

of inference. When general conclusions are drawn, they can also sound generic and colourless: e.g. p. 195 in the 'Conclusions' chapter: 'Representational art not only depicts the ships and people who sailed them but also various types of fish and shells, highlighting the links between fishing and seafaring as well as maritime trade.' – how could fishing not be related to seafaring? Or (p. 196) 'The sea itself does not, and by its nature cannot, represent a palimpsest of human activity...Unlike a landscape...the seascape is a surface of flows and change....'. The determinist 'Maritime interaction not only motivated politico-economic development and facilitated human mobility, it also transformed social structures and modified individual human actions.', again in the chapter Conclusions: Final Words, p. 196, conveys little conclusive meaning. Finishing the book, the reader may assume that everything there is to say has been got out of the data and that the conclusions, however bland, are pretty straightforward. While it is true to say the data have been well-wrung here, Knapp knows there are many other ways and dimensions of exploring it beside his own, and that it has been gathered in a wide variety of research contexts which affect its quality. Thus, the book could be as profound and thought-provoking as the Mediterranean's winy depths – but it is workmanlike instead, a serviceable raft on the surface.

SARO WALLACE

RESEARCH FELLOW, DEPARTMENT OF ARCHAEOLOGY,
UNIVERSITY OF MANCHESTER
sarowallace@hotmail.com

- Broodbank, C., 2014. *The Making of the Middle Sea: a History of the Mediterranean from the Beginning to the Emergence of the Classical World*. London: Thames and Hudson.
- Knapp, A. B., and S. Demesticha, 2017. *Mediterranean Connections: Maritime Transport Containers and Seaborne Trade in the Bronze and Early Iron Ages*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Hitchcock, L., and A. M. Maeir, 2014. Yo-ho, yo-ho, a *seren's* life for me! *World Archaeology* 46: 624–40.
- Monroe, C., 2009. *Scales of Fate: Trade, Tradition and Transformation in the Eastern Mediterranean*. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.
- Wachsmann, S., 1998. *Seagoing Ships and Seamanship in the Bronze Age Levant*. College Station, Texas: Texas AandM University Press.
- Wedde, M., 2000. *Towards a Hermeneutics of Aegean Bronze Age Ship Imagery*. Bibliopolis: Mannheim und Möhnsee.

Food for thought: socialising meals, cuisine and subsistence practices in prehistoric Southeast Europe

Maria Ivanova, Bogdan Athanassov, Vanya Petrova, Desislava Takorova and Philip W. Stockhammer (eds). *Social Dimensions of Food in the Prehistoric Balkans*. pp. xvii+367. 2018. Oxford: Oxbow. ISBN: 978–1–78925–080–0 £48.00

Food practices and their social implications are an important focus of investigation for a wide range of disciplines. In anthropology in particular the cross-cultural importance of meals or of the exchange of food and substances in creating and enduring social bonds gained attention already in Malinowski's era and has remained a central theme of inquiry ever since.¹ It is now widely acknowledged that food practices play an active role in the negotiation of social identities, relationships and distinctions at different social scales. In archaeology, the economic dimensions of subsistence practices have always held an interest, but food itself was not recognised as a significant analytical or theoretical concept until recently. Since the 2000s, however, there is a growing interest in the cultural and social analysis of food, accompanied by a surge of novel perspectives and methods in palaeo-botanical, zoo-archaeological, palaeo-anthropological and material culture research, including the regions in question here.²

Social Dimensions of Food in the Prehistoric Balkans reflects these changes, focusing on the cultural, social, ritual and ecological dimensions of food practices from the Mesolithic to the Early Iron Age and advocating a combination of practice-oriented approaches with new scientific techniques. At the same time, it demonstrates the profusion of fresh data and the emergence of new research themes, including the human-animal relationship, feasting and ritual consumption, memory, culinary practices, ecological dimensions, the variability of subsistence preferences and the dispersal of farmers, crops, livestock and foodways across Greece and the Balkans. The volume consists of 19 chapters, in addition to an extended introductory section by the editors, apparently originally presented at an

¹ E.g. Carsten 1995; Fernández-Armesto and Smail 2011; Goody 1982.

² E.g. Halstead and Barrett 2004; Hastorf 2017; Mee and Renard 2007; Pollock 2012.

international conference held at the Heidelberg Academy of Sciences in May 2015. It is partly related to an ERC project by one of the editors (Philipp Stockhammer). The lack of a preface does not help us understand the volume's history or whether it also includes newly commissioned papers.

In the Introduction the editors set out the aims of the book in interesting detail. They can be summarised in three main points: a) to contribute to the integration of past and present studies of food, or of archaeology with Food Studies (p. vii); b) 'to implement a transcultural archaeology that integrates an archaeology of the senses, practice-oriented approaches and cutting-edge scientific techniques' (p. vii), and, ultimately, c) to show how archaeology, with the historical depth and materiality of its data, can add a long-term diachronic perspective to wider studies of food practices (p. xi-xii). A further goal of the volume is to highlight the crucial role of the Balkans in the dissemination and adjustments of food practices across the wider geographical context, i.e. from the Near East to Central Europe and vice versa.

The volume, thus, seeks to locate itself on new ground as a cohesive discourse on food as a prominent social (and symbolic) medium, 'entangling different approaches' (p. xi-xiii) and emphasising the human interaction with food as well as the inter-regional co-operation. It certainly achieves most of its stated aims, especially those of showing the importance of approach and data-integration as well as the dynamism of culinary practices. But whether it provides a cohesive treatise or comprehensive coverage or, more importantly, a clear *outline* of the much desired long-term, historical perspective is very questionable. This would have required a final remark at the very least. Instead, the complete absence of a concluding section (after 19 individual contributions) leaves the reader at a loss. A second caveat is the lack of any partitioning – e.g. thematic, chronological or geographical. This, in conjunction with the lack of chapter abstracts, leaves it to the reader to understand the logic of the volume's structure and to make connections between its contents. A third shortcoming is the partial (and sometimes confusing) geographic coverage, starting from the volume's title. 'Balkans' seems rather narrow, given that the volume includes important evidence from Anatolia (Ch. 2, pp. 14–30), Romania and Central Europe as well as a chapter that distinguishes between 'Aegean' and 'Balkan' prehistory (Ch. 19, pp. 320–367) (how is 'Aegean' different from 'Greece', featuring in three other chapters?). Perhaps 'Southeast Europe', a term featuring in a couple of chapter titles, instead of

'Balkans' would have worked better. Furthermore, some regions are under-represented. For instance, the overall balance tilts heavily towards Bulgaria, whereas all of the three chapters on Neolithic Greece (Chapters 3–5) deal mostly with the same few and well-known sites in Macedonia (e.g. Makriyalos) in whose research all four authors happen to be involved as a team and about which they have published several papers of similar content in other edited volumes (see Note 13 for references). Despite these shortcomings, the strength of the volume is certainly its ability to inform us on a variety of social and cultural issues concerning food, to embrace these concepts as matters of research rather than as self-explanatory and to illustrate their contextually contingent nature.

The first two chapters reflect the recent shift of attention in zooarchaeological research to the human-animal relationship, including herd management systems. In a theoretically-centred paper, Bartosiewicz and Bonsall (Ch. 1, pp. 1–13) offer a useful critique of the traditional functional and mechanistic models of herd reconstruction and management, pointing out that the vast majority of faunal data represents dead stock rather than livestock and should therefore be approached accordingly. Advocating the abandonment of the pressure of having to envision herds, the paper calls for a shift of emphasis from meat production to meat consumption and for an effort towards a more precise terminology. Russel (Ch. 2, pp. 14–30) approaches the interaction between humans and animals through a focus on food taboos as detected in the faunal patterning at Çatalhöyük, and to a lesser extent at Opovo, providing a comprehensive presentation of the differential occurrence and treatment of animal body parts as well as of the animal representation in art and in depositional patterns. Her contextual and integrated analysis offers a very interesting insight into patterns regarding the domestic vs. wild animal perception and manipulation by early farming societies, including possible connections between different kinds of taboo on the one hand, and socio-cultural norms concerning food, social distinctions such as clans or sodalities with totem animals, group identities and myth or religion, on the other. It is regretful that these interesting points, especially those about kinship, appear briefly and largely as concluding remarks rather than suggestions regarding specific ways of detecting such connections.

In the first of the three chapters on Neolithic Greece, Kotsakis (Ch. 3, pp. 31–46) discusses the context of food consumption, opposing eating in public and

eating in private (i.e. inside houses). He argues that the replacement of pit-dwellings with solid over-ground houses over time reflects a progression from public food-sharing to privatised hospitality, defined as 'the domestic mode of living' (p. 36). This only occurred, according to Kotsakis, at a later stage, when 'houses hide their residents behind walls, forming ... a new, separate social group, the household' (p. 37) and reflects a 'secession of the household from the collective social body' (p. 43) and a movement to social complexity and change. There are several caveats in this argument. Firstly, it seems to reiterate, if in a more blurred version, the model of progressive household isolation, and generally of a progression from social cohesion and communal values to inequality and antagonism over the course of the Neolithic, advanced by Halstead ³ more than twenty years ago. However, debate on all of these notions, including the relationship between household and community,⁴ has moved forward considerably. Such models, which tend to rely on top-down perspectives and the grand models of social evolution, as does the equation of complexity with hierarchy, the view of change as teleological and the classification of societies either as simple (i.e. egalitarian) or complex (i.e. unequal), have been challenged across a broad range of different contexts by new, bottom-up approaches, which reveal instead household interdependence, social balance, integration and/or heterarchy and cross-cutting networks of power.⁵ It is surprising that the author does not take this rich literature into account. Secondly, this argument is not convincingly supported by the evidence. For instance, the many examples of flat sites with pit-dwellings, thus of 'eating out', as well as of public spaces for conspicuous consumption that are dated to the Late rather than the Early Neolithic are cursorily dismissed as simply preserving 'the ancient pattern of habitation' (p. 39). And so is the role of kinship in inter-household connections and other levels of social organisation,⁶ despite abstract references to ancestry and lineage. Finally, there is a problem with conceptual definition and with theorisation. The variety of terms and notions used by the author, i.e. 'house', 'household', 'dwelling', 'community', 'domestic' and so on are confusing. For instance, what exactly is meant by 'a frozen conflict between the communal and the household unit' (p. 32)? What is the relationship of house, dwelling and household, and why should earlier Neolithic societies be

deprived of the 'domestic mode of living' and of the 'household' as a context of food-sharing? Actually, shared food consumption is a most fundamental component of the very formation and definition of a household, a key part of the processes that make up its creation and sustaining,⁷ and not the other way around. Similarly, 'household' and 'domesticity' have been shown to apply to all types of societies, mobile and sedentary alike, with or without permanent architecture, including the Upper Palaeolithic hunter-gatherer societies.⁸

The other two chapters on Greece are more methodologically-oriented. Urem-Kotsou (Ch. 4, pp. 47–65) examines the morphology, style and organic residues of ceramic vessels in order to identify food practices, including the key issue of a Neolithic baking or boiling culture, and to detect changes in cuisine and consumption. As has long been suggested with regard to southern Greece,⁹ Urem-Kotsou finds that the first pots from sites in western Macedonia were also not used for cooking. An interesting suggestion here is that food may have continued to be prepared in a pre-pottery period fashion (p. 50). During the Early and the Middle Neolithic technological and stylistic innovations resulted in a proliferation of shapes and the regular use of vessels for cooking, but boiling still remained the most common method. Baking and a greater culinary variety, including stews and liquid dishes, seem to occur in the Late Neolithic, when vessels grew more complicated and variable. Significantly, it was accompanied by a remarkable increase in decorated serving ware, highlighting the social role of shared food-consumption, especially in public contexts, which also seem to proliferate in this period (pp. 58–60). Although the author does not seem to escape the stereotypical opposition of earlier Neolithic pottery as playing a unifying role within a community and later Neolithic pottery as a marker of social distinctions, the interesting pattern that emerges here actually indicates maintenance and intensification rather than erosion of shared values over the course of the Neolithic.

The social significance and use of painted pottery is fully demonstrated by Bajcev's thought-provoking paper (Ch. 6, pp. 86–108) on Starčevo material. Employing an exemplary use-alteration analysis and a very refreshing new perspective, Bajcev convincingly deconstructs the unproductive dichotomy between 'elite' and 'utilitarian' items and specifically the assumed function of painted

³ Halstead 1995, 1999.

⁴ Souvatzi 2012.

⁵ E.g. Chapman 2003; Kohring and Wynne-Jones 2007; Mina 2018; Moore 2012; Souvatzi 2007.

⁶ Ensor 2013; Souvatzi 2017.

⁷ See Souvatzi 2008: 9–18 for definitions and related anthropological literature.

⁸ E.g. Zubrow, Audouze and Enloe 2010.

⁹ Vitelli 1995.

ware as a luxury or prestige marker intended solely for display. Her analysis shows that far from being static, painted vessels were used for various food-related purposes, ranging from food preparation by fermentation to storage and from grinding foodstuffs to making medicinal mixtures, in addition of course to their many social or symbolic functions. One important implication here is that all material products are used in a social context, and their relationship with this context is recursive. Indeed, in Neolithic Greece too, the context of finding and use of fine ceramic wares also indicates that even the most highly decorated pots could have had a more daily use than is usually assumed.¹⁰ At the same time, the high proportions of richly decorated serving ware (for example, at Dimini they amount to over 31% of the ceramic assemblage)¹¹ underline the importance of shared food consumption in social life and in reinforcing social bonds. In turn, the elaboration of the means of food preparation and consumption, further indicate where the value of the so-called 'prestige' pottery must be situated and assessed.

Recent archaeological literature has also demonstrated that food exchanges, especially in communal gatherings and ceremonies, play an important role in the development and renegotiation of a variety of social roles and relationships.¹² Three chapters in the present volume focus on ritualised consumption or feasting in shared contexts through an archaeo-zoological focus and with regard to pits. Isaakidou and Halstead (Ch. 5, pp. 66–85), the third chapter on Greek Macedonia, revise the evidence from the well-known example of LN Makriyalos I, including the large pit-feature which contained an extraordinary amount of animal bones and material culture and has been interpreted as representing large-scale, communal, and perhaps regional, commensality.¹³ Their integrated analysis of faunal, botanical, ceramic and human skeletal data suggests a distinction between largely plant-based daily meals and special occasions involving meat and leads to a discussion of the significance of meat in commensal practices. Similarly, Greenfield and Jongsma-Greenfield (Ch. 7, pp. 109–140), and Bacvarov and Gorczyk (Ch. 8, pp. 141–156) explore the ritual dimension of meat consumption as reflected by animal bone concentrations and special deposits in unusual pits in EN Blagotin, Serbia, and LN Sarnevo, Bulgaria, respectively. Greenfield and Jongsma-Greenfield's paper also

offers a most welcome attempt to systematise the identification of feasting (faunal) assemblages in the archaeological record, including conceptual definition, general archaeological indications and specific zooarchaeological evidence, thus providing a good general methodological basis. Their data analysis leads them to suggest that feasting was an integral part of Early Neolithic societies. It is a pity that the paper ends there and does not take this important point any further, for instance by providing some discussion of the social role and meaning of feasting in early farming societies or by synthesising data from some other contemporary sites, or even by integrating some ethnographic or anthropological examples. In a more interpretative paper, Bacvarov and Gorczyk address pits and structured deposition in SE Europe and make the interesting suggestion that pits with exceptionally rich and uniquely combined contents may be conceived as 'ritual packages' based on translocal relations and contributing to the construction and preservation of collective memory. Furthermore, 'ritual packages' comprise heavily and intentionally fragmented material, including animal bones as food or as feasting remains, whose deposition extends the social life of food beyond the moment of consumption (p. 154).

The interesting concept of 'ritual package' may be of wider analytical applicability and cross-cultural utility. For instance, it recalls Pauketat's¹⁴ notion of 'bundling' inspired by his analysis of North American practices of sacred bundling (or assembling) of objects. Bundles are seen as composed of and mediating a series of relationships, forms of remembrance and social traditions. Regarding the idea of structured deposition and deliberate fragmentation, put forward by Chapman¹⁵ for the Balkans, one additional interpretation may be that it served for social enchainment and relational identities, especially when accompanied by a reuse of fragments.¹⁶ One important omission from Bacvarov and Gorczyk's otherwise valuable argument is an account of time, other than the fact that Sarnevo was used for 50 years (p. 142). But what is the stratigraphy of the ritual pit under study, and, more importantly, does it suggest a relatively short depositional episode or a repeated process, a cycle of ritualised and collectively organised act? The lack of any such information collapses the time scale, thus blocks an attempt at understanding history-making processes. For instance, in Pauketat's argument, acts of bundling are potential processes of historical

¹⁰ Souvatzi 2008: 180–182, 224–225.

¹¹ Souvatzi 2008: 119–120.

¹² E.g. Pollock 2012; Spielmann 2002.

¹³ Halstead 2007; Halstead and Isaakidou 2014; Pappa *et al.* 2004; Urem-Kotsou and Kotsakis 2007.

¹⁴ Pauketat 2013.

¹⁵ Chapman 2000.

¹⁶ Chapman and Gaydarska 2006; Chapman *et al.* 2011.

meaning making and therefore form the fabric of history.

Ground- and chipped stone technologies and their role in prehistoric farming form the basis of two chapters in the volume. Ivanova (Ch. 10, pp. 173–189) does an excellent job in highlighting the cross-cultural importance of cereal grinding and associated tools, habitually a heavily underestimated activity and material class in prehistoric archaeology. Focusing in particular on milling slabs from a variety of sites across SE Europe, she shows how contrasting patterns in grinding tool morphology between the Hungarian Plain and the Balkans can be used to infer differences in the exploitation of cereals, in farming practices and in food systems. Flint assemblages from Bulgaria, especially sickles, provide Gurova (Ch. 11, pp. 190–214) the opportunity to observe long-term patterns in crop production as well as to identify connections with the Near East. One significant conclusion is that the labour for harvesting and threshing obviously ‘required a particular social/kinship organisation’ (pp. 209–210). As with Russel’s chapter (see above), it is regretful that this paper does not explore this issue further. For instance, Karimali’s¹⁷ study of the production of threshing sledges in Neolithic Thessaly shows that several production systems and overlapping distribution networks operated simultaneously, and that the ‘distance’ between producers and consumers was primarily a distance in kinship and socio-cultural ties.

A further two, regrettably very short, contributions explore the interesting phenomenon of salt exploitation in prehistory and its relationship with social status and wealth. Harding (Ch. 13, pp. 221–229) offers a useful overview of the various scales of salt production, trade and use (including in food) and the social, economic and symbolic dimensions of salt in prehistory, incorporating examples from Iron Age Halstatt and from later antiquity. Advocating a contextual approach, Harding recommends that there is no *a priori* association of salt with hoards or wealth. A rather different conclusion is reached by Nikolov (Ch. 12, pp. 215–220), who interprets salt trade as being associated with people of a higher status and as key to the emergence of the exceptionally rich graves of Varna.

The chapter by Krauss, De Cupere and Marinova (Ch. 9, 157–172) approaches the old and recurrent question of the Neolithisation and Neolithic origins of SE Europe from a new perspective, bringing food production and nutrition strategies into the

discussion of the development and dispersal of subsistence practices across the Balkans. On the basis of new archaeological, zooarchaeological and archaeobotanical data, differences in economy and dietary preferences in Romanian Banat, from what is usually found in the core areas of the Early Balkan Neolithic, may be due to a survival of a Mesolithic tradition in the former region (p. 171). Significantly, this suggestion aligns with new research in the Aegean, which indicates mobility and connectivity between late foragers and early farmers rather than mutual exclusion and isolation as was previously believed.¹⁸ Rosenstock and Scheibner’s study (Ch. 19, pp. 320–367) addresses the impact of Neolithisation on human diet and stature and more widely the long-term trends and differences in the Aegean and the Balkans from the Mesolithic through to the end of the Bronze Age, from the point of view of anthropometric and stable isotope research. Their analysis suggests that while in the Aegean no major change in human stature seems to have occurred after Neolithisation, in the Balkans stature started to decline already during the Mesolithic. Both cases show, according to the authors, that human height was influenced not only by food but also by various other factors, such as the admixture of shorter Aegean ancestry and the possible effects of migration of people from the Near East to the Aegean and from the Near East or the Aegean to the Balkans. This suggestion would seem to provide support to the traditional migrationist (or diffusionist) models of ‘cultural groups’ and ‘Neolithic packages’,¹⁹ although the authors point out that the anthropometric and isotopic data published so far are very patchy and they do mention (although in passing) the effect of pre-existing adaptive processes in the Balkans at least.

The remaining chapters deal with later periods, from the Early Bronze Age to the Late Iron Age, and with more diverse topics, ranging from changes and continuities in plant-based food in Bulgarian Drama (Gleser and Marinova, Ch. 14, pp. 230–247) and in Eastern Rhodope (Popov *et al.*, Ch. 16, pp. 263–277) to bioarchaeological aspects of food production and consumption at a gold-mining site, indicating interrelated innovations in metallurgy and food practices (Nikov and colleagues, Ch. 17, 278–299), and to the relationship between changes in animal husbandry and the creation of regional hierarchies (Nikodemus, Ch. 15, pp. 248–262). The issue of hierarchisation is also addressed by Gorczyk, Athanassov and Stockhammer (Ch. 18, pp. 300–319) through the prism of hunting at the Iron Age fortified settlement of Bresto, Bulgaria,

¹⁷ Karimali 2005.

¹⁸ Reingruber 2018.

¹⁹ See Chapman and Souvatzi in press for discussion.

though from an important alternative and critical perspective. Taking into account the context of the overall system of animal management at the site, they refute dominant views of hunting either as a resource buffering in difficult times or as an elite prestige activity. They argue instead that it was a communal activity used as a means for the maintenance of social solidarity at a time when the pull towards hierarchisation was strong. Indeed, this significant new outlook is in accordance with the recent literature on collective processes and complex social integrative mechanisms resisting hierarchisation, evidenced across a very broad range of societies, from Neolithic Europe and the Near East²⁰ to the pueblos of the American Southwest²¹ and to the Mesoamerican politically centralised societies.²² The fact that the site in question here is of a later date only serves to emphasise that history is non-linear and change towards hierarchisation not inevitable.²³

Overall, what I would have liked to have seen in addition to what the book contains is a more congruous view forward, including a suggestion about how these exciting new data and approaches can be articulated into a 'deep historical perspective on Asian and European food practices', which is the volume's overarching aim. This would have required greater attention to history, history-making processes and perceptions of time.²⁴ Critical discussion of earlier approaches and illustration of novel perspectives and methods are useful but not enough if we are to move towards suggestions about diachronic patterns or to reach historical understanding. Given also the number of issues that the book addresses, as well as the varying emphasis on theory and definition in the different papers, a Concluding Chapter summarising the points of consensus and pointing the way forward would have helped.

Furthermore, the volume would have gained more, had it included a plethora of other themes crucial to a social analysis of food, especially: a) landscape dynamics and the interactive relationship between people and land,²⁵ including potential landscape modification and land management systems,²⁶ of which, surprisingly, there is little or no mention whatsoever; b) the role of cooking facilities and of the variety of cooking implements apart from

pots and stone tools; and c) how exactly kinship, sodalities, community, larger socio-economic groupings and wider social institutions, often referred to in the volume but only in an abstract manner, can actually play a role in foodways and in connections, distinctions and transformations through food consumption.

But on the whole, the book's weak points are counteracted by its openly interpretative rather than descriptive and prescriptive character; its incorporation of interdisciplinary and integrated analyses; and its employment of multiple scales of analysis (e.g. domestic space and the shorter term but also external, communal or public areas, whole settlements and the medium- and longer-term). Despite the fact that it is not in its composition the best example of a holistic and comprehensive approach to food as a social, symbolic and historical medium as I would look forward to, *Social Dimensions of Food in the Prehistoric Balkans* is definitely a salient and timely production, offers nuanced analyses, sets out directions for future regional studies and deserves attention and readership by both junior and senior researchers.

STELLA SOUVATZI
HELLENIC OPEN UNIVERSITY
stellasouvatzi@hotmail.com

- Carsten, J. 1995. The substance of kinship and heat of the hearth: Feeding, personhood, and relatedness among Malays of Pulau Langkawi. *American Ethnologist* 22: 223–241.
- Chapman, J. 2000. *Fragmentation in Archaeology. People, Places and Broken Objects in the Prehistory of South Eastern Europe*. London: Routledge.
- Chapman, J. and B. Gaydarska. 2006. *Parts and Wholes: Fragmentation in Prehistoric Context*. Oxford: Oxbow Books.
- Chapman, J. and S. Souvatzi. in press, to be published in October 2020. The Neolithic of Southeast Europe: Recent Trends. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 49.
- Chapman, J., B. Gaydarska, E. Skafida and S. Souvatzi. 2011. Personhood and the life cycle of *Spondylus* rings: an example from Late Neolithic Greece, in F. Ifantidis and M. Nikolaidou (eds) *Spondylus in Prehistory: New Data And Approaches - Contributions to the Archaeology of Shell Technologies* (BAR International Series 2216): 139–160. Oxford: Archaeopress.
- Chapman, R. 2003. *Archaeologies of Complexity*. London: Routledge.
- Ensor, B.E. 2013. *The Archaeology of Kinship: Advancing Interpretations and Contributions to Theory*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

²⁰ E.g. Souvatzi 2007; Kuijt 2001.

²¹ E.g. Moore 2012.

²² Hendon 2010.

²³ Souvatzi, Baysal and Baysal 2018a.

²⁴ E.g. Shryock and Smail 2011; Souvatzi, Baysal and Baysal 2018b.

²⁵ E.g. Souvatzi 2013.

²⁶ E.g. Tankosić and Katsianis 2017.

- Fernández-Armesto F. and D. Lord Smail. 2011. Food, in: A. Shryock and D. Lord Smail (eds) *Deep History: the Architecture of Past and Present*: 160–188. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Goody, J. 1982. *Cooking, Cuisine and Class. A Study in Comparative Sociology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Halstead P. 2007. Carcasses and commensality: Investigating the social context of meat consumption in Neolithic and Early Bronze Age Greece, in C. Mee and J. Renard (eds) *Cooking Up the Past: Food and Culinary Practice in the Neolithic and Bronze Age Aegean*: 25–48. Oxford: Oxbow Books.
- Halstead, P. 1995. From sharing to hoarding: The Neolithic foundations of Aegean Bronze Age society?, in R. Laffineur and W.-D. Niemeier (eds) *Politeia: Society and State in the Aegean Bronze Age* (Aegaeum 12): 11–20. Liège: University of Liège.
- Halstead, P. 1999. Neighbours from hell? The household in Neolithic Greece. In P. Halstead (ed.) *Neolithic Society in Greece* (Sheffield Studies in Aegean Archaeology 2): 77–95. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Halstead, P. 2012. Feast, food and fodder in Neolithic-Bronze Age Greece: commensality and the construction of value, in S. Pollock (ed.) *Between Feasts and Daily Meals. Toward an Archaeology of Commensal Spaces* (eTopoi: Journal for Ancient Studies, special volume 2): 21–51.
- Halstead, P. and J.C. Barrett (eds) 2004. *Food, Cuisine and Society in Prehistoric Greece*. Oxford: Oxbow.
- Hastorf, C. A. 2017. *The Social Archaeology of Food: Thinking about Eating from Prehistory to the Present*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hendon, J. A. 2010. *Houses in a Landscape: Memory and Everyday Life in Mesoamerica*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Karimali, E. 2005. Inferences and limitations in chipped-stone modeling: learning from an ethnoarchaeological case (threshing-sledge production in Thessaly, Greece), in: X. Terradas (ed.) *L'Outillage Lithique en Contextes Ethnoarchéologique* (BAR International Series 1370): 47–56. Oxford: Archaeopress.
- Kohring, S.E. and S. Wynne-Jones (eds) 2007. *Socialising Complexity: Approaches to Power and Interaction in the Archaeological Record*. Oxford: Oxbow Books.
- Kuijt, I. 2001. Place, death and the transmission of social memory in early agricultural communities of the Near Eastern Pre-Pottery Neolithic, in M.S. Chesson (ed.) *Social Memory, Identity and Death: Anthropological Perspectives on Mortuary Rituals* (Archaeological Papers of the American Anthropological Association 10): 80–99.
- Mee, C. and J. Renard (eds) 2007. *Cooking Up the Past: Food and Culinary Practice in the Neolithic and Bronze Age Aegean*. Oxford: Oxbow.
- Mina, M. 2018. Casting doubts on metallurgy and the transition to social complexity, in S. Dietz, F. Mavridis, Ž. Tankosić and T. Takaoğlu (eds) *Communities in transition. The Circum-Aegean Area in the 5th and 4th Millennia BC*: 67–74. Oxford: Oxbow.
- Moore, J. D. 2012. *The Prehistory of Home*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Nuttall, M. 2000). Choosing kin: Sharing and subsistence in a Greenlandic hunting community, in P.P. Schweitzer (ed.) *Dividends of Kinship. Meanings and Uses of Social Relatedness*: 33–60. London: Routledge.
- Pappa, M., P. Halstead, K. Kotsakis, and D. Urem-Kotsou. 2004. Evidence for large-scale feasting at Late Neolithic Makriyalos, northern Greece, in P. Halstead and J.C. Barrett (eds) *Food, Cuisine and Society in Prehistoric Greece*: 16–44. Oxford: Oxbow Books.
- Pauketat, T. R. 2013. Bundles of/in/as time, in J. Robb and T.R. Pauketat (eds) *Big Histories, Human Lives: Tackling Problems of Scale in Archaeology*: 35–56. Santa Fe: School for Advanced Research Press.
- Pollock, S. (ed.) 2012. *Between Feasts and Daily Meals. Toward an Archaeology of Commensal Spaces* (eTopoi: Journal for Ancient Studies, special volume 2).
- Potter, J. M. 2000. Pots, parties and politics: Communal feasting in the American Southwest. *American Antiquity* 65: 471–92.
- Reingruber, A. 2018. Geographical mobility and social motility in the Aegean before and after 6600 BC. *Præhistorische Zeitschrift* 93(1): 1–24.
- Shryock A. and D. Lord Smail (eds) 2011. *Deep History: The Architecture of Past and Present*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Souvatzi, S. 2007. Social complexity is not the same as hierarchy, in S.E. Kohring and S. Wynne-Jones (eds) *Socialising Complexity: Approaches to Power and Interaction in the Archaeological Record*: 37–59. Oxford: Oxbow.
- Souvatzi, S. 2008. *A Social Archaeology of Households in Neolithic Greece. An Anthropological Approach*. New York and Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Souvatzi, S. 2012. Between the individual and the collective: household as a social process in Neolithic Greece, in B.J. Parker and C.P. Foster (eds) *Household Archaeology: New Perspectives from the Near East and Beyond*: 15–43. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.
- Souvatzi, S. 2013. Land tenure, social relations and social landscapes. In M. Relaki and D. Catapoti

- (eds) *An Archaeology of Land Ownership*, 21–45. London: Routledge.
- Souvatzki, S. 2017. Kinship and social archaeology. *Cross-Cultural Research* 51 (2): 172–195. Special Issue: Murdock and Goody revisited: (Pre) History and Evolution of Family Systems, Part I.
- Souvatzki, S., A. Baysal and E.L. Baysal (eds) 2018b. *Time and History in Prehistory*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Souvatzki, S., A. Baysal and E. L. Baysal. 2018a. Is there prehistory? in Souvatzki, S., A. Baysal and E.L. Baysal (eds) *Time and History in Prehistory*: 1–27. London and New York: Routledge.
- Spielmann, K. A. 2002. Feasting, craft specialisation, and the ritual mode of production in small-scale societies. *American Anthropologist* 104: 195–207.
- Tankosić Ž. and M. Katsianis. 2017. Cycladic or Mainland? The prehistoric landscapes of southern Euboea, in: A. Sarris, E. Kalogiropoulou, T. Kalayci and E. Karimali (eds) *Communities, landscapes, and interaction in Neolithic Greece* (International monographs in prehistory: archaeological series 20): 234–246. New York: Berghahn.
- Urem-Kotsou, D. and K. Kotsakis. 2007. Pottery, cuisine and community in the Neolithic of north Greece, in C. Mee and J. Renard (eds) *Cooking Up the Past: Food and Culinary Practice in the Neolithic and Bronze Age Aegean*: 225–246. Oxford: Oxbow.
- Vitelli, K. D. 1995. Pots, potters, and the shaping of Greek Neolithic society, in W. Barnett and J. Hoopes (eds) *The Emergence of Pottery: Technology and Innovation in Ancient Societies*: 55–63. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press.
- Zubrow, E., F. Audouze and J. G. Enloe. 2010. Introduction: domesticity expressed, in E. Zubrow, F. Audouze and J.G. Enloe (eds) *The Magdalenian Household: Unraveling Domesticity*: 1–7. Albany NY: State University of New York.

Archaic to Classical

Myrina Kalaitzi. *Figured Tombstones from Macedonia, Fifth–First Century BC*. pp. xxx+288, ill., maps, many b+w and colour pls. 2016. Oxford: Oxford University Press, in collaboration with the Institute of Historical Research, National Hellenic Research Foundation. ISBN 978–0–19–874645–4 hardback £120.

Myrina Kalaitzi dedicates this important new study of ancient Macedonian tombstones of the fifth through first centuries BC not to any named individual but to ‘the courageous reader.’ Most readers will not need courage to understand its familiar structure: a catalogue of surviving tombstones preceded by a chronological survey discussing major trends in the corpus. As Kalaitzi outlines in her Introduction, it is a structure determined less by a conceptual or theoretical model than by scholarly precedent – a structure that has been developed and deployed by scholars of ancient material culture on numerous occasions in order, ostensibly, to describe rather than interpret. The framework presumes that, when the corpus is addressed in comparative terms, visual patterns will emerge, ones that might tell us about cultural values shared between the people who produced or commissioned the individual monuments.

For a study of this kind, Kalaitzi’s book is exemplary, offering a meticulously detailed presentation of 216 tombstones that have survived from ancient Macedonia. Some of these, like the magnificent fifth-century stele from Pydna (no. 24) showing a mother sorrowing over the limp body of her child, or the stele from Dikaia of a girl holding a dove (no. 157), are already well known in their own right. They are here contextualized with many others that have received only minimal scholarly attention, including some that will not be familiar even to specialists. Kalaitzi has expended a tremendous amount of effort to study first-hand as many monuments as possible, while at the same time informing her readers of new discoveries or monuments that have not yet been fully published.

The result is a wealth of information and observations, including new studies of important groups of tombstones such as those from the ‘Great Tumulus’ at Aigai and those from Hellenistic Beroia. In both the main text and the catalogue, descriptions