

## CONTENTS

---

*List of Figures* ix

- 1.** Creating an Archaeology without Borders 1  
*Maxine E. McBrinn and Laurie D. Webster*

---

**PART I: EARLY AGRICULTURAL ADAPTATIONS IN THE  
U.S. SOUTHWEST AND NORTHWESTERN MEXICO**

---

- 2.** The Transition to Agriculture in the Desert  
Borderlands: An Introduction 25  
*Gayle J. Fritz*
- 3.** The Setting of Early Agriculture in Southern Chihuahua 35  
*A. C. MacWilliams, Robert J. Hard, John R. Roney,  
Karen R. Adams, and William L. Merrill*
- 4.** Modeling the Early Agricultural Frontier in the Desert Borderlands 55  
*Jonathan B. Mabry and William E. Doolittle*
- 5.** Early Agriculture on the Southeastern Periphery of  
the Colorado Plateau: Diversity in Tactics 71  
*Bradley J. Vierra*
- 6.** A Method for Anticipating Patterns in Archaeological Sequences: Projecting  
the Duration of the Transition to Agriculture in Mexico—A Test Case 89  
*Amber L. Johnson*

7. The Case for an Early Farmer Migration into  
the Greater American Southwest 107  
*Steven A. LeBlanc*

**PART II: CONVERGING IDENTITIES:  
EXPLORING SOCIAL IDENTITY THROUGH MULTIPLE DATA CLASSES**

---

8. Exploring Social Identities through Archaeological Data  
from the Southwest: An Introduction 145  
*Linda S. Cordell*
9. Archaeological Models of Early Uto-Aztecan Prehistory  
in the Arizona-Sonora Borderlands 155  
*Jonathan B. Mabry, John P. Carpenter, and Guadalupe Sanchez*
10. Interaction, Enculturation, Social Distance, and  
Ancient Ethnic Identities 185  
*Patrick D. Lyons and Jeffery J. Clark*
11. Networking the Old-Fashioned Way: Social and Economic Networks among  
Archaic Hunters and Gatherers in Southern New Mexico 209  
*Maxine E. McBrinn*
12. Architectural Metaphor and Chacoan Influence in  
the Northern San Juan 227  
*Scott G. Ortman*
13. Life's Pathways: Geographic Metaphors in Ancestral  
Puebloan Material Culture 257  
*Kelley Hays-Gilpin*
14. The Dynamic Nature of Cultural Identity during the Fourteenth  
and Fifteenth Centuries in Central New Mexico 271  
*Suzanne L. Eckert*

**PART III: NEW RESEARCH FROM NORTHERN MEXICO:  
BORDERS, CONTACTS, LANDSCAPES, AND HISTORY**

---

15. Avances del Norte de México (New Research from Northern Mexico) 285  
*Eduardo Gamboa Carrera*
16. Imaginary Border, Profound Border: Terminological and Conceptual  
Construction of the Archaeology of Northern Mexico 291  
*Francisco Mendiola Galván*

- 17.** Epic of the Toltec Chichimec and the Purépecha  
in the Ancient Southwest 301  
*Patricia Carot and Marie-Areti Hers*
- 18.** Mesoamerican Influences in the Imagery of Northern Mexico 335  
*Arturo Guevara Sánchez*
- 19.** Turquoise: Formal Economic Interrelationships between  
Mesoamerica and the North American Southwest 343  
*Phil C. Weigand*
- 20.** The Cultural Landscape of Cliff Houses in the  
Sierra Madre Occidental, Chihuahua 355  
*Eduardo Gamboa Carrera and Federico J. Mancera-Valencia*
- 21.** All Routes, All Directions: The Prehistoric Landscape of Nuevo León 365  
*Moisés Valadez Moreno*
- 22.** Contributions of Walter W. Taylor to the  
Archaeology of Coahuila, 1937–1947 373  
*Leticia González Arratia*
- 23.** Archaeology and Physical Anthropology: A Reflection on  
Warfare in the Archaeological Vision 385  
*M. Nicolás Caretta*
- 24.** Pacification of the Chichimeca Region 393  
*Martha Monzón Flores*
- List of Contributors* 405
- Index* 409

# 1

## CREATING AN ARCHAEOLOGY WITHOUT BORDERS

---

*Maxine E. McBrinn and Laurie D. Webster*

Pre-Hispanic contacts and cultural continuity between the southwestern United States and northwestern Mexico have commanded the interest of archaeologists since the earliest work in the region. Many of the founders and early practitioners of archaeological research in the Southwest, such as A. V. Kidder, Emil Haury, and Earl H. Morris, also spent time working in Mesoamerica. It was natural that they considered cultural continuity to extend over the international border into Mexico. Between the two world wars, E. B. Sayles (1936), Walter W. Taylor (2003; see also González Arratia, Chapter 22), and other U.S. archaeologists conducted fieldwork in northern Mexico. Since then, the Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia (INAH) has become active in the archaeology of the northern borderlands, with Mexican-trained archaeologists now conducting most of the work in this region.

The Ninth Southwest Symposium was organized with the goal of sharing knowledge and increasing dialogue and collaboration between archaeologists in the U.S. Southwest and northwestern Mexico. (For the historical roots of this international meeting, see the introduction by Eduardo Gamboa Carrera, Chapter 15.) This volume presents the proceedings of the symposium held January 9–10, 2004, in Chihuahua City, Chihuahua, Mexico. This was the second Southwest Symposium

held in Mexico; the first, in 1998, was in Hermosillo, Sonora. The 2004 conference was jointly planned by INAH and the board of the Southwest Symposium and was organized by Michael Whalen. It followed closely on the heels of the 2003 Pecos Conference, held at the important Chihuahuan site of Paquimé. This recent and rewarding trend of holding meetings in both the U.S. Southwest and northwestern Mexico underscores the deep historical and cultural connections that bind these regions into a broader culture area.

The theme of the 2004 Southwest Symposium was “Archaeology without Borders: Contact, Commerce, and Change in the U.S. Southwest and Northwestern Mexico.” A primary goal of the conference was to offer participants a glimpse of the work being done by colleagues on the other side of the border. Convening the meeting in Mexico encouraged high participation by Mexican archaeologists working for INAH and others affiliated with Mexican academic institutions. Two of the four sessions were *a priori* dedicated to sessions organized by Mexican archaeologists, the other two by archaeologists from the United States. The themes of the Mexican sessions were “Identidad y Cultura” (Identity and Culture), moderated by Alejandro Martínez Muriel, and “Contacto y Comercio” (Contact and Commerce), moderated by Joaquín García-Bárcena González. The themes of the U.S. sessions were “Variability in Agricultural Adaptations in the North American Southwest,” organized by Robert J. Hard and John R. Roney, and “Converging Identities: Exploring Social Identity through Multiple Data Classes,” organized by Maxine McBrinn and Laurie Webster. Simultaneous translations of all papers were provided.

## ORGANIZATION OF THE VOLUME

This volume gathers together nineteen of the twenty-six papers presented at the symposium and incorporates one post-conference addition, Chapter 7 by Steven LeBlanc, included at the suggestion of the agricultural session organizers. Several presenters were unable to contribute to this publication because of time constraints or because their papers were being published in other venues.<sup>1</sup> As organizers of one of the sessions, we were invited by the Southwest Symposium board to edit the volume. We asked discussants Gayle Fritz (Chapter 2) and Linda Cordell (Chapter 8) to introduce the papers from their respective sessions and Eduardo Gamboa Carrera (Chapter 15) to contribute an introduction to the Mexican papers. In this introduction we focus on the general themes of the symposium.

Unlike the proceedings of the Hermosillo symposium (Villalpando 2002), which published some chapters in English and others in Spanish, the board decided to publish the proceedings of the Chihuahua symposium entirely in English. The exception is Eduardo Gamboa’s introduction to the Mexican chapters (Chapter 15), presented in both languages for the benefit of Spanish-speaking readers. Following the symposium, most of the Mexican-session papers were translated into English by a Mexican translator working through the INAH office in Chihuahua. (The three chapters by Weigand, Carot and Hers, and Caretta were originally writ-

ten in English.) We edited the papers to improve their readability and to reflect the conventions of scholarly writing in the United States. We are extremely pleased to make this Mexican research available to an English-speaking audience.

## **TOWARD AN ARCHAEOLOGY WITHOUT BORDERS**

The international border between the United States and Mexico is a construct of the modern world. Pre-Hispanic cultural traditions did not change abruptly at the border, of course. Rather, the contemporary borderlands were once part of a great cultural continuum that stretched from north-central Mexico to the Great Basin and California and even beyond (see Reed 1964; McGuire 2002; LeBlanc, Chapter 7; Mabry, Carpenter, and Sanchez, Chapter 9). This broad area shares a number of geographical attributes, including an arid climate and significant topographical variation, which influenced the cultural traditions of peoples dependent on the resources of this vast region.

The name one applies to this region largely depends on the side of the border on which one resides. Most archaeologists from the United States know it as the Greater Southwest, whereas Mexican archaeologists refer to it as the Northwest, or La Gran Chichimeca. Although these terms approach the region from different perspectives (see Mendiola Galván, Chapter 16), all acknowledge the bi-directional exchange of people, goods, and ideas. The concept of the “Greater Southwest” culture area harkens back to the 1920s (Kroeber 1928), although the term itself was not coined until later (Beals 1943). Erik Reed (1964) famously used it to describe the region extending from Durango, Colorado, to Durango, Mexico, and from Las Vegas, Nevada, to Las Vegas, New Mexico. This term, however, conceptualizes the region from a U.S. perspective, not a Mexican one. Another term now popular with southwestern archaeologists, “North American Southwest,” suffers from the same one-sided perspective, given that geographically the southwestern part of North America lies not in the United States but somewhere around Oaxaca, Mexico (McGuire 1997, 2002). Nevertheless, this term has the advantage of describing a geographical region rather than a culture area and thus avoids many a priori assumptions about cultural affiliation, linguistics, and historical connections linked to the “Greater Southwest” concept. (See McGuire 2002 for further discussion of this issue.)

U.S. visitors to Paquimé who study the map in the visitor center may be surprised to find the entire U.S. Southwest subsumed under the rubric of La Gran Chichimeca. This is the prevailing view from the south, however. This term is equally problematic because it represents a Mesoamerican perspective on the northern frontier (Mendiola Galván, Chapter 16; see also Gamboa Carrera, Chapter 15). This leaves northern Mexico somewhere in the middle, part of neither the U.S. Southwest nor Mesoamerica. Another term for this region—the western U.S.-Mexico borderlands—avoids these biases of perspective and defines the region in its own geographical terms (see also Vierra 2005) but seems rather narrow for an area that

extends hundreds of miles north and south of the border. Others have settled on calling the region the Southwest/Northwest (McGuire 1997, 2002), an awkward but serviceable compromise.

The international border and the different concepts and perspectives used to describe this border region strongly influence our interpretations of the past. The presence of the border obscures the dynamic interplay of cultural influences and population movements that has characterized the U.S. Southwest and Northwest Mexico through time. It also reinforces an artificial partition of the region, giving archaeologists only a piecemeal view of broader cultural trends (Braniff 1997; Fish and Villalpando 1997; McGuire 2002). The division of this region into two separate countries also influences the field techniques, theoretical approaches, and research problems applied to the region as a whole. U.S. and Mexican archaeologists not only speak different languages, they also receive different academic training, acquire their funding from different sources, and follow different research priorities and mandates. (For detailed discussions of these issues, see McGuire 1997; Minnis and Whalen 2004; Newell 1999.) More prosaically, fieldwork in another country requires an extra layer of bureaucracy above and beyond that required for work in one's home country, necessitating work visas, passports, permits, and certification.

The same border that divides the two countries also hinders access to each others' work. A quick glance at the bibliographies from the Mexican chapters in this volume shows the large number of papers published internally by INAH, read as papers at meetings, or published in journals to which many academic U.S. libraries do not subscribe. This difficulty of access and a general lack of bilingualism have led to only superficial use of the Mexican literature by most English-speaking archaeologists. Although more Mexican archaeologists read English, they, too, have difficulties accessing the work of their U.S. colleagues, especially that published in the so-called gray literature.

A decade ago, Randall McGuire (1997) analyzed the citations made by authors who participated in a joint U.S.-Mexican symposium that addressed the international borderlands (Carpenter and Sanchez 1997). In that volume, 57 percent of the citations by Mexican authors were to literature written in English, whereas only 6 percent of the citations in the U.S. chapters were to literature written in Spanish. We conducted a similar analysis for this volume (excluding bibliographic references cited in this Introduction) and found a decline in the number of cross-language references cited.<sup>2</sup> Thirty-one percent of the citations in Part 3, the chapters on northern Mexico, are to literature published in English—roughly half the proportion noted by McGuire. But thirty-four of these fifty-six English citations were made by the three authors who submitted their chapters in English (Weigand, Carot and Hers, and Caretta), who are obviously more conversant in that language. Even more alarming, less than 1 percent of the citations by U.S. authors were to references written in Spanish. Thus, while it might have been hoped that scholars would have become more conversant with the research conducted by their international colleagues during the past ten years, the opposite appears to be true.

Although not encouraging, this situation is mitigated by several factors. Many of the theoretical issues of current interest to U.S. archaeologists presently lack parallels in the Mexican literature. Also, several of the U.S. chapters focus on research conducted on the Colorado Plateau, far north of the international border, where few Mexican archaeologists have worked or published. The fact that many of the Mexican authors cite their own publications shows that a large corpus of research has recently accumulated on the Mexican Northwest. Yet, whether as a result of language problems or lack of accessibility, virtually none of these references are cited by U.S. authors. This general unfamiliarity with the cross-border literature illustrates that scholarly dialogue and communication still have a long way to go before an “archaeology without borders” becomes a reality.

Differential access to research funding is another important concern. The U.S. Southwest enjoys international acclaim and high tourist dollars, with people from all over the world coming to visit such high-visibility sites as Mesa Verde, Chaco Canyon, and Casa Grande. Southwestern archaeology also attracts considerable financial support from both the public and private sectors. Many more archaeologists are employed in the southwestern United States than in northern Mexico, and research funding parallels this trend (McGuire 1997, 2002; Minnis and Whalen 2004:261–264). Northwestern Mexico is in the unenviable position of having to compete with the great pyramids and palaces of Mesoamerica for its research funding. As a result, much less is known about the archaeology of northwestern Mexico—and not because of a lack of intrinsic interest. Yet many archaeologists in Mexico, as well as the United States, have historically viewed northwestern Mexico as a peripheral region. Only recently has a major Mexican publication spurred renewed interest in this region as one with its own unique culture history (Braniff et al. 2001). More encouraging, INAH’s recent investment in the new museum at Paquimé is a sign of Mexico’s increased commitment to this region, and the designation of Paquimé as a World Heritage Site has raised its significance and visibility on an international scale.

Despite the many obstacles posed by the border, it is imperative that we share information. Archaeologists have long recognized that many cultural traditions entered the U.S. Southwest from the south, not just the triad of maize, beans, and squash but also ceramics (LeBlanc 1982), cotton and loom weaving (Teague 1998:98–101), the concept of ballcourts (Scarborough and Wilcox 1991), the Flower World ideological complex (Hill and Hays-Gilpin 1999), and other socio-religious concepts (Riley 2005), to name just a few. Other cultural traditions may have spread to the south, such as cliff-house architecture, rock art representations of the flute player, and the bow and arrow (Carot and Hers, Chapter 17; Guevara Sánchez, Chapter 18). Trade goods such as turquoise (Weigand, Chapter 19), macaws (Minnis et al. 1993), and copper bells (Vargas 2001) also moved across today’s international border, but as Carot and Hers (Chapter 17) and Guevara Sánchez (Chapter 18) point out, these were a minor part of the larger exchange. The movements of people and ideas were far more influential. Without more detailed information

about the intermediary points of transmission on both sides of the border, we are left to speculate about the processes, timing, and routes of these exchanges.

Questions of cultural continuity between the U.S. Southwest and Northwest Mexico are most fruitfully explored when U.S. and Mexican archaeologists work together. Fortunately, in recent years several successful collaborations have occurred between INAH and Mexican-trained archaeologists and those based in the United States or Canada. The Joint Casas Grandes Expedition (Di Peso, Rinaldo, and Fenner 1974) is one classic example, and Jane Kelley's *Proyecto Arqueología de Chihuahua* (Kelley et al. 1999, 2004) and the INAH-Museum of New Mexico-University of New Mexico program led by Raphael Cruz Antillón, Timothy Maxwell, and Robert Leonard (Cruz Antillón et al. 2004) are others. Collaborative research has grown considerably in the past decade, especially in the states of Chihuahua and Sonora (e.g., Fish, Fish, and Villalpando in press; Hard, Zapata, and Roney 2001; McGuire and Villalpando 1993; McGuire et al. 1999; see also Foster and Gorenstein 2000; Jiménez Betts and Darling 2000). We applaud those archaeologists who have braved the bureaucracy of the border and eagerly await more collaborative projects.

As the joint projects mentioned earlier illustrate, dialogue and collaboration between Mexican and U.S. scholars are most successful when a topic is narrowly defined and of mutual thematic interest. One successful example was the 1994 symposium in Tucson that focused on the prehistory of the borderlands (Carpenter and Sanchez 1997). The participants were already familiar with each others' work and had, in many cases, participated in joint research, making the symposium a summation and continuation of ongoing dialogue. When a topic is of unequal interest or when theoretical approaches or methodologies are not shared, true dialogue is less likely. In our view, the sharing of information at future Southwest Symposia is most likely to be achieved when participants from both sides of the border are invited to participate in a single session with a tight topical focus rather than in sequential sessions of English- and Spanish-speaking presenters.

## **MAJOR THEMES OF THE NINTH SOUTHWEST SYMPOSIUM**

Issues of identity, boundaries, and territory appear in various guises in all three sections of this book. As archaeologists, we are stymied by our inability to neatly categorize as we struggle with the issue of boundaries and scale. The diagnostic criteria we use to define societies privilege a fraction of the overall material culture, such as ceramics or architecture, producing culture areas that may not have existed in the past or do not conform to distinctions recognized at the time. This may be influenced by our modern lives within state-level societies, where absolute boundaries and territories are so politically important. More egalitarian societies probably had a very different cultural map and may not have felt the same need to subdivide the world. Certainly, they were interested in who was or was not a member of their group, but they may not have relied on absolute criteria. Lacking higher-level

governing bodies to create boundaries, the line between near and far was probably more flexibly drawn, creating the smear of continuity we see in the archaeological record.

## **AGRICULTURAL ADAPTATIONS IN THE U.S.-MEXICO BORDERLAND**

The chapters in Part 1 of this volume present new research on the introduction and adoption of agriculture in the U.S. Southwest and northwestern Mexico. The appearance of agriculture in this region is of perennial interest to most archaeologists working there, for many of the same reasons this question fascinates researchers working in Europe. Neither Europe nor the U.S. Southwest and northwestern Mexico are regions where important economic crops were first domesticated. In both regions, however, profound material and social changes accompanied or shortly followed the introduction of agriculture.

The adoption of agriculture in the U.S.-Mexico borderlands and other parts of the world has been an active area of study for decades. Still, fundamental questions remain. Did domesticated crops and knowledge of farming diffuse into existing populations from outside these regions, did migrants bring these crops and this knowledge with them, or did a combination of processes occur (see Mabry and Doolittle, Chapter 4; Johnson, Chapter 6; LeBlanc, Chapter 7; Mabry, Carpenter, and Sanchez, Chapter 9)? The answer is important because the appearance of agriculture ushered in a suite of cultural changes—increased sedentism, the introduction of ceramics, more durable architecture, expanding population densities, greater social complexity—that intensely altered the societies that followed. These developments were fundamental to creating the dominant societies in the region. The appearance of agriculture has also been theoretically linked to the introduction of new language groups, including Indo-European in Europe (Renfrew 1987) and Uto-Aztecan in the U.S. Southwest (Bellwood 1997; Hill 2001; LeBlanc, Chapter 7; Mabry, Carpenter, and Sanchez, Chapter 9). Of course, a number of differences are seen in the archaeological patterns of North America and Europe, including the temporal span of the transition and the nature of the material remains available for analysis. The commonalities, however, are instructive.

Initial research on early agriculture in the U.S. Southwest focused on the antiquity and forms of the earliest domesticated maize (Manglesdorf 1950, 1958, 1974; Dick 1965; Wills 1988, 1995) and the possible routes of its introduction (Haury 1962; Berry 1982; Wills 1988:2–3). This period is analogous to European research on the age and spread of the Linearbandkeramik Culture (Kossinna 1902) and the migration of Indo-Europeans into Europe (Childe 1926, 1950). More recent research in western North America and Europe has shown this transition to be considerably more diverse than originally thought and suggests that the best explanation may be early migration followed by cultural diffusion (e.g., Price, Gebauer, and Keeley 1995; Matson 1991; see also Mabry and Doolittle, Chapter 4, and Mabry,

Carpenter, and Sanchez, Chapter 9). Recently, European researchers have begun to examine the genetic diversity of both modern and ancient populations to critically examine the migration hypothesis, with results that suggest selective intermarriage between migrants and existing populations (Balter 2005; Haak et al. 2005). This approach holds much promise for American researchers as well (see LeBlanc, Chapter 7). These studies reveal that understanding the complex transition from foraging to farming in Europe and the U.S. Southwest and northwestern Mexico requires multiple lines of evidence from archaeology, linguistics, botany, and genetics.

As Linda Cordell has pointed out (1997:127–128), prior to the 1950s and 1960s no one felt it necessary to explain why people began to farm once this became a viable option. Given that farming permitted the creation of complex societies and our modern world, it was taken for granted that this was superior to a foraging life-way. Not until ethnographic and archaeological research demonstrated that hunter-gatherers were at least as healthy as farmers did researchers become interested in the question: Why did people adapt agriculture? Today, this question forms the crux of current research and hypotheses, especially in the Southwest.

Models such as those offered by Mabry and Doolittle (Chapter 4) and Johnson (Chapter 6) explicate how and why peoples in the U.S. Southwest and Mexican Northwest incorporated agricultural practices into their subsistence systems. Mabry and Doolittle explore a wide range of farming niches and methods suitable for the region's arid environment, whereas Johnson's model predicts the pace of the transition from hunting and gathering to agriculture, based on environmental and climactic factors. Although these models differ widely in their goals and ambitions, both offer new ways to interpret the archaeological record.

Regional variation in the timing of and dependence on maize agriculture (Fritz, Chapter 2; Mabry, Carpenter, and Sanchez, Chapter 9) obscures easy answers to the fundamental questions of the appearance of agriculture in the region. Why did some groups continue to follow a hunter-gatherer lifeway, supplementing wild resources with maize and tending their gardens as part of their yearly rounds (Wills 1988), while others quickly took advantage of the stability farming provided (Mabry 2002; Roney and Hard 2002; Mabry and Doolittle, Chapter 4)? Some groups took much longer than others to commit to this new subsistence method (MacWilliams et al., Chapter 3; Vierra, Chapter 5). In other cases, migrating groups may have brought their agricultural knowledge and methods with them (LeBlanc, Chapter 7). Some researchers have suggested the presence of a well-defined agricultural frontier, with maize grown behind a line and "pure" hunters and gatherers ahead of it (Carpenter, Sanchez, and Villalpando 2002; Geib and Spurr 2002; Matson 1991). Although with more data we may yet find a better-defined agricultural frontier, the research reported here does not support this notion.

Temporal and geographical variation in the commitment to agriculture raises questions about our use of terminology. As MacWilliams and colleagues point out (Chapter 3), although chronologically we may be dealing with the Middle or Late Archaic periods, by that time some groups were no longer practicing an "archaic"

subsistence pattern. These authors and others prefer the term “Early Agricultural” to describe the period of transition, reserving the terms “Middle Archaic” and “Late Archaic” for specific chronological periods (see also Huckell 1995, 1996).

Recently, archaeologists have begun to explore the possibility that agriculture was introduced to some parts of northwestern Mexico and the U.S. Southwest by Uto-Aztecan speakers from central Mexico (Hill 2001; LeBlanc, Chapter 7; Mabry, Carpenter, and Sanchez, Chapter 9). LeBlanc’s chapter offers a valuable summary of the linguistic, genetic, and archaeological data in support of this hypothesis and also some ways to test it. The Uto-Aztecan migration hypothesis mirrors ideas about the spread of early farming in Africa, Europe, and the Middle East and offers the potential to find global patterns, as well as local variability, in the spread and adoption of agriculture.

## **ARCHAEOLOGICAL APPROACHES TO SOCIAL IDENTITY**

Part 2 of this volume focuses on questions of social identity. The assignment of identity to archaeological remains has been a primary goal of archaeology since its inception (Jones 1997). Archaeologists cannot speak of past peoples without assigning some name to each group, even if that name is derived from a prominent artifact class, such as the Beaker People, the Clovis Culture, or the Basketmakers (Cordell 1997; Kossinna 1902). Although these assignments may not represent social divisions of the past, such terms are useful and easy. Unfortunately, even when archaeologists understand the limitations of the terminology, their use reifies its meanings. Only recently have archaeologists begun to appreciate the complex and multilayered nature of social identity. One result is the decreasing use of the term “ethnicity,” which implies a single, static group identity, as opposed to fluid and nested identities that may be internally or externally defined.

The idea that social identity cannot always be defined objectively is articulated by Michael Moerman (1965), who pointed out that an individual’s assignment to a particular social group (in his case, “Lue”) is situational. Frederik Barth (1969) consciously used a subjective definition of ethnicity and suggested that an objective definition was impossible. In his view, a man was “Pathan” because he identified himself as “Pathan.” The idea that social identity is situational and not uniform within the bounds of space and time makes these social distinctions difficult to address through the medium of material culture alone. Without the benefit of living informants, what tools are available to archaeologists to interpret social identity (see Ferguson 2004; Mills 2004:3–11)?

Practice theory, the idea that enculturation is visible in the material record, offers one approach (Bourdieu 1977, 1990; see also Lemonnier 1986). Although technological style was first used in Europe to examine contemporary and historical social differences, archaeologists soon realized that this approach also offered a window into the prehistoric past. Since then, concepts of technological style, social boundaries, and social agency have proven to be effective archaeological tools for

exploring social identity (Dobres 2000; Dobres and Hoffman 1999; Hegmon 1992, 1998; Jones 1997; Stark 1998).

At about the time practice theory was becoming a standard method in archaeology, researchers in the U.S. Southwest began seeking new ways to infer social groups and patterns of migration from the archaeological record (e.g., Bernardini 2002, 2005; Clark 2001; Duff 2002; Eckert 2003, see also Chapter 14; Lyons 2001, 2003; McBrinn 2002, 2005; Stone 2003). Jeffery Clark (2001; see also Lyons and Clark, Chapter 10), building on the work of Christopher Carr (1995) and others, developed concepts of acculturation, interaction, and technological style to examine migration in the Southern Southwest. Others used oral histories from contemporary Pueblo groups to structure their models (e.g., Bernardini 2002, 2005; Lyons 2001, 2003), testing them with evidence from architecture, ceramics, rock art, or other material classes to interpret the timing and routes of migrations. Such studies, coupled with renewed interest in cultural affiliation as a result of the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 1990 (e.g., Ferguson and Loma'omvaya 1999), have energized archaeological research in the Southwest and provided archaeologists with new conceptual tools for exploring questions of cultural and social identity.

Another recent approach for investigating social identity in the archaeological record is the study of conceptual metaphors embodied in various classes of human behavior, such as architecture, ceramic and textile designs, mural decorations, and language (Ortman 2000, see also Ortman, Chapter 12; Hays-Gilpin, Chapter 13; Sekaquaptewa and Washburn 2004, 2006). These researchers draw from the fields of cognitive psychology, linguistics, and symmetry studies (e.g., Fauconnier 1997; Lakoff 1993; Lakoff and Johnson 1980; Washburn and Crowe 1988) to explore the contextual use of designs and other media at varying scales, using these patterns to infer shared metaphorical meanings as a window into the mental constructs of past social groups. This approach is especially effective when native consultants are involved and cultural continuity is assumed.

The chapters in Part 2 examine social identity for a wide range of groups and time periods in the U.S. Southwest. They demonstrate that social identity in the Southwest, as elsewhere, is rarely clear-cut or well defined. Modern Pueblo people derive their identities from a complex web of village, clan, moiety, or sodality affiliations and universal identifiers such as kin, sex, and status. Membership in any one of these groups can be signaled in different ways. When we graft onto this complex situation a long tradition of migrations and periods of consolidation and dispersal, even a general term like "Puebloan" is of indeterminate meaning (see Lyons and Clark, Chapter 10, for an example of "Puebloan" peoples moving into a new area and adopting local traditions). Mapping group histories into the past is extraordinarily difficult and requires significant assumptions on the part of the researcher (Ferguson 2004). Mapping groups forward from a point in the past is also fraught with difficulty (e.g., Irwin-Williams 1979; Ford, Schroeder, and Peckham 1972). The most successful attempts may be those conducted at the village or tribal scale

that integrate oral histories into their models (e.g., Bernardini 2005; Lyons and Clark, Chapter 10).

Although the authors in this section use a variety of means to examine social identity, common issues emerge. All lead back to the basic notion that social identity is situational and negotiated and exists at both conscious and unconscious levels. The scale of identity matters in these kinds of studies and influences the kinds of material culture considered. Researchers concerned with the negotiation of identity by individuals or close kin groups (e.g., Mabry, Carpenter, and Sanchez, Chapter 9; McBrinn, Chapter 11) employ different kinds of evidence than those who explore identity on a clan or tribal level (Eckert, Chapter 14; Hays-Gilpin, Chapter 13; Lyons and Clark, Chapter 10; Ortman, Chapter 12). For example, as described by McBrinn (2002, 2005, see also Chapter 11), the manufacture of cordage would have been a common, perhaps even a daily, activity. Material produced at this level of frequency might show the results of enculturation (*habitus* and practice) to a greater degree than an activity conducted more intermittently. To borrow from Lyons and Clark (Chapter 10), because cordage is created by craftspeople working at a smaller social distance than people building new room blocks, cordage and architecture are likely to reflect different aspects of social identity.

This leads to a second set of considerations. The more evidence from different media and social contexts one can incorporate into a study, the more social distinctions (or identities) one is likely to discern. Just as a comparison of gender or ranking is impossible if only artifacts made by high-ranking males are considered, so inferences about social distinctions are only possible if a variety of material classes are used. Fortunately, the outstanding preservation of perishable artifacts in many parts of the southwestern United States and northwestern Mexico extends the range of artifacts available for study in this region, making it a superb area to conduct this kind of cross-media research.

### **CONTACTS, LANDSCAPES, AND THE HISTORY OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL PRACTICE**

Part 3 presents chapters from the two symposium sessions organized by Mexican archaeologists. Discussing new research from the states of Durango, Zacatecas, Nuevo León, Coahuila, and Chihuahua, these chapters address three basic themes: cultural contacts, cultural landscapes, and the history of archaeological practice and discourse. Cultural interaction is a common concern of many authors. Questions of contacts between the southwestern United States and northern Mexico, as well as the flow of goods and ideas, have long captured the interest of archaeologists on both sides of the border (e.g., Bradley 1993; Braniff 1995; Carot 2000; Haury 1945, 1962; Hedrick, Kelley, and Riley 1974; Kelley 1966; Pohl 2001; Weigand and Garcia de Weigand 2001; Woosley and Ravesloot 1993). Several chapters in the volume emphasize the social, ideological, or economic linkages between these regions and other parts of Mexico. The scale of these studies ranges from Phil Weigand's (Chapter

19) analysis of the long-distance exchange of turquoise between Mesoamerica and the U.S. Southwest, to a summary of Walter Taylor's concern with connections between Coahuila and West Texas (González Arratia, Chapter 22), to Gamboa Carrera and Mancera-Valencia's (Chapter 20) study of economic and social relations within the Casas Grandes regional system.

The focus of analysis varies as well. Guevara Sánchez (Chapter 18) uses the medium of rock art to investigate stylistic relationships and possible contacts among groups in Durango, Zacatecas, Chihuahua, and the U.S. Southwest. The study by Carot and Hers (Chapter 17) has a broader focus, employing multiple lines of evidence (architecture, ceremonial and funerary practices, ceramics, iconography) to explore the bi-directional movements of people and ideas across what the authors conceptualize as a mutual cultural "bridge" linking the Toltec Chichimec and Purépecha (Tarascan) cultures of north-central Mexico with the Hohokam and ancestral Pueblos of the southwestern United States. Their research underscores the fluid and dynamic nature of the boundaries between these regions over time. Monzón Flores (Chapter 24) uses a different form of evidence—early Spanish texts—to critique sixteenth-century encounters between Spanish interests and nomadic groups in the Chichimeca region. Although this perspective, by its nature, is almost entirely one-sided, Monzón Flores's study expands our understanding of post-conquest dynamics and consequences for indigenous groups in what is now northern Mexico (see also Pailles and Reff 1985; Spicer 1963).

The archaeology of cultural landscapes is of considerable interest to Mexican archaeologists, just as it is in other parts of the world (e.g., Ashmore and Knapp 1999). Gamboa Carrera and Mancera-Valencia (Chapter 20) draw from the models of Carl Sauer and other cultural geographers and introduce a new interpretive model they call "archaeogeography" to interpret the natural and cultural landscapes of Paquimé and nearby cliff dwellings of the Sierra Madre Occidental. Their analysis finds close ties between the cliff dwellings and the ritual city of Paquimé expressed through shared iconography, architectural features, and a communication system based on roads and watchtowers. Their work augments recent studies of interaction in the Casas Grandes regional system (VanPool et al. 2000; Whalen and Minnis 2001). Cultural landscapes of the sacred are the focus of Valadez Moreno's (Chapter 21) study of hunter-gatherer societies in Nuevo León, which considers how rock art, rituals, and the ordering of ceremonial space structured social relations. Citing the importance of caves and prominent topographical features as prime ritual spaces (cf. Taube 1986), Valadez Moreno explores the metaphorical meaning of imagery related to hunting, the veneration of water, and human and animal fertility.

Finally, several authors focus on the history of archaeological research and discourse in the borderlands region. González Arratia (Chapter 22) makes extensive use of contemporary archival sources in her critique of Taylor's research in Coahuila between 1937 and 1947. Discussing Taylor's theoretical concern with relationships between the cultures of Coahuila and those of West Texas and Mesoamerica, González offers a year-by-year account of his fieldwork, collections, and interpreta-

tions and addresses reasons much of his work remained unpublished until after his death (e.g., Taylor 2003).

Philosophical and epistemological reflections on archaeological methods and discourse structure the contributions by Caretta (Chapter 23) and Mendiola Galván (Chapter 16). Caretta expounds upon the problem of inferring pre-Hispanic warfare from archaeological remains and urges physical anthropologists to become more involved in these analyses. Mendiola Galván calls for increased epistemological vigilance by archaeologists in their use of archaeological labels and terms. His insightful critique into the historiography of such concepts as Mesoamerica, Greater Southwest, and Gran Chichimeca illustrates how these concepts have produced ambiguities and obscured the cultural diversity of northern Mexico.

The recent publication of *La Gran Chichimeca* (Braniff et al. 2001) has forged a new appreciation for this region. In promoting the rich archaeological heritage of northern Mexico in much the same way Mesoamerica and the U.S. Southwest have been presented to the public, the volume affirms the significance of the region, its outstanding cultural resources, and its diverse cultural past. Increasing work in northern Mexico by Mexican, U.S., and Canadian scholars, new avenues of funding, an increased commitment by INAH, and greater international collaboration are signs that, while we are not there yet, we are finally approaching an archaeology without borders.

*Acknowledgments.* We express our appreciation to our two reviewers, Randall McGuire and an anonymous reviewer, for their detailed and insightful comments on our Introduction and the other chapters in this volume. We found their comments extremely helpful, and we incorporated most of their suggestions. This volume is a much better product because of their input. We also thank Darrin Pratt, our editor at the University Press of Colorado, for his exceptional guidance and patience during this process. Michael Whalen and the Southwest Symposium board offered us the opportunity to edit this volume and encouraged us as we worked through the process. We thank them for their confidence and support.

## NOTES

1. The following papers were presented at the symposium but do not appear in this volume:

K. Renne Barlow, *Understanding Variability in Time Spent Farming Maize: Examples from the Fremont and the Tarahumara*

Roy Bernard Brown, Patricia Fornier García, and Alfonso Rosales López, *Contacto y Comercio: un Acercamiento Arqueológico a los Pobladores de El Paso del Norte, Pueblos y Parajes*

Rafael Cruz Antillón and Tim Maxwell, *La Turquesa en el Sistema Regional de Casas Grandes*

Edgar K. Huber and Heather J. Miljour, *Early Maize on the Colorado Plateau: New Dates from West-Central New Mexico*

Viviane Jaenicke-Després, Edward Buckler, Bruce Smith, John Doebley, and Svante Pääbo, *Analysis of Key Genes in the Domestication of Maize from Archaeological Maize Cobs*

Peter Jiménez Betts, Humberto Medina González, and Enrique Garcia, *Riptide on the Chichimec Sea: Perspectives on Ritual Landscapes of Northern and Central Mesoamerica*

Laurie Webster, *Early Mogollon Social Identity: Evidence from Clothing, Containers, and Ritual* (an expanded version of this paper appears in the volume *Zuni Origins: Anthropological Approaches on Multiple Americanist and Southwestern Scales*, ed. David A. Gregory and David R. Wilcox. University of Arizona Press, Tucson, in press.)

2. These tallies were generated from the original manuscripts, before additional cross-language citations were added at the suggestion of reviewers.

## REFERENCES CITED

Ashmore, Wendy, and Arthur B. Knapp (editors)

1999 *Archaeologies of Landscape: Contemporary Perspectives*. Blackwell, Oxford.

Balter, Michael

2005 Ancient DNA Yields Clues to the Puzzle of European Origins. *Science* 310:964–965.

Barth, Frederik

1969 Introduction. In *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: The Social Organization of Cultural Differences*, ed. Frederik Barth, 9–38. Little, Brown, Boston.

Beals, Ralph L.

1943 Cultural Relations between Northern Mexico and the Southwest United States: Ethnologically and Archaeologically. In *El Norte de México y El Sur de Estados Unidos: Tercera Reunión de Mesa Redonda sobre Problemas Antropológicos de México y Centro América*, ed. Rafael García Granados, 191–199. Sociedad Exicana de Antropología, México.

Bellwood, Peter

1997 Prehistoric Cultural Explanations for Widespread Linguistic Families. In *Archaeology and Linguistics: Aboriginal Australia in Global Perspective*, ed. P. McConvell and N. Evans, 123–134. Oxford University Press, Melbourne.

Bernardini, Wesley

2002 *The Gathering of the Clans: Understanding Ancestral Hopi Migration and Identity, A.D. 1275–1400*. Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Anthropology, Arizona State University, Tempe. ProQuest, Ann Arbor.

2005 *Hopi Oral Tradition and the Archaeology of Identity*. University of Arizona Press, Tucson.

Berry, Michael S.

1982 *Time, Space, and Transition in Anasazi Prehistory*. University of Utah Press, Salt Lake City.

Bourdieu, P.

1977 *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

1990 *The Logic of Practice*. Polity, Cambridge, England.

Bradley, Ronna J.

- 1993 Marine Shell Exchange in Northwest Mexico and the Southwest. In *The American Southwest and Mesoamerica: Systems of Prehistoric Exchange*, ed. Jonathan E. Ericson and Timothy G. Baugh, 121–158. Plenum, New York.

Braniff, Beatriz

- 1995 Diseños Tradicionales Mesoamericanos y Norteños. Ensayo de Interpretación. In *Arqueología del Occidente y Norte de México; Homenaje a J. Charles Kelley*, ed. Barbro Dahlgren and Ma. de los Dolores Soto de Arechavaleta, 181–209. Instituto de Investigaciones Antropológicas, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México.
- 1997 Comentarios. In *Prehistory of the Borderlands*, ed. John Carpenter and Guadalupe Sanchez, 129–130. Arizona State Museum Archaeological Series 186. University of Arizona Press, Tucson.

Braniff, Beatriz, Linda S. Cordell, María de la Luz Gutierrez, Marie-Areti Hers, and Elisa Villalpando.

- 2001 *La Gran Chichimeca: El Lugar de las Rocas Secas*. Conaculta y Jaca Books, México y Milano.

Carot, Patricia

- 2000 Las Rutas al Desierto: de Michoacán a Arizona. In *Nómadas y Sedentarios en el Norte de México: Homenaje a Beatriz Braniff*, ed. Marie-Areti Hers, José Luis Mirafuentes, Ma. De los Dolores Soto, and Miguel Vallebuena, 91–112. Instituto de Investigaciones Antropológicas, Estéticas, e Históricas, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México.

Carpenter, John P., and Guadalupe Sanchez (editors)

- 1997 *Prehistory of the Borderlands*. Arizona State Museum Archaeological Series 186. University of Arizona Press, Tucson.

Carpenter, John P., Guadalupe Sanchez, and Maria Elisa Villalpando

- 2002 Of Maize and Migration: Mode and Tempo in the Diffusion of *Zea mays* in Northwest Mexico and the American Southwest. In *Traditions, Transitions, and Technologies: Themes in Southwestern Archaeology*, ed. Sarah H. Schlanger, 245–256. University Press of Colorado, Boulder.

Carr, Christopher

- 1995 A Unified Middle-Range Theory of Artifact Design. In *Style, Society, and Person: Archaeological and Ethnological Perspectives*, ed. Christopher Carr and Jill E. Neitzel, 171–258. Plenum, New York.

Childe, V. G.

- 1926 *The Aryans: A Study of Indo-European Origins*. Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner, and Co., London.
- 1950 *Prehistoric Migrations in Europe*. Aschehoug, Oslo.

Clark, Jeffery J.

- 2001 *Tracking Prehistoric Migrations: Pueblo Settlers among the Tonto Basin Hohokam*. Anthropological Papers of the University of Arizona 65. University of Arizona Press, Tucson.

Cordell, Linda

- 1997 *Archaeology of the Southwest*, 2nd ed. Academic, New York.

- Cruz Antillón, Rafael, Robert D. Leonard, Timothy D. Maxwell, Todd L. VanPool, Marcel J. Harmon, Christine S. VanPool, David A. Hyndman, and Sydney S. Brandwein  
2004 Galeana, Villa Ahumada, and Casa Chica: Diverse Sites in the Casas Grandes Region. In *Surveying the Archaeology of Northwest Mexico*, ed. Gillian E. Newell and Emiliano Gallaga, 149–176. University of Utah Press, Salt Lake City.
- Dick, Herbert  
1965 *Bat Cave*. School of American Research Monograph 27, Santa Fe.
- Di Peso, Charles C., John B. Rinaldo, and Gloria Fenner  
1974 *Casas Grandes: A Fallen Trading Center of the Gran Chichimeca*, Volume 4. Amerind Foundation, Dragoon, Ariz., and Northland Press, Flagstaff, Ariz.
- Dobres, Marcia-Anne  
2000 *Technology and Social Agency: Outlining a Practice Framework for Archaeology*. Blackwell, Oxford.
- Dobres, Marcia-Anne, and Christopher R. Hoffman (editors)  
1999 *The Social Dynamics of Technology: Practice, Politics and World Views*. Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, D.C.
- Duff, Andrew I.  
2002 *Western Pueblo Identities: Regional Interaction, Migration, and Transformation*. University of Arizona Press, Tucson.
- Eckert, Suzanne L.  
2003 *Social Boundaries, Immigration, and Ritual Systems: A Case Study from the American Southwest (New Mexico)*. Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Anthropology, Arizona State University, Tempe. ProQuest, Ann Arbor.
- Fauconnier, Giles  
1997 *Mappings in Thought and Language*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Ferguson, T. J.  
2004 Academic, Legal, and Political Contexts of Social Identity and Cultural Affiliation Research in the Southwest. In *Identity, Feasting, and the Archaeology of the Greater Southwest*, ed. Barbara J. Mills, 27–41. University Press of Colorado, Boulder.
- Ferguson, T. J., and Micah Loma'omvaya  
1999 *Hopoq'uaqam niqw Wukoskyavi (Those Who Went to the Northeast and Tonto Basin): Hopi-Salado Cultural Affiliation Study*. Report on file at the Hopi Cultural Preservation Office, Kykotsmovi, Ariz.
- Fish, Paul Robert, and Maria Elisa Villalpando  
1997 Introduction. In *Prehistory of the Borderlands*, ed. John Carpenter and Guadalupe Sanchez, xv–xvi. Arizona State Museum Archaeological Series 186. University of Arizona Press, Tucson.
- Fish, Suzanne K., Paul R. Fish, and Elisa Villalpando (editors)  
In press *Enduring Borderlands Traditions: Trincheras Sites in Time, Space, and Society*. University of Arizona Press, Tucson.
- Ford, Richard I., Albert H. Schroeder, and Stewart L. Peckham  
1972 Three Perspectives on Puebloan Prehistory. In *New Perspectives on the Pueblos*, ed. Alfonso Ortiz, 19–39. University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque.

- Foster, Michael, and Shirley Gorenstein  
2000 *Greater Mesoamerica: The Archaeology of West and Northwest Mexico*. University of Utah Press, Salt Lake City.
- Geib, Phil R., and Kimberly Spurr  
2002 The Forager to Farmer Transition on the Rainbow Plateau. In *Traditions, Transitions, and Technologies: Themes in Southwestern Archaeology*, ed. Sarah H. Schlanger, 224–244. University Press of Colorado, Boulder.
- Haak, Wolfgang, Peter Forster, Barbara Bramanti, Shuichi Matsumura, Guido Brandt, Marc Tänzler, Richard Villems, Colin Renfrew, Detlef Gronenborn, Kurt Werner Alt, and Joachim Burger  
2005 Ancient DNA from the First European Farmers in 7500-Year-Old Neolithic Sites. *Science* 310:1016–1018.
- Hard, Robert J., José E. Zapata, and John R. Roney (editors)  
2001 *Una Investigación Arqueológica de los Sitios Cerros con Trincheras del Arcaico Tardío en Chihuahua, México*. Informe al Consejo de Arqueología, Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia. Center for Archaeological Research, University of Texas at San Antonio, Special Report 27-S, San Antonio.
- Haury, Emil W.  
1945 The Problem of Contacts between the Southwestern United States and Mexico. *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology* 1(1):55–74.  
1962 The Greater American Southwest. In *Courses toward Urban Life: Archeological Considerations of Some Cultural Alternatives*, ed. Robert J. Braidwood and Gordon R. Willey, 106–131. Viking Fund Publications in Anthropology 32, New York.
- Hedrick, Basil C., J. Charles Kelley, and Carroll L. Riley (editors)  
1974 *The Mesoamerican Southwest: Readings in Archaeology, Ethnohistory, and Ethnology*. Southern Illinois University Press, Carbondale.
- Hegmon, Michelle  
1992 Archaeological Research on Style. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 21:517–536.  
1998 Technology, Style, and Social Practices: Archaeological Approaches. In *The Archaeology of Social Boundaries*, ed. Miriam T. Stark, 264–279. Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, D.C.
- Hill, Jane H.  
2001 Proto-Uto-Aztecans: A Community of Cultivars in Central Mexico? *American Anthropologist* 103(4):913–934.
- Hill, Jane, and Kelley A. Hays-Gilpin  
1999 The Flower World in Material Culture: An Iconographic Complex in the Southwest and Mesoamerica. *Journal of Anthropological Research* 55:1–37.
- Huckell, Bruce B.  
1995 *Of Marshes and Maize: Pre-ceramic Agricultural Settlements in the Cienega Valley, South-eastern Arizona*. Anthropological Papers of the University of Arizona 59. University of Arizona Press, Tucson.  
1996 The Southwestern Archaic: Scale and Perception of Pre-ceramic Hunter-Gatherers. In *Interpreting Southwestern Diversity: Underlying Principles and Overarching Patterns*, ed. Paul R. Fish and J. Jefferson Reid, 7–15. Anthropological Research Paper 48. Arizona State University, Tempe.

Irwin-Williams, Cynthia

- 1979 Post-Pleistocene Archaeology, 7000–2000 B.C. In *Handbook of North American Indians, Volume 9, Southwest*, ed. Alfonso Ortiz, 31–42. Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, D.C.

Jiménez Betts, Peter, and J. Andrew Darling

- 2000 Archaeology of Southern Zacatecas: The Malpaso, Juchipila, and Valparaiso-Bolaños Valleys. In *Greater Mesoamerica: The Archeology of West and Northwest Mexico*, ed. Michael Foster and Shirley Gorenstein, 155–180. University of Utah Press, Salt Lake City.

Jones, Sian

- 1997 *The Archaeology of Ethnicity: Constructing Identities in the Past and Present*. Routledge, New York.

Kelley, J. Charles

- 1966 Mesoamerica and the Southwestern United States. In *Archaeological Frontiers and External Connections: The Handbook of Middle American Indians*, Volume 4, ed. Gordon Ekholm and Gordon R. Willey, 95–110. University of Texas Press, Austin.

Kelley, Jane H., Joe D. Stewart, Art C. MacWilliams, and Karen R. Adams

- 2004 Recent Research in West-Central Chihuahua. In *Identity, Feasting, and the Archaeology of the Greater Southwest*, ed. Barbara J. Mills, 295–310. University Press of Colorado, Boulder.

Kelley, Jane H., Joe D. Stewart, Art C. MacWilliams, and Loy C. Neff

- 1999 A West-Central Chihuahuan Perspective on Chihuahua Culture. In *The Casas Grandes World*, ed. Joe D. Stewart and Carroll L. Riley, 63–77. University of Utah Press, Salt Lake City.

Kossinna, G.

- 1902 Die Indogermanische Frage Archäologisch Beantwortet. *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie* 34:161–222.

Kroeber, Alfred L.

- 1928 Native Culture of the Southwest. *University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology* 23, 375–398. University of California Press, Berkeley.

Lakoff, George

- 1993 The Contemporary Theory of Metaphor. In *Metaphor and Thought*, 2nd ed., ed. Andrew Ortony, 202–251. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Lakoff, George, and Mark Johnson

- 1980 *Metaphors We Live By*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

LeBlanc, Steven A.

- 1982 The Advent of Pottery in the Southwest. In *Southwestern Ceramics: A Comparative Review*, ed. A. H. Schroeder, 27–52. *Arizona Archaeologist* 15. Arizona Archaeological Society, Phoenix.

Lemonnier, Pierre

- 1986 The Study of Material Culture Today: Toward an Anthropology of Technical Systems. *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* 5(2):147–186.

Lyons, Patrick D.

- 2001 *Winslow Orange Ware and the Ancestral Hopi Migration Horizon*. Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Anthropology, University of Arizona, Tucson. ProQuest, Ann Arbor.
- 2003 *Ancestral Hopi Migrations*. Anthropological Papers of the University of Arizona 68. University of Arizona Press, Tucson.

Mabry, Jonathan B.

- 2002 The Role of Irrigation in the Transition to Agriculture and Sedentism in the Southwest: A Risk Management Model. In *Traditions, Transitions, and Technologies: Themes in Southwestern Archaeology*, ed. Sarah H. Schlanger, 178–199. University Press of Colorado, Boulder.

Manglesdorf, Paul C.

- 1950 The Mystery of Corn. *Scientific American* 183:20–29.
- 1958 Ancestor of Corn. *Science* 128:1313–1320.
- 1974 *Corn*. Belknap, Cambridge, Mass.

Matson, R. G.

- 1991 *The Origins of Southwestern Agriculture*. University of Arizona Press, Tucson.

McBrinn, Maxine E.

- 2002 *Social Identity and Risk Sharing among the Mobile Hunters and Gatherers of the Archaic Southwest*. Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Anthropology, University of Colorado, Boulder. ProQuest, Ann Arbor.
- 2005 *Social Identities among Archaic Mobile Hunters and Gatherers in the American Southwest*. Arizona State Museum Archaeological Series 197. University of Arizona Press, Tucson.

McGuire, Randall H.

- 1997 Crossing the Border. In *Prehistory of the Borderlands*, ed. John Carpenter and Guadalupe Sanchez, 130–137. Arizona State Museum Archaeological Series 186. University of Arizona Press, Tucson.
- 2002 The Meaning and Limits of the Southwest/Northwest: A Perspective from Northern Mexico. In *Boundaries and Territories: Prehistory of the U.S. Southwest and Northern Mexico*, ed. M. Elisa Villalpando, 173–183. Anthropological Research Papers 54. Arizona State University, Tempe.

McGuire, Randall H., and Maria Elisa Villalpando

- 1993 *An Archaeological Survey of the Altar Valley, Sonora, Arizona*. Arizona State Museum Archaeological Series 184. University of Arizona Press, Tucson.

McGuire, Randall H., Maria Elisa Villalpando, Victoria Vargas, and Emiliano Gallaga M.

- 1999 Cerro de Trincheras and the Casas Grandes World. In *The Casas Grandes World*, ed. Curtis Schaafsma and Carrol Riley, 134–148. University of Utah Press, Salt Lake City.

Mills, Barbara J.

- 2004 Identity, Feasting, and the Archaeology of the Greater Southwest. In *Identity, Feasting, and the Archaeology of the Greater Southwest*, ed. Barbara J. Mills, 1–23. University Press of Colorado, Boulder.

Maxine E. McBrinn and Laurie D. Webster

Minnis, Paul E., and Michael E. Whalen

- 2004 Forty Years after the Joint Casas Grandes Project: An Introduction to Chihuahuan Archaeology. In *Identity, Feasting, and the Archaeology of the Greater Southwest*, ed. Barbara J. Mills, 261–275. University Press of Colorado, Boulder.

Minnis, Paul E., Michael E. Whalen, Jane H. Kelley, and Joe D. Stewart

- 1993 Prehistoric Macaw Breeding in the North American Southwest. *American Antiquity* 58(2):270–275.

Moerman, Michael

- 1965 Ethnic Identification in a Complex Civilization: Who Are the Lue? *American Anthropologist* 67(5):1215–1230.

Newell, Gillian E.

- 1999 American and Mexican Archaeology: Differences in Meaning and Teaching. *SAA Bulletin* 17(5):29–31.

Ortman, Scott G.

- 2000 Conceptual Metaphor in the Archaeological Record: Methods and an Example from the American Southwest. *American Antiquity* 65(4):613–645.

Pailes, Richard A., and Daniel T. Reff

- 1985 Colonial Exchange Systems and the Decline of Paquimé. In *The Archaeology of West and Northwest Mexico*, ed. Michael Foster and Philip Weigand, 353–363. Westview, Boulder.

Pohl, John M.D.

- 2001 Chichimecatlalli: Strategies for Cultural and Commercial Exchange between Mexico and the American Southwest, 1100–1521. In *The Road to Aztlan: Art from a Mythic Homeland*, ed. Virginia M. Fields and Victor Zamudio-Taylor, 86–101. Los Angeles County Museum of Art, Los Angeles, and University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque.

Price, T. Douglas, Anne Birgitte Gebauer, and Lawrence H. Keeley

- 1995 The Spread of Farming into Europe North of the Alps. In *Last Hunters—First Farmers: New Perspectives on the Prehistoric Transition to Agriculture*, ed. T. Douglas Price and Anne Birgitte Gebauer, 95–126. School of American Research Press, Santa Fe.

Reed, Erik K.

- 1964 The Greater Southwest. In *Prehistoric Man in the New World*, ed. Jesse D. Jennings and Edward Norbeck, 175–193. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Renfrew, Colin

- 1987 *Archaeology and Language: The Puzzle of Indo-European Origins*. Cambridge University Press, New York.

Riley, Carroll

- 2005 *Becoming Aztlan: Mesoamerican Influence in the Greater Southwest, A.D. 1200–1500*. University of Utah Press, Salt Lake City.

Roney, John R., and Robert J. Hard

- 2002 Early Agriculture in Northwestern Chihuahua. In *Traditions, Transitions, and Technologies: Themes in Southwestern Archaeology*, ed. Sarah H. Schlanger, 160–177. University Press of Colorado, Boulder.

Sayles, E. B.

- 1936 *An Archaeological Survey of Chihuahua, Mexico*. Medallion Paper 22. Gila Pueblo, Globe, Ariz.

Scarborough, Vernon L., and David R. Wilcox (editors)

- 1991 *The Mesoamerican Ballgame*. University of Arizona Press, Tucson.

Sekaquaptewa, Emory, and Dorothy Washburn

- 2004 They Go Along Singing: Reconstructing the Hopi Past from Ritual Metaphors in Song and Image. *American Antiquity* 69(3):457-486.  
2006 Metaphors of Meaning in Mural Paintings, Pottery and Ritual Song. *Plateau* 3(1): 26-47.

Spicer, Edward

- 1963 *Cycles of Conquest*. University of Arizona Press, Tucson.

Stark, Mariam T.

- 1998 *The Archaeology of Social Boundaries*. Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, D.C.

Stone, Tammy

- 2003 Social Identity and Ethnic Interaction in the Western Pueblos of the American Southwest. *Journal of Archaeological Theory and Method* 10(1):31-67.

Taube, Karl A.

- 1986 The Teotihuacan Cave of Origin: The Iconography and Architecture of the Emergence in Mesoamerica and the American Southwest. *RES: Anthropology and Aesthetics* 29-30:31-82.

Taylor, Walter W.

- 2003 *Sandals from Coahuila Caves with an Introduction to the Coahuila Project, Coahuila, Mexico: 1937-1941, 1947*, ed. Nicholas J. Demerath, Mary C. Kennedy, and Patty Jo Watson. *Studies in Pre-Columbian Art and Archaeology* 35. Dumbarton Oaks, Washington, D.C.

Teague, Lynn S.

- 1998 *Textiles in Southwestern Prehistory*. University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque.

VanPool, Todd L., Christine S. VanPool, Rafael Cruz Antillón, Robert D. Leonard, and Marcel J. Harson

- 2000 Flaked Stone and Social Interaction in the Casas Grandes Region, Chihuahua, Mexico. *Latin American Antiquity* 11:163-174.

Vargas, Victoria D.

- 2001 Mesoamerican Copper Bells in the Pre-Hispanic Southwestern United States and Northwestern Mexico. In *The Road to Aztlan: Art from a Mythic Homeland*, ed. Virginia M. Fields and Victor Zamudio-Taylor, 196-211. Los Angeles County Museum of Art, Los Angeles, and University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque.

Vierra, Bradley J. (editor)

- 2005 *The Late Archaic across the Borderlands: From Foraging to Farming*. University of Texas Press, Austin.

Villalpando, Maria Elisa

- 2002 *Boundaries and Territories: Prehistory of the U.S. Southwest and Northern Mexico*. Anthropological Research Papers 54. Arizona State University, Tempe.

Maxine E. McBrinn and Laurie D. Webster

Washburn, Dorothy K., and Donald W. Crowe

1988 *Symmetries of Culture: Theory and Practice of Plane Pattern Analysis*. University of Washington Press, Seattle.

Weigand, Phil C., and Acelia García de Weigand

2001 A Macroeconomic Study of the Relationships between the Ancient Cultures of the American Southwest and Mesoamerica. In *The Road to Aztlan: Art from a Mythic Homeland*, ed. Virginia M. Fields and Victor Zamudio-Taylor, 184–195. Los Angeles County Museum of Art, Los Angeles, and University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque.

Whalen, Michael E., and Paul E. Minnis

2001 *Casas Grandes and Its Hinterland: Prehistoric Regional Organization in Northwest Mexico*. University of Arizona Press, Tucson.

Wills, W. H.

1988 *Early Prehistoric Agriculture in the American Southwest*. School of American Research Press, Santa Fe.

1995 Archaic Foraging and the Beginning of Food Production in the American Southwest. In *Last Hunters–First Farmers: New Perspectives on the Prehistoric Transition to Agriculture*, ed. T. Douglas Price and A. B. Gebauer, 215–242. School of American Research Press, Santa Fe.

Wosley, Anne I., and John C. Ravesloot (editors)

1993 *Culture and Contact: Charles C. Di Peso's Gran Chichimeca*. Amerind Foundation, Dragoon, Ariz., and University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque.