

Bridging the Gaps. Integrating Archaeology and History in Oaxaca, Mexico. A Volume in Memory of Bruce E. Byland. DANNY ZBOROVER and PETER C. KROEFGES, editors. 2015. University Press of Colorado, Boulder, ix + 428 pp. \$75 (hardcover), ISBN 978-1-60732-328-0.

Reviewed by Verónica Pérez Rodríguez, University at Albany SUNY.

While other volumes on Oaxacan ethnohistory or historical archaeology focus on individual documents, buildings, or communities, this volume provides a regional breadth that speaks of the proliferation of studies beyond the Valley of Oaxaca. It espouses a perspective that expands traditional understandings of what falls in the realm of history and the lines of evidence that researchers can and should use.

The volume begins with Danny Zborover's excellent discussion of 27 centuries of pictorial and literary traditions in Oaxaca. The author argues for an integrative approach to "bridge the gaps" between archaeology and history and among the prehispanic, historical, and contemporary periods. He summarizes the progression of writing from the Middle Formative monolith at San José Mogote and the Classic-period carved stone monuments to the Postclassic and colonial codices, *mapas*, *lienzos*, and archives. Zborover brings his discussion to the present as indigenous communities, in Oaxaca and abroad, turn to contemporary forms of communication, digital media, the Internet, and contemporary art to engage with their heritage. He outlines emerging lines of research and how the chapters that follow contribute to them.

Ronald Spores champions ethnohistory as a replicable methodology that can improve current understandings of prehispanic societies and calls for the use of a convergent approach. In the chapter, however, Spores stops short of fully illustrating how the ethnohistorical record informed his interpretations of the carved panels or the early colonial burial mentioned from his project at Yucundaa.

In Chapter 3, John Pohl gives a personal account of working with Byland in the Tilantongo Valley survey. Next, Viola König argues that Santa María Cuquila, in the Mixteca Alta, corresponds with the "jaguar town" toponym in the Codex Egerton. König's identification contradicts the one offered by Jansen and Pérez Jiménez in their 2011 volume *The Mixtec Manuscript: Time, Agency, and Memory in Ancient Mexico*, where they identify the toponym to be Cuyotepeji (Ñuu Ñaña) in the Mixteca Baja. König discusses her supporting evidence, warns against renaming the codex, and showcases community engagement activities in Cuquila.

Geoffrey and Sharisse McCafferty reminisce about working with Byland in the Tamazulapam survey and

offer an interpretation of Lady 9 Grass from Codex Nuttall as a Mixtec version of Cihuacóatl, based on her use of a skeletal buccal mask. They discuss the depiction of weaving instruments in the codices as symbols of female power and the metaphorical weaving of (i.e., creation of) cultural landscapes.

In Chapter 6, Bruce Byland frankly discusses, using cognitive psychology, the "confirmation bias" and the errors of "premature closure" and "inadequate synthesis" that he and Jansen have committed while working to identify toponyms like "the hill of the wasp" and "the red and white bundle." Byland argues that these places are located near Tilantongo and Jaltepec, in the Nochixtlán Valley, while Jansen places them in the Valley of Oaxaca, in and around Monte Albán. Byland offers us an example of how to discuss academic differences in an open, professional, and civil dialog.

Next, Michael Lind's chapter outlines the functional and morphological differences between Pilitas (Mixtec) polychromes and Catalina (Cholula) polychromes. He integrates ceramic analysis and codical information about their function and context. Carlos Rincón's chapter traces the development of the pluri-ethnic polity of the Coixtlahuaca Valley. Between 2007 and the publication of this volume in 2015, a research team led by Stephen Kowalewski surveyed the Coixtlahuaca Valley. Yet Rincón does mention these data as well as van Doesburg's work on some of the documents referenced in the chapter.

Stephen Whittington and Andrew Workinger present results from their survey of Teozacoalco, while talking about colonialism and cultural contact with the Spanish, the Aztec, the Zapotec, and Tilantongo. Their work incorporates the Mapa de Teozacoalco and the communities depicted in it; among these are the Formative site of El Fortín and Classic-period Iglesia Gentil.

Sebastian van Doesburg and Ronald Spores show how the integration of archaeological and ethnohistorical records can help locate the communities and saltworks in the Mapa de San Vicente de Palmar. They outline interesting directions for future research on the settlement history of the Mixteca Baja, the local ceramic industry, and the history of salt extraction and its trade prior to its expanded use in colonial silver mining.

Liana Jimenez Osorio and Emmanuel Posselt Santoyo integrate oral history and archaeological survey on San Miguel el Grande. They locate Classic and Postclassic settlements whose names and oral histories link them with the foundation of the municipality.

In Chapter 12, Zborover makes a strong, if lengthy argument for decolonizing historical archaeology by integrating prehispanic histories and their communication media. He presents the results of his inclusive approach in Santa María Zapotitán, in the Chontalpa, and he identifies "tensions" between the various lines of evidence, which he uses to direct his research.

Peter Kroefges discusses his work on the Chontal communities of Huamelula and Astata, which were relocated inland after pirate attacks. The author references two *lienzos* and a copy of a map produced by a British pirate to talk about the the original location of the sites, population size, and distribution prior to their relocation.

Judith Zeitlin compares three lines of evidence on early colonial indigenous life in the Isthmus of Tehuantepec. By discussing the curated accounts by Burgoa and De Montemayor as examples of public transcripts, and comparing these to the hidden script in the archaeological record of Rancho Santa Cruz, Zeitlin argues for indigenous agency. She finds that Tablón Orange ceramics were an indigenous response to the imported *majolicas*.

Also, these ceramics incorporated the *xicalcolihqui* motif that was indexical of Prehispanic concepts. Finally, Viola König and Adam Sellen discuss the history of nineteenth-century exploration and the collections that German and Mexican explorers produced.

The volume makes an important contribution to historical and archaeological scholarship on Mesoamerica, which according to Zborover follows a North American paradigm that continues to further “neocolonial agendas that perpetuate the ‘people without history’ master narrative” (Zborover 2015:283). Most of the chapters are fine examples of carefully drafted research that questions the bounds of what has been termed historical and prehispanic archaeology and the false temporal and material divide between history and archaeology.