

characters, the Washburns. At the same time, the female characters appear to have less agency than the men, since their lives are often dictated by their choices of men. For example, Emma constantly dotes upon, worries about, and hovers around Frankie, while Prudence, on the other hand, experiences a life of loss and trauma, due to having an absent father and being sexually assaulted. And even though the men may appear to have more opportunities—Jonathan is a medical doctor and Frankie attends Princeton—the men must also risk their lives to protect the nation. And, finally, the novel deals with sexuality and the expectations regarding femininity and masculinity. Many times, Prudence has sex with men, while Frankie and Billy must share their feelings for one another only in private.

In addition to spinning a masterfully complex and revealing narrative, Treuer also embeds moments of subtle intertextuality in *Prudence*. Anyone familiar with Ernest Hemingway's work, in particular the Nick Adams stories, will recognize characters like Dick Boulton, from "The Doctor and the Doctor's Wife" (1925) and Prudence from "Ten Indians" (1927). In doing so, Treuer speaks back to a well-known canonical author and re-presents indigenous characters in more fully sketched forms, creating an interesting dialogue between texts.

Ultimately, the characters of *Prudence* must navigate their own paths toward healing, and each chooses a different way. It is the nuanced negotiations that each character journeys that makes *Prudence* such a remarkable novel. As a result, this book is an interdisciplinary treasure and will be useful to students of American Indian studies, literature, and history, as it allows readers a close look at the exchange of perspectives between Native and non-Native people in a specific place and time in American history.

Mary Stoecklein
University of Arizona

The Pueblo Bonito Mounds of Chaco Canyon: Material Culture and Fauna. Edited by Patricia L. Crown. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2016. 296 pages. \$80.00 cloth.

Pueblo Bonito is widely considered to be the focal point of the Chaco world, an interacting group of pueblos stretching across a huge area of the Colorado Plateau, most active in the eighth through thirteenth centuries C.E. Pueblo Bonito is the archetypical Chaco great house, with structures that are larger and more formally constructed than the houses in the communities of habitation sites with which they are associated. Some of the larger great houses have large, formal mounds. These mounds have been the subject of much speculation during the lengthy span of Chaco archaeology, which is nicely summarized in this volume's introduction. In spite of their volume and interest, relatively little excavation has been done in these mounds and even less done by modern standards. The mounds in front of Pueblo Bonito are especially large, and unlike other great houses, there are two. Most of the excavation that has occurred at

Pueblo Bonito took place in the 1890s (George Pepper) and the 1920s (Neil Judd and the Smithsonian Institution).

The Smithsonian Institution placed three trenches in the Bonito mounds and backfilled them with material from the site. The University of New Mexico undertook a project to do a detailed reevaluation of the mounds' stratigraphy. Though the project did minimal excavation of deposits intact after the 1920s excavations, it recovered more than 200,000 artifacts from the backfill. This volume reports on that large assemblage, performing modern analyses on the materials and placing them in the context of today's knowledge of artifacts from Chaco and its associated sites.

Stratigraphy is the archaeological answer to seeing change through time. Some temporal control is present in that the materials in each of the three trenches can be dated ceramically, showing that the West trench does contain earlier materials than that from the East trench. This allows for some study of temporal trends in the artifacts, but there is inevitably great temporal overlap. What can be challenging is that the materials come from a blurred record—a dual disposal dilemma in that the occupants of Pueblo Bonito discarded the materials once and then the archaeologists decided what to keep and what to discard. The excavators have worked hard to conform to archaeological norms of provenience control, but they are working with materials that were homogenized in the 1920s. Each analyst had to deal with the nature of the sample.

Although the analyses conscientiously compare the findings from the mound trenches with Chaco Project sites, the question arises about the extent to which the samples can be compared. Because only two habitation rooms of 139 rooms mapped were excavated at Pueblo Alto, conclusions about the similarity of the two great houses are strained. It is interesting and reassuring that the Bonito mound materials group very closely on a sherds to lithics regression, but curiously this regression and the ternary plots were done with all of the Pueblo Alto material rather than the mound (236–7), which makes one assume that everything in the backfilled trenches is also from the rooms, which Crown says is unlikely. This study could have focused on the distinctive mounds, as using all of Alto introduces some later and earlier deposits than the Pueblo Alto mound.

Having been involved in the ceramic analysis for the National Park Service Chaco Project, I was pleased to see Patricia Crown's detailed discussion of red, brown, and orange wares. Crown has a deep background in these wares from her dissertation work and extensive field experience. The Chaco Project analysts adopted and persisted with an abbreviated red ware typology, separating sources strictly on temper, missing some source information that would have been accessible with established pottery types. Crown's application of more typological as well as technological analysis gives a better idea of red wares in Chaco.

The analysts were enjoined to consider four central themes in their studies: production, exchange, consumption, and discard. With respect to production, Crown argues against the idea that the level of ceramic production in Chaco—more specifically at Pueblo Bonito—was low based on the presence of some ceramic production tools and materials. The Chaco Project argued that after the earliest periods the level of ceramic

production in the canyon was low based on the high proportions of vessels from the Chuskas and a relative paucity of potting tools and absence of firing features. Cibola gray and white wares were made throughout the Chaco world, but within the levels of analysis available, the mound project and the Chaco Project do not distinguish among sources in that enormous body of pottery. The point that some pottery was made in Chaco during the height of the phenomenon is well taken, but the arguments such as fuel and clearly varied sources of all wares found in Chaco cannot be refuted and rejected on the basis of a few tools and materials. Rather than asserting that “almost certainly some of the Cibola White Ware was also brought to the canyon from other production locales” (217), I would counter that much of that pottery was made elsewhere. High-level clay-source analysis may eventually shed light on this difference of opinion.

Hannah Mattson gives a highly detailed account of the gray wares recovered from the mounds, which considers many attributes included in the Chaco Project analyses and adds a number of other metric attributes to broaden the consideration. These variables allow her to further consider the existence of production groups that must have existed, given the thousands of vessels produced over decades and considerable space. These observations show that there was preferential use of vessels from definable sources and variable sizes for different tasks or occasions.

The study of discard when analyzing back dirt is especially challenging since the context of discard is critical and the context has been erased by the original excavation. The assumption that the materials found in the trenches were from those locations originally is in part an act of faith. Excavation of the rooms at Pueblo Bonito resulted in huge quantities of back dirt; is the backfill from the rooms or from the mound? This demonstrates the need to keep careful notes not only on where we find things, but also on where fill comes from when we do the right thing and fill in our excavations. Back dirt has been to some degree cherry-picked for artifacts, affecting what is found when the back dirt is carefully analyzed.

We are always looking for ways to compare categories, and percentages and ternary plots provide one method (224–5). However, ternary plots treat a sherd as equal to a flake equal to an animal bone, which is a very shaky equivalency. When we can see that the Alto sample with 55,000 faunal elements differs greatly from the Bonito mound, we need to be cautious about the implied equivalency of artifacts. Likewise, comparing percentages in bar graphs that give no sample sizes is of dubious value (e.g., 128). While the information is always available, I found myself wishing sample sizes had been provided for me in these comparisons rather than having to search them out bar by bar.

Unfortunately, artifact figures are missing in this book. Precisely one artifact is shown: an enlarged photo of two pieces of Narbona Pass chert. Illustration of the high-frequency varieties of hatched ceramics would be better than trying to visualize them from the table of line widths shown in Table 3.6, as would an illustration of the ornament categories or some of the large number of bone tools.

With respect to the profiles of the mounds, this project focused on evaluating the stratigraphy of the Pueblo Bonito mounds and the material culture recovered in the

project. Therefore, a summary figure of those findings would add greatly to the overall usefulness of the volume. Anyone using this book needs to be aware of the important companion article that provides not only such profiles but essential context for the project (Wills, et al., *American Antiquity* 81:3).

These studies collected and analyzed huge quantities of data—as befits mound studies in Chaco—and interpret and understand those data and contextualize them with data from the Chaco Project and other relevant Southwestern studies. This is a noble effort at recouping data from a crucial site that passed through an earlier time’s screening of collectible materials. As such, it is a rare opportunity at a second chance—how often would so much information be available from a site excavated long ago? In spite of the challenging conditions of provenience, this is a significant contribution to the documentation of material culture from Chaco great houses.

H. Wolcott Toll

Office of Archaeological Studies, Museum of New Mexico

The Railroad and the Pueblo Indians: The Impact of the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe on the Pueblos of the Rio Grande, 1880–1930. By Richard H. Frost. Salt Lake City: The University of Utah Press, 2016. 280 pages. \$34.95 cloth.

In some cases, the impact of the transcontinental railroads on tribes and tribal reservations was very great. The United States Congress not only provided some railroads free rights-of-way, but also provided a number of railroads huge grants of land to encourage them to construct their lines. The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railroad received such a “checkerboarded” grant and used it, or attempted to use it, in constructing its line through Pueblo country in New Mexico.

Prior to this book, the impact of the railroad on those Pueblos has not been adequately studied. Richard Frost has done considerable primary research in the pertinent archives on the subject, and this work covers new historical ground, providing a good understanding of the issues created by a land-grant railroad constructing a line through Indian country. In tandem with the Christian McMillan’s recent work (*Making Indian Law*, 2007), Frost’s book provides an excellent explanation of the railroad’s interaction (or lack thereof) with the tribes along its right-of-way. Too often today, historians fail to undertake the necessary drudgery of primary research in remote and sometimes difficult archives. The extent of Frost’s archival research and analysis of the resulting archival materials is evident in the depth of his investigation of the issues.

Anyone who has studied the history of the Pueblos knows the unique nature of federal policy and interaction with the Pueblos compared to other tribes in the United States. The resistance of Santo Domingo Pueblo and the interactions of the western Pueblos (Laguna and Acoma) are here described in the context of federal-Pueblo relations. In the course of telling this story of the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railroad, the author puts events in the context of the day-to-day interactions with government