since on p. 132 we are told that the Heidelberg jaw "is quite unlike the one found at Piltdown"; and how many "beginners" will recognize that optimistic fossil of the Gay Twenties, M. Coué, who is brought in on p. 224 to illustrate the power of suggestion in Palaeolithic art? Simple slips in editing the latest edition, perhaps; but when such anachronisms occur in such large numbers it convinces one that what was needed was a complete rewriting job rather than what Collingwood would call a scissors-and-paste job of amending here and there. (Typical of the casual attitude is the fact that an error in the 1933 edition, which describes a Saharan site as being located 1800 miles *east* of the Nile, has remained uncorrected in all editions since and stands out unrepentantly on p. 247 of the present book.)

There are more serious anachronisms. There is a nostalgic note in the statement that the earliest artifacts in Europe belong to the "Eolithic Period", and the Cromerian "industry" is offered as an example in spite of the refusal of Oakley, Warren and Barnes to accept it or the Sub-Crag flints as due to hominid workmanship. The Levalloisian is still referred to as a distinct industry although there is abundant evidence nowadays to show it is only a technique of knapping which cuts across a number of industries on several continents; the Magdalenian is put in Wurm II times; Capsian is described as belonging to the Aurignacian group in spite of adequate evidence that it is a post-Pleistocene "Mesolithic" phenomenon; the old chestnut of the Solutreans as armed invaders from the East who subjugated the previous peoples of Western Europe and maintained themselves as a "dominant caste" is kept in circulation. The maps of cultural distributions have not changed, as far as I can see, from those in the first edition and they refer only to the European, North African and Middle Eastern areas.

On the credit side, the book is clearly and attractively written with no serious lapses into jargon. There is a useful illustrated chapter on the typology of stone and bone tools, and the chapters on art, though disproportionately long, are an interesting introduction. Sympathetic magic is suggested as the main impulse for the wall art, though art for art's sake or for pleasure is not excluded, especially for portable art. The Eastern Spanish art is attributed to

North African influence from the Capsian — an hypothesis of dubious value at the present time.

Publishers nowadays, as the pool of classics which can be reprinted dries up, are notoriously eager to transform virtually any hardcover book into a paperback if there is any chance of tapping the student or popular market. As a teacher of this subject I am continually hamstrung by the lack of a good, detailed text in English which can serve as the nucleus for courses involving the Palaeolithic. But if this book is intended as such an introduction to the Old Stone Age, as its sub-title suggests, it certainly does not fill the bill as far as university students are concerned. If meant for laymen it might be more acceptable, though I prefer to recommend a book such as J.G.D. Clark's *World Prehistory — An Outline* which, although treating the Palaeolithic in a much shorter space, is far more up to date. Putting out slightly revised editions of old stand-bys is no longer good enough. To paraphrase W.W. Howells, we need not revised versions of old books but new books by revised authors. The attitude of the publishers in the present case is well demonstrated on the cover: with the whole range of Palaeolithic art to select from, they blithely abandon any attempt at consistency and choose to decorate the cover with what looks to me like a modern artist's version of a Bronze Age hunting scene.

Philip E.L. SMITH
Department of Anthropology
University of Toronto

*
* *

Papago Indian Pottery. Bernard L. FONTANA, William J. ROBINSON, Charles W. CORMACK, Ernest E. LEAVITT, Jr. The American Ethnological Society. Viola E. Garfield, Editor, 1962, xviii-163 pp., 129 illustrations. $5.75.

The four authors have produced a very useful study of pottery made by the Papago Indians of southern Arizona. The Papago are an interesting group archaeologically, since they are close relatives of the Pima who occupy the land around the famous "greathouse" ruin of Casa Grande. There has been much discussion as to whether the Pimans (Pima and Papago) could have built the greathouse, could have been its destroyers, or whether they were simply humble residents of the area pushed into the background by successive conquerors. It was hoped that a careful study of Papago pottery and a comparison with that made by Casa Grande people would throw light on the problem. The authors also felt that a description of pottery making and disposal would be useful in the study of Papago social life, both past and present.

There are some thirty potters scattered among the Papago villages. The authors interviewed them all, and one they watched and photographed through