

missions of the Apalachee province. Each author brings to the table exciting new insights ranging from discussions centered on the archaeological correlates of mission life; temporal and archaeological chronologies; mission demise and destruction; settlement models; Indigenous ceramic typologies; a Florida mission model replete with detailed criteria, including the discernment of cultural affiliation and contact; military assemblages; funerary traditions; and Hispanic lifestyles as evident from ceramics, foodways, and religious doctrines. Notable contributions include those chapters devoted to food production economies, the lives of the friars, the archaeology of site 8JE106, the collapse of the Apalachee province, and a reconstruction of the history of sound and acoustics at Mission San Luis de Talimali in modern Tallahassee.

This forward-looking contribution chronicles sustained long-term research and those interrogations of the evidence that have resulted in significant advances and changing perspectives on relations among Indigenous Apalachee and Timucuan peoples, Jesuit and Franciscan friars, and Spanish soldiers and settlers. Although the editors trace the advent of Apalachee-Spanish mission archaeology to Professor Hale G. Smith and the archaeologists of the Department of Anthropology at Florida State University in 1950, the past 30 years since Bonnie G. McEwan's edited volume, *The Spanish Missions of La Florida* (1993), have proven a watershed moment for scholarly understandings of the missionary enterprise in *La Florida*—particularly as it pertains to questions of ethnogenesis, both Hispanic and Indigenous foodways, syncretism, conflict, and warfare. In rendering their individual and collective contributions to contemporary understandings of the Florida missions, this work serves to humanize both the archaeological experience and the lives of the very peoples subject to the fractious frontiers of the Spanish borderlands experience.

doi:10.1017/aaq.2023.83

***Global Perspectives on Landscapes of Warfare.* Hugo C. Ikehara-Tsukayama and Juan Carlos Vargas Ruiz, editors. 2022. University Press of Colorado, Denver; Editorial de la Universidad del Magdalena, Santa Marta, Colombia. vi + 300 pp. \$75.00 (hardcover), ISBN 978-1-64642-099-5.**

Meghan E. Buchanan

Department of Sociology, Anthropology, and Social Work, Auburn University, Auburn, AL, USA

Global Perspectives on Landscapes of Warfare adds to ongoing discussions about the nature and scale of warfare in the past by examining the transformation of landscapes as part of defensive and offensive warfare-related strategies. In the introductory chapter, coeditors Hugo C. Ikehara-Tsukayama and Juan Carlos Vargas Ruiz lay out the book's primary aim: to discuss and compare how communities in conflict modified and interacted with landscapes in varied geographic and historical contexts. To facilitate these comparisons, it is organized into two sections, Old World and New World, and readers are invited to compare these regions' developmental trajectories, environmental contexts, sociopolitical complexity, and different methods and approaches to the study of landscapes. Accompanying each chapter are numerous visual aids, many published in color. Although the book is largely global in scope, the editors acknowledge that some regions are not included but that warfare in those regions has received attention elsewhere.

Two overlapping research themes emerge from the contributions to this book. First, many authors explore the character and use of different kinds of fortification and defensive systems. Drawing on site patterning, topography, and paleoenvironmental data, Igor Chechuskov argues that Late Bronze Age

fortifications in the Urals may have protected people and livestock from flooding and steppe winds, rather than serving defensive purposes. James Williams tests three hypotheses about the role of fortified settlements during the Longshan period in China and rejects all three based on his GIS-based analysis of site locations, resource availability, and political boundaries. Instead, Williams claims that fortifications were related to craft specialization, serving to protect the production of specialized objects for exchange and trade. Similarly, Lizzie Scholtus contends that fortified Iron Age and Roman settlements in northeastern France were used for defensive purposes and for controlling access to and protecting the extraction of raw material resources in the region. Tiffany Early-Spadoni draws on viewshed analyses of fire beacon, fort, and road networks from Middle Bronze Age Syria and Iron Age Assyria to understand the movement of military campaigns and strategic communication systems within polities. Using line-of-sight visibility and site-spacing data, Kerry Nichols explores changes in site locations in the lower Missouri River Valley during the Middle and Late Woodland periods, arguing that Late Woodland settlements were more clustered; they allowed for increased mutual defense after the introduction of the bow and arrow. Lauren Kohut develops a model for hypothesizing and assessing alliance building in the Colca Valley of Peru. Her GIS-based alliance modeling considers landscape data (terrain, distance, estimation of travel times, etc.) to approximate threat identification (when a threat becomes visible to people at a site), lead time (the time needed for a threat to reach the site after it becomes visible), and response area (the area around a site in which allied neighbors could send aid for defense).

The second theme questions the historical development and scale of warfare and its association with sociopolitical complexity. Viktor Borzunov demonstrates that Neolithic and Chalcolithic fortifications in the West Siberian taiga were local developments, rather than being built by migrating herding/farming communities from the south and east. Takehiko Matusugi traces changes in fortified settlements, weaponry, and violent trauma during the Yayoi and Kofun periods in Japan, finding decline in warfare over time even while the amount of weaponry in elite burial contexts increased: Matsugi attributes this decline to shifts to collective ideologies as opposed to individualistic ideologies. Nam Kim and Russell Quick discuss Bronze Age fortifications at Co Loa in Vietnam, describing how their construction incorporated unique landscape features and arguing that the city was created as a seat of political power, with its massive fortifications inscribing power relations (locally and extralocally) on the landscape for generations. Juan Carlos Vargas Ruiz begins with ethnohistoric accounts of the Llanos of Colombia, where Europeans described powerful chiefs, fortified settlements, warfare, and captive taking. Vargas Ruiz then turns to the archaeological record of the region to assess the deeper history and transformation of landscapes of violence in the Llanos. Ikehara-Tsukayama documents changing settlement and defensive patterns in the Nepeña Valley of Peru, tying transitions in defensive systems (and who has access to them) to changes in sociopolitical organization and regional politics.

The book concludes with a chapter by Elizabeth Arkush, which should become required reading for archaeologists researching warfare. Arkush adeptly highlights several shortcomings in the book and in the archaeology of warfare more broadly. She argues that archaeologies of warfare are missing robust middle-range theory that connects interpretations about warfare to the realities of the archaeological record and our research methods. An additional shortcoming that she highlights relates to issues of equifinality: there can be multiple reasons to build a wall, so how can archaeologists distinguish between warfare-related reasons and others? Compounding the issue of equifinality are the long periods of time with which researchers work. Without finer chronological resolution (some case studies span hundreds, if not thousands, of years), it is difficult to assess whether sites within landscapes of warfare were occupied contemporaneously or sequentially; this makes it challenging to interpret the outcomes of analyses of lines of sight, site clustering, and buffer zones.

Global Perspectives on Landscapes of Warfare has much to offer scholars of ancient warfare: geographic and temporal diversity, data-driven analyses, copious graphics, and many compelling hypotheses and theories for other researchers to explore. Contributing authors engage in ongoing discussions about the many different kinds of evidence for (or against) the presence of warfare in

the past, and they advance knowledge about associations among practices of warfare, sociopolitical complexity, and the consequences of warfare as enacted on multiple scales across past landscapes.

doi:10.1017/aaq.2023.66

***Life at the Margins of the State: Comparative Landscapes from the Old and New Worlds.* Alicia M. Boswell and Kyle A. Knabb, editors. 2022. University Press of Colorado, Louisville. xiii + 251 pp. \$67.00 (hardcover), ISBN 978-1-64642-294-4. \$53.00 (e-book), ISBN 978-1-64642-295-1.**

David Pacifico

Department of Art History, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, WI, USA

This volume asserts that margins only look marginal from the center; hegemonic cores and subaltern peripheries are mutually constitutive and of equal import. It demonstrates that complexity comes in many forms, and that prioritizing landscapes uncovers “counter narratives” (p. 4) to political hegemony that reveal “shadow polities” (pp. 3, 239) in the interstices between centralized states. Its goal is to retheorize complexity, unpack conceptual distinctions between cores and peripheries, and interrogate landscapes. To do so, it presents decentered perspectives to regional studies, new directions in settlement pattern analysis, alternative approaches to the directionality of power, reconfigured expectations about statehood and subjects, updated interrogations of heterarchy, and fresh takes on peer-polity interactions and secondary state formation.

In their introductory chapter, Bradley J. Parker, Alicia M. Boswell, and Kyle A. Knabb state that margins are “the crucibles of historical change” (p. 3). Geographical and political marginality go together and inevitably turn assumptions about political complexity “on their head (p.4, 140).” They argue that marginalized groups leverage the landscape to assert agency, manage internal hierarchies, maintain identity, and negotiate with hegemonic, centralized neighbors from positions of grassroots power.

In southern Jordan, Knabb explores an Iron Age (1200–586 BC) periphery defined by its rugged topography. Seminomadic agropastoralists exploited the landscape to avoid entanglements with neighboring Edomite societies undergoing centralization and stratification. Mobile subsistence allowed the population to avoid detection, attack, and demands for tribute from emerging state authorities. Selective engagement by seminomadic groups is evident from occasional Edomite ceramics found within peripheral settlements.

In her case study about the Moche Valley in Peru, Boswell argues that a group known as the Collambay leveraged natural and built environments to manage Chimú imperial expansion into their territory between AD 900 and 1470. The Collambay occupied the mountainous *chaupiyunga*, a crossroads of maritime and highland goods in northern Peru. They practiced political appeasement by facilitating and controlling the exchange of goods with the Chimú. Collambay landscape modifications—including funerary monuments, symbolic walls, and surveillance settlements—concretized Collambay territorial control and identity, thereby preserving their political and cultural center.

Medieval Iceland (ca. AD 870–1300) was squeezed between two competing empires—Britain and Denmark—while pursuing its own independence. Tara D. Carter measures economic activity there as “a proxy for . . . social relationships within and between” (p. 74) Icelanders and empires. Settlement and production patterns show that rural Icelanders in the “congested countryside”