

defined, how it articulates with the concept of identity, and how the village community becomes a “social agent” itself, creating meaningful “villagescapes” and structuring social interactions and experiences of being.

Most of the authors follow well-trodden research paths to investigate how aggregation, ceremonial practice, monumental construction, and specialized architecture contribute to, and function within, a sense of community within the coresidential space of the village. For the earliest villages in the Eastern Woodlands, Victor D. Thompson (Chapter 2) considers how collective action might operate within a basically egalitarian context of Archaic shell mound villages; Neill Wallis (Chapter 3) specifically considers why, in light of the many drawbacks to village life, people were willing to form villages in the first place.

Jennifer Birch and Ronald F. Williamson (Chapter 6) consider the initial village formation of northern Iroquoian people during the Middle and Late Woodland periods and how gendered power dynamics changed with the adoption of matrilineal residence patterns and matrilineal descent. Lynne P. Sullivan (Chapter 7) also examines gendered power dynamics in Mississippian villages of southeastern Tennessee. The authors of both chapters argue that a gendered division of power between men in community leadership and women in kin group leadership positions may have facilitated between-community social ties at a regional scale. Robert A. Cook (Chapter 8) and Richard Jefferies (Chapter 9) both examine the importance of the village layout as a symbol and also the personification of village community in contexts as different as Fort Ancient in Ohio (Cook) and the circular villages of Late Woodland Virginia (Jefferies).

Four chapters specifically examine seemingly outlier case studies. Shaun E. West, Thomas J. Pluckhahn, and Martin Menz (Chapter 4) introduce the concept of the “hypertrophic village” to investigate the development and symbolic importance of the extraordinarily large village site of Kolomoki in Georgia during the Middle and Late Woodland periods.

Other chapters consider situations in which village settlements did not develop or where they were not sustained. Eric E. Jones (Chapter 5) considers what factors may have prevented dispersed populations in North Carolina and Virginia from coalescing into villages. In Chapter 10, Martin D. Gallivan, Christopher J. Shephard, and Jessica A. Jenkins focus on how Algonquian village communities were able to maintain social relationships despite long seasonal dispersals of most inhabitants from the village home base. Kurt A. Jordan (Chapter 11) similarly examines

how Seneca villagers reorganized into dispersed “neighborhoods” during the historic period.

While not all of the authors follow through explicitly with the organizing theme of social power within and between villages, they all contribute to a greater understanding of the range of variation in authority, influence, and (yes) power in basically heterarchical societies. They are able to do so by utilizing a productive research strategy that includes questioning common assumptions, critically examining definitions, disaggregating variables into possible component subvariables, untangling general “processes” into steps, and considering the range of variation in our understanding of the village community.

A Study of Southwestern Archaeology. STEPHEN H. LEKSON. 2018. University of Utah Press, Salt Lake City. xvii + 408 pp. \$34.95 (paperback), ISBN 978-1-60781-642-3.

Reviewed by John Ware, The Amerind Foundation

Steve Lekson says that *A Study of Southwestern Archaeology* is his last book. Apropos a final publication by a prominent Southwestern archaeologist, the book includes a number of philosophical discussions about archaeology versus history, history versus heritage, science versus the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, indigenous archaeology versus historiography, processual versus postmodern, inter alia—all worth reading, in my opinion. Many of his animadversions are contained in 110 pages of narrowly spaced endnotes, so be prepared to flip back and forth constantly as you read. Full disclosure: in a section titled “Bombs Away,” Lekson devotes eight pages in his book to challenging much of my recent work on Pueblo social history, so readers should know that Steve and I have a long history of disagreements and our views on Chaco and the greater Southwest often diverge greatly. Caveat lector.

Lekson’s “study” is in fact mostly about Chaco. In Lekson’s view, Chaco is a Mesoamerican-style city-state—comparable to an Aztec *altepetl*—complete with kings and lesser nobles, commoners, and capital cities in a large economically and politically integrated region: in other words, an empire in the northern Southwest. Lekson, who has always proclaimed his heterodoxy and grumpy outsidership, seems untroubled that few Southwestern archaeologists agree with his interpretation. And he thinks he knows why: his colleagues cannot imagine Chacoan complexity, because we are all stuck in a box called “Pueblo Space.”

“Pueblo Space” was created in the racist anthropology of the nineteenth century, when Pueblos were consigned to the intermediate society evolutionary class by Lewis Henry Morgan. All Pueblos, past and present, are egalitarian, nonhierarchical, peaceful, communal, independent, self-sufficient, and unchanging. There is no room in “Pueblo Space” for anything more complex than a tribe, or perhaps a simple chiefdom, and certainly not a city-state. And what is to blame for all this bias? Anthropology, which turned its back on history and embraced Santa Fe’s “Pueblo Mystique” marketing efforts that defined the Pueblos for tourists, collectors, and, according to Lekson, anthropologists.

Lekson’s description of “Pueblo Space” as the current view of Southwestern archaeologists is an idealized (when not completely fictionalized) description of the Pueblos that dates to the first half of the twentieth century, where it owes a heavy debt to Ruth Benedict and others. Most scholars of the Pueblos and, more importantly, their Native colleagues have not taken Pueblo egalitarianism seriously for decades. Despite an ethos of egalitarianism, all Pueblos distinguish between ritual elites and commoners. In most Pueblos, ritual elites have the power to levy sanctions on individuals up to and including expulsion from the community for life (and in the past, witchcraft accusations could lead to the ultimate sanction). Anthropologist Joseph Jorgensen, who published a massive comparative analysis of 172 indigenous groups in western North America (1980, *Western Indians*), described the Rio Grande Pueblos—the most likely Chacoan descendants—as the most top-down, centralized ritual and political organizations in western North America north of Mexico.

Lekson’s views on “Pueblo Space” have been clear in his lectures and writings for at least the last 30 years. He embraces the notion that Pueblo ancestors voted with their feet in the late 1200s to escape Chacoan hegemony (by then, manifested by the late Chacoan site of Aztec, New Mexico). He relegates droughts and other climate impacts to the dendroclimatological “tail wagging the dog of Southwestern pre-history” (p. 138). According to Lekson, a post-Chaco reinvention of Pueblo society combined with the profound impacts of Euro-American conquest and colonization in the centuries afterward effectively severed the link between the historic Pueblos and their precolonial Pueblo ancestors. However, modern scholarship increasingly views the hierarchical authority structures we see in all contemporary Pueblos as having roots in deep prehistory. What, exactly, was reinvented, and where? Did prehistoric social change and Euro-American conquest sever all connections between

past and present? Lekson does not say, and his notion of “Pueblo Space” has little to do with the history of Pueblo scholarship. Instead, “Pueblo Space” is a rhetorical device designed to accomplish two things: (1) to justify ignoring Pueblo ethnographic research and (2) to disparage opposing views by putting them in the “Pueblo Space.” Lekson’s unique style of expression and his cherry-picking of citations and data to justify his assertions make the book fun to read for some, infuriating for others; the book’s title imitates Walter Taylor’s *A Study of Archaeology* (1948), which was certainly not a dispassionate examination of archaeological method and theory.

Lekson refuses to grant “agency” to Chacoans, who were apparently incapable of creating their own brand of complexity. Chaco was a peripheral Mesoamerican society, a “secondary state” that relied on Mesoamericans to provide the evolutionary impetus as well as the governing model of social complexity. For Lekson, this is “history,” and anthropology is “anti-history.” But what kind of history is this? Aztec *altepetls* have their own history: there were many of them, and they flourished in historical contexts that postdate Chaco.

But if Chaco was not a Mesoamerican city-state, how should we explain the presence of copper bells, macaws, and cacao in Pueblo Bonito and other great houses? Chaco—in my view—was too far away and too deficient in resources to be within Mesoamerica’s sphere of direct economic and political influence. What could possibly motivate legions of Mesoamericans to travel 1,200 miles on foot through their northern frontier to establish a secondary state in such a cold, arid, resource-poor region of northwestern New Mexico? Turquoise acquisition? Doubtful. Consider, however, that the view looking south from Chaco offered tantalizing glimpses of Mesoamerican power and its symbols that emergent Chacoan leaders could use to validate and intensify their status. Macaws, copper bells, and cacao, which were transported to the Southwest over long distances, could be used in Chaco to inspire awe. And all of these exotics could be carried in a basket or backpack (as depicted on some Mimbres bowls). Chaco may have been beyond the hegemonic reach of Mesoamerican states that lacked wheeled vehicles and domestic traction animals but was not too far for powerful objects and ideas to spread north and be transformed by nascent ritual elites. Under the circumstances, and despite Lekson’s rejection of the term, *rituality* (coined by Robert Drennan and applied to Chaco by Norman Yoffee) seems to me a better fit than *secondary state*. And perhaps Cahokia, Lekson’s favorite Chaco analogue, was on a similar trajectory.