BOOK REVIEWS


Standing tall as the first published book to deal with Western Australia’s historical archaeology, Nayton has done an admirable job of integrating archaeological and historical sources to inform us about the region’s early colonial period. The book’s title is intriguing and acted as a good initial draw to find out what the archaeology of market capitalism is and how it is expressed in physical remains. The introduction provides quality information on how the book deals with its topic and in doing so sparked enough interest to make me want to keep reading. Nayton’s research agenda is as extensive as it is ambitious and she uses a good mix of archaeological data and historical research to answer an array of well-thought-out, relevant and mostly answerable questions. She also develops a range of questions to be asked of future research. During the process of synthesising a considerable amount of local, regional and global data, Nayton carefully considers the archaeological and historical sources (recognising their associated problems) that together describe a transformation in the development of Western Australia’s towns and landscapes. Along the way she describes the struggles and acknowledges some of the shortcomings of the research methodologies that, with persistence and modification, have led to some rewarding research results.

Interesting regional backgrounds, in-depth research, deliberating and theorising takes the reader to the end of Chapter 5 and is time well spent for Nayton as it gives essential context and history to her topic and defines the research and its purpose. The archaeology sections that kick in for Chapters 6, 7, 8 and 9 are thorough and her detailed investigations and further analysis are of high quality. Her use of American literature for comparative purposes was most enjoyable and, in an area of study where comparative data is unavailable, served the purpose well of backing up some of her hypotheses.

Nayton’s field survey work and excavation methodologies are well-thought-out and described in detail. Some of her laboratory procedures, like using South’s (1977) type-ware-class-group classification scheme, could have been more contemporary (see work by Adams 2003 and Brooks 2005). However, her laboratory procedures were thorough and a lot of effort went towards finding ways to extract information from the assemblages. One of the benefits of her comprehensive artefact analysis is that it enabled the development of reliable chronological sequences, a commendable feat for such a tight time period of events.

All up, Nayton has been tenacious in her quest for answers and this book represents some good archaeological research. Its originality is enlightening; it poses new questions and sets the high standard of research, especially in regard to collating information from multiple sites. Scholarly wise, effort wise and in its contribution to the field of historical archaeology, Nayton’s book is worthy of the label ‘significant’.

It is a loss to the discipline of archaeology that Nayton, who sadly passed away late last year, will not be contributing to future archaeological endeavours.

Alister Bowen
Honorary Associate
La Trobe University
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James Symonds, Anna Badcock and Jeff Oliver (editors), Historical Archaeologies of Cognition: Explorations into Faith, Hope and Charity, Equinox Publishing, Sheffield, 2013, x, 198 pages; hardback, bw illus., ISBN 9781845533434. GBP £60

In spite of appeals over the years by James Deetz, LuAnn De Cunzo, Carol Nikolai and others to make religion as central to historical archaeology as class, gender and ethnicity, notions of belief and spirituality have often been ignored by archaeologists working with the remains of the early modern period. It is thus gratifying to see the challenge taken up in this highly diverse collection of essays, drawing on work from North America, Europe and Australia. The volume emerged from a 2007 CHAT conference that considered ‘how evidence of faith, hope and charity might be recovered in the material world’. The volume is divided into five main sections containing a total of 13 papers on a truly global array of subjects, linked (sometimes loosely) by notions of material culture and religious faith.

The introductory essay by Symonds and Oliver begins by disentangling the concepts of faith, hope and charity and pays tribute to the foundational work of James Deetz and Henry Glassie. Part I (‘Landscapes, Power and Belief’) includes three essays, the first on the unexpected discovery of Catholic artefacts in seventeenth-century Jamestown and what this meant in terms of religious conflict and negotiation in the early American colony. A paper on the development of urban spaces and church buildings in northern Finland explores how the State maintained close control over churches to assert Lutheran orthodoxy in the seventeenth and eighteenth century. We can only hope that we will see much more of the historical archaeology of Scandinavia in the coming years. The final contribution to this section also considers urban redevelopment, in the context of twenty-first-century Baltimore, where heritage, urban gentrification and ‘belief’ in capitalist free markets clashes with crime, ghettoism and gang violence.

Part II (‘Faith in Fashion’) begins with Carolyn White’s comparison of trans-Atlantic eighteenth-century clothing artefacts recovered from sites in New Hampshire and London. This is followed by a study of Huguenot (French Protestant) refugees in eighteenth-century England, and how their manufacture of luxury items for sale in local markets promoted excess consumption and displays of wealth, values which undermined the Huguenots’ Calvinist faith and belief in decency and civility.

Part III (‘Colonial Entanglements’) begins with Jon Prangnell and Kate Quirk’s essay on Methodism and Evangelicalism in the nineteenth-century Queensland mining town of Paradise. This is the most explicitly and rigorously archaeological paper in the collection, in the sense of relating artefacts to meaning in the context of Methodist morality in a colonial goldfields township. This is followed by Jeff Oliver’s paper on identity and indigeneity in British Columbia, which traces the intellectual shift in postcolonial studies from notions of acculturation to more hybridised, fragmented realities characterised by indigenous resistance.
Part IV (‘Confinement and Resistance’) is grounded firmly in the archaeology of the twentieth century. Its three papers relate to various forms of militarism: symbols of resistance employed by Channel Islanders in World War II German internment camps; the faith, hope and charity maintained by 120,000 Japanese Americans held in U.S. internment camps (‘ephemeral cities of confinement’) during the same period; and responses to the 1981 Hunger Strikes in Long Kesh/Maze prison in Northern Island. Read together, these three papers are not only compelling but also very moving, and successfully draw out the emotional intensity of artefacts and places associated with hope and suffering.

The final section (‘Death and Remembrance’) focuses on monuments to death. Harold Mytum uses gravestone patterning and inscriptions to explore theological debates and their expression among different denominations in eighteenth and nineteenth century New England, Britain and Ireland. The volume concludes with an account of war memorials in Exeter, Devon, and how these can be used to understand the feelings and beliefs of those who sought to honour and remember those who died in service to their nation.

The papers in this volume are uniformly well written, succinct and carefully argued contributions to an intriguing and diverse array of topics. While this diversity is a strength it also results in a looseness which needs a stronger unifying voice to add coherence and authority to the collection. Despite the title there is little or no explicit discussion of ‘cognition’ (perception, the process of knowing) and its relationship to faith, spirituality and their material correlates. Nevertheless, there is vigour and a great deal of interest in this volume, which makes an important contribution to understanding the archaeology of faith, hope and charity. It offers important case studies and signposts for historical archaeologists in Australasia in responding to the material correlates of this vital aspect of the human experience.

Peter Davies
La Trobe University


Readers of Australasian Historical Archaeology may know of the Canary Islands as a sort of ‘laboratory’ for early modern European, particularly Iberian, colonialism beginning in the 14th and 15th centuries (and possibly also as a tourist destination renowned for beautiful beaches and pleasant weather). An Archaeology of the Margins is the first book by Farruña, an archaeologist based at the University de la Laguna on Tenerife who works and lives in the islands of which he writes. This is the first major English-language monograph concerned with the archaeology of the Canary Islands. The book touches only peripherally on these landmark colonial encounters, being concerned more with pre-colonial archaeology, and the longer-term legacies of colonialism in the interpretation of the Canarian past. The lack of emphasis on early Spanish colonialism should not be perceived as a weakness of the book in this context, as there is still much of interest for historical archaeologists, especially those of us interested in the ongoing impacts of colonialism on our understanding of the past.

The Canary Islands are interesting from this perspective for two reasons. First, they lie in something of a liminal position, as a historical and contemporary colony of Spain, they represent a European territory that lies geographically in the area of Africa, and as we will see, is at least from an archaeological perspective more closely associated with the larger continent. The archaeology of the Canary Islands is defined as an “archaeology of the margins”, but according to Farruña, it is important to remember that for a global perspective on the past, “the margins are as important as the centers” (p. 19). The second area of interest, especially for those of us who work with indigenous communities, is that the Canary Islands are defined as explicitly lacking an “indigenous” archaeology as the term is usually used, in the sense that there is apparently no living indigenous community in the archipelago who could participate in and shape archaeological research and heritage management (p. 14).

Canarian indigenous archaeology is thus only concerned with the precolonial period, which is a dramatic contrast to that found in Australia, New Zealand, and the Pacific. Indigenous archaeology in the Canary Islands is concerned primarily with rock art sites, though there are also habitation caves, open-air villages of semi-buried houses, as well as shell middens, and portable heritage including ceramic, bone, and lithic artefacts. Human remains, especially mummies, have been of particular interest in Canarian archaeology, though the stratigraphic context of these finds has often been lost or destroyed during removal of the remains, especially in nineteenth and twentieth century investigations (Chapter 1).

The indigenous peoples of the Canary Islands were definitely African. Their contemporary identity is tied to “Amazighity”, which is the noun form of a shared identity of indigenous North Africans, stretching from the western part of Egypt to the coast of Morocco, and including the Canary Islands. Of course, archaeologists have not always recognized or acknowledged this African connection, which is most apparent in the chapters outlining the history of archaeology in the region. Chapter 2 covers the beginnings of archaeology in the Canary Islands from the nineteenth century through the Franco dictatorship, while archaeology under the dictatorship is covered in Chapter 3. The earliest archaeological work in the islands was antiquarian in nature, with an emphasis on removing human remains, especially mummies, from their archaeological context for display in private or museum collections as “curiosities”. Archaeological thought was driven by the diffusionist model, especially where cranial measurements seemed to indicate a “Cro-Magnon” connection for the origins of the Canarians. Not surprisingly, the major influences in Canarian archaeology at this time were French, thus the underlying aim of such claims was nationalistic, connecting human time-depth to a shared past in the motherland (pp. 26-29).

The professionalization of archaeology in the Canary Islands was only gradual, with the discipline being driven by a bourgeois elite that used their control of the past as a reflection of their power and prestige as the rulers of Canarian society. Museum societies and collections were especially important to this process. Eventually, archaeological heritage was legally recognized in 1911 with the Law of 7th June on Excavations and Antiquities, though it is noted that the adoption of this law in the Canary Islands did not really stop the plundering of antiquities (pp. 38-39). In fact, if anything, the situation seemed to worsen, especially under the Franco dictatorship (1939–1975). Under the dictatorship, archaeological research was single-mindedly devoted to “proving” the past unity of Spanish ancestors throughout the empire that Franco envisioned. This meant that the past of not only mainland Spain, but also Spain’s African colonies (or desired colonies) was homogenised in order to fit the dominant ideological claims about a unified empire (pp. 43-49). Needless to say, archaeology carried out with such a goal in mind did not follow the most rigorous scientific standards, nor was there a particularly sensitive eye to long-term heritage preservation.
After the dictatorship, there was an improvement in legislation relating to archaeological remains throughout Spain, accompanied by a decentralisation of archaeological practice, with much of heritage management controlled at a regional level. However, Farrujo points out that for the Canary Islands, “the majority of protection measures, in practical terms, have no impact on conservation” (p. 61). In part, this may be connected to the ongoing devaluing of indigenous cultural remains in favour of the privileging of “elitist” (meaning European, bourgeois) heritage sites, notably Spanish colonial architecture in major cities of the Canary Islands, such as Aguere on Tenerife (pp. 70-73). This is a pattern not limited to the Canary Islands, of course, but is a general feature of global cultural heritage, especially as encapsulated in the UNESCO World Heritage listings.

With this background in mind, Farrujo turns to several case studies of what he considers “negative” and “positive” examples of archaeological heritage sites in the Canary Islands, in relation both to local communities and tourism. One negative example is Tindaya Mountain on Fuerteventura, which is home to some of the most significant rock art sites in the islands. In the 1990s, the famous Basque sculptor Eduardo Chillida proposed hollowing out the interior of Tindaya for a Monumento a la tolerancia. The local authorities approved the project, despite the fact that it would have completely destroyed several of the largest rock art panels, and negatively impacted others. While the project has been put on hold, partly because Chillida abandoned the work due to local concerns, the local council has still not rejected it as a future possibility (pp. 82-83).

More positive examples of the management of indigenous Canarian heritage can be found at the archaeological sites of La Cueva Pintada de Gáldar, La Zarza y La Zarcita, and El Júlán. La Cueva Pintada de Gáldar is a significant, and publicly accessible, site with painted rock art and habitation features and an interpretive centre, which are visited by tens of thousands of mostly local visitors each year (pp. 85-88). El Júlán is an engraved rock art site with Lybico-Berber inscriptions, a form of early hieroglyphic writing reflecting the North African origins of the Canary Islands’ indigenous inhabitants. This site is likewise visited by tens of thousands of people each year, including a larger proportion of foreign tourists (pp. 92-94).

Farrujo closes the book dealing with some of the tensions and inherent contradictions in archaeological practice in the 21st century. These tensions can be related to one of the key processes that historical archaeologists study: the relationship between global and local. Thus tourism, which is the primary industry of the Canary Islands (receiving over 11 million visitors in 2009, in an island chain with just under 2 million local residents), is seen as necessary to the future economic viability of the islands. But, tourism must also be approached with caution, especially as regards heritage because tourists can negatively impact heritage sites physically, and because heritage tourism often commoditises an exotic, imaginary other in ways that can reinforce racial or cultural stereotypes (pp. 98-100). Likewise, global measures of heritage significance, such as inclusion on the UNESCO World Heritage listings, are simultaneously seen as an object of serious critique, and as an object of desire, with the book listing several suggestions for indigenous Canarian sites worthy of nomination (pp. 111-112).

It would appear from this book that archaeology in the Canary Islands has an enormous potential for growth. Indigenous (i.e. precolonial) archaeology appears to have a dire need for good stratigraphic excavation and interpretation. At the same time, historical archaeology in the archipelago could be extremely important, especially regarding the early interactions between the Imaizighen and the Spanish that led to the “disappearance” of the former. Farrujo suggests that the maritime nature of life in the Canary Islands has also been underexplored (p. 115), along with a more general approach incorporating the study of whole landscapes, rather than single sites.

The legacies of colonialism are something that all archaeologists must grapple with in one form or another, especially if we want to produce knowledge that is relevant for the contemporary world. As Farrujo points out, the utility of this kind of analysis is both to look “outside” to bring in theoretical frameworks, tools, and ideas from global archaeology, but also to apply what is learned “inside” from the local context to build creatively on the overall discourse of our discipline (p. 115). This is a useful observation, and in this way, An Archaeology of the Margins is a valuable contribution to such an important pursuit.

James L. Flexner
School of Archaeology and Anthropology
The Australian National University


As a visitor to Sydney this reviewer has often gone to the Hyde Park Barracks and gazed at the excavation artefacts on display and thought of the research potential represented by these objects. This monograph represents a vital step towards understanding this unique collection of objects. Arising from the Exploring the Archaeology of the Modern City (EAMC) project, a joint investigation between the Historic Houses Trust of New South Wales, the Archaeology Program at La Trobe University and the Australian Research Council this monograph represents the first detailed exploration of the artefact collection that is available to the historical archaeology community and the general public. Drawing on the expanded artefact catalogue that arose from this initial project, Crook, Davies and Murray explore the world of the Hyde Park Barracks when it housed an Immigration Depot (1848–1886) and Destitute Asylum for Infirm and Destitute Women (1862–1886). The former occupied levels 1 and 2 and the latter level 3.

Over the years the Hyde Park Barracks had been subject to multiple excavations by different archaeologists and a number of different artefact catalogues were produced. Further, incomplete records made the analysis of artefacts beyond difficult. Under the EAMC project the artefact catalogue was revised and updated with work conducted between 2008 and 2011 seeing the correction of 4885 records and the addition of 1225 new records from the analysis of unsorted bulk material. This has resulted in a detailed collection that is open to investigation.

The Hyde Park Barracks was constructed between 1817 and 1819 to accommodate male convicts and over the years it was added to with makeshift buildings gradually surrounding the main building, which houses the museum today. It is this building that is the focus of An Archaeology of Institutional Confinement with the artefact collections from levels 2 and 3 being at the centre of the analysis.

Broken down the first chapter provides a brief history of the Hyde Park Barracks and its architecture. The second chapter explores the archaeological history of the barracks’ main building detailing excavations, deposition processes and the nature of the artefact collection. Chapter three considers
the history of charity and immigration in nineteenth-century NSW focusing on institutional care. Chapter four considers the working of the institution including room use, inmates, sanitation, medicine and visitors and special occasions. Chapter five draws on the artefact collection to explore life within the barracks and contains good quality clear photographs of artefacts. Chapter six explores the life of the Matron and her family and artefacts that can be linked to their living spaces. While chapter seven considers the theoretical background of institutional archaeology and considers the findings of the authors in respect to consumption, labour and spirituality. One omission is conclusions to these chapters bringing an abrupt end with no drawing together of the ideas.

Interestingly the theoretical chapter is at the end of the volume, it would be more useful to have a theory discussion at the beginning as this informs the analysis of artefacts. It is impossible to view artefacts and their meaning without the mental framework we all carry about both institutions and how artefacts are used in daily life. Davies et al. state in this final chapter that they do not view institutions as distinct from factories and the military, and hold the view that a critical element of modernity is institutionalisation of many aspects of life ‘outside’ of totalising institutions (p. 94). The reader needs more than a sentence to understand this important point and how it affects their analysis of the artefact collection as this is far from the usual approach taken in institutional archaeology. The authors needed to argue their case for this approach and demonstrate how their beliefs informed their work allowing the reader to make an informed decision about whether they supported their argument by following the path of the evidence. The authors seem to assume that all institutional archaeology is about total institutions (p. 94) because one or two well-known researchers in the field have followed this path. The field is more diverse in its view, and is not limited to discussions of social control and discipline. In viewing the nature of the volume up until the concluding chapter it would perhaps have been better to take the theoretical discussions of total institutions and the authors’ arguments of a different way to consider institutional archaeology to a theoretical chapter where they could be fully explored. The appeal of this volume is likely to be much wider than just those interested in institutional archaeology. Currently artefacts from the Destitute Asylum and Immigration Depot can be seen on display in the Hyde Park Barracks and this is likely to create an interested audience among the general public for this book. The book has enough detail to provide research data for the institutional archaeologist about the history of the institution and its unique collection of artefacts, while also providing a good story about the barracks for the general public.

In this monograph the descriptions of artefacts provide a glimpse into life within the asylum and are a vivid highlight of the volume. However in institutional archaeology we are confronted with the issue of linking artefacts to people. Unlike households, the inmates of institutions were many and the staff as numerous. Hyde Park Barracks is fairly unique in having one matron for such a long period and limited housing for the destitute women. This would offer the opportunity to discuss artefacts in a unique way. The authors discuss objects that can be associated with known activities, i.e. sewing, smoking, reading, religious activities, and the giving of medicine. But they do not consider the intentional deposition of objects. The women coming into the asylum would likely have had only limited possessions; there is little evidence of storage and personal spaces. Objects may have more to do with their obvious use. The find of a whole bodice, a complete cap and books in the collection suggests that they were important to someone. It is unlikely that in an institution where women were given one outfit of clothes that a loss of a whole cap or bodice went unremarked. In another example, the authors describe a blind woman using matches as a trade object to receive assistance in getting around the asylum. Matches represented both light and a way to light pipes, and were also an object of value within the internal economy of the barracks: they had value to other inmates. The need to preserve items that had personal importance and trade value has to be considered, in a world where you were mostly reliant on staff for your daily living and personal privacy was very limited.

As someone familiar with institutional archaeology the argument that the artefacts studied and the documents used paint a picture of a world of comfort and care within the barracks in the view of the authors is less than convincing. The life in barracks, like in other institutions, seems to have followed the belief that those in institutions should not have a better life than the working man. There was no charity in the barracks, that a blind woman was forced to trade an object to receive assistance in getting round the place speaks volumes. The clothing was limited even if the artefacts demonstrate a range of patterns. The one outfit they were provided with was in daily use, and they may have a second outfit to wear on wash days. New clothes were only provided on special occasions. This does not suggest comfort and care. The thread on homemade reels found under the floorboards may have a unique value in itself because it allowed the possessor to repair their clothes and maintain their personal appearance. It consequently has a unique value that the authors do not consider. The section on medicines reflects the real lack of care provided at the barracks, while the dispensary section and remarks concerning the water closets reflect the reality of limited funding being made available to those managing the asylum. This reflects a world were care is basic, as the Government Asylums Board quote from 1876 (p. 45) shows, there was little room for recreation and the wards were badly adapted for the healthy accommodation of large numbers of aged.

Overall, while this reviewer has some questions about the theory and conclusions drawn from the artefact assemblage, this does not detract from the value of this monograph as a unique opportunity to discuss an institutional artefact assemblage closely linked to a group of defined people. It fulfils this role really well and does provide an insight into the private world of an asylum.

Susan Piddock
Research Associate, Department of Archaeology
Flinders University
Email: Susan.Piddock@flinders.edu.au


Many Australian archaeologists have learned their trade on Cyprus, drawing on the rich tradition of Cyprus-Australian engagement begun by James Stewart in the 1930s. Some will have travelled along the A1 from Larnaca to Limassol and may have noticed by the highway the large yellow structure at Kalavasos Tenta – known, tongue in cheek, as ‘the Tent at Tenta’. It was constructed in the mid-1990s and protects the exposed remains of the Aceramic Neolithic site situated on a hill slope. In fact, Kalavasos Tenta is located in the southern reaches of a c.12 km long valley – the Vasilikos valley – which comprises a rich and varied cultural landscape boasting archaeological features and built heritage dating through 10,000 years of history.
Ian Todd, the excavation director of the Kalavasos project, has worked in the Vasilikos Valley for some 40 years, making the documentation of its ancient history and archaeology his life’s work. *Human Settlement in the Vasilikos Valley* constitutes the twelfth monograph from Todd, with more to come, and presents the results of decades of field survey along the valley (the Vasilikos Valley Project). The dozen volumes of published work to date make an invaluable contribution to the study of the island’s past. However, *Human Settlement in the Vasilikos Valley* broadens the focus of Todd’s previous work, augmenting his documentation of ancient archaeological sites with observations concerning the more recent past – what members of ASHA would instantly recognise as historical archaeology and built heritage.

Todd is to be commended for this. He has operated in Cyprus since the 1960s, observing the *Antiquities Law* which (at Section 2) defines an ‘antiquity’ as being an object from ‘earlier than the year 1850’. In other words, there is no statutory reason why Todd should need to consider archaeology that post-dates the mid-nineteenth century. If we applied the same law in Australia we would see the bulk of this country’s non-Aboriginal archaeology go unprotected. It is therefore particularly refreshing to see Todd’s latest publication place the ancient archaeology within a broader chronological context. We may hope that other archaeologists on Cyprus (and in the ‘Old World’ generally) follow his example.

It is not hard to detect in *Human Settlement* a sense of Todd’s nostalgia for the not-so-distant past. After all, it was only in the late 1960s that the last of Cyprus’s famous camel trains ceased to cross the island, following the routes now cut by highways teeming with cars. As one middle-aged bank manager once told me, as a child he was bathed in a stone basin in their family courtyard and now he works in an institution, making computer transactions across hemispheres. With a shrug of amazement he described it as moving from the Stone Age to the Computer Age in a single generation. This phenomenon has had serious impacts on the more recent heritage of Cyprus and there is a sense of urgency about Todd’s documentation of the historical archaeology and built structures in the Vasilikos Valley, where rampant development was exposing and destroying sites even as Todd recorded them.

This is a circumstance familiar to many European countries. It illustrates the differing perceptions of the value of different ‘archaeologies’ in places like Cyprus and Australia. Perhaps we should not be surprised if the seeming endless physical activity that humans, before their agricultural terracing since the medieval period, water mills, dams and irrigation channels, field shelters, sheep and goat folds, kilns, threshing floors, a railway, aging government buildings (including a colonial-era police station) and a number of bridges. This part of the book will feel familiar to those historical archaeologists who have worked on surveys in rural Australia. The reader gets the same sense of the seemingly endless physical activity that humans, before our own relatively sedentary times, needed to engage in just to survive.

Todd’s background research also provides us with some fascinating insights into the recent Cypriot past. His précis of the many village petitions for improved water supply in the 1920s, that led to the construction of certain life-supporting wells around Kalavasos (page 71), is a reminder of how small Cypriot communities sometimes had to battle for the most basic infrastructure in the face of often ambivalent government authorities. Todd’s discussion of the *Village Roads Law* (1899), which required every able-bodied villager to spend six days each year labouring on any road that the council required (page 70), is an illustration of how community and national interests intersected at the local level. Todd’s own survey follows in the footsteps of an 1885 survey, conducted for very different reasons, by a young Horatio Kitchener. Todd makes regular reference to Kitchener’s plans, observing changes in the landscape since 1885 but making Kitchener’s work feel as relevant today as ever. There is also plenty for the train buffs (pages 66-69) and interesting discussions on the threshing floors (pages 63-66) and water mills (pages 40-51) that were once such an important part of Cypriot village life. These glimpses of nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Cyprus flesh out the somewhat stereotyped characters in Durrell’s *Bitter Lemons*, which may be a more familiar book to Australian readers.

Although Todd never uses the phrases, what he describes in *Human Settlement* is a ‘cultural landscape’ and his calls for action in the face of destructive development would constitute ‘cultural resource management’. In this regard *Human Settlement* lags in relation to contemporary heritage theory and practice (e.g. Taylor & Lennon 2012 on cultural landscapes). It reads like the first half of a conservation management plan and will leave heritage managers wanting more. But management planning is not the book’s aim. It is a call to action while the author acknowledges his own limitations in bringing that action about. Here is an area that Australian practitioners, with their experience in the integration of historical archaeology, built heritage and modern urban planning may be able to make an important contribution to. This is not to say that the Cypriot authorities are not aware of the problem or that they are not seeking to respond appropriately within the context of diminishing public resourcing and the Global Financial Crisis.

*Human Settlement* raises some important issues for Cyprus, of equal importance to Australian cultural heritage practitioners, although Todd does not make specific reference to them:

- It is not appropriate to manage heritage places by reference only to their age. The *significance* of places should be determined by reference to the heritage assessment criteria.
in the *Burra Charter* (historical, aesthetic, scientific, social, spiritual significance), and they should be managed accordingly.

- The significance of individual heritage places should not be assessed and managed in isolation because they commonly form part of a suite of places that together comprise a cultural landscape.
- Cultural heritage laws should integrate with laws pertaining to urban planning and environmental management to most effectively conserve heritage places.

Archaeological field survey in Cyprus has a long history (see Iacovou 2004; some summarised by Todd himself at pages 122-131) including the Sydney Cyprus Survey Project and the Canadian Palaipaphos Survey Project. As a result, there are some highly accomplished surveys against which Todd’s can be measured. In some respects (and this is a matter that Todd admits himself in his introductory remarks) the Vasilikos Valley survey falls short of contemporary standards. The survey commenced in 1976, long before differential GPS units and Google Earth. Thus, Todd’s standard site recording form, reproduced on page 1, feels old-fashioned and stuffy, a far cry from the digital recording systems and GIS databases that many ASHA members will be accustomed to. However, on reading Todd’s work you might well wonder if it lacks so much as a result of the absence of the technological bells and whistles. Using aerial photography and detailed topographic maps, Todd is able to locate with some precision the sites that he identifies and discusses, placing them within a topographic, geological and hydrological context. If anything, *Human Settlement* serves to demonstrate that all the technological skill in the world is no substitute for a willingness to spend long hot days in the field, breadth of knowledge (about ceramics, lithic technologies, stratigraphy, taphonomy, history and archaeological context), and persistence. Nonetheless, it would have been nice to see the results of a project begun in 1976 in print earlier than 2013!

Ultimately, *Human Settlement* is a book for specialists. It will principally interest archaeologists working in Cyprus, especially those researching the prehistoric period. However, it will occasionally provide useful comparanda for historical archaeologists operating in Australia. Further, it will assist Australians familiar with Cyprus to envisage village life in the recent past, and will act as a reminder that Cyprus is more than white beaches, pubs and sunburnt European holiday-makers.

Andrew Sneddon  
*The University of Queensland Culture & Heritage Unit*
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