

cases of ethnographic fatigue” (p. 53) among prospective participants.

The next two chapters present statistical analyses of the inventory data and comprise the real meat of the study. Chapter 5 establishes vessel groups based on their size/function and explores the impact of “contextual factors” such as household composition, cultural identity, and use frequency on vessel use life. The data suggest weak correlations among most variables, and Shott concludes that “contextual factors explain little variation in Michoacán vessel use life” (p. 110).

Given the limited impact of context, Chapter 6 extends the analysis to in-depth evaluations of use life and vessel size. Vessel size in this case includes weight as well as dimensional properties. Analyses reveal positive correlations between vessel size and use life for both *cazuelas* (casserole basins) and *ollas* (jars); the association of use life and vessel size for *comales* (round, flat griddles) is ambiguous. Comparisons of the annual inventory data with the near-monthly inventories are telling but hardly surprising. Vessels that last less than one year are likely underrepresented when the census interval spans one year or more (p. 139).

Many readers will find that Chapter 7 provides the most useful discussion because it places the Michoacán data in broader, cross-cultural perspective. One interesting outcome is the poor correlation between rim diameter and use life, but the overall finding is that vessel size and use life continue to covary in a strong, positive fashion.

Chapter 8 offers an ill-conceived exercise in which Shott generates a “discard assemblage” from 49 failed vessels collected from the three near-monthly census households. The remains of each vessel were bagged separately, and bagged sherds were then matched to the original inventoried vessel. The results indicate that the assemblage of broken pots was “characterized by high completeness and low brokenness” (p. 169). Given that this “discard assemblage” was intentionally curated after breakage, with no mixing and subject to neither depositional nor postdepositional processes, the correspondence between broken vessels and original whole vessels affords scant insight. The concluding Chapter 9 is a four-page précis in which Shott reiterates the correlation between use life and vessel size and appeals for more attention to formation theory.

I was quite frustrated by this read. On one hand it offers valuable, actualistic data on pottery use lives and ceramic inventories—in other words, it is a solid study of contemporary material culture. On the other hand, this research says little about any archaeological record, either in particular or in only the vaguest of senses. Consequently, although I applaud the “ethno” side of this effort, I find the “archaeo” side to be problematic.

This case study *is* successful, however, in highlighting the uneasy standing of ethnoarchaeology within the academy as well as its service to archaeology. To his credit, Shott calls out the poorly reasoned, postmodern critiques of ethnoarchaeology that have become fashionable of late (pp. 8–10). But his solution is scarcely better. Ethnoarchaeology makes its strongest contribution when it begins with a question derived from the archaeological record. Unfortunately, conducting a pottery census among modern households and collecting a few dozen broken pots says very little about any actual archaeological record. Just because one can model what *might* happen does not mean that it *has* happened or that it *will* happen. Why conjure fictional archaeological records when there are plenty of actual records that cry out for our attention?

Very few archaeological assemblages mimic ethnographic temporality (i.e., mini Pompeiis). Most represent deposits that span decades, if not centuries. Additional assemblages consist of construction fill that indiscriminately mingles debris from multiple time periods and contexts. Yet, Shott insists that, whenever possible, sherds should serve to establish an ethnographically meaningful “life assemblage” (p. 22). This same reasoning apparently justifies the questionable “discard assemblage” exercise in Chapter 8. But forgive me if I push back and simply ask, Why? Why should we strive to reconstruct the original number of vessels from an assemblage that conflates decades of accumulation? In fact, Shott’s own Chapter 5 data demonstrate no significant relationship between characteristics of household composition (family size, age/sex distributions) and characteristics of their pottery inventories (vessel frequency, vessel volume, vessel types). If representative, what do we learn about long-term human behavior by reverse engineering a ceramic assemblage as advocated in this chapter?

In sum, this case study offers well-documented information on modern material culture. In that regard, the data will certainly be mined for years to come. At the same time, its ethnographic lens distorts its archaeological utility. Consequently, in terms of the study’s relevance to building archaeological theory, I am afraid that its use life is destined to be considerably shorter.

Archaeological Networks and Social Interaction. LIEVE DONNELLAN, editor. 2020. Routledge, Abingdon, Oxon, UK. xvii + 238 pp. \$160.00 (cloth), ISBN 978-1-13854-520-5. \$48.95 (e-book), ISBN 978-1-35100-306-3.

Reviewed by Matthew A. Peebles, Arizona State University

Network analyses have seen a dramatic increase in popularity in archaeology over the last decade. Networks have long been used as a metaphor, and relational thinking is certainly not new to archaeology, but there is still much to be done to develop approaches that profitably combine relational theories with formal network analyses at various spatial and social scales. This book is an attempt to explore some of the potential connections between network techniques and general models of social interaction using archaeological data.

This edited volume was inspired by a discussion session at the 2017 European Archaeology Association annual meeting. The chapters are varied, and they focus on an array of topics revolving around how to construct, interpret, and visualize relations as formal networks using case studies from Europe as well as one from North America. The chapters run the gamut of current work on network thinking in archaeology, ranging from discussions of theoretical concepts or tentative attempts to evaluate and formalize relational theories using network tools to empirical evaluations of networks using quantitative approaches such as partitioning, centrality analysis, and comparisons of generative network models. In general, the first half of the book leans more heavily on theoretical discussion, and the second half more heavily on empirical examples.

Although the chapters are diverse, there are a few key themes that most chapters touch on to varying degrees. These studies are concerned with the ways interpersonal social relations can be analyzed using network tools, as well as the tensions among investigations of social relations at micro versus meso versus regional scales. Many of the chapters consider the role of objects in mediating interactions among people as well as the potential blurring of boundaries between people and things that can occur in social transactions. Indeed, objects are treated as active participants in interaction throughout most of the volume.

Several chapters rely on approaches to thinking about social interaction from other fields, including Marilyn Strathern's ethnographic work in Melanesia, which focuses on the ontologies of face-to-face networks and the complexities of personhood in transactions involving people, animals, and objects. Carl Knappett provides a detailed discussion of this theoretical approach and considers how it could be applied through formal network methods. Chapters by Aline Deicke and Owain Morris take on these ideas directly and apply them to empirical case studies. Other chapters take inspiration from other relational models focused on

interaction and identity (Simon Barker, Simona Perna, and Courtney A. Ward's is focused on marble pavements from the Roman town of Pompeii) or the social values ascribed to objects (Lieve Donnellan's is on Pithekoussai—off the coast of Italy—widely thought to have been a Greek colony). Importantly, all of these authors note the difficulty in directly mapping such complex relational concepts onto formal networks, but they suggest that considerations of both theoretical models and formal analyses together may be useful in making more nuanced interpretations of interactions and their associations.

Several of these chapters explore methods for constructing two-mode networks and associated affiliation networks where sets of actors are not connected directly but instead are connected through objects involved in transactions among them. In his chapter on beadwork in Viking Age Scandinavia, Søren Sindbæk directly compares the utility of two-mode networks to traditional approaches for evaluating interaction with material culture in detail. Although many have suggested that such approaches are a good fit for archaeological data, specific applications have been rare. The prevalence of two-mode approaches in this book reflects the deep focus on objects as active parts of interactions and network formation, and it points to potential new directions for future research.

The final two chapters—one by Mark A. Hill, Kevin C. Nolan, and Mark S. Seeman on Hopewell social interactions, and another chapter by Francesca Fulminate on Iron Age Italy—provide the most detailed empirical analyses in the book, and both represent attempts at evaluating models of interaction at regional scales with reference to formal networks created from lithic materials and transportation infrastructure respectively. These chapters highlight how network metrics and structural properties can be used to select among alternative explanations for the underlying social processes generating interactions in a given context.

This volume provides a good discussion of trends in recent archaeological network literature in Europe as well as the history of such approaches, although work in other parts of the world is not extensively considered. It is unfortunate that the figures are black and white—several are difficult to evaluate in this format—but this is a problem for network studies in general. Overall, *Archaeological Networks and Social Interaction* provides a useful distillation of recent research on networks in archaeology and the complexities of connecting relational theories with formal networks using archaeological data.