Could this be the “better” guide to French ceramics on colonial sites? The volume was born of a conference on French pottery in North America held in September 2002 in Marksville, Louisiana. It showcased speakers from the U.S., Canada, and France. Out of the 14 chapters gathered by editor George Avery, 13 were presented at this meeting. The conference poster and program, as well as a list of participants and their paper abstracts are included at the end of the book. As Avery warns his readers, some chapters are more like transcripts of oral presentations rather than formal research papers.

Gregory Waselkov and John Walthall published their classification system for French faiences shortly before the conference took place, making the gathering a natural venue to discuss their work. Because chapters 2, 3, 4, and 14 specifically deal with this topic, they will be examined together after the others have been reviewed.

Chapter 1, “Update on the ‘Tunica Treasure,’” by Earl Barbry, Jr., opens the volume with the transcript of a conversation that he had with H. F. “Pete” Gregory and George Avery. Their exchange focuses on the “Tunica Treasure” after it was repatriated to the Tunica-Biloxi tribe of Louisiana. The tribe was committed to handling this important collection with care, and wanted to use it as a public education tool. They restored some of the ceramics and decided to display both sherds and whole vessels to denounce the effects of grave looting on their culture. Interestingly, they came to see the preservation of the ceramics in their museum as a symbolic reburial, and one that precludes a real re-interment of this fundamental collection. This chapter exhibits 53 beautiful pictures of whole ceramic vessels from the “Tunica Treasure.” The pictures are striking but come with very little information about the ceramics themselves.

In chapter 5, “Nearly Half a Century of Research in Québec,” Marcel Moussette summarizes 50 years of research on French pottery in the St. Lawrence Valley. The field took off with historical archaeology in the 1960s. Two Parks Canada laboratories, Ottawa and Louisbourg, played an instrumental role in putting out the first publications. Then, the still indispensable Collection Patrimoine on Place Royale was started. Most of these early publications were, appropriately, very descriptive. More recently, there has been a shift away from the stylistic approach, towards archaeometric analysis. This is partly due to the problem of the identification of coarse earthenwares and because locally made vessels look like imported ones. With morphological and chemical analyses, Michel Blackburn and Moussette proved that some “North Devon” coarse earthenwares were in fact not English at all. Given this great result, more archaeometric studies are underway, including a promising survey of Laurentian potters by Yves Monette. This chapter has 18 excellent pictures of ceramics from the sites of the Intendant’s Palace in Quebec city, La Prairie near Montreal, and Nouvelle-Ferme on Île-aux-Oies.

As discussed in chapter 6, “Archaeometric Applications in the St. Lawrence Valley,” Yves Monette, Marc Richer-LaFlèche, and Marcel Moussette also analyzed the coarse earthenwares from the farming site of the Rocher de la Chapelle on Île-aux-Oies. They applied petrographic analysis and ICP-MS (inductively coupled plasma mass spectrometry) to 77 sherds. They found out that local wares do have a distinct composition, and in particular, higher levels of sodium. They also came up with new groupings for the ceramics that seem to indicate that more than one local potter was involved in their production. Variations in the rubidium-strontium ratio (Rb/Sr) may ultimately help identify various workshops, and perhaps narrow down their locations in the St. Lawrence Valley. The authors have included the scatter plots and tables mentioned in the text, which facilitate the reading. There is also a handy appendix of the compositional data of the ceramics they analyzed.
Chapter 7, “A Provence Perspective,” is by Henri Amouric and Lucy Vallauri, two long-standing specialists in French ceramics from Provence, in southeastern France. Since their chapter is written in French, it will be summarized in more detail here.

In France, the work of Jean Chapelot on the Saintonge potters was a stepping-stone for studies of ceramics on colonial sites. More recently, the development of historical archaeology in the French Caribbean, of urban excavations of both consumer sites and pottery, and archival research in southern France have all pushed the field forward.

Amouric and Vallauri first address the issue of ceramic identification. They note that stonewares from the Loire Valley remain the least well known of the French stonewares. For French faïences, decoration style seems more significant than origin. Some of the popular local decorations have been found not only in Moustiers, Marseille, and Varages, but also Toulouse and Montpellier. Other Moustiers decorations were copied in Bordeaux and Samadet. Geochemical analyses are sometimes helpful. For example, they helped distinguish between faïences from Moustiers and others from Varages, Nevers, or Montpellier. Plain faïence, blanche or brune, poses an even bigger identification problem, and plain French and Italian tin-glazed earthenware can appear identical.

The authors then acknowledged the recent advances also made outside of Provence. There is now no doubt that Albisola ware, that appeared at the end of the 17th century in Italy, was widely imitated in France, in Toulouse, Bordeaux, Nevers, and Lyon for example. Saintonge dominated the colonial market in the 17th century, but other potteries competed with it in the next century. Amouric and Vallauri suspect that green-glazed tableware and sugar forms from Sadirac, for example, were exported to the colonies. They mention the presence of coarse earthenware cooking pots and painted tableware from Cox on colonial sites as well. In fact, Cox alone did not produce all of these ceramics. Painted tableware and cooking pots were also made in Giroussens and Lomagne, near Toulouse, and Giroussens wares seem to be the most frequent type found on colonial sites.

Amouric and Vallauri’s comments on their area of expertise, Marseilles, are the most pertinent. Beside faïences from Marseilles, Moustiers, and Varages, they identify Huveaune tableware, cookware from both Vallauris and Biot, and storage vessels from Biot in colonial assemblages. Huveaune ceramics were all slip decorated, but either painted, decorated with circles of dots, or marbled. Their background appeared red or yellow. The better pieces were incised and show flowers, birds, fish, and sometimes people. Bowls, basins, and chamber pots were the most exported forms.

Pottery at Biot and Vallauris thrived for centuries because of their location next to the Mediterranean Sea and their clay rich in kaolinite. For the colonies they made cooking pots, cooking pans, bowls, chafing dishes, and some tableware. Biot also specialized in large oil jars and container pots for fresh grapes. In the latter, grapes could be preserved long enough to reach New France, or be stored until Christmastime.

In the authors’ view, Italian ceramics from the Gulf of Genoa are inextricably linked to Provence potteries. To their surprise, Albisola wares have been identified on colonial sites, but not plain white faïences from Genoa and blue-on-white faïences from Savona. Amouric and Vallauri claim to recognize some of them in the faïences from Place Royale.

Their conclusions about the colonial ceramic trade are that ceramics came from the regions that dominated Atlantic commerce. Saintonge earthenwares and stonewares were most common from 1650 to 1700, when French cities on the Atlantic Coast were in the lead. In the 18th century, some of this trade was redirected to the southeast of France and its Mediterranean ports. The routes were either direct across seas, or indirect and transported through southwestern France. Marseilles traded heavily with the Antilles, but also with New France, and between 1731 and 1770 with New Orleans.

Amouric and Vallauri conclude by noting the absence of ceramics from Saint-Quentin-la-Poterie, Dieulefit, or Saint-Jean-de-Fos on colonial sites—rather surprising since those were major pottery centers. For the faïences, they think that exports from Provence largely dominated the colonial market, which is debatable. They wish that Spanish and Italian tin-glazed ceramics could be more easily distinguished, and that more 19th-century sites were studied. Hypothetically, Turkish pipes and ceramics could have
reached the colonies through the same routes as Chinese porcelain—these Turkish wares are not rare in Provence. Finally, they wonder about what kind of faience might have been made in New Orleans by the potter Pierre Paul Caussy. The colonial archives contain traces of his activity there, between 1729 and 1732, and before he relocated to Rouen.

This text is richly illustrated. Most of its 54 pictures depict ceramics from Provence and Italy, and have already appeared in previous French publications.

In chapter 8, “From Texas, La Belle and Fort St. Louis,” authors James Bruseth and Jeff Durst present the excavations of the ship La Belle and Fort St. Louis. French explorer René Robert Cavelier de La Salle was trying to locate the mouth of the Mississippi River when he landed on the Texas coast in 1684. Fort St. Louis was the location of his short-lived colony, and La Belle was the last ship to survive this expedition. Eventually, La Salle also lost La Belle in a storm, with all his cargo aboard. The shipwreck was found in 1995. A cofferdam allowed James Bruseth and his team to excavate the wreck as a terrestrial site. They dismembered its hull timber by timber and recovered over a million artifacts.

Archaeological work at Fort St. Louis started in the 1950s. It was Kathleen Gilmore who confirmed in the 1970s that this was indeed the site of La Salle’s colony (chapter 9, this review). Magnetometer survey and excavations have yielded maps of both its Spanish and French occupations. The density of green lead-glazed ceramics helped narrow down the location of the French fort. This chapter has interesting fieldwork pictures, survey maps, and site plans of Fort St. Louis. It also has pictures from La Chapelle-des-Pots in France, where the authors took a trip to see Saintonge ceramics. Please note that the name of this village is misspelled as “La Chapelle de Pots” in the book. Spelling does matter, as there is also an historic pottery called La Chapelle-aux-Pots in Beauvaisis.

In chapter 9, “Ceramics from Fort St. Louis,” Kathleen Gilmore contributed a delightful account of how she became acquainted with French ceramics, and how she identified the Keeran site as Fort St. Louis. She recognized early on the importance for French colonial sites of green-glazed coarse earthenware, and acknowledges the difficulty of distinguishing between some French and Spanish ceramics. Her pictures of coarse earthenware, faience, and majolica illustrate the point.

Chapter 10 is titled “Onboard La Belle.” Ceramics from La Belle amounted to 31 whole or almost complete vessels and 258 sherds. Nancy Reese’s paper focuses on the whole vessels: 5 faience, 14 coarse earthenware, and 12 stoneware. The faience vessels were all plain apothecary jars called albarelle or albarello in French. It is unlikely that they were made in La Rochelle however, as Reese proposes. Even if La Rochelle were indeed specialized in apothecary jars, the faience pottery there only started in 1721, while La Belle sank in 1686. As a city which specialized in medicinal faience, Montpellier is a better candidate. It hosted one of the oldest and most famous schools of medicine in Europe. Faience making developed early, in the 1570s, and specifically to cater to pharmacists and physicians. Medicinal jars were one of Montpellier’s specialties.

Looking at coarse earthenware, Reese reminds the reader that Saintonge ceramics come both with and without slip. La Belle had to resupply in St. Domingue after the supply ship St. François was lost, and this seems to explain the presence of coil-made coarse earthenware in its assemblage. Another fascinating finding of Reese is that some of the coarse earthenware pots were used as weapons. Filled with oil, they were lit and thrown onto enemy ships to set their decks on fire. The nine fire pots from La Belle are probably the largest collection in existence.

Some of the French stonewares were apothecary jars from Beauvaisis, and the rest were drinking pitchers from Normandy and Germany. Unfortunately, Reese did not comment further on the function of this assemblage, except for the fire pots. For example, the apothecary jars seem to indicate that the crew either faced or were expected to face frequent wounds and injuries. Also, the absence of stoneware storage vessels seems striking, but perhaps this is common on non-merchant ships. La Belle’s ceramics deserve a more in-depth study, and it is eagerly awaited.

In chapter 11, “A Survey of Texas Missions,” Shawn B. Carlson looks at the distribution of French ceramics at five Texas missions from ca. 1720 to 1820. Despite the “wide variety of
ceramics” available at these sites, Carlson only studies tin- and lead-glazed earthenware. His analysis is based on two ratios and a chronology table. The first ratio of French to Mexican ceramics shows that French ceramics entered the area from New Orleans. This seems to fit recent views of New Orleans as the epicenter of a vast regional market, and as a contraband hub for the Caribbean.

The chronological analysis that follows is awkward, and frankly, not very useful. Carlson does not indicate which ceramics and which dates of production he selected. This is a concern since some of the dates that he uses elsewhere are incorrect. For example, 1690–1765, the usual range for Seine polychrome faïences, does not work for La Rochelle polychrome, since again, La Rochelle faïences did not exist before 1721. Furthermore, because most of these ceramics have a long period of production, Carlson ends up with a table that spans the years 1650 to 1899 for missions that were only occupied between the 1710s and the 1820s.

Finally, his third ratio compares the amount of various coarse earthenwares to the amount of French faïences at each site. Carlson uses these figures to highlight the respective degrees of influence at the different missions of Mexican wares, local wares, and British imports. Why these observations could not have been made using simple proportional percentages instead of faïence ratios is not clear.

Chapter 12, by John H. House, introduces a new colonial site on the lower Arkansas River. Wallace-Bottom was serendipitously discovered in 1998 a few hundred yards south of Menard-Hodges, the official French post in Arkansas. In reality, four decades of archaeology at Menard-Hodges have failed to confirm that it is without a doubt, a French colonial site. Wallace-Bottom, on the other hand, has a clear French colonial component. The post was occupied between 1686 and 1749, and this corresponds to the dating of the artifacts found at Wallace-Bottom. House proposes that this new site might be the original French Arkansas post.

House studies 66 sherds that came from surface collection and small-scale excavation. Most of them are French, and a few are illustrated in the article. Figure 3 exhibits an Albisola sherd. Albisola ware is usually found on French colonial sites in contexts that date from the second half of the 18th century. The presence of this sherd might indicate that the assemblage dates closer to the mid- rather than early 18th century. This would seem to fit with two other sherds pictured in figure 2, a sherd of Rouen polychrome, a ware that appears in post-1740 contexts in the Mississippi Valley and at least after 1725 in New France, and a Moustiers blue-on-white sherd with flower decoration that was popular around the 1730s and 1740s.

Aubra L. Lee’s chapter 13, “A French Pottery in Louisiana,” presents the excavation of another exciting new site, a French pottery at Wilton Plantation, lower Louisiana. This is the first kiln site excavated in the whole colony of Louisiane. Among its features, Lee identified two working floors, some dismantled flue and fireboxes, a portion of the firing chamber, and remains of a shed-like building that covered the kiln. She determined that the site corresponded to a 5 m high circular updraft kiln, which is a common type in Western Europe. The documents from the Wilton Plantation site are great, the pictures of kiln or shed-like construction from France less so. Reports about kiln excavation in France are hard to locate, but these remains could be compared to standing preserved kilns, either shed covered, as at La Chapelle-des-Pots, or inside the potter’s workshop, as at Cox.

The ceramics made at Wilton Plantation were low-fired, slipped, and lead-glazed coarse earthenwares. The color of the glaze varied a lot. Several bowls, a jar, a jug, and a covered pot—mislabeled as another jar—are pictured in the book. In Lee’s view, it is probable that other forms were made. Even for classic utilitarian vessels like these, it would have been great to include profile drawings of the products of this new pottery. Note that Lee’s bibliography is missing a few references cited in her text.

Chapters 2, 3, 4, and 14 deal with the Walthall-Waselkov classification system for French faïences. In chapter 2, Walthall recalls his discovery of faïence, after he identified the remains of the French church of the Cahokia tribe in the top levels of Monks Mound. He also describes how French ceramics were used in colonial Illinois. The absence of a lot of coarse earthenware indicates that “the French did not do a lot of cooking in pottery” and preferred metallic cookware. Also, faïences are usually 30 or 40 years older than the sites’
periods of occupation, and show traces of repair. This means that they probably were curated and used for special occasions rather than as everyday ware. Some of the 13 pages of pictures, mostly of faïences from French colonial sites, show examples of mended vessels with lead-filled drill holes, and of sherds shaped as game pieces or pendants.

As for his faïence classification system, Walthall initially wanted to help standardize the description of these ceramics. Comparison between sites would then become easier. He decided to stay clear of French folk names and from naming types after type-sites. Instead, he chose to name them for the “general area or style that they were named for in France.” From the beginning, Walthall warned that these styles were not to be confused with the real place of origin of the faïences, because popular patterns were copied all over. Rather, “styles” described decorative traditions of certain areas. Another great contribution of his, is how his system took into account the variety of rim types. After George A. Long in Canada, Walthall helped promulgate the classification of these recurrent rim patterns.

The way in which he deals with types is more problematic. First, the fact that some types are defined based on glaze and patterns, and others on glaze and colors can be confusing. Walthall also named these types for regions or cities in France, all somewhat related to faïence history, but he chose from among many possibilities. So the type names are both arbitrary and real. They are not easy to remember, since they are non-descriptive French geographic names, and also not easy to forget, given that the faïences named for these locations were not necessarily made in these places.

In chapter 3, Gregory A. Waselkov explains how he helped transform this classification system by incorporating more of the existing French literature on the subject. French books on historical ceramics are abundant but biased. They are often based on museum collections, sometimes potteries’ archives, and rarely on archaeological research. Museum pieces can be a far cry from common wares.

Waselkov rightly points out that the Brittany type has probably nothing to do with the region of Brittany itself. “Brittany” faïences have a simple line or band around the rim. During the colonial period Brittany was in fact a very minor faïence area. Until the end of the 18th century, its main pottery, Quimper, only made copies of popular designs from Nevers, Moustiers, and Rouen. Its famous folk style, which probably inspired the attribution of the simple line design to the region, only showed up during the 19th century. Significantly also, this decoration was first attributed to Brittany potteries based on a personal communication and not a publication. There is then no evidence so far that Brittany came up with the “Brittany” decoration. This case illustrates well how the names chosen by Walthall can cloud the discussion about French faïences.

On another point, Waselkov insists that he and scholars like Walthall are only focusing on colonial faïences. The faïences found in France, on 18th-century urban sites, for example, are very similar to their colonial counterparts, however. The two areas of study should not remain forever separated.

In chapter 4, Ed Jelks applies Walthall and Waselkov’s classification system to faïences from Louisbourg. The crux of his contribution is not its short text—Jelks could not come to the conference and H. F. “Pete” Gregory instead presented his paper—but its 51 pages of pictures of faïences and coarse earthenwares. Jelks’s work illustrates the difficulties that arise when this system is applied to sites outside of the Illinois area. For New France and the Caribbean a greater number of rim types need to be included, and the variations of already-classified rim types have to be better defined. Also, the classification system works best for tableware sherds, but shows its limits when it comes to classifying other types of vessels, like hollowwares.

In chapter 14, George Avery, H. F. “Pete” Gregory, Jason Emery, and Jeffrey Girard describe faïences from northwest Louisiana also using Waselkov and Walthall’s classification terms. They survey 10 sites, but the bulk of their 2,996 sherds come from the Los Adaes (2,204 sherds) and Tauzin-Wells sites (501 sherds), that date from the period before and after the 1770s, respectively. A table summarizes which styles, types, and rim varieties are present at each site, and vessel forms are discussed in the text.

The authors conclude, for example, that faïence blanche dominates in northwest Louisiana before
1770s, and is then replaced by faience brune. The data about rim varieties is the most interesting. Some rim varieties, like Rim G, for example, can be good temporal markers. Before the 1770s, the most popular rims are the various Provence types, at least at Los Adaes. They represent 240 out of 526 decorated faience sherds, or 42%. After the 1770s, Rim G and all of its derivatives dominate; at Tauzin-Wells, 29 out of 138 painted faience sherds, or 21% of the total, are Rim G and variations on G. Similarly, Rim G was popular after the mid-18th century in Illinois.

With this volume, George Avery hoped to advance French pottery classification and publish a reference for French ceramics. Its 14 essays are very diverse in tone, topic, and quality, however. Specific information about French coarse earthenware, stoneware, and faience is dispersed throughout the book, which does not make it the most adequate artifact guide.

The historic value of this document, in that it shows how French pottery research developed, is much appreciated. Also valuable were the chapters that presented new sites or new discoveries, although they did not necessarily fit with Avery’s larger agenda. Overall, the numerous and lavish illustrations look professional. Unfortunately at $75, this is a very expensive ceramic album, and as Avery suggested, this volume might only be affordable to CRM firms and to the National Park Service. This is regrettable, especially since nowadays the Internet offers a convenient way to illustrate and update typologies that are accessible to all.
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Lost Architecture of the Rio Grande Borderlands
W. Eugene George
Texas A&M University Press, College Station, 2008. 105 pp., index. $35.00 cloth.

The construction of dams whenever, wherever, and for whatever noble purposes, always has deleterious effects on the people to be relocated and on their built landscape destined for inundation.

This work is a study of architecturally significant buildings in the United States and Mexico border zone inundated by the Falcón Reservoir in 1953. It is a revision and update of architect W. Eugene George’s 1975 report, Historic Architecture of Texas: The Falcón Reservoir, published by the Texas Historical Commission and Texas Historical Foundation, Austin, in a limited edition of 500 copies.

The personal commentaries clearly document the human toll of dam building. Those of Ricardo Paz-Treviño, recounted in the foreword he was invited to write, describe the importance of place and the built environment to those whose social and cultural lives revolved around family ties and the places they lived and visited on both sides of the border. George’s reminiscences combine the history of his involvement in studies of historic architecture in the Falcón Reservoir region, and his deep love for the area, its architecture, and its people. He relates the style and technical aspects of urban and rural structures to their historical, cultural, and environmental contexts in this area, beginning in about 1750 and terminating in 1953 with the filling of the reservoir. He documents architectural influences from this vernacular style in recently constructed Texas houses.

George outlines the history of efforts to mitigate the effects of the inundations (pp. 91–92). The joint U.S.-Mexico Falcón Dam and Reservoir project on the Rio Grande began in 1949. Once the locations of the dam and reservoir became known in the winter of 1948–1949, salvage operations began. The Smithsonian Institution, the National Park Service, and the University of Texas at Austin in the United States, collaborating with the Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia in Mexico, carried out surveys and salvage archaeology of prehistoric and historic sites, along with documenting extant architecture in ranches and towns between 1949 and 1953. The work was truncated when, as a result of heavy precipitation, the water rose in early 1953, two years earlier than predicted.

Prehistoric and historic archaeological sites, along with the abandoned towns and ranches on both sides of the border were flooded (pp. xv–xxiii). So as not to become hazards to navigation, many of the standing structures on the American side of the river were dynamited or bulldozed (Texas Beyond History <http://www.texasbeyondhistory.net/falcon>). The history of the studies is scattered throughout the work, in the preface, the introduction, chapter 6, the epilogue, and the appendix.

The author entered the scene in 1961 when he contracted with the National Park Service to “measure and document Mission San Antonio de Valero, the Alamo ... for the Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS)” (p. xvi). At that time Edward B. Jelks suggested that George complete the architectural studies of historic buildings in the catchment basin of the Falcón Reservoir. George had access to the photographs, along with the metrical and descriptive data gathered from 1949 to 1952 and archived at the Texas Archaeological Research Laboratory. In addition, George included the additional HABS studies he had carried out in 1961. He completed the report in 1975.

After 1975 George maintained his active interest in the documentation of historical architecture, especially that of the lower Rio Grande. He is to be commended for considering it to be part of his architectural practice and for enlisting students of architecture in this activity (p. xxi). His interest in documentation of the inundated Falcón Reservoir structures was piqued again in 1983 when the lowered water level exposed the town of Guerrero Viejo in Tamaulipas, Mexico. In chapter 6 and the epilogue, George documents the post-1983 alternating exposures and inundations of structures within the reservoir with excellent color photographs of Guerrero Viejo.
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Two sites in Texas are also illustrated. He makes succinct observations on the looting and site destruction occurring with lowered water levels.

George presents the basic architectural descriptive data (black-and-white photographs, plan views, and elevations) with some historical data on founding dates and occupants in chapter 5. In the introduction and chapters 1–4, George includes the same types of illustrative materials but with the addition of line drawings of various architectural details and perspectives. He proposes and briefly discusses the need to understand vernacular architecture in terms of its historical roots, its environmental contexts, the building technology used, and the social and cultural functions of the structures.

The settlements studied are descendants of communities and ranches established in the area along the Rio Grande after 1750, as part of a strategy to secure the northern borderlands and communication lines of the Viceroyalty of New Spain. George suggests that the structures and towns had roots in several centuries of community development in New Spain. He goes into detail on building technology used, including discussion of the historical sequence of techniques and materials, especially with the changes occurring when the area was incorporated into the American political and economic system.

This is an important discussion. The description of techniques and materials would serve any archaeologist well for investigating structures throughout northern Hispanic America. Finally, the author presents a brief reconstruction of life along the Rio Grande, incorporating the structures in and around that life took place. One of the more interesting notes here is his presentation of the architectural legacy of a late-19th-century priest, Pierre Yves Keralum.

This work is an important contribution to the anthropology of Hispanic America. Brief, but well illustrated, the work presents historical architectural information from a two-century period during which Mexico became independent and lost substantial lands in the north. It would be interesting to determine if the degree of continuity and change differed among those communities separated between two national systems. Apart from a few comments on ceramics, George does not mention any excavations of historic sites. Yet at least one was carried out at the Leal Ranch and is reported at the web address he cites, Texas Beyond History <http://www.texasbeyonddhistory.net/falcon>.
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Archaeological Ethics and Capitalism: From Ethics to Politics is an edited volume in which the authors scrutinize the centralized position of archaeology in the contemporary world, and archaeology’s political and social impact on diverse publics. The work is a culmination of various position papers from the symposium, An Ethical Archaeology in a Capitalist World, held at the fifth meeting of the World Archaeology Congress. The chapters cover various aspects of long-established ethics in archaeology, and critically evaluate archaeologists’ self-imposed responsibilities and relevance in the modern capitalist world. What is called into serious question is archaeologists’ position within society, and the book is a call for all archaeologists to understand that they are part of the social and political capitalist structures that serve to organize, motivate, and constrain approaches to the study of the past and its application in the present. In each particular case, the authors argue that this critical thinking will lead to a more socially and politically informed, and thus ethical, archaeology.

The book is set up in four parts, headed “Introduction,” “Ethics in Questions, Archaeology in Capitalism,” “Archaeology as Capitalism,” and “Ethical Futures, Emancipatory Archaeologies.” Fodder for discussion and a call for action begin with the first pages of the book. Randall McGuire sets the stage with his introduction questioning the craft of archaeology and toward whom it is or should be directed. It is an important query that requires in-depth thought and a repositioning of the archaeologist in the study of the past produced in the present. This critical stance is carried through each chapter, culminating in Dean Saitta’s final commentary on the social, economic, and political impacts of archaeological research on present-day communities. The sections of the book tackle differing aspects of the larger issue and provide unique perspectives drawn from individual experiences.

The chapters in part 2 take on the debate of objectivity in archaeology and the interpretation of the past. The authors dismiss all notions of objectivity and argue for a shift in focus that urges all archaeologists to recognize that knowledge is produced in the present, and therefore archaeological work should be accountable to contemporary groups and include them in the creation of research designs. Alongside community involvement in knowledge production and restructuring archaeological ethics resides a prevalent theme in each chapter—ownership of the past. Alexander Bauer, Shane Lindsay, and Stephen Urice raise the issue that existing ethical standards are inefficient in terms of how descendant communities view their own heritage and antiquities. The authors suggest that without intimate knowledge of the descendant community and the values of its heritage and ancestors, archaeologists claiming objectivity, control of materials and knowledge, and stewardship may not be all that different from looters. George Nicholas and Julie Hollowell argue for a stronger applied approach to archaeology, involving a shift in focus that entails using archaeology to find solutions to the social, political, economic, and environmental problems of present-day communities. Charles Riggs and Nick Shepard bring to light pitfalls and miscues when archaeologists try to remain objective or serve the discipline, while at the same time attempting to work with a diverse community. Shepard’s cautionary tale of Cape Town is revealing, and illustrates the contestation of ownership of, and empowerment through archaeological remains in the face of modern development.

Part 3 shines a light on the practice of archaeology influenced and shaped by modern capitalism. It is not a study of capitalism, but rather it is a critique, and challenges archaeologists to acknowledge their culpability within contemporary capitalist practices. The authors structure archaeological practice based on the idea (or ideology) of archaeological knowledge being
produced and the disseminated knowledge being consumed. Paul Everill looks at the system of labor (highly trained, poorly paid archaeologists) and the extraction of the raw materials (archaeological data) for knowledge creation. Everill argues that contract archaeology is increasingly market driven, which creates competition, which in turn creates tensions between budgets and deadlines, and leads ultimately to the decline in the quality of life for thousands of the discipline’s highly educated proletariat. In a different view of archaeology and capitalism, three chapters written by Pedro Funari and Erika Robrahan-González, Neil Silberman, and Alison Kehoe look at market forces and their impact within the business of heritage management, and how archaeological sites are used to pander to heritage tourism—the profits only benefit non-indigenous developers. Silberman further explains how heritage sites, originally meant to be used as tools for public education, have succumbed to capitalist forces through the idea of earning revenue as sanitized leisure-time destinations. Helaine Silverman also looks into heritage tourism and competition for knowledge (and profit) between an indigenous, local museum and a privately operated, sanitized, upscale tourist-driven museum. Tamima Mourd’s chapter is a call to reevaluate the position of archaeologists in the political context of the area in which they work, as well as archaeologists’ ethical responsibility in aiding and participating in imperialists’ projects. In Mourd’s case she is speaking directly about archaeologists participating in various military-funded or -headed projects, and revealing the impact of European and U.S. colonialism and oppression in the Near and Middle East. Her research is a plea to question humanitarian values and archaeological ethics as they relate to conducting archaeology in areas of conflict or war zones. The idea of protection and cultural rights come into question, and this, according to the author, conflicts with any venture associated with military occupation.

The work in part 4 provides directions for archaeology’s ethical future. It revolves around the realization that archaeologists’ responsibilities rest with both descendant communities and non-descendant populations in areas where the practice of archaeology will have an impact. With differing approaches, the chapters in this section are a call to action through political and socially relevant archaeological praxis. The chapters in this section, such as those by Ermengol Gasiot Balbé, Joaquim Puigdoménech, Elena Sintes Olives, and Dawine Wolfe Steadman, and Reinhard Bernbeck and Susan Pollock, confront the role of archaeology and the ideology of memorialization and identity politics. Memorials lead to a collective amnesia, as monuments are offered up as closure rather than discussion of events past and present. The authors from this section astutely identify that these memorials avoid confrontation, as they create an environment of what is called a “reconciliatory consensus” that deadens the monuments’ impact on the politics of the present. Balbé and his colleagues argue that archaeology should be firmly positioned in political praxis that entails fusion between the archaeologist and the activist. Ronayne’s study is very interesting because she intentionally moves away from any instinctual feeling to excavate or attempt to “recover the past” in light of major government construction displacing whole villages—and destroying the archaeological record. Instead, Ronayne identifies the local population’s concern with archaeology and its correlation with government activities. Her work sheds a cold light of reality on how archaeology can be perceived outside the discipline.

The overall goal of the book is to challenge critically the foundations of archaeology in order to promote discussion and create a new path for archaeological practice. The scholars in this book certainly meet, and at times surpass the book’s expectations. If there is a downside it is the number of complex topics and examples in a single book. It is evident that each section in its own right represents a separate book. The sheer number of diverse locations and specific case studies makes it somewhat easy for the reader to lose the common theme or thread of the entire treatise. As a result, the flow between sections, and at times chapters, loses a bit of continuity. The book may have benefited from the inclusion of a section with discussion among the authors in the form of reaction papers. This is probably next to impossible in the book’s current state, because it would simply add to the already copious amounts of information, making for an extremely long book. This is a very minor point, and should not detract from
an otherwise well-written and thought-provoking book. Although this is a critique, it is also a testament to the level of scholarship, since the reader wants to know more about what each author is thinking. As stated above, such things are minor critiques of what is a fantastic book. It does successfully educate and inspire. It is timely, necessary, and certainly relevant to archaeologists and archaeology students of all levels.

STEPHEN A. BRIGHTON
DEPARTMENT OF ANTHROPOLOGY
CENTER FOR HERITAGE RESOURCE STUDIES
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND
COLLEGE PARK, MD 20742
Archaeology as Political Action
Randall H. McGuire
University of California Press, Berkeley, 2008. 312 pp., 9 b&w photos, 3 maps, index. $29.95 paper.

McGuire urges archaeologists to take action and make the world a better place, whether that is by uncovering lost truths through archaeology, collaborating with subaltern communities, or making conditions more fair within the field itself. He uses dialectical Marxist theory to describe how he strives to accomplish this in his own work. He argues that archaeologists should engage in praxis, which he describes as “seeking to know the world, critique the world, and most important to take action in the world” (p. 220). This Marx-inspired view of praxis is more specific than the praxis found in post-modern practice theory. McGuire focuses on transformational and emancipatory actions that benefit humankind. He emphasizes collective action, rather than individual agency, and uses class as a launching point for his work. He acknowledges that the use of Marxism is not the only means of praxis, for example, citing similarly transformational work in feminist, indigenous, and other critical archaeologies.

The cover art for this book looks like a red flag. Be aware, reading the first half of the book feels like being shaken by the shoulders and berated for engaging in bourgeois self-indulgence and political apathy. For example, he suggests that unlike the working classes, “the bourgeoisie have no interests in transformation [of the world]” (p. 96). According to McGuire, many American archaeologists in particular dislike politics. They wish that everyone would just be friends so they can “get back to sorting potsherds” (p. 17). Readers might wonder if these are fair accusations. McGuire passionately urges readers to do some soul searching as to how their archaeological practices might contribute to oppression within the world and within the discipline.

As a text firmly grounded in Marxist theory, the book bears Marxism’s merits and potential shortcomings. On the one hand, McGuire presents inspiring discussions of class and material inequality, and these discussions are a significant contribution to a humanistic archaeology of capitalism. On the other hand, his critique that political ideologies mask and obscure the political nature of the past (p. 235), might not give people enough credit for recognizing that they are oppressed. It is a complex debate that will not be resolved here.

Nonetheless, McGuire’s point that archaeology is inherently political is well taken. It is grounded in a vivid mosaic of examples from around the world, demonstrating how archaeology has made a difference, for better or worse. He also provides two lengthier case studies of his own research in the U.S. and Mexico. These examples and case studies are the strength of the book and give readers guidance in practicing the transformational archaeology that McGuire advocates.

One chapter details his collaborative work in Mexico, as well as the history of archaeology in Mexico and its connections with perceived U.S. imperialism and Mexican nationalism. He contextualizes modern archaeology in Mexico within an age of fast capitalism and neoliberalism that increasingly results in commodified and privatized archaeology, not unlike trends in the U.S. Stories from this chapter indicate some of the challenges of international collaboration, ranging from differences in participants’ research goals, resources, languages, and even expectations regarding dining in the field. In describing his collaborative work, he outlines the complex relationships between Mexican archaeologists, U.S. archaeologists, Nortenos (Spanish descendants in northern Mexico), and members of the Tohono O’odham nation (whose traditional lands span the U.S.-Mexico border). For example, he describes a failed attempt to repatriate Tohono O’odham inhumations after consultation among the three nations was unsuccessful.

Perhaps the strongest chapter in this book outlines archaeological work by a field school at the Ludlow Massacre site, which was part of the Colorado Coalfield War, 1913–1914. The site was the location of a bloody conflict between
Colorado National Guardsmen and armed strikers, resulting in the deaths of men, women, and children. At this site and in this chapter, McGuire collaborated with other archaeologists, calling themselves the Ludlow Collective. They cite their main target audience as unionized laborers, rather than the middle classes who are typically drawn to archaeology. Similar to the chapter on Mexico, this chapter only briefly discusses the excavations on the site (for more on that work, see a fascinating book by another member of the Ludlow Collective, Dean J. Saitta, 2007, *The Archaeology of Collective Action*, University Press of Florida, Tallahassee). Here, McGuire uses the project as a platform to discuss a number of concrete ideas for doing archaeology in a way that benefits people other than the lead archaeologists themselves. For example, archaeologists worked with Colorado public schools to develop teaching materials based on the events at Ludlow. They also coordinated the archaeological field school to overlap with the United Mine Workers of America’s annual memorial service at the massacre site. There, field school students had opportunities to meet unionized miners who were then striking for many of the same issues (such as an eight-hour day) that were the catalysts of the Ludlow massacre almost a hundred years ago. On a similar note, field school students were only asked to work five eight-hour days each week. This was arranged with the express purpose of teaching students their rights as workers, and leading them to question longer workdays that will surely be asked of them once they enter the field professionally.

As part archaeology, part ethnography, part political history, part humanist manifesto, this book will be of interest to diverse audiences, such as those in historical archaeology, applied anthropology, and indigenous studies. It should raise awareness for professionals in academia and heritage management, and selections from the book could be used in the classroom for fruitful discussions of archaeological theory and practice, as well as collaborative archaeology.

Sarah E. Cowie
Department of Anthropology
University of Arizona
Tucson, AZ 85721-0030
Guide to Documentary Sources for Andean Studies, 1530–1900 (3 vols.)
Joanne Pillsbury (editor)
University of Oklahoma Press, Norman, 2008. 1,296 pp., index. $195.00 cloth.

This is the first book of its kind: a comprehensive guide to published documentary sources for the early modern Andes, covering virtually all genres—chronicles, treatises, administrative inspections (visitas), travelers’ accounts, belles lettres, theological and pastoral literature, and Amerindian linguistics. In three sturdy, large-format volumes on heavy paper, with elegant maps and attached red-ribbon bookmarks, the Guide is a luxury production. As authors, the editor recruited some of the best Andean scholars of South America, North America, and Europe, many of them the foremost authorities on their subjects. They include (among many others) Rolena Adorno, Xavier Albó, Noble David Cook, Pierre Duviols, Teodoro Hampe, Catherine Julien, Sabine MacCormack, Luis Millones, Kenneth Mills, Juan Ossio, Franklin Pease, Frank Salomon, Nicolás Sánchez-Albornoz, John Frederick Schwaller, and Gary Urton. Volume 1 has essays on documentary genres, while volumes 2 and 3 are an alphabetical encyclopedia of almost 200 authors and texts.

The Guide’s coverage is more selective than its title suggests. While the first volume has some useful information about archival documents, the Guide is essentially devoted to published sources. Furthermore, in spite of its broad genre coverage, it pays relatively little attention to the 18th and 19th centuries, to the Chilean, Venezuelan, and Colombian Andes, or to Hispanic colonial society. The heart of the project is a subject that has occupied ethnohistorians’ attention for the last half century: colonial documentation of indigenous peoples in what had been the Inca heartland. The key documents discussed are Spanish chronicles of the Inca and colonial states, administrative inspections of tribute-paying Indian communities, and Spanish churchmen’s studies of Indian cultures, languages, and “idolatrous” religion. The one body of 19th-century sources that receives sustained treatment is the writings of foreign scientific travelers, from the Germans Johann Jakob von Tschudi and Max Uhle, to the American Ephraim George Squier.

Within these parameters, the book is remarkably complete. The entries in volumes 2 and 3 are almost uniformly clear, full, and succinct. Especially useful are the entries’ bibliographies of manuscripts, first editions, and later editions and translations up to today. The entries have fascinating details, such as the dry crust of bread thrown in a Harvard College food fight, by which the 19th-century historian William Prescott lost much of his sight. Some are marvels of encapsulation, as when Rolena Adorno synthesizes the fruit of her decades of work on the indigenous artist and chronicler Felipe Guaman Poma de Ayala. The linguist Rodolfo Cerrón-Palomino contributes a compact biography of the author of the first grammar of Mochica, the now-lost language of the north Peruvian coast; the historian Kenneth Mills does the same for Diego de Ocaña, a curious and observant cleric who toured the Andes to raise funds for a Spanish shrine. Alongside the well-known Andean authors, the Guide includes many less familiar ones: an entry by Caesar Farah and Stuart Schwartz on Ilyas ibn Hanna al-Mausuli (a Syrian Christian priest and traveler, who in 1668 produced the first Arabic-language account of the Andes), one by Teresa Gisbert and Tom Cummins on the Prince of Sansevero (an 18th-century Italian freemason and Inca enthusiast), and another by Gisbert on Melchor Maria Mercado (a 19th-century watercolor painter of Peruvian and Bolivian scenes).

Volume 1 is somewhat less well executed than the other two. Its thematic essays are sophisticated but not always systematic. It lacks an integrated account of the government institutions that produced many of the documents. The various types of church councils are the subject of three separate essays, yet their institutional context is never fully explained. A number of the essays, however, are excellent and systematic surveys of
their subjects. Among them are Regina Harrison’s on church doctrinal treatises, Sabine Dedenbach-Salazar’s on indigenous-language dictionaries, Noble David Cook’s on administrative inspections and censuses, Barbara Mundy’s on relaciones geográficas, and Raquel Chang-Rodriguez’s on literary poetry and prose.

The volumes also have abundant full-page black-and-white illustrations, which are well printed (if somewhat low contrast). Many are facsimiles from illustrated manuscripts, such as drawings by Guaman Poma, and an extraordinary cosmological line drawing by the Indian author Santa Cruz Pachacuti Yamqui Salcamaygua. Equally lovely are lithographs and engravings from 19th-century scientist’s books, which include images of Inca ruins, botanical diagrams, and maps.

In spite of the three volumes’ length (totaling well over 1,000 pages), space is sometimes wasted. The illustrations are not always well served by full-page reproduction, such as 16th-century book frontispieces that were smaller in their original versions. Some of their space might have been better devoted to text, since some entries are too brief to do their subjects justice. The entry on the important chronicler Pedro de Cieza de León by the late Franklin Pease—perhaps the world’s most qualified author on the subject—is far too short at 1,000 words (apart from bibliography). Much of the space is taken up by three pages of crude woodcuts, originally published with Cieza’s text, and reproduced much larger than necessary.

In spite of relatively minor reservations, this book will be vital for a range of readers, particularly historical archaeologists. The colonial Andes produced one of the richest documentary records available for any premodern society, but one that is singularly opaque to a nonspecialist. The early modern Spanish had an information culture: their state was bureaucratic, their society legalistic, their scribes and authors numerous. Many documents were published, some in their own time, others in later centuries. These sources (like all historical sources) are complex, treacherous, but indispensable. Vital complements to field archaeology for both the pre-colonial and colonial eras, these colonial sources are available in any research library, but are all but useless without an understanding of their historical context. Fortunately, historians and literary scholars have produced a large body of knowledge about their authors, genres, modes of production, and agendas. The Guide to Documentary Sources provides much of this information in a single reference guide.

Jeremy Ravi Mumford
Department of History
University of Mississippi
Oxford, MS 38677
Dreams of the Americas: Overview of New France Archaeology
Christian Roy and Hélène Côté (editors)
Association des Archéologues du Québec, QC, 2008. 242 pp., illus., index. $25.00 paper.

The bilingual volume *Dreams of the Americas: Overview of New France Archaeology* is a superb introduction to the extremely varied studies being conducted on French colonial archaeological sites throughout the hemisphere, and the benefits that can result from academic cooperation and communication across international borders. Published to commemorate the 400th anniversary of the founding of Quebec city, this ambitious volume succeeds in celebrating that French heritage by calling attention to the impact of French traders, colonists, soldiers, merchants, and sailors throughout the former colonial domain. The book accomplishes the impressive goal of presenting research conducted throughout the French colonies, from the frozen reaches of northern Canada to the humid isles of the French West Indies, by some of the most recognizable names in French colonial archaeology today.

Although the legacy of France’s colonial American empire is readily apparent in francophone Canada and the islands of Guadeloupe and Martinique, this French heritage is not nearly as tangible in other areas of this formerly vast realm. Once comprising a significant portion of the North American continent and the Caribbean, much of the French colonial domain was gradually conquered by, or traded to colonial rivals. Although French is one of Canada’s national languages, French place names dot much of the mid-continent, and spicy étouffées still feature on creole menus, many North Americans are more familiar with the continent’s British, and even Spanish, heritage. Even those well informed about French colonial history are typically more knowledgeable about famous explorers and statesmen—like Champlain, Iberville, and La Salle—than about the common individuals who traded with native peoples, farmed the land, mined natural resources, and voyaged by canoe via the inland rivers. Until recently, researchers had generally ignored the role of France in the European settlement of the Americas or focused solely on the superstars of French exploration and colonization. Fortunately, in the past several decades historians and archaeologists have begun to explore France’s unique colonial policies, practices, and establishments in North America, as well as the lives of French inhabitants and traders who toiled in relative anonymity. *Dreams of the Americas* participates in this crucial enrichment of the historical record through a variety of studies that showcase the architecture, industrial exploits, foodways, maritime transportation, and diverse material culture of New France’s colonial inhabitants.

Since *Dreams of the Americas* was published to celebrate the anniversary of the founding of Quebec city, it logically follows that the first two, as well as the last of the volume’s thirteen articles concern archaeology in Quebec. Françoise Niellon’s excellent resume of the history of the city’s earliest years is a fitting introduction to the volume’s exceptional scholarship. Through detailed archival research and well-selected graphics, Niellon evokes a poignant image of the hardships endured by Quebec’s earliest European settlers. Marcel Moussette and William Moss, two researchers intimately familiar with archaeology in Quebec, continue the discussion by bringing the reader up to speed on the colonial archaeology conducted throughout the city. In addition, Moussette and Moss place Quebec in context through a comparison to Montreal, and a broader look at the differences in colonial expansion between the French in Canada and the British in America. Following this introduction to Quebec city, Peter Pope provides an excellent discussion of the importance of the North American cod fishery to France and the industry’s impact on a specific region of Newfoundland, through the framework of a maritime cultural landscape study, an approach that successfully integrates.
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a consideration of both terrestrial and maritime archaeological resources.

Kenneth Kelly next transports the reader from the cold Canadian north to the tropical islands of the French Antilles, and introduces plantation archaeology in an oft-ignored corner of the Caribbean. Kelly’s examination of plantations on both Guadeloupe and Martinique presents some intriguing disparities and interesting conclusions about the effect of different colonial regimes and historical trajectories on the institution of slavery in the Caribbean. Returning to Canada, Marc Lavoie’s summary and interpretation of the archaeological work conducted on Acadian homesteads in Belle-Isle, Novia Scotia, in connection with his careful reading of the relevant historical documents, provides a comprehensive view of Acadian life in this corner of the colony, especially in regard to the familial connections that bound residents together and structured their interactions. Though Lavoie provides several tables and figures, the chapter would have benefited from a graphic illustration of the complex genealogical associations described, as the relationships between several generations of Acadians are less than clear to a reader unfamiliar with the area’s former inhabitants.

Venturing into the central regions of France’s North American colonies, the following three chapters explore French occupation in America’s heartland at Fort St. Joseph in Michigan (Michael Nassaney), Fort Toulouse in Alabama (Craig Sheldon, Ned Jenkins, and Gregory Waselkov), and Pointe Coupée in Louisiana (Rob Mann). Recent excavations at these sites, as described in the chapters, highlight the potential each holds for illuminating the history of the French in the mid-continent. In addition, the widely separated locations of these occupation sites confront the reader with the reality of the vast expanse once claimed by France.

Following these site- and region-specific studies, the final five chapters examine particular types or categories of material culture across broader segments of the French colonial empire. Hélène Côté’s superb article compares vernacular architecture in New France to its counterpart in France to determine the possible social, economic, and ecological reasons for the choice of particular styles in the colonies. Her broader analysis reveals insights into the owners, builders, and tenants of various buildings, insights that would have remained hidden in an individual consideration of each site. Paul-Gaston L’Anglais’s chapter on faience investigates the temporal introduction of various plate styles that may assist in dating archaeological features and sites, along with other attributes such as decoration. Unfortunately, L’Anglais limits his examination of faience plates to those found in Quebec, whereas a more expansive look at faience from archaeological excavations throughout the French colonies might have strengthened his conclusions. Terrance Martin’s assessment of faunal remains from various sites in the Illinois Country, and Yves Monette’s study of lead deposits and lead exploitation in New France demonstrate the utility of specialized analysis for intersite comparison that reveals trends among sites and differences between them. Finally, Daniel LaRoche’s chapter ends the volume where the reader began—Quebec city—and rounds out the volume by presenting an analysis of three French colonial maritime vessels found in the city during construction on the riverfront.

Though a comprehensive work that introduces the reader to French colonial archaeology throughout the former empire, as with any good compilation, Dreams of the Americas merely whets the reader’s appetite for more information on different regions, especially the Antilles and the colony of Louisiane, and specializations within the discipline, such as isotope analysis and maritime archaeology. Nevertheless, this book is an ideal text for introductory courses on French colonial archaeology, and due to an equal distribution of French- and English-language articles, appeals to native speakers of both languages. The volume’s broad coverage by renowned experts in the field of French colonial archaeology makes it a superlative addition to any library on general colonial history and archaeology, and essential to any collection of works on the French colonies.

KENDRA KENNEDY
DEPARTMENT OF ANTHROPOLOGY
UNIVERSITY OF WEST FLORIDA
PENSACOLA, FL 32514
The History of Witchcraft: Sorcerers, Heretics, and Pagans
Jeffrey B. Russell and Brooks Alexander
Thames & Hudson, New York, NY, 2008. 216 pp., 105 illus., index. $21.95 paper.

Witchcraft is perhaps not at the top of the list of subjects historical archaeologists need to brush up on, but as with all other religious phenomena, material culture associated with the practice of witchcraft or sorcery may be encountered and require interpretation. The second edition of this overview of historical themes in witchcraft adds to the original 1980 volume a second author, a revised introduction, and two new chapters on contemporary witchcraft. Essentially an intellectual history, it does not examine material culture in detail, but does provide a framework and background that may have utility for researchers.

The introduction gives the reader a useful overview of topics covered (and not covered) as well as an important lesson in terminology. The authors provide etymological background on the many terms thrown around in these circles—witch, sorcerer, magician, pagan, wicca—and place them in the perspectives of the disciplines that use them. Anthropologists, historians, and practitioners prefer different definitions and look at witchcraft from unique angles, and a review of these distinctions is important to understanding the remainder of the book.

Russell and Alexander begin by discussing sorcery, initially as a worldwide phenomenon, its context in ancient history, then as an element of later European witchcraft which absorbs the next several chapters. By sorcery, the authors mean the attempt to manipulate the hidden connections among natural phenomena, and include various kinds of magic within that sphere. Official religion or private act, mechanical or spirit-based in conception, high (alchemy, astrology) or low (midwifery, spells), the complexity of sorcery and paganism was simplified, distilled, and categorized over time through Hebrew, Greek, Roman, and then Christian lenses. The blurring of sorcery with demonology, and association with things un-Christian led to the medieval and Renaissance concept of the evil witch. It is unfortunate that the authors drop the discussion of everyday sorcery/magic, as for much of medieval and modern history one is far more likely to encounter evidences of these phenomena than of witchcraft as they define it.

In the chapter on the origins of European witchcraft (leaving the rest of the world behind at this point) the authors examine the interaction of various belief systems to codify witchcraft as an activity of evil. There are many strands of thought, ranging from the growth of dualism in Western monotheism (i.e., Satan in opposition to God), cultural traditions of the festivals of Dionysos and Bacchus leading to the witches’ sabbat (early anti-Jewish attitudes emerging), and the long process of replacement of northern European paganism with Christianity. Here also, the authors discuss various schools of historical thought, including ecclesiastical invention, folkloric/pagan survival, and Christian heresy. Clearly, they see the stereotype of the witch—attending the orgiastic sabbat, riding a broom, killing and eating children, desecrating the cross, making a pact with Satan—as a composite of concepts from these historical strains of thought that did not crystallize until the 14th century.

One particularly enlightening thread of discussion is the continuing conflation of sorcery with demonology (only evil spirits could be commanded), and thus its inevitable link with heresy, a religious rather than civil crime. Attacks on heretical sects such as the Cathars and Waldenses on the continent set the stage for a series of church inquisitions resulting in the torture, confession, and burning of many thousands of the accused from 1450 to 1700. Curiously, in Britain (and the colonies) witchcraft was not so connected to heresy, and thus was treated as a civil crime with capital punishment in the form of hanging. Separate chapters on the witch craze on the continent and in Britain examine these trends, both intellectual and legal, in detail. The year 1450 is a key date in the spread of witch prosecutions, when the number of trials dramati-
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cally increased just as legal/religious treatises on witchcraft such as *Malleus Maleficarum* (1486) were rolling off the earliest printing presses. The spread of knowledge coincided with the spread of fear in significant ways.

After working through the conceptual and legal basis for witchcraft prosecutions, Russell and Alexander discuss the nature of witchcraft and society during this period. Suggesting that searching for the social mechanisms involved in accusations limits a broader understanding of the phenomenon, they elaborate on issues related to gender, the Reformation and its effects, and the psychological and cultural climate that fueled the witch craze. The decline of witch hunts is placed squarely in the realm of changing cultural and religious attitudes brought about by the skeptical philosophy, where *maleficium* lost its credibility, and witchcraft and possession were begun to be seen as individual aberrant behavior rather than a supernatural conspiracy.

Late chapters detail the intellectual origins of the modern witchcraft movement, beginning with the Romantic revival of pagan ideas melded with occult interests, secret societies, and suspect scholarship. The authors characterize modern witchcraft as a combination of survivals and revivals, with many neopagan concepts largely inventions of the 20th century. This thesis is laid out in some detail, ending with an up-to-date chapter on contemporary trends, including feminism, 1960s counterculture, and the use of the Internet to create the modern Wiccan community. These last sections are enjoyable, but somewhat breathless in pace, and less relevant to historical archaeologists.

Of particular interest are the many images presented in the book, ranging from fanciful historic drawings of witches cavorting with the Devil, to presumably more-accurate renderings of gallows, burning grounds, and torture chambers. The witch house in Bamberg, Germany in the early 1600s (no longer standing) is displayed in elevation and plan view (p. 87), both fascinating in its detail and horrific in its implications. Contemporary photos display modern paraphernalia of neopagan ritual, along with a couple of temporary ritual sites in use. The illustration of a Bellarmine jug containing human hair, nail clippings, and a pin-stuck cloth heart from excavations at Westminster (p. 19), begs further discussion, but as with many of the other objects displayed in this volume, they are illustrative rather than subjects of analysis. The authors do better with paintings and drawings in terms of incorporating them into their discussions.

In summary, this is a good, concise overview of the history of witchcraft, focusing in turn on Europe, Britain, and most recently, America. As intellectual history it provides excellent background information and a good bibliography for further research on the topic. For the historical archaeologist it falls short, largely in using material culture as a source of interesting illustrations rather than as an integral part of its presentation. For a more directly relevant study, the reader should consult Ralph Merrifield’s *The Archaeology of Ritual and Magic* (1988, New Amsterdam Books, New York, NY).

**Jeff Wanser**
**Hiram College Library**
**Hiram College**
**Hiram, OH 44234**
Reviews
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Edited by Charles R. Ewen
French Colonial Pottery: An International Conference
George Avery (editor)
Northwestern State University of Louisiana Press, Nachitoches, 2007. 486 pp. $75.00 paper.

Could this be the “better” guide to French ceramics on colonial sites? The volume was born of a conference on French pottery in North America held in September 2002 in Marksville, Louisiana. It showcased speakers from the U.S., Canada, and France. Out of the 14 chapters gathered by editor George Avery, 13 were presented at this meeting. The conference poster and program, as well as a list of participants and their paper abstracts are included at the end of the book. As Avery warns his readers, some chapters are more like transcripts of oral presentations rather than formal research papers.

Gregory Waselkov and John Walthall published their classification system for French faiences shortly before the conference took place, making the gathering a natural venue to discuss their work. Because chapters 2, 3, 4, and 14 specifically deal with this topic, they will be examined together after the others have been reviewed.

Chapter 1, “Update on the ‘Tunica Treasure,’” by Earl Barbry, Jr., opens the volume with the transcript of a conversation that he had with H. F. “Pete” Gregory and George Avery. Their exchange focuses on the “Tunica Treasure” after it was repatriated to the Tunica-Biloxi tribe of Louisiana. The tribe was committed to handling this important collection with care, and wanted to use it as a public education tool. They restored some of the ceramics and decided to display both sherds and whole vessels to denounce the effects of grave looting on their culture. Interestingly, they came to see the preservation of the ceramics in their museum as a symbolic reburial, and one that precludes a real re-interment of this fundamental collection. This chapter exhibits 53 beautiful pictures of whole ceramic vessels from the “Tunica Treasure.” The pictures are striking but come with very little information about the ceramics themselves.

In chapter 5, “Nearly Half a Century of Research in Québéc,” Marcel Moussette summarizes 50 years of research on French pottery in the St. Lawrence Valley. The field took off with historical archaeology in the 1960s. Two Parks Canada laboratories, Ottawa and Louisbourg, played an instrumental role in putting out the first publications. Then, the still indispensable Collection Patrimoine on Place Royale was started. Most of these early publications were, appropriately, very descriptive. More recently, there has been a shift away from the stylistic approach, towards archaeometric analysis. This is partly due to the problem of the identification of coarse earthenwares and because locally made vessels look like imported ones. With micro-morphological and chemical analyses, Michel Blackburn and Moussette proved that some “North Devon” coarse earthenwares were in fact not English at all. Given this great result, more archaeometric studies are underway, including a promising survey of Laurentian potters by Yves Monette. This chapter has 18 excellent pictures of ceramics from the sites of the Intendant’s Palace in Quebec city, La Prairie near Montreal, and Nouvelle-Ferme on Île-aux-Oies.

As discussed in chapter 6, “Archaeometric Applications in the St. Lawrence Valley,” Yves Monette, Marc Richer-LaFlèche, and Marcel Moussette also analyzed the coarse earthenwares from the farming site of the Rocher de la Chapelle on Île-aux-Oies. They applied petrographic analysis and ICP-MS (inductively coupled plasma mass spectrometry) to 77 sherds. They found out that local wares do have a distinct composition, and in particular, higher levels of sodium. They also came up with new groupings for the ceramics that seem to indicate that more than one local potter was involved in their production. Variations in the rubidium-strontium ratio (Rb/Sr) may ultimately help identify various workshops, and perhaps narrow down their locations in the St. Lawrence Valley. The authors have included the scatter plots and tables mentioned in the text, which facilitate the reading. There is also a handy appendix of the compositional data of the ceramics they analyzed.
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Chapter 7, “A Provence Perspective,” is by Henri Amouric and Lucy Vallauri, two long-standing specialists in French ceramics from Provence, in southeastern France. Since their chapter is written in French, it will be summarized in more detail here.

In France, the work of Jean Chapelot on the Saintonge potters was a stepping-stone for studies of ceramics on colonial sites. More recently, the development of historical archaeology in the French Caribbean, of urban excavations of both consumer sites and pottery, and archival research in southern France have all pushed the field forward.

Amouric and Vallauri first address the issue of ceramic identification. They note that stonewares from the Loire Valley remain the least well known of the French stonewares. For French faïences, decoration style seems more significant than origin. Some of the popular local decorations have been found not only in Moustiers, Marseille, and Varages, but also Toulouse and Montpellier. Other Moustiers decorations were copied in Bordeaux and Samadet. Geochemical analyses are sometimes helpful. For example, they helped distinguish between faïences from Moustiers and others from Varages, Nevers, or Montpellier. Plain faïence, blanche or brune, poses an even bigger identification problem, and plain French and Italian tin-glazed earthenware can appear identical.

The authors then acknowledged the recent advances also made outside of Provence. There is now no doubt that Albisola ware, that appeared at the end of the 17th century in Italy, was widely imitated in France, in Toulouse, Bordeaux, Nevers, and Lyon for example. Saintonge dominated the colonial market in the 17th century, but other potteries competed with it in the next century. Amouric and Vallauri suspect that green-glazed tableware and sugar forms from Sadirac, for example, were exported to the colonies. They mention the presence of coarse earthenware cooking pots and painted tableware from Cox on colonial sites as well. In fact, Cox alone did not produce all of these ceramics. Painted tableware and cooking pots were also made in Giroussens and Lomagne, near Toulouse, and Giroussens wares seem to be the most frequent type found on colonial sites.

Amouric and Vallauri’s comments on their area of expertise, Marseilles, are the most pertinent. Beside faïences from Marseilles, Moustiers, and Varages, they identify Huveaune tableware, cookware from both Vallauris and Biot, and storage vessels from Biot in colonial assemblages. Huveaune ceramics were all slip decorated, but either painted, decorated with circles of dots, or marbled. Their background appeared red or yellow. The better pieces were incised and show flowers, birds, fish, and sometimes people. Bowls, basins, and chamber pots were the most exported forms.

Pottery at Biot and Vallauris thrived for centuries because of their location next to the Mediterranean Sea and their clay rich in kaolinite. For the colonies they made cooking pots, cooking pans, bowls, chafing dishes, and some tableware. Biot also specialized in large oil jars and container pots for fresh grapes. In the latter, grapes could be preserved long enough to reach New France, or be stored until Christmastime.

In the authors’ view, Italian ceramics from the Gulf of Genoa are inextricably linked to Provence potteries. To their surprise, Albisola wares have been identified on colonial sites, but not plain white faïences from Genoa and blue-on-white faïences from Savona. Amouric and Vallauri claim to recognize some of them in the faïences from Place Royale.

Their conclusions about the colonial ceramic trade are that ceramics came from the regions that dominated Atlantic commerce. Saintonge earthenwares and stonewares were most common from 1650 to 1700, when French cities on the Atlantic Coast were in the lead. In the 18th century, some of this trade was redirected to the southeast of France and its Mediterranean ports. The routes were either direct across seas, or indirect and transported through southwestern France. Marseilles traded heavily with the Antilles, but also with New France, and between 1731 and 1770 with New Orleans.

Amouric and Vallauri conclude by noting the absence of ceramics from Saint-Quentin-la-Poterie, Dieulefit, or Saint-Jean-de-Fos on colonial sites—rather surprising since those were major pottery centers. For the faïences, they think that exports from Provence largely dominated the colonial market, which is debatable. They wish that Spanish and Italian tin-glazed ceramics could be more easily distinguished, and that more 19th-century sites were studied. Hypothetically, Turkish pipes and ceramics could have
reached the colonies through the same routes as Chinese porcelain—these Turkish wares are not rare in Provence. Finally, they wonder about what kind of faience might have been made in New Orleans by the potter Pierre Paul Caussy. The colonial archives contain traces of his activity there, between 1729 and 1732, and before he relocated to Rouen.

This text is richly illustrated. Most of its 54 pictures depict ceramics from Provence and Italy, and have already appeared in previous French publications.

In chapter 8, “From Texas, La Belle and Fort St. Louis,” authors James Bruseth and Jeff Durst present the excavations of the ship La Belle and Fort St. Louis. French explorer René Robert Cavelier de La Salle was trying to locate the mouth of the Mississippi River when he landed on the Texas coast in 1684. Fort St. Louis was the location of his short-lived colony, and La Belle was the last ship to survive this expedition. Eventually, La Salle also lost La Belle in a storm, with all his cargo aboard. The shipwreck was found in 1995. A cofferdam allowed James Bruseth and his team to excavate the wreck as a terrestrial site. They dismembered its hull timber by timber and recovered over a million artifacts.

Archaeological work at Fort St. Louis started in the 1950s. It was Kathleen Gilmore who confirmed in the 1970s that this was indeed the site of La Salle’s colony (chapter 9, this review). Magnetometer survey and excavations have yielded maps of both its Spanish and French occupations. The density of green lead-glazed ceramics helped narrow down the location of the French fort. This chapter has interesting fieldwork pictures, survey maps, and site plans of Fort St. Louis. It also has pictures from La Chapelle-des-Pots in France, where the authors took a trip to see Saintonge ceramics. Please note that the name of this village is misspelled as “La Chapelle de Pots” in the book. Spelling does matter, as there is also an historic pottery called La Chapelle-aux-Pots in Beauvaisis.

In chapter 9, “Ceramics from Fort St. Louis,” Kathleen Gilmore contributed a delightful account of how she became acquainted with French ceramics, and how she identified the Keeran site as Fort St. Louis. She recognized early on the importance for French colonial sites of green-glazed coarse earthenware, and acknowledges the difficulty of distinguishing between some French and Spanish ceramics. Her pictures of coarse earthenware, faience, and majolica illustrate the point.

Chapter 10 is titled “Onboard La Belle.” Ceramics from La Belle amounted to 31 whole or almost complete vessels and 258 sherds. Nancy Reese’s paper focuses on the whole vessels: 5 faience, 14 coarse earthenware, and 12 stoneware. The faience vessels were all plain apothecary jars called albarelle or albarello in French. It is unlikely that they were made in La Rochelle however, as Reese proposes. Even if La Rochelle were indeed specialized in apothecary jars, the faience pottery there only started in 1721, while La Belle sank in 1686. As a city which specialized in medicinal faience, Montpellier is a better candidate. It hosted one of the oldest and most famous schools of medicine in Europe. Faience making developed early, in the 1570s, and specifically to cater to pharmacists and physicians. Medicinal jars were one of Montpellier’s specialties.

Looking at coarse earthenware, Reese reminds the reader that Saintonge ceramics come both with and without slip. La Belle had to resupply in St. Domingue after the supply ship St. François was lost, and this seems to explain the presence of coil-made coarse earthenware in its assemblage. Another fascinating finding of Reese is that some of the coarse earthenware pots were used as weapons. Filled with oil, they were lit and thrown onto enemy ships to set their decks on fire. The nine fire pots from La Belle are probably the largest collection in existence.

Some of the French stonewares were apothecary jars from Beauvaisis, and the rest were drinking pitchers from Normandy and Germany. Unfortunately, Reese did not comment further on the function of this assemblage, except for the fire pots. For example, the apothecary jars seem to indicate that the crew either faced or were expected to face frequent wounds and injuries. Also, the absence of stoneware storage vessels seems striking, but perhaps this is common on non-merchant ships. La Belle’s ceramics deserve a more in-depth study, and it is eagerly awaited.

In chapter 11, “A Survey of Texas Missions,” Shawn B. Carlson looks at the distribution of French ceramics at five Texas missions from ca. 1720 to 1820. Despite the “wide variety of
ceramics” available at these sites, Carlson only studies tin- and lead-glazed earthenware. His analysis is based on two ratios and a chronology table. The first ratio of French to Mexican ceramics shows that French ceramics entered the area from New Orleans. This seems to fit recent views of New Orleans as the epicenter of a vast regional market, and as a contraband hub for the Caribbean.

The chronological analysis that follows next is awkward, and frankly, not very useful. Carlson does not indicate which ceramics and which dates of production he selected. This is a concern since some of the dates that he uses elsewhere are incorrect. For example, 1690–1765, the usual range for Seine polychrome faïences, does not work for La Rochelle polychrome, since again, La Rochelle faïences did not exist before 1721. Furthermore, because most of these ceramics have a long period of production, Carlson ends up with a table that spans the years 1650 to 1899 for missions that were only occupied between the 1710s and the 1820s.

Finally, his third ratio compares the amount of various coarse earthenwares to the amount of French faïences at each site. Carlson uses these figures to highlight the respective degrees of influence at the different missions of Mexican wares, local wares, and British imports. Why these observations could not have been made using simple proportional percentages instead of faience ratios is not clear.

Chapter 12, by John H. House, introduces a new colonial site on the lower Arkansas River. Wallace-Bottom was serendipitously discovered in 1998 a few hundred yards south of Menard-Hodges, the official French post in Arkansas. In reality, four decades of archaeology at Menard-Hodges have failed to confirm that it is without a doubt, a French colonial site. Wallace-Bottom, on the other hand, has a clear French colonial component. The post was occupied between 1686 and 1749, and this corresponds to the dating of the artifacts found at Wallace-Bottom. House proposes that this new site might be the original French Arkansas post.

House studies 66 sherds that came from surface collection and small-scale excavation. Most of them are French, and a few are illustrated in the article. Figure 3 exhibits an Albisola sherd. Albisola ware is usually found on French colonial sites in contexts that date from the second half of the 18th century. The presence of this sherd might indicate that the assemblage dates closer to the mid- rather than early 18th century. This would seem to fit with two other sherds pictured in figure 2, a sherd of Rouen polychrome, a ware that appears in post-1740 contexts in the Mississippi Valley and at least after 1725 in New France, and a Moustiers blue-on-white sherd with flower decoration that was popular around the 1730s and 1740s.

Aubra L. Lee’s chapter 13, “A French Pottery in Louisiana,” presents the excavation of another exciting new site, a French pottery at Wilton Plantation, lower Louisiana. This is the first kiln site excavated in the whole colony of Louisiane. Among its features, Lee identified two working floors, some dismantled flue and fireboxes, a portion of the firing chamber, and remains of a shed-like building that covered the kiln. She determined that the site corresponded to a 5 m high circular updraft kiln, which is a common type in Western Europe. The documents from the Wilton Plantation site are great, the pictures of kiln or shed-like construction from France less so. Reports about kiln excavation in France are hard to locate, but these remains could be compared to standing preserved kilns, either shed covered, as at La Chapelle-des-Pots, or inside the potter’s workshop, as at Cox.

The ceramics made at Wilton Plantation were low-fired, slipped, and lead-glazed coarse earthenwares. The color of the glaze varied a lot. Several bowls, a jar, a jug, and a covered pot—mislabeled as another jar—are pictured in the book. In Lee’s view, it is probable that other forms were made. Even for classic utilitarian vessels like these, it would have been great to include profile drawings of the products of this new pottery. Note that Lee’s bibliography is missing a few references cited in her text.

Chapters 2, 3, 4, and 14 deal with the Walthall-Waselkov classification system for French faïences. In chapter 2, Walthall recalls his discovery of faience, after he identified the remains of the French church of the Cahokia tribe in the top levels of Monks Mound. He also describes how French ceramics were used in colonial Illinois. The absence of a lot of coarse earthenware indicates that “the French did not do a lot of cooking in pottery” and preferred metallic cookware. Also, faïences are usually 30 or 40 years older than the sites’
periods of occupation, and show traces of repair. This means that they probably were curated and used for special occasions rather than as everyday ware. Some of the 13 pages of pictures, mostly of faïences from French colonial sites, show examples of mended vessels with lead-filled drill holes, and of sherds shaped as game pieces or pendants.

As for his faïence classification system, Walthall initially wanted to help standardize the description of these ceramics. Comparison between sites would then become easier. He decided to stay clear of French folk names and from naming types after type-sites. Instead, he chose to name them for the “general area or style that they were named for in France.” From the beginning, Walthall warned that these styles were not to be confused with the real place of origin of the faïences, because popular patterns were copied all over. Rather, “styles” described decorative traditions of certain areas. Another great contribution of his, is how his system took into account the variety of rim types. After George A. Long in Canada, Walthall helped promulgate the classification of these recurrent rim patterns.

The way in which he deals with types is more problematic. First, the fact that some types are defined based on glaze and patterns, and others on glaze and colors can be confusing. Walthall also named these types for regions or cities in France, all somewhat related to faïence history, but he chose from among many possibilities. So the type names are both arbitrary and real. They are not easy to remember, since they are non-descriptive French geographic names, and also not easy to forget, given that the faïences named for these locations were not necessarily made in these places.

In chapter 3, Gregory A. Waselkov explains how he helped transform this classification system by incorporating more of the existing French literature on the subject. French books on historical ceramics are abundant but biased. They are often based on museum collections, sometimes potteries’ archives, and rarely on archaeological research. Museum pieces can be a far cry from common wares.

Waselkov rightly points out that the Brittany type has probably nothing to do with the region of Brittany itself. “Brittany” faïences have a simple line or band around the rim. During the colonial period Brittany was in fact a very minor faïence area. Until the end of the 18th century, its main pottery, Quimper, only made copies of popular designs from Nevers, Moustiers, and Rouen. Its famous folk style, which probably inspired the attribution of the simple line design to the region, only showed up during the 19th century. Significantly also, this decoration was first attributed to Brittany potteries based on a personal communication and not a publication. There is then no evidence so far that Brittany came up with the “Brittany” decoration. This case illustrates well how the names chosen by Walthall can cloud the discussion about French faïences.

On another point, Waselkov insists that he and scholars like Walthall are only focusing on colonial faïences. The faïences found in France, on 18th-century urban sites, for example, are very similar to their colonial counterparts, however. The two areas of study should not remain forever separated.

In chapter 4, Ed Jelks applies Walthall and Waselkov’s classification system to faïences from Louisbourg. The crux of his contribution is not its short text—Jelks could not come to the conference and H. F. “Pete” Gregory instead presented his paper—but its 51 pages of pictures of faïences and coarse earthenwares. Jelks’s work illustrates the difficulties that arise when this system is applied to sites outside of the Illinois area. For New France and the Caribbean a greater number of rim types need to be included, and the variations of already-classified rim types have to be better defined. Also, the classification system works best for tableware sherds, but shows its limits when it comes to classifying other types of vessels, like hollowwares.

In chapter 14, George Avery, H. F. “Pete” Gregory, Jason Emery, and Jeffrey Girard describe faïences from northwest Louisiana also using Waselkov and Walthall’s classification terms. They survey 10 sites, but the bulk of their 2,996 sherds come from the Los Adaes (2,204 sherds) and Tauzin-Wells sites (501 sherds), that date from the period before and after the 1770s, respectively. A table summarizes which styles, types, and rim varieties are present at each site, and vessel forms are discussed in the text.

The authors conclude, for example, that faïence blanche dominates in northwest Louisiana before
The historic value of this document, in that it shows how French pottery research developed, is much appreciated. Also valuable were the chapters that presented new sites or new discoveries, although they did not necessarily fit with Avery’s larger agenda. Overall, the numerous and lavish illustrations look professional. Unfortunately at $75, this is a very expensive ceramic album, and as Avery suggested, this volume might only be affordable to CRM firms and to the National Park Service. This is regrettable, especially since nowadays the Internet offers a convenient way to illustrate and update typologies that are accessible to all.

Myriam Arcangeli
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Boston, MA 02215
Lost Architecture of the Rio Grande Borderlands
W. Eugene George
Texas A&M University Press, College Station, 2008. 105 pp., index. $35.00 cloth.

The construction of dams whenever, wherever, and for whatever noble purposes, always has detrimental effects on the people to be relocated and on their built landscape destined for inundation.

This work is a study of architecturally significant buildings in the United States and Mexico border zone inundated by the Falcón Reservoir in 1953. It is a revision and update of architect W. Eugene George’s 1975 report, Historic Architecture of Texas: The Falcón Reservoir, published by the Texas Historical Commission and Texas Historical Foundation, Austin, in a limited edition of 500 copies.

The personal commentaries clearly document the human toll of dam building. Those of Ricardo Paz-Treviño, recounted in the foreword he was invited to write, describe the importance of place and the built environment to those whose social and cultural lives revolved around family ties and the places they lived and visited on both sides of the border. George’s reminiscences combine the history of his involvement in studies of historic architecture in the Falcón Reservoir region, and his deep love for the area, its architecture, and its people. He relates the style and technical aspects of urban and rural structures to their historical, cultural, and environmental contexts in this area, beginning in about 1750 and terminating in 1953 with the filling of the reservoir. He documents architectural influences from this vernacular style in recently constructed Texas houses.

George outlines the history of efforts to mitigate the effects of the inundations (pp. 91–92). The joint U.S.-Mexico Falcón Dam and Reservoir project on the Rio Grande began in 1949. Once the locations of the dam and reservoir became known in the winter of 1948–1949, salvage operations began. The Smithsonian Institution, the National Park Service, and the University of Texas at Austin in the United States, collaborating with the Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia in Mexico, carried out surveys and salvage archaeology of prehistoric and historic sites, along with documenting extant architecture in ranches and towns between 1949 and 1953. The work was truncated when, as a result of heavy precipitation, the water rose in early 1953, two years earlier than predicted.

Prehistoric and historic archaeological sites, along with the abandoned towns and ranches on both sides of the border were flooded (pp. xv–xxiii). So as not to become hazards to navigation, many of the standing structures on the American side of the river were dynamited or bulldozed (Texas Beyond History <http://www.texasbeyondhistory.net/falcon>). The history of the studies is scattered throughout the work, in the preface, the introduction, chapter 6, the epilogue, and the appendix.

The author entered the scene in 1961 when he contracted with the National Park Service to “measure and document Mission San Antonio de Valero, the Alamo ... for the Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS)” (p. xvi). At that time Edward B. Jelks suggested that George complete the architectural studies of historic buildings in the catchment basin of the Falcón Reservoir. George had access to the photographs, along with the metrical and descriptive data gathered from 1949 to 1952 and archived at the Texas Archaeological Research Laboratory. In addition, George included the additional HABS studies he had carried out in 1961. He completed the report in 1975.

After 1975 George maintained his active interest in the documentation of historical architecture, especially that of the lower Rio Grande. He is to be commended for considering it to be part of his architectural practice and for enlisting students of architecture in this activity (p. xxi). His interest in documentation of the inundated Falcón Reservoir structures was piqued again in 1983 when the lowered water level exposed the town of Guerrero Viejo in Tamaulipas, Mexico. In chapter 6 and the epilogue, George documents the post-1983 alternating exposures and inundations of structures within the reservoir with excellent color photographs of Guerrero Viejo.
Two sites in Texas are also illustrated. He makes succinct observations on the looting and site destruction occurring with lowered water levels.

George presents the basic architectural descriptive data (black-and-white photographs, plan views, and elevations) with some historical data on founding dates and occupants in chapter 5. In the introduction and chapters 1–4, George includes the same types of illustrative materials but with the addition of line drawings of various architectural details and perspectives. He proposes and briefly discusses the need to understand vernacular architecture in terms of its historical roots, its environmental contexts, the building technology used, and the social and cultural functions of the structures.

The settlements studied are descendants of communities and ranches established in the area along the Rio Grande after 1750, as part of a strategy to secure the northern borderlands and communication lines of the Viceroyalty of New Spain. George suggests that the structures and towns had roots in several centuries of community development in New Spain. He goes into detail on building technology used, including discussion of the historical sequence of techniques and materials, especially with the changes occurring when the area was incorporated into the American political and economic system.

This is an important discussion. The description of techniques and materials would serve any archaeologist well for investigating structures throughout northern Hispanic America. Finally, the author presents a brief reconstruction of life along the Rio Grande, incorporating the structures in and around which that life took place. One of the more interesting notes here is his presentation of the architectural legacy of a late-19th-century priest, Pierre Yves Keralum.

This work is an important contribution to the anthropology of Hispanic America. Brief, but well illustrated, the work presents historical architectural information from a two-century period during which Mexico became independent and lost substantial lands in the north. It would be interesting to determine if the degree of continuity and change differed among those communities separated between two national systems. Apart from a few comments on ceramics, George does not mention any excavations of historic sites. Yet at least one was carried out at the Leal Ranch and is reported at the web address he cites, Texas Beyond History <http://www.texasbeyondhistory.net/falcon>.
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Archaeological Ethics and Capitalism: From Ethics to Politics
Yannis Hamilakis and Philip Duke (editors)
Left Coast Press, Walnut Creek, CA, 2007. 325 pp., index. $79.00 cloth.

Archaeological Ethics and Capitalism: From Ethics to Politics is an edited volume in which the authors scrutinize the centralized position of archaeology in the contemporary world, and archaeology’s political and social impact on diverse publics. The work is a culmination of various position papers from the symposium, An Ethical Archaeology in a Capitalist World, held at the fifth meeting of the World Archaeology Congress. The chapters cover various aspects of long-established ethics in archaeology, and critically evaluate archaeologists’ self-imposed responsibilities and relevance in the modern capitalist world. What is called into serious question is archaeologists’ position within society, and the book is a call for all archaeologists to understand that they are part of the social and political capitalist structures that serve to organize, motivate, and constrain approaches to the study of the past and its application in the present. In each particular case, the authors argue that this critical thinking will lead to a more socially and politically informed, and thus ethical, archaeology.

The book is set up in four parts, headed “Introduction,” “Ethics in Questions, Archaeology in Capitalism,” “Archaeology as Capitalism,” and “Ethical Futures, Emancipatory Archaeologies.” Fodder for discussion and a call for action begin with the first pages of the book. Randall McGuire sets the stage with his introduction questioning the craft of archaeology and toward whom it is or should be directed. It is an important query that requires in-depth thought and a repositioning of the archaeologist in the study of the past produced in the present. This critical stance is carried through each chapter, culminating in Dean Saitta’s final commentary on the social, economic, and political impacts of archaeological research on present-day communities. The sections of the book tackle differing aspects of the larger issue and provide unique perspectives drawn from individual experiences.

The chapters in part 2 take on the debate of objectivity in archaeology and the interpretation of the past. The authors dismiss all notions of objectivity and argue for a shift in focus that urges all archaeologists to recognize that knowledge is produced in the present, and therefore archaeological work should be accountable to contemporary groups and include them in the creation of research designs. Alongside community involvement in knowledge production and restructuring archaeological ethics resides a prevalent theme in each chapter—ownership of the past. Alexander Bauer, Shane Lindsay, and Stephen Urice raise the issue that existing ethical standards are inefficient in terms of how descendant communities view their own heritage and antiquities. The authors suggest that without intimate knowledge of the descendant community and the values of its heritage and ancestors, archaeologists claiming objectivity, control of materials and knowledge, and stewardship may not be all that different from looters. George Nicholas and Julie Hollowell argue for a stronger applied approach to archaeology, involving a shift in focus that entails using archaeology to find solutions to the social, political, economic, and environmental problems of present-day communities. Charles Riggs and Nick Shepard bring to light pitfalls and miscues when archaeologists try to remain objective or serve the discipline, while at the same time attempting to work with a diverse community. Shepard’s cautionary tale of Cape Town is revealing, and illustrates the contestation of ownership of, and empowerment through archaeological remains in the face of modern development.

Part 3 shines a light on the practice of archaeology influenced and shaped by modern capitalism. It is not a study of capitalism, but rather it is a critique, and challenges archaeologists to acknowledge their culpability within contemporary capitalist practices. The authors structure archaeological practice based on the idea (or ideology) of archaeological knowledge being
produced and the disseminated knowledge being consumed. Paul Everill looks at the system of labor (highly trained, poorly paid archaeologists) and the extraction of the raw materials (archaeological data) for knowledge creation. Everill argues that contract archaeology is increasingly market driven, which creates competition, which in turn creates tensions between budgets and deadlines, and leads ultimately to the decline in the quality of life for thousands of the discipline’s highly educated proletariat. In a different view of archaeology and capitalism, three chapters written by Pedro Funari and Erika Robrahan-González, Neil Silberman, and Alison Kehoe look at market forces and their impact within the business of heritage management, and how archaeological sites are used to pander to heritage tourism—the profits only benefit non-indigenous developers. Silberman further explains how heritage sites, originally meant to be used as tools for public education, have succumbed to capitalist forces through the idea of earning revenue as sanitized leisure-time destinations. Helaine Silverman also looks into heritage tourism and competition for knowledge (and profit) between an indigenous, local museum and a privately operated, sanitized, upscale tourist-driven museum. Tamima Mourd’s chapter is a call to reevaluate the position of archaeologists in the political context of the area in which they work, as well as archaeologists’ ethical responsibility in aiding and participating in imperialists’ projects. In Mourd’s case she is speaking directly about archaeologists participating in various military-funded or -headed projects, and revealing the impact of European and U.S. colonialism and oppression in the Near and Middle East. Her research is a plea to question humanitarian values and archaeological ethics as they relate to conducting archaeology in areas of conflict or war zones. The idea of protection and cultural rights come into question, and this, according to the author, conflicts with any venture associated with military occupation.

The work in part 4 provides directions for archaeology’s ethical future. It revolves around the realization that archaeologists’ responsibilities rest with both descendant communities and non-descendant populations in areas where the practice of archaeology will have an impact. With differing approaches, the chapters in this section are a call to action through political and socially relevant archaeological praxis. The chapters in this section, such as those by Ermengol Gasiot Balbé, Joaquim Puigdomènech, Elena Sintes Olives, and Dawine Wolfe Steadman, and Reinhard Bernbeck and Susan Pollock, confront the role of archaeology and the ideology of memorialization and identity politics. Memorials lead to a collective amnesia, as monuments are offered up as closure rather than discussion of events past and present. The authors from this section astutely identify that these memorials avoid confrontation, as they create an environment of what is called a “reconciliatory consensus” that deadens the monuments’ impact on the politics of the present. Balbé and his colleagues argue that archaeology should be firmly positioned in political praxis that entails fusion between the archaeologist and the activist. Maggie Ronayne follows a similar call to activism working with present-day Kurdish communities. Ronayne’s study is very interesting because she intentionally moves away from any instinctual feeling to excavate or attempt to “recover the past” in light of major government construction displacing whole villages—and destroying the archaeological record. Instead, Ronayne identifies the local population’s concern with archaeology and its correlation with government activities. Her work sheds a cold light of reality on how archaeology can be perceived outside the discipline.

The overall goal of the book is to challenge critically the foundations of archaeology in order to promote discussion and create a new path for archaeological practice. The scholars in this book certainly meet, and at times surpass the book’s expectations. If there is a downside it is the number of complex topics and examples in a single book. It is evident that each section in its own right represents a separate book. The sheer number of diverse locations and specific case studies makes it somewhat easy for the reader to lose the common theme or thread of the entire treatise. As a result, the flow between sections, and at times chapters, loses a bit of continuity. The book may have benefited from the inclusion of a section with discussion among the authors in the form of reaction papers. This is probably next to impossible in the book’s current state, because it would simply add to the already copious amounts of information, making for an extremely long book. This is a very minor point, and should not detract from
an otherwise well-written and thought-provoking book. Although this is a critique, it is also a testament to the level of scholarship, since the reader wants to know more about what each author is thinking. As stated above, such things are minor critiques of what is a fantastic book. It does successfully educate and inspire. It is timely, necessary, and certainly relevant to archaeologists and archaeology students of all levels.
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Archaeology as Political Action
Randall H. McGuire
University of California Press, Berkeley, 2008. 312 pp., 9 b&w photos, 3 maps, index. $29.95 paper.

McGuire urges archaeologists to take action and make the world a better place, whether that is by uncovering lost truths through archaeology, collaborating with subaltern communities, or making conditions more fair within the field itself. He uses dialectical Marxist theory to describe how he strives to accomplish this in his own work. He argues that archaeologists should engage in praxis, which he describes as “seeking to know the world, critique the world, and most important to take action in the world” (p. 220). This Marx-inspired view of praxis is more specific than the praxis found in postmodern practice theory. McGuire focuses on transformational and emancipatory actions that benefit humankind. He emphasizes collective action, rather than individual agency, and uses class as a launching point for his work. He acknowledges that the use of Marxism is not the only means of praxis, for example, citing similarly transformational work in feminist, indigenous, and other critical archaeologies.

The cover art for this book looks like a red flag. Be aware, reading the first half of the book feels like being shaken by the shoulders and berated for engaging in bourgeois self-indulgence and political apathy. For example, he suggests that unlike the working classes, “the bourgeoisie have no interests in transformation [of the world]” (p. 96). According to McGuire, many American archaeologists in particular dislike politics. They wish that everyone would just be friends so they can “get back to sorting potsherds” (p. 17). Readers might wonder if these are fair accusations. McGuire passionately urges readers to do some soul searching as to how their archaeological practices might contribute to oppression within the world and within the discipline.

As a text firmly grounded in Marxist theory, the book bears Marxism’s merits and potential shortcomings. On the one hand, McGuire presents inspiring discussions of class and material inequality, and these discussions are a significant contribution to a humanistic archaeology of capitalism. On the other hand, his critique that political ideologies mask and obscure the political nature of the past (p. 235), might not give people enough credit for recognizing that they are oppressed. It is a complex debate that will not be resolved here.

Nonetheless, McGuire’s point that archaeology is inherently political is well taken. It is grounded in a vivid mosaic of examples from around the world, demonstrating how archaeology has made a difference, for better or worse. He also provides two lengthier case studies of his own research in the U.S. and Mexico. These examples and case studies are the strength of the book and give readers guidance in practicing the transformational archaeology that McGuire advocates.

One chapter details his collaborative work in Mexico, as well as the history of archaeology in Mexico and its connections with perceived U.S. imperialism and Mexican nationalism. He contextualizes modern archaeology in Mexico within an age of fast capitalism and neoliberalism that increasingly results in commodified and privatized archaeology, not unlike trends in the U.S. Stories from this chapter indicate some of the challenges of international collaboration, ranging from differences in participants’ research goals, resources, languages, and even expectations regarding dining in the field. In describing his collaborative work, he outlines the complex relationships between Mexican archaeologists, U.S. archaeologists, Nortenos (Spanish descendants in northern Mexico), and members of the Tohono O’odham nation (whose traditional lands span the U.S.-Mexico border). For example, he describes a failed attempt to repatriate Tohono O’odham inhumations after consultation among the three nations was unsuccessful.

Perhaps the strongest chapter in this book outlines archaeological work by a field school at the Ludlow Massacre site, which was part of the Colorado Coalfield War, 1913–1914. The site was the location of a bloody conflict between
Colorado National Guardsmen and armed strikers, resulting in the deaths of men, women, and children. At this site and in this chapter, McGuire collaborated with other archaeologists, calling themselves the Ludlow Collective. They cite their main target audience as unionized laborers, rather than the middle classes who are typically drawn to archaeology. Similar to the chapter on Mexico, this chapter only briefly discusses the excavations on the site (for more on that work, see a fascinating book by another member of the Ludlow Collective, Dean J. Saitta, 2007, *The Archaeology of Collective Action*, University Press of Florida, Tallahassee).

Here, McGuire uses the project as a platform to discuss a number of concrete ideas for doing archaeology in a way that benefits people other than the lead archaeologists themselves. For example, archaeologists worked with Colorado public schools to develop teaching materials based on the events at Ludlow. They also coordinated the archaeological field school to overlap with the United Mine Workers of America’s annual memorial service at the massacre site. There, field school students had opportunities to meet unionized miners who were then striking for many of the same issues (such as an eight-hour day) that were the catalysts of the Ludlow massacre almost a hundred years ago. On a similar note, field school students were only asked to work five eight-hour days each week. This was arranged with the express purpose of teaching students their rights as workers, and leading them to question longer workdays that will surely be asked of them once they enter the field professionally.

As part archaeology, part ethnography, part political history, part humanist manifesto, this book will be of interest to diverse audiences, such as those in historical archaeology, applied anthropology, and indigenous studies. It should raise awareness for professionals in academia and heritage management, and selections from the book could be used in the classroom for fruitful discussions of archaeological theory and practice, as well as collaborative archaeology.

SARAH E. COWIE
DEPARTMENT OF ANTHROPOLOGY
UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
TUCSON, AZ 85721-0030
Guide to Documentary Sources for Andean Studies, 1530–1900 (3 vols.)
Joanne Pillsbury (editor)
University of Oklahoma Press, Norman, 2008. 1,296 pp., index. $195.00 cloth.

This is the first book of its kind: a comprehensive guide to published documentary sources for the early modern Andes, covering virtually all genres—chronicles, treatises, administrative inspections (visitas), travelers’ accounts, belles lettres, theological and pastoral literature, and Amerindian linguistics. In three sturdy, large-format volumes on heavy paper, with elegant maps and attached red-ribbon bookmarks, the Guide is a luxury production. As authors, the editor recruited some of the best Andean scholars of South America, North America, and Europe, many of them the foremost authorities on their subjects. They include (among many others) Rolena Adorno, Xavier Albó, Noble David Cook, Pierre Duviols, Teodoro Hampe, Catherine Julien, Sabine MacCormack, Luis Millones, Kenneth Mills, Juan Ossio, Franklin Pease, Frank Salomon, Nicolás Sánchez-Albornoz, John Frederick Schwaller, and Gary Urton. Volume 1 has essays on documentary genres, while volumes 2 and 3 are an alphabetical encyclopedia of almost 200 authors and texts.

The Guide’s coverage is more selective than its title suggests. While the first volume has some useful information about archival documents, the Guide is essentially devoted to published sources. Furthermore, in spite of its broad genre coverage, it pays relatively little attention to the 18th and 19th centuries, to the Chilean, Venezuelan, and Colombian Andes, or to Hispanic colonial society. The heart of the project is a subject that has occupied ethnohistorians’ attention for the last half century: colonial documentation of indigenous peoples in what had been the Inca heartland. The key documents discussed are Spanish chronicles of the Inca and colonial states, administrative inspections of tribute-paying Indian communities, and Spanish churchmen’s studies of Indian cultures, languages, and “ idolatrous” religion. The one body of 19th-century sources that receives sustained treatment is the writings of foreign scientific travelers, from the Germans Johann Jakob von Tschudi and Max Uhle, to the American Ephraim George Squier.

Within these parameters, the book is remarkably complete. The entries in volumes 2 and 3 are almost uniformly clear, full, and succinct. Especially useful are the entries’ bibliographies of manuscripts, first editions, and later editions and translations up to today. The entries have fascinating details, such as the dry crust of bread thrown in a Harvard College food fight, by which the 19th-century historian William Prescott lost much of his sight. Some are marvels of encapsulation, as when Rolena Adorno synthesizes the fruit of her decades of work on the indigenous artist and chronicler Felipe Guaman Poma de Ayala. The linguist Rodolfo Cerrón-Palomino contributes a compact biography of the author of the first grammar of Mochica, the now-lost language of the north Peruvian coast; the historian Kenneth Mills does the same for Diego de Ocaña, a curious and observant cleric who toured the Andes to raise funds for a Spanish shrine. Alongside the well-known Andean authors, the Guide includes many less familiar ones: an entry by Caesar Farah and Stuart Schwartz on Ilyas ibn Hanna al-Mausuli (a Syrian Christian priest and traveler, who in 1668 produced the first Arabic-language account of the Andes), one by Teresa Gisbert and Tom Cummins on the Prince of Sansevero (an 18th-century Italian freemason and Inca enthusiast), and another by Gisbert on Melchor Maria Mercado (a 19th-century watercolor painter of Peruvian and Bolivian scenes).

Volume 1 is somewhat less well executed than the other two. Its thematic essays are sophisticated but not always systematic. It lacks an integrated account of the government institutions that produced many of the documents. The various types of church councils are the subject of three separate essays, yet their institutional context is never fully explained. A number of the essays, however, are excellent and systematic surveys of
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their subjects. Among them are Regina Harrison’s on church doctrinal treatises, Sabine Dedenbach-Salazar’s on indigenous-language dictionaries, Noble David Cook’s on administrative inspections and censuses, Barbara Mundy’s on relaciones geográficas, and Raquel Chang-Rodríguez’s on literary poetry and prose.

The volumes also have abundant full-page black-and-white illustrations, which are well printed (if somewhat low contrast). Many are facsimiles from illustrated manuscripts, such as drawings by Guaman Poma, and an extraordinary cosmological line drawing by the Indian author Santa Cruz Pachacuti Yamqui Salcamaygua. Equally lovely are lithographs and engravings from 19th-century scientist’s books, which include images of Inca ruins, botanical diagrams, and maps.

In spite of the three volumes’ length (totaling well over 1,000 pages), space is sometimes wasted. The illustrations are not always well served by full-page reproduction, such as 16th-century book frontispieces that were smaller in their original versions. Some of their space might have been better devoted to text, since some entries are too brief to do their subjects justice. The entry on the important chronicler Pedro de Cieza de León by the late Franklin Pease—perhaps the world’s most qualified author on the subject—is far too short at 1,000 words (apart from bibliography). Much of the space is taken up by three pages of crude woodcuts, originally published with Cieza’s text, and reproduced much larger than necessary.

In spite of relatively minor reservations, this book will be vital for a range of readers, particularly historical archaeologists. The colonial Andes produced one of the richest documentary records available for any premodern society, but one that is singularly opaque to a nonspecialist. The early modern Spanish had an information culture: their state was bureaucratic, their society legalistic, their scribes and authors numerous. Many documents were published, some in their own time, others in later centuries. These sources (like all historical sources) are complex, treacherous, but indispensable. Vital complements to field archaeology for both the pre-colonial and colonial eras, these colonial sources are available in any research library, but are all but useless without an understanding of their historical context. Fortunately, historians and literary scholars have produced a large body of knowledge about their authors, genres, modes of production, and agendas. The Guide to Documentary Sources provides much of this information in a single reference guide.

Jeremy Ravi Mumford
Department of History
University of Mississippi
Oxford, MS 38677
The bilingual volume *Dreams of the Americas: Overview of New France Archaeology* is a superb introduction to the extremely varied studies being conducted on French colonial archaeological sites throughout the hemisphere, and the benefits that can result from academic cooperation and communication across international borders. Published to commemorate the 400th anniversary of the founding of Quebec city, this ambitious volume succeeds in celebrating that French heritage by calling attention to the impact of French traders, colonists, soldiers, merchants, and sailors throughout the former colonial domain. The book accomplishes the impressive goal of presenting research conducted throughout the French colonies, from the frozen reaches of northern Canada to the humid isles of the French West Indies, by some of the most recognizable names in French colonial archaeology today.

Although the legacy of France’s colonial American empire is readily apparent in francophone Canada and the islands of Guadeloupe and Martinique, this French heritage is not nearly as tangible in other areas of this formerly vast realm. Once comprising a significant portion of the North American continent and the Caribbean, much of the French colonial domain was gradually conquered by, or traded to colonial rivals. Although French is one of Canada’s national languages, French place names dot much of the mid-continent, and spicy étouffées still feature on creole menus, many North Americans are more familiar with the continent’s British, and even Spanish, heritage. Even those well informed about French colonial history are typically more knowledgeable about famous explorers and statesmen—like Champlain, Iberville, and La Salle—than about the common individuals who traded with native peoples, farmed the land, mined natural resources, and voyaged by canoe via the inland rivers. Until recently, researchers had generally ignored the role of France in the European settlement of the Americas or focused solely on the superstars of French exploration and colonization. Fortunately, in the past several decades historians and archaeologists have begun to explore France’s unique colonial policies, practices, and establishments in North America, as well as the lives of French inhabitants and traders who toiled in relative anonymity. *Dreams of the Americas* participates in this crucial enrichment of the historical record through a variety of studies that showcase the architecture, industrial exploits, foodways, maritime transportation, and diverse material culture of New France’s colonial inhabitants.

Since *Dreams of the Americas* was published to celebrate the anniversary of the founding of Quebec city, it logically follows that the first two, as well as the last of the volume’s thirteen articles concern archaeology in Quebec. Françoise Niellon’s excellent resume of the history of the city’s earliest years is a fitting introduction to the volume’s exceptional scholarship. Through detailed archival research and well-selected graphics, Niellon evokes a poignant image of the hardships endured by Quebec’s earliest European settlers. Marcel Moussette and William Moss, two researchers intimately familiar with archaeology in Quebec, continue the discussion by bringing the reader up to speed on the colonial archaeology conducted throughout the city. In addition, Moussette and Moss place Quebec in context through a comparison to Montreal, and a broader look at the differences in colonial expansion between the French in Canada and the British in America. Following this introduction to Quebec city, Peter Pope provides an excellent discussion of the importance of the North American cod fishery to France and the industry’s impact on a specific region of Newfoundland, through the framework of a maritime cultural landscape study, an approach that successfully integrates...
a consideration of both terrestrial and maritime archaeological resources.

Kenneth Kelly next transports the reader from the cold Canadian north to the tropical islands of the French Antilles, and introduces plantation archaeology in an oft-ignored corner of the Caribbean. Kelly’s examination of plantations on both Guadeloupe and Martinique presents some intriguing disparities and interesting conclusions about the effect of different colonial regimes and historical trajectories on the institution of slavery in the Caribbean. Returning to Canada, Marc Lavoie’s summary and interpretation of the archaeological work conducted on Acadian homesteads in Belle-Isle, Nova Scotia, in connection with his careful reading of the relevant historical documents, provides a comprehensive view of Acadian life in this corner of the colony, especially in regard to the familial connections that bound residents together and structured their interactions. Though Lavoie provides several tables and figures, the chapter would have benefited from a graphic illustration of the complex genealogical associations described, as the relationships between several generations of Acadians are less than clear to a reader unfamiliar with the area’s former inhabitants.

Venturing into the central regions of France’s North American colonies, the following three chapters explore French occupation in America’s heartland at Fort St. Joseph in Michigan (Michael Nassaney), Fort Toulouse in Alabama (Craig Sheldon, Ned Jenkins, and Gregory Waselkov), and Pointe Coupée in Louisiana (Rob Mann). Recent excavations at these sites, as described in the chapters, highlight the potential each holds for illuminating the history of the French in the mid-continent. In addition, the widely separated locations of these occupation sites confront the reader with the reality of the vast expanse once claimed by France.

Following these site- and region-specific studies, the final five chapters examine particular types or categories of material culture across broader segments of the French colonial empire. Hélène Côté’s superb article compares vernacular architecture in New France to its counterpart in France to determine the possible social, economic, and ecological reasons for the choice of particular styles in the colonies. Her broader analysis reveals insights into the owners, builders, and tenants of various buildings, insights that would have remained hidden in an individual consideration of each site. Paul-Gaston L’Anglais’s chapter on faience investigates the temporal introduction of various plate styles that may assist in dating archaeological features and sites, along with other attributes such as decoration. Unfortunately, L’Anglais limits his examination of faience plates to those found in Quebec, whereas a more expansive look at faience from archaeological excavations throughout the French colonies might have strengthened his conclusions. Terrance Martin’s assessment of faunal remains from various sites in the Illinois Country, and Yves Monette’s study of lead deposits and lead exploitation in New France demonstrate the utility of specialized analysis for intersite comparison that reveals trends among sites and differences between them. Finally, Daniel LaRoche’s chapter ends the volume where the reader began—Quebec city—and rounds out the volume by presenting an analysis of three French colonial maritime vessels found in the city during construction on the riverfront.

Though a comprehensive work that introduces the reader to French colonial archaeology throughout the former empire, as with any good compilation, *Dreams of the Americas* merely whets the reader’s appetite for more information on different regions, especially the Antilles and the colony of Louisiane, and specializations within the discipline, such as isotope analysis and maritime archaeology. Nevertheless, this book is an ideal text for introductory courses on French colonial archaeology, and due to an equal distribution of French- and English-language articles, appeals to native speakers of both languages. The volume’s broad coverage by renowned experts in the field of French colonial archaeology makes it a superlative addition to any library on general colonial history and archaeology, and essential to any collection of works on the French colonies.

Kendra Kennedy
Department of Anthropology
University of West Florida
Pensacola, FL 32514
The History of Witchcraft: Sorcerers, Heretics, and Pagans
Jeffrey B. Russell and Brooks Alexander
Thames & Hudson, New York, NY, 2008. 216 pp., 105 illus., index.
$21.95 paper.

Witchcraft is perhaps not at the top of the list of subjects historical archaeologists need to brush up on, but as with all other religious phenomena, material culture associated with the practice of witchcraft or sorcery may be encountered and require interpretation. The second edition of this overview of historical themes in witchcraft adds to the original 1980 volume a second author, a revised introduction, and two new chapters on contemporary witchcraft. Essentially an intellectual history, it does not examine material culture in detail, but does provide a framework and background that may have utility for researchers.

The introduction gives the reader a useful overview of topics covered (and not covered) as well as an important lesson in terminology. The authors provide etymological background on the many terms thrown around in these circles—witch, sorcerer, magician, pagan, wicca—and place them in the perspectives of the disciplines that use them. Anthropologists, historians, and practitioners prefer different definitions and look at witchcraft from unique angles, and a review of these distinctions is important to understanding the remainder of the book.

Russell and Alexander begin by discussing sorcery, initially as a worldwide phenomenon, its context in ancient history, then as an element of later European witchcraft which absorbs the next several chapters. By sorcery, the authors mean the attempt to manipulate the hidden connections among natural phenomena, and include various kinds of magic within that sphere. Official religion or private act, mechanical or spirit-based in conception, high (alchemy, astrology) or low (midwifery, spells), the complexity of sorcery and paganism was simplified, distilled, and categorized over time through Hebrew, Greek, Roman, and then Christian lenses. The blurring of sorcery with demonology, and association with things un-Christian led to the medieval and Renaissance concept of the evil witch. It is unfortunate that the authors drop the discussion of everyday sorcery/magic, as for much of medieval and modern history one is far more likely to encounter evidences of these phenomena than of witchcraft as they define it.

In the chapter on the origins of European witchcraft (leaving the rest of the world behind at this point) the authors examine the interaction of various belief systems to codify witchcraft as an activity of evil. There are many strands of thought, ranging from the growth of dualism in Western monotheism (i.e., Satan in opposition to God), cultural traditions of the festivals of Dionysos and Bacchus leading to the witches’ sabbat (early anti-Jewish attitudes emerging), and the long process of replacement of northern European paganism with Christianity. Here also, the authors discuss various schools of historical thought, including ecclesiastical invention, folkloric/pagan survival, and Christian heresy. Clearly, they see the stereotype of the witch—attending the orgiastic sabbat, riding a broom, killing and eating children, desecrating the cross, making a pact with Satan—as a composite of concepts from these historical strains of thought that did not crystallize until the 14th century.

One particularly enlightening thread of discussion is the continuing conflation of sorcery with demonology (only evil spirits could be commanded), and thus its inevitable link with heresy, a religious rather than civil crime. Attacks on heretical sects such as the Cathars and Waldenses on the continent set the stage for a series of church inquisitions resulting in the torture, confession, and burning of many thousands of the accused from 1450 to 1700. Curiously, in Britain (and the colonies) witchcraft was not so connected to heresy, and thus was treated as a civil crime with capital punishment in the form of hanging. Separate chapters on the witch craze on the continent and in Britain examine these trends, both intellectual and legal, in detail. The year 1450 is a key date in the spread of witch prosecutions, when the number of trials dramati-
Historically increased just as legal/religious treatises on witchcraft such as *Malleus Malificarum* (1486) were rolling off the earliest printing presses. The spread of knowledge coincided with the spread of fear in significant ways.

After working through the conceptual and legal basis for witchcraft prosecutions, Russell and Alexander discuss the nature of witchcraft and society during this period. Suggesting that searching for the social mechanisms involved in accusations limits a broader understanding of the phenomenon, they elaborate on issues related to gender, the Reformation and its effects, and the psychological and cultural climate that fueled the witch craze. The decline of witch hunts is placed squarely in the realm of changing cultural and religious attitudes brought about by the skeptical philosophy, where *maleficium* lost its credibility, and witchcraft and possession were begun to be seen as individual aberrant behavior rather than a supernatural conspiracy.

Late chapters detail the intellectual origins of the modern witchcraft movement, beginning with the Romantic revival of pagan ideas melded with occult interests, secret societies, and suspect scholarship. The authors characterize modern witchcraft as a combination of survivals and revivals, with many neopagan concepts largely inventions of the 20th century. This thesis is laid out in some detail, ending with an up-to-date chapter on contemporary trends, including feminism, 1960s counterculture, and the use of the Internet to create the modern Wiccan community. These last sections are enjoyable, but somewhat breathless in pace, and less relevant to historical archaeologists.

Of particular interest are the many images presented in the book, ranging from fanciful historic drawings of witches cavorting with the Devil, to presumably more-accurate renderings of gallows, burning grounds, and torture chambers. The witch house in Bamberg, Germany in the early 1600s (no longer standing) is displayed in elevation and plan view (p. 87), both fascinating in its detail and horrific in its implications. Contemporary photos display modern paraphernalia of neopagan ritual, along with a couple of temporary ritual sites in use. The illustration of a Bellarmine jug containing human hair, nail clippings, and a pin-stuck cloth heart from excavations at Westminster (p. 19), begs further discussion, but as with many of the other objects displayed in this volume, they are illustrative rather than subjects of analysis. The authors do better with paintings and drawings in terms of incorporating them into their discussions.

In summary, this is a good, concise overview of the history of witchcraft, focusing in turn on Europe, Britain, and most recently, America. As intellectual history it provides excellent background information and a good bibliography for further research on the topic. For the historical archaeologist it falls short, largely in using material culture as a source of interesting illustrations rather than as an integral part of its presentation. For a more directly relevant study, the reader should consult Ralph Merrifield’s *The Archaeology of Ritual and Magic* (1988, New Amsterdam Books, New York, NY).

Jeff Wanser
Hiram College Library
Hiram College
Hiram, OH 44234
Missions, Missionaries, and Native Americans: Long-Term Processes and Daily Practices
Maria F. Wade
University Press of Florida, Gainesville, 2008. 288 pp., index. $69.95 cloth.

This volume by Maria F. Wade, except for a very brief chapter on the Jesuit and Franciscan activity among South Florida’s Calusa, is a study of the activities of those two religious orders among the native inhabitants of northeastern Mexico, Texas, and Baja and Alta California from the earliest appearance of the Spaniards among the people there, to the early 19th century. The treatment is divided into three distinct parts. Part 1 sets the background with chapters on the battleground, the religious and spiritual climate of Europe and the Americas, and on the Franciscans and the Jesuits and their diversity of spirit. Part 2, after a very brief chapter on Jesuit and Franciscan activity in south Florida, concentrates its attention for the better part of the volume on the two orders’ activity in northeastern Mexico, the Franciscan work in Texas, Jesuit and Franciscan work in Baja California, and Franciscan proselytization in Alta California. The closing chapter of part 2 examines the two orders’ distinct daily schedules and contrasting approaches to implementation of the liturgical and divine calendars. Part 3 has separate chapters on religious and economic practices of the Franciscans and Jesuits. Maria Wade’s overall tone in this study is critical of the approaches of both religious orders, particularly concerning the decline in the native peoples’ numbers that resulted, and the missionaries’ condemnation of native practices that had counterparts in both European folk traditions at that time, and more importantly, in the Catholic Church.

The book’s author displays a very wide vocabulary and a penchant for words such as “numinous,” that this reviewer has no recollection of having seen used elsewhere. But she is also on a few occasions careless in her usage of words, as in her describing the rosary as a sacred object rather than the mere tool that it is. More overdone is her statement, “Town leaders even held trials to condemn locusts, rats or swallows and excommunicate them.” Unless those leaders were high churchmen, they would have had no authority to excommunicate.

Some of the author’s statements would have benefited from elaboration as to their reliability and pertinence to her topic. One such is the statement on page 26, “Like the economic dimension of vows and indulgences, the Christian relic business was extremely lucrative and its development foregrounds a fascination with death, body parts, bones, fluids, and saintly odors.” Another is her statement on page 98, “Interestingly the king here assigned responsibility for school instruction to the Tlascalans rather than to the friars.” Many readers will be left wondering why.

The work is based on a wide variety of sources, but in places a more-detailed documentation of the sources would have been useful. But these criticisms represent only very minor reservations. Wade’s work is an admirable one in which she has presented a most readable and informative account of Jesuit and Franciscan labors in the regions that she covers.

JOHN H. HANN
SAN LUIS ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND HISTORIC SITE
2021 WEST MISSION ROAD
TALLAHASSEE, FL 32304
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