A wide-ranging contribution to social zooarchaeology, *Animals and Inequality* comprises chapters describing human interactions with animals in seventeen societies in North America (Mississippian, Chaco Canyon, Paquimé, Central California); Mesoamerica (Teotihuacan, Tenochtitlan, Maya); South America (Wari); Europe (Anglo-Saxon and medieval England, Roman Mediterranean, Neolithic Poland); Anatolia, Mesopotamia, Mongolia, West Africa, and Shang China. Topics covered are similarly comprehensive, including trade, cuisine, and wool production; and animals as symbols, offerings, luxury goods, and divinatory media.

One of several themes of the volume is the performative role of animals in ritual. At both Teotihuacan and Tenochtitlan, elites employed animals to dramatize their power over conquered peoples. Sugiyama et al. describe how the capture, manipulation, and interment of carnivores at Teotihuacan naturalized socioeconomic inequalities through reference to trophic hierarchies. López Luján et al. explore a similar appropriation of the symbolic potential of animals at the Templo Mayor. Display of exotic, inedible species denoted the conquest of the Pacific Coast, simultaneously recalling the tripartite Mexica cosmos.

A second theme that emerges in this volume is that the procurement and consumption of taxa encode ideas about the status and power of elites. This encoding may occur through the “luxury of variety” (p. 80) or through control over specific, highly valued taxa. At Cerro Baúl, Peru, deFrance describes how Wari elites conspicuously consumed an array of exotic animal products, while commoners subsisted on local staples. Jackson demonstrates that at Mississippian sites, faunal remains reflected both status-based and regional differences. Focusing on the central California coast, Sunseri suggests that inequalities emerged because of differential access to trade goods, such as fur seal pelts and deer hides.

While many elites prized trade goods and exotics for their rarity, social objectives could also be achieved through displays of abundance. Watson suggests that the communal hunting and feasting of large game at Chaco Canyon represented elite attempts to generate solidarity. Communal feasting also features in Marcinia’s discussion of domesticates in Neolithic Poland, where distinct patterns of bone fragmentation differentiate cattle remains from those of sheep/goat. Consumption of cattle bone marrow signaled the symbolic importance of this taxon during the...
Early Neolithic, and a subsequent shift to sheep and goat paralleled changes in social organization and settlement patterns.

Domesticates are linked to the development of inequalities by several contributors. Arbuckle suggests that in Bronze Age Anatolia, managerial elites emerged in association with increased wool production. The fourth-millennium BC “wool horizon” (p. 222) marks a shift from household production to the generation of a wool surplus, which elites could store and trade to their advantage. The wool trade is also the subject of Atici’s chapter. He uses records on clay tablets to explore the roles of sheep, donkeys, and cattle in production, exchange, and transport between central Anatolia and the Mesopotamian urban center of Assur. In Anglo-Saxon England, wool was also the basis for emerging social inequalities, according to Crabtree and Campana’s analysis of several faunal assemblages from East Anglia. They argue that the rise of specialized wool production in rural areas was a major factor in the rise of complexity in the seventh century.

Several chapters seek to understand broader social processes through the exploration of a specific animal. Holeman suggests that scarlet and military macaws embodied the red and green color symbolism that ordered the ritual world of Paqimé, northern Mexico. Wright explains how the burial of horse heads in Mongolia created chronotopes, “temporal and spatial anchors” that materialized memory (p. 288). Using colonial accounts, Norman reconstructs attitudes toward the free-ranging royal pythons of the Hueda Kingdom, West Africa. The defeat of the Hueda people by the Dahomey was underscored by the systematic destruction of the snakes, avatars of a protective Hueda deity.

Elite links to animals are discussed in several chapters. Sharpe et al. compare Maya zooarchaeological and iconographic evidence, showing that elites at San Bartolo had direct access to symbolically charged animals such as jaguars. Dietary analysis further revealed that frequencies of elite-associated taxa changed through time from small mammals, turtles, and birds to peccaries and deer (p. 101). MacKinnon’s chapter deals with dietary evidence of “romanization” in the Mediterranean, where local elites emulated Roman patterns of pork consumption. Deer are the focus of Sykes’s chapter on consumption of meat in medieval times. She describes how venison shifted from famine food to a symbol of aristocratic privilege. Highlighting the acts of hunting, apportioning, and consuming, Sykes emphasizes the performative potential of human-animal interactions.

By far the most innovative contribution to Animals and Inequality is Campbell’s chapter on Shang China. Taking a phenomenological approach, Campbell traces human and animal lives and deaths through the transformative experiences of warfare, divination, consumption, sacrifice, and interment. The “pathways” of humans, dogs, cattle, deer and chariot horses intersect and diverge, evincing the “mutability of animality, humanity, and divinity” (p. 270) among the Shang.

Animals and Inequality is well illustrated, though many detailed figures were reproduced at a scale that makes them impossible to decipher, detracting from what
is an otherwise handsome volume. A well-done index and references at the end of individual chapters facilitate use.

While the primary audience for this book will be zooarchaeologists, archaeologists working on complexity in any region of the world will find much to interest them. As the editors observe (p. i), “animals are integrated into the fabric of human cultures” and serve as “symbolic reference points around which cosmologies, cultural practices, aesthetics, and identities are built.” The chapters in this excellent volume demonstrate that our entanglement with nonhuman animals has a complex (pre)history that we’re only now beginning to unravel.

ERICA HILL, University of Alaska Southeast


This volume reveals where behavioral archaeology is, theoretically, methodologically, and conceptually, forty years after Michael Brian Schiffer and colleagues first outlined what it could be in the mid-1970s. It is an appropriate Festschrift (in everything but name) honoring Schiffer’s major contributions to archaeology and consists of 15 chapters by 17 of his colleagues and students. Behavioral archaeology (BA, hereafter) involves the study of human interactions with artifacts, architecture, landscapes, and other humans, in all times and places. It constructs generalizations about such interactions that facilitate interpretation and understanding of the archaeological record and cultural systems in the past and today.

Deni Seymour demonstrates that Pompeii-like archaeological manifestations can provide temporally high-resolution reflections of behavioral events and implies Pompeii-like events are specified by the investigator, not by the phenomena themselves. To estimate the temporal duration of Clovis, John Douglas uses Bayesian statistics, such as the reasoning manifest in Wesley and Merrilee Salmon’s statistical relevancy model of science that influenced BA. Patrick Lyons holds that the learning frameworks notion of BA leads to consideration of not only decorative icons but also provenance and technological attributes of pottery as revealing ancient migration and distinguishes migration from enculturation, ethnicity, exchange, and emulation.

Stephanie Whittlesey and Jefferson Reid call upon BA’s tenets to refute arguments concerning certain migration events. That such disagreements can occur between two factions of practitioners suggests a central tenet of BA—that correlates of behaviors and artifacts be used as interpretive analogs—is identical in technique and outcome to the fundamental archaeological technique of ethnographic analogy.