

(pp. 121–125). Some readers may find the dialogue in the intervening Chapters 7 and 9 somewhat abstruse, parsing posthumanist theory and endlessly debating what constitutes “new materialism.” In short, new materialism encompasses posthumanism and meta-physical or relations-centered approaches (Chapters 2 and 10) and emphasizes the complex “meshwork” of vibrant matter (soil, rocks, bodies, and countless other phenomena) as emergent and continually changing. The new materialist approach is favored among European archaeologists, perhaps because it sidesteps the problematic (mis)appropriation of Indigenous philosophies (Chapter 5, p. 71). Yet, as Benjamin Alberti notes in his essay, “Archaeologies of Ontology” (*Annual Review of Anthropology* 45:163–179, 2016), the “painstaking work of developing new archaeological metaphysics on the basis of an alternative Western intellectual tradition brings us no closer to grappling with the ontological difference presented to us anthropologically.”

Alberti’s point is particularly relevant for archaeologists working in the Americas (presumably most readers of *American Antiquity*). Why would one not rely on Indigenous knowledge—not only as supporting evidence but as theory itself? This is what Lindsay Montgomery is advocating in Chapter 4. Scholars engaging in Indigenous ontologies should pay particular attention to this chapter and her keen observations throughout the book. Additionally, Cipolla (Chapter 10) offers a valuable discussion of collaborative Indigenous archaeology—not just as decolonized practice but as “shared ontological spaces”—what the Anishinaabe refer to elsewhere as “braided knowledge,” which weaves together complementary ways of knowing.

Importantly, contributors echo the sentiments of Métis scholar Zoe Todd (“An Indigenous Feminist’s Take on the Ontological Turn: ‘Ontology’ Is Just Another Word for Colonialism,” *Journal of Historical Sociology* 29:4–22, 2016), who observes that most anthropological theory regarding relational ontologies derives from Indigenous knowledge, but Western intellectuals often fail to properly acknowledge Indigenous thinkers. This is what Cipolla might refer to as “creeping colonialism” (p. 173) and what Montgomery would call “epistemological injustice . . . [where] dominant systems of knowledge production shape the ways in which collaborative knowledge is evaluated, validated, and incorporated” (p. 174). Here, the dialogue (especially in Chapters 5, 11, and 12) is particularly effective in “dwelling longer in [the] discomfort” (p. 81) of our discipline’s colonial baggage, addressing how the dominant Western perspective creates a divide in social theory and archaeological praxis, and perpetuates social divides between the

disfranchised and the privileged. Rather than seeking a neat and tidy singular (dominant) perspective, the authors of this book move the ontological project forward by advocating for more “openness” (p. 202), calling for greater inclusion, diversification, and decolonization of the field.

The Organization of Ancient Economies: A Global Perspective. KENNETH HIRTH. 2020. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge. xvii + 441 pp. \$39.99 (cloth), ISBN 978-1-108494700. \$32.00 (e-book), ISBN 978-1-1088-59707.

Reviewed by Gary M. Feinman, Field Museum of Natural History

Decades removed from scholarly declarations that the polarizing formalist-substantive debate was over, the niche for a book-length treatment of premodern economies that both takes stock and outlines analytical paths forward remains open. Explicitly comparative, aimed at both general readers and disciplinary experts, and rich in empirical examples drawn from archaeology, history, and anthropology, this volume grounds the reader in assembled knowledge of the economic past. With chapters devoted to the domestic economy, the informal institutions that link households, the ties between domestic units and formal institutions, the financing of institutions, resource mobilization/taxation, merchants and trade, craft production, and markets and marketplaces (bookended by introductory and concluding chapters), the text features basic interpersonal and institutional units relevant to premodern economic practice.

By focusing a largely bottom-up lens on households and other fundamental components of the economy, Kenneth Hirth is able to describe rich variation in ancient and premodern economies (with examples drawn from prehispanic Mesoamerica, the classical Mediterranean world, Late Imperial China, Sumer, and many more contexts) while building an empirically grounded case to critique and eschew the categorical, stage-based monolithic models that have long dominated studies of humankind’s economic past. By illustrating the variability of premodern economies and defining the basic units that he considers essential to their study, the aims the author states for the book are largely met. The bibliography is an impressive resource, and the glossary is an important pedagogical tool. But, more to the point, how and where does this leave the investigation of the documented variation in premodern economies across time and space?

Hirth acknowledges that his approach is empirically focused, theoretically eclectic, and selective in drawing from both substantive and formalist thought. But a deemphasis on the building and testing of new theoretical perspectives rarely means theory free, especially with a topic as richly debated as premodern economies. Instead, it tends to foster selective reliance on old paradigmatic tenets and seemingly commonsensical notions—in this instance, drawn from formalist, substantive, and even culture-historical thought. In discussing premodern households and their presumed adherence to the avoidance of risk, the author paraphrases William Faulkner: “You cannot swim for new horizons until you have the courage to lose sight of the shore” (p. 320).

But what is the evidential basis for the asserted assumptions (cf. Atwood, in *Economic Analysis beyond the Local System*, 1997, pp. 147–169) that “household self-sufficiency is the primary goal of the domestic economy” (p. 20), or that households are uniformly resistant to risk, or for the verbal coinage of a “law of unobtrusive expropriation”—a working principle—that people will be more supportive of emerging institutions that make fewer demands on their time and resources than those that make more demands (pp. 324–325)? How then do we understand the processes associated with the foundations of many of the globe’s earliest cities and central places—Teotihuacan, Monte Albán, Cahokia, Rome (more could be listed)—where people flocked from afar, immigrated toward political power where their taxes were likely raised, and, when they arrived, quickly changed how they built their houses and what many did for a living?

The author’s adoption of entrenched archaeological presumptions and truisms regarding the uniform conservatism of domestic decision-making and practice in premodern contexts underpins the blanket assertion that marketplaces only become important “where informal exchanges and the noncommercial economy could no longer regulate the distribution of resources” (p. 331), a finding that does not accord with extant historical evidence (e.g., Feinman and Garraty, *Annual Review of Anthropology* 39:167–191). Likewise, given the amply documented variation in ancient economies that is marshalled in the volume, grounding explication on the premise “that the cultural norms of society provided guidelines for the economy to run smoothly and with minimal short- and long-term risk to its members” (p. 319) seems to rely on a culture-historical trope that sidesteps in-depth recognition of cross-cultural patterns and processes that could help account for the marked diversity and dynamics of change that characterize humanity’s economic past (and present). In his decision to concentrate on

economic units rather than the practices of production, distribution, consumption, and inequality, different classes of evidence are underrepresented in this text, which, if more thoroughly examined, may have prompted fuller analytical explanations of variation and change. The limited attention devoted to diverse manifestations of economic inequities (and how they varied across time and space) is a missed opportunity to engage readers with the material richness of the archaeological record and its potential to gauge the depth and multiple dimensions of inequality beyond the “winners” who wrote histories. Also left unproblematic is why we cordon off most of economic history—ancient and premodern economies—from the last centuries in the West, especially given that those who isolate the modern West do not agree on just when that supposed “unique” transformation began. Hirth accurately notes key technological differences (fossil fuels, high-speed transport, and communication), but he also rightfully recognizes that when it comes to the way work is organized, this dichotomous distinction blurs. So in spite of the vast technological and institutional changes that preceded the last centuries in the West, to what degree do we really need completely separate disciplines and tools to study “modern economies”?

In sum, *The Organization of Ancient Economies* amasses a panoply of rich archaeological and historical case examples, structured in descriptive discussions of key economic units that thereby serve as a valuable chapter in the study of premodern economies. Nevertheless, it sticks close to shore, and so the book basically passes on the opportunity to set new conceptual agendas toward the understanding of global variation in human economic practices across deep time.

Ritual, Play, and Belief in Evolution and Early Human Societies. COLIN RENFREW, IAIN MORLEY, and MICHAEL BOYD, editors. 2018. Cambridge University Press, New York. \$123.99 (hardcover), ISBN 978-1-10714-356-2. \$39.99 (paperback) ISBN 978-1-31650-780-3. \$32.00 (e-book), ISBN 978-1-10854-861-8.

Reviewed by Paul B. Pettitt, University of Durham

Amenhotep III, successor to Thutmose IV as pharaoh of Egypt during the fourteenth century BC, boasted of killing 96 head of wild cattle in a single expedition and 102 lions during the first decade of his reign. This was not simply hunting as sport, but a highly ritualized process fundamental to the symbolism of his prowess, the land’s fecundity, and ultimately the stability of the