The Western scientific study of the ancient peoples and cultures of Asia began on 12 April 1783 when a young jurist and alumnus of Harrow and University College, Oxford, set sail for India aboard the Crocodile. Waiting Sir William Jones in Calcutta was the post of puisne judge of the Supreme Court; behind him he left failure to attain a seat in Parliament and sufficient financial security to allow him to continue his studies in Persian and Arabic languages. Jones relinquished in London a life where he was respected as an orientalist, a distinction that led to his election as fellow of the Royal Society in 1772 when he was twenty-six years old, as well as membership in Samuel Johnson’s exclusive literary club, which met at the Turk’s Head in Soho.

By the time Jones arrived at Calcutta, he had compiled a list of subjects to investigate in his new home: “History of the ancient world, Proofs and illustrations of scripture, Traditions concerning the deluge, medicine, chemistry, surgery and anatomy of the Indians,” in addition to the study of native laws, trade, commerce, antiquities, and the arts. Excited by the intellectual challenges Asia promised, he recounted to his friends in Calcutta, “When I was at sea last August on my voyage to this country, which I had long ardently desired to visit, I found one evening, on inspecting the observations of the day, that India lay before us, and Persia on our left, while a breeze from Arabia blew nearly on our stern. . . . It gave me inexpressible pleasure to find myself in the midst of so noble an amphitheatre (the Indian Ocean), almost encircled by the vast regions of Asia, which has ever been esteemed the nurse of the sciences, the inventress of delightful and useful arts, the scene of glorious actions, fertile in the productions of human genius, abounding in natural wonders, and infinitely diversified in the forms of religion and government, in the laws, manners, customs, languages, and in the features and complexions of men. I could not help remarking, how important and extensive a field was yet unexplored, and how many solid advantages unimproved” (pp. 197–198).

An ambitious scheme emerged from these reflections, one of too vast a scope to be
undertaken by a single scholar, especially a newcomer to Asia whose livelihood depended upon the practice of law and for whom there were few officially sanctioned rewards for the pursuit of research and language learning such as those enjoyed in an academic setting. Jones’s dream had to be realized as a collaborative effort with other individuals fired by this enthusiasm who would collect ancient manuscripts and coins, interview Brahmin pundits, travel to unknown reaches of the Indian subcontinent to collect biological specimens and data about isolated tribal populations, record epigraphical inscriptions on monuments and temple walls, and then publish the results of their efforts and observations. In short, it seemed necessary to establish a learned society, one modeled on the Royal Society.

Thirty gentlemen responded to Jones’s invitation to assemble in the Grand Jury Room of the Supreme Court at Fort William on 15 February 1784, many of whom had made contributions to the study of Indian history, literature, and law while advancing their own administrative and commercial careers within Bengal, which was under the control of the East India Company. Jones charged these founders of this “Asiatick Society” to “investigate whatever is rare in the stupendous fabric of nature; you will correct the Geography of Asia by new observations and discoveries; will trace the annals, and even traditions, of those nations, who from time to time have peopled or desolated it; and will bring to light their various forms of government, with their institutions, civil and religious... if now it be asked what are the intended objects of our enquiries within these spacious limits, we answer MAN and NATURE; whatever is performed by the one or produced by the other” (pp. 203–204).

Garland Cannon, professor of English and linguistics at Texas A & M University, is the world’s leading authority on Sir William Jones. His contributions to many learned journals and scholarly societies as a historian of eighteenth-century India and England, as the author of Oriental Jones (1964), and as the editor of Letters of Sir William Jones (1970) and Sir William Jones: A Bibliography of Primary and Secondary Sources (1979) were among his accomplishments lauded during the many observances of the Asiatic Society Bicentenary held in India, England, Belgium, and the United States from 1984 to 1986. This new biography contains 30 percent new material collected over the past three decades. It offers a rounded picture of Jones’s life and intellectual contributions within the historical setting of the “intercivilizational encounter between Britain and India,” and benefits from the author’s “experience from extensive travel and residence in India needed to appreciate the cultural situation in which Jones found himself” (p. vii).

The fifteen chapters are organized chronologically into periods of Jones’s life from one- to five-year intervals, each chapter bearing an engaging title, such as “A Barbaric Oriental Conqueror—1770” (chapter 1); “Delicate Arab Maidens and Liquid Ruby—1770–1772” (chapter 2); “An Ass Laden with Gold—1780” (chapter 5); “A Vision of the Indian Ocean—1783–1785” (chapter 8); “A Burning Tropical Sun—1790–1791” (chapter 13); “Scholar-Martyr—1791–1794” (chapter 14). The chapters are preceded by a brief preface describing the author’s motivations for writing the book and his acknowledgment of persons and organizations assisting him, an introduction that sets the scene for Jones’s place in eighteenth-century scholarship and politics, and a chronology of Jones’s life with short notes opposite the dates. Following the chapters are detailed footnotes and bibliography so that “the scholar can pursue specialized interests by utilizing the endnotes and particularly the references in Letters for which this biography is in some ways a complementary volume” (p. vii). There is an appendix including five hitherto unpublished letters written by Jones in 1780 and 1787. The book concludes with a detailed subject and author index in which life dates of individuals appear beside each name. The two illustrations are the frontispiece portrait of Jones at the age of forty-seven painted by A. W. Davis, and the logo of the Asiatic Society (p. 358).

Major themes of The Life and Mind of Oriental Jones are the success of the Asiatick Society (which continues today as the Asiatic Society of Bengal to distinguish it from its
offshoot, the Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland, founded in 1823 with branches of the London office in Bombay, Madras, Colombo, and Singapore) and its scholarly publications, beginning with the first volume of *Asiatick Researches* in 1788. Jones was the first president of the society, and he published his research papers and annual discourses in the four volumes that appeared during his lifetime. His colleagues in India made their substantial contributions to *Asiatick Researches* as well, and topics covered a broad spectrum of research efforts, including Indian music, Chinese literature, a cure for elephantiasis, anatomy and behavior of the scaly anteater, speculations on the source of the Nile, identification of the spikenard plant mentioned by classical Greco-Roman writers, the Indian origins of chess, history of the zodiac, descriptions of ancient coins and monuments, and habits of the Indian loris, along with frequent writings on languages, Sanskrit texts, and Hindu customs.

Cannon makes it clear that Jones left three outstanding achievements, which contributed directly to the development of Asian archaeology and anthropology: (1) the discovery of a common origin for the family of languages that came to be called Indo-European, as announced in Jones's Third Discourse in 1786, when he proposed that Sanskrit was linguistically related to Latin and Greek because of an earlier common source, thereby laying the foundation for modern comparative linguistics; (2) the establishment in the Tenth Discourse of 1793 of the first absolute chronological date that correlates Indian and European history, by identifying the Greek name of Sandracottus with the Chandragupta Maurya (died 286 B.C.) of Indian sources; (3) the translation of Sanskrit, Arabic, and Persian literary sources into English and the introduction of certain works of Sanskrit literature into Europe, where they had a profound effect upon the development of Romanticism. Among Jones’s chief literary contributions are translations of the drama *Sakuntala* (1789) by Kalidasa (fl. fifth century A.D.), the *Gita Govinda* (1792), and the lawbooks of *Manu* (1794, published posthumously). Cannon gives careful attention to these achievements, providing specimens of Jones’s translations and poetry, and emphasizing that through these writings Jones revealed the richness of Sanskrit studies to Indians as well as to Europeans, thereby demonstrating through recovery of ancient texts the high civilization of ancient India.

Attention is given, as well, to the voluminous correspondence Jones maintained with leading figures of his day, including Benjamin Franklin, Joseph Banks, Edmund Burke, Robert Chambers, Warren Hastings, Lord Monboddo, John Shore, Charles Wilkins, Thomas Colebrooke, Edward Gibbons, and Joshua Reynolds. However, readers of the biography will be struck by the secondary place accorded the natural sciences in Jones’s approach to a reconstruction of the past. To be sure, there are two zoological studies in the early volumes of *Asiatick Researches*, one on the pangolin of Bihar and another on the loris of peninsular India and Sri Lanka (then known as Ceylon). Jones observed that the loris was correctly classified and described by Linnaeus, but he found Buffon's account unsatisfactory. Since Jones did not approve of experimental biology involving animals, zoology did not advance under the society’s aegis during his tenure as president. Botany flourished, however, and Jones was instrumental in adding new species to those classified by Linnaeus and also contributed to the botanical gardens of Bengal. Some of the plants Jones collected found their way to Kew Gardens in London.

Implicit in the encomium of “Father of Indology” bestowed upon Jones by his admirers is a recognition that his efforts, especially in the founding of his society, formed the basis of later anthropological and archaeological researches of the peoples of South Asia. It is remarkable that Jones comprehended so fully the value of a scientific study of Asian populations in an era when his European colleagues had barely begun anthropological inquiries. Jones’s interest in Indian languages was rooted in his faith that comparative linguistic studies would reveal the origins of human populations, routes of ancient tribal migrations, and the causes behind cultural diversity that shaped the five principal ethnic
groups of Asia in which he was keenly interested—the Persians, Arabs, Tartars, Chinese, and Indians. Each "nation" was the subject of a series of essays published in *Asiatick Researches* that attempted to resolve the problem of establishing a common origin. While his interest in Indian languages had been motivated initially by a practical goal of translating native legal sources from Sanskrit or vernacular tongues into English for use in British courts, Jones developed an appreciation of linguistic knowledge, especially a command of Sanskrit. He believed that through comparative language studies it would be possible to demonstrate how the geographically separate and culturally distinctive world of ancient India might be related to the Greco-Roman world and to modern Western civilization. Jones did not favor religious proselytization of native Indians by Europeans, as he respected cultural differences and held all men to be equal. He was a Whig sympathetic to the American colonists seeking independence from Britain and had seriously contemplated living in America before accepting the judgeship in Calcutta. He distrusted power in political and ecclesiastical bodies, but remained a devout Christian while defending Hindus and Muslims in their right to practice their own religious customs.

As Cannon ably demonstrates, Jones's conception of antiquity did not exceed the confines of Mosaic chronology, and he sought to accommodate all ethnic groups of mankind into a scheme compatible with the Genesis accounts. As a believer in the monogenesis doctrine of a single and common origin of all peoples, Jones assumed that the natives of India were descendants of Ham, biblical progenitor of the dark-skinned races. He searched for correspondences of Hindu gods with those of Egyptian, Mesopotamian, Greek, Roman and Judeo-Christian traditions, extending his investigations beyond linguistics to comparative data to be derived from "languages and letters; philosophy and religion; remains of old sculptures and architecture and memoirs of the Hindus."

Concerning archaeological investigations, little was known about the Indian subcontinent during Jones's lifetime, save for records of land grants to Brahmins and brief descriptions of temples ascribed to rulers of various dynasties. These deeds were written in Sanskrit or in undeciphered scripts. Facsimile copies of inscriptions were sent to Jones by persons from all over India, and these found their way into the growing archives of epigraphical sources for which the society was to become famous. Charles Wilkins, a founding member of the society, deciphered the Brahmi script dating to the sixth century A.D., but early Brahmi script carved into upright edict stones remained unread until forty years after Jones's death. The significance of ancient coins, rock-cut temples, and Buddhist and Hindu literary sources was poorly understood during the first years of the society's existence, and Jones was more interested in India's ancient intellectual achievements in law, politics, and literature than in its monuments and architecture. He recognized that Hindu concepts of geography, chronology, and astronomy had become hopelessly entangled in myth, but he was certain that the elements of Newtonian physics could be discerned in the Vedas and that Indian medicine might contribute to advances in public health. Cannon makes the point that Jones was successful in setting the stage for advances in anthropology and archaeology through his own pioneering work and his establishment of the Asiatic Society, but that organized research strategies in these disciplines were initiated in the following century. As the Asiatic Society acquired paintings, sculptures, numismatic collections, and zoological and botanical specimens, it became necessary to house these in a museum. This edifice was constructed in Calcutta in 1808, and its collections are another legacy of Jones's love of learning. Through its portals were to pass the Miocene-Pliocene fossils of the Siwalik Hills, the first discovered stone artifacts that established India's place in world prehistory, and the core of the collections that survive today in the Indian Museum, and in India's Anthropological Survey, Geological Survey, and Zoological Survey. The *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal* became the organ of the Asiatic Society in the early nineteenth century and re-
mains a stimulating scientific periodical today.

As one who enjoys reading biographies and autobiographies of anthropologists and archaeologists, particularly those active in South Asia, I rate The Life and Mind of Oriental Jones high above other published life histories with respect to Cannon's meticulous scholarship combined with an entertaining and gracious style of writing. Indeed, my original intention to skim certain portions of the text and notes was dropped as each sentence carried me into the next with ease and the promise of additional intellectual rewards. Having conducted graduate seminars on the topics of the history of anthropology and the palaeoanthropology of South Asia at my academic institution, I foresee that this new biography of Jones will enter my reading lists as a required text in future seminars. Cannon’s alternation of descriptive portions of the text with narrative of biographical events in the life of Jones with his wife and colleagues in late eighteenth-century Calcutta is a delightful format followed in every chapter. Students and established scholars in archaeology, linguistics, anthropology, history, and the history of science will value this new biography, and by reading it they will also gain a greater appreciation of Milton's observation that "no man who hath tasted learning but will confess the many ways of profiting by those who, not contented with stale receipts, are able to manage and set forth new positions in the world." Such were the roles of the founder and members of the "Asiatick Society" who met on that February evening in Calcutta over two hundred years ago and established the beginnings of scientific inquiries into the origins, diversity, and affinities of the ancient and contemporary peoples of Asia.


Reviewed by Leonard Y. Andaya, Department of History, University of Auckland

The study of Philippine history, like that of most histories of Southeast Asia, has been burdened by the artificial political divisions imposed by former colonial regimes. Unfortunately, scholars have rigidly adhered to these artificial boundaries in approaching the history of the period before the nineteenth century. Specialists on Indonesia frequently ignore the southern Philippines when generalizing about the region because they regard it as part of another country. Philippine specialists attempt to incorporate the southern Philippines into some comprehensible picture with the northern and central regions because they see them as forming one unit. In this compartmentalization of historical studies, scholars have tended to rely almost exclusively on sources originating from the former colonial power. For the pre-twentieth-century period, Philippine specialists have been equally reliant on Dutch materials. In consequence, these historians often adopt subconsciously the viewpoint of their sources. For Philippine history this has meant that the southern Philippines has often been regarded as an oddity, an area out of step and in continual conflict with the rest of the Philippines.

Laarhoven's examination of Maguindanao society in the seventeenth century, which was originally submitted as an M.A. thesis to Ateneo de Manila in 1985, is perhaps the first attempt to depict the island of Mindanao within its natural zone of activity, which in the seventeenth century included the southern Philippines, north Maluku, and Sulawesi. She has pieced together a picture of an effective functioning sultanate that exhibited many of the characteristics of other Muslim sultanates to the south. Basing her findings primarily on Dutch archival material from the period, she succeeds in demonstrating the economic and political vitality of the Maguindanao sultanate throughout the
seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. In this respect she has accomplished one of her principal aims, which is to question the validity of C. A. Majul's original claim—made in his study *The Muslims in the Philippines* (1973), and subsequently repeated by Filipino scholars—that Maguindanao declined after the death of Sultan Kudrat (d. 1671).

Less convincing, however, is Laarhoven's belief that she has demonstrated her second aim, which is to explain H. de la Costa's observation of Maguindanao's "considerable advance in the direction of centralized government" at this time (p. xvi). Using Ted C. Lewellen's definition (*Political Anthropology*, 1983) of what constitutes a "centralized political system," which she quotes on p. 143, she then tries to detect these factors in Maguindanao society. The difficulty lies in the fact that Maguindanao was never a permanent Dutch post, and so there were no systematic monthly and yearly reports that could help provide a meaningful examination of the nature of government and its changing function throughout the period under study. While the reports consulted by Laarhoven are detailed, they are few and far between and do not consistently focus on the same issues. This is a failing not of Laarhoven herself but of the sources, and the question may be one that will never be adequately answered.

Laarhoven includes in an appendix some translations of Dutch documents on Maguindanao, which will be of interest to Philippine historians who have previously depended upon Spanish documents for any picture of society in the southern islands. From the archival sources, she has also compiled a useful table of goods moving to and from Maguindanao. Nevertheless, the table can be used only as a rough guide since Laarhoven herself admits that the records did not incorporate trading activities outside the pur-view of the Dutch. The book lacks an index, which may have been acceptable in a thesis but is a major omission in a work that contains so much new information.

Laarhoven states in her introduction that because of constraints of time and academic requirements she "intentionally minimized incorporating data from published researches based on Spanish documents so that more space could be devoted to what the Dutch sources reveal" (p. xiv). Yet more could have been revealed by using both sources. For example, it would have been instructive to combine Dutch accounts with the Jesuit Francisco Combes's description of the principal ethnic groups in Maguindanao in the seventeenth century (*História de las islas de Mindanao, Jolo, y sus adjacentes*). The great importance Combes attached to the Lutao does not appear to have made as great an impression on the Dutch. This is simply one case where a comparison of sources could have provided a greater depth to the analysis. It is to be hoped that in time Laarhoven, or others inspired by this effort, will attempt to examine both the Spanish and Dutch archives to piece together still more of the dynamics of the societies in the southern Philippines in this much neglected early modern period.


Reviewed by Matthew Spriggs, Australian National University

This large-format book, copiously and beautifully illustrated, looks destined for placement on the coffee table. But looks can be deceiving, and it would be equally well placed in the academic library. The result of a decade of study, this book became a "classic" immediately upon publication.

When the authors began their study in 1971 there was little information available on the traditional pottery in Papua New Guinea (PNG); the only previous synthesis, that of Margarete Schurig in 1930, had long been in need of revision and expansion. The authors visited nearly every pottery-producing area
in PNG during the course of their study—a major achievement in areas that are not easy to reach even today. Many long waits for transport on small airstrips, wharfs, and beaches must have been part of this odyssey.

Useful maps and tables in the introduction summarize the languages in the pottery-making areas, the distribution of particular pot-making techniques, and whether the potters are male or female (or both, in one or two areas). Chapter 2 gives further details on materials and techniques. The following nearly 300 pages give a region-by-region summary from the West Sepik to the Solomons. Appendix A gives a clear presentation of the terminology used in describing vessel shape and vessel parts, and a second appendix lists where the results of clay analyses carried out as part of the project are archived. A quick count gives over 518 photographs, many in color.

The value of this work in stimulating further study can be illustrated by three research projects that have used its results. The first is that of Yvonne Marshall (1985), who used the information on gender of the potters to construct a model of "who made the Lapita pots?" The likely answer—not surprising, given the information presented in this book—is women. The second study is that of Terry Hunt (1989), who obtained clay samples from one of the authors from the extant Manus Province pottery centers for use in a comparison with Lapita and later pottery from the Mussau group in New Ireland Province. Chemical analyses demonstrated the likelihood that some of the decorated Lapita pottery came from Manus and was similar in composition to that made in the recent past at Mbuke Island. Late context pottery in Mussau was probably imported from the Hus pottery center, the other main pottery production center in Manus in this century. Finally, a project on Austronesian language terminologies that commenced in late 1990 in the Linguistics Department in the Research School of Pacific Studies at Australian National University has found May and Tuckson's book a valuable source of terms to do with pottery making in PNG languages.

A final and lasting contribution of May and Tuckson's work is to document a traditional technology that is on the verge of extinction in many of the villages in which they studied. They were probably the last people able to document pottery making in many of these villages. By the year 2000 traditional pottery making may well have totally ceased in the majority of the villages described in this book. In two areas I know something about, Manus and the Solomons, I would expect that pottery making will be an entirely extinct art by the end of the decade. May and Tuckson's work means that something of this body of traditional knowledge will be preserved.
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Reviewed by Carla Sinopoli, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

This sumptuously illustrated small volume is the catalogue of an exhibit of Japanese ceramics held at the IBM Gallery of Science and Art in New York in 1990–1991 under the sponsorship of the Japan Society and the government of Japan. The exhibit consisted
of 70 ceramic objects from 45 different lenders. Color and black-and-white photographs of each object provide ample evidence of the mastery of the ceramic art by ancient Japanese potters. The catalogue takes up the last 43 pages of this 112-page book and contains detailed descriptions of each vessel by Harada Masayuki, Matsumura Keiji, Doi Takashi, and Tanabe Ikuo.

Preceding the descriptions of the exhibited objects are six brief chapters by various authors that introduce the chronological and cultural periods represented in the exhibition. These chapters vary somewhat in tone and quality, but overall they provide a useful introduction for nonspecialists to general issues in ceramic studies and to the early ceramic-using cultures of Japan. Anne P. Underhill leads off the book with an introduction to general anthropological understandings of processes of ceramic change, focusing on the roles of environmental, technological, and social factors in ceramic production. In so doing, she explicitly positions ceramics as a category of material culture that affects and is affected by their role in the broader social or cultural context, whether as utilitarian objects, prestige goods, or ritual vessels. This perspective is, to a greater or lesser extent, pursued by each of the subsequent authors in chapters on ceramics of the Jōmon, Yayoi, Kofun, and Asuka, Nara, and Heian periods. One contribution focuses on sue ware and thus overlaps chronologically with the chapters on the Kofun and on the Asuka, Nara, and Heian periods.

Richard Pearson discusses both temporal and regional variations in ceramic forms and decoration from the Jōmon period (10,500–300 B.C.). He emphasizes that there were “in fact several Jōmon cultures” (p. 15), occupying different ecological zones and producing somewhat different ceramic vessels. He describes the major forms and traditions of the pottery, figurines, and other ceramic objects from the six main phases of the Jōmon period. He then turns to a discussion of some recent interpretations by Japanese scholars of the social contexts of Jōmon ceramic decoration, use, and discard.

Gina Barnes describes the ceramics of the Yayoi period (300 B.C.–A.D. 300). She notes that this was a time of profound cultural and technological change throughout Japan, beginning with the adoption of rice agriculture from the mainland and ending just before the formation of class society. Early Yayoi ceramics exhibit parallels with ceramic traditions of Korea, with the addition of some Jōmon features. By middle Yayoi times there is evidence for regional differentiation in ceramic styles in the context of increasing complexity in forms and decoration. In the late Yayoi period in the Kinai region, ceramic forms become more standardized, which is perhaps indicative of the emergence of specialized ceramic workshops. Barnes emphasizes the continued regional diversity in ceramic production and forms during late Yayoi times, in the context of some general patterns of change in ritual vessels and ceramic use by emergent elite.

The next three chapters by J. Edward Kidder Jr., Miwa, and Richard L. Mellott address sue ware and other wares of the first Japanese states. Sue ceramics are mass-produced, unglazed stoneware vessels made in a wide variety of forms. Sue ware derives from Korean ceramic traditions and became common in Japan in the fifth century A.D. These ceramics appeared first as elite vessels, found in high-status tombs, and later became widespread domestic and ritual forms. Along with vessels of haji ware (unglazed earthenware), they were produced by specialist guilds in large-scale workshops. Technological changes, including the introduction of the potter’s wheel and the development of large chamber tombs, accompany changes in demand for ceramic forms in the early Japanese states.

Kidder discusses the ceramics of the Kofun burial mounds (A.D. 258–646). His chapter is somewhat more difficult for readers who are not Japan specialists to follow than the previous chapters. For example, he discusses haji ware several times, but without providing any definition of it. Kidder focuses on sue wares, haji vessels, and haniwa (clay images placed on top of the tombs). Early haniwa were tall clay cylinders, 1–2 m high, while later haniwa include elaborately sculpted houses, clothed human figures, animals, and tools. These provide a vivid record of contemporary material styles.

Miwa presents a general discussion of sue
ware, considering manufacturing techniques, chronological change, and vessel form and use.

Mellott examines ceramics from the Asuka, Nara, and Heian periods (A.D. 552–1185), considering production locales, techniques, and vessel types. Changes in ceramic production and forms occur as new wares are adopted by the elite throughout this sequence. Mellott considers four types of ceramic wares: *haji*, *sue*, lead-glazed, and ash-glazed. *Haji* ware was produced by specialists using simple hand-building technologies and is found throughout the sequence. *Sue* ware is also found throughout the sequence, although, as noted, it changes from a ritual ware to a common domestic form by the seventh century. New elite forms emerge to fill the role formerly held by *sue* ware; these include lead-glazed wares from Korea and China, and in the ninth century ash-glazed wares, imitations of Chinese celadons.

This small book provides a considerable amount of information on Japanese ceramics and cultural developments from 10,500 B.C. to A.D. 1185. Although specialists may learn little new from this volume, it provides nonspecialists with a well-written and aesthetically pleasing introduction to Japanese ceramics written by some of the most knowledgeable scholars in the field.


Reviewed by BARBARA THIEL, Northern Kentucky University

This volume reports on various archaeological, ethnographic, and linguistic surveys conducted in 1982 on the island of Batan (north of Luzon) and part of northern Luzon, Philippines, by researchers from the University of Kumamoto in Japan. The surveys were conducted in cooperation with the National Museum of the Philippines. The research is part of a larger three-year project, and this volume presents an abridged report on the research.

The objective of the research is "to clarify the various aspects of the diffusions of cultural elements of the South Islands in the prehistoric Japanese Islands as compared with those of the China Sea areas with special reference to Batan and Babuyan Islands." The research "was carried out in order to solve the problems from the anthropological, ethnological and linguistic points of view" (p. ii).

The report is divided into three parts: Part 1, archaeological survey and excavations; part 2, ethnographical survey; and part 3, linguistic survey. Over half the volume is devoted to the archaeological work. As a result of the survey, 60 sites were located in central Batan. For each site there is a brief description of the setting and the findings, and a map showing the locations of the sites. The sites contained earthenware pottery, burial jars or sherds of jars, pottery and stone tools, or pottery and Chinese porcelain, and one site was a jar burial cemetery. An interesting item at one site was an earthenware mold for casting a metal spear point.

Limited excavations were conducted at one of the sites, Sumhaw Site. The excavations and the findings—earthenware pottery, stone tools, and Chinese porcelain—are described. A brief three-day survey was conducted in an area of the Cagayan Valley in northeast Luzon. Earthenware sherds and stone tools were collected from five previously known sites.

The artifacts collected during the surveys on Batan and Luzon were analyzed, and the results are described and illustrated. The report includes 66 pages of excellent drawings and photographs. The archaeological work conducted is important because it adds a great deal to our knowledge of the archaeology of Batan Island and relates this information to other areas of the Philippines.

The ethnographic survey was conducted for three weeks. The people of Batan are pri-
barily of the Ivatan ethnic group, and 96 percent of the population speak the Ivatan language. The survey was carried out chiefly in the towns of Basco and Ivana. Since the period of stay was so short, the researchers "chiefly made our efforts to research on the present life environment and subsistent technology of the inhabitants" (p. 167).

Brief descriptions are given of the environmental conditions of the island, and the number of households and number of workers in various occupations are listed. The bulk of the survey is devoted to farming, fishing, dwellings, and pottery making. Lists of crops, farming tools, and Ivatan and Itbayat words for 146 edible wild and cultivated plants are given. Next is a description of fishing methods, and of boats and methods of boatbuilding. The locations of settlements and methods of house construction are briefly described. Pottery making is then discussed. Methods of forming and firing pots are given, along with a list of tools used in the manufacturing process. Although the ethnographic information is limited, what is presented is very informative and also useful for comparative purposes.

The third section of the report is devoted to the linguistic survey. This section discusses all four of the inhabited Batanes Islands, not just Batan. The languages spoken are Yami, Itbayat(an), Vasay(en) (Northern Ivatan), Isamorong (Southern Ivatan), and Babuyan. The languages are subdialects of one language (Ivatan), but some are very different from others. The name of the group is the "Bashiic group," also called the "Vasayic language group." In this section of the report "the comparison between Vasay (Northern Ivatan) and Isamorong (Southern Ivatan), especially the language spoken in Basco and the one spoken in Mahatao [towns in Batan], is made" (p. 217).

Included in the linguistic study are descriptions and examples of the phonological system in Vasay and Isamorong, dialectal similarities and variations, phonological variations, and morphological and lexical variations. Following this is a discussion of a tentative subgrouping of the Vasayic languages, including historical relationships between the languages. This linguistic survey makes valuable additions to our knowledge of this language group.

Overall, the volume is very informative. This area of the Philippines is little known archaeologically, ethnographically, or linguistically, so the data and interpretations presented add considerably to our knowledge of this region, and provide a useful basis for comparative analyses with other related regions.


Reviewed by BARBARA THIEL, Northern Kentucky University

This monograph describes archaeological excavations conducted on the island of Panay, in the central Philippines, by the Victoria Archaeological Survey in cooperation with the National Museum of the Philippines. The society offered to assist the museum in a nationwide program and was assigned the island of Panay, which in 1975 was almost unknown archaeologically. Subsequent annual field trips of four to eight weeks' duration resulted in surveys in all provinces of Panay, and some excavation as well. "The purpose of this report is to present the detailed results of the investigations to date" (p. 1).

The broad context of the project was "to establish the type and variety of sites on Panay, to estimate their number and to establish their state of preservation and assess their research potential" (p. 6). Given the limited amount of time in the field and the wide range of site types that could be expected, it was decided to focus on Stone Age sites. The
main objective of the Panay Island project is to construct regional sequences for the island; a second major objective is "to determine how and when agriculture was introduced and to identify interface between hunter-gatherers and agriculturalists" (p. 9).

It was decided that systematic survey coverage was impracticable because of the limited time and resources, so the investigation focused on caves and rock shelters. Only those that offered the best prospects were visited. The number, types, and locations of the sites located in the survey are not given in this publication. The publication primarily consists of a detailed description of the analyses of the materials obtained in the excavations.

Major excavations were conducted at the site of Lapuz Lapuz, and one 1 m test pit was excavated at each of four other sites, Noulan, Langub, Pilar, and Gui-ub. Descriptions of the sites, excavation methods, and stratigraphy of the sites are given. Most of the report is devoted to the results of detailed analyses, in particular from Lapuz Lapuz, conducted on stone flake tools, pottery, animal bone, and mollusks. These analyses are an important and useful part of the report. Detailed descriptions, drawings, graphs, charts, and tables are included. It would be good for other researchers to conduct such analyses so we would have a better basis for making comparisons between sites and for making generalizations about prehistory.

All five of the sites are interpreted as hunting-and-gathering campsites occupied on a short-term seasonal basis. The pottery is thought to have been obtained in trade from agriculturalists, as is the case in other areas of the Philippines. At the end of the report Coutts provides a summary and interpretation of Panay prehistory and the island's relationship to other areas in the Philippines.

This volume is an important contribution to Philippine prehistory. Its wealth of primary data and the conclusions drawn from them will make it a very useful source for future research in Philippine archaeology.
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cannot serve as the basis for correlations with the Potwar Plateau, as formerly considered by DeTerra and other workers (chapter 3). Chapters 4–6 are concerned with a detailed understanding of the geological evolution of the Siwalik and post-Siwalik sequences.

The subjects of the remaining chapters (7–12) are two open-air localities discovered at Riwat, near Rawalpindi. The oldest stone artifacts were found in gritstone/conglomerate strata of Upper Siwalik context. A minimum age for hominid activity at about 1.9–2.1 myr is proposed, based both on palaeomagnetic dating of these deposits to between about 0.73 and 2.4 myr and on the reasoning that the artifacts antedate the folding of the Soan Syncline at about 1.9–2.1 myr. The authors plan to corroborate this date in the future. Three specimens are interpreted as genuine, and these comprise one flaked cobble and two flakes. The majority of the 29 lithic elements listed are rolled. Five pieces previously considered as artifacts (Dennell et al. 1988a, 1988b) are now thought of as relatively unconvincing. Several criteria are used, including the number of flake removals, to determine whether or not the recovered quartzite pieces are the result of hominid modification. According to this, lithic elements are "ranked" into five groups, of which ranks 0–1 constitute geologically modified stone and rank 5 genuine artifacts; ranks 2–4 signify uncertainty as to the natural or artifactual origin. This methodology is highly questionable; lithic elements that give reason to doubt their artifactual nature should as a rule not be included in an assemblage.

The lithic assemblage from Site 55, located about 1 km from the previous site, was recovered from a gritstone and conglomerate context. The age of the site is at least 45 kyr, based on thermoluminescence (TL) dating of the loess that covered the lithic material. The artifacts from this locality were found in "fresh," "abraded," and "weathered" conditions, and although Rendell et al. argue for their in situ occurrence partly based on conjoined pieces (65 pieces in 24 sets), their differential preservation and conglomerate context are suggestive of some redeposition. The majority of stone materials—weathered cobbles and flakes—appear to be the result of flaking due to natural processes. The collection comprises mainly flaked cobbles. Other specimens are small to large nuclei, flakes, bladelike flakes, and blades. In their brief regional comparison (pp. 189–190), the authors attempt to relate the assemblage to the archaeological record of India, Central Asia, and the Near East, ignoring any of the sites known from East Asia. The reason for this appears to be some evidence for core preparation of Levallois type, a technological facies that appears never to have become established east of India. The evidence for Levallois-derived artifacts, however, cannot be supported, judging from descriptions and illustrations. The authors are uncertain whether small flake removals on "many pieces" may be attributable to utilization; they state, "If we assume that it resulted whilst a piece was being used, it provides some indication of those which were artefacts" (p. 189; emphasis added). It seems that the authors do not refer to such elements as tools, because they claim that differentiation between debitage (by-products of stone flaking) and utilized specimens is a problematical issue (p. 131). In this context it is important to point out the authors' contention that geologically generated quartzite flakes and hominid-percussed quartzite can be so similar as to make positive identification difficult. The drawings and photographs show that modification may qualify as secondary retouch, use retouch, or natural damage. Site 55 is interpreted as a raw material source, since osseous fossil remains and hearths were absent. However, they believe they have found indications that the locality may have been used as a skin-processing site, based on what they regard as artificial features: a wall footing, a stone-lined pit, and a niche. This evidence for hominid formation is ambiguous at best. Furthermore, the assumption that the conglomerate surface was for the purpose of drying animal skins is untenable. The authors cite ethnographic data to "support" and supplement their findings, but this does not lend any credence to their suppositions.

The appendices (pp. 219–346) include tables of artifacts, artifact coordinates, spot
heights, a list of conjoined pieces, site plans, and illustrations. Maps and site plans are well drawn here and throughout the main text, although lithic illustrations are of variable quality.

The book contains a number of factual errors. The authors argue that "few palaeoanthropological discoveries of importance were made in Asia after 1939" (p. 5), while further on (p. 126) they contend that "precious little research [has been conducted] into hominid origins in Asia for more than a generation." This betrays a profound ignorance of the Asian literature (see Pope [1988] for a concise review). Surely, the materials from Lantian, Dali, Lampang, and Niah, to name but a few, are of substantial palaeoanthropological significance. It is unclear why the authors in their discussion of loess deposits do not refer to the important work by Liu et al. (1985).

The strength of this monograph lies in the detailed synthesis of the regional geology. The archaeology requires a major revision in terms of artifact identification and lithic methodology, while the data are frequently stretched with interpretations lacking in integrity.
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