cases it was impossible to relate the symptoms of tarantism to an actual venomous infection. While these medical specialists in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries concluded that tarantism was an unfortunate consequence of ignorance and superstition, De Martino considers the 'bite of the tarantula' to be a symbolic key to a healing space that was culturally sanctioned and organized. He sees tarantism as an effective venue for expressing and partially resolving dynamic conflicts between the needs of individuals and the restrictions imposed by the material and cultural conditions of the society. Tarantism, for De Martino, is the "expression of a minor predominantly peasant religious formation. . ." (p. xxi), with roots in the Pythagorean and Orphic rites of the ancient Greek colonies of southern Italy and a ritual organization originating in the Middle Ages in response to what may have been a real epidemic of poisonous tarantula bites.

In the foreword to the English translation, anthropologist Vincent Crapanzano finds "a striking parallel between tarantism and the exorcism of the North African religious brotherhoods such as the "Isawa, the Gnawa, and the Hamadsha" (xii). But he cautions against pushing the parallel too far—like De Martino, Crapanzano is interested in preserving the distinctions of each historical phenomenon while recognizing similarities and mutual influences.

The kind of anthropological study De Martino presents is dated, exhibiting a respectful but also hegemonic and paternalistic attitude. The text is strongly influenced by the assumptions of the writer, in this case De Martino's functional psychoanalytic and existentialist framework, and the voice of the subjects is ignored or utilized only in support of the writer's interpretation. Nonetheless, this is a very well written account of an important and fascinating subject, and it challenges readers to reflect upon questions of historical and anthropological method, and to develop more culturally sensitive and pluralistic perspectives on the culture of healing.

———Giovanni Minonne, University of Michigan

Gil J. Stein, *The Archaeology of Colonial Encounters. Comparative Perspectives*. Santa Fe: School of American Research Advanced Seminar Series, School of American Research Press, 2005, 445 pp.

DOI: 10.1017/S0010417507000850

This book emerged from a weeklong research seminar at the School of American Research in 2000 entitled "The Archaeology of Colonies in Cross-Cultural Perspective." It is organized less as a series of distinct papers than as chapters that refer closely to each other, the arguments of each informing and expanding on those of the others. The authors bring together widely dispersed cases of colonization, ranging in area from Mesopotamia to California, and in time from the fourth millennium B.C. through the nineteenth century. Most

interesting is the range of the manifestations of colonial movement, from the trading colonies established by Uruk and Assyria in Anatolia (Stein), often within existing Anatolian settlements, to more substantial emporia around the Mediterranean settled by the Greeks (Dietler on Massilia) and the Phoenicians (Van Dommelin on Ibiza, Western Sardinia, and Andalusia), to the more classic cases of imperial Roman colonial establishments in Greece and Anatolia (Alcock).

The other case studies come from the Americas, almost all in imperial settings, although with major differences between them. These include two Mexican cases—the Soconusco region in the colonial period (Gasco) and the Zapotec settlement in Teotihuacan (Spence), two studies of Peru, one of the contrasting experiences of Spanish and Russian colonization in California (Lightfoot), Schreiber's account of the Wari colonial experience in Nasca, and D'Altroy's examination of the far more interventionist Inka resettlement and colonization. A concluding section by J. Daniel Rogers attempts to make sense of all this in terms of archaeological methodology. There is an excellent index and a unified and impressive bibliography.

This is a fine set of studies, presented by archaeologists deeply involved with the questions on the table. Each is valuable for its illumination of one of the many facets of colonial settlement. There must be some doubt as to whether we should accept the term 'colony' as the equivalent of the Greek *apoikia*, so that any group of settlers away from home will count, or whether we should restrict ourselves to the more standard sense of a colony established by a state outside of its immediate territory. The example I found most fascinating was Spence's treatment of the community of Tlailotlacan, a displaced Zapotec enclave in the heart of the capital city of the Aztec empire. The immigrants seem to have controlled the production and supply of lime to the city. This was but one of a network of Oaxacan sites, and Spence traces the movement of objects and of women (through isotope analysis of their teeth) from their homeland to the city and other communities of the Oaxacan diaspora. Here we have a trading and artisan community emanating from a nonhegemonic source, just like the Punic sites whose fate Van Dommelin charts in the Western Mediterranean. Perhaps it would make sense to make a simple distinction between imperial colonies sent by a state into territories it actively controls and those that remain embedded within an existing society without exercising control over it.

This sort of categorization, however, is just what every author in the book argues against. Almost every chapter begins with some ritual Wallerstein-bashing. (It is hard to beat Dietler's line that world systems models have had "less heuristic than hallucinogenic" effects on archaeology.) This is usually followed by a rejection of all dichotomies, the least popular being that between colonizer and colonized. It is, of course, true that the range of players and their interactions in any given colonial situation is far too complex to be

reduced to simple opposition. Still, Alcock bravely warns against throwing out the baby with the bathwater when we attempt to nuance the relationship between, say, the categories "Roman" and "Greek" (p. 325).

Roger's attempt to rebuild a structure from all this deconstruction is not entirely successful. If he is right that we must look beyond individuals and the random remains of their actions that archaeologists recover, his final recommendations—that we quantify our finds and situate them in their cultural and temporal contexts so that we can compare them in a significant fashion—does not seem far from what archaeologists have always done or at least attempted to do. C. Gosden's recent *Archaeology and Colonialism* (Cambridge, 2004) usefully proposes the investigation of a "middle ground" between colonizer and colonized as a way forward.

——— Elizabeth Fentress, Arco degli Acetari 31, Rome

Donald S. Moore, *Suffering for Territory: Race, Place, and Power in Zimbabwe*. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 2005, 424 pp.

DOI: 10.1017/S0010417507000862

Donald Moore tells a story of how victims of forced eviction in the colonial and postcolonial periods (1890 to the present) have used their suffering at the hands of the state to claim ownership of the land. ("We suffered for this land, therefore it is ours.") Focusing on Kaerezi, a part of Zimbabwe's eastern border with Mozambique, Moore traces three phases of suffering: (1) colonial land dispossession, (2) participation in Zimbabwe's national liberation war, and (3) postcolonial removals. After suffering from colonial land dispossessions, people supported nationalist guerrillas fighting for Zimbabwe's independence from Mozambique on the promise that they would get their lands back after independence. Struggles over the nation intersected with local struggles, and both were *kutambudzikira nyika* ('suffering for territory') (p. 189). In this suffering they were led by their chief, Rekayi Tangwena, who is famed for helping Robert Mugabe—the man who would be president—escape through their land into Mozambique to take charge of Zimbabwe's liberation war. Today—and this is Moore's main argument—Tangwena's people cite their suffering for the nation to claim entitlement to a special place in postcolonial Zimbabwe.

The book unfolds in three parts, each dealing with how space is governed, mapped, and entangled. Each section has three chapters. Part I, "Governing Space," explores what Moore calls "lines of dissent." Here he examines competing claims between the state, the chief, and ancestral spirits to authority over local people and space, which affect both the state's land-use interventions and local people's livelihoods. Part II turns to competing meanings of a particular place. Local people saw their land as "the Tangwena chiefdom" (i.e., the chief and his people), while the colonial state partitioned the area into "Gaeresi