

in agrarian societies in two ways. First, there is insufficient statewide information available about the production and distribution system for many of the agrarian states; second, in agrarian states political centralization did not significantly influence the organization of production. This latter argument, valid or not, of course begs the question of how representative of an entire state (say of Egypt) an individual village is. Might there not be a third reason? The data set used by Pryor for preindustrial societies is derived from the Standard Cross Cultural Sample which in the case of agricultural societies happens to consist of individual village studies.

Pryor cannot be faulted for not relating his data as best as he can to a large number of theories and propositions about production stages and economic systems. Nevertheless, some controversial, well-known theories and models close to the heart of anthropologists and others are not addressed. For instance, Ester Boserup's model of agricultural intensification (via shortened fallow periods) and its relation to population density, property relations, and stratification does not receive attention, nor does the dependency/world systems assumption that socioeconomic core regions cause and/or maintain poverty in peripheral regions. It would have been of interest to learn what his data set tells us about these and other models. True, one cannot do all, and Pryor in this volume has done much. It is surprising, nevertheless, that no reference is made to Fernand Braudel, David Landes, and Eric Wolf among historians, economists, and anthropologists; nor (given his evolutionary approach) to Elman Service, Morton Fried, and Marvin Harris.

Much of the data on which this empirically oriented work is based appears in table form throughout the book. A considerable amount, however, is available in appendices that can only be found online. This is understandable given the size limitations of books. It becomes irritating, though, if crucial information is tucked away in the appendix, such as the nature of the various types of economic systems of developing economies that are mentioned in the text (146, 196 ff.), yet identified only in the appendix. It is also a leap of faith that the online information will still be available in one or two decades. Already now the reviewer could not find the appendices via the publisher's web page as the reader is directed to do, though they could be accessed via the author's home page.

Finally, a minor matter, but irritating all the same because it could so easily have been avoided: Despite the comparative nature of this work, which

includes discussions and data presentations of a wide variety of societies, the index, while listing types of societies and countries, does not contain references to individual ones.

Despite these shortcomings, anthropologists and others interested in the comparative study of economies will find this truly scholarly work highly useful. It is refreshing to read a study that endeavors to use a quantifiable set of data to empirically answer a broad range of questions concerning the nature of economic systems, their relation to the environmental and social contexts, and their transformation over time – questions that all too often have encouraged imaginative speculations as answers. Pryor's effort in this study reminds one of the scholars – anthropologists among them – who at the turn of the last century called for the need for more hard data rather than additional models of the evolution of culture. They would have agreed with Pryor's point that "premature theorizing without [a] factual basis ... will only divert attention from the real economic (and intellectual) problems" (281). The difficulty is that "armchair theorizing is a pleasant way to pass the time, especially while leaving the hard work of empirical validation to others" (279). Pryor attempts to provide such validation in this work, and by and large he has succeeded in doing so.

## Drei neue Maya-Hieroglyphen Kataloge

Berthold Riese

### 1 Ausgangslage

Laufende Neufunde von Inschriften, Erstveröffentlichungen von Altbeständen aus privaten und öffentlichen Sammlungen und die damit einhergehende Zunahme von Entzifferungsversuchen machen eine systematische Bestandsaufnahme und Fortschreibung derselben sowohl auf der Ebene der Texte und der in ihnen vorkommenden Hieroglyphen und Zeichen als auch auf der Ebene der Entzifferungen zu einem immer wieder virulent werdenden Desiderat der Maya-Schriftforschung.