BOOK REVIEWS

William Gowland: The Father of Japanese Archaeology. Victor Harris and Kazuo Goto, eds. Tokyo: Asahi Shinbunsha and London: British Museum Press, 2003. 199 pp. ¥9000. ISBN 4-02-257835-1.

Reviewed by Mark Hudson, *University of Tsukuba*

William Gowland (1842–1922) was a British chemist who was employed by the Imperial Japanese Mint in Osaka for 16 years (1872 to 1888). In addition to active interests in art and mountaineering, Gowland was a keen amateur archaeologist who surveyed hundreds of Kofun era tombs in western Japan. After his return to the UK, Gowland's collection of artifacts, plans, and photographs eventually made its way to the British Museum. Although parts of this collection had been seen by Kofun specialists Sueji Umehara, probably in 1924, and Hatsushige Otsuka in 1967, the volume under review here is the first extensive publication of the Gowland collection.

The main body of this book consists of plans and photographs of the tombs surveyed by Gowland, as well as drawings and photographs of the artifacts he collected. The illustrations are all accompanied by detailed notes. Short chapters by Victor Harris, Hironori Ueda, Hatsushige Otsuka, and Kazuo Goto provide further background on Gowland and his archaeological work. The entire book has text in both Japanese and English. Despite a number of typos, the translations from Japanese read smoothly, although I feel it would have been more appropriate to use British rather than American English on this occasion.

The volume's photographer, Kazuo Goto, describes the difficult conditions under which he was required to take the photos reproduced here (p. 185), yet the results are impressive. Goto's photographs provide us with an excellent archaeological record of the Gowland collection that is also artistically pleasing, the often rather stark contrast recalling Gowland's own photos of a century earlier. The detailed notes that accompany these photos will be of great value to scholars working on the material culture of Kofun period Japan.

Gowland's approach to survey and excavation appears to have been meticulous. As early as 1878, he employed screening with sieves of different mesh size during excavations at the Shibamura tomb (now known as Shibayama) in Higashi Osaka City. In terms of interpretation, Gowland developed critical views on some of the so-called imperial mausolea and on the extent of Yamato power in the earlier Kofun period. Otsuka (p. 173) writes that "Gowland's findings did not reach the ears of Japanese academia because all three [of his] papers were published after his return to England, unfortunately with no way for them to gain acceptance in contemporary Japanese archaeological circles." Ueda (p. 160) expands on this by suggesting that Gowland's failure to publish until after his return to the UK "was surely not coincidental. He judiciously foresaw the uproar his reports would cause, and determined to hold off publication until he was safely out of the country." Further discussion of this issue and further background on Gowland himself would have made this volume of more interest to scholars outside of Kofun studies. A chronology of Gowland's life and

a list of relevant publications would also have been welcome additions. For instance, in an extract from an 1895 letter reproduced here on p. 20, W. G. Aston wrote to Gowland that he was "Glad to hear Mrs. Gowland and the young person are flourishing." Since we are told that Gowland was unmarried while in Japan (p. 18), could it be that his new wife and child explain his delay in publishing his research as much as his reluctance to be controversial while actually in Japan? Perhaps the major frustration with this book is that it never makes explicit exactly what is and is not known about Gowland's life.

Without doubt, however, this volume presents a timely reevaluation of Gowland's archaeological work in Japan, work that had been largely forgotten by the Japanese archaeological community. Together with Edward Morse, Heinrich von Siebold, and others, Gowland was one of a number of Western scholars who were influential in the development of archaeology in Meiji Japan. To call Gowland "*The* Father of Japanese Archaeology" is surely an exaggeration, but he was certainly a major founding figure. As this book makes clear through letters and other materials, Gowland was in close contact with many other Western scholars in Meiji Japan, including Ernest Satow, W. G. Aston, Basil Chamberlain, and Romyn Hitchcock. But his connections, if any, with Edward Morse are not discussed here. It would be interesting to know of the existence of such a connection, because the early excavations of these two men overlap almost eerily. As far as one can determine from this volume, the first actual excavation conducted by Gowland was at the Shibamura tomb mentioned above. According to Victor Harris (p. 21), Gowland made a preliminary investigation at Shibamura on July 10, 1877, which was less than three weeks after Morse had "discovered" the Omori shell middens in Tokyo on June 20 of that same year. Morse's excavations at Omori in the autumn of 1877 were closely followed by Gowland's dig at Shibamura on December 29–30, 1878.

This book seems to be part of a trend toward the reevaluation of the work of early Western pioneers in Japanese archaeology. Tatsuo Kobayashi (2004), for example, has recently emphasized the significance of Neil Gordon Munro's 1908 volume *Prehistoric Japan*. Munro would have been pleased by this, since—according to letters recently uncovered by my colleague Tom Bogdanowicz—he was quite bitter at the treatment given to him by the Japanese archaeological community. At the risk of sounding somewhat cynical, I can only hope that it doesn't take a hundred years for the Japanese archaeological community to evaluate the work of postwar Western archaeologists working in Japan.

In conclusion, then, this will be an extremely useful volume for students of Kofun tombs and material culture, the detailed descriptions of sites and finds providing the sort of information that is difficult to find in English. Readers interested in the history of archaeology will have their appetites whetted but come away wishing for more.

REFERENCE CITED

Kobayashi Tatsuo
2004 Trends and perspectives in research on Jomon culture. *Bulletin of the International Jomon Culture Conference* 1:53–61.

Jade Dragon. Sarah Milledge Nelson. Littleton, CO: RKOLOG Press, 2004. 221 pp. Trade paperback. $19.95. ISBN: 0-9675798-2-1.

Reviewed by Adrian Praetzellis, *Sonoma State University*

"I don't think of myself as an adventurous person, although I enjoy foreign travel and meeting people of other cultures. I might have turned down this adventure if I could

have seen the future, but maybe not. There were pluses and minuses" (Nelson p. 7).

Here are some words of advice for those who believe that "archaeology" and "story" should never appear in the same sentence: Turn the page now. *Jade Dragon* is the second of Sarah Nelson's archaeological suspense novels and continues the exploits of a Korean-American archaeologist whom we first met in Nelson's haunting first novel, *Spirit Bird Journey*.

The book's two parallel story lines are narrated in the first person and take place in contemporary China and in that country's ancient past. The modern protagonist, archaeologist Clara Alden, is visiting a site dubbed the Goddess Temple and must contend with local scholars and looters. Her spirit, meanwhile, travels deep into the past and, in the form of a bird, observes and guides a group of tribal people. (It's tough to review a novel without giving away too much!) Chapters of varying length hop between past and present, a style that advances the action rapidly and maintains the reader's interest.

Jade Dragon is about jade and the importance of that mysterious stone in both modern and ancient China. Plundering archaeological remains for valuable pieces is big business in China, in spite of the possibility of a death sentence for the perpetrator. As the people of the ancient past come alive through Nelson's novel, the contemporary looters crime becomes even more heinous. By destroying the archaeological contexts in which these precious objects have come to us, these scavengers extinguish past lives. I cannot help thinking that Nelson's occasional digs at art historians may have been influenced by the fact that their profession is rooted in the same fixation with material things that fueled the frenzy of pillaging that destroyed so many archaeological sites in advance of construction of the Three Gorges Dam.

Sarah Nelson is not the first archaeologist to have realized that some of our insights simply cannot be expressed through conventional scholarly presentations. George Gaylord Simpson's posthumously published *The Dechronization of Sam Magruder* (London: St. Martins Griffin, 1997) is an early example, while Janet Spector's *What This Awl Means* (Minneapolis: Minnesota Historical Society Press, 1993) is required reading in many universities and a welcome break from the usual bland undergraduate fare. The late James Deetz went even further, writing in the journal *Historical Archaeology* that "Simply put, archaeologists *are* storytellers" (Vol. 34:94, 1998), for hermeneutic understanding is a dialog of sorts between data and contexts, both archaeological and historical. Like Simpson, Spector, and Deetz, Nelson is no dabbler. A faculty member at the University of Denver, she has written a dozen books on archaeology, including *The Archaeology of Northeast China* (ed., London: Routledge, 1995) and *The Archaeology of Korea* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993). Nelson is also an experienced traveler in China and offers glimpses into the practice of archaeology, as well as the realities of life: Readers who have unanswered questions about the state of Chinese public toilets will want to order this book.

While *Jade Dragon* is a good read—and parts are extraordinarily rich in both emotion and ethnographic detail—it's not without fault. The author is at her strongest when she is evoking time and place; the flip side is some unnaturally stiff dialog that would fit more easily in a lecture hall than a real conversation. And perhaps it's the field archaeologist in me that felt a great yearning for a map with which to track the characters' journeys, for they're always on the move. The publisher, RKLOG Press (spell out the letters), is guilty of occasional lapses in production values such as changes in the font and instances of blank half lines.

Parts of *Jade Dragon* are almost ethnographic in their detail. One can sense a lifetime of anthropological observation bubbling up as the author paints her picture of a matrilineal society in which women are, nevertheless, subjugated in marriage. It's clear that the book was written by an archaeologist, for this story of the deep past hinges on elements that have archaeological manifestations: Creating a ceremonial structure involves breaking pots; the mem-

bers of an evolving elite enhance their social status by displaying rare artifacts; trade causes one village to prosper at the expense of others.

Modern theory-driven interpreters of prehistory have created a uniformly austere past dominated by forces like adaptation and class conflict in which altruism is simply greed's mask. While Nelson's anthropological approach shows she is keenly aware of the role these forces play in the long view, happily in *Jade Dragon* we are offered an antidote to such bleak and cynical versions of the human story: the optimistic notion that friendly, mutual relationships would also have been a part of cultural-historical change. And that interethnic communication can at times be a source of curiosity and wonder, rather than xenophobia that slides inevitably to war.

The Excavation of Khok Phanom Di: A Prehistoric Site in Central Thailand. Volume VII: Summary and Conclusions. C.F.W. Higham and R. Thosarat, with contributions by B.F.J. Manly and R. A. Bentley. London: Society of Antiquaries, 2004. (Distributed by Oxbow Books.)

Reviewed by ANNA KÄLLÉN, *Museum of National Antiquities, Stockholm*

The long-awaited seventh and last report volume from the Khok Phanom Di excavations in 1984 and 1985 was recently published by the London Society of Antiquaries. The authors, Rachanie Thosarat and Charles Higham, are here summarizing and concluding the results from the six preceding report volumes from Khok Phanom Di, the renowned prehistoric mound site in central Thailand. The book is produced in an accessible hardcover format of 182 pages, including appendices, bibliography, and index, with 21 tables and 92 figures. It is a suitable report format, apart from the photographs, which would have benefited from a more careful layout and a finer raster.

The text is divided into five chapters. The first is a short introduction to the site and the 1984–1985 excavations, followed by a summary of the results in the second chapter. Chapter three contains the analysis of mortuary remains. The fourth chapter deals with social organization, and the final one presents Khok Phanom Di in wider perspective, with comparisons to linguistic theories and interpretations of other excavated sites in Southeast Asia.

An area of 10 by 10 meters was excavated at the mound site Khok Phanom Di in 1984–1985. A series of radiocarbon dates indicate that the cultural layer, which is up to 12 meters deep, accumulated rapidly between 2000 and 1500 B.C. The first human activity at the site is described as an estuarine settlement of maritime hunter-gatherer-fishers who interacted with intrusive rice cultivators in its hinterland. The activities that followed over four centuries display cultural continuity as well as major cultural changes.

The human activities at Khok Phanom Di have been divided into eight cultural phases, while the recovered burials have been subdivided into seven mortuary phases, illustrated neatly as a diagram in Figure 25. With mortuary phase 3, there are considerable changes in the attitude to ceramics, and the skeletal remains suggest a change in activity patterns. Rice is now more common in burials, whereas there is a decline in fishhooks and shell jewelry. These indications of change are backed up with substantial references to biological data suggesting major transitions in the habitat from marine to freshwater, back to marine and finally, to dry land conditions, during the time that the site was used.

Human remains from 154 burials have been analyzed with emphasis on health. The human remains basically reconfirm the impact of the environmental changes on the community, with changes in activity patterns and health status. Strontium isotope analysis of teeth indicates that some of the interred individuals were raised elsewhere and have come to the site as adults.

Among the artifacts were clay net sinkers, bone points and awls, stone adzes, hoes, shell knives, shell beads and bangles, turtle carapace ornaments, potters' anvils and burnishing stones, clay cylinders, and extraordinary pottery and potsherds. Most artifacts were recovered from mortuary contexts and have been analyzed foremost in terms of raw material. A number of computerized analyses have been performed, such as multiple regression analysis, cluster analysis, four-dimensional nonmetric multidimensional scaling, and a multiple varimax rotated factor matrix for each mortuary phase.

At the end of the volume, Higham and Thosarat summarize as follows:

> Our preferred view is that Khok Phanom Di was occupied by a community whose forbears had occupied coastal habitats in Southeast Asia for millennia. With the intrusion of agriculturalists ultimately from the area of the Yangzi valley, they entered into a new web of social relationships which brought females into the community, and with them the exotic dog, a knowledge of rice and its potential as a cultigen, and new opportunities for the exchange of artefacts fashioned from the local shellfish and clay resources. (p. 158)

"One of the principal objectives in completing this analysis of Khok Phanom Di, is to integrate these changes with patterns of human adaptation" (p. 18). "The excavation has provided the opportunity to examine the interactions between the environment, subsistence, technology and the health of the inhabitants over time" (p. 21). These and many more examples from the text include words such as "adaptation," "subsistence base," and "model." The theoretical base of the Khok Phanom Di excavation is clearly to be found in the positivist school of processual archaeology developed by Lewis Binford and others in the early 1970s. This is also reconfirmed by Higham and Thosarat's references to social theory, all of which, with one exception, predates 1984. According to the objectivist ideals of positivism, the role of science is to deal with the chaotic reality through means of simplification and to strive for value neutrality. Hermeneutics is a fundamentally different theoretical base used in most research in human science and social theory today. In hermeneutics, reality is abstract, ungraspable, and uninteresting if seen neutrally and out of context. With a hermeneutic approach, therefore, knowledge cannot be formed as a simplification but must be actively created through a problematization of reality. Archaeologists working with a hermeneutic research approach have since the 1980s criticized processual archaeologists for reductionism and oversimplification in their interpretations of human society, for conveying undisputed sexist and imperialistic images of prehistory disguised in claims of neutrality and objectivity, and for a general lack of critical reflection on the terminology and categorization used in analyses of material culture and social organization.

Swimming around, as I am, in the hermeneutic pool of Scandinavian archaeology, I have asked myself many times why it is that the archaeology of Southeast Asia has never really picked up the more humanist and intellectually stimulating critique involved in the hermeneutic approach used in almost all human science in the world today and instead insists on holding on to a theoretical foundation that is now by most considered to be too rigid and oversimplifying—even for natural science, let alone human sciences. In the case of Khok Phanom Di, there is nothing in the constitution of material remains at Khok Phanom Di that makes this site particularly suitable for questions of adaptation and subsistence. On the contrary, based on my reading of Higham and Thosarat's text,

I am convinced that the image of Khok Phanom Di and its prehistoric inhabitants can only benefit from a bit of critical discussion. Let me take three concrete examples.

There are quite amazing indicators of elaborate mortuary rituals emphasizing the individual and the particular at Khok Phanom Di. Bodies were covered in red ochre and wrapped in cloth together with pottery and other grave goods and interred in supine position surrounded by a wooden structure, in what appears to have been an elaborate ritual involving feasting. The importance of the particular is displayed in the great variation of outstanding grave goods. All analyses of these mortuary remains are based first on the assumption that the importance of an object lies inherent in the material it was made of and second that "many things" is synonymous with wealth. Both these assumptions are easy to trace back to a value system of the modern world and are very difficult to sustain with reference to recent research in human science. Human culture is simply far messier than that, if you want to take it seriously. It is fantastic and disturbing with its contradictions and inconsistencies. The multiple varimax rotated factor matrix therefore fails to move me, it fails to make me appreciate the greatness of the life of the 22-year-old woman in burial no. 47, who was interred cradling a newborn infant in her left arm, or the 19-year-old male in burial no. 147, who was interred alone with no grave goods. Can we really draw the conclusion that his life had no value? These questions must be asked if we want to take the people of Khok Phanom Di seriously.

The image conveyed of the physical people of Khok Phanom Di is, in an example from mortuary phase 2, one of physically robust males of great upper-body strength paddling canoes, and frail fertile females collecting shellfish. Based on skeletal evidence of more or less developed muscles and degenerated joints, "it is suggested that men were often engaged in riverine or maritime travel which involved fishing and the collection of shells for conversion into ornaments of social value" (p. 24). This is despite the fact that there is no difference between males and females in terms of the number of grave goods with which they have been endowed. Again, it is not difficult to trace these essentialist images of men and women to ideals of the modern world, which appear in value neutral disguise in the story of Khok Phanom Di as projections of strong and socializing traveling men and frail, food-collecting, fertile women. In the amazingly rich mortuary material at this site, there are excellent opportunities for a discussion on gender that does not end in yet another stereotyped projection of essential categories of men and women.

A recurring figure in the story about Khok Phanom Di is "the intrusive farmer," who plays the role of the threat in the hinterland to the idyllic hunter-gatherer's world: "The dog is an exotic species in Southeast Asia, and its arrival at the site is most probably the result of contact between long-established hunter-gatherers, and the first groups of intrusive farmers in the hinterland" (p. 7). The immediate question that comes to mind is exactly *how* this contact was constituted, a contact between the intrusive and the enduring, involving an exchange of dogs and immigration of women? Similar discussions about the introduction of agriculture have been going on in Scandinavian archaeology for decades. Those discussions have now moved beyond the simplified idea of stable categories of intruders and endurers to more complex understandings that leave room for some of the messiness of human culture. Even more interesting for the case of Khok Phanom Di is to ask why the introduction of rice cultivation at sites in Southeast Asia 3700 years ago is described in terms of conquest and intrusion. These are words from military and imperialist terminology. Maybe the answer is to be found in the last chapter of this volume, which reopens for discussion the idea of expansive rice cultivators from Yunnan entering into Mainland Southeast Asia around 2000 B.C. I am far from convinced, and I would welcome a discussion on the vocabulary used: It conveys an image of conquest and intru-

sion that is not substantiated anywhere in the material culture from this time in this area.

In conclusion, there is reason to rejoice that there is now a complete and detailed report from the excavations of the amazing site of Khok Phanom Di. Personally, I also hope for future dynamic and problematizing discussions in the archaeology of Mainland Southeast Asia, creating vibrant stories that are able to account for some of the human magnificence at sites such as Khok Phanom Di.

And through Flows the River: Archaeology and the Pasts of Lao Pako. Anna Källén. Studies in Global Archaeology 6. Uppsala: Uppsala University, 2004.

Reviewed by Joyce C. White, *University of Pennsylvania Museum*

The excavations at Lao Pako represent a pioneering chapter in Southeast Asian archaeology—one of the first prehistoric research programs in Laos since the country began opening up to the world of modern archaeological research in the late 1980s. It is not easy being among the first outsiders to work in a country with little infrastructure or history of archaeological research. The project is remarkable for being a sustained effort over the course of eight years by a gutsy Swedish graduate student, Anna Källén, who in this volume presents a synthesis of her efforts.

Some Southeast Asian archaeologists will enjoy Källén's approach to Lao Pako, perhaps especially members of the younger generation. Other archaeologists may feel provoked, such as those over 50 years of age. Many readers will experience a continuously changing range of reactions, from thoughtful stimulation to irritation to eyebrow raising. The reactions will reflect as much on the reader as on the text, as *the personal realms* of reader and writer are deliberately included in Källén's interests: "I do not aim for *my archaeology* to be safe, but instead thought-provoking, debating and challenging" (p. 184, emphasis added). The topics challenged are not limited to dominating theoretical frameworks during the relatively brief history of the modern discipline of Southeast Asian archaeology. They even touch upon aspects (albeit selectively and in passing) usually addressed over drinks at the bar—such as the impact of the social organization of dominant players in that research and views of Lao government officials on the purpose and value of the archaeological research. Källén aims quite self-consciously to raise her treatment of Lao Pako out of the well-worn route of how to write an archaeological dissertation.

Yes, this volume is actually a Ph.D. dissertation, even if it is presented as the sixth volume in the series Studies in Global Archaeology. Except for a preliminary report in BAR (British Archaeological Reports, Källén and Karlström 1999), this is the first book-length treatise on a prehistoric site in Laos, a country at the heart of Southeast Asia that is a virtual archaeological terra incognita. As such it should be widely read, irrespective of the reader's comfort with the theoretical orientations or discursive style of the author. I recommend reading the text from beginning to end (i.e., not as a reference to "look up" a fact of personal interest). By maintaining an open mind throughout and allowing one's mind to be stimulated by the views of a member of the coming generation of Southeast Asian archaeologists on an important and fascinating site, the reader will likely experience a variety of shifts in his or her perceptions of Mainland Southeast Asian archaeological research.

Lao Pako is a late Iron Age site (first half of the first millennium A.D.) along the Ngum tributary to the Mekong in Vientiane Province. It is one of those rare Southeast Asian prehistoric sites that is only

Asian Perspectives, Vol. 45, No. 1 © 2006 by the University of Hawai'i Press.

a single phase, small (1 hectare), and "rich." The single phase means that issues of sorting out chronology and sequence that often dominate other site reports in the region are minimal, in comparison with the multiphase, often multimillennia sites more commonly excavated. The compact size means that a dissertation-sized project is able to get a reasonable sense of what is there. That the site is rich—in the sense that within the smallish site a dense deposition of a wide range of intact or reconstructible material remains from deliberate interments, as well as deposits left from specific activities, particularly metal production—means that vivid visual evidence was recovered that helps to engage the archaeological imagination regarding the significance and place of the site in understanding Southeast Asia's past.

Many aspects of this report, from excavation methodology to data presentation to theoretical framework, could evoke extended discussions. The use of phosphate analyses to define site extent could be more commonly applied in Southeast Asia. During a visit to the site in 2001, I observed that for this particular site (relatively shallow and with nearly complete access to the site's surface), the dissertation strategy of excavating a random sample of test pits was likely to have been both viable and worthwhile—possibly a first for Southeast Asian prehistoric sites. The manner of presenting the data is attractive, engaging, unconventional, and creative, but at times thin on presenting aspects of the evidence normally expected in site reports, such as scales for all illustrations or synthesizing data tables to support assertions in the text. The theory involved in justifying the interpretation of Lao Pako as a "ritual site" would entail a lengthy discussion indeed. Obviously there is not enough space in this review to do any one topic justice. Therefore I will confine myself to a few observations on topics that I find of personal interest: audience and the nature of the Iron Age of Southeast Asia.

The book's focus on applying a postcolonial critique with postprocessual and structuralist overtones means that the audience for this volume is professional Southeast Asian archaeologists who were born and educated in developed countries. Although Källén shows awareness of the colonialist underpinnings of most current archaeology in Southeast Asia and of the differing agendas of indigenous archaeologists from those born and educated in the West, this book does little to bridge the communication gap. Indigenous Southeast Asian archaeologists may find the volume hard to read, understand, appreciate, or use as a model for their archaeological research. This is an observation, not a criticism, as Källén's primary objective is to stir up the complacency of the established discourse—not only a valid goal but arguably an important one in the context of a Ph.D. dissertation.

What is probably of broadest interest to the potential readership is what Lao Pako contributes to the data and understanding of the late Iron Age of Mainland Southeast Asia. Fieldwork during four seasons between 1995 and 2003 uncovered evidence for two main types of activities at this site: deliberate interments usually of sets of whole vessels (at least one including an infant burial) and remains of production activities, especially iron production and probably textile production. The ceramic vessels reveal yet another distinctive ceramic tradition, although small finds like spindle whorls and clay rollers are closely paralleled at other sites on the Khorat Plateau in Thailand. Källén interprets the production and interment activities as ritually related.

Lao Pako adds to the growing body of evidence that Iron Age Southeast Asia was a diverse and complex place, not comfortably fitting into a uniformitarian scenario of hierarchical chiefdoms on their way to becoming states. Just picture some other cultures of roughly the same time period in the Mekong basin—the Plain of Jars, Ban Chiang Late Period, the jar burial sites of the lower Mun and Chi, Phnum Snay, and Noen-U-Loke to name a few—and a picture of a riot of regional self-expression in everything from ceramics to burial rites to social organization comes to mind. So much is happening in the Iron Age, yet lit-

tle scholarship has tried to meaningfully bring out the salient evidence in all its rich diversity. The field cannot ignore this variability much longer.

One important area of contribution by Källén to the discussion of mortuary deposits is the beginning of the end of their treatment as an isolated behavior set, disconnected from daily life. Sites in Southeast Asia with mortuary remains have long been analyzed explicitly or implicitly as if they were "cemeteries," but it is increasingly evident that mortuary remains in this region are usually found amongst evidence for daily life—metal production in the case of Lao Pako and other sites mentioned in the text, and/or dwellings, food remains, and so on. The cemetery assumption has facilitated analyses focusing on wealth and status differentials fundamental to validating the neo-evolutionary paradigm. If the dead were not buried in cemeteries, the foundations for many aspects of the analysis of the development of social complexity in prehistoric Southeast Asia will need to be rethought and reanalyzed. The principles underlying interment decisions and behaviors will need to be sought from new approaches and paradigms—perhaps with inspiration from postprocessual concepts.

It took admirable courage to write this "outside the box" treatment of Lao Pako, especially determinedly putting its excavation and interpretation into the historical and social scholarly context as experienced by the author. She risks dismissal by still-powerful, senior, mostly male members of the field who have invested their careers in entrenched paradigms. But even some of us over 50 are weary of the pervasive and unending reproduction of simplistic linear evolutionary frameworks focusing on origins and progressive dominance scenarios, irrespective of whether or not the data lend themselves to such an approach or emphasis. Efforts like Källén's will serve to help break out (not just peer out) of the evolutionary box, broaden the archaeological discourse in the region beyond stale progressive paradigms, and bring more of our data into global archaeological discussions.

I hope Källén's broad reach for scholarly perspectives and stimulation evokes similar broadening among up-and-coming Southeast Asian archaeologists. On the other hand, while awareness and articulation of "where one is coming from" is important, I hope the style emphasizing the author's personal sentiments as a centerpiece of scholarship is just a passing fad and does not become the dominant model for dissertations and other archaeological scholarship for the younger or any generation. Perhaps my stance is old-fashioned, but I have been around long enough to witness the inevitable transience of theoretical orientations. One returns again and again to a site report—take Ban Kao (Sørensen 1967) as an example—that has a thorough, well-organized description of the evidence of the site according to basic archaeological principles: stratigraphy, typology, relative and absolute chronology, depositional contexts, and so forth. In a good report, I find it is quite easy to factor out out-dated interpretations that may have been current at the time of publishing, even if I also appreciate learning "where the excavator was coming from." I can easily forgive methodologies that fall short by more recent standards if I can extract still useful and reliable empirical data. Such a site report retains its value indefinitely, irrespective of its formative paradigm. To create archaeology that is both stimulating at the time of writing *and* of enduring contribution to the field is the ideal aspiration. Many data are presented in this volume, and only time will tell if 40 years from now, this volume on Lao Pako sits dog-eared and underlined in the bookshelves of most members of the profession.

REFERENCES CITED

Källén, A., and A. Karlström
1999 *Lao Pako: A Late Prehistoric Site on the Nâm Ngum River in Laos.* British Archaeological Reports 777. Oxford: British Archeological Reports.

Sørensen, P.
1967 *Ban-Kao: Neolithic Settlements with Cemeteries in the Kanchanaburi Province.* Vol. 2 of *Archaeological Excavations in Thailand.* Copenhagen: Munksgaard.

Fishbones and Glittering Emblems: Southeast Asian Archaeology 2002. Anna Karlström and Anna Källén, eds. Stockholm: Museum of Far Eastern Antiquities (Östasiatiska Museet), 2003. 540 pp. 396 Swedish kronor.

Reviewed by John N. Miksic, *National University of Singapore*

The European Association of Southeast Asian Archaeologists (EurASEAA) held their ninth biennial conference in Sigtuna, a historic city in Sweden, in May 2002. This volume contains a large proportion of the papers presented at that conference, published in what constitutes record time for such large and diverse archaeological meetings as the EurASEAA meetings have become. The meetings of this association must be considered one of the two most important gatherings of scholars working in this field, along with the congresses of the Indo-Pacific Prehistory Association (IPPA).

The desire to publish as many contributions as possible leads to a wide variation in the quality of papers in the association's conference volumes. One of the compensating advantages of this philosophy is that we learn the names and work of some scholars, particularly Asians, who would not otherwise have their voices heard. Eighteen contributors of the 73 (approximately 25 percent) in this volume are Asian. The organizers put in hard labor to raise funds to enable the Asian scholars to attend the conference; for this as well as their timely issue of this publication, they are to be commended.

Because the papers are published soon after they are presented, they tend to be little changed from the conference versions. They are brief, and many of them concern research projects at various intermediate stages of implementation, for which no conclusions are yet available. Some are "opinion pieces"; others concentrate on presenting data in various states of digestion or analysis. A total of 50 papers (and two "poster sessions," which are equivalent to papers in length) are included in this book.

As a means of grappling with the problem of discussing such a varied book, I will isolate a few themes that bridge the different sessions and choose—on the basis of my own subjective evaluation—those papers that best exemplify these themes for special mention.

One interesting topic concerns the role of the European archaeologist in Asia. This theme is introduced in the conference's keynote address by Ian Glover. As he notes (p. 24), "What follows is in no way a history of European involvement in the development of archaeology in Southeast Asia for that would take a substantial volume." The recent publication of a history of the École Française d'Extrême-Orient indicates what such a history might contain. It is to be hoped that such a volume, largely written by Southeast Asians, will appear someday. In the 1960s, some Southeast Asians began to study at archaeology graduate schools in other parts of the world. Others, however, such as R. P. Soejono and Pisit Charoenwongsa, remained in their own countries and served as directors of the major archaeological research institutions; foreign-trained archaeologists became significant only in the late twentieth century.

As Glover notes (p. 27), too many foreign archaeologists continue to ignore the work of local scholars and "sometimes attempt to circumvent, rather than to collaborate with the local researchers, do not communicate their results, forget to send copies of the publications, and do not send back material allowed out on loan." A large proportion publish outside the region, in English, French, or German, "and are reluctant to become involved with the academic life of the host country" (p. 29). It is genuinely a wonder that Southeast Asians continue to be as hospitable to foreign archaeologists as they are. One hopes that

the younger generation of scholars will reflect upon the sins of their elders and strive to better their record.

Attitudes that might be termed nationalistic have surfaced in Southeast Asian archaeology, although such a stance is more overt in some countries than in others. Glover himself, who previously perceived nationalism as divisive and malign in its effects, admits the validity of the argument of the Philippine archaeologist Victor Paz that despite excesses, nationalism can be positive: It legitimizes the subject, encourages the flow of resources, and generates data that can be used for multiple purposes.

Magnus Fiskesjö discusses the history of European museums, such as the well-known Swedish Museum of Far Eastern Antiquity, that specialize in Asian artifacts (pp. 459–469). His interest is particularly drawn to the "splendid isolation of the European museums from their collections' Asian origins . . . [and the] strange circumstances of the originally European museum institution as transposed to the nations of Asia" (p. 459).

The latter subject is not developed further. Instead, Fiskesjö notes that the past 15 years have seen an immense growth in the flow of European tourists to Southeast Asia. As a result, rather than being the major medium of exposure to Southeast Asian culture, artifacts in European museums are now more like tourist souvenirs brought back by one's grandparents. New museum display techniques will be needed to make these souvenirs interesting to modern visitors, but simple reliance on new technology or new approaches such as "infotainment" are not likely to succeed in realizing the potential of the objects to educate visitors.

Ian Glover contributes a paper on "Southeast Asian Archaeological Collections in United Kingdom's Museums" (pp. 417–433). The conclusion, which came as a surprise to him, is that Britain actually possesses few archaeological collections from Southeast Asia. Most of this material arrived haphazardly, by donations, purchase, exchanges, or bequests from collectors, and mostly from Burma and Malaysia. Most of the objects have no firm provenance or dating. Much of Glover's paper, an inventory of what does exist, is a useful catalogue of collections.

Another interesting contribution to this topic is Kanji Tawara's history of Vietnamese archaeology (pp. 445–458). He deals with fluctuating attitudes toward the history of the Hung kings at various periods, from the fifteenth century until the post-1954 period. The contents and conclusions will be familiar to those who have studied Vietnamese historical archaeology, but it is useful to have the story summarized in condensed form.

The volume contains several substantive contributions to Southeast Asian prehistory. The paper by M. Spriggs, S. O'Connor, and P. Veth on shell middens of East Timor (pp. 49–58) is one of the best organized of the volume. Six of these sites are "Mesolithic" in date (5500–3600 B.P.) and "seem to represent a hunting and gathering lifestyle rendered unsustainable when Neolithic agricultural lifestyles developed on Timor with attendant massive environmental impacts upon the flora, fauna and geomorphology of the island" (p. 49). Most of these middens have no pottery and seem to have disappeared shortly after 4000 B.P. "Their demise is related to colonization by Neolithic farmers, and/or the rapid adoption of agriculture by indigenous groups *once it became available* at around that time" (p. 54) [emphasis added].

It is possible to debate several aspects of this paper. The use of such terminology as "Mesolithic" and "Neolithic" already conveys certain implications about the relationship between the technology and the culture of the area that remain to be determined. Indonesian and other archaeologists have argued that such terminology should be replaced for Southeast Asia because it carries assumptions about such connections imported from outside the region.

Other queries must await further evidence: Can we accept the assumption of "massive impact" on the region from immigrants with new subsistence strategies? If shellfish gathering became unsustainable as a result of immigrants, why should this be

so? The fact that three shell middens near Dili date from the last 600 years and another at Baucau is dated 2050 B.P. seems to contradict the hypothesis that the previous lifestyle was unsustainable. It is argued that the extinction of bush rats, which formerly supplied a major source of nutrition, coincided with the inception of agriculture (p. 55) and made a mobile lifestyle unsustainable. No evidence is provided to demonstrate that the shell middens represent seasonal rather than permanent occupation.

The authors note that no "Neolithic" village sites have yet been found, although Glover found pottery and other Neolithic evidence that begins to appear around 4000 B.P. They honorably admit that the difference between ancient and recent site distribution "probably results partly from our survey strategy to date, as we have concentrated our survey efforts away from contemporary village sites" (p. 58), so we don't know when modern sites were established. Have they been occupied for the last 4000 years? Or were Neolithic sites not detected for some reason having to do with survey technique? These queries aside, the article presents a valuable preliminary look at a project with potential to provide much important new data on the prehistory of the eastern archipelago.

Another paper on prehistory, by Nguyen Kim Dung, is entitled "Prehistoric Techniques in the Ha Long Culture on Cat Ba Island: J. G. Anderrson's Discoveries and Recent Research" (pp. 59–69). This paper contributes important new information on Vietnamese research in this area over the past 40 years, including the author's own excavations on Cat Ba Island from 1998 to 2001, during which nine Pleistocene sites dating back 25,000 years were identified. The paper also contains gracious recognition of the work of the Swedish geologist/archaeologist, J. G. Anderrson, in the 1930s.

Yunnan is the focus of a paper by Jiang Zhilong on excavations at the site of Yangputou (pp. 75–80). In 1998–1999, 495 burials were discovered, with over 4000 artifacts, including bronze, iron, gold, jade, agate, ceramics, and much lacquer in the previously unknown form of male genitals, as well as lacquered wooden handles for axes with bronze blades set at angles like Indonesian *cangkul* digging tools, bronze halberds, and spears. Some bronze phalluses were also recovered. In a related paper (pp. 80–96), M. von Dewall provides a detailed description of the burial of a small child placed inside an extensively decorated bronze situla found in Hop Minh, Yen-bai Province, northern Vietnam, as an example of bronze's dominant role in Southeast Asian cultural traditions of ritualized mortuary practice, which can be traced back to the Dongson and Dian cultural spheres. She notes (p. 90) the interesting contrast in the situation between Dongson culture, which is comparatively well documented by stratified deposits including settlements, and Dian, where no settlements have yet been found and which is dated almost exclusively by Han Chinese imports found in burial contexts. The Dian bronze burial goods are, however, of much higher quality workmanship, diversity, and artistic inspiration.

The volume contains some very interesting studies of trade. One of these, by Olaf Winter (pp. 1219–1234), concerns the origins of the famous kula ring. A Swedish expedition to Kiriwina in 1998–1999 constitutes one of the few archaeological research projects to have been devoted to the Trobriand Islands, made so famous by the ethnography of Bronislaw Malinowski. The Amphlett Islands in the D'Entrecasteaux archipelago are now the main distributors of ceramics in the Trobriands, which are mostly used in ceremonial cooking for funerals. In prehistoric times, however (i.e., approximately 500–1500 years B.P.), it seems that Woodlark Island, Wanigela, and Collingwood Bay were the main distribution centers for ceramics to the Trobriand Islands, which have no clay suitable for pottery making. Pottery trade between the mainland and Trobriands appears to have taken place during the period A.D. 500–1500. Then in the sixteenth century, the Amphlett Islands achieved a monopoly of pottery distribution. Winter provides interesting explanations for this shift and adds the important observation that the distri-

bution of prehistoric pottery shows that the exchange system was then more widespread than the modern kula system.

Karen M. Mudar and Vincent C. Piggott discuss the possible rationale for early copper production in Lopburi Province, central Thailand (pp. 149–160). They postulate, "The correlation of changes in both subsistence and production should contribute to an understanding of subsistence strategies that . . . fostered long-term, nonhierarchical, egalitarian, social and economic relations in the region" (p. 149). "Agricultural insufficiency can be linked to specialized production in explaining the maintenance of heterarchical economic and social relations within a Southeast Asian context" (p. 150). One may perhaps pose a question here: How can one identify or define "insufficiency"? Such a concept must be based on the assumption that there is such a thing as "sufficiency." How can this be proven? Can we measure population and agricultural production with sufficient precision to determine whether the condition of "sufficiency" has been met? This is likely to be a constantly changing equation; population may well grow as resources become more abundant, thereby leading to a constant game of "catch-up." One can hypothesize that population will continue to grow up to a factor of several times if food supplies are assured and the nutritional and other needs of mothers and children can be met with sufficient reliability.

The situation is likely to have been dynamic rather than a rapid shift from one homeostatic situation to another. This is not to say that intensification of craft production is not a strategy for obtaining food. What is in doubt is whether this set of factors can lead to heterarchical social and economic organization. One cannot argue that copper production arose here because of a poor environment. Obviously it arose because rich copper ore was available. Thus, although the environment was relatively unproductive from an agrarian point of view, it was highly productive from a metallurgical perspective.

A similar question can be asked regarding the authors' argument in favor of heterarchy. What is the evidence for such a situation? In their terms, proof comes in the following form: "Availability of means and materials for specialized production to all households in a community can be signaled by community-wide organization of specialized production and lack of evidence for workshops—exactly how we characterize production at Non Pa Wai and Nil Kham Haeng" (p. 152). But how can one determine whether *all* households in an archaeological site had equal access to knowledge and techniques? And even if they did, skill levels would still produce inequalities. Negative evidence such as inability to identify workshops is not acceptable as definitive. Village-level specialization is quite typical of Southeast Asian production systems for such items as pottery and weaving as well as metal, but it is not always correlated with egalitarian or heterarchical social systems. What would constitute definitive evidence would be data on household living standards or standardized burials.

This paper tests the hypothesis that the supply of food in the valley was "relatively unpredictable and, therefore, was supplemented by trading for food." Sources of data include rainfall and soil types, evidence that subsistence instability prompted coping strategies, and confirmation of subsistence shortfalls. Part of the argument rests on climatic data taken from present conditions rather than those existing 3000 years ago (p. 153). Can we assume that these conditions have not changed?

The authors present a hypothesis: "If agricultural regimes stabilized, and harvests were predictably abundant, we would expect to see a decrease in diversity and in number of wild species through time" (p. 154). This is not necessarily true. Numerous other explanations are possible. There is still a long way to go before the hypothesis advanced here can be seriously tested. The danger is that the analysis of data will be driven by a particular agenda—that of proving a particular interpretation—rather than objectively examining a number of possible lines of interpretation.

"It is hoped that our synthesis will en-

able us to assess root causes for the delayed emergence of social complexity in the local region and perhaps across greater Southeast Asia" (p. 159). This is a worthy goal, although one should be prepared to face the fact that the answer will turn out to be relatively simple: low population density. Why population density should have remained low is a separate problem.

Kazuo Miyamoto contributes a useful study of ceramics found in Eastern Han-style tombs in Thanh-hoa District, north Vietnam, by the Swedish archaeologist Olov Janse (pp. 181–190). Grave goods such as glazed pottery and bronze vessels found in these tombs are also found in Yunnan, Guangdong, and Hunan Provinces at this period but not in areas populated by ethnic Han people. Some vessels found in Guangdong are inscribed Xi Yu, a prefecture in northern Vietnam. These objects were therefore probably made in Vietnam and exported northward. Historically, this phase—especially the second half of the second century—can be connected with the successful bid for autonomy by Si Nhiep (Shi Xie), whose base was in southern China (including Nan Hai Prefecture).

In a similar vein, Ruth Prior uses ceramics excavated by Janse and now stored in the Museum of Far Eastern Antiquities, Stockholm, and in the Peabody Museum, Boston (pp. 191–202). She establishes a database for the material and uses it to discuss the production and distribution of ceramics in Han-style brick tombs. Her question is: Did the kiln site at Tam Tho, Thanh Hoa Province, which supplied many of the ceramics in the Thanh Hoa brick tombs, also provide ceramics for sites further south, in central Vietnam (Hoi An/Tra Kieu area), where people of a different ethnolinguistic group may have been living (the Cham)? During his excavations,

> Janse encountered a ceramic fabric that he recognized as not produced at Tam Tho. It was a white ware, high fired and originally covered with a pale glaze, either green or cream in color. . . . The absence of this fabric, which appears to be made from a kaolin clay, at Tah Thom, led Janse to suspect that it was possibly introduced from Tonkin, where it is well represented in Han tombs or imported from China directly. (p. 197)

Prior applied petrographic analysis to the Peabody collection and determined that a type of flat-bottomed jar at Tra Kieu was not from Tam Tho. Tra Kieu ceramics resemble those of the northern kilns but were primarily handmade, thus not by Sinicized potters. This contradicts one of Janse's conclusions. However, Prior thinks Janse may have been correct to the extent that the Chinese did introduce a new level of ceramic technology to the region (wheels, kilns). High-fired cream wares with glaze sometimes are inscribed with Chinese characters. Perhaps these are potters' marks, thus probably made by Chinese potters. She identifies other wares as evidence that Vietnamese potters were "eager to impersonate Chinese forms and motifs but as yet without demonstrating the skills in their production as shown in the white wares" (p. 202).

More important scientific analysis is provided in a paper by Cynthia Lampert, Ian Glover, Carl Heron, Ben Stern, Rasmi Shoocongdej, and Gill Thompson entitled "Resinous Residues on Prehistoric Pottery from Southeast Asia: Characterization and Radiocarbon Dating" (pp. 203–206). This paper notes that of 426 potsherds recovered by Chester Gorman in Spirit Cave, only 22 can now be located. Gorman dated them around 7500 B.P. Four had resin coatings on interior and exterior. AMS dating is reported to contradict claims for early origin for the ceramics, but frustratingly, the dates are not given here! One has to consult the *Proceedings of the 4th ^{14}C and Archaeology Symposium* and *Archaeological Chemistry* VI.

Sten Tesch, in the "Introduction" to the papers from session 7, "The Power of the City: The Role of Urban Centra in the Growth of Early Historical Southeast Asian Kingdoms" (pp. 213–218), shows that comparison with Sigtuna, where the conference was held, can yield unexpected insights into Southeast Asian data. In that

session, Jacques Gaucher's article on "New Archaeological Data on the Urban Space of the Capital City of Angkor Thom" (pp. 233–242) describes some results of his survey, begun in 2000, of the entire 3 × 3 km area of Angkor Thom. Much of the southern half of the site is now nothing but forest. Thus the survey involved cutting alleys 4 m wide, 1500 m long, and 200 m apart, through each of the four quadrants of the site. The survey identified a total of 62 "hollow structures" divided into "open" and "punctual" types that form an overall grid pattern. Gaucher infers that these correspond to a system of streets, canals, dams, and drains. Excavations to search for habitation remains in this area may yield important results.

Eric Bourdonneau contributes new data on the canal system of the Mekong Delta, augmenting the work of Malleret, whose 1959 map is found to be inaccurate—more of a sketch than a map. One important discovery is that the density of canals is probably much higher than Malleret suggested. Since according to Bourdonneau the Vietnamese began to populate this part of the delta only in the eighteenth century, most canals must predate their arrival, but they could have been built anytime within about 2000 years.

Although it is not strictly archaeological, Alexandra Green's article on nineteenth-century Burmese wall paintings (pp. 323–334) is also noteworthy for the quality of its information and the analysis applied to the topic. She shows how the subject matter of the murals changed after the Pagan period and shows how these changes can be understood in terms of the evolution of the relationship between Buddhism and kingship. Lydia Kieven's chapter on "Loving Couples Depicted in Temple Reliefs in East Java of the Majapahit Time" (pp. 335–348) also succeeds in extracting useful new cultural history from art historical data.

It is not possible to do justice to the scope of the material presented in this volume, even in a review as long as this one has become. The role of EurASEAA in disseminating so much information about rapidly expanding knowledge of Southeast Asia's past is very welcome. One hopes that the retirement of Ian Glover as one of the main coordinators of this association (which he announced at the organization's most recent conference in London in September 2004) will not affect this situation.

Southeast Asian Archaeology: Wilhelm G. Solheim II Festschrift. Victor Paz, ed. Manila: University of the Philippines Press, 2004.

Reviewed by Peter Lape, *Department of Anthropology, University of Washington, Seattle*

This Festschrift volume edited by Victor Paz is a fascinating read and would be a valuable addition to the library of anyone interested in the intellectual history and present state of Southeast Asian archaeology. Comprised of 31 chapters from a wide variety of contributors including Bill Solheim's colleagues, students, and others who have been influenced by his work, it provides a glimpse into the intersection of Solheim's biography and the trajectory of archaeology in Southeast Asia since the late 1940s.

The book is divided into three sections. Part 1 ("Bill and Archaeology") includes seven chapters that trace Solheim's contributions to the field, his life history, and the development of archaeological research in Southeast Asia. I found this part to be the most interesting and valuable section of the volume. Many of the oral traditions of the early days of research in the region, the

origins of professional organizations (such as the Indo-Pacific Prehistory Association), academic journals (such as *Asian Perspectives*), and departments (particularly those at the University of Hawai'i and the University of the Philippines) are here committed to print. For those of us who are relative newcomers to the region and the field, this section provides fascinating insights into the particular history of the discipline and the region. Chapters by Shutler, Golson and Kennedy, Ronquillo, and Meacham in particular give a personal glimpse into Solheim's life as an archaeologist and the early days of current institutions like IPPA and *Asian Perspectives*. Other chapters further contextualize this personal history in terms of continuing theoretical debates about ceramics (Stark) and population movements (Oppenheimer). Glover closes this section with a discussion of Western scholarly involvement in Southeast Asian archaeology in relation to larger political shifts from colonialism to postcolonial nationalism.

It is interesting to note that the conflicts of interest between foreign and local archaeologists in the current nationalist environment described by Glover seem to have been largely circumvented by Solheim himself. Many of the contributions in the second and third parts of this volume are written by Solheim's students from Thailand and the Philippines, and their contributions are examples of the legacy of Solheim's deep and ongoing commitment to training Southeast Asian students in archaeology. The strength of the archaeology program at the University of the Philippines, for example, is in part a result of Solheim's participation as resident scholar, teacher, and mentor of students. Solheim appears to be a model for moving beyond foreign–local conflicts, through engaging and mentoring colleagues and students, teaching in Southeast Asian institutions, and promoting wider interest in Southeast Asian archaeology both within and beyond academia.

Parts 2 and 3 ("Island Southeast Asia" and "Mainland Southeast Asia") are comprised of a mix of descriptive reports and methodologically and theoretically oriented papers from these respective regions. As editor, Paz clearly cast a wide net in his quest for contributions, and the result is voluminous if somewhat mixed in quality. Indeed, a heavier editorial hand might have made for a lighter read; the binding on my copy soon gave out under the strain of supporting over 600 pages. A number of chapters are descriptive site reports, which at first seemed to be a poor fit for this volume. However, as detailed reports on Southeast Asian sites are rarely published, I also welcome any opportunity to get this material into print. Standouts include chapters by Szabo, Kelly, and Peñalosa on Ille Cave, Palawan, and Voeun and von den Driesch on Angkor Borei fish. Three of these chapters include descriptions of older excavations that had not been previously published, or reports on recently reexcavated sites. These valuable contributions include Lertrit's chapter on new excavations at Sab Champa, Welch and McNeil on partially completed analysis of ceramics excavated from Ban Suai in 1966, and Allen's report on the 1963–1964 excavations at Ban Makha, which presumably have not been published before. Several excellent chapters focus on the Hoabinian and are more analytical in presentation, including White and Gorman on lithic reduction sequences and Viet on subsistence strategies.

Overall, the many chapters in these latter two parts of this book will give the reader a glimpse into the fractured world that is Southeast Asian archaeology. While the strong showing of archaeologists from Southeast Asian countries in this volume is an encouraging sign, the apparent lack of central questions or standard practices to guide archaeology in the region seems problematic to me. As the practitioners of Southeast Asian archaeology become more numerous and diverse, will our approaches also become increasingly disconnected to the point where we have little to say to each other? I opened the pages of this book thinking that I might find a set of papers based on the intriguing theories proposed by Solheim himself. Instead, the contribu-

tors to this volume rarely discuss Solheim's ideas directly. Perhaps this is inevitable in a Festschrift, which aims for a respectful distance rather than critical engagement with its human subject. Most contributors tiptoe around Solheim's most well-known theories, such as his *Nusantao* hypothesis on the origins of Austronesian-speaking peoples in the Pacific. Only Meacham, Oppenheimer, and Bulbeck write directly about these ideas, while those who have written critically about them (such as Bellwood) keep a polite distance. Two contributors, Tanudirjo and Jiao, take care to avoid direct criticism, which serves to dissipate their own presentation of potentially valuable alternative hypotheses.

Paz writes in his postscript that Solheim is finalizing a new book on his *Nusantao* hypothesis. Hopefully that will stimulate new interest and testing of these ideas in ways that better unify those working on the archaeology of Southeast Asia and neighboring regions. These disappointments (or more accurately, unrealistic expectations) aside, this volume remains a valuable contribution to the field and would be useful for those interested in its disciplinary history and as a glimpse into its current practice, as well as an introduction to the life of Bill Solheim and his ideas.

After Captain Cook: The Archaeology of the Recent Indigenous Past in Australia. R. Harrison and C. Williamson, eds. Walnut Creek: AltaMira, 2004. 231 pp. + xx. 54 b/w illustrations; 4 tables; index. $32.95 softcover. ISBN 0759106576.

Reviewed by Ian Lilley, *ATSIS Unit, University of Queensland*

This volume is the international edition of a published session at the Australian Archaeological Association (AAA) conference in 2000. It was originally issued under the same title through the University of Sydney in 2002. It was selected as one of the first volumes in a new World Archaeological Congress (WAC) Indigenous Archaeology series, which, in the words of the series editors' foreword, "is committed to . . . the empowerment of Indigenous peoples." Aside from this foreword and some administrivia in the front papers—and an attractive new cover—the two volumes are identical. Before saying anything more, I should declare that I am WAC secretary but play no role in the publication of this series.

Following the volume editors' scene-setting introduction, "Too Many Captain Cooks?" there are ten chapters and an epilogue organized into three major groups reflecting areas of research concentration. The first group comprises chapters by Ferrier on contact-period material culture, Harrison investigating the archaeology of the pastoral industry (ranching), Lydon analyzing settler photography at an Aboriginal reserve, and Williamson discussing contact-period archaeology in Tasmania. The second group, on indigenous land rights, includes only two papers, one by Riches and the other by Veth and McDonald. The former is about how archaeology might help remedy shortfalls of Native Title legislation, the latter about archaeology and "exclusive possession" (i.e., defining group boundaries and cultural continuity through space and time). The final major section deals with ways in which heritage managers can overcome decades of "erasure" of the historical archaeology of In-

digenous Australians, featuring studies by Byrne, Brown, Avery and Goulding, McIntyre-Tamwoy and Godwin, and L'Oste-Brown. Tim Murray acts as discussant in his epilogue, critically recapping the other chapters in a historicized international context.

The title of the introduction refers to the tendency of Aboriginal Australians to weave the English navigator Cook into local histories, even in regions thousands of kilometers from those he visited, while at the same time he is mythologized by Australia's Anglo-Celtic majority as a father of the settler nation. For the volume editors, "the sharing of Cook as a historical figure for both settler and indigenous Australians" creates a productive space in which "a *shared* Australian history can emerge" (p. 4, their emphasis). This is a worthy goal, to be sure, and one that by the evidence of this book generated a lot of compelling research that was highly topical when first delivered at AAA. It is now five years on, though, and one has to ask how the work is standing the test of time. Is this stuff still relevant, or is it now all a little passé? Given that the volume is an international edition, this question must be posed in relation to global developments and not just those in Australia. Does the volume *really* "provide a model for the rest of the world," as the WAC series editors claim (p. xv)?

While I was thinking about this question, Silliman (2005) published a paper entitled "Culture Contact or Colonialism: Challenges in the Archaeology of Native North America," which canvasses a range of relevant issues. He makes it clear that the volume under review, as well as other Australian work over the last decade or so, is not just still relevant but remains internationally class-leading. Citing *After Captain Cook* and other material by the volume editors, as well as contributors Byrne and Murray and other Australians, Silliman observes that archaeologists in Australia "seem more attuned already" to the challenges he addresses (p. 57). Like Silliman, I (and the contributors to *After Captain Cook*) would be amongst the first to acknowledge the pivotal insights into these challenges made by North American scholars over a long period. His comment nonetheless reinforces anecdotal evidence that Australia is ahead of the game at the moment when it comes to advancing understanding of the complexities of history in a settler nation. For instance, I was invited to give a paper in a session on postcolonialism and decolonization at the 2005 Society for American Archaeology conference. In later informal discussion with a number of the other presenters in the session and a group of Native American colleagues, it was repeatedly acknowledged that Australia was different from and, in their view, generally "more attuned" than the United States when it came to relations between archaeologists and indigenous people. It has been much the same at all the SAAs I have attended over the last five years or so, as it was at the World Archaeological Congress in Washington, D.C., in 2003.

This impressionistic picture is reinforced by more concrete evidence from the related world of international cultural heritage management. The World Bank leans heavily on Australia ICOMOS's Burra Charter (http://www.icomos.org/australia/burra.html) for guidance on "world's best practice" in its management of "physical cultural resources" (http://www.lema.ulg.ac.be/research/suit/WorldBankno8.pdf), as did the Chinese government in its recently promulgated "China Principles" (http://www.icomos.org/australia/images/pdf/china_prin.pdf). Much the same is happening in Iraq, where "world-class site management plans based on the Burra Charter" are being developed (http://hnn.us/readcomment.php?id=35981). The Burra Charter was originally designed to deal with nonindigenous historical built heritage, but it has evolved in a way that has seen its wording and applications expand to accommodate pre-European indigenous heritage as well as shared colonial heritage. As alluded to by the WAC editors (p. xv), this is partly because in the very small world that is Australia (despite its vast land area), archaeology and heritage man-

agement are not only conceptually and technically related, as they are elsewhere, but are often carried out by the same individuals at different times in their careers or as different facets of multidimensional professional lives. Moreover, a sufficient number of the more influential individuals involved work on both indigenous and nonindigenous issues for their approaches to all these matters to become entangled or hybridized in their high-profile research and in the development and implementation of state and national policy and practice relating to archaeology and heritage. In other words, issues of scale have engendered more fruitful professional cross-fertilization than is common elsewhere in the world.

There is something else going on, though, aspects of which I (2000a) have addressed in relation to the approaches of professional bodies (e.g., AAA, SAA) to indigenous questions. I found that despite obvious similarities, there were also telling differences between the United States on the one hand and British Commonwealth settler nations on the other. I contended that the SAA was demonstrably much more concerned than the associations in Commonwealth nations to accommodate all identifiable interests in indigenous archaeological heritage than to acknowledge the primacy of indigenous views in such contexts. I argued that this situation results ultimately from different visions of "the nation" that are well documented by historians and political scientists and that are tied to the middle-class interests of most archaeologists in these societies.

It is in the context of these different approaches that U.S. archaeologists faced Columbus' sesquicentenary, closely followed by NAGPRA, the two of which have combined to send U.S. archaeology in the directions Silliman dissects. Contrary to what McGuire (2004:387) believes, Australia has no legislation like NAGPRA, though we have developed policies about repatriation of cultural property and have had to face difficult repatriation cases that were broadly similar to the continuing Kennewick/Ancient One case. On the other hand, it was not until 1993 that we saw the legal recognition of Native Title after 200 years of denial, whereas in North America various sorts of native title have long been formally recognized (if not always honored), at least in some regions. As Murray (p. 219) notes, the content and tone of most of the papers in *After Captain Cook* (as well as of earlier works such as my [2000b] collection and of forthcoming works such as Harrison et al. in press) reflect the reactions of Australian archaeologists to what they see as the iniquity of the failed Yorta Yorta Native Title claim in southern Australia, which foundered on the finding that the Yorta Yorta had changed too much to retain traditional ties to their land, and to the judge's dismissal of archaeology as irrelevant to the case.

As is clear in *After Captain Cook,* there are two general feelings about these matters among Australian archaeologists. The first is that social justice would be better served if the judiciary (and, by extension, the wider community) had a different view of cultural continuity and change in Indigenous Australia—one that did not diminish the authenticity of contemporary indigenous identity because that identity differs from those recorded by early European observers. The second feeling is that archaeology was demonstrably complicit in the development of the conventional view, and so the discipline should play a central role in fostering a shift in perception (Lilley 2005). Of particular concern has been the need to do away with the distinction between history and prehistory while at the same time showing that the Aboriginal past was dynamic rather than static, as continues to be conventionally thought. Neither of these concerns is peculiar to Australian archaeology, and both were raised in North America well before Australian archaeologists came to the party. However, the idea is that by combining these two notions, archaeologists will be able to demonstrate that continual cultural change was (and remains) normal in Aboriginal society, whether before or during the colonial period, and thus that "nontraditional" Aboriginal people in settled Australia can retain ties to land that qualify as Native Title.

In short, Australian archaeologists are, generally speaking, quite explicit about promoting a left-liberal social justice agenda.

While I have no doubt that most of my archaeological colleagues in the United States are liberals with similar perspectives on social justice, my observation of them in formal settings such as the SAA suggests neither they as individuals nor the organizations such as SAA that represent them seek to advance such matters as assertively as we do in Australia. Why is that? While I think the issue ties back to my arguments about visions of nation, it may also come down to some more nebulous matter of national "character" or "temperament" that makes Australians approach such matters more bluntly or pragmatically than our U.S. colleagues (but probably similarly to those in Canada or New Zealand, who tend to be just as plain-speaking). Whether or not such a notion stands up to scrutiny, I agree the book remains at the cutting edge internationally. Read it and see what *you* think!

REFERENCES CITED

Harrison, R., J. McDonald, and P. Veth
in press Archaeology, claimant connection to sites and native title. *Australian Aboriginal Studies* 2005/1.

Lilley, I.
2000a Professional attitudes to indigenous interests in the Native Title era, in *Native Title and the Transformation of Archaeology in the Postcolonial World:* 99–119, ed. I. Lilley. Sydney: Oceania Monographs.

Lilley, I., ed.
2000b *Native Title and the Transformation of Archaeology in the Postcolonial World.* Sydney: Oceania Monographs.

McGuire, R.
2004 Contested pasts: Archaeology and Native Americans, in *A Companion to Social Archaeology:* 374–395, ed. L. Meskell and R. Preucel. Oxford: Blackwell.

Silliman, S.
2005 Culture contact or colonialism: Challenges in the archaeology of Native North America. *American Antiquity* 70(1):55–74.

Agriculture and Pastoralism in the Late Bronze and Iron Age, North West Frontier Province, Pakistan. Ruth Young. Oxford: BAR International Series 1124, 2003. Bradford Monographs in the Archaeology of Southern Asia No. 1.

Reviewed by Jonathan Mark Kenoyer, *Department of Anthropology, University of Wisconsin, Madison*

This volume provides a refreshing new perspective on the chronology, archaeology, and changing patterns of agriculture and animal husbandry in northwestern South Asia. Although many of the chapters contain a great deal of detail that will be of interest only to specialists, the general scholar interested in the history of South Asia should find this volume extremely useful.

Archaeological research in northwestern South Asia has a long history, beginning with the surveys by Cunningham in the late 1800s and subsequent excavations at Taxila and Charsadda in the early 1900s. The chronological framework and general interpretations proposed by scholars on the basis of these excavations and comparative historical documentation became the foundation for all later discussions of cultural development during the early historic period. Recent excavations and new radiocarbon dates from the site of Charsadda collected by the Bradford-Peshawar team (Ali et al. 1998) have for the first time challenged the older chronology and reoriented the discussion on the emergence of urbanism during the early historic period. The research presented in this volume represents the environmental archaeological component of the larger study being conducted on the transition between the late Bronze Age and the Iron Age.

 © 2006 by the University of Hawai'i Press.

In chapter 1, the overall setting for the study is discussed along with some of the major aims and objectives. Two contrasting areas—the northern valleys and the southern lowlands or plains—are compared using archaeological evidence from sites excavated in the Swat and Dir Valleys, the Peshawar Plain and the region around Taxila, which is located to the east of the Indus River. In chapter 2, the methods for studying ancient plants (archaeobotany) and animals (archaeozoology) are outlined, along with a discussion of the ways in which samples were collected from the different sites under consideration. One of the main problems identified by the author is the lack of consistent sampling and the problems faced in making comparisons between the types of samples collected for the different sites. Even with poor data, the author has been able to present a solid discussion by keeping her questions relatively simple and clearly correlated to the nature of the available data. The actual data from previously excavated sites as well as the recent excavations at the Bala Hisar area of Charsadda are compiled in extremely useful comparative tables in the appendices.

Chapter 2 also outlines the ethnographic study that was conducted to complement the study of the archaeological remains. A brief discussion of historical accounts of the agriculture and pastoral traditions is also included. The author should be commended on her careful attempt to avoid pitfalls in earlier ethnographic studies that assume continuity without carefully testing the evidence. In chapter 3 she has carefully pointed out that there have been major changes in populations, religious traditions, and ideology, as well as water management strategies. These changes are taken into account in her subsequent interpretations based on ethnographic patterns. Major factors that would have been equally relevant to the prehistoric inhabitants and modern populations of both the northern valleys and the alluvial plains are altitude, topography, climate patterns, and the availability of water. The main changes between the past and the present are seen in the nature of water management systems and the continuous fluctuation of ethnic groups.

Chapter 4 presents a summary of the archaeological sites in both study regions and a comparative chronology for the major cultural and subsistence developments in each region. As an archaeologist who is intimately familiar with the original excavation reports, I found this chapter to be quite interesting, and I greatly admire the author's ability to present a body of confusing data in a relatively meaningful manner. The nonarchaeologist may want to skip the details and read the general interpretation and conclusions. Basically, the sites in the northern valleys reflect a relatively similar trajectory of cultural development, with significant new developments occurring around 1700–1400 B.C. On the basis of discussions by earlier scholars, the author interprets these changes in pottery, architecture, metallurgy, and the types of animals being used as the result of migration or invasion. Unfortunately, she does not provide any evidence to support this conclusion, which is based on the long-outdated Indo-Aryan invasion model (Kenoyer 2005; Shaffer 1984). Any and all of these changes can be explained by other models and need not be associated with invasion or the intrusion of new populations, especially in light of the important linkages demonstrated by the author in chapter 9.

The results of recent excavations at the site of Bala Hisar, Charsadda, are presented in chapter 5, along with the revised chronology of the site and its implications for many earlier interpretations. The origins of the site can now be dated to around 1400–1200 B.C. instead of 600–500 B.C. as proposed by earlier scholars. The so-called defensive wall at Charsadda is now dated to around 1200–900 B.C. and may have been built to protect the site against floodwaters rather than the attack of Alexander's army in 326 B.C., as proposed by Alexander Cunningham. The early dates for Charsadda have created a ripple effect that will change the chronology of other sites (such as Taxila) and require a new model for urban developments in the northwestern subcontinent. The author suggests that sites such as Bala Hisar at Charsadda and Hathial and Bhir Mound at Taxila are probably incipient urban centers. Furthermore, these

sites would have been linked to other urban centers in the northern valleys, such as Bir-kot-ghundai (modern Barikot), which is located along the trade route through Swat and dates to approximately the same time period.

The environmental (archaeobotanical and archaeolozoological) data from the northern valleys are examined in chapter 6 and compared with evidence from rural Harappan sites, as well as sites in the Bannu basin. As with chapter 4, the nonspecialist will want to skim this chapter and head for the conclusions. Domestic animals such as cattle, sheep, and goats and domestic plants such as barley, lentils, and rice are found to be the most important subsistence items in the northern valleys during the late Bronze and early Iron Age. The general paucity of wild animal remains suggests that they were not as important in the diet, but the author does not remind the reader of the problems with sampling and the lack of representative samples from each of the sites. This same criticism can be addressed when considering the overall subsistence patterns described for each site and comparisons made with sites in other regions. This is always a problem when dealing with archaeological data, but the temptation to ignore the sampling problem in order to make generalizations and comparisons usually wins out, as is the case in this chapter.

In chapter 7, the new data on subsistence patterns from excavations at Bala Hisar, Charsadda, are presented. The author does note that the faunal and botanical data from the excavations are not representative due to the nature of the excavations and the mixing of strata. Nevertheless, a presentation of what was discovered is relevant to outline some general trends and also to see if the data resemble the subsistence data collected from urban Harappan sites. She concludes that like urban Harappan sites, Bala Hisar shows a dominant use of wheat along with some lentils and that these crops are most likely the result of winter cultivation. The absence of many other domestic plant types can be attributed to the small sample size and relatively small total excavation area. The discovery of water buffalo at Bala Hisar in the later phases of occupation is also compared to the pattern of buffalo use at urban Harappan sites. The general conclusion is that the absence of barley and the presence of water buffalo at Bala Hisar confirm that this site was organized with a general urban subsistence package. The fact that the urban site of Bir-kot-ghundai in Swat does not have buffalo is interpreted as a result of environmental conditions.

Chapter 8 presents the discussion of the author's two short seasons of ethnographic research (described in chapter 2) on subsistence practices in the northern valleys and the alluvial plains, along with a comparison with data collected by earlier scholars. While the previous two chapters had interpretive problems based on the sampling strategies associated with archaeological research, the varied approaches used by different ethnographers produce similar interpretive problems in this chapter. The ethnographic data were collected through interviews in April–May 1998 and July–August 1999, a total period of less than four months. The first interviews were conducted with settled farmers and non-sedentary groups around Charsadda, as well as with some pastoralists in the Dir and Swat Valleys. The second field season was conducted in Swat and the lower Dir Valley. The author notes that this research is not sufficient to provide a full understanding of the regional subsistence patterns, but it can reveal general patterns in terms of the major plants and animals being used and an example of movement patterns for mobile communities. The overall conclusion is that subsistence patterns in the highlands and northern valleys are very complex, while those on the plains are relatively simple. In contrast to sedentary farmers of the plains, the northern valleys have four major subsistence strategies: winter transhumant, inter-valley transhumant, summer transhumant, and nomadic pastoralist. While this is not surprising given the different environmental factors, the degree of difference is thought to be quite striking. The author points out that the difference in subsistence in the northern valleys cannot be simply correlated to different ethnic groups as has been suggested by other scholars but needs

to include social standing, personal choices by different families, and the animals themselves.

The final two chapters provide a discussion of the various interpretive models used by earlier scholars as well as a "new model" proposed on the basis of the ethnographic data discussed in chapter 8. This new model is not clearly articulated, but it appears to be

> a model where crops and animals are both important, though different species and seasons may be important for different groups. However, the overlap between these groups at all stages, and between both sedentary groups in the Vale of Peshawar and mobile groups from the Northern Valleys means that distinguishing between the settled and the mobile groups at any given site would be dependent on determining more subtle discriminants than is possible with the current data sets. (p. 80)

It is unfortunate that the author does not provide any examples of how these "subtle discriminants" can be identified archaeologically. Another conclusion proposed by the author is that prior to 1400 B.C., the northern valleys were of great significance for trade and had cultural and strategic importance. While there is no question that there was some degree of long-distance contact, if these valleys were strategically important trade routes the excavated sites should have more convincing evidence for contact with both the Indus Valley and the highlands of Central Asia. The issue of cultural importance is more difficult to quantify either archaeologically or ethnographically.

I strongly recommend this book for any scholars interested in the history of the northern subcontinent. The author has achieved the goal of exploring and contrasting the subsistence strategies of the two study areas, but I am not convinced that she has developed new explanatory and predictive models, as claimed in chapter 10. The most important contribution has been the systematic analysis and compilation of disparate data sets and the identification of future directions for research. This book will serve as an excellent comparative resource for environmental studies until more comprehensive excavations and analyses are carried out in the region.

REFERENCES CITED

Ali, T., R. Coningham, M. A. Durrani, and G. R. Khan
1998 Preliminary report of two seasons of archaeological investigations at the Bala Hisar of Charsadda, NWFP, Pakistan. *Ancient Pakistan* 12:1–34.

Kenoyer, J. M.
2005 Culture change during the late Harappan period at Harappa: New insights on Vedic Aryan issues, in *Indo-Aryan Controversy: Evidence and Inference in Indian History:* 21–49, ed. L. L. Patton and E. F. Bryant. London: RoutledgeCurzon.

Shaffer, J. G.
1984 The Indo-Aryan invasions: Cultural myth and archaeological reality, in *The People of South Asia: The Biological Anthropology of India, Pakistan, and Nepal:* 77–90, ed. J. R. Lukacs. New York: Plenum Press.

Kohika: The Archaeology of a Late Māori Lake Village in the Ngati Awa Rohe, Bay of Plenty, New Zealand. Geoffrey Irwin, ed. Auckland: Auckland University Press, 2004.

Reviewed by Harry Allen, *Department of Anthropology, University of Auckland*

The Kohika volume explores the archaeology of a Māori lake village situated on the flood plain of the Rangitaiki and Tarawera Rivers, not far from where they jointly

flow into the ocean in the eastern Bay of Plenty, New Zealand. The village was abandoned in the seventeenth century A.D., following a flood that introduced quantities of pumiceous alluvium onto the site. A rising water table and subsequent buildup of peat preserved materials from this village. The site was discovered as a result of farm drainage, and the Whakatane and District Historical Society excavated there between 1974 and 1978. Subsequent excavations were carried out by Professor Geoffrey Irwin from the University of Auckland. This volume of papers edited by Irwin documents his research, together with specialist papers covering Māori traditional knowledge, geomorphology, vegetation change, faunal remains, coprolite analysis, obsidian sourcing, and stone, fiber, and wood technology. Given the range of topics covered, this is more than a site report. Despite the delay between excavations and field analyses (1975–1981) and publication (2004), this volume represents a very useful contribution to current archaeological problems in New Zealand. It throws further light on the nature and timing of Māori settlement in the Bay of Plenty toward the end of the prehistoric period. The volume is supported by color plates and excellent illustrations.

I will discuss the specialist papers first. Central to the current understanding of New Zealand archaeology in the northern North Island is the presence of Kaharoa tephra, which was distributed as air-fall from the Kaharoa eruption at Mount Tarawera and dated to c. A.D. 1350. This event is crucial to our understanding of anthropogenic changes in vegetation—particularly the shift from lowland rain forest to pyrogenic bracken fern—which have been dated relative to this tephra layer (Newnham et al. 1998). At present, all evidence for convincing anthropogenic impacts on the vegetation occurs at or just after the time of the Kaharoa eruption. At Kohika, the period before the Kaharoa eruption is dominated by forest vegetation on dunes and ridges and flax *(Leptospermum* and *Coprosma)* in the swamps. Evidence for major vegetation change to bracken fern *(Pteridium esculentum)* and shrubs occurs about 50 years after the Kaharoa eruption, at c. 600 B.P. Such anthropogenic changes to the vegetation provide indirect evidence for the early presence of humans in New Zealand (McGlone and Wilmshurst 1999). In these terms, the suggestion is that the eastern Bay of Plenty was settled by A.D. 1350–1400. The chapter on site chronology (Irwin and Jones) makes use of a Bayesian calibration to argue that direct evidence for human occupation of the site occurs in the interval A.D. 1610–1690 and lasts for only a short period of 70–80 years. Thus occupation of the Kohika site occurs about 250 years after the first paleoecological indications of a human presence.

The excavations at Kohika consisted of four adjacent but noncôntinuous areas, with the Whakatane and District Historical Society excavations making a fifth area (termed Area HS). Recent excavations in New Zealand, such as Pouerua (Sutton et al. 2003), have demonstrated that excavations require a dual strategy: first, opening areas that are sufficiently large that they relate to the scale of later Māori settlements; and second, working in terms of detailed contexts that enable sequences of smaller events to be built up. Irwin's work at Kohika is a forceful demonstration of the usefulness of this approach, using stratigraphy and geomorphology to correlate excavation areas that are separated by distances of up to 40 m. This research reinforces the point that a taphonomic knowledge of how a site has emerged over even a short period of time is essential to an understanding of human behavior and human–landscape interactions there. The sequence of events in Area D is a case in point. In chapter 4, Irwin argues for the buildup of three artificial floors: The first is a bright yellow floor, then a Yellow House (floor), which is replaced after a short interval by the White House (floor). All three structures were built against the palisaded wall of the site, and, in the case of the Yellow House and the White House floors, their back walls were a part of the embankment that formed the site perimeter and assisted to keep floodwaters out. The Yellow House floor showed signs that it had been affected by an earthquake, as some

temporary but unsuccessful repairs were made. After this time the Yellow House was dismantled and a new White House built on the same spot, with the presence of wood chips suggesting that part of the house was manufactured in situ.

Wet sites are renowned for their preserved organic remains, and Kohika is no exception. The majority of recovered portable artifacts consisted of posts, spear shafts, darts, bird spears, digging tools, fern-root beaters, canoe paddles, hull parts, fittings, bailers, fiber-working tools, and woodworking tools. These were the everyday equipment of a Māori lake village. Less common items included bowls, hair combs, spinning tops, a ladder, and vine coils. An additional chapter by McAra usefully covers woven fabrics, rope, and netting.

Three chapters are devoted to the analysis of nonwooden/nonfibrous artifacts. These included items made from bone, pumice, obsidian, and greenstone (serpentine/jade). An additional two chapters deal with faunal remains and coprolite analysis. The latter analysis, of dog rather than human coprolites, provides evidence of human diet in the form of bracken fern starch, pollen of *Sonchus* and *Typha,* and also of intestinal parasites. A concentration of dog coprolites outside the palisade suggests that the dogs were tethered there and fed on fish bones and small fish. This parallels an insight provided by Byrne (1973) that dogs in New Zealand were treated in a manner similar to the way pigs were raised in the rest of Polynesia. Dog bones were prominent in the faunal materials from the site, their bones being used for artifact manufacture. Skinning marks on the bones suggest that pelts were taken to be used for dog-skin clothing. Unlike at other New Zealand sites, dog crania appear not to have been cooked and eaten. Pollen in the coprolites indicates that most dogs were present during the summer. Cut and saw marks on human long bones and crania indicate that human bones were also used for artifact manufacture, but the authors leave open the question as to whether human flesh was consumed at Kohika (cf. Barber 1992).

A chapter by Wallace, Irwin, and Neich is devoted to house parts and designs. Houses and their place in Māori settlements have been an important factor in the understanding of later Māori prehistory ever since Groube (1965) advanced the argument that Pā sites were refuges rather residential settlements. Moreover, he argued that villages were absent in the precolonial period. Similarly, Groube (1969) argued that larger carved houses *(whare whakairo)* and raised carved storage houses *(pataka)* were also late products of new chiefly wealth and the availability of metal tools that facilitated detailed carving work. The excavations at Kohika revealed a definite large carved house, a probable *pataka,* and informal structures in area HS, as well as a sequence of smaller domestic houses and *pataka* fragments in Area D. Although seriously weathered and burnt in some cases, the styles of carvings on boards from the large carved house and also on a standing figure (part of the support for the central ridgepole) suggest that these were the work of a single carver who worked in a style not currently recognized within traditional Bay of Plenty carving styles. Three other carving styles were recognized in carved pieces from the site, suggesting that a minimum of four carvers had worked there in less than 100 years. Taphonomic considerations suggest that the carved house was abandoned and had collapsed some time before it was burned.

One of the strengths of the Kohika research comes from the combining of the archaeological evidence for house floors, the pattern of postholes, and the geomorphology of the site edges with the location and type of the preserved house and other materials. This adds greatly to our knowledge of village layout and the construction of smaller domestic houses. Fully comparable information is not available for the area excavated by the Whakatane and District Historical Society, where the large carved (meeting?) house was located. Irwin, Johns, and others have secured Royal Society of New Zealand funding to return to Kohika in order to further explore these questions in 2005.

A number of points emerge from the Kohika research that have implications for New Zealand archaeology in general. The first is the renewal of interest in the study of wet sites after nearly two decades during which little work was being done on them (Gumley et al. 2005; Newnham et al. 1998; Wilmshurst et al. 2004). This is almost certainly the result of additional funding now being available through the Royal Society of New Zealand Marsden Fund, as wet site excavations are expensive in terms of time and the conservation requirements of items recovered. In the past, wet sites were excavated in order to make significant finds of artifacts and carved objects, often out of context (Johns 2001).

The current work at Kohika demonstrates the importance of archaeological contextual and environmental information in making interpretations. Such projects now require the input of a range of specialists, as demonstrated by the findings from Kohika. Secondly, the research at Kohika and at a number of other large projects—for example, Pouerua and Bell Block (S. Holdaway pers. comm. December 2004)—reinforces the importance of excavating areas that are meaningful in terms of the size and scale of Māori settlements. Finally, following Groube's (1965) and Prickett's (1982) work, house and house forms have reemerged as a significant area of debate in New Zealand archaeology. In this context, it is a pity that Irwin et al. make no reference to Sutton's (1990, 1991) arguments concerning locational and ideational aspects of Māori house forms at Pouerua and elsewhere.

This is an excellent and important volume for New Zealand archaeology, one that adds greatly to our knowledge of the New Zealand past. It is recommended as setting a benchmark for the study of wet sites in the Pacific and elsewhere.

REFERENCES CITED

Barber, I.
1992 Archaeology, ethnography and the record of Maori cannibalism before 1815: A critical review. *Journal of the Polynesian Society* 101:241–292.

Byrne, D.
1973 Prehistoric Coprolites. Unpublished M.A. thesis. University of Auckland.

Groube, L. M.
1965 *Settlement Patterns in New Zealand Prehistory*. Dunedin: Anthropology Department, University of Otago.
1969 From archaic to classic Maori. *Auckland Student Geographer* 6:1–12.

Gumbley, W., D. Johns, and G. Law
2005 *Management of Wetland Archaeological Sites in New Zealand.* Science for Conservation. Wellington: Department of Conservation.

Johns, D. A.
2001 The conservation of wetland archaeological sites in New Zealand, in *Enduring Records: The Environmental and Cultural Heritage of Wetlands:* 246–253, ed. B. Purdy. Oxford: Oxbow Books.

McGlone, M. S., and J. M. Wilmshurst
1999 Dating initial Maori environmental impact in New Zealand. *Quaternary International* 59:17–26.

Newnham, R. M., D. J. Lowe, M. S. McGlone, J. M. Wilmshurst, and T.F.G. Higham
1998 The Kaharoa Tephra as a critical datum for earliest human impact in northern New Zealand. *Journal of Archaeological Science* 25:533–544.

Prickett, N.
1982 An archaeologists' guide to the Maori dwelling. *New Zealand Journal of Archaeology* 4:111–147.

Sutton, D. S.
1990 Organisation and ontology: The origins of the Northern Maori Chiefdom, New Zealand. *Man* 25:667–692.
1991 The archaeology of belief: Structuralism in stratigraphical context, in *Man and a Half: Essays in Pacific Anthropology and Ethnobiology in Honour of Ralph Bulmer:* 540–550, ed. A. Pawley. Auckland: The Polynesian Society.

Wilmshurst, J. M., T.F.G. Higham, H. Allen, D. Johns, and C. Phillips
2004 Early Maori settlement impacts in northern coastal Taranaki, New Zealand. *New Zealand Journal of Ecology* 28:167–179.

Walpole: Ha Colo, une Île de l'Extrême, Archéologies et Histoires. Christophe Sand, ed. *Les Cahiers de l'Archéologie en Nouvelle-Calédonie* 14. Nouméa: Département Archéologie, Services des Musées et du Patrimoine, 2002. 122 pp. 101 figures; 9 tables; 4 appendices.

Reviewed by Mike T. Carson, *International Archaeological Research Institute, Inc. (IARII)*

Volume 14 of *Les Cahiers de l'Archéologie en Nouvelle-Calédonie* is a comprehensive monograph concerning the archaeology and history of Walpole Island. Like its predecessors, this volume is an excellent example of how to present primary field and laboratory data within a meaningful interpretive context. The various contextual overviews, site-specific studies, specialized analyses, and general observations are incorporated with a focus on their contribution to understand the prehistory of the island and its place in the archaeology of the wider region. The major conclusions are clearly linked to the primary field and laboratory data, and readers can easily review and evaluate the raw data for any variety of purposes. Moreover, the authors present a sophisticated analysis of how their findings relate to larger research issues of enduring value.

At first, one may wonder what of archaeological significance could be found on a block of coral limestone less than 3.5 km long, isolated more than 150 km southeast of the New Caledonian mainland. In fact, Walpole (or Ha Colo) has yielded evidence of human occupation since the beginning of human settlement in the larger region at approximately 800 to 520 B.C., including stratified rockshelter deposits, a rich assortment of portable artifacts, mortuary features, and an array of architectural remains.

By the time of European contact in 1794, the island was uninhabited, yet visitors reported mysterious vestiges of ancient human inhabitants. In this sense, Walpole could be categorized as one of the "Mystery Islands" of the Pacific. As the authors point out, however, their work removes much of the "mystery" of the island's past.

The book's introductory section establishes Walpole Island in regional archaeology, specifically in reference to the role of such a unique environment in human prehistory. Aside from the introductory overview, the volume includes six main chapters, a chronological synthesis, a summary conclusion, and four data-rich appendices that each offer a different perspective or set of data important to understanding the prehistory of the island.

Chapter 1 presents the geology of Walpole Island, of interest to geologists and archaeologists alike. This information has previously been reported only in some rather obscure notes and reports, and the present overview will be valuable for a number of researchers working in the region.

Chapter 2 considers the vegetation communities and faunal populations, enabling a sense of ecological zones of the island that may relate to zones of potential land use for the prehistoric inhabitants. The concise and informative overview supports significant interpretative work later in the book. Within this chapter, though, the text emphasizes two points. First, the island has a unique set of natural resources that could have supported at least a small population. Second, the historic-era guano mining operation provides an opportunity to examine the impact of a small population on the island's resources within a known time frame.

Chapter 3 synthesizes information from local oral traditions, historical accounts of guano miners, notes from unlicensed pillagers, and the records of limited earlier archaeological forays. In addition, the authors present the major findings of recent field surveys, in terms of major zones of the island. The information is not simply listed for the sake of routine. Rather, the authors

identify some important research issues, generate testable hypotheses, and offer a larger interpretive context for the results of their present work.

Chapter 4 documents the stratigraphy of test excavations in four key rockshelters, along with radiocarbon dates from associated contexts. Radiocarbon dates from prior investigations are also included and scrutinized. Altogether, 11 dates are available. The rockshelter excavations encountered well-preserved cultural deposits with a fair amount of internal stratigraphy. The excavation profiles are nicely documented in reference to plan and section views of the rockshelters. The provenience of each radiocarbon sample is well documented for further evaluation. Good-quality photographs enrich the technical portrayal of the excavations.

Chapter 5 presents and discusses a surprising range of shell, stone, and bone artifacts. Superb illustrations and photographs make this chapter especially useful. Of greatest interest will probably be the shell artifacts. In particular, the authors do a good job of documenting the manufacturing sequence of *Conus* sp. shell rings.

Chapter 6 is a sophisticated physical anthropological study of human skeletal remains. The analysis directly addresses the question of whether or not the prehistoric inhabitants of Walpole could have been itinerant Polynesians. The represented individuals could relate to prehistoric Tongan populations, but they could also relate to prehistoric New Caledonian populations. The analysis also evaluates what is known for certain versus what may have been the case about mortuary practices.

A chronological synthesis is offered in narrative form, considering issues of first discovery, regular settlement, and recurrent temporary occupation. The strength of this chapter is its ability to articulate the island-specific data in the context of the archaeology of the larger region. In other words, this chapter answers some questions about how activities in a peculiar place like Walpole are related to concurrent activities elsewhere in the region.

True to the form of any good monograph, the concise conclusion recaptures the main theme of the book and evaluates what has been learned about this theme from the content of the book's chapters. In this case, two themes are specified. First is the role of Walpole as a Mystery Island in the Pacific. Second is the role of Walpole to understand human use of an extreme environment in a long-term perspective. The island-specific results are thereby made valuable in a general sense for Pacific prehistory and for studies of human–environment relations.

One of the more memorable strengths of this book is that it exemplifies the potential of modern archaeological research, not only in terms of how it is conducted but also in terms of how the results are presented in published form. Too often, government compliance studies and academic projects produce bland reports of little value to anyone but the handful of people who already know their contents. This book, however, proves that significant new information can be learned from a well-designed research project, as well as published in a manner that is both useful and attractive for a variety of researchers.

KIBO—Le serment gravé: Essai de synthèse sur les pétroglyphes calédoniens. Jean Monnin and Christophe Sand, eds. *Les Cahiers de l'Archéologie en Nouvelle-Calédonie* 16, 2004.

Reviewed by YANN-PIERRE MONTELLE

It is common sense that "digging a hole"[1] on a surface like the face of a boulder guarantees the permanence of a message written in stone—a perennial memory. In a certain

way, this is what the authors of this remarkable book have accomplished. Their recording campaigns and sophisticated synthesizing have resulted in the production of a work that is here to stay, firmly anchored in the pantheon of seminal works in rock art research. This book, I predict, will become a reference book for rock art students. My humble recommendation would be to translate this work into English.

Chapter 1 dissects the "hermeneutic" abuses perpetuated under colonial agendas and/or misguided scholarship. From this chapter, we learn that writing about alterity (otherness) is a complicated process in which the writer needs to remain shielded from the political and racial a priori of the time. Recontextualizing the voice of the author within the ideological currents of the time is a very effective process to relativize the erroneous statements and racial declamations that might offend the potential reader.

It is interesting to realize that until recently, the Kanaks were given no history and were assumed to have been a late wave of incoming population with no affiliation whatsoever with the archaeological records. The authors have made a good case against this racial prejudice by showing that absence of evidence does not equate to evidence of absence. In their justified approach, the waves of colonialization in the last few centuries have resulted in a traumatic collapse of internal knowledge.

Archaeological evidence from Lapita potsherds to land tenure would indicate that, contrary to common belief, the Kanaks are the direct descendants of the first settlers c. 3,000 years ago,[2] and they undoubtedly started the practice of writing messages on the stones. The authors, however, are well aware that it might take more than a book to bring down the rooted erroneous beliefs that the Kanaks are the perpetuators of a cultural regression brought about by a lack of oral tradition, suffer from an obvious lack of aesthetic concerns and technological knowledge, and ultimately display a total lack of interest in regard to the petroglyphs.[3] By the end of the chapter, the authors have succeeded in resituating the evidence in a more empirical framework and minimizing the effects of these erroneous aprioristics.

In chapter 2, the reader is invited to enter into the crux of the synthesis with an archaeological inventory of the known petroglyphs in New Caledonia. After defining their terms[4] and setting up the "workspace" and methodologies, the authors provide 67 pages of systematic mapping and plotting for all identified petroglyphs. For each region, a local map is provided that helps situate the sites. Perhaps a larger map showing the full extent of these areas would have enhanced the reader's appreciation for the overall geographical configuration, which is thoroughly discussed further on in chapter 5 (see pages 203 to 205).

Chapter 3 is dedicated to the typology of the known petroglyphs. The authors have opted for a typology based on the analysis of the shapes of recurring motifs. The results are 40 divisions that are rigid enough to present categories but flexible enough to provide a suitable ground for subtle variations within given categories. The danger with categorizing is that it can end up being an exercise in futility *(tiré par les cheveux),* due primarily to the fact that each element of the categories often presents variations that defy categorization. But here the authors have established a taxonomy that survives trivialization. It operates within a system of classification that uses a precise yet generic typology. Table 3.8 (p. 174) offers an interesting synthesis of the authors' effort. Categories 1, 3, 4, and 5 are the most represented. These are the spirals, the cross ("enveloped" crosses), the ellipses (with axial segment), and the circles. These four motifs recur overwhelmingly in New Caledonia and in many other parts of the world.[5]

The combination of chapters 2 and 3 effectively prepares the reader for chapter 4. In this chapter, ethnoarchaeology finds its *lettre de noblesse.* As any trained archaeologist knows, ethnoarchaeology is often too delicate and problematic to be of any empirical use. It is a well-known fact that "alterity" needs to be handled carefully, and the archaeological methodologies and

discourses are often too coarse and "rub the informants the wrong way." But in this particular case, the data is for the most part from reliable secondary sources. When informants provide data, it is treated respectfully and with consideration. It is not misused subjectively in order to "fit the bill." The authors have succeeded in establishing an interpretive methodology that is removed from ethnocentric a priori. The authors' tone is always on the prudent side, and when affirmations are made, they are accompanied with ample explanations.

In a nutshell, in this chapter we learn that based on local knowledge, the petroglyphs were/are embedded in multiple mythical layers that might or might not relate to the iconography. But we also learn that, as elsewhere, the petroglyphs are multifunctional. They are additionally described as mapping devices (boundary marking, demarcations), counting, mnemonics, and so on. As expected, the authors' conclusion is that there is not a singular homogeneous system but rather some sophisticated hermeneutic mechanisms that have yet to be understood; fair enough.

Chapter 5 provides the readers with a systematic analysis of all the results that have been gathered throughout the preceding chapters. Here the authors focus their investigation on the emic "who." They ask: Who were the people who left these messages on the stones? By briefly considering the variety of possible functions/meanings for these engraved motifs, the authors again arrive at the inconclusive conclusion that too many factors of variability are involved in order to provide a "Rosetta stone." Thus the question, "What is the meaning of these petroglyphs?" remains unanswered.[6] Hints are provided with respect to the mnemonic nature of these motifs, but the authors are prudent not to adventure any further into the precarious hermeneutic void.

Chapter 5 also introduces an important aspect of rock art research: chronology. Despite the absence of direct dating (^{14}C) due to the exorbitant cost, the authors propose an alternative approach based on the cross-checking of both local and regional data.[7] They conclude that the chronology is complex and that the practice of inscribing messages on the stones probably began with the arrival of the first settlers some 3,000 years ago. With this concluding chapter, the authors have provided their readers with what in my mind is a remarkable analysis. By approaching the petroglyphs from multiple directions, they have brilliantly created an investigative platform that can produce valid hypothesis while avoiding unsupported conclusions.

In their conclusion, the authors pledge to pursue the work by (1) intensifying the surveying campaigns and the inventory of petroglyphs, (2) finding the funding for direct dating, and (3) maintaining a high empirical level in their comparative analysis. And as a result, the petroglyphs will finally be resituated in their historical and social contexts. Needless to say, I commend the authors for their valuable efforts and reiterate my humble gratitude for this valuable contribution to rock art research.

NOTES

1. Sur le bord d'un ravin de Karaguereu, j'ai vu trois cupules qui venaient d'être faites. Surpris, je demandais ce que cela signifiait: "C'est un serment, kibo", me répondit mon compagnon canaque. Il entendait par là que les indigènes étaient convenus entre eux de ces signes, pour confirmer une décision prise, ou marquer qu'un acte avait été excécuté, et il s'étonnaient que je n'ai pas songé à l'inteprétation de ces signes, le mot de la langue qui signifie affirmation, serment, etant kibo, ce qui veut dire précisement: "creuser un trou" (p. 181).
2. That this message is not getting across is typical of colonies where conceding ancestral connections to the land often equate to redistributing the land to its original owners. It does not take a Machiavelli to realize that this might generate a great deal of hardship in the exploiting communities in New Caledonia and elsewhere.
3. Despite these racially loaded a priori, the authors are confident that the remedy is in the public awareness, hence their desire to write a book primarily for a local audience. This recommendable position echoes the widespread concern of rock art researchers with finding ways to heighten public awareness about the fragility of rock art.

4. Despite their efforts, the term "rock art" is still inadequate, and their contribution adds even more weight to the urgency to provide a terminology that will satisfy all parties involved in rock art research.
5. Here the authors could have made a leap into a wider analysis of motif recurrence on a global scale. This would have substantiated the localized analysis of motifs in the Pacific (Annex 6).
6. The fact is, 99 percent of the time, rock art is unexplainable. It is therefore important to move away from the etic "why" (meaning) and instead investigate more thoroughly the emic "how" (function). In the same vein, it can also be said that it is important to perform an analysis based on categories that are genuine/relevant to the people under investigation rather than using preestablished categories for organizing and interpreting the social practices of a given culture.
7. The authors acknowledge the potential for other adequate methodologies to be used, such as the study of surface erosion of the petroglyphs or the superposition of motifs, and so on.

Sailing in the Wake of the Ancestors: Reviving Polynesian Voyaging. Ben Finney. Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press, 2003. ISBN 1-58178-025-7.

Reviewed by ATHOLL ANDERSON, *Australian National University*

Nobody has done more than Ben Finney to develop modern Polynesian voyaging. His vision of experimental sailing coupled with a revival of cultural pride amongst Polynesians, the one the vehicle of the other, first attained shape with the construction of *Nalehia* in 1965 and later blossomed with the famous *Hōkūle'a.* Finney has been the intellectual mentor, driving force, and international public face of the project for 40 years—a remarkable achievement. This is his third book on the project, and it brings the history up to date by describing the construction and sailing of *Hawai'iloa* and of the various canoes from elsewhere in Polynesia that the Hawaiian project has inspired. The main events described are the canoe regatta associated with the Sixth Festival of Pacific Arts in Rarotonga, 1992, and the passages of many of the same canoes from the Marquesas to Hawai'i in 1995. The 1999 voyage to Easter Island is mentioned briefly in an epilogue.

Finney writes an engaging narrative that is concerned mainly with chronicling the successes and failures of the modern vessels and voyages. It is to his credit that despite the explicitly improving objectives of the project, he does not shrink from recording the tantrums, bad decisions, and other lapses along the way. These enliven the text, and the book will appeal to the broad readership for which it is more clearly intended than the Polynesian specialist.

For the latter, Finney's recounting of the later history of the voyaging project is valuable, although details of vessel construction and sailing trials are few. In the wider context, however, some disquiet may be felt. Finney has not kept up to date with the archaeology and indigenous politics that he discusses here and there in the book. For example, in describing the loss of traditional Māori lands, he neglects to mention that since 1975 the Waitangi Tribunal has done much to redress earlier wrongs. As a result, my own tribe, Ngai Tahu, now commands assets of around half a billion dollars. More pertinently—and in the light of the project aims, more fundamentally—he declines to address the various criticisms that have been leveled at the voyaging project throughout the years and especially recently. These center on the incompatibility of the original objectives, described as"an effort in cultural revival as well as an experiment in voyaging" (p. 10). They have never rubbed along well, and too often the scientific experiment has been compromised in the interests of cultural pride.

This is apparent throughout the book. For instance, *Hawai'iloa* was meant to answer some of the criticisms of *Hōkūle'a* by construction entirely in traditional materials, but it ended up with spruce hulls and modern lashings, rigging, and sails, as tests of sennit and pandanus disclosed that these were too weak to be used in voyaging. But surely, isn't that the point? If my Mitsubishi station wagon cannot do 200 mph unless I install a Ferrari engine, then doing so could hardly validate my inflated sense of its potential speed; if reconstructed vessels can only sail as desired with modern materials in critical areas, then they cannot validate various propositions about prehistoric voyaging. *Hawaikinui,* similarly, abandoned its original traditionally cut sails and opted for those of a modern yacht, while some canoes have chosen nontraditional gunter rigs and often added headsails as well. The voyages, too, do not inspire confidence in the conclusions for prehistory that are drawn from them. In the Rarotongan gathering, the Atiu canoe capsized at the beginning, the Mitiaro and Aitutaki canoes were towed part of the way, and the Mangaian canoe made an accidental passage that left its captain and escort vessel behind. The irony of these events was lost on the Cook Islands premier who, as Finney reports, welcomed the eventual gathering of the crews by roundly condemning Andrew Sharp.

Yet in experimental terms, the voyaging project has failed to dispose of Andrew Sharp's criticisms of traditionalism. Indeed, Finney's project is cast very much in a neotraditional mold that takes assumed achievements of the ancestors as the benchmark against which to measure contemporary voyaging. Finney declines to explore the serious implications of substantial departures from traditional marine architecture and rigging that are involved in modern Polynesian voyaging and refuses to engage in the recent discussions of these. I have the impression that what matters most to him, and always has, is the building of Polynesian pride in the generic activity of long-distance sailing. That is a worthy objective and one not under attack by recent criticism of the scientific aspects of the project. Were Finney to separate the two objectives—as, for example, by dropping the subtitle of this book—and allow modern voyaging to stand in its own right, then other issues need not get in the way of the cultural achievement that he has done so much to foster.

In summary, *Sailing in the Wake of the Ancestors* is an interesting book that is informative and lively on the subject of modern Polynesian sailing but repetitive and disengaged on the subject of prehistoric voyaging.