A good research book, in contrast to a textbook, is not one that provides ready-made answers but one that forces us to ponder fundamental questions that continue to occupy our minds even after we finish reading the book. According to this criterion, The Genesis of East Asia is a very good book, highly recommended for advanced students and researchers of East Asian cultures and history as well as for scholars working in other parts of the world. While disagreement about details or even about the main thesis of the book is inevitable, Holcombe should be commended for having the courage to dive into the endless ocean of primary and secondary sources, and for his ability to distill a coherent and thought-provoking work.

As is clearly stated in the title, the book addresses the region defined as East Asia (the area covered roughly by the modern states of China, Vietnam, Korea, and Japan) during the last centuries B.C. and the first millennium A.D., a period during which, according to Holcombe's analysis, a unique East Asian identity was shaped. The basic argument of the book, that such an identity existed (insofar as any identity can really "exist") during the first millennium and is not merely a post-factum fabrication, is addressed head-on in the introduction and demonstrated time and again through historical anecdotes and analysis of historical records from the different cultures that have evolved in this region. Chapters 2–5 are devoted mainly to China (though with many eye-opening excursions to other areas in the region and beyond); chapter 6 to Vietnam; chapter 7 to Korea; and chapter 8 to Japan. The thematic strands of the book are effectively brought together in the concluding chapter, where the author argues that globalization, or "East Asianization," to use Holcombe's term (p. 219), and the creation of distinct local cultures and identities are two sides of the same fundamental historical process that shaped the East Asian region as we know it.

The author, especially in the first five chapters, which deal primarily with the history of mainland China, does not follow a strict chronological line. Although the chapters can be seen as arranged according to a vague developmental trajectory, Holcombe freely travels back and forth through the millennium addressed by the book with examples from different periods sometimes discussed in the same paragraph. While this style is not very didactic, it makes for very interesting reading, bursting with amusing historical anecdotes and insights. Indeed the best parts of the book are those in which the author is able to transcend the chronological and geographic boundaries and highlight meaningful patterns of East Asian cultures and history. Such is, for example, the discussion of the importance of the Chinese script (Holcombe prefers the Japanese term kanji) to the integration of the region and to
the independent growth of local cultures within it (pp. 60–77). Abandoning the chronological-descriptive style typical of most books that address global and long-term processes allows for a higher level of discussion that assumes the reader has a certain basic knowledge, although there may be a price (to the publisher, perhaps, more than to the author) of losing the large potential audience of introduction-class students. In chapters 6–8, on regions outside mainland China, the discussion is less thematic and much more chronologically, and these chapters are, to my mind, the less inspiring parts of the book.

The Genesis of East Asia is an important book not only because of the sheer amount of data it contains, which is limited by the format of the book, but because it is insightful and thought-provoking. Time and time again the author exerts considerable effort to avoid simplistic presumptions and to present historical processes in their immense complexity. Repeated attempts to address the concept of “ethnicity” and what it meant (or did not mean) in East Asia during the first millennium A.D. exemplify a clear-minded evaluation of a very complex and emotionally charged issue (see, for example, pp. 49–52). Holcombe is correct in pointing out that diversity within the so-called “Chinese” population sometimes exceeds the differences between Chinese and non-Chinese people, and that the educated elite in territories that are today part of Vietnam, Korea, and Japan were in many respects closer to their Chinese counterparts than either they or the Chinese elite were to the commoners in their respective countries. Such insights warn us against the cavalier use of labels such as “Chinese” or “Korean” for historic populations. It is regrettable that Holcombe himself is not always so careful, for example, in identifying the Yue tribe with archaeological remains dating back ten thousand years (!) and ascribing to them the domestication of rice (p. 20).

Holcombe recognizes anachronism as a major obstacle for which there are no simple solutions. As he points out, sometimes even our limited vocabulary forces us to use terms that are outright anachronistic (p. 166). Clearly national and ethnic identities did not yet exist as such in East Asia during the first millennium A.D., but, as Holcombe puts it, ethnicity is not exactly a lie either (p. 49) because human groups in the past did have their distinctive cultural characteristics. However, those characteristics were never stable features that developed in isolation but rather dynamic constructions, the outcome of interactions among people and groups that evolved and recombined according to changing socio-political needs. While The Genesis of East Asia, like other books of its kind, looks for the origins of modern phenomenon such as the Chinese, Japanese, Korean, and Vietnamese nation-states, and as such has an inherent anachronistic core, avoiding the two extreme positions and operating in the less clear-cut space of fluid ethnic and cultural identities may be one of the important lessons of this book.

The data on which Holcombe draws is predominately taken from the official or semi-official histories of the region, all written in classical Chinese. These documents, written by and for the intellectual elite of the region, represent, as Holcombe himself recognizes, a one-sided picture of the historical processes. Such heavy reliance on one type of data prevents the author from seriously addressing issues that are very relevant to the theme of the book, such as the development of popular local sentiments and unique cultural attributes, changes of economic adaptations, and the spread and regional influence of new technologies, to name just a few. While Holcombe devotes much space to the cultural complexity of the region (see, for example, good discussions on pp. 209–210 and 221–227), ironically, relying on the official histories forces the author time and again, almost against his will, to present a traditional view of East Asia as a seemingly homogeneous, Sinicized cultural region. Unfortunately, archaeological data, which could balance the Chinese/elite orientation of most written sources, is used only rarely and quite simplistically (e.g., p. 169). As the bronze mirror on the cover of the book
can illustrate, systematic analysis of archaeological data would have contributed, for example, to a better understanding of the varied aspects and levels of interregional interactions that are, after all, at the core of this book. It could have benefited not only from the incorporation of more archaeologically derived data but also from a more systematic application of anthropologic models. While the introduction on the book cover present it as a “study of state formation in East Asia,” the actual sociopolitical processes of state formation are not addressed by the book. More reference to anthropologically oriented archaeological research, such as, for example, the work of Gina Barnes (Barnes 1986), could have helped Holcombe further distinguish his model from the traditional Sinocentric paradigm and deepen his analysis of the important processes addressed by the book. Applying such anthropological theory could also elucidate the discussion on interregional interactions by incorporating ideas about human motivations and machinations.

One component of the book, its maps—or, rather, the lack of thereof—deserves harsh criticism. The three small and highly schematic maps are unfit for any serious work, let alone a book such as The Genesis of East Asia, for which geography is so essential. Better maps with clear geographic components such as mountain ranges, lakes, deserts, and so on, and thematic maps describing, for example, the spread of Buddhism or the linguistic variability of the region, would have contributed immensely to the coherence of the book. A similar problem, though perhaps not as grave, is the decision not to incorporate names of people and places in their original East Asian script. Such practice, which usually reflects the publisher’s unwillingness to deal with these “strange” scripts, is no longer justified, due the minimal extra work it imposes using current technology. Another weak point of the book is its index, which is elementary at best (only eight pages long with few categories and even fewer subcategories). A book such as this, which aims at the graduate level and at a professional audience, cannot afford to be cavalier about such seemingly technical issues.

Regardless of the above criticism, I found reading The Genesis of East Asia highly rewarding and I warmly recommend it to anyone whose areas of research or interests are even remotely associated with the history of the region during the first millennium A.D. Thinking again about issues that are relevant to many scholars in the humanities and social sciences, such as the meaning of local and regional identities, processes of social and cultural change, and the relations between center and periphery, is in itself a good reason to read Holcombe’s book.

REFERENCE


Reviewed by C. Melvin Aikens, University of Oregon

This volume is made up of selected papers from academic sessions and public symposia held in Aomori, Japan, 21–25 October 1998. The Aomori conference followed...
sessions at the National Museum of Ethnology in Osaka and preceded additional sessions in Hokkaido, each part of the traveling Monbusho International Symposium “Foraging and Post-Foraging Societies: History, Politics, and the Future.”

The editors introduce the book in a chapter titled “Complex Hunter-Gatherer Studies in Japan and the North Pacific Rim.” Thence, it falls out in three parts: “Evolutionary Changes in Hunter-Gatherer Cultures: Theoretical Perspectives”; “Pacific Rim Hunter-Gatherers in Different Environments: Ecology, History, and Diversity”; and “Jomon Hunter-Gatherers at Sannai Maruyama and its Vicinity: Prehistoric Hunter-Gatherers in Northeastern Japan.” The editors aptly trace the genealogy of this collection back to Affluent Foragers, published in 1981 as volume 9 of Senri Ethnological Studies (Shuzo Koyama and David Hurst Thomas, eds.). Following up on that beginning, the key themes variously explored by the different authors of the present volume are long-term change in hunter-gatherer sociocultural complexity and cultural variability in relation to environmental and historical contexts. Sites and localities from Okinawa to northern California figure in these discussions.

Beginning Part I, Ben Fitzhugh discusses the evolution of complex hunter-gatherers on the Kodiak archipelago. He traces out a trajectory from colonization and expansion about 7,000 years ago to a subsequent advent of territoriality and reduced foraging ranges. This was fostered by mass-harvest fishing technology after about 4,000 years ago, and led on to increased population density, competition and the emergence of social inequality by about 2,000 years ago. Serious competition and warfare by about 1,000 years ago, and a consolidation of political power and social inequality within the last few centuries, lead up to the ethnographically known situation.

William Prentiss and James Chatters follow Fitzhugh. They characterize in broad fashion the evolution of socioeconomic systems on both the northwest coast and interior parts of North America, envisioning an explicitly selectionist dynamic. As they read the evidence, an early array of diverse subsistence-settlement systems—mostly of the foraging type—was decimated by severe pressures of Neoglacial cooling about 4,000 years ago. The economies that survived this period of selective stress were logistically organized collector systems, which then flourished with ameliorating climate after about 3,500 years ago to spread the logistically organized and socially complex systems that have characterized the region ever since. It is an appealingly reasonable and straightforward perspective that can help focus much further investigation.

Part II of the volume, which addresses the considerable cultural diversity that exists within the fairly homogeneous North Pacific environmental zone, appropriately begins with a paper by Peter Schweitzer. His thoughtful account, focused on the higher Beringian latitudes, demonstrates that there is yet reason to take account of cultural tradition and continuity (amidst our current preoccupation with ecological and sociocultural models) if we are to fully understand the uneven distribution of social inequality along the edge of the North Pacific. James Savelle and George Wenzel follow with an insightful interpretation of Thule social structure in the eastern Canadian arctic that also weaves together ethnographic, archaeological, and environmental considerations, but in a different way. Their task, which they accomplish very well, is to relate the social institutions of the Inuit whaling crew leader and men’s house to the structuring of corporate groups in the eastern Arctic. The paper is both theoretical and concrete, anchored with reference to variably complex community patterns seen among eight Thule period archaeological sites on Somerset Island.

The last three papers of Part II work with geographical extremes of the region under consideration. Carolyn Dean Kuhn Dillian uses obsidian source data to reexamine an old ethnographic question about territorial relationships among the Karok, Modoc, and other tribes of northern California. In adducing substantial geochemical evidence that the Modoc, rather than the
Karok, made the large obsidian bifaces that were traded widely for use in the White Deerskin Dance of north coastal California, she also provides a very good review of the historical and theoretical discussion of this long-standing problem.

Vladimir Pitul’ko gives an eye-opening picture of early human penetration of the high arctic in his concisely detailed report of a large and rich polar bear and reindeer hunting site on Zhokhov Island, well north of the mainland coast in eastern Russia at latitude 76 degrees north. Some twenty-two radiocarbon dates place this occupation between about 8000 and 10,000 cal yr B.P., though one date falls close to 12,000 years ago and another near 14,000 years ago. A substantial collection of cores, lamellar blades and flakes, bone, antler, and ivory tools, and even wooden arrow shafts and a sledge runner, clearly identifies the Zhokhov assemblage with the Sumnagin upper Paleolithic complex of the region.

Hiroto Takamiya carries discussion into the far south with his examination of hunter-gatherer occupation on the island of Okinawa. He graphs site numbers that indicate traces of occupation in initial/early Jomon times, and suggest stable colonization by late Jomon people after about 4,000 years ago. A hunting-gathering lifeway that targeted coral reef fish, nuts, and wild seeds persisted through the early Yayoi-Heian period, with cultivation appearing after the eighth century A.D. Hunting-gathering on Okinawa was dominated by cultivation only after the twelfth century A.D., in conjunction with invasion from outside and a major spike in site numbers. Based on limited data, Takamiya speculates that the earliest people were highly mobile foragers, with decreasing mobility during the final Jomon period.

Six papers in Part III address various issues connected with Sannai Maruyama, a huge Jomon complex of deep middens and hundreds of houses at the northern tip of Honshu, not far from the railway station in Aomori City. The site spans some 1,600 years of early and middle Jomon time between about 5900 and 4300 cal yr B.P. It is the best-known exemplar of a series of large "core settlements" that have become known in the Tohoku region over the past decade and will, when comprehensively evaluated, foster a major shift in our perspective on the "affluent foragers" of the Japanese Islands. Yasuhiro Okada places the site regionally in archaeological and environmental context, and discusses the course of temporal change in its settlement structure over some 1,500 years. There is much evidence of building, rebuilding, and tool manufacture, and two large, waterlogged middens have preserved a great wealth of organic materials that bear on various aspects of culture, environment, and subsistence.

Yo-Ichiro Sato, Shinsuke Yamanaka, and Mitsuko Takahashi report significantly lower diversity in the DNA structure of chestnut seeds from the site as compared with modern wild chestnuts from the immediate vicinity. They note that reduction of genetic diversity is a common characteristic of domesticants, and say that "The remarkably low genetic diversity in excavated samples from the Sannai Maruyama site ... strongly suggests human intervention." Junko Habu, Mark Hall, and Masayuki Ogasawara examine the chemistry of early and middle Jomon pottery from Sannai Maruyama and nearby sites, showing that most of it was made locally. This finding supports the conventional wisdom about Jomon pottery manufacture, and is a strike against some recent speculations that Sannai Maruyama may have been a center for trade in pottery and everyday commodities, in addition to more clearly exotic items also attested there. Brian Chisholm and Junko Habu report a pilot study of human bone from the nearby Furuyashiki site, using stable isotope analysis. It shows that close to half of the individual’s protein was derived from marine food species, a figure somewhat below that for Hokkaido Jomon people, but higher than that for Jomon people in central Honshu. The results suggest that further such studies will document interesting local variations in Jomon subsistence.

Daisei Kodama discusses the Komakino Stone Circle, a few kilometers from Sannai
Maruyama and dated to about 4,000 years ago, making it partly contemporary with the larger site. It is a distinctive manifestation among several kinds of stone circles found in central and northern Honshu, which functioned variously as cemeteries and multifunctional ritual centers. Kodama provides excellent detail not just on Komakino, but on a number of other centers in the region. He concludes with a very interesting note on how the modern village of Nozawa, near Komakino, continues to maintain traditional customs and roles in caring for communal properties, and suggests that the construction and maintenance of Komakino were probably carried out in a similar manner.

Mark Hudson concludes the volume with “Foragers as Fetish in Modern Japan,” an essay on Japanese national identity. His main contention is that the Jomon people have been “Japanized” by a great deal of scholarly, media, and public attention, because of “a fetish-like desire for an authentic Japanese tradition that penetrates deep into prehistory.” But in the familiar post-modernist way, he does not address any of the concrete evidence that archaeologists, physical anthropologists, and others have used to assess the character and strength of possible continuities between Jomon and modern Japanese people. Instead he speaks of interpretations motivated by symbolism, imagination, myth, fetish, nostalgia, and romantic desire. It is an updated solipsist formula that implies—but carefully never quite states—that while the past apparently existed, we are too much in the grip of our own contemporary fixations to do more than project them back confusedly onto times we cannot really hope to understand.

Overall, Hunter-Gatherers of the North Pacific Rim is a diverse and valuable set of papers that advances some of the concerns of its distinguished predecessor volume, Affluent Foragers: Pacific Coasts East and West, and introduces important new evidence and emphases. It is a significant addition to the increasingly global literature on hunter-gatherer archaeology.


Reviewed by Peter Skilling

Tracing Thought through Things is the seventh Gonda lecture, delivered on 12 November 1999 at the Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences. The author, Janice Stargardt, is one of the small number of British archaeologists who have given sustained attention to Southeast Asia. She starts with a concise review of the setting: archaeology in Indology; iron tools and food resources; continuity of settlement; and urbanization, trade, and Buddhism. Rice, “along with bananas and coconuts, may have been introduced into India from South East Asia” (p. 11). Iron production, agricultural developments, and rice cultivation were factors that “provided the necessary preconditions for the extraordinary flowering of new religious and philosophical thought in the 1st millennium BC, that shaped the intellectual and religious history, first, of India and then exerted a profound influence on the wider world” (p. 12).

Unfortunately, problems arise when we come to Amarāvatī. The suggested association of the Caitika school (Stargardt uses the form Caityaka: the name is variously spelt, as we shall see) with the Great Caitya at Amarāvatī is not borne out by available evidence: at best it is a hypothesis that has
been exaggerated over the years until it has become fact.\textsuperscript{1} Two Amaravati inscriptions use the term. The first does not say, as rendered by Burgess, that the Great Caitya was “in possession of” “the school of the Caitikyas,” but that a “wheel of the Dharma” was set up and donated to that school at the western gate of the Mahācetiya of the Blessed One (bhagavāto mahācetiye cātikya-nām nikāsa [read nikīya]-parīgahe aparādāre dhanacacākam dedham[man thā]pita).\textsuperscript{2} In the second inscription, “jadikyānām”—the form used here—can be dative or genitive plural. Its referent is ambiguous. It can refer to the donor or her husband (see Sivaramamurti, who, intentionally or not, is also ambiguous: “the wife of the householder Sidhatha of the Jāti-kīya school”). It cannot be a genitive plural referring to the Mahācetiya, which belongs to the Blessed One (bhagavat). It could be dative plural: the lamp pillar was donated to the Jāti-kīyas: “Khādā, wife of the householder Sidhatha, with her daughters, sons, mother, brothers, daughters-in-law . . . have set up a lamp pillar for the Jāti-kīyas . . . at the foot of the Great Cetiya of the Blessed One.”\textsuperscript{3} But the epigraph with its difficulties cannot be strong evidence for Caitikas “possession” of the Mahācetiya, and indeed we know very little about how the early cātīyas were managed.\textsuperscript{4}

The Caitikas were an early branch of the Mahāsāṃghika school.\textsuperscript{5} In addition to at Amaravati, they are mentioned once each at Ajanta and Nasik.\textsuperscript{6} None of their scriptures survive, and virtually nothing is known about their doctrines: only three are listed in Vasumitra’s classical compendium of tenets, all three shared by the Pañcālas and Aparāsīlas. (The Caitikas were not, as Burgess would have it, “otherwise called the school of the Pārvaśilas.”) It is sometimes assumed, quite wrongly, that the school had a special association with cātīyas, and that the presence of cātīyas or stūpas means the presence of Caityakas. On the contrary, Vasumitra ascribes to them the view that offerings to cātīyas do not bring great fruit.\textsuperscript{7}

Cātīyas dominate the early Buddhist sites of India and South-East Asia.\textsuperscript{8} The ideol-
meter-high) silver reliquary and a solid gold replica of a palm-leaf manuscript engraved with excerpts from Pali texts. It is much regretted that, although the precious objects were found in situ, the excavation report was sketchy. Even worse is the fact that in the intervening years the objects have been allowed to deteriorate. The author is right to recognize that the preparation of the objects was part of a significant ritual (p. 26), although many of the suppositions on that page might be contested.

Stargardt’s main concern is the inscription on the lid of the reliquary and its relation to the fifth excerpt in the golden manuscript. The inscription is a single line running around the band or lip of the cover. The curious situation that she sets out to explain is the fact that the fifth excerpt in the golden book is incomplete, with two of the fourteen buddhanānas omitted. This made the golden manuscript a “ritually imperfect object,” as such “unfit to become the central relic in the relic chamber of the stūpa. This place was taken by the Great Silver Reliquary” (p. 27). That is, among the inscriptions on the lid are the ninth and tenth buddhanānas. Stargardt concludes, “Thus the fourth inscription on the lid of the Great Silver Reliquary rectifies the defect in the Golden Pali Text by completing it!”

This seems to be the case. But the author’s next step is to conclude that the entire meter-high reliquary was conceived and fashioned just to allow the missing words to be added, so that “together Golden Pali Text and Great Silver Reliquary formed a ritually perfect deposit of exceptional meritorious and material value” (p. 28). My problem here is simple: we do not know what ideas, if any, the Pyu had about ritual perfection and imperfection. And we do not know what ideas, if any, they had about scribal lapses. Inscriptions are often imperfect, and the abbreviation of lists is a common practice.

The inscriptions bring us to a problem that starts with the title and runs throughout the latter part of the book. This is the description of the golden manuscript and the Burmese Pali inscriptions as “the earliest examples of Pali.” But what does the author mean by “Pali,” and what is evidence that the gold plate inscriptions are indeed the earliest? Earliest in comparison to what? These questions are not raised. Are the early dedications from, for example, Sanchi or Amaravati, Pali? At least some would seem to be, when we take into account that in that period consonants were not yet doubled. Is the Sarnath inscription of the second or third century C.E. Pali? If one limits the question to texts and to citations, then the Sarnath inscription is the most likely candidate for the earliest inscription.

The only other early Pali text known to the author seems to be the four leaves of Vinaya from Kathmandu: “Burma has preserved the earliest examples of Pali, which predate by many centuries the few isolated paper leaves of the Kathmandu Pali manuscript.” Stargardt makes no reference to the large number of textual citations in perfect and indisputable Pali from other early sites in Burma, and the equally numerous textual citations from the Chao Phraya valley and adjacent areas in central Thailand. Some Pali ye dhamma inscriptions from Nakhon Pathom were published as long ago as 1895 by Fournereau; further Pali epigraphs were published later by Coedès and by Thai scholars, and the corpus is now considerable.

None of these Pali documents—including the Khin Ba Mound gold plates—bear dates or are associated with objects that bear dates. Their dating is based on paleographic considerations, on which the experts notoriously disagree. In the present case, the proposed “dating of mid-5th to not later than mid-6th century for both the Golden Pali Text and the Great Silver Reliquary lid inscriptions” (p. 25), credited to Lore Sander (certainly an experienced and authoritative voice), is quite plausible. But to assert that the texts are the oldest without comparing them to the others is premature.

If we accept the proposed dating, then some of the inscriptions from Thailand are possibly contemporary, and some are certainly not much later. Given that none of
the Pali inscriptions have secure dates, one wonders why it is necessary to insist on some being older than others. For this reviewer the remarkable point is that Pali texts were engraved on metal and stone in the Pyu and—to use the conventional but debatable term—Dvaravati cultures, and that in many cases the same texts were chosen for inscription. The golden plates and the Dvaravati corpus both seem to cite, or at least invoke, the Patīsambhidāmagga, which suggests that both cultures accorded a certain importance to this text or its ideas. In sum, we find remarkable resonances between the two cultures, separated by several river valleys and mountain ranges, and epigraphic practices unknown in Sri Lanka, usually seen as the fountainhead of the Pali tradition. Inscriptional practices were not identical, however, since at Dvaravati texts were not only deposited in caityas but also displayed on pillars and dhamma caikakas.

Here and there are incomprehensible sentences. “A total of twelve names of Pali-based Buddhist sects are preserved in the Pali traditions of Sri Lanka” (p. 19) defies interpretation. With regard to the texts inscribed in the golden manuscript, the author says that “none is later than c. the 2nd century AD e.g., the Visuddhamārga and Abhidhammathasanghaha” (sic, for -sangaha; p. 24). But the Visuddhamārga dates to the fifth century, the Abhidhammathasanghaha several centuries later (the exact date is not known). And none of the golden texts is from either source.

That the Śrī Kṣetra stūpas “carried the cylindrical tradition of Andhra stūpas (and especially of Andhra stūpa-shaped reliquaries) to an extreme form” (p. 21) is doubtful. The “Pyu” stūpas still standing have undergone a millennium and a half of weathering and renovation, and in any case the Andhra stūpas are hardly cylindrical. I do not believe any evidence of the special features of the Andhra idiom—gateways, āyaka pillars, carved slabs—has come to light.

It is gratifying when attention is paid to Śrī Kṣetra, an important early urban site with significant Buddhist remains. The author is to be congratulated for making us aware of an interesting problem, for documenting it, and for attempting an ingenious solution, even if it does not succeed. She has initiated a debate that promises to be fruitful, and has directed scholarly attention to the rich heritage of Pali inscriptions and remarkable artefacts of the Pyu. We await the second volume of her study of the Pyu,16 which will, we hope, provide more detailed evidence for this debate.

The monograph has a frontispiece and 23 plates. At the end is an “Inventory of the Contents of the Relic Mound at Khin Ba’s Mound” (pp. 51–53), based on Duroiselle’s report in the Annual Report, Archaeological Survey of India for the Year 1926–27. The detailed bibliography is useful but marred by misprints. One entry has as many as four (counting punctuation): “Burgess, J. 1887. The Buddhist Stupas of Amaravati and Jagayapeta [Jagayapeta: same mistake in caption to Pl. 7] ... Trubner [Trübner] ... E; [J] Hultsch [Hultzsch].” (Stargardt uses “Jagayapeta” with a single “y” throughout.) Others include “Bhilsa the Topes” for “The Bhilsa Topes” (not only in the bibliography but in the caption to Pl. 6), “Archaeological Survey of India 1927–7” for “... 1926–7”; “Louvain-le-neuve” for “Louvain-la-Neuve.” There are also unexplained abbreviations (AAWLM, ABIA, etc., pp. 57.4, 21). Misspellings haunt the text: for example, “Angutta Nikāya” for “Anguttara Nikāya” (p. 24). In other words, the monograph would have benefited from a careful proofreading.

NOTES


4. Whether the Jātikīyas do equal the Caitikas might be debated, and the meaning of “dhammatha” is not clear.


6. Tsukamoto, A Comprehensive Study, III Nāsiṅk 9 (pp. 497-498), cetika-upāsākiyasa mūgādāsasa saparivārasya lēna deyadhama . . ., “the gift of an upāsīka who is a Caitika”?—I am not confident of the interpretation. For Ajanta see ibid., III Ajanṭa 43 (pp. 368-369). The sentence is not complete and cannot help us.

7. See Bareau, Les sectes, p. 88. According to Vasumitra the same view was held by two other Mahāsāṃghika schools, the Pūrvaśālas (Bareau, p. 100) and Aparaśālas (ibid., p. 105).

8. If the presence of caityas meant the presence of Caitikas, they would have been the biggest, and perhaps richest and most powerful, Buddhist school, not only in India but anywhere caityas are found. That this is not the case is obvious.


11. The author’s conviction is expressed several times: the inscriptions are “the earliest surviving Pali texts in the world” (p. 24) and “the earliest surviving texts in pure canonical Pali” (p. 25).


13. For this see Oskar von Hinüber, The Oldest Pāli Manuscript. Four Folios of the Vinaya-Pitaka from the National Archives, Kathmandu (Untersuchungen zur Sprachgeschichte und Handschriftenkunde des Pāli II) (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1991).


Minori Cave is a limestone tunnel cave in the Cagayan Valley in northern Luzon. Chamber D, located at one of the cave’s two entrances, was excavated by the Phil-
ippine National Museum in 1981–1982, and then by Mijares and another museum researcher in 1999, and they obtained a radiocarbon date on charcoal of around 4600 yr B.P. Most of the stone artifacts are of andesite with a smaller contingent made of chert. During his graduate studies program at the University of New Mexico, Mijares analyzed the technology and use-wear traces of a sample of 110 Minori flakes in the context of studies he undertook on experimentally knapped and utilized andesite and chert flakes. One particular concern of Mijares is to show the likelihood that prehistoric Philippine inhabitants had used andesite flakes as tools, as this would serve as a reprimand to those Philippine archaeologists who routinely ignore andesite artifacts. His second main objective is to investigate the hypothesis that the "stagnant" nature of stone knapping in the Philippines (and elsewhere in Southeast Asia) reflects the prevailing focus on producing expedient stone tools to work the wide range of useful plant material found in the region's forests. These are important matters, and the publication of Mijares' thesis research is a fitting commencement to the Contribution to Archaeology Series set up by the faculty and staff of the Archaeological Studies Program at the University of the Philippines, as Victor Paz (in his capacity as series editor) notes in his preface.

Following standard practice in the Philippines, Mijares defines a flake tool as a flake with, first, a serviceable sharp edge and, second, the appropriate dimensions to be held between thumb and index finger in a way that exposes the sharp edge. This definition would especially apply to Mijares' seventeen experimentally knapped flake tools (eleven of andesite, six of chert) because they are on average longer and wider than the specimens in his sample of Minori flake tools (as recognized by Mijares) and their working edge tends to be more acute. This observation comes from Mijares' tables, which summarize the statistics of eighteen technological variables (eight metrical and ten nominal) for both the Minori and the experimental flakes. The seventeen experimental flakes were then subjected to a range of slicing, sawing, cutting, scraping, whittling, and chopping tasks over periods between 16 and 58 minutes. The utilized edges were observed at 10×, 50×, and 200× magnification and their traces of use wear, in the form of use-scar terminations, presence of polish, and direction of any striations, recorded. Magnification at 200× allowed the most useful observations, and these suggested a relationship between use wear and type of task, at least when carried out on hard plant material (bamboo and rattan); meat cutting left far fewer use-wear traces, especially on the andesite flakes. Finally, the experimentally determined usage signature was sought on Mijares' sample of Minori flakes, and found on 74 percent of the andesite flakes and all of the chert flakes.

With respect to Mijares' first research objective, he concludes that use-wear traces can be recorded on andesite flakes, especially at magnifications of 200× and higher, even though the procedure is tedious and may involve inspection of individual phenocrysts. However, to explain why a smaller proportion of andesite flakes revealed any use wear compared to chert flakes, Mijares suggests that the prehistoric occupants of Minori had recognized the inferior quality of andesite tools compared to chert tools. Other possible explanations, such as the greater difficulty in recognizing edge wear on andesite compared to chert, especially if a soft material such as flesh had been worked and particularly when we consider the confounding effects of contact with deposit in the site and then (in the case of the flakes excavated in the 1980s) edge damage during curation, are not addressed.

With regard to the second research objective, Mijares concludes that the flakes had been primarily used to work hard material, of which bamboo and rattan are the obvious candidates as they are ubiquitous in the study region. These simple stone tools were fully adequate to produce the cane and timber tools essential for survival in tropical forests, and so the scarcity of formal stone tools in prehistoric Southeast Asia would be a sign of optimal adaptation rather than cultural stagnation. Most archaeologists currently working in Southeast Asia would
wholeheartedly endorse this particular conclusion.

A few details of Mijares' instructive and useful study could be queried on technical grounds. His operational definition of stone tools would exclude those with steep edges, which might indeed be considered optimal for certain tasks like scraping, as well as "microliths," which would have been hafted prior to use. The seventeen experimental flakes of andesite and chert may not be considered a sufficiently large reference assemblage to determine a reliable use-wear signature, particularly in view of the quantity of cross-indexed variables (artifact lithology, type of activity, and worked material) covered by the experiments. As hinted above, consideration does not appear to have been accorded to abrasion between deposit and artifact and other potential mechanisms of edge damage beside use wear. There also does not seem to be any photographic documentation of the effects of cutting deer meat on the edges of andesite flakes, even though p. 52 refers to Plate 16, which is meant to show this.

Finally, Mijares' assumption that the type of hard material being worked cannot be reliably discerned from use wear may be too pessimistic, in view of Daniel Davenport's (2003) identification of rattan processing based on experimental stone tools utilized by Cagayan Valley Negrito hunter-gatherers in traditional plant-working tasks. The research design of these experiments, directed in the 1980s by the Australian archaeologist Johan Kamminga, is impeccable as it involved a large number of stone artifacts applied by experienced forest dwellers to plant materials during and immediately after their extraction. My purpose in raising the comparison is not some egregious belittlement of Mijares' research based on reports that have appeared subsequently, but to make the point that advances in use-wear analysis continue. The study undertaken by Mijares is a positive contribution to that research agenda, and will certainly highlight its relevance to Philippine archaeologists, who are likely to be the main beneficiaries of Mijares's study.
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Reviewed by BARBARA THIEL, Department of Sociology, Anthropology and Philosophy, Northern Kentucky University

This book is a revised version of the book originally published in 1964, but written in 1959. The author has written the new edition because the first edition has been out of print for many years, and because he wants to bring up to date concepts of the pottery traditions proposed in the first edition. He emphasizes that this is not a new book presenting or summarizing the archaeology of the central Philippines. The first edition had six chapters. The revised edition has eight chapters plus a postscript. The first four chapters are the same as the first edition. Chapter 5 presents new data from 1959 to 1983. Chapter 6, "Relationships Through Space and Time," is patterned after Chapter 5, "Internal and External Relationships," in the first edition, but is different. Chapter 7, "The Philippine Iron Age," is like Chapter 6, "The
Philippine Iron Age," in the first edition, but is updated. Chapter 8, "Cultural Reconstruction," is a brief chapter that presents a framework of Philippine prehistory and a discussion of his concept of the Nusantao boat/trading people. Chapters 5 through 8 were written in 1982. The 1999 postscript is an update that summarizes changes and additions from 1983 to 1999.

Chapter 1 is an introduction that presents the purpose of the original study, which was to examine H. Otley Beyer's 1947 hypothesis for the introduction of Iron Age culture to the Philippines: that it was brought from the south with the Malays. This hypothesis was to be examined based on new data, primarily pottery. At that time there were no recognized pottery types for that area, so it was necessary to set up a system of ceramic analysis. As a beginning, several pottery complexes were to be set up for the Philippines using published descriptive information. Examination of the new data would show whether the pottery complexes were valid (p. 2).

To examine the hypothesis, five research questions were proposed. The new data came from two sources: material from Solheim's excavations in the Philippines in 1951 and 1953 and the collection from the 1922–1925 University of Michigan expedition to the central and southern Philippines in 1922–1925. The collection is in the Museum of Anthropology at the University of Michigan, where Solheim studied it. There are 485 sites in the total collection, 120 caves, 134 burial groupings, and 231 graves. The Chinese and Asiatic porcelains were studied by someone else. Solheim studied the pottery and other artifacts. The pottery from the sites had decoration styles from the Kalanay, Bau, Novaliches, and Loboc pottery, so the sites were divided into and described by these categories. Each site is presented separately. A site is briefly described, then the pottery from the site is described by the same vessel form and decoration categories as were used in chapters 2 and 3. Information on pottery from many of the sites is also given in tables. The pottery is also illustrated by profiles, drawings, and photographs. After the information on the pottery is given, there is a description of the other artifacts found at the site. These include artifacts of iron, glass, bone, shell, stone, bronze, and wood. After the sites from each pottery complex are discussed, there is a summary of the complex including time relationships, space relationships, cultural reconstruction, technology, social information, and indications of external contacts. There is also a description and discussion of the shell bracelets in the Guthe collection.

Chapter 4, "The New Data (up to 1983)," does not present new data, but reviews new archaeological data and inter-
pretations that have been published since 1959 when the first edition was completed. The new data are discussed by geographic area, beginning with the Philippines. Solheim describes sites and pottery related to the Kalanay, Bau, and Novaliches complexes. He then discusses excavations, pottery, and some other artifacts from Taiwan, Micronesia, Eastern Indonesia, Eastern Malaysia and Brunei, Western Indonesia, West Malaysia, Thailand, Cambodia, Vietnam, South China, and Hong Kong.

Chapter 6 is titled "Relationships through Space and Time." Solheim begins by making some changes in terminology made necessary by the new data. The original pottery complexes and associated artifacts were thought to define archaeological cultures. But it has become obvious to him that from the very wide distribution of this pottery in Southeast Asia and the great duration in time, what was at first considered the Kalanay pottery complex could not be the pottery of one widely spread culture (p. 173).

He defines a pottery tradition as made up of two or more pottery complexes sharing related types and varieties and continuing over a long time. What he classified as the Kalanay pottery complex in the first edition is two or more pottery complexes, so he changes the name to Sa-Huynh-Kalanay pottery tradition when referring to the Kalanay-related pottery in the Philippines and/or Southeast Asia. Similarly he changes the Bau pottery complex to the Bau-Malay pottery tradition. He uses the concept of a pottery tradition to facilitate comparison over the whole of Southeast Asia and beyond, and to help work out area-wide contacts and relationships.

The next section is on internal relationships (within the Philippines). A new distribution map is given of the pottery traditions and complexes. He then discusses the dating of the pottery, which can now be more precise than in the first edition because of the introduction of 14C dating and other new information.

This is followed by a section on external relationships (with the rest of Southeast Asia). Solheim mentions the interpretations of Southeast Asian prehistory by Bellwood, Shutler and Marck, Blust, and Reed. They support the idea that south China was the homeland of Philippine languages, pottery, and other cultural traits, moving first to Taiwan and from there south into the Philippines. Solheim disagrees with this interpretation.

He compares the Sa-Huynh-Kalanay pottery tradition with similar decorations and forms in other parts of Southeast Asia, and discusses relationships between various areas. He gives his ideas on the development of this pottery tradition and other cultural elements and how this is related to his concept of the Nusantao Austronesian speaking boat/trading people of coastal mainland and island Southeast Asia. He then discusses the Bau-Malay pottery and its relationships in Southeast Asia, and the Novaliches pottery and its relationships.

Chapter 7 is titled "The Philippine Iron Age." The first part of the chapter presents a summary of each of the pottery traditions, the Sa-Huynh-Kalanay, Bau-Malay, Novaliches, and Loboc. A concise description of the distinctive features of each pottery tradition is given, along with other artifacts associated with each, the locations where sites have been found, its time period, and its changes through time. The second part of the chapter is an evaluation of Beyer's hypothesis of the origins of Philippine Iron Age culture. Testing this hypothesis was the purpose of the original study.

Chapter 8, "Cultural Reconstruction," discusses some aspects of Philippine prehistory. In previous publications he proposed four major periods. Here he discusses the periods from the Incipient Filipino at 3000 B.C.E. to the middle Emergent Filipino at 1000 C.E. As part of this discussion he gives a summary of the development and spread of the Nusantao boat/trading people and their pottery.

The last chapter of the book is titled "1999 Postscript to the Archaeology of Central Philippines." Here he discusses some new data since 1983. This includes a discussion of double spouted pottery, some further descriptive and temporal information on the Sa-Huynh-Kalanay and Bau-
Malay pottery traditions, some animal head and human head effigies on pottery, some information on Philippine languages, and a discussion of the meaning of the Sa-Huynh-Kalanay pottery tradition.

This is an important book for several reasons. The original data on pottery presented in chapters 2, 3, and 4 are still much used and are quite useful as descriptions of major Philippine pottery traditions, and for cultural comparisons within the Philippines and other areas of Southeast Asia. It is good to have it reprinted to have it available to a wider audience. The data in chapter 5 bring together information on a large body of recent excavations in Southeast Asia that will be of value to anyone doing research on Southeast Asian archaeology.

The discussion in chapter 6 brings together and summarizes his ideas on the development of pottery and other aspects of culture in the Philippines, and his ideas of the Nusantao. These ideas remain an important alternative hypothesis to those presented by other archaeologists. His ideas of the Nusantao and the supporting information deserve careful consideration.

This book is quite valuable for anyone doing research on Southeast Asian archeology. One negative aspect of the book is that it is not properly referenced. In the first edition there are 62 references, all of which are cited in the text. In the revised edition they are all still cited, but 23 of them are not in the list of references. Of the 176 new citations in the revised edition, nine are not in the references. This is very unfortunate. Not only is the book incomplete, but the references in the first edition provide a set of references to the older archaeological literature on the Philippines and some other parts of Southeast Asia. Not having these in the revised edition will make accessing this literature for research purposes more difficult.


Reviewed by SAWANG LERTRIT, Silpakorn University, Bangkok

Popular archaeological books that synthesize archaeological information from mainland Southeast Asia into a readable volume are surprisingly rare, whether in native languages or in English, given that research in archaeology in the area has long been conducted. Early Cultures of Mainland Southeast Asia represents such a volume, and the author of the book, Charles Higham, deserves high praise. This book is similar in several ways (e.g., chronological span of the text, archaeological conception framework, organization of the book, and same publisher) to one of Higham’s previous books, Prehistoric Thailand: From Early Settlement to Sukhothai (1998), which he coauthored with Ratchanie Thosarat. Significant differences between the two books are that the new volume has larger geographical coverage and more new data from recent research, especially from Thailand.

The book is composed of eight chapters. Each chapter is abundantly illustrated with excellent color and black-and-white photographs, line drawings, maps, and plans. The 558 color images are particularly magnificent—the majority of them are not easily accessible in other books and media of similar subject. The book is structured in the manner of culture history and evolution of society, starting from hunting-gathering society to early civilization. Chapter 1 briefly introduces natural characteristics, history of archaeological study, and culture history of mainland Southeast Asia. Higham goes on to begin his cul-
tural framework (chapter 2) by summarizing archaeological evidence dating between 40,000 B.P. and 3,000 B.C.E., which he assigns to the time of “hunters and gatherers.” Higham uses data derived principally from Vietnam and Thailand, with much emphasis on a coastal site of Khok Phanom Di in eastern Thailand where the author carried out excavations. I was surprised that Higham does not include Lang Kamnan, a stratified (late Pleistocene-middle Holocene), well-defined site located in Kanchanaburi, western Thailand, in this chapter (see Shoocongdej 2000).

Chapter 3 revolves around Neolithic rice cultivation tradition. The emergence of agriculture, especially rice cultivation, becomes the central theme of the chapter. Higham argues that rice was introduced to mainland Southeast Asia from China (replacement), rather than local development (continuity). However, it is unclear how the “intrusion” of rice agriculture occurred and proceeded and how the indigenous people (hunters-gatherers) interacted with newcomers (agriculturalists). The major sources of his data came from sites in Thailand (northeast and central), although he refers to sites in Vietnam and Cambodia. In northern Thailand, the 3000-year-old rockshelter site of Pratoo Pha was excavated. It is probably thus far the best-preserved site in Southeast Asia—from fiber, hair, basketry, whole wooden artifacts, and complete rice grains were preserved. Notable artifacts include polished stone adzes, incised pottery vessels, wooden red painted lades, a textile head band, and stone bracelet fragments, all of which were found in association with human graves (see more details and figures in Saengchan 2002). Recently, the Thai Fine Arts Department archaeologists had excavated a site named Nong Ratchawat in Suphanburi. The site relatively dates to Neolithic period on the basis of pottery tradition similar to those from Ban Kao, including tripod pottery (Supamas Duangsakul, pers. comm.). It is hoped that when more Neolithic sites are identified, we will have a better picture of Neolithic settlement and people in the region.

Higham moves on to the Bronze Age (chapter 4). In this chapter, we see the increasing number of surveyed and excavated sites, and again the majority of the sites mentioned in the text are from Thailand. Higham provides succinct description and synthesis of archaeological data with reference to changes in some cultural traditions (e.g., pottery tradition, burial rite, and settlement system). It is a pity that the sections that deal with the Bronze Age sites in Cambodia, Vietnam, and Burma are not richly illustrated when compared to the text on the Bronze Age in Thailand. Note that even though several of the Bronze Age sites mentioned were previously occupied by Neolithic people, the transition from Neolithic to Bronze Age is still poorly understood. It should be noted that single component Bronze Age sites in Southeast Asia are relatively rare, and we should explore other areas more extensively, such as the eastern part of Thailand (further southeast of Khok Phanom Di and Nong Nor), where archaeology is little known, while there are sites yielding high potential for research on the Neolithic to Bronze Age transition (see, e.g., Direksilp 1999).

In chapter 5, Higham takes us to the Iron Age, in which chiefdoms were developed and a clearer picture of hierarchical societies is discerned. This chapter presents both continuity and changes in cultural patterns from the preceding Bronze Age. Readers are provided with data-rich text and superb color images. As I was reading this chapter, my eyes kept looking forward to color images to come every next page. Higham may not be well familiar with geography and/or topography of central Thailand when he says on page 221 that “The presence of moated settlements in the Chao Phraya lowlands.... Excavations at Sab Champa and Chansen have provided evidence....” It should be noted that Sab Champa is situated on a highland (ca. 180 above msl), not a lowland, in the Eastern Highland area of central Thailand and is approximately 15 km east of the Pa Sak River, not Chao Phraya (see Lertrit 2003; Lertrit et al. 2001).

Chapters 6 and 7 examine the formation of states in mainland Southeast Asia—chapter 6 deals basically with early states,
while chapter 7 looks critically at the classic or more highly complex state of Angkor in Cambodia. According to Higham, states in Southeast Asia were not caused by a single prime factor, and statehood is not a "discovery" but an "evolution" from chiefdoms. Four major states (Funan, Chenla, Dvaravati, and Champa) are discussed. As an archaeologist, Higham uses archaeological evidence to support his arguments and interpretations in accordance with other lines of evidence such as ethnographic, epigraphic, iconographic, and numismatic evidence. The last and shortest chapter (chapter 8) reiterates major points discussed in chapters 2-7.

Overall, I found that Higham brings us a lot of food for thought and provides us with a large body of raw data. I also found that some of his interpretations/arguments are largely speculative, but some are well established. I am aware that it is not easy to incorporate such temporally, spatially, and culturally diverse data into a clear and concise story, especially when you have to do it for public community. The book is a little off-balance in terms of volume of data—data from sites in Thailand, especially from the northeast where Higham has been working for decades, are relatively abundantly presented over those from other areas (countries) in mainland Southeast Asia. It seems that Higham must have been able to read Thai, but he also lacks attention to some key Thai-language literature (e.g., Direksilp 1999; Fine Arts Department 1988; Kaewpluek 1972; Pisinupong n.d.; Saraya 1994). Like Higham, I am certain that a lot more archaeological evidence is being, and will be, discovered, and in prospect it will enhance our better understanding of the ancient cultures of Southeast Asia. And by then I look forward to another volume by Higham.

**Early Cultures of Mainland Southeast Asia** is an easy-to-read book. It is fairly succinct and visually impressive. Jargon is almost totally absent from the book. Furthermore, I would say that color plates alone are sufficiently worth obtaining this book. Higham should be proud for making the volume more readable for general readers while it also stands as a standard scholarly book for archaeology students and professors. Non-archaeology students and teachers also will find the volume valuable—I was informed that an oriental-language professor had checked out the book from my university library and that the waiting list is long. I have recommended it for my undergraduate and graduate students; though it seems very likely that my students probably cannot afford the book.

**REFERENCES**

**Direksilp, Kammanit**  
1999  Prehistoric Settlement Pattern in Pong Nam Ron District, Chanthaburi Province. M.A. thesis, Department of Archaeology, Silpakorn University, Bangkok. (In Thai, with English abstract.)

**Fine Arts Department**  
1988  *Archaeology of Four Regions*. Bangkok: Fine Arts Department. (In Thai.)

**Kaewpluek, Arthit**  
1972  Prehistoric Pottery from Sab Champa. B.A. thesis, Department of Archaeology, Silpakorn University, Bangkok. (In Thai.)

**Lertrit, Sawang**  

**Lertrit, Sawang, Preeyanuch JUMPROM, and Anan KLINPOKLAB**  

**Pisinupong, Peerapon**  

**Saengchan, Vivian**  

**Saraya, Dhida**  

**Shoocongdej, Rasmi**  
The excavation of Ban Wang Hai, Northern Thailand, began in 1996, as part of a Thai-French collaboration titled “The Thai-French Prehistoric Research Project” that had been initiated in 1985 to study the Paleolithic period through to the Iron Age in the upper northern regions of Thailand. The excavation of Ban Wang Hai in Lamphun Province described in this monograph represents the Iron Age period. This monograph, previously published in French, provides details of the excavation as well as the analysis of the artifacts and the human remains that followed. Contributions from other specialists, such as metallurgists and jewelry analysts, are inserted as appropriate. There are many good-quality color photographs and drawings that significantly enhance the text, although figures are not always in numerical order. A significant addition, which accounts for half of the monograph, is the translation to Thai. Not only is this appropriate, considering that the work defines Thai prehistory, it also makes this work more accessible to Thai archaeologists.

Details of the history of excavation at the site of Ban Wang Hai and descriptions of the Thai-French team excavations are provided after a brief introduction. Archaeological details of stratigraphy are described along with a brief mention of the palynological analysis undertaken and an even briefer comment on the only archaeometrical date from the site—that of a burnt bone sample with calibrated dates of 429–657 C.E.

The human skeletal remains are discussed in some detail regarding the way in which they were buried and the taphonomic processes that have occurred since, so-called “field anthropology.” This, along with other evidence, has led the authors to suggest that some people were interred in coffins. A valuable addition to the discussion of the people would be that of demographics, pathology, and morphology. Only brief comments are provided but acknowledgment is made that this analysis was severely limited by a requirement by the Thai Fine Arts Department that the human remains not be removed from the ground. This is unfortunate as biological anthropology studies can make a significant contribution to the description of prehistoric life as has been shown for such sites as Ban Chiang (M. Pietrusewsky and M. T. Douglas, Ban Chiang, a Prehistoric Village Site in Northeast Thailand. I: The Human Skeletal Remains [Philadelphia: Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, University of Pennsylvania, 2002]) and Khok Phanom Di (N. Tayles, The Excavation of Khok Phanom Di, a Prehistoric Site in Central Thailand. Vol. 5: The People, Research Report 61 [London: Society of Antiquaries of London, 1999]). Some descriptions are presented for dental health and some notes of a few skeletal pathologies are provided, but this type of information limits its comparability with other skeletal collections.

Considerable detail is provided regarding the funerary deposits, all of which were able to be fully excavated. Burial jars from this site are discussed with good photographs provided. The contents of the large burial jars has not been confirmed but burnt bone is a possibility. Burial jars from other sites typically contain human skeletal material either from primary or secondary burial. While burial jars are not uncommon in Southeast Asia, the authors suggest the Ban Wang Hai jars do not have any exact parallels. They also suggest that “In Thai cemeteries, the use of burial jars does not seem to have appeared before the second
quarter of the first millennium" (p. 33), however, previously they discussed the infant burial jars from the “ancient period” of Ban Chiang and fail to mention the extensive use of infant jar burials at the Bronze Age site of Ban Lum Khao (C. F. W. Higham, *Early Cultures of Mainland Southeast Asia* [Bangkok: River Books, 2002]).

Grave furniture is first described in an interesting overview chapter of the funerary deposits and their significance and then descriptions are detailed in a later chapter. Suggestions are made regarding the status of individuals and the presence and type of jewelry with the human remains. Necklaces of glass, stone, and shell beads are predominantly found in infant and child burials; bronze with adults. Much detail is provided in particular for the analysis of the stone beads, predominantly carnelian and agate, including measurements, analysis of composition, and suggestions of possible origin and site of manufacture. It is suggested that the beads were manufactured within Southeast Asia, rather than India.

Iron artifacts were an important inclusion in many graves. Iron knives and agricultural tools are described, and some attempts to infer their function based on their similarity to modern artifacts are a useful addition. Three of the most distinct burials are detailed, including one adult with a disabling ankylosis of the spine, which the authors rightly suggest questions the significance of the addition of agricultural tools with the body. Another young adult male was buried with an iron sword, purported to be a unique feature, not seen in other protohistorical Thai burials.

The ceramic vessel morphology and decoration are described and many drawings provided. A brief comparison with other Thai ceramic forms is provided but limited by the small sample. Photographs of modern pottery manufacturing in a nearby village suggest a similarity in method and style to the prehistoric pottery of Ban Wang Hai.

Some brief final comments are made before a very detailed catalogue for each burial is provided, including descriptions of the human bones and associated grave goods, photographs, and drawings. This book is predominantly descriptive in nature, providing more of a technical report of the details of this Iron Age cemetery with limited room for discussion and interpretation. The addition of ethnographic evidence (for example, pottery manufacturing and the use of iron tools and spindle whorls) assist in bringing these prehistoric artifacts to life. Overall, this book provides a valuable addition to the study of Thai prehistory and it is commendable that it has been published in multiple languages, making it more widely accessible.


*Reviewed by JANICE STARGARDT, Sidney Sussex College, University of Cambridge*

This large book is descriptive in approach and the subject is organized on a typological rather than geographical basis. Its five core chapters cover ghats, tanks, kundas, wells, and water in palaces and gardens. There are also two introductory chapters and a conclusion. The book does not claim an exhaustive coverage of these types but attempts to present interesting examples of each. The author starts her survey from the premise that all architecture makes statements, and goes on to argue that the water architecture she presents functioned or functions to separate domains: to sepa-
rate "the sacred and profane, the public and the private, ... men and women and ... castes of various degrees of purity or pollution" (p. 8). The study progresses logically and clearly along the lines indicated. Each core chapter begins with a good map showing the locations of the type of water architecture discussed and also contains good line drawings of significant details observed in specific examples. The book is thus very much in the Handbuch tradition of Brill, but in the large format of Studies in South Asian Art and Archaeology, edited by Jan Fontein (itself the continuation of Studies in South Asian Culture, founding editor Johanna van Lohuizen [1969–1984; edited 1984–1993 by myself]). It is perhaps pertinent to state what this book is not: the author recognizes that the endowment of water works was a vitally important area of royal patronage but excludes that dimension from her study on grounds of space. Disappointingly, the only work she cites on the socioeconomic aspects of water in India is Karl Wittvogel's much criticized Oriental Despotism: A Comparative Study of Total Power (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1973).

Nonetheless the book is the result of impressive travel and indefatigable photography, measurement, and drawing. It is handsomely produced on good quality paper with Brill's handsome typefaces, but alas with a sprinkling of typos, including one on the first page of the table of contents. All plates are on art paper, sixteen of which are in color. The book was printed in the Netherlands with a subsidy from the British Academy.


Reviewed by Dawn F. Rooney

This excellent book, written from an anthropological and archaeological perspective, brings a new balance to the increasing number of publications on Angkor. Although it is aimed at the general public, the substantial content, the time span covered, and results of the latest research make this book a useful source for specialists as well. Ample illustrations with descriptive captions support the concisely written text, which is set out in eight balanced chapters that develop chronologically. Numerous publications have focused on the Khmer civilization at its apogee in the Angkor period but say little about before and after that time. This book, however, covers the period from the beginning of recorded history to the French colonial domination in the twentieth century.

The author, Michael Coe, professor emeritus of anthropology at Yale University and member of the National Academy of Sciences, is a respected scholar and author of numerous publications, and is renowned for his work on the people and art of the pre-Colombian New World. His books on the Maya civilization in Mesoamerica are highly acclaimed. He approaches his study of the Khmer civilization with the same quality and depth of scholarship that characterize his previous works.

Interpretations of the pioneering French surveys of Angkor began soon after the signing of a French protectorate over Cambodia in 1863. The clearing and preservation of Angkor was carried out for nearly three-quarters of the twentieth century under the auspices of the École Française d'Extrême Orient (EFEO), a scholarly body set up by the French colonial government in 1898 to
study the history, language, and archaeology of Indo-China. During that time, a chronology based on an art historical study of decorative elements on the temples was established and hundreds of inscriptions carved in stone were translated. By the middle of the twentieth century, the French were employing modern archaeological methods at Angkor. Then, Cambodia closed in the early 1970s for nearly two decades because of civil unrest. Between 1979 and 1989 limited work on the temples took place. It was only with a peace settlement in 1991 and the addition of Angkor to UNESCO’s World Heritage Site list in late 1992 that conservation of the monuments at Angkor began again in earnest. Since then, numerous international organizations have worked with Cambodia on restoring and conserving the archaeological sites and conducting research in multiple disciplines. This book presents the latest results of the recent international fieldwork, which includes the production of large-scale images of the entire Angkor region using airborne synthetic radar.

Borders of the present-day countries on the mainland have fluctuated throughout history and at its height of territorial and political power the Khmer empire encompassed an area that included northeastern Thailand and southern Vietnam and parts of Malaysia and Myanmar (formerly Burma). Thus, Coe rightly examines the Khmer civilization and Angkor in the broader context of the region as a whole and points out both the cultural diversity and the similarities in the evolutionary development of the inhabitants, geography, religion, and language that unite mainland Southeast Asia as a cohesive region. Topographical features of mainland Southeast Asia are described with details of the alluvial Angkorian plain and the surrounding mountain chains. An explanation of rice farming in Cambodia provides useful information for a clearer understanding of the controversial topic of Khmer water management. Coe’s next chapter includes a lucid explanation of the evolution of language, which pinpoints the complexity of the region. He deduces that a Khmer is “a person of Southeast Asian descent who speaks the Khmer language and practices the Theravada Buddhist religion (or at least has done so since this form of Buddhism was introduced as a state cult to Cambodia in the fifteenth century)” (p. 40).

Familiarity with the author’s terminology (described in the introduction) for historical periods discussed in chapters 4–8 is helpful as it differs from the terms that are more commonly applied to Khmer studies. Little is known about the period of “Hunters and gatherers (? to c. 3600–3000 BC),” which marked the beginning of habitation on the mainland. This period corresponds to the Paleolithic and Mesolithic ages of the western part of the Old World. The “Early Farming period (3600–3000 BC to c. 500 BC)” is identified by settled village farming life and rice agriculture on the mainland. Iron tools and weapons were introduced during the “Iron Age (c. 500 BC to c. AD 200–500),” and it was the era of “red soil” circular village sites. The “Early Kingdoms period (c. AD 100–200 to AD 802),” generally referred to as “pre-Angkor,” examines the early states in the region, known as “Funan” and “Zhenla” in Chinese records. This was the period of the Indianization of Southeast Asia, when cultural and trade exchanges took place between the two regions. Coe gives a succinct explanation of the generally accepted perception of how it evolved. Angkor Borei in the Mekong Delta region of present-day Cambodia is the oldest center of the Early Kingdoms period yet discovered. Based on radiocarbon dates and ceramic chronology, Angkor Borei was occupied from at least 400 B.C.E. through the Early Kingdoms period. A joint archaeological project between the University of Hawai‘i (led by Miriam Stark) and the Royal University of Fine Arts in Phnom Penh (co-director, Chuch Phoeurn) is working to establish the history of Angkor Borei and to determine patterns of land use. Sambor Prei Kuk in Kompong Thom Province, east of the Great Lake, is a subsequent center of the Early Kingdoms period and was built in the seventh century by Ishanavarman I as his capital. This extensive
complex was dedicated it to the Hindu god Shiva.

A cache of cast bronze images was discovered in a burial chamber reportedly located between Phnom Rung and Surin on the Khorat Plateau in northeastern Thailand in 1964. The so-called Prakhon Chai bronzes entered the international art market immediately after their discovery, so the exact number is unknown, but several pieces are in public collections today and serve as references. The images are exceptionally beautiful and mainly depict Mahayana Buddhist bodhisattvas, either Maitreya, the Buddha of the future, or Avalokiteshvara, the “savior of the present age,” in a standing or seated posture. They testify to the developed state of bronze making in the area at an early date (circa seventh to ninth century) and suggest that they were made under the direction of a powerful ruler. Although this cache has been known as the Prakhon Chai bronzes since its discovery, recent evidence (which may not have been available when Coe's text was completed) suggests that the designation for this group is incorrect and that they were actually found at the temple of Prasat Hin Khal Plai Bat II, in Lanhan Sai, Buriram Province, northeastern Thailand (Emma C. Bunker, The Prakhon Chai story: Facts and fiction, Arts of Asia [March–April 2002]: 106–125).

The Classic or Angkorian period (802–1327 C.E.) comprises “the ancient Khmer culture at the time of its apogee.” The author traces the history and cultural development of the period through rulers and their capitals beginning with the founding of the Khmer empire. The following chapter on the life and culture of the Classic period is one of the most interesting in the book and it is a credible accomplishment given the paucity of available sources. Drawing on clues provided by the Thai capital of Ayutthaya (1351–1767 C.E.) and a late thirteenth-century firsthand account by a Chinese emissary, Coe considers what Angkor was like as a city. He provides insight into the daily life and structure of Khmer society and covers topics such as administration, law and order, economics, communications and transportation, architecture, arts and crafts, performing arts, rituals, and warfare.

Water management for the inhabitants of mainland Southeast Asia has been crucial throughout history, and how the Khmers controlled the water has long been a perplexing issue for scholars. The annual cycle of the monsoons, which alternates between a wet and a dry season, requires controlling the heavy influx of water during the rains and storing sufficient water for irrigation during the long dry season. Initially, French archaeologist B.-P. Groslier perceived greater Angkor as a “hydraulic city” that could have supported nearly two million inhabitants and concluded that the four barays (a large manmade body of water surrounded by banks of earth) constructed at Angkor during the Classic period were used to provide irrigation water for the rice fields in the city and surrounding area. This theory was challenged in the 1990s. Critics pointed out that the late thirteenth-century account does not mention the barays in regard to rice cultivation, and none of the inscriptions say anything about the economic function of the barays. They also question the effectiveness of the barays given their locations and whether they would have been sufficient to feed the inhabitants of Angkor. And geographer Robert Acker, who recalculated Groslier’s figures, concluded that the system “could have fed only 7.8 per cent of Angkor’s inhabitants.” The most recent archaeological evidence regarding water management at Angkor evolved from a revolutionary study conducted by two respected scholars using radar images and field excavations. A survey of the inlets and outlets in the eastern dikes of the east and west barays conducted by Christophe Pottier of the EFEO and coring carried out by Roland Fletcher of the University of Sydney identified a “high energy water flow” for the West Baray. Further exploration by this team revealed a complex grid of channels in the northern half of Angkor and a significant channel south of the West Baray. The combined evidence is conclusive that the barays were used in agricultural irrigation.
The post-Classic period (post-Angkor; 1327–1863 C.E.) is little known with hardly any published research. Coe addresses the gap in this book. He covers the various opinions on the reasons for the downfall of Angkor, which challenge the traditional theory of the fall of the capital to the Thais in a decisive battle of 1431. It has generally been believed that Angkor faded into obscurity after the move of the capital southward in the fifteenth century and that the introduction of Theravada Buddhism, which was a dramatic shift from Hinduism, contributed to the lost memories of Angkor. Coe, though, presents evidence for continuous occupation of parts of the Angkor area even though the religious and political character changed.

Coe’s interest in the Angkorian civilization may seem like a broad jump in time and space given his long study of peoples in South America. But as he explains in the preface, his study of Khmer culture began over fifty years ago when he was a graduate student at Harvard. While working on the Maya, he decided to study Angkor as a comparative example of a monsoon forest civilization. Although the dates of the two cultures preclude the possibility of any exchange, a comparative study can “help specialists in one region to develop insights and devise new research strategies from looking at what has happened and is happening on the other side of the Pacific Basin” (p. 12).

Coe has published six other books with Thames & Hudson, and, once again, the author, publisher, architectural editor (Colin Ridler), and editorial staff have worked together to produce a book that is outstanding in all aspects.


Reviewed by ELEANOR MANNIKKA, Department of Art, Indiana University of Pennsylvania

Jacques Dumarçay’s latest book on architecture should be more accurately titled “An Architect’s Collection of Insights into Khmer and Javanese Temple Construction.” Within an average of forty-two pages of text the author discusses a variety of points involving no less than forty-five Khmer monuments and nearly forty Javanese structures. This dizzying tour de force barely touches the surface of the architectural knowledge of the author, but it leaves an uninformed reader at the starting gate. Without an intimate and thorough experience of Khmer and Javanese temples, the reader will soon be lost in a tangle of affirmations and technical descriptions. It is also hard to understand why a book on Southeast Asian architecture would include structures in England, Goa, Japan, India, and France.

Dumarçay is someone I have long admired for his vast and profound knowledge of Khmer and Javanese temples. This book, however, does not do justice to how he arrived at many of the statements or theories he proposes. If he had supplied a more thorough background the book would be easier to understand. He could have excluded the second chapter on the reservoirs at Angkor in favor of expanding other sections on the meaning or use of models in architecture, the purported
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theme of the small book. In some instances, as in chapter 3, “Successive Models of the Same Monument,” he would have fared better by staying with only one monument. Instead, he covers a multiplicity of temples ranging from the Borobudur to the Bakheng in a hopscotch fashion that inevitably leaves several gaps from large to small. For example, he tells us that the Borobudur was constructed in three stages: the first stage comprised two terraces in a pyramidal form; in the second, the width of the stairways was unified and a base was added to the walls of the first level. Although the text cites only these two differences, related to Dumarçay’s theory that Hinduism emphasized perspective and Buddhism did not, the most impressive difference (that of the plan of the upper elevation) is never mentioned. It is illustrated in Figure 38 but not discussed. As for the final stage, it is not described or illustrated, yet readers may not have a clear memory of the upper elevation. We are referred to a 1956 work by Stutterheim to fill in the blanks.

That leads to another problem. It has been nearly a half-century since Stutterheim’s work. Surely references to the meaning of the monument should include such basic works as Barabudur: History and Significance of a Buddhist Monument, edited by Luis Gomez and Hiram Woodward (Berkeley, CA: Berkeley Buddhist Studies Series, 1981). Dumarçay only includes four or five works in English in his footnotes (there is no bibliography); the vast majority of cited works are in French.

Without keeping abreast of the most recent scholarship it can be dangerous to postulate theories and not prove them. When he states, “the instruments [the Khmers] used to determine the positioning of structures were very simple” (p. 101), he bases the statement on tools and instruments illustrated in bas-reliefs at the Bayon, hardly the ultimate and definitive source on Khmer instruments. But more importantly, he implies that simple instruments meant errors in construction and uses some anomalies at Ta Keo to illustrate his point. It is quite possible that the instruments themselves were simple; I do not know. But the results were spectacular. Look what Michelangelo achieved with a chisel.

Since the extraordinary precision found in the measurements of Angkor Wat could be understood to contradict his statement, Dumarçay—in this and many similar instances—needs to take a broader range of facts into account. The precise measurements at Angkor Wat have been published since 1968 in a volume well known to Dumarçay. As I stated in my book on Angkor Wat, when precision was not needed for religious or sacred reasons, such as the length of two opposite walls or the rough right angle of a corner, the Khmers were not all that precise because it did not matter. When it came to the axes and circumferences of Angkor Wat, however, the story changes completely. So when Dumarçay states that only simple tools were used in construction he has to explain how these simple tools could create the degree of accuracy recorded in the measurements and solar and lunar alignments at Angkor Wat.

The author’s theory of models used by master architects in Java and Cambodia is not much different than what we accept today in the methodology of master painters and sculptors. As new tools and techniques become available in any of these media, new art or architectural forms can then be created. As always, architecture, like any art, is a continually developing and evolving process.

In the first eighteen pages of the book, the evolution of architectural style is under consideration. Of course this evolution is decidedly more complex than that of sculptural or painting styles. The vast three-dimensional scale, economics, politics, and thousands of people involved in the creation of a major monument such as Preah Khan or Candi Sewu go far beyond the imagination of one artist. On another note, if the author had chosen a single, linear series of monuments at one site to illustrate his explanations of architectural evolution, the text would be easier to follow.

“Illustrate” can be used literally in this case as well. In some instances I found the illustrations to be very helpful. When the
technique of grinding of stone against stone was described in the text, two drawings of how people are similarly “ground” in one of the hells depicted at Angkor Wat graphically brings the text to life. This was one of the high points of the book, and there are others that often happen in the same way: the illustrations coincide so well with the text that an image or an idea is clearly brought forward.

Many times, however, the illustrations could have been excluded. That is a failing that is easy to repair. Do we really need the drawing of the double stairway at the Chateau of Chambord in France in a book on Khmer and Javanese architecture? In other instances, the drawings need to be more specifically connected to the text, or vice versa. In the discussion of changing doorways at Sambor Prei Kuk, we are shown the ground plan of towers S7 and N7 in Figures 14 and 15. This leads to logical questions that are not taken into account in the too-brief text: How does the doorway configuration relate to the height and width of each tower? Does the size of the central lingam and yoni, quite different in each instance, have anything to do with the space of the sanctuary? In the smaller tower, the circumambulation space is enormous, and in the larger tower it was quite small. Was there a significant chronological gap between the constructions of both towers, explaining the difference in the diameter of the vaulting over the sanctuary? Are these the kinds of architectural differences that explain the change in the doorways or not? None of these questions is considered or addressed, yet Dumarcay could easily hold forth on all of them. Since he decided to restrict his discussion to doorways alone, it might have served him better to illustrate only the doorways and how they changed.

There are several instances in the book of nearly “throw-away” lines that are astounding statements requiring a defense that is not there. For example, if Dumarcay is certain that Javanese temple formats determined Khmer stylistic or construction elements at any particular point in history, then he has to show us how and why—especially why—these elements could not have evolved from a Khmer context. Whether he is right or wrong does not matter as much in the end. What does matter is that he did not acknowledge opposing points of view or why he feels these views are flawed or open to debate.

This brings up the problem of varying “levels” in the text of the book. As previously noted, it is assumed the reader will know the architectural appearance of nearly ninety Javanese and Khmer monuments. On page 38: “The temple of Singosari, which has a cruciform plan, probably refers to the same model as Candi Sembrodo on the Dieng Plateau, and though the volumes and decoration are indeed different, the proportions of the plan are identical, not only for the main structure but also for its foundation base.” The quote is by way of showing how the references to a base model vary little with time. There is no illustration of either Candi Sembrodo or Candi Singosari to accompany the text, nor is there a discussion of the decoration and volume and exact ground plan of each temple. How do they work together?

In contrast, when discussing the continuity of the “monster” head as a form over the doorway of a Javanese temple, there are accompanying illustrations to show us this kala head, or kirtimukha. If the reader has the knowledge to accurately visualize Candi Sembrodo and Candi Singosari in all their complexities, with no illustrations, then why bother to illustrate the ubiquitous, all-too-common “monster” head?

In summary, this book is best for someone who has taught Khmer and Javanese architecture long enough to understand all the allusions and comparisons that fill the text. When Dumarcay states that a faulty East Baray was one of the main causes of a shift of the Angkorian capital to Koh Ker (p. 49) or when he disagrees with Coedes and maintains that Zhou Daguan’s reference to a “bronze sleeping Buddha” does actually mean the East Baray, the fully educated reader will know there is much more to the picture. The relatively uninitiated reader will be lost long before then.

Reviewed by Patrick V. Kirch, University of California, Berkeley

The building blocks of regional prehistory are the detailed, data-rich monographs that provide a permanent record of excavated sites and their stratigraphy, along with the pottery, portable artifacts, faunal remains, and other materials recovered from them. There is much talk, at present, that the archaeological monograph will shortly be superseded by digital or web-based “publications” and databases; this remains to be seen. For the time being, archaeologists such as Christophe Sand should be congratulated for continuing to bring out the rich details of their research in timely monographs such as Tiouandé.

The toponym “Tiouandé” applies to a river valley on the northwest coast of New Caledonia (Grande Terre), as well as to an indigenous Kanak tribe who have traditional rights to this region. In 1999, the Tiouandé tribe granted permission to Sand and his team, including Kanak archaeologists J. Bole and A. Ouetcho, to carry out a program of site inventory and test excavations in their traditional territory. In 1952, the pioneering team of E. W. Gifford and R. Shutler Jr. had excavated at a large coastal midden site in Tiouandé (their Site 50), and at another midden (Site 6) at Baye (Poindimé), slightly southeast of Tiouandé, obtaining evidence for nearly two millennia of occupation. The attraction for renewed archaeological research in the Tiouandé region was the discovery of several rockshelters in karst terrain inland of a large mangrove estuary. This monograph describes sixteen new sites recorded in 1999, as well as the results of four “sondages” or test excavations. Together with a reanalysis of the Gifford and Shutler results, they provide the basis for a regional chronology and cultural sequence for the northwestern part of La Grande Terre.

Chapter 1 describes the sites, which for the most part are concentrated on and around a limestone hill. The sites include rockshelters, such as the large EHI013 shelter, which has hand-outline designs in red ocher on the walls and well-stratified occupation deposits. There are also house mounds and platforms, human burials, agricultural features (yam mounds), and a post-contact-period cemetery. The excavations are detailed in Chapter 2, which begins with a reanalysis of the stratigraphy of sites EHI050 and EHI051 excavated by Gifford and Shutler. The 1999 excavations focused primarily on the large EHI013 rockshelter, with three 1-m² test pits; a fourth pit was excavated in site EHI022, a smaller shelter associated with a circular house mound. The EHI013 shelter has deep, well-stratified deposits, with numerous charcoal and ash lenses, while the EHI022 shelter exposed several earth ovens.

No less than 25 radiocarbon age determinations were obtained by Sand and his colleagues, both from the new excavations and from samples excavated by Gifford and Shutler in 1952 (these samples were curated in the P. A. Hearst Museum of the University of California, Berkeley). These dates, reported in full in chapter 3, provide a strong basis for a regional chronology, which, as Sand notes, covers virtually the entire time span of human occupation of New Caledonia (p. 39). The initial occupation of Tiouandé dates to ca. 800–750 cal B.P., which is toward the end of the Lapita period, itself quite short-lived in New Caledonia, as Sand has demonstrated in other work.

The 1999 excavations yielded large quantities of pottery and lesser but not insignificant numbers of nonceramic artifacts, all of which are described and extensively
illustrated in chapter 4. The ceramic sequence begins with an early form of paddle-impressed ware characteristic of the late Lapita period, continues with “intermediate” period ceramics marked by vessels with inturned rims, and ends with classic Oundjo tradition ware. The nonceramic artifacts include a number of shell beads, rings, and a single one-piece fishhook (the latter a very rare artifact category in New Caledonian excavations), as well as lithic flakes.

Chapters 5 and 6 are devoted to the invertebrate and vertebrate faunal remains from the 1999 test excavations. The density of shellfish remains was remarkable, with between 21 and 36 kg/m³ in three units and an incredible 115 kg/m³ in one sonde of site EHI013. Bivalves dominate the assemblage, particularly four genera: Polymesoda, Dendostrea, Anadara, and Cafiorium. These results show the extraordinary richness of the inshore marine resources of La Grande Terre. The fishbone assemblages are also diverse, with some twenty-six families represented in a sample of 631 NISP for the main EHI013 rockshelter. Fragmentary human remains are treated in a separate chapter by F. Valentin.

In his concluding discussion, Sand situates the Tiouandé sites and local sequence within the larger framework of New Caledonian prehistory, our current understanding of which—it must be stressed—is largely owed to Sand’s own researches over the past two decades. Although the sample sizes from Tiouandé remain modest, sufficient new material has been obtained to reveal the outlines of a sequence that touches upon many of the main transformations within New Caledonian prehistory. Among these are the emergence, during the course of the first millennium C.E., of what Sand calls the “Kanak Cultural Complex” (l’Ensemble Culturel Kanak), a set of traits that can be traced from that time into the so-called “ethnographic present.” It was during this period that a system of exchange was established between the northeast coast of La Grande Terre and the Loyalty Islands, marked by the circulation of pottery, ceremonial axes, and shell ornaments.

In sum, this work is a valuable contribution to the archaeology and prehistory of one of Oceania’s largest and, until recently, least well-known islands. Its publication only two years after the completion of fieldwork sets a standard for prompt dissemination of results. A summary in English, for the benefit of the anglophone archaeologists who tend to dominate Pacific studies, would have enhanced the volume, but this is a minor quibble.


Reviewed by Ethan E. Cochrane, University College London

The fiftieth anniversary of the excavation of Site 13 on the Foué Peninsula, New Caledonia, the original Lapita site, was a momentous occasion. Site 13, excavated by Edwin Gifford and Richard Shutler Jr., produced a style of decorated pottery that has inspired a half-century of productive research on ancient Oceania. The papers brought together in this volume are momentous as well and indicate that after fifty years, research on Lapita and other aspects of Oceanic prehistory shows no signs of slowing.

Pacific Archaeology is a monumental vol-
ume containing thirty-three chapters presenting new data and interpretations, thoughtful syntheses of existing data, and important new insights from the luminaries of Oceanic archaeology as well as the next generation of scholars. With its well-referenced and well-introduced chapters, I expect *Pacific Archaeology* to hold a place on many readers’ shelves as a sourcebook for Oceanic archaeology, much like Jennings’ (1979) *Prehistory in Polynesia* and Davidson et al.’s (1996) festschrift for Roger Green, *Oceanic Culture History*.

The chapters in *Pacific Archaeology* are divided into four sections (with introductory chapters by Sand and Shutler): “Old Oceania,” “The Austronesian Spread,” “Oceanic Diversity,” and “The Pacific and Archaeology.” The abundance of chapters precludes a detailed review of each author’s contribution, so I will summarize the work in each section, pointing out new, interesting, and perhaps controversial findings.

Three chapters are included in the section on Old Oceania. A chapter by Chazine reports on the relatively unknown archaeology of Borneo, while chapters by O’Connor and Chappell and by Allen present some different (and divergent) ideas about the timing of original human presence in Greater Australia and Island Melanesia.

The second section, “The Austronesian Spread,” contains overview chapters on Oceanic colonization from the perspective of human genetics by Oppenheimer and sailing technology by Anderson, as well as a chapter on the colonization of Palau written by G. Clark and Wright. Most of the other chapters in this section are substantive presentations of new data on Lapita-associated archaeology from various areas and include chapters on Wantom Island by Specht, Bedford’s chapter on Vanuatu, a discussion of New Caledonia pottery by Chiu, two chapters on Fiji by Nunn et al. and Parke, and a presentation on western Borneo archaeology by Ono.

In one of the two broadly synthetic writings on “The Lapita Sphere,” Roger Green (in an extensively endnoted and referenced chapter) usefully groups much of the var-

ous writings on Lapita phenomena into four sets sharing similar explanatory themes. Green’s own conclusion is that Lapita references a cultural horizon and regional traditions that are the product of a “series of node and network type migrations” (p. 112) in Near and Remote Oceania. Many archaeologists will agree with Green, but with phrases such as “this Lapita culture indeed represents related groups of peoples who possessed a sense of ethnicity” (p. 113), I am left thinking of the sociocultural interpretations of phases, horizons, and traditions offered by Americanist culture historians in the middle of the twentieth century (realizing that Green was trained thus). Such culture-historical interpretations were difficult to evaluate and led in part to the downfall of that paradigm (Lyman et al. 1997). Glenn Summerhayes examines obsidian and pottery distributions in the Bismarck archipelago, noting that early diversification of obsidian distribution networks is not mirrored by pottery distributions. Summerhayes anticipates Spriggs’ argument in a later chapter and reminds us of “the problem of focusing on only one class of material culture in modeling the socio-economic nature of Lapita communities” (p. 143).

The third section of the volume, “Oceanic Diversity,” is aptly titled, for the chapters herein range from household archaeology to rock art to herpetofauna. Again, there are both chapters that present new data and several syntheses that summarize the current state of knowledge or explore new directions. Spriggs explores what is meant by “post-Lapita” developments, mainly in Vanuatu. He summarizes recent explanations of the similarities and differences in post-Lapita ceramics as either “representing continued regional interaction … or cultural drift through isolation” (p. 208) and notes that nonceramic data (e.g., middens pits, burials, and monumental architecture) may strengthen our population-level explanations. Spriggs suggests that a genealogical approach taken from Thomas (1999) may be appropriate. In short, the genealogical approach assembles unique histories for different aspects of
the archaeological record—pottery, monument building, subsistence—noting their points of intersection and contrast. Unfortunately, Thomas does not develop methods that differentiate artifact similarities representing historical relatedness of populations from those similarities that may arise in populations that are not in contact.

In other synthetic contributions Burley and J. Clark review the archaeology of Fiji and West Polynesia, arranging this work around various research themes, and Allen examines how we might approach the archaeological study of nearshore marine ecosystems. Allen's chapter is a valuable contribution and introduces some new concepts for the study of Pacific marine fauna. In particular Allen discusses the concepts of keystone species and ecosystem engineers, noting that human impact on these taxa can have far-ranging effects on marine environments. For example, sea turtles likely have large roles in ecosystem maintenance, and their human-induced decline may have substantially changed marine environments over time.

Other chapters in this section include a study of incised and applied relief ceramics from New Ireland by Garling, who suggests continuity between these ceramics and earlier Lapita pottery, and a review of the Palauan radiocarbon chronology by Phear et al. demonstrating the overlapping nature of occupational phases (this review, however, does not include a substantial number of draft reports by the International Archaeological Research Institute, Inc., many of which include additional radiocarbon dates). Wilson provides the first spatio-temporal model for rock art in the Pacific and identifies rock art throughout the southwestern Pacific. Valentin reports on the osteological and funerary variation in burials from three localities at the site of Lapita at Koné. Grant-Mackie et al. examine a New Caledonian herpetofauna (frogs and lizards) assemblage, but are not yet able to conclude whether New Caledonia's herpetofauna were stowaways on the canoes of human settlers or were able to colonize La Grande Terre on their own. Burley, presenting new excavation data, argues that prehistoric occupations at the Sigatoka Dunes site were episodic and associated with particular habitats and activities. Anderson et al. also present new excavation and survey data for the Gambier Islands.

Leleivai examines the interplay of oral history and archaeology on 'Uvea, noting in particular the differences in the dating of events in oral historical and archaeological contexts. The two approaches can produce different answers and in my opinion they should not be seen as contradictory, but are knowledge claims made in very different frameworks.

Pearthree and Di Piazza examine the distribution of a fishhook head type, bone-shaped whale-tooth pendants, lure points, and a harpoon point in the Phoenix and Line Islands. They argue that similarities in these artifact types across East Polynesia reflect an "Archaic East Polynesian cultural tradition" (p. 334). Assuming this means an interacting or related population, I am reminded of the chapters by Green and Spriggs and the necessity for developing a general theory and associated systematics that explain similarities as possibly analogous (e.g., harpoon points) or homologous (e.g., pendants).

In the last chapter of this section, Kahn examines variation in groups of spatially associated protohistoric structures (houses, marae), termed "households," in the 'Opunohu Valley on Mo'orea. Importantly, she has more tightly focused the typical landscape-scale of analysis for such architecture in French Polynesia to examine intrahousehold and interhousehold variation. Kahn identifies variation in late Maohi households attributable to a variety of factors and champions "the interpretive potential that household archaeology has for understanding questions concerning the evolution of social and political complexity in Polynesia" (p. 365).

The final section, "The Pacific and Archaeology," presents four somewhat personal chapters examining the intersection between Oceanic archaeology and various overlapping constituencies (see also Borofsky 2000): islanders, outlanders, govern-
ments, artists. Sorovi-Vunidilo charts a path toward better archaeological research by incorporating islander perspectives in all phases of work and by encouraging archaeologists' conscious attention to the responsibilities they have to the living descendants of the archaeological record. Cauchois details the organizational changes in the administration of archaeological projects in French Polynesia and discusses the primary goal of identifying all of the archaeological resources in French Polynesia to both facilitate comparative research and plan for the preservation of cultural resources. Prickett provides an overview of 150 years of New Zealand archaeology, highlighting past antiquarianism, modern archaeology and the Maori, and "alternative archaeologies" (p. 381) or pseudoarchaeology (see Feder 1999). The last chapter of the volume, by Urlich, discusses Lapita pottery from the perspective of a Maori potter and examines the possibilities of clay-working technology in ancient Maori contexts.

Pacific Archaeology is a beautifully produced volume with well-written and well-illustrated chapters. Sand has produced no mere set of conference papers, but an important work displaying the current state of Oceanic archaeology, which leads me to a final analytical comment. Many of the synthetic chapters (and some of the substantive) in Pacific Archaeology tacitly ask, how do we explain artifact similarities and differences within and between islands and archipelagos? It seems this question exists because Pacific archaeologists currently do not use a general explanatory theory that is explicitly linked to particular kinds of observational units or classes used to tabulate archaeological phenomena. Our explanations of similarities and differences, and the population-level relationships they represent, depend on the linkage between observation and theory.
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Reviewed by MARSHALL I. WEISLER, School of Social Science, University of Queensland

From our first days as students of Pacific prehistory we are told that the Neolithic colonization and settlement of Oceania ranks as one of the great achievements of
humankind. Set within the grand southern ocean are a number of isolated landfalls whose successful settlement pushed the capabilities of Oceanic colonists to their extreme limits. If the condition of isolation wasn’t enough to strain the colonization process, many of these remote islands typically had limited marine and terrestrial resources, low rainfall, and periodic drought. In the higher latitudes, cooler temperatures constrained horticulture and fostered a new and limited array of marine life. In this regard, the high volcanic Norfolk Island (~35 km$^2$) is a standout example. Situated in the subtropical zone, four hundred nautical miles south from New Caledonia and an equal distance north of New Zealand, it has evidence of prehistoric settlement, yet was found abandoned when observed by Europeans in 1774. During four field seasons between 1995 and 1999, a multidisciplinary team organized by Atholl Anderson and Peter White sought to (1) investigate the source of the inhabitants and whether multiple origins had been involved; (2) investigate the extent of isolation during its prehistoric occupation; and (3) document any significant impact of prehistoric colonists on the geomorphology, vegetation, and faunas (p. 2).

The volume is devoted primarily to excavations conducted at the Emily Bay site. Situated along the south rocky shore inland from the sandy beach at Emily Bay, the largest known habitation site on the island extends for about 3000 m$^2$ with a 30-cm-thick cultural layer containing sparse cultural material. Features included scoop hearths, trash pits, post holes, and a pavement. Bioturbation from muttonbird burrows and nest sites is very common (p. 136). The most abundant artifacts are basalt flakes, East Polynesian adzes, and two dozen obsidian flakes. Nonstone artifacts were few but consisted, most notably, of a harpoon point, a one-piece rotating hook of marine ivory, and a drilled tab. Pacific rat (Rattus exulans) bones were common and mtDNA analysis indicated source populations in central East Polynesia and New Zealand. Surprisingly, turtle bone was uncommon. Sea birds were a major source of food as well as fish caught on baited hooks; shellfish was a minor dietary contribution. Fourteen chapters describe and analyze the stratigraphy, radiocarbon dating, artifacts, fauna (including mtDNA of rats), other midden, land snails, and pollen cores and a summary chapter. To get a good sense of the Emily Bay settlement I strongly suggest reading the summary narrative on pages 138–139 before tackling the rest of the volume. Below I discuss the analytical chapters.

I found the chapter on domestic and religious structures to be one of the most engaging because it is a good example of holistic anthropological archaeology and an effort was made to place the religious structure within the broader context of Polynesian culture-history. The religious feature was not a marae but, more accurately, a shrine (Sinoto 2001), as a marae is an open space or clearing. The Emily Bay shrine consists of a 15 m$^2$ exposed section of pavement, three upright stones, what looks like a slab-lined fireplace, an oven, and much domestic food and tool refuse. The physical evidence for the shrine by itself was not totally convincing until the linguistic and ethnographic evidence was set within the comparative regional context. One important point omitted was that the shrine is just east of the probable house site, which reveals a pattern seen repeatedly in late prehistoric Hawai‘i; that is, shrines are situated east of the main habitation feature within a residential complex or kauhale (Weisler and Kirch 1985: Figs. 9–11). This is an important and recurring pattern found within Polynesian residential sites, and the Emily Bay data extends the practice some four centuries than previously documented.

Turner et al. analyzed technology, sources, and residues of Emily Bay stone artifacts. Using a debitage typology established by Turner that considers flake weight, dorsal surface characteristics, and termination type, flakes were assigned to one of seven size classes that, importantly, represented stages in adze manufacture. Of the 3,178 basalt flakes, 82 percent were of the smallest size class (class 7, <3 g) and are typically produced during the initial stages
of adze blank production. Other stages identified included adze preform working and adze reworking. Reworking strategies are “aimed at managing costs of time and effort” (p. 56). Turner’s innovative study also identified reworked preform flakes that are indicative of a wider range and size of adze forms than indicated by the preform/adze assemblage. These included Duff types 1, 2, 4A, and possibly 3. Although the expediently made “scappy flake adzes” were reported as unknown from Polynesia, I have seen these in unreported Hawaiian and Pitcairn assemblages. Raw material for Norfolk adze manufacture was simply picked up from the rocky shore, and this resource locale should be designated as a “source” (see Weisler and Sinton 1997:197–180) and not a “quarry” as the authors state. The residue analysis of ten basalt flakes by Fullagar identified processing of wood and/or plant material.

Of note is an experimental study to determine the function of bivalve fragments—the most common suspected shell artifact form. The artifacts were limited to forty fractured small bivalves, nineteen of which exhibited use wear and residues documenting that even nondescript broken shells may have been used for scraping and perhaps cutting functions. How many tools, labelled as midden, await discovery in other curated assemblages from Oceanic sites? Little mention is made of what looks like a shell fishhook point illustrated in Fig. 2 (p. 69), despite that fact that Norfolk has scant raw material for making shell artifacts. Perhaps this is why the only finished hook, a rotating form, was made from a suspected elephant seal tooth. A drilled bone fishhook tab and incurved point fragment were also recovered. The most significant artifact was a turtle-bone toggling harpoon point distinctive of early East Polynesian material culture. That “[t]he assemblage is typical of early East Polynesian material” (p. 73) is interesting, yet somewhat overstated considering the limited assemblage from a relatively small excavated sample.

The nonfish and nonbird fauna consisted of elephant seal, turtle, historically introduced pig, possible dog, and Pacific rat bone. The elephant seal is the northernmost occurrence of Mirounga leonine and demonstrates the contribution of archaeology to biogeographic studies. It was curious that turtle remains were so few as it can be common in colonization-period sites elsewhere in Polynesia—perhaps the limited archaeological occurrence reflects the biogeographic distribution of the species. The most detailed study was of the 569 rodent bones to determine the species represented, how these taxa compared to the possible source region(s) of the Norfolk human colonists, and if rats were eaten. It is unfortunate that a dog carnassial tooth identified in the field by Anderson and Smith has not been relocated (p. 78)—it would have been the only confirmed prehistoric occurrence of this humanly transported commensal on Norfolk Island.

Matisoo-Smith and colleagues describe the genetic makeup of the sampled Pacific rat bones from the Emily Bay site to understand the origins of the source populations and the frequency of post-colonization contact. The genetic diversity is quite high, suggesting a varied founding population from one locale (that is, the genetic diversity arrived en masse at one time); multiple source areas (islands), each adding some genetic variability to the Norfolk population; or genetic diversity added after early human colonization. Which case is right? The authors advocate multiple introductions (p. 81). The range of haplotypes, two of which have never been identified previously, suggest that more regional sampling may be beneficial. Source areas identified are tropical East Polynesia and the earliest layers from the archaic Washpool site in New Zealand. This latter assignment is strengthened by possible New Zealand obsidian transfer to Norfolk. East Polynesian influence on Norfolk and ties to New Zealand are indicated.

Sea birds provided an easily obtainable food resource for early colonists across the Pacific and their importance on Norfolk cannot be overemphasized. Nearly nine thousand bird bones made up the Emily Bay assemblage, which was dominated by petrels (85 percent of MNI, 92 percent of
NISP, and >80 percent biomass). It was reassuring to see that not all the bird bones were considered to be the product of human meals; rather, bones may have accumulated beneath feeding stations of predators, from burrow collapse or pathology (p. 87; see also Weisler and Gargett 1993). I was left wondering why the large Norfolk Island Pigeon (Hemiphaga spadicea) survived into the early historic period, unlike many columbids across Polynesia, and why terns weren’t eaten although they are common in the modern fauna.

Due to its position in the higher latitudes of the Pacific, the modern Norfolk Island fish fauna share a near equal mix of tropical and temperate species. The focus of the analysis of the Emily Bay (NISP = 10,031), Cemetery Bay (NISP = 22), and Slaughter Bay (NISP = 7) archaeological assemblages was to understand how the “prehistoric inhabitants may have developed a distinctive set of adaptive strategies” (p. 102). Some 95 percent of all MNI for the Emily Bay assemblage consists, in rank order abundance, of Lethrinidae, Carangidae, Labridae, Serranidae, and Lutjanidae. “Since the assemblage is dominated by benthic feeders, it seems most likely that the Norfolk fishers relied on baited hooks which they used from canoes stationed over the submerged reefs” (p. 107). This fishing technique is more likely due to the nature of the marine coast than an adaptation to the temperate-tropical fish fauna. One need only consider the archaeological fish assemblages from makatea islands (e.g., Henderson, Niue, and Ma’u’ke, which have similar narrow reefs) that are dominated by fish taken on baited hooks over the outer reef slopes.

The molluscs provide another example of the restricted resources available to the Norfolk colonists. Small sea snails (nerites), accounting for 95 percent of all shellfish by weight, were collected along the rocky intertidal zone at low tide. Only 350 g/m³ were recovered from one trench, attesting to the minor contribution of shellfish to the overall diet.

Land snails can be an indicator of general vegetation communities, habitat disturbance, and long-term environmental change. To identify prehistoric human impact on Norfolk, thirty-nine samples of modern land snails were collected from six environmental zones and analyzed in reference to eighteen sequences of land snails cored from the Emily Bay site and Cemetery Bay. The greatest diversity of land snails was found before and during the Emily Bay prehistoric occupation, decreasing markedly during European times, and is attributed to the introduction of Rattus exulans (p. 122). However, the pollen sequence reported by Macphail et al. shows that fire was, indeed, used to clear land (p. 127).

Coring just inland of Emily Bay in the Kingston Swamp clearly revealed that mid-Holocene fires (before 2580 B.P.) shaped the Norfolk landscape and ecology probably prior to the arrival of humans. Although many would disagree, the well-known ti (Cordyline) was reported as not a Polynesian introduction (p. 133), while flax was probably introduced from New Zealand.

The volume concludes with a chapter summarizing Norfolk Island settlement within the broader context of Oceanic prehistory. Returning to the three questions outlined in the beginning of the volume, I take each one in turn. (1) The inhabitants are clearly of Polynesian origin where the Norfolk colonists had a rotating fishhook, bone harpoon toggle, Duff adze types (1, 2A, 4, and possibly 2C), and a household functional structure separating sacred and secular activities along an east-west axis. Is it possible that multiple origins are evidenced by the material remains? The diversity of ancient mtDNA present in the ten analyzed Pacific rat bones suggests just this possibility. There is the introduction of obsidian from Raoul and possibly New Zealand, as well as flax brought from either place. (2) Isolation is more difficult to quantify and it may be that sea conditions and the four hundred nautical miles separating Norfolk from the nearest large landfalls were barriers against more frequent voyaging. (3) The Norfolk colonists did indeed impact the landscape, vegetation, and
faunas through the introduction of plants, the Pacific rat (which was a new avian and land snail predator) and, of course, through human predation, especially on the sea bird populations.

This volume is not a study of the archaeology of Norfolk Island, but an in-depth analysis of the excavations at Emily Bay with exploratory forays into adjacent bays and adjunct environmental studies of pollen and land snails. I would like to see test excavations (and not coring) conducted at the higher elevations to determine the presence of charcoal dispersed through possible inland gardening zones. We now have good evidence for coastal adaptation and subsistence, but what about inland settlement and use? Was there any settlement in the interior of the island, especially at the locations of surface adze finds? In this latter regard, there is an urgent need to geochemically analyze stone tools that appear to be non-Polynesian to determine prehistoric contact with New Caledonia and perhaps elsewhere. With only an approximately 2 percent sample of the Emily Bay site, future excavations may well uncover much new and exciting information regarding prehistoric settlement that bears directly on the research questions outlined in this excellent volume. I commend the editors for assembling a fine multidisciplinary team for addressing issues of relevance to all Oceanic scholars.
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Reviewed by Robert L. Welsch, Dartmouth College, and Sebastian Haraha, Papua New Guinea National Museum and Art Gallery

An Anthropologist in Papua is a celebration of the ethnographic field research of Francis Edgar Williams, typically known as F. E. Williams, who served as government anthropologist of Papua from 1922 until his death in a plane crash in 1943. This volume is a rich feast of images and impressions of village people, their daily life, and their celebrations, representing eight of the fifteen or so regions in Papua in which Williams conducted fieldwork. All of these field trips were conducted in Williams' capacity as government anthropologist in the colonial administration of Lieutenant Governor Sir Hubert Murray. Nearly all of the 235 images reproduced here are visually arresting scenes from a very early moment in Papua’s history. The majority are pub-
lished here for the first time, although
readers familiar with Williams' work will
find enough familiar images to let them
feel at home with the material.

But the authors of this volume have
done much more than assemble a collec­
tion of interesting photos to illustrate Wil­
liams' broad anthropological interests, re­
search topics, and field sites. They have
captioned these images with extended quo­
tations from Williams' own writings, both
published and unpublished. The volume is
divided chronologically into sections that
broadly represent the most important com­
munities Williams studied. Each of these
eight sections begins with an extremely
helpful map identifying most—though not
quite all—of the locations referenced in
the captions. This is a complex and multi­
layered presentation of photos and the
context in which they were taken. The
captions bring more than a superficial
knowledge of Williams' monographs and
reports. Where Williams' own words
provide few appropriate quotations, the
authors have added their own useful com­
ments. We occasionally found captions that
missed the point of Williams' writings and
probably reflect an unfortunate presentist
perspective. For example, when document­
ing the people of the Purari Delta, the
authors consistently refer to the people as
"Namau," a term that the authors even tell
us Williams never used because of its pejo­
rative meaning. The term had been used
by the much less culturally sensitive John
Holmes, the LMS missionary based in the
Purari, as well as by several subsequent
anthropologists and art historians, most no­
tably Douglas Newton. But use of the term
seems wholly out of character with the rest
of the volume. Such minor criticisms aside,
the captions are generally nuanced and so­
plicated.

The authors' achievement does not stop
here, for Young and Clark's sixty-page
introduction provides a detailed biography
of the anthropologist and an assessment of
how we should view Williams' work in
the context of the structural-functionalist
paradigms of the day. It also provides an
informative discussion of Williams' ambig­
uous role as government anthropologist.
Students of colonialism and of roles that
anthropologists have played in support of
colonial efforts to control native peoples
will find evidence here that Williams' role
was a complex one. Anthropologists
who worked in colonial territories did
not always walk lockstep with higher
level administrators. Williams' writing
often feels patronizing—and even racist—
by early twenty-first-century standards. But
as Young and Clark note, Williams was
extremely sympathetic to the plight of
Papuan villagers, and in his day Williams
represented an extremely liberal perspec­
tive.

Students interested in the history of an­
thropology will find Williams an interest­
ning foil for better-known academic anthro­
pologists of the interwar period. The
authors pay particular attention to the awk­
ward position in which Williams so often
found himself. Drawing on a wealth of
field experiences Williams often had opini­
ons not shared by Governor Murray.
Williams spent more time engaged in field­
work in Papua than anyone of his era and
produced six monographs and many shorter
publications. He often experienced in his
fieldwork the inconsistencies and com­
plexity of understanding Papuan culture as
lived and practiced by diverse peoples
actively experiencing social and cultural
change. Williams was not adverse to the
idea of playing a role in how these societies
changed. Even though his reports and
monographs contain contradictory state­
ments of his informants, none of the
anthropologists who have worked in any
of the main areas Williams studied has
found significant fault with any of his data.
Yet, it is an undeniable fact that, isolated in
remote Papua, Williams did not receive the
respect of his academic colleagues that one
might have expected from so active and
prolific an ethnographer. Young and Clark
argue—convincingly, in our view—that
the views of his contemporaries were
strongly shaped by the fact that Williams
never fully accepted functionalism as his
own theoretical model. This perspective
was about as close to heresy as one could
get so far as the anthropological establishment in England and Australia were concerned.

Students of anthropology will also find Williams’ critique of functionalism remarkably refreshing. His critique is implicit in most of his published work, but was explicit in at least one essay, “Creed of the Government Anthropologist,” in which he expressed the view that culture “always remains to some extent a hotchpotch and sorry tangle.” He accepted that different cultural elements were integrated, but felt the functionalists had overemphasized the integration of culture, largely ignoring “to what extent cultures do not work or to what extent they work badly.”

It has been nearly a quarter-century since the last major reassessment of Williams’ work appeared—in Erik Schwimmer’s introduction to The Vailala Madness and Other Essays. This book is a most welcome and sensitive reevaluation of a much overlooked anthropologist. The volume emerged as a response to Julia Clark’s photographic exhibition, Eye to Eye: Observations by F. E. Williams, Anthropologists in Papua 1922–43, developed by the National Archives of Australia in 1999. This exhibition continues to travel around various centers in Papua New Guinea, a testimony to the importance that both the exhibition and this volume will have for many years to come.

As a book of historic ethnographic photographs, this volume builds on Michael Young’s Malinowski’s Kiriwina. It is part of a growing interest in historic photos of ethnographic subjects that owes much to the work of Elizabeth Edward at the Pitt Rivers Museum in Oxford. This book, together with Young’s other book, Gerald Sullivan’s Margaret Mead, Gregory Bateson, and Highland Bali, and Robert Welsch’s volume on the anthropological research of Field Museum curator A. B. Lewis, An American Anthropologist in Melanesia, now offers students of visual culture several rich photographic data sets they may use for comparisons of style, perspective, and the use of photography as a field methodology. Visual anthropologists and anthropologists interested in the history of anthropology will definitely want to add this beautifully designed and beautifully produced title to their must-read list.
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Reviewed by Joan A. Wozniak, Eugene, Oregon

Rapa Nui (Easter Island) is a lone volcanic island in the southeastern Pacific Ocean. Because of its isolation (the closest landmass, Pitcairn Island, present population...
55, lies 1100 km to the west) and the presence of hundreds of massive anthropomorphic images ("giants" made of tuff or basalt), Rapa Nui has been veiled in an air of mystery since its rediscovery by Europeans in 1722. For the past three centuries people around the world have speculated whence these images and their makers came and how they got there. During the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries few European ships stopped at the island, except to exploit the islanders. Even those explorers making scientific voyages to study Pacific cultures recorded only token observations of the native culture on Rapa Nui. It was not until the early twentieth century that a scientific study of Rapa Nui culture was undertaken. This ethnographic and archaeological investigation was led by an English woman named Katherine Scoresby Routledge.

In 1919, following her work on Rapa Nui, Routledge wrote a book for a non-technical audience titled *The Mystery of Easter Island: A Story of an Expedition* (London: Hazell, Watson & Viney). In her book Routledge related tribal land divisions, oral traditions, and myths of the island as told to her by informants, several of whom had lived prior to the establishment of a permanent foreign presence—the missionaries. She also described the stone images (moai), the platforms on which they were placed (ahu), and other archaeological remains of Rapa Nui. Circumstances within Katherine’s life in England following the publication of *The Mystery of Easter Island* prevented her from publishing a scientific manuscript on her research. Furthermore, many of Routledge’s notes and photos disappeared shortly before her death in 1935 and were thought lost.

Jo Anne van Tilburg, the author of *Among Stone Giants: The Life of Katherine Routledge and Her Remarkable Expedition to Easter Island*, has spent many years tracking down Katherine’s scientific notes and interviewing surviving members of Katherine’s family. Many of us who have worked on Rapa Nui and have been aware that van Tilburg had acquired access to Routledge’s notes have been anxiously awaiting the publication of a sequel to Routledge’s 1919 ethnography—maybe a more scientific treatise of her studies. *Among Stone Giants* is not that book. Instead, van Tilburg uses Katherine’s recently discovered diaries and notes, and the interviews with Katherine’s family to develop a biographical sketch of a Victorian woman and aspiring anthropologist who relished documenting world views of cultures in faraway lands. Van Tilburg skillfully portrays Katherine, her extended family, English colleagues, and Victorian society in general. Van Tilburg also relates Katherine’s reactions to, and interactions with the people whose lives and culture, myths and dreams she put to pen.

Van Tilburg is an archaeologist who has worked on Rapa Nui for more than twenty years and heads the Easter Island Statue Project. In *Among Stone Giants* she proves to be most capable of analyzing both Katherine herself as well as Katherine’s notes on Rapa Nui culture. The first few chapters of *Among Stone Giants* introduce the reader to Katherine Pease, who was born into a Quaker family and grew up in a stultifying Victorian England. Van Tilburg delves into the background of the Quaker faith and Victorian England to preface how the internal conflicts within English society influenced Katherine. For example, Katherine grew up during the period when Victorian women were considered to be the property of men, but Quakers believed in the innate equality of women and men. Quakers practiced tolerance and respect for different opinions with the ultimate spiritual authority residing in one’s own conscience. Katherine’s character, her social life, her perception of spirituality and mysticism, and her view of women’s role in marriage were determined more by her Quaker upbringing than by English society, however.

Katherine aspired to be both an ethnographer and an archaeologist at a time when the field of anthropology was young and life in English society was male dominated. It was unusual for a Victorian woman to attend Oxford, and yet Katherine studied
modern history there. Although she took the same exams as male students and received similar grades, she was not allowed to earn a degree. This and other injustices to women during this period led to Katherine’s embrace of the women’s suffrage movement and to her putting off marriage until middle age.

Katherine Pease’s trip to Rapa Nui came about through her acquaintance with two men. One was her teacher, R. R. Marett, a scholar of comparative religions who encouraged Katherine to pursue her interest in anthropology and archaeology, new fields of study at the turn of the twentieth century. The second was William Scoresby Routledge, an adventurer from a scientifically oriented family, whom she married. Like Katherine, William relished travel to foreign lands. Their life together became one of “scientific expeditions” to study various cultures and to collect archaeological material.

An acquaintance of the Routledges who worked for the British Museum (home to many Rapa Nui artifacts) had encouraged them to more carefully study the written language of Rapa Nui so that they might expose the secrets of the island and determine the homeland of the original inhabitants. Rapa Nui was the only Pacific island on which people had developed writing (called rongorongo). During the early nineteenth century English sailors had returned from Rapa Nui with boards and staffs of “talking wood” (called Kohau rongorongo) that had been incised with stylized characters of animals and plants.

The Routledges journeyed to Rapa Nui in a yacht named the Mana that they had built for their trip to the South Pacific. While Katherine had previous ethnographic experience, neither of the Routledges was trained in scientific techniques of archaeological research. They therefore solicited scientists who could help sail their yacht and then perform the archaeological study once they arrived on Rapa Nui. Van Tilburg relates how most of these scientists deserted the Routledge expedition during the year-long voyage to Rapa Nui and how the Routledges therefore had to rely on a single page of notes written by R. R. Marett on archaeological method. During the eighteen months Katherine resided on the island she learned the Rapa Nui language and was able to befriend many Rapa Nui elders. She documented the islanders’ culture through careful interviews about their religion and politics and their traditional customs. Katherine did not find additional Kohau rongorongo on Rapa Nui but she did find links to the island whence the Rapa Nui ancestors likely came.

After years of studying Routledge’s writings, van Tilburg has acquired unusual insight into the life and thoughts of a woman who chose to give up the comforts of wealthy English society to live a relatively primitive life on Rapa Nui. The reader relives Katherine’s feelings and thoughts during her stay on Rapa Nui and especially her sadness when she had to leave “her” island to return to England.

In Among Stone Giants van Tilburg presents a biography of an early twentieth-century feminist. The story depicts an independent and educated Victorian woman whose goals were to visit exotic places and to understand the world views of indigenous people taken over by colonial powers. One of the many strong points exhibited in Among Stone Giants is the adequate background material van Tilburg inserts, making it possible for the reader to better understand not only the world in which Katherine Routledge lived, but also how early anthropological endeavors were carried out. Van Tilburg provides the context of the research environment during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries that enables readers in the twenty-first century to understand how one of the most important ethnographies written about Rapa Nui came to be. Among Stone Giants also exposes why Katherine’s 1919 book lacks many aspects found in modern ethnographies.

Van Tilburg enables readers of Among Stone Giants to better understand how spiritualism influenced Routledge (and likely enhanced her understanding and documentation of the spiritual nature of Rapa Nui beliefs). She does this by first relating the
beliefs held by nineteenth-century spiritualists and later in the story how the shamans on Rapa Nui had similar beliefs. One example is that both spiritualists and Rapa Nui shamans believed that dreams were important harbingers of the future; a second is that both groups believed that spirits of the dead conferred with the living.

Among Stone Giants is also an engrossing book of adventure and I immensely enjoyed reading it. Van Tilburg truly displays a knack for detective work and turns it into an absorbing read. What became of Katherine Routledge and her unpublished scientific notes after her return to England is a story of intrigue in itself.

What van Tilburg does not provide in her book is additional ethnographic or archaeological information known to have been collected by Katherine Routledge during her stay on Rapa Nui. Ethnographers and archaeologists have long wanted to know what Routledge would have included in such a treatise. Now Katherine Routledge has a second chance. Jo Anne van Tilburg is the author who can write that scientific treatise and I for one am anxiously awaiting that publication.
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