implicit in an ontological turn that separates out and rejects "discursive cognitivism" in favor of "nondiscursive materiality," as elaborated by Harrison-Buck. But there is also the title itself. The "other-than-human" descriptor, coined by A. Irving Hallowell in an Ojibwa ethnography in 1960, was admittedly equivalent to the more common "nonhuman." It indicates a resilient ontological divide in which *human* is the marked term against which all other identities are measured. Significantly, a few authors examine this dichotomy and find it wanting, suggesting instead a continuum of existences and interpolations between idealized poles of human and nonhuman. Indeed, in a fully relational ontology founded in dynamic and transformative assemblages, neither humans nor nonhumans should constitute monolithic phenomena. Just as objects and animals can range from more to less humanlike, so too might humans exhibit a continuum of statuses, including subhumans and suprahumans, which should have some archaeological visibility. But with their exploration of the great diversity of contexts and statuses of object personhood, agency, and animacy, the contributors raise a number of new questions that amplify the volume's role in ongoing theoretical dialogues.

Religion and Politics in the Ancient Americas. SARAH B. BARBER and ARTHUR A. JOYCE, editors. 2018. Routledge, London. xvi + 307 pp. $39.95 (paperback), ISBN 978-1-138-90789-8.

Reviewed by Christine S. VanPool, University of Missouri

This volume explores archaeological approaches to studying religion, drawing upon examples from across the New World and case studies from different periods of the past, ranging from Preceramic Peru to the period of European contact and colonialism in North America. Arthur Joyce's introduction to the volume states that the essays are designed to meet three goals:

> (1) To move beyond a focus on religion as a means of political integration; (2) to consider Native American religion from the perspective of indigenous ontologies; and (3) to consider the archaeology of religion and politics from the perspectives of theories of materiality [p. 11].

Each of these goals fits current trends in archaeological analyses of religion, and the volume as a whole expands on the burgeoning body of literature published over the last decade or so.

To meet the first goal of focusing on religion beyond its political and "functional" importance, all of the essays to some degree are focused on how individuals or communities manipulate "religion." One of the strengths of this volume is its illustrations of diverse approaches to studying religious communities. The second goal of integrating indigenous ontologies is met through the careful application of ethnographic data in several cases. Those interested in Amerindian ontologies will find the chapters by Alt and Pauketat (Mississippian religion), Christopher Rodning (Cherokee religion), and Maria Nieves Zedeño (summary chapter) particularly interesting. Other chapters, including those by Sarah Barber (Early Formative period in Chiapas, Mexico), David Carballo (Aztec religion), Edward Swenson (Late Moche and Early Lambayeque cultures of Peru), Matthew Piscitelli (Late Archaic in Peru), and Scott Hutson and colleagues (Maya religion and ritual), rely more on archaeological data to explore underlying ontological frameworks. Likewise, the third goal of applying materiality studies is met successfully. For example, Erina Gruner's chapter on Chaco Canyon complements previous work on materiality done by Ruth Van Dyke.

There is much to praise in many of the chapters. For example, many of the authors consider the nature and importance of bundles and in doing so provide excellent insight into their importance and variation. Alt and Pauketat note that bundles can be people, places, and things; Barber characterizes ball courts as bundles; and Zedeño in the concluding chapter provides a detailed discussion of the concept as it is presented in the volume that is worth reading. The discussions of the materiality of bundles may in fact be the most interesting contribution of this volume, to some readers. Likewise, those seeking theoretical and methodological approaches to studying religion will find useful insights from Walker's innovative essay, which reconstructs Amerindian ontology in Amazonia through his study of landscape utilization.

However, there are a few characteristics of the volume that might frustrate some readers. Perhaps most notably, there is little consistency in terminology. Such issues have been present in the anthropology of religion since E. B. Tylor's first musings on the topic in the nineteenth century, but terminological issues are problematic here. While not clearly stated, many (but not all) authors appear to reject common terms (e.g., *animism*, *spirit*, *supernatural*) and instead use a variety of wordy or awkward phrases to seemingly refer to the same thing. One such set of phrases

https://doi.org/10.1017/aaq.2019.28 Published online by Cambridge University Press

includes "animate soul-bearing beings," "other-than-human beings," and "other-than-human entities." These categories are overly vague, and it is not always clear from the context whether the authors mean living things we find in the world around us, or the spiritual aspect of the being that has moved into a different realm, or hidden forces working around us. I personally find my dog to be an "other-than-human entity," yet she is a fundamentally different sort of entity than those created by the Zuni of New Mexico when they deliberately broke items to make them no longer useful in this world but useful in the spiritual world. Another potential issue is that the "other-than-human beings" discussed in places might include human souls. The ethnographic record is replete with instances in which groups emphasize that recently deceased people can appear as apparitions wearing their clothes and speaking. Generations later the deceased person becomes nameless and joins the corporate ancestors. From a global and comparative perspective, humans tend to have elaborate ceremonies to please the recently deceased, so that the dead will move on and not bother the living or, conversely, to call them back to help the living. For many warrior sodalities, an enemy's scalp or head could be used to harness a powerful *human* spirit. These important insights are not captured by, and may in fact be obscured through, such terminology.

Captives: How Stolen People Changed the World. CATHERINE M. CAMERON. 2016. University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln. xiv + 213 pp. $40.00 (hardcover), ISBN 978-0-8032-9399-1.

Reviewed by David H. Dye, University of Memphis

Catherine Cameron's first page of *Captives: How Stolen People Changed the World* opens with Helena Valero's capture by Yanomamö raiders in the Amazon and the Chibok schoolgirls kidnapping by Boko Haram jihadists in northern Nigeria. What follows is a well-researched argument urging archaeologists to consider the importance of captives in the distant past and to identify captive-taking as an important mechanism for culture change.

In the first chapter, "The Captive in Space, Time, and Mind," Cameron discusses the antiquity and pervasiveness of captive-taking through kidnapping, raiding, and warfare in small-scale societies. What follows is a review of the global scope of captive-taking, especially the selective taking of children and women. She also emphasizes the permeability of social boundaries and shows that the landscape of captive-taking entangles communities at varying social scales.

Data on captive-taking are derived from eight broad regions of the world. In Chapter 2, four regions in North America are discussed, along with other accounts from Africa, Europe, South America, and Southeast Asia. Identifying patterns common to captive-taking around the world helps in understanding the social lives of captives in small-scale societies. The patterns identified represent a first step in the recognition of captives as subordinate individuals, in addition to contributions made by captive persons to the formation and maintenance of social boundaries and practices in captor communities.

In Chapter 3, "The Captive as Social Person," Cameron outlines the social positions captives may be offered in captor society. Here she provides a microscale examination of the ways in which captives may become incorporated into captor society and the social roles offered them. In addition, the characteristics of captured individuals may have a determinative effect on their ultimate social position, which may range from wife or adoptee to abject slave. The captor's assessment of whether "others" might be civilized or properly trained in captor social practices is particularly significant to the captive's social status and treatment.

Captives may have been an important source of power in the past. As aspiring leaders require followers and control over the labor of others, captives meet these social and political needs without the reciprocal obligations involved in demanding the services of kin. Captives were a potent source of power for their captors. Their presence and degraded condition emphasize the status and control exercised by their captors. In this respect, archaeologists should investigate the role of captives in the creation of complex societies.

In "Captives, Social Boundaries, and Ethnogenesis," Cameron investigates the effects captives may have on the creation and maintenance of social boundaries. Captives may strengthen social boundaries by following captor cultural practices or by serving as reminders of incorrect behavior. Captives may reinforce social boundaries as they mix with unrelated people. Emphasis is placed on the fluidity of small-scale groups that continually break up and re-form in different configurations. In this light, Cameron cautions archaeologists to wean themselves from the view of social groups as entities with lengthy histories.

In Chapter 6, "Captives and Cultural Transmission," Cameron argues that captives could introduce new cultural practices into captor societies. This chapter is especially important for archaeologists, who often lack adequate models for understanding how cultural practices move among social groups. She

https://doi.org/10.1017/aaq.2019.28 Published online by Cambridge University Press