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Book Reviews

Frontier Life in Ancient Peru: The Archaeology of Cerro la Cruz


Reviewed by Margaret Brown Vega, Department of Anthropology, Indiana University-Purdue University Fort Wayne, Fort Wayne, IN 46805.

Few archaeologists working outside of the Central Andes know of the Casma polity (ca. A.D. 900–1300), and even among Andeanists the Casma polity has been overlooked and understudied. This is due, in part, to the difficulties of archaeologically identifying groups of people, especially when they are located near other more well known cultures or societies. It is exactly this situation that makes Cerro la Cruz, a frontier settlement of the Casma polity, an appropriate case for examining frontiers archaeologically. The central premise of this book is to illustrate the utility of theories of frontier zones developed from historical case studies for analyzing ancient conditions. Melissa Vogel effectively places Cerro la Cruz in a regional geopolitical context that spans the Middle Horizon (ca. A.D. 600–1000) and the Late Intermediate period (ca. A.D. 1000–1470), a time of dramatic social and political change in the Central Andes. Within this setting we get a glimpse of how people who resided within the shifting frontiers between competing polities negotiated life.

The book begins (Chapter 1) by describing the site of Cerro la Cruz in terms of previous interpretations about site function and geography. Given the location of the site, Vogel raises the issue of the study of peripheries. She also provides background on the culture history of the north coast of Peru, where Cerro la Cruz is located (Chapter 2). With the decline of the Wari highland state in the Middle Horizon period, the people of the north coast experienced dramatic changes. The degree to which the Wari state impacted people living in this area, including the Moche polity which was in decline at this time, is unclear. Vogel tells us that the Moche did not have a strong presence in the Chao Valley, and she suggests that the emergence of a Casma polity at this time could have been a source of internal stress for Moche society [p. 21]. Based on this interpretation, the Casma polity is relevant for reconsidering changes documented for other polities around the north coast during the transition from the Middle Horizon to the subsequent Late Intermediate period.

In Chapter 3 the author elaborates on the two primary themes of site function and geographic location in light of theories on frontiers and political geography. She briefly reviews core-periphery models, specifically world systems theory [pp. 43–46]. Vogel considers peripheral areas to be dynamic and complex frontiers. She favors the work of Lightfoot and Martinez and their emphasis on frontiers rather than core-periphery models and an attempt to theoretically decolonize such spaces (Lightfoot and Martinez 1995). The frontier concept is highly appropriate for the Chao Valley, a region with fuzzy boundaries and multiple cultural influences [p. 48]. Vogel concludes the chapter with a brief review of other studies in the Andean region that examine frontiers.

In Chapter 4 she focuses on the geographic setting of Cerro la Cruz and describes prior research at the site and in the region. She presents two hypotheses regarding the location and function of the site: the location was selected for defensive purposes, or for strategic control of the valley. Rather than considering these as competing possibilities, Vogel asserts that Cerro la Cruz was established for a variety of reasons including control, protection, visibility, and subsistence considerations [p. 68]. She bases her assessment on a spatial analysis involving these variables and uses pottery styles as a proxy for identity.

Following this broad regional and theoretical introduction, Vogel focuses on the specifics of frontier life at Cerro la Cruz (Chapter 5). She describes daily life in the settlement, from mundane subsistence practices to practices related to ritual and defense. She includes an interesting discussion of labor-saving techniques for constructing terraces and other structures at Cerro la Cruz. At the end of the chapter Vogel again considers the two hypotheses for the site’s function, noting evidence for both defensive and strategic considerations. She concludes that the Chao Valley was a northern frontier of the Casma polity to the south, and that Cerro la Cruz was a frontier settlement with material culture revealing Casma, Chimú, and local influences.

After briefly considering life on the frontier at Cerro la Cruz, Vogel expands her discussion to include evidence from the larger region and the
Casma polity as a whole (Chapter 6). Specifically, she considers the relationship between the Casma polity and the Chimú Empire. Cerro la Cruz was ritually closed and abandoned around the time the Chimú expanded and consolidated its control in the Chao Valley. Thereafter, the Chimú extended their political influence farther south, well into the Casma polity territory.

In her conclusion (Chapter 7), Vogel emphasizes that the people of Cerro la Cruz negotiated the changing political landscape along the northern frontier of the Casma polity. As the Chimú Empire expanded into Casma territory, the people of Cerro la Cruz witnessed the transformation of the Chao Valley from a frontier to a border zone. Eventually, the Chao Valley was conquered, presumably driving away the inhabitants of Cerro la Cruz. Owing to the changing nature of life in the Chao Valley, Vogel argues that traditional approaches to peripheries are less useful than more recent concepts of frontiers and political geography.

One strength of the book is the holistic discussion of Cerro la Cruz. That is, although the site contains defensive elements, Vogel does not constrain her discussion to military or defensive themes. Instead, she successfully weaves in evidence for ritual, production, consumption, and subsistence activities to create a backdrop for daily life in the community. Then she contextualizes the fortified attributes of the site in terms of the concerns of the people who constructed them and dwelled in the social and political landscape.

The detailed descriptions of architecture and excavations are a valuable resource for those working in neighboring regions; they represent the largest body of published data on the Casma polity. Vogel also provides an incredibly useful synthesis of material culture styles, including the various names used for pottery in different northern coastal valleys and their relationships to each other. She assembles disparate pieces of evidence to construct a solid foundation for her ongoing work on the Casma polity and for others in the future.

The book highlights the broader significance of this case study in a way that is useful to Andeanists. Non-Andeanists may desire more from the discussion of frontiers and the specifics of the site of Cerro la Cruz and the Casma polity, but this is because the Casma polity is not well documented. Vogel is careful to point out that there are still many gaps in our knowledge. She indicates that her continued research at the capital city of El Purgatorio in the Casma Valley will address some of the lacunae. The book would have also benefited from a more thorough review of the literature on frontiers and borders, beyond Wallerstein’s (1974) world systems theory or Lightfoot and Martinez’s (1995) frontier concept. Nevertheless, Vogel successfully relates her study to other Andean scholarship that addresses frontiers.

The book is a welcome and significant contribution to Andean studies. Of particular importance is that Cerro la Cruz is one of the few fortified sites along the Peruvian coast that, to date, has been excavated and reported. This type of site has been overshadowed or ignored in the literature (Arkush and Stanish 2005). In addition, Vogel considers the evidence for a variety of activities that took place within and near the walls of the frontier settlement of Cerro la Cruz. This case study is central to the Andean debate on the nature of fortified sites and conflict in pre-contact times.

Vogel’s work on identifying the Casma polity will be instrumental in understanding the sociopolitical landscape of a major transitional period along the central and northern coasts of Peru. The political changes during this period clearly impacted people—such as the inhabitants of Cerro la Cruz—in complex ways. This study joins other recent reconsiderations of the impact of Andean polities such as the Wari and Inka on peripheral or provincial populations (Jennings 2010; Malpass et al. 2010). Vogel’s book is important for our understanding of those polities, and peoples, who have been long overlooked.
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The Incas: Lords of the Four Quarters


Reviewed by Richard L. Burger, Department of Anthropology, Yale University, 10 Sachem Street, New Haven, CT 06525.

The Incas are a perennial favorite subject, and this has been the case since Garcilaso de la Vega penned his 1609 blockbuster The Royal Commentaries of the Incas and General History of Peru. Even before this, Jose de Acosta’s Natural and Moral History of the Indies (2002 [1590]) went through four different
Spanish editions within its first 20 years, and it was quickly translated into French, Italian, German, Dutch, and Latin editions. William H. Prescott likewise had success with his 1847 bestseller *A History of the Conquest of Peru*, and in more recent times, the Canadian historian John Hemming’s (1970) *The Conquest of the Incas* not only was widely read, but also garnered him numerous awards and prizes. While all of these authors brought considerable talents to their tasks, a deep fascination with the Incas by the general public also played a role in the enthusiastic reception of their works.

The attraction of the Incas for the general public is responsible for the inclusion of the word “Inca” in almost all popular books and exhibits on the ancient Andes. It is no coincidence that the most popular textbook for courses in Andean archaeology is Michael Moseley’s *The Incas and Their Ancestors*, a title belied by the author’s focus on the earlier, pre-Inca cultures of Peru. In 2003, Lucy Salazar and I curated a traveling exhibit on Hiram Bingham’s collections from Machu Picchu and as part of the process of grant preparation, we conducted audience surveys and focus groups to assess the plans including the proposed exhibit title *Machu Picchu: Royal Estate in the Clouds*. We were exasperated to learn that all evaluations agreed that the word “Inca” had to be in the exhibit title if the show was to draw the largest possible audience. The title was changed accordingly to *Machu Picchu: Unveiling the Mystery of the Incas*.

What is the source of the powerful attraction that the Incas have had for so many people for so long? One factor certainly is the drama of the Spanish conquest and the challenge to understand how such a small group of Spanish adventurers was able to topple an empire of some 12 million inhabitants. Another factor that keeps the Incas fascinating is reconciling the wealth and magnificence of Inca civilization with the absence of cultural features often presumed to be essential to all complex societies, such as writing, wheeled vehicles, and money. The distinctive nature of Inca civilization has made it a source of contention beginning with the 16th-century debate whether this native American empire could be considered spiritually or politically equal to, or even comparable with, that of their Iberian invaders. Radically different views on this question continued among 18th and 19th century social theorists and philosophers and persist to the present day. A third factor accounting for the current fascination with the Incas is their conscious promotion as an international tourist attraction by the Peruvian government and their allies in the travel industry. Over the last two decades their advertising campaigns have successfully added Machu Picchu and its related Inca sites in Cuzco to the newly invented Seven Wonders of the Modern World (through cyber voting) and the “bucket list” of middle class consumers from countries on every continent. With visitation to Cuzco surpassing 800,000 people per year, interest in the Incas has never been higher.

Given the above, it is surprising that there have been few books in recent decades that offer a comprehensive and visually stimulating synthesis of Inca culture and society. The second half of 20th century saw a boom in Inca historical and archaeological research. The three most influential Inca scholars were John Howland Rowe at the University of California, Berkeley, John Murra at Cornell University, and Tom Zuidema at the University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign. All three were anthropologists who spent more time with historical documents than with archaeological evidence despite their appreciation of the potential contribution of archaeology to the subject. Curiously, none of them attempted to write a synthesis suitable for use as an introduction for general readers or as a textbook for university classes. The celebrated historian Maria Rostworowski wrote *Historia de Tawantinsuyu*, an overview of the Incas that was one of the most popular history books ever published in Peru. While an English version of it was published by Cambridge University Press in 1999, the absence of illustrations and the nearly exclusive focus on historical evidence limits its value. Several North American archaeologists have also made attempts at writing a popular synthesis of Inca civilization, and a number of fine volumes have resulted, most notably, *The Inca Empire: The Formation and Disintegration of a Pre-Capitalist State* by Thomas Patterson (1991), *Daily Life in the Inca Empire* by Michael Malpass (1996), *The Incas* by Terence D’Altroy (2002), and *The Incas: New Perspectives* by Gordon F. McEwan (2006). Each of these books has value, but also limitations for various reasons, whether due to sparse illustrations, quality of writing, or scope of view. Fortunately, with the publication of *The Incas* by Craig Morris and Adriana von Hagen we finally have a volume that successfully communicates the richness of Inca culture and society in lucid prose and marvelous illustrations.

I must admit that I approached this book with some trepidation. Morris was, in the words of Joyce Marcus (2007:3), “the leading Inka [sic] archaeologist of his time,” but he died suddenly before completing this volume. I am pleased to report that although it took five years, Craig’s collaborator, the Peruvian writer von Hagen, and the publishers have brought the posthumous work to a successful completion and fruition. The book reflects the deep knowledge, graceful writing, and balanced approach that characterize
all of Morris’s work. During his career, Morris pioneered the application of sophisticated archaeological method and theory to large Inca centers and produced a vision of Inca administration that was distinctively anthropological. While Morris often focused on the material conditions of Inca prosperity, he was equally fascinated with questions of statecraft and the ideological web that sustained the empire as seen through his research at Huanuco Pampa and La Centinela. Drawing upon this lifetime of experience, Morris was able to create a volume of exceptional intellectual richness and aesthetic quality that was fully realized by von Hagen’s taking the volume to completion.

The book is organized in a somewhat unconventional manner. Following an introduction to the environmental setting and immediate predecessors of the Incas, Morris and von Hagen turn to principles of Inca statecraft, with special attention to the infrastructure and the ideology of the state that made the production and maintenance of these features possible. The next chapter focuses on the economic system and the Andean social mechanisms and technologies that enabled these activities to become great and reliable sources of wealth. The following chapter shifts to a consideration of religious practice and ideology with a vivid description of the rituals and belief system that motivated the Inca rulers and the people who they incorporated into the Inca state that they called Tawantinsuyu. Having laid the foundations for an understanding of Inca society and culture, the authors turn their attention to the architects, potters, weavers, and smiths who were responsible for the architecture and artifacts that are the primary concern of travelers and museum visitors.

The remaining half of the book is organized spatially rather than thematically. A chapter on Cuzco, the capital of the realm, is followed by chapters on each of the four quarters into which the empire was organized. The authors use the famous Inca road system (Capac Ñan) to take the reader from one site to another. This organic approach conveys a sense of the structure and diversity of the Inca world much more effectively than previous syntheses. It also allows the authors to discuss and illustrate a greater number of sites than traditionally done in a book of this kind. The volume ends with the dramatic encounter between the Andean world and the Spanish invaders and so the clash of the Spanish and Inca empires. The authors wisely include a treatment of the prolonged Inca resistance movement following Atahualpa’s capture and execution by Pizarro. Throughout this book, Morris and von Hagen struggle to understand the Inca culture and society on its own terms, yet still situate it within a comparative perspective.

In addition to being a well written and deeply informed account of the Incas, this book also succeeds visually in conveying the excitement of Inca archaeology. There are 189 illustrations, including 49 color photographs, of archaeological sites, colonial drawings, and Andean landscapes, as well as multicolored textiles, featherwork, and goldwork. The illustrations are carefully chosen and beautifully reproduced, a welcome opulence in an age of fewer well-illustrated archaeology books than in the past.

References


The Early Bronze Age Village on Tsoungiza Hill. Nemea Valley Archaeological Project, I.


Reviewed by Jeannette Forsén, Department of Historical Studies, Ancient History and Classical Archaeology, University of Gothenburg. Box 200, SE-40530 Gothenburg, Sweden.

The book under review here is a “heavy” contribution and long awaited (as the excavations were in the main carried out in the 1980s and the manuscript was ready in 2006) that concerns the Early Bronze Age material from Tsoungiza Hill in the Nemea Valley in the northeastern Peloponnesse, Corinthia, Greece. The format, with just over 1000 pages, is gigantic in all respects, encompassing five specialist studies, as well as over 600 exemplary illustrations: maps, photos, sketches, plans, pottery drawings, and tables. The title is a little bit of a
mismomer as Daniel Pullen, after his introduction (Chapter 1), begins his discussion of the excavated data with the Neolithic period (Chapter 2). He considers the Final Neolithic period to be “one of the most poorly understood periods in Aegean prehistory” [p. 19]. This is still (in 2013) unfortunately true and there are few data from Tsoungiza that can illuminate this problem, mainly due to its unclear stratigraphy.

Chapters 3 to 6 deal with the Early Bronze Age and are divided into the Early Helladic (EH) I, the EH II Initial, the EH II Developed, and the Early Helladic III periods. This terminology is site specific and not meant to be applied to other sites, but luckily Pullen includes a concordance with Lerna and other sites in the Argolid/Corinthia [table 1.2] to help the reader with correlations. There are some problems with the terminology that Pullen uses, however. In Chapter 3 he discusses the term “transitional EH I to EH II Initial” period [pp. 89–90, 134–138], then talks about the “EH I–II transition” [p. 141], and further on in the text he suggests that the EH II Initial period should be considered a “transitional period between the EH I and EH II Developed periods” [p. 200]. By this point I was utterly confused.

Notwithstanding the confusing terminology, Chapter 3 contains a welcome “new” pottery assemblage of EH I date that encompasses 180 cataloged items including the transition to EH II. Including the shape repertoire, the detailed classification of the EH I pottery corroborates, and to a certain degree supplements, earlier classifications by Dousougli (1987) and Weisshaar (1990) in the Argolid. The long awaited solution to what precedes the so-called “Talioti phase,” if anything, is not given in this material, which is unfortunate. Pullen considers the radiocarbon date of 3326–3102 cal. b.c. (AA-10827) from Cistern 2 to “conceivably be in the acceptable range for EH I” [p. 15], but “too early for the end of EH I” [p. 51]. If such an early date was adopted for the entire EH I period, Maran’s (1998: 9) suggestion that the Talioti pottery assemblage represents it in the northeastern Peloponnese could be accepted; but more data are needed (maybe the recent excavations at Delpriza in the Hermionid will supply some solutions to the problem).

Chapter 4 details the EH II Initial period and Chapter 5 the EH II Developed period. As in Chapter 3, we are presented with a plethora of information in excellent figures, tables, photographs, and drawings. What I found most enchanting are the photographs from Harland’s excavations in the 1920s, which Pullen incorporated in a clever way in his magnum opus. He states several times that the difference between the EH II Initial and EH II Developed periods is in “relative proportions” of different pottery classes [pp. 160–161, 200, 241], and a careful reading reveals that certain classes appear for the first time in the EH I Developed phase just as some vessel forms disappear [tables 4.4, 4.10, 5.15] [pp. 199, 337–348]. The terms “Initial” and “Developed” are site specific and correspond to Lerna III phases A–early C. Pullen clearly states that there is no instance where stratified pottery of all four periods (i.e., EH I, EH II Initial, EH II Developed, and EH III) is found one above the other; instead it is through “stylistic criteria” that the pottery sequence has been worked out [pp. 141, 197]. Be that as it may, there seems to be little reason to question the pottery sequence, although the typological development would have been less convoluted if each vessel form had been presented in separate figures as done by Wiencke (2000) and Rutter (1995) for Early Helladic pottery from Lerna.

One remark in Pullen’s conclusions regarding the EH II Initial period deserves a comment. Wall 38 does “not fit well into later Early Helladic II architectural types” [p. 197]. It should no longer be doubted that unequivocal evidence of EH II apsidal houses exists in the Argolid. The apsidal houses of EH II date documented under the Rundbau at Tiryns [p. 197: n. 112] were, in 1995, matched by several similar buildings of EH II date at the Apollon Maleatas sanctuary site at Epidaurus (Theodorou-Mavrommatidi 2004).

Chapter 6 deals with the EH III pottery and follows the masterfully crafted outline of Rutter’s (1995) Lerna IV volume. In most respects the EH III pottery assemblage from Tsoungiza fits the scheme created for the contemporary Lerna material. However, Pullen cautions us not to expect complete correspondence between even neighboring sites [p. 484]. Unfortunately, Tsoungiza experienced a habitation hiatus during the crucial period around the EH II/EH III transition, the “Wendezeit” (Maran 1998: 161–305), more recently referred to as “the 4.2 event” (Finné et al. 2011).

Pullen concludes with several chapters on special artifact categories such as figurines and ornaments (Chapter 7), objects connected with textile production (Chapter 8), and metal/stone objects and bone tools (Chapter 9). Of special interest to me are his discussions of the logic behind different sizes and forms of spindle whorls, as well as his suggestion that the enigmatic terracotta anchors were distaffs used for spinning flax fibers into thread [pp. 600–603]. Woven mats, he thinks, were probably used as tournettes or slow potters’ wheels for the production of “fruitstands” of EH I date. The replacement of this vessel form, which is rather spectacular in size and execution, by basins in early EH II, taken together with other changes, suggests changes in consumption habits or of the people producing them (Wiencke 1989: 503, n. 56).
The remaining 400 pages of the volume are mainly written by other specialists and concern chemical and lead isotope analyses (Chapter 10), the chipped stone industry (Chapter 11), ground stone tools (Chapter 12), faunal remains (Chapter 13), and paleoethnobotany (Chapter 14). Pullen reappears with Chapter 15, the conclusions, where he places Tsoungiza in the larger picture. It is interesting to read that Tsoungiza had a “closer cultural sharing” with Asea in Arcadia, than with other neighboring sites. Pullen says that this may be due to a similar setting and a transhuman population [pp. 893–894]. Moreover, Pullen concludes that “even a small, inland settlement like Tsoungiza was connected to the larger Aegean world” [p. 903], a welcome corroboration of the results from Asea in Arcadia, another small inland site (Forsén 1996). Pullen has completed an enormous undertaking, making an incredible amount of data readable, and “shown that even a smaller site can yield important information” [p. 909].

The Balkan Peninsula—by virtue of its size, range of landscapes, biodiversity, and geographical position at the frontiers of southeastern Europe and the Levantine Corridor—holds many clues to understanding Early and Middle Pleistocene hominin dispersals “Out of Africa” and Asia. The caves of Yarimburgaz, Kozarnica, and Petralona (located in Turkey, Bulgaria, and northern Greece, respectively) contain deposits that suggest a deeper penetration of archaic hominins (probably of different species) into Europe at different times and speeds. Early Balkan prehistory is a vital part of the broader debate about the beginnings of European prehistory, a debate that, since the Tautavel meeting twenty years ago (Roebroeks and van Kolfschoten 1995), has played a significant role in Old World Palaeolithic archaeology. Early Balkan prehistory is a vital part of the broader debate about the beginnings of European prehistory, a debate that, since the Tautavel meeting twenty years ago (Roebroeks and van Kolfschoten 1995), has played a significant role in Old World Palaeolithic archaeology under the heading of “the Earliest Occupation of Europe” (Roebroeks 2001).

Behind this broad theme lies a multifaceted research agenda, which addresses more issues than that of time alone. The hominin species, routes, directions, places, habitats, timing, cultures, and technologies are just a few of the issues that have in recent years witnessed impressive advances thanks to regional and site-focused field projects on the continent (e.g., in Spain, France, the U.K., Italy) or at its gates (Lordkipanidze et al. 2000). These projects have identified Lower Palaeolithic sites in a variety of karstic, fluvio-lacustrine, and littoral environments; they offer the empirical data to rewrite the narrative of the European Early Palaeolithic (MacDonald and Roebroeks 2012). At the same time there is a marked disparity with the scant archaeological material from the Balkan Peninsula. The contrast becomes more pronounced when the dearth of hominin fossils and material culture is juxtaposed with the rich palaeontological evidence, animal and plant, that suggests that it was a biodiversity hotspot (Griffiths et al. 2004). The Lower Palaeolithic of Greece is an elegant example of this paradox. The book reviewed here sets out to reappraise every piece of the notoriously cryptic record and to offer an explanation for the apparent paucity of early sites. And it succeeds.

Based on his Ph.D. thesis submitted to the University of Leiden in November 2010, Tourloukis combines the results of multiple seasons of fieldwork—participating in surface surveys or revisiting long-known sites—with work in libraries and GIS. It is interesting that Tourloukis, who received his initial archaeological training in Greece, chose a Dutch university to pursue his doctoral studies under the guidance of Wil Roebroeks, a pioneer of European Palaeolithic archaeology. In so doing, he broke with the traditions of the French and British schools of thought that have guided early research in Greece. The author presents first-class research on a challenging...
The reader will find in it a critical appraisal of the Lower Palaeolithic sites and finds set against an interpretation that takes into account the biases, often destructive, introduced by Quaternary geomorphic processes. And herein lies the major contribution of the book. By adding a geoarchaeological dimension to the paltry record of the Greek Lower Palaeolithic, the author elaborates on the geological factors operating here. This approach opens up new avenues for future work.

In the 1960s the discoveries of a handaxe from Palaeokastro, a handaxe tip from Kokkinopilos, and a Homo heidelbergensis cranium from Petralona Cave placed Greece on the Palaeolithic map and raised expectations of comparable discoveries. At the end of the 20th century, however, the evidence remained scanty and geographically discontinuous, with only a handful of sites and less than a dozen large cutting tools (e.g., bifaces). The red beds of Kokkinopilos and Petralona Cave were still the most significant sites, forming the core of the Lower Palaeolithic record. Tourloukis’ work enriches the record, adding two more impressive bifaces to the Kokkinopilos inventory. More importantly, he introduces a sharper focus by prioritizing stratigraphic correlations over morpho-typological affinities of the finds. In the end, we are left with fewer sites, but with greater hope of discovering others.

The book, consisting of six main chapters and a seventh synthetic one, offers the first comprehensive synthesis of the least-known period of Greek prehistory. Unlike previous syntheses composed on a smaller scale, Tourloukis employs a geoarchaeological perspective. He begins by presenting his research questions, objectives, and methodology (Chapter 1). In Chapter 2 he sets the first occupation of Europe within the broader discussion of the Early Palaeolithic period and worldwide hominin dispersals. He then provides a brief overview of the Lower and Early Palaeolithic records from the circum-Mediterranean region, based on the best-documented sites. This exercise provides a geographic and chronological context within which the Lower Palaeolithic of Greece can be framed and discussed more productively. A robust archaeological signal, he concludes, is only present from the middle and the latest part of the Middle Pleistocene; as one goes back in time it becomes increasingly dimmer. During the early Middle Pleistocene there are fewer secure sites, while even further back into the Early Pleistocene sites are not only far less numerous, but also usually contested with regard to their status and dating.

Chapter 4 briefly considers the Middle Palaeolithic archaeology of Greece, before going on to review the earliest substantial archaeological evidence, organized geographically. Here the author critically evaluates old and new data on finds, contexts, and associated dates. In Chapter 5 Tourloukis discusses two survey projects that, as so many others beforehand, failed to produce any stratified Lower Palaeolithic evidence.

Chapter 6 presents a geological explanation for this lack of evidence, involving geoarchaeological and geomorphic processes. Combining the effects of climate, tectonics, eustasy, isostasy, and land surface processes, the author proposes various interrelated factors that could explain why there is so little Lower Palaeolithic evidence in Greece. He concludes that many of the earliest sites probably lie beneath the sea today. This is an apt assessment and more underwater research is needed to map the submerged prehistoric landscapes of the northeastern Mediterranean. The closing chapter pulls together the conclusions of the previous ones in order to suggest strategies and identify places for future work. Tourloukis describes the broader implications of the combined archaeological and geoarchaeological perspective advanced in this thesis.

He identifies topographic configuration and tectonic history as the main factors responsible for the low visibility of early sites in Greece compared with the Lower Palaeolithic records of Italy or Iberia. Understanding these geographical factors, however, can help archaeologists identify regions suitable for prospection. During the last five years, research has been conducted on Crete and the islands of the Ionian Sea and the northeastern Aegean by teams addressing similar questions. This work has revealed archaeological sites and materials attributable to archaic and modern hominins around previously unexplored rivers and lake basins. This thrilling—and still largely unpublished—evidence has been discovered through predictive modeling based on the same approach as that taken by Tourloukis on the Greek mainland. This confirms that his geoarchaeological site location model is a valid one; the complementary data also lend credibility to his main conclusions. For a country where, despite half a century of research, Lower Palaeolithic archaeology is still in its infancy, this book is consistent with current efforts to revise approaches to the subject. Not only does it provide a comprehensive review of past research, but, more importantly, it offers a way forward for the future.
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Social Zooarchaeology: Humans and Animals in Prehistory


Reviewed by Nick Overton, Department of Archaeology, University of Manchester, Oxford Road, Manchester, M13 9PL, U.K.

From the beginnings of the discipline, as archaeologists began replacing zoologists in studying archaeological faunal remains, zooarchaeology has developed under an economic shroud. Taking its direction from the scientific impetus of 1960s processual archaeology, zooarchaeology’s focus on the explicitly observable and quantifiable led animals to be conceived of as economic units, calories, and weights. More significantly, zooarchaeological narratives focused on interpreting the human actions that shaped faunal assemblages within strictly economic frameworks, revolving around concepts of “optimization” and “maximization.” It is into this academic landscape that Nerissa Russell’s new volume steps, with the intention to highlight that “social factors are as significant as taphonomic factors in shaping animal bone assemblages” [p. i]. In a theater dominated by economics and subsistence, what type of home can Russell build for the “social” within a “Social Zooarchaeology?”

The introductory chapter, “Beyond Protein and Calories” (Chapter 1) makes no bones about the fact that the gaze of the zooarchaeologist has in the past been “inappropriately narrowed” [p. 7] by the consideration of animals solely as food, and must now be expanded. Russell argues that animals must be considered in a variety of contexts—as “pets, symbols, wealth, objects of feasting and sacrifice” [p. 7]—in order to explore the social relations that are enacted through animals. From the outset, the potential value of this approach is evident; no longer constrained by economic themes, faunal remains provide a bounty of information pertaining to social relations in the past.

The next two chapters (Chapters 2 and 3) waste little time in demonstrating that animal remains are far from exclusively economic indicators. Chapter 2 utilizes a broad range of evidence, from all prehistoric periods and contemporary ethnographies across five continents, to demonstrate the symbolic and non-economic roles that animals and animal remains can play within societies. Although discussions of symbolism may seem abstract for a material-based study such as zooarchaeology, Chapter 3, “Animals in Ritual,” addresses how such themes might manifest themselves materially. Once again, Russell presents a large body of evidence covering a broad range of themes—from structured deposition to scapulismancy—to demonstrate that ritual practices involving animal remains are “ubiquitous in human societies” [p. 142], and, crucially, that they are visible in the material record. These early chapters leave little doubt that animals and their remains can possess non-economic meanings, and that the taphonomic and selective effects of ritual practices shape archaeological faunal assemblages in significant ways.

The rest of the book progresses in a chronological and thematic fashion. Russell approaches themes traditionally seen through the lens of nutrition and optimization head on: most significantly, hunting and domestication. Her discussion of hunting explores both economic and social motivations, again incorporating a wide range of examples, in a way that requires the reader to question any single motivation for hunting. She makes no attempt to mask the nutritional importance of hunting; however, the myriad of social motivations for and the potential roles of hunting within societies indicate that nutrition alone is no longer a suitable framework for understanding hunting practices seen in faunal assemblages. The discussion of hunting is thematically supplemented and followed by an intriguing chapter (Chapter 5) considering species extinctions. While hunting is discussed regularly, the consideration of human-led extinctions of species presents an interesting and somewhat overlooked form of human-animal interaction. It offers a tantalizing avenue of study for zooarchaeology, within both archaeological narratives and contemporary debates regarding conservation and environmental change.

As the opening chapters are convincing in arguing that hunting should not be viewed exclusively as a meat obtaining exercise, the subsequent discussions of domestication make the reader consider these processes as more than simply a meat securing exercise. The extensive review of definitions, potential methods, and possible motivations for domestication demonstrate that a single, economically driven account is too narrow. Russell also poses a larger question: if animals held profound social roles and meanings, how did domestication affect human lives?
She presents convincing evidence that huge social transformations were potentially entwined with the changing dynamics of human-animal relationships. Unlike traditional meat-orientated analyses, this discussion considers living animals. Russell addresses the significance of animals well beyond their value as meat, and in a wide range of social frameworks to demonstrate the potential impact of such social processes on faunal assemblages.

The breadth of research presented in this volume is vast. The bibliography, which exceeds 150 pages, is enough to indicate that this is a laudable project and a valuable contribution to the discipline. Russell succeeds in demonstrating that animals and their remains contain important social meanings and can be involved in a wide range of practices that can shape faunal assemblages. Therefore, such meanings, processes, and practices can be explored using zooarchaeological methods. Russell does not shy away from traditional economic themes (e.g., nutrition and hunting strategies); she demonstrates that consideration of the “social” is appropriate at every stage of the analytical and interpretive process, and not just those previously deemed non-economic. Furthermore, the book is an excellent resource, collating the enormous variety of behaviors and practices over temporal and geographical ranges. Russell demonstrates that there is no single interpretive framework for faunal remains, and that zooarchaeology should adopt a “contextual approach” [p. 142].

While Russell clearly acknowledges that the book is anthropocentric in the sense that it is “using [animals] to understand people” [p. 5], a more problematic and underlying anthropocentrism is also present. Throughout the volume, she characterizes animals through a reductionist lens, such that they exist as static resources inscribed with human meanings (e.g., symbolism or wealth), which stems from a strict divide between human and animal realms. This divide is present in discussions of hunting as the pursuit of human dominance over nature and the characterization of domestic animals as “permanent children” [p. 238]. Therefore, this “Social Zooarchaeology” only considers how animal remains are implicated in human social relations. Recent posthumanist theorists would suggest that a more profitable approach considers nonhumans as agents that engage with humans in mutually influential relationships (e.g., Haraway 2008; Hill 2011). Russell rightly states that human-nonhuman relationships may be “inherently unequal” [p. 168], but this should not preclude the possibility for nonhumans to “act back.” A non-anthropocentric consideration of human-nonhuman social relationships would permit an exploration of how nonhuman agents (i.e., animals) affect human perceptions and understandings, which are integral to how they were used and treated as symbols, wealth, or food. This would only add to the contextually specific approach, which is “closer to the scale of lived experience” [p. 400], advocated by Russell throughout the volume.

This criticism should not detract from what this work achieves. Russell states that her aim is to inspire [p. xi], and she clearly succeeds in demonstrating the need to consider animals and their remains in a wide range of human social practices, and the suitability of zooarchaeology to address such themes. The volume is written in an enjoyable and comprehensible manner, and will engage students and technicians of prehistory, zooarchaeology, and archaeology. The editing and formatting are excellent, but there is a notable lack of figures. The 500+ page volume contains only two tables and no illustrations. While illustrations may be impractical in an already large volume, it seems reasonable to expect some illustrations in chapters about animal symbolism in art, specific treatments of skeletal elements, objects made from animal remains, and the incorporation of animal remains in architecture, graves, and other deposits. As a reference book, it would be more accessible if it contained visual examples of the themes highlighted above.

References