

# BOOK REVIEWS



*The Journey from Eden.* Brian M. Fagan. New York: Thames and Hudson, 1990. 256 pp.

Reviewed by SUSAN G. KEATES, *School of Anthropology, Oxford*

The theme of this well-illustrated book is concerned with hominid migration from Africa to other continents during the Pleistocene Epoch. In the five parts (17 chapters) the author describes how the various disciplines concerned with the elucidation of hominid morphological and behavioral evolution contribute to an understanding of hominid adaptations to the diversity of palaeoenvironments encountered on the long journey that led from Africa to East Asia, Europe, Australasia, the Americas, and eventually to the Pacific.

The main focus of Fagan's book is concerned with the evolution of anatomically modern *Homo sapiens*. The author concentrates on the African, Near Eastern, and European hominid fossil and lithic material, and also draws on the genetic data that have been generated in recent years to pinpoint the place and time of the emergence of modern humans. The data from these regions are treated in sufficient detail by the author. He recounts the history of archaeological research that led to the discoveries of sites such as Tabun and Qafzeh in Israel, and the varying scientific opinions on the significance of these finds.

It is noticeable that the journey leads first to Europe, although Far Eastern hominids are demonstrably older than "The European Neanderthals" (chapter 7). The reason for this temporal "dislocation" seems to be that Fagan is in favor of the theory that our species evolved in Africa and replaced non-African hominids during the past 50,000 to 200,000 years. One would expect this event to be visible in the archaeological record, yet in the Far East, especially in China, no

evidence of new technologies such as Levallois has been recovered after many decades of research. Fagan speculates that the evidence for possible change may not have survived, because modern humans immigrating into Southeast Asia manufactured nonlithic tools. This scenario implies that the indigenous populations were culturally backward, ignoring that these hominids had successfully occupied this forested region for a period of about one million years. Although the issue of replacement versus multiregional evolution has been a major focus of discussions by anthropologists and archaeologists during the past few years, there are indications that researchers are tiring of this subject.

The colonization of Australia and the various hypotheses on how hominids reached this continent are discussed in chapter 10. The migration to this region from Island Southeast Asia is now dated at ca. 40,000 years, and involved not only open-water travel, but also the rapid adaptation to different environments. A similar challenge to human ingenuity seems to have been associated with the spread of modern humans into glacial Europe (chapter 11). A number of authors have argued that advanced language capabilities and a subsequent change in technology made it possible for *Homo sapiens sapiens* to exploit resources in that region of Europe more successfully than the Neanderthal populations. Although Fagan points out that Chatelperronian assemblages are a mixture of Mousterian and early Upper Palaeolithic technology (which to some workers indicates cultural continuity in Europe), he believes that the stratigraphi-

cally later Aurignacian stone industry is an entirely different and significantly advanced cultural complex. The author agrees with those who reason that the Aurignacian represents evidence of the genetic replacement by modern humans of Neanderthal hominids. The issue, however, particularly the evolution and development of language, remains unresolved as does the date for the first settlement of the Americas (chapter 15).

Unfortunately, this book is riddled with mistakes, inaccuracies, and omissions too numerous to mention in a review of this length. For example, in a Figure (p. 19) comparing the anatomy of *Homo erectus* and modern humans, only the former is described as a hominid, although both species belong to this family. The Ngandong fauna (Central Java) is characterized by forest-adapted taxa, and not, as Fagan writes, by "grassland species" (p. 122). The statement that in the Far East "archaeologists have ignored" (p. 118) bamboo as a raw material for tool manufacture is inaccurate. The point the author should have made is that many workers have suggested that nonlithic materials, including the ubiquitous bamboo, may have formed a major part of the technological repertoire in the Asian Palaeolithic. Only the recent work of Pope (e.g., 1989) has provided a model in which the archaeological (e.g., the distribution of chopping-tools as perceived by Movius), chronometric, and palaeoenvironmental data are combined to explain the largely unstandardized nature of lithic assemblages in Asia. The discoverer of the first cranium from Zhoukoudian is incorrect-

ly identified as one "Bei Qen-Xung" (p. 113). The correct name—Pei Wenzhong (Pei Wen-chung in the old spelling of the now-abandoned orthography)—is readily available in one of the few references the author cites on the Far East. Indeed, citing references is one of the book's main failures. Although some important references to the literature can be found in the section "Further Reading," the absence of many is conspicuous. In the literature on Far Eastern archaeology ("Northeast Asians," chapter 14), it is unclear why a number of these were not mentioned in that section of the earlier chapter 9, "The Primeval Asians," where Fagan chose to list not one single reference. This omission is especially evident in chapter 9, where the author refers to Pope's work, including a number of sentences that are reproduced verbatim (cf. pp. 118–120 and Pope 1989:53–55), but without listing the actual source (see below).

This book is interesting and covers a wide range of relevant and currently debated topics. Yet in several instances it is obvious that Fagan came ill prepared for the long journey on which he embarked, which is frequently confused and confusing.

#### REFERENCES

- POPE, G. G.  
1989 Bamboo and human evolution. *Natural History*, October, pp. 48–57.

*Recent Advances in Micronesian Archaeology: Selected Papers from the Micronesian Archaeology Conference, September 9–12, 1987.* Ed. Rosalind L. Hunter-Anderson. *Micronesica*, Supplement No. 2. Guam: University of Guam Press, 1990. viii + 434 pp.

*Reviewed by* PATRICK V. KIRCH, *University of California at Berkeley*

While archaeological investigations of Polynesia and Melanesia were rapidly advancing throughout the 1960s and 1970s,

Micronesia remained a backwater of Oceanic prehistory. Largely because of U.S. federal funding for cultural resource management

projects (supplemented by some "pure" research funding), this situation began to change dramatically after 1975. By 1987, more than 200 archaeological projects had been carried out in Micronesia, from Palau in the west to the Marshall Islands in the east. To foster communication between archaeologists—as well as social anthropologists and physical anthropologists—involved in this work, Rosalind Hunter-Anderson and Michael W. Graves organized the Micronesian Archaeology Conference, held in Guam in September of 1987. The present volume contains 29 papers presented at the conference, along with an introductory essay on "Recent Advances on Micronesian Archaeology" by Hunter-Anderson and Graves. The volume is divided into two parts: The first, titled "Archaeology and Ethnohistory," contains 22 papers authored by archaeologists as well as social anthropologists and ethnohistorians, while the second part, on "Physical Anthropology," contains eight papers. Limited by the space of this review, I will not comment on every paper, but will confine myself to a representative selection.

As is to be expected for a region that remained an archaeological terra incognita until so recently, a number of authors concern themselves with aspects of origins, chronology, and culture history. J. S. Athens (pp. 17–32) provides a description and typology of pottery from Nan Madol, Pohnpei, with important implications for the immediate origins of the Central Carolinian populations. Athens considers the pottery to be a variant of "Late Lapita Plain Ware," thus pointing to "an origin somewhere in the southeast Solomon or New Hebrides islands" (p. 30). This is a view seconded by W.S. Ayres (p. 203), who skillfully draws upon artifactual, economic, and architectural evidence to construct a cultural-historical sequence for Pohnpei from ca. 500 B.C. to the historic period. Of considerable interest is Bruce Masse's paper, "Radiocarbon Dating, Sea-Level Change and the Peopling of Belau ca. 1500 B.C." Masse believes that the radiocarbon corpus of some 81 dates indicates first settlement at ca. A.D. 1. His interpretations of sea-level change are key to this argument, in

dismissing the "Ngibtal hypothesis" (named after a legendary village destroyed by a typhoon) that early sites have been drowned. However, in light of the bias of work toward the rock islands, and the absence of geomorphologically informed subsurface coastal testing of Babeldaob, one might question whether we can really rule out first millennium B.C. occupation of the large volcanic island.

Also on the matter of initial settlement, C. S. Streck (pp. 247–260) presents surprisingly early radiocarbon dates for human occupation on Bikini Atoll. Streck appears to accept the earliest date (1965–1665 B.C.) as valid, even though the vast majority of his 35 dates are later than A.D. 900. If Streck is correct, the Marshall Islands were settled as early as the first Lapita push in the Bismarck Archipelago! This is hard to reconcile with Ayres's and Athens's views on eastern Micronesian origins from "Late Lapita." Clearly, more work on the key Bikini deposits is warranted to resolve this issue.

A number of papers in the first section address issues of "cultural complexity" and sociopolitical transformation. Not surprisingly, most of the emphasis is on the larger volcanic islands of Yap, Kosrae, and especially Pohnpei. Pohnpei, of course, has long been noted for the presence of Nan Madol, whose complex of artificial islets support some of the largest and most remarkable monumental architecture anywhere in Oceania. Work by both Athens and Ayres has now demonstrated that Nan Madol has been occupied since at least A.D. 1, and possibly earlier. The possibility that the site first consisted of a complex of stilt houses erected over a reef flat is very intriguing, in light of new evidence for Lapita stilt house architecture in Melanesia [Kirch 1988]. The debate over the sequence of processes of sociopolitical evolution in Pohnpei is taking shape as a fascinating dialogue between both archaeologists and ethnohistorians. S. Falgout (pp. 89–98), for example, suggests that Pohnpei oral traditions should be actively considered so as to provide alternative interpretations to those derived from strictly archaeological evidence. D. Hanlon (pp. 99–116) goes farther, applying a "post-

modernist" critique of early European interpretations of Nan Madol. By exposing how earlier investigators were contested socially and culturally, he cautions contemporary archaeologists to reflexively examine the "rhetorical, institutional, generic and political contexts within which they carry out their investigations" (p. 112).

It is clear that the archaeologists themselves have learned much about the changing nature of central Micronesian sociopolitical organization, as indexed through changes in architecture and settlement patterns (less so through artifactual evidence for hierarchy of exchange). J. E. Bath and J. S. Athens (pp. 275–290) use archaeological data from Nan Madol, Sapwtakai, and other sites to test a set of nine test implications (derived from an analysis of oral traditions) concerning the "Saudeleur to Nahnmwarki transformation." For the island of Kosrae, where the Lelu site bears striking similarities to Nan Madol, T. Ueki (pp. 303–316) tests several hypotheses for increasing social stratification. Ueki's model, which closely follows the work of Ross Cordy in Hawaii (Cordy 1981), puts the fundamental cause for sociopolitical change on population growth, leading to "local conflict" and hierarchy. To this reviewer, a theoretically more sophisticated position is that eloquently argued by J. G. Peoples (pp. 291–302), who contrasts *functional* versus *conflict* (or *coercive*) approaches to stratification. By considering such matters as *motivation* and *opportunity*, Peoples brings the role of social actors back into discussions of sociopolitical transformation.

The final set of papers in the volume deals with physical anthropology, especially the long-standing issue of the origins of Micronesian peoples. Of particular note is the paper by C. L. Brace et al. (pp. 323–348), based on detailed analyses of dental as well as craniofacial measurements. Brace et al. isolate an apparently statistically robust Jomon-Pacific cluster of skeletal populations, which includes Polynesians and Micronesians (but excludes Australo-Melanesians). These findings are of considerable significance, although one may take issue with Brace et al.'s interpretation that "prehistoric Japan may well have played a far more im-

portant role in the peopling of the Pacific than generally has been realized" (p. 343). Equally likely, to this reviewer, is the possibility that Jomon Japan and Oceanic populations share a common biological ancestry whose geographic origins might be sought in the coastal South China region, a region totally unrepresented in their samples to date (for the late Pleistocene and early Holocene periods). The succeeding papers by Howells (pp. 363–372), Pietrusewsky (pp. 373–402), and Turner (pp. 403–416) also affirm the biological relationships between Micronesian and Polynesian populations. One cannot help but be distressed, however, by the continued view of Melanesia as some sort of biological monolith (e.g., Pietrusewsky, pp. 318, 399). Although Turner (p. 412) rightly dismisses Terrell's extreme view of Polynesia "as just another Melanesian village" (1986:261), the idea that there is some sort of tightly definable Melanesian phenotype is equal nonsense. Archaeologists and linguists have recently come to recognize the incredible diversity present within the geographic region known as "Melanesia," diversity clearly due to more than 40,000 years of human settlement. It is time for the biological anthropologists to address the same diversity in genetic terms.

*Recent Advances in Micronesian Archaeology* is a milestone volume that clearly documents the tremendous advances that have been made in our understanding of the archaeology and prehistory of Micronesia. Moreover, the volume encapsulates an overview of the very lively debates concerning varieties of island adaptations, of origins and migrations of Micronesian populations, and of the processes of sociopolitical change and transformation that can be expected to continue to inspire new research in the region. The editor is to be congratulated on the prompt publication of this key work, which deserves to be in the library of every serious Oceanic scholar.

#### REFERENCES

- CORDY, R.  
1981 *A Study of Prehistoric Social Change: The Development of Complex Societies in the Hawaiian Islands*. New York: Academic Press.

KIRCH, P. V.

1988 The Talepakemalai site and Oceanic prehistory. *National Geographic Research* 4: 328–342.

TERRELL, J.

1986 *Prehistory in the Pacific Islands*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

*Imperial Pagan: Art and Architecture of Burma*. Paul Strachan. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1989. 206 pp. Plates, diagrams, notes, bibliography, index.

*Reviewed by* JOHN N. MIKSIC, *University of Singapore*

This book marks the first serious attempt to bridge the gap between the archaeological and historical communities and the general public for one of the most important archaeological complexes in Southeast Asia: Pagan. The author has attempted the difficult objective of producing a scholarly and analytic book that can also be used as a field guide to the site. This is a difficult feat, and it is satisfying to report that the author has been successful.

The book falls into the academic genre of art history rather than anthropological archaeology. Much attention is devoted to tracing the various external and internal sources of Pagan's art. There are no reports of excavations, nor does the book contain any new information regarding the relationship between the temples and the economy or settlement patterns of early Burma. The anthropologically inclined archaeologist can, however, find material here that can be used to reconstruct some of the dynamic relationships between society, technology, and the environment in Pagan.

The contents of this book are identical to *Pagan: Art and Architecture of Old Burma*, a hard-cover volume published by the author's own company in Scotland in 1989. The volume is divided into two parts. The first part provides a 34-page history of Pagan and its art, while the second part is devoted to detailed discussions of 77 particular ruins from the site. This is a small proportion of the 2217 structures at the site that were listed at the time the book was first written, but all the main temples from A.D. 1100 to 1300 have been covered.

The introduction, subtitled "The Western

Discovery of Pagan," provides a brief overview of the European historiography of the site, from Marco Polo through the colonial period to UNDP/UNESCO's current involvement with the site. Gordon Luce's life and work receive appropriate attention.

Chapter 1, "The Rise of a Dynasty at Pagan," deals with the site's original occupation in the mid-ninth century, and examines the various theories proposed to explain why the site appeared in the driest part of the whole country. Some have suggested that human beings caused climatic change in the area by cutting down trees to fire kilns that churned out enormous quantities of brick to construct the largest complex of ceremonial architecture in all Southeast Asia. In fact, the bricks used in the temple building were not made locally, and early inscriptions already refer to Pagan as "Parched Land." Its location at a node of riverine and overland transport routes is probably the most significant factor favoring the formation of a ceremonial center at Pagan. It may be purely coincidental, but Pagan's location resembles that of the large complex of temples at Padang Lawas, north Sumatra. The Padang Lawas temples, built around the eleventh to thirteenth centuries, lie in the driest part of the island, again at a junction of traditional communication routes. The author also argues that Pagan's decline was not due to the Mongol attack of A.D. 1287, but to other (unspecified) factors, and that the site remained important until the mid-fourteenth century.

Pagan's architecture is highly variable, as one might expect of any large group of artifacts with many stylistic elements, built over a period of three centuries. The author re-

duces this complexity by classifying the monuments as either stupas or temples, called *gu* or "caves." The oldest *gu* at Pagan dates from the eleventh century, and is dedicated to Vishnu rather than Buddha. The *gu* developed a particular form that differs from most shrines in other parts of Southeast Asia in that the main image was walled up in the center of the building, and the only visible statues were those placed in small recesses. The author also distinguishes between three phases of development: early, middle, or late, based on stylistic criteria that can sometimes be correlated with data from inscriptions. However, he also notes instances where older motifs were resurrected, complicating the task of the scholar. More rigorous use of seriation theory might have been of use in this regard.

The author's main field of expertise is architectural history, and his inferences and arguments on this subject seem reliable. One of the book's principal contributions is the abundance of good technical descriptions of architectural elements. These are not, however, easy reading; only a few specialists in architectural history are likely to be able to visualize the structures described in such passages as this: "The shrine arch is framed by a splendid brick and stucco pediment arrangement, with a sinode cinquefoil superimposed upon a hierarchic scheme of horizontal tiers, reminiscent of the *pyatthat*, rising to a relief *sikhara* and finial." For those interested in technical comparisons between building types in Asia, this type of information will be very useful.

At times the author uses the opportunities provided by the multiplicity of structural and stylistic elements to try to trace lines of contact and communication. Although all scholars would agree that the subject of culture contact is an important one, anthropological archaeologists are likely to be skeptical of the utility of the art-historical methods used to attack the problem of analyzing the contributions to Burmese architecture by different sources of style. For example some believe the doorjambes on the Kyauk-ku-ohn-min are the work of immigrant Bengali carvers; another scholar argues that they are indigenous because the physical types of Brahma

reliefs in a related temple are Mongoloid not Indo-Aryan. The workers could also have been Mon artists brought back captive by Anawrahta; the Pyu also must have made contributions. The inability to distinguish between the work of immigrant and local workers plagues most studies that try to be objective in using artistic data to decipher communication routes and directions. This kind of problem will probably never be fully resolved. If this subject is intractable, some might argue that it should be removed from discussion about the past; but then we would disqualify ourselves from making more than the most general observations about the effects of culture contact versus local development. The old idea of diffusionism has long since been expunged from most (although not all) scholars' intellectual vocabularies, yet no alternative framework has arisen to take its place.

Some topics that one might expect to be prominent do not occupy much of the author's attention. For example, votive tablets were found deposited in the interior of the brick mass of a stupa (Shwe-hsan-daw). Writing of the king who had the stupa built, the author says, "Doubtless Anawrahta's intention had been to enhance the spiritual-force field effect. . . ." This obviously points toward some use of concepts associated with mandalas. The author is, however, anxious to show that Mahayana Buddhism was not influential at Pagan. In this regard he may have unconsciously allowed his desire to avoid contradicting the assumptions of the modern Theravada Burmese, or injuring their sensibilities, to affect his scholarly judgment. Actually, one cannot usually find a rigid distinction in the beliefs of laymen between "pure" Theravada and "pure" Mahayana. It is interesting and more profitable to examine the precise nature of Burmese Buddhist beliefs of the past rather than succumbing to the temptation to classify them in exclusive nonoverlapping categories.

The author frequently refers to Kyanzitha's "purification program" without describing it. The implication is that the ruler implemented an orthodox religious revival such as occurs in modern religions like Christianity or Islam, which are concerned

to demarcate themselves clearly from competing versions of a revealed truth. This approach is probably based on an anachronistic assumption about the nature of religious belief in premodern Southeast Asia. A brief review of the link between Buddhism and nat-worship in modern Burmese Buddhism would be a useful way of suggesting the type of contribution that Burmese culture might have made to the religion of Pagan. Kyanzitha himself claimed to be an incarnation of Vishnu.

One may list a few instances wherein the author's attempt to deny beliefs associated with Mahayana Buddhism any role at Pagan has led to some doubtful arguments. The outer wall of the Abe-ya-dana *gu* (described on pp. 59–61), probably built by Kyanzitha in the early twelfth century, is decorated with paintings depicting Mahayana, Tantric, Hindu deities, and bodhisattvas (not individually identifiable). Similar paintings also occur at Naga-yon *gu* (pp. 62–65); the author explains them away as decorative rather than devotional. According to legend, Naga-yon was built where a Naga kept watch over a future king while he slept; this literary motif is derived from a legend associated with Mahayana Buddhism. (The images of the Shwe-zigon are said to be in vitarka-mudra, but the Buddha depicted in plate number 49, p. 58, is in abhaya-mudra. Could this actually be the main image of the Naga-yon, which is in abhaya-mudra?)

A thirteenth-century sect based in the eastern area of Pagan espoused the drinking of alcohol and involvement in political affairs.

The author agrees with modern Burmese Buddhists that they were degenerate Theravadins rather than Mahayana or Vajrayana adherents. Thus he concludes that the paintings of this sect “are not evidence of active northern Buddhist cults. As with the Early Period examples, such as the Abe-ya-dana, the paintings are subsidiary to the fundamental Theravada icons and illustrate no known Mahayana or Tantra text. Thus, such works are more like a colourful and flamboyant ‘wallpaper’ than a devotional or didactic iconographic programme” (p. 94).

Paintings with strong parallels to the Mahayana-Vajrayana art of north India and Nepal continued to be created until the very end of the Pagan period. For example at Paya-thon-zu (“The Three Temples”), paintings depict a Bodhisattva (with twin *sakti*) integrated with motifs from earlier Pagan. The author hypothesizes that these similarities are due to immigrant artists taking refuge at Pagan from invading Muslims (p. 131), but these could equally well have been created by local artisans.

The text is marred by misprints and faulty constructions, but some passages are expressively written. Photographs, mostly black and white, and drawings, including many plans and elevations, are well reproduced. Despite the criticisms I have made concerning the author's interpretation of the religious background of the temples, this book is a valuable addition to our literature where his main subject, the architecture of Pagan, is concerned. One wishes more like it were available for other parts of the region.

*The Food of China.* E. N. Anderson. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1988. 313 pp.

*Reviewed by* YUNXIANG YAN, *Harvard University*

Few people would disagree with the author's observation that “[T]he Chinese are united by an interest in and commitment to good cooking and good food” (p. 137). Indeed, food has always been of central importance

in social life throughout the history of China. This is well captured in an old Chinese aphorism: “Food is Heaven for ordinary people.” Anderson has undoubtedly chosen one of the most important and illuminating

topics to explore the core in the Chinese culture.

The main goal Anderson sets up for his inquiry is to determine the strategies by which China has fed its millions of people and to reveal advantages inherent to the Chinese food system. In his view, China succeeded in solving its food problem by the intensive, highly diversified, sustainable agriculture. This system worked well until the recent past. The first half of the book is a narrative history of food, and focuses on the relationship between land use and Chinese cuisine. The reader's attention is first directed to archaeological sites that show that agricultural activities in China appeared as early as 6000 B.C. Large farming villages inhabited by people who were nourished by a rich, varied diet emerged by around 4000 B.C. By the beginning of the historical era (1700–1100 B.C.), a food system characterized by a dichotomy between "grain foods" (*fan*) and "dishes" (*ts'ai*) was created as a result of the high productivity of agriculture and the increasing needs of refined food for elaborate rituals and feasts among the Shang nobles.

Three eras are identified by Anderson as the most important and innovative stages in the history of food in China. The first period culminates with the Han Dynasty, during which agriculture developed sophisticated technologies for water conservation and irrigation, rice cultivation, multiple cropping in many areas, and natural fertilization. More important, the Han government policies stressed agriculture. In addition, systematic dissemination of farming knowledge was encouraged, and this practice became a model for subsequent dynasties. The second crucial period was, according to Anderson, that of disunion following Han, particularly the Wei Dynasty. With the spread of Buddhism, western Asian crops and foodways came into China. These carried with them new styles in food preparation, especially for wheat products. Moreover, it was during this period that South China became important as a productive region by developing its own distinctive agricultural system and food complex. It is interesting that Anderson highlights this period in China's food history, for many Chinese historians have

deemphasized its importance because of the political disunion of the times. To Anderson, the Sung Dynasty was the last era of great innovation in the history of Chinese food. During this time land use, food production, and cuisine gained in complexity and took their definitive modern shapes. Following the Sung Dynasty, Chinese food systems were further elaborated, but the fundamental patterns remained unchanged until the twentieth century.

According to Anderson, China had developed an efficient, sophisticated food system by the advent of industrialization. Its success may be attributed to four main factors: (1) beginning with the Han Dynasty, agriculture has been a top priority in governmental policy making. The diffusion of information and knowledge about agriculture has always been promoted by government and the elite. (2) Chinese peasants have proven themselves among the most skillful and knowledgeable farmers in the world; when provided a stable social environment and a rational government they will work well in independence. (3) Traditional medicinal beliefs also played a positive role in the diversification and nutritional complexity of Chinese food. The pursuit of healthy food enlarged the scope of food production. (4) the social function of food (religious sacrifice, social communication, social competition, and prestige) also contributed to the sophistication of the food system and created standards of connoisseurship aspired to by both upper and lower strata of society.

The second half of the book deals with the food system in its present form. Chapters include a well-informed discussion of regional specialties, an incisive analysis of basic cooking strategies, an enlightening examination of the medicinal and nutritional aspects of Chinese foodways, and finally, a survey of the function of food in Chinese social life. Anderson examines the social, institutional, technological, and aesthetic facets of Chinese food synchronically and diachronically. This interdisciplinary feature makes his book an interesting, rich, and insightful synthesis of the culture of food in China.

Anderson consciously puts his account of Chinese agriculture and food system in



a comparative perspective. He writes, "Chinese agriculture represents the culmination of the labor- and land-intensive, hyper-efficient 'biological' option in farming. Modern American agriculture represents another pole: The 'mechanical' option, characterized by enormous use of energy (mostly from petroleum) and an extremely wasteful approach to land" (p. 130). There is, he argues, much that the West can learn from China. Although Anderson does not ignore problems in the Chinese model, such as ero-

sion and deforestation, he pays so little attention to the negative side that one wonders whether he might have romanticized his subject. Similar biases are reflected in his primary focus on Cantonese cuisine and foodways in the second part of the book, resulting no doubt from his personal field work experience in Hong Kong. This is, however, a common problem faced by anthropologists, who tend to see society from the perspective of the communities they know best.

*Bronze, Clay and Stone: Chinese Art in the C. C. Wang Family Collection.* Annette L. Juliano. Seattle and London: University of Washington Press, 1988. 75 entries on objects, 75 color illustrations; selected bibliography; index of Chinese names and terms.

*Reviewed by* KATHERYN M. LINDUFF, *University of Pittsburgh*

This volume is a catalog of a less well-known portion of the collection of Chinese art carefully selected by C. C. Wang over the past several decades. As recounted by Wang himself in a short "Forward" to the catalogue, this particular part of the collection was put together only after rethinking the classical Chinese canon of literati taste that places painting and calligraphy in the most prominent positions, to the neglect of other forms of art. Because most small sculptures of bronze, clay, and stone from this period were used in a funerary context, they bore the stigma of being inauspicious and were not considered worthy of aesthetic consideration by the literati. As a result, with the exception of the ritual bronze vessels, objects such as those reviewed in this catalog have not been of interest to Chinese collectors. Although small, funerary sculpture has found its way into Western collections and has received the attention of antiquarians, it has not been seriously researched either by Chinese or Western historians of art. This study, then, marks the reevaluated taste of a literati collector, and a shift in scholarship to treat this particular material with scholarly care. By doing

so, it adds to the corpus of identifiable items with which we may begin to assess the styles, uses, and scope of the Chinese sculptural tradition.

Juliano's "Introduction" begins with a review of past literature on the subject of funerary sculpture and points out the problems of authentication, provenance, dating, and style when working with undocumented, and largely unexcavated, materials such as are in this collection. Until the resumption of excavations and, in 1972, of the publication of Chinese archaeological journals, firm, comparative data were missing. Even so, it was not until 1977 that the first serious major study to treat pottery burial figures as a significant expression of China's sculptural tradition, worthy of investigation and stylistic evaluation, was published (Ezekial Schloss, *Ancient Chinese Ceramic Sculpture from the Han through the T'ang*). This publication confirms the importance of the material and adds to its explication.

The catalog includes fourteen bronze ritual vessels that date from the late Shang to the later Han dynasties (ca. 1100 B.C. to A.D. 220), 53 ceramic funerary sculptures from the

Western Han to the Tang Dynasty (ca. 220 B.C. to ca. A.D. 800), and five stone sculptures made between the late Han and the Sui dynasties (second century A.D. to A.D. 595). They are separated into groups first by medium and then by date. The questions that Juliano addresses for each include subject matter, symbolism, technique, and style. She comments on the aesthetic appeal of each piece, as well as on its subject and probable use. The condition and the method of analysis used to assess each is noted. For each of the 75 items there is a glorious, full-page, color photograph, a rare feature in publications on Chinese materials.

Scholarly references to related materials in other collections and to excavated objects of similar type are used to verify the seeming authenticity of each item. Special attention is paid to materials found in scientifically excavated contexts and a black-and-white photograph of each is included in the Appendix at the end of the volume. The care taken in pre-

sentation of intrinsic information about the entries is exemplar with only one exception. Where inscriptions appear, such as on bronze ritual vessels (e.g., Figs. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8), they unfortunately are not translated. In addition, little is said directly about the authenticity of objects, although the high quality of certain objects is noted as are unusual or unique features (see Figs. 18, 22, 34, 43, 44, 45, 47, 64, 68). Both the general reader and specialist will find notes of interest.

In all, this volume celebrates the talents of a great collector of Chinese art, and with this, the artifacts. The collection is that of a person interested in developing a representative set of funerary materials, especially animal and figure studies in clay. Broader questions about how and why these materials rose to popularity within early Chinese aristocratic society are provoked in such a collection, but are not addressed here and await further publication.