

Book Reviews



Anahulu: The Anthropology of History in the Kingdom of Hawaii. Patrick V. Kirch and Marshall Sahlins. Vol. 1: *Historical Ethnography.* Marshall Sahlins, with the assistance of Dorothy B. Barrère. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.

Reviewed by JEFFREY TOBIN, *Rice University*

In *Anahulu*, Kirch and Sahlins bring together archaeology and archival ethnography. Here the most prominent archaeologist and social anthropologist working in Hawai'i join forces, in an attempt to produce the definitive work on nineteenth-century Hawaiian society. As Sahlins explains, "Our aim is to bring down the World System, through the mediation of the Hawaiian System, into the way the rock walls are laid out, the remains of houses show forth, and the irrigation ditches are traced in the soil of the upper Anahulu River Valley" (p. 101). In this first volume, Sahlins makes scant reference to the archaeological record. Rather, he provides historical background for the volume that follows. This may be for the best, because Sahlins's grasp of archaeology seems less than masterful. Consider his claim that a certain "transformation can be dated (by ^{14}C) almost precisely to 1804" (p. 52). By itself, radiocarbon dating is certainly not precise enough to distinguish between a transformation that took place in 1804 and another that took place, say, in 1795 or 1812. Thus, the claimed "synergetic effects" (p. 1) of the collaboration might be more discernible in Kirch's volume than in Sahlins's.

More masterful is the archival research that Sahlins has accomplished with Barrère's assistance. They make excellent use of an enormous depth and breadth of sources, including journals and letters of missionaries and other *haole* residents of Hawai'i, Kingdom of Hawai'i Land Com-

mission documents, and various Native Hawaiian texts. Their scholarly resourcefulness is unsurpassed in the field of Hawaiian history. In this volume, *Anahulu* is most often mentioned merely as an example of a kingdom-wide phenomenon and is only occasionally the focus of the narrative. This makes the book all the more useful for those whose principal interest falls outside Waiialua District. The book stands on its own as one of the best histories to date of Hawai'i from 1778 through 1860.

To be sure, in this history, as in all ambitious histories, there is much to dispute. Sahlins engages in his own fair share of polemics via the time-honored medium of footnotes. For example, Sahlins quickly dismisses David Stannard's *Before the Horror* (Honolulu: Social Science Research Institute, 1989); this despite the fact that Kirch has found Stannard's work worthy of major consideration. Sahlins comes to the aid of former student Jocelyn Linnekin by criticizing Haunani-Kay Trask's review of Linnekin's first book. Here the issue is the interpretation of the word *kama'aina*. Trask faulted Linnekin for glossing the word as "long time resident of a place" and for applying it to people who are not Native Hawaiians. Sahlins misinterprets Trask's critique. He provides ample evidence of Native Hawaiians who were *kama'aina* of a place by virtue of being long-time residents of that place, but does not address the issue of non-Hawaiians being considered *kama'aina*. In fact, elsewhere he quotes from mid-nineteenth-century peti-

tions in which Native Hawaiians explicitly opposed the possibility of non-Hawaiians becoming citizens and landowners in Hawai'i.

Sahlins's most controversial position may turn out to be his depiction of the Hawaiian *ali'i* (chiefs) as active agents in the destitution and death of their people. He argues that the Hawaiian population declined at least in part as the result of chiefly avarice. He writes that "the great *ali'i* were congenitally unwilling and financially unable" to pay their people a decent wage (p. 135). Accordingly, he doubts that the *ali'i* ever had much *aloha* for the *maka'ainana*. "[The people] could do no more than call upon the governing chiefs to assume their ancient responsibilities, invoking the reciprocal love (*aloha*) that was supposed to subsist between the *ali'i* and the *maka'ainana*. But in thus appealing to the chiefs to assert their authority, the people were asking for the restoration of an earthly kingdom that never really existed" (p. 131). Sahlins similarly attempts to cast doubt on *aloha'aina*—Hawaiians' love of the land (p. 186). It is unfortunate that Sahlins chose not to consider the brilliant work of Lilikalā Kame'elehiwa on these issues. Sahlins must be familiar with Kame'elehiwa's 1986 dissertation on the development of capitalism and private property in nineteenth-century Hawai'i (recently published as *Native Land and Foreign Desires* [Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press, 1992]). Sahlins makes extensive use of other secondary sources, theses, and works in press, so it is strange that he overlooked this one. In any case, this volume is worse for the omission.

A surprising disappointment is the paucity of anthropological insight. There is a discussion of Hawaiian kinship (pp. 193–211) that is brilliant despite some rather confused comments on infanticide. Otherwise, little effort is made to produce the promised "historical ethnography." Instead, the book is the usual historical recitation of great events and of the actions of great men and women. Sahlins does little to elucidate the cultural contexts in which specific chiefly and missionary decisions

were made (again, here is a place where he could have profited by attending to Kame'elehiwa's work). In contrast with *Historical Metaphors and Mythical Realities* (1981) and *Islands of History* (1985), in this volume Sahlins fails to integrate his anthropological structuralism with his historical narrative. In his previous works Sahlins demonstrated how fruitful a structurally informed diachronic approach can be. In the current work, Sahlins seems to have forgotten the lessons he taught the rest of us. Here the phrase "structure of the conjuncture" appears as a mantra rather than as the tremendously productive analytical concept it was in *Islands of History*.

The style that served Sahlins so well in the past has also begun to wear thin. His flippancy seems better suited to essays and short monographs than to a grand history. For example, his references to chiefly bodies as "mountainous" (p. 57) and "stretched to their organic limits" (p. 80) or to a specific chief as "literally a big power" (p. 93) suffer from repetition and begin to belie a disrespect for his subject. Consider also Sahlins's comment on an event in which *maka'ainana* put goat excrement in *poi* that was destined for the *ali'i*: "As excrement is negative food, the last seems an appropriate reciprocation for what the chiefs were dumping on the common people" (p. 146). Not only is this joke recycled from *Islands of History*, but there is also the question of whether or not the observation that "excrement is negative food" really advances the analysis. This volume is also laden with gratuitous citations of European canonical authors (e.g., Rousseau, Hobbes). It is as if Hawaiian history is of interest only so far as it can be translated into European terms. Similarly, Sahlins applies European categories including "corvée labor" and the "ancien regime" to Hawaiian society. It is understandable that a nineteenth-century missionary such as William Richards would perceive Hawaiian culture in ways that would make it familiar, but this sort of ethnocentrism is not so forgivable in an anthropologist.

Anahulu: The Anthropology of History in the Kingdom of Hawaii. Patrick V. Kirch and Marshall Sahlins. Vol. 2: *The Archaeology of History*. Patrick V. Kirch. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.

Reviewed by THEGN LADEFOGED, *University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand*

The Anahulu project was a multidisciplinary study designed to document the metamorphosis of nineteenth-century Hawaiian society as it entered the world economy. The project has produced three monographs: the volume reviewed here, in which Kirch, along with contributions from Sahlins, Spriggs, and Weisler, interprets the ethnohistorical and archaeological material; a companion volume by Sahlins (1992) that documents the ethnohistory of the area; and an edited volume by Kirch (1989) that details archaeological data from the rockshelters of Kawailoa-uka, the upper valley in Anahulu.

The Anahulu project combined archaeology and ethnohistory to provide a detailed understanding of the chronology and processes that took place in Kawailoa-uka. Archaeological evidence provides insight into the economic activities of the valley's inhabitants and establishes a temporal framework for environmental dynamics. The archaeological data addresses ethnohistorically undocumented dimensions of Hawaiian culture. Conversely, the ethnohistorical data provide the specific detail often unobtainable in archaeology that facilitates fine-grained sociopolitical interpretation. Combining the two sources made it possible to propose a detailed history of Anahulu that has implications for Hawai'i in general.

Although there has been extensive archaeological research on the prehistory of Hawai'i, the Anahulu project was the first to focus explicitly on historic transformations in indigenous Hawaiian society. The authors adopt an explicitly structural approach, as evidenced by various themes throughout the volume. Attention is given to the conjunction between prehistoric Hawaiian cultural systems and the impinging world system of the nineteenth century, suggesting that transformations in Hawaiian society were the result of both

Hawaiian and European participation. Furthermore, it is suggested that the incorporation of Hawai'i into the world economy is reflected in the archaeological and ethnohistorical data from Anahulu. As such, the structural elements of the valley's archaeology form the basis from which to identify, examine, and analyze historic changes occurring throughout the archipelago. The structural perspective is carried through to other topics, including the search for the underlying principles of indigenous land use and division at various spatial scales.

The volume consists of five chapters. The first details the research objectives of the project and provides an overview of the O'ahu environment and prehistory. Chapter 2 discusses the rockshelters in the upper valley, which were used intermittently until the late A.D. 1400s, after which only a few were inhabited on a permanent basis. Assemblages from the rockshelters and surrounding area suggest that the environment was transformed from native forest, to swidden gardens, to historic intensive agriculture. Chapter 3 provides a detailed history of each *ili* (land unit) in the upper valley. Relying on ethnohistorical sources as well as archaeological survey and excavation, Kirch, Sahlins, and Weisler chronicle the social relations of Anahulu's prehistoric inhabitants and trace their economic transformations. Chapter 4, by Spriggs and Kirch, examines the technological and sociological structures of the irrigation systems in the upper valley and is one of the most interesting in the volume. By analyzing the spatial configuration of the irrigation ditches, bifurcation points, and dams, the authors delimit sociological and political relations among the farmers. The authors note that the irrigation system was historically instituted and reveals an increased intrusion by the chiefs into the lives of valley occupants. It is suggested

that the hydraulic infrastructure of Hawaiian irrigation systems was determined primarily by social not technological factors.

Chapter 5 summarizes the chronology of the upper valley and discusses four areas of change during the transition from the prehistoric to historic. Environmental transformations in the valley are reviewed, and the suggestion is made that agricultural intensification resulted from the demands of an escalated political economy. The detailed discussion of how architecture and settlement patterns were transformed from the prehistoric to historic period is effective. The discussion of material culture documents a trend of increasing European goods and suggests how specific items were used symbolically and socially. Given the innovative interpretative approach of the volume, the chapter ends with a disappointingly brief summary of the project's theoretical contributions.

The volume elucidates the instrumental role of political economy in structural transformations during the early historic period. It offers several alternatives to common conceptions in Hawaiian archaeology about the role of population pressure and technological imperative in agricultural intensification. The volume's use of Hawaiian spatial divisions and terminology as the units of analysis is generally clear. However, in Chapter 4 when various sites within each *ili* are discussed, it is occasionally unclear as to where the sites are located. A map showing both *ili* and site numbers would have been helpful. Most of the figures are clear, although in a number of them the annotation is illegible. Furthermore, graphs of the data would have clarified some of the agricultural data. Occasionally the volume uses sexist terminology such as references to "the

hand of Polynesian man and his biological associates" (p. 169). The use of the colonial term "Sandwich Islands" as opposed to the term Hawai'i is also potentially problematic. Kirch's (pp. 9–17) selective representation of his previous model of Hawaiian prehistory is curious (compare pp. 9–17 with Kirch 1984:107 and 1985:306–307). In the past few years it has become apparent that his original hypothesis of prehistoric demographic equilibrium or decline is unlikely. In his current review of O'ahu and Hawaiian prehistory, Kirch neglects to acknowledge or amend his earlier work on the topic.

Despite these minor quibbles, the volume is a significant contribution to our understanding of the prehistoric to historic transition in Hawai'i. As such, it will become a standard reference for the transitional period throughout the Pacific.

REFERENCES

- KIRCH, P. V.
 1984 *The Evolution of the Polynesian Chiefdoms*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- 1985 *Feathered Gods and Fishhooks: An Introduction to Hawaiian Archaeology and Prehistory*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- KIRCH, P. V., ED.
 1989 *Prehistoric Hawaiian Occupation in the Anahulu Valley, Oahu Island: Excavations in Three Inland Rockshelters*. Contributions of the University of California Archaeological Research Facility 47. Berkeley: University of California.
- SAHLINS, M.
 1992 *Historical Ethnology*. Vol. 1 of *Anahulu: The Anthropology of History in the Kingdom of Hawaii*. P. V. Kirch and M. Sahlins. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Archaeology of the Lapita Cultural Complex: A Critical Review. Patrick V. Kirch and Terry L. Hunt, eds. Thomas Burke Memorial Washington State Museum Research Report 5. Seattle: Burke Museum, 1988. iv + 181 pp.

Reviewed by MICHIKO INTOH, *Hokkaido Tokai University*

This is a useful publication that provides a preliminary account of the Lapita cultural complex. Lapita is a pottery tradition of a distinctive style of decoration: characterized by dentate-stamping. Research on the Lapita cultural complex has been a dominant focus of Pacific archaeology for at least the past three decades. Recognition of this pottery tradition as a cultural complex has contributed significantly to understanding the nature of human dispersals into the South Pacific. The population that possessed the Lapita cultural complex is now known to be the major ancestral population of the Polynesians. This publication synthesizes Lapita data available in 1987 but does not include the Lapita Homeland Project.

The volume begins with a short history of Lapita archaeology by Pat Kirch. This chapter is particularly useful for researchers who are not directly involved in Lapita archaeology, because information on Lapita archaeology has been hard to obtain because of preliminary and partial publication. Readers may be excited to read how the concept of the "Lapita cultural complex" was developed and a large multi-institutional project called the "Lapita Homeland Project" was launched.

The following chapters include the spatial and temporal boundaries of Lapita by Kirch and Terry Hunt; the environmental context of Lapita settlement locations by Dana Lepofsky; ceramic technological and compositional studies by Hunt; the decorative system of Lapita pottery by Nancy Sharp; sourcing, technological, and functional studies of flaked stone assemblages by Melinda Allen and Gwen Bell; fishing strategies by Virginia Butler; Lapita subsistence by Lisa Nagaoka; and network models for Lapita exchange by Hunt.

In the section on spatial and temporal aspects of Lapita, a total of 79 Lapita sites are

listed, of which only six are rockshelters or caves and the rest represent open sites. A table of site type, site area, and excavated area shows considerable variation in the nature of research on Lapita. Only 30 of these sites have one or more ^{14}C dates available. These dates were calibrated for secular and reservoir effects for direct comparison. The earliest reliable dates for Lapita fall between cal. 1705–1441 B.C., but the majority of Lapita sites appear to lie in a range between cal. 1200–400 B.C. The spatial distribution of Lapita sites ranges from Aitape (north coast of New Guinea) in the west to Samoa in the east. Kirch and Hunt regard these temporal and spatial distributions as inconclusive and give attention to areas in the west as well as in the east that might repay additional study.

Various aspects of Lapita culture drawn from other papers are as follows: Lapita people had settled on the coast, but marine resources were not the major factor in deciding the site. Lapita settlement patterns appear remarkably similar across Melanesia and western Polynesia.

Lapita fishing activities, based on five samples, are similar in taxonomic representation. Four reasons are suggested to explain this pattern: similarities in bone density among prominent families, identification bias, marine environment similarities, and cultural factors. The exploitation of shellfish by Lapita populations seems to have been extensive, covering a wide range of habitats. The size of exploited shells was reduced over time.

Domesticated faunal remains are sparse, but three domestic animals (pig, dog, and chicken) are associated with Lapita. Dogs and pigs are reported from four sites in three islands, Mussau, Tikopia, and Fiji, and chickens were recovered from five sites. In examining faunal data (both fish and animals), several methodological pro-

blems are identified. These include inconsistent and strongly biased recovery techniques, incomplete taxonomic and quantitative analyses, and inadequate data reporting/presentation. It is demonstrated that the data can be significantly manipulated by excavation techniques and the screen mesh size used in excavations.

A significant point is made that there was a heavy initial reliance on the natural fauna until the horticultural base was large enough to support the population.

Analyses of Lapita pottery are focused on technology and decorative systems. The technological aspects of Lapita pottery are not well understood. A small number of technological studies are summarized, but are not synthesized. In addition to the use of the anvil, kinds of temper are of particular significance not only for the analysis of trading but for examining the related technology involved. Such data are particularly critical when plain Lapita sherds are analyzed. In this regard, it is regrettable that there is no consideration of the changing aspects of classic Lapita to late Lapita. This is because technological characteristics should be critical factors in relating the early eastern Caroline Island pottery in Micronesia to plain Lapita (cf. Intoh 1992:80).

As for the design analysis, element occurrences are compared in Fiji and Reef/Santa Cruz motifs. It is shown that the later assemblages include more design elements, more individual motifs, and more variations on basic motif structures than Fijian assemblages. It could have been much more interesting if these analyses on technology and design motifs had been combined.

Lapita flaked-stone techniques are characterized by the predominant use of a bipolar flaking technique, with some use of direct freehand percussion as well. There seems to be some correlation between the amount of chert and obsidian: decreasing obsidian and increasing chert/increasing obsidian and decreasing chert. Useful compilation tables of sourced obsidian from Lapita sites and amounts of excavated ob-

sidian and chert flaked stones in Lapita sites are provided.

This publication shows us how little data we had in 1987 compared with the popular descriptions of "Lapita cultural complex" and clearly points out areas in need of further investigation, in terms of geographic as well as research objectives.

The last chapter summarizes the problems and issues in Lapita archaeology by Kirch. The topics discussed are origins, the Lapita dispersal, Lapita economy, style and variability in Lapita material culture, long-distance exchange, Lapita society, and what happened to Lapita after 500 B.C. These are the major portions of the "Lapita Cultural Complex."

However, it is not yet clear to me how a site is defined as a Lapita site. There are some sites associated with a few dentate-stamped potsherds and some sites with no potsherds but with some stone flakes. Are these Lapita sites or not? We may have to understand not only the integrated figure of the cultural complex but also diverse figures of Lapita communities.

Although some of the results from the Lapita Homeland Project and some other related projects are now available (Allen and Gosden 1991; Galipaud 1992; Spriggs 1990), this publication is recommended first to students and researchers who hope to understand such an attractive and yet complicated topic, the Lapita Cultural Complex.

REFERENCES

- ALLEN, J., AND C. GOSDEN, EDs.
1991 *Report of the Lapita Homeland Project*. Occasional Papers in Prehistory 20. Canberra: The Australian National University.
- GALIPAUD, J. C., ED.
1992 *Poterie Lapita et peuplement: Actes du colloque Lapita, Nouméa, Janvier 1992*. Nouméa: ORSTOM.
- INTOH, M.
1992 Pottery traditions in Micronesia, in *Poterie Lapita et peuplement: Actes du colloque Lapita, Nouméa, Janvier 1992*:

67-82, ed. J. C. Galipaud. Nouméa: ORSTOM.

Proceedings of the Lapita Design Workshop, Canberra, Australia, December 1988. Occasional Papers in Prehistory 19. Canberra: The Australian National University.

SPRIGGS, M. J. T., ED.

1990 *Lapita Design, Form and Composition:*

Semelai Culture and Resin Technology. Memoirs of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences. Vol. 22. Rosemary Gianno. New Haven, Ct.: Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences. 1989. xxxiv + 238 pp., plates, tables, charts, graphs, drawings, notes, bibliography, index.

Reviewed by WILLIAM A. LONGACRE, *University of Arizona*

This is the published version of Rosemary Gianno's dissertation, an exhaustive ethnolinguistic study of the Semelai people of Tasek Bera, Malaysia. Her focus is on the technology of resin production and use within the general Semelai culture. It is based upon 2 years of fieldwork, 1980-1982, and this monograph incorporates new materials gathered during a subsequent trip to Malaysia during 1987.

She reviews the ethnographic and archaeological study of resins in a thorough overview of the subject. Resins are used in an astounding variety of ways from sealing the surfaces of pottery to their use in torches and as incense and even as chewing gum! She presents a highly useful summary of chemical techniques and especially instrumental techniques for resin analysis. She notes that infrared spectrophotometry seems among the most useful techniques for sourcing resin samples.

She presents a wide-ranging review of the infrared spectrophotometry spectra for a number of resin samples from a variety of species of trees in Southeast Asia. In an appendix (A), the actual spectra are reproduced, a valuable comparative contribution for future study. Resin finds are relatively rare in archaeological sites. This is probably because they are easily confused with rocks. She notes the obvious but useful observation that resin pieces will be dramatically lighter in weight than rocks. These published spectra will be useful in sourc-

ing future resin finds from archaeological sites in Southeast Asia.

The remainder of the book is a highly detailed description of Semelai culture and society followed by a comprehensive discussion of Semelai ethnobiology. This leads into the extremely detailed discussion of the collection and trade of resins and other plant fluids and the use of resins by the Semelai people. This latter includes coverage of the use of resins in torches, as sealants and glues, and as incense, medicine, and even as a poison. This entire section is rich in native vocabulary and phrase so that probably half of the book is in the Semelai language.

Back matter includes the infrared spectra mentioned above as well as word lists in Semelai terms for plant names and other terms and numerous oral literature texts that Gianno transcribed as part of her field record.

This is a most impressive contribution to Southeast Asian ethnography. I know of no source that contains as much detail about collecting and using resins, and I suspect that this work will stand alone for some time to come. Gianno presents ethnographic observations that will be useful to the archaeologist working in sites that might produce prehistoric resins. And clearly, her work with infrared spectra and her publishing of the actual spectra with identifications will be of special use to prehistorians working in the area.

Disciplines Croisées [:] Hommage a Bernard Philippe Groslier. Under the direction of Georges Condominas with the assistance of D. Bernot, M. A. Martin, and M. Zaini-Lajoubert. Paris: Editions de l'Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales, 1992. [In French]

Reviewed by JOHN N. MIKSIC, *National University of Singapore*

This volume consists of five essays on the life, personality, and work of B. P. Groslier and 14 articles of a diverse range of topics, loosely linked by the fact that most (though not all) pertain to subjects in which B. P. Groslier had some interest.

In the Introduction, G. Condominas, Director, Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales (better known by its acronym, EHESS), notes that this volume, the second of a projected interdisciplinary series on Southeast Asia, was in progress when B. P. Groslier (hereafter referred to by his initials, BPG, as his friends often did) died on 29 May 1986. He was to have contributed an article on the archaeology and agriculture of the Angkorian civilization. It was decided to dedicate the volume to him, which explains why the chapters in the book are so varied.

The articles devoted to the man give a fascinating and frank portrait of one of the most colorful scientists who ever worked in Southeast Asia. Groslier, born at Phnom Penh in 1926, was the third generation in his family to work in Cambodia. His father was the first French child born there (on 4 February 1887), and his grandfather served there as a colonial administrator.

The details of BPG's life and work have already been covered in a thorough obituary in *Asian Perspectives* (Moore 1986-1987). Interesting additional information is found in one of the articles in the volume being reviewed: a short biography of George Groslier, BPG's father, by BPG himself.

After studying painting at the Ecole des Beaux-Arts, Paris, Groslier père conceived a desire to popularize Khmer art to the French public. He built the Phnom Penh Museum in 1920 and acted as conservator until 1942. He also organized the School

of Cambodian Arts, devoted to preserving traditional arts, and organized craftsmen into marketing cooperatives. During World War II he worked as an amateur radio operator for the Allies, was captured, and died under Japanese torture in 1945. His son obviously loved him and wished to emulate him.

BPG's main claim to fame was his development of the Conservation d'Angkor into "one of the biggest archaeological projects in the world" during the 1960s (Condominas, p. 21). He met General De Gaulle personally in a successful endeavor to get resources to carry out his plans for Angkor.

Although his greatest talent was administration, BPG spent more time on fieldwork. BPG envisioned not only physical restoration of monuments, but also "detailed study of the history in all its aspects of the *longue durée* of Angkorian civilization, one of the most original and grandiose produced by the genius of man and society" (Condominas, p. 32).

M. Condominas does not gloss over BPG's faults. He characterizes BPG as "like many true creators, arrogant" and hypersensitive to criticism. Condominas had at least one important personal conflict with BPG, which is recounted in some detail, as Condominas says, to avoid any suspicion of "hagiography." On the other hand, although BPG sometimes appeared proud, Condominas ascribes this to a great shyness that he tried to hide. BPG liked to shine in front of important visitors, but showed no arrogance to lower personnel, who in return were devoted to him.

BPG believed that archaeology was "a branch of history" (Condominas, p. 24). Written sources figured prominently in his approach. His earlier studies emphasized the influence of India, especially in the religious sphere, but later he focused on in-

digenous features such as the cult of water and sun and the omnipresent theme of the churning of the elixir of immortality.

BPG was very interested in water control and the notion of the "hydraulic city." Although he believed that the ancient Khmer had "subordinated their science to their symbolism" (Condominas, p. 25), he concluded that Khmer civilization collapsed not because of conversion of the populace to Theravada Buddhism (*pace* Coèdes) but because of foreign invasions and consequent disruption of irrigation. BPG gave large figures for water capacity of the system, which he himself noted were hard to prove because they were based on the assumption that all the infrastructure was in use simultaneously, but Condominas comes out in full support of the original figures (footnote 9, p. 27).

This controversy continues. The most recent contributor to the literature, P. Stott (1992) concludes that "not one drop of their [i.e., the large *baray* at Angkor] water is likely to have fed the rice fields of Angkor" (Stott, p. 55; he cites the work of Van Liere and others who have reached the same conclusion).

BPG conducted large-scale excavations at many extremely important sites, including the "Palace" of Angkor Thom; Mimot, a large moated site like those in the Mun and Chi basins of northeast Thailand; Sras Srang, a cemetery site; and the Baphuon (including a habitation site of the tenth through twelfth centuries rich in Chinese ceramics). Herein lies the greatest tragedy of BPG's career: as Paul Corbin writes in his contribution to this volume, "Bernard Philippe Groslier: A complete archaeologist": "It is heart-rending that as a result of circumstances none of these admirable excavations, the material from which he was 'storing in the barn', as he said, while awaiting a favorable opportunity, were not published before his premature demise" (Corbin, p. 50).

From what can be gleaned from published sources, BPG was a systematic excavator. He felt French archaeological methods needed improvement: its digging

methods were archaic, it lacked theoretical objectives, and it was not laboratory oriented (J. C. Gardin, "Bernard Groslier and the Center for Archaeological Research", this volume). A photograph of his excavations at the Angkor Thom "Palace" shows a systematic grid of squares with balks. His references to stratification show that he was aware of its importance.

Thus it is all the more regrettable that much of his knowledge died with him. French archaeologists familiar with his notes describe them as difficult if not impossible to decipher. We may never have a clear idea of the precise nature of BPG's discoveries at the so-called "Palace" site, although the balks, if they were not excavated, may still yield some vital information. This, and several other sites at Angkor, are vital to the solution of complex questions, many of which BPG himself posed.

A subject in dire need of study is a full history of the Conservation similar in approach to Bernet Kempers's book on the restoration of Javanese monuments during the colonial period (Bernet Kempers 1978). Indeed, such studies are needed for all of Asia. Much restoration work is being carried out in many Asian countries with poor or no attention to the archaeological research potential of sites. The methods of restoration themselves are often poorly documented. The recent furor over the Indian-led restoration of Angkor Wat is only one such case.

The bulk of the book consists of articles on a wide range of topics related to Southeast Asia, few related to archaeology. Articles are arranged according to the alphabetical ordering of their authors' names.

There are several anthro-linguistic presentations. J. Cauquelin describes the phonology and grammar of Puyuma, an Austronesian language of Taiwan; O. C. Dahl discusses three words used in Malagasy to designate divine beings; and B. Formoso compares Thai, Issane, and Lao kinship terminology. C. Raymond discusses 40 Burmese archaeological terms borrowed by different methods from Pali. Not sur-

prisingly, many of the words are related to Buddhist monastic buildings and religious practices.

Articles of archaeological interest include a French-language translation of H. Loofs-Wissowa's article published in English in 1976 arguing that the rayed motif in the center of Heger I Dongson drums does not represent a star or sun. J. Stargardt contributes an article on a problem that particularly interested BPG: water supply of urban centers in early Southeast Asia. She notes that aerial photos of Sri Ksetra could be interpreted as showing that the Pyu created a symbolic *dharmacakra* and mandala with moats and embankments and that water in the system literally circulated in a circumambulatory manner, a perpetual *pradaksina*. She also notes the unusual possibility that funerary monuments were associated with fertility and symbolically placed near canals before the water entered the city and the fields. Although her article contains numerous thought-provoking hypotheses, it also makes obvious the need for much more fieldwork to be done before the hypotheses can be confirmed.

In the related realm of art history, N. Turpin discusses a Visnu statue from Prasat Kravan, one of the first sites that BPG restored. BPG had the statue displayed in the lounge at the Conservation in Angkor for many years. The statue is important because it illustrates a transition from the Bakheng to the Koh Ker style, which took place around A.D. 925, and is connected with the increasing transfer of power from the king to the nobility.

A number of articles deal with anthropological and historical topics. M. A. Martin contributes an interesting account of the "History and peopling of the Cardamom Range under the Khmer monarchy." This isolated part of western Cambodia has been for centuries a refuge area for displaced populations, never under the control of any state. Much of the article presents fragmentary but valuable anthropological data on conditions in the mountains in 1970: settlement patterns, linguistic characteristics, health, and so forth.

T. Obayashi's "Statistical classification of

the cultures of Southeast Asia and Oceania" is one result of a project at the beautiful National Museum of Ethnology at Osaka conducted from 1982 to 1987. The aims were fourfold. The first was to create a data bank improving upon the Human Relations Area Files (HRAF). This project used 343 traits, coded for 327 ethnic groups. These data are intended to be used in classifying Southeast Asian and Oceanic cultures, to encourage studies based on correlations between traits, and to test techniques of statistical analysis. A huge number of conceptual and practical obstacles confront such an enterprise. This effort gives no sign of reviving faith in the efficacy of such an approach. Results are either predictable or irreconcilable with historical data. It is extremely difficult to narrow the explanation of correlations to any one factor.

J. Dumarcaý, BPG's architectural assistant who worked for him at Angkor for 6 years, gives a map and description of the layout of the Conservation d'Angkor. This document will be useful to anyone who studies the history of the Conservation.

An article by the distinguished Indonesian anthropologist Koentjaraningrat gives an overview of "The Hindu-Buddhist and Islamic civilizations in Indonesia." The references are not entirely up to date; for example, there is no reference to the work of the Indonesian scholar Boechari on Lampung inscriptions, and the discussion of Srivijaya's capital does not mention the work of Pierre-Yves Manguin of the Ecole Française d'Extrême-Orient and the Indonesian National Research Centre for Archaeology at Palembang.

G. Smith discusses the ecological and cultural context of the famous cattle of Madura Island, Indonesia. He shows why the cattle population of the island has remained relatively stable while the human population of Madura has doubled in the twentieth century and the number of water buffalo has declined drastically. He assigns this change to the disappearance of the water buffalo's habitat as a result of human pressure and changing human subsistence strategy.

B. J. Terwiel argues that the Ahom, originally a Tai group who migrated to Assam in the thirteenth century, acquired Tara as a principal deity while residing in upper Burma, where she was particularly revered. The Ahom have long been isolated from other Southeast Asian groups and may preserve some archaic traits now superseded in the parent population. Other Tai groups including the Siamese may have experienced similar Tantric influences before accepting Theravada: drinking alcohol and eating meat in rituals seem more akin to their pre-Buddhist practices and would have helped them assimilate Buddhism.

On a different note, M. Zaini-Lajoubert analyzes the search for an Islamic theory of Malaysian literature in the context of the *dakwah* movement. She comes to negative conclusions: that "a real, well-defined theory has never been formulated" and that the few works based on such a theory "... have a very marked didactic character, a very moralizing tone, and if they succeed in communicating Islamic matters to the readers, the style of the majority, in the

form of sermons, are not very attractively rendered and frequently give the reader a feeling of lassitude" (Zaini-Lajoubert, p. 372).

Few people (other than reviewers) will read all the articles in this book, but by the same token most scholars interested in Southeast Asia will find something of profit in it.

REFERENCES

- BERNET KEMPERS, A. J.
 1978 *Herstel in Eigen Waarde: Monumentenzorg in Indonesia*. Zutphen: De Walburg Pers.
- MOORE, E.
 1986– Bernard Philippe Groslier 1926–
 1987 1986. *Asian Perspectives* 27(1):173–180.
- STOTT, P.
 1992 Angkor: Shifting the hydraulic paradigm, in *The Gift of Water: Water Management, Cosmology and the State in South East Asia*: 47–58, ed. J. Rigg. London: School of Oriental and African Studies.

The Excavation of Khok Phanom Di, a Prehistoric Site in Central Thailand. Vol. 1: *The Excavation, Chronology and Human Burials*. C. F. W. Higham and R. Bannanurag. Reports of the Research Committee of the Society of Antiquaries of London 47, 1990. Dunedin, New Zealand: University of Otago. xv + 372 pp.

Reviewed by WILHELM G. SOLHEIM II, *University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, Honolulu*

The final report on the excavations of Khok Phanom Di is to appear in four volumes. This, the first volume, is purely descriptive, covers the details of the excavation, the chronology, and the human burials, and appeared in 1990. The second volume was to appear in 1991 and the third and fourth in 1993–1994 (Higham, pers. comm.).

Khok Phanom Di is a huge shell mound in Chonburi Province, southeast of Bangkok and about 20 km northeast of the shore at the northeast corner of the Gulf of Siam. Much of the shell making up the

bulk of the mound is marine in origin, so it is likely that the coast was close to the site at the time of its occupation. This occupation is ¹⁴C dated from about 2000 to 1400 B.C. (p. 19). It is an extremely rich site with many burials and accompanying pottery, and other burial-associated artifacts in restorable condition. No metal artifacts were recovered. It is the first coastal site extensively excavated and reported in Thailand and neighboring coastal Cambodia and is an extremely important site.

The short first chapter (pp. 1–17) presents the context of the site both physi-

cally and historically as far as archaeological research in Thailand is concerned. Higham explains why he chose this site for excavation and gives a concise account of how the excavation was done. With fair knowledge of the site's contents from previous smaller excavations, Higham planned for excavating a 10-m² area that extended to a depth of 7 m in some areas. For protection from the rain he erected a roof "... of 13 m steel trusses raised on hardwood supports" (p. 13). This was certainly the most impressive prehistoric excavation in Thailand up to this time and probably for some time to come.

Chapter 2, "Cultural Aspects of the Sequence" (pp. 19–141), presents the ¹⁴C dates for the site, the cultural contents of each excavation layer, including plans of each of these layers showing their features, each mortuary phase, and tables presenting "The distribution of fish, bird, mammalian, turtle and shellfish remains in the lenses, pits, postholes, burial fill and areas of disturbance" (pp. 118–141).

An understanding of the distribution of the burials is basic to most of this book and is presented at the beginning of chapter 2. I summarize and quote portions of this: "At Khok Phanom Di, the survival of prehistoric stratigraphic contexts was so consistently good that it was nearly always possible to recognize an interment from the grave silhouette long before the human remains themselves were encountered.... Only very rarely did any of the 154 *in situ* burials intercut and disturb earlier ones" (p. 19).

During excavation, a square or quadrant was totally cleaned and the surface was "examined for patterned differences." With this it was possible to identify a variety of features, including the outlines of graves. When a grave was recognized the grave fill was removed, exposing "the human remains and any associated offerings, [and] soil samples were taken from various parts of the grave to permit subsequent laboratory analyses.... At the same time as the burial itself was under investigation, the analysis of the pits, postholes, and midden spreads in its vicinity were recorded to

enable any structures or grave-side ritual activity to be identified" (p. 20).

In layers 10–11, the burials were grouped, and Higham called these clusters. These clusters had various numbers of burials situated close together with surrounding areas vacant. "During the build-up of layers 5–9, the mortuary ritual showed new developments. One of these was the preferred disposal of the dead in a row with no close proximity between individuals.... Two women belonging to this period were interred under a raised structure. At the same time, the ritual attending the dead also evolved: while graves still pointed towards the east, there was an elaboration of structures built over groups of graves and an increase in the disparity between rich and poor sets of grave goods" (p. 20).

The remaining ten chapters (pp. 143–363) present the individual burials in sets of clusters and mortuary phases. For each cluster and phase a table presents for each burial of that set the age, sex, approximate number of children, orientation, depth of grave cut below datum, and the associated grave goods. The many figures present the plans of each cluster and phase, the vertical distribution of burials of that set, and drawings of each burial with location of associated artifacts and to the side of the burial a drawing of reconstructed, associated pottery and major artifacts. The pottery forms and decoration are similar to those of Laang Spean in Cambodia (C. and R. Mourer, 1970, 1971) and Gua Cha and other sites in West Malaysia (Peacock 1959; Sieveking 1954–1955). Included among the associated artifacts are impressive, carved turtle carapace ornaments (pp. 173, 179, 180, 279, etc.), fired clay pottery anvils, and a fishhook cut from a pig's tusk (p. 180).

It is important in book reviews to correct a few errors. I managed to locate one error, which does not mean that there are not more. On p. 330, first and second line, a miniature clay anvil is referred to as being illustrated in Fig. "201." This should refer to Fig. 239. This book is a first-class presentation of data, in great detail. I look

forward with anticipation to the next three volumes.

REFERENCES

MOURER, C., AND R. MOURER

- 1970 The prehistoric industry of Laang Spean, province of Battambang, Cambodia. *Archaeology and Physical Anthropology in Oceania* 5(2):128-146.

- 1971 Prehistoric research in Cambodia during the last ten years. *Asian Perspectives* 14:35-42.

PEACOCK, B. A. V.

- 1959 A short description of Malayan prehistoric pottery. *Asian Perspectives* 3(2):121-156.

SIEVEKING, G. DE G.

- 1954- Excavations at Gua Cha, Kelantan,
1955 1954 (Part I). *Federation Museums Journal* 1 and 2:75-138.

The Evolution and Dispersal of Modern Humans in Asia. T. Akazawa, K. Aoki, and T. Kimura, eds. Tokyo: Hokusen-sha Publishing Company, 1992. 660 pp., over 150 illustrations.

Reviewed by MICHELE TOOMAY DOUGLAS, *University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, Honolulu*

The papers collected in this volume were presented at a symposium held at the University of Tokyo in 1990, dealing with the problem of evolution and dispersal of *Homo sapiens* from the Asian perspective. The editors state that the symposium was the outgrowth of a continuing project funded by the Japanese Ministry of Education to investigate the origin and dispersal of Mongoloid peoples. In an effort to place this research into a global perspective, the symposium assembled many of the major names in biological anthropology and archaeology. The book contains all but three of the original symposium papers (31 in all) and is divided into four sections. Following each section of papers, the edited text of the discussion period is presented.

The first section, "Overview of Human Evolution in Asia," contains papers by G. Pope, A-M. Tillier, and B. Vandermeersch. Pope presents the evidence for evolutionary continuity in East Asia, and the other papers focus on the subadult and adult skeletal material from Tabon, Skhul, and Qafzeh. The discussion of the papers is noticeably deficient because much of it centers around a paper that is omitted from the volume. The major points of the discussion, summarized by Eric Trinkaus, are the advantage of a global perspective,

departure from a Euro-African perspective, and the necessity to "unite behavior and biology" (p. 39).

The second section, "Archaeology and Human Adaptation in West Asia," is the largest of the book, containing 11 papers. The first five papers deal mainly with blade industries of the Palaeolithic in Syria, Israel, and Lebanon (S. Muhesen, N. Goren-Inbar, K. Ohnuma, Y. Nishiaki and L. Copeland, L. Meignen, and O. Bar-Yosef). Following these is an interesting paper by Eitan Tchernov on the bio-chronology and dispersal events in the Levantine that examines the association of human migration with climactic change and biotic dispersal out of Africa. O. Bar-Yosef has a second paper examining climate variability and human adaptations in the Levant. A. Ronen associates blade technology with cultures and concludes that modern behavior originated in the Near East (West Asia). Human evolution in relation to the recent early dating for Levantine fossils is discussed by A. Marks, who concludes that, at present, there is no archaeological evidence to support the "out of Africa" model. A. Jelinek reviews the problems in the chronology of the Middle Palaeolithic in Southeast Asia, which apply equally well to the chronology in East Asia. The final paper in this

section, by Eric Trinkaus, examines the contrasts between the Qafzeh and Skhul material and late archaic humans. Trinkaus finds significant morphological differences in the femoral shaft, dental wear, and scapula diameters and suggests that they represent behavior differences. The reader is perplexed by the presence of this biological paper at the end of a predominately archaeological section, but there appears to be a rather loose attempt to move from stone to behavior and behavior/culture to morphology. The discussion of this section (Vandermeersch and Marks), although not providing a good summary of the papers, does offer some insights into Neanderthal morphology.

The third section of the volume, "Human Evolution in East and South Asia," seems to be an area dominated by the Japanese researchers, and it is here that we see some of their results. A paper on Okinawan long-limb geometry (T. Kimura and H. Takahashi) provides very specific data on a small sample. N. L. Cuong presents a brief review of the hominid fossils in Viet Nam that makes an excellent overview article for the non-Vietnamese student, complete with mammalian faunal lists. A. Sonakia addresses evolution in South Asia. H. Baba and F. Aziz provide a detailed paper on several human tibial fragments from Sambungmacan, Java. Q. Zhonglang presents a discussion of stone industries of *Homo sapiens* in China, which again seems slightly out of place in the midst of a discussion of *Homo* biology. W. Xinzhi deals with East and Southeast Asia. J. Kamminga reports on a reanalysis of the Upper Cave Zhoukoudian material, and G. Bräuer asks if the replacement model of human evolution works in Southeast Asia. Christy Turner continues to argue for *in situ* evolution of modern humans in Southeast Asia on the basis of dental morphology, with the addition of some small European and African samples. C. L. Brace and D. P. Tracer compare dental reduction and craniofacial morphology in recent Europe and Asia. Instead of an edited discussion at the end of this division, Pope and Turner present a brief summary of the papers.

Some illumination is a welcome relief as the reader wades through the diverse topics of this section.

The final portion of the volume is called "From Morphology to Genes." In this section, the skeletal biologists (Y. Dodo et al.; N. Ossenberg; M. Pietrusewsky et al.) present metric and nonmetric statistical analyses of populations from Japan, the American Northwest, and Asia and the Pacific, respectively. The nonmetric data from Japan are quite interesting but suffer from a lack of comparison with populations to the south of this archipelago. Sandra Bowdler reviews the hominid fossil material from Australia. Genetic evidence is provided by S. Harada on alcohol sensitivity and K. Tokunaga and T. Juji using HLA genes to trace migration in East Asia. L. Cavalli-Sforza et al. provide a summary of a multivariate analysis of the classic genetic polymorphisms in Asia. They find a north-south and east-west gradient as well as a circular gradient around Japan. This section is very noticeably missing the paper by R. Ward on mt-DNA, the focus of much of the initial discussion, an omission that leaves the reader hanging.

This large volume of papers on the evolution of modern man in Asia at once proposes to fill in the gaps in this vast topic as it skips from East to West and North to South. Although the mixture of archaeological and morphological interpretations is a welcome advance, I found the combination to be too weighted to be truly advantageous. The editors could have made some adjustments to the sequence of papers in the volume, which would have greatly improved the progression through the material. The production of the book is excellent, with an attractive red cover, good-quality paper, and well-reproduced illustrations, and the translations into English are very good. Although the symposium may have suffered from having a slightly too diverse outlook, this collection of papers would be useful for any student of human evolution in Asia. We can look forward, with great anticipation, to the published proceedings of the second symposium that was held the following year.

Archaeology of the P'eng-Hu Islands. Tsang Cheng-hwa. Special Publication 95. Taipei: Institute of History and Philology Academia Sinica, 1992. 492 pp., including 80 figures, 91 color plates, 50 tables, bibliography, glossary of Chinese characters, and a Chinese summary.

Reviewed by WILHELM G. SOLHEIM II, *University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, Honolulu*

The P'eng-hu Islands (*P'eng-hu Chun-tao*) are about 45 km west of the central west coast of Taiwan and are ordinarily known in the West as the Pescadores. Tsang did archaeological field research on the Islands from February 1983 to July 1985.

The book is divided into three parts with ten chapters and four appendices. Part 1, titled "Introduction to Research," has two chapters: "The P'eng-hu Islands and Their Adjacent Regions," "An Introduction to the Geographical and Cultural Historical Backgrounds of These Three Regions—the P'eng-hu Islands, the Southeastern Coast of the Chinese Mainland, and the Island of Taiwan" (pp. 3–34), and "Problems and Research Strategy" (pp. 35–42). Part 2, "The Archaeology," has five chapters, the titles of which adequately explain their contents: chapter 3, "The Site Survey" (pp. 45–68); chapter 4, "Excavation at a Coarse Cord-marked Ware Site: Kuo-yeh A" (pp. 69–99); chapter 5, "Excavations at Fine Cord-marked Ware Sites: Suo-kang and Nan-kang" (pp. 101–169); chapter 6, "Trial Excavation at a Plain Red Ware Site: Ch'ih-k'an-t'ou" (pp. 171–179), and chapter 7, "Excavations at Historical Sites: Nei-an C, Shui-an A, and Shih-pan-t'ou-shan A" (pp. 181–229). Part 3, "Discussion and Conclusions," has three chapters: chapter 8, "The Colonization of the P'eng-hu Islands" (pp. 233–264); chapter 9, "Implications for the Prehistory of the Southeastern Coast of China and the Island of Taiwan" (pp. 265–287); and chapter 10, "Implications for Historical Archaeology in Taiwan" (pp. 289–297). Appendix A presents "Site Descriptions" (pp. 299–327), B has "Carbon 14 Dates from the P'eng-hu Islands" (pp. 329–331), C is "Optic Microscope and Electron Microprobe Determinations of Artifact Samples from the P'eng-hu Islands and Taiwan" (by Ch'en Cheng-hong) (pp.

333–339), and D presents "Preliminary Observations on the Suo-kang Burials" (by Michael Pietruszewsky) (pp. 341–352).

The Coarse Cord-marked Ware Site equates with the Ta-p'en-k'eng (TPK) Culture of Taiwan, the first culture with pottery and polished stone tools on the Taiwan mainland, and hypothesized the first with agriculture. TPK sites on the Taiwan mainland are rare and have not produced a large inventory of artifacts. The data from Kuo-yeh A, on the east coast of P'eng-hu Tao, increase knowledge about the TPK Culture considerably. The ¹⁴C dates from the site indicate that its occupation was around 4600 to 4800 years B.P. (pp. 97–99). "The subsistence related evidence shows that the major subsistence resources for the Kuo-yeh A inhabitants did not come from the island itself, but rather from the marine resources along the shoreline. Shellfish, fish, and presumably seaweed from the intertidal rocks and coral reefs were probably the dietary staples" (p. 98).

The Fine Cord-marked Ware Sites equate closely with some of the Red Corded Ware Culture sites of the Taiwan mainland, but not with those mainland sites with the burnished red pottery (pp. 277–278). The Red Corded Ware Culture followed the TPK Culture. The two sites reported were year-around, coastal villages, occupied around 4600 B.P. Marine resources were of major subsistence importance, but indirect evidence suggests that some agriculture was practiced. Trade with other P'eng-hu islands and the Taiwan mainland is indicated (p. 168).

The Plain Red Ware Site apparently equates with the Plain Red pottery of the Taiwan mainland (Chang and collaborators 1974:50). This was a very small fishing village or fishing camp, used about 4000 years ago (p. 178).

Very little historical archaeology has been done on Taiwan, so the information resulting from the excavation of historic sites on the P'eng-hu Islands is of importance for adding to the scanty historical records of the Islands and of the early historic Chinese contacts with Taiwan. The temporary occupation of the Islands, starting as early as the ninth century A.D., follows a total gap of settlement and contact with any outside source since about 2000 B.C. (pp. 228, 262).

In his chapter on "The Colonization of the P'eng-hu Islands," Tsang presents a logical interpretation of the previously recorded data, clearly showing the purposes for colonization, the subsistence patterns indicated by the different sites, and the, at times, extensive trade within the Islands and between the islands and the Fukien mainland and the southwestern coastal area of Taiwan.

All of the prehistoric cultural assemblages on the islands of P'eng-hu show their strongest affinities with the prehistoric cultures of southwestern Taiwan. It can be said with confidence that southwestern Taiwan is undoubtedly the direct source area for the prehistoric cultures on the islands of P'eng-hu. . . .

The coarser cord-marked and fine cord-marked ware assemblages on the P'eng-hu Islands, however, also seem to be related to some of the contemporaneous ceramic assemblages of the southeastern coast of the mainland. The close resemblances in certain features of the Suo-kang phase of P'eng-hu and Sham Wan of Hong Kong, as well as Ta-mau-shan and T'an-shih-shan of Fukien, indicate that contact between P'eng-hu and these regions must have occurred. (pp. 248-249)

Before bringing up what is to me the most important part of this report, I would like to make a few remarks about specific points mentioned. On p. 47 Tsang mentions the difficulty of surveying all of the small Islands. He states "In fact, however, most of these unsurveyed islands are merely reefs of very small size, and most unlikely locations for human settlement

sites." Although I agree that these many small reefs are unlikely locations for settlements, they may well have been used for burials by maritime-oriented people. In eastern Indonesia I have found burials on tiny coral islands, some near settlement areas and others isolated from any possibly nearby settlements.

On p. 79, in giving details about the pottery from Kuo-yeh A, Tsang states "Since most of the sherds had gray cores . . . and irregularly colored interior and exterior surfaces, it may be postulated that the pottery was fired in open kilns at low temperatures." I agree that the irregular coloring of the surfaces probably reflects open firing; however, the gray cores do not necessarily mean firing at low temperatures. These cores, resulting from lack of oxidation of the carbon present therein, may result from either low firing temperature or from firing in a reducing atmosphere at a fairly high temperature followed by very rapid cooling of the pottery after firing, with oxidation of the exposed surfaces from the residual heat left by the firing but this heat being dissipated too rapidly to allow oxidation of all of the clay wall away from the surfaces.

Portions of four bone fishhooks were recovered from the Suo-kang site (p. 134). This type of fishhook (p. 139, fig. 40-2, 8, and 9, and pl. 27-1 to 4) "has not yet been found from the Neolithic sites in the regions adjacent to P'eng-hu, such as Taiwan and the southeastern coast of China . . ." but are similar to Pacific Island hooks (p. 140). I mention this to bring it to the attention of Pacific archaeologists who might not read this excellent report in detail.

On p. 182, Tsang mentions "slender bottles" as being found with a number of porcelain sherds and other artifacts from a test pit at the Nei-an C site. This type of vessel, pictured in plate 49, is very similar to bottles found in quantity in the old Chinese section of Manila. These, according to H. Otley Beyer (pers. verbal comm.) were used to ship and store mercury.

The most interesting information in this report for me is that having to do with the homeland of the Austronesian-speak-

ing people. This hypothesized homeland and the expansion of the Austronesian-speaking people has been of particular interest to me for the last 20 years. I will not repeat what I have said before about the Nusantao Maritime Trading Network but refer to one of my few papers that have appeared in print (1984–1985). The most widely accepted homeland for the Austronesian-speaking people is Taiwan, as ably advanced by Peter Bellwood (1984–1985:115). In that article he stated (p. 115): “Sometime during the fifth millennium B.C. members of these [agricultural] communities (probably from Fujian) crossed the Formosa Strait to Taiwan.... These groups were able, first of all, to survive and probably to establish nonhostile relations with existing hunting and gathering groups, and secondly to establish viable agricultural economies in which cereal cultivation (rice, millet) played a major role.” The first rice culture of Taiwan, according to Bellwood, is the Ta-p'en-k'eng Culture.

Tsang has this to say about the early neolithic societies of the P'eng-hu Islands and Taiwan (p. 261):

The intensive fishing and exchange activities would have certainly stimulated frequent open sea voyaging, and consequently, would have resulted in frequent contact and interactions among the peoples of P'eng-hu, Taiwan, and even the southeastern coast of the mainland. As a consequence, the flow of cultural information and mutual effect among the regions would have inevitably taken place. The changes in pottery styles of the Suo-kang phase in P'eng-hu and on the southwestern coast of Taiwan during the period around 4500 B.P. clearly indicate the influence from the cultures on the southeastern coast of the Chinese mainland, and exemplify this cultural exchange.

The most important cultural information introduced from the mainland coast to P'eng-hu and Taiwan, however, was probably wet-field rice cultivation. This is clearly indicated by the discovery of rice husks and stems, which have been identi-

fied as *Oryza sativa indica*, in the potsherds recovered from the sites of Suo-kang on P'eng-hu Tao and Ch'ih-k'an B on Pai-sha Tao of P'eng-hu ... as well as from K'enting on the south coast of Taiwan....

The sites with this early rice are those with the fine cord-marked ware pottery, which was in use around 4600 B.P. (p. 168) and not as early as the fifth millennium B.C. as proposed for rice by Bellwood.

Tsang in several places emphasizes the maritime orientation of the early people on the P'eng-hu Islands and coastal Taiwan. I point out some of these, quoting out of context. “The P'eng-hu Islands were first colonized by these marine-oriented people from the southwestern coast of Taiwan” (p. 258). “The intensive fishing and exchange activities would have certainly stimulated frequent open sea voyaging, and consequently, would have resulted in frequent contact and interactions among the peoples of P'eng-hu, Taiwan and even the southeastern coast of the mainland” (p. 261). “The eustatic change of the Taiwanese Regression ... may have served as a stimulus to the continuous development of more intensive marine exploitation and more effective seafaring. Such intensive marine activities in the Taiwan Strait would have accelerated the interaction and flow of information among the peoples in the regions surrounding the Taiwan Strait” (pp. 278–279).

I have hypothesized (1984–1985:81) that it was the Nusantao maritime traders, “along the coasts of northern Luzon, southern Taiwan, and South China, between 4500 and 5000 B.C.,” who developed Proto-Austronesian as a trade language. I now refer to it as a lingua franca, and from this Austronesian evolved along these coastal areas by soon after 4500 B.C.

Tsang ended his discussion of the prehistoric period of the southeastern coast of China and Taiwan as follows:

Based on the current archaeological evidence mentioned above, I do not agree with Bellwood that “Taiwan is

a potentially vital area for the transmission of cultural innovations from the Asian mainland into the islands" (1979:207), if he chooses to "emphasise [sic] the importance of the Corded Ware-Yuan-shan cultural tradition" (1979:207). Since the homeland of this tradition was most likely on the coast of the mainland between Fukien and Vietnam, as I mentioned previously, I would postulate that the Austronesian languages and cultures were probably transmitted into insular southeast Asia and the Pacific Islands along the eastern coast of the southeast Asian mainland rather than through the island of Taiwan.

I fully agree with Tsang that the important route of movement of the culture carried by the Nusantao Austronesian speakers was south along the South China coast and the coast of Viet Nam, with the Nusantao Maritime Trading Network expanding across the South China Sea from central Viet Nam to southern Palawan, in the Philippines, and the coast of Borneo, from where it continued to expand around the north and south coasts of Borneo, into eastern Indonesia and southern Mindanao and out into the Pacific. I have presented my reasoning for this in the revised paper

that I presented in Taiwan (n.d.), revised after reading this book by Tsang.

All chapters are clearly and well written. The maps are presented at a scale that is easily read, and the tables and text are clear and readable. This is a physically pleasing book to read and its contents are important.

REFERENCES

- BELLWOOD, P.
 1979 *Man's Conquest of the Pacific*. New York: Oxford University Press.
 1984– A hypothesis for Austronesian origins. *Asian Perspectives* 26(1):107–117.
 1985
- CHANG, K. C., and COLLABORATORS
 1974 Man in the Choshui and Tatu River Valleys in Central Taiwan: Preliminary report of an interdisciplinary project, 1972–1973 Season. *Asian Perspectives* 17(1):36–55.
- SOLHEIM, W. G. II
 1984– The Nusantao hypothesis: The origin and spread of Austronesian speakers. *Asian Perspectives* 26(1):77–88.
 1985
 n.d. The Nusantao and Prehistoric Contacts among the Peoples of Southeast Asia, South China, Korea, and Japan. Paper presented at the International Symposium on Austronesian Studies Relating to Taiwan held in Taiwan, 29–31 December 1992.

New Perspectives on the Art of Ceramics in China. George Kuwayama, ed. Los Angeles: Los Angeles County Museum of Art, 1992. 156 p., paperback.

Reviewed by CHUIMEI HO, *Field Museum of Natural History, Chicago*

The volume contains seven papers read by Yutaka Mino, Rose Kerr, Mary Ann Rogers, Rosemary Scott, John Guy, Pamela Vandiver, and Nigel Wood at a conference organized by George Kuwayama at the Los Angeles County Museum of Art in September 1987. The conference was held in connection with two ceramic exhibitions, "Imperial Taste: Chinese Ceramics from the Percival David Foundation" and "In Pursuit of the Dragon: Traditions and Transitions in Ming Ceramics."

The volume showcases research on Chinese ceramics by museum professionals and ceramic scientists in Britain and the United States. The papers are based on data derived from: (1) recent investigations by Chinese archaeologists (Mino, Kerr, Rogers, Guy); (2) museum and literary studies (Scott); and (3) technical analyses in the laboratory (Vandiver, Wood). In dealing with archaeological data, the authors share with other non-Chinese researchers the handicap of not having first-

hand access to excavated materials. They cope with this handicap well, however. Familiarity with Chinese excavation reports and other publications enables them to summarize recent progress and to offer significant new interpretations. George Kuwayama, the organizer of the conference, deserves much praise for selecting this particular group of specialists and asking them to take a fresh look at museum objects in the light of the latest archaeological finds.

All seven papers are amply illustrated. The photographs often appear on the same page as the text, which is an editorial nightmare but a convenience for readers. However, some photographs tend to be dark, and some reproductions of paintings are small. The volume would have been even more useful if a list of Chinese characters had been included.

Rose Kerr's "Ming and Qing Ceramics: Some Recent Archaeological Perspectives" and Rosemary Scott's "Archaism and Invention: Sources of Ceramic Design in the Ming and Qing Dynasties" can be seen as complementary papers. Both are focused on ceramics of the same periods, and both provide insights into museum collections. As for research resources, Kerr examines a number of reports on burials and kiln sites, and Scott reviews aspects of ceramic design based on library research.

The ceramics of the Ming and Qing periods (late fourteenth–early twentieth centuries) are often packed together as one continuous unit, but differentiated from the ceramics of the Song and Yuan periods (eleventh–fourteenth centuries) in terms of aesthetic preference and potting techniques. Perhaps because more examples of Ming and Qing ceramics are still on the market and in private and public collections, interest in that group of ceramics is strong and has resulted in a large number of publications of the connoisseur type. However, field research on kilns, burials, and settlement sites of the Ming and Qing dynasties is relatively scarce as compared with earlier historical periods. As a result, scholars working on ceramics of the last 600 years traditionally have relied heavily on literary records and museum pieces as

their primary sources of data. Kerr's work is particularly interesting because it makes use of available Ming–Qing archaeological data.

In the first part of her paper, Kerr discusses two contemporary but different views on ring-handled vessels of the sixteenth–seventeenth centuries: one view derives from a burial containing a bronze model of double-ring design and the other from notes of connoisseurs commenting on that particular shape in ceramics. By doing so, Kerr is interested in revealing facets of religious and social history, using ceramics as one of the keys.

The second part of her paper is a collection of notes on recent finds from Imperial kiln sites at Jingdezhen, dating to the first half of the fifteenth century, and the relationship of these with pieces in Western museums. The third part contains "a rambling account," as Kerr puts it, of ceramic finds from datable archaeological contexts from the Yuan through Qing periods. Neither of these last two parts is tightly structured. However, both include ideas that deserve fuller treatment. One example is her original observation that white-glazed ceramics were in vogue during the early fifteenth century, as shown by finds in that stratum at the Imperial kilns, but in the Qing period such ceramics were regarded as cheap blanks. This idea could be pursued further. Although this reviewer is not entirely convinced, I would like to see historical records of the two periods examined in more detail and the social status of Ming and Qing white wares compared more carefully.

Unlike Kerr, who seeks to use ceramics to fill in details of social and religious history during Ming and Qing times, Scott concentrates on information extractable from the ceramics themselves. By examining vessel shapes and decorative designs, she looks into four possible sources of inspiration: archaism, vessels in other materials, literature, and the symbolism of good wishes. The taste for archaistic and cross-media designs is considered by Scott to have been promoted by Imperial patronage and that of elite scholar-officials, but an interest in dramatic and good luck de-

signs was fashionable throughout Chinese society. Such views are familiar among scholars interested in Ming–Qing ceramics, but Scott ably summarizes current thinking on the subject. Although her references could have been expanded to include more Chinese and foreign sources, this is more than balanced by her good illustrations, often of pieces from museum collections that she knows well.

In reading Scott's paper, one is aware of the lack of a wider picture against which her groupings of ceramics can be evaluated. One wishes, for instance, to know how large her samples were for her to have concluded that *The Water Margin*, *The Journey to the West*, and *The Romance of the Three Kingdoms* were the most popular works of fiction used in the decoration of ceramics. One would also like to see a chronological breakdown. The main published versions of all three novels appeared in the early Ming period; were themes from them more common then than in later times? When discussing ceramics of the fourteenth–nineteenth centuries, it is essential, I think, to make distinctions among ceramics targeted to different functions and to consumers from different social backgrounds. Could it be true that certain archaistic vessel shapes were conditioned by the functions they served? I think so. Ming and Qing records regarding official rites make it clear that ritual objects had to be more conservative in design to play the ceremonial role required of them.

To be sure, Scott is not concerned with the question of why certain sources of inspiration should have prevailed over others, nor with the mechanisms through which new designs were transmitted to potters, nor with the economic and social factors that caused those designs to be adopted. Her paper is solidly within the museological tradition of dating, sourcing, and explaining individual pieces and finding comparable pieces in other museums and publications. She has done a fine job in this regard.

Another paper concerned primarily with the sourcing of museum collections is Yutaka Mino's "Recent Finds of Chinese Song and Yuan Ceramics." Like Kerr,

Mino examines and matches kiln data with museum pieces. His survey includes examples of Yue, Longquan, Guan, Yaozhou, Ding, Jun, Cizhou, Qingbai, Jizhou, Quanzhou, and Jian wares. He also sometimes refers to pieces unearthed from non-kiln sites in Southeast Asia, China, and Japan. Most of his article consists of captioned photographs: there are 38 pages of these and only one page of text.

The article can serve as a minihandbook for collectors and museum professionals interested in tracing parallels to pieces that may be in their own collections. The examples that Mino has included were chosen for aesthetic merit and because parallels exist among published pieces from kiln excavations. Not all are typical products of the kiln complexes in question, and in a few cases Mino has emphasized particular wares over others without explaining why. For instance, seven Yue ware vessels from museums are illustrated and compared with excavated pieces, but the article gives much less space to other wares of comparable age and importance.

An area in which I disagree with Mino lies in his evaluation of recent ceramic archaeological work in China, which he says has not been able to change "the mainstream chronology and types of Song and Yuan ceramics." He is mainly right if the study of ceramics is only about the identification and dating of museum pieces. Moreover, much credit must be given to the ceramic scholars of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries who, with the benefit of little (if any) archaeological data, built up a chronological and typological framework that is still substantially valid. But it would be too bad if one were to conclude that the results of the last 40 years of vigorous field research have done no more than to "confirm, elaborate and modify" established views. In my opinion, one of the greatest values of recent archaeological work on ceramics has been to put together a growing body of trustworthy data and testable hypotheses that will allow art historians as well as other scholars to break away from past impressions, to develop new paths of research, and to contribute significantly to the mainstream

study of history. The study of ceramics is undergoing exciting changes, from an era of connoisseurship to one of scientific scholarship. This excitement is abundantly evident in Mino's own work as well as in that of the other contributors to this book.

Unlike the other papers, which cover a wide range of wares over an extended time span, Mary Ann Rogers concentrates on one particular ware of the early twelfth century, the enigmatic Ru ware, the identification of which forms one of the most complicated but interesting issues in Chinese ceramic history. In her paper, "The Mechanics of Change: The Creation of A Song Imperial Ceramic Style," she discusses the recently investigated Qingliangsi kiln in Henan Province where the famous but enigmatic Ru ware was made. Rogers explores three topics on which insight has been shed by the Qingliangsi data: the relationship between Ru ware and the contemporary Koryo celadon of Korea; the Northern Song court as an important factor in promoting the art movement of which Qingliangsi production forms a part; and the relationship of Qingliangsi with Northern Song Guan [Imperial] ware on the one hand and with Southern Song Guan ware on the other.

Rogers seconds Margaret Medley's idea that Koryo celadon could have been a source of inspiration for the achievement of Ru ware. The idea is plausible considering the cultural and political interest the two countries had in each other, but is difficult to prove in the absence of more textual evidence. Without fresh evidence, how are we to convince nationalistic scholars that Koryo influenced Ru when China by the early twelfth century had already been producing green-glazed ceramics for more than a thousand years and exporting them for several hundred, while Korean potters had only advanced beyond earthenware a century or two before? It would be interesting if celadon production were to prove to be another case like that of gunpowder and cast-iron smelting—technologies developed early in China but later learned so well by a fast-developing foreign country that they had to be reimported.

The arts and crafts of the Song period

are often broadly divided into Northern and Southern phases according to the shift of the political capital, from Kaifeng in the North to Hangzhou in the Southeast. Rogers offers a finer division of artistic expression during the time span of the Northern Song. Her view is interesting and original. She examines different forms of art—paintings, ceramics, and bronzes—of the eleventh and the twelfth centuries and concludes that a new aesthetic philosophy came to prevail in the early twelfth century because of the interest of the Court and that this transformed artistic styles in several media. Ru ware is seen as one response to that new philosophy.

John Guy's paper, "Southeast Asian Glazed Ceramics: A Study of Sources," offers another perspective on ceramic studies in Asia. Guy attributes the shapes and designs of glazed wares made in Southeast Asia to three sources. From India, he suggests, come the storage jars of the *purna kalasa* type as well as ritual utensils like conches and *kundika* sprinklers; from China come covered jars, bowls, and bottles; such forms as stem-dishes and funerary jars come from the indigenous earthenware tradition. Other items such as lime jars and wine containers (which have a close resemblance to storage jars) might belong to the last category as well. Guy also attempts to identify the functions of the various vessel shapes in terms of the social and religious customs of the region. He refers extensively to bas reliefs, statues, bronze prototypes, excavated ceramics from kilns and settlements in Southeast Asia, and sometimes historical documents as well. The paper is neatly structured, and its arguments are amply supported with references.

Guy does not indicate whether he feels that he has exhausted the full repertoire of Indian- and Chinese-derived vessels; only six groups of derivative vessel shapes are identified. One suspects he might not be able to identify many more. Although there is no denying that India and China have had an important impact on Southeast Asian cultural outlooks during the last 2000 years, ceramics do not seem to illustrate that impact very well. Indeed, kiln

site reports from Thailand, Cambodia, Burma, and Viet Nam—on which adequate data have only begun to be assembled within the past decade—contain many more vessel shapes than Guy's paper covers. Is this undiscussed majority, as appears to be the case, dominantly non-Chinese and non-Indian in inspiration? Do some of the vessel shapes involved represent innovations or can all be derived from earlier earthenware prototypes? Did potters in various parts of Southeast Asia differ significantly with regard to the degree of outside influence they show? Or is Guy justified in treating the kilns of Southeast Asia, for the sake of simplifying his argument, as representing a single pan-regional entity?

The last two papers of the volume, "Technical Studies of Ancient Chinese Ceramics" by Pamela Vandiver and "Recent Researches into the Technology of Chinese Ceramics" by Nigel Wood, are written from the viewpoint of material science. Vandiver is concerned with the problem that art historians and archaeologists have not fully appreciated the powerful tools developed by laboratory scientists. Her paper was written to educate non-technical readers about the usefulness of technical studies. She cites results of microstructure analyses, many of which are her own work, on Chinese earthenware and on Yue, Jun, Guan, Jian, Qingbai, and *famille verte* wares to demonstrate that each ware type can usually be characterized in terms of certain glazing and firing patterns. These patterns can be used to

explain the visual appearance of each ware type and can contribute toward cultural interpretations.

The Guan ware of the Southern Song period is an interesting exception, Vandiver points out. Three Guan ware samples yield disparate patterns, each of which can be linked with characteristics of a separate ware: Jun, Yue, and Longquan, respectively. It seems in this case that the scientific results match well with the complicated relationships among these wares as seen by archaeologists and art historians. Mary Ann Rogers explains some of those relationships in her paper.

Unlike Vandiver, who discusses only certain ware types, Wood offers overall views of two broad subjects: first, the history of technical studies on Chinese ceramics by Chinese and Western scientists and, second, the technological development of the Chinese ceramic industry from the Neolithic to Ming times. Wood has long been interested in approaching the subject in terms of two main ceramic regions within China: the North and the South, each of which had distinctive technical traditions shaped by local natural resources and climate. He sketches these ideas convincingly in this paper.

The volume is well structured, amply referenced, and skillfully presented. It constitutes an authoritative and easily followed introduction to the technological background of Chinese ceramics. In my opinion it could profitably be read by anyone who hopes fully to understand the subjects of ceramic design and production.

Pacific Northeast Asia in Prehistory: Hunter-Fishers, Farmers, and Sociopolitical Elites. C. Melvin Aikens and S. N. Rhee, eds. Pullman, Wash.: Washington State University Press, 1992. 223 pp.

Reviewed by RICHARD PEARSON, *University of British Columbia, Vancouver*

This collection of 27 papers from the Circum-Pacific Conference held in Seattle, 1–6 August 1989, is organized into three main sections: Hunting-Fishing-Gathering Cultures, Farming Cultures in North

China and Korea, and the Emergence of Sociopolitical Elites. I attempt in this review to enumerate the total contents of this volume, with brief evaluative comment.

Two papers surveying the Palaeolithic and Early Holocene of Korea by K. D. Bae and S. B. Yi outline major discoveries and problems and alert the reader to previous extravagant claims. An intriguing attempt to quantify shell midden remains from the Yankovskaya culture, dating from the eighth to third centuries B.C., is provided by D. Brodianski and V. Radov, of the Far Eastern State University, Vladivostok.

A group of eight papers explores Japanese Jomon subsistence patterns. These include a study by T. Haraguchi of dolphin hunting and ceremonialism at the Mawaki Site, Ishikawa Prefecture (famed for its arrangement of huge wooden posts and wooden carving). P. Bleed's study of diversity of stone tool types and subsistence diversity at the Yagi Site, southern Hokkaido, concludes that the Early Jomon occupants were virtually sedentary, able to reach various resources within a short distance of their settlement. M. Aikens and T. Akazawa document the carryover of Jomon fishing traditions into Yayoi times in sites on the Boso Peninsula, Chiba Prefecture. Two papers, by M. Minagawa and T. Akazawa, and by B. Chisholm, H. Koike, and N. Nakai, discuss Jomon palaeodiet based on isotopic analysis of human bones. General conclusions are that populations in Hokkaido depended on larger proportions of meat than of plant foods in their diet, in comparison with populations from central Honshu or Kyushu. Minagawa and Akazawa further point out that, although the analogy between Jomon and cultures of the Northwest Coast is often drawn, in fact, Northwest Coast peoples generally have a proportion of meat to plant foods that is closer to those of the peoples of Hokkaido. Running through these papers is the strong conclusion that in many, if not all, parts of Japan, Jomon communities were not seasonally mobile, but secured resources from immediately adjacent locales at different seasons of the year, using a diverse tool kit. H. Koike notes changes in subsistence patterns accompanying population growth, such as the tendency for younger individuals of both deer and shellfish to be

taken, in addition to greater dependence on secondary foods derived from "r" strategy species. Ikawa-Smith's paper on ring-shaped burial mounds of Late Jomon Hokkaido continues on this theme of residential permanency, stating that "the ideology of residential permanency was so strong among some Jomon people that when they were unable to realize it in this world, they contrived to maintain it in the arrangement of graves for the dead" (p. 83). These "kanjodori" grave mounds symbolize group solidarity in a time of social instability and tension. T. Kobayashi, in his paper, "Patterns and Levels of Social Complexity in Jomon Japan," identifies six different Jomon settlement types, noting that changes in settlement patterns from incipient to Late Jomon suggest increasing social complexity and clearer definition of social units. He also identifies a principle of dual social organization, expressed in distinct intrasite spatial groupings and incipient social ranking. H. Watanabe, whose papers always provide insights for archaeologists, outlines continuities in dwelling habit, food economy, social life, and warfare among North Pacific cultures. He postulates a northern Pacific culture zone and discusses residential stability and settlement type, dividing the northern Pacific Maritime culture zone into the Northwest Coast, Bering Sea, Okhotsk Sea, and Japan Sea zones. North Pacific maritime hunter sedentism is associated with the development of wooden houses and a home base with complex spatial structure. Some papers postulate an unbroken evolution of hunting and gathering in southern Hokkaido, whereas Aikens acknowledges (p. 100) the recent discoveries by Crawford and Takamiya of a late stage of cultivation adopted by the Hokkaido Ainu, after which they returned to hunting and gathering.

Part 2, entitled "Farming Cultures in North China and Korea," comprises six papers, four dealing with China and two with Korea. W. M. Yan's paper reviews the evidence for cultivation of plants, using a Neolithic periodization based on nonsubsistence criteria. He places Early Neolithic from 6500 to 5000 B.C. and

Late Neolithic from 5000 to 3000 B.C. X. B. Shi's two papers review the evidence for pre-Yangshao cultures and Neolithic culture systems of China. One of the more interesting papers, by Y. Wa, provides useful background on the Dongbei region, with a summary of historical sources, ethnographic observations, and outlines of archaeological cultures. Through a comparative study of stone tools, Y. N. Chon postulates that rice cultivation diffused to Korea from eastern China, south of the Huai River.

The third part, entitled "The Emergence of Sociopolitical Elites," contains six papers dealing directly or indirectly with Chinese and Korean ancient social complexity. A. Underhill describes archaeological data for the Longshan Period of China that reflect social complexity: size and type of settlement, differentiation in housing, and use of bronze items and special ceramics. She finds evidence for large central walled sites with defense facilities, elite residences constructed of adobe, limited evidence of metallurgy in rich burials, and elite ceramics possibly used in competitive display. S. Nelson, in her paper dealing with agriculture and sociopolitical development in prehistoric Korea, attempts to apply Rindos's three sequential cumulative modes of domestication: Incidental Domestication, Specialized Domestication, and Agricultural Domestication. Although the approach seems useful, given the paucity of data on plant domestication it seems more like a frame of reference for the time being. She proposes that the Yami of Taiwan can be considered as an example of Incidental Domestication, despite their intensive, irrigated taro subsistence base. M. L. Choi discusses the trade system of the Korean Wiman Period (194–108 B.C.) through distribution of knife money of the Yan state. Exploration of the implications of the data look promising for future research. S. N. Rhee's paper, "Secondary State Formation, The Case of the Koguryo State," combines the theory of secondary state formation with archaeological data from the region north of the Yalu River, concluding that Koguryo emerged as a state from

the first century B.C., around the time when it expelled the Chinese commandery of Xundu. G. Barnes reviews the development of hard-fired ceramics in the Korean peninsula in light of proposed typological and chronological revisions by Korean scholars and relates them to new data on the production of stoneware from China. H. J. Ro's revised framework for Korean prehistory ignores any sign of cultivation in the Chulmun Period, separates indigenous and foreign cultural traits in the Mumun Period, and proposes a "Korean Bronze Age" that synthesizes these two.

The epilogue of the volume by K. C. Chang contains a second version of his formulation of the shamanistic foundation of Chinese and American Indian cultures, which has roots back to the European Palaeolithic, the first version appearing in *The Archaeology of Ancient China* (1986:414–421. New Haven, Ct.: Yale University Press.) To its credit, the shamanistic hypothesis of Shang religion has more explanatory power than other studies of Shang bronzes, but the setting of this tradition in opposition to Judaeo-Christian beliefs seems unnecessarily reductionist to me.

Because this volume consists of conference proceedings published less than 4 years after the event, the editors' apparent decision to adopt a rough and ready attitude to editorial problems seems justified and welcome. Unclear translation, slips in Romanization, and missing page numbers for references cited can be found, but they are not serious.

The major contributions of this volume are, in my opinion, the exploration of Jomon subsistence and society and the approaches to cultural complexity. Spotty data and superficial analyses sometimes make the theoretical applications little more than metaphors; however, the perspectives are still worth pursuing. Many other interesting perspectives are found in these papers, which are obviously required reading for regional specialists. The editors and conference organizers certainly deserve our thanks.