

societies need to be looked at in new ways” (p. 372). This book does that, with a richness of data that will make it a key resource for archaeologists interested in these sorts of ritual societies.

Vernacular Architecture in the Pre-Columbian Americas. CHRISTINA T. HALPERIN and LAUREN E. SCHWARTZ, editors. 2017. Routledge, London. xiii + 228 pp. \$132.00 (hardcover), ISBN 978-1-138-64615-5 (2017). \$38.36 (paperback), ISBN 978-0-367-87651-7 (2019).

Reviewed by David M. Carballo, Boston University

Most of us spent a lot more time at home this year, and chances are you have reflected a little more than usual on physical and geographic variability in domestic life. You may have ruminated on how social relations might be shaped differently by whether we live in dense or dispersed settings, whether we reside in single-family houses or connected apartments, or the amount of private space we occupy and how is it balanced with the public spaces we are accustomed to enjoying. This timely edited volume by Christina Halperin and Lauren Schwartz examines variability in domestic lifeways within the precolumbian Americas through the particular lens of what, following a linguistic analogy, could be branded as architectural vernaculars. Evocations of linguistics within architectural studies are common, because they capture tensions between tradition or rule-boundedness with innovation and creative expression in semiotic practices. They have been adapted by archaeologists as is the case here and in parallel scholarship on “architectural grammars” or “space syntax.” Contributors to the volume did not converge on a unified definition for vernacular architecture, and some terms that they use as synonyms include common or ordinary buildings, domestic architecture, and utilitarian building practices. Yet, in the aggregate, the chapters demonstrate how the construct can be heuristically employed to highlight how past peoples made conscientious choices in building styles and techniques across the spectrum of settlement type and socioeconomic status.

The volume is organized into three thematic sections with bookending introductory (Halperin and Schwartz) and concluding (Julia Hendon) chapters. Authors often engage multiple themes, but the division provides greater coherence to the cases. The first part focuses on issues of construction and production and features cases from the coastal (Jerry Moore) and highland (Anna Guengerich) Andes and

from lowland Mesoamerica (Schwartz). The section that follows places greater emphasis on issues relating to style and cultural or household identity, with cases from the Wari (Donna Nash) and Maya (Halperin) worlds. A final section engages more with temporal change and includes cases from highland Mesoamerica (Kristin De Lucia) and from the wide-ranging North American interaction spheres centered on Cahokia, in Illinois (Susan Alt), and Chaco Canyon, in New Mexico (Kellam Throgmorton).

Halperin and Schwartz open by noting that vernacular architecture “is both everywhere and nowhere” (p. 3). Although it may constitute more than 90% of the world’s built environment, the pivotal role of the everyday rhythms of life once lived in such structures was ignored by earlier generations of archaeologists in favor of elite and public architecture. Excavations of non-elite architecture were largely an outgrowth of the disciplinary shift in attention to settlement survey, when excavation of domestic spaces was often folded into regionally based research. As De Lucia notes in her chapter, a focus on vernacular architecture helps remind us that non-elites possessed agency and that we should reject implicit assumptions in the framing of analyses of elite or monumental buildings in terms of intentional actions and strategies, whereas analyses of common buildings are framed merely in terms of function and rule-bound tradition.

Varied strategies of non-elites are explored by authors using different methods. Both Moore and Guengerich incorporate ethnographic analogies from the Andes into their studies. Yet whereas Moore’s study is an ethnoarchaeological exploration of the use life of dwellings made from *tabique*, Guengerich draws on contemporary Andean practices of reciprocal labor in kin networks in proposing that houses in the Chachapoyas region reflect a neolocal residence pattern, with variance in labor costs relating to social capital and networks. Several contributors examine how vernacular architecture can be in discourse with types and styles of buildings promoted by powerful political and religious institutions. This could be manifested in local adaptations or “losses in translation,” as Schwartz argues was the case for circular shrines at smaller sites in the Maya region juxtaposed with monumental examples at state capitals. Stylistic variability and hybridity could also indicate tensions in administrative relations and worldviews between colonizing and subject populations in expansionistic states and empires, as suggested by Nash for the provincial Moquegua region during the Wari horizon. Architectural variability within shared macro-traditions may relate more to utilitarian and ecological concerns, as Throgmorton argues for the

Chacoan Southwest, or be a purposeful archaism in a radically new order, as Alt proposes for the Cahokian world.

The volume represents a significant contribution to household archaeology in the Americas by highlighting issues of conscious decision making on the part of non-elites and how the “99 percent” within past societies created, adapted, or rejected more formal or institutional architecture as part of the trajectory of long-term societal change.

Emergent Warfare in Our Evolutionary Past. NAM C. KIM and MARC KISSEL. 2018. Routledge, London. xv + 217 pp. \$155.00 (hardcover), ISBN 978-1-62958-266-5.

Reviewed by George R. Milner, Pennsylvania State University

For hundreds of years, humans have been regarded as innately violent, especially toward members of other communities. An alternative view is that an originally peaceful nature was irredeemably corrupted once people settled down, started to rely on domesticated plants and animals, and developed organizationally complex societies. Diving deep into humankind’s evolutionary past, the authors explore the origins of the relationship between cooperation and competition, with the latter distressingly often devolving into outright warfare.

For archaeological purposes, warfare might be considered culturally sanctioned fighting between different communities in which individual and collective advantages accrue to the participants and anyone classified as an enemy is an acceptable victim. The size and structure of war parties, nature and duration of fighting, number of casualties, and weapons employed are not relevant to such a definition.

For the societies of the last several millennia, simply identifying warfare’s existence can be hard, although not nearly as difficult as estimating its frequency, intensity, and societal impact. Turning to anatomically modern humans dating to the Paleolithic, finding unequivocal signs of intergroup violence is the best that one can reasonably expect. Solid evidence is even harder to identify for our hominin ancestors, despite the prominence of their supposed behavioral repertoire in how we view our apparent propensity toward violence and the seeming impossibility of escaping it.

As Nam Kim and Marc Kissel point out, violence was part of our hunter-gatherer past, to judge from skeletal trauma. It is difficult, however, to determine how those injuries came about. Here it is useful for

archaeologists to draw a distinction between the cause and manner of injury or death, as is common in forensic work. That is, the nature of the trauma (e.g., an arrow wound) is different from the circumstances that resulted in the injury (e.g., homicide or combat).

Turning to our hominin ancestors, data in the form of skeletal trauma are too thin to address systematically the origins of intergroup conflict. Instead, Kim and Kissel use other indirect lines of evidence, notably primate behavior. Chimpanzees figure prominently here, especially their periodic hunting forays and attacks on neighboring groups.

Rather than cast competition in opposition to cooperation, the authors emphasize the need for individuals to work together when engaging in intergroup conflict. This “socially cooperative violence” (p. 113), labeled “emergent warfare,” likely originated in the Pleistocene. The option of attacking conspecifics was not a stand-alone and hardwired aspect of our distant ancestors’ psyche (if it could be called that). Instead, Kim and Kissel see it as part of a gradually developing capacity to recognize group identities, cooperate in various tasks, and communicate effectively. Such violent acts were one aspect of the behavioral adaptability, with its benefits, costs, and situational flexibility, that forms the basis of our species’ success. Our ancestors did not sit around campfires happily holding hands and singing “Kumbaya” until they were somehow undone by growing crops, tending animals, and living in chiefdoms or states.

The authors discuss how peace is not simply an absence of war, neither today nor in the past. It must be actively constructed and maintained, and it might be established through elaborate political mechanisms or uneasy standoffs between potential foes who find fighting more costly than not doing so. The purposeful creation of peace in the past demands the attention that warfare is already receiving.

Going beyond warfare and the principal topics covered in this book, more archaeological work should be directed toward violence within individual societies, including what took place and who was affected. Only recently has within-group violence gained traction as a focus of research, which has mainly involved skeletal remains. But even the significance of skeletal trauma needs rethinking. Survival from trauma, as marked by healed fractures and the like, is usually considered to be of little consequence, except as an indication of the accommodations, even compassion, that injured individuals received. For late Holocene sites where skeletal samples can be large, it is possible to estimate quantitatively the lingering effects of injuries in terms of lost years of life; that is, the cost of trauma