Most archaeologists today would agree with the author's opening assertion that "...the study of pre-historic tools in an objective manner is the first step towards developing and establishing Paleolithic pre-history." But they might not accept the narrowness of the author's application of this idea in this volume. The book represents an attempt to apply typological methods of stone artifact classification as developed in France during the 1950s and 1960s by François Bordes, J. Tixier, and others to prehistoric assemblages outside Europe—specifically, to those of the Indian subcontinent. It is, in the author's own words, a "laboratory manual" for researchers in palaeolithic studies based on the terminology of stone tool classification developed in France.

Of course, a standardized vocabulary is essential to the advancement of any scientific discipline, and there is nothing wrong with trying to translate such a vocabulary out of its original French into an English nomenclature for wider use. At the level of descriptive typology, this book is fairly successful, and it might serve for purposes of formal classification of stone artifacts. Yet such an extended glossary of terms neither does justice to the research by Bordes and his associates in lithic technology, nor does it do much to advance our knowledge of prehistoric lithic technology.

For example, what about Bordes's accomplishments in the area of stone tool manufacture and replication of techniques? Experimental studies in handaxe manufacture, pressure flaking, and heat treatment of stone have led to an appreciation of the technical problems experienced by ancient stone toolmakers and have even suggested alternative ways these problems may have been solved. The same can be said about a growing literature of controlled experiments in stone tool use as well as laboratory experiments with different lithic materials. Far from breaking the "function-biased mind of the archaeologists" (p. 21), as the author asserts, perhaps we ought to be acknowledging the technological as well as the typological aspects of palaeolithic stone tools. This book's attempt at strict adherence to taxonomic concerns, to the exclusion of technological considerations, does a disservice to the research by Bordes and many other scholars, such as S. A. Semenov, Don Crabtree, and Lawrence Keeley, who have made important discoveries about processes of stone tool manufacture and use. It also can cause confusion to anyone who wants to explain the technical differences among different stone tool types. Many of the typological distinctions presented in this book can only be understood in relation to technical processes. For example, the uninitiated reader will be no closer to understanding what a burin is or why it might be important after reading this book than he was when he started. It therefore remains to be seen of how much real use the category burin, as described here, will be to archaeologists working in areas like India and Southeast Asia. Much of the same argument applies to other terms defined or described in this book.
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This volume is a collection of 36 papers, most of which were presented at the Colloquy on Early South East Asia held at the School of Oriental and African Studies, London in September 1973. The colloquy focused on the period from c. 1000 B.C. to A.D. 1000, but many of the papers include information on earlier periods as well.

A wide range of topics and perspectives is to be expected in a collection of this type. The editors have, however, managed to tie the volume together to a remarkable degree by providing an introduction to each of the two parts, which helps to structure the papers somewhat, and by supplying a general index, three appendices, and five maps, which greatly facilitate cross-checking and integration of information and arguments contained in the various papers.

The three appendices include: (1) a checklist of 14C dates from Southeast Asia covering the period from c. 5000 B.C. to A.D. 1000. Full data are provided concerning location, radiocarbon date, object dated and its associations, and references cited; (2) a similarly detailed checklist of Heger Type I bronze drums; and (3) a checklist of place names, proper names, titles, and terms appearing in Chinese sources, giving the Chinese characters and their Pinyin, Wade-Giles, and, where appropriate, Sino-Vietnamese forms of transliteration. All three forms of transliteration are used by contributors to this volume.

The maps show the distribution of (1) mineral deposits in Southeast Asia, (2) Heger Type I bronze drums, (3) 14C dates from c. 5000 B.C. to 500 B.C., (4) 14C dates from c. 500 B.C. to A.D. 500, and (5) inscriptions in Indochina and Thailand of the fifth to eighth centuries A.D. Individual papers are provided with maps, detailed notes, and supplementary bibliographies as needed. The comprehensive bibliography at the end of the volume runs to an impressive 21 pages.

Enough time had elapsed between the colloquy and final publication to allow contributors to respond to new information provided by other participants at the colloquy. This circumstance is reflected in the frequent references to other papers in the volume and in four short articles written expressly in reply to papers presented at the colloquy and included in this volume. This also contributes to the integration of the material contained in the various papers.

The uneven development of archaeology in Southeast Asia is unfortunately but predictably reflected in the colloquy papers as well. Burma, where almost no archaeological work has been undertaken in recent years, produced no pages for this volume, whereas a total of 14 pages deal in whole or in large part with Thailand. Much of this emphasis on Thailand is the result of the astonishing finds made at such sites as Non Nok Tha and Ban Chiang. I cannot help wondering, however, how much equally significant work could be accomplished in other areas of Southeast Asia given comparable levels of interest and support.

Several of the papers in this volume use the following format: (1) a brief summary of the excavation results of a particular site is presented, (2) the site is compared with other sites, and (3) the results are expanded into a more or less tightly argued account of cultural development in the region as a whole. Papers by Bayard (Non Nok Tha), Bronson (Chansen), Loofs (U-Thong), Sørensen (Ongbah Cave), and Watson (Kok Charoeng) fall into this category. These papers are remarkably consistent in describing a series of early sites in central and northeast Thailand with complex and reasonably sophisticated material cultures of very limited extent. Sites favorably situated for long-distance trade began to show signs of involvement in such trade during the late first millennium B.C. and early first millennium A.D. while providing little or no evidence for political consolidation or "Indianization" until much later.

Overviews appearing in this volume that concern such maritime areas as Vietnam (Davidson), Indonesia (Glover), the Malay Peninsula (Peacock), and the Philippines (Fox) are equally consistent in portraying a series of material cultures homogeneous over wide areas. Glover's paper concludes by suggesting that the highly mobile, sea-adapted peoples responsible for these homogeneous cultures had developed regular trading links between Mainland Southeast Asia, India, Madagascar, and New Guinea by the first millennium B.C. and that these peoples have been largely responsible for the spread of Indianization and Islam. New art styles or institutions introduced by the sea peoples were then developed along indigenous lines by the more settled agricultural peoples of the interior or lowlands. This idea is not new but is becoming increasingly well supported archaeologically.

Bronson, in his paper on Chansen, presents a model for state formation that is consistent with the available archaeological and ethnographic data and that helps to explain the inland/coastal dichotomy noted.
by Glover, Peacock, and others. Bronson argues that long-distance trade was a principal stimulus to state formation because (1) imported objects are inherently rare and therefore capable of conferring prestige even when stored in indefinitely large quantities, (2) imported objects are easily monopolizable and their vendors, being foreigners and in small numbers, are easily controlled, and (3) traders with high profit margins are more easily taxed than agriculturalists with little surplus. The profits obtainable through monopolistic control of a valuable resource or a key transportation route encourage territorial expansion to eliminate competition even when the territory gained is itself of little value. I would add that control of long-distance trade is generally most easily affected at the points of interface between local and external sources of supply. This usually occurs in estuarine or coastal locations.

Bronson also failed to mention that dealings with outsiders and dealings in nontraditional objects are often not subject to customary law. External trade therefore provides one of the few sources of working capital or storable wealth which is not encumbered by social obligations.

A number of authors provide site data without significant attempts at interpretation. Included among the papers of this kind are Soejono on Gilimanuk, Selimkhanov on Non Nok Tha, Smith on Non Nok Tha, Sutiragas on Ban Chiang, Solheim and Ayres on Phimai and other Khorat Plateau sites, Carbonnel on Cambodian neolithic sites, and Maleipan on Sab Champa. The remaining papers include such topics as linguistics (Shorto, Bayard), art history (Lyons, Soekmono, Subhadradis Diskul, de Casparis), history (Boechari, Smith, Wolters), and the "megalithic problem" (Christie, Glover, Bronson and Bayard).

Ng studied the distribution of early historic settlement relative to agriculturally productive alluvial soils and potable water. The correlation between settlement and these two variables is indeed striking. Ng's conclusions concerning the effects of this distribution of suitable land on the political expansion and cohesion of states in the area deserve consideration. The author failed to note, however, that all but one of the 41 sites mapped is located at or near the margin of soils suitable for paddy rather than in the presumably heavier soils in the center of the valleys. Most, if not all, of these sites are also adjacent to large rivers. It is obvious that a number of other variables must be considered before we can gain an adequate understanding of indigenous site selection criteria. Ng should be commended for his methods, however, which have tremendous analytical potential.

Pirazzoli-t'Serstevens' very detailed study of the historical and ethnographic literature pertaining to the significance and use of drums in Southeast Asia raises a number of questions concerning the role of trade, migration, and diffusion in the distribution of Heger Type I bronze drums, although she does not address these archaeological questions directly.

Von Dewall attempted to identify several key types of bronze tools and weapons and to locate individual workshop centers on the basis of the distribution of the various types. Focusing on a small number of easily recognizable key types can be a useful technique. Von Dewall's data consisted of published photographs and inspection of three museum collections, often without detailed provenience information available, so that the results are not as solid as one might wish.

Jacques argues in his paper that early historical reconstructions based heavily on Chinese texts were reasonable at a time when archaeological data were lacking but that this is no longer the case, for southeastern Indochina at least. Historians should therefore focus on the historic states of Bhavapura and Aninditapura, as revealed in inscriptions, rather than continuing to argue about the greatly misunderstood Funan and Chenla. That such an approach can be productive is evidenced by Jacob's paper, which deals with the wealth of information extractable from pre-Angkorean inscriptions concerning such things as occupational specialties, agricultural products, and media of exchange.

Bronson's review of the archaeological and literary evidence for Srivijaya, a place long enshrined in the histories as an important empire, raises serious questions concerning the viability of many of the historical arguments that center on Srivijaya. This paper also lends support to Jacques' call for greater consideration of indigenous evidence and less reliance on argument from external sources.

Many archaeologists who in the past have preferred to ignore the external sources and the complex problems involved in their interpretation are now beginning to use these sources as supplementary information, as advocated by Jacques. Historians and historical geographers such as Wheatley seem firmly committed to arguing from Chinese texts as they have always done. Wheatley, in a note accompanying his paper on urban genesis, goes so far as to dismiss Davidson's arguments for pre-Chinese state formation in Tongking as inconclusive. The fact remains that Davidson's argument rests on Vietnamese histories and a large body of supporting archaeological evidence. Wheatley's position seems to rest on the assumption that nothing of any importance could have happened in Tongking until the Chinese arrived to record it.

The papers presented in this volume do not differ greatly in style or content from the majority of articles appearing in various Southeast Asian journals.
The value of each paper is greatly enhanced, however, by the ease of evaluation and comparison which the high level of integration provides.

This volume was not intended to be a course text and would probably not serve well in that capacity. It does provide good access to the available literature as well as a body of theory in which to view that literature. In spite of the high price, I urge anyone seriously interested in Southeast Asian prehistory to obtain a copy of this book or at least ensure that a copy remains accessible.