ARCHEOLOGY 751

miliar to many American scholars. In addition, the theoretical perspective, based in part on neo-Marxists such as Godelier, Ekholm, Friedman, Rowlands, and others, is thought-provoking. Like many other investigators of the problem of state formation, Hedeager is unable to specify a direct causal mechanism for the development of class differences, but she provides a valuable analysis of the interrelationships among ritual, production, exchange, and the development of hierarchy and centralization.

The conclusions, generalizing from this case study to broader analyses of social change, are not as convincing as the detailed analysis of the specific case. More important, Denmark appears very isolated. Hedeager has explicitly chosen to focus on Denmark, but a larger perspective is still needed. Many of the prestige goods, claimed to be the material foundation of increasing class division, are Roman imports, but we are provided with no information about what the Romans are doing during this critical period. It seems in this book as if ambitious warlords in Iron Age Denmark had access to Roman imports more or less at will, without much interaction with actual Romans or Roman colonies. Much of the theoretical background described in the opening chapter is about so-called pristine states, and Iron Age Denmark is clearly a "secondary" state. While Hedeager has rightly drawn our attention to the importance of internal factors, even in the development of secondary states, there are significant differences between the two processes. In its focus on internal factors, this book lacks an illumination of something very interesting and, in fact, essential in this case: how do states develop in the presence of other, existing states? Despite this weakness, I recommend this volume for its careful analysis of archeological material and thoughtful discussion of some of the issues of state formation.

Mesoamerican Elites: An Archaeological Assessment. Diane Z. Chase and Arlen F. Chase, eds. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1992. 390 pp.

MICHAEL E. SMITH State University of New York, Albany

Two conclusions can be drawn from this collection of 19 articles on ancient Mesoamerican elites. First, the study of elites in archeological contexts is a difficult endeavor. Archeologists cannot simply assume that polychrome pottery,

stone buildings, or other such traits will always identify ancient elites. Second, there is little agreement among Mesoamericanists on how to approach the study of elites and social stratification. Five chapters deal with general issues: the introduction and conclusion by A. Chase and D. Chase; a paper by Hirth on elites and trade; a discussion of Maya and Aztec stratification by Sanders; and a theoretical paper by ethnologist George Marcus. Nine of the chapters deal with Maya sites, including A. Chase on Caracol; Pendergast on Altun Ha and Lamanai; Freidel on Yaxuna; D. Chase on Sta. Rita Corozal: Fox, Wallace, and Brown on the Quiché; and Henderson on the southeastern zone. Three Maya papers are noteworthy: Haviland and Moholy-Nagy present an excellent discussion of the types of evidence for stratification at Tikal; Tourtellot, Sabloff, and Carmean investigate Terminal Classic society through comparisons of Seibal and Sayil; and Webster contributes an outstanding treatment of social stratification at Copan.

For Central Mexico, there are papers by Grove and Gillespie on Chalcatzingo; Cowgill on Teotihuacan; and Charlton and Nichols on Postclassic and Colonial Otumba. I found the two papers on Oaxaca to contain the most compelling arguments on the nature of Mesoamerican stratification. Joyce Marcus compares textual and iconographic evidence on Maya and Zapotec royal families, and Kowalewski, Feinman, and Finsten summarize the Oaxaca survey data relating to stratification and also critique Mesoamerican stratification studies and elite as an analytical concept.

Perhaps the major disagreement among the authors in Mesoamerican Elites concerns class structure. Chase and Chase argue repeatedly that a two-class model (nobles and commoners) does not fit Mesoamerica. They see more variability in ranking, including the presence of a middle class among the Classic and Postclassic Maya. Joyce Marcus counters with a strong argument for the existence of only two social classes in Mesoamerican states; her paper stresses class endogamy and variation within strata. Sanders argues that only the most heavily urbanized, commercialized societies (Teotihuacan and Tenochtitlan) had emerging middle categories. This is an important research issue. Although my view of the data accords more with Marcus and Sanders than with the Chases, it is disappointing to see little convincing evidence for either position in this volume.

This lack of evidence on class structure is part of a general methodological-theoretical weakness in the analysis of Mesoamerican socie-

ties, which is manifested in these articles in at least three ways. First, the term elite is not a useful conceptual tool for Mesoamerica. George Marcus notes that social scientists use the term in an informal or colloquial fashion and the only context in which it has been given analytical significance is the study of modern capitalist societies. Second, there is a surprising lack of quantitative data in this book. Wealth, power, and status, the primary concepts in the analysis of stratification since Weber, are measured by continuous variables, yet only four of the nineteen chapters have data tables. A number of authors make quantitative arguments without presenting data (it should also be noted that some authors refer to figures that are not present in the book). Finally, one comes to a more fundamental problem: Mesoamericanists have yet to decide upon useful social concepts for the study of inequality, and, therefore, we have been unable to establish realistic archeological correlates for such concepts. Among these articles, the Chases and Kowalewski et al. show the greatest recognition of this problem. Studies of social stratification in Mesoamerica have a long way to go; nevertheless, the articles in Mesoamerican Elites cover important issues and present new findings that must be taken into account by anyone concerned with the topic.

The Middle Paleolithic: Adaptation, Behavior, and Variability. *Harold L. Dibble* and *Paul Mellars*, eds. University Museum Monograph 78. Symposium Series, Vol. 4. Philadelphia: University Museum, University of Pennsylvania, 1992. 228 pp.

JAMES SACKETT
University of California, Los Angeles

This miscellany stems from a symposium held during the 1989 meetings of the Society for American Archaeology. It may not attract a wide audience, given its lack of thematic cohesion, the substantial background knowledge required to read it with profit, and the fact that fairly similar versions of many of its chapters have recently seen publication elsewhere. Nonetheless, it is a handsome and extremely well edited volume that usefully samples the current state of research into the archeological background against which modern human beings emerged. What follows is only an impressionistic sketch of the volume's rich and varied contents.

Andre Debenath provides a set-piece of solid Bordesian description of the Middle Paleolithic industries of the archeologically classic Charente region. This is complemented by Alain Turq's succinct analysis of the flint procurement and flaking strategies that generate assemblages attributed to the Quina Mousterian. Turq recognizes the descriptive efficacy of the conventional type-list systematics introduced by François Bordes nearly a half century ago; but, like most contributors to the volume, he believes that explaining the variability it orders must be approached by unraveling the dynamic chaînes opératoires that lie behind the list's static artifact categories.

Harold Dibble and Nicolas Rolland review how their analyses of tool reduction sequences and the statistical structure of Mousterian industries helped carry Middle Paleolithic research out of the impasse of the Bordes/Binford debate. Here their argument is extended to deal more comprehensively with factors involving raw material and intensity of occupation. Their emphasis on the multiplicity of causes underlying Mousterian assemblage variability and the growing inutility of Bordes's original assemblage types, or *facies*, is heartily seconded in Leslie Freeman's discussion of Cueva Morin.

By way of contrast, the taxonomic integrity of at least some of the facies is upheld by Paul Mellars during the course of arguing that his long-held views regarding the temporal segregation of the Ferrassie, Quina, and MTA industries can partly be accounted for in terms of the factors stressed by Dibble, Rolland, and Turq.

Two papers summarize the state of Middle Paleolithic studies in specific regions. These are Alain Tuffreau's survey of northern France and a review of Cantabrian Spain by Victoria Cabrera Valdes and Frederico Bernaldo de Quirós. In a quite different vein, two contributions attempt to wrestle more general behavioral implications from the Middle Paleolithic archeological record. Catherine Farizy and Francine David contrast butchering patterns at two French open-air sites. Donald Henry compares the differential procurement and use of stone resources in two shelter sites on the Jordanian Plain. Both studies indicate that the logistical flexibility and planning capabilities of the hominids involved may not have differed significantly from those suggested by Upper Paleolithic sites.

Some papers stand alone. An intriguing note is struck by Amy Campbell's discussion of the possible use of water wells in the Mousterian of Saharan Egypt. Marcel Otte's personal views of the Mousterian, as usual, make interesting reading. Geoffrey Clark's contrast of the replacement and continuity schools of