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 “Lov- ing 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.


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 disassociate 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.


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

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-