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Community-Based Archaeology: Research with, by, and for Indigenous and Local Communities
SONYA ATALAY
University of California Press, Berkeley, 2012. 328 pp., 20 figs., bib., index. $70.00 cloth, $29.95 paper.

In Community-Based Archaeology, Sonya Atalay outlines her thoughts and experiences regarding the benefits of a truly collaborative archaeological practice. In designing research projects with, by, and for various stakeholder communities, Atalay provides a methodology for decolonizing archaeology while promoting its use as a tool for social change. By crafting research designs through a methodology Atalay calls community-based participatory research (CBPR), archaeological projects become relevant and accessible to local communities. In turn, these communities benefit from an inclusive and integrative process that develops and fosters ground-level capacity in the stewardship of cultural resources. In this collaboration-driven model, CBPR allows for the democratization of archaeological practice while also providing a platform for shared authority and knowledge production with local and descendant communities.

Atalay’s text is divided into eight chapters tracing the origins, principles, and various practices of community-based archaeological projects. Using five case studies, Atalay differentiates CBPR from other forms of community or public archaeology by anchoring its principles in postcolonial theory. Her approach examines the internal and external forces that continue to decolonize archaeological practices. Discussions of self-reflexivity, subjectivity, multivocality, ethics, public education, and outreach within the archaeological community have exerted internal influences on the way archaeology is practiced and approached. In addition to these internal influences, Atalay stresses how Native American activism shifted archaeological practice toward a more inclusive and culturally sensitive approach. Both of these internal and external forces were central in creating and embracing CBPR, a methodology that directly addresses theoretical and ethical concerns of academics and descendant communities alike.

In discussing CBPR, Atalay differentiates it from public and community archaeology by asking the question, who does the research benefit? Central to Atalay’s definition of CBPR is the decolonization of archaeological practice. By involving descendant communities in every aspect of the research project, from design to execution, CBPR provides a methodology that fundamentally shifts the power paradigm of traditional archaeological research projects from archaeological objectives to community goals. In developing a CBPR project, where community concerns and research questions are given primacy, a true collaborative nature is fostered by both academics and the people they work with. Through such a framework, CBPR differs from most concepts of public or community archaeology.

Another way in which CBPR differs from previous concepts of public and community archaeology is through knowledge production and dissemination. CBPR is concerned with how knowledge is produced, who produces it, who this knowledge is for, and ultimately, who benefits from it. In CBPR these concerns directly influence community engagement, research partnerships, and power sharing through a decolonizing of the research process. Essential to this process is the recognition that every member participating in CBPR has valuable input, knowledge, and skill-sets that complement other facets of the project. The community therefore is involved as an active participant in the research rather than being a passive consumer of “expert” knowledge. Through this manner, in being consciously aware of the political action of archaeological research, CBPR serves as a collaborative and reciprocal tool for social and civic engagement.
One goal of Atalay’s book is to provide a way to operationalize the theory of CBPR into practice. Since CBPR is flexible and locally specific, there is no one-size-fits-all methodology. Instead, Atalay offers five commonalities that she draws from involvement with various CBPR projects, as follows: “1) they utilize a community-based, partnership process; 2) they aspire to be participatory in all aspects; 3) they build community capacity; 4) they engage a spirit of reciprocity; and 5) they recognize the contributions of multiple knowledge systems” (p. 63). In approaching research projects with these commonalities in mind, Atalay has found great success in implementing CBPR.

Atalay acknowledges the difficulty of applying CBPR to all archaeological projects, and dedicates a significant portion of the book to addressing potential skeptics with relevant examples showcasing how CBPR offers a beneficial reorientation for archaeology. Using five case studies, Atalay shows how projects can benefit from a CBPR model by ameliorating tense and untrusting relationships between archaeologists and communities. In using CBPR, research designs and goals become transparent, building a level of mutual respect and trust for both parties involved in an archaeological project. In addition to this transparency, by sharing authority through decision making, planning, and execution, CBPR provides a level playing field for multiple knowledges and skill-sets to contribute to a project. Atalay refers to such collaboration as “braided knowledge,” a substantive and enlightening way of integrating multiple truths into a story.

Atalay also addresses concerns of those who wish to practice CBPR but are hesitant. She understands how scholars are often restricted by stringent timelines, making the practice of CBPR difficult. Atalay cogently explains how the research methodology presented in her book can overcome this and other difficulties commonly restricting full community participation. In approaching projects with CBPR, Atalay reminds research participants to be aware and open with their goals and timelines from the outset of meeting with community members. In being transparent with personal concerns, many of the difficulties and questions arising from adopting a CBPR methodology can be mitigated. Atalay urges that the benefits to scholarly and community research through the use of CBPR are worth the constraints and obstacles that may occur.

Community-Based Archaeology is a must read for those seeking substantive approaches in decolonizing archaeological practice. The methodology and examples explored by Atalay address numerous concerns and hesitations that may prevent the adoption of CBPR. Atalay convincingly reveals the benefits of CBPR for both professional archaeologists and descendant, local, and indigenous communities by grounding her methodology in postcolonial theory. The practice of CBPR successfully operationalizes postcolonial theory, fundamentally shifting the power paradigm toward a productive and meaningful engagement between all participants in a project. Community-Based Archaeology will serve as a beacon and guide to self-critical archaeologists wishing to engage the public in a substantive manner.

Marc Lorenc
Monmouth University
Department of History and Anthropology
West Long Branch, NJ 07764-1898
Breathing New Life into the Evidence of Death: Contemporary Approaches to Bioarchaeology
AUBREY BAADSGAARD, ALEXIS T. BOUTIN, AND JANE E. BUIKSTRA (EDITORS)
School for Advanced Research Press, Santa Fe, NM, 2011. 340 pp., 37 figs., 20 tables, refs., index. $39.95 paper.

The papers in this edited volume arose out of an eponymous seminar held at the School for Advanced Research in 2008. Divided into three themes, the nine contributions represent a contextual approach to the production of bioarchaeological understanding, including both theoretical and data-driven studies. Every paper foregrounds the interrelationship between individual and collective skeletal remains and the sociocultural factors that affect the process and interpretation of the treatment of the dead.

Part 1 involves three theoretical, historical, and methodological explorations loosely centered on the theme of community. Pamela Geller links the living and the dead in the Mayan world through a nuanced treatment of child sacrifice, arguing that the practice both contributed to a cohesive society and was permanently embodied by individual mourners who amputated their own finger for a sacrificed child. In studying burials from Halaf times, Susan Pollock suggests that rather than focusing on deviation from the normative burial pattern as an explanatory framework, it may be more useful in many contexts to pay attention to the idiosyncrasies as well. Drawing on social theory, Pollock argues that variation in Halaf burial is not necessarily intentional or meaningful, but rather a flexible perspective or improvisation in ritual surrounding death. In a complementary chapter, Rachel Scott presents burial data from early Christian Galway and argues that, rather than finding meaning in patterned differences in burials, looking at similarities that crosscut the graves demonstrates the significant role of religion in Irish society. Both Pollock and Scott persuasively revise the Binfordian model, wherein mortuary treatment reflects social identity, to underscore the influence of community and conformity in burial.

Part 2 provides two perspectives that push bioarchaeological research in a more cultural direction. By grounding her fictive narratives in traditional osteological data sources, Alexis Boutin effectively highlights individual experiences in Alalakh, Syria, in the 2nd millennium B.C. through unique and compelling prose. This focus on the human scale is echoed in María Cecilia Lozada’s call for a multidisciplinary approach to ancestry. With genetic analysis on the rise, Lozada points out the need to differentiate cultural and biological understandings of social relationships with a case study of the Chiribaya of Peru, where cranial modification styles correlate with burial groups better than genes do. Both contributions call attention to the various ways that personhood may have been constructed in the past and the pitfalls associated with contemporary attempts to reconstruct these intricate relationships.

Four authors contribute bioarchaeological case studies to part 3. Christina Torres-Rouff and Aubrey Baadsgaard investigate cultural additions to the biological body with, respectively, a study of labret use in prehistoric Chile and mortuary dress in the Royal Cemetery of Ur. Both take as a starting point Joanna Sofaer’s notion of the body as material culture and suggest that these objects not only reflect an individual’s identity but also helped create that identity in life and in death. Christopher Knüsel discusses masculine social identities in late medieval England with a thorough analysis of elbow injury patterns that resulted from overuse among lower-status men training to use the longbow. The synthesis of pathology data with bioarchaeological context and historical information allows Knüsel to both reconstruct activity patterns and identify the social memory of the warrior. Within this section and the volume as a whole, however, the standout contribution comes from Ann
Stodder, whose treatment of skull art from the Sepik coast of New Guinea emphasizes the idea that death is a complex social process rather than a simple biological event. These human skulls are modified by skilled artisans, who turn individuals into ancestors following biological death. Yet their story does not end at this point; individual ancestors move into collective memory as time passes, allowing those once-sacred skulls to become trade commodities, eventually ending up in the collection of the Field Museum. Stodder expertly employs ethnographic information, history, iconography, and biological remains to complicate the life/death dichotomy and reformulate it as a continuum with various scales of social memory.

Pulling the diverse chapters together is a meaty introduction by editors Jane Buikstra, Aubrey Baadsgaard, and Alexis Boutin, which presents a brief but thorough history of bioarchaeology as a discipline, summarizes the contributions to the volume, and encourages bioarchaeologists to define themselves by the questions they ask, not the methods they use, and to communicate the answers to those questions to an increasingly diverse public. Some of this introductory chapter, however, would have been better used as a conclusion or discussion piece, which the volume lacks. In terms of mechanics, the bibliography is extensive and the index is useful, but the volume is not particularly well copyedited, to the point of being distracting in several chapters.

As a whole, this book draws together a range of methodological and theoretical perspectives that complement one another and provide an integrated view of the discipline of bioarchaeology. Many of the contributions are not as novel in 2013 as they likely were when first presented in the seminar series in 2008, yet even today they showcase the volume editors’ assertion that, in terms of holistic approaches to the past, bioarchaeology “is helping to lead the way, even interrogating the very nature of archaeological research, reporting and increasing its relevance to modern communities” (p. 25). As such, the volume is a strong statement on the current practice and future directions of the anthropological study of death in past societies.

Kristina Killgrove
Department of Anthropology
University of West Florida
1100 University Parkway
Pensacola, FL 32514
Alister Bowen’s monograph details an archaeological site that may be unusual to the point of perhaps being unique. As Bowen himself notes in the introduction, his Chinaman’s Point site in the colonial Australian town of Port Arthur may well be the only archaeologically excavated Chinese fish-curing site anywhere in the world, never mind in Australia’s southeastern state of Victoria. This monograph (the third in the Australasian Society for Historical Archaeology’s Studies in Australian Historical Archaeology series) nonetheless holds interest beyond the likely narrow demographic of colleagues interested in 19th-century Chinese fish curing.

The monograph begins with an introduction clearly outlining research questions and themes. As Bowen notes, while the initial aim may be to understand Chinese involvement in colonial Victoria’s fishing industry, the broader theme is to examine Chinese society in colonial Australia, and the implications thereof for both Chinese and non-Chinese alike. While the introduction is clearly laid out, and will be of interest to anyone interested in comparative historical archaeology practice and theory between their home region and Australia, this is the section that perhaps most clearly show the monograph’s origins in Bowen’s Ph.D. thesis. This is particularly true of the theory discussion, which, while entirely relevant, does read like a distilled doctoral dissertation overview.

Chapter 2 discusses the history of commercial fishing in Australia. This fascinating chapter discusses Aboriginal, European, and Chinese commercial fishing activities both generally and within the specific contexts of Victoria and Port Albert. Bowen outlines cultural exchanges, technological development over time (beginning with the 5th century in the European discussion), the historical background to the colonial settlement of Port Albert and its broader region of Gippsland, and the scale of the economic activity of the local fishing industry. It may come as a surprise to many readers to learn just how lucrative Chinese fish curing was: a Chinese fish curer could sell his wares for more than four times the price a European fisherman could charge for his uncured fish.

Chapter 3 focuses more specifically on Chinese fishing industries in China, but also contains a discussion of Chinese emigration to Victoria in the colonial period. Chinese immigration in the 19th century was at its peak during the gold rush period, offering immediate points of comparative commonality to the western North American experience. This discussion in turn builds the ground for chapter 4, which further narrows the focus to the role of the Chinese in Victoria’s fishing industry (though the chapter does touch upon activity in other Australian states and the Northern Territory). The chapter focuses on both industrial activity and economic and labor structures. Chinese fish-curing methods are outlined in detail, and an explicit comparison is made with Chinese fishing activities in the United States.

Chapter 5 describes the archaeological excavation Bowen carried out at Chinaman’s Point, and chapter 6 contains the artifact analysis. In addition to describing the archaeological data, these chapters contain highly detailed information on methodology and the source of typological terminology that should greatly enhance the monograph’s utility for further comparative analysis. A central challenge for Bowen—mentioned in both chapters—is that bottle collectors and other artifact hunters had looted the site over the last century and a half. Additionally, historical documents and photographs demonstrated that up to 100 m of the site foreshore had eroded away in the century and a half between
the site’s occupation and the archaeological excavation. This inevitably impacted both data recovery and data interpretation. Bowen is commendably open about both the extent of the problem and the likely impact on his data; the issue is tackled head-on rather than ignored or gently brushed to one side. In fact, much of the data seem interpretively robust despite these challenges, with the ceramics assemblage (overwhelmingly dominated by Chinese ceramics), faunal evidence, and artifacts relating to the fishing industry among those offering interesting insights into everyday life at Chinaman’s Point. Given the scope of both bottle collecting and erosion, the glass assemblage is more problematic (as Bowen acknowledges), but even here individual artifacts such as Chinese medical vials and bottle bases likely modified to be used as lamp chimneys have been usefully employed in overall site interpretation. There is also artifactual evidence of opium smoking at the site.

Chapters 7 and 8 contain discussions of site dating, interpretation, and the overall summarizing conclusion. These help summarize the monograph’s contributions to both the understanding of the Chinese involvement in Victoria’s fishing industry specifically, and the Chinese immigrant experience in Australia generally. Bowen’s monograph offers an important contribution to our understanding of both. The number of directly analogous sites to which Chinaman’s Point can currently be compared is perhaps small, but Bowen’s work will be of interest to many colleagues working on Chinese sites around the Pacific Rim given the data it provides on Chinese emigrant cultural activity and material culture. Additionally, the monograph offers useful insights into Australian colonial society that are more broadly useful for anyone interested in 19th-century comparative colonialism, and serves to demonstrate the disciplinary strength of Australian historical archaeology in the early 21st century.

Alasdair Brooks
Apt. 526
Saratoga Building
Al Bursha 1
Dubai, UAE
Culinary Creolization: Subsistence and Cultural Interaction at Fort Michilimackinac, 1730–1761

JENNA K. CARLSON

Archaeological Completion Report Series, Number 18, Mackinac Island State Park Commission, Mackinac Island, MI, 2012. 138 pp., 22 illus., 13 tables, bib., 3 apps. $48.95 paper.

Over the course of five chapters and three appendices, Jenna Carlson explicates the archaeological history of Fort Michilimackinac in Michigan with a particular focus on the faunal assemblages from Houses C and D at the site, and their ties to the multiple cultural groups living at the site in the 18th century. This work culminates from Carlson's master's thesis and provides another archaeological record of the faunal-rich site and geographic region. In this report, Carlson compiles known historical occupancies of these two houses, to the point of examining ancestries of all residents, including bicultural spouses. In particular, she examines the Parants and the Bolons, both “middle- to upper middle-class fur trading families” (p. 69).

Carlson's central argument is that through analysis of these remains, one can see both “creolization” and “transculturation” at work during this critical juncture in history, when the site transitioned between French and British occupation and saw mixing with Native American populations in the region and even within households. Per Carlson and previous archaeological research, the term “creolization” refers to multigenerational changes over time, while the term “transculturation” specifies changes due to contact among cultural groups over shared space.

Ultimately, Carlson poses three questions regarding this subsection of the Fort Michilimackinac site during the 31-year span of occupancy, namely: (1) what was consumed, (2) whether Native American ancestry is discernible within the assemblage, and (3) what exists as comparisons and points of contrast during the French and subsequent British encampments at the site.

Overall, Carlson's chapters follow the traditional progression one expects in a faunal report. Once Carlson explains the geographic and historical contexts of the site, she seamlessly transitions into her research, data recording, and collection methods. From there, Carlson's reporting investigates the animal remains found at Houses C and D, documenting raw data in both table and chart/diagram form, leaving the reader with a primary understanding of how the two houses relate. The fourth chapter illustrates the relationship of two houses to the Fort Michilimackinac site's rich zooarchaeological and occupancy history. This penultimate chapter reframes the data in the context of the three core questions Carlson posed at the beginning of her report.

Through discussion of economic and ethnic markers in diet and food consumption, Carlson comes to the conclusion that the comparison of these two houses during this time and within the context of the various parties living here during the time show both a fusion and clear ethnic markers. The amount of wild vs. domesticated animals and the types of animals whose remains show clear indicators of consumption document the impacts of “transculturation” and “creolization.” It is interesting that the Native American impact shows more prominently in the data from the British occupancy than from the French occupancy, although the latter is the primary focus of Carlson’s report. Differences in consumption of some foods such as beaver and use of other animals such as birds mark the archaeological record in a way worthy of further exploration, which Carlson provides quite adeptly.

Through her use of traditional zooarchaeological practices (discussion of NISP, MNI, biomass calculations, and the Shannon-Weaver index) and multi-sited archaeological report-
ing, Carlson provides a view into life at the multiethnic site of Fort Michilimackinac. She delineates the factors considered within dietary reconstruction data and argues for their inclusion through bone alteration documentation. She combines multiple house units at the same site, using previous studies as well as her own zooarchaeological research of the previously excavated collections. Although the assemblage is not definitive about occupational history in terms of duration and seasonality, Carlson does her best in showing how to deduce some of this information without overstepping the inherent limitations. She likewise documents the limits on the types of zooarchaeological analysis she could do given variations in excavation methods used at comparative sites in the region.

Ultimately, Carlson’s report adds much to an already rich data collection for this critical juncture in Michigan site history during the 18th century. Through her meticulous discussion of the site’s history and that of the respective occupants of Houses C and D, Carlson promotes a deeper analysis of the cultural and ethnic shifts as they exist not only in interactions but also in dietary consumption. This promotes the ideas of inclusion of “transcultural” and “creolization” investigations as appropriate and as possible in sites occupied simultaneously by people of multiple ethnic identities in zooarchaeological research. The inclusion of discourse on British, French, and Native American diet and how diet influenced, related, and reinforced traditional customs of the representative groups is a cogent and insightful approach.

There are only a few items left to hope for in a report such as this. Although there are certainly many figures and tables in her report, Carlson could have included several more, particularly in the synthesis of the two houses presented in chapter 4. The raw data are of course of paramount importance and are included, but the comparative datasets are more text-based than tabular, making them at times a little cumbersome. Additionally, one of the maps provided of the fort (fig. 3) would have benefited greatly from an insert labeling the house units more directly, as the 18th-century map is essentially illegible as presented. Clearly, it must be to a degree readable in its original state given Carlson’s later identification of Houses C and D, but the figure and the subtext provided do not help the reader situate these houses within the fort proper. Lastly, although the chapters and larger scope of this investigation are presented cogently, some areas within the chapters take some additional reading to piece together, as Carlson frequently alternates between small and large scale, raw and analyzed data. Archaeologists could benefit from seeing the development within each chapter a bit more, which would allow further cross-site comparison to occur as the rich history of Michigan and the Great Lakes region fur trade continues to increase in scope. Carlson’s contribution with Culinary Creolization: Subsistence and Cultural Interaction at Fort Michilimackinac, 1730–1761 serves both as a continuation and an advancement of faunal investigations and interpretations within dietary consumption analysis in the Great Lakes and fur trade region as well as within multiple ethnic group occupancy sites.

ALISON DIEFENDERFER
2918 HAY TERRACE
EASTON, PA 18045-2550
Researchers now have at their disposal a truly comprehensive and fascinating resource on postmedieval Britain and Ireland. *A Fine and Private Place* is really two impressive volumes in one. The first section, divided into seven chapters, integrates data from postmedieval and historical sites in England, Scotland, and Ireland. The second section, the gazetteer, presents summary information for all postmedieval and historical sites in these areas, including references for each. For the first time a book pulls together, makes accessible, and synthesizes all available data to note patterns, trends, and changes in burial practices from the 16th century through the 19th century.

As the authors note, the archaeology of postmedieval human remains in Britain and Ireland is primarily carried out by professional archaeologists when a site is threatened, and only rarely is it the topic of dedicated research. Because of this, much of the data remains unpublished. As a result the field as a whole has suffered from a lack of easily accessible and comparable data from postmedieval burials. It is of tremendous importance, then, that the authors were successful in tracking down so many sites, compiling the data from them, and weaving a story of burial practices covering a period of more than 400 years.

The first seven chapters consist of an introduction, conclusion, and five topical chapters. The five topical chapters combine the data from all of the sites in these regions and discuss the preparation of the body, the dressing of the body, the burial landscape, unusual burials, and the use of the body for medical research. The authors carefully combine social history with the available data to explain, for instance, changing trends in dressing the body for burial. The shift from looser to more fitted burial shrouds from the 16th to the 19th centuries, for example, is noted using a combination of shroud pins and artistic representations, and the discussion is augmented by a review of burial laws surrounding fabric use for burial shrouds. Appendix 1 lists all of the major laws passed between 1547 and 1902 concerning burial practice, which is enormously helpful for understanding patterns in the graves themselves. Gorgeous color photographs, such as an excellently preserved open-back 18th- to 19th-century shroud from Christ Church, Spitalfields, accompany the text.

Part of the strength of this text is how it navigates between large social and historical changes and close inspection of individual bodies and cemeteries. In one example, the authors provide excellent detail about how changes in practice and ideology associated with the Reformation, changing ideas about health and safety of decomposing bodies, and the increasing personalization of the dead led to areas other than churchyards becoming acceptable burial locations. In their discussions and interpretations the authors carefully avoid overgeneralization, such as in pointing out that Ireland was less affected by Reformation practices, and monastic burial continued as a tradition for a longer period in that region.

All of the discussions in the book, from burial location to grave goods, are supplemented by extensive tables detailing sites from the study, their dates, original references, and how they fit with the discussion. For instance, a table on page 35 lists the limited number of pieces of jewelry found at some of the sites, which provides an example to the authors’ point that inclusion of personal adornments was relatively rare at this period.
The tables, text, and images are just part of what make this book an excellent resource; the gazetteer, the second half of the book, is designed to be a resource unto itself. Organized by country, county, and then site name, it lists all of the sites the authors could track down, the grid reference, the type of site, the date of the cemetery, the number of bodies excavated, the excavation date, and a brief summary of the investigative project, along with references. With 68 pages of these listings, it should be a primary starting place for anyone doing research on the 16th through the 19th centuries. The authors also have an open call for help in adding to the gazetteer.

Clearly very important for postmedieval burial research in England and Ireland and related topics, this is the first book to draw these types of data together and provide synthesis and interpretation. In the last two topical chapters, focusing on unusual burials and the medical use of bodies, the authors also include some discussion of the skeletal remains themselves, discussing, for instance, the use of bodies to practice surgery, such as the case of a cranium found at Cotton Court, Hill Street in Belfast that had 11 postmortem practice trepanations. In the conclusion, the authors note that “[t]oo frequently the bone report [from these sites] is entirely separate from the description of the archaeology. We have regularly been frustrated by the difficulty or impossibility of matching the individuals in the bone report with the burials mentioned in the text” (p. 159). The authors have appropriately attempted to accommodate some skeletal data into this volume, and while more could have been useful, one of their final concluding points is a call for a greater integration of the archaeological and skeletal data.

In the end, this book should be indispensable to those doing work in postmedieval archaeology and bioarchaeology of England and Ireland, as well as an invaluable comparative source, and will hopefully serve as an inspiration for those working in the United States and other regions to draw together historical data into such a volume. The authors have set a precedent for doing the hard work in tracking down sources and making important data accessible to all researchers, and their efforts have more than paid off in a fascinating, comprehensive, and invaluable book.

Meredith A. B. Ellis
Department of Anthropology
Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs
Syracuse University
Syracuse, NY 13244
Evolutionary and Interpretive Archaeologies: A Dialogue
ETHAN E. COCHRANE AND ANDREW GARDNER (EDITORS)
Left Coast Press, Walnut Creek, CA, 2011. 361 pp., 28 figs., 7 tables, refs., index. $94.00 cloth, $36.95 paper.

Evolutionary and Interpretive Archaeologies: A Dialogue is a collection of 15 papers, edited by Ethan Cochrane and Andrew Gardner, on the topics of evolutionary and interpretive archaeological perspectives. Cochrane and Gardner organized these papers so each author’s research expresses their ideas, which can be applied to almost every discipline of archaeology. The introductory chapter by Gardner and Cochrane is a detailed synopsis of the need for better explanations about Darwinian applications in archaeology and the need to dialogue with interpretative theories. The book is organized into three parts: (1) “Theoretical Concerns,” (2) “Context of Study,” and (3) “Future Directions.”

Part 1, “Theoretical Concerns,” is composed of four papers. The first section, or chapter 2, by Cochrane details how archaeology and Darwinian theory serve to explain the archaeological record. The spreading of ideas lends itself to the evolutionary units of transmission culturally, which can be compared with even the spreading of a tool design or the application of pottery design. There are several distribution charts exemplifying the evolutionary transmission of artifact classes. Gardner explains in chapter 3 the “agency agenda,” how in the 1970s the concept that developed into theory of interpretive archaeology had connections with postprocessualism, Marxist functionalism, and structuralism.

In chapter 4, R. Alexander Bentley examines how changes in cultural processes produce differences in style and function through time and space. In the end, Bentley believes evolutionary transmission is the best approach to predicting cultural development patterns that can be followed from similarities in style and function.

In the next chapter, Bill Silla examines the development of the Inka State as a way to support the agency theory in the development of cultural traits. Interpreting the archaeological patterns reflects on how the idea of agency gets its momentum from individuals who combine the cultural traits of a society to achieve change.

Simon James’s essay in chapter 6 expresses the need to learn more about the evolution of violence. He feels that the books written on these postprocessual topics never quite explain why communities and societies progressed from a processual warfare and military strongholds to thriving industrialized organizations. Chapter 7 examines how human behavior influences others and their actions. Robert Layton questions whether there is a correlation between behavior and the environment as reflected in violence. He points out from a reflection on theorists such as Hobbes and McGuire that the behavior of groups is not “by nature peaceful or warlike.”

There are many theories on the evolutionary development of societies. Chapter 8, by Ulrike Sommer, discusses the variety of descriptions concerning ethnicity. The original definition of ethnicity was applied to a narrow, select group of people who shared a common set of values or traits, which set them apart from others. These similarities were used to categorize people into political classifications for the purposes of organizational constructs in the evolutionary development of a nation. Each stage as a progression of evolution could be traced through artifacts.

Chapter 9 was written by Claudia Glatz, Anne Kandler, and James Steele to show how organizations influence the evolutionary development of styles and traditional ceramic products as exemplified in the archaeology of the Hittite Empire. The authors of this detailed study explain how the production of pottery can be interpreted both as a function of demand by the elite and as a reflection of
the increase in the need for domestic quality and utilitarian ceramics with the growth of agrarian societies.

In Chapter 10, Ruth Whitehouse focuses on the importance of how the human body has been interpreted in the archaeological record. Chapter 11 concentrates on theories that suggest the possible links between the evolutionary similarities in the stages of development of varieties of artifacts. Jamshid Tehrani covers many ideas including the Pitt-Rivers evolutionary trail following the development of artifacts back to the central starting point. Chapter 12 examines landscape archaeology.

Part 3 is a summation of the differences in theories by the scholars of evolutionary and interpretive archaeology and anthropology. In chapter 13, the two authors suggest more effort should be concentrated on the scientific relevance of information concerning human behavior. In chapter 14, Matthew Johnson presents a brief look at the foundations of archaeological theory and how Darwin’s evolutionary influence had a tendency to skew the interpretation of past records. The concluding paper, “An Evolutionary Perspective on the Goals of Archaeology,” was written by Stephen Shennan. It argues for research that can produce a result explaining the development of patterns of behavior, whether they were founded in evolutionary or cultural theory. The progressive stages of development, whether they are physical or cultural, can be linked if only by one thread, and that is the founding principle put forth in the laying of the Darwinian foundation.

The goal of this collection of papers is to show that scholars who profess an opinion about interpretive and Darwinian archaeology should practice working together. It gives prime examples of the need to merge the theories together. All theories to date have been influenced in some way by Marxism, feminism, structuralism, poststructuralism, and phenomenology. The archaeologists try to interpret the patterns of behavior from the remains of the earlier inhabitants, but trying to interpret thoughts is very difficult when you can only postulate the actions. The standard established an interpretative groundwork that suggests that studying the past was the safest path to follow when trying to find an answer.

Owen Sutton
University of California
PO Box 86811
San Diego, CA 92138

BRIAN CONNELL, AMY GRAY JONES, REBECCA REDFERN, AND DON WALKER


This extensive monograph centers on the excavations conducted at Spitalfields Market, London, between 1991 and 2007 and the medieval burials associated with the St. Mary Spital cemetery, one of the largest samples of human remains excavated from an urban context (n=10,516). This volume—deliberately limited to interpretations of the bioarchaeological record—focuses on the synthesized analysis of population demographics, adult stature and subadult growth and development, biological relatedness and biodistance, health and disease, and traumatic insults to bone. The authors present demographic and paleopathology trends from the 12th to 16th centuries by charting patterns of biological change within and between the various temporal subsets of their data and by maintaining a chronological narrative that works very well.

The introduction to the monograph gives the reader, casual and invested alike, much of the necessary context and background on the archaeological project. Beyond a sense of place for the priory and hospital, the introduction also provides a layout of the intercemetery variation utilized during data analysis (e.g., temporal phases, burial practices and types, the source population), as well as a breakdown of other cemetery samples used later in the text for comparison to the Spitalfields sample. Most bioarchaeological texts report similar data, but Brian Connell and colleagues go beyond the ordinary, genuinely committing to a thorough analysis of intercemetery variation and how this variation influences cultural, environmental, and genetic continuity in medieval London.

Once this broader context is established, the authors transition to relatively standard (although compulsory) reporting arenas, using the next two chapters to outline methodological considerations and to present the results of the laboratory analysis (sensu stricto). The “Materials and methods” chapter summarizes the initial pilot study and the subsequent sampling strategies, providing justification for the final sample size (n=5,387) used in the remainder of the monograph. The methodologies implemented during laboratory analysis are also herein delineated; to the authors’ credit they follow standard recording strategies not always implemented in, but sorely missing from, other bioarchaeological studies. Future researchers using this volume for comparative purposes will find the standardized data collection strategy and reporting protocols of Connell et al. an attractive attribute. The coverage on laboratory analysis in the “Results” chapter is overarching and impressive. Taking a page from Tufte, Connell et al.’s graphical presentation of the tabular data is well done and provides clarification when the text is repetitive or, at times, confounding. A large amount of data is presented in a clear and concise manner, leaving the reader with some sense of the Spitalfields skeletal assemblage size. Field and laboratory images enhance the results chapter and provide excellent visual support for differential diagnoses in the paleopathology section. These images are particularly significant in the “Treponematosis” subsection, wherein the authors lay out their evidence for the earliest signs of treponemal infection in Britain.

Chapter 4, “St Mary Spital in context,” represents the bulk of the monograph and is a synthesis of the laboratory analysis, placing the results in the larger context of medieval London and the various health risks (e.g., pollutants, occupational hazards) and cultural factors.
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(surgical intervention, health care systems) associated with general health and well-being in London. The authors also use historical, archaeological, and osteological data to outline compelling evidence for the relationship between a massive volcanic eruption in the 13th century and the appearance of mass graves at the St. Mary Spital cemetery, where the dead are clearly not victims of the Black Death or the Great Famine. Connell and colleagues close this chapter with a detailed comparison of the Spitalfields sample to other cemeteries within London and throughout Europe, finding similarities, but also noting disparities. The peoples of London during the medieval period suffered from urban living, where suitable conditions existed for disease transmission and the cultural stressors associated with urban hazards, not frequently found in rural environs.

The final chapter provides a general overview of the project findings and presents considerations for future research using the Spitalfields sample. The authors hint at a more robust analysis of the demographic data, which would have contributed greatly to the analysis of the Spitalfields sample. For instance, unbiased reconstructions of the age-at-death distribution using transition analysis (a proportional odds probit model with age on a log scale) to investigate group-specific survivorship differences within the cemetery would provide useful insight into the life and death of the Spitalfields population. This would necessitate a more thorough study of the craniometric and postcranial metric data to obtain useful biodistance data. As the authors note, however, time constraint, and not analytical oversight, was the contributing factor to the occasionally limited analyses presented.

Overall, Connell and colleagues advance bioarchaeological research and skeletal analysis. The monograph is well written and provides a synthesis of the largest urban cemetery skeletal collection in Britain. Scholars and researchers will appreciate the breadth and depth of reporting, while dilettantes in medieval studies will revel in the well-told story of St. Mary Spital and the Augustinian priory and hospital of London.

JOSEPH T. HEFNER
JOINT POW/MIA ACCOUNTING COMMAND
CENTRAL IDENTIFICATION LABORATORY
JBPHH, HI 96853-5530
Interpreting Ground-Penetrating Radar for Archaeology
LAWRENCE B. CONYERS
Left Coast Press, Walnut Creek, CA, 2012. 220 pp., 216 illus., bib., index. $99.00 cloth.

Since the 1990s archaeologists have increasingly used ground-penetrating radar (GPR) as an important survey tool to investigate and interpret archaeological sites, due in large part to the efforts of anthropologists and geophysicists like Lawrence Conyers. With over 20 years of experience conducting GPR surveys on more than 600 archaeological sites the world over, Conyers, a well-published professor of anthropology at the University of Denver, Colorado, has tirelessly worked to communicate the use and benefits of non-invasive geophysical surveys on archaeological sites. In his recent book, *Interpreting Ground-Penetrating Radar for Archaeology*, Conyers has created a quasi-memoir of his vast experience with GPR in archaeological survey contexts. The book targets archaeologists, students of geophysics and archaeology, and academic/professional GPR operators, whom the author guides through the sequential application of GPR survey methods, data analysis, interpretation, and interdisciplinary collaboration.

Conyers acknowledges that most GPR data are used as a preliminary planning device for archaeological investigations, but emphasizes that GPR data should be employed as an anthropological research tool to understand people, societies, and cultures.

The author employs an almost informal, but highly informative conversational writing style throughout the text. This literary approach is best exemplified by the sparing and selective incorporation of geophysical technical jargon and Conyers’s personal recount of GPR surveys, data, and interpretations. The technique allows the text to flow as the intricacies of GPR use and data interpretation on archaeological sites from a variety of examples are related to the reader and illustrated in hundreds of images. Writing candidly about his acquired practical GPR knowledge, Conyers puts pride aside to discuss information generated by his own and his students’ geophysical surveys. Useful information gained from survey mistakes, data misinterpretation, and successful GPR surveys on a variety of archaeological site types with a multitude of site conditions is presented throughout the rich text. The approach aims to guide GPR practitioners toward appropriate survey methods, data interpretation, and pre- and post-survey collaboration with clients and/or other archaeologists. The book also provides illuminating examples of geophysical benefits and limits as an interpretive and planning tool used by geophysicists, archaeologists, and cultural resources managers.

After introducing the text and the basic concept of GPR, Conyers presents the fundamental method and theory of GPR in chapter 2. This chapter outlines the ways in which operators should determine the type of GPR antenna to use based on site conditions and expected cultural feature types. Conyers also describes the effects of water retention variation and voids in soil profiles, software application processing steps, and wave reflection descriptions. In his third chapter, Conyers provides a critique of his students’, colleagues’, and his own GPR survey methods and interpretations. Emphasis is placed on the laborious effort of closely examining reflection maps depicting radar profile data prior to establishing a context for the interpretation of generated amplitude maps. This theme is threaded throughout the text and is best illustrated by dozens of paired radar profile and amplitude map images. The complexities of geological formations and variations that affect GPR data are discussed in chapter 4. The author highlights the ways in which buried sand dunes, rivers and river terraces, bedrock, beaches, lake sediments, and lava flows affect GPR data. Depending on site conditions and survey methods, GPR will provide data on natural and cultural subsurface variations.
Differentiation between the two is necessary, which Conyers explains may be completed through a combination of radar profile analysis, site research, consultation, coring, probing, and exposed profile examination. Chapters 5 and 6 present ways that ground surface variation, proximity to above-ground objects, radio waves, electrical conductivity, water retention, soil type changes, and geochemistry affect radar attenuation, penetration depth, air waves, and distortion.

Discussion of GPR data on every type of archaeological feature one may encounter would be a near impossible task. Noting this dilemma, Conyers devotes chapters 7–10 of the text to highlight examples of several archaeological resource types typically identified during GPR surveys, including building foundations, cellars, storage pits, middens, shell mounds, tunnels, buried living surfaces, gardens, and shafts. Recognizing the prevalence of GPR surveys employed in human burial identification, chapter 8 is dedicated solely to GPR investigations of grave shafts. Chapter 11 focuses on ways in which GPR can be employed as an anthropological tool to recover data and form interpretations about societies and cultural change over time. Among the most important chapters of the text, readers would certainly benefit by an expanded discussion of GPR as an anthropological research tool. Before concluding in chapter 13, the author wisely dedicates 16 pages to underscore the importance of collaboration and clear communication between GPR operators and other archaeologists and/or clients about site conditions, survey limitations, pre- and post-GPR subsurface excavation data, site geology, expectations, deliverables, timelines, and myriad other aspects that affect GPR surveys and interpretations.

If this book has any drawbacks, it may unfortunately be the monograph’s sale price. Listed at just under $100, the book’s cost is undoubtedly directly related to the wealth of immensely helpful grayscale and full-color glossy images embedded on nearly every page of text. Images of reflection and stratigraphic profiles, amplitude maps, survey plans, and site conditions abound, all of which the author uses to illustrate complex geophysical survey data to the reader. Regardless of the sale price, this enlightening text is highly recommended for academic and professional archaeologists, geophysicists, and students of archaeology and geophysics.

Michael J. Gall
Richard Grubb & Associates, Inc.
Cranbury, NJ 08512
Britain Begins
BARRY CUNLIFFE
Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK, 2013. 553 pp., 282 illus., index. $45.00 cloth.

Britain Begins is an exploration of the geological origins of Britain and Ireland and the subsequent impact of the emerging cultures of the people who populated its landscape. The timeline covered is from around 10,000 B.C. to just before the Norman invasion in the 11th century. This is a vast span and Barry Cunliffe begins his chronicle with the classical descriptions and observations of the isles, its peoples, and the sea journeys made by Greeks and Romans (e.g., Julius Cesar in 55 B.C. and 54 B.C.). This builds a history of the isles’ position within the classical world. The identification of Britain itself comes from Herodotus repeating the hearsay of tin being an export from the isles known as the Cassiterides, to Strabo in the 1st century B.C. recording the first named instance of Britannia with its Pictish spelling of Pretannia, taken from Pretani, the Celtic for “painted ones.” This cultural legacy is used later in British history to support the foundation myths and origin stories created for the emerging scholarly class by the Northumbrian Bede, ca. A.D. 731, and the Welsh Nennius, ca. A.D. 800, that were rooted in Biblical texts and synthesized with other knowledge. These origin stories would continue to influence scholars for nearly a thousand years.

During the 19th century the geological origins of Britain were hotly disputed. On one side were eminent archaeologists, such as William Buckland, whose view was firmly informed by catastrophic Biblical events, a view that prevented him from recognizing the true significance of the “Red Lady of Paviland” in 1823, a Cro-Magnon man he excavated in a cave in Wales and dated to the Roman era. On the other side, challenging the “Flood” and its subsequent timeline for the chronological origins of Britain and man were the uniformitarians such as James Hutton, who influenced Charles Darwin, and Charles Lyell. Cunliffe presents a historical range of archaeological excavations and discoveries, including skeletal remains, tools, and tool marks on prehistoric bones displaying evidence of butchery on now extinct animals; and he relates these to the formation of theories on the antiquity of man. This is a chronology of archaeology and an overview of its early development in Britain.

The emergence of the British and Irish landscapes is revealed in a journey through their geomorphic formation and climatic environments during various glacial episodes to the topographic composition of the isles we recognize today. A range of climate maps, data, and illustrations supports this. The consequent repopulation began about 12,000 years ago at the end of the last ice age when the temperatures began to warm. The changes in temperature brought a range of grass and tree species and animals, resources that led the way to anthropogenic impacts such as clearing pastures and farming for those early humans migrating and repopulating the landscape.

Throughout this migration narrative is the role of the sea and its relationship in assisting the mobility of human populations, and how those populations have maintained connections with other communities within Britain and the Continent. Cunliffe discusses the evidence for the three types of maritime craft found in Britain and the principal motivations behind mobility, including mobility as a manifestation of aspiration and where this is found in the British archaeological record. This is also discussed alongside current techniques of DNA analysis in population studies and its relationship to mobility patterns of groups throughout the Continent. Cunliffe proposes the advantages of an interdisciplinary approach toward progressing a new understanding of the isles and their peoples.

He then considers the Mesolithic to Neolithic transition in Britain and their strategies of food production and cultivation and examines the “invasion” model of prehistory, which is questioned due to its being rooted in
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colonial attitudes and beliefs. Throughout his narrative Cunliffe presents a big picture view and offers several hypotheses for appraisal, not least that mobility may be linked to climate change and population pressure.

Migration to the isles inevitably brought communities looking to create a sense of place and meaning. This is explored through the evidence of residences showing groups within the landscapes, and the variety of monuments to the dead indicating settlers had systems of belief and held values. This is explored in relation to regions throughout Britain and Ireland, demonstrating the similarity between groups and suggesting the likelihood of there being contact and interaction between migrant communities. This is considered further within the context and spread throughout Britain of the Beaker phenomenon, ca. 2500 B.C., and the technology to produce copper and the consequent British uptake of a new value system. Furthermore, Cunliffe proposes that by 2000 B.C. the ensuing migrations of Celts to Britain and Ireland distinguished the inhabitants as speaking in Celtic dialects.

The next period charts the rise of bronze weaponry and warrior elites, noting finds found prolifically in rivers, which suggest the presence of belief systems. Other finds indicating material culture include feasting equipment such as cauldrons and flesh hooks, spearheads, and gold ornaments. Iron was slowly introduced but Britain was changing considerably during this age, and Cunliffe explores how communities developed within regions and became culturally distinctive. As the Roman world impacted Gaulish commerce, Britain and Ireland's maritime networks were renewed. This was also the time of the Druids and human sacrifice, and, from the classical writers, Cunliffe examines accounts of their practices.

Following the Celtic period there were the invasions of the Romans and the many forays by Vikings, and in between Cunliffe considers the changing ethnic makeup of the British during the Anglo-Saxon period. Earlier Roman mobility enabled the movement of various peoples from across its empire to Britain, and Saxons and Jutes among others migrated to the isles later on. The relationship between all these peoples to the original British settlers is not entirely clear, as DNA evidence cannot easily distinguish between a Jute and a Scandinavian on a Viking raid several hundred years apart. This raises interesting questions about the ethnicity of the English and if they exist as a distinct ethnic group or are a composite of several ethnicities. It is a question that remains under review.

Britain Begins is essentially the story of us and how the landscape and the people of Britain and Ireland began. Cunliffe presents a wide range of archaeological examples and current scientific data throughout the narrative, and the book is richly illustrated with color and black-and-white photographs, maps, drawings, and graphs. There is no bibliography but there is an index and a guide to further reading divided helpfully by chapters, as are the illustration sources, in this deeply considered, extensive, and compelling account of Britain.

D. COLPMAN
18 HAMPTON COURT ROAD
HARBORNE
BIRMINGHAM
B17 9AE UK
Entangled: An Archaeology of the Relationships between Humans and Things
IAN HODDER
John Wiley & Sons, West Sussex, UK, 2012. 252 pp., 26 figs., index. $36.95 paper.

Ian Hodder, archaeologist and theorist, is currently an anthropology professor at Stanford University. He has written extensively about his projects at Haddenham in eastern England and Catalhoyuk in Turkey. His evolutionary and postprocessual archaeological theories unfold in his latest book, Entangled: An Archaeology of the Relationships between Humans and Things. He skillfully explains how the archaeological record illustrates how the lives of the people in a Neolithic village progress in a web of organizational patterns.

The front cover is an impressive array of conceptual art by the Numen group. It depicts exactly how Hodder views the interdependence between human life and all things. Every time a thing touches the life of a person it creates a thread. The strands multiply exponentially until they control the lives of an entire society or an individual. Things define human existence. Each life becomes so intertwined with new things that human life creates relationships with things that are necessary for survival. Things define what we are, how we live, and where we live. Things control the order of a person’s movement from one job to the next, and even one area to another.

Many things all around us we take for granted. The natural order of things that affect human existence also determines the connections to a person's surroundings. This book explains how humans look and approach many surroundings differently. Humans are an essential part of this ecosystem because everything is interrelated. The things around us are stable but have movement; they are not inert. Hodder explains several approaches to the things and objects in a human life. A thing like a computer functions in many ways. It provides information, but it takes other things to make it work. The computer needs many things to operate: electricity, disks for storage, and a source of input to make it worthwhile. It becomes a lifeline to the outside world; without these things we cannot function. Computers have evolved into sophisticated machines, which entangle a human life into a web of circuitry. A human's life, actions, and thoughts become entangled forever in these electrically charged units. These things are part of a consumer society based on planned obsolescence that discards the things when they are not worth repairing. The concern to save the environment and stop this self-destruction has created a new awareness.

Communication is one of the most essential things for a society. The evolution of writing was a thread that became a link to bind homogenous groups. One notable thing in writing was the development of paper. Humans advanced from stone tablets to writing on papyrus. The more advanced a society, the more demand there was to increase communication and documentation. Thus, there was a need to find a way to record information. The demands led to the development of paper. Paper was a thing that gave us the capability to record what we do every day and a way to store large quantities of information. The manufacturing of paper from trees increased the need to invent new machinery to meet the demands on this industry. These things are all dependent upon one thing: paper. Today, the demand for paper has grown so large that a shortage of trees has become an environmental concern.

Hodder effectively illustrates the relationship between humans and the smallest entity, or thing. It was a natural thing when man began to establish a place in the ecosystem and adapted to his surroundings. The meager decisions in a primitive life grow more complicated as man becomes more dependent on things that are necessary to make life better or comfortable. The dependency on animals for
food and work increased the human awareness of how much they need to support their mere existence. These small relationships expand into large conduits, which force a society to make things durable enough until another thing can replace it.

The archaeological comparisons of things show how a cooking adaptation can exemplify the whole process. The harnessing of fire made life better, and the realization of warmth and protection became a necessary thing. This led to developing ways to maintain the source of the flame. This dependence on preserving the fire influenced the structural designs of the shelters and hearths and how cooking was conducted. The association with these things builds a dependency on a group to have fire as a center where everyone congregates and exchanges ideas and property or uses it as protection. Originally, fire was a valuable resource and moved from place to place. A date can be established from the embers because it establishes a new point of origin. The remains can be dated from the charcoal and the debris.

Things can come into a life through many processes: projection, transferal, externalization, displacement, exchange, and inheritance. The basic principle of work transforms material things into tangible property. When we purchase an item we exchange it for another thing: money. Material possessions become a part of a person's inheritance. This gives them a position in the world.

Each chapter in this book supports the development of cohesive things in a human life and how entangled they become when a human grows dependent on each piece of a puzzle. The simple process of going to a job creates a network of sinews in every movement. Things can determine events, social interventions, and relationships. In this provocative book, Hodder explains how there is an evolutionary trail of collective things that shape human behavior.

OWEN SUTTON
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
P.O. BOX 86811
SAN DIEGO, CA 92138
Archaeological Theory Today, 2nd edition
IAN HODDER, (EDITOR)
Polity Press, Malden, MA, 2012. 320 pp., 14 illus., 2 tables, index. $89.95 cloth, $29.95 paper.

Eleven years after the publication of the popular and influential *Archaeological Theory Today* (Hodder, Ian [editor], Polity Press, 2001), Polity Press has published the second, updated edition of the archaeological reader. This useful collection of essays presents a picture of the important theoretical concepts that inform the practice of contemporary archaeology.

*Archaeological Theory Today*, 2nd edition, is intended to introduce students to the influential strands of thought in contemporary archaeology. As editor, Hodder stresses in his introduction that archaeological theory has not only become accepted, it has also reached its maturity. This maturity is seen in the proliferation of volumes and conferences centered on archaeological theory, and the emphasis in the current job market on the ability to teach theory. Hodder conveys some main points that evidence the maturation of archaeological theory.

First, the acceptance and maturity of theory is seen in development of theory through the incorporation of cross-disciplinary ideas from biology, ecology, sociology, cybernetics, geography, and art history, just to name a few. Hodder is keen to emphasize that archaeological theory does not merely borrow from scientific, social-scientific, and humanist disciplines, it also contributes to these disciplines. One must wonder if he is overstating the case, as it seems doubtful that biologists and cybernetic researchers are referencing archaeological studies in their research.

Moreover, the incorporation of ideas from various disciplines highlights the multivocal nature of archaeological theory, which can also be characterized as fragmentation. Indeed, devotees of theory are often divided on the issue of theory in archaeology. Is it theory, or theories? Are scholars still searching for that one unifying “Grand Theory,” or is it enough to apply multiple theoretical perspectives to one's archaeological research? Hand in hand with the multivocality of theory is the continued tension and disconnection between theory, method, and practice that are the result of different levels of theoretical engagement.

Despite this diversity of ideas, however, the last several decades of theoretical engagement have resulted in clear “convergencies” of ideas that anchor theories of archaeology. These are ideas or concepts that have wide, if not universal, appeal to archaeologists and include agency, materiality, *longue durée*, and material culture, the evidentiary core of the discipline of archaeology.

Thus essays included in this volume are representative of a certain perspective of theory and the most influential and emerging theoretical ideas in archaeology today. As a second edition, it is interesting to see which theoretical subjects have been deemed mature theories and therefore worthy of re-inclusion and which are new or have been expanded upon and, of course, which theories continue to be excluded.

The expected chapters focus on the theories of Hodder’s “convergencies.” Chapters on “Behavioral Archaeology” (Vincent La Motta, chap. 4), “Agency” (John Barrett, chap. 7), “Archaeologies of Place and Landscape” (Julian Thomas, chap. 8), “Materiality” (Carl Knappett, chap. 9), and “Post-Colonial Archaeology” (Chris Gosden, chap. 12) are updated, but not all that dissimilar to those found in the first edition. These chapters outline the theoretical ideas that have demonstrated their longevity and importance in archaeological research, be it prehistoric, historical, Near Eastern, or European.

Among the new is the expanded selection of perhaps more “processual”-archaeology influenced theories or theories that seek a
middle ground between “processual” and “post-processual” ideas. These include “Darwinian Cultural Evolution” (Stephen Shennan, chap. 2), “Human Behavioral Ecology” (HBE) (Douglas Bird and James O’Connell, chap. 3), “Complex Systems and Archaeology” (Timothy Kohler, chap. 5), and “Towards a Cognitive Archaeology” (Colin Renfrew, chap. 6). Although historical archaeologists may have some difficulty in applying some of these theories, such as HBE and Darwinian cultural evolution, to their research, it is nonetheless important to be aware of the ideas.

The most esoteric selection in this collection is “Symmetrical Archaeology” (Bjørnar Olsen, chap. 10). If you are scratching your head over symmetrical archaeology, you are undoubtedly not alone. This chapter seems to be a chapter representative of Hodder’s characterization of the diversity of theory and the tension between ideas and practice. Symmetrical archaeology, as explained by Olsen, can be stripped down to one programmatic proposition: “that humans have always been cyborgs and that the human condition is characterized by its inextricable enmeshment with things and other non-human entities” (p. 209). This is a standpoint that seeks to blur and eradicate the subject-object dichotomy that archaeologists use when approaching material culture. This postcolonial influenced approach appears to position objects as subjects that need to be elevated from their subaltern situations, in essence proposing a symmetrical power relationship in researcher’s archaeological method.

The heart of symmetrical archaeology seems to be a discussion on object agency, which is an exciting venue of research. Unfortunately, the politicized critique of an essentialized unilinear power dynamic of researchers toward objects may detract many archaeologists from the perhaps more useful engagement with ideas of object agency. A researcher certainly needs to be self-reflexive, and circumstances and physical objects undoubtedly influence the actions of people, but returning to Hodder’s point about the tensions between theory, method, and practice, one must ask, “how would a symmetrical archaeology be practiced in all of its political and metaphysical form?” Olsen himself admits that the research carried out thus far in symmetrical archaeology is modest, and he cites only a handful of researchers. Perhaps more useful for the historical archaeologist is a consideration of distributed, or secondary, object agency as proposed by Alfred Gell (Art and Agency: An Anthropological Theory, Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK, 1998).

One has to wonder at the inclusion and expansion of certain chapters to the exclusion of other important ideas in archaeology. One important lacuna is feminist archaeology. This is not a case of removal, but rather a continued omission. There were no chapters on feminist archaeology in the first edition of Archaeological Theory Today, and one would think, 10 years later, feminist approaches to archaeology would merit at least one chapter. This omission is especially surprising given that feminist archaeologists and scholars have critiqued specifically this issue of the exclusion (e.g., Conkey, Meg, Questioning Theory: Is There a Gender of Theory in Archaeology?, Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory 14[3]:285–310, 2007; Wylie, Allison, Doing Archaeology as a Feminist: An Introduction, Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory, 14[3]:209–216, 2007). If postcolonial archaeology, heritage, and symmetrical archaeology are deemed worthy, why is feminist archaeology, which has had profound impact on theory and method, not worthy? A feminist approach to archaeology is multivocal and focuses on redistributed knowledge and ambiguities (Wylie 2007), which are all important issues in archaeological research today as demonstrated by their appearance in the various chapters. While this absence may be viewed as “mainstreaming of feminist theory” (Conkey 2007, p. 293), to not have a chapter on it in a volume meant as an introduction of theory to students is a glaring lacuna.

The concluding selection of chapters in this volume deals explicitly with ethical concerns in archaeology. These include “The Social Life of Heritage” (Lynn Meskell, chap. 11), “Post-Colonial Archaeology” (Chris Gosden, chap. 12), “Archaeology and Indigenous Collaboration” (Chip Colwell-Chanthaphonh, chap. 13), and lastly, “Archaeological Visualization” (Stephanie Moser, chap. 14), a historiography and a caution regarding self-
reflexivity in archaeological practice. This concluding section marks the major change from the first edition and reflects not just disciplinary self-reflexivity, but also, increasingly, the need for archaeologists to question the ethics of the practice of archaeology.

For the most part, *Archaeological Theory Today*, 2nd edition, is indeed a product that reflects the diversity of contemporary concerns in archaeology. For the student of archaeology, this is a useful volume that presents mature and “cutting edge” ideas in archaeology that perhaps elicit more questions than answers, achieving, intentionally or otherwise, what it set out to accomplish.

JEAN LI
MONMOUTH UNIVERSITY
DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY AND ANTHROPOLOGY
WEST LONG BRANCH, NJ 07764
If one were playing the children’s game “point to the thing that is different” and were shown a series of Papua New Guinea (PNG) objects including a Baruya garden fence, an Ankave eel trap, a songen mourning drum, a ritual bundle for male initiations, and a French Dinky Toy model racing car, it is probable that before reading Pierre Lemonnier’s book the answer would be wrong. The correct answer is that none of the above is different. They are all objects that focus and aggregate key aspects of human relations and play important roles in the stability and mutation of cultural configurations. Lemonnier’s goal in this slim but challenging volume is to identify that concentration of multiple meanings and show how such charged objects interact with human actors to become, in effect, more than the sum of their parts.

The author of Mundane Objects essentially wants the reader to recognize that the creation (i.e., production) of objects is as critical to their comprehension as is their consumption. This point is especially apropos because Lemonnier has a long intellectual affiliation with the French technologie culturelle school and its intense focus on technology (e.g., as in chaîne opératoire studies). Thus his concern that current trends in material cultural studies with their focus only on consumption are missing a critical point—an absence he emphasizes by his observation that Appadurai’s much-cited volume The Social Life of Things (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1988) literally “paid no attention to the materiality of things” (p. 17). So too does he have little encouraging to say about the current rush to “materiality” (p. 18) that he characterizes as a “fashionable catchall” or the concurrent obsession with the “Quest for the Holy Agency.” In both instances his dissatisfaction centers on both the disconnect of the concepts from the critical ethnographic data and material base as well as the tendency of objects to increasingly have agency sans actors. But he is not an inveterate naysayer for he notes that materiality, agency, actors, technology, and so forth are all “good to think about ... if we are to understand the propensity of human beings to associate material actions and physical objects with the production and rendering visible of social relations” (p. 19).

Lemonnier’s case studies are primarily those associated with his decades of research in PNG in which he combines what one might think of as Geertzian “thick description” with detailed analysis of technology to illuminate how objects can serve as the heart of a system of thoughts that cement the way people live together (chap. 1). His examples, ranging from eel traps to model racing cars, make the point that such key objects are seldom ritual items per se and are likely to be indistinguishable from their mundane counterparts. A prime exemplar of this is the Baruya garden fences. These robust fences, theoretically built to keep pigs out of the crops, are over a meter in height with sharpened posts two meters tall that, as the author notes, would stop a small car. Given the absence of any pigs able to leap such barriers the fences are clearly overbuilt for their purported function.

Through careful observation the Baruya fences are deconstructed as functional barriers and recreated as nonverbal communicators reinforcing in redundant ways highly esteemed and critical Baruya social values of cooperative work wrapped in kin rules governing in-law relations, the work obligations of male co-initiates, and the reinforcement of a primary Baruya social rule of male dominance of women. The construction process of cooperative male overbuilding of fences expresses often unspoken values tied to kinship and cooperative patterns that Lemonnier links to sister-marriage practices. To corroborate his point the author notes that in neighboring groups
where sister marriage has been abandoned, so too has the construction of overbuilt fences.

The essential intellectual thrust in the volume is that some objects have a special role in supporting and reinforcing social relations. They do this by rendering visible or actualizing in a performative way important aspects of social organization, culture, and systems of thought or actions ... importantly, objects often do what mere words cannot. They bring together in their creation social values that must be “thought together” and that often express essential aspects of social relations that are best unspoken. How are they able to do this?

Objects have a physical substance that is expressed in their component parts, their materials, their fabrication, their use, and their sheer physicality that captures and communicates important aspects of social relations and cosmology—thus Lemonnier's insistence that the production of objects is as critical as their consumption to studies of agency, materiality, and the biography of things. Not only do objects make visible and tangible social relations but also they reinforce them by acting as perissological resonators, that is, they bring together heretofore discrete domains (e.g., kinship, exchange, death, marriage) through a process of repetition to reinforce a message. They can do this because of their unique ability to facilitate convergences, to serve as condensers bringing together and simultaneously incorporating (i.e., not polysemically) various modes of relationship, be they supernatural beings, odors, physical pain, verbal pronouncements, or mental visions.

Lemonnier challenges readers to rethink “objects,” to reunite their production with their consumption, and to be aware that their physical essence as well as their relationship with actors are essential aspects of their being. This new vision of objects rests on these key points “1) their making and using relate different domains of social life that are thus brought together in the actors’ minds in a unique way; 2) they are part of some kind of non-verbal communication; 3) that special communications concerns key values or key characteristics of particular social relations that are usually hidden, although they pervade everyday life; and 4) the very physicality of the artifacts in question is involved in the process and is not equated to a vague and putative link with their ‘materiality’ but it can be precisely shown” (p. 119).

For a discipline such as archaeology that rests on the principle that one can derive an understanding of past societies based on their material remains, that is, their objects, Lemonnier’s arguments are refreshing. At a time when so much of sociocultural anthropology has abandoned the material world, except as concepts that are disconnected from its physicality, his focus on objects and their potential to reveal social relations is significant. It is also a focus grounded in deep description and long-term ethnographic observation of both technologies and social relations. Therein lies the rub for archaeologists because Lemonnier is adamant that understanding the role of apparently mundane objects as resonators and condensers of key social values is not apparent in their form, their context, their symbolic decorations, or, in fact, their physicality. It only becomes clear in the detailed ethnographic investigation of their composition, manufacture, and employment. This is a disappointing inference for archaeological research and one that confirms again why the continued dependence on anthropological theory leaves archaeology to so often be dismissively characterized by cultural anthropologists as a theoretical weak sister. There is much of value in Lemonnier’s arguments, especially in the conceptualization of objects as points of convergence, as resonators and as condensers of key social values—a conceptualization that holds great potential for our interpretation of the material of past societies. Readers may even be amazed to learn about the condensing and resonating power of Dinky Toys to a generation of French society! Mundane Objects will challenge the conception of the everyday objects that archaeologists routinely collect, catalog, and all too often set aside with little further thought—that in and of itself makes Lemonnier’s volume a worthwhile read.

Thomas E. Emerson
Illinois State Archaeological Survey
209 Nuclear Physics Lab
23 East Stadium Drive
University of Illinois
Champaign, IL 61820
On 10 August 1680, Pueblo Indians in New Mexico rose in revolt against their Spanish overlords. They martyred Franciscan missionaries, killed Spanish settlers, looted farms, destroyed churches, and burned Christian ecclesiastical objects. Many of the surviving Spanish fled to Santa Fe where they fortified the Governor's Palace and faced an ever-growing army drawn from throughout the Pueblo world. After several days, the rebels allowed the Spanish safe passage to leave New Mexico. As the Spanish refugees trudged south to El Paso, Spanish survivors and allied Indians joined them. After 82 years of colonial rule, Pueblo warriors had won freedom for their people. The Pueblos would remain beyond the pale of Spanish control until the Spanish reconquista of 1692. The returning Spanish reestablished the Catholic religion and forced the Pueblos back into their colonial communities.

Historians have read Spanish chronicles to intensively study the Pueblo Revolt and the reconquista but they have largely skipped over the decade of Pueblo independence. Bereft of documents except for the testimony of a few captives and a handful of military accounts, the epoch from 1680 to 1692 resists documentary analysis. In *Revolt: An Archaeological History of Pueblo Resistance and Revitalization in 17th Century New Mexico*, Matthew Liebmann uses historical archaeology and anthropology to give the reader a fuller understanding of this period.

Liebmann's analysis deftly weaves together data and insights from documents, indigenous oral histories, and archaeology. *Revolt* does not pass judgment on the success of the Pueblo Revolt. The author seeks to escape characterizations of the insurrection as either a romanticized Pueblo victory or as a tragic indigenous defeat. Rather, he attempts to unmask the cultural logic that Pueblo peoples used to make sense of their world in the epoch between the revolt and the reconquista.

More broadly Liebmann presents his narrative of Pueblo independence as a case study with significant implications for a global understanding of subaltern resistance, cultural revitalization, and how colonized populations manipulate colonial signs. He strives to bring the events of the Pueblo Revolt into a dialogue with generalizable colonial processes. To do this, he draws on Anthony Wallace's mid-20th-century theory of revitalization movements and on late 20th-century theories of postcolonialism.

*Revolt* springs from a long standing and intensive collaboration between Liebmann and the people of Jemez Pueblo. This collaboration began in 2001 and continues to today. For much of this period, Liebmann was the Jemez Pueblo tribal archaeologist. He, along with paid interns from the Pueblo, collected archaeological data during multiple field seasons from 2001 to 2008. At the request of the Pueblo, Liebmann and his crews conducted a non-invasive archaeology that did not disturb ancestral remains. They used surveying instruments and ground-penetrating radar to map and record architecture. They collected ceramics and lithics, but after analysis returned the artifacts to their original provenience. These methods of surface examination collected a great deal of data from Pueblo Revolt period villages. Pueblo people had built these single component communities on remote mesa tops where a desert climate and slight vegetation assured good preservation and high visibility for architecture and artifacts.

Liebmann divides his narrative into three parts: (1) before the revolt, (2) the period of Pueblo independence, and (3) the reconquista.
In each part, he mobilizes archaeological data and Pueblo oral history as independent sources of information to correct biases in Spanish chronicles. He also uses archaeology to complete and enhance those texts and to provide data on the minutiae and mundane details of everyday life.

He begins his analysis with a discussion of Pueblo life from the time of Spanish conquest in 1598–1680. He raises the much asked question “Why did the Pueblos revolt in 1680?” He finds a multitude of reasons including Spanish taxation, exploitation of Indian labor in the encomienda system, evangelization, religious repression, enslavement, disease, and a drought. He concludes with a detailed account of the revolt drawn from Spanish documents and Pueblo oral history.

Liebmann brings archaeology to the forefront in his analysis of Pueblo independence. He and his crews investigated three communities from this period. After revolt, the Jemez people abandoned their colonial village and built two new settlements, Patokwa and Boletsakwa. In 1689 the people of Zia Pueblo fled their pueblo and established a fortified town at Cerro Colorado, a location now on the Jemez Reservation. They did this in fear of Pueblo reprisals because they had allied themselves with Spanish attempts at reconquest.

Liebmann’s analysis of architecture and ceramics reveals the ambiguities of revitalization during Pueblo independence. Both architecture and ceramics revived some pre-Hispanic traditions but also terminated others. They participated in a Pueblo ethnogenesis that for the first time helped to create a common identity among Pueblo people. The Zia’s alliance with the Spanish pointed to the ambiguities in this identity. The analysis also demonstrates how Pueblo peoples appropriated and remade colonial culture, including the trappings and images of Catholicism, to create new identities for themselves.

Liebmann’s final part discusses the reconquista in 1692. In 1694, after the reconquista, Jemez people fled their two communities to found a more remote and defendable settlement at Astialakwa. That same year the Spanish, with Zia allies, attacked the Jemez and forced them back to their colonial mission. The archaeologists found evidence of this attack in Astialakwa and made inferences about mundane life in the short-lived settlement.

Liebmann draws several broad conclusions from his study. He notes that revitalization movements use and reinterpret material culture. He argues that people in revolt and building revitalization struggle over signs and images that lie at the heart of their insurgencies. This leads subalterns to transfer and redeploy the symbols of colonial culture. Finally, he decenters resistance as a simple opposition of colonizer and colonized. He hopes that he has demonstrated how archaeologists can reconstruct native worlds that set the stage for dramas interpreted from historical documents.

Liebmann’s book succeeds both as a study of the Pueblo Revolt and as a broader discussion of subaltern resistance, revolt, and revitalization. He writes very well and in an engaging way that makes the book easy to read. It is a good introduction to the Pueblo Revolt for nonspecialists in the Southwest. His analysis and conclusions demonstrate that scholars need to decenter our analyses of the colonial situation to get at the nuances and ambiguities that shaped native revolts.

RANDALL H. McGUIRE
DEPARTMENT OF ANTHROPOLOGY
BINGHAMTON UNIVERSITY—SUNY
BINGHAMTON, NY 13902-6000
Carl Lounsbury’s purpose in compiling this anthology is to illustrate how—in one generation—scholars transformed the study of early American architectural history. No longer is it architects evaluating early American buildings as inferior copies of European design. Rather, it is buildings studied as clues to how immigrants adapted to the ever changing conditions of the New World. It is the joint product of architectural and social historians, archaeologists, folklorists, and geographers. One of the chapters was coauthored. In the other 11, Lounsbury demonstrates an impressive command of architectural history and building function—English and American, domestic and public. This book will appeal to a wide range of scholars. The chapter endnotes form an excellent bibliography.

The anthology is organized in four sections. The first—“The Origins of Early American Architecture”—contains three chapters. In the first of these, Lounsbury takes a transatlantic look at issues that arise in tracing early American architecture back to its European roots. One of these is the almost complete disappearance of first generation structures with the exception of a handful of New England dwellings. In Virginia, settled 1607, the oldest dwelling dates only to 1665. One reason for the disappearance of so much early building is that almost all of it was wooden. As late as 1798, perhaps 95% of standing structures were built of wood. The relatively low cost of high-quality timber led to rapid evolution away from British carpentry practices.

In the second chapter, “Adaptation and Innovation,” Lounsbury and four collaborators revisit the evolution of Chesapeake architecture, 1607–1720. Their goal is to refine the hypotheses put forward by Cary Carson et al. in 1981 (Impermanent Architecture in the Southern American Colonies, Winterthur Portfolio, Vol. 16, Nos. 2&3, pp. 135–196). Using the data from hundreds of subsequent excavations, especially those from Jamestown, they trace the evolution of Chesapeake dwellings from the slightly framed, mud-walled buildings of the first few years into robust, clapboard covered, post-in-the-ground buildings, and finally into the frame-and-brick farmhouses of the early 18th century. They look at architecture as a reflection of culture and show how changes in architecture had parallels in changes in diet, animal husbandry, clay tobacco pipes, and social structure. They link a late-17th-century increase in brick construction to the arrival of new, well-financed immigrants determined to signal their status and take political control. Shorter and wider ranging than the 1981 essay by Carson et al., the chapter’s authors are not able to fully develop their ideas. For those wanting more, however, Carson and Lounsbury have edited an entire volume, The Chesapeake House (University of North Carolina Press, 2013).

In 1662 Governor William Berkeley persuaded the Virginia General Assembly to develop Jamestown by subsidizing the construction of brick townhouses. Archaeologists located two of these brick rows. In the final chapter in this section, Lounsbury traces the evolution of the English row house from the 14th to the 18th century. With ample space, Virginians built larger than average townhouses and arranged their rooms side by side rather than front to back. (I wonder if Jamestown builders also were attempting to adapt to climate? The side-by-side plan could provide better cross-ventilation.)

The second section, “Design and the Building Process,” contains two short chapters in which...
Lounsbury demonstrates how Americans adapted British architecture to American tastes and budgets. In the first essay, on a Virginia courthouse, he shows how the building committee adopted a young architect's innovative plan while simplifying the structure's exterior. In the second, Lounsbury looks at the architecture of colonial Charleston, South Carolina, the richest city in English North America. While Charlestonians carefully copied British public buildings, their dwellings quickly evolved away from European prototypes.

In the third section, Lounsbury looks at “Regional Building Patterns: Ecclesiastical Architecture.” Churches and meetinghouse survival rates are similar to those of secular buildings. Most early religious structures were wooden expedients that quickly disappeared. In Pennsylvania and New Jersey, researchers can document 660 colonial meetinghouses and churches of which only 110 survive. Log buildings were the most common—all but two have vanished. Ethnicity, ideology, and date of establishment all left their imprint on religious architecture. In Virginia, Anglican churches were built to the long, narrow, early-17th-century English style. Across the Potomac in Maryland—where the Church of England only became the state church in 1692—Anglican churches were built wider and shorter to facilitate hearing the sermon.

The last chapter in this section—“God is in the Details”—outlines how religious beliefs influenced church and meetinghouse design and decoration during the colonial period. In the early 19th century—except for Quakers and a few others—most of these distinctions broke down. Republican ideology and fading ethnicity led to the adoption of a national style in which preachers came down from their lofty pulpits to face parishioners arrayed in neat rows. As the style of these new churches changed over time, travelers could no longer identify the denomination of a church from its design.

In the fourth and final section, “Williamsburg,” Lounsbury looks at three aspects of the community and the restoration. The first chapter is on the struggles of vestries, college trustees, and public officials to create the public buildings of 18th-century Williamsburg. The second and third chapters address some of the architectural challenges in interpreting and reinterpreting the colonial town.

The second chapter is a case study on how intellectual training can blind designers to past conditions. The architects responsible for the restoration of Williamsburg were trained in Beaux-Arts design methods and “academic classicism.” The architects—understanding neither frontier conditions nor courthouse function—designed a capital building that violated both archaeological and documentary evidence.

In the final chapter, Lounsbury reviews the motives that led to the restoration, subsequent changing attitudes, and the sometimes harsh criticism directed toward the restoration by modernist and postmodernist architects and critics. While he wonders to what extent modern research can reshape the colonial revival restoration, Lounsbury finds that ongoing research, research that marries architectural and social history, continues to expand our knowledge of colonial America.

GARRY WHEELER STONE
NEW JERSEY STATE PARK SERVICE
223 KINGS HIGHWAY EAST
HADDONFIELD, NJ 08033-1909
Handbook of Postcolonial Archaeology  
JANE LYDON AND UZMA Z. RIZVI (EDITORS)  
Left Coast Press, Walnut Creek, CA, 2010. 525 pp., 15 figs., 1 table, index. $129.00 cloth, $49.95 paper.

This thought-provoking and fascinating book, a World Archaeological Congress Research Handbook, contains a wide-ranging set of 36 essays that examine the generalities and specificities of postcolonial archaeology as practiced in a variety of contexts. In addition, there is an introduction and an epilogue by the editors. The primary goal of the volume is to examine in what ways the postcolonial critique has been incorporated into archaeological thinking and practice. This critique is understood as having had major impacts on the way archaeologists act in the present, and on how they study, analyze, and write about the colonial past. The book is divided into five sections. Unfortunately, in a review of this length it is not possible to touch on each contribution, but general themes that appear throughout the book will be highlighted.

It should be noted that the “postcolonial” in postcolonial archaeology does not refer to the historical time period postdating the colonial era but rather to a theoretical orientation, specified by the editors as having a “self-reflexive, political dimension” with a “fundamental ethical basis in examining oppression and inequality in the present” (p. 19). Part of this self-reflexivity involves a reflection on the role that archaeologists act in the present, and on how they study, analyze, and write about the colonial past. The book is divided into five sections. Unfortunately, in a review of this length it is not possible to touch on each contribution, but general themes that appear throughout the book will be highlighted.

In addition to considering archaeology as a discipline born of the colonial period, chapters also focus on new ways of using archaeology to examine the colonial past and the production of new archaeological narratives. These papers bring in perspectives from different regions of the world: North America, Australia, Africa, India, and Ireland. An outgrowth of this re-examination of the colonial past is a set of chapters that examines approaches to different aspects of identity (gender and sexuality, race and class) as well as the notion of archaeological (cultural) identity itself and how these topics intersect with colonialism and postcolonialism.

As stated above, postcolonialism is not conceived of as relating to the postcolonial time period but rather to a mode of thinking and doing archaeology. As Lina Tahan states: “The independence of Lebanon as a republic did not make us ... truly postcolonial in thought and instinct” (p. 301). For her, postcolonialism involves the contestation both of the legacies of colonialism and remnants of colonial assumptions and ways of doing. This is a sentiment echoed by many of the authors who also add the concepts of recentering the role of indigenous people not only as a topic of study but also as having played an active role in bringing knowledge of the past to light (Whitney Battle-Baptiste, O. Hugo Benavides); providing alternative histories (Joost Fontein, Peter Schmidt and Karega Munene); focusing on issues of identity such as gender, sexuality, race, and class and how they intersect; and interrogating the foundations of archaeology as a colonial discipline (Theresa Singleton). An outgrowth of this is an examination of practice and ways of incorporating other ways of seeing, analyzing, and representing the archaeological past (including in museums), particularly as it relates to working with
or in indigenous communities or practicing archaeology as an indigenous scholar.

An important theme in postcolonial scholarship worldwide is the issue of reparation or redress. Because of the materiality of the archaeological record this redress often has to take place within a legal framework that governs the management and return of cultural material and skeletal remains and, in some cases, land. Chapters on the success or otherwise of the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act in the United States (Jon Daehnke and Amy Lonetree) are balanced by a consideration of practices (including land-use claims) in Australia (Michael Green and Phil Gordon, Peter Veth). There are also chapters that touch on issues around the cultural property held by museums, particularly property that might have been obtained through colonial practices or dishonest trading (Alexander Bauer, Magnus Fiskejö). Fontein considers issues of global vs. local heritage in a chapter on Great Zimbabwe.

This book is not, strictly speaking, a “how-to” manual, but many chapters contain good ideas and examples for how practitioners might go about transforming their practice, especially those in part 5: “Strategies of Practice: Implementing the Postcolonial Critique.” Here scholars advocate the need for partnership with local and indigenous communities (Fernando Armstrong-Fumero and Julio Hoil Gutierrez, Liam Brady and Joe Crouch), archaeological ethnography (Lynn Meskell), storytelling (Sandra Scham), indigenous standpoint theory (Martin Nakata and Bruno David), public interest ethnography (Peggy Reeves Sanday), and critical race theory and community organizing approaches (Carol McDavid and Fred McGhee).

There is not much discussion of the “tug-of-war” issues that have emerged in many developing nations between heritage preservation and the need for economic development, although Meskell touches on it briefly. It is also clear from many of the discussions that history did not stand still with the end of colonialism and the attainment of independence. The impact of the Cold War and globalization will no doubt be examined in further collections in the years to come.

In a collection of this nature it is also appropriate to reflect on the geographic placement of the contributors considering that the chapters contain more than one reference to the problems of “gatekeeping,” “silencing,” and the role that Western institutions play in determining research agendas. Of the 44 scholars who contributed to the volume, 27 of them are based at institutions in the United States of America, 6 are from the United Kingdom and Europe, and 8 are from Australia. There are no authors based in South America (although there is one from Mexico), only one from Asia (Japan), and one (a coauthor) from the entire continent of Africa. This is not to take anything away from the quality of the papers (and at least some of the authors are expatriates) but, perhaps unwittingly, the composition of the book most clearly highlights the problems of access and representation that many archaeological scholars on the ground in previously colonized areas face in communicating their practice and theoretical approaches to members of the discipline at large.

Natalie Swanepoel
University of South Africa
PO Box 392
Unisa 0003, South Africa
In *Outside the Hacienda Walls*, Allan Meyers asks some very important questions for those doing archaeologies of political economy and social relations during colonial and postcolonial periods in Yucatán: “Who controls the landscape? What spatial features or processes give some people power over others? Which spatial meanings gain currency and which ones are suppressed?” As the title suggests, the focus here is on the villagers and hacienda workers living on hacienda lands, outside the walls of the sumptuous family and administrative compound of the owners. Hacienda Tabí is one example among “hundreds” of such places that were active in the period between Mexican independence and the revolution. In discussing the important role archaeology played in learning about the people and economy of the hacienda, Meyers points out that “knowing where people lived is as important as knowing who did and did not live there” and sets out to explore the landscape of debt peonage in terms of everything from built environment and material finds, birth and death records and other legal documents, to descendant narratives and soil chemistry.

*Outside the Hacienda Walls* is an example of the value of anthropological archaeology in addressing a period in Yucatán that was contentious in the past and can be controversial in present interpretation. Meyers strikes a successfully balanced tone appropriate for either professional or lay readers; this would be a terrific text for an upper division college course or, arguably, a Latin American culture or history class. It also provides an important link to complementary research by those engaged in the archaeology of earlier, Caste War era haciendas such as Rani T. Alexander’s *Yaxcabá and the Caste War of Yucatán* (University of New Mexico Press, 2004), or works by Jason Yaeger, Jennifer Dornan, Richard Leventhal, and this author about those Maya villagers who migrated away, geographically and politically, from the oppression of plantation debt peonage during the Caste Wars and the Porfiriato.

This was a long-term project, undertaken over a decade, and it stands to reason that questions and approaches (not to mention research logistics) changed over the course of that time. The consistent thread that grounds the work through time is Meyers’s interest in the material realities and experiences of debt peonage at multiple scales: the stories of day-to-day life as the oppressive system impacted workers in their housing, in their neighborhoods, in their village, and in their navigations of physical and social terrain at the hacienda and on the plantation as a whole. Meyers begins the book with a poignant narrative pieced together from documents about one man who met a tragic, common, and (we now know) preventable death through malnutrition, and its impact on his wife and coworkers. Though the book is about archaeology at the level of landscapes, Meyers never lets the reader lose sight of the human-scale realities of a society and economy built around coercion and debt.

The methodology is interdisciplinary, demonstrating a command of data ranging from interviews with locals to soil chemistry to archival research. The scientific approach of triangulating independent datasets to strengthen interpretation, which serves the humanistic ends of historical anthropology so well, makes the conclusions drawn in this book clear and compelling. It is an excellent case study for the undergraduate classroom, but that does not mean the interpretations lack nuance. Throughout the book, Meyers intertwines a narrative about how his team collected data (what data they decided to collect and why, as well as the more usual how) with his interpretations of the
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landscape past and present. This strategy allows him to differentiate between strongly supported conclusions and more speculative and circumstantial interpretations (that are nonetheless grounded in some data and experience).

He ends the book with a discussion of forgetting and remembering, specifically the regional history of debt peonage. Meyers notes that this labor system, an economy built on the backs of the grandparents and great-grandparents of the majority of Yucatán’s current population and manifested on the landscape, goes virtually unmentioned in museums, guidebooks, plaques and displays, or guided tours. This state of affairs was no doubt the reason he decided to aim this book at travelers and tourists to the area, not simply students and other academics.

This book may irritate people who look for straightforward report-style interpretations uncluttered by discussions of the politics, logistics, personnel, and multiagency contexts of long-term archaeological projects. In fact though, these are part of the book’s strength, providing context for all the methodological and interpretive decisions made. This kind of transparency is useful for the reader, undergraduate or postgraduate: research questions and methodologies are never developed in a vacuum. The relationship building Meyers’s team did with everyone from local government and preservation groups to the descendant community illustrates trust-building. This project and this book demonstrate that in the long term, at its best, archaeology is a locally based process built on relationships, rather than a seasonal event where students and professors swoop in, excavate, and leave.

Minette Church
Department of Anthropology
University of Colorado at Colorado Springs
1420 Austin Bluffs Parkway
Colorado Springs, CO 80918
The Spanish conquest of the Inca beginning in 1532 was followed immediately by conflicts over the colony’s vast wealth. Conquistadores resisted royal authority and fought among themselves (Francisco Pizarro was assassinated in 1541), while warriors of the neo-Inca state raided the Spanish from their fortress in Vilcabamba. Jeremy Ravi Mumford analyzes this tumultuous history, focusing on the role of Francisco de Toledo, the fifth and most significant of the early viceroys (1569–1581), who conquered the neo-Inca state and established the outlines of subsequent colonial administration. The book centers on Toledo’s reorganization of native life by resettling them in central towns.

Native labor was central to Spanish policy. Drafted to work the mines (notably silver at Potosi and mercury at Huancavelica), as well as other work, natives produced the wealth that supported local notables and flowed to Spain (and later also to Manila). By the 1560s, however, native populations had been seriously diminished by war and epidemic disease. The central question for the Spanish was how to continue to harness native labor while not destroying its economic base, and trying (sometimes pretending) to “civilize” natives and save souls. Toledo’s solution was resettlement: forcing natives from scattered homesteads into new central towns where they could be counted and their labor and tribute effectively controlled. Known as reducciones, these planned towns were to be built on “a uniform, quadrilateral street grid surrounding a central plaza and church, governed by indigenous men holding Spanish municipal offices and titles” (p. 1). To make the towns permanent, officials were instructed to destroy the original homes. The realization of this ideal, however, varied depending on local circumstances, the analysis of which provides the major contribution of Mumford’s book. While Mumford’s focus is on Spanish policies, he also examines the role of native leaders (caciques) who served as mediators, a form of indirect rule.

According to Mumford, rather than having been designed to destroy native culture, as most have believed, Toledo’s reducciones also preserved some native customs, including the system of dual community organization (into sayas) and corvee labor (the mita). Mumford focuses on Toledo’s use of ethnographic observations (mediated through Spanish eyes) to understand native practices in order to adapt them to Spanish rule. Less than a year after arriving in Lima, Toledo set out with the entire vice-regal court on his famous five-year general inspection (visita) of the central and southern highlands (roughly modern Peru and Bolivia). During this inspection, Toledo and his collaborators gathered information in the communities, tabulated their population, assigned tribute obligations, organized community officials, and decided on the best place to locate the new towns. Toledo’s inspectors were told to consult native leaders about the location of the new towns, but they also consulted local Spanish authorities.

Toledo both admired and despised the Inca. In his view, they were tyrants, but that tyranny was necessary to their successful engineering and vertical mountain economy. Located in the tropics, the Andes recreate most of the world’s major terrestrial ecological zones vertically along the mountain slope, from tropical to high alpine climates, while rainfall and geography produce many additional microniches. Broken topography separates those ecozones, so they appear like vertical archipelagos (as modern authors call them) in a mountain sea. Well before the Inca, communities had sent colonists (mitimas, anglicized spelling of mitimaes) to live in these distant “islands” to exploit their variety (pota-
toes from high and maize from low altitudes, for example) and to send the results via llama caravans back home. The Inca transformed this mitima pattern into statecraft: moving whole communities to new regions for political as well as economic reasons. Native communities therefore often consisted of mixed ethnic populations that owed allegiance not to the local community but to distant ethnic lords in their homelands, a very different conception of land use than in Spain.

These differing Spanish and native conceptions of land use, as well as conflicting interests of inspectors, priests, encomenderos, caciques, etc., complicated and slowed the formation of the new towns, and sometimes led to contradictory policies. Nonetheless, the need for native labor and its dependence on the vertical economy influenced many decisions. In some cases, Toledo (who idealized the Inca system of resource extraction) permitted mitima natives to reside near their rural fields and pastures, even as most natives had to move far from their fields. After a few decades, however, many natives returned close to their fields, so that many resettlements became primarily administrative/ceremonial centers, much like Inca towns. In the end, however, even as he allowed for continuity in some details, Toledo effected enormous changes in native life, assigning “more than a million people ... to live in about six hundred reducciones” (p. 119).

Mumford develops his argument by reviewing the conceptual origins of the resettlement policy in Spain, the Caribbean/Mesoamerica, and the Andes, and then examining the Peruvian General Resettlement itself, using information from archives, archaeology, other scholars, and Spanish chronicles. Mumford provides a nuanced view of the give-and-take reality of Spanish policy concerning native community organization, including discussions of native flight from the resettlements, other population movements, and the gradual loss of collective land rights. Readers will be especially interested in Mumford’s discussion of the use of historical archeology in the reconstruction of the resettlement process in the Colca Valley, where he utilizes the work of Steven Wernke. Chapter 10 summarizes Mumford’s argument, outlines the later history of the resettlements, and examines a few extant Andean communities founded as resettlements. Indeed, some contemporary communities in the Ayacucho Valley, like Quinua where I have worked, maintain formal titles to distant lands in the tropical rain forest (montaña), remnants of the mitima system, although because of internal and external power struggles these communities are often unable to exercise their formal claims in practice.

Mumford’s final chapter (“Epilogue”) discusses modern population relocations in Europe (Soviet collectivization) and repopulation efforts in Africa (Tanzania) and elsewhere, emphasizing that Toledo’s reducciones had anticipated them. Mumford strangely omits discussion of the forced resettlement of rural peasants during Peru’s Shining Path War in the 1980s. I do not know if this program was influenced by Toledo’s example or even by the more immediate strategic hamlet policy of the U.S. Vietnam War, but the Peruvian military forcibly moved peasants into newly created towns (sometimes on the outskirts of an existing town) in their efforts to defeat the guerillas. When they could, farmers gradually returned to their rural homes close to fields, as in the colonial period, but they continued to claim their new town homes for their greater access to education, transportation, and other resources. Omission of this contemporary Peruvian example while including discussions of Europe and Africa is odd in a book on resettlements in Peru.

Caveats aside, Mumford’s book adds considerably to our understanding of the history of Spanish/native interactions in the Andes and is a significant addition to the literature.

William P. Mitchell
Monmouth University
Department of History and Anthropology
400 Cedar Avenue
West Long Branch, NJ 07764-1898
Saint Croix Island, Maine: History, Archaeology, and Interpretation
STEVEN R. PENDERY (EDITOR)
Maine Historic Preservation Commission and the Maine Archaeological Society, Augusta,
2012. 310 pp., 184 illus., 16 tables, refs., index. $29.95 paper.

Saint Croix Island, Maine, measures less than 100 × 300 yds., yet its history, archaeology, and history of archaeology defy its small size. The island saw the earliest sustained contact between native tribes and the French, and an attempt in 1604 to establish a settlement. The island also saw possibly the earliest problem-oriented historical archaeology, in 1797. Steven Pendery and a stellar supporting cast do an excellent job of telling the story of this island.

The volume is densely packed with information. The authors make good use of the plentiful illustrations, a mixture of period maps and images, landscape photographs, archaeological plans, artifact drawings and photographs, and interpretive/reconstructive drawings. The volume lacks the choppiness that often plagues compendia.

In his preface, Pendery sets the goal of the volume as sharing the history and archaeology of the island with the public. In chapter 1, Pendery introduces the setting, the history, and the archaeology. He stresses the role of the island in early French exploration, and emphasizes that this area saw early, sustained contact and interaction between a native tribe and a European colonizer. Pendery also underlines the importance of the island in the history of historical archaeology. He casts the study as having been written for the public.

In chapter 2, Eric Thierry documents the French history on the island. In 1604 Pierre Dugua sailed for the New World to create a settlement in his newly obtained grant. The two ships carried 120 individuals in all, including a variety of tradesmen, sailors, soldiers, clergymen, and Samuel Champlain. Champlain recognized that St. Croix Island offered a good anchorage and was defensible. By October 1604, all the main buildings were completed. Severe cold in the winter of 1604–1605 devastated the settlers, and scurvy ran rampant. By spring, 35 or 36 of the 79 colonists were dead. The settlement was moved in 1605, and the last French activity on the island was in 1613.

The French arrival at St. Croix Island and their expansion into the broader reaches of Acadia had significant impacts on the Passamaquoddy tribe. In chapter 3, tribal member Donald Soctomah describes the many outcomes of the arrival of Europeans. He stresses the many years of mutual loyalty and friendship between the tribe and the French.

In chapter 4, Johnson describes the history of the island and its environs in the 18th–20th centuries. Even long after the French had departed, the island had an interesting history. Pendery presents the history of archaeological research in chapter 5. Such discussions might typically begin in the early 20th century, but here archaeological research began in the 1790s. In 1780 Canada and the United States began the chore of finalizing the international boundary. Armed with a copy of Champlain’s plan and with Champlain’s descriptions of the island, early excavators found convincing evidence that the 1604 French settlement had indeed been on St. Croix Island.

In chapter 6 Pendery combines archival and archaeological data to reconstruct the cultural landscape during the French Outpost span (1605–1613) and the Lighthouse period (1856–1976). Champlain’s map from Les Voyages (1613) is a critical piece of evidence in determining both the location and the nature of the French buildings.

Metal artifacts are discussed in chapter 7. Key classes of metal artifacts include iron fasteners, architectural hardware, tools, furniture fittings, a few arms-related items, and kettles and pieces of cut kettle. A possible crucible of fired clay was also recovered. In this and the
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other material culture chapters, period drawings and data from other early French sites are utilized.

Pendery also wrote the ceramics analysis in chapter 8. His study is strengthened by direct comparisons in France with materials from known production centers. The stoneware includes Domfrontais, Bessin Cotenin, Beauvaisis, Loire, and unidentified gray varieties. Pendery presents photographs, profile drawings, period images, and his own conjunctural drawings of how the whole pieces would have appeared.

Giovanna Vitelli presents the glass assemblage in chapter 9. The emphasis is naturally upon the earliest component, and she documents case bottles, flasks, tableware, and window glass. Vitelli includes vessel drawings and detailed descriptions.

The glass beads are provided a separate discussion in chapter 10. James Bradley describes 51 of the 57 beads reported to have been recovered from the island. The assemblage is attractive for bead studies because it is early and because the occupation span was short. Bradley places the beads into the Kidd system, and compares the assemblage with other known collections from French sites, early English sites, and native contexts.

In chapter 11, Pendery, Stéphane Noël, and Arthur Spiess discuss diet and nutrition. They look at archival and artifactual (i.e., ceramics, glass, and metal cooking implements) indicators of dietary practice, and discuss the faunal analysis. An interesting element of the discussion is the efforts the French went to in trying to prevent or cure scurvy.

Chapter 12 reports on the 23 human burials, with some very interesting findings. Thomas Crist, Marcella Sorg, Robert Laroque, Molly Crist, and John Benson coauthor the chapter. They present evidence of the earliest European autopsy conducted in the New World, and evidence of the first oral surgery by Europeans in the New World. In the last chapter, Virginia Reams, Margaret Scheid, and Deborah Wade discuss the modern management and interpretation at St. Croix Island International Historic Site.

Is this a success as a public-oriented volume? Public outreach at many parks and many cultural resources management projects is reduced to a trifold brochure and basic signage. There is commonly a huge gap between the details in technical reports and what is shared with the public. The implicit assumption is that the public does not want or cannot handle the details. Consider military history as a parallel, however. The public purchases and reads literally thousands of volumes of highly detailed, technical discussions of specific battles. Do not those interested in archaeology deserve the same level of detail? I would argue that this volume succeeds marvelously as a public-consumption document. It provides much information, but the reader can pick and choose what sections they read, to match their interests. There is no tone of condescension, and no dumbing down of the narrative. The contributors are to be commended.

Where does that leave the readers of Historical Archaeology? The work provides a lot of important data on early French colonial artifacts and lifeways. This is a highly useful source. Although its stated goal is public outreach, the information is also important to historical archaeologists.

This volume warrants a thoughtful read. It tells interesting stories of discovery, interaction, failure, and a long history of research, all played out on a 300 × 100 yd. landscape. The volume’s broader importance may well be as a model for providing detailed information to the general public. Kudos for a job well done.

CHRIS ESPENSHADE
CCRG
2530 SPRING ARBOR ROAD
JACKSON, MI 49203-3602
In The Oxford Handbook of Public Archaeology, editors Robin Skeates (Durham University), Carol McDavid (Community Archaeology Research Institute), and John Carman (University of Birmingham) have assembled 34 essays that seek to capture the spirit of the rapidly developing world of public archaeology. What is perhaps most noteworthy about the book is the range of perspectives from which it presents the relationship between archaeology and the public, both in terms of content and in terms of the authors who contribute that content. Befitting its intent to provide a survey of the field and to push public archaeology in new directions, the book is divided into four sections, and each section includes the voices of, in the editors’ words, “experienced practitioners” as well as “established and ‘younger’ scholars” (p. 2). This mixture of practice and scholarship, and of experience and new perspectives, proves to be very successful.

The first section, titled “Histories of Public Archaeology” includes six chapters that explore how the archaeologies of different parts of the world have been shaped by the cultural context in which they are carried out. Carman’s chapter begins this discussion by suggesting a framework for studying the global history of archaeological heritage management. He draws examples from Europe, Britain, India, the United States, and Australia, and while the space allotted is, admittedly, just barely sufficient to introduce the concept, it prepares the reader well for the chapters that follow. Subsequent essays in this section include a legislative history and analysis of the significance of the National Park Service Organic Act for the regulation of archaeology in the United States, an exploration of the relationship between metal-detector users and archaeologists in the UK, as well as chapters that examine how archaeology and archaeological resources have been presented, understood, or used in Malta, Latin America, and India. The chapter by Dilip K. Chakrabarti deserves particular attention because of the attention it focuses on the many challenges facing archaeology originating in the developing world. Legacies of colonialism, the multiethnic nature of many developing countries, and the different research agendas guiding local and international audiences all shape the political environment in which archaeologists must situate their work, whether for themselves, for other archaeologists, or for members of the general public.

The contents of the second section of the book, “Researching Public Archaeology,” focuses a critical lens on how public archaeology understands and researches itself, and on how it explores the structure of its relationships with others. This particular set of boundaries allows the editors to link their contributors in an unexpected but effective way. It includes content as varied as Laurajane Smith and Emma Waterton’s discussion of the authorized heritage discourse and Neil Brodie’s exploration of the research methods used to uncover the antiquities market. These two chapters are indicative of the expansive scope of the content found both in this section and throughout the book. At both scales it does an excellent job of pushing through more restrictive definitions of “public archaeology” to include not only the relationships that archaeologists want to have with the public, but also the relationships that the public is initiating with archaeology, regardless of whether or not the archaeologists are necessarily comfortable with the form that those relationships take.

In the third section of the book, titled “Managing Public Archaeological Resources,” the editors let the concept of “archaeology as resource” guide the essays. The section begins with Anthony Pace identifying some
of the conceptual similarities and differences between the idea of sustainability as applied to environmental and archaeological resources. He identifies a need to re-emphasize the role of stewardship in heritage resource management, stressing that while heritage consumption in the present is a powerful economic force, strengthening the stewardship ethic within site management might better allow the resources to remain accessible to future generations. The other essays that follow generally draw attention to the fact that while public archaeology will always have one foot in the past, it is also very much a part of the modern world of legal regulation and competing demands for financial and other resources. Adrian Praetzel-lis provides his view of the modern state of cultural resources management archaeology in California, identifying its successes, its failings, and areas that will soon demand greater attention. Others go into detail exploring the use and curation of material within archaeological archives, or the changing policy environment in the UK, within which actors from the archaeological, agricultural, and environmental fields must increasingly collaborate in order to achieve success under difficult circumstances.

At over 300 pages, “Working at Archaeology with the Public: Principles, Practices and Debates” is the largest and final section in the Handbook. Standing alone it would constitute a significant accomplishment in the scholarship of public archaeology, but the value of the contributing authors’ work is made all the more apparent for having been so thoroughly contextualized by the preceding three sections. The chapters included here generally either detail different types of partnerships and examples of community driven archaeology, or they draw attention to particular issues confronting the public archaeologists who conduct this work. Themes explored in the section include “Archaeologists as Professional Public Servants,” “Public Interpretation and Presentation,” “Public Learning and Education in the USA,” and “Working with Particular Publics.” As with earlier sections, these final chapters contain a mix of familiar and new voices. The book benefits from the insights offered by Barbara Little, Alice Beck Kehoe, Patrice Jeppson, and Joe Watkins among others whose work continues to shape the field.

The authors’ exploration of projects where members of the public have worked alongside archaeologists through participatory geographic information system research, community service learning, community-initiated site interpretation, or other techniques will provide excellent guidance for those who might be looking to form their own partnerships with stakeholder groups. Conversely, and speaking to the nature of the work being discussed, these examples may also help members of the public to determine what it is that they most want from their relationship with archaeology. The Oxford Handbook of Public Archaeology is both ambitious and successful. Its geographic scope, the range of issues introduced, and the mix of theoretical and practical content will make it a very appealing sourcebook for those looking to understand the current state of the field and its likely future trajectory.

DOUGLAS R. APPLER
DEPARTMENT OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION
UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
117 PENCE HALL
LEXINGTON, KY 40506-0041
Terrance Weik’s *The Archaeology of Antislavery Resistance* presents a powerful synthesis of the ways people of African descent sought to escape and resist bondage and exploitation. The author presents a wide-ranging overview of freedom-seeking strategies employed throughout the Americas. Weik’s own work provides the central case study without overshadowing the work of other scholars engaged in parallel studies. The text is grounded in a multidisciplinary perspective drawing upon numerous theoretical perspectives. The book will appeal to a wide audience within historical archaeology and intersects emerging interests in history, ethnic studies, and the social sciences in general.

The first chapter situates archaeology within broader antislavery studies. This includes the importance that studies of resistance have for individuals and communities of African descent in the present. Although a relatively new contributor to the field of antislavery studies, the archaeology of the African diaspora has a long tradition of examining sites that speak to these issues. The introductory chapter also clearly states that multiple forms of both resistance and freedom exist. As such, archaeological projects seeking to address antislavery topics must use specificities regarding these topics.

The following chapter discusses principal themes related to the study of antislavery resistance. This discussion further demonstrates the need for a nuanced and contextual approach to framing studies of antislavery resistance. Weik underscores the multidimensionality of slavery as it exists at various points of time and pays particular attention to its existence in Africa and the New World. Resistance is a similarly complex practice appearing in both visible and covert forms. Weik’s discussion of these issues acknowledges the subject’s political nature and connects historical studies with modern human rights issues. These connections stem from the ongoing inequalities facing the descendants of freed Africans in the past and present.

The third chapter provides the theoretical center of Weik’s study, which revolves around the construction of an anthropological framework for antislavery studies. This framework advocates an explicit theorizing of resistance, freedom, liberation, ethnogenesis, and scholarly networks. A longtime interest of historical archaeologists, resistance for Weik is more than physical actions seeking freedom. Resistance lives in the hearts and minds of enslaved peoples. It is present in numerous physical and cultural manifestations. Resistance changes through time and necessitates diachronic study. Weik also expands our understanding of freedom and liberation. While many conceptualize freedom as the ability to make one’s own choices, Weik looks for the material signatures of freedom seeking by the enslaved. This broadens our understanding of freedom as the goal of the enslaved and instead examines it as a process. Weik goes on to conceptualize ethnogenesis as a theory challenging an essentialist view of culture and identity. The chapter closes with a discussion of networks, doubly framed regarding their role in antislavery resistance as well as modern networks of knowledge production. Weik weaves these themes together to produce a multidimensional approach seeking to negate deterministic, simplistic perspectives about the nature of antislavery resistance, community, and identity.

The following two chapters provide overviews of previous archaeological research. Chapter 4 examines the archaeology of maroon settlements in the Caribbean, South America, and the U.S. Case studies from Jamaica and Brazil demonstrate how material culture from such sites speaks directly to issues of identity. Research in the Great Dismal Swamp is potentially revealing evidence for defensive architecture and hints at a more sedentary life.
Chapter 5 discusses previous and ongoing archaeological research into antislavery collaborations and the Underground Railroad. Many of these sites, such as Harriet Tubman’s Home, provide clear manifestations of individual and communal struggles against slavery. Other sites, such as New Philadelphia, provide glimpses into the lives of freed Africans. As Weik is quick to point out, however, the specter of inequality through time allows research at each of these sites to speak to issues of freedom and liberation in the past and present.

Chapter 6 focuses on Weik’s work at Pilaklikaha in Florida. This site was once home to an African Seminole community, which Weik defines as people of African descent who had considerable cultural connections with Seminoles. These interactions include serving Seminole labor demands, partial genetic descent from Seminoles, or Africans living in indigenous territories. The site of Pilaklikaha dates to the early 19th century, and Weik skillfully draws upon the limited archaeological evidence to discuss kinship, social organization, subsistence, and spirituality of the site’s inhabitants. The ephemeral quality of the settlement is partly overcome through Weik’s careful analysis, which situates archaeological and documentary evidence alongside oral history.

The concluding chapter opens with an acknowledgment of archaeology’s potential to combat Eurocentric, racist, and document-centric approaches to antislavery resistance. Weik also mentions numerous future directions including the need for work outside of North American, Caribbean, and South American contexts. Weik’s writing is straightforward and accessible. His long-term engagement with the archaeology of antislavery resistance is evidenced through an expert treatment of the topic. The book’s topic, geographic scope, and theoretical framework are timely and speak to issues of interest beyond the African diaspora. I highly recommend it.

Edward González-Tennant
Monmouth University
Department of History and Anthropology
400 Cedar Ave.
West Long Branch, NJ 07764
Beer Barons of B.C., Featuring the Secrets of the Stanley Park Brewery
BILL WILSON
Tamahi Publications, Lantzville, BC, 2011. 72 pp., illus. $30.00 paper.

The focus of this slim volume is a directory listing more than 200 British Columbian breweries, an exhaustive listing from the Gold Rush era (1858) to the present. The directory details brewery names, locations, owners, dates, and black-and-white images of labels or bottles with a sprinkling of historical notes and explanations. Each brewery was also given an alphanumeric designator, which helps the reader track the breweries as they changed names and owners over time. The directory is prefaced by a brief overview of the British Columbia (BC) brewery industry and a history of the Stanley Park Brewery, the site of which is now an important Vancouver park. Another section, which was oddly plunked into the middle of the directory, has full-color images of labels and bottles. This section also has extra tidbits and facts that are quite enjoyable.

Unfortunately, the images section and the directory are difficult to cross-reference. The directory is listed alphabetically by location and then (somewhat) chronologically. The labels are simply listed alphabetically by brewery. Adding the alphanumeric code to the labels section would have been very helpful.

I have long been a huge fan of Bill Lindsey’s “Historic Glass Bottle Identification & Information Website,” and I believe this book would also be a dynamite resource as a website. The directory could be transformed into a searchable, updatable, sortable, formatted table with thumbnail links to images. Histories of individual breweries could each have their own page within the site. This would solve many of the minor design quirks of the book.

Overall, the directory is an excellent reference for BC brewery bottle finds. There is one important caveat emptor, however. This book was written by a bottle digger and collector with no archaeological pretensions. The directory’s data are based on sound archival research, although awkwardly cited and needing footnotes, but the bottle and label images are all from the author’s collection or fellow diggers’ collections.

Some archaeologists may not want to support this publication. Others may ask if there is a middle ground for archaeologists to work with bottle collectors. On request, the author explained how his collector group chooses which sites to dig:

I participated in most of the significant digs in British Columbia. There are a core group of perhaps 150 diggers here in the province who monitor construction sites, awaiting opportunities to dig up old refuse sites from the 1860’s to the early 1900’s. The location of these sites is often known for years by our group through research of local directories, phone books, etc. and this information is closely guarded until the opportunity arises (Bill Wilson 2012, elec. comm.).

With so few archaeologists and so many collectors, we archaeologists cannot eliminate hobby collectors that are operating within the law. Archaeologists and collectors have had and will continue having selective, productive partnerships where archaeologists recover data that was otherwise completely unavailable to them. It is hoped that with collaboration, education, and the right people, we archaeologists can take advantage of collectors’ enthusiasm for history and their knowledge base to gather better data and save some history along with a bunch of dirty bottles.

LAURA SEIFERT
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