

these two cities, an important insight with much potential in its application to lithic assemblages. Knight concludes that Cantona operated its own independent exchange networks for provisioning eastern Mesoamerica with obsidian.

Chapters 9–11 span the Classic to Postclassic periods. José Luis Punzo Díaz provides a comprehensive overview of the Chalchihuites culture of northwest Mexico. Rather than a “frontier,” he posits it as a zone of interaction and cultural contact that both produced and used objects representing broader pan-Mesoamerican traditions, with such materials serving as prestige goods displayed by local elites. To understand long-term continuity in Cholula, Timothy J. Knab and John M. D. Pohl advance the concept of rotating power structures as both more stable and common than the Aztec imperial model. The authors compare the maintenance of barrios that extend back at least to the sixteenth century with partnerships in long-distance exchange, asserting that both flourished because of the greater number of participants and amount of social capital. Tracing the sponsorship of competitive feasts in return for positions of civic power back to the establishment of the Quetzalcoatl cult during Toltec times, the authors conclude that Cholula promoted a centralizing ideology without military dominance, which bound ethnically diverse groups together throughout central and southern highland Mexico. Niklas Schulze and Blanca E. Maldonado provide a fascinating overview of the movement of metal objects in Late Postclassic Mexico, where metal’s value as a material was symbolic and aesthetic rather than economic. Focusing on formal homogeneity and unique alloys of copper bells excavated at the Aztec Templo Mayor, they conclude the bells were redistributed and reworked by local artisans, probably in state-run workshops.

I congratulate the editors for assembling such an informative series of essays. The strength of this book is the empirical data, and I encourage colleagues to take the plunge and explore these richly presented analyses of sites and their materials.

Andean Ontologies: New Archaeological Perspectives. MARÍA CECILIA LOZADA and HENRY TANTALEÁN, editors. 2019. University of Florida Press, Gainesville. xx + 384 pp. \$110.00 (hardcover), ISBN 9780-8130-5637-1.

Reviewed by Tamara L. Bray, Wayne State University

This edited volume comprises 12 chapters written by scholars from Argentina, Bolivia, Canada, Chile,

Ecuador, Peru, and the United States that cohere around a common interest in exploring the notion of Andean ontologies. The origins of the volume lie in a symposium organized by the editors for the annual meeting of the Society for American Archaeology in 2016. The book includes many of the papers presented in that forum, together with a few additional contributions, including a thoughtful concluding chapter by Catherine Allen. Although a handful of the authors treat Andean phenomena more generally (e.g., Mary Glowacki’s discussion of human heads in Andean iconography in Chapter 7, and Bruce Mannheim’s constructivist focus on Quechua language and associated frames of reference in Chapter 9), the majority center on specific sites with the aim of garnering insights into native ontologies via the archaeological evidence. Contributors use a variety of interpretive approaches and methods to gain entry to potentially distinct ways of knowing and being in the pre-Columbian world.

The opening chapter by Henry Tantaleán introduces the volume’s principal construct: the idea of an Andean ontology (or ontologies) distinctive from that (or those) of the West. He first outlines the sources from which archaeologists may derive insights into Andean ontologies—ethnohistory, iconography, ethnography, and the native language—and then provides an overview of various keywords such as *pacha*, *camay*, *huaca*, and the like. Tantaleán describes Andean ontologies, however one gains access to them, as a source both of testable hypotheses and interpretive inspiration. Throughout the chapter, a tension seems to exist between the idea of exploring Andean ontologies via the archaeological record versus using ontology as a heuristic to explain archaeological phenomena (i.e., as something good to think with). The subsequent chapters tend to follow one of these two tracks of working with the notion of ontology—a concept that one could argue has become so expansive here as to be in danger of forfeiting its semiotic value.

After the introduction, the book leads with a chapter by Richard Lunniss, who focuses on the coastal Ecuadorian site of Salango, a sacred locale that served as a center of ritual activity for several millennia beginning in the Late Formative period. Through detailed analysis of the architectural history of the site, the distribution of offering deposits, mortuary patterns, and associated artifacts, Lunniss seeks to reconstruct the ontology of the ancient inhabitants of this often-overlooked sector of the Andean realm. Authors Nicco La Mattina and Matthew Sayre move the discussion in the next chapter to the site of Chavín de Huántar, where they similarly aim to identify the ontological orientation of Formative period congregants via the

archaeological evidence. There is an exercise in demonstrating that Chavín iconography is a closer fit with Descola's category of analogical ontology than with that of animism. Shifting the analytical orientation, María Cecilia Lozada looks to ethnohistoric and ethnographic data as a source of hypotheses regarding emic understandings of the body, life cycles, and disease in Chapter 4 to inform her bioarchaeological study of a large mortuary assemblage from Chiribaya Alta and several other sites in southern Peru. Seeking insight into how bodies and individuals figured in local indigenous ontologies during the Late Intermediate and Middle Horizon periods, she investigates correlations between biological age and categories of associated funerary objects, as well as the mortuary treatments of diseased individuals.

Chapter 5 by Luis Armando Muro, Luis Jaime Castillo, and Elsa Tomasto-Cagigao—centering on the late Moche site of San José de Moro on the north coast of Peru—is similarly concerned with the ontological status of the body. This study focuses on the human remains associated with a set of elite mausoleums uncovered at San José de Moro. Based on their analysis, the authors suggest that the Moche operated within an ontological framework that construed the body as a process, periodically transformed through social interventions, rather than as a permanently stable thing—an orientation they refer to as a “corporeal ontology.” In another study from the north coast (Chapter 6), Giles Spence-Morrow and Edward Swenson explore the ontological order of late Moche society as revealed through investigations at the site of Huaca Colorado. Focusing on the multiple episodes of architectural renovation and associated ritual sacrifice that occurred in the ceremonial sector of the site, the authors develop an interpretation of the evidence that emphasizes corporeal interdependencies and the interrelationship between parts and wholes. This leads them to attribute a synecdochal ontological orientation to the Moche people of this era, one that corresponds to Muro and colleagues' premises, at least in terms of the significance of relationality and corporeal agency.

Benjamin Alberti and Andres Languens's contribution in Chapter 7 offers a reflection on the potential of Amazonian perspectivism to inform a new archaeology of landscapes. Taking as their starting point the idea that bodies and landscapes are mutually constituted, they argue for a new ontological understanding of the body wherein it is viewed as multiple rather than as singular and universal. Assessing the utility of this ontological orientation in the context of the La Candelaria culture of Northwest Argentina, they present alternative explanations for why

stylistically similar pottery might be found across distinct environmental zones. In their discussion, the authors approach ontology (e.g., perspectivism) as a heuristic for developing a different interpretation of the archaeological evidence comprising the La Candelaria culture. In the next chapter, Juan Villanueva similarly works from the ontological orientation of contemporary indigenous peoples—in this case, the Aymara of the Bolivian altiplano—to interpret changes in the ceremonial assemblages from three archaeological sites in the Titicaca Basin. He frames his discussion in terms of native notions of time and its inextricable linkage to space, as expressed in the concept of *pacha*. Arguing that the same ontological orientation could be differentially enacted at different moments in time, he reads diachronic changes in the archaeological record from an ontological perspective, suggesting that relations between the temporal dimensions of the past (i.e., the dead) and present (i.e., the living) changed over time in materially legible ways.

In the penultimate chapter of the volume, Andrés Troncoso offers an ontological analysis of a 3,500-year sequence of rock art production in the Valle El Encanto in north-central Chile. Emphasizing the historically constituted nature of ontologies, he works from the archaeological record to gain insight into the changing ontological orientations of the pre-Columbian inhabitants of this valley. Troncoso approaches the ecology of the valley as an assemblage comprising both human and nonhuman entities (including landscape features) whose capacities and relations vis-à-vis one another—as evidenced by different types and placements of rock art—changed over time. In the concluding chapter, Catherine Allen offers several insightful observations that serve to both ground the contributions pragmatically and draw out common themes, including the utility of thinking through indigenous concepts, theorizing the body, and the significance of relationality in the Andean world.

In sum, this volume offers insight into the wide range of orientations and investigations gathered under the banner of the ontological turn in Andean archaeology. To paraphrase Holbraad, Pedersen, and Viveiros de Castro (<https://culanth.org/fieldsights/the-politics-of-ontology-anthropological-positions>), the ontological turn is about making “the otherwise” visible by experimenting with the conceptual affordances present in a given body of material—be it a body of practices, discourses, or artifacts—and all such materials are amenable to ontological analysis. The chapters in this volume demonstrate the variety of ways such analyses may be formulated, the directions in which they may lead, and the potential

they may hold for interpreting the archaeological record.

Return to Ixil: Maya Society in an Eighteenth-Century Yucatec Town. MARK Z. CHRISTENSEN and MATTHEW RESTALL. 2019. University Press of Colorado, Louisville. 302 pp., 19 illustrations. \$76.00 (hardcover), ISBN: 978-1-60732-921-3.

Reseñado por Laura Caso Barrera, Colegio de Postgraduados, Campus Puebla

En este libro se conjuntan el trabajo precursor de Matthew Restall (*Life and Death in a Maya Community: The Ixil Testaments of the 1760s*, 1995) sobre testamentos de Ixil de la década de 1760-1770 y los encontrados por Mark Christensen en 2007, que abarcan de 1748 a 1760. Los 109 testamentos de la población de Ixil, al norte de Yucatán, localizados en archivos locales por ambos autores, permiten tener una visión más completa de esta comunidad maya a mediados del siglo dieciocho. Los testamentos son documentos de gran importancia que, a pesar de su estructura rígida, nos permiten acercarnos a la vida cotidiana de los individuos que los dictaron, así como a la riqueza y su distribución, los sistemas de herencia y de propiedad.

Los testamentos fueron impuestos a las poblaciones indígenas en el siglo dieciséis, pero al parecer dicho recurso fue apropiado por los nativos, principalmente por las élites y la nobleza como una forma de salvaguardar su patrimonio y regular la transmisión de la propiedad. En diversas comunidades indígenas a lo largo del período colonial aumentaron el número de testamentos en períodos de crisis agrícolas y epidemias, como fue el caso de Ixil durante el siglo dieciocho que enfrentó plagas, huracanes y posteriormente hambrunas. El proceso de imposición y adopción del testamento en las diversas poblaciones indígenas está ligado al establecimiento de las repúblicas de indios, cuyos funcionarios fueron los encargados de establecer en sus poblaciones el sistema testamentario, siendo uno de los más importantes el escribano de cabildo. Como bien lo señalan los autores en el caso de las poblaciones mayas, los escribanos tuvieron una posición privilegiada y salieron de las filas de la nobleza. Los escribanos de cabildo redactaban muy diversos documentos oficiales como peticiones, registros, testamentos, documentos de compraventa y registros de bautismo, casamiento y defunción. La rígida estructura de los documentos legales apenas permite vislumbrar ciertas preferencias

y estilos que caracterizan a cada escribano. Sin embargo, en ciertos documentos podemos “escuchar” las voces y los sentimientos de los testadores. Los escribanos también realizaron la composición de documentos misceláneos como los Libros de Chilam Balam, donde amalgamaron conocimientos de la cultura maya y de la cultura europea. Los elaborados textos que aparecen en el Chilam Balam de Ixil, tanto bíblicos, calendáricos y médicos, contrastan con la sobriedad de los testamentos de la misma población (Caso Barrera, *Chilam Balam of Ixil: Facsimile and Study of an Unpublished Maya Book*, 2019).

Uno de los capítulos más importantes del libro es el que hace referencia a la vida económica en el siglo dieciocho de la comunidad de Ixil y se complementa con el capítulo sobre la familia. A partir de los testamentos podemos acercarnos a los sistemas agrícolas, que aparentemente fueron los mismos que en la actualidad, es decir, solares cerca de las casas con árboles frutales y apiarios, así como milpas en lugares lejanos. Destacan los solares con plantas nativas como zapotes, palmas y henequén, así como los que tenían plantas introducidas como plátanos, ajos y cebollas. Es importante mencionar la gran cantidad de animales europeos que se enumeran en los testamentos, como garañones, mulas y caballos.

Los autores señalan que los testamentos reflejan la riqueza de una nobleza amplia, multifacética y compleja, así como la forma en que sus miembros heredaban su patrimonio a sus descendientes. Los indígenas mesoamericanos tuvieron formas establecidas para repartir sus bienes. Por ejemplo, Motolinía menciona que los mexicas legaban sus casas y heredades a sus hijos y el mayor, si era varón, las poseía y cuidaba de sus hermanos y hermanas (de Benavente, *Memoriales*, 1971:4). Algo similar plantea Landa para el caso de los mayas yucatecos, apuntando que solo los hijos varones recibían herencia y a las mujeres se les daba algo por “piedad o voluntad” (de Landa, *Relación de las cosas de Yucatán*, 1982:42).

Al parecer con la legislación española los sistemas de sucesión hereditaria se modificaron, pues se les dio el derecho a legar a hombres y mujeres. Sin embargo, en algunos de los codicilos de los testamentos de Ixil, se observa una reticencia a la división del patrimonio, cuando seis o siete años después de haberse hecho el testamento los herederos aún no habían recibido su herencia y tenían que recurrir al cabildo. Esta práctica que se observa en Ixil contravenía lo dispuesto en 1585 en el tercer concilio provincial mexicano, que señalaba que el testamento debía tener efecto al término de un año. Posiblemente otra pista que muestra la poca disposición a dividir, sobre todo