
Reviewed by J. D. Jennings, University of Hawaii

Even if it contained only the publisher’s preface by William P. Lebra and the remaining pages were blank, Archaeology at the Eleventh Pacific Science Congress would be an extremely important publication, because it marks the birth of a new series dedicated to “facilitating the growth of archaeological research in Asia and the Pacific,” an area where new data have led to new perspectives at a rate matched nowhere on earth in the past decade, except possibly in the Alaskan Arctic. By incorporating a series of summary articles and progress reports in one volume, the publication has also broken the infuriating (to an interested outsider) “Kula ring” of the dozen or so Oceanic prehistorians who for several years have been exchanging duplicated but “unpublished” statements of their thoughts and findings. The Kula ring was, of course, quite appropriately devised both to offset the publication lag and to accelerate the exchange of crucial comparative data from widely scattered key locations over the Pacific, as vast distances and great costs prevent the annual meetings and conferences which serve comparable purposes for less scattered scholars.


While all the papers will be useful in context, as in any symposium, the articles vary greatly in quality. All reports except Hughes’s provide data previously only available to Kula members, although Hughes offers a summary of recent osteological finds in China not known to the general student. While all contributors merit critical review, I can single out for comment only the three or four items which have wider interest for prehistorians generally.

In his settlement-pattern case studies, Green demonstrated that he understands the limitations of the settlement-pattern model for extending and refining the interpretation of archaeological data, as he documents his debt to ethnohistoric and ethnographic sources. He correctly views the settlement-pattern concept as an organizing principle, not as the key to all knowledge, as have some less rigorous scholars. Green also, in passing, enhances his contribution by using his data to test—more properly, evaluate—the usefulness of Ruppe’s ordering of the validity of four standard archaeological survey techniques.

Pearson’s summary of late Taiwan and Ryukyu finds brings order out of scattered statements and a few recently run radiocarbon dates. Shuttler’s paper is substantially the one which appeared in “The Proceedings of the Sixth International Conference, Radiocarbon and Tritium Dating,” but it will be useful to non-Kula members, as he brings together most of the radiocarbon dates that have indicated that Polynesian prehistory has a depth of more than 2,000 years and that Melanesian prehistory is older. Moreover, there are close cultural connections between the two at the earliest levels.

Voitov and Tumarkin’s conclusion that, so far as winds and currents are concerned, Polynesia could have been colonized via either Micronesia or Melanesia is not new but is based on much more refined oceanographic data than have been available before.
I continue to wonder, however, that these and other scientists persist in refuting the excessive and un­scholarly claims of Heyerdahl, whose misuse of evidence already has been exposed.

Boriskovsky’s short attempt to distinguish palaeo­lithic and mesolithic chipped-stone types emphasizes the futility of extending these entirely inapplicable European terms to the study of Southeast Asian data. Until students rid themselves of the European models (and therefore terms), the stone-age remains of Southeast Asia will not be understood.

Aside from being immediately useful, the collection of papers is well printed by the offset method and is attractively comb-bound. Even more pleasing is the knowledge that numbers 2 and 3 are available and number 4 is forthcoming. Aside from the journal

_Archeology and Physical Anthropology in Oceania_,

now in its third year, no general outlet for archeologi­cal material from the Pacific area exists, and in this new series the Social Science Research Institute of the University of Hawaii merits the thanks of all Pacific anthropologists and historians. The availability of _The Asian and Pacific Archaeology Series_ should spur scholars toward early and complete re­porting of research.


Reviewed by DONN T. BAYARD, University of Hawaii

This volume is the catalog of a photographic exhibi­tion assembled in conjunction with the symposium “Early Chinese Art and its Possible Influence in the Pacific Basin,” organized by the Department of Art History and Archaeology of Columbia University in August 1967. In addition to selecting the seventy photographs and drawings to be exhibited, Fraser and graduate students in the department have sup­plied a framework of commentary and description to accompany them. This framework is based on eleven art motifs which occur in the art of Shang, Chou, and Han China and which are distributed widely in the Pacific Basin as well: the long tongue; displayed monster; displayed, flanked figure; architectural mask; simultaneous image (‘ao-t’ieh, etc.); utural motif (a sort of ‘ao-t’ieh in reverse); monster-mask headgear; alter ego (an animal figure superposed over a human one); tongueblade; rump mask; and forehead lozenge. The distribution of these motifs is traced from China through Island Southeast Asia and Oceania (relying on protohistoric and historic materi­al), Mesoamerica and Peru (prehistoric material), and the Northwest Coast of North America (proto­historic material). In some cases the authors present a large amount of detail on the symbolic meaning of the motif in the area in question; in other cases this is not discussed.

A quick check of each areal section’s symbolic use of the motifs produced the following rough totals: apotropaic or protective, 28; destructive-creative, 9 (all but two from either the Iatmul of New Guinea or the Northwest Coast); other or no explanation of symbolism, 46. Given these figures, I found it puzzling that Fraser concludes, “.. these motifs center almost entirely on moments involving transition from one state to another, particularly devouring and birth­giving, the epitome respectively of destruction and creation” (p. 118).

In both the introduction and concluding portions of this book Fraser discusses three possible reasons for the strong resemblances he finds in the art of the areas covered: the influence of environment; Lévi­Strauss’s structural-functional explanation of such similarities; and a historical explanation which “.. necessitates the postulating of numerous intra­Pacific contracts” (p. 2). Fraser dismisses the first two explanations on the basis of the great diversity of cultures and physical environments in the area, and concludes, “In short, there appears to be no logical alternative to the view that early Chinese art did significantly influence the art forms of various cul­tures of the Pacific basin” (p. 118), although he admits that the mechanisms by which this influence was spread are not known.

Although many of the parallels presented are quite close ones, I have the impression that several alter­native explanations are possible. Aside from the possi­bility of coincidental development of many of the motifs discussed in any art style emphasizing bilateral symmetry (for example, La Tène), the explanation that seems to me most suitable to explain the general parallelism present in the art forms of early China and protohistoric Indonesia and Oceania would be a common origin for the motifs somewhere in mainland Southeast Asia (not dealt with in this volume) well before the rise of Chinese civilization. The lack of indications of the presence of these motifs in the archaeological record would not seem particularly surprising given the construction materials of most of the objects presented in this volume and the in­cipient state of Southeast Asian archaeology. Cer­tainly what dates are available at present for eastern Oceania indicate that the ancestors of many of the makers of the protohistoric and historic objects ex­hibited were already settled in eastern Melanesia by late Chou times. A combination of convergence, retention of very general similarities in art styles, and local stimulus diffusion would in my view be a more economical explanation for these parallels in Oceania than the fleets of Chou vessels required for a contact explanation.

The New World parallels are admittedly more puzzling; the close correspondence of the rump mask motif in late Shang China and Chavin Peru in both design and contemporaneity constitutes perhaps the most convincing case for trans-Pacific contact pre-
sent here. But again, stimulus diffusion of these motifs in the New World seems a more economical explanation of their distribution in time and space, regardless of whether they originated through isolated early contact with China or by convergence. A case in point is the occurrence of at least seven and probably nine of the eleven motifs in the art of the late Middle Mississippian Southern Cult in the southeastern United States. While general parallels exist with Mesoamerican art styles, few if any specific correspondences can be found, and stimulus diffusion plus later independent development are the currently accepted explanations. In this regard, Toltec art and the Southern Cult seem to be in a position rather parallel to Chou art and Indonesia-Oceania, although with less time separating the former pair.

While this volume has little to do with the subject matter of the majority of the papers presented at the symposium for which it was assembled, the illustrations are handsome and well reproduced, and a thirty-page bibliography makes it a useful volume for those interested in the artistic styles and symbolism of the Pacific area.


Reviewed by A. Y. DESSAINT, University of Hawaii

Agricultural Change and Peasant Choice in a Thai Village is a study of decision-making—the first significant application to anthropology of an approach that has gained wide acceptance in the social sciences. It is also the first intensive study in English of the Lü (or Lue), a Tai-speaking ethnic group settled in parts of southern China, northern Laos, and northern Thailand. This is an important work, both from the ethnographic point of view and from the theoretical point of view. The methods and results of the study are likely to form the basis for a great deal of future research on economic development and social change.

Michael Moerman already has devoted several perceptive articles to Ban Ping, a village located near Chiangkham in northern Thailand. Ban Ping is a Lü village, not a Thai (i.e., Siamese) village as the title suggests. The author spent some twenty months there in 1959–1961 and in 1965. The book under review is a revision of Moerman’s doctoral dissertation, Farming in Ban Phaed, presented at Yale University in 1964.

The villagers of Ban Ping are the descendants of a group brought from the Sip Song Panna, in southern China, by the Prince of Nan in the 1850s. Glutinous rice cultivation was the basis of their economy long before that time, but, according to Moerman, rice cultivation is the aspect of their village life that has changed most drastically since their coming to Ban Ping. Improved transportation, marketing facilities, and technological changes have made an impact even in this relatively remote area.

Moerman recently suggested that many anthropological theories are nothing more than local old wives’ tales translated into jargon (June Helm, The Problem of Tribe, Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1967). Although external explanations are frequently put forth, Moerman’s study is largely an attempt to understand a certain domain—rice cultivation—as recognized by the Lü in terms of their own categories. The villagers’ work involves alternative courses of action as recognized by the Lü themselves and the way in which various types of villagers choose among possible alternatives. The concern with rice cultivation is combined with an interest in extra-community relations and ways in which rice cultivation and extra-community relations affect each other. The approach allows the reader to understand the rationality of an agricultural system in which the farmer is impressed by cash, but takes into account the subsistence value before the market value of a crop and neglects such practices as weeding, seed selection, and the use of fertilizers and insecticides.

The Ban Ping situation is in sharp contrast with the situation in Java as found by Clifford Geertz. Moerman shows the importance and the implications of the greater availability of land and labor resources in Ban Ping. Indicative of the usefulness of Moerman’s approach are his interesting discussions of the manipulation of ethnicity by tractor owners (who are outsiders) and of the manipulation of kinship ties for labor mobilization.

Moerman begins with an examination of the technology and of extra-community relations associated with plough agriculture and with tractor agriculture, respectively. He considers how the farmer decides which kind of rice to plant, when to plant it, how to seed it, and so on. He then studies the possible alternative in land acquisition and in labor mobilization, which leads him into a consideration of the kinship system and of the social structure. Next he turns to a consideration of two major decisions to be taken by the wet rice farmer: which fields to cultivate and whether to use a tractor or a plough. He considers these alternatives both as conscious choices on the part of the farmers and as the balancing of costs (land, cash, labor, capital investment) and returns (rice harvested per land and labor unit as well as in relation to the cash involved).

In 1960, tractors operated by commercial interests outside the village made possible the cultivation of former jungles and wastelands at a reduced labor cost. Mechanization, individuation, and commercialization of land, labor, and agriculture, though not caused by the introduction of tractors, were certainly accelerated. The timing of tasks in tractor agriculture
Luce in the villagers used tractors in order to bring under knowledge and to the use of tractors therefore distinguished student of Burmese history and culture. As such, ethnography is likely to remain imperfect, as Moerman's delimitation of his "universe of discourse" is not wholly satisfactory. By omitting an analysis of Lü economics and rice marketings, Moerman does not provide the reader with a complete understanding of Lü rice cultivation. Nevertheless, he has demonstrated the usefulness of decision-making models that allow us to view changes in rules and criteria—in other words, the way in which people view their own world—and not just changes in behavior. The analysis should substantially sharpen one's understanding of social change.

The study should also put an end once and for all to clichés about the dichotomy of wet and dry rice cultivation, about the increasing commercialization of agriculture, and about traditional attitudes that prevent a rational approach to agriculture. We must now examine in detail the importance of particular technological systems and crop types, land and water resources, and methods of acquiring land and of mobilizing labor. By comparing the results of this study of Lü irrigated rice cultivation with Izikowitz's classic work on Lamu dry rice cultivation, one can make interesting comparisons of labor and timing requirements in two different agricultural systems in neighboring areas. Moerman's appendix on glutinous rice should be read in conjunction with Tadayo Watabe's Glutinous Rice in Northern Thailand (Kyoto: Centre for Southeast Asian Studies, Kyoto University, 1967).

Not the least merit of this work is its lively and concise style which makes it highly readable. It would have been even more so if the abundant illustrative case material had not been largely relegated to footnotes. There are some inaccuracies (e.g., there are seventy-one provinces in Thailand, not seventy-six as stated on page 4), but this is an important study that contains sound ethnographical data and stimulating theoretical ideas.


Reviewed by STANLEY J. O'CONNOR, Cornell University

These two large and sumptuous volumes are a most deserved tribute to Gordon H. Luce, the distinguished student of Burmese history and culture. The forty-three papers contributed by his friends and colleagues chart the contours of many fields of social science and humanist inquiry underway in Southeast Asia and will be indispensable reading for specialists in the area.

The useful selected bibliography of works by Mr. Luce in Volume I is especially welcome. Since 1916, when he wrote his first paper for the Journal of the Burma Research Society, Mr. Luce has advanced knowledge of the ancient Burmese, Mons, and Shans on an astonishing number of fronts, including epigraphy, archaeology, language, folk literature, and religion. The appearance of his Old Burma: the Early Pagan Period is awaited as the definitive work on the history and monuments of Pagan. One item that should be added to the bibliography is Luce's translation of the Man Thau (Southeast Asia Program, Data Paper No. 44, Ithaca: Cornell University, 1961), written by the ninth century Chinese historian Fan-ch'o.

The remainder of Volume I is devoted to twenty-six papers on subjects primarily of interest to students of Asian history, cultural anthropology, and linguistics. The articles range in accessibility to the general reader from an impressionistic account of Mon folk music and monastery life in lower Burma by U Khin Zaw to papers on linguistics that bristle with specialized terminology by Professors Jones, Bernot, Buling, Egerod, Haudricourt, Henderson, Mark, and Li.

Among the papers of unusual general interest is the study by Robert and Betty Morse of the migration...
of the Rawang, one of the most recent of the Tibeto-Burman speaking groups to move south from the high Tibetan plateau to the hills of north Burma. Using shaman chants and a firsthand knowledge of the possible pathways that thread down through the snow-clad mountains, the authors draw a convincing map of movements that are recorded only in oral tradition.

In his article "Les Môns de Dvâravatî," G. Coëdès gives a helpful summary of the growth of knowledge of the ancient Môn kingdom located in the Menam basin of Thailand. Coëdès draws attention to the anomaly arising from the dearth of written Môn records in Thailand where there is such an abundance of archaeological evidence, while the converse is true in the Môn lands of lower Burma.

O. W. Wolters, using Chinese sources, offers some new insight into the vexing question of the location of the capital of the maritime empire of Srîvijaya in the eleventh century. On the basis of his reconstructions, it would appear that Palembang, the regional capital of the empire after its expansion in the second half of the seventh century, retained that distinction at least until the eleventh century. Sometime between 1079 and 1082, the capital appears to have shifted to Jambi, which is located about 140 miles northwest of Palembang in southern Sumatra. Despite this significant shift in the internal political relationships of the empire, Srîvijaya retained its economic importance for early Asian maritime trade, and Palembang probably continued to be a center of some importance in entrepôt trade.

A wide range of evidence discussed by Jean Rispaud in his article, "Contribution à la géographie historique de la Haute Birmanie," advances the northern perimeter of Khmer political influence between the ninth century and the first quarter of the thirteenth century. He establishes Khmer presence in the upper Mekong valley beyond Chiang Sen and in the Shan states of Burma. Rispaud is able to draw on a variety of supporting evidence for this theory—Chinese records, Khmer epigraphy and archaeology, and Thai chronicles. The limits of the empire would then be considerably north of those accepted by Professor Coëdès in his history of Southeast Asia.

Volume II contains papers on Asian art and archaeology by the following scholars: Ba Shih, Kamaleswar Bhattacharya, J. J. Boeles, Jean Boisselier, A. B. Griswold, Alastair Lamb, J. E. van Lohuizen-de Leeuw, U Lu Pe Win, Louis Mallaret, K. Nandakic, Kraïsi Nimmânaheminda, Jean Perrin, H. L. Shortho, M. C. Subhadradis Diskul, Michael Sullivan, and Daw Thîn Kyi. Such a distinguished array of contributors arouses high expectations that are admirably met. While the prehistorian will find that none of the contributions focuses on his special archaeological concerns, the historian and the student of art history will find much here to engage his attention.

Several of the papers deal with complex iconographic problems. H. L. Shortho identifies a number of attributes and personages on a series of plaques on the basement of the Ananda temple at Pagan. K. Bhattacharya examines both the metaphysical and political significance of the sheath of gold or silver (kola) that was sometimes placed over the linga of Siva in ancient sanctuaries in Cambodia and Champa. J. J. Boeles draws on two Vajrayâna Buddhist texts, the Hevajra-Tantra and the Hevajrasapkakrîya, to identify a type of bronze maqîdâla plaque and a number of bronze figures of yoginis found in Cambodia and Thailand. He demonstrates that as the beginning of the twelfth century developed Vajrayâna Buddhism was a vital tradition in the Pimai region in northeastern Thailand, and he speculates that it may be from this region that Vajrayâna spread to Angkor at the center of the Khmer empire.

Professor Mallaret discusses an important stone sculpture of Sûrya found in the Mekong Delta in the extreme south of Viet Nam that dates from the end of the sixth century through the seventh century. This sculpture brings to five the number of free-standing images of Sûrya dating from the pre-Angkorian period in Khmer art—images that in both style and iconography suggest ultimate influence from Iran or northwestern India. Mallaret raises the possibility that Chen-la, the successor states to Funan, may have absorbed influences from the Kushan or Indo-Scythian dynasty which, according to Chinese records, ruled Funan in the mid-fourth century.

Important methodological problems of interest to art historians and archaeologists are raised by Griswold and Lamb. In his article, "Imported Images and the Nature of Copying in the Art of Siam," Professor Griswold develops a typology for the draping of the monastic robe on images of the Buddha. He demonstrates convincingly that sculptors followed with care the prescriptions of monastic discipline in the disposition of the robe. These prescriptions vary according to sect, and inflections of dress have both geographical and chronological implication. Griswold is able to date a number of images found in Thailand, some of them from as early as the fifth century, and to offer helpful pointers toward discriminating imported images from those fabricated locally that are scrupulously faithful in style to Indian or Sinhalese prototypes.

Lamb's study of ancient glass found in the Malay Peninsula raises a number of difficult questions about the value of glass beads as evidence of chronology. In several sites on the peninsula, Lamb found puny caps and other evidence that indicates the re-use of Middle Eastern scrap glass for local manufacture. The possibility exists that the scrap could be drawn from abandoned glass houses in the Mediterranean and have a considerable antiquity prior to shipment to Southeast Asia. There is the further implication that duration of popularity in the style of glass beads is so great that "Roman type" beads possibly may date from the sixteenth century.

It has been possible in this brief compass to comment upon only a few of the many valuable papers in these volumes. Mr. Griswold, his fellow editors, and the publisher of Artibus Asiae are to be congratulated for the organization of these volumes and for the care and beauty of their production.
The report on Beikthano—one of the handful of complete site reports for the area—is an important milestone in Southeast Asian archaeology. It is the second adequate report for a protohistoric or historic site and the first such report to be produced by the archaeological service of a Southeast Asian country.

Since the report is difficult to obtain, it will be useful to present a brief summary of the site to amplify the data presented by Aung Thaw in his 1961 and 1963 *Asian Perspectives* articles.

Beikthano (called Peikthanomyo in earlier publications) is an urban site in Central Burma located at 20° N, 95° 23' E. It was excavated during six seasons between 1959 and 1963 under the direction of U Aung Thaw and U Myint Aung.

The site is a large area (about 8 sq. km) surrounded by a trapezoidal baked brick wall. Inside the wall are the remains of more than one hundred substantial brick structures. Such architectural richness is unknown at other contemporary Southeast Asian sites. Also unique for Indianized sites in the area is the presence of many brick crypts that contain burial urns. The crypts are scattered over the terrain outside the city’s walls. The use of brick seems to have been confined to religious, funereal, and defensive functions. Most actual residences were built of temporary materials.

Four radiocarbon dates have been obtained:  
- Phase I, Site 9: 1950 ± 90 B.P. (I-434)  
- Phase II, Site 9: 1880 ± 95 yrs B.P. (NZ-452)  
- Phase I, Site 11: 1725 ± 95 yrs B.P. (NZ-451)  
- Phase II, Site 11: 1650 ± 85 yrs B.P. (NZ-453)

All dates are presumably calculated with the old 5568 half-life. The four dates all pertain to the first two periods of occupation at Beikthano, said by the excavator to extend from the first to the fifth centuries A.D. The second period represents a quantitatively unimportant reoccupation that is dated on stylistic grounds to the eleventh century.

The great importance of this early dating can be appreciated when one considers that only four Indianized sites have been excavated in the whole of Southeast Asia that can be securely assigned to the first half of the first millennium: Oc-Eo in South Vietnam, U Thong and Chansen in Thailand, and Beikthano in Burma. Only two of these sites, Oc-Eo and Beikthano, were definitely urban in size at this early date. The publication of the Beikthano report thus doubles the sample of sites that appear to have been the earliest cities in Southeast Asia.

A large part of the artifact assemblage seems to be unique in terms of our present knowledge of Southeast Asian antiquity. The abundant burial urns, elaborately flanged and ridged (several are illustrated in Frédéric’s *Art of Southeast Asia*) are not known outside Burma. The domestic pottery has a generic resemblance to contemporary assemblages in India and peninsular Southeast Asia (notably large carinated cooking pots with cord-marked bases), but the pieces are not closely similar to any foreign pottery. A few features may indicate connections with more distant cultures. Tops of sprinkler vessels are common at Beikthano. Similar sprinklers are found at early historic sites in India and also, sporadically, in Thailand (Phases IV and V at Chansen, ca. A.D. 450-800). A peculiar group of “pouched” and S-curve spouts has analogues in both India and Thailand (at Chansen, mainly Phases III and IV, ca. A.D. 250-600).

A distinctive collection of sherds with stamped designs at Beikthano will eventually become an important horizon-marker for Burmese archaeology. Identical sherds have not yet been found outside Burma, but the idea of decorating pottery with stamped pictorial designs is known to be from northern India (e.g., from Hastinapura), Thailand (Chansen and Lopburi, A.D. 600-1000), and, interestingly, from Lake Ta-Li in Yunnan, the center of the Nan Chao Kingdom (eighth-thirteenth centuries A.D.).

Several sherds are stamped with the trefoil-like *sīrīvatsa* emblem that I believe heretofore has only been observed in Southeast Asia on the so-called “Funan” coins, which have long puzzled numismatologists in the area. A number of the coins themselves were also excavated at Beikthano. Made of silver, these coins appear to be identical with the usually unprovenanced examples that are often seen in private and museum collections in Thailand and which have been found at U Thong and Oc-Eo. The presence of the *sīrīvatsa* design on non-numismatic artifacts at Beikthano may indicate that the origin of these coins is Burmese rather than, as some authorities have believed, Indochinese. It also indicates that the coins are quite early.

In a pattern which is beginning to appear rather characteristic of early first millennium sites in the area, Beikthano produced very few artistic objects. The stuccos and figurines illustrated in the report are all, with the single exception of a terracotta *kinnara*, from Period II, the site’s eleventh century reoccupation.

One or two amendments to the report’s conclusions should be made. The “rouletted” pottery that Aung Thaw compares to the well-known Rouletted ware of Arikamedu and other south Indian and east Indian sites is not very Indian-looking. If anything, it resembles the product of much later Khmer potters. A small stone slab with cut-out flower designs is classified by the excavator as an “incised tablet.” It appears to be a jewelry mold similar to those found at Oc-Eo, U Thong, and Chansen.

The report takes the Archaeological Survey of India’s site reports as its model. Like them, it is terse,
rationally organized, and copiously illustrated. It is (again like its Indian prototypes and unlike certain other Southeast Asian archaeological writings) long on data and short on analysis. Such restraint is exemplary but also rather frustrating. One could wish, for instance, that the author had discussed and perhaps illustrated more comparative material, especially from other sites within Burma. The general outlines of Burmese prehistory and protohistory are almost unknown to foreign scholars. A summary of recent work and of relevant material in museum collections would be most useful.

Not enough data is presented to enable the reader to reconstruct the spots where the illustrated artifacts were found. In spite of the fact that many types of pottery and other artifacts are described and that numerous sections are published (including sections through structures—a great novelty in Southeast Asian archaeology), no data is supplied to enable the reader to tie the typology and the stratigraphy together. The author appears to feel that the material culture of Beikthano's four-century existence is homogeneous from beginning to end. Perhaps it is, but the proposition is sufficiently doubtful to make more detailed stratigraphic information desirable.

Period I, the author suggests, begins in the first century and ends in the fifth century. The evidence (radiocarbon and epigraphic) for the early limit appears to be quite solid. However, one must entertain the possibility that the site's initial occupation continued well past A.D. 500. The choice of the fifth century as a late limit is based largely on the fact that Beikthano's artifact assemblage differs from, and thus is presumably earlier, than that of Sríkshetra, the capital of the Pyu Kingdom. But the dating of Sríkshetra, which has not been nearly as well excavated or published as Beikthano, is none too good. Historical sources (Chinese and local) suggest a timespan of about A.D. 600–800. Even if this date is accepted and if we can be certain that a late phase of Period I at Beikthano does not overlap with an early phase at Sríkshetra, it is still possible that Beikthano's first occupation extends up to the beginning of the seventh century. For the time being, we should not assume that all Period I material at Beikthano necessarily dates as early as A.D. 500. Some of it may be considerably later.

One last comment should be made. Aung Thaw's confident attribution of Beikthano to the Tibeto-Burman-speaking Pyus rather than to the Mons or perhaps to a third linguistic group may seem controversial to some non-Burmese scholars. But perhaps for the time being "Pyu" is as good a choice as any. The question of linguistic-ethnic identification of protohistoric archaeological entities in Southeast Asia must be left open until more inscriptions in local dialects are discovered.

These minor criticisms are not meant to detract from the splendid accomplishment of the author and his colleagues. The Beikthano report is in many ways better than anything that has yet been done in Southeast Asia. The importance of the site itself equals the importance of its publication. Architecturally, Beikthano is quite clearly and quite thoroughly "Indianized." Taken together with discoveries at Chansen and Oc-Eo, it is no longer possible to doubt that Indian influence in a large part of Southeast Asia begins at or before the beginning of the first millennium A.D. This is several hundred years earlier than previous estimates. Moreover, Beikthano is indisputably a city or a complex very like a city. The fact that there are two cities in Southeast Asia at such an unexpectedly early date (the other is Oc-Eo) alters our ideas about the development of urbanization in the area. Certainly if there are two cities, there may be more. Perhaps some of them are even earlier. As with the development of agriculture and metallurgy, so it may be with urbanization. Not so long ago, Southeast Asia was believed to have remained in a state of savagery until well into the Christian era. The excavations at Beikthano have made a central contribution to pushing back Southeast Asian chronological frontiers.


Reviewed by J. P. SHARMA, University of Hawaii

Professor H. D. Sankalita has made a significant contribution to the field of archaeology by his comprehensive study of the prehistoric background of Indo-Pakistani culture. The book has been written on the basis of the Pandit Bhagwanlal Indraji Lectures, delivered by the author under the auspices of the University of Bombay in 1960. Its primary aim is to offer a critical review of the work done on the prehistory and protohistory of the subcontinent, especially during the last twenty years, in which the author's own role is considerable. While no new theories have been advanced about the origins of civilization, the major effort has gone into a careful elucidation of material accumulated during a century of excavations.

A full-length picture emerges of the transitions of prehistory (beginning with the early Palaeolithic, 150,000 B.C., through the middle Palaeolithic, 25,000 B.C.) up to the "modern" (ca. 5,000 B.C.) periods, that is, Neolithic, Chalcolithic, and Bronze ages, and the highly individually patterned beginnings of civilized life. The first chapter, "Lower Palaeolithic Cultures," establishes the fact that these industries were widely distributed over the greater part of India. The author made a thorough examination of the main archaeological sites and the assemblages...
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found. The distribution of the two main cultures—the Sohan (chopper-chopping) and the hand-axe—are mapped.

Chapter II, "The Middle Paleolithic Cultures of India," continues with a more detailed analysis of tool types, aided by a plethora of illustrations. On the question of the Nevasian culture of peninsular India, Sankalia does not postulate an indigenous evolution out of the hand-axe-cleaver industry. Fundamentally, the people of the later culture had little need for tools such as the hand axe and cleaver. "All this suggests a basic change in the life of the people, and probably the people themselves. Arrival of new cultural influences is definitely indicated. This should be most probably from Africa" (p. 213).

The next two chapters carry the discussion down through the Mesolithic to Bronze Ages. Sankalia reviews the important new feature that arise from excavations revealing extensions of the Indus civilization. The scholar rightly refuses to add a new hypothesis on the origin of this ancient civilization, especially with respect to the Iranian influence. But Sankalia makes it quite clear that radiocarbon dates for Lothal and Kalibangan indicate that the Indus civilization came to its end by 1,800 B.C. (xii), at least 300 years earlier than is usually supposed.

The author has brought to this book his detailed knowledge of the facts of Indian archaeology coupled with a scholarly and orderly presentation. He critically cautions against generalized schemes of interpretation and interpolation of archaeological data. Sankalia lets the facts speak for themselves, and these are compiled from a careful study of finds at all major sites in the subcontinent. The work is greatly enhanced by the addition of 130 illustrations and maps, supplemented by charts, tables, and the beginning of what promises to be an exhaustive bibliography of Indian archaeology.

Although the work represents a major achievement in the synthesis of knowledge on this subject, and a must for any student of prehistory, I would have hoped only for a somewhat livelier style to accompany the painstaking scholarship.


Reviewed by WILHELM G. SOLHEIM II, University of Hawaii

This is a valuable secondary reference book that includes a considerable amount of data from varied sources, many of which are hard to find not only in the United States but in the Philippines. The book disappointed me, however, because I misinterpreted its secondary title. When I saw the word "cultural," I thought it indicated inclusion of a general picture of Philippine culture and cultures, which would be valuable to the anthropologist and archaeologist. A more appropriate secondary title might have been "A Physical, Economic, Demographic, and Regional Geography." The one short chapter (21 pages) that conceivably could be regarded as concerned with Philippine culture apart from aspects of the economy devotes four and one-half pages to "Pre-Spanish Patterns and Culture Sources" (pp. 116-120), while the rest is concerned with the effects of the Spanish and American occupations. The authors present this section on culture as well as can be expected when about 11,000 years of cultural beginnings, evolution, and diffusion is compressed into those few pages. Not one of the sources on this period is referred to, nor is there a single item in the bibliography concerned with this period other than Blair and Robertson.

The book is divided into three parts. Part I (pp. 9-112), "The Physical Environment," is the one portion of the book that is valuable to the archaeologist. Combined with the section in Part III, "The Physical Setting," information is presented on the geology, topography, climatology, soils, plants, and animals (though the latter is weak) for the Philippines as a whole and in more detail for the different regions. Part II (pp. 115-298) is well summarized by its chapter headings: "The Cultural History of the Filipinos," "Population: Growth, Spread, and Distribution," "The Several Agricultural Economies," "Resource Exploitation," and "Secondary Production Patterns." Part III is titled "The Regional Environments" (pp. 301-597). Here the Philippines is divided into twenty-three regions. The treatment of each region follows the same pattern: a brief introduction, "The Physical Setting," and then a section titled "The Cultural Setting." The latter includes population distribution and changes during the recent past, economy, and transportation facilities. The foundation for the culture is well presented, but nothing is built on that foundation. In the center of the book are bound over fifty plates. These form a section in themselves with no correlation to the text. Each plate has a caption and the total covers more or less what is covered in the text, except that the plates include a considerable amount of information on architecture, which is little touched on in the text.

Documentation is often omitted from factual statements. For instance, the authors state that, "No town or city, in the modern sense, existed in the pre-Spanish Philippines" (p. 166). This may well be true, but there simply has not been sufficient archaeological research for such a positive statement to be made. What sort of a settlement would have accumulated the riches in porcelain and stoneware that have been plundered from the burial grounds at Puerto Galera,
Mindoro? For this site we will possibly never know, since grave robbers have apparently done a good job. The evidence there of since grave robbers have apparently done a good job. This unpopulated condition was most notable in pre-Spanish and Spanish times, as only a small population was resident on the island in 1900. The data tell us nothing about pre-Spanish times other than that in 1570 the Mindoro population was estimated at three to four thousand (p. 432), so it is likely that in late pre-Spanish times there was a small population. We just do not have the data to make any statement about "pre-Spanish" population in Mindoro. There was some kind of important center on northern Mindoro during Sung and Yuan times, but we do not know its significance.

On pages 302-303 the authors talk about the cultural diversity in the Philippines with some seventy-six ethnolinguistic groups that they say are of Malayan origin. While this paragraph points out the ethnic and cultural diversity of the Philippines, the authors use questionable data and present no references as sources of their statements. What do they mean by "Malayan in origin" in referring to dialects? Are they using Beyer's hypothesis that the people who were the ancestors of the major portion of the present-day Filipinos were the bearers of the Philippine Iron Age, coming into the Philippines from the south, along the Indonesian arc, and ultimately from Malaya, or are they using "Malayan" as a diminutive of Malayo-Polynesian? In the latter case the use is wrong; in the former, the hypothesis is probably wrong, but in either case, if the authors had indicated their sources they would not be at fault. The only place that I noticed where they do refer to Beyer (p. 446) is for the origin of the name Visayan for the people and islands of the central Philippines. They say that the name "... is in some way related to the Javanese Sri Vijayan Empire, which ... held a part of the Philippines in its political sway." Both this possible origin for the word and the suggestion that any part of the Philippines has ever been a portion of the Sri Vijayan Empire have been seriously questioned during the last ten years; but at least the authors can blame these statements—out of date as they are—on Beyer.

From personal knowledge I am able to suggest two further additions to the text. These can be checked historically, though I have not done so. On page 309 Wernstedt and Spencer say that "... the strong cultural ties that many residents of the Babuyans have with northern Luzon encourage migration to the still lightly settled and economically more attractive section of the main island." This follows statements about the slow increase of population in the Babuyans since 1918 and the unusually small population there in spite of agricultural potential for expansion. I spent about a week on Fuga in the Babuyans in 1952 and was told that over one hundred years ago the Spanish moved all the inhabitants of the Babuyan Islands to the mainland, where they settled primarily in Cagayan. After the Americans took over the Philippines a number of the original inhabitants and their descendants returned to their own islands to join a few who had returned earlier. Others remained in their new homes in Cagayan. Since that time there has been considerable movement back and forth among related families.

On page 388 the authors say that "After World War II much of the historic Intramuros district lay in the ruins of Manila's liberation. It was in Intramuros that a die-hard core of Japanese defenders made their final stand and destruction was virtually complete." A former Thomasite friend was once telling me about his home in Intramuros, and I asked him whether he had been able to save anything from the ruins of his house. He told me that he returned to his home while there was still sporadic shooting in Intramuros. He said that there was little damage to his street and he found his house in good condition. He had been there only a short time, however, when an American patrol noticed him and moved him out of the area for his own safety. When he was allowed to return in about three days he found the area almost leveled, with American bulldozers completing the job. He believed until his death, a few years ago, that American bulldozers were totally responsible for the destruction of at least that portion of Intramuros where his home had been.

The points I have raised are minor to the book as a whole. It has brought together useful information for anyone going to work in the Philippines for the first time or returning to work in a new region. I am sure that for geographers it has a wealth of information.


*Reviewed by Wilhelm G. Solheim II, University of Hawaii*
students who wish to investigate it" (p. 1). I feel that Mr. Scott has fulfilled this purpose, for the most part. His chapters on linguistics and the written records are full, and easy to follow. However, his chapters on archaeological research are reasonably trustworthy, easy to follow, but unfortunately very incompletely footnoted, so that if one wants to check what he has said, or go deeper into the sources on a subject which he has brought up, one must turn to the bibliography and from it try to search out the source. This lack is hard to explain, since this is precisely the fault that Scott so justly criticizes in Beyer's publications and those of others—that they often do not present the sources of important statements. Be that as it may, this is a valuable book for anyone working on Philippine prehistory or presenting it to an audience.

The first two chapters are on archaeological data, the first concerned with possible land connections of the Philippines, dating methods, and the Paleolithic Age, and the second with the "Mesolithic," Neolithic, and Metal ages. The small mistakes I note here detract only a little from the presentation of the data. On page 11 Scott says that a stagodon is "... a kind of armor-plated rhinoceros," while in actuality it is an elephant-like animal. On page 13, in explaining how the presence of porcelains can be used for dating a site, he says that "... a bowl manufactured in the 13th century could have been placed in a grave prior to that date," while obviously it could not have been so placed. Perhaps this is a printer's error. On page 24 he has confused the name of the so-called Mesolithic culture, "Hoabinhian," for the name of the province where it was first found, which should be Hoabinh. On the same page he makes a more serious error in saying that Hoabinhian-type tools, according to data from excavations in the Malay Peninsula, "... first appeared in post-Pleistocene times, probably no earlier than 7000 B.C." The source of the statement is not given, and I have no idea from what article or book this quotation may have come. Dating of the Hoabinian is controversial and is based almost exclusively on the absence of extinct fauna, suggesting that it is totally in the Holocene. Mr. Chester Gorman now has a late Hoabinhian assemblage from northern Thailand beginning before 9700 B.C. (personal communication), and I have predicted that when we get better dating we will find the Hoabinian going back several thousand, and possibly several tens of thousand years, into the late Pleistocene. This is new data that Scott could not have known when writing the book. The 7000 B.C. date, however, was not relevant even at the time he was doing his research for this book. On page 25, in talking about the different kinds of adzes, he mentions "... a fan-shaped adze-head with a tang protruding like the handle of the fan, and these tanged adzes have been found in crude form in Hawaii and eastern Polynesia." This statement is incorrect. Scott is probably referring to the adze illustrated by Beyer in number 1 of Plate 8 of his "Outline Review of Philippine Archaeology by Islands and Provinces," but when this adze is compared to the typical Hawaiian tanged adzes Beyer illustrates in his Figure 13 of Philippine and East Asian Archaeology, it is evident that they are not at all similar. What Beyer is suggesting as similar to the Hawaiian and eastern Polynesian tanged adzes is the Luzon adze (Beyer, Philippine and East Asian Archaeology, Quezon City: National Research Council of the Philippines, Bul. No. 29, 1948: 30-31 and Fig. 12). On page 28 Scott gives a date for the appearance of pottery in Masbate at about 2710 B.C. Apparently he got this from my book. The Archaeology of Central Philippines (Manila: Monographs of the National Institute of Science, No. 10), where this misprint occurred. I first presented the correct date of 2710 B.C. in my article "Further Notes on the Kalanay Pottery Complex in the Philippines" (AP III, 2: 162).

Much of the third chapter, "Linguistics and Palaeography," deals with words in the Philippine languages borrowed from Sanskrit or Chinese. As an example of such loans from Sanskrit, Scott mentions riya, for deer, as found in Malay, Makassar, Igorot, and Tagalog (p. 52). Scott suggests that it is startling that such a basic word would have been borrowed. He does not suggest the alternative, that the word may have been a loan from Austronesian to Sanskrit. The same alternative is available for Chinese loanwords; if the same word, or root, is found in a number of Austronesian languages and in Chinese also, the loan probably was from Austronesian to Chinese. I like Scott's suggestion that the Sanskrit words probably were not introduced into the Philippine languages by speakers of Sanskrit, but rather by Southeast Asian travelers, Filipinos included, between India and the Philippines (p. 54). In this chapter, without indicating his source, Scott repeats (p. 50) a statement that he made in the previous chapter (p. 36), to the effect that trepanning was done in the Philippines. I do not recall any such skulls in the Philippines, except a very few that I saw at San Carlos University that were reputed to be trepanned, but which appeared to me to be the result of injury that probably caused death. In any case, I do not recall any signs of healing of the bone in the cases of these "near little holes.

Chapter 4 is primarily concerned with Chinese records of the Philippines, 5 with the Maragtas, and 6 and 7 with the activities of José E. Marco and the manuscripts he supposedly discovered. These are convincing chapters, the first two without surprise. The summary of the last two chapters, however, is surprising, but well supported. In Scott's words, "The José E. Marco contributions to Philippine historiography—in., the Povedano 1572 map, and the Povedano 1572, 1577, 1578 and 1579, Morquecho 1830, and Pavón 1837-1839 manuscript—appear to be deliberate fabrications with no historic validity" (p. 136). If accepted, this claim would remove from the record the majority of the presently widely accepted data on late prehistoric Philippine social and political organization and allow us to start over again, practically from the beginning.
The present work of 650 titles is the result of eight years' work that began with a preliminary list of 125 references to the anthropological literature on Ifugao. Judging from the number of Philippine scholars consulted, one is not hesitant to accept Conklin's statement that the "... present revision ... covers, through 1967, all known major works and a wide sampling of the remaining secondary sources on the Ifugao area and its inhabitants" (iii).

The notation employed is a bibliographic innovation that I hope will be followed widely. The reader knows from the notation whether each title has been checked (only 73 titles, mostly from the Dominican Archives in Quezon City, have not been checked) and whether it is a primary or a secondary source. Conklin has also marked those titles that would be of special utility for ethnographic or ecological research. In addition, a reference to a repository is given for each title. For those titles available at Yale, the Sterling Library call numbers are supplied.

Within the body of the work, the original sources cited are annotated for the type and origin of the data they contain, such as transcript, typed copy, or letter; and titles in non-European languages, with the exception of the SIL publications in Ifugao, are translated.

In view of the thorough preparation and range of sources—from Spanish and American colonial documents to current Philippine journals and magazines—I expect that this work will prove to be an invaluable tool for research in Ifugao.

The only serious shortcoming of this bibliography is its lack of a topic reference system. Without an index or some other system of topical notation, the work is fairly difficult to use. To locate references on a single topical problem, one has to read the entire list.

Future bibliographic work on the area could provide some content additions that would be very useful. For instance, within the Mountain Province there is literature of anthropological interest that does not become available in any of the standard journals. One example is the Sagada Social Studies Series (W. H. Scott, ed., Sagada, Bontoc Sub-province). Sagada publishes descriptions written by residents of the area as well as transcribed and translated texts. Literature of this type may be available for Ifugao as well.

As Ifugao Bibliography is the third "revision," I hope that if there is a fourth these suggestions can be incorporated. However, for now, "It provides an opportunity to note the range of original and secondary sources available, the changing quality and quantity of such materials through time, and the topical areas in which there are strong biases or conspicuous gaps" (iv).

Reviewed by MICHAEL DAVIDSON, Yale University


Reviewed by HENRY T. LEWIS, University of Hawaii

Even within the tradition of anthropology's more esoteric titles the name of this monograph may stand as a kind of hallmark for recondeite studies. The subject of this work concerns the use of folklore for historical reconstructions, in this highly specific case for the Ifugao of northern Luzon. The author, Father Francis Lambrecht, has served the Congregation of the Missionaries of the Immaculate Heart of Mary in the Philippines since 1924 and he has completed numerous works on the Ifugao and Gaddang. At present he is a lecturer in anthropology at the graduate school of St. Louis University in Baguio.

The substantive material of this book is very nearly impossible to comment upon unless one is a specialist on the Ifugao. To understand the title one needs to know that in the epic narrative of the Hudhud, Dinulawan and Bugan are mythical figures who live in the imaginary village of Gonhadan. One must also understand that the Hudhud is found only in the southern Ifugao region around the town of Kiangan. Being only an occasional visitor to Ifugao Province, I am by no stretch of the imagination a specialist on the Ifugao, much less the Hudhud area covered by Father Lambrecht. Consequently, I hardly can do justice to the scholarship involved, and the scholarship is impressive. The few comments made here are necessarily limited to the theoretical and methodological issues raised in Father Lambrecht's monograph.

The author's aim is threefold: (1) to relate the Hudhud epic to Ifugao migrations and the emergence of upland rice terraces; (2) to demonstrate the existence of an earlier "matriarchal culture"; and (3) to elucidate the "original Ifugao marriage procedure." An examination of these points by the reader involves some consideration of the reliability of myths for historical reconstruction, as well as an appreciation of the theoretical assumptions regarding migration, diffusion, and evolution that characterize the more traditional emphasis in Philippine studies.

Mythology is at best only suggestive as indirect evidence, where it provides names, places, or al-
legorical "facts" in support of a particular hypothesis. As literal evidence, mythology is certainly suspect, and some of the author's interpretations in this line are questionable. However, his conclusion that the Hudhud supports the idea of a historically recent establishment of Ifugao upland terraces is both reasonable and coherent in that it lends support to related linguistic, historical, and archaeological evidence. However, Father Lambrecht's interpretation of earlier marriage patterns and matriarchical influences is highly conjectural, and his conclusions are not in keeping with what is more generally known and accepted in anthropology today.

Anthropological studies in the Philippines have, for a number of years, been shifting away from the earlier diffusionist dominance of H. Otley Beyer, on the one hand, and the students of Wilhelm Schmidt, on the other. Now one may hope that the tradition of dedicated scholarship that is so characteristic of the works of Father Lambrecht will make a permanent and lasting impression on Philippine anthropology.


Reviewed by JONATHAN H. KRESS, Yale University

Our knowledge of Taiwan's prehistory is coming of age. Research has reached that awkward stage in which evidence demands that we reject older, simplistic formulas, but is not sufficient to supply new ones. Sung's report on O-luan-pi is eloquently symptomatic of this state of the art. I applaud the quality of the report and the rapidity of its publication. It adds a large quantity of valuable data to the rather meager literature on Taiwanese archaeology; but it raises and accentuates as many questions as it answers.

The site of O-luan-pi lies on the southwestern slope of a hill, 90 m high, on a small peninsula at the southern extremity of Taiwan. It was discovered in 1956 when C. C. Lin, professor of geology at Taiwan University, noticed the outline of a stone coffin in the dirt road leading from the O-luan-pi lighthouse to the town of Heng-ch'un. The excavation in August 1966 yielded six extended cist burials, one unprotected flexed burial, a large quantity of fine, red pottery exhibiting considerable typological diversity, a smaller quantity of coarse, brown pottery, several pottery bracelets, numerous stone hoes, adzes, sinkers, etc., and a number of shell and bone artifacts. With the exception of the brownware and the single flexed burial, the material is identical in almost every detail to that from the prehistoric cemetery at K'en-ting, a few miles to the northwest, and very similar to material from three sites on tiny Hsiao-liu-chiu Island, several miles off the western coast south of Kao-hsiung. Both kinds of pottery appear in abundance in the "P" area of this site, with the brown pottery in a stratigraphically superior position. (The term "brown" is used advisedly. This pottery at Feng-pi-t'ou ranges in color from dark orange to almost black, as is typical of carefully fired earthware. Moreover, the "red" pottery is really only a very pale orange.) The underlying redware exhibits the same fine paste and exuberance of form found at O-luan-pi. The occurrence in both places of such exotic forms as the long-necked bottle, the Chinese term preferable to the term "fruit stand" used in the English summary—and vessels with tall ring feet decorated with geometric cut-outs denotes a definite historical connection between the two areas. The superimposed coarse brown pottery is of a more generalized paste and form. Therefore, any conclusions about its historical or cultural relationships become weaker, but it is so homogeneous in both respects at both sites that the possibility of no connection seems unlikely. Temporarily, this brown pottery is usually assigned to the Iron Age when the presence (presumed) of metals explains the absence of associat-
ed stone agricultural and manufacturing implements. Although this Feng-pi-t'ou stratigraphic evidence is not conclusive, I feel that future findings will support Sung's deductions.

The affinities between Feng-pi-t'ou and O-luan-pi have led Sung to conclude that the culture of the "Stone Cist People" was strongly influenced by an early phase of the Lungshanoid development in Taiwan, tentatively dated to the middle of the third millennium B.C. at Feng-pi-t'ou. Yet with the exception of the Heng-ch'un area (K'en-ting and O-luan-pi), stone cists are not at all characteristic of the prehistoric cultures of the west coast. These cists plus some other components of the O-luan-pi cultural inventory, particularly the well-developed shell industry, are found all along the narrow eastern coastal plain as far north as Su-ao. At many of these sites the stone cists are associated with megalithic monuments, and Lungshanoid influences are generally weak. In a few instances the cist burials are attributable to the work of the Ami tribe that now inhabits that area, but the most secure date that can be assigned to the vast majority of them is "post-cord-marked pottery horizon," a period encompassing nearly five thousand years.

It would appear, then, that the culture of the Heng-ch'un area represents a mixture of two strong and independent traditions. The time at which this mixture took place and the ultimate source of the disparate cultural elements remain to be defined. It is possible that the custom of constructing stone cist coffins arrived in Taiwan via the Babuyan and Batanes islands at a time when the red-pottery phase of the Lungshanoid complex was still prevalent on the southwestern coastal plain. It could have taken hold among those people only in the Heng-ch'un area, and thence spread to the east coast. But to my knowledge, the use of slabs of stone to line graves has been reported only twice in the Philippines, the obvious source for any introduction from the South. During the Iron Age of the Batanes, jar burials were placed inside stone cists. (There is a possibly similar stone cist in the Botanical Gardens near Heng-ch'un containing an iron "sword" but no ceramics.) A single stone slab covering a presumably extended burial containing Chinese porcelains of undetermined age has been reported to me by residents of El Nido in northern Palawan. Both these manifestations are obviously too late to have influenced the neolithic cultures of southern Taiwan.

There are other more attractive alternatives. Throughout the prehistory of Taiwan, the peoples of the western coastal plain were dependent on the central mountain range and the east coast for lithic raw materials, particularly in the southwest where the plains are comprised mainly of limestone and aluvium. Cist burials could have been introduced to the east coast directly and independently of any Lungshanoid influence. (A northern source cannot be completely ruled out, for archaeological similarities between the east coast and the Ryukyus have been noted.) They could also have developed there quite free of any outside influence. The two traditions could then have become mixed through east-west contacts or a southward movement of both peoples.

Without good dates for any of the stone cists it will be impossible to advance beyond speculation. Further information on the duration of the Lungshanoid in southwestern Taiwan is also needed. Finally, it must be remembered that these problems cannot be solved in Taiwan alone. We must have a clearer picture of the archaeological situation on the mainland opposite Taiwan, in northern Luzon, and in the islands in the Bashi Straits. Sung has recently completed some excavations on the east coast of Taiwan which hold great promise, but more definite conclusions are still several years in the future.

In conclusion, it should be pointed out that, in spite of their propensity for borrowing, the "Stone Cist People" were not complete cultural scavengers. They had imaginations of their own which they used in altering and refining traits they adopted from others. Their most spectacular achievement was an elaboration on the cut-outs in the ring feet that supported many of the Lungshanoid bowls. They extended the cut-outs from the base of the bowl to the bottom of the ring-foot itself, leaving the bowl atop a series of long, thin legs. Certainly this is not much to recommend a culture to the study of succeeding generations, but the importance of the O-luan-pi site is in the eclectic nature of its occupants and its key geographical position. Much of the site remains to be excavated, and since a habitation site of "Stone Cist Peoples" in this area has yet to be found, a continuation of the work might change the picture considerably.


Reviewed by Alice Greensfelder, Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri

On the dust cover of this book the publisher states that "Mr. MacShane has attempted to provide clear and accurate descriptions of some of the world's great monuments, to assess their significance ... and to make a few philosophical observations about them and the people who built them." This is an admirable purpose, and the author in his preface goes on to say that while he deals with the significance of these works of art, he wishes to fulfill the reader's expectations without losing him in "archaeological jargon." Mr. MacShane further states that the meaning of ruins is not easily found nor easily stated. I wish to say at the outset that I agree with the preceding sentence. How can an author write a book that is any more meaningful than a simple recording of an intelligent traveller's observations and reactions without possess-
ing a trained eye with which to observe and the frame-
work of a profound body of knowledge with which to
evaluate the material observed?

Mr. MacShane’s first port of call is Borobudur, and
he speaks of the influence of Hindu art in its lower
tiers. He describes bas-reliefs along the walls of the
terrace as static and repetitive and comments upon
the quality of the workmanship. He attempts to
define the function of a stupa, explaining that the
Buddhists were the first temple and stupa builders
and that their buildings developed from the early
cave temples such as those at Ajanta and Ellora.

With an abundance of superficial words, the author
describes the form as a successful achievement but
fails to express what Borobudur is “saying” and
why.

Mr. MacShane has written of the various temples
and ruins in the same order in which he travelled to
them, and it is not until he reaches Agra and Delhi
in India that he deals with monuments I have visited.

He describes Fatehpur Sikri in these words (p. 156):
The success of Fatehpur Sikri is purely architectur-
al, for with the exception of the Jami Masjid,
which contains a marble tomb of the saint, all the
buildings of the city are constructed of unadorned
red sandstone. Because of this limitation of materi-
al, the architects were unable to rely on exterior
decoration to give variety to their work. Instead
they were forced to arrange a ground plan and to
design buildings which by themselves and in their
barest forms would be interesting. To accomplish
this end, they had first to overcome the deadening
effect that perfect symmetry usually induces.

They did not, of course, build in a wholly asym-
metrical manner, since for asymmetry to be effect-
ive it must be placed against a background of
symmetry.

The words roll on without getting to a substantive
statement. This portrayal is typical of the author’s
literary failure. His “observations” become empty
value judgments. His comments on the Taj Mahal
are more emotional and less cluttered, creating a
sharper statement, although the rhetoric is still larded
with “too obvious to mention” and “for as every-
body knows.”

Mr. MacShane’s unfortunate way of writing and his
use of phrases such as “let us consider,” “to be sure,”
and “the edifice of the mosque itself is literally a sea
of columns” deter the reader from absorbing some of
the quite cogent observations he makes about the
colors and proportions of the buildings in Isfahan.

The chapter that deals with Persepolis strongly
illustrates the inadequacies of this book. On page 198
is a good description of the stone capitals of two bull
heads connected by a common back, but there is no
explanatory note that the bulls were so constructed
that the roof beams could be supported. On page
211 the author compares the sculptured figures to
“Greek sculpture [which] is extremely athletic.”
Descriptive words such as “taste,” “skill,” “serene,”
“no haste,” or “incompetent planning” are used,
which again are not the words used by a trained ob-
server such as André Godard who, in The Art of Iran,
brings out the plastic qualities of the very shallow
bas-reliefs and describes them aptly in such phrases
as “[they possess] “the lightness of a gently modelled
drawing.”

This is not to say that this book has no value. The
photographs are many and well selected, although it
is unfortunate that we do not know their source. The
book is a pleasant introduction to the various sites the
author visited and could be of use to the fireside
traveller as he sits with his maps before him and
plans his next journey. The appendix, a travel guide,
should be checked, since it was compiled almost ten
years ago. For example, there is now in Isfahan a
delightful hotel called the Shah Abbas, a converted
caravansary, that is not mentioned. Many Golden
Ages is not a book for the scholar, nor will it teach
the uninformed the meaning of these buildings, for
Mr. MacShane does not truly observe the space, nor
is he able to place man in it.


Reviewed by ERIC H. LARSON, University of Connecticut

The Work of the Gods in Tikopia is a detailed ac-
count of pagan rituals and beliefs practiced by west-
ern Polynesians on the island of Tikopia. The book
also examines these rites, called “Work of the Gods”
by the people of Tikopia themselves, in the context
of Tikopia society. Professor Firth conducted in-
tensive field research on the island on three different
occasions, and his observations of the pagan religion
were made in 1928-29 and in 1952. The Work of the
Gods in Tikopia, with a new theoretical introduction
to this second edition and an epilogue dealing with
the abandonment of paganism on the island, is one
of three volumes on Tikopia religion. Tikopia
Ritual and Belief (George Allen & Unwin, 1967) is
a series of collected papers by Firth which treats
those aspects of Tikopia religion apart from “Work
of the Gods” or related only indirectly to it. His
forthcoming volume, Rank and Religion in Tikopia,
will include a full-scale analysis of the major changes
which have resulted in the shift from paganism to
Christianity. Today the Tikopia embrace Christian-
ity as their only religion, but as late as 1955, a
minority of the population still clung to their indigen-
ous beliefs.

A number of Tikopia concepts express the main
ideas upon which the islanders based their native
religion. Atua referred to particular spirits of deceas-
ed chiefs and certain of their family ancestors. Atua
also signified gods who never lived on earth as human
beings, ghosts of the recently deceased, and spirits
who entered into objects and animals for purposes of their own. While the Tikopia believed in the primacy of a single atua—a culture hero who, as a chief, once lived on Tikopia—they considered him neither as sole creator of the universe nor as arbiter bringing order out of conflicting and diverse circumstances. Manu, or mana, referred to supernatural power or efficacy possessed by atua, by certain material objects and animals, and particularly by the four Tikopia chiefs and their human spirit mediums. Tapu were negative sanctions instituted to prevent human actions in specific situations. Tapu could be applied by chiefs in part because of their relative abundance of manu. Tapu served as a means of conserving food and resources for important rituals and feasts and for maintaining secular control over the population. Ora, the spiritual counterpart of a recent corpse, was taken by spiritual ancestors to rangi, a kind of “heaven” of the dead. In these rangi, of which there were several, the supernatural lived in much the same way as do mortals on earth.

“Works of the Gods” provided the formalized ritual means for maintaining contact with spiritual beings and inducing them to provide Tikopia with sufficient food and good health. The rites were initiated twice a year and lasted on each occasion for a six week period. Preceding the ritual cycle, increased efforts in garden cultivation were extended to make sufficient provision for the elaborate feasts of various ceremonies. The six weeks of rituals fell into several main divisions: a ceremony indicating the beginning of the sacred period; a re-sacralization of canoes; a refurbishing of thatch buildings in which certain rituals were carried out; a series of harvest and planting rites for the yam; a sacred dance festival; several memorial rites on the sites where sacred thatch buildings had once stood; and during the season of the southeastern tradewinds, the ritual production of turmeric. The four chiefs and male ritual elders of lineages performed the major roles of ceremonial enactment. Although the number of Tikopia involved in the activities varied according to the particular ritual, the more important rites traditionally drew large numbers of both sexes.

The author has skillfully drawn ritual and beliefs together with the secular substructure of Tikopia society. He explains, for example, how each of the clans with their chiefs was responsible for enactment of specific rituals during the sacred cycle. Ritual elders, or pure, for their parts, functioned on behalf of their particular lineages, propitiating ancestral spirits of their disparate patrilineal groups. The “Work of the Gods” served in this capacity as a means of identifying kin groups which function autonomously in religious ceremonies. Religion made further incursions into the circle of kin groups when instruction and ideology of the supernatural were passed from elders to the younger generation. The author also explains how in the immediate preparation for a ritual, lineages and clans cooperated and thus tightened the social cohesion of the entire island. In the area of politics, the highest ranking secular chief is described in his role as inaugurating agent of the ceremony which began the ritual cycle and as holder of privileges relating to the primary god of the Tikopia.

The Work of the Gods in Tikopia is written by an author who has intimate knowledge of the people he is studying. Firth’s fluency in the Tikopia language, rapport with the native population, keen observation, and actual participation in pagan ritual enabled him to document in precise detail a religious system which has since been abandoned. As such, Work of the Gods in Tikopia stands as an important historical document of Polynesian ethnography. That it frames religion in the wider context of Tikopia society makes it doubly important to social scientists.