

Melk-Koch in the 1980s, when as a Western scholar she was not grant access to various materials at the Humboldt University. According to Liebersohn, Thurnwald “chose to return to Nazi Germany in 1936”; but Melk-Koch, in the work on which he relies, shows that Thurnwald really had no choice. If he had received an offer to continue teaching in the United States, he would almost certainly have accepted and been spared the ignominy of planning *Lebensraum* for the Nazis in East Africa.

This brings me to some more general points in conclusion. The quartet whom Liebersohn links together as somehow collectively responsible for bringing “the gift” back to Europe were, as he himself shows, very diverse characters with very diverse values. While Thurnwald eventually worked for the Nazis, Boas and Malinowski agitated against them in the final years of their lives. Mauss had by this time fallen silent. Yet Malinowski and Thurnwald were similarly opposed to socialism, temperamentally more inclined to endorse the conservatism of Edmund Burke than to share Mauss’s interest in cooperatives and new forms of mutuality such as the welfare state. When they wrote about gift exchange, these scholars had radically different phenomena in mind. Boas and Malinowski may have thought they were challenging the axioms of the embryonic discipline of economics, but most of what they wrote is entirely consistent with an emphasis upon individual utility-maximization; Mauss and Thurnwald seem to have had a deeper appreciation of the limitations of this perspective. In short, at the end of this essay I was craving a more differentiated picture and wondering if the very diverse phenomena studied by these four scholars can be lumped together under a single rubric, “the gift.”

Finally, I was puzzled by Liebersohn’s dismissal of the work of Karl Polanyi (in favour of Max Weber: see pp. 174f., n. 8). Polanyi drew on all four ethnological scholars of gift exchange in his own economic anthropology, but he did not make significant use of this category, preferring the ideal types “reciprocity” and “redistribution.” Yet in positing a decisive break at the end of the eighteenth century, Liebersohn’s general model is entirely compatible with that of Polanyi. What Mandeville had proclaimed generations earlier as an intellectual conceit became a reality in the era of Hastings, Burke, and James Mill: Europeans suddenly lost their own traditions of gift exchange, which explains why these were ignored by the founding fathers of sociology in the nineteenth century and had to be reimported by the ethnologists in the twentieth. It is perhaps a bit too simple, but it remains a powerful model, with rich implications for the twenty-first century.

Chris Hann

**Liebmann, Matthew, and Melissa S. Murphy** (eds.): *Enduring Conquests. Rethinking the Archaeology of Resistance to Spanish Colonialism in the Americas*. Santa Fe: SAR Press, 2011. 325 pp. ISBN 978-1-934691-41-0. Price: \$ 34.95

While colonialism is undeniably one of the “haunts” of historical archaeology, native perspectives on colonial

enterprises have been relatively less well represented than European ones in the historical and archaeological literature. The reasons for historical bias are largely artifacts of the nature of the surviving sources, and for this reason historians of the Americas have done groundbreaking and intensive work over the past few decades with notarial archives and sources written by native hands. The archaeological record is equally authored by native hands and has the potential to address the daily experience of colonial life, yet historical archaeology in Spanish America has developed much more unevenly. “Enduring Conquests” is a welcome addition to the nascent literature on Pan-American historical archaeology.

The edited volume is the result of a School of Advanced Research short seminar on the topic. Matthew Liebmann and Melissa Murphy show a sure editorial control in the high degree of consistency of the chapters. The contributors read each other’s chapters, and the central concern of the book – the native colonial experience – overrides regional and temporal differences. The participants in the Advanced Seminar make for a coherent and logical group in that they focus on Spanish America and mostly share theoretical perspectives. Indeed, similar language is used throughout, creating conceptual threads that integrate the work as a whole. Each chapter in some way deals with ideas concerning entanglement, agency, strategic action, and the breaking down of conceptual boundaries. “Enduring Conquests” equally contributes to the literature on the application of practice theory and constructivist approaches in archaeology.

The chapters loosely proceed both geographically and chronologically through Spanish America, beginning with the mid-sixteenth-century *entradas* in the southeastern US. Robin Beck, Christopher Rodning, and David Moore set the tone for the rest of the book by turning a seemingly obvious case of native resistance to colonial rule on its head. Beck et al. argue that Juan Pardo’s efforts at colonization of the interior southeast played into Native American political and social machinations. The construction of forts and provisioning of Spanish soldiers by Native Americans was less a submission to Spanish authority than a display of the ability to mobilize labor and reinforce native military goals. Once those goals shifted, as they did by June 1568, the forts were erased from the landscape, never to return. Kathleen Deagan’s chapter on Hispaniola and La Florida emphasizes that effective resistance was through the alliance of native and other groups – in other words, along class rather than race or ethnic lines.

The next few chapters shift to the Andes. Melissa Murphy, Elena Goycochea, and Guillermo Cock present the only data from physical anthropological data in the book in their study of Late Horizon and possible colonial burials. Here, we see direct evidence of violence through the use of metal weapons, but wielded by whom, when, and where remain debatable. The archaeological observation of disinterment is provocative yet hard to interpret. Steven Wernke argues that the early, short colonial occupation of Malata in the Colca Valley of Peru was organized to create a “centripetal” civic plaza and processions to the

chapel that also recognized indigenous social hierarchy. The remodeling of the town and chapel during its short life span appears to be the on-the-ground result of clerical resistance to hybridity in ritual practice. In contrast to such strict rejection of convergent practices, Jeffrey Quilter presents a fascinating array of hybrid material culture (including cut paper and decorated textiles) at the late sixteenth-century Magdalena de Cao settlement dating to both before and after the town was largely abandoned.

The following three chapters deal with Mexico and Central America. Using evidence of pictorial manuscripts, legal testimony, and ceramic analysis, Thomas Charlton and Patricia Fournier recount the pivotal role Red Ware seems to have played in the expression of the mid-sixteenth-century conspiracy for independence centering on Martín Cortés, a noble son and heir of Hernando Cortés. Red Ware vessels were decorated with a coat of arms, and indigenous foods were served in them at sumptuous feasts, the material enactment of a creole “patriotic ideology.” Russell Sheptak, Rosemary Joyce, and Kira Blaisdell-Sloan take a longer chronological view from a landscape perspective to look at shifting tactics to preserve rights and communities over time in northern Honduras. They provide detailed documentary and archaeological evidence of late sixteenth-century disputes over tribute quotas, seventeenth- to eighteenth-century meritorious claims based on monitoring for pirates, strategic use of churches and church sodalities, and shifting group identification, which add an archaeological perspective to familiar themes in Spanish American historical studies. The chapter by Minette Church, Jason Yaeger, and Jennifer Dornan is in some senses the odd duck, as it deals with nineteenth-century British colonialism. Nevertheless, this chapter underscores that British Colonialism in Central America worked within the framework of both the Spanish and Maya past.

The two chapters concerning the US Southwest, one by Matthew Liebmann and the other by Robert Preucel, both underscore that a focus indigenous survival masks complex internal dynamics that are indicated by changes in architectural style, ceramic frequencies, and built environment and landscape use. Voss’ chapter is a lucid coda to the volume in that it highlights how *presidios* (Spanish military forts) can be viewed as centers of Native American heritage. The very embodiment of colonial might, the quadrangle walls of the fort, was a product of increasingly coerced native labor. Even though previous archaeological interpretations focused on forts as manifestations of European culture, Voss cogently argues that the presidio quadrangle walls were material results of the “social relations of architectural production.” Voss’ evidence paints a picture of remarkably poor incorporation of native Californians into wage labor and colonial exchange systems, a rejection of or nearly total lack of access to the goods used so heavily within the quadrangle walls.

The amount of archaeological detail varies from chapter to chapter; some use limited exemplars or summaries of data presented elsewhere, while others present substantial amounts of a range of archaeological data. A consistent point of methodology among these diverse approach-

es is the call for “extramural” investigation (Deagan; Voss) or its implementation (such as Beck et al.; Liebmann; Preucel; Sheptak et al.; Quilter). Sheptak and others note that this ideal can be hard to implement because of the persistence of precolonial material culture practices. In other words, fully colonial sites may not be identified as such because they look much like precontact ones. The use of documentary information is more consistent, so that the net result is a substantial contribution to an anthropological understanding of colonialism.

While all of the authors present native views on colonialism, they are mostly remarkably resistant to the idea of resistance. Just as dichotomous views of “natives” and “Spanish” have oversimplified and thus impeded understanding, the idea of resistance implies a push-pull, mechanistic response to colonialism. As many authors note, resistance can be seen everywhere, or in some cases, it can be parsed out of existence. Every chapter underscores that indigenous peoples were neither effete nor monolithic in their actions, just as colonizers and their schemes and policies varied. The rethinking of the archaeology of resistance has been valuable because it encourages us to think in more nuanced ways. At the same time, we should not let variability overshadow the overall pattern of fundamental differentials in power created by colonialism that are legacies that last to today. This volume captures two senses of enduring conquests: the lasting legacy of inequalities and the creativity, ability, and staying power of indigenous peoples.

Kathryn Sampeck

**Macri, Martha J., and Gabrielle Vail:** *The New Catalog of Maya Hieroglyphs. Vol. 2: The Codical Texts.* Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2009. 308 pp. ISBN: 978-0-8061-4071-1. Price: \$ 65.00

Diesem zweiten Band des “Neuen Maya-Hieroglyphenkataloges” war im Jahr 2003 ein erster Band vorangegangen, den damals außer Martha Macri als Hauptautorin Matthew Looper mitverfasst hatte. Für den jetzt vorliegenden zweiten Band ist Looper durch Gabrielle Vail ersetzt worden. Da ich den ersten Band in einer ausführlichen vergleichenden Besprechung in *Anthropos* 101: 238–246 im Jahr 2006 bereits vorgestellt habe, verweise ich in Bezug auf technische und konzeptionelle Einzelheiten auf jene Besprechung und beschränke mich hier auf die Besonderheiten des zweiten Bandes und eine Gesamtevaluation des Katalogvorhabens.

Das Anliegen des Kataloges ist es, den seit der Veröffentlichung der bisherigen Hauptreferenzwerke von Günter Zimmermann “Die Hieroglyphen der Maya-Handschriften” (Hamburg 1956) und John Eric S. Thompson “A Catalog of Mayan Hieroglyphs” (Norman 1962 und spätere Nachdrucke) angewachsenen Bestand an Schrifttexten einzubeziehen und die inzwischen weitgehend gelungenen sprachlichen Entzifferungen der Zeichen einzuarbeiten. Insofern ist die Vorlage eines neuen Kataloges als Forschungsinstrument zu begrüßen. Gleichzeitig stellt sich aber die Frage, ob ein gedruckter und daher unveränderbarer Katalog noch die geeignete Form für ein solches Verzeichnis ist; gibt es doch seit etwa 1980 das Instrument