
Reviewed by CHARLES HIGHAM, University of Otago

During the early 1980s, the British Academy maintained a Research School in Southeast Asia, first in Singapore and from 1984 in Bangkok. Under the direction of Milton Osborne and then John Villiers, it provided a research base for British and occasionally Commonwealth scholars by maintaining a modest library and physical presence, and provided small grants for research. After a move from Singapore to Bangkok, it was decided to hold a conference linked with the official opening of the new home. The meeting, held both in Bangkok and Nakhon Pathom, was well attended and attracted a number of new and interesting papers. This book contains 13 of the 24 contributions and represents both an *ave* and a *vale* to the School, for it was soon to be closed.

In the introduction, Ian Glover describes how the conference was designed to revisit issues raised at a colloquy held in London in 1973, later published in a major book, *Early South-East Asia* (Smith and Watson 1979). Although the 13 surviving papers do not cohere thematically, the book as a whole is a useful and welcome addition to the limited literature on the topics covered.

Bayard's contribution has the commendable aim of examining the data used to underpin interpretations and explanations of the prehistoric record with particular reference to Thailand. It is, for example, alarming to find that such a simple statistic as the estimated area of prehistoric Ban Chiang varies from not over 5 ha (Higham and Kijngam 1984) to 50 ha (White 1982). In an age when population numbers and site size provide basic information for social interpretations, this divergence is not acceptable, and exaggeration has already provided some dreadful errors of interpretation by the unwary (MacDonald 1980). Bayard has for long been a sceptic of attempts to understand Thai prehistory through the application of general models. In his paper, he eschews such terms as autonomous village or chiefdom, terms that in my view open the area to comparative analysis with better-documented regions. He advocates such terms as Ban and Muang. Would he wish to substitute Vietnamese, Khmer, or Mon terms in other parts of Southeast Asia? He also finds little to commend my use of a prestige good exchange model in trying to understand what variables operated in prehistoric Southeast Asia. Here again, our paths diverge, for where I find it stimulating to take interpretative scenarios (models is not a word advocated by Bayard) and see if they work in our region, Bayard feels that the material must be considered without the advantage of a comparative approach. This does not imply that Bayard's contribution has little merit. Like everything he writes, it is fair, stimulating, and must be considered carefully.

Chu-mei Ho presents a brief review of her fieldwork in the Lopburi Region. At once, we find terminological problems compared with the previous paper, for where Bayard prefers the anodyne terms General Period A or B, she uses the terms
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“Early Metal Age” and “High Metal Age.” Why can’t we use terms like Neolithic and Bronze Age? Ho has undertaken some very useful research in central Thailand, and it is particularly helpful to read her thoughts on the distribution of moated sites, a key factor in understanding growing social complexity in central Thailand.

Pigott, Natapintu, and Theetiparivatra consider aspects of the copper mining complex at Phu Lon, on the southern bank of the Mekong River. It is refreshing to find them considering social aspects of the site, such as seasonality of copper mining. But a word of caution is also necessary on the old chestnut, chronology. They refer to the bronze spear from early period Ban Chiang as dating to 2000 B.C. and to the inception of copper working at Phu Lon to the early second millennium B.C. with a reference to a 1988 publication by Natapintu for the supporting radiocarbon dates. The radiocarbon dates for successive contexts at Phu Lon at 2 sigma are 1750–1425 B.C. (basal), 1000–420 B.C., and 790–275 B.C. This suggests to me a date in the middle of the second millennium, although one date for a particular context is of little value.

For anyone interested in metal working in early Southeast Asia, Bronson’s contribution is essential reading. Carefully researched and well illustrated with useful distribution maps, the paper covers distribution, extractive technology, and exchange of metals and is rich in ethnographic analogies and insights into a host of relevant variables. It also comprises almost a quarter of the entire book.

Suchitta’s article that follows is a useful addition to our knowledge of iron working in central Thailand, confirming beyond reasonable doubt that late prehistoric and early historic iron technology involved a bloomery furnace. It thus stands in sharp contrast to the Chinese casting tradition. Vallibhotama then considers the settlement forms in which such iron forging played a key technical role. He has an unsurpassed experience of field archaeology in this region, and brings all his knowledge to bear on the distribution of the earlier moated sites in central Thailand.

One of the most impressive aspects of the conference was the number of Thai archaeologists who contributed papers and discussion. Saraya has contributed a notable study of the site of Sri Thep and the shadowy polity known as Sri Chanasa; Veeraprasert has brought together some useful information on the remarkable site of Khlong Thom, with its rich assemblage of beads; and Indrawooth describes amulets in the context of exchange contacts between India and Southeast Asia.

Watson’s excavations at Khok Charoen were among the earliest undertaken by foreign workers in Thailand. Intrigued by the widespread distribution of pottery decorated with impressed bands, he explores the relationships in prehistory between various parts of Southeast Asia. This particular decorative technique has assumed considerable significance of late as a widespread marker of the probable intrusion of agriculturalists from the upper Yangzi Valley who spoke one of a number of proto Austro-Asiatic languages, and Watson’s sharp eye for detail represents an early recognition of these similarities.

With this paper, we leave the mainland and explore through three further contributions, aspects of the pre- and early history of the islands. It is always a pleasure to follow Solheim’s grand designs and far-flung contacts forged by his Nusantao traders, even if his ideas have attracted few followers. I, for one, wonder why it took such a long time for bronzes to reach Island Southeast Asia if his exchange contacts were so early and intensive. More prosaic, and certainly better founded in fact, is Wisseman-Christie’s consideration of early Javanese trade, and the proceedings end with Henson’s account of the discovery and analysis of jar burials in the Philippines.

This book is a pot-pourri of papers. The reader can pick and choose, and few will not find something of interest. If the aroma is not as fresh as it was in the aftermath of the meeting, that is no fault of the editors, who must be commended on their grit and determination to do justice to an occasion recalled in a final page of photographs that show some nostalgic flashbacks. Donn Bayard is seen with Chin
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You-di, the grand old man who did so much to help aspiring young farang archaeologists in the early days, and Pisit Charoenwongsa, his spiritual descendant, who likewise has smoothed the way for a generation of eager prehistorians.
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Reviewed by JOHN W. OLSEN, Department of Anthropology, University of Arizona

This book represents the landmark first volume of a projected six-volume series covering the entire spectrum of central Asian prehistory and history from the Palaeolithic to the present. Conceived in 1976 as a component of UNESCO’s ongoing History of Civilizations of Central Asia Project, this first volume to be released includes contributions by 23 authors, from Afghanistan, China, England, Hungary, India, Iran, Italy, Mongolia, Pakistan, Russia, Tajikistan, the United States, and Uzbekistan.

According to the editors, the text is intended to address the inadequate representation of Central Asia in the historical curricula of universities and secondary educational institutions by providing reliable encyclopedic coverage of the region’s myriad cultural traditions and complex archaeological record.

Although the book successfully accomplishes this general goal, many of the specific arguments underlying its general conclusions suffer from the unfortunate and largely uncontrollable history of its publication. The final text was accepted by UNESCO for publication in 1987, thus archaeological discoveries and revised interpretations that emerged during the inordinately long 5-year period that the book was in production do not appear in the text. In addition, it was during this period that the U.S.S.R. experienced its final dissolution, and many local scholars in the newly independent states of Central Asia had not yet had the opportunity to express their own views on the various culture histories of Central Asia without the dubious benefit of Soviet guidance. (The terms “Soviet Central Asia,” “Soviet Union,” and “U.S.S.R.” appear throughout the text, although the editors point out that subsequent volumes will reflect the changes that have affected the region over the past three years.)

These events, unfortunately, have yielded a book that was, in part, significantly out of date before its release in terms of the basic archaeological data from which rather specific conclusions are often drawn. Statements such as, “No remains of Lower Palaeolithic sites ... are so far known [in Central Asia]” (p. 21) and “Cultural relics of [the Palaeolithic] period have not yet
been found in the Xinjiang Uighur Autonomous Region [China]" (p. 107) are now known to be incorrect, but only on the basis of data forthcoming since 1987. Clearly, neither the editors nor individual authors can legitimately be taken to task for this problem; it merely demonstrates one negative consequence of the long production schedules that are so often a feature of texts generated by large international committees.

The book’s 20 chapters cover a geographical territory bounded roughly by 30° to 50° north latitude and 50° to 110° east longitude, a broad definition of “Central Asia,” which the editors in their introduction, and L. I. Miroshnikov in his excellent appendix, persuasively point out incorporates traditional topographically derived definitions with a recognition of the fact that central Asia is not a precisely delimited cultural province.

The editors have forged interesting international alliances to produce archaeological syntheses that exist in no other text: Ranov, Dorj, and Lu on the Lower Palaeolithic (Chapter 2); Derevyanko and Lu on the Upper Palaeolithic (Chapter 4); Derevyanko and Dorj on the Neolithic of northern central Asia (Chapter 8); and Tosi, Malek Shahmirzadi, and Joyenda on the Bronze Age in Iran and Afghanistan (Chapter 9) are cases in point.

Fully competent authors were selected to describe the archaeological sequences of their own geographical bailiwicks, and a balance successfully has been struck between the presentation of basic data and their interpretation. My only qualm with such interpretations, and it is a rather substantial qualm, is that they often seem to replicate what now seem rather anachronistic reconstructions of the past. The statement made in reference to physical variability discernable within central Asian populations that, “In southern Tajikistan there was the same degree of gracility as in Kara-depe and Geoksiur. Thus, the establishment of the gracile varieties occurred more intensely in Afghanistan and along the Amu Darya than in Turkmenistan and south Tajikistan” (p. 25, emphasis added) smacks of the sort of racial classification that human biologists have shunned for the past generation in the West.

The notions that “... Central Asian Lower Palaeolithic groups of fossil man came together and lived within the same framework of the laws of general development as governed the same stage of anthropogeny in many parts of the Old World” (p. 62, emphasis added) and “... one thing may confidently be said: the ascent of contemporary man, once the primeval and early stages were past, was a single process throughout all the continents of the globe” (p. 63, emphasis added) hark back to a period of Soviet-influenced anthropology that was already becoming less and less influential before the collapse of the U.S.S.R. in 1991 (Dolukhanov 1993).

The book’s Chinese contributors persist in using the term “culture” while neglecting to provide a coherent definition of the word. What is one to make of statements such as, “The remains of the Kayue culture are often superimposed on the Majiayao or Qijia cultures” (p. 329)? This particular confusion is compounded by the editors’ assertion in their concluding remarks that Central Asia is best thought of as “... one geographical, historical and cultural unit, covering its prehistoric and protohistoric periods” (p. 473). This conclusion struck me as especially odd because my long-held belief that Central Asia is most accurately characterized by the fluidity of its geographical and cultural borders and by nearly continuous openness to interaction with its neighbors had been, I thought, amply borne out by the data and conclusions presented by the book’s many authors!

Indeed, of the book’s more than 500 pages, I find only the editors’ concluding remarks, fortunately limited to only three pages (pp. 473–475), truly disappointing, because it is here that Dani and Masson fail to exercise their opportunity to draw together the complex threads of their authors’ contributions. Instead, they have fallen back upon the hollow verbiage of a bygone era that adds nothing to the book’s otherwise remarkable achievement. Cases in point: the editors conclude, “... in the Neolithic period, man took a great
step in his march towards civilization,” and they define human development as “... the long and tedious process of man’s endeavour for better living conditions in which the whole of humanity has participated with a sharing of knowledge and skills—a historical process reflecting complex dialectics and not all smooth sailing, but with periods of crisis, interruption and economic and cultural changes” (p. 474).

Dani and Masson are to be congratulated for wrestling a polyglot text through the tender mercies of professional translators. Descriptions of postglacial foragers as “Neolithic predators” and references to “dynamic husbandry” (=pastoral nomadism?) and “polycentral archaeological investigations” (?) aside, the text is not seriously flawed by linguistic problems.

The contributions of Dani and Masson’s edited work far outweigh its problems, and, with adequate prior explanation of the recent historical context in which the book’s conclusions were drawn, students should be able to employ the text’s monumental synthetic contributions without being unduly perplexed by its quaint Soviet overtones. One hopes that these anachronisms will be exorcised from future volumes in the series.
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Reviewed by MARCUS B. GRIFFIN, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Although the Tasaday controversy remains unresolved, reading this book gives an understanding of the passionate viewpoints, level of scholarly inquiry, and lack of data that has plagued the debate. Although an American Anthropological Association Scholarly Series publication, the essays were written simply enough for a public audience. This is important, considering that the Tasaday stories captivated and were perpetuated by public interest and imagination. The authors are to be commended for their clear prose.

There are 18 contributors to the volume representing the “Skeptics,” the “Supporters,” “New Perspectives on Old Data,” “Comments from Outside Scientists,” plus a preface, introduction, and conclusion by Thomas N. Headland. The comments from scientists not previously involved in the Tasaday controversy put the debate in a discussion larger than simply “are the Tasaday a hoax or not.” Perhaps, however, fewer contributors in the latter sections might have avoided unnecessary redundancy.

Disagreement over the exact nature of the Tasaday controversy is clearly illustrated in this book. Unfortunately, Headland does not give this disagreement enough attention in his introduction or conclusion. He suggests a working hypothesis in the book, as he did for the AAA symposium for which the chapters were originally written:

A small band of people known as Tasaday lived in caves in the south-
ern Philippines following a stone-tool-using foraging mode of subsis-
tence, without iron, eating only
wild foods, and having no contact
with agricultural peoples (p. 15).

Although this is reasonable and is an at-
ttempt to keep discussions at a scholarly
level, few authors actually stick to the hy-
pothesis.

Following Headland's introduction, Ger-
ald Berreman immediately accuses the
"hoax busters" of switching from the Tasa-
day-as-Stone-Age-people to a less contro-
versial and more defendable position that
the Tasaday are "real" people deserving
respect. Unfortunately, his sometimes vis-
ceral prose prevents him from clearly dem-
onstrating this switch. For example, on the
question of linguistics, he talks past Carol
Malony by pitting the authority of Sum-
mer Institute of Linguistics (SIL) linguist
Clay Johnston against her. Berreman essen-
tially says that Malony was too caught up
in the Tasaday sensation to notice that
what they were speaking was nothing
more than Cotabato Manobo, the lan-
guage of a neighboring agricultural peo-
ple. He does not address the issue that the
Tasaday dialect lacked any agricultural
words and the relevance Malony and
others claim this has for calculating the in-
terrelatedness of Tasaday and Cotabato
Manobo. What Berreman does very well,
however, is to raise significant questions
about peculiarities in the actions of the
Tasaday and the field conditions in which
scientists were allowed to work.

Perhaps the least constructive chapter in
the book is that by Oswald Iten, the
anthropology-trained Swiss journalist to
first claim the Tasaday a hoax in 1986. For
example, he suggests that Fathers Sean
McDonagh and Rex Mansmann of the
Passionate Fathers of the Santa Cruz Mis-
sion changed their minds from Tasaday-
as-hoax to Tasaday-as-a-separate-ethnic-
group to obtain a US $750,000 USAID
grant. Iten offers only opinion and little
data to support his argument. He seems to
place himself above earlier researchers by
suggesting that if they had walked into
the area (as he did) instead of flying in by
helicopter they would have seen that the
Tasaday were simply Cotabato Manobo
wearing leaves.

The most persuasive argument set forth
by those who consider the Tasaday a hoax
is by Levita Duhaylungsod and David
C. Hyndman. They analyze the political
economy of the region, rural development
interests, and the actions of the Office for
Southern Cultural Communities. Theirs is
a well-documented essay demonstrating
how the Presidential Assistant for Minority
Affairs (PANAMIN) director Manuel Eliz-
alde could have created the hoax and why
he should want to. They also explain how
"Tasaday" may have been related to others
in the area.

Scientists and commentators on both
sides of the debate called for additional
fieldwork to be done and rigorous data
analysis. Amelia Rogel-Rara and Emma-
nuel S. Nabayra do just this in their chap-
ter, "The Genealogical Evidence." They
lay out their central questions surrounding
who is who in the area and explain their
research methodology. They returned to
the field to collect extensive pedigrees of
20 "full-blooded Tasaday" adults and 20
adult non-Tasaday who lived at the caves
as spouses. Through their analysis they
demonstrate that Zeus A. Salazar's widely
divergent genealogical data were tainted
by informant inaccuracy. If we are ever to
understand what happened in the early
1970s, let alone who the Tasaday are or
were, more work such as Rogel-Rara's
and Nabayra's is necessary.

Chapters by Carol Malony, Richard E.
Elkins, and Lawrence A. Reid explore lin-
guistic data and conclude that Tasaday
speech is a separate but related dialect of
Cotabato Manobo. Each supports the Tasa-
day as a separate people. Linguistic contro-
versy, such as that encouraged by Berre-
man, has focused on what defines a
language from a dialect and what dialects
indicate about the intensity of social inter-
action or separation. Clay E. Johnston ex-
plores the Tasaday language as well and
concludes that Tasaday and Cotabato Man-
obo are about 90 percent the same, with significant and unusual differences between the two.

Jesus T. Peralta, currently Director IV of the National Museum of the Philippines and one of the few Filipino scientists allowed to visit the Tasaday, provides an insightful look at the role of the National Museum in the Tasaday issue. He reflects on his early field experiences, the controversial stone tools, and his 1986 visit to the Tasaday after the hoax sensation. Unlike other contributors to this volume, he offers an explanation for why the Tasaday may have wanted to wear leaves in 1986.

The implication ... was that the Tasaday were putting on the leaves for the benefit of outsiders who had come to see and photograph them, having been conditioned to this in the past. ... It appeared rather to be a spontaneous attempt to maintain an appearance because of the economic benefits that it brought (p. 162).

Peralta concludes that Manobo and Tasaday interaction will intensify even more in the near future, resulting in linguistic and cultural convergence of the two, leaving the Tasaday “as only so much ethno­graphic data” (p. 164).

Part IV, Comments from Outside Scientists, places the Tasaday controversy in a perspective larger than a simple “are they or aren’t they a hoax?” opposition. Richard B. Lee locates the Tasaday in terms of three discourses: the Tasaday themselves, the Tasaday and Philippine reality, and the Tasaday and the West. Although Lee takes the position that the Tasaday are not a Stone Age relic isolated from outside contact for hundreds of years, he cautions against casting them aside as a hoax.

We must not let the Tasaday case be used as a vehicle either for delegitimating anthropological studies of hunters and gatherers, or as a vehicle for delegitimating the foragers themselves, by calling into question their cultural autonomy or claims to authenticity—and by implication their rights to survival as cultural entities (p. 171).

John Bodley and Leslie E. Sponsel provide insightful essays on the debate and indigenous people and also the role the Tasaday have played in anthropological thought and inquiry. William A. Longacre makes an important and often overlooked point in his chapter, “Cave Archaeology: A Possible Solution to the Tasaday Problem.” The scientists who originally conducted research on the Tasaday were highly trained and equally experienced. As Longacre says, “Frank Lynch and Robert Fox were solidly trained social anthropologists with extensive field experience in the Philippines” (p. 195). Although not mentioned, Douglas Yen and Jesus T. Peralta were by no means amateurs nor ignorant of Philippine politics and intrigue. One must question the likelihood that Fox, Lynch, and Peralta could have been fooled by Elizalde and Manobo actors. In the end, Longacre’s call for archaeological analysis of the Tasaday caves is a very good suggestion.

Headland provides a useful and comprehensive conclusion and exhibits his usual fine attention to detail. He states what has become clear: the controversy is not settled, but the differences of argument have been clarified. However, because this book should be targeted to a popular as well as academic audience, it is unfortunate that the reader is forced to piece together that scientists who worked with the Tasaday in the early 1970s were not, in fact, heralding the Tasaday as a pristine, isolated, Stone Age people. Berreman rightfully points out that journalists and movie stars far outnumbered scientists. No author clearly separates the media-based agenda of journalists and photographers on the one hand and the serious scholars collecting empirical data to figure out who the Tasaday really were on the other hand (Longacre comes closest). In any case, the Tasaday are no longer the people they were in the 1970s.

This book is a must-read for those inter-
ested in the debate. Now that the various viewpoints have been brought together in one volume, perhaps we should shift our anthropological gaze toward the Tasaday's future rather than try to reinvent their past.


Reviewed by DAVID J. WELCH, International Archaeological Research Institute, Inc., Honolulu, Hawai‘i

In 1983 and 1984–1985 Douglas Anderson directed two seasons of archaeological excavations at Lang Rongrien Rockshelter, a site on the Malay Peninsula in southwestern Thailand. Originally undertaken to gather data on Hoabinhian hunter-gatherers in this portion of the peninsula, the excavations uncovered three cultural levels underlying the Hoabinhian levels. These contained tool assemblages that are quite distinct from the Hoabinhian, dominated by flake rather than core tools. Four radiocarbon dates on charcoal from hearths in the upper two of these levels ranged from 27,000 to 38,000 B.P. As presented in this report, the deposits provide well-dated and probably the most reliable and best-documented evidence of Late Pleistocene human occupation in mainland Southeast Asia. These excavations must be regarded as among the most important and informative investigations of Pleistocene and early Holocene human adaptation in Southeast Asia.

The rockshelter is located on the west coast of the peninsula in the Krabi River valley, about 12 km inland from the coast. The shelter, situated on the side of a tower karst, is fairly large, with a floor space of approximately 450 m². Although a section had been disturbed by farmers gathering organic-rich soil for their fields, large areas free from modern disturbance remained available for excavations. Fortunately, the disturbance failed to extend below a thick layer of roof fall that sealed the earliest cultural deposits. By excavating through the roof fall in the disturbed section, a substantial area of these earliest levels was exposed during the second field season, while leaving the intact upper deposits elsewhere in the shelter untouched.

The excavations were carried out carefully, yielding a long stratigraphic record of use and reuse of the shelter during the past 40,000 years. The upper levels were disturbed not only by recent activities but by burials placed in the shelter by late prehistoric populations. Ground stone axes and adzes and Neolithic pottery of types commonly found on the Malay Peninsula dating to approximately the second millennium B.C. were found in association with the burials. Two strata composing the middle levels of the deposit contained typical Hoabinhian artifacts associated with radiocarbon dates ranging between 9700 and 7500 years B.P. Sealed beneath the 1-m-thick layer of limestone rock fall were three strata containing hearths, artifacts, bone, and charcoal. Although presenting a major obstacle to the excavators and requiring a week of laborious effort to excavate through, the roof fall effectively sealed those lower levels from later disturbance. Dates from the upper layer ranged between 27,000 and 32,000 B.P.; a single date of 37,000 B.P. was obtained from the middle layer.
In addition to presenting a full report on the excavations and analyses of the recovered cultural materials, including detailed descriptions of the artifacts recovered during the excavations, Anderson also includes extensive comparative and interpretive material. After discussing the location of the site in Chapter I, history of the excavations in Chapter II, and the stratigraphic sequence and radiocarbon dates in Chapter III, he places the prehistoric occupations within the context of likely past environments and environmental changes in Chapter IV. He argues the importance not only of the direct effects of Late Pleistocene and Early Holocene sea level changes on available land areas, but also of the ways in which these changes and other factors may have altered the Southeast Asian climate during that span of time. Chapter V, although entitled “Description of the Archaeological Materials,” is much more than that. In discussing the Hoabinhian levels and artifacts, Anderson includes a comparative review of Hoabinhian assemblages from elsewhere in Southeast Asia and his conclusions on how the Lang Rongrien assemblage fits in with these others. A similar comparative analysis is carried out for both the Neolithic and Late Pleistocene materials. He concludes the report with suggested revisions of the Southeast Asian Late Pleistocene–Early Holocene cultural sequence.

This book is thus more than a site report. Its strength lies in the wide-ranging comparisons Anderson makes, his efforts to synthesize Hoabinhian and Late Pleistocene materials from Southeast Asia, and his placement of these materials within the context of environmental change during the periods the shelter was used. Anderson presents two main arguments. First, he suggests that the Southeast Asian environment has been subject to more climatic change during the Late Pleistocene and Early Holocene than is generally recognized. Second, he argues that these changes are reflected in changes in the material culture of those groups that inhabited Southeast Asia during those periods. In his suggested revision of the Late Pleistocene–Early Holocene cultural sequence, he argues that the Hoabinhian cannot be seen simply as a continuation of an earlier Pleistocene core tool chopper–chopping tool tradition. The Hoabinhian should be considered a distinct terminal Pleistocene–Early Holocene industry, one whose origin and development is related to the environmental changes of that period. This Hoabinhian tool industry is quite distinctive from flake tool traditions that appear to be dominant in the Late Pleistocene, as documented at Lang Rongrien and at several other sites in Island Southeast Asia.

Errors in the text are minimal. My major criticisms concern the omission of a few items that I think would have strengthened the report. Chapter II discusses the conduct of the excavations, but fails to present any discussion of the initial objectives of the excavation, of why this particular rockshelter was selected for excavation beyond the recognition of it as an important site, or of the site’s relationship to other sites in the survey area. Although the descriptions of the artifactual material are thorough, the information on the nonartifactual data is limited. An appendix contains a count of the identifiable faunal remains found in the Hoabinhian layers and Table 2 provides a general indication of the abundance of marine resources found in different layers; however, a quantitative and more detailed presentation of the faunal remains, especially from the lower levels, would have been welcome. Given Anderson’s emphasis on the importance of understanding the environmental context of the rockshelter occupations, this lack of emphasis on the nonartifactual materials is surprising.

Although I was disappointed in these omissions, what the book does contain is important and valuable. Anderson presents his data and arguments concisely, but convincingly. The nature of the excavations and the context of the excavated materials is clear; the artifact descriptions are thorough. The excavations and artifacts are well illustrated by a large number of fig-
I found almost nothing in the text that I would wish to see illustrated that was not included either as a photograph or as a line drawing. The greatest value of the book lies in Anderson’s efforts to use his data and the comparative data from elsewhere in Southeast Asia to suggest the need for rethinking traditional views of Pleistocene and Early Holocene traditions in Southeast Asia.


Reviewed by Terry L. Hunt, University of Hawai‘i, Mānoa

Ethnoarchaeology is often described as the study of human behavior and material culture in the present to make inferences about the past. Its ultimate goal has been to bring greater certainty to behavioral or organizational reconstructions drawn from archaeological phenomena. Over the years, ethnoarchaeologists have made some progress in delineating what can and cannot be known with greater certainty. With the work of Binford and Schiffer, for example, archaeologists have come to appreciate that definitive behavioral-material culture correlations remain elusive. Many studies in ethnoarchaeology, and the closely related approach of experimental archaeology, have moved away from a search for simple behavior-material correlations. Instead, researchers have focused on two approaches. The first examines patterns of social and economic organization and their potential archaeological manifestations. The second approach, broadly archaeometric in practice, analyzes the physical and chemical dimensions of material culture to make inferences about the past. Certainty is achieved through the uniformitarian principles of the natural sciences, rather than the problematic applications of ethnographic analogy.

In his introduction, Skibo points out that unlike stone tools, pottery has not been systematically studied for use-alternation. Understanding functional dimensions of ceramic variability will prove significant in explanations of change, particularly where technology and performance requirements interact. In contrast to earlier work by Skibo and his colleagues, other (nontechnological) questions of pottery function seem to be only vaguely linked to a goal of ethnographic reconstruction.

In chapters 2 and 3, Skibo provides his rationale for ethnoarchaeology and experimental archaeology in constructing inferences about the past. In this discussion, Skibo argues that material-behavioral correlates deduced from ethnoarchaeology and experimental work are not analogic. However, the low-level principles suggested by the case study given seem to be a collection of empirical generalizations about cooking performance and particular ethnographic observations that could be applied only in analogic fashion to archaeological interpretation.

In Chapter 3 Skibo outlines pottery use studies in archaeology. He makes the useful distinction between intended and actual function. Analysis of actual function, in contrast to what a particular form might be good for (intended function), is possible through use-alteration study of mechanical and chemical additions and deletions—the focus of Skibo’s work.

Skibo’s research is innovative. He exam-
ined nearly 200 vessels collected and documented for their use as part of the Kalinga Ethnoarchaeological Project on Luzon Island in the Philippines. Skibo links observations of village pottery use activity (well documented and illustrated) with physical and chemical alterations of the vessels. In the laboratory, Skibo also performed experiments to clarify, as needed, the relation of pottery use and resulting alterations. Skibo outlines a model for ceramic alteration, suggesting that nonuse alterations (e.g., in depositional context) can be distinguished from use alterations.

Skibo’s analyses focus on three dimensions: residues of absorbed fatty acids in pottery (compared to those in several foods); patterns of surface attrition from use; and carbon deposition from the charring of food (interior) and soot deposition (exterior).

Through analysis of fatty acid residues, Skibo is able to discriminate vegetable/meat from rice cooking pots. More specific determinations were not possible, but this will vary in each case. Skibo tests the applicability of fatty acid residue analysis (i.e., preservation) to archaeological pottery by excavating sherds from a depositional context in Kalinga. Skibo describes two decompositional processes (oxidation and hydrolysis) that rendered fatty acid identifications impossible. Advances in fatty acid analysis and unusual depositional contexts for preservation may allow wider applications in archaeological research.

The analysis of ceramic surface attrition through use revealed wear, in the form of pits, scratches, polish, thermal spalls, and pedestal temper grains. These features could be linked to the ethnographically observed patterns of use. In particular, vegetable/meat cooking pots had interior patterns of attrition from regular stirring of the contents. Rice cooking pots did not show the same kind of attrition. Applying such generalizations about wear has promise in archaeological cases, especially when restricted to the mechanics of attrition. However, where other variables (e.g., identifiable residues) may be unknown, definitive links to behavior remain problematic.

Finally, Skibo studied carbon deposits, as charred food and soot, in the Kalinga pots and in experiments. His analyses show that patterns of carbon deposition on pottery surfaces record factors such as heat source, intensity, presence of moisture, and kinds of foods cooked.

In sum, through ethnoarchaeological and experimental research, Skibo documents actual pottery use and the alterations produced. He provides, in the final chapter, a summary of use-alteration traces and components related to pottery use activities. From this information archaeologists could see broad differences in pottery use-alterations resulting from cooking, cleaning, and storage.

As Skibo points out, this study is the first comprehensive investigation of pottery use-alteration. Significantly, Skibo suggests that use-alteration case studies of prehistoric pottery assemblages are now needed. Such studies of archaeological pottery may highlight an unresolved problem. In ethnoarchaeological and experimental context, we know the processes that can account for the patterns we observe. The material-behavioral correlates can be linked in an investigative strategy of confirmation. In archaeological cases, however, we may find it more difficult to go from patterns of alteration to a straightforward reconstruction of use. In short, problems of equifinality arise.

Skibo’s study is excellent. Archaeologists interested in pottery should read it carefully. The research is rigorous and well conceived. But, despite its clear strengths, it is difficult to see many direct applications to archaeological problems. In some cases it will be possible to link the physical and chemical properties identified with use to the processes (including behavior) that produced them. However, it remains unclear what role such information might play in archaeological explanations. What if we were to know, with complete certainty, that ancient pots of a particular assemblage were used to cook vegetables/meat? This information gains meaning, or relevance, only in a larger theoretical context. Otherwise, particular bits of information about the past remain little more than paleoethnographic description in a
theoretical void. This issue does not diminish the value of Skibo’s work in ethnoarchaeology. Instead, it raises critical, as yet unresolved, methodological issues for the discipline of archaeology as a whole.


Reviewed by Wilhelm G. Solheim II, University of Hawai‘i, Mānoa

This can best be described as a serious coffee-table book. It is 8.5 by 11 in., (1.6 x 28 cm) of heavy art paper. It is impressive with its many color pictures of the gold artifacts and for the obvious, extensive research by the author in published sources.

This is primarily a catalog of the Hunter Thompson Collection of gold artifacts. This is a marvelous collection, virtually unknown before an exhibit on Javanese gold by the National Museum of Singapore in 1987 (p. 14), for which a catalog was published by John Miksic (1988). Nothing is mentioned about the collection itself, its permanent location, or its collector.

The book has four chapters, the first “A History of the Art of Ancient Javanese Gold” (pp. 14–27). Concerning earlier publications on Javanese gold, Miksic remarks that very little has been published on this subject, the one example being a book by Stutterheim (1937), which was written in Dutch and has long been out of print (p. 23). He goes on to say that the only collection that surpasses this collection is that of the Museum Nasional of Indonesia, Jakarta, which has never been fully studied or published.

The second chapter is titled “Gold in Early Javanese Culture: Historical Sources” (pp. 28–39). Chapter 3 is “Archaeological Discoveries of Gold in Southeast Asia” (pp. 40–52). Here he considers the techniques of recovering gold and its uses in Java. For those interested, I add a few references he missed: Fox (1970: color plate 1-B a–c), Francisco (1963), Guthe (1934), Heine-Geldern (1974: 806–809), Legarda (1978), Malleret (1961; 1962)

"Premiere Partie L'Orfevrerie et la Monnaie d'Argent," 3–126, Pls. 1–43; 1963: 114–115; 1967), and Solheim (1964: pl. 28a–m; 1981:66–72). This is not meant to be faint praise; Miksic has really located many obscure sources.

The main body of the book is the Catalogue (pp. 53–126). He divides the artifacts into four groups, based on age. These are as follows: “Preclassic (roughly until A.D. 200), Protoclassic (again roughly dating from the period A.D. 200–A.D. 650), Early Classic (corresponding to the period of central Javanese civilization, between the late seventh and early tenth centuries); and Late Classic (associated with east Javanese civilization, between the early tenth and late fifteenth centuries).”

The Preclassic, or late prehistoric, pieces are all of sheet gold used in burials as a variety of face coverings. The Protoclassic has primarily a variety of ear ornaments for pierced ears plus a few beads and chains. The Early Classic pieces become more complex and are strong on finger rings, both with and without set jewels, but very complex ear ornaments continue to be popular. There also are a few simple, but beautiful, pendants, and more complex pendants. One group of, to me, unusual objects are what Miksic calls “bird rings” (pp. 84–87). These have either a jewel or gold ball, usually attached to a ring base by four claws. The ring bases are not explained, but to me it does not appear that they were meant to be worn on a finger or toe. There is a variety of other objects, including bracelets, spouts and lids for kendis, urns, and small statues, primarily Buddhist, ornaments for clothing, and necklaces or headdresses. There are not as many Late Classic pieces, but they are im-
pressive, including very ornate earrings and parts of kris handles.

The Appendix (pp. 120–121) presents “Gold items listed under accessions in the Annual Reports of the Batavian Society for Arts and Sciences 1930–1942.”

Each plate contains one to as many as 15 pieces. They are described in the text with a single number for each plate and no label for the individual pieces. The plates are not numbered and at times it is difficult to match the text description with the object described. This lack of labels on the plates enhances the appearance of the plates, but at times the struggle to equate the description with the object being described becomes a bit frustrating.

I noticed that on p. 64, second column, paragraph three, both references (Malleret 1962 and Villegas 1983) are not included in the Bibliography (pp. 122–126).

Fifteen years ago little attention was paid to beads, but the last few years there has been a considerable scientific focus on beads, where and how they were made, providing valuable data for working out international and local trade patterns. The same should apply to gold and all forms of jewelry. Let us hope that Miksic’s fine book will lead the way.

REFERENCES


Reviewed by Wilhelm G. Solheim II, University of Hawai‘i, Mānoa

A new archaeological society, with its own journal, has been established in Malaysia. The Ikatan Ahli Arkeologi Malaysia (IAAM) (Association of Malaysian Archaeologists [AMA]) was established in late 1986 and the first volume of its journal, Jurnal Arkeologi Malaysia, appeared in 1988. I have looked at the first three volumes.

The first volume has all articles in Malay. Because probably the primary purpose of the Association, and its journal, is to popularize archaeology in Malaysia and bring
more young people into the field, it is logical to publish in Malay. For those of us who, unfortunately, are not able to read Malay it presents a disadvantage. It is important for all archaeologists interested in the archaeology of Southeast Asia to know the research going on in Malaysia and its results. Except for the Indonesians, very few of these, outside of those specializing in the archaeology of Malaysia, are able to read Malay. It would be very helpful to have abstracts of each article in English. The second volume has four of the eight articles in English and the third volume four of eleven.

The subject matter covered in these volumes is varied. To illustrate this I list the names and authors of the articles in English. From Volume 2 (1989): Kamaruddin bin Hassan, “Palynological study of samples from the archaeological site at Kota Tampan, Perak, Peninsular Malaysia” (pp. 9–17); M. J. Aitken, “Two scientific techniques relevant to the dating of ceramics: thermoluminescence and archaeomagnetism” (pp. 18–24); Adi Haji Taha, “Archaeological, prehistoric, protohistoric and historic study of the Tembeling Valley, Pahang West Malaysia” (pp. 47–69); and Nik Hassan Shuhaimi Nik Abd, Rahman, and Othman Yatim, “Takuapa revisited: A commentary on Alastair Lamb’s pre-Malacca entrepot in the Malay Peninsula” (pp. 93–99). Volume 3 (1990): Tan Teong Hing and Abdul Rahim Hj. Samsudin, “Gem and rock artifacts at Pulau Kelumpang, Perak” (pp. 15–24); G.W.H. Davidson, “Shell remains from the protohistoric settlement at Pulau Kelumpang, Perak” (pp. 25–38); Angel P. Bautista and Zulkifli Jaafer, “Introduction to the measurements of human skeletons from archaeological sites” (pp. 72–110); and Adi Haji Taha and Zulkifli Jaafer, “A preliminary report on archaeological research and excavation at Gua Kelawar, Sungai Siput, Perak” (pp. 111–124).

The format, printing, and line drawings are first class. The plates, and there are many of them, are of variable quality, with stone artifacts and earthenware sherds often printed too dark to make out details. It is, however, a commendable production, and the plates will no doubt improve.

Each volume lists the members of the Association. It started with 47, and by the third volume there were 114 members, the great majority of them from Kuala Lumpur. We hope it will continue to expand. For further information write to: Ikatan Ahli Arkeologi Malaysia, d/a Jabatan Sejarah, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, 43600 Bangi, Selangor Darul Ehsan, Malaysia (FAX [603] 8256484).


Reviewed by STUART H. SARGENT, University of Maryland at College Park

I approach this book, not as a linguist, nor as a specialist in the texts from which it takes its material (the Mencius, Chan-kuo Tz’e, Mo-tzu, Chuang-tzu, Han Fei-tzu, and Shih-chi), but as one who has been teaching Classical Chinese for several years in American universities. Although Harold Shadic’s A First Course in Literary Chinese (Ithaca, 1968) has served my purposes well, I find Dawson’s new text stimulating and full of possibilities.

Potential users of Dawson’s book will want to know what kind of audience he is addressing. To judge by his Introduction, which includes a section on the writing of characters and the counting of strokes, Dawson assumes no knowledge of Chinese on the part of the student. He expects his reader to have a fairly sophisticated sense of English, however, and the nuances of translation he discusses from
time to time may require considerable expli-
cation by the teacher. We shall see, in
fact, several aspects of this book that call
for supplementary input from a good
teacher. For example, the first seven selec-
tions for reading are from the Mencius,
which is to my mind a rather formidable
challenge to the neophyte. The student
new to Classical Chinese may feel quite at
sea in these selections, where the issue
under discussion often appears rather tri-
fling, or the argument seems to wander in
aimless circles. A teacher with some insight
into the rhetoric and philosophy of Men-
cius is needed to imbue these selections
with significance and interest.

Given the proper classroom situation,
however, the book has much to recom-
mend it. The excellent physical produc-
tion (print, page size, paper quality) makes
for clarity; and as a slim, single-volume
textbook, it is convenient to port and per-
use—much more so than Shadick. The or-
ganization of the text, which I shall outline
next, is also thoughtfully planned.

Following the Introduction is a guide to
the pronunciation of Wade-Giles and Pin-
yin, both of which are used in the Vo-
cabulary in the back of the book. (Note
that British English is the reference point:
we are told that "e" is to be read like the
"ir" in "sir"!) There are those who would
object to the decision to use modern Man-
darin readings for words written so long
ago, but because Classical Chinese is still a
living language, I am not bothered by the
anachronism. Nevertheless, when a charac-
ter representing a phonetic fusion of two
words is pointed out in the notes, it
would be appropriate to introduce the
archaic pronunciations to show how the
fusion works, and Dawson's failure to do
so is disappointing.

A "Key to the Radicals of All the Char-
acters Which Occur in Passage A" follows,
as an aid to the novice who must learn to
recognize radicals to be able to use the Vo-
cabulary. Then come the Text Passages, A
through Q. Each column of text is num-
bered, from the first column of A (1)
through the last column of Q (251), and
each horizontal register is lettered a
through z, giving each character in the 17
passages a unique number-letter designa-
tion on the grid. This facilitates reference
to a single character (e.g., 73n) or a string of characters (e.g., 73nu).

Notes on Text Passages A–E come next,
with each comment indexed to a word or
string in the texts through the number-
letter code. The important function words
and constructions are explained as they
come up in the reading, with emphasis on
the clues one uses in recognizing the parts
of speech of the words and on reflecting
the proper nuances in translation.

A "Grammatical Survey I" precedes the
rest of the notes. If it has not been appar-
ent to the reader already, the reasoning be-
hind the selection of texts becomes evident
here: Passages A–E contain a very high
concentration of the important function
words, auxiliary verbs, and pronouns; 17
of these, used repeatedly, make up 32 per-
cent of the characters in those five passages.
The first Grammatical Survey is devoted to
these words and their various functions,
largely bringing together for review and
easy reference observations that have been
made in the preceding notes.

The student is now ready to move into
the final group of text passages, and the
Notes resume. This time, they are not as
exhaustive as the previous group, presum-
ably because the students are able to figure
out more for themselves. (There are several
places, however, where I feel Dawson has
passed over in silence a word or phrase
that still requires explication: 134b; 179st;
186g; 211jn; 214ab; 225y; and 235mq.)
The reading passages increase somewhat in
narrative interest, although the ones that
are excerpted from longer narratives seem
naturally unsatisfyingly incomplete.

A "Grammatical Survey II" following
the last batch of text notes briefly reviews
the new interrogatives, auxiliary verbs,
etc., that were not encountered in Texts
A–E and then turns to four special topics.
The first is a series of rules or strategies by
which one may identify the case, or part of
speech, of a given word in context. The
second topic is a survey of reasons for
departures from longer narratives seem
naturally unsatisfyingly incomplete.

A "Grammatical Survey II" following
the last batch of text notes briefly reviews
the new interrogatives, auxiliary verbs,
etc., that were not encountered in Texts
A–E and then turns to four special topics.
The first is a series of rules or strategies by
which one may identify the case, or part of
speech, of a given word in context. The
second topic is a survey of reasons for
departures from what is supposed to be
Then various topics under the rubrics of Time and Number are explored. In general, this Grammatical Survey, though falling far short of being a systematic and complete outline of the language, is a valuable reference.

Translations of Passages A–E come next, serving as an appendix to be consulted by students in the first stages of the book.

The final component of Dawson's textbook is the Vocabulary, arranged by the 214 radicals. The conciseness of the entries and the clarity of the layout make it easy to consult. In cases where amplification is needed, one is referred to the proper place in the notes; otherwise, however, there is no way to locate a word in the texts to check on its usage in context.

Dawson's is a tightly controlled learning program. Through careful selection of texts, he has kept his vocabulary to just over 900 characters (less than half of Shadick's) while covering the basic grammar and essential function words of the language. It is especially remarkable that this could be achieved through authentic, real-world texts (Shadick's first six chapters are rewritten or manufactured passages for the graded introduction of the grammar). What is regrettable is that students may finish the book with a good linguistic foundation but without the satisfaction of having read some of the more significant or famous passages in the source texts (nor will they know anything about the authorship and nature of those texts, unless their teacher has supplied the information). Everything written after the second century B.C. is ignored; when Dawson states without qualification that "dates are normally expressed as the name of the ruler followed by the number of the years of his reign" (p. 104; emphasis mine), it is as if he never anticipated that his reader might want to go on and work in the next 2000 years of Classical Chinese texts.

Perhaps that is the price to be paid for limiting the bulk of the volume. A desire for slimness may also explain the lack of illustrative examples in places where they might have helped clarify a point. References to the Text Passages are often sufficient, but frequently it would have been pedagogically wise to have several sentences (in Chinese, with translations) juxtaposed to establish a paradigm or to show transformations (e.g., note 4b) and contrasting structures (e.g., notes 3z, 126e, and 195v1961).

It is to be supposed that the classroom teacher will be the one to fill out the discussion with such examples. The teacher will also have to come up with exercises, for Dawson provides none.

I should like to turn now from general observations to comments on a few of the specific points in the notes and Grammatical Surveys that raised questions in my mind.

I wonder whether is really ever a noun (1s; 51qr; p. 66), although it is sometimes glossed that way. Would not a deleted explain these constructions more efficiently? (This is one of several cases in which I felt that, although Dawson's interpretation may be correct, there are other possibilities that should have been acknowledged.) Another observation on this word: Dawson is quite aware that often "contains" the resumed object (23fh; 44q; 229j); I think this fact could have been profitably taken into account in the discussion of at 15pq.

In sentences where "normal" word order is altered to prepose a phrase, Dawson believes emphasis is being placed on the preposed element (7ef; p. 67; 1831) or on both it and an adverbial phrase at the end of the sentence (15el; p. 104). I suggest that this phenomenon, like the pa-construction in Modern Chinese, has a different explanation that has not been fully articulated. Perhaps these so-called dislocations are mandated by a need to clear space after the verb for those "adverbial phrases" that must be attached to the verb and are the crucial parts of the sentence. If one must speak of "emphasis," I think it tends to be on what comes after the preposed element, not on that element itself.

The discussion of at 12dj mentions many "meanings" ("to," "towards," "from," etc.) that are really translations
suitable to different contexts in English. My own bias is toward reading first and translating later, and so I would have preferred giving the student a root meaning (such as “with respect to”) or a basic function for the word at the outset and then suggesting these derived translations at appropriate points afterward.

Dawson is sometimes curiously unable to see that a word is functioning as a verb. In note 231, he points out that in 貢者, hsien is “verbal”; yet in 17pr, he fails to recognize that 貢白者 exhibits the same construction. Perhaps his reliance on familiar English terminology has caused him to mistake the stative verbs as adjectives and thus label them “non-verbals.” Similarly, the second wang in 王之不王 is correctly identified as a verb nominalized by the preceding chih, but then he goes one step further and classifies it as a noun (p. 103). This could confuse many a student.

This textbook handles the special functions of the final particles 也 and 矣 in verbal sentences very well, explaining that the former is associated with judgments and continuing states, the latter with momentary events. (I would speak in terms of static and dynamic situations, but we are clearly talking about the same thing.) Although I am impressed with the astute observations he makes about their usages (notes 6a; 25hi; 37x; 51w52d; 58g; 60g; 111s; etc.), I feel Dawson is somewhat too rigid in referring all occurrences of i back to a single rule, as when he states that its use in commands is explained by the expectation of “once-and-for-all obedience” (p. 67). There are so many uses of this particle (many not encountered in this book), that a more careful articulation of its nuances is called for.

There are a very few misprints in the New Introduction to Classical Chinese. At note 35de, 講 is an error for 講; at note 121p, 布 is an error for 希. In the Text Passages, the punctuation at 121p should be moved up to 121k, and there should be punctuation at 1311. On the same page, I suspect that there should be punctuation at 124v, 124z, 126u, and 126y.

I have tried to indicate some of the strong and weak points of this book. The final proof of a language textbook, of course, is in its actual use in the classroom, and I have not had time to put it to that test as yet (though some of my students have discovered it in the library and report favorable impressions). At this point, I can best sum up by saying that Dawson’s work is an excellent guide for the presentation of several complex topics. Despite its limitations, it merits consideration for course adoption.