



Grace Barretto-Tesoro. *Identity and Reciprocity in 15th Century Philippines*. British Archaeological Reports International Series 1813. Oxford: John and Erica Hedges Ltd., 2008. viii+193 p.

Heterarchy and 15th Century Calatagan

The last decade of the 20th century has brought out major archaeological studies on pre-state Philippine societies (usually in the Visayas areas), done mostly under the revitalized concept of “chiefdom” as a socio-political category and framed within the “prestige-goods economy” model. The publications and dissertation works of Junker (on Negros) [2000], Bacus (on Dumaguete) [1996] and Nishimura (on Cebu) [1988] all came out in the 1990s and have opened up important terms and themes for debate and discussion on the structures, patterns, and dynamics of societies in the Philippines from the 10th to 16th centuries. Such a period in Philippine history (or prehistory) is perhaps significant given the kind of social transformation that took place in many communities during this period: increasing social complexity and dynamics in the Philippines prior to the impact of Spanish colonization. This in turn, effected a new wave of social transformation to the politics that emerged in that period presently considered in this review, especially during the 1400s and 1500s. This period is also marked by the active and increasing role of external and internal trade in the archipelago and beyond. The present study on 15th century Calatagan (Batangas) in Barretto-Tesoro’s *Identity and Reciprocity (IR)* extends and engages the above-mentioned directions in Philippine archaeological research. As *IR* is consciously set on engaging the dominant themes of chiefdom studies so far — the status and strategies of the elites, the role of foreign trade, the rise of craft specialization, for example — its interpretations and readings invite comparison with preceding archaeological studies on central Philippines, especially that of Junker [2000]. The reader of *IR* might

do well to revisit or reread such works which *IR* has set as its comparative backdrop. A careful study of these relatively recent works — with similar broad themes and period of focus — should result in a long-needed update of our Philippine prehistory narratives, especially as reflected in textbooks and references used by students at various levels of studies.

Themes, Arguments, Structure of the Book

Aside from presenting the most comprehensive study to date on prehistoric Calatagan, *IR* opens new approaches in studying the so-called chiefdom societies by analyzing mortuary data from several Calatagan sites and following several related lines of inquiry: (1) the response of the locals to expanding foreign trade, as indicated in burial patterns; (2) the dynamics of identity construction (both at the group and at the individual levels), as reflected in pottery styles; (3) the manifestation of cultural affiliation, status, and personal identities (sex, age) in burial objects; and (4) the indications of agentive decisions in the use of burial objects (p. 15). *IR* pictures Calatagan social relations from cross-sectional perspectives: elite/non-elite segments, gender lines, age-groups, households, and individuals with varying strategies for displaying identities and taking advantage of varying sources of power, both material and spiritual.

The two “spheres of activity” in Calatagan that *IR* focuses on are “pottery production and the construction of social identities” (p. 21). Along these lines of focus, the two interesting arguments in *IR* are: (1) that in contrast to the claimed patterns generated from other central Philippine sites, Calatagan local pottery production in the 15th century remained decentralized (distributed at the household level; non-specialized; probably done by women) and vibrant even in the context of foreign trade (represented by the large volume of foreign ceramics present in burial sites) (see chapter 4); and (2) such a decentralized context served as a condition for the play of varied and flexible identities (“multiple and fluid,” *IR*: chapter 6.3) among Calatagan individuals, especially in relation to their burial practices. The resulting social dynamics arising out of such decen-

tralized pottery production and the wide latitude of identity-making and ritual-based powers encourages to serve as *IR*'s basis for asserting that "although traditional elements of a complex and hierarchical society did not exist in Calatagan, it can be considered a complex society" (p. 159).

Of the ten chapters comprising the book, six chapters form the "core" of its major findings. These are chapter 4 (pottery types, sites, technical descriptions, production costs), chapter 5 (burials and mortuary objects: earthenware and foreign ceramics), chapter 6 (identities and agency), chapter 7 (cultural identity markers; distinction between offerings for the spirits and provisions for the dead), chapter 8 (personal identity and achievement markers), and chapter 9 (prestige markers). The careful presentation of these six chapters will be of great interest to those who want the "plain" empirical results (as usable "data") of the study and the underlying innovative methods applied in it. As mentioned in the outline above, there are three identity markers distinguished in *IR*: (1) "cultural" markers (represented by the use of cooking pots and monochrome ceramics): which are unrestricted in use, widely distributed, and might be considered as the baseline for community identity; (2) "personal" markers (represented by the use of decorated pots): an achieved identity due to skills and abilities honed by one's activities and routines; and (3) "prestige" markers (represented by the use of porcelain plates with sun and bird motifs): status-based identity maximized especially by the elites and their close companions. Students of Philippine prehistory, however, who are more into theories and frameworks will find interesting the discussions on "heterarchy" (as a model in approaching social dynamics), agency, and reciprocity in social relations (as described in chapters 2, 3 and 10).

Some impressions

There are three sequential points relative to *IR*'s theoretical drift that I would like to underline and comment on. Firstly, the interest of *IR* on "heterarchy" and "agency" perspectives — with their accompanying

keywords: fluid identity, multiplicity of power, flexibility, decentralization, non-specialization, and multi-centered distribution — can sometimes feel to be pushed too much, such that while remarking early on in the text that 'heterarchy *complements* rather than contradicts hierarchy' (p. 20, *emphasis mine*), what seems to build up eventually is an emphasis on aspects of social practices that negate the "hard" structures of society. Note the following sequence of descriptions: 'it is *not* strictly hierarchical,' 'status is *not* hereditary,' 'ritual is *not* controlled,' 'craft production is not standardized,' 'goods are *not* distributed from a center,' 'space is *not* partitioned,' 'social positions are *not* fixed' (p. 155, *emphasis mine*; also, p. 36, underlines "a non-hierarchical perspective"), which, perhaps to sound simplistic, defines Calatagan as an exact reverse of Junker's Tanjay (hierarchical settlements, hereditary status, craft standardization, spatially partitioned elite/non-elite residences). The question, as one scholar who also used the heterarchy framework puts it, is simply to "assess whether archaeological evidence indicates the *predominance* of hierarchy or heterarchy" [O'Reilly 2000: 3, *emphasis mine*]. Secondly, it seems to me that this 'pigeon-holing of societies in evolutionary stages' (p. 36) — the 'prevention' of which is one reason why *IR* endorses the heterarchy approach — is not objectionable *as such*. At a coarse-grained level of description, to broaden the temporal scales, it is possible to see a pattern of transformation from a *predominantly* heterarchical to a strongly hierarchical society (cf. the case of a site in Thailand, as studied by O'Reilly [2000: 14]). As the evolutionary biologist Jared Diamond noted, presentation of evolutionary-stages framework is only used as a 'useful shorthand to discuss human societies' and 'examples pigeonholed under the same stage are inevitably heterogeneous' [Diamond 1999: 267]. What if, seen at a proper scale and sacrificing some details so as to see the broad patterns, the traditional typological sequence 'tribe' → 'chiefdom' does not really differ dangerously from the sequence (like in the case of a Thai site) of 'heterarchy' → 'hierarchy'? Thirdly, the problem about heterarchy/hierarchy, perhaps ultimately, is

not just about empiricities but about constructing more refined concepts to help us imagine well the apt scenario for the data. In this case, Saitta and Keene [1990] have long criticized this intuitive tendency to think that hierarchical equates elitism. In their view, centralized leadership does not axiomatically mean the destruction of egalitarianism; neither should hierarchical organization be automatically read as an elitism of power.

Between *IR*'s heterarchic reading and the hierarchy-emphasizing views of most chiefdom-framed studies lies the still open space for a tighter description of the range, diversity, and dynamics of non-state prehistoric Philippine political systems.

(Myfel Joseph Paluga · Department of Social Sciences, CHSS, University of the Philippines, Mindanao)

References

- Bacus, Elisabeth A. 1996. Late Prehistoric Chiefly Politics in the Dumaguete-Bacong Area and Central Philippine Islands. *Philippine Quarterly of Culture and Society* 24: 5–58.
- Junker, Laura Lee. 2000. *Raiding, Trading and Feasting: The Political Economy of Philippine Chiefdoms*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- Diamond, Jared. 1999. *Guns, Germs, and Steel: The Fates of Human Societies*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co.
- O'Reilly, Dougald J.W. 2000. From the Bronze Age to the Iron Age in Thailand: Applying the Heterarchical Approach. *Asian Perspectives* 39(1–2): 1–19.
- Saitta, Dean J.; and Keene, Arthur S. 1990. Politics and Surplus Flow in Prehistoric Communal Societies. In *The Evolution of Political Systems: Sociopolitics in Small-scale Sedentary Societies*, edited by Steadman Upham, pp. 203–224. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nishimura, Masao. 1988. Long Distance Trade and the Development of Complex Societies in the Prehistory of the Central Philippines — The Cebu Archaeological Project: Basic Concept and First Results. *Philippine Quarterly of Culture and Society* 16: 107–157.

林 行夫 (編). 『(境域) の実践宗教——大陸部東南アジア地域と宗教のトポロジー』 地域研究叢書 19. 京都大学学術出版会, 2009, 836 p.

本書は、ビルマ（ミャンマー）からタイ、カンボジア、ラオス、中国南西部へと続く東南アジア大陸部の諸地域における宗教と社会の動態を、多角的な視点から明らかにした論文集である。編者である林が序文で述べているのであるが、本書は、従来、ミクロな生活世界の実践宗教は、国家あるいは制度といった枠組みの中で、二項対立的に中心に対する周縁あるいは外縁と、閉塞的かつディスクリートな他者関係のなかで捉えられることが多かったのに対し、実践宗教を、空間的な境界領域のみならず、制度的、文化的境界領域をも包含する「境域」という、いわば開放的、連続的で柔軟な関係性の中で捉える視点から照射し、その独自の生きざまを明らかにしようとしている点に特色がある、示唆的で挑戦的な論考集である。

評者は、これまでアイヌ、東シベリアのサハ、チベット系社会における宗教実践、あるいはその再活性化を研究対象としてきており、東南アジア地域については門外漢である。しかし、2007年4月に出席した国際宗教史学会のストックホルム特別会議では、「Religion on the Borders（境界にある宗教）」がテーマとなり、内と外、聖と俗、自己と他者など二項対立的に捉える視点はもはや重要な意味をなさないという認識のもと、宗教研究の新しい視点として「境界性」が照射されていたことを目の当たりにしている。また、本書が対象としている地域には、1970年代以降外国人の調査研究が事実上実施できなかった国や地域が含まれていること、とりわけ、国家の政治動向の中で宗教の断絶を経験した地域が含まれていることは、評者が調査をしてきたあるいは調査を進めている地域とも重なり合う。このため、本書は比較研究という点からも大いに関心をそそるものであり、ここでは他地域研究者の視点からという限定の上で、批評を試みるものであることをはじめに断っておきたい。

本書は、編者による序文、3部構成で配列され