

- HUDSON, L. 1987. "East is east and west is west? A regional comparison of cult belief patterns," in *Cult archaeology and creationism*. Edited by F. B. Harrold and R. A. Eve, pp. 49–67. Iowa City: University of Iowa Press.
- MC COLLISTER, BETTY. Editor. 1989. *Voices for evolution*. Berkeley: National Center for Science Education.
- MC KUSICK, M. 1984. Psychic archaeology from Atlantis to Oz. *Archaeology* 37(5):48–52.
- NIELSEN, RICHARD. 1988. *Linguistic evidence which supports that the Kensington Runestone is genuine*. San Diego: Epigraphic Society.
- O'MEARA, J. T. 1989. Anthropology as empirical science. *American Anthropologist* 91:354–69.
- SABLOFF, J. Editor. 1982. *Archaeology: Myth and reality*. San Francisco: Freeman.
- SINGER, B., AND V. A. BENASSI. 1981. Occult beliefs. *American Scientist* 69:49–55.
- STIEBING, W. R. 1984. *Ancient astronauts, cosmic collisions, and other popular theories about man's past*. Buffalo: Prometheus.
- WAUCHOPE, R. 1962. *Lost tribes and sunken continents*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- WHITE, J. P. 1974. *The past is human*. New York: Taplinger.
- WILLIAMS, S. 1987. "Fantastic archaeology: What should we do about it?," in *Cult archaeology and creationism*. Edited by F. B. Harrold and R. A. Eve, pp. 124–33. Iowa City: University of Iowa Press.
- . 1988. Fantastic messages from the past. *Archaeology* 45(1):62–70.
- WOMACK, S. 1982. "Creationism vs. evolutionism: The problem for cultural relativity," in *Confronting the creationists*. Edited by S. Pastner and W. Haviland, pp. 27–34. Northeastern Anthropological Association Occasional Proceedings 1.

## On Middle Paleolithic/Middle Stone Age Hominid Taxonomy

MILFORD H. WOLPOFF AND RACHEL CASPARI  
*Paleoanthropology Laboratory, Department of Anthropology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. 48109, U.S.A./Department of Anthropology and Sociology, Albion College, Albion, Mich. 49224, U.S.A.*  
 30 I 90

We accept the notion that "the pattern in the evidence for symbolic behavior is the same whether the hominids associated with Middle Paleolithic/Middle Stone Age archaeological assemblages are archaic *H. sapiens*, Neanderthals, or morphological moderns" (see Lindly and Clark, "Symbolism and Modern Human Origins," *CA* 31:233–40) and want to discuss one of the implications Lindly and Clark suggest (p. 239): that "the taxonomic units themselves are unreliable." It is our position that the morphology of the hominids at the Middle Paleolithic/Middle Stone Age sites with large samples provides support for this suggestion. In particular, we draw attention to the samples from Mount Carmel, Qafzeh, and Klasies River Mouth. These sites are large enough to allow the assessment of *sample characteristics*, which are found to be a more valid source of taxonomic information than isolated individuals, especially when the comparisons are between closely related groups whose ranges of morphological variation are likely to overlap markedly.

After McCown and Keith's comprehensive study, the Mount Carmel remains were divided into three parts, now deposited at the Rockefeller Institute (Jerusalem), the Harvard Peabody Museum (Cambridge), and the British Museum of Natural History (London). The specimens have never been reunited, and therefore the McCown and Keith monograph (1939) is based on the only study of the sample as a whole. There are three important points to be made about the conclusions they drew from their analysis. First, they regarded the Skhül and Tabün specimens as representing the same population ("we had before us the remains of a single people" [p. 12]), and Tabün was not always the more archaic (see discussions of the Skhül IV nasal process, IX orbit shape, VI nuchal area, V relative radius size, II coronoid process, and the midshaft femur shape of specimen 7). Second, the Mount Carmel folk were thought to be "in the throes of evolutionary change" (p. 14) because numerous individual intermediate features and sets of intermediate characters "bridge the structural hiatus lying between the Neanderthal and the Neanthropic types" (p. 372). Third, they contended that "the Mount Carmel people are not the actual ancestors of the Cromagnons but Neanderthaloid collaterals or cousins of the ancestors of that type" (p. 17). In our opinion, a half-century of additional discoveries and comparisons provides no basis for regarding the Mount Carmel remains as any more modern than McCown and Keith did (in fact probably less so, since the subsequent discovery of Amud shows that the Skhül sample overlaps even more with the Levant Neandertals than they observed).

There is some thought that a similar interpretation cannot be applied to Qafzeh, even though it appears to be earlier if the thermoluminescence and electron-spin-resonance dates can be accepted as valid. Some workers consider Qafzeh to be even more modern than Skhül, explaining the later Levantine appearance of Neandertals (or of a mixture including Neanderthal morphology as is described for Skhül) as the consequence of interbreeding of local "moderns" with European immigrants forced southeast by the deteriorating climate of the last glaciation. But is Qafzeh more modern, or even less Neanderthal-like? Our research suggests that it is not. Qafzeh 9 is the specimen inappropriately treated as the "type" for this site. However, it is between adolescent and adult in age, according to Vandermeersch, and a teenager of 15–16 (dentally) by our analysis. For a specimen so young it has unexpectedly great supraorbital development (unfortunately, the entire glabellar region is missing); the bulk of male supraorbital growth is in the late teens and early twenties. In our opinion the "modern" status of the Qafzeh sample is overstated for other reasons as well. For instance, the averages for the dental metrics (including the anterior teeth) are similar to or even greater than in the earlier Würm European Neandertals. The Qafzeh 3 female is far too archaic to be conceivably regarded as a "morphological modern," and the surprising amount of cranial plaster suggests that many of the Skhül 5–like features of the Qafzeh 6 male may be more the consequence of decisions made during reconstruction than reflections of the specimen's biology.

The fragmentary hominid remains from Klasies River Mouth are generally considered modern *H. sapiens* and provide a large portion of the evidence used by workers who postulate an early, unique African origin for modern humans. While some of the specimens in this sample are small and certain fragments exhibit what are often considered modern features, given the comments that have been made about it we find the sample as a whole surprisingly archaic. The apparent modernity of some of these specimens may reflect comparisons with early *H. sapiens* from other geographic regions, since features that are archaic in Europe and other areas may not characterize Late Pleistocene southern Africans. Metric and morphological comparisons with the oldest provenienced Holocene specimens from the southern Cape and the small sample of Middle and Late Pleistocene Africans indicate that *as a sample* the Klasies material is not particularly modern. For example, facial size as reflected by zygomatic height is considerably greater in KRM 1665 1 than the Holocene sample's mean or range and than that of comparable Late Pleistocene African specimens (Florisbad and Ngaloba [LH 18]). It is large even compared with those of Middle Pleistocene Africans (larger than Broken Hill's, though smaller than Bodo's). The anterior interorbital breadth in KRM 16425, the same specimen that exhibits modern supraorbital morphology, also exceeds that of the Holocene sample and Florisbad, though it is less than that of Omo 3. Additionally, two of the four Klasies mandibular symphyses lack a mental eminence; all of the Holocene South Africans have chins.

In our opinion, there is support for the observation that some taxonomic categories, such as "anatomically modern *H. sapiens*" as applied to Middle Paleolithic/Middle Stone Age samples, are unreliable and do not reflect real biological or behavioral entities. We find no indication from archeological remains that Middle Paleolithic/Middle Stone Age populations described as "anatomically modern *H. sapiens*" were behaviorally different from their contemporaries. The skeletal remains are problematic for different reasons. The three samples we have discussed have all been considered "anatomically modern" on the basis of a limited number of carefully selected characteristics found in some of the specimens. But when the samples as a whole are considered, these characteristics are found to be variable, and the populations appear to have been archaic when compared with the Late Pleistocene or Holocene remains from the same regions. In our opinion the samples cannot be considered "morphologically modern" by any meaningful definition of the phrase—which is perhaps the reason there has yet to be proposed a workable definition that fits them and us but excludes other populations generally regarded as archaic. We believe that the widespread characterization of non-European Middle Paleolithic/Middle Stone Age skeletal remains as "morphologically modern" reflects the fact that they are not Neanderthals (members of a European clade) rather than whether they are archaic or modern in grade. Attributes of archaic and modern samples vary appreciably in different regions, and therefore, while Late Pleistocene

temporal changes occur and are important, we believe that these can only be understood in a regional context. Besides, there is much to be said for the idea that human populations are modern when they behave in recognizably modern ways, no matter what they look like.

## On Mediterraneanist Studies

DAVID GILMORE

*Department of Anthropology, State University of New York at Stony Brook, Stony Brook, N.Y. 11794-4364, U.S.A. 15 190*

Pina-Cabral's (CA 30:399–406) attack on the work of Anglophone anthropologists in the Mediterranean region for being ethnocentric raises some useful points, but its language is so intemperate that some response seems necessary—if only to provide a defense for those who seek to follow John Davis's suggestion that Mediterranean anthropology be more comparative. Pina-Cabral is enraged by intra-Mediterranean comparison and, in particular, by my employment of psychological insights and concepts to aid such comparison and by the comparison of aspects of his own Iberian culture (e.g., honor and shame) to certain aspects of culture in the Middle East and North Africa.

On the first point, Pina-Cabral lays down the law: psychology is never to be used in culture study. Especially in southern Europe, such phenomena as sexual mores, interpersonal relations, notions of gender identity have no real psychogenetic component but are results of the acting out of structural principles. This is an interesting argument (and one that I have heard stated more eloquently and persuasively), though Pina-Cabral fails to provide a shred of epistemological support for it. Yet we are told that anthropologists who identify and try to analyze such behaviors as *machismo* or male gender-identity conflict in the peoples they study (without denying similar conflicts in their own culture) are projecting their own psychological problems onto the data. Apparently only North Americans have psyches that affect their attitudes and behavior.

The other criticism has more serious implications. Pina-Cabral insists that southern Europe, especially Iberia, must be compared not to the Middle East or North Africa but only to northern and western Europe. Unlike some Middle Easterners, the men of Sicily, Andalusia, Sardinia, etc., do not seclude their women and have no similar notions of masculine honor and feminine shame. Seven centuries of Muslim domination in Andalusia and four in the Balkans have left no significant influences. There is no basis for comparison here. Further, the honor-and-shame concept is an ethnocentric imposition upon southern European culture, a fervid delusion of Anglophone neurotics. Rather than addressing every point in this attack, which is myopic and Eurocentric, I invite Pina-Cabral to respond to some