

ceremonies. Yet, Jefferson was more interested in Native American origins than living traditions, and much like other settler colonists, he assumed that the region's Native people had disappeared. Ironically, his observations about the mound situated the Monacan in archaeological culture history and commented on their persistence. Chapter 3 synthesizes what is known about them from modern archaeological surveys and excavations that aimed to write their history to 1607. It presents evidence about their houses, settlements, economy, warfare, and burials. But it goes beyond archaeological "facts" to craft a picture of town life in which the presence of burial mounds defined certain townscapes as sacred places and seats of chiefly authority. The interpretation shifts the understanding of Indigenous rule strictly from materialist concerns to an emphasis on the nexus of land, history, and identity. A Native-centered approach is key to Hantman's seminal analysis of Jamestown's survival in Chapter 4, and it serves as a crucial link in recovering the later Monacan from colonialist historiography.

Hantman has not written a truncated culture history. Instead, he traces the diverse ways in which the Monacan persisted and maintained community after 1607. The archaeological and ethnohistorical evidence in Chapter 5 sheds new light on Monacan survivance from 1650 to 1800, when the myth of their disappearance became accepted knowledge among Virginia's English settler colonists. Some Monacan remained in their large towns into the early eighteenth century. Others dispersed. They formed smaller, less visible settlements, they established trading towns, and they joined Siouan- and Iroquoian-speaking peoples. The Virginia Piedmont was devoid of neither Indigenous bodies nor Indigenous histories, as has been implied in terminal narratives. Local dispersal, as Hantman notes, is a more accurate description of how the later Monacan dwelled in the land and persisted within the social and cultural landscapes of Virginia than what is portrayed in tropes of disappearance.

In the final chapter, Monacan voices resonate loudly. Here, Hantman reflects on his long-term collaborative relationship with the Monacan beginning in 1990—one year after the state recognized the tribe—to 2018, when it received federal recognition. The chapter navigates the modern Monacan Indian Nation's painful history, during which their indigeneity was not only questioned but also denied in acts of documentary genocide sanctioned by Virginia's eugenicist policies. Pejorative labels still sting, as do other difficult reminders. Although the specific details vary, the Monacan people's complex ancestry and hurtful colonial history has a familiar ring to readers

knowledgeable about other Native communities in North America whose struggles for federal recognition and sovereignty are burdened—if not impeded—by such legacies. For the Monacan, their stories of survivance are what matter and what they want told. Hantman has done this. Collaborative projects recorded the architectural and archaeological presence of their last 200 years, and they resulted in the return of ancestral remains and artifacts to their rightful owners. In an unexpected turn, archaeology enabled the Monacan to gaze at the faces of two ancestors, a man and a woman, reconstructed at their request. Until then, no Monacan had ever seen images of ancestors older than those in a 1914 photograph. By listening closely as Hantman has, other archaeologists can learn how a humanistic approach can contribute to decolonizing archaeological practice.

Conquistador's Wake: Tracking the Legacy of Hernando de Soto in the Indigenous Southeast. DENNIS B. BLANTON. 2020. University of Georgia Press, Athens. xv + 256 pp. \$29.99 (paperback), ISBN 978-0-8203-5635-8.

Reviewed by Marvin T. Smith, Valdosta State University (retired)

Dennis Blanton has produced a wonderful volume on excavations at the Glass site, a sixteenth-century Native American village with an abundance of European trade goods, located in southern Georgia. The book is written for a broad audience, although footnotes provide much scholarly detail of interest and importance to archaeologists and historians. It should be noted that Blanton has also produced a series of technical reports through the Fernbank Museum in Atlanta that provide more detail for a professional audience, but the present volume provides an exciting look at Blanton's fieldwork, changing interpretations, changing methodology, and exciting discoveries. It is well written in a first-person style that details Blanton's thought processes as the excavations proceeded over the course of several field seasons. This volume is the kind of work that more professional archaeologists should be writing to reach the public that supports our research. I believe that Blanton's report will become a model for popularizing archaeology and therefore should be read by a much broader audience than simply people interested in the archaeology of early contact between Europeans and Native Americans in the American South.

That being said, I do have some reservations about Blanton's interpretations and conclusions. Although

he considers other explanations for the presence of European objects, he settles on the interpretation that the Glass site was visited by Hernando de Soto in 1540. In contrast to the Soto route proposed by Charles Hudson (*Knights of Spain, Warriors of the Sun: Hernando de Soto and the South's Ancient Chiefdoms*, 1997), Blanton suggests a different route. He makes a strong case for the Glass site being the capital of a province located on the lower Ocmulgee River. He argues that this province is Ichisi, mentioned in the chronicles of the Hernando de Soto expedition. If Glass is the provincial capital as Blanton says, the Glass site represents the town of Ichisi. Soto's secretary, Rodrigo Ranjel, states in his account of the Soto entrada that the Spaniards placed a cross on the mound at Ichisi. The only evidence of a mound at Glass is a layer of fill that seals in the temple structure. This structure has numerous sixteenth-century European artifacts on its floor sealed under the fill, and thus the "mound" postdates contact and could not have been seen by Ranjel.

Blanton argues that Glass and the surrounding province are exactly the kind of place that would attract Soto (pp. 143, 158). I am not convinced. Blanton states that Glass is the capital of the province, which otherwise consists of dispersed farmsteads. Blanton's population estimate for Glass is only 113–257 inhabitants (p. 127). The entire province must have been quite small, and it would seem to have been incapable of supporting Soto's army of 600 men, their horses, and a herd of pigs. Sites on the Fall Line (the geographic border between the Coastal Plain and Piedmont physiographic provinces) in the Soto route reconstruction of Charles Hudson are much larger and seem to be better candidates for places Soto would have wanted to travel to find food and wealth.

Elsewhere it has been argued that the context of the European artifacts at Glass is unusual and may not indicate direct contact with Europeans. The most likely mechanism for the acquisition of these items is scavenging of settlements in coastal South Carolina associated with Lucas Vázquez Ayllón (1521–1526; see, for example, the chapter by Marvin T. Smith and David J. Hally in Clay Mathers's forthcoming edited volume, *Modeling Entradas: Sixteenth-Century Assemblages in North America*, in press from the University Press of Florida).

Mark Williams (cited at p. 205n18) argues that this lower Ocmulgee province represents a group of people who migrated from the Oconee Valley in the mid-sixteenth century. Williams argues that they were attracted to move south to be near the Spanish settlements on the coast after 1565. Conversely, perhaps their movement was the result of disruption following

the Soto expedition of 1540. Either way, they may have brought along European-derived items acquired from the Soto expedition while living in the Oconee Valley, an area that figures prominently in the Hudson Soto route reconstruction.

Blanton's careful excavations and excellent reporting bring attention to this important site. He proposes an alternative Soto route that differs from the Hudson route (which is different from the route proposed by John Swanton during the early to mid-twentieth century). Blanton's proposed route is carefully thought out, but as he notes, it requires finding additional archaeological sites in specific areas of the Oconee Valley. Therefore, his route is very testable. Blanton's fine work should stimulate further research, and I look forward to the continuation of the debate.

Droulers-Tsiionhiakwatha: Chef-lieu iroquoien de Saint-Anicet à la fin du XVe siècle. CLAUDE CHAPDELAINÉ, editor. 2019. Paléo-Québec 38. Recherches amérindiennes au Québec, Montreal. xx + 464 pp. \$30.00 (paperback), ISBN 978-2-920366-50-3.

Reviewed by Gary Warrick, Wilfrid Laurier University

Published archaeological site reports sadly have become a thing of the past. Academic publishers today are looking for synthetic and theoretical contributions from archaeology, with minimal data presentation. However, archaeologists fundamentally rely on the raw data contained in site reports, which ideally should serve as the lasting archive of our destructive examination of the past. *Droulers-Tsiionhiakwatha* is not only an exemplary site report, providing literally everything a reader needs to know about the site and its contents, but also a summary of almost 40 years of St. Lawrence Iroquoian archaeology in the Saint-Anicet region, southwest of Montréal, Québec. Claude Chapdelaine and his colleagues and students have done a remarkable job of summarizing their investigation of a circa AD 1500 St. Lawrence Iroquoian village (1.3 ha) in incredible detail, using state-of-the-art methods of analysis.

The book is written in French, and it is Volume 38 of the Paléo-Québec series, published by Recherches amérindiennes au Québec. It is edited by Claude Chapdelaine, one of the most accomplished and respected archaeologists in Canada. Since 1974, most Indigenous archaeological site excavations in Québec have been published but have been overlooked and undervalued by English-speaking Canada and