

whole series of frequently convincing arguments for transoceanic contacts involving the tropic and temperate zones of the New World. Inventions and customs like script, sun-worship, calendar systems, the use of zero, hierarchy, royal sister marriage, pyramid building, metal forging, mold-made adobes, road-building, mummification, pottery, wheeled animal figurines, the *patoli*-game, loom with cotton cultivation and spinning, balances with graduated weights, bow and arrow, blow-gun, sling, trepanning, ear extension, tattoo, etc., were all elements which *could* have been thought of twice or repeatedly, and thus they were considered inconclusive as evidence of trans-Atlantic or trans-Pacific influence. Henceforwardly, whenever diffusionists emerged with a new case of Old and New World parallelism which to them indicated contact, their argument was predestinated to be labeled "not proven" and automatically to fall into oblivion.

Nevertheless, the attempts of mustering arguments in favor of cultural contact across the sea have never quite petered out: of most recent years they have actually gained impetus even in America where the resistance against diffusionism for many years has been strongest. The apparent fear of another turn of the pendulum back from doctrinaire isolationism to extreme diffusionism is reflected in a vigorous recent attempt by J. H. ROWE to dam the flow in his paper on "Diffusionism and Archaeology". To use ROWE's words, doctrinaire diffusionism is a hardy weed which has now crossed the fence of ethnological pastures and begins to infest archaeology. He adds: "We are now being subjected in archaeological meetings to ever more strident claims that Mesoamerican culture was derived from China or southeast Asia, early Ecuadorian culture from Japan, Woodland culture from Siberia, Peruvian culture from Mesoamerica, and so forth" (p. 334).

There must be some particular reason for this new threat of a return of the pendulum, and two alternative explanations emerge: Either the continued presentations of the diffusionists must seem convincing to an increasing number of scholars, or else the arguments of the isolationists fall short of being generally accepted as conclusive. The second answer would per force be valid if there is any justification for ROWE's depreciative judgement of the evidence put forth by the diffusionists. If the evidence for diffusion is vague, the come-back of the diffusionists can only be due to the failure of the partisans of isolation to demonstrate the water-tight validity of *their* view.

A recent paper by D. FRASER on the "Theoretical issues in the Transpacific diffusion controversy" clearly demonstrates the lack of uniformity of theoretical assumptions in the interpretation of available evidence. He shows that, what stands as valid evidence of diffusion for one scholar may have diametrically opposite meaning for another. The Asian *pachisi* and the closely analogous Mexican game of *patoli* are used by both diffusionists and independent inventionists to bolster their own respective case. One camp argues that because of their formal similarity, links must exist, and proceeds to search for these links; whereas the other camp says that the distance and associate conditions preclude relationship, and thus the game demonstrates perfectly the validity of independent invention. Similarly, as also pointed out by FRASER (p. 469 f.),