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As a finished product of an excavation that closed during the 1970’s, it is needless to enumerate the importance of this book. It is a very welcomed study on the archaeological excavation done in Ayao-Iyao, Lemery, Batangas, Philippines. The site report, much like the excavation, is a complete analysis of the cultural sequence that occurred within the site. It is available from the Ateneo de Manila University Press, and is the collaborative effort based on the separate masters theses of the three authors: Cecilia Y. Locsin, Maria Isabel G. Ongpin, and Socorro Paz P. Paterno. The book is available in both hardbound and paperback editions.

The foreword is presented by Dr. Wilhelm G. Solheim, one of the leading pottery experts whose expertise ranges from the Neolithic to the Metal Age in Southeast Asia, including the Philippines. In the Introduction, which in itself is an important part of the book, the authors explain the lengthy analysis, writing, and publication processes.

The first chapter deals with the current literature used throughout the study. It is, perhaps, one of the most important parts of the book that, unfortunately, falls flat with regards to simplified and unexhausted sources that the authors used. The publications used regarding the archaeological studies, at most, ended at around 1978. This is an oversight that sets the framework for the entire read: the possibility of out-of-date information that will require the readers to find other updated reports. This includes using the so-called Tasaday community (that allegedly only uses stone tools and sticks as their primary technology) without the benefit of a brief discussion regarding the possibility of deception. (For an elaborate
This is not to say that the rest of the book is immediately rendered useless; in fact, the strength of this product is that the information can still provide a clear view of the Lemery cultural sequence, which is included in the second chapter. Here, the geological description of the site is explained, alongside with the cultural layers, making it easier for the readers to determine the sequence of events. The subsequent chapters focus on specific artefacts and their contexts. This includes an elaboration on the analysis of the obsidian flakes, found mostly in the layer that points to an occupation during the Paleolithic times. This also proves that the area was already inhabited at least 10,000 years BP, although the authors believe that this may have been interrupted mainly due to volcanic eruptions, as evidenced by the volcanic tuff that presents itself as a layer during their excavation. The eruption (likely from the nearby Taal Volcano) shows that it continued to affect the site habitation up until the sixteenth century.

The next chapter focuses on the stone tools and flakes (that are not obsidian), along with an analysis of animal bones found throughout the excavation. Stones made up of basalt and quarts were used as stone hammers. These findings also point to a seasonal habitation of the site. The animal bones analysed produced some important aspects that must be considered regarding Philippine archaeology. Many of the worked animal bones were found in the pre-Iron Age deposits as shown in Table 5.5 (Locsin et al. 2008:152-153), and butchering evidences on the bones were also studied. In the Iron Age, material associated with some of bones of canine bones were found, along with some microliths, stone flakes, and hematite, which was attributed to possible hunting activity as evidenced by ethnographic studies done on the nearby Negritos and their hunting dogs. However, there is also a problematic question of accepting the equine bones that were found at what they termed Horizon IIC, or 4000–8000 BC, which is only one of the two identified as such in the excavation. Although the authors posit the possibility that these may have come from the Arabic equine line in the southern part of the Philippines in Mindanao, the number of the find is also problematic, with only one sample seriously considered found in the “undisturbed” IIC layer. It is hard to make a conclusion regarding the presence of one equine bone sample at such a time-depth, that this information must be taken with a grain of salt.

Chapter 6 elaborated on the burials, including the 29 individuals, the urns in which seven of them were buried in, and also the ceramic grave goods that accompanied the individuals. The burials were all concluded to
be part of the Iron Age, ranging from 190–240 AD (according to C\textsuperscript{14} tests run on bone samples). The forms of the pottery were broken down, which gave it a stylistic approach, while the decorations were also discussed. The wealth of information that the authors gave the readers included the petrographic analysis of the clay materials, which allowed them to identify the clay source. Indeed, the authors pointed out that while most of the pottery found utilised the nearby clay source, there were some forms of pottery with clay that are not easily available within the site, indicating that these may have been traded specifically from other cultural groups. The authors skim through the questions regarding the afterlife as based on the grave furniture, without actually committing to a particular idea. Instead, they provide some light discussions on Solheim’s Sa Hyunh-Kalanay theory that embraces a wide scope of Iron Age culture based on the curvilinear designs found in a wide array of location: Vietnam, Indonesia, Taiwan, and in Masbate, Philippines. (I should add that while the authors of the book referred to the 1964 edition, there is now a revised edition that has been published in 2002.)

I again reiterate the regrettable choice of the authors not to update their background literature, in which they may have gathered a wider array of pottery found in the local area. These including (but are not limited to) the jar burials found in Barangay Calubcub Segundo, San Juan, Batangas (Salcedo 1979), the evaluation of the jar burials in Ulilang Bundok, Calatagan, Batangas (Dela Torre 2008), and discussion on the status (and not necessarily the wealth of the individual while alive) of the burials in Calatagan, Batangas as excavated by Fox (Barretto 2002; Barretto-Tesoro 2008) which, although mostly focused on the extended burials found, are still good starting points for the study of the continuity of the Southern Tagalog region. The status of pottery in the archaeological evidence—which includes discussions on the burial jars and even household items found in various areas in Batangas—was also the topic tackled by the various authors of Pang-Alay: Ritual Pottery in Ancient Philippines (Valdes 2003a). Invaluable information wherein the cut-out pattern from the ring-dish found that puzzled the authors in Lemery is not only limited in Solheim’s Masbate archaeology, but is also present in the cut-outs of similar presentation dish found in Higantes Island, Negros Occidental (Bautista 2003), and which they compared only to Tenazas’ (1968) earthenware finds in Pila, Laguna. Valdes (2003b) contributed to describing the earthenware pottery forms found in Calatagan, Batangas as excavated by Fox. Although some of these may already encompass the 14\textsuperscript{th}–16\textsuperscript{th} CE materials (well beyond what may be
the Metal Period of the Philippines), these literature may serve as supplement to the findings in Lemery, especially with regards to the practice of form and decoration on the pottery. Moreover, other Iron Age sites have been found over the years, many of which may have also been compared with the artefacts in Lemery, Batangas.

There were several instances during my reading of the book where I admittedly had to imagine how the site excavation would have turned out if the method of excavation used the context system. Would it have been possible to find the grave cuts for the extended burial 21, which disturbed burial 17 (urn 3), thus having a clearer conclusion on the possibility of “ritual breaking” of pottery found inside the burial urn? Other instances, such as the equine bone, also have me wondering if there may have been other disturbances that were not easily discovered. Despite this, it is evident that the authors as archaeologists have definitely lived up to the expectations of their field, going all the way to ensure that the needed data be readily available.

This book will undoubtedly be well-received, whether it be from archaeologists, anthropologists, historians, or even local history buffs. It is a much-awaited addition to the lack of books that focus primarily on the archaeology of a region in the Philippines. The work done in this book took a long time to be produced, which the authors explained in a fairly apologetic way in their foreword, but the end result did not disappoint. The information that this book has added to the archaeological community is not doubted. We all look forward to the next set of study, in which the authors may now tackle the recent literature. Hereon, the archaeology of Lemery, Batangas can only move forward.
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The main theme of this book focuses on how material forms come into being and the extent to which things are interstitial to the process of social production. Jones argues in this book that the material world offers a vital framework for the formation of collective memory. The concept of memory is used by the author to critique the interpretive archaeologists’ treatment of the artefacts as symbols, and the treatment of the behavioural archaeologists of artefacts as units of information (or memes). He instead argues that the artefacts should be treated as forms of mnemonic that have an impact on the senses. He supported this argument by providing case studies from prehistoric Europe.

Chapter Summaries

There are 10 chapters in this book—four were allotted for the