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EDITOR’S CORNER

Christopher B. Rodning

Christopher B. Rodning is a professor of anthropology at Tulane University.

Analogy is essential to archaeology. We apply analogical reasoning toward interpreting patterns in archaeological evidence, and we often refer to analogies in communications with archaeology students and the general public about the significance of archaeological finds and the knowledge derived from them. We must of course be careful and critical in the steps we take in analogical arguments, and also thoughtful in our assessments of analogies that we encounter in scholarly literature and popular literature about archaeology. Thanks to Maxime Lamoureux-St-Hilaire and contributors to his special thematic section, “Analogies and Comparative Approaches for Mayanists,” for reflecting on these issues, following conversations that took place during the course of the digital symposium at the 2019 SAA Annual Meeting in Albuquerque from which this set of six articles derives.

Lars Fogelin writes for this issue of the magazine about his recent, self-published work, An Unauthorized Companion to American Archaeological Theory. His essay here concentrates more on models of publishing in archaeology, and the relevance of self-publishing to archaeological scholarship, than it does on his commentary on theoretical debates and dialogues in American archaeology. If the main reason for writing and publishing is to spread our ideas widely, and to have our arguments read and considered, then it is worth asking what are the best models for doing so. During the course of writing about contemporary archaeological theory, Fogelin decided that for him, self-publishing was the best approach. Meanwhile, his Companion is worth reading—it is irreverent but insightful, it is lively and readable, and it characterizes theory as part of the archaeological “tool kit” for studying what life was like in the past. Fogelin reflects thoughtfully on how we know what we know in archaeology, and how we go about developing research topics and then making sense of what we find.

Archaeologists know much about connections between food and culture in the past, and of course conference foodways are part of archaeology culture in the present. Thanks to Rachel Feit, principal at Acacia Heritage Management and connoisseur of the culinary culture and landscape of Austin, Texas, and its surrounds, for her first column here about the Austin restaurant scene. As you make plans for sessions at the upcoming SAA Annual Meeting, meals with old pals, and events honoring venerable colleagues, please consult her “atlas of Austin eats” and her rich local knowledge about the culinary culture and landscape of Austin, Texas, and its surrounds, for her first column here about the Austin restaurant scene. As you make plans for sessions at the upcoming SAA Annual Meeting, meals with old pals, and events honoring venerable colleagues, please consult her “atlas of Austin eats” and her rich local knowledge about what you can eat and where you can find it; please also keep an eye out for her forthcoming column about cheap and fast meals close to conference and campus venues.

Speaking of the SAA Annual Meeting, the preliminary program is now posted on the SAA website, and Joe Watkins writes in his “From the President” column here about new policies in place for SAA 2020. These policies are designed to ensure that the annual conference is safe and inclusive for all participants, and to ensure there are protocols in place to respond to situations that may arise and circumstances that may necessitate

continued on page 3
FROM THE PRESIDENT

Joe Watkins, PhD, RPA

It is the joint responsibility of myself and the other board members of the Society for American Archaeology to develop the policies and practices that govern our society’s meetings and events. This is a responsibility we take incredibly seriously, and we are using this article to give further context to the recent announcement of the Meeting Safety Policy and Code of Conduct for SAA Events.

Policies are one of the most important tools we have to shape our annual meeting and our society as a whole. Policies give direction to SAA personnel, they can be changed quickly in response to unforeseen situations, and when combined with supportive bylaws, make for an efficient and responsive process for implementing procedures.

The process of improving the SAA’s meeting policies began immediately following the Albuquerque meeting, when we formed the SAA Task Force on Sexual and Anti-Harassment Policies and Procedures to begin researching best practices across multiple professions and to deliver recommendations on how to combat harassment at individual and structural levels. Draft policies were then presented to the board and made public for comment by members. In total, more than 70 responses were submitted by concerned members, who highlighted several areas for further review, including the need for a detailed reporting timeline and clarification on the difference between disclosure and reporting. The board and the task force then used these comments to guide the revision process for the draft policies.

These finalized policies (available at https://www.saa.org/annual-meeting/submissions/anti-harassment-policy) are the result of that member feedback. They include a variety of tools and procedures that empower the SAA to act decisively in response to a wide range of potential scenarios and subject matters, from active physical threats to inappropriate display of images during a presentation. In every scenario, the policies have been written to protect the privacy of parties involved, improve the meeting climate for a wide range of attendees, and ensure that survivors of trauma find immediate safety and receive redress for their concerns.

Crucially, the 2020 policies designate a pair of ombuds to be present at the meeting. These individuals will be trained experts who can provide quick and efficient responses to any meeting attendee who is experiencing stress or conflict, while reducing the burden on SAA staff. The 2020 policies describe the procedures laid out for disclosure and reporting on-site and define an advance reporting process to help us prevent registration of individuals who may pose a security threat. They will also provide flexibility in responding to unforeseen scenarios; while SAA cannot plan for every possibility, having trained staff on-site will allow us to be more responsive in resolving situations.

It is our ultimate goal that the Austin meeting will be a safe and inclusive space for everyone. To that end, we will continue to prepare to implement these policies clearly and consistently. This is the latest step in our process of listening to membership and taking action to improve the SAA, and we are grateful for everyone who has added their voice to the conversation so far. Your advocacy has been, and always will be, an essential component in changing the SAA, and we will continue to welcome the input of all members moving forward.

Editor’s Corner, continued from page 2

responses by the SAA. New policies include guidance for reporting concerns before and during the annual conference.

Kyle Bocinsky, director of the Research Institute at Crow Canyon Archaeological Center, writes in his volunteer profile column about the important contributions that the Queer Archaeology Interest Group (QAIG) has made to SAA members and to the SAA community more generally, and about his own volunteer contributions to SAA bylaws and investment committees. It is fortunate for us and for archaeology that he found supportive and inspiring role models within our SAA community (and within AAA) when he was a student. His story is a good reminder that volunteerism makes a major difference to SAA members, and to the SAA as an organization.

I have learned that “it takes a village” to make a magazine. Thanks to the many people on the SAA Archaeological Record team, including several SAA staff members. Thanks as well to contributing authors and coauthors, the diverse sources of ads and announcements, and members of my supporting krewe at Tulane University in New Orleans, including Mikayla Absher, graduate student in anthropology and periodic proofreading assistant.
attended my first academic conference in the fall of 2007 as an undergraduate anthropology major: the American Anthropological Association (AAA) meetings in Washington, DC. It was an incredibly formative experience, not only because I presented my first attempts at academic research but also because it was the first time I got a sense of the community I’d be joining were I to continue in a career in anthropological archaeology. The AAA meetings were large (almost overwhelming), diverse, welcoming, and oriented toward justice and activism. On the first night of the conference I found “my people” at a welcome reception for LGBTQ anthropologists (I’m gay), and although I was probably at the reception for less than an hour, I remember leaving with complete confidence that there was a place for me in our field. I’ve never been proven wrong.

In 2009, as a first-year graduate student, I attended my first SAA meetings. Meg Conkey, whose research on feminist theory in archaeology I so admired, became SAA president; Linda Cordell was awarded the SAA Lifetime Achievement Award and gave what I remember to have been an emotional and inspiring speech about her experience as a woman in a traditionally male-dominated field. Dr. Cordell described how essential her community had been to her success, and later in the evening many women whom I look up to recounted their own experiences, both positive and negative. Over the next several years, and under the leadership of people far more organized and committed than myself (I’m looking at you, Dawn Ruteki and Chelsea Blackmore), the SAA founded the Queer Archaeology Interest Group (QAIG) to support and encourage research on sexuality and gender identity in the past, and to support LGBTQ archaeologists through networking and advocacy. To date, the QAIG has organized a special issue of the *SAA Archaeological Record* on increasing inclusion and diversity in the field,
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SAA has a legacy of being a force for good—not only in our discipline but also in our broader society as an advocate for cultural preservation, ethical research, and self-determination of Native nations. As an organization, however, SAA has sometimes hesitated to lead, even as it walks along the plain path of justice. I am encouraged, however, by my personal experience witnessing how a group of committed members can steer the SAA toward being more openly welcoming to the LGBTQ community. We’ve recently seen another striking example of member-driven change in response to the events of the 2019 SAA meetings—a petition signed by over 800 SAA members stimulated a bylaws amendment clarifying the SAA Board’s role in ensuring everyone is safe from harassment and assault at SAA events. I was a signatory on the petition and was invited to join the SAA Bylaws Committee that helped craft and ultimately endorsed the amendment that was approved by the membership. I also currently serve as the chair of the SAA Investment Committee, which is responsible for advising the board in the investment and spending of the Society’s financial assets. I feel fortunate to have the time and energy to volunteer in our professional society. It is deeply rewarding to participate in necessary and positive change in the SAA, and I encourage all members to get involved in leading the Society however they can. The SAA, and the field of archaeology, will be the better for it.

*continued on page 13*
Introducing the new open access journal:
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Global Pasts: Archaeology, Heritage, People is a new open-access journal covering archaeology, anthropology and heritage studies in their widest perspective, emphasising the connection between various disciplines in order to better understand the human past. This includes both scientific and humanities-based approaches. We strongly encourage multidisciplinary research. Papers from a single discipline are also welcomed where they address questions of wider relevance but should be framed for a non-specialist audience in order to facilitate communication between fields. The journal publishes original research articles, review articles, and short communications and strongly encourages authors to make their data fully available.
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FOOD FUNDAMENTALS FOR BETTER EATING AT THE SAA ANNUAL MEETING IN AUSTIN

Rachel Feit

Rachel Feit is a principal with Acacia Heritage Consulting, based in Austin, Texas.

If you’re like me, you may be procrastinating over those three papers you’re supposed to deliver at the SAA Annual Meeting. Instead of writing them, you’re stalking Eater, Yelp, and newspapers online to plan your meal agenda for the five days you’ll spend in Austin in April. It’s a worthy pursuit for sure, because Austin is a foodie town, and exploring a city’s culinary offerings is, in my opinion, half the fun of most any conference. As an archaeologist who also happens to be a former food writer, I am here to guide.

When I first arrived from Chicago 25 years ago, Austin felt like a dining desert to me. These days it’s a destination for chefs who want to showcase their culinary chops, without the cutthroat competition that occurs in larger cities. The Austin dining scene today feels like a charming, spontaneous backyard potluck, where anything goes, and surprise guests pop in with unexpected food treasures, and their glamour. Near the conference hotel you can nibble on perfectly charred Neapolitan pizza at Bufalina, slurp up citrusy pisco sours and ceviche at Yuyo, sample the habit-forming johnny cakes at Emmer & Rye, or tuck in to Nouveau-Chinese at Old Thousand. There’s even a tony new food court, Fareground, where some of Austin’s most eclectic eateries showcase their goods in a single downtown space. Although Austin has its share of high-priced plates—Jeffrey’s, Olamaie, and Uchi are great places to blow an entire paycheck—there’s still a jeans-and-boots feel to even the smartest dining rooms.

But when it comes to good eats in Austin, there are two things you really must know about: tacos and barbecue. Both are rooted in the state’s immigrant foodways, branded with Anglo Texas’s cowboy imprimatur. Both foodstuffs have colorful histories that tread well into the domain of myth. Tacos and barbecue can be found at almost any street corner, in food trucks and starched tablecloth restaurants, at grocery stores and gas stations. They are this city’s main food groups, its culinary greeting card, its comfort food.

You really can’t go wrong by starting your day with a taco. Fast, portable, eminently customizable, and cheap, tacos once packed the lunch boxes of Austin’s early Mexican American workforce; these days local taco shops have lines out the door serving the city’s multicultural residents. A taco gives you a fix of salt, fat, protein, and heat, all in one bite. Anything can go into a taco—stewed or grilled meats, fish, beans, cheese, cabbage, cactus, pickled onions. Many here will tell you that it’s the perfect food; their adaptability makes them beloved by vegetarians and carnivores alike.

All types of tacos can be found in this berg, from the artisanal versions at spendy sit-down places like Suerte, La Condesa,
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Comedor, Fonda San Miguel, and El Naranjo, to casual Tex-Mex and fusion versions from Ciscos, Tamale House, Juan-in-a-Million, Veracruz All Natural, Torchy’s, and Taco Deli. But Austin’s most hallowed contribution to the pantheon is the breakfast taco, which many claim—probably apocryphally—was invented here. Breakfast tacos usually include some combination of eggs, potatoes, cheese, beans, and breakfast meats on a flour tortilla but often feature other foods too. Although Austin may not have actually invented them, this town’s chauvinistic appropriation of breakfast tacos has been so complete that . . . sorry, San Antonio . . . no other city dares to challenge. Do yourself a favor and sample a taco or 10 for breakfast, lunch, or dinner while you’re here.

If you are a meat-eater, barbecue is the other food you won’t want to miss. Barbecue emblazons our state’s culinary banner, and central Texas is its heartland. Barbecue is fundamental; it is tradition. Each plate is infused with the collective knowledge of a hundred previous pit masters whose secrets are still being transmitted around smokers at community gatherings, weddings, funerals, church events, tailgates, stock shows, and rodeos.

Central Texas is most famous for its brisket and sausage. The latter is served in twine-tied links of coarse-ground meat. Sausage was popularized by German, Polish, and Czech immigrants who brought their family recipes to Texas with them. Meanwhile, the emphasis on barbecuing beef brisket and ribs, instead of pork, is definitely an outgrowth of Texas’s cattle culture. These distinctive influences blended with barbecue traditions inherited from African American and southern foodways to create the sacred Texas Trinity: brisket, sausage, and ribs. Barbecue places around town usually serve all three. However, many like to highlight one type of meat over another. Franklin’s and La Barbecue, for instance, are legendary for their melt-in-your-mouth brisket. Hearty beef ribs can be had from Micklethwait Craft Meat and Stiles Switch. Sam’s Barbecue is one of the few places that still serves mutton, which is more common within African American pit traditions. The best sausage, in my opinion, comes from the small-town spots in the Tex-Czech nucleus between here and Houston.

Most barbecue places in Austin are casual, order-at-the-counter spots with a few tables or benches outside. Sit-down places with real dining rooms include Lambert’s, Blacks, Iron Works, Stiles Switch, Green Mesquite, and Scholz Garten. For an unforgettable barbecue experience, take a short trip outside Austin’s city limits to Smitty’s in Lockhart or Louis Mueller in Taylor, where the businesses still operate from buildings in which generations of previous pit masters have left their smoke-blackened mark on walls and tin-pressed ceilings. Don’t forget the bottle of Big Red.

Now stop procrastinating and get back to those papers.
I decided to organize a forum for the 84th Annual Meeting of the Society for American Archaeology in 2019 that would group several Mayanists (and one Andeanist) of diverse specialties and career stages to address the use of comparative approaches in our field. It was my first time organizing a forum, so I wasn’t entirely sure how to structure it, nor did I even seriously try to anticipate the directions it would take. Since forum participants do not even submit an abstract but instead prepare to discuss topics outlined in the forum abstract, my primary goal was to promote a healthy, robust, and productive conversation. This approach turned out to be ideal, and we had an engaging and fruitful directed group discussion, the result of which is now available as a podcast, thanks to Christopher Sims and Kirsten Lopez of the Go Dig a Hole! podcast.1

The point of departure for our forum was that the use of cross-cultural comparative approaches is so engrained in our analogical, archaeological thinking that it is sometimes applied uncritically. And that, despite their omnipresence, there is no shared academic procedure for using comparative approaches. Thus, two principal objectives of the forum were (1) to better define how and why we use comparative methods and (2) to identify key, contemporary anthropological questions related to cross-cultural approaches in Maya archaeology. Below, I first provide a theoretical introduction to comparative approaches and their role in Maya studies, after which I highlight some of the key points that surfaced during the forum: general guidelines for improving our comparative scholarly practices.

**Archaeological Interpretation in the Maya Context**

Analogical reasoning is now a universal archaeological practice. While the transition periods to processual and to postprocessual archaeology witnessed debates about the value of analogical reasoning for drawing conclusions (see Ascher 1961; Binford 1967; Gould and Watson 1982; Wylie 1985, 1989), these debates have now mostly faded away. Most archaeologists now “give up the paralyzing demand for certainty and make fuller, more systematic use of the means available for assessing the relative strength and cogency of analogical arguments” (Wylie 1985:80). The nature of inferences has also changed in our golden age of archaeological sciences. Many new proxies allow us to rely on ever-strengthening cable-like arguments—consisting of varied, complementary threads—to explain the archaeological record (following Wylie 1989). One could say that the discipline has fully adopted the methods advocated by processualists, while anthropological archaeologists are also asking the kind of questions posed by postprocessualists. In this processual-plus-like academic context (sensu Hegmon 2003), analogical reasoning remains a preferred thread for coloring the past and making it recognizable to us and our audiences.

The genres and uses of archaeological, analogical reasoning are too diverse to all be summarized in this short article. Yet, three categories seem particularly relevant: (i) allusions to human universals familiar to all of us, such as the unifying force of commensality; (2) comparisons between ethnographically or (ethno)historically documented practices and archaeologically detected ones, such as quadrangular patio organization among the Maya (see Wauchope 1938); and (3) cross-cultural comparisons among historically or archaeologically documented cultures of the past, such as comparisons between Classic Maya and Classic Greek polities (see Thompson 1954). A key distinction applicable to the examples above is analogical scope. In the case of the patio analogy, the scope is on a specific practice or technology (architecture) and can be said to be microscalar. Meanwhile, in the analogy between the governmental organizations of political entities—Classic Maya and Classic Greek “city-states”—the scope is broad and quite polythetic, or
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macroscalar. Other good and more recent examples include David Freidel and colleagues’ (2016:38) microscalar comparison between Classic Maya writing implements and those of the ancient Mediterranean world and Takeshi Inomata’s (2001) macroscalar comparison of the courtiers of Classic Maya royal courts and those of Medieval China and Japan. Yet, most examples of analogical reasoning do not fit squarely in either of these categories, which can instead be envisioned as two ends of a spectrum.

As Mayanists, we have access to a rather unique array of datasets to interpret the archaeological record. The archaeological record itself is quite rich, including scores of fairly-to-very-well-researched sites to compare our materials to, and so for most ancient Maya periods and areas. When addressing later Maya periods, we also have an ever-growing corpus of historical documents in the form of hieroglyphic texts and their accompanying, informative art. To this must be added the many interdisciplinary proxies that now reveal elusive realities about the Maya past, be they isotopic data extracted from teeth or geochemical elements drawn from floors. Yet, when it comes to analogies, we often rely on rich ethnohistorical data from the Maya world and broader Mesoamerica. To these may be added the many ethnographic studies of distinct Maya groups produced in the past century. Of course, care must be used when using these data through “direct historical” lenses. Yet, many scholars have demonstrated that key modern cultural traits have survived the effects of colonialism and may be carefully applied toward studying the archaeological record—for asking questions about topics ranging from technology to ideology and sociopolitical structures (e.g., Hill and Monaghan 1987; Wauchope 1938; Woodfill 2019).

This ensemble of datasets still leads some to argue for a certain “Maya exceptionalism.” That said, the case for Maya exceptionalism is likely overstated and rather comparable to feelings from scholars working in many other regions, as has been expressed by Luis Muro, who noted that the same sentiment exists among Andeanists, including specialists of Moche civilization—an archaeological culture often compared to the Classic Maya. In fact, current trends among Mayanists argue for the opposite (see point 1 below). The reality is that the complex questions we like to ask about ancient Maya institutions, economy, and ideology tend to not be entirely answerable, despite the many sources of information described above—a fact that is true across the archaeological board. This explains why we often turn to cross-cultural comparisons to seek well-documented analogies for studying the ancient Mayas, a scholarly practice that still yields many pitfalls (see Watanabe 2004). Below, I address five avenues that may help us avoid such pitfalls.

Comparative Approaches for Mayanists: Where to Go?

In this section, I summarize five key themes for cross-cultural approaches to the ancient Mayas, which can mostly be applied to other archaeological cultures. This is but an introduction, and the following five articles expand on these themes, which may best be defined as avenues for improving comparative practices, or as general analogical guidelines:

1. Choosing relevant comparative case studies that fit our studied chronologic and regional iteration of the Ancient Mayas by integrating context-specific arguments.

2. Taking the appropriate space in publications or presentations to define the “loaded terms” we use. These terms often have implicit comparative value, one that should be specified and not guessed by the audience.

3. Being honest in how we use comparative cases by highlighting not only similarities but also contrasts, which can be equally relevant and meaningful.

4. Actively engaging specialists in the comparative case studies.

5. Taking into account our audience in choosing the appropriate comparative case studies.

1. Choice and Relevance of Comparative Case-Studies

The archaeological construct of “the Ancient Maya” can be misleading. I personally prefer the (Latinate-derived) term “Ancient Mayas,” which, although imperfect, at least reflects the plurality of cultural groups composing the Maya world. Beyond language-related cultural distinctions, the broad archaeological nature of the term also requires us to specify which chronological iteration of the ancient Mayas we study, as this obviously impacts the relevance of analogies. Reflectively describing the context of our site or materials of study within ancient Maya civilization is thus an obvious important first step before proceeding to comparisons.

For example, Evan Parker, one of the SAA 2019 forum participants, studies the earliest villages of the Puuc region of northern Yucatán (Figure 1), dated to as early as 1000 BCE. He has noted that because he studies what was likely a fairly egalitarian society, he must choose the appropriate comparative case studies. In this context, Classical Greek city-states hardly make for an adequate analogy. Instead, ethnohistorically documented egalitarian societies and their practices seem far more relevant. This observation emphasizes that one would benefit from studying any given case study in its own terms—and using the relevant comparative case
study—rather than as a “developmental stage.” To summarize, when using any cross-cultural comparisons, one must explain the relevance of the comparative case, or why a given analogy is adequate for the site and period of study.

2. The Definition of Loaded Terms
Many terms we use to characterize ancient realities are loaded with implicit cultural analogies. While many archaeological terms are relatively straightforward and broadly applicable, like road, burial, or household, others deserve to be defined and/or justified. In particular, when using concepts borrowed from modern sociology (e.g., power), politics (e.g., government), or economics (e.g., marketplace), we should take adequate space or time to clearly define them and make them comparatively relevant. For example, the term palace has been used as a label for very distinct architectural complexes in different areas and different periods of the past. In the case of Maya archaeology, “palaces” might be long-range structures in the Puuc Hills of the northern Yucatán in Mexico (Figure 2); complex, multipatio compounds in the central Petén of Guatemala (Figure 3); or large elite residences such as those of the southeastern Maya frontier (Figure 4). It is worth taking time, even in compact articles, to define and contextualize the loaded terms we use, as these are generally borrowed from Western, relatively modern society. For example, in my own work on Classic Maya political regimes, I decided to focus on what I define as regal palaces (I should note that my dissertation also defines the other loaded terms in this definition):

To circumvent further confusion, I use the term regal palace, which I define as an elaborate multi-structure compound located in a site’s epicenter that housed the ruler’s household and that was the focus of the communicational, administrative, economic, and ceremonial functions of the royal court. These were architectural institutions designed by and for royal courts as the centerpiece of their political apparatus. Regimes coalesced within regal palaces, assembling the royal court and enabling the exercise of politics [Lamoureux-St-Hilaire 2018:45–46].

This definition narrows down the breadth of conceptual possibilities for palaces by placing constraints on location, form, and function. In addition, following point 1 above, I later specify that regal palaces correspond to a (mostly southern Lowlands) Classic Maya institution; they do not necessarily apply to earlier or later periods or to all subregions of the Maya World (Lamoureux-St-Hilaire 2018).

3. Honest Comparisons
One of the forum participants, Arthur Demarest, adamantly emphasized that when we compare any two cultures, we are contrasting “polythetic sets of individual elements on relative scales” (following Clarke 1968:83). We should thus never expect to make analogies between whole cultures, but rather between specific cultural elements. Assuming we are comparing broadly similar cultural phenomena, certain parallels will emerge. Yet, odds are that many differences will also become apparent, and these may actually be just as meaningful as the similarities, as noted by forum participant Patricia A. McAnany. Thus, in addition to arguing for relevant analogies, we must also pay attention to which elements of polythetic sets (i.e., cultures) are either analogous or dissimilar. Not paying attention to these differences, or assuming that two cultures are overly similar because of certain shared elements, undermines the efficacy of comparative approaches.
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4. Collaboration

In our efforts to craft the most convincing inferences about the archaeological past, we draw on multiple types of data. Cross-cultural comparisons, if used adequately, can be strong complements in these cable-like arguments. That said, it can be tricky to find the right literature on other world areas, which tends to be vast, especially if that literature is not archaeological but historical, epigraphic, or ethnographic. While it may be tempting to use Google Scholar to find a single example of what we seek as an analogy, this approach consists of cherry-picking and undermines the relevance of analogies. It is possible to take the necessary days, weeks, or semesters to immerse in the appropriate literature, although such time allocation is rarely optimal. An alternative is to collaborate with well-versed scholars of other world areas or disciplines. Just like we collaborate with chemists or biologists for studying interdisciplinary proxies, we should not hesitate to collaborate with specialists in our comparative case studies to craft stronger analogies. Not only is this collaborative approach a good way to increase
the relevance of analogies, it also broadens our interpretive framework and the impact of our writing.

5. Audience Awareness

Before developing comparative approaches to help answer questions in Maya archaeology, we should consider our audience. While our primary audience tends to be Mesoamerican archaeologists and students of archaeology, the knowledge we are building will reach many people outside of these categories. From our public lectures to mass media recycling our ideas, our words reach broad and diverse audiences. Comparative approaches can be powerful pedagogical tools. As noted by C. Mathew Saunders, using basic comparisons between civilizations that are familiar to grade-school children—for example ancient Rome or late medieval England—can facilitate explaining more complex aspects of ancient Maya civilization.

That said, as noted by Luis Múro and Brent K. S. Woodfill during our forum, our interested public often includes inhabitants of the countries and communities where we conduct research and members of descendant communities of the groups we study. There is potential harm in using, and potentially misusing, Western-centric comparative case studies. It is thus important to involve Indigenous communities and perspectives in building our archaeological models. Olivia C. Navarro-Farr also noted that, in increasingly diverse undergraduate archaeology classrooms, students can struggle to relate with the images we project of the past. In particular, some question whether we as archaeologists even take into account Indigenous ontologies in our arguments. While a multivocal comparative approach should be our goal, it can be difficult to achieve. Yet, addressing this challenge in print and during presentations or lectures is crucial if we want to progress toward this goal. In addition, being aware that the models we impose on the archaeological record can impact descendant communities is simple enough. In sum, for our cultural analogies to be relevant to a diverse public, we must strive for a multivocal approach, a practice that can begin with a reliance on a diverse set of comparative case studies.

Conclusion

Above, I have summarized key themes and questions that created a certain consensus among the 12 discussants of the SAA 2019 Annual Meeting forum “Comparative Approaches for Mayanists: Where to Go?” My objective in grouping these ideas here is not to be prescriptive or moralizing. Yet, I suspect that, just as they do for me, these guidelines can
be good reminders for archaeologists seeking to build the strongest and most relevant analogical inferences. While the vocabulary and examples in this article are clearly geared for students of the ancient Mayas, I believe these themes are broadly applicable to archaeology in other world areas.
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Note
1. Beyond myself, forum discussants at the SAA 2019 Annual Meeting were Arthur Demarest (Vanderbilt University), Keith Eppich (Tyler Junior College), Rachel Horowitz (Appalachian State University), Patricia McAnany (University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill), David Mixter (Binghamton University), Luis Múro (Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú), Olivia Navarro-Farr (College of Wooster), Evan Parker (Tulane University), C. Mathew Saunders (Davidson Day School), Whittaker Schroder (University of Pennsylvania), and Brent Woodfill (Winthrop University). A recording of the forum is available thanks to the Go Dig a Hole! podcast team and is accessible at https://soundcloud.com/godigahole/ep60.
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Notes
1. An (albeit cursory) search of the 2009 SAA program (https://documents.saa.org/container/docs/default-source/doc-annualmeeting/annualmeeting/final-program/program2009.pdf?sfvrsn=75d48f68_-4) supports my memory. A search for “queer,” “gay,” “lesbian,” “sexuality,” or “LGBT” (and variations) comes up with nothing, and “gender” returns only a single paper that may have engaged with gender identity/nonconformity in the past.


3. Check out https://queerarchaeology.com/, and if you think a field school should be added to the list, please submit it!
The SAA 2019 forum on comparative approaches in Maya archaeology provided much food for thought in regard to the use of analogy and comparative cases in the interpretation of material remains. Like the U.S. Southwest, the Maya region is home to a diverse Indigenous population with deep cultural taproots and significant durability in cultural practices despite the heavy hand of European colonialism. In both regions, such rich and textured heritage induces caveats regarding the appropriateness of cross-cultural analogies that may violate the singularity of cultural practices. On the other hand, comparative approaches can help to strip away the exotic mystique that clouds and problematizes the study of another culture.

Here, we focus on the cross-threading of analogy with ontology and the challenges that different ontological framings of the world pose for the use of analogy and deployment of a comparative framework in archaeological interpretation. By ontology, we refer to an understanding of how things come into being, the nature and relations of being, and which things are thought to have existence in a vitalistic sense. As an existential philosophy, ontology underpins action and decision-making, more than most archaeologists care to admit. Archaeology is a material science that works back from material remains to infer the actions and decisions that created a particular pattern, be it a chemical signature, a single object, an arrangement of objects, a structure or network of structures, or an entire landscape. Among multiple non-Western cultures including the Maya, idiosyncratic geographic features (Figure 1), constructions, objects, natural forces, and animals have varying degrees of agency and personhood (e.g., Bassett 2015; Woodfill 2019), and this recognition creates relationships and obligations that affect the archaeological record. Because ontology can be foundational to human (and nonhuman) action, it should be a key component of archaeological interpretation.

Figure 1. Sunlight streams into Juliq’ Cave, one of the most important embodied Earth spirits in the Chisec area, Guatemala. Photograph by Brent K. S. Woodfill.
Analogy, on the other hand, is a type of reasoning that ascribes similar function to two or more entities that are/were separated in space, time, or place of origin. When applied to archaeology, one entity is archaeological while the other is linked securely to a function through direct observation or some kind of historical documentation (generally ethnography or documentary sources). During the reign of processual archaeology (1962–1982), analogy was seen as a powerful means to boost interpretive reach although caveats about constraining the range of acceptable analogical material—either temporally or spatially—were discussed (e.g., see Salmon 1983:61–83).

Until recently, archaeologists in the U.S. Southwest and the Maya region have used analogical reasoning to leap from ethnographic and ethnohistorical documentation gleaned from descendant and neighboring communities to interpret the archaeological past with barely a nod to the intervening 500 years of European colonialism. Is this a bad ahistorical practice as often alleged? In both areas, there is remarkable durability in some realms of cultural practice—for example, kiva societies in the Southwest and devotion to rain and earth supernaturals in the Maya region. The ontological foundations of these practices may not have shifted as dramatically as the terms post-Hispanic or post-Columbian suggest (see Chinchilla Mazariegos [2017] for a thoughtful discussion of Maya myths and coloniality). In this analogical realm, archaeologists thread the needle between asserting ontological durability—which aligns with many Indigenous movements that seek greater self-representation and political autonomy—and fending off accusations that we denigrate Indigenous peoples by fossilizing their ontologies as timeless or incapable of change (Hervik 2008).

Edward F. Fischer (2001:13–15) separates “cultural logics,” the durable, underlying ontological schemata that organize interpretations of the world, from the more flexible traits that occur as people integrate new experiences, knowledge, technology, and systems into their culture and consciousness. Many Maya groups continue to give offerings and prayers to the beings who occupy the living landscape (Figure 2), although they are often couched in an ostensibly Christian worldview. In fact, Christianity, along with other aspects of Spanish culture, was conceptualized through a specifically Maya ontology and was modified as such to make sense within it. The resulting syncretism has proven to be remarkably resilient to five centuries of attempted conversion, frustrating the efforts of colonial friars, twentieth-century catechists, and contemporary missionaries to wipe out the precolumbian foundation of Maya Christianity.

What of analogy across time and/or space? Large-scale analogical comparison was frowned upon by devotees of postprocessual archaeology as violence to cultural (and ontological) uniqueness. Only higher-level theory could be brought to bear on the interpretation of a specific material manifestation. Within the postprocessual paradigm, the logic of tacking among ideas, materials, and interpretation referenced in Maxime Lamoureux-St-Hilaire’s introduction (this issue) and originally introduced to archaeology by Alison Wylie (1993) became a vertical and hierarchical process with lateral reasoning through analogy seen as an ill-advised and discouraged shortcut. Where descendant communities are involved, one can ask how such communities fared under the umbrella of postprocessualism in which cultural uniqueness was emphasized, not to mention the causal priority given to...
“doings” (Fowles 2013) of overtly noneconomic importance. An approach to the past in which cultural diversity and singularity are emphasized certainly avoided the excessive depersonalization of processual archaeology.

The study of mortuary contexts under processual archaeology provides a cogent example. An early and influential comparative study by Arthur Saxe (1970) concluded that mortuary treatment (particularly the establishment of cemeteries) was correlated with status consolidation by descent groups and intergenerational transmission of wealth (see Goldstein [1976, 1981] and Morris [1991] for extended discussions and evaluations). Eventually, this conclusion was generalized to include political power as well. Conveniently, this interpretation was congruent with historical and contemporary mortuary treatment in the United States. The limits to this comparative framework surfaced as postprocessualists set about deconstructing the generalized linkage that was prone to falsification with specific case studies (see Parker Pearson 1993). But old ideas die slowly, and the common-sense appeal of the Saxe framework prolonged its life. Meanwhile, in the Maya region, the status/wealth/power framing of mortuary treatment began to give way to greater attention to ontological concerns with the afterlife and regeneration of the souls of deceased individuals in descending generations (ethnographically and to some extent hieroglyphically attested; McAnany 2020). Could it be that mortuary treatment in the precolumbian Maya region was just as concerned with safeguarding human souls as with consolidating inheritance? In this case, closer attention to ontological principles of a descendant community served to suggest corrections to an overextended comparative framework. As a sidebar, Christopher Carr and Robert McCord (2015) similarly have written about Hopewell burial practices as primarily concerned with the posthumous journey of the soul.

On the other hand, a willingness to deploy a big analogy can have the effect of smashing interpretive frameworks that denigrate Indigenous achievements—particularly those of Indigenous Americans. Bruce Trigger (2010:409–410) observed that despite the stridency with which processual archaeology decried diffusionism, the adamancy served to place civilizations of the Americas on an equal footing with those of Eurasia. For instance, in the process of asserting that Maya civilization was comparable to Greek civilization, racist hierarchies were shown to be untenable. Likewise, when Gordon R. Willey (1976) asserted that Mesoamerican religious practices should be considered a world religion—similar to Christianity, Islam, and Buddhism—he drew a leveling analogy that reversed colonial-era demonization of Indigenous Mesoamerican religions (McAnany 2007).

In lectures and student advising, Lewis Binford stressed the difficulty of producing ideas about the past that are not part of one’s cultural milieu; although he did not use the word ontology, he was referring to something similar. More recently, Eduardo Vivieros de Castro (2014) described the fundamental anthropological problem as being rooted in an ontological narcissism—scholars gaze upon the Other and see themselves reflected back. Ontology can be a powerful and enduring force for organizing meaning and behavior, not only in the cultures we seek to study but in our very archaeological interpretations. Through a careful application of culture-specific ontology and reasoned analogy, it is possible for scholars to question some of the underlying biases and assumptions they carry with them, from the aforementioned assumption that more elaborate grave goods necessarily equal higher status to the common treatment of economics as a cultural sphere independent from (and at times contrasted with) religion. Throughout Mesoamerica, there are deities and Earth spirits who need to be placated with expensive ritual acts before extracting or harvesting many commodities, and any comprehensive economic model must include these often-overlooked costs in its tally (Figure 3).

At the idea end of things, grist for interpretations about the past can come directly from archaeological materials sensu stricto (which often pose problems of equifinality) or from analogy (whether framed as expectations or deployed ex post facto). Either way, great care must be taken to avoid doing violence to the past through ill-conceived analogy, invocation of inappropriate comparison, or unfounded assumptions as to the universality of our own ontology, but these arrows in our methodological quiver are essential tools for the work of archaeological research.

Figure 3. The sacred flame is lit in a hilltop altar during a ceremony on December 21, 2012. Photograph by Brent K. S. Woodfill.
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When considering comparative approaches to the study of the ancient Maya, I start by thinking about my journey to the study of Maya stone tool technologies. As an undergraduate, I worked with archaeological materials associated with mobile hunter-gatherers from the Paleoarchaic period in the Great Basin region in western North America. Through this research, and encouragement to explore the diverse literature about lithic technology, I discovered a love of lithic artifacts and lithic analysis and decided to apply that interest to my long-standing interest in the Maya. Little did I realize that this would put me in a liminal place between lithicists and Mayanists, one that I would mediate when giving talks, as I would choose to focus more on Maya archaeology or more on lithic analysis, depending on the context. It was during my earliest professional conferences as a graduate student that I realized the position I found myself in—between archaeologists interested in hunter-gatherer lithic technology who (mostly jokingly) told me that lithics in complex, sedentary societies were boring and not nearly as interesting (nor as well made) as those in mobile societies, on the one hand; and on the other, Mayanists who were always wondering why lithics were important, and what they could tell us when we had so many other materials to study, like nice architecture, tons (literally) of ceramics, and written texts.

While significant research has been done on lithics in the Maya region, and in Mesoamerica more broadly, much of it has focused on the easily sourced and flashy obsidian (see Levine [2014] for a summary) and the study of formal tools, such as bifaces, particularly those found in ritual contexts. In contexts where lithics are sometimes the only artifact type present, like some hunter-gatherer sites, in-depth studies of lithics are the norm, and research focuses on both formal tools and production debris to provide the most information possible about past lifeways. As someone who came from studying hunter-gatherers, I was (and still am) particularly interested in studying production debris and utilitarian tools, which are less commonly addressed among studies of the Maya. Additionally, as I work in the Maya Lowlands, much of my research focuses on chert, which is not what people think of when considering Maya lithics; people instead typically first think about obsidian.

In thinking about the disparate approaches and attitudes toward lithics, I realized that the major strength of lithic studies in archaeology is that they are inherently comparative. The disparate approaches include those that place lithics at the center of archaeological studies and utilize them to examine broad topics of anthropological interest, such as social organization, mobility, and economics (mostly studies of mobile peoples) versus those that have relegated them to appendices and discussions of only certain segments of populations (such as studies of Maya lithics). However, the methodologies that we utilize to study lithics were developed through comparative examinations of multiple, distinct groups of peoples, mostly mobile hunter-gatherers. My early exposure to stone tools of mobile hunter-gatherer societies led to my application of organizational frameworks to the study of the Maya. Yet these methodologies can be adapted to explore sedentary societies. While keeping up on the literature about lithic studies and the Maya can be a challenging task, doing so allows me to think broadly about how technologies and technological change relate not just to mobility and sedentism but also to past behaviors in a variety of contexts.

Here, I want to address the ways in which lithicists in sedentary societies draw on studies of mobile societies to interpret lithic materials and the patterns identified through lithic studies in sedentary societies. I hope to emphasize two main points. First is the utility of cross-cultural comparisons for strengthening our methodological and theoretical frameworks, both in the study of lithics as a whole but particularly for the study of lithics in the Maya region. As John E. Clark (2003:45) has put it, “I am less concerned that Mesoamerican lithic studies are not at the very cutting
edge of issues in method and theory than that they are theoretically lifeless.” By drawing on comparisons from other regions, we can engage broader theoretical frames used by other lithicists and breathe life into Maya lithic studies. Second is the important role relatively common materials (like lithic debitage) can play in our understanding of people’s past behaviors regardless of the society being studied. Through comparative frameworks, we can utilize common, seemingly unimportant lithic data to enhance our methodological and theoretical frameworks.

Frameworks for Lithic Analysis

Early studies of lithics were based on ethnographic and ethnoarchaeological studies of lithic-producing peoples, the majority of which are mobile hunter-gatherer groups (see McCall [2012] for a summary). The broad theoretical trends with which we address lithics today, such as technological organization (see Nelson 1991; Robinson and Sellet 2018), are rooted in these early ethnographic and ethnoarchaeological studies. The study of hunter-gatherer societies continues to be at the forefront of methodological innovations for analyzing lithics, such as morphometric analyses, as well as for creating the frameworks through which to interpret the collected data.

Among my Maya archaeology colleagues, discussions of the applicability of comparisons almost always focus on group size, political complexity, and subsistence patterns. However, as a lithicist, I am drawn to studies of lithics in societies that did not parallel the Maya in those areas but where the frameworks and methodologies of lithic studies were developed. If we ignored all such comparisons, the majority of the analytical techniques and interpretive frameworks used to study lithics would be irrelevant. Despite potential limitations due to the different roles that lithics play in sedentary and mobile societies, I rely on technological organization approaches to interpret Maya lithics. Technological organization, a framework developed through studies of mobile hunter-gatherers, relates tangible features of material culture with broader anthropological issues, such as social and economic behaviors, through identifying factors that shape tool production including, but not limited to, raw material access, time, and energy (e.g., Nelson 1991).

The application of the technological organization framework to sedentary societies may require some changes due to the inherent differences in sedentary and mobile societies. In mobile societies, the greatest constraints on tool production are mobility and the weight of lithic materials. In sedentary societies, this constraint is eliminated, but materials still must be moved from source locations to production spaces to use locations. And in many cases, lithics are not made by the people who used them. Thus, the acquisition of finished tools from specialists also results in constraints on tool manufacture and use.

By examining technological constraints on tool production due to tool function and acquisition in sedentary societies, we can think about ways in which tool form might vary differently in sedentary versus mobile societies. Studies of bifaces in the Maya area have illustrated that general use tools—for example, General Utility Bifaces—are frequently large and thick, in contrast to the thinned bifaces that we associate with mobility (Horowitz et al. 2019). Bifacial thinning is seen as a step in the process of biface production, particularly as thinned bifaces are lighter to transport and tend to have sharper edges (Kelly 1988). However, it is the difference in function and the need for reliable materials that constrained the specialized producers who manufactured these thicker bifaces. My colleagues and I (Horowitz et al. 2019) analyzed a selection of limestone bifaces from households in the Maya Lowlands and found that these bifaces were purposefully made to be thick as this increased their utility and made them more efficient (Figure 1). Although we did not focus on this, the production of these tools by specialists makes it more likely that the tools will need to be reliable, and function when necessary, and thus will constrain reliability (in this case the thick biface size) (Nelson 1991).

As illustrated in this brief discussion, through the use of frameworks such as technological organization, studies of Maya lithic technology can be brought into the realm of theoretical studies of lithics more broadly and can provide information about key questions of anthropological interest. This effort necessitates familiarity with and fluency in
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Theoretical trends in lithic analysis in other world areas, hence the utility of and importance of cross-cultural comparisons.

Cross-Cultural Comparisons of Common Materials

One of the most interesting aspects of stone tools in sedentary societies is that they are frequently made by specialists. In the Maya area, both bifaces and blades were produced by specialists. However, a large amount of generalized lithic production was done by householders (Horowitz 2018). Information on specialized and generalized production stems from detailed analyses of production debris, particularly debitage, rather than the analysis of the final products, as these are usually found in the location of use rather than production (Figure 2). To fully understand the production and exchange of lithic materials, we must focus on debitage analyses, as is common in studies of lithic production elsewhere in Mesoamerica and in other world areas.

Through detailed analyses of production locations and the subsequent information on specialized and generalized tool production, we can study how tool users acquired their tools and how this might impact the ways in which those tools were produced. In particular, the presence of generalized production in household contexts suggests that residents could make their own tools, particularly expedient ones, but that the production of items that required greater skill, such as bifaces or blades, was not something that most people had the training or knowledge to do. Since the acquisition of formalized tools from specialized producers affected how these tools were used, the ability to obtain them was built into how tool users thought about the use-lives of these implements.

Outside the Maya area, scholars of sedentary societies have identified similar trends in lithic production by both specialists and nonspecialized producers. There is a well-documented connection between sedentism and an emphasis on the production and use of informal tools (i.e., those with minimal production effort; Parry and Kelly 1987). William J. Parry and Robert L. Kelly (1987) suggest one reason for the absence of formal tools (i.e., those that require more effort and knowledge to produce) is the lack of raw material shortages among sedentary peoples, who can stockpile raw material resources when necessary.

Francesca Manclossi and Steven A. Rosen (2019) provide another example of the dichotomy between formal and informal lithic tools in the Bronze Age in the Near East, where the production of formal chert blades as agricultural tools was common, alongside both generalized lithic production and that of metal tools. These blades were made by specialists, much like Mesoamerican prismatic blades, and then widely distributed for use in a variety of composite tools.

The presence of both informal and formal tools in these contexts points to a “core” principle. Where specialists exist, the broader population no longer practices the skills necessary to make those more complex tools but continue to make basic, everyday tools. To tie this back to the theoretical frameworks discussed above, the ways in which people obtained formal tools may influence both the forms of and usages of tools. Thus, although we can (and should) use frameworks developed to study mobile peoples in the study of sedentary societies, we should make some adjustments for constraints, such as specialized production influencing tool form. For the Maya region, the presence of specialized and unspecialized lithic producers illustrates how people obtained their tools as well as the interactions that may have led to these acquisitions. Thus, by learning about production mechanisms through detailed studies of production debris, we can better understand procurement networks, as well as how these networks may affect the organization of lithic technology. Such studies cannot be conducted without detailed analyses of lithic artifacts, particularly production debris and utilitarian tools. Focusing on these more common but less flashy aspects of lithic technology provides holistic understandings of its integration into economic and social activities.

Conclusions

I would like to conclude by mentioning that the concerns discussed here are in no way exclusive to the Maya area. Lithic specialists focused on other sedentary societies have explored these issues and continue to do so (e.g., Raczek 2010; Rosen et al. 2014; Tripcevich and Contreras 2010). Furthermore,
scholarship by lithic analysts in Mesoamerica has addressed many of the theoretical considerations discussed here (e.g., Kwoka et al. 2019; Meissner 2017), and the integration of methodological and theoretical frameworks first introduced in other areas has become the norm. By considering how comparative approaches are applicable to lithic studies, we can provide frameworks that bring the study of lithics in complex, sedentary societies to the methodological fore, as well as to increase their relevance to studies of the ancient Maya and other sedentary peoples.
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INCLUSIVE COMPARISONS FOR UNDERGRADUATES IN ARCHAEOLOGY
REPRESENTATION AND DIVERSITY IN AND BEYOND THE CLASSROOM

Olivia C. Navarro-Farr

Olivia C. Navarro-Farr is an associate professor of anthropology and archaeology at the College of Wooster, in Wooster, Ohio.

As is the case with many of my early-to-mid-career peers, I have been fortunate to have had the opportunity to teach a variety of undergraduate archaeology courses for some years now at various institutions, including state schools, a community college, and a small liberal arts college. I am now in my eighth year at an institution that considers faculty-mentored undergraduate research as its cornerstone. This means I find myself in the yearly position of ushering a wide array of students (Figure 1) through their own research theses incorporating wide-ranging topics, regions, and specializations in archaeology, anthropology, and even sociology. The aspect of mentored research that always invites the greatest challenge is working with students through theory. Though this is the case across these fields, I limit my conversation here to archaeology.

At my home institution, all archaeology students are required to take the archaeological method and theory course, which both I and my colleague P. Nick Kardulias offer rotationally. Ideally, students take this course prior to initiating their theses. Things generally go well with all the expected complications of any course, yet it is always a particular challenge to help students learn how to apply theory to their own homegrown research, data, and interpretations. Students seem to approach that experience tentatively, with some intimidation and a certain sense of, well—how does one actually “do” theory? The SAA 2019 forum on comparative approaches in Maya archaeology organized by Maxime Lamoureux-St-Hilaire, and this set of articles, are therefore entirely appropriate for addressing these challenges and have helped me think through some of these as they apply to teaching and mentoring. To this discussion, I bring my experience in mentoring undergraduate research, and I acknowledge the benefit of understanding how to best help students consider and apply comparative approaches for archaeological interpretation(s).

Comparative Approaches for Undergraduates: Mindful Inclusivity

In many ways, the key points of our forum discussion broke down the complexities of this fundamental element of archaeological research: how to think about comparable datasets across space, time, and scales. Comparisons and analogies are central to archaeological reconstructions of ancient lifeways; this is a given. When I teach my introductory courses in archaeology, I often begin by explaining to students that we must visualize the past, which requires some imagination. The way we populate these understandings and envision what past(s) looked like in the classroom for our students is through comparative analogies. These typically derive from cases with which students are familiar. For example, case studies from across ancient Europe may help familiarize uninitiated students to the ancient Maya. Using terms to describe chronologies such as “Early Classic” and “Late Classic” situate the ancient Maya along the standards of ancient Greece, with which many are more familiar, at least generally. Similarly, the way we characterize ancient Maya royalty is illustrated with language taken directly from medieval Europe. These terms are useful and illustrative and, as they are long embedded in our discipline, are unlikely to change. In the same way, the fantasy epic Game of Thrones, as an alternative, fictional, and magic-laden world influenced heavily by modern ideas about life in medieval Europe, provides a quick and widely followed narrative useful for illustrating what we understand about ancient Maya court politics and rivalries from archaeology and epigraphy. Yet this easy relatability of ancient Maya politics with more familiar European terminology and history reveals the profound and insidious impacts of colonization. That which is European is canon, familiar, and it is the lens from which we describe fundamental elements of ancient Maya political structure. Again, I do not argue with the fact that it can prove useful for instruction, and I acknowledge my own reliance on such material for comparative purposes. I do not think this
pattern of comparison is likely to change altogether; however, I do believe we should work to identify the effects of a colonized understanding of ancient Indigenous political systems as seen from archaeological science and demand that our students acknowledge and reflect on its implications. This permits students to build their own critical approaches to archaeological comparisons and helps them tease out useful elements for comparison from those that may be problematic.

Representation in Research and Teaching: Inclusivity in Comparative Approaches

My students seek inclusive representation; to be clear, my students want to see themselves both in terms of areas of inquiry about the past as well as in the actual practice of the research. When I consider the subject of archaeological comparisons for elucidating archaeologically based understandings of ancient Maya lifeways, I want my students to be aware of the diversity of scholars in the field and how the modern Maya are included (or not) regarding their own intellectual perspectives on continuity and change. I do this because increasingly diverse student populations seeking to participate in archaeological research are longing to see themselves represented both in the field and in the intellectual currents we utilize to explain, theorize, position, and describe our research and interpretations. I argue that we must seek to foster such diverse participation all along the pipeline from undergraduate to future professionals (academic and otherwise) if our field is to gain strength and maintain relevancy. How can we create comparative analogies that more appropriately reflect diverse voices and participants? How do we acknowledge determinisms grounded in Western logics as we seek comparisons with ancient Maya lifeways? Once identified, are we equipped to critically evaluate such comparisons and seek others that may reflect the actual “world-system” that the ancient Maya, with their own vast diversity, inhabited?

To begin addressing these questions, we can refer to our own discipline’s historical grounding in scientific research principles, assumed to be unbiased and empirical. In doing so, we recall the implicit androcentric biases in the very language that structured the questions posed and assumptions intrinsic to archaeological science in its earliest years (e.g.,
the famous “Man the Hunter” example [Lee et al. 1968], or the emphasis in our periodization on tool industries—Stone Age, Iron Age, and so on [see Conkey 2003]). These androcentric biases were subsequently laid bare once the discipline broadened to include increasing numbers of women, whose scholarship has enriched the field, making gender more visible, has contributed toward peopling the past, and has helped articulate “critical analyses of heretofore assumed and taken-for-granted” (Conkey 2003:872; for more on contributions of Black feminist theory to these discussions see Battle-Baptiste [2011] and Sterling [2015]).

Another comparative example of what I describe comes from a sister discipline, and it involves recent innovative work in the genetics of skin pigmentation. Tina Lasisi (2017) argues that greater diversity in science yields a greater variety of scientific questions and otherwise unexplored research avenues. New questions reveal insidious biases that may be invisible to a scientific community that is majority white. For example, increased investigation of the genetics behind skin pigmentation reveals how previously held ideas about such variation were highly inadequate due not in small part to an overreliance on the variability within the far more nuanced examination of European populations as opposed to a comparatively shallow exploration of skin pigmentation variation across the continent of Africa (Lasisi 2017; Lasisi and Shriver 2018). In a similar fashion, thinking about the ancient Maya and drawing on comparative examples to illustrate or position such understandings also benefit from a diverse body of practitioners. I therefore reason that scholars should make concerted efforts to underscore comparative scholarship that draws on a wider breadth of experiences. For example, comparative approaches that rely on Indigenous ontologies (Kuwaniwiswma et al. 2018; Woodfill 2019), oral traditions (Echo-Hawk 2000), Indigenous approaches to archaeological practice (Gnecho and Ayala 2011), queer theory (Blackmore 2011), and ethnoarchaeological data (Brown 2004) are important to utilize when considering evidence about lifeways of the ancient Maya world. Doing so provides important opportunities for students to see broad ranges of critical comparisons that both illustrate ancient Maya lifeways from comparative vantage points and also from diverse ontological perspectives.

Archaeology is enriched by the diversity of its participants and perspectives that guide how archaeological data is generated and interpreted. Our academic community must tackle the issue of representation proactively. A first step involves recruiting more diverse participation in archaeological fieldwork and coursework to create avenues for an increasingly diverse pipeline while also improving conditions and academic environments conducive to retention of diverse students and faculty. Moreover, our system of peer review, which governs who and what gets published and who is granted critical research funding, must support a true arena of ideas encompassing many forms of diversity in scholarship. In acknowledging the diversity of individuals and ideas within our discipline, such an inclusive peer review system can avoid limiting publication to only those examples that reflect and reify the status quo and implicit biases within our field. Otherwise, we run the risk of perpetuating imbalanced interpretations of archaeological evidence, which can have the effect of limiting scholars of color, queer scholars, and other underrepresented perspectives including the descendants of the very people we study. Furthermore, as Jeremy Sabloff (2008) argues, we should be rewarding public-centered scholarship (including popular books, blogs, and online forums). We should also be mindful of including literature and scholarship that reflects the diversity of participants internationally (and, where possible, in different languages). Such approaches not only ensure balanced coverage of perspectives but can also strengthen student yield, as this would permit student appreciation for and understanding of the international dimensions of our research that reflect a global community of participants and specialists.

International Collaborations: Inclusive Practices

As a researcher working in a collaborative international context, I think it is also important to address comparative approaches in our practice while simultaneously endeavoring to craft successful collaborative research programs with our colleagues in Latin America. These efforts are not without challenges, and they should be considered in tandem with issues of representation and the history of colonialism. With regard to issues of representation, we must be mindful of the international communities of partners with whom we work and on whom we rely for permits, access, and, critically, excavation and infrastructure. Our efforts must balance working partnerships with emphasis on healthy and open communication with our partners in-country who represent varied backgrounds and experiences. Drawing on these and working collaboratively serves to strengthen research. In terms of collaborative direction on international projects, directors and senior staff must also work toward a balance of perspectives that draws on the strengths of all involved and avoids overly hierarchical relationships among codirectors based in the United States and those based elsewhere that may reflect intrinsic colonialist (e.g., English-language-dominant or U.S.-centric) biases. In the case of our project in Guatemala, our work has benefited from a shared directorial style in which a cohort of national and foreign directors work as a team on decisions and protocols for fieldwork and laboratory analyses at an annual meeting held at the College of Wooster. This style permits open and shared discussion of some of our project’s greatest fiscal, research, and collaborative challenges.
in an open forum where all are invited to lend their unique perspectives. Decisions regarding everything from updating laboratory processing protocols to which areas of investigation will be prioritized yearly are considered and made collectively and in careful consideration of the perspectives and experiences of our international senior staff members.

Conclusions
In this short piece, my goal has not been to provide a laundry list of examples of more inclusive comparative approaches for studies in Maya archaeology. Rather, my aim has been to contribute to ongoing conversations about why diversity in scholarship matters for identifying how to critically evaluate cross-cultural comparisons in the archaeology of the ancient Maya. I have spoken primarily from my vantage point as a professor of undergraduate courses in archaeology. From this perspective, I have attempted to make the case for inclusivity in practice both in the ranks of our discipline professionally, and in terms of how we think about and/or critically evaluate comparative cases for our students to learn about the ancient Maya and to see places for themselves in our field.
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Comparative approaches in archaeology have been applied to cross-cultural phenomena, including among other topics the development of sociopolitical complexity and the collapse of political systems. As archaeologists in many parts of the world have shifted focus away from the study of collapse to an interest in resilience, comparative approaches that focus on the resilient qualities of cultures over time have the potential to highlight similarities and variability in responses to political and climatological crises.

In his introduction to this thematic section of articles, Maxime Lamoureux-St-Hilaire has outlined the role of analogy as a specific type of comparative approach in archaeological inference used to generate and test hypotheses by filling in gaps in the archaeological record with data from ethnography, ethnohistory, ethnoarchaeology, or experimental archaeology. Three of the five key themes that emerged from our forum at SAA’s 2019 Annual Meeting— “Keeping Comparisons Honest,” “Collaboration,” and “Audience Awareness”—are especially useful to an understanding of resilience in the Maya area.

Although analogy is an approach that can be misappropriated to create circular arguments, comparative analysis in general when used “honestly” can pinpoint similarities and differences across cultures (Smith and Peregrine 2012). In the context of resilience, comparative approaches can identify continuity and discontinuity, processes of stability and change, and responses to crisis within specific historical periods. In addition, a comparative study of resilience cross-culturally can serve as a laboratory of sorts to test the results of certain strategies to cope with crisis.

Defining Resilience

Discussions of resilience in archaeology have tended toward resilience theory, influenced by ecological and systems theory approaches. In this context, ecologists have contrasted engineering resilience, or the time required for a system to return to a single state of equilibrium, with ecological resilience, which acknowledges multiple states of equilibrium (Holling and Gunderson 2002). This latter model has been visualized as an adaptive cycle, whereby a system’s instability increases alongside the interconnectedness of its elements, ultimately collapsing due to external stressors. Although not strictly cyclical, this model when applied too rigidly to archaeology may assume discrete stages that oversimplify human systems. A strict interpretation of resilience theory draws too heavily on abstract models borrowed from general systems theory (Bradtmöller et al. 2017). The adaptive cycle should instead be considered a heuristic model that can serve as a guiding framework for understanding resilience. In this light, our models must be flexible to characterize complex processes.

Archaeologists would benefit from comparative interpretations of resilience from other social science fields, including psychology. Such approaches are also influenced by the ecological model, but their application to human individuals and communities assumes an added complexity (Fisher and Feinman 2005; Redman 2005). David Chandler (2014) has discussed psychological resilience in terms of “bounce-back ability,” or the ability of a subject to cope with external, oppressive conditions. Beyond resilience as stoicism, Chandler has identified “post-classical” resilience as a more realistic long-term process in which subjects continuously respond to their socio-ecological environment, developing new methods of coping.

In archaeology, such an approach would align well with landscape archaeology and historical ecology, which seek to understand the relationships between societies and their environment, not as environmentally deterministic but as...
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relational processes that develop over time. A comparative approach, therefore, would examine the specific strategies that societies or communities adopt to respond to or prepare for different periods of trauma. Alongside such a research agenda, archaeologists can compare different processes that work across separate timescales, what Ronald K. Faulseit (2016) has classified as cultural and political resilience, and what Patricia A. McAnany (2013) has previously discussed in the Maya context as the changing reliance on systems of kinship and kingship.

Adopting psychological and community resilience perspectives into archaeology can better acknowledge the role of agency in culture change. While discussions of political collapse often highlight human inaction as a contributing factor, the role of human action is sometimes minimized in the processes of cultural resilience. In Native American studies, however, scholars have rejected the notion of passive resilience, instead adopting the concept of survivance, a French term and a portmanteau of survival, resistance, and endurance, emphasizing an active form of presence and continuity (Vizenor 1999). Survivance is a specific form of resilience that takes place in settler-colonial contexts of genocide, but the recognition that resilience is not passive or accidental is important to recognize in other historical examples.

Direct Historical Approaches

The traditional focus of many Mayanists on the Classic period (AD 250–900) has previously led to the questioning of the utility of the direct historical approach as an analogy to Classic period political systems. The dramatic traumas and transformations of Maya societies since the Classic period are thought to have altered political systems to such an extent that projection into the past will lead to faulty inferences. These transformations include first the collapse and rejection of the k’uhul ajaw system of rulership in the southern Lowlands at sites like Palenque and Copan as early as the late eighth century and early ninth century, political reorganization across Mesoamerica during the Postclassic period (AD 900–1521), and later the period of Spanish conquest and colonialism beginning during the sixteenth century. Such a caution is necessary; however, this perspective reflects a bias toward the Classic period. When the focus shifts away from merely reconstructing Classic period political systems to an emphasis on resilience across time, comparative approaches offer an incredible opportunity to track and contrast cultural and political responses to crisis using a conjunctive approach of archaeology, anthropology, and history.

The political collapse in the southern Lowlands at the end of the Classic period has garnered extensive scholarly and public interest; however, these processes reflect only a limited period of trauma in the long history of Maya cultures (Diamond 2005; Webster 2002). A more complete understanding of resilience during the Classic period requires further engagement with other documented periods of crisis and survivance in the Maya area. A brief list of such periods would include attempts at political reorganization in the southern Lowlands at sites like Ceibal, Ucanal, Nakum, Tikal, and Calakmul, among others, and in the northern Lowlands, including at Chichen Itza and Mayapan. Examples of resilience are prominent during and after the Spanish conquest, including among the Tipu, Kowoj (Zacpetén), Itzá (Tayasal), Lacandón (Nahá, Lacanjá Chansayab), Lacandón Ch’ol (Lakam Tun), K’iche’ (Q’umarkaj), and Caste War refugees (Chan Santa Cruz), among others (Figure 1).

More recent history can also add important context to an understanding of landscape use and resilience throughout the region. Especially with ambiguous archaeological features—for example, crude, dry-laid stone walls throughout the Usumacinta and Petexbatun regions—their interpretation as defensive walls has been aided not only by drawing on ethnohistoric sources but also in their potential reuse during the Guatemalan civil war where the same tactical locations became significant defensive locations for the Comunidades de Poblaciones en Resistencia (Scherer and Golden 2009:298; Figure 2). A closer engagement with this recent history can aid in the interpretation of the relationship between defensive, agricultural, or other features; settlements; and the broader landscape. In this light, the direct historical approach can be useful not necessarily in...
reconstructing past sociopolitical systems but in understanding cultural resilience and how communities maintain or reestablish their links to places.

Other Analogies

Another effort to place analogical reasoning on a firm foundation, beyond the use of the direct historical approach, has involved either adopting comparisons from societies at similar levels of sociopolitical complexity and/or societies occupying analogous environmental contexts. Under this traditional approach, preindustrial agrarian societies in tropical latitudes provide the most suitable analogies for the prehispanic Maya. These guidelines also allow a comparison of ecological and cultural resilience across similar landscapes. However, as Lamoureux-St-Hilaire has argued in this issue, the variability of cultural landscapes across the Maya area, from the Highlands to the southern Lowlands to the northeastern Lowlands (as well as within these subregions) challenge such monolithic comparisons. To his point, adopting new terminology (e.g., the Mayas, Maya peoples, Maya cultures, etc.) could be beneficial in highlighting such variability. Still, a comparative method that seeks to identify both similarity and difference can draw on a range of archaeological cultures.

An approach concerned with resilience can benefit from engaging with comparison from societies like Angkor based in similar kinds of tropical environments, as well as societies that responded to natural and social crises in different environments (Chase and Scarborough 2014). Landscape modifications at Angkor may differ in type and scale from the forms of intensive agriculture adopted by the Maya, including terrace and wetland agriculture in response to limitations in the availability of groundwater and shallow soils. However, broader patterns of creation, modification, and abandonment of landesque capital, or improvements to land inherited across generations, in tropical environments, alongside the challenges in reusing such features and reoccupying areas that had not been maintained, provide compelling narratives for the explanation of prolonged periods of crisis that hampered later resettlement (Brookfield 2001; Figure 3).

Recent anthropological perspectives on crisis may serve to contextualize how past populations coped with crisis and instability. In wealthy nations, crisis tends to be considered as a rupture in a more desirable, prosperous state (Hage 2009). Crisis is therefore viewed as a singular event that upsets longer periods of stability, a brief moment that one has to pass through temporarily. However, one interpretation of history is that crisis is actually the norm and stability the exception, and indeed for many people and societies today, crisis is a chronic state, forcing people to remain resilient in volatile situations that have no indication of improving within an individual’s lifetime (Erickson 1999). Ghassan Hage (2009) has introduced the concept of permanent or persistent crisis, implying the existence of constant ruptures. This approach emphasizes the possibilities for exercising agency even in times where that agency is limited, an existential immobility that Hage (2009) terms “stuckedness.” This sense of stuckedness builds “a sense of community among those who ‘wait out’ the crisis” (Hage 2009:102).

Although some Maya kingdoms showed a degree of stability across multiple centuries, persistent crisis is a useful term to...
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describe the instability of some kingdoms throughout much of the Classic period. Adopting this perspective can help us shift away from an explanation of why the southern Lowlands experienced a political collapse during the eighth and ninth centuries to questions that address how kingdoms and communities remained resilient through earlier periods of crisis. Epigraphic sources, as well as comparative data from other unstable political systems, whether so-called archaic states or “chieflty” societies elsewhere in the Americas, can contextualize this resilience in spite of political crisis.

Conclusion

An understanding of the relationships among Maya people, landscapes, and cultural and ecological resilience relies on comparative approaches adopting perspectives from diverse communities of scholars, fields of study, and stakeholders. Research from environmental archaeologists provides crucial datasets to interpret resilience and stakeholders. Beyond being honest about the purposes of such comparisons, landscape studies will continue to necessitate collaboration. Such collaboration involves engagement with diverse specialists, including soil scientists, hydrologists, paleoethnobotanists, and faunal analysts, among others. In addition to the obvious benefits of such collaborations, further collaboration with stakeholder communities, whether descendant or other local communities, can provide an opportunity for archaeologists and local stakeholders to learn from each other. Although the cultural and natural landscapes of the Maya area are continuously being transformed, the agricultural practices of modern rural populations provide information relating to how people respond to environmental changes, and in turn how the environment is impacted over the short and long term. Furthermore, if the knowledge gained from the study of past societies is to impact future sustainability, modern communities must be part of this research from the outset.

Finally, as Mayanists draw on comparisons from past and contemporary societies, engagement with the broader public can highlight the accomplishments of the Maya and other Indigenous cultures who are too often left out of historical narratives. In turn, scholars working in other parts of the world can adopt and test archaeological models generated in the Maya area. Despite the lacunae in the archaeological record and the ambiguous data archaeologists face in the Maya area, the Maya have provided a wealth of data on settlement patterns, low-density urbanism, state formation, and cultural continuity that can inform the archaeology of other world regions. Through teaching, outreach, and popular writing, we can continue to challenge and to correct misconceptions about Maya culture and history, and perhaps the public will increasingly begin to cite the Maya not as an example of the failure of past civilizations but as a remarkable illustration of cultural continuity and persistence in the face of environmental and social crises and colonialism.
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Household archaeologists, and archaeologists more generally, face the critical challenge of re-peopling ancient landscapes.

—Cynthia Robin, “New Directions in Classic Maya Household Archaeology”

As we commit archaeology in the twenty-first century, scholars of the human past must come to a singular understanding about the nature of our field. Theory, as a unified framework for the explanation of antiquity, is dead. We do not inhabit the science envisioned by Lew Binford and the old “New Archaeology.” There are no highly focused investigations using middle-range theory to build general covering laws concerning the evolutionary nature of human culture. Similarly, the postprocessual future also failed to emerge. There is no widespread acceptance of material culture-as-text, using the deconstruction of such texts to subvert and undermine existing structures of inequality and power. “Theory is dead,” wrote Arthur Demarest (2009:262). “It died of terminology.”

Yet the critical challenge of archaeology remains. This includes the exploration and explanation of human antiquity, all the while in the context of a post-paradigmatic field. Archaeology can function, and function well, without large-scale theory. Indeed, defined as the investigation of the human past through the medium of the archaeological record, archaeology does not especially need Thomas Kuhn or his paradigms at all. A thousand different theories can flourish, each tailored to specific research needs and the local archaeological record. All the while the larger archaeological project remains, the exploration and explanation of the past. Central to this project is the ability to accurately model the past, and not just with abstracted social and political units but with individuals, collections of individuals, and the cultures they used and created. Our task is realistically depicting people in the past or, as Cynthia Robin (2003:334) writes, “re-peopling the ancient landscape.” Robin (2001, 2003) has written specifically about household archaeology, but her ideas can be broadly applied at diverse social scales. Structures do not build themselves. Cultures did not inhabit abstracted settlement patterns. Housemounds and complexes did not spring, unbidden, from the earth. People did these things. Re-peopling an ancient landscape involves a special focus on actual human beings. As we do not have direct access to these people, the archaeological record exists as proxy data that imperfectly reflect past actions. Ancient people did not live in abstracted social units; they lived in families, however they chose to define them. They did not inhabit settlement pattern models; they lived in their own equivalents of farms, villages, communities, and cities. They did not labor under theorized oppressive political structures; they governed and were governed by kings, queens, lords, captains, and governors, again, whatever they chose to call them. To re-peopling these ancient landscapes, to move from abstract concepts to meaningful units, requires the application of comparative analogy to the proxy data of the archaeological record.

Theory Is Dead. Analogy Is Not.

Analogy has long been considered something of an ugly step-child of archaeological thought. In his introduction to this set of articles, Maxime Lamoureux-St-Hilaire details the discussions over the use of analogy in the landmark articles from the 1960s to the 1980s. His summary covers strengths and weaknesses in the uses of analogy in archaeology, the dangers of overreliance on single or particular sources, and the ways in which analogy tends to flatten or homogenize different diverse peoples. From that literature, we have the two well-known approaches to the use of analogy, cross-cultural and direct-historical. In cross-cultural analogy, different cultures, separated in time and space, are directly compared. In direct-historical analogy, scholars compare ancient people to their most likely descendants, generally making analogies from the present into the past. Both are valid perspectives from which to build predictive models of the archaeological record, although they come with well-documented caveats. These caveats have led to fierce criticism of, and often knee-jerk reactions to, the use of analogy to guide archaeological interpretation.

This essay is not a literature review of the debate over the advantages and disadvantages of the use of analogy in archaeological thinking. It is an exploratory essay on the use of analogy as a solution to the problem of re-peopling the ancient past and as a solution to the difficulties of archaeological
thought in the twenty-first century. Analogy, either cross-cultural or direct-historical, can generate culturally meaningful social units and then suggest ways in which these units interacted with each other through time. Used in this way, it generates predictive models that can be tested against archaeological proxies. For a post-paradigmatic field, analogy serves as a powerful investigatory tool, functioning as both theory and method for the exploration and explanation of the human past. This essay discusses the ways in which analogy can best function as theory and method and, indeed, the ways that scholars have already used analogy in this manner. It is long past time to embrace this stepchild, who was never that ugly to begin with.

For the exploration of the human past, we must begin with a concept of culture as an integrated whole, yet one that possesses numerous moving and interlocking parts. These parts could be interlocked systems, an economy or a social system. It could be an individual household on a landscape, surrounded by neighbors and relations. A part could even be a single individual, if such resolution is available. The importance of transforming analogy into predictive, testable, conditional statements lies in the realization that one does not have to use an entire society or culture as the basis for analogy. As Demarest pointed out in our 2019 forum, we can just use the parts, or elements of the “polythetic sets,” that are relevant for the research at hand. This approach is depicted in Figure 1. One has a fairly well-known culture, Classical Greece, Feudal Japan, modern hunter-gatherers, or the ethnographic, ethnohistoric Maya. The entire society is not the basis for comparison but rather the analogous portions relevant to the topic being researched. The analogies are transformed into conditional statements that are tested against the archaeological record. If Maya political structures resembled Classical Greek city-states, then our investigations should produce data similar to that of Classical Greece. Analogy then becomes a way to build an argument and, thus, produce knowledge about the society or culture that is only known archaeologically. It is both theory and method, freed from constraints of large-scale paradigmatic thought.

Such comparative approaches help not only with the exploration of the past but with its explanation as well. Analogy allows us to find spaces of convergence between scholars, descendant communities, and the general public. It uses terminology that most people are familiar with and avoids complicated theoretical constructs. People generally know what a city-state is. A ruling figure such as a king or queen does not need to be explained. A “family” is easier to describe than a “conjugal unit.” Individual kingdoms locked in cycles of warfare and diplomacy among enemies and allies is easier to grasp than a generalized discussion of peer-polity interactions. Of course, the application of common terms should not be done without considerable thought. Analogies should be explicitly stated as such. Both descendant communities and the general public know what an analogy is. Describing a nucleated Classic Maya polity as a kind of city-state provides an explanation for an ancient phenomenon that most people can connect with.
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They can, hopefully, grasp the limitations of the analogy as well. For example, Patricia A. McAnany described the term “Royal Court” as a successful comparative term. Scholars borrowed the label from medieval societies in Europe, China, and Japan. They noted the similarities between these known societies and the archaeology of the big Classic centers. “Royal Court” is a term immediately grasped by readers in either descendant communities or in the general public. It requires little elaboration. A successful use of analogy, the term “Royal Court” explores and explains archaeological research. Using this manner of comparative analogy, scholars have “peopled the Classic Maya court” (Houston and Stuart 2001).

What Can Be Done

The best case study for successful use of comparative analogy as both theory and method comes from a project most Mayanists already know. In the early 2000s, Bruce Dahlin and his colleagues (2007) studied the geochemical signatures present in an open space at the Classic Maya city of Chunchucmil. The location of this open space and the general agricultural paucity of the area led Dahlin to suspect the presence of a marketplace in the center of this city. They then studied a known culture, the modern Maya market in Antigua, Guatemala. From that culture, they focused on the analogous portion, a modern marketplace, and tested the soil chemical residues. The geochemical signatures could then be compared to the geochemical signatures from Chunchucmil. The results tally (Figure 2). This correlation strongly suggests the presence of a marketplace at Chunchucmil during the period of its occupation. It is a simple, strong, analogous argument that seems to have convinced a large portion of the field about the presence of marketplaces and marketing activity in Classic Maya civilization. Dahlin produced knowledge about an ancient society that did not previously exist, and he did so without any reference to a large-scale theoretical paradigm. It remains a brilliant piece of post-paradigmatic archaeological research using comparative analogy between a known culture and an archaeological one in a direct historical manner.

My own research has featured both the use of comparative analogy and purely theoretical models. In my recent work on changing settlement at the Classic Maya city of El Perú-Waka’ in Guatemala, I suggested that changes in urban settlement might be a result of insecurity on the landscape. Toward the end of the eighth century AD, outlying communities seem to have been partially or wholly abandoned in favor of a densely nucleated population living in the old city’s defensible core. I made a distinct, cross-cultural analogy between medieval Italy of the tenth century and the Classic Maya of the eighth century (Eppich 2015). In Italy, the decline of centralized authority and the collapse of civil society rendered the landscape exceptionally dangerous. Tenth-century Italians abandoned their dispersed villas and villages on the productive valley floors to cluster into heavily fortified hilltop towns and highly defensible castles. This shift in Italian history is known as the “incastellamento,” the castling of the medieval population, the term itself borrowed from chess. My published and ongoing work argues that the Maya engaged in their own incastellamento during the shift from the Late to the Terminal Classic period, roughly AD 750–850. Outlying farms and villages were abandoned while densely populated cities grew and groaned with inhabitants. If so, then further exploration of the archaeological record around the site core should yield numerous early eighth-century farms and communities in the city’s rural periphery and a general scarcity of those same farms and communities for the later ninth century. At least so far, this seems to be the case. Ceramics dating to the ninth and tenth centuries are concentrated in the site core and in the residential neighborhoods immediately adjacent to the site core (Figure 3). Outside the city center, the outlying rural
areas seem only lightly dusted with the same ceramics. While research is ongoing, it appears that the people in rural landscapes of this area were on the move during the late eighth and early ninth centuries.

Conclusion
Ultimately, it does not matter where testable hypotheses come from. The important bit is the testable part—in this case, the transformation of comparative analogy into conditional statements. “Analogies,” writes Martin Wobst (2016:1083), “are simply devices to stimulate the invention of ideas.” As such, they are just thought-tools used in generating hypotheses. But they are potent tools, especially in their ability to re-humanize the past and re-people ancient landscapes. And, of course, the true value of any tool lies in how well it is used, if I may be permitted to make that analogy.

In evaluating our own arguments and the overall use of comparative analogy, there are real opportunities to be critical of arguments in general and of our own hypotheses in particular. Is the analogy appropriate? Are the conditional statements testable? Do expectations match excavated evidence? Would other analogies be more appropriate? All of this includes revisiting the utility of how we generate hypotheses and re-examining the ultimate goals of Maya archaeology, as well as the best way to achieve these goals.

The answers to these questions should be communicated to non-specialists. Archaeologists should be able to explain what they are doing and why they are doing it. We should never be baffled or insulted by anyone asking, “Why do you bother?” Comparative analogy provides a ready, comprehensible response. There were people on this land, ancient Americans, whose past matters to our present. We study these people to learn the commonalities present in all human societies, or to learn what makes certain societies distinct. We study the past to connect cultures that are only known archaeologically to both their descendant communities and to the general public, who, ultimately, support and fund our own existence as scholars of the past.

Finally, there is a certain freedom to be found in the use of comparative analogy as theory and method. There is great flexibility to be found when research goals are no longer slaved to the demands of large-scale theoretical constructs. The post-paradigmatic nature of our field should be embraced and not lamented. Where we go from here is up to us.
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In my experience, publishing an academic archaeology book is like dropping a pebble into a dark pool. A few ripples maybe, but mostly my books just get swallowed up and disappear. In the first year after publication of a book, I might get a couple reviews and, perhaps, a few hundred copies might get sold—most of which are purchased by libraries, where my books sit mostly unread. My friends and colleagues congratulate me on the book, while freely admitting they have never read it. In time, I include the book in my promotion materials and, with luck, get job security and a raise. Don't get me wrong, I am very grateful to have tenure, and I am constantly stunned that anyone would pay me to be an archaeologist. But what I really want are readers, and for the most part, I have not attracted as many as I would like through traditional academic publishing. Sadly, based on the numbers, my experience is typical of most archaeologists.

While specifics are hard to come by, the average academic book (archaeological or otherwise) sells about 300 copies in its lifetime—mostly to libraries (Barclay 2015). Print runs of academic books are often 1,000 copies or less. Given these low numbers, publishers need to charge high prices for their books to remain profitable or, as is often the case for the small academic presses, merely less unprofitable. Even following this dismal economic logic, the academic publishing industry requires the unpaid, or barely paid, labor of authors and peer reviewers. One of my colleagues laughs about a book contract she signed that specified she would get royalties starting with the thousandth copy sold, while the print run was only 800. The reward for all of this unpaid labor is the privilege of stocking our personal libraries with paperbacks that often cost $60 or more. No wonder so few of my friends and colleagues have bought my books, and I have not bought theirs. And so, academics now find themselves volunteering their labor for an academic publishing industry that is failing in its most basic goal—authors sharing their works with readers. To be clear, the cost of books is not the only barrier to finding readers, and there is also the fact that none of us have the time to read as much as we would like. I cannot give my friends and colleagues more time, but I can, at least, give them the book. At a minimum, they will have to come up with a new excuse for why they didn’t read it.

In mid-September of 2019, I uploaded the entirety of my most recent book, An Unauthorized Companion to American Archaeological Theory (Fogelin 2019), in both PDF and EPUB formats to my academia.edu page (https://arizona.academia.edu/LarsFogelin). The book was the product of more than three years of dedicated work, but rather than publish it through an academic press, I gave it away for free. I did all of this as an experiment—an experiment in writing, an experiment in open-access publishing, but mostly an experiment in finding readers. Today, a bit more than month later, I feel like I have found my readers for the first time in my academic career. Throughout the process of writing, publishing, and promoting the book, I have learned a few things that I believe may have value for other archaeologists. In a nutshell, it really is not that hard to give away a book—and with a few disciplinary changes, it could be standard practice for all archaeologists. But just as importantly, foregoing academic publishing freed me from many of the worst elements of academic writing. It allowed me to find my voice. As it turns out, that voice is an obnoxious punk biting the hand that feeds him (Caraher et al. 2014).
I originally intended *An Unauthorized Companion* to be a short piece, a supplement for graduate students facing their first theory class. After years of teaching archaeological theory, I wanted to write something that said “everything is going to be all right.” Sure, some archaeological theory is esoteric and dense, but with some exceptions, archaeological theory really ain’t that hard. With a command of a few basic concepts and some healthy skepticism, anybody can engage with theory and use it to understand the lives of people in the past.

As I began writing, I quickly realized that I could not employ the same kind of rarefied academic language I was criticizing. If theory is practical, the writing needed to reflect that. If theory is fun, the writing needed to reflect that. If theory is a product of archaeological practice, the writing needed to reflect that, whether those practices are good, bad, or just plain stupid. Freed from the artifice of academic writing, I was able to give voice to my inner punk and shake my tiny fist at the archaeological establishment—an establishment of which I am undoubtedly a member. My writing began to include jokes, swears, and intentionally outrageous statements questioning archaeological orthodoxies. Yet, I also found I was able to convey complex critiques in fairly simple ways. Perhaps most surprisingly, I found I could address profound and troubling issues in archaeology—issues like sexism, racism, and inequality—far better than I could using academic language. It is hard to call out bigotry if you cannot use the word “bigot.” The result of all of this was a short book that no academic press would ever publish. I never planned on self-publishing; it was simply the inevitable result of the writing choices I made along the way.

As I came to the end of writing, I became increasingly anxious about how to make the e-book. I was scared at the thought of publishing without peer reviewers, copyeditors, and jacket designers. Peer review fell to a few unfortunate people: my spouse and several colleagues, to whom I am very grateful. None of them got paid, of course, but formal peer reviewers would not have received more than a token payment by a traditional academic press in any case. I handled production myself. I started by looking at well-designed e-books, considering complex and interesting typefaces and radical new formatting options. In the end, I realized I have no talents as a graphic artist and simply chose the simplest design possible and used a reliably legible font. I used Microsoft Word to make the PDF version, with margins scaled to fit nicely on a laptop or tablet. It was more difficult to make the EPUB version, but I followed a friend’s directions to strip out all the formatting from the manuscript before using Apple Pages to convert it to an EPUB (Adams 2019). I made my own cover. All told, it took a couple days to format the PDF and a couple hellacious weeks to produce the EPUB. Other than those two weeks of formatting, all of the unpaid work writing and reviewing the book would have been just as unpaid, or barely paid, had I published through an academic press.

Based on this experience, I have concluded that much of the discussion about open-access publishing is overwrought. Far too much attention is paid to writing grants, raising money, and paying archaeological journals and academic publishers to release works for free. The fee for posting open-access journal articles ranges from several hundred to several thousand dollars. There are no standard fees for books, but it can be expected that the fees would be substantially more. I am not suggesting that the fees charged by publishers are unfair. The editors, copyeditors, and jacket designers need to be paid. There are printing costs. I have no doubt that *An Unauthorized Companion* would benefit from professional copyediting and someone with artistic talent designing the cover. There are few things in this world I love more than holding a well-made book in my hands. But is all that extra expense worth it? Most archaeologists cannot afford open-access fees, and we cannot rely on the ad hoc use of grants to support the regular production of archaeological articles and books. How about we all try something else? Let’s just make the books ourselves and give them away. The books we produce might be a bit less polished than those produced professionally, they might only exist as e-books, but at least someone might actually read the damn things.

All of this is why I posted *An Unauthorized Companion* on academia.edu rather than publishing it through normal channels. Once I uploaded it, I sent e-mail messages announcing it to friends at other universities, and a few of my former students wrote about it on Facebook and Twitter. In the month following publication, the PDF version of *An Unauthorized Companion* was downloaded about 680 times and the EPUB about 50 times. That is, in one month, the downloads of my self-published book exceeded the lifetime sales of any of my previous, traditionally published books—though I freely admit that comparing downloads to book sales is an imperfect comparison at best. I have since sent the book out for review at the major journals, and I am happy to say that, with the exception of *American Antiquity*, all have welcomed it despite its odd provenance. They may or may not review it, and if they do, the reviews may or may not be positive, but most book reviews editors with whom I have corresponded were not overly troubled that the book was self-published. All of this, though, requires some further discussion.

There is no doubt that the downloads of *An Unauthorized Companion* and the willingness of journals to review it are at least partly due to my existing reputation in the field of archaeological theory—a reputation based entirely on my previous traditional publications, the use of a couple of those publications in archaeological theory classes, and my position as a tenured faculty member in a prominent archaeology program. It was a hell of a lot easier for me to give away a book and get people to read and review it than it would be for someone just starting out. One of the most important benefits of traditional peer review and publishing is bringing the work of new and lesser-known authors to the attention of the broader archaeological community.

---

**WHAT I LEARNED WRITING AN IRREVERENT ARCHAEOLOGICAL THEORY BOOK AND GIVING IT AWAY FOR FREE**
Publication through a traditional publisher tells would-be readers that the work has already been reviewed and found to be worthwhile. If other archaeologists, particularly junior archaeologists, begin to give away their books, we are going to need a new system for bringing self-published books to the attention of archaeologists. What is needed is a central clearinghouse for self-published, open-access archaeological books and articles—a location where the works of junior and lesser-known archaeologists can be easily found, read, and, most importantly, reviewed by other archaeologists.

As to what this clearinghouse would look like, it really is not that hard to imagine. The clearinghouse would be a website where archaeologists could post their work as PDFs, EPUBs, or whatever. Since there would be no peer review prior to publication, there would need to be a way for people to review and recommend papers after publication—a.k.a., post-publication peer review (Swoger 2014). In order to keep the website from descending into a particularly noxious Reddit forum, only archaeologists would be allowed to publish and review (using their real names), but everyone would be able to view and download whatever was published. The result would be a single, central location for self-published, open-access archaeological works with post-publication peer review replacing traditional peer review.

Hosting papers and allowing reviews is not an overly complex programming issue. The website could likely be constructed with off-the-shelf components. As for storing the papers and books, terabyte hard drives now cost less than $50 apiece. In fact, the only part that would be difficult would be screening legitimate archaeologists who would be allowed to post works and review them. Building and maintaining that list would be a major chore. As luck would have it, there is already an organization in the United States that has just this sort of list, publishes archaeological works, and fosters archaeological innovation. This group is called the Society for American Archaeology, and they already have a website with a dedicated “Member Center” that is password protected. At fairly minimal cost, the SAA could add a new section to their website where archaeologists could post their works and review the works of others—open access, for free, for everyone. It is difficult to imagine a more appropriate activity for an organization that seeks “to expand access, for free, for everyone. It is difficult to imagine a more appropriate activity for an organization that seeks “to expand access, for free, for everyone.”

The final question for self-publishing in archaeology, at least for academic archaeologists, is how these works will factor into tenure and promotion? At this point I do not know how colleges and universities will evaluate self-published works—though, because I am an associate professor who plans to put himself forward for promotion to the rank of full professor within the next couple years, I guess I will find out soon enough. How universities and colleges account for self-published works will determine if self-publishing will be restricted to those who have already established their reputation through traditional publishing, or whether self-publishing and post-publication peer review will become another way younger archaeologists can bring dynamic new ideas and discoveries to the discipline. Until archaeologists accept self-published works for promotion and tenure, I cannot suggest, in good conscience, that my younger colleagues self-publish their own works. For now, all I can say is that I can see no reason why I would publish a book through an academic press ever again—there is simply no upside. It appears I am getting more readers giving my book away for free. I think it is time for archaeologists to ask why, if we are already giving our labor to academic publishers, should we not just start giving away the product of our labor as well?
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he distinguished archaeologist Dr. Michael D. Coe, known to students and colleagues as Mike, passed away on September 25, 2019. He was 90. Mike had an enormous influence on the field of Mesoamerican archaeology, especially within Maya studies, and he trained many generations of students that carry on his legacy. On behalf of those students, I offer this brief tribute to the mentor who many of us considered both professor and friend.

Mike's professional accomplishments are copious and not easily summarized. A member of the National Academy of Sciences and a recipient of the Order of the Quetzal, the highest honor bestowed by the government of Guatemala, Mike was a prolific author and expert storyteller who brought ancient cultures vibrantly to life. He was the author of over 20 books, many of which remained in print for much of his 50 years of academic scholarship, including his influential volume, *The Maya*, first published in 1966 and now in its ninth edition. Coe loved the written word, and he expected sophisticated prose from his students. He was deeply committed to making archaeological research accessible to anyone with an interest. Although perhaps best known for his role in promoting the phonetic basis of Maya hieroglyphic writing, at a time when much of the field rejected such a notion, Coe is also well known for being an early advocate of environmental archaeology, especially in the Gulf Coast Olmec area. His project in the 1960s at the important Olmec center of San Lorenzo and his resulting publication, *In the Land of the Olmec* (1980), utilized detailed topographic mapping of the landscape surrounding this center in conjunction with stratigraphic excavations, ceramic analysis, and iconographic data to reconstruct the origins of Olmec civilization. In addition to being a foundational contribution to the field of Olmec archaeology, this project provided a template for the integration of stratigraphy and artwork, the daily and the transcendent, that has become a hallmark of Mesoamerican archaeology.

In later work, he would bring the same insistence that art be taken seriously as anthropological data to his understanding of ancient Maya culture. *The Maya Scribe and His World* (1973), a publication that arose out of an exhibit Mike organized of rarely seen Classic Maya vases at the Grolier Club in New York City, is considered by many Mayanists to be among the most important publications of the twentieth century. The beautiful and precise renderings of Classic Maya iconography presented in this volume were matched only by Mike's prescient interpretations of the mythological and courtly scenes and his identification of the Primary Standard Sequence, a band of hieroglyphs found on many of the vases. This work continues to be cited regularly by Maya archaeologists, epigraphers, and iconographers, nearly 50 years after its publication. Mike remained at the forefront of Mesoamerican archaeology until his death, contributing to the work of his students and others two weeks before he passed. As recently as 2018, Mike was in the news when the Grolier Codex (now known as the Códice Maya de México)—which Mike published as genuine in the 1970s but which many considered a forgery—was finally authenticated by an international team of experts as the earliest ancient Maya book. That same year, Mike participated in the SAA meetings as a discussant in a panel on Angkorian Cambodia.

Michael D. Coe was educated at Harvard (AB 1950, PhD 1959), where, famously, he met his life partner, the food scholar Sophie Dobzhansky Coe. He would complete her manuscript *The True History of Chocolate* (1996) after her premature death near the time of his retirement from Yale. Like many young anthropologists of his generation, he served briefly in the CIA and learned Mandarin while stationed in Taiwan. He taught first at the University of Tennessee (1958–1960) and spent the rest of his
career at Yale University as the Charles J. MacCurdy Professor of Anthropology, Coe served as chair of the Department of Anthropology and the Council on Archaeological Studies and was a curator of anthropology at the Peabody Museum of Natural History. His career was centered in Mesoamerica, but Coe published regularly on research in Cambodia and colonial New England, areas of long-term fascination.

When Mike was an undergraduate student at Harvard, a family vacation to Yucatán provided him the opportunity to visit Chichen Itza, and Mike immediately switched his major from English to anthropology, under the guidance of the renowned Alfred Tozzer. Family travel remained important to Mike throughout his life, and he was always planning new excursions with his five children and later with his many grandchildren. If these excursions included fly-fishing in addition to other adventures, all the better.

At this moment in the early twenty-first century, when archaeology as a discipline is reckoning with its unacceptable history of mistreatment of women, it is notable that Mike unequivocally and generously supported the research of numerous female graduate students throughout his career, from the early 1960s until after his retirement in the late 1990s. His deep respect for female scholars was evident in how he spoke about the research of his partner, Sophie, and that of groundbreaking epigraphers such as Tatiana Proskouriakoff and Linda Schele. Mike was always more interested in new ideas and precise analysis than he was with pigeonholing anyone.

As a professor, he was often away for long periods of time on research, generous with his library and photos, full of stories of new discoveries that no one else had yet heard about, and consistent in his expectations of excellence. His insatiable curiosity about the ancient world was infectious, and no one survived his classes unless they too were ready to share in his fascination with the intricacies of indigenous America. Mentors who truly take pleasure in supporting their students, with no ego to wound and no party line to uphold, are rare to find. Mike will live on not only in his voluminous scholarship and pathbreaking discoveries but also through the collegial treatment of anyone truly passionate about the past.

—Traci Ardren, University of Miami
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OSVALDO SILVA GALDAMES
1940–2019

Osvaldo Silva Galdames died at the age of 78, on March 3, 2019, in Santiago, Chile, as a consequence of an accidental fall while vacationing in Rocas de Santo Domingo. Silva Galdames, an archaeologist and historian, graduated from Universidad de Chile. With support from a grant from the Fulbright Program, he did graduate work at Temple University, where he received his MA in anthropology in 1971. He was a doctoral student in anthropology at Cornell University from 1973 through 1975, with the support of a fellowship from the Ford Foundation. It was here, under the tutelage of John V. Murra, that Osvaldo became interested in Andean ethnohistory. He is well known for his contributions to the field of ethnohistory, and he was a professor at the Universidad de Chile for more than 50 years.

I came to know him when we were undergraduate students. In fact, along with four other classmates, and under Osvaldo’s leadership, we fought to gain the needed recognition for archaeological studies at our university and its history department. As students, we also attended the first Congress of Chilean Archaeology in San Pedro de Atacama in 1963, on the occasion that the Sociedad Chilena de Arqueología was founded. Because of our involvement, the university initially implemented elective courses in archaeology and anthropology, and years later, the Department of Anthropology was created. Meanwhile, the Department of History incorporated ethnohistory into its curriculum, and Osvaldo was also a key figure in the development of this area of scholarship and teaching at our university. I have fond memories from the time we were classmates, identifying with each other about what we thought about archaeology and anthropology studies in an environment that had hardly recognized such interests by faculty and students. I was glad to become one of his best friends. Being myself from outside the big city of Santiago (from Punta Arenas by the Magellan Strait thousands of miles away in the extreme south), Osvaldo introduced me to his family. I became quite familiar to his parents, brothers, and sisters. Together, we dreamed about doing fieldwork, discovering unknown cultures, and pursuing careers in anthropology. We shared a fondness for the Universidad de Chile, where we were students, and where Osvaldo was later a professor. I recall with great nostalgia the days when we, having saved some of the little money that we made when we were students, attended some of the soccer matches during the 1962 World Cup together.

Osvaldo’s passion for the social sciences, and in particular the fields of history and ethnohistory, was influenced by his grandfather, Francisco Galdames, an eminent historian who wrote a well-known history of Chile. I recall his wonderful library when visiting his grandfather’s summer house by the beach, where rare books kept our interest alive.

By the early 1970s, Osvaldo became involved in what has been defined as one of the most important scholarly projects in Chile, the Encyclopedia of Chile. The project, initiated by the Chilean government and Congress in the 1940s, was intended to be a national project for documenting the foundational characteristics of our country and compiling documents of different sorts. Knowledge generated through this project was meant to provide specific guidelines for national development and strategic planning. I worked closely with Osvaldo on the encyclopedia, because anthropology and archaeology played important roles in this project. Overall, some 80,000 articles related to geography and economics were written, some 17,000 on natural sciences, and over 35,000 on topics such as history, archaeology, education, and politics.

Although this mammoth project did not conclude as had been planned, it did generate an enormous number of documents, which have been archived in the Library of Congress in Santiago. In 2007, a new project was started in an effort to recover and to digitize some of the archived materials, and 3,557 collections of documents—each one containing thousands of articles—have now been digitized and are accessible to scholars and students.

As an ethnohistorian, Osvaldo developed two lines of research, one focused on the study of the Mapuche cultural tradition in Chile, and another focused on the Inka. One example of his contributions to Inka studies was his involvement in the Inka road project led by John Hyslop and his consideration of Inka roads and settlements in areas in the southern part of the Inka empire, near Santiago. Perhaps his most important contribution in the field of ethnohistory was his work on the Mapuche culture of Chile. Oswaldo studied topics such as Mapuche agricultural systems and socioeconomic structures.

continued on page 42
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JAMES B. STOLTMAN
1935–2019

James B. Stoltman, professor emeritus of anthropology at the University of Wisconsin, died in Madison on September 11, 2019. Jim’s career spanned nearly six decades of research, teaching, service, and outreach. He worked in various regions of North America and in China, with the majority of his contributions in the midcontinental United States. His work profoundly influenced how archaeologists understand virtually every Midwestern cultural tradition, from Paleoindian through Mississippian.

Jim was born in Minneapolis, and he received his undergraduate education in geology at the University of Minnesota, graduating in 1957. He then served in the U.S. Navy for four years. His teaching career began at Tulane University (1965–1966), after which he moved to Wisconsin where he joined the faculty in the Department of Anthropology at UW-Madison. He was tenured in 1970 and promoted to the rank of full professor in 1974, and he served as department chair from 1981 until 1984. His “retirement” in 1998 only accelerated his collegial collaborations and research output.

Jim earned his MA in anthropology at the University of Minnesota in 1962 and his PhD in anthropology at Harvard University in 1967. He incorporated his master’s thesis into his monograph on the Laurel culture of Minnesota (Stoltman 1973). His PhD dissertation (Stoltman 1974) focused on the prehistory of Groton Plantation in South Carolina. His influences at Minnesota and Harvard were Elden Johnson and Stephen Williams, respectively. The majority of Jim’s subsequent research, field schools, and publications focused on Wisconsin, though he returned to Southeastern topics with some frequency.

Jim published important regional and pan-regional syntheses (e.g., Stoltman 1978, 1979, 1992; Stoltman and Christiansen 2000), paying careful attention to disentangling formal and temporal units. His methodological contributions are particularly notable, especially his applications of ceramic petrography as a means of addressing ancient interaction and technology throughout North America as well as in Mesoamerica, South America, and China. His petrographic research in the eastern United States has been a game-changer in our understanding of Hopewell (e.g., Stoltman 2015) and Mississippian (e.g., Stoltman 1991) societies. Jim’s special gift was the ability to combine explorations of significant historical and processual issues (e.g., the nature of contact between Woodland and Mississippian societies) with innovative and influential analytical approaches to those questions (e.g., quantitative ceramic petrography), all in clear, jargon-free prose. For a full list of Jim’s approximately 100 publications, see the January–December 2019 issue of The Wisconsin Archaeologist (vol. 100, nos. 1–2).

Jim served as major professor on 22 doctoral dissertations. Half of them dealt with topics in Midcontinental archaeology, ranging from the Early Archaic through Mississippian traditions, while the other half covered a variety of subjects in areas ranging from northern and western North America to Australia, Europe, and the Middle East. This breadth reflects Jim’s catholic approach to archaeology, his promotion of the thoughtful application of method and theory regardless of geographic setting, and his keen interest in, support for, and trust in his students’ work wherever it might take them. Many of his students contributed to a full issue of the Midcontinental Journal of Archaeology in his honor (vol. 25, no. 2, Fall 2000).

As an instructor, Jim was remarkable. His teaching evaluations in all of his courses were exceptional, usually ranking at the top of the department. In addition to the usual mix of introductory and advanced courses for full-time students, he often taught an evening course on Wisconsin archaeology, attracting many continuing students and others interested in local archaeology. His courses on archaeological method and theory were legendary among his graduate students for the towers of books and copious notes he required—all of which became essential in their own careers as teachers and mentors.

Jim served as a governor’s appointee to the Wisconsin Historic Preservation Review Board and the Burial Sites Preservation Board. He was also elected as president of the Wisconsin Archeological Survey and the Wisconsin Archeological Society; the latter organization awarded him its Lapham...
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Research Medal in 1979. He was elected as an American Academy for the Advancement of Science Fellow in 1982, and the Midwest Archaeological Conference conferred upon him its Distinguished Career Award in 2015. Jim received numerous research grants from NSF, NEH, National Geographic, and other agencies and organizations.

More important than all of his professional achievements was Jim, the person. He was a genuine, true human being. He didn’t think of himself; he thought about others. He cared, and he did it all with a boyish grin and a joy for life that was contagious. He was a guide, mentor, colleague, and friend to countless people for decades. He will be missed.

Jim is survived by his wife of nearly 60 years, Sallie, their children, Wendy, Jeff, and Andy, four grandchildren, and one great-grandchild. We urge you to read the family’s tribute to Jim at https://www.cressfuneralservice.com/obituary/332798/James-Jim-Stoltman/.
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Osvaldo Silva Galdames, continued from page 40

from the 1500s through 1700s. His scholarship on the Promaucaes, on the southern frontier of the Inka Empire, has made important contributions to knowledge of the Mapuche people, knowledge that is crucial to government officials in the present as the Mapuche community seeks recognition and integration within the modern nation of Chile.

Osvaldo was a professor of Latin American history and ethnology, chair of the Department of History several times, co-founder and editor of Cuadernos de Historia, and founder of Revista de Historia Índígena. He was also a visiting professor at several universities in Latin America, including the Universidad del Valle, Cali, Colombia, and Universidad de Sao Paulo, Brazil, where he taught courses on colonial history in the Americas. Among his scholarly works, it is important to highlight Prehistoria de América (1990, Editorial Universitaria), Culturas y pueblos de Chile prehispánico (1991, Editorial Salesiana), and his Historia de Chile, which has been re-issued 17 times since its original publication in 1991 (Editorial Universitaria).

Osvaldo Silva Galdames’s legacy is reflected in the numerous young professionals he taught, his research activities, and most importantly his leadership in transforming the anthropology profession in Chile into an important contribution to the country’s development. Undoubtedly, he will be dearly missed especially by his former students, who will continue to pursue and to advance his interests as the best remembrance of the excellent professor he was.

—William Green (Beloit College), T. Douglas Price (University of Wisconsin), and Robert F. Boszhhardt (Mississippi Valley Archaeology Center)
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SANTIAGO EVARISTO UCEDA CASTILLO
1954–2018

On January 14, 2018, Andean archaeology lost one of its greatest figures of the last half century, Santiago Evaristo Uceda Castillo, who passed away unexpectedly in Trujillo, Peru, at the young age of 63. His loss was a devastating blow to his family, friends, students, colleagues, and the Andeanist community in general.

He was born on October 12, 1954, in the northern highland town of Santiago de Chuco. At a very young age, his family moved to Trujillo, where he grew up in the late 1950s and 1960s. In the mid-1970s, he earned his bachiller and licenciado degrees at the National University of Trujillo. Santiago worked closely with noted French lithic expert Claude Chauchat, and he also became an expert in lithic analysis. In the 1980s, he earned a master’s degree in quaternary geology and a doctorate in prehistory at the University of Bordeaux.

Santiago reinvented himself by starting an archaeological project to investigate the Moche pyramids (Huaca de la Luna and Huaca del Sol), one of the major centers of the Moche culture (AD 200–900) of northern Peru. The recovery in 1991 of an adobe brick with a frieze fragment at Huaca de la Luna led to the discovery of a finely preserved polychromed wall depicting a being named the Decapitator, and this find demonstrated that the Moche culture produced buildings with friezes, not just painted walls. Santiago parlayed this discovery into a long-term project for the next 26 years, expanding the excavations to the entire site, which were carried out in conjunction with considerable conservation efforts to make the site a world-class tourist attraction.

The results of his extensive program of excavation and conservation showed that Huaca de la Luna was a special platform mound center with associated plazas that served principally as a place for the public display and private sacrifice of captives in ceremonial warfare. Collaboration with Steve Bourget revealed the presence of dozens of human sacrifices that took place within the confines of the mound summit and were apparently associated with El Niño rain events. Huaca de la Luna was rebuilt and augmented several times over a period of a few hundred years, each time with a new set of polychrome mud friezes to decorate the mound facade and walls of associated rooms and plazas. Excavations expanded to include an investigation of the huge Huaca del Sol located several hundred meters to the west, revealing that this mound was used for more secular administrative purposes. Santiago and his team were also able to correctly determine the actual size and shape of that mound, which had suffered much damage during the Spanish colonial era.

Finally, Santiago was able to convincingly demonstrate that the flat pampa in between Huaca del Sol and Huaca de la Luna is occupied by a dense urban complex complete with elite houses, storerooms, streets, and canals. These discoveries, made over a series of excavation campaigns, completely negated the idea, prevalent in the 1950s and 1960s, that the site was an empty ceremonial center, and they vindicated Max Uhle’s observation some 120 years ago that the pampa had housed most of the site’s inhabitants.

By his own estimate, Santiago raised about $10 million over the course of his 27 years directing the project. Funds were used for investigation but also for conservation, including experiments to test various methods for dealing with the difficult problem of conserving adobe walls and friezes that are left exposed for public viewing. His funding sources included private foundations, government grants, awards given to the project for outstanding achievements such as the Queen Sofia Award for Conservation and Restoration of Heritage (Spain 2005), and, in later years, admission fees to visit the site. Largely through Santiago’s efforts, the Moche huacas became the second most visited archaeological site in Peru, after Machu Picchu.

During the many years of the project, Santiago authored or coauthored dozens of articles and books about the excavations at the site and about Moche culture in general. Among these many publications, he produced, with the help of his
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able-bodied assistants, several volumes of yearly site reports, something that most Andean archaeologists never realize during their entire careers.

For 30 years, Santiago was a professor of archaeology, and he served twice as dean of the Faculty of Social Sciences at the National University of Trujillo. He found time to give us guided tours of his excavations each year we visited, and he also greatly aided us in many ways. Professionally, he recommended one of his former students to be our codirector on our archaeological project in the Casma Valley. On personal matters, he helped us numerous times. On one occasion, he helped expedite the delivery of a mattress from Trujillo to Casma. On another, he helped expedite the purchase of plane tickets from Trujillo to Texas after we learned of the death of Shelia’s father while visiting Trujillo.

After a trip to Europe, Santiago developed a persistent cough that led to his admittance to a local hospital in Trujillo in late December 2017, and he died three weeks later, after not having left the hospital. His sudden death, hastened by misdiagnosis and incorrect treatment of his condition, shocked and saddened his family, friends, students, and colleagues. He is survived by his wife, Nadia Belounis, and their daughter, Anaïs.

The fate of project at the Moche pyramids remains uncertain. His codirector was responsible mainly for the considerable conservation efforts there, not the archaeological investigations or the details of running a large tourist attraction. Most importantly, the funding that Santiago was able to bring in year after year to support the conservation, investigations, and tourist facilities has been interrupted by his passing. In the meantime, we mourn his passing, but we also celebrate his extraordinary contributions to Andean archaeology that will be remembered for many years to come.

—Thomas Pozorski (University of Texas Rio Grande Valley) and Shelia Pozorski (University of Texas Rio Grande Valley)
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**March 3, 2020**
**Online Seminar:** Recommendations for Developing Harassment and Assault Free Archaeological Field Schools
3:00 p.m.–4:00 p.m. EST
FREE and for SAA Members Only

**March 19, 2020**
SAA’s 85th Annual Meeting: Registration Closes

**April 22–26, 2020**
SAA’s 85th Annual Meeting in Austin, TX

**April 25, 2020**
SAA’s Public Archaeology Day in Austin, TX

**May 1, 2020**
Submissions Open for SAA’s 86th Annual Meeting in San Francisco, CA

Learn more about the Online Seminars and to register visit
www.saa.org/OnlinSeminars
See you in Austin!

SAA’s 85th Annual Meeting
April 22-26, 2020

www.saa.org/annualmeeting

www.visitaustin.org

Visit Austin, Texas

@MeetAustin

@VisitAustinTX