

is an archaeological construct, and their conclusion that the formerly strong Fort Ancient–Mississippian barrier becomes permeable after AD 1300 is really describing a small sample that reflects distinct subsistence patterns for each site, not stand-ins for categories. Michael W. French and Pollack avoid discussing sites in southeastern Indiana and southwestern Ohio relevant to their argument. Both chapters assiduously avoid citing recent studies (e.g., numerous by Robert Cook and Aaron Comstock) that bear directly on the nature of relationships between Mississippian societies and Fort Ancient groups between AD 1000 and 1300. This is neither good scholarship nor good public synopsis.

As a regional synthesis, this volume is incomplete. The chapters successfully describe changes in land use (goal 1) and patterns of interaction (goal 3), and they are partly successful in contextualizing broader trends (goal 5). Specifically, many chapters address the fluctuating preferences for high-quality toolstone versus lower-quality local sources over time—and how this related to changes in residential mobility—and variable participation in regional horizons such as Adena and Hopewell ceremonialism. Some chapters attempt to define a distinctive Falls identity, and mentions of historicity and historical ecology are generally unincorporated into the main argument. The discussions of boundaries and identity generally suffer from a mismatch between the scope of data included and the scale of the conclusions desired.

There are formatting errors and inconsistencies sprinkled throughout the volume (e.g., Table 8.1, Table 9.1, Figure 9.6). Citations for the sources of figures and in-text references are periodically missing or incorrect (e.g., Figure 2.5, Figure 6.3). The inconsistencies in presentation, lack of coherence, and smattering of editing and production oversights (see p. 128) are not expected for a book from an academic press that costs \$90.

Pollack, Bader, and Carlson ambitiously set out to provide descriptive regional synopsis, public presentation of “gray” literature along the border between Kentucky and Indiana, and a theoretically substantive contribution to the literature of historical ecology. Although there is immense value in making available publicly funded archaeological data and interpretations, the two scholarly objectives are unmet. The book lacks focus and coherence. A comprehensive synopsis would be *enormously* useful. The current volume moves significantly toward that. A theoretically informed, nuanced accounting of the historicity of human–environment relationships in the Falls region would be an important contribution to archaeology. The volume falls short here. Attempts to

append a historical-ecology perspective to several chapters distract from their descriptive value. That said, the volume is a valuable and useful guide to findings from CRM archaeology in the area of the Falls of the Ohio River.

Household Economy at Wall Ridge: A Fourteenth-Century Central Plains Farmstead in the Missouri Valley. STEPHEN C. LENSINK, JOSEPH A. TIFFANY, and SHIRLEY J. SCHERMER, editors. 2020. University of Utah Press, Salt Lake City. xvi + 251 pp. \$70.00 (hardcover), ISBN 978-1-060781-773-4.

Reviewed by Susan C. Vehik, University of Oklahoma

The Wall Ridge site consists of one residential lodge. The site is assigned to the Glenwood phase of the Nebraska variant of the Central Plains Village tradition. The Nebraska variant dates to AD 1200–1350, and Wall Ridge was occupied during the later part of that range. The Glenwood phase is restricted to a small area of western Iowa overlooking the Missouri River Valley. The site was excavated in 1984, with analyses of finds taking place over the next several decades.

Research goals include definition of site paleoecology, occupation duration, seasonality, economic and subsistence strategies, site abandonment, size and composition of residence group, and cultural interactions. These are integrated into a theoretical theme common to Central Plains Village tradition research and many other archaeological studies around the world: the role of nucleated versus dispersed settlement systems in small-scale farming.

Chapters 2 through 11 cover standard topics such as site setting, excavation methods, laboratory procedures, site stratigraphy, features, house architecture, and radiocarbon dating. Analyses address ceramics, lithics, pipes, bone and shell tools, archaeobotanical remains, and zooarchaeological materials. These studies are descriptive and detailed, and they involve some new analytical techniques. Most chapters include brief comparisons to other Central Plains Village tradition sites, especially those belonging to the Glenwood phase.

The remainder of the book comprises the primary contribution to the theoretical theme. The chapter on lodge architecture (Chapter 12) considers construction sequence, the role religion may play in house architecture, site abandonment, and—most importantly—duration of lodge occupation. The latter depends partially on ceramic analyses and determination of ceramic vessel discard rates. There is a detailed construction of food energy budget as

reflected by storage capacity along with faunal and botanical remains. These reconstructions require a number of ideas, arguments, and extensive analyses of data. These analyses are supported by numerous in-text tables and other data available online. Readers will need to assess all this information carefully to determine if they accept or reject the conclusions presented. The principal conclusion of the chapter is that the lodge was likely abandoned because of resource exhaustion long before its architectural life was exhausted. This leaves readers wondering why was it overbuilt, or whether the occupants had no inkling that resource inadequacy was going to plague them.

The penultimate chapter is “Lodge Housekeeping” (Chapter 13). This discussion includes residents’ use of the lodge, the moving of material around the lodge, the filling of subterranean features, pottery vessel function, and diet and energy budgets. This is potentially the most controversial chapter because it involves accepting a number of arguments about relative plant and animal contributions to diet. The upshot is that there was an extremely high reliance of Wall Ridge–site residents on maize. This was a problem for site residents because maize only contributed a small amount of protein to the diet. Indeed, at least based on an animal MNI calculated from nontool bones, protein sources would have been inadequate. Most analyses of diet exclude tool bones because of the possibility of overrepresentation resulting from trade or collection of bones from animals that died from causes other than hunting. If tool bones are included, then bison contribute more food to Wall Ridge residents. More than other animals living closer by. This issue has important implications for reconstruction not only of foodways but also of settlement and hunting strategies.

The last chapter—coauthored by Joseph A. Tiffany, Stephen C. Lensink, James L. Theler, William Green, and Shirley J. Schermer—summarizes archaeological finds from Wall Ridge and interprets the site as representing evidence of a dispersed farming strategy. This chapter argues that the lodge was occupied year round, bison were procured by small task groups or through trade rather than by communal hunting and village abandonment as was practiced later in time, activities related to economic production were evenly distributed between sexes, site and lodge occupation was short lived, the site was abandoned because of dietary stress on the household, the household included two or three nuclear families organized matrilineally and matrilocally, and external interaction was mostly focused on nearby groups—primarily others within the Central Plains Village tradition.

Overall, this study provides much to think about and debate. Even the authors of the various chapters

do not agree with some of the conclusions (p. 205). These disagreements include the use of tool bones in calculating MNI and the role of bison in Wall Ridge residents’ subsistence. Also debated is dietary stress. These are significant points of disagreement.

Household Economy at Wall Ridge is an important contribution toward understanding small-scale farming communities of the North American Plains. The book is well produced, with few typos. It also comes with extensive supporting data and outstanding graphics at a reasonable price. Ample amounts of interesting supplemental data are easily accessed online from the University of Utah Press website.

Archaeological Narratives of the North American Great Plains: From Ancient Past to Historic Resettlement. SARAH J. TRABERT and KACY L. HOLLENBACK. 2021. Society for American Archaeology, Washington, DC. viii + 272 pp. \$34.95 (paperback), ISBN 978-0-932839-63-3.

Reviewed by Crystal A. Dozier, Wichita State University

Archaeological Narratives of the North American Great Plains, by Sarah Trabert and Kacy Hollenback, dives into recent and established research on the archaeology from Canada to Texas. Written in an accessible tone, the book presents a thorough understanding of the Indigenous history of the region, from first settlement of the continent to the establishment of the reservation system that shapes cultural resource management today. The authors take an explicitly Indigenous-focused approach in the volume, with special attention paid to emphasize the diversity of Plains peoples and lifeways. The book meets the stated goal of providing up-to-date perspectives on some common debates and interpretations of Plains archaeology while acknowledging Indigenous knowledges. Scholars looking to expand their understanding of the region will appreciate this book, in particular for its accessible prose, its consideration of Indigenous perspectives on archaeology and the past, and its extensive bibliography.

The first chapter provides a background in the history of archaeology in the Plains, which is especially useful in regard to the theoretical shifts in archaeological interpretation. This chapter would be very valuable for graduate students looking for an in-depth perspective on why the processual/post-processual debate and divide was not as intense in Plains archaeology as it was in other world areas, although reference to that debate is probably outside