In editing this volume, Grant Evans, currently a Reader in Anthropology at the University of Hong Kong, undertook a task of heroic proportions. To compile a comprehensive anthropological account of even a single culture is daunting; to attempt to compress all of Asia into less than 400 pages would seem the ultimate intellectual folly. Fortunately, and it must be confessed, contrary to this reviewer's initial expectations, Evans and his collaborators have produced a genuinely interesting and useful volume, one that can be read profitably by professionals as well as the undergraduate students for whom it is intended.

Previous attempts to make Asian anthropology accessible to foreigners have been either of the colonial era "soul of the Orient" genre, in which glib stereotypes about Eastern culture ("Asians are characterized by shame rather than guilt") are contrasted with equally glib beliefs about Western cultural patterns, or are dry encyclopedias composed of capsule ethnographies of representative cultural groups. Fay Cooper Cole's classic "Peoples of Malaysia" exemplifies the latter approach. Evans's approach is radically different. He has brought together a set of essays that explore the diversity of Asian cultures through an equally diverse array of anthropological concepts. Thus, successive chapters discuss human evolution and the origins of Asian cultures, languages, kinship, economics and livelihood, the role of the state, class, status, and caste, ethnicity, women, religion, urban anthropology, development anthropology, and the future of anthropology in the region. Each chapter simultaneously provides an introduction to current anthropological theory on its topic and illustrates these concepts with Asian ethnological examples. The best chapters (Evans's introduction, his chapter on class, status, and caste, and his concluding chapter on the future of anthropology; Clark Sorensen's discussion of family and kinship; Christine Helliwell's chapter on women in Asia; Patrick Guinness's review of urban anthropology) employ the great diversity of cultural patterns found in Asia to illuminate limitations and blind spots in current theory.

As is expected in a multiauthored volume such as this one, there is considerable variation in the quality and readability of different chapters. Sandra Bowdler's account of Asian origins and Amara Prasithrathsint's review of the linguistic mosaic, which should provide the student reader with a clear view of genetic and historical patterns underlying the region's evident diversity, are unfortunately among the weaker chapters. John Clammer's discussion of economic anthropology is overly schematic, no doubt reflecting the need to compress very complex material into too little space. The discussion of applied anthropology by Jesucita Sodusta, although insightful in some aspects, fails to do justice to the problems inherent in the involvement of anthropologists in development research. Joy Hendry's chapter, which
uses Japan as a test for theories of modernization, raises important questions but pays insufficient attention to the rich body of anthropological theorizing about processes of cultural change.

Although Evans has covered many of the central issues in anthropological study of Asia, some important topics have been given minimal attention or omitted entirely. Most surprising in this regard is the absence of a chapter on biological anthropology. Also lacking is a detailed discussion of the post-Pleistocene prehistory of the region. The two-and-one-half pages devoted to this topic by Sandra Bowdler are wholly inadequate to the task. Material culture and technology are also given little attention. This is especially unfortunate in light of growing anthropological interest in questions of indigenous knowledge of resource management and the environment.

The book is nicely produced. The bibliography is of interest in itself as a guide to the recent ethnological literature on Asia. The photographs are generally interesting and relevant to points under discussion. The volume would have been considerably enhanced by the inclusion of a map showing the locations of ethnic groups cited in the text.

Overall, the strengths of this book greatly outweigh its weaknesses. It should nicely fill a previously vacant niche in undergraduate Asian studies programs. Grant Evans is to be commended for having had the audacity to undertake what most of us would have thought to be an impossible assignment.


Reviewed by SEETHA N. REDDY, ASM affiliates, Inc.

Dilmun—the paradise land described in the Sumero-Babylonian religious texts—has fascinated and challenged scholars for decades. Its identification and description had critical implications for the definition of trade and socioeconomic interactions between the third millennium B.C. Indus Valley or Harappan civilization and the Near East. This book is an account of an exploration of the Makran Coast in modern Pakistan for archaeological evidence of such cultural and economic connections, conducted in 1960 by George Dales, along with his wife, Barbara Dales, Cuyler Young, and Rafique Mughal. The focus of the search was to find Dilmun, the perceived locus of socioeconomic interaction between the Harappans and the Mesopotamians. The book is organized into three parts: part 1 comprises the vast majority of the book's text and presents the expanded diary of George Dales kept during the actual survey; part 2 is an account of the excavations at the Harappan site of Sutkagen Dor in the Makran; and part 3 presents the pottery descriptions and classifications from the Makran Harappan sites of Sutkagen Dor and Sotka Koh.

Part 1, the diary entries, begins with a brief summary of a preliminary visit made in 1959 to Pakistan by George Dales describing the bureaucracies and sociopolitical networking involved in the start of an archaeological project in South Asia (which, surprisingly, does not seem to have changed much in the last three decades). The main diary entries related to the 1960 survey commence with the Dales' arrival in Pakistan in September 1960. Detailed entries during the month-long set-up pro-
cess give a clear idea, especially to scholars with limited fieldwork experience in South Asia, of the degree of effort, time, and patience required to initiate an archaeological expedition in the region that involves both survey and excavations. This procedure involved obtaining, purchasing, and arranging for field permits, customs clearance, field equipment, food supplies, field assistants and support staff, and—very importantly—transportation, both by land and water. It is, however, interesting to note that several privileges were made available to the Dales through foreign diplomatic circles which most probably would not have been accessible to a South Asian scholar on a similar mission.

The diary entries are very effective in giving the reader a feeling of adventure and excitement through vivid descriptions of boat rides on the Arabian Sea, camel-back rides into barren frontier lands, field camps in deserted landscapes, and visits to the rural settlements in the Makran. The length of the expedition was 45 days and involved an ambitious route on sea and land totaling 975 miles. The expedition started with a westward boat ride from the city of Karachi to the coastal town of Gwadar, from where an inland northwest route led to the Harappan site of Sutkagen Dor, believed to be an outpost of the Indus civilization. This site was test-excavated and the vicinities surveyed to explore for connections between the Indus and Mesopotamia. After this excavation and survey, the expedition route was directed southeast to the coast. Several consecutive field camps were set up along the coast moving east, to facilitate reconnaissance surveys along the coast and also on inland plateaus. Throughout the project, the located sites were mapped and artifacts were collected. The field methodologies and sampling procedures are discussed in the diary and, even though the project was broadly problem-oriented as is made evident in the introduction, the archaeological correlates needed to demonstrate Dilmun were not articulated. The results of the survey did suggest that Dilmun was not in Pakistan or within the Indus civilization cultural sphere, and Geoffrey Bibby subsequently identified Bahrain in the Persian Gulf as Dilmun.

The diary gives a clear perspective on westerners working in South Asia in 1960 in terms of the problems confronted, and also, very importantly, the benefits that were available to them as non-natives, particularly as Western men. The authors can be commended for not extensively editing the diary entries, as they provide a rare glimpse into the attitudes of westerners toward South Asia at that time. These entries also give valuable insights into the interaction between Western scholars and South Asians (both scholars and non-scholars), and also reveal how interactions and perceptions have changed in the last three decades. The diary could have very easily stood on its own as a historical account of an archaeological expedition/adventure into an area rarely visited by Western scholars in the 1960s.

In comparison to the first part of the book, the subsequent parts 2 and 3 are mainly descriptive and very short. Part 2 is an account of the excavations at the site of Sutkagen Dor and includes discussion of the four small test operations, three on the citadel and one to the east of the citadel. The discussions are accompanied by section drawings and plans of the site. In comparison to other Harappan sites (specifically toward the east), the artifacts recovered from the site were marked by a notable absence of seals, figurines, beads, faience objects, and clay balls. In addition, only pottery was recovered from the site of Sotka Koh (on the Makran coast, southeast of Sutkagen Dor). The authors suggest that this may reflect differences in activities and function between these coastal sites and the sites of the central Indus Valley. The Sutkagen Dor settlement is interpreted as having been settled by Harappons, who brought pottery along with them and later established a local distinctive ceramic industry.

The last section of the book, part 3, presents the description and classification of the pottery from the three distinct locales: test excavations at Sutkagen Dor, surface
survey at Sutkagen Dor, and the surface survey of Sotka Koh. The classification of the pottery is done through the use of the ceramic typology formulated by Dales and Kenoyer for the site of Mohenjodaro. The results of the ceramic analysis suggest that the Makran ceramics are broadly similar to the central Indus Valley ceramics, but also distinctive. There are certain unexpected patterns, for example, the notable absence of large, black, painted storage-jar trade vessels that would be expected for a trade outpost site. The authors also argue that the quality of the ceramics suggests that these two sites were not border outposts of the Indus civilization.

This book is a worthwhile resource for scholars interested in several aspects of archaeology: history of archaeology, conducting fieldwork in South Asia, and the trade and sociocultural interactions between the Indus and the Mesopotamian civilizations in the third millennium B.C. In addition, the distinctive format of informal diary entries, excavation descriptions, and pottery analysis is a refreshing addition to the literature on the Indus Valley or Harappan civilization in South Asia.


Reviewed by Kenneth A. R. Kennedy, Cornell University

A reviewer who has become thoroughly familiar with a recently published source prior to receiving an invitation to evaluate it gains the advantage of being able to assess its practical merits in the context of related research activities. Such are the circumstances of the present reviewer’s opportunity to refer to this new study of the dental anthropology of South Asia written by his colleagues at Deccan College, Pune. For an on-going research program in the palaeoanthropology of the Indian subcontinent, this volume has proved invaluable. Walimbe and Kulkarni offer an up-to-date survey of the kinds of data the scientific study of the human dentition can provide with respect to determining the health and nutritional status, adaptations to changing life-styles, pathology, phenotypic diversity, and evolution of ancient and modern peoples of India, Pakistan, and Sri Lanka.

The hypotheses the authors set out to test are that: (1) tooth-size reduction and simplification of occlusal morphological features are related to technological changes, subsistence patterns, and methods of food preparation; and (2) odontometric data, combined with studies of sexual dimorphism, bilateral symmetry of the right and left sides of the dental arcade, and tooth sizes are significant indicators of inter-group biological (genetic) distances.

This comparative study includes eighteen prehistoric skeletal series from Mesolithic, Neolithic, Harappan, Chalcolithic, and Iron Age archaeological sites plus subjects from four living populations in India (Gond, Mahadeo Koli, Mahar, and Maratha). The latter series includes members of both rural farming communities in which some hunting-foraging activities are combined with fishing and recent migrants to urban centers. Dental casts were taken for all living subjects of the four endogamous groups following selection of individuals who were in sound oral health and unrelated to members within the same group.

Following a foreword by V. N. Misra, Director of Deccan College, and a brief introduction (chap. 1), Walimbe and Kulkarni describe the archaeological and liv-
ing populations in their sample (chap. 2), methodology of field and laboratory procedures with attention to the dental casting program (chap. 3), and morphometric analyses of the dentitions from the contemporary populations (chap. 4) and archaeological series (chap. 5). The volume concludes (chap. 6) with a discussion of results. Support is found for the hypothesis that tooth size and technology are related, but with the qualification that the rate of simplification of occlusal patterns is slower than the trend in reduction of tooth size among the living subjects of their sample. Furthermore, some dental differences among these living communities are attributable to dietary and occupational differences rather than to genetic factors. Some 170 references are listed, a number of the sources published as recently as 1992, so attention has been given to current developments in the field of dental anthropology.

This volume will be of interest to South Asian archaeologists, physical anthropologists, and specialists in dental anthropology. It is generally well written, with clear graphics and tables. There is a map with locations of archaeological sites, but the position of Sarai Khola should be to the southeast (not southwest) of Timargarha. The location of Mahurjhari appears on the map, but a description of the site is not in the discussion of archaeological series in the text (pp. 15–19). The term “metrics” would be more appropriate than “metry” in denoting mensural data (p. 5). These oversights, plus a few typographical and grammatical problems, are minor criticisms of a praiseworthy and timely study of biological adaptations observed in the dentitions of some ancient and contemporary populations of South Asia. It marks the advances achieved by the authors and by John R. Lukács (Walimbe’s mentor) over the course of the past two decades. It is also a tribute to the highly qualified research staff of Deccan College, which has attracted Indian and foreign scholars to Pune over the past six decades in the course of their investigations of human biological and cultural diversity in ancient India.


Reviewed by CARLA M. SINOPOLI, The University of Michigan

This substantial volume contains 57 papers, a subset of the 132 presentations from the Tenth International Conference of South Asian Archaeologists in Western Europe held in Paris in 1989. The papers, by scholars based in Europe, North America, and South Asia, amply document the diverse and exciting research under way in South Asian archaeology and art history.

The book is divided into two sections: part 1 contains contributions on pre- and protohistoric periods; part 2 is largely concerned with historic periods and objects. The volume thus covers a very broad time span (from the lower Paleolithic to the late eighteenth century A.D.) and a broad geographic area, with papers on all regions of South Asia, as well as Oman (Bökönyi), Iran (Casonova, Gropp, Hakemi, Mariani, Lombardi Pardini, and Pardini), Central Asia (Francfort, Kircho, Masson), and China (Shunying). The broad regional perspective is entirely appropriate given the extensive large-scale interactions that characterize the ancient world and the sometimes arbitrary nature of archaeological defi-
nitions of "culture areas." However, while several of the non-South Asian papers do deal with regional processes (e.g., the interesting papers by Masson and Kircho on the Namazga V and earlier periods in Turkmenia), others present detailed discussions of archaeological data that would be better suited to more specialized publications (e.g., Mariani on Shahri Sokhta architecture and Shunying on Xinjiang painted pottery).

Space limitations preclude a discussion of each paper. I will instead briefly summarize general themes and some specific papers with a particular emphasis on part 1, as its prehistoric focus is most relevant to the readers of Asian Perspectives.

Part 1: The South Asian Paleolithic is discussed in papers by R. W. Dennell and L. Hurcombe and K. A. R. Kennedy. Dennell and Hurcombe question the legitimacy of the "Soan flake tool industry" through an examination of Paterson's misapplication of European typologies to South Asian contexts and, in a second paper, review recent surface finds from the Pabbi Hills of northern Pakistan. Kennedy presents an analysis of the fossil hominid skull from the Narmada Valley, which he classifies as early Homo sapiens. The "Mesolithic" is discussed in a paper by G. Khanna on the site of Bagor in Rajasthan. Although Khanna makes interesting points concerning lithic procurement and mobility, his paper also illustrates the terminological problems inherent in the adoption of European and African chronological classifications—the Bagor "Mesolithic" is reported to date to the middle Holocene (c. 6000—4000 B.C.) and to include the exploitation of domestic herd animals. Remains from the important early agricultural site of Mehrgarh are discussed by Thiebault (charcoal), Sellier (mortuary remains), and Lukács and Minderman (dental pathologies). Other important papers in part 1 include discussions of recent archeological surveys in Sri Lanka (Bandaranayake), the Makran (Besenval), and Madan (Tusa) regions of Pakistan, and recent excavations at the second millennia B.C. site of Pirak (Kachi Plain; Stacul) with its evidence for local continuity and inter-regional contacts.

Not surprisingly, a large number of papers in part 1 deal with the Indus civilization. These papers fall into three categories: recent fieldwork, specific artifacts or categories of artifacts, and comparative analyses and discussions. In the first group are reports on recent excavations at Harappa (Dales and Kenoyer), the fortified site of Kuntasi in Gujarat (Dhavalikar), and pre-Harappan levels at Nausharo (Kachi Plain; Samzun). The second group of papers examines the "fig deity seal" (Parpola), ringstones (During-Caspers) and the Great Bath of Mohenjo-daro (Gropp), and peacock motifs in Chalcolithic ceramics (Kars-de Vries). The third set of Indus papers are interpretive and raise questions on the "uniformity hypothesis" (Blackman and Vidale, p. 37) or "sameness paradigm" (Possehl, p. 237) of the Harappan—the commonly held assumption of Indus economic and cultural uniformity both within sites and across the greater Indus region. Ardeleanu-Jansen (terracotta figurines), Blackman and Vidale (stoneware bangles), and Franke-Vogt (inscribed objects) demonstrate that distributions of artifact categories vary significantly both within and between sites. Possehl addresses a similar issue through a broad discussion of regional variation in ceramic traditions and subsistence patterns, as does Weber in a consideration of botanical remains. Mughal examines regional variation during the Late Harappan period. This last set of papers highlights the considerable recent progress in Indus research and the vast potential for the development of refined understandings of the political, economic, and social underpinnings and variability within the "Indus civilization."

The papers in this section are presented in no particular order, and though the absence of a tyranny of strict chronological ordering is refreshing, it would have been helpful to have related papers grouped in a more consistent manner. A paper by Yule and Hauptman (copper hoards) which appears in part 2, should have been moved to the first section of the book.

Part 2: Contributions in this section are largely art-historical and treat Hellenistic,
Buddhist, Hindu, and Muslim artifacts and architecture. Most focus on particular objects or sets of objects, including sculptures (Bautze-Picron, Bhattacharya, Diserens, Kuwayama, Siudmak, Taddei), coins (Raven), paintings (Jera-Bizard and Maillard, Cimino, Bautze-Picron, Mevissen), and other categories of goods (figurines, Harle; manuscript covers, Klimburg-Salter; Muslim prayer compass, Newid). Issues such as chronology, stylistic sources, and the political and sacred contexts of images or objects are addressed. Architectural papers include discussions of Chalukya (Filliozat) and Vijayanagara (Michell) temples of South India and an interesting paper by Ehnbom on a sixteenth-century Muslim tomb in Sind that partakes stylistically of Hindu and Muslim religious imagery and architectural influences.

In sum, this well-produced volume provides a smorgasbord of information on current research in South Asia. The volume is well illustrated, with numerous photographs and line drawings. If there are faults in the book, they are those shared by most volumes of conference proceedings. The papers are variable in quality, tend to be very brief, and are addressed to a community of specialists, often failing to provide sufficient context for interpretation or evaluation; most of them report on ongoing research and are not intended as definitive discussions. The book is thus an important source for information on recent research and discoveries (at least as of 1989). The wide range of issues discussed and the kinds of archaeological materials covered lend a lack of coherence to the volume, but also allow a glimpse of the spectrum of ongoing research and perspectives of contemporary South Asian archaeologists. This book, like other volumes of proceedings from the biennial European conference, is thus an important resource for scholars of South Asian archaeology.


*Reviewed by KATHLEEN D. MORRISON, Northwestern University*

This volume is really two books rolled into one. The authors provide both an extensive reference and identification manual for plant macrofossils (including wood) likely to occur in archaeological contexts in Himalayan South Asia and a brief discussion of the plant material from the sites of Burzahom and Semthan in Kashmir. Either of these topics could have formed the basis of an excellent and much needed volume for South Asian archaeologists; the combination diminishes the practical utility of the book somewhat. Nevertheless, this is still an important source for those interested in the environmental change or the human use of plants in mountain South Asia.

Archaeological plant material from the sites of Burzahom and Semthan form the basis for this study. The temporal span represented by these two sites is great indeed, approximately 3500 years. Using this long-term record of plant cultivation, the authors hope to trace the relations between plants and ancient humans in one ecological zone of Kashmir. This is a lofty goal, particularly considering the lack of comparable data from other sites.

After a short introduction, the authors sketch the cultural chronology of the two sites. Burzahom, first excavated in 1935, has long been considered the type-site for the northern Neolithic. More recent excavations under the direction of the Archaeological Survey of India have resulted in the definition of four cultural periods. These include the Burzahom Neolithic I (2375–1700 B.C.) and II (1700–1000 B.C.), the
Megalithic (1000–600 B.C.), and the Early Historic (600 B.C.–A.D. 200). At the less-well-known site of Semthan, the occupation span is somewhat longer. Here excavations by the Archaeological Survey have resulted in the definition of five phases. The first phase is the Pre-N.B.P. Phase (1500–600 B.C.), which overlaps the latest phase at Burzahom. N.B.P. stands for Northern Black Polished, a distinctive ceramic ware found throughout northern India between about 600 and 100 B.C. (Ghosh 1989: 255). This volume clearly was not written for those not already familiar with the archaeological shorthand of South Asia. Following this is the N.B.P. Phase (600–200 B.C.), the Indo-Greek Phase (200–1 B.C.), the Kushan Phase (A.D. 1–500) and the “Hindu Rule” Phase (A.D. 500–1000). Only scant detail on the sites in different periods or phases is given. This presents little problem for area specialists. However, nonspecialists might be forgiven if at this point they have little notion of the relevance or context of these locations and periods. Although the two sites are said to be in the same ecological zone, the authors provide rainfall and temperature data only for Burzahom and do not indicate the elevation of either location.

Discussion of the archaeological context abruptly ceases in chapter 3, which presents keys and identification criteria for cereals (wheat, barley, oats, rice, and millets), pulses, horticultural fruits, weed seeds, and woods. To my mind, this is the most valuable portion of the book. The discussion of wheat (Triticum Spp.) begins with a general consideration of wheat morphology and taxonomy, moving from general endomorphic and exomorphic characteristics to a detailed discussion of pericarp structure as revealed by SEM. The photographs are of generally good quality and, along with the line drawings, provide an essential adjunct to the identification keys. Barley (Hordeum Spp.) is also well described, as are oats (Avena Spp.). Rice (Oryza sativa) is treated much more briefly (one photomicrograph and one SEM photograph with husk detail). Millets, pulses, and horticultural fruits are given rather more cursory, although adequate, treatment. Weed seeds of the region are illustrated with line drawings (no scale indicated) and short descriptions and are grouped by family. In contrast to the more detailed consideration of cultigens, no identification key for weed seeds is given and there are no photographs. Wood taxa are well described and illustrated. This uneven treatment of data classes in an otherwise excellent identification guide reduces its value as a working aid to analysis. One might have wished that the authors had written two books, of which the first was a (spiral bound) detailed identification manual and key. Chapter 4, an experimental study of the effects of carbonization on cereal size, provides a useful transition from the identification keys to chapter 5, a description of the archaeobotanical assemblages of Burzahom and Semthan (arranged by taxon rather than by location or time period). Certain information is missing, however, such as sample sizes of charred grain assemblages whose mean, maximum, and minimum sizes are reported. The archaeological material is well described, although again sample sizes behind grain measurements are not reported. Both the photomicrographs and the SEM photographs are clear and complement the descriptions of uncharred material in chapter 3.

Chapters 6 through 11 (and three appendices) constitute a series of short and sketchy treatments of the diffusion of plants into Kashmir, probable uses of plants recovered from the two sites, vegetation, climate, the origins of agriculture, plant economy at the two sites, statistics in palaeoethnobotany, and the ecology of Kashmir. Coverage of these important topics is choppy at best and at its worst consists of unelaborated lists. Together with Chapters 1 and 2, these topics might have formed the basis of a second important book that would truly integrate ecological and archaeological aspects of Kashmiri palaeoethnobotany. The talent and hard work of the authors are manifestly clear, and although the mixed format (both laboratory manual and archaeobotanical
report) and uneven coverage of the volume are disappointing, it will still be valuable for those interested in plant remains and the archaeology of the Himalayan region.

**REFERENCE**


Reviewed by JOHN N. MIKSGIC, National University of Singapore

This is a most useful and potentially important volume. Each of 255 monuments at Pagan is documented in a standard format of one or more pages. Eight more volumes are projected in which all of the more than 2000 monuments at the site will be described.

The Inventory has very precise aims: to establish a typology for the monuments; to ascertain the number and distribution of monuments of each type; to discern patterns in Pagan's artistic evolution; to acquire data useful in determining priorities for future preservation; and to document the condition of all structures in case another major earthquake like the one that struck in July 1975 should occur. Geologists believe that there is a high probability of further quakes in the Pagan area, and given available resources very few monuments can be protected against their effects. Thus it is likely that the Inventory will be the only means of studying many monuments in their present state of preservation.

The Inventory presents a considerable amount of information in remarkably concise form. The location of each monument is given in terms of latitude and longitude, as well as map coordinates. Brief verbal descriptions appear under the headings of monument type, size, features such as gates, construction materials, present condition, iconography, epigraphic and published references, and date of construction. Excellent drawings of ground plans of all monuments are also given, very valuable information that took much time to prepare. The plans employ conventions providing such details as locations of floor debris and masonry added subsequent to the original construction.

The largest amount of space in the book is devoted to clear black-and-white photographs giving general and detailed views of each monument. The photographs are augmented with symbols identifying subsidiary structures, components of temples such as vestibules, niches, and screen-walls (distinguished according to seven types of temple), stupas (two types), monasteries, and underground structures. Interior decoration such as murals and painted inscriptions receive considerable attention. Nine different states of present condition are also distinguished.

At the end of the volume is an index in table form in which one can look up a monument by number and obtain information as to its construction period, building type (temple, stupa, monastery, etc.), size, ground plan, medium of decoration, and existence of epigraphic data. This is followed by one general site map and six detailed maps giving locations by the number of monuments in relation to a grid.

The monuments of Southeast Asia are a great source of data not only for art historians but for archaeologists concerned with studying the evolution of complex societies. Scholars have spun numerous theories regarding the relationship among religion, economy, and political systems, but a solid data base does not yet exist that we can manipulate to apply some quantitative as
well as qualitative tests to these theoretical constructs.

The publication of this volume is a most welcome beginning to what one hopes will be a concentrated effort to fill this void. As the author notes in his short introduction, only the largest structures or those with greatest tourist potential have been previously published, and these are not representative because in many instances they are living monuments and have undergone continual alterations over centuries. The character of sites of monumental complexes in Southeast Asia can be better understood through an extensive study of the "average" monuments rather than the unique ones. Few of these have ever been studied or recorded. Monumental complexes are found in many parts of Southeast Asia, including Cambodia, Thailand, Viet Nam, Malaysia, Sumatra, Java, and Bali, but in most cases documentation has been acquired in haphazard fashion, according to subjective judgments and giving priority to the largest or most beautiful, which are therefore by definition unique and not representative of the majority of artifacts of this type. Too often the results of such documentation have sunk into archives never to resurface or from which they can only be recovered with such difficulty that it is sometimes easier simply to repeat the exercise of documenting the sites.

This publishing project constitutes an attempt to introduce a new sort of reference book. The format of the volume is efficient in providing much essential information in well-organized and compact fashion. It should become a model for compiling and publishing inventories of monuments in other parts of Southeast Asia, which scholars from several disciplines can use. When this nine-volume series is completed, Pagan will have become the best-served monumental complex in all Southeast Asia in terms of the accessibility of detailed information to international scholars.

It is highly desirable that this endeavor should be expanded to cover other such complexes in the region. Southeast Asian scholars are rapidly becoming aware of the usefulness of large, systematically acquired data bases, and it is not a vain hope that such a vision could actually materialize.


Reviewed by Leonard Y. Andaya, University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa

The primary aim of this study is to explore the impact of valuational concepts on the process of monetization in Southeast Asia from the third century B.C. to the early fifteenth century. A central aspect of this inquiry is an analysis of the manner in which modes of exchange articulated with other societal institutions in this period. As part of this exploration, Wicks has sought to explain the discontinuities in the numismatic record and to identify the geographical bases of the monetary systems of early Southeast Asia.

The book begins with a general introduction analyzing conventions of money use based on recorded transactions, with a discussion of the fine distinctions of exchange. Each of the subsequent chapters begins with an analysis of the published material for the area discussed chronologically and ends with a summary of the area's valuational concept and extent of monetization. As one of the aims of the work is to identify the geographical scope of Southeast Asia's monetary systems, it also includes a chapter on southern China and another on southeastern Bengal, Assam, and Arakan. Wicks attempts to avoid imposing a particular structure onto the sources by basing his discussion on the available evidence, whether from a dynastic chronicle, a temple inscription, or a
traveler's account. But despite the differing concerns of the sources, Wicks has succeeded in maintaining a central focus through the summary statements at the end of each chapter. In the concluding chapter he synthesizes the disparate and complex information regarding Southeast Asia's monetary system in the premodern period and locates his ideas within a larger framework of studies of monetization.

Wicks's work is an important contribution to an understanding of the process of monetization in early Southeast Asia. His discussion of coinage is especially useful because it distinguishes a hierarchy of metals in the choice of coins and emphasizes the wide monetary and nonmonetary uses to which coinage was put. This sophisticated analysis will help to clarify the often confusing and confused reports of the existence of a "monetized economy" in certain early and early-modern Southeast Asian societies.

This study is equally valuable in elucidating the impact of the monetization process on indigenous society. Although Southeast Asia has had a long history of trade with the outside world, Wicks demonstrates that up to the fifteenth century foreign goods were acquired for status enhancement rather than for capital accumulation. Early coinage, too, was not intended to facilitate trade but to fulfill fiscal and religious obligations. Although Wicks agrees that generally there is a direct correlation between administrative complexity and money use, he cites the intriguing exception of the impressive Angkorian civilization, which did not employ any monetary system in its heyday between the ninth and thirteenth centuries. The introduction of base metals as coinage only appears in the fifteenth century in Southeast Asia as a reaction, Wicks argues, to the greater marketization of the economy. Two major exceptions to this rule were Viet Nam and fourteenth-century Majapahit, which employed Chinese copper cash.

Such exceptions provide a challenge for other scholars to continue this ambitious and well-researched study. Indeed, Wicks views his own work as a springboard for country specialists to undertake a more comprehensive investigation. Some features of society that are highlighted in Wicks's analysis of valuational concepts and monetization can be profitably reexamined in greater detail in each country. Among those which come to mind are the economic relationship between the ruler and the religious authorities, the redistributive function of religious foundations, the extension of centralized control through monetization, and the changing economic and political significance of areas based on a knowledge of the evolution of the country's monetization system. The sophistication of Wicks's analysis should serve as a model for any such endeavor.

A work on monetization is long overdue in Southeast Asian studies. Even while acknowledging the variation of weights and measures in time and place, Southeast Asianists have often written about and discussed trade in a vague and imprecise fashion. This book has demonstrated the complexity of the entire mechanism of exchange and the care with which one has to examine its implications in local society. It should help to raise any future debate on trade and its impact on Southeast Asia to a higher level.


Reviewed by Elisabeth A. Bacus, University of Michigan

This volume is part of the Case Studies in Archaeology Series designed to provide concise works on recent developments in various areas of archaeology for use primarily in undergraduate teaching. It presents a summary of the excavation, analysis,
and interpretation of Khok Phanom Di and is authored by the project's directors. The site, located southeast of Bangkok and 22 km northeast of the Gulf of Siam, is a deeply stratified mound covering c. 5 hectares and standing 12 meters above the surrounding alluvial plain. During the period of prehistoric occupation, radiocarbon-dated to 2000–1500 B.C., the site was situated in a changing coastal–estuary environment, one of abundant and diverse natural resources. Hence the possibly overstated subtitle of this book.

The introduction provides background on the natural environment, past and present, of Southeast Asia (defined as encompassing the “area from the valleys of the Yangzi to the Chao Phraya rivers”) and serves to situate Khok Phanom Di within an area of great agricultural potential—that is, the lowland humid tropics, which are characterized by a summer monsoon climate and where wild rice was once widely distributed. Thus, the reason for archaeological research at this site is to investigate the origins and development of rice cultivation. A brief summary of the archaeological record of this region focuses on sites considered relevant to understanding the transition to plant, specifically rice, cultivation and the development of sedentary communities. The absence of references to Thai archaeologists is a serious problem. Archaeological data from Khok Phanom Di are suggested as relevant for evaluating two historical scenarios for the origins of rice cultivation, one placing origins in the Yangzi Valley followed by its adoption in areas to the south and the other of local development in the valleys of the Chao Phraya, Mekong, and Red rivers. The book also considers “the fortunes of those who lived at this site over the five centuries of its prehistoric occupation” (p. 15), an indication of the lack of focus in the problem orientation of the Khok Phanom Di project and the organization of this volume.

Chapter 2 focuses on the 1985 excavation of a 10 × 10 × 7 meter area, noting also previous excavations by Thai archaeologists (though no references are provided), and provides background to the undertaking of this project (e.g., funding, specialists). The majority of this chapter is an interesting narrative of the layers, of various material remains and features, especially burials (one unfortunately referred to as “the princess”), uncovered, and of the authors’ initial impressions of spatial patterning and changes in material remains during the course of excavation. A figure of one or more of the excavation profiles would have greatly enhanced this discussion. Serious omissions include no discussion of their research design, of problem-oriented sampling strategies in excavation, and of the analytical and interpretive limitations posed by their excavation of an area comprising c. 0.2 percent of the surface area of the site.

Three chapters discuss the biological and artifactual materials recovered. Chapter 3 discusses chronology and focuses on analysis of 154 burials. It begins with an identification of changes in mortuary rituals and the definition of seven successive mortuary phases, although it is not clear how these relate to the layers previously discussed, and the assignment of each burial, when possible, to one of nine clusters of successive burials. A number of analyses (e.g., distribution of genetically determined skeletal features, patterns of tooth evulsion, palaeopathology, distribution of various mortuary artifacts) are aimed at ascertaining: the biological relationship among the individuals of each burial cluster; diet, disease, and age at and causes of death; social organization and specifically social and gender inequality; and craft specialization. Results suggest that: most of the individuals comprising each cluster were biologically related to each other; individuals in each cluster of successive burials can be genealogically linked; clusters represent distinct social groups; peaks in overall mortuary wealth occur in phases 2 and 5; wealth differentiation among clusters begins in phase 5; no relationship exists among age, sex, and mortuary wealth; “no restriction of pottery-making” in phases 2–4 but, beginning in phase 5, only primarily rich burials of females, infants, and children were associated with potting tools (p. 62); and a predominance of females beginning in
phase 4, which is interpreted as possibly "reflect[ing] an increasing matrilocal aspect to the later people at Khok Phanom Di" (p. 63). This at times confusing discussion of mortuary analysis could have been made more lucid by including a statement of the research questions the analyses were meant to address. Reading would also have been facilitated by one or more tables indicating the burials that comprise each cluster in each phase and their respective grave accompaniments.

Chapter 4 is a clear and informative discussion of the various faunal and floral analyses conducted by specialists and the data these provide for the reconstruction of prehistoric environment and subsistence. Analysis of the rice remains indicates that there was rice cultivation during the earliest dated occupation of the site. This chapter highlights the interdisciplinary strength of this project. Chapter 5 is a nicely illustrated summary of the various types of artifacts recovered, though a few minor problems in the text references to figures 5.6 and 5.12 should be noted.

"What Happened at Khok Phanom Di," the title of the following chapter, summarizes mortuary phases 1–3 and interprets the changes seen in phase 4 (e.g., fewer shell beads in burials, less ornately decorated pottery vessels, fewer shellfish, different artifacts associated with male and female graves, and no fishhooks and netweights) as the result of an environmental change (indicated primarily by changes in shellfish species) that occurred at the end of phase 3. Craft specialization (specifically in pottery production by women) and exchange (of pots for exotic shell jewelry) are posited as the means to prestige and status, and are used to account for the rise in mortuary wealth, seen particularly in female burials; the presence of exotic shell jewelry, more elaborately decorated pottery, and a change in cemetery organization in phase 5; and the emphasis on matrilineal descent and the development of status differentiation suggested for phase 6. This chapter also very briefly mentions the survey of the surrounding Bang Pakong Valley and discusses the excavation of Nong Nor, a site initially believed to have been contemporary with Khok Phanom Di, but smaller, less opulent, and located in a less rich habitat. The stated aim was to elucidate the overall settlement pattern and demonstrate the central political role of Khok Phanom Di, although the brief discussion of nonsystematic survey methods and excavation suggests that the data would not be adequate for addressing either of these issues even if Nong Nor had been a contemporary site and not one pre- and postdating the occupation of Khok Phanom Di.

Chapter 7 presents an environmental argument—wealth and predictability of resources in coastal areas—for the development of sedentary communities and suggests that sedentism leads: to greater technical, social, and subsistence complexity; to the "production and exchange of goods [and surplus foods] symbolizing achievement"; and to more rapid population growth, which over time leads to scalar stress in communities and results either in their segmentation or in the establishment of social ranking (p. 123). It is unfortunate that the issues raised in this section did not receive more systematic and referenced discussion. Evidence from a number of sites contemporary with Khok Phanom Di is also cited as indicating the development of status differences at this time. Truncated sentences at the bottom of pages 127 and 129 should be noted.

Chapter 8 considers the broader significance of Khok Phanom Di in light of recent studies in biological anthropology and linguistics. The authors suggest that the inhabitants of the site were possibly part of the process of prehistoric human expansion in mainland Southeast Asia. In addition, they suggest that the distribution of language families in Southeast Asia indicates three separate prehistoric expansions of rice agriculturalists (i.e., one to insular Southeast Asia, a second south from the Yangzi, and a third that originated in the present area of Austro-Asiatic languages) and, in conjunction with archaeological evidence, propose in the final chapter three scenarios for the origins and expansion of rice agricultural communities. The authors conclude with their support of local transi-
tions to rice cultivation in areas of the Red River Valley, Mekong, and central Thailand, in addition to that which occurred in the Yangzi Valley, and briefly consider some of the evidence needed to further evaluate this historical model.

This volume provides students with an interesting and accessible introduction to the archaeological investigations of Khok Phanom Di, a site providing important data for reconstructing and studying changes in social and economic organization during the mid-second to third millennium B.C. of central Thailand and of Southeast Asia. Unfortunately, it suffers from a number of problems that limit its usefulness, particularly for teaching. These primarily concern the use of anthropological and archaeological concepts and issues such as ranking, craft specialization, sedentism, and settlement hierarchy without adequate definition or discussion. More importantly, discussion of the logic and methods by which archaeological data are used to address such issues, evaluate models, or support their interpretations is often lacking. In addition, there is often an uncritical use of ethno­graphic data, particularly in chapters 6 and 7.

However, this volume does possess a number of strengths, including the presentation of many of the analyses of biological and artifactual remains that represent valuable contributions to the archaeology of this area, the emphasis on the necessity for interdisciplinary research, and the references to a number of Southeast Asian sites. In addition, the book evidences some cooperation between Thai and Western scholars, as well as the role of students in this project. Also noteworthy is the fact that it represents the first and only volume currently available on a prehistoric Southeast Asian site specifically for undergraduate teaching and other interested nonprofessionals. Regrettably, Khok Phanom Di and the questions raised regarding sedentism, the origins of rice cultivation, and forms of social and political organization would have greatly benefited from a more explicit theoretical approach and more rigorous archaeological treatment.


Reviewed by Katheryn M. Linduff, University of Pittsburgh

Until recently, the Western-language literature on early Chinese art has been dominated by documentary analyses following the sinological tradition and by stylistic studies based on the German model. Writing aimed at deeper interpretations of either ancient periods or types of art and/or at defining the contexts of their creation have appeared only very recently. Martin J. Powers's book on art and politics offers an innovative beginning to the study of the very rich period of the Han Dynasty.

Powers addresses a puzzle long observed in Han art, the simultaneous existence of very distinctive styles and types of art in the political centers of northeast China. In previous models, a core, or official, style was identified with the aristocracy, and others, especially the funerary arts in Shandong, were viewed as provincial aberrations. Powers's study challenges that model, both on methodological grounds and with contextual evidence. His main premise is that patronage played a central role not only in the selection of subject matter but also in instigating change in visual presentation. In particular, he wants to show how issues of political expression can be seen as the motivating force in Han pictorial art.

For instance, Powers argues that the art found in the sculpted programs of the walls
of local tombs and shrines of northeast China in Shandong Province was an overt display of social criticism and debate. Shaped by the rise of the nonaristocratic, educated Confucian literati, he claims that this representational art was both rhetorical and critical and questioned authority of the rich and royal alike. This expression did not mimic the ideals of courtly taste, but was a newly created type, one that echoed the values of the Han literati who were its patrons.

By considering the design and construction of tombs and shrines, their mural schemes, subject matter, and style of presentation, he distinguishes three major traditions of taste and places each within a narrative of political rivalries in Han China. He calls the first tradition “ornamental.” It was popular in the early and middle Han and reflected the taste of the aristocracy. Its aesthetics correlate to the standards afforded by the aristocracy—“more in any shape, means ‘more’” (p. 88).

The ornamental tradition was systematically critiqued by the scholars during the middle years of the western Han. They criticized the social value of concentrated wealth for “[t]o them it was precisely the time and labor required that made ornamental art a drain on the rural economy; a parasitic industry feeding off the lifeblood of an enchanted populace” (p. 82). By the time of the emperors Wang Mang, Guangwu, and Ming in the first century A.D., a new tradition, sponsored by the literati, emerged. This tradition, called “classical” by Powers, was characterized by art that: (1) suppressed traditional signs of luxury; (2) emphasized conventional signs for filial piety, frugality, and sacrifice; and (3) surreptitiously hinted at financial strength. The nonaristocratic scholars favored this art because they entered court through a recommendation system and that system “was based on a standard of values separate from the old feudal equation of wealth and rank” (p. 91).

Powers argues that one of the most significant features of the classical expression was the use of omens as a critical tool (chaps. 8 and 9). The scholar “knew that the omen was a wonderful vehicle for criticism because it did not issue directly from his own person” (p. 257). Also, cause-and-effect arguments often appeared in this type of art. For instance, the wind blows, a roof falls off; the rebels arise and are brought to justice; a scholar is good and the phoenix alights on his roof (pp. 373–374).

In the second century, a third tradition, the “descriptive,” is identified by Powers. This new art featured elaborate ornamentation in the aristocratic tradition as well as more realistic renderings of luxury items such as fine horses, dogs, carriages, and buildings. According to Powers, this was the result of the political context. This new art was controlled by the court eunuchs and their clients, mostly merchants, who supplied the court with material luxury goods. By that time, the classical tradition had lost its potency.

In these chapters, Powers stresses a key issue. During the formative stage of the Chinese bureaucratic system, some of the literati commissioned a new kind of decorated monument that rejected the overt display of inherited wealth in favor of pictorial arguments about political legitimacy and social justice. By analyzing the rhetorical strategies of stone inscriptions, critical essays, and official memoirs, Powers discovered similar strategies in the art of these “middle income” patrons and, in this way, related features of style directly to issues of political expression.

His argument is effectively presented in beautifully crafted prose. The study is not, however, without its shortcomings. An example is its lack of consideration of other contributing features, such as social or individual context, to artistic change. Powers’s concentration on the literati (perhaps out of respect for them) and their goals leaves one wondering whether and how the others were engaged in the debate. Overall, however, both his approach and hypothesis are significant departures from past analyses and his introductory remarks about art-historical methods are important contributions to the field.

Powers focuses on art and its audience rather than on the artist and his market. In doing so, he replaces the linear, evolutionary, or influence-reaction model common
in traditional art-historical studies with a dialectical one based on his understanding of the competition between Han scholars and the court-based aristocracy. By surveying contemporaneous attitudes toward art, he places the locus of action in the center of the social group—not an ethnic group or nation—where possibilities both from within and without are filtered, selected, nurtured, or rejected (p. 30). His emphasis on the aesthetic inclinations of the population, as opposed to the personal aesthetics of the artist, enables him to "restore to the history of art a profound and often neglected human dimension" (p. 30).

This book is a must-read for all students of early China. It is accessible and could be of interest regardless of the reader's field and background. It includes a wealth of information on the Han and presents it within a dynamic interpretive scheme. Powers's analysis reconnects Han art with human behavior, and whether or not we agree with his imaginative interpretation, he must be applauded for his sophisticated and beautifully written text. He leads one to question and puzzle anew over the material as well as his creative model.


*Reviewed by FUMIKO IKAWA-SMITH, McGill University*

Starting with her 1973 doctoral thesis on the subsistence-settlement system of the Chulmun villages in west central Korea, Sarah Nelson has done a great deal to remedy the situation she found when she first went to Korea in 1970: "that very little was written about the archaeology in English or other western languages" (p. xiii). This latest book-length contribution covering the prehistory and protohistory of Korea up to the establishment of the United Silla Kingdom in A.D. 668 will go a long way in helping those of us without the necessary linguistic skills who nevertheless try to include Korea in our teaching and research. The book is furnished with some nice photographs and many useful maps showing site locations and probable boundaries of protohistoric polities. Also useful for reference purposes is what appears to be a comprehensive list of radiocarbon dates that are organized into three charts and inserted in relevant sections of the text.

The earliest part of the Korean prehistory is covered in the chapter entitled "Forest Foragers 500,000 to 10,000 B.C.," even though, as it turns out, there is no firm evidence for human presence in the Peninsula as early as 500,000 B.C. An age in this magnitude was suggested for the lithic specimens from the lowest layer of Hukwuri Cave southeast of Pyongyang, but many archaeologists, we are told, question both the age and artifactual nature of the specimens. The Chon'gongni assemblage from a site near Seoul was called "Acheulian" and hence "Lower Palaeolithic," because of the presence of four "hand-axes" in the assemblage of 1126 lithics, but it now appears to date anywhere from 200,000 to 40,000 years. I am not comfortable in any event with the "Early Foragers" characterization for the whole of the Pleistocene and early Holocene. In spite of the burst of research activity in recent years, we still don't know much about the palaeoenvironment or the nature of the lithic industries, let alone subsistence strategies, represented at some 50 sites. The chapter in a sense is a useful summary of the current state of knowledge, including the limitations in the primary sources.
The next chapter, "Early Villages," contains the best presentation I have seen of the period variously called Neolithic, Early (or Early and Middle) Neolithic, or Chulmun. Nelson, who suspects that there is nothing "natural" or "real" about the regional groupings proposed by various workers (p. 61), nevertheless recognizes three regional traditions (p. 97): Yungki­
mun (raised-line design) pottery that appears earliest on the east coast, Chulmun (comb-pattern) of the west central region, and the flat-based pottery of the north. Apart from one outlier date of 12,000 B.C., radiocarbon dates from an east coast site at Osanni cluster between 6000 and 4500 B.C. (recalibrated), and the classic Chulmun in the west central area seems to have appeared about the same time. These dates suggest to Nelson "the strong regional differences and weak stylistic change through time" (p. 97), making the relative chronology based on ceramic attribute untenable. It is unfortunate that ceramics are illu­
strated by line drawings whose poor quality makes it impossible to appreciate the regional variations.

Rice is reported from a horizon dated to 2400–2100 B.C. in western Korea. A new kind of pottery, called Mumun, is present along the south coast by 2000 B.C., somewhat later toward the north. Judging by a date associated with a clay mold, bronze was being manufactured in central Korea by 900 B.C. The pattern of the first appearance of the elements that make up the ranked society of the Mumun period, Nelson points out, does not support the commonly held idea that a nomadic group, sometimes specified as the Ye-Maek of Chinese chronicles, entered from the north, bringing new pottery styles and rice agriculture. It is more likely that as "a distant echo of China's expanding civilization" (p. 110), various elements entered Korea separately, with different groups.

In the chapters covering the periods after 400 B.C., frequent references are made to documentary sources that are used in this volume as "paleoethnographic material to be tested against archaeological evidence" (p. 9). Nelson's general conclusion is that "[m]any details of Korean archaeology tend to support the documentary evidence, much of which has been considered as simply fairy tales" (p. 267). For example, she finds it difficult to accept the assertions of some North Korean archaeologists who attempted to deny the presence of the Chi­
nese commandery of Lelang mentioned in Chinese texts. In her opinion, "the written documents are too substantial to be dismissed when considered in conjunction with the archaeological finds" (p. 189). On the other hand, she believes that a stratified state-level society had existed in the Lelang region well before the Han conquest (p. 203), and that one should not be misled by the fragmentary nature of archaeological remains.

The title of the last chapter is "Ethnicity in Retrospect," which is the organizing theme of the whole volume. At the outset, the author notes (p. 3) that "the elucidation of the formation of the Korean people" is perceived "as the chief purpose of archaeology," particularly as Korea has been "invaded virtually from all sides (with even a cultural invasion from America)," and because, the reviewer may be permitted to add, the people who consider themselves to be physically, linguistically, and culturally homogeneous are now politically divided. The Japanese also seek the roots of their ethnicity in their pre­
historic past. It seems to this reviewer that both the Koreans and the Japanese will find the answers by creating the past in the image of the present, because their interest in their ethnicity is a phenom­
enon of what Befu called "cultural nationalism" (Befu 1993). Nelson offers her prudent answer as the last sentence of the book: "The Korean ethnicity was forged slowly, and made up of many strands" (p. 267).

REFERENCE

This volume marks Jack Golson's retirement in December 1991 from the professorship of prehistory in the Research School of Pacific Studies at the Australian National University, a position Jack held with great distinction for thirty years.

It comprises a foreword by Graham Clark, 21 essays presented in three “parts,” and “The Golson Bibliography from 1953.” Part 1 is historical, comprising essays by Peter Gathercole writing on Cambridge, 1949–1951; Les Groube on Golson in New Zealand, 1954–1960; and John Mulvaney, Matt Spriggs, and Rhys Jones writing differently and very well in each case on Golson’s fellowship and then professorship, 1960–1991. Finally, Peter Ucko, in a small and somewhat enigmatic piece, pays tribute to Golson’s contribution to international archaeological organizations.

Part 2, named “Festal Writings,” is a broader net dragging, in as it does a major essay by John Chappell, framing possible times of the migrations to Australia at 60,000, 80,000, and 100,000 years ago, and another by Doug Yen that criticizes Green, Kirch, and Rhindos for insisting on a Darwinian notion of cultural evolution when a modified Lamarckian approach might better suit the objects and purposes of our study. Barry Fankhauser and Tom Loy offer separate essays on related aspects of organic residue analysis. Geoff Irwin’s essay on “Voyaging” draws insightful implications from archaeological and historical data and their analysis by simulation. Rhys Jones’s discussion of the “discovery of the Pleistocene archaeology of Australia” is marvelously written. More than that, it is historic in its scope, erudite, and purposeful. Like several other essays in the book, it ends with a programmatic statement about the future of archaeology and what it should entail. This tendency to offer prescriptive, future agendas is common to the best and most humane essays in the festchrift. I take this emphasis to be a reflection of the way Golson causes people to think, beyond ourselves and toward a better prehistory.

Part 3, “Festal Writings (continued),” contains half the essays in the book, and these occur in related pairs, each of which is focused on a theme or period. Usefully, individual contributions within these pairings differ from one another along the lines of current debates in the region and more broadly in the discipline.

Sandra Bowdler and Jim Allen offer back-to-back discussions of the Pleistocene in Australia. Bowdler usefully reiterates established issues and debates whereas Allen emphasizes research potential, gaps in current knowledge of the Pleistocene of Greater Australia and how best to fill them.

Peter Bellwood and Les Groube discuss aspects of the peopling of the Pacific. Bellwood looks west for influences on Oceanic prehistory, and his text reminds us that discerning these and dating them accurately remains one of the great frontiers in Oceanic archaeology. The next chapter is quintessentially Les Groube, an insightful and aggressive play on the contradictions between what appears to have happened and how people have explained all that. The essay begins with the notion that there “has been a persistence of an earlier addiction to viewing the past as the history of the migrations, successes, failures and replacements of various ‘races.’” There follows a pioneering treatment of the demography of colonization and the influence of disease processes. It is truly a great paper.

Matt Spriggs’s review of “Island Melane-
sia: The Last 10,000 Years” establishes him as the preeminent prehistorian of that vital region. Wal Ambrose recognizes sources of Manus ceramics with characteristic modesty and accuracy of statement, leading to important conclusions. Roger Green and Janet Davidson offer excellent reviews of Polynesian and New Zealand prehistory, respectively, as they are best equipped to do. Josephine Flood and Jim Specht describe “Cultural Resource Management in Australia” and “Museums and Cultural Heritage” in the Pacific, respectively. These are thoughtful reviews describing situations that are at once intractable and far from perfect. I can only say that my New Zealand experience over twenty years would suggest that Mabo and realizations of independence throughout the Pacific will, in time, be good for “heritage management”—although that term itself is redolent with paternalisms.

There never has been any doubt at all that Jack Golson is a great prehistorian. This volume exhibits some of the characteristics of his leadership: diversity of opinion is encouraged, hence held strongly and argued with cogency and conviction; and there is great generosity of spirit, shown in the breadth of topics covered and a strong sense of science as a great thing, much of which is still to be done.


Reviewed by JAN RENSEL, University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa

The appropriateness of the title of this volume is immediately apparent, as the component papers focus inside houses both literally, in the orientation and layout of domestic spaces, and figuratively, in the cultural meanings of those spaces as enacted on a daily and ceremonial basis. On a third level the title resonates in a repeated consideration of how, even within structures, different groups define inner and outer in various contexts.

This collection is a product of the Comparative Austronesian Project at the Research School of Pacific Studies, the Australian National University, which has as its goals the development of a historically based understanding of Austronesian-speaking populations, a general framework and common vocabulary to discuss distinguishing features of that heritage, and comparisons among cultures and societies from throughout the Austronesian region. With such a scope, the examples in any one volume are necessarily limited, but this set strikes a judicious balance, including papers on closely related groups (three on Borneo longhouses) as well as venturing farther afield (dwellings in Sumatra, Roti, Goodenough Island, and Maori meetinghouses in New Zealand).

The ethnographic chapters are framed by consideration of overarching themes by Fox and by Roxanna Waterson. In his introduction Fox does an admirable job of highlighting points of comparison. An analysis of Austronesian house terms points to commonalities underlying the range of physical manifestations in domestic space. Within the Malayo–Polynesian division of the Austronesian language family, certain house elements—posts and ladder, ridgepole and hearth—are particularly prominent. Several chapters emphasize the function of such features as ritual attractors. In addition, a house, sometimes imaged as body with head and tail, or as tree
with base and tip, serves as a theater for the enactment of group identity. External orientation and internal organization—reflected in order of construction as well as in practical and ceremonial uses—are key to houses’ representing and reinforcing social order. Waterson elaborates on certain themes, especially the problem of ambiguity or fusing of functions within spaces (public/private, temple/dwelling, male/female, etc.). In her concluding chapter she reiterates the call for detailed consideration of the range of actual functions, rather than glib categorization of the structures as ideally construed. The intervening chapters, though varying in style and perspective, exemplify this focus on context and practice.

As Alexander notes, the form of Borneo longhouses—rows of individual units under one roof built on piles, accessible by notched ladders—has been the focus of much speculation concerning the reasons for both its development and its persistence under changing conditions. In addition to practical, ecological, and defensive functions, longhouse features such as the communal veranda and permeable walls between apartments foster sociability, a high value in contemporary Borneo societies. Alexander analyzes the composition and differentiation of longhouse apartments in relation to Lahanan (Sarawak) social structure, labor organization, and continuity in the community.

The theme of sociability is taken up more directly by Helliwell, who argues that the independence of households within the longhouse has been overemphasized in studies that rely on formal models of inner and outer spatial divisions. In a well-organized and compelling account of life inside a Gerai Dayak longhouse, Helliwell describes how the outer, unpartitioned gallery is used less as an area for the community members beyond the immediate household than for strangers and outsiders. In contrast, “private” inner spaces of family apartments are actually shared with the longhouse community through the voices, resources, and firelight transmitted through common walls. Sather also urges that the independence of constituent families in Iban longhouses be reconsidered. He provides insight into an indigenous view of household/community relationships in a detailed examination of Iban rituals, both those that focus on the longhouse itself, and life-crisis ceremonies enacted as stages in a journey through the longhouse.

Overemphasis on jural structures has also contributed to the perpetuation of a misleading dichotomy, “women: domestic:: men: public” which Ng attacks in her analysis of spatial use in traditional Minangkabau houses in West Sumatra. Drawing on data about postmarital residence patterns, life-cycle movements of women’s sleeping spaces, and the complementarity of areas for sexual and social reproduction (through food), Ng develops a more elaborate syllogism relating house levels and spaces to conceptions of social and biological reproduction. Spatial use on ceremonial occasions reinforces the idea that Minangkabau houses are built for women, who are centrally identified with the continuity of their matrilineal group.

Continuity is a central theme in Fox’s paper on the traditional Rotinese house, the constituent elements of which are named and associated with particular symbolic images from origin chants. The orientation of the house according to pairs of coordinates (east/west, right [south]/left [north], and above/below) has rich symbolic significance implicating ordinary and ritual uses of space. In an intriguing postscript, Fox compares the orientation and key named structures of Rotinese houses with those of two groups on Timor. Unfortunately, half of the figures in Fox’s essay have north at the bottom and east to the left, requiring mental gymnastics for those committed to following his argument and comparing them with the other figures. Was this intentional, a gentle warning from Australia against “hemispherism”?

Young’s primary focus is on the dissemblance of power manifest in Kalauna houses on Goodenough Island. Whereas the outsides are largely undifferentiated, house interiors are known to conceal magical paraphernalia, giving occupants power in daily interactions and protecting houses
against intruders. Even though Kalauna houses lack the elaborate symbolism, orientation, and spatial oppositions salient in other studies in this volume, Austronesian themes echo in the conception of the centerpost as anchoring the house and its occupants in the village, and the belief that ancestral spirits occupy the ridgepole and walls.

Van Meijl examines Maori meetinghouses in New Zealand, discussing relative distinctions between tapu and noa (sacred and common) areas within the meetinghouse and the surrounding marae (ceremonial center). Orientation and particular features inside the meetinghouse maintain the presence of ancestors and evoke a sense of timelessness and continuity with past and future, despite historical transformations since the arrival of Europeans.

Van Meijl also explicitly tackles the issue of change in physical and symbolic constructions. Many of the other papers allude to housing changes only in passing: Helliwell notes that more than three-fourths of Gerai dwellings are now freestanding; Ng reports that more than 70 percent of Minangkabau houses are of modern construction; Alexander, Fox, and Young all mention government campaigns for housing innovations. Fox notes that the government prohibition of under-house burial lessened the significance of the above/below symbolism in Roti houses. He also acknowledges that the Rotinese are concerned about which features of the house are essential to maintaining tradition. For the most part, however, the impact of such changes is unexamined. Given the Comparative Austronesian Project's goal of a historically based perspective, more attention to ongoing changes in housing, and their implications for sociocultural meanings, seems warranted. In sum, this volume is a welcome contribution to the literature on houses and their relation to social life in the Pacific. Indeed, it is a provocative challenge to continue the project, including a focus on changes in material and social construction.


Reviewed by GEORGIA LEE, Institute of Archaeology, University of California, Los Angeles

Australian rock art is renowned for its variety, abundance, and antiquity, and for the fact that it continues to play a vital role in today's indigenous Australian communities. As Australia is one of the few places in the world where the tradition of painting or carving on rock is ongoing, anthropologists are in the unique position of being able to ask questions of those doing the rock art. But can one extrapolate backward through time from today's ethnographic explanations? This is but one of the important issues discussed in Layton's book as he focuses on the cultural context of rock.

Chapter 1, "Anthropological and Archaeological Approaches to Australian Rock Art," is an interesting introduction, asking whether one should try to understand rock art through archaeological study or by anthropology and ethnographic analogy, and whether it is possible for these two approaches to be integrated. Anthropologists approach rock art by asking questions of living Aboriginals, whereas archaeologists contend that information gathered from living descendants, long removed from the original traditions, cannot be relied upon.

Ethnographic studies appear to be most valid in the northern and central parts of Australia where there are communities with
continuing traditions. However, other parts of the continent have been heavily impacted by European colonization and continuity is lacking. In addition, Layton warns against extrapolating too readily from one part of Australia to another: in aboriginal times Australia was not culturally uniform.

Layton describes the social background, including sacred places, clan totemism, and life cycles. Although there is variety in stylistic expression, there are many common themes in the religions of the country. As rock art can result from many different activities as diverse as increase ceremonies, illustrations of ceremonial or legendary figures, or a secular record of events, variability can be explained as due to function rather than as artistic change over time (i.e., abstraction to naturalism). His discussion of connections between rock art, sand drawing, bark painting, and body decoration is particularly interesting.

Layton considers hand stencils and animal paintings that show internal organs (x-ray style) to be "secular." According to him, and as a result of his distribution analysis, the occurrence of x-ray paintings that are randomly accumulated and in a continuous line of shelters correlates with the secular content of the art; sites relating to clan totemism (having a more limited range of motifs) are distributed in discontinuous patterns, reflecting the territorial organization of communities.

A fascinating discussion of the history of colonial impact on Aboriginal society is included in Chapter 4, "Rock Art and the Colonial Impact." Layton states, "The contention that there has been a complete break in indigenous traditions may be correct for some of the most heavily colonized areas of Australia, but not elsewhere. Sufficient knowledge exists to construct some generalizations about form and function, distribution and meaning in Australian rock art" (p. 113).

Discussing the theory of relationship between the structure of culture as a system and the performance of discourse in a cultural idiom, the author asks what factors contribute to continuity or change and which can be determined from types of indigenous explanations about rock art: "If one is concerned to study the role of rock art as an artefact of contemporary culture it can be argued that its original significance is irrelevant.... [K]nowledge and beliefs about sites are not static and the importance given to a site may change over time ..." (p. 119).

The analysis of figures as artifacts of culture is a preliminary step in quantifying stylistic variation. This is a problem faced by those attempting to classify rock-art motifs; can an observer unfamiliar with that culture interpret a motif and place it into a typology without information on how members of the culture would have recognized the figure?

I enjoyed the section on classification. This is a sticky dilemma, one that has resulted in diverse (and often humorous) "identifications" by various researchers, particularly when dealing with geometric motifs such as simple circles, rayed circles, and so on. It is a problem that is not confined to Australian rock art. For example, using various classifications, we find that circles have been described as a young girl's breast, or a fireplace, or a dance ground; a slash across two concentric rings (rather like a no smoking sign) indicates an old woman's breast; and concentric rings stand for a camping place of a totemic hero or heroine—or maybe a headdress framework (!). Clearly, as Layton points out, geometric designs should be described in formal terms.

"Stylistic Variations in Time and Space," Chapter 7, concerns the problems of distinguishing style from technique. Does style emerge from conventional rules of a particular artistic tradition, or does it signify unity or distinctiveness, or is it an adaptation to the limits on formal variation imposed by technique? Style and technique may be related, for the material and the tools that are utilized will favor certain formal patterns.

Pigment and methods of its application and types of petroglyphs are described, as well as the way in which style is defined by others. For Layton, stylistic traits consist of the overall qualities of form and organization characterizing the corpus of perfor-
mance or texts in a particular cultural tradition. He considers the formal characteristics of Australia rock-art traditions to be explicable not in technical terms but in terms of their role in visual communication: clear messages to a defined target population.

Multivariate analysis is used to plot the geographic distribution of motifs in order to test coherence of intuitively identified traditions. This is followed by an in-depth discussion of direct and indirect dating efforts for Australian rock art. A considerable amount of dating attempts have been made, and dates now establish the practice in three areas of Australia before the end of the Pleistocene, more than 10,000 years ago.

In his final chapter, "Rock Art and Human Adaptation in Australia," Layton attempts to place the recent rock art of the north and center of Australia into a wider perspective. He takes a holistic view, discussing the natural environment and changes wrought by climatic variations, including sea-level changes.

Layton's view rejects a unilinear sequence of simple to complex. Rather, he examines styles of rock art as developments that encode visual information in regular forms; where two or more styles coexist they are likely to fulfill different functions. Although Layton questions that style can be explained in functional terms, he does look for evidence of change in the cultural context of rock-art traditions: a change in frequency of motifs or changes in location of sites in the landscape or the development of two or more styles in a single culture. Noting the upsurge in the use of shelter sites over the last few millennia, he suggests that it can be interpreted as a consequence of increasingly complex principles for mapping people onto the landscape rather than as a simple response to climatic change. As new territorial systems evolved, they were signaled by the use of rock art. Layton then points out several problems with his hypothesis and indicates where it might be tested.

The book ends with a section on vandalism and alienation.

Some of Layton's statements are particularly salient: for example, he describes rock art as "messages expressed in durable forms" that illuminate achievements of the native Australian cultures and that "humanly made, repeated patterns or motifs ... have been constructed to encode information of some kind." There are recurrent themes in the book: it is wrong to assume that contemporary indigenous people have nothing of value to tell about rock art in Australia; rock art functioned during the course of human settlement to assist varied and successful adaptations to diverse and changing environments; and oral interpretations should be used with caution, especially when they are interpreted or filtered through the mind of someone with a European cultural background.

Appendix 1 lists the sources used in Layton's distribution analysis, and Appendix 2 is the result of his computer analysis of sites and regions.

The index is divided into sections labeled "Culture heroes, tricksters and legendary beings," "Groups," "Places," "Rock art subjects," and "General," a rather cumbersome method of organization for anyone not familiar with the tongue-twisting Aboriginal words and unable to distinguish whether one denotes a culture hero or is a place-name.

Although I found Australian Rock Art: A New Synthesis to be a satisfying study, I would have liked a concluding chapter at the end to tie it all together. However, it goes beyond many rock art books by examining how and from what viewpoint one can approach the study of rock art. There is a lot of information here, clearly presented. Layton has produced a thought-ful and thought-provoking book.

The price of the book is rather steep, especially for a volume lacking color photographs. Given the visual impact of many of Australia's glorious rock paintings, it is unfortunate not to have some of them in color. Layton's discussion of anthropological versus archaeological approaches to the study of rock art would be particularly valuable as a text for a class dealing with that subject; however, the price of this volume likely will put it beyond the means of most students.

Reviewed by HARRY ALLEN, University of Auckland

The Department of Prehistory has now combined with the Department of Biogeography and Geomorphology and the Quaternary Dating Research Centre to form a new Division of Archaeology and Natural History within the Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies. The Department of Prehistory has, over the past years, provided the discipline with a number of excellent publications through its Occasional Paper Series, including Pacific Production Systems (1990), A Community of Culture (1993), and Women in Archaeology (1993). Sahul in Review, which represents the results of a well-thought-out conference (Australian Archaeological Association, 1991) and the rapid publication of papers from it, maintains both the impetus and the quality of the series. The volume demonstrates the truth of the editors' claim that Pleistocene archaeological sites are continuing to be discovered at a rapid rate in Australia. They note 165 such sites throughout the continent, including Tasmania and New Guinea, and across all regional and ecological boundaries.

Issues of scale, resolution, and explanation are explored in the first three papers (Horton, Ballard, Frankel). All are useful. In particular, Frankel extends his previous discussions on the construction of periods that are appropriate for both the nature of the evidence and the data to be explained.

The proof of the pudding for Australian Pleistocene archaeology lies in the essential review articles in this volume. Smith and Sharp cover the geographic and temporal structure of the archaeological record; Bowdler extends the picture to the still virtually unexplored Sunda region; Rosenfeld presents the evidence for Pleistocene art; while O'Connor et al. discuss settlement and population indices. Finally, Pardoe presents a thought-provoking discussion of the human fossil evidence and the variety of explanations associated with it. These general reviews are followed by useful regional discussions such as that by Gosden for New Guinea, Spriggs for Pacific agriculture, Morwood for Cape York Peninsula, Hope for the Murray-Darling Basin, and McNiven et al. for Tasmania. In addition, there are detailed local papers on particular sites or areas.

Three papers are of particular interest. First, Furby et al. show the association of giant marsupial fauna and stone artifacts bearing mammalian blood and hair residues dating to >28,000 B.P. at Cuddie Springs. This suggests that the hitherto intractable and elusive problem of evidence for human interaction with the giant fauna has been at least partly solved. Second, Brown's work on the Pleistocene Manna-largenna site on an island in Bass Strait is also worthy of note. Its 14C dates range between 20,000 and 8000 B.P. when the site was apparently abandoned as a result of rising sea levels cutting the island off from the Bassian land bridge. The site complements the now better-known Pleistocene caves from southern and central Tasmania. Finally, Smith and Sharp update their useful bibliography of Pleistocene archaeological sites across Sahul, Greater Australia, or Near Oceania!

A major problem in Australian Pleistocene archaeology at present is the discrepancy between the earliest 14C dates (30,000–40,000 B.P.) and the thermoluminescence dates from northern Australia sites such as Malakunanja II and Nauwalabila I (50,000–60,000 B.P.). Bowdler states a position in favor of the carbon dates, on the grounds that none of the excavated Australian cave sites contain deep archaeological deposits underlying dates of the order of 40,000 B.P. However, until a
more precise calibration between the two series of dates is attempted, the jury will remain out on this question.

I take the reviewer's prerogative in mentioning Harvey Johnson's claim, in his excellent review of the role of shellfish in the diet of the Pleistocene inhabitants of the Willandra Lakes region, that I overestimated the volume of the Garnpung I midden by three orders of magnitude. I happily acknowledge the overestimate as a record but would add in defense that the volume was extrapolated from an area covered not by fragile shells but by scattered artifacts and the near indestructible fish otoliths.

*Sahul in Review* is an inexpensive but essential text that deals with the Pleistocene archaeology of Australia in an even-handed and constructive manner. The entire volume suggests that Pleistocene archaeology in Australia is in good stead, with the majority of its practitioners doing an excellent job of explicating the country's past. It marks a turning point in the maturity of the discipline.


Reviewed by Laura Lee Junker, Vanderbilt University

This two-volume publication is comprised of edited versions of papers presented at the 14th Congress of the Indo-Pacific Prehistory Association (IPPA) held in 1990 in Yogyakarta, Indonesia. The papers report on archaeological research carried out over the broad geographic expanse of Asia and the Pacific, ranging from the Indian subcontinent to northeastern Asia, Southeast Asia, Melanesia, and Polynesia. The time spans, research foci, and theoretical issues covered in the two volumes are equally diverse and wide-ranging, including such topics as Pleistocene hominin origins, the transition to food production and sedentism, the development of sociopolitical complexity, and the operation of production and exchange systems in prehistoric Asian and Pacific societies of varying social organization. Like the conference from which the publication is derived, the sixty short papers are organized into sessions and subsessions focused on specific research themes that are generally theoretically defined rather than geographically delimited.

This emphasis on shared research problems cross-cutting national and cultural boundaries reflects an important aim of the Indo-Pacific Prehistory Association: to provide a forum for theoretical dialogue between prehistorians living and working in different regions of Asia and the Pacific.

While Peter Bellwood served as the editorial coordinator of both volumes, individual session chairpersons/organizers were responsible for editing the papers in their subsession. This resulted in some unevenness in the editorial process and varying success in integrating the works of various contributors into a coherent theme. Most useful were those subsessions in which the editor or editors included a short introduction to the section's primary theoretical topic or research theme. These introductions frequently provided theoretical background not found in individual papers and succinctly summarized contrasting points of view. Some outstanding examples are: Jack Golson's coherent introduction to a set of papers on the transition to agriculture in
the Pacific, Chris Gosden and Jim Specht’s lead article in a conference session on Lapita finds in the Bismarck archipelago, and James Fox’s introductory remarks for a section dealing with traditional western Austronesian agricultural practices. It is hoped that the upcoming publication of the 1994 IPPA conference will include these valuable introductory syntheses as a means of summarizing current debates for readers specializing in other areas of Asian and Pacific archaeology.

Although it is impossible to mention all of the numerous contributed papers in a review of this length, or even to touch on the complete range of research problems and theoretical topics covered in the volumes, I will attempt to highlight some of the more controversial research issues. The Palaeolithic and Pleistocene research reported on focuses on some familiar debates: the dating of *Homo erectus* in Asia, the utility of Europe typological models to classify stone tools, the meaning of lithic diversity, and the accuracy of reconstructions of palaeoenvironments. Papers by Kennedy and Chiment, Zhang Yinyun and Sarto illustrate that chronological relationships and morphological differentiation between *Homo erectus* and *Homo sapiens* in East and Southeast Asia continue to be complicated by a lack of consensus about appropriate dating techniques and taxonomic criteria, leaving unresolved claims of chronological overlap. In terms of Palaeolithic tool assemblages, archaeologists working in Northeast Asia continue to be comfortable with employing European typological schemes (e.g., Pokee paper), while Southeast Asian specialists clearly favor the development of classificatory approaches emphasizing the distinctive functional characteristics of Southeast Asian core and flake industries (e.g., H. Allen’s paper on the Javan palaeolithic).

One disappointing tradition that continues to plague palaeolithic studies in Asia, as reflected in some of the conference papers, is the tendency to interpret inter-regional diversity in lithic assemblages primarily in terms of the presumed “cultural” or even linguistic affiliation of the tool-makers. This interpretive framework ignores recent ecologically oriented research in various regions of Asia linking resource variation, major differences in human subsistence adaptations, and the functional requirements of stone tools. However, a paper by Djubiantono and Semah cautions that the paleoenvironmental reconstructions vital to Pleistocene and immediately post-Pleistocene hominin research should not assume broad ecological similarities across vast areas of Asia but instead examine ecological adaptations on a microregional scale.

A large number of papers in the conference publication are devoted to the related issues of defining “Hoabinhian” subsistence adaptations and processes involved in the development of early agricultural communities. Several papers contribute to the development of more sophisticated models of post-Pleistocene hunter-gatherer behavior. These include: works by McKinnon and Shoocondej using archaeological data to argue effectively for seasonal movements of “Hoabinhian” groups between distinct environmental zones in Southeast Asia; Ghosh and Chaudhuri’s statistical study of the relationship among ecological conditions, demographic factors, and economic orientation among India’s contemporary hunter-gatherers; and Mountain’s discussion of how a complex strategy of resource management and scheduling could have allowed New Guinea hunter-gatherers to survive independently in tropical forests prior to agriculture. Similarly, numerous papers in a session on traditional agricultural practices in island Southeast Asia (chaired by James Fox) provided the kind of in-depth ethnographic and ethnohistoric analysis that is needed to formulate sophisticated, well-grounded theories of the transition to food production. Several startling new finds and theoretical interpretations emerged from these sessions, which are guaranteed to generate future discussion and controversy: for example, Wenming’s report on pre-Hemudu rice remains (c. 7000 b.c.), and the idea advanced by sev-
eral researchers (and summarized in Golson’s introduction) that Southeast Asian and Pacific agricultural origins may be independent.

One of the liveliest debates captured in the conference publication involved the related questions of Austronesian origins and the colonization of the Pacific, examined from linguistic, archaeological, and biological perspectives. In terms of archaeological data, Meacham argues against the traditional north-south migration scenario based on claimed contemporaneity of early Taiwanese and Philippine ceramics and other “Neolithic” material, while Spriggs counters this view with alternative chronological interpretations. The biological data are equally problematic, with Brace and colleagues demonstrating a Jomon Japan-Polynesian connection based on morphological features, contradicted by Hertzberg’s and his colleagues’ equally compelling DNA evidence for close biological ties between island Southeast Asia and Polynesia. As is often the case in such debates, interpretations primarily hinge on methodological arguments: the perceived reliability of assigned dates on “Neolithic” archaeological assemblages from various regions in Asia and arguments about the relative merits of skeletal versus DNA evidence for assessing biological diversity in Asian populations. Focusing the discussion specifically on the origins of the “Lapita” peoples of Western Oceania, a series of papers edited by Specht and Gosden provide a well-balanced discourse on two currently favored models among Lapita specialists: the “fast train” model (rapid colonization of the region by an external population) and the “gradualist” model (gradual evolution of indigenous pre-Lapita people).

Whereas the contributions dealing with issues of complex society development are surprisingly limited and are not integrated into sections with well-defined research themes, a number of papers are notable for their innovative analytical techniques and significant new theoretical frameworks. These include: Welch and McNeill’s use of the “Hopewell interaction sphere” concept to examine Angkor-period trade networks in the Phimai region of Thailand, Higham’s model of “big man/big woman” prestige goods exchange and competitive feasting to explain mortuary patterning in Metal Age Thai sites, and Kian-Chow’s analysis of the layout of a Chinese Shang Period king’s tomb in terms of political ideologies.

A number of the IPPA conference papers offer significant methodological contributions that may cause archaeologists working in Asia to rethink their techniques and approaches to important research questions. J. Allen aptly demonstrates the vital importance of geoarchaeological research in investigating settlement organization and economic development in the riverine and maritime-trade-oriented polities of Island Southeast Asia. Rahman confronts the challenges of excavation and preservation of materials in waterlogged coastal sites involved in this maritime trade. Papers by Takamiya, Vincent, and White provide ample support for the argument that detailed paste characterization studies on ceramics (e.g., neutron activation analysis, petrographic analysis) are essential to addressing adequately such issues as the organization of pottery production and inter-regional trade patterns in the emerging prehistoric complex societies of Asia. In the same vein, the work of Beardsley and colleagues on Easter Island obsidian illustrates how geochemical sourcing techniques on lithic material can be used to identify the boundaries of political territories and social networks of interaction.

In general, the papers in the two volumes are well written and cover a diverse range of theoretical issues certain to be of interest to the broad spectrum of archaeologists working in Asia and Oceania. The IPPA conferences and their subsequent publications provide an almost unique opportunity to hear about the work of colleagues who often disseminate their research through local publications that may not always be readily accessible to an international audience.
Although the Lapita cultural complex has been a dominant focus of research in Oceanic archaeology for more than three decades, there remains considerable disagreement over what Lapita actually represents beyond distinctive ceramics. The Lapita Homeland Project was undertaken in an attempt to rectify this situation to some extent by providing the archaeological data necessary to evaluate competing models of Lapita origins and development within the Bismarck Archipelago, referred to as the Lapita homeland. Following initial reconnaissance in 1984, 19 separate projects involving 24 archaeologists were carried out over a five-month period covering an area from Manus in the northern Bismarcks to Nissan Island in the northern Solomons. The final results of the project are brought together in this edited volume as 16 papers accompanied by an introduction by Jim Allen and a concluding assessment of Lapita in the Bismarcks by Chris Gosden.

The first four papers deal with the Pleistocene/early Holocene period, beginning with a discussion of Pleistocene voyaging and the settlement of Near Oceania by Geoffrey Irwin in which he develops a predictive model for settlement of the region based in part on firsthand observations. The other papers report on cave sites from New Ireland with Pleistocene occupation including Matenkupkum (Gosden and Robertson), Panakiwuk (Marshall and Allen), and Balof (White et al.). Although a detailed analysis of all material recovered is not presented for each site, the collective data represents an important first step in attempts to build models of early settlement extending back to 33,000 B.P. in the Bismarcks.

The remaining contributions present data from a wide range of Lapita and post-Lapita sites scattered through the Bismarcks. A majority of these papers fall into two general categories: general reports from larger projects involving numerous sites where additional fieldwork was carried out following completion of the Lapita Homeland Project, and detailed reports covering a few sites or a single site.

Each of the three papers in the first category deals with extensive sequences, including pre-Lapita occupation in two cases. Matthew Spriggs's summary report provides an overview of the Nissan sequence extending from c. 5000 B.P. to the present, including a controversial "Lapita without pots" phase. Patrick Kirch et al. discuss results of the 1985-1986 field seasons in the Mussau Islands, where pre-Lapita sites have yet to be found. According to Kirch, there is no evidence of a local development for the Lapita complex and the Mussau ceramic sequence indicates direct continuity between Lapita and post-Lapita periods. In his discussion of the methodology developed within the Arawe Islands project, Chris Gosden outlines an approach based on "landscape archaeology" within a regional context utilizing distribution patterns of obsidian and pottery. In Gosden's opinion, "what is needed is a holistic framework encompassing both the artifacts within the landscape as a whole and the deposits containing them, which can be understood in archaeological terms as the record of past human action" (p. 206).

Detailed Lapita site reports make up the bulk of the contributions to the volume and in a number of cases "squeeze a lot of information out of very little evidence" (Gorecki et al., p. 221). Examples include a report on limited test excavations from Boduna Island in the vicinity of Talasea by Wallace Ambrose and Chris Gosden, Ian Lilley's discussion of six badly disturbed and undated Lapita sites from the Duke of York Islands, and an attempt by Gorecki et al. to establish the presence of a Lapita site.
at Lamau (the first from the New Ireland mainland) on the basis of a single dentate-stamped Lapita sherd and a reconstructed pottery vessel with incised decoration from which carbonized residues were dated to c. 1700 B.P. Holly McEldowney and Chris Ballard’s report on the undated Mouk Island Lapita site in the Admiralties makes the most out of minimal evidence and rightly points out that “the recent assessment of an ‘almost total absence’ of Lapita sites in the Admiralty Islands must be considered far from proven” (p. 101).

Jim Specht provides a detailed analysis of Lapita and other ceramics collected from the surface of an intertidal reef flat at Kreslo on the south coast of western New Britain. Although unstratified and undated, the site context raises interesting questions regarding Lapita site locations, particularly the possibility of structures built on piles over the reef.

The Reber-Rakival site on the island of Watom at the northern end of New Britain was the first Lapita site to be investigated and published (by Meyer in 1909) and was excavated by Specht in 1965–1966. Additional excavations were carried out by Roger Green and Dimitri Anson in two localities as part of the Lapita Homeland Project. Their report confirms that settlement occurred during the middle to late portion of the Lapita period and documents a slow change in ceramics over time with no major breaks. Similarities with early post-Lapita pottery from New Ireland (Lossu and Lasigi) and Buka in the northern Solomons suggest to the authors continuity rather than replacement. Investigations of two non-Lapita sites at Lasigi on the east coast of New Ireland with occupation dating from the late Lapita period to c. 1900 B.P. are reported by Jack Golson. Although he draws no conclusions, Golson points out the similarities between ceramics from these sites and late Lapita to early post-Lapita sites on Watom, Nissan, Buka, and elsewhere.

In his thought-provoking paper, Wallace Ambrose examines the scanty Lapita pottery evidence in the Manus archipelago and its relation, both temporal and spatial, to other pottery styles. Based primarily on assemblages from three dated sites on Lou Island, Ambrose defines two post-Lapita pottery wares and documents replacement of the earlier Sasi ware (2100 B.P.) by Puin ware (1650 B.P.). Contrary to the evidence for gradual ceramic change from Kennedy’s Kohin Cave site, Ambrose states that “there appears to be a clear discontinuity between Lapita and later wares on Manus” (p. 109). Unfortunately, there are presently no sites in the Admiralties in which the possible link between Lapita and Sasi ware can be examined. Of considerable interest is Ambrose’s definition of six clay groups from Manus utilizing x-ray microprobe analysis of clay-fine silt fractions. This represents a significant improvement over conventional methods of compositional analysis in which nonplastic inclusions are not removed.

Richard Fullagar and Robin Torrente’s paper investigates obsidian exploitation at Umleang on Lou Island through a groundbreaking technological study of debitage samples from the surface of a locality with extensive quarrying, probably beginning before European contact. In order to examine whether obsidian was being exchanged and the nature of the exchange system, procurement of raw material and artifact production were analyzed, including choice of resources, blade manufacturing sequence, efficiency as reflected in waste by-products, and spatial patterning within the site. Although the initial aim of inferring the nature of exchange on the basis of production could not be achieved, a number of promising avenues for future research are discussed.

Report of the Lapita Homeland Project is without question an essential volume for Lapita specialists and a valuable source of data for Oceanic archaeologists in general. The papers are well written and present an enormous amount of data from a region that was largely terra incognita archaeologically. However, data reporting tends to take precedence over explicit discussions of the theoretical frameworks employed in data gathering, with the notable exception of Chris Gosden’s contributions. This
is due in part to the organization of the Lapita Homeland Project and, as Jim Allen states in the introduction, "one disadvantage is that the project possessed no central direction or theoretical focus during the field research or subsequent analyses beyond the general issue of Lapita origins" (p. 4). In my opinion, the volume would also have benefited from a conclusion in which issues such as the lack of agreement among contributors to the volume over models of Lapita origins and development within the Bismarcks (i.e., indigenous development versus Southeast Asian origins) could have been discussed by the editors. Despite Jim Allen's claim (p. 5) that the implications of data produced by the project had not been assimilated to the point where a synthesis was possible, the volume would have clearly benefited by such an attempt.


Reviewed by JANET DAVIDSON, Museum of New Zealand, Te Papa Tongarewa

The To'aga site is an extensive pottery-bearing site on the small island of Ofu. Its investigation is an excellent example of how academically oriented research and Cultural Resource Management requirements can be successfully combined within the relatively limited resources of CRM.

The site was discovered in 1986, when bulldozing for a landfill exposed pottery, and was investigated more fully during 1987 and 1989. Reports on the first two seasons have already been published; this volume is the final report on the results of all three seasons. As we have come to expect from Pat Kirch, this is a comprehensive and well-illustrated report, and carries some of his special trademarks in the geomorphological investigation of the site by systematic transects and the analysis of land snails. Because the report is so thorough, it is possible to question some of the conclusions. The nomination of the site for the Register of Historic Places should ensure that further work is possible in future.

After an introduction in which the editors outline the research strategy, Kirch describes the environmental setting and Hunt the surface archaeological features of the narrow coastal terrace, which is nonetheless the largest strip of flat land on the island. Kirch then develops a model of the morphodynamics of the coastal terrace. The model is reviewed successively against the excavation data, radiocarbon dates, and geoarchaeological analysis of sediment samples (by Hunt, Manning, and Tyler).

The excavations of 131 m² are described in detail by Kirch and Hunt. The transect approach enabled the extent of the pottery-bearing deposit to be estimated as at least 21,000 m² in a narrow strip at the base of the talus slope. The main stratigraphic units identified were sedimentological; the principal cultural layer was layer II, a calcareous sand containing pottery and other artifacts. A few small errors have slipped into the wealth of detail in this chapter.

Kirch reviews the 14 radiocarbon dates from the site. Three are from aceramic contexts and two from probably prehuman contexts. Whereas the five shell dates for ceramic deposits fall roughly between 500 B.C. and A.D. 500, the four charcoal dates have 1 sigma ranges extending back from around 400 B.C. to 1300 B.C. Even though the charcoal samples are claimed to be from relatively early contexts, two are
from the same context as one of the shell samples. This raises questions about comparability of the two kinds of samples, including the possibility of inbuilt age of charcoal samples.

With 2434 sherds, To'aga is second only to Sasoa'a in the still small group of Samoan ceramic sites. This surely says something about pottery in Samoa; even when the environmental problems concealing ceramic sites are overcome, the amount of pottery here, compared with Tonga or Fiji, is very small.

The ceramics are analyzed in some detail by Hunt and Erkelens. Although 2402 sherds were recovered in the 1987 and 1989 excavations, only 1663 are included in the breakdown according to context and style in Tables 9.1 and 9.2, from which "eroded" sherds were explicitly excluded. If some 30 percent of the sherds were too eroded to include (surface and contextless sherds are not mentioned), this aspect of the depositional history of the site should have been spelled out.

A subsample of 737 sherds was drawn for detailed analysis from early, middle, and late contexts (the bulk of the "early" sherds presumably coming from unit 23, rather than unit 28 as stated). The assemblage consisted entirely of bowls, with minimal decoration. Both "thick" and "thin" wares are present and, as in Western Samoa, thin ware declines in importance through time without totally disappearing. Clay compositional analysis suggested that with the exception of a few red-slipped sherds that may be exotic, the bulk of the assemblage was made from local self-tempered clays. An independent analysis of 29 sherds by Dickinson identified four temper types, all consistent with a Samoan origin.

The nonceramic artifact assemblage described by Kirch is relatively small but, because of the nature of the deposit, included bone and shell items not found in ceramic sites such as Sasoa'a. These included an important assemblage of one-piece fishhooks and tabs of *Turbo* shell, a shell adze, and a small array of ornament fragments.

The sourcing of stone tools from To'aga and three sites on Ta'u by destructive XRF and nondestructive energy dispersive XRF is addressed by Weisler, who compared selected archaeological specimens with source samples from the Tatagamatau adze quarry complex on Tutuila and two dike swarms on Ofu. The results, although tentative, suggested use of one of the Ofu sources for flakes and contact between To'aga and Tatagamatau during the aceramic period.

The well-preserved faunal assemblage is analyzed by Nagaoka. Identified bones comprise 2196 fish and 687 other bones, including rat, bird, turtle, and other marine mammals. Pig was represented by one tooth. Only a few of more than 40 invertebrate families identified were numerically important. The possible value of some taxa as raw material as well as food is discussed, but the often encountered problem of the inclusion of dead shell either as part of the beach ridge matrix or as house floor material does not seem to have been considered. Analysis of bulk samples clearly demonstrated the value of small screens in recovering bone remains. Overall, the study showed little temporal change. A tantalizing comparison with other faunal assemblages from the region stresses the need for greater comparability.

The 74 identified bird bones, representing at least 15 taxa, are reported in greater detail by Steadman and include two megapode bones from an early context. Even so, Steadman comments that although the assemblage appears to represent the first 1000 years of occupation of the island, it is not typical of what one might expect during the first 500 years. A few bones are described as rolled—another indication of the possibly complex history of deposition.

Early in the volume, in his description of the natural and cultural setting, Kirch comments: "The prehistory encapsulated within the To'aga site is as much a history of environmental dynamics as of cultural changes in pottery types or adze forms." To this reader, the cultural information was rather disappointing, whereas the investigation of environmental change, which was a major thrust of the investigation, has yielded some of the most interesting results.
It is suggested that the coastal terrace could not have begun to form until after the Holocene sea-level maximum of about 5000 to 3000 years ago. The first human colonists would have found a very narrow coastal terrace. From about 2000 years ago, however, the terrace prograded rapidly, and this process, combined with the deposition of colluvium, led to the burial of the early deposits. The geoarchaeological analysis of sediment samples makes an important contribution to the overall argument, emphasizing the value of this work in a situation of this kind.

Despite the claims that the site contains well-stratified deposits representing continuous occupation from c. 3200 to 1000 B.P., there is little convincing evidence of this in the cultural content of the deposits. No characteristic Lapita sherds were found; there is little change in ceramics, and that little is no more than was documented within a much narrower time frame in Upolu. There is virtually no change in faunal remains, and nonceramic artifacts are too few and too dispersed to offer evidence of change. One cannot help feeling that most of what was recovered from the ceramic deposits represents a much narrower time frame than the radiocarbon dates appear to suggest. Add to this the possibilities of disturbance and redeposition hinted at by eroded sherds and rounded bird bones, and one is led to conclude that, despite the undeniable importance of the site, the extraction of more fine-grained information from it in future is not going to be easy.

These quibbles aside, the book represents a major contribution to the prehistory of Samoa and western Polynesia, and should be on the shelf of everyone interested in Polynesian archaeology.