

1996), have made it possible to understand the main survival strategies. Two kinds of occupations have been established: short-term camps characterised by ephemeral activity (layers 3A, 3B, 4, 4A and 4V), usually with a single fireplace, although occasionally with two or more hearths, and seasonal camps of intensive activity, in the winter and autumn (layers 3V and 6–9) and in the spring (layers 4B and 5), all with up to six fireplaces. Ancient people did not procure reindeer at the ford across the Vitim River, but rather conducted non-specialised, opportunistic hunting of large and small mammals and birds, as well as fishing. The authors suggest that the meat of large mammals was moved from the camp. An independent study of a small portion of the Bol'shoy Yakor' I bone materials (263 pieces) by Turner *et al.* (2013: 76) established that humans were butchering, cooking and breaking animal bones. The degree of perimortem fragmentation is very high, which suggests that practically no waste was left. There is also evidence for carnivore activity, probably fox or dog, on the bone assemblage. This is in accordance with other archaeozoological data obtained for this site.

Overall, this is a solid research publication on the Upper Palaeolithic in a lesser studied region of Siberia. It provides us with a much better understanding of human subsistence and adaptation around the Pleistocene/Holocene boundary in the Vitim River Basin, and we should be grateful to the translators, Hommel and Reynolds, for making the volume available to the Anglophone world. I would recommend this book to all students of prehistoric Siberia, East Asia and Beringia.

References

- GÓMEZ COUTOULY, Y.A. 2016. Migrations and interactions in prehistoric Beringia: the evolution of Yakutian lithic technology. *Antiquity* 90: 9–31. <https://doi.org/10.15184/aqy.2015.176>.
- KLEVEZAL, G.A. 1996. *Recording structures of mammals: determination of age and reconstruction of life history* (translated by M.V. Mina & A.V. Oreshkin). Rotterdam: Balkema.
- KUZMIN, Y.V., S.G. KEATES & C. SHEN (ed.). 2007. *Origin and spread of microblade technology in Northern Asia and North America*. Burnaby, B.C.: Archaeology.
- MOCHANOV, YU. A. 2009. *The earliest stages of settlement by people of Northeast Asia* (translated &

edited by R.E. Bland). Anchorage (AK): Shared Heritage Program.

- PITUL'KO, V.V. & E. YU. PAVLOVA. 2016. *Geoarchaeology and radiocarbon chronology of Stone Age Northeast Asia* (translated by R.E. Bland). College Station: Texas A&M University Press.
- TURNER, C.G. II, N.D. OVODOV & O.V. PAVLOVA. 2013. *Animal teeth and human tools: a taphonomic odyssey in Ice Age Siberia*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

YAROSLAV V. KUZMIN

Sobolev Institute of Geology & Mineralogy,
Siberian Branch of the Russian Academy of Sciences,
Novosibirsk; Tomsk State University, Russia
(Email: kuzmin@fulbrightmail.org)

TOM DILLEHAY (ed.). *Where the land meets the sea: fourteen millennia of human history at Huaca Prieta, Peru*. 2017. Austin: University of Texas Press; 978-1-4773-1149-3 \$75.



Dillehay's book is an outstanding contribution to Andean archaeology. Its greatest strength is the incorporation of multidisciplinary studies carried out through both fieldwork and laboratory analyses in an attempt to understand how the site of Huaca Prieta was formed over several millennia. The 15 chapters and 19 appendices demonstrate how this combination of inter- and multi-disciplinary research helps to address broader questions related to the origins of social complexity during the early stages of human history. The research, led by Tom Dillehay and the late Duccio Bonavia (1935–2012), is a splendid continuation of the pioneering work carried out 73 years ago by the legendary Junius Bird at the American Museum of Natural History (Bird *et al.* 1985).

The book begins by contextualising the research carried out at Huaca Prieta, the nearby Paredones mound and surrounding localities. Theoretical considerations centre on the ontology of the human activities carried out at these sites (Chapters 1–2). For Dillehay, the major concern of Pre-ceramic populations like the one settled around Huaca Prieta was “the maintenance of cohesion and the reproduction of individual communities and their kinship and household group identities”, and, in this

regard, “mound building was essential for the creation of a sense of community among dispersed foragers who were incorporating crops and needing a permanent place to integrate” (Dillehay, pp. 16–17). This view is radically different from current views of mound building during the early stages of social complexity in the Central Andean region (compare with Haas & Creamer 2006; Shady 2009). Dillehay posits that the social process or ‘social construction’ of monumental architecture is a necessary result of human interaction, rather than the interest of corporate groups or elites imposing their monumental desires over the population. In any case, it might be that the Huaca Prieta mound construction during phase IV is an anomaly in comparison to sites in the Norte Chico region, such as that at Caral, which had a rather different trajectory. Dillehay’s research suggests that Huaca Prieta arose as the outcome of multiple short-term rituals carried out by individuals, extended families and/or different communities that were congregated in the same general locality for millennia.

This volume additionally contributes a new proposal for a chronological model of Huaca Prieta, based on more than 100 radiocarbon dates from cultural contexts (more dating information is contributed from geological strata, Chapters 5–6). Interpretation of these dates is done in conjunction with consideration of the environmental history, obtained through the study of Holocene sediments deposited in the Chicama Valley over the past 8000 years.

The incorporation of studies of faunal and plant remains (Chapters 9–10) represents a major effort on behalf of the authors to characterise and contextualise the economy, subsistence and food-procurement strategies of the people related to Huaca Prieta, Paredones and the domestic units around them. Although the authors of these chapters are cautious in their interpretations due to statistical issues, the multiple tables are a useful tool for comparative perspectives. The fact that sharks were important in the local diet since the first stages at Huaca Prieta supports previous results obtained at other sites such as Gramalote in the Moche Valley, which subsisted mainly on shark meat during the early part of the Initial Period (1500–1200 cal BC; Prieto 2015). For Vasquez and his colleagues, the sharks from Huaca Prieta were captured in brackish and saltwater

estuaries connected to the sea (see pp. 201, 207, 363, 365 and cf. p. 268). For me, sharks were captured in the sea during the breeding and mating season in the austral summer using reed boats (Prieto 2015: 621 & 625). Although this information is not quoted by Vasquez *et al.* (see pp. 208, 268, 363), it is interesting that they have reached the same conclusion as I did in my doctoral dissertation in 2015. I would like to think, based on current evidence, that the coasts of the Moche and Chicama Valleys were infested with sharks between 6500–3000 BP. Despite this minor detail, the main point here is the importance of shark fisheries for more than 3500 years in this part of the Peruvian North Coast. This reinforces the hypothesis that early foragers intended to maximise their energy to obtain large returns of meat protein for their daily subsistence. I also wonder whether the fishermen from Huaca Prieta used dried shark meat as a commodity for exchange, as was proposed for Gramalote, perhaps for the non-local plant products such as the chili peppers found in the rich organic deposits of Huaca Prieta (masterfully studied by Katherine L. Chouiu) and Paredones (Bonavia *et al.*).

Finally, the extraordinary chapter on ‘Twined and Woven Artifacts’ (Chapter 12) written by J. Splitstoser must be acknowledged. When one reads the descriptions and conclusions made by Junius Bird on the materials discussed, it is hard to believe that there is anything else to be said or discovered. Splitstoser advances the analysis of textiles in the Andean region, providing a more complex consideration of the construction of the fabric itself. As a researcher investigating ancient maritime communities, I found the description and further interpretations of the netting techniques fascinating. Furthermore, Splitstoser discusses the possible existence of two distinct contemporaneous fabric traditions—plain weave and weft twining—and, after careful study of the threads and fabric construction, suggests that non-specialist individuals made those sophisticated early textiles.

Dillehay’s volume is not only a great tribute to Junius Bird and Duccio Bonavia, but also an excellent example of how modern archaeological research should be conducted and oriented. This volume is a foundational landmark, and can be used to teach students both at undergraduate and graduate levels to provide guidance for how to conduct and publish future archaeological research.

References

- BIRD, J., J. HYSLOP & M. DIMITRIJEVIC. 1985. *The Preceramic excavations at the Huaca Prieta, Chicama Valley, Peru* (Volume 62, Part I). New York: American Museum of Natural History.
- HAAS, J. & W. CREAMER. 2006. Crucible of Andean civilization. *Current Anthropology* 47: 645–775. <https://doi.org/10.1086/506281>
- PRIETO, G. 2015. Gramalote: domestic life, economy and ritual practices of a preHispanic Maritime Community. Unpublished PhD dissertation, Yale University.
- SHADY, R. 2009. Caral-Supe y su entorno natural y social en los orígenes de la civilización, in J. Marcus & P.R. Williams (ed.) *Andean civilization. A tribute to Michael E. Moseley* (Monograph 63 Cotsen Institute of Archaeology): 99–120. Los Angeles: University of California.

GABRIEL PRIETO

Huanchaco Archaeological Program,
Universidad Nacional de Trujillo, Peru,
(Email: gabrielprietobur@gmail.com)

GEORGE F. LAU. *An archaeology of Ancash: stones, ruins and communities in Andean Peru*. 2016. Abingdon: Routledge; 978-1-138-89899-8 £110.



George Lau is a prolific writer on Andean, especially north-central highland, archaeology; this book represents his fourth volume since 2011. An erudite, profoundly informed scholar, Lau combines a surprisingly low-key

writing style with startling insights and interpretations, such that he seduces rather than bludgeons you with new takes on old data, or the application of high theory to South American contexts. As with his 2012 *Ancient alterity in the Andes*, the author introduces a theme, in this case monumental stone sculpture and construction, and works it into the archaeology of a region to tease out diachronic relationships between people and cultures. The book is fundamentally about ancient (and modern) Andean engagement with stone, a topic not covered at

book-length since Richard Schaedel's seminal doctoral thesis in 1952.

The Ancash region of the north-central Andes provides the backdrop to this study in stone. To those unaware of this region, suffice to say that over the last few millennia it and its immediate environs saw the emergence of coastal Andean civilisation (La Galgada, Caral, El Paraíso and the like), as well as the rise of the first pan-Andean religious cult, centred at the site of Chavín in the highlands. Indeed, the book is a sweeping treatise of Andean archaeology as experienced through the prism of Ancash. The focus might be local, but the scope is definitely Andean, and, in its thematic appeal, international. In this sense, I am reminded of Richard Bradley's work on monuments and natural places in the European Neolithic (1998, 2000), in that the author uses a specific geographic and cultural context—Ancash—to present and explain a broader theme, that of human engagement with stone construction and sculpture.

Thus, the volume appeals beyond its immediate South American context, providing an informed case study on the relationship between humans and stone from the perspective of phenomenology, object agency, distributed personhood and sacred landscapes. This overarching engagement is what he terms *lithicity*, explained as the “stone's physical forms and properties and the series of understandings that make it special (or not), the focus for cultural experience and the source for causal sequences in the proximity of social others” (p. 17). In this sense, lithicity captures both the physical and metaphysical relationship between people and stone, a relationship that is both historically and culturally conditioned, and crucially, shifts through time. While this theme has been addressed for the Inka (AD 1400–1532) recently by the likes of Carolyn Dean and Jessica Joyce Christie, this volume encompasses a *longue durée* of human/stone interaction across 5000 years and a multitude of cultures.

Throughout the various examples listed in the book, the author highlights the materiality of stone, its *otherness* and how it can act as an agent cementing a community's relationship with the land. In effect, stone is a constant, mediating cultural flux through alternating cycles of veneration, iconoclasm and rediscovery. Following a tone-setting, theory-laden first chapter, the book leads on with an appreciation of the physical nature of stone, where it is found, how it is extracted and shaped, and who—through time—worked on it. The next chapters deal with particular periods, sites and cultures. During the long Late