

the context of the wider area; all but two articles in vol.IV (1973) deal with areas outside Hong Kong proper (G.H.R. von Koenigswald, 'Early Man in Java'; Wilhelm G. Solheim II, 'Early Neolithic in South China and South East Asia'; Henri Fontaine & Georgette Delibrias, 'Ancient Sea Levels in Vietnam'; C.J. Barrett, 'Tai Wan Reconsidered'); much of vol.V (1974) is also devoted to south China, India or general archaeological topics (K.C. Chang, 'Interrelationship of North China, South China and Southeast Asia in Ancient Times'; Asok K. Ghosh, 'Denticulates in India'; F.H. Kendall, 'Thermoluminescence Dating'; F.P. Lisowski, 'Vertebrate Palaeontology and Museums in China'; H.Y. Shih, 'The Archaeology of the Yangtze Delta'; C.T. Yeung & W. Meacham, 'Recent carbon-14 dates from South China'); and again, of the six articles published in the latest volume (VI, 1975), only two are concerned with Hong Kong itself, the rest being about Southeast Asia or China (Don Bayard, 'North China, South China, Southeast Asia'; J.C.S. Davidson, 'Recent Archaeological Activity in North Vietnam'; William Meacham, 'The Middle Neolithic of the South China Coast'; Wilhelm G. Solheim II, 'The Nusantara and South China'). According to the contents of the *Journal*, therefore, Hong Kong, although not now properly speaking belonging to Southeast Asia, has become one of the centres of dissemination of archaeological scholarship concerning the Southeast Asian cultural sphere of which it was clearly a part in the remote past.

We shall hear more about this in due course. In the circumstances outlined above, Mr Meacham has kindly agreed to act as local correspondent for IPPA (*Newsletter* and *Bulletin*) and will keep us informed on the role of Hong Kong in Southeast Asian archaeology in the past and in the present.

H.H.E. Loofs

## PHILIPPINES

### Megalithic Monuments in Mindanao?

It was recently brought to my notice that in the course of an AID-sponsored road construction project in Mindanao, the southernmost great Philippine island, Australian engineers came across curious big stones which the bulldozers could not easily remove.

Dr Eric Casiño, Head Anthropologist at the National Museum in Manila, was duly notified (there is a geologist but no archaeologist or anthropologist on the Australo-Philippine team) and came at once to investigate the matter; he was of the opinion that these strange stones were indeed prehistoric dolmens, i.e. megalithic monuments consisting of massive upright stones with a flat one on top, as are known from many parts of the world.

If confirmed, this would be a very important, not to say sensational archaeological discovery for, although there are many signs of megalithic practices to be found amongst southeast Asian population groups in the past or even the present, dolmen-type monuments are rare in Southeast Asia and are in particular unknown in the Philippines (except maybe on the Batan and Babuyan Islands between Luzon and Taiwan which still remain to be fully archaeologically explored). The Ifugao, in the mountains of Northern Luzon, possess a culture which can properly be called 'megalithic' in which, similar to that of the Naga in Assam, upright stones play an important part; but there are no dolmens. In Mindanao itself, the only megalithic elements so far published are stone burial urns or vats found in two caves north of Kulaman by Dr Marcelino Maceda; they seem to be not unlike those from Central Sulawesi (Celebes) or Northern Laos. But again no dolmens.

Investigations on this most interesting matter continue.

H.H.E. Loofs

## FIELD RECONNAISSANCE OF EASTERN PANAY ISLAND, PHILIPPINES

### Introduction

As the first step in a joint research and training programme with the National Museum of the Philippines, the Victoria Archaeological Survey recently carried out a preliminary reconnaissance of the eastern margin of Panay Island (Figs 1 and 2). This area was selected for a number of reasons.