

the function(s) of ancient or modern artifacts. The compilation of narratives from these five individuals illustrates a novel way of documenting and preserving cultural heritage. Not surprisingly, the five narratives recall both positive and painful memories about a bygone era in the project area (i.e., San Antonio village) in the 1940s.

Chapter 9 is the final part of the second volume. Here, the authors reflect on the research questions that were delineated in chapter 4. As the authors note, the geographic location of the project area (i.e., San Antonio) was not particularly suitable for settlement during the Spanish, German, and Japanese periods. The village was a considerable distance from the major port of maritime commerce and, although it was used for farming during the Latte Period, it was ill-suited for German coconut farming (to produce copra) and the subsequent introduction of sugarcane farming by the Japanese. As the authors note, the general dearth of archaeological evidence in the project area prior to the construction of Japanese defenses in the late 1930s is unsurprising. However, an abundance of American-made munitions and other military hardware (e.g., howitzer shell casings, hand grenades, canteens, mess kits, and .50 caliber bullets) confirm that the area witnessed significant combat during the 15 June 1944 invasion of Saipan to expel Japanese forces. The project also documented evidence of military construction (e.g., Coast Guard Loran Station) near the end of the war and into the subsequent decades of the Cold War.

In sum, the publication of this project as companion volumes in the Access Archaeology series of Archaeopress Publishing (Oxford) is laudable. The overwhelming majority of archaeological research projects are undertaken in the region within the context of economic development stemming from tourism. Because such research is often unavailable from published and accessible venues, important fieldwork goes unnoticed except by those who are employed in the profit-driven CRM industry. The authors of these two volumes should be commended for the time and energy they committed to the production of these monographs. The publication of archaeological research is a professional obligation and the availability of these companion volumes in both open-access and print venues ensures that their project findings will be widely disseminated. Indeed, it would be most helpful if sponsoring agencies and institutions, both in the private sector and governmental, were to invest resources in supporting more publications of archaeological research in like manner. Open-access publication enlarges the readership of scholarly work by both professionals and the general public, including the indigenous peoples whose ancestral heritage is often the focus of archaeological investigation. When the lead author, Boyd Dixon, was recently given a CNMI Humanities Council Lifetime Achievement Award, the adoption of these two volumes by educators in the local schools was mentioned as one of several hallmarks of his storied career in the islands.

*The Affect of Crafting: Third Millennium BCE Copper Arrowheads from Ganeshwar, Rajasthan.* Uzma Z. Rizvi. Oxford: Archaeopress, 2018. 176 pp., 53 figures, 13 tables, extensive catalogue (black and white throughout). Paperback £32, ISBN 978-1-78969-003-3; E-publication £16, ISBN 978-1-78969-004-0.

*Reviewed by Peter JOHANSEN, Department of Anthropology, McGill University*

Uzma Rizvi's book provides a critical new perspective on an important regional archaeological landscape that has largely been

marginalized as a somewhat enigmatic frontier backwater of the Indus Valley Civilization (IVC). Northeastern Rajasthan during the

third millennium B.C.E. was a significant place of IVC resource extraction (copper), yet one that developed neither the well-known cultural nor sociopolitical trappings of its neighbor's supra-regional, urban-rural "civilization." Indeed, while much analytical effort over the past three decades has gone into understanding the role of craft production in the social and political organization of the IVC, other important regional loci of local craft production and community beyond the IVC have seen far less attention. Rizvi's study of northeastern Rajasthan's Ganeshwar-Jodhpura Cultural Complex (GJCC) re-centers the analytic lens squarely onto this less well-understood regional settlement landscape of copper-crafting communities.

In this book, Rizvi argues that the GJCC must be viewed in its own terms as a politically and economically autonomous region of "complex" communities whose sociocultural identity and character were coproduced through their relationships with a local distribution of copper minerals and the transformative practices through which copper was crafted into unique forms and styles of objects. In addressing this argument, Rizvi makes a second and arguably more considerable theoretical intervention. By entwining multiple threads of social theory—most notably that of the new materialisms—she presents us with an understanding of how, through the practice of crafting, human bodies, metallic minerals, and places co-construct an affect of belonging that is simultaneously social and cultural and, critically, is dynamically tethered to a particular time and space. At the scale of archaeological analysis presented in this study (i.e., regions, regional settlement clusters, regional artifact types), this new ontological framing provides a novel and intriguing explanation for regional-scale distributional variation in artifact and site types. This framing transcends the more frequently deployed explanatory narratives of the culture-history approach to South Asia's archaeological record, while engaging similar datasets.

The book is separated into two parts. The first consists of a set of four chapters that outline Rizvi's argument, theoretical intervention, and interpretations of the GJCC

based on her assessment of the published data that precede her study and the results of her archaeological survey and typological analyses of the corpus of copper artifacts recovered from 1978–1979 excavations at Ganeshwar. The second part of the book is a photographic catalog of the Ganeshwar copper artifacts, the majority of which are small copper arrowheads. This is followed by two tabular appendices. The first is a complete list of GJCC sites, provenienced by state and district with geocoordinates and site areas included for sites identified by the author's pedestrian survey and a limited number of previously recorded sites. The second appendix consists of provenience and metric data for the Ganeshwar copper artifacts.

Chapter 1 serves as a general introduction to the GJCC and to Rizvi's reframing of a theory of crafting, which she aptly characterizes as the "affect of crafting." Research on the GJCC prior to Rizvi's study took place largely during the 1970s and early 1980s. The interpretations of the GJCC that Rizvi challenges here have been difficult to evaluate given an absence of site reports and published datasets beyond short season summaries in *Indian Archaeology Review* and a handful of interpretive articles.<sup>1</sup> Moreover, only two radiocarbon dates have been published from the entire archaeological complex. Rizvi's reevaluation of the published data and the results of her own survey are mobilized to argue that the GJCC were socially and culturally independent complex communities sandwiched between the IVC and Ahar-Banas cultural regions. These GJCC communities maintained their cultural (and ostensibly political) autonomy through a unique set of situated cultural and material practices orbiting around human-material relationships involving copper.

Central to Rizvi's argument is an affectual turn in theorizing crafting, one which she argues is productive of a wider sociality and set of cultural logics and practices. Her focus in retheorizing crafting through affect has two entangled elements, or what Rizvi terms "acts" of crafting: resonance and place (-making). "Resonance" is theorized as an intangible embodied response to crafting that emerges from the material (beyond its physical

properties) to become productive of dynamic human and human to nonhuman relationships. Rizvi characterizes it further as a “sensory aesthetic empathy” that is generative of a situationally dynamic subjectivity and sense of cultural and social belonging. With its origins in entangled socio-material practice, crafting resonance distributes agency between humans and nonhumans. It is productive of meaning, value, and a sense of culturally-inflected belonging that inhabit daily perceptions and experience. Rizvi argues that the persistence of particular styles and forms of copper artifacts (and an entangled sociality) in northeastern Rajasthan during the third millennium B.C.E. can best be explained as resulting from these embodied responses to copper crafting practices: “Morphological consistency is theorized as producing affective responses that engender belonging: one belongs through things” (p. 17).

Rizvi spatializes the affect of crafting through her second theoretical plank: place-making. Where the phenomenological emphasis of resonance is on belonging, with place it is on becoming. It is through place-making that the affect of crafting achieves an attention to a multi-scalar and integrative spatiality and temporality. This attention builds towards an archaeological epistemology of social and economic practice, where the results of the settlement patterning and site types are interpreted as crafting communities and eventually as “reflecting” sociopolitical complexity (discussed further in chapter 2 and chapter 4). Yet regardless of the emphasis on site function and type, Rizvi’s notion of place entails a clear move away from an archaeological epistemology that seeks to recognize political forms from the reflections of patterned spatial proxies and towards an understanding of politics and sociality through spatial practices that craft communities. Resonance and place are theorized as entangled affective conditions of crafting, both of which engender belonging and becoming through embodied practices. These practices produce dynamic and uniquely disposed sets of social relations between all things, human and nonhuman alike, simultaneously crafting materials and communities.

Chapter 2 is devoted to contextualizing the copper artifact collection from Ganeshwar

within what is currently understood about the wider GJCC. This chapter also begins developing Rizvi’s argument that the GJCC was a complex prehistoric community with a cultural cohesion that owes its origins to an economic niche, cultural resonance, and place-making, all of which orbited around copper crafting. Rizvi begins by reviewing the available palaeoenvironmental data, followed by a discussion of her archaeological survey, a review of the 1978–1979 excavations, and the periodization of deposits at Ganeshwar.

Rizvi’s survey is described in broad strokes. The landmark collaborative, community-based model deployed by Rizvi is especially noteworthy and the extent and scope of community engagements are truly impressive. In the 1990s, K. Paddayya (1996) called for and implemented public archaeology and education programs in the communities surrounding archaeological sites that he was documenting in northern Karnataka. Rizvi’s approach here builds considerably on this imperative by integrating principles from Tuhiwai Smith’s (1999) call for a decolonizing methodology in the social sciences and humanities. This commendable and visionary approach has led this project to a spectrum of community collaborations and important developments in community heritage and public education, as well as interpretive framings and archaeological theory. I would have liked further and more detailed attention to the methods of pedestrian survey, surface documentation, and collection implemented in this study. And while I am compelled by the conjoined use of cluster analysis and discussions with members of contemporary village and crafting communities to construct the archaeological interpretation of the five GJCC copper crafting community complexes, I would like to have read more details on the constitution of this analysis to better understand how this important interpretive framing was constructed. At a regional level, I have a sense of the distribution of site types and their composition as complexes, but as an archaeologist interested in the social organization of production, and what Rizvi so deftly describes as the sociality of crafting, I would like to learn more about the spatial

distribution of archaeological surface deposits at the scale of the regional site complex and especially at the site scale, and in turn how these spatial patterns in data point to heterarchically organized practices of production. The chapter ends with an important synthesis of the Ganeshwar excavations, one that identifies inconsistencies among the earlier reporting and provides a coherent and comprehensive narrative.

Chapter 3 shifts focus from regions and sites to the GJCC's material culture and implications for constructing a tentative chronological sequence. Rizvi's discussion is primarily focused on copper objects, yet there are short but important descriptive sections on ceramic wares and forms, lithics (microliths), and other miscellaneous "small finds." The section on the GJCC ceramics was written despite significant challenges, including lack of access to excavated sherds and patchy published reportage. Rizvi nevertheless puts together a solid descriptive typology by using previously published sources and the materials from her own surface collections. The discussion of the copper artifacts examines the major functional-morphological types of artifacts and provides the first morphological typology of what is arguably the most prolific product of GJCC copper crafting: copper arrowheads. Rizvi outlines the key attributes and variables used to construct the typology and describes what differentiates each of her seven types in sections with illustrative photos of diagnostic examples. Much of the remainder of the chapter indexes this typology by comparing copper materials from archaeological sites in surrounding regions to suggest chronological associations between GJCC and other surrounding "archaeological cultures" (e.g., Kayatha, Early Harappan, Mature Harappan, and Painted Grey Ware). Rizvi is careful here not to suggest how or why these regional and indeed temporal transmissions of GJCC style were made, instead pointing towards future avenues of research to address these questions. The chapter ends with an acknowledgement of the difficulties of constructing a watertight chronology for the GJCC given the paucity of radiocarbon dates and the absence of comprehensive ceramic analyses of excavated materials (and indeed

the need for more published excavation contexts), yet given the available data she proposes a credible tentative working chronology for moving forward.

The final chapter revisits the theoretical intervention outlined in the first, building a set of interpretive conclusions about GJCC crafting and community in light of the data described in chapter 2 and chapter 3. Central to these conclusions is the importance of the corporeality of practice, and how it is that intersectional identities were or are produced and indeed reproduced through the body's engagement with technologies, materials, and place, a disciplining of "all things into their own subjectivities" (p. 59). Rizvi asks us here to focus on the intangible: in crafting resonance, the creation of an aesthetic response generates a sense of belonging in community. Yet at the same time she asks us to consider resonance as the locus of communication between humans and things, and hence the context and medium for the creation of meaning, a process with palpable material consequences. Both offer us an entrée towards an archaeological epistemology of resonance. In the final instance it is this affective response, with its culturally-inflected aesthetic empathy, crafted through the making of copper that Rizvi argues resonates to create GJCC cultural cohesion and a unique field of style and form in crafted copper objects.

Rizvi's book makes an important and original theoretical contribution to archaeological understandings of how past human communities were created and maintained through their relationships with one another and with things. Future work on GJCC archaeological sites and regional archaeological landscapes will no doubt bring us closer to understanding how multi-scalar social and political relations were assembled and articulated around crafting and other GJCC cultural logics and practices.

#### NOTE

1. Back issues of *Indian Archaeology Review* are available for 1953–2001 on the Government of India National Mission on Monuments and Antiquities (NMMA) website at URL: [nmma.nic.in/nmma/archReview.do](http://nmma.nic.in/nmma/archReview.do).

## REFERENCES CITED

- PADDAYYA, K.  
1996 Modern impacts on archaeological sites in India: A case study from the Shorapur
- Doab, Karnataka. *Man and Environment* 21(2):75–88.
- TUHIWAI SMITH, L.  
1999 *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. London: Zed Books.

*The Politics of the Past in Early China*. Vincent S. Leung. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019. xii + 202 pp. Hardcover US \$100, ISBN 9781108425728; Paperback US \$30, ISBN 9781108443241; E-book US \$80, ISBN 9781108619196.

*Reviewed by* Lothar VON FALKENHAUSEN, *Art History Department, University of California Los Angeles*

In his introductory chapter, Leung forcefully dismantles the essentializing notion, pervasive in older Sinological writings, that references to the past in early Chinese texts were overwhelmingly didactic in their motivation. He instead proposes to focus on the “deliberate mobilization of the field of the past as ideological capital toward the construction or deconstruction of various political arguments and ethical ideas” (p. 13). So far, so good, but can anyone come up with a new and truly superior understanding? As one reads on, such initial doubts are quickly dispelled. Chapter by chapter, Leung carefully builds a compelling and, as far as I am able to judge, quite original argument that does justice both to the diversity of the texts and the agency of their authors in their historical and sociopolitical circumstances. The textual loci adduced in support of this new narrative are judiciously chosen and conscientiously translated. Rather than attempting to cover every pertinent text, Leung deliberately restricts himself to a limited range. The result is a slim but intelligent volume that is eminently worth reading.

Chapter 1, by far the longest in the book, ranges from the Western Zhou bronze inscriptions to the Confucian Analects and the *Mozi*. In contradistinction to the protagonists of the Bronze Inscriptions, who dwelled upon their genealogical links to illustrious ancestors in ritual settings, Confucius—in what strikes one as an astonishingly

modern gesture—was the first to treat the past as a veritable smørgåsbord of precedents available to all comers, regardless of background, to help them determine their course of action as autonomous moral agents in the present age. The authors of the *Mozi*, while sharing a similar outlook on the past, flipped Confucius’s vision by treating the past as a series of negative examples illustrating the chaos that would ensue if individuals were to exert their autonomy instead of submitting under the discipline of an orderly régime imposed by a sage ruler.

Chapter 2 juxtaposes the *Laozi* (as represented in the manuscript text excavated at Guodian, Jingmen [Hubei]) and the *Mengzi*. According to Leung, these two approximately contemporaneous texts both implicitly deny the relevance of any historical reference: the *Laozi* by initiating a “cosmogonic turn” and tracing the origins of the world way back to a patently mythical female figure; and the *Mengzi* by insisting that it is only one’s inborn moral nature, rather than any precedent from history, that will determine human action in concrete situations of the present.

Chapter 3 treats the attitudes to the past espoused in the writings of the Warring States-period Legalist thinkers and the imperial Qin ideologues. While the former constantly referred to the past as a way of emphasizing that times had changed and historical precedent was useless in dealing with new circumstances, the latter proclaimed