

cultivation of newly created ideas. The resulting easy, quick, and widespread availability of new knowledge appears to both stimulate and enable further innovation. What conditions in high-end cuisine permit this regime of intellectual property protection and its attendant innovation-friendly atmosphere? In what other domains might these conditions obtain? Theorists of intellectual property rights and those hoping to reform patent systems would probably quite like to know.

Second, the book documents how one organization designed itself to successfully routinize the creation of new ideas. However, lacking comparison cases, it is difficult to understand if and how the specific practices Opazo described might be more broadly applicable. Are there generalizable mechanisms underlying these specific practices? In what other domains might those mechanisms also apply? And how might these mechanisms manifest differently in those domains? The answers to these questions will likely be of great interest to innovation researchers and the beleaguered managers of the legions of companies outside the food industry which try—and often fail—to become and remain innovative.

The growing ubiquity of innovation and R&D teams in high-end cuisine and their apparent success at routinizing innovation suggest that something of great interest is happening in this setting—Opazo's book calls attention to the phenomenon. Theorists and practitioners of innovation should examine this setting in more detail.

*Scenesapes: How Qualities of Place Shape Social Life.* By Daniel Aaron Silver and Terry Nichols Clark. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2016. Pp. viii+441. \$37.50 (paper).

Michael Ian Borer  
*University of Nevada, Las Vegas*

Pool balls clank against one another, interrupting the soft sounds of the recorded accordion. Outside, older men sip cappuccinos as their wives examine fresh fruit and vegetables, plotting the week's dinners within earshot of the church bells. Elsewhere in the city, the smells of fair trade coffee mingle with mixed spices sprinkled over stir-fry by the tattooed sleeve of a self-trained chef. The olfactory fusion tempts the nostrils of young folks sitting outside the coffee shop/art gallery/performance space/soon-to-be marijuana dispensary habitually bobbing their heads to 90s hip-hop streaming on laptops. A few train stops away, wing tips and pumps scurry across a cement floor to grab nonfat lattes hastily labeled with their first names. They don't have time to notice the attached card with the free digital download of the song playing as they scurry back to their lunch meeting where they are constantly interrupted by the urgent beeps of their smartphones and breaking news alerts from the Bloomberg channel.

Daniel Aaron Silver and Terry Nichols Clark present scenes like these in *Scenesapes: How Qualities of Place Shape Social Life* to introduce two of

the issues that sustain their grand theoretical and methodological treatise: (1) because scenes are often made up of similar amenities and activities—like music and coffee—their specific character is more difficult to access and assess to show their differences, and (2) to extract the precise meanings of various scenes, sociologists need to rely on a pragmatic and workable set of aesthetic dimensions that can be combined, mixed, and cross tabulated. Built on at least a decade's worth of their own studies of urban cultural dynamics across various cities and countries, *Scenescapes* is Silver and Clark's impressive, and often respectfully audacious, attempt to mollify these two issues. They offer an analytical model consisting of 15 dimensions used with a "combinatorial logic" when identifying and depicting specific scenes, especially in comparison with others.

They admit that their dimensions, even the three main categories of authenticity, theatricality, and legitimacy, "are not the normal stuff of academic social science journals" (p. 37). Let the iconoclasts rejoice! Their goal, in short, is to "take concepts familiar in the social and cultural theory (like glamour and charisma), root them in the ground, in the amenities that dot our streets and strips, and show that such concepts can be places alongside the likes of median gross rent or GDP" (p. 37).

Silver and Clark build their 15-scene-dimensions model from an exhaustive and vast array of urban ethnographies, journalistic descriptive accounts of city life, classical social theories of economic behavior, and poetic philosophical declarations. Their ability to combine supposedly disparate ideas to address and explicate the disparities in cultural amenities between scenes is remarkable, as is their ability to show the importance of culture for examining the social life and lives of cities. Relying on and joining a recent move by culturally oriented urban sociologists who have resurrected "the idea to bring seemingly transcendental values down to earth and to see their tangible role in social life" (p. 322), Silver and Clark show that scenes—as complex combinations of multiple aesthetic dimensions—play causal roles in economic developments, housing and real estate, religiosity, and political action. And even when they playfully appoint ideal-typical labels like "Disney Haven" for sanitized environments, "LA-LA Land Tinsel" for uber-hip, jet-setting opulence, and "Nerdistan" where computer programming centers outnumber liquor stores, they demonstrate how and advocate for the study of scenes as a means for cultivating context-dependent urban policies on national, regional, and local levels.

Despite the breadth of topics explored throughout the book and the extensive sources the authors use to bolster their theoretical foundations and warrant their empirical findings, their reliance on "quantitative flânerie" is likely to make the ethnographer's palate quiver with distaste. Armed with Census Bureau data and the Yellow Pages to target the "living experiments" of 40,000 zip codes, their digital age ethnographer "can observe the many scenes of North American life without leaving home" (p. 71). Instead of offering their multidimensional model of scenes as a heuristic device to think with to explore the dynamic variation of scenic dynamism—which is their most endearing and most-likely-to-be enduring contribution—their expressed

goal is to test hypotheses by measuring and ranking scenes based on the relative presence of the cultural amenities and attitudes these scenes house and embolden. Silver and Clark are at their best when they leave their desire to quantify aesthetics behind and dive into the everyday-life qualities of cities, especially the ones they've studied in and reside within (Toronto and Chicago, respectively). But they seem irresistibly drawn to zooming out and using "a large  $N$  (number of cases) [to] go beyond the specific case" (p. 20). This would be fine if they didn't stick their big toe into the aesthetic, and therefore sensuous, wavering waters of urban places and the experiences urban people have within and between them. Zooming out is antithetical to the recent literature that prompts researchers to move closer into the embodied and emplaced lives of the people they wish to understand in order to examine their literal sense-making, what Dennis Waskul and Phillip Vannini refer to as "somatic work" ("Smell, Odor, and Somatic Work," *Social Psychology Quarterly* 71: 53–71). I think Silver and Clark know this. Perhaps it explains why they reveal the Achilles' heel of their perspective when it rigidly depends on large and distanced data: "Can what are in the end organizational directories really get at something as seemingly ethereal and ephemeral as the experiential meaning of place? Is it not the case that the number of establishments in a place is so much a function of population, income, and density that looking for aesthetic meaning in them is difficult at best and quixotic at worst?" (pp. 75–76). No and yes. But, again, they already knew that. And so do ethnographers who have uncovered the aesthetic demeanor of scenes including boxing (e.g., Loïc Wacquant), beauty (e.g., Ashley Mears), biking (e.g., Jeffrey Kidder), and blues bars (e.g., David Grazian).

For those interested in counting the number of cultural amenities in and across cities, *Scenescape*s is a wonderful exemplary guide. Though Silver and Clark provide a great substantive rationale for those seeking to uncover the sensuous qualities of and interactions with scenes and the places that foster them, they'll have to look elsewhere for methodological support.

*House Full: Indian Cinema and the Active Audience.* By Lakshmi Srinivas. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2016. Pp. xi+313. \$37.50 (paper).

Matthew W. Hughey  
*University of Connecticut*

Where is meaning? Sociology has long debated how meanings are made, fixed to, and negotiated with various objects, discourses, and practices. Varied subfields now differently emphasize how forces of production and authorial intent, cultural gatekeepers and bureaucratic structures, and the reception of elite or heterogeneous audiences together shape the polysemy of cultural objects. These contestations constitute much of the verve and promise within the sociology of the media in general and examinations of cinema in specific. It is here that Lakshmi Srinivas's text enters the fray, as *House Full* attempts to "shift inquiry to the contexts and practices that situate cin-