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CULTURE CONTACT, CULTURAL INTEGRATION AND DIFFERENCE:
A Case from Northern Mesopotamia

Sevil Baltali
Department of Anthropology, Yeditepe University, Turkey
ABSTRACT
Ancient northern Mesopotamia reveals the presence of southern Uruk-style material cultural elements along with indigenous styles in fourth millennium B.C.E. In this study, I argue that we need to focus on the ways northern Mesopotamian societies constructed ‘cultural difference’ through an analysis of the meanings of southern-style elements within northern contexts. I further argue that an investigation of culturally-particular ideas of “own” and “other” should involve a relationship between analytic and folk categories of cultural boundaries.
INTRODUCTION
In this article, I revisit one of the most intriguing archaeological cases of culture contact between north and south Mesopotamia, the so-called “Uruk expansion” in the fourth millennium B.C.E. (ca. 3700-3100 B.C.E.). During this period northern Mesopotamian sites reveal widespread distribution of southern Uruk-style material cultural elements along with indigenous styles (Stein 1999; Frangipane 2001, 2002b; Rothman ed. 2001; Postgate ed. 2002). I focus on the socio-cultural meanings of southern-style elements within the indigenous northern Mesopotamian sites. I suggest that we need to investigate the culture-internal symbolic divisions of ‘cultural difference’ through diachronic contextual examination of material culture, and in so doing we can arrive at an understanding of how people in the past themselves constructed cultural differences. Therefore, I investigate the culturally-particular ways of envisioning and representing the ‘own’ and the ‘foreign’.

However, to be able to achieve this we indeed need to consider the relationship between indigenous construction of cultural difference and our analytic cultural boundaries, as there can be a divergence between folk and analytic boundaries. Therefore, I evaluate the utility of the anthropological concept of culture in the archaeological investigation of culture contact situations with reference to an example of cultural interaction between the societies of Mesopotamia during the fourth millennium B.C.E.. I adopt theoretical elements such as the concepts of cultural integration, and folk and analytic cultural boundaries from Boasian anthropology.

The article consists of two main parts. The first part provides a discussion of the theoretical concepts of cultural integration and folk and analytic boundaries. The second part evaluates the utility of these concepts through an analysis of a wall-painting from an indigenous site (Arslantepe) located in northern Mesopotamia.

CULTURE, CULTURAL INTEGRATION AND BOUNDARIES
Within the field of archaeology the concept of culture is most commonly associated with the late nineteenth century European culture-historical approaches (e.g., Kossinna 1911; Childe 1939). These approaches had a holistic view of culture which covered shared traits and would be represented as “archaeological cultures.” The concept of “archaeological culture” referred to classified assemblages of material culture that were regarded as the product of geographically and historically distinct groups of people (Shennan 1978). Similarities in archaeological material within particular geographical settings were interpreted as representing cultural entities. Material cultural differences were taken as reflections of essential cultural differences.
The Boasian practice of archaeology is placed under the general rubric of the culture-historical approach. This is because a closer look at the Boasian concept of culture, as used in this culture-historical archaeological methodology, reveals that its adherents indeed repeated these European culture-historical approaches. Boasian culture-historical methodology thus consisted of establishing artifact typologies based on the consistency of the style and the production technique of artifacts. A pattern of repeated associations of certain artifacts at a given geographical locality was defined as “culture”: for example, “Teotihuacán Culture” (see Boas 1940: 530-4). Detected changes in artifact types within stratigraphic sequences were viewed as a dislocation and replacement of a particular culture (1940: 534 & 528). “Culture traits” were compared to establish cultural similarities and differences among geographically distant cultures (Boas 1905: 225). The synchronic similarity of artifact types across space meant contact and affiliation between groups, or diffusion.

Culture-historical approaches and the ‘archaeological culture’ concept have been criticized and abandoned in contemporary archaeological theory largely because culture-historians viewed cultures as bounded and static units that coincided with distinct spatial areas, and because they equated material cultural assemblages with groups of ethnically-related people (Emberling 1997; Gosden 1999; Hall 1984; Hodder ed., 1978, 2004; Hodder and Hutson 2003; Jones 1997; Kramer 1977; Shennan 1978). However, if we re-evaluate Boasian anthropological concepts of culture, cultural integration, and their approaches to cultural boundaries independent of their practice of archaeology with a presentist agenda, we can see that these concepts do not in fact reproduce culture-historical assumptions.

Boas’ writings on the aims of anthropology, ethnology and his criticism of 19th century cultural evolutionism reflect an understanding of culture that is not bounded and fixed in time and space, and coinciding with distinct groups of people (Boas 1940: 639-647). The main argument in Boas’s critique of 19th century cultural evolutionism was that cultural elements should not be taken out of their meaningful contexts and classified according to an evolutionary trajectory (Boas 1887; Bashkow 2004: 445; Stocking 1974: 61-67). The physical similarities of cultural elements across societies do not necessarily mean they conveyed the same meanings across space and time (Boas 1940). Therefore, according to Boas, the arbitrary classification of “traits” based on superficial analogies cannot be accepted as an explanation. He insisted we contextualize these elements and try to understand their culturally-contingent meanings which could only be obtained through a careful study of unique histories; consider, for example, Boas’s discussion of “the rattle”: 
The rattle is not merely the outcome of the idea of making noise and of the technical methods applied to reach this end; it is besides this, the outcome of religious conceptions, as any noise may be applied to invoke or drive away spirits; or it may be the outcome of the pleasure children have in noise of any kind; and its fork may be the characteristic of the art of people. (Boas 1887 after Stocking 1974: 63)

The communities who share similar culture traits do not necessarily belong to the same group with the same ideas and customs; instead communities can use similar elements according to their own understanding and integrate these elements into their cultural context in a particular way (Boas 1940). The outward appearance of material culture is not considered to be the direct reflection of culture. According to this concept of cultural integration, people in cultures actively select certain foreign elements—while rejecting others—and integrate them according to their own ever-changing meaning systems, and their cosmologies (Benedict 1934: 47; Boas 1940: 272). The flowing forms are shaped and reshaped according to the worldviews of the borrowers, which means that the new elements are integrated into pre-existing yet slowly changing cultural forms (Boas 1940: 284). I stress that the concept of cultural integration accommodates a temporal dimension because integration is a dynamic process, which can transform culture: “selection of foreign material embodied in the culture of the people, and the mutual transformation of the old culture and the newly acquired material” (Boas 1940: 435). Boasian concepts of cultural integration thus emphasize the culturally-specific ways of appropriating foreign elements (Boas 1940: 284; Benedict 1930: 260; Kroeber 1952: 344). Once these new elements enter into their new cultural context people give them new meanings and use them for culturally-specific purposes. To be able to understand the culturally-specific meanings of material cultural elements that Boasians called “traits,” their “historical unfolding” should be studied contextually (Boas 1940: 250-255). The most important implications of these notions of cultural integration and the historical approach are firstly that the outward appearance of material culture is not the direct reflection of a culture and secondly, ‘culture areas’ defined as a result of studying spatial distribution of ‘traits’ do not necessarily coincide with distinct groups of people. The boundaries of ‘culture’, language and groups of people do not necessarily coincide (see also Boas 1911; 1940: 435). Therefore, cultures are not seen as predetermined, essential and static entities but rather dynamic and historically contingent.

According to the Boasians, cultures result from never-ending, almost accidental processes of diffusion and integration which bring culture change (Boas 1940; Benedict 1930; Kroeber 1952). When new ideas are introduced, they can be
important stimuli for inner changes (Kroeber 1952: 291). As a result of diffusional processes, culture traits move across space and time but once they are integrated into their new context they become culturally specific (Boas 1940: 278 & 251-4).

Concepts of cultural integration and diffusion raise the issue of cultural boundaries. Boas did not conceptualize cultural boundaries as bounded, static and impenetrable but rather as permeable, fluid and plural (see Boas 1940: 291; Bashkow 2004: 445). Inherent in the idea of diffusion were the flows of people, ideas, styles, languages and objects between places (see Boas 1940: 284; Bashkow 2004: 445). They were aware of the ‘hybrid’ nature of cultures, since they thought the historical interactions between communities and the constant flow of elements such as styles, ideas, art and languages made cultures hybridized (Boas 1940: 220; Bashkow 2004: 444).

Boas stressed the importance of the contrastive and analytical value of cultural boundaries (Boas 1940). However, as Bashkow argues, the distinctions between analytic and folk boundaries were recognized: “things that people consider their own may be regarded as foreign from some analytical perspective [and vice versa]” (Bashkow 2004: 455 & 453). A trait that is initially considered foreign within a group can become their own over time, thus not foreign (Bashkow 2004: 448). This distinction between analytic and folk boundaries is crucial because it reveals that they recognized the classic problem of ethnographic analysis is what goes into the interpretive processes; the distinction between the interpretations offered by people—interlocutors—and the analysis made by the anthropologist as result of observation (see Turner 1967; Wagner 1975). Boasians were aware of the “secondary realizations” offered by the interlocutors and therefore did not take their analytical boundaries and/or the folk boundaries as the reflection of essential and natural cultural boundaries (Bashkow 2004). They did not accept their analytical boundaries as the reflection of the cultural boundaries people envision for themselves (Bashkow 2004: 447). According to Boasians, the folk boundaries people draw for themselves are symbolic rather than being pre-given and natural.

In his recent study, Bashkow uses a Boasian approach to cultural boundaries in his ethnography of Orokaiva in Papua New Guinea to illustrate how what Orokaiva accepted as the “other: whiteman” can be considered as their own—Orokaiva—from the perspective of the anthropologist because the very cultural notions of the Orokaiva people determine what and how they construct as the ‘other’ (see Bahkow 2004: 450).

The things that are considered as ‘foreign’ by Orokaiva can be considered as their own from the perspective of the anthropologist because what is ‘foreign’ is a culturally-integrated element: that is to say a culturally-reinterpreted element, and
therefore their own. According to Bashkow this ‘divergence’ between analytic and folk boundaries generates a “zone of foreign”: “…a zone of things that, from the perspective of the analyst, might nonetheless be interpreted as internal to their culture” (2004: 447).

This “divergence” between analytic and folk boundaries is very important to consider in archaeological interpretations of cultural difference. In archaeology, we as the analysts generate our own interpretations at the present moment of the meaning systems of past communities which involves an active relationship between the two (Shanks and Hodder 1995: 3-29). What the archaeologist considers ‘foreign’ may have been considered as not foreign by the people in the society or initially might have been considered ‘other’ and then integrated (reinterpreted or reshaped) into already existing patterns and accepted as their own. An element that is considered foreign within a group initially can become their own over time, thus not foreign, which encourages a diachronic contextual analysis of material culture.

CULTURE CONTACTS IN NORTHERN MESOPOTAMIA
This part consists of three sections. The first section provides a brief background of fourth millennium B.C.E. Mesopotamia, the cultural contacts between northern and southern Mesopotamian communities and the dominant interpretations. The second section deconstructs the archaeological construction of “Uruk” and “Local” culture categories in an attempt to illustrate how they may reproduce the problematic culture-historical assumptions. The final part discusses a wall-painting from the ‘indigenous’ northern “Uruk-influenced local center” of Arslantepe to evaluate the concepts of cultural integration and cultural boundaries and the “zone of the foreign”.

Background to Fourth Millennium B.C.E. Mesopotamia
Fourth millennium B.C.E. southern Mesopotamia reveals the formation of state societies, urbanization and literacy. The changes towards hierarchical organization and urbanization are manifested through the presence of large cities, settlement hierarchy, monumental architecture, long-distance exchange and large-scale use of bureaucratic devices. A four-tier settlement hierarchy had at its apex the city of Uruk (200 ha). The city name Uruk is used to define both this period in Mesopotamian history and the “Uruk culture” (Charvat 2002; Nissen 1983). The Uruk period is divided into early, middle and late periods based on changes in settlement patterns, architecture, pottery, seals and writing. In northern Mesopotamia during this period there were regional centers that seem to have varied in their socio-political and economic organizations
The formation of urbanized state societies in southern Mesopotamia during the late Uruk period coincided with the widespread distribution of southern-style material cultural elements such as architecture, ceramic, and administrative technology in northern Mesopotamia (Southeastern Turkey, Syria, northern Iraq and western Iran). The widespread distribution of southern Mesopotamian Uruk-style material culture in northern Mesopotamia has been called the “Uruk expansion” (Algaze 1989, 1993, 2001).

The Archaeological Construction of the “Uruk” and the “Local”

The implicit assumption in the archaeological approaches to the “Uruk expansion” is that there are two distinct cultural entities represented by two different material cultural assemblages: the “Uruk” and the “local”. As mentioned, the name Uruk refers to the period and to the culture. According to widely used criteria the Uruk culture in the north can be identified by a number of characteristic findings such as pottery, cylinder seals, sealings and sealed objects, sculpture in the round and a particular tripartite architectural type (Algaze, 1993: 39; Sürenhagen 1986: 9; Stein 1999: 149). If a site in northern Mesopotamia reveals all of the above, it is considered a “genuine Uruk” site inhabited by southerners (e.g., Algaze 1993; Sürenhagen 1986; Stein 1999). If some of them such as Uruk pottery types are found mixed with a “local” ceramic assemblage (for example the local production of Uruk styles) and if hybrid forms in ceramics and architecture are found then the site is accepted as “Uruk-related or influenced local” (Rothman ed., 2001; Helwing 1999). In several cases the presence of Uruk-style wall cones and the typical Uruk ‘beveled-rim’ bowls were accepted as sufficient to define a site as an Uruk site inhabited by southerners (e.g., Algaze 1993: 34-35). The ‘local’ refers to the indigenous societies of northern Mesopotamia, and it has been characterized mostly by “chaff-tempered” ceramics that have been shown by surveys and excavations to have had a broad distribution “extending from coastal Syria through the Transtigridian plains and into the southern flanks of the Anatolian highlands in Turkey” (Algaze 1993: 24). There are several major sites in northern Mesopotamia that are accepted as indigenous northern sites which have long term occupation revealing periods before and during the so called “Uruk expansion” period such as Arslantepe.

As it is seen, in some cases these categories are viewed as the direct reflection of groups of people (e.g., Southerners/Uruk people). However, in most cases Mesopotamian archaeologists refer to material styles rather than groups of people when...
they use the terms “Uruk”, “local” and “Uruk-related local” (Helwing 1999; Rothman 2002; Frangipane 2002). There are potential problems with the division of Mesopotamia into two distinct groups: first, the “local” and the “Uruk” categories create internally undifferentiated entities represented by ideal artifact types. Secondly, they are analytic categories creating arbitrary cultural boundaries and they should not be mistaken as the cultural boundaries drawn by people in the past for themselves. It should not be assumed that there were distinct “Uruk” and “local” cultures with clear boundaries of cultural difference that remained the same for that time period (approximately six hundred years).

However, I do not advocate the abandonment of our analytic boundaries in culture contact studies. On the contrary, I stress that we need analytic categories to analyze and sort data, but we should not take our arbitrary analytic boundaries for granted. For analytical purposes, the categories of “local” and “Uruk” to define differences in material styles are useful for their comparative value; but we need to investigate how communities of northern Mesopotamia themselves constructed ‘cultural difference’ and envisioned ‘the foreign’ through a site-specific, diachronic and contextual analysis of the meanings of southern styles in northern Mesopotamian sites. An investigation of possible meanings of these styles is necessary to understand the symbolic culture-internal divisions of “own/other”. We here face the classic problem of the divergence between our analytical categories and the folk categories of people in the past which I will illustrate in the next section.

Case Study: Arslantepe ‘Temple/Place’ Wall-Painting

Arslantepe is located in eastern Turkey (see FIGURE 1). The site has been excavated by the University of Rome La Sapienza, under the directorship of Prof. Marcella Frangipane. The site is accepted as an “Uruk influenced local center” (Frangipane 2001: 325). It is accepted as local because of its long-term occupation revealing periods before the Uruk contact periods, and because it reveals the continuity of a distinct material cultural style in architecture, ceramics and architectural decorative elements during the contact periods (Frangipane 1993). Pertaining to this period, two superimposed stratigraphic layers have been identified; levels VII where evidence for interaction with the south was limited and level VIA where southern-style material cultural elements were more widely incorporated into the Arslantepe material culture—that is why level VIA is accepted as “Uruk influenced local” (Frangipane 1993, 2002).

The major finding of level VIA is a ‘temple/palace’ complex in which there is a long connective corridor, the walls of which are painted with lozenge shapes in red on
white. Some of the rooms within the complex also are painted with geometric and stylized figures in black, red and white. One wall of the ‘temple/palace’ complex had a painting with a scene (Frangipane 1997: 64, 2001: 338, 2002a: 337). The painting is located on the wall of the corridor behind temple B. In this painting two figures of stylized bulls face one another, and are surrounded with a decoration of red and black concentric lozenge shaped triangles (see FIGURE 2). The bodies of the bulls are depicted by two triangles painted in black with red outlines. The rest of the motifs are in red. A figure is pulling what seems to be a monumental cart. He holds a ring with reins attached to the bull’s horns. Over the whole scene is a canopy. This theme has commonly been found on typical Uruk seals, and one example of this seal was also found at Arslantepe (Frangipane 1997: 65; Frangipane 2002b: 284, 288; Littauer and Crouwel 1990: 15-18 see FIGURE 3). In interpreting this wall-painting, we can suggest that a “foreign” theme was adopted by Arslantepe elites, thus revealing the imitation of foreign styles. We can classify the theme of the wall painting as “foreign/Uruk” because the iconography was repeatedly used on southern Uruk seals (e.g., Algaze 2002: 70).

Arslantepe elites might have considered this wall painting as the representation of the “foreign-other,” however from the perspective of the analyst it should be considered as part of Arslantepe’s iconography because when we diachronically compare the style of this temple/palace wall-painting to the other wall-paintings in houses and temples of the previous period, we see that what is considered as “Uruk” theme was integrated into already existing forms. The Uruk seal theme was reshaped, integrated into Arslantepe’s styles and re-contextualized within a temple/palace complex. As far as we know, this kind of representation is not found in southern Mesopotamian temple walls.

When Arslantepe wall paintings from the previous period (level VII) are analyzed, we see first that wall-paintings were important decorative aspects of houses and temples and secondly, the same color choice (red, black and white) is seen in this period (Palmieri 1978). All the paintings reveal stylized figures rendered in geometric forms. For example, in the northeast part of the site rectangular small dwellings were excavated (Palmieri 1978). The walls of some of these structures were painted with stylized images. At the back wall of one of the structures is a painting of black triangles on white background (see Palmieri 1978: 11, fig. 5). An older phase reveals linear motifs in white and red on black (Palmieri 1978: 11). The level VII temple building’s internal walls were also painted in red, white and black with stylized figures. Wall paintings, stylized geometric figures and the red-black-white color combination had
been important decorative elements within Arslantepe’s architectural spaces. In level VIA the same styles and color choice continued.

The Arslantepe elite may have considered the theme on the wall-painting as “foreign” (related to Uruk) and it might have had a prestigious meaning signifying the connection of Arslantepe elite to the elites of Uruk polities revealing commonalities in ruling ideologies (Frangipane 1997, 2002a). In this case, it can be suggested that Arslantepe elites gained prestige and legitimacy by way of their access to the Uruk ‘other’. Arslantepe’s elite, for internal social interests, however, chose to represent a southern themed preeminent figure through wall-painting on the most visible part of the temple/palace complex. They remolded this theme according their own social interests and their own artistic traditions. Therefore, I stress that the Uruk iconographic elements, which the Arslantepe elites may have considered foreign, were transformed and integrated into already existing stylistic patterns within a new context. These iconographic elements should be considered as part of the Arslantepe meaning system from the perspective of the archaeologist because Arslantepe elites represented their own symbolic culture-internal distinction.

Arslantepe elites borrowed a southern glyptic theme and re-interpreted it according to their own visual-expressive ways through applying it to a new medium: wall-painting. Therefore, in the creation of a pictorial representation of a preeminent person (a possible ruler) they used their culture-internal perception of the ‘foreign’ which simultaneously possesses the categories of ‘own’ and ‘other’. Their own notions of cultural difference categorically involve both the ‘own’ and the ‘other’. The ‘other’ comes about as a result of their own culturally particular way of envisioning what is not ‘own’—the external—therefore both categories should be considered as culture-internal.

Another possible interpretation is that although the Arslantepe elites borrowed what we consider a foreign Uruk theme, this does not mean that they considered it foreign, because after all they integrated and represented it according to their own artistic medium and tradition; we might suggest that they thereby projected a ‘local identity’. Even in that case, I as the analyst would suggest that ‘local identity’ simultaneously comprises the categorical ‘own’ and ‘other’. A further possible interpretation can involve the application of hybridization theory which suggests that—especially in colonial situations—new and “mixed” cultures emerge (e.g., Friedman 1995: 84; van Dommelen 2005: 116-122). We might suggest that the wall-painting at Arslantepe reflects a hybrid identity. However, from the perspective of the analyst the very notion of hybrid possesses the amalgamation of two or more boundaries: the ‘owns’ and the ‘others.’ Therefore, I suggest that cultural difference should not be
viewed as just a manifestation of identity because this view of culture-as-identity eliminates the vital relationship between indigenous categories and our analytic categories and thus jeopardizes the anthropological concept of culture (Bashkow 2004).

CONCLUSIONS

“Culture contact” presupposes that there are indeed different cultures interacting despite the recent critiques of the “culture” concept in the fields of socio-cultural anthropology and archaeology. The fundamental criticism leveled against the concepts of culture and cultural boundaries states that they create bounded, naturalized and essential entities (Wolf 1972; Jones 1997). It has been commonly accepted in both fields that the conceptualization of cultures as stable, bounded spatial entities is very problematic. The criticisms stem from the view that cultural boundaries are plural and constructed actively by people within societies rather than being essential (Clifford and Marcus 1986; Gupta and Ferguson 1997; Hodder 1982, 2003; Jones 1997). Do these criticisms mean that we have to altogether abandon the anthropological concepts of culture and cultural boundaries in our studies of “culture contact”?

In this preliminary study, I attempt to examine the culture-internal perception and representation of cultural difference by analyzing a wall-painting at the northern Mesopotamian indigenous site of Arslantepe. Instead of focusing on the investigation of ‘cultural differences’ between “Uruk” and “local” communities, I shifted the emphasis to the culturally-particular ways of constructing “own” and “other”. I argued that accepting our analytic categories of “Uruk” and “local” as the reflection of cultural boundaries has the potential danger of reproducing the problematic culture-historical assumptions. I further argued that to be able to investigate culture-internal categories we need to consider the relationship between analytic and folk categories. Focusing on one category and accepting that one category as the reflection of the indigenous construction of cultural boundaries of the past communities is problematic, because it reproduces the views of cultures as natural and essential entities. Borrowing theoretical concepts such as cultural integration and the divergence between folk and analytic boundaries (Boas 1940; Bashkow 2004), I tried to illustrate that the “zone of the foreign” created by this divergence shows the possible symbolic construction of the “foreign” which is created by the culturally particular perceptions of “own” and “other”. 
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Figure 1. Location of Arslantepe (After Frangipane 2001: 325, fig. 9.2).

- = Uruk settlements (colonies)
○ = Local LC settlements in which Uruk (probably alien) groups interacted with the indigenous population or interfered in the site occupants’ lives
△ = Local LC sites with no substantial Uruk presence
★ = Local Uruk-influenced center
Figure 2. Wall-painting from the wall of “temple/palace” complex at Arslantepe (After Frangipane 2001: 330, fig. 9.9).
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Figure 3. Uruk style seals: (1) from Arslantepe, (2) from Uruk (After Frangipane 2002b: 288, fig. 76).
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CULTURAL CONTACTS IN COLONIAL SETTINGS:  
_The Construction of New Identities in Phoenician Settlements of the Western Mediterranean_

Ana Delgado and Meritxell Ferrer  
Universitat Pompeu Fabra, Barcelona
ABSTRACT
The Phoenician settlements of Cerro del Villar (south of Spain) and Mozia (Sicily) constitute two appropriate settings to analyze the processes of formation of new identities in the western Phoenician colonial areas. The material culture of these settlements, founded during the 8th century B.C.E., express the coexistence of Phoenicians with various western Mediterranean populations.

The present study analyzes how the inhabitants of these colonies consciously used their material culture to construct new identities. Architecture, technological innovation, ritual and tableware for the service of food and drinks show a formal homogeneity that expresses links with the metropolis and with other Phoenician Mediterranean settlements. All these elements are highly visible and public, which contrasts with the presence of material elements of local cultures or hybrids in the domestic sphere, or in workshops associated with handcrafted processes already known by the local groups. Architecture, technology, ritual and tableware were all used actively in the construction of new identities in these settlements. These new identities go beyond ethnicity and are the expression of social and political negotiations within colonial spaces.
INTRODUCTION
Phoenician settlements are a perfect laboratory to analyze the processes of constructing social identities. Colonies are one of the physical settings where we can find cultural contacts and encounters between colonial communities and local peoples. There we see the coexistence of peoples with diverse cultural traditions that are in constant transformation. The opportunities of social mobilities, new relations of power and scenery marked by constant social interaction make these colonies culturally-dynamic spaces where the inhabitants must build new social identities.

Cerro del Villar (south of Spain) and Mozia (Sicily) are two Phoenician colonies founded during the 8th century B.C.E. The Phoenician diaspora, headed by the metropolis of Tyre, was a colonial undertaking mainly of a commercial nature, and involved the creation of numerous enclaves along the Mediterranean coastline (from Cyprus to Gibraltar) and in Atlantic territories (including Gadir, Lixus or Abul). (FIGURE 1).

In both of the colonies analyzed in this article Near Eastern groups cohabited with different western Mediterranean populations. This coexistence of different groups of origin and different ethnicities is expressed in household artefacts and products associated with maintenance tasks, as well as in other productive activities. Moreover, material practices related to architecture, tableware, ritual and new technologies show how residents of these colonies created new identities that would legitimize the cultural and social cohesion of these new settlements.
THE SETTLEMENT OF CERRO DEL VILLAR: A PHOENICIAN COLONY IN SOUTHERN IBERIA

The southern Mediterranean coast of Iberia was one of the main areas of attraction available to Phoenician merchants. Between the 8th and 6th centuries B.C.E., Phoenicians created in this area more than ten permanent installations that featured residential areas as well as craft, commercial, and harbour infrastructures. The colony of Cerro del Villar, founded in the second half of the 8th century B.C.E., was one of the main Phoenician settlements in the western Mediterranean area.

For the foundation of this colony, the Phoenicians chose an uninhabited island in the estuary of the Guadalhorce River. They were established in a “no-man’s land,” characterized by a marshy, damp and inhospitable environment (Carmona 1999). No local communities’ settlements are reported in the surrounding areas of the colony at the moment of its establishment. The closest one, according to the information available, is the village of San Pablo, under the present city of Malaga, approximately 5 km away from the Phoenician settlement of Villar. The choice of this emplacement responds to their determination to create an enclave segregated from the local population as well as respect for native structures of power.

During the 8th century B.C.E., in this Mediterranean area the majority of the local population occupied lands relatively separate from the coast, rich in pastures and cattle resources (FIGURE 2). Shortly after the foundation of the Phoenician colony, some indigenous groups created their village at the bottom of the valley looking for better agricultural land. Some of these groups were highly involved in the exchange with the colonial communities along the coast (Aubet and Delgado 2003). Nevertheless, for the first few decades, exchange relations with local groups in the immediate territory seldom occurred, except for coastal settlements, as the low number of Phoenician material found in these native settlements shows.
The Phoenician colonists who founded Cerro del Villar did not value just the commercial possibilities of this territory, but rather its strategic position within networks of terrestrial and maritime communication. Phoenician navigators and Phoenician merchants found in this small island a place protected from winds and maritime currents, which made it a good harbour. Cerro del Villar was also one of the last Mediterranean ports where a navigator could moor before the difficult crossing of the Gibraltar Strait, en route to the markets of the Atlantic territories, and the mythical Tartessos (Aubet 1999a: 41-42). In Atlantic southern Iberia, there were communities with rich mineral and agricultural resources and a long and intense tradition of exchange with foreign merchants (Delgado 2002). From the Guadalhorce’s estuary also began an alternative road, this time by land, to access the Tartessic domain and the rich lands of Granada.

Colonial Architecture and Social Identity
Excavation campaigns carried out by Maria Eugenia Aubet have uncovered around 5% of the total surface of the settlement. In these campaigns several areas have been excavated: residential buildings, a marketplace area and various spaces dedicated to the development of handcrafted activities (Aubet et al. 1999; Aubet 1991: 29-51; Aubet 1997: 11-22; Delgado et al. Forthcoming) (FIGURE 3). Among the latter we must highlight the production of wheel-made pottery and metalwork—iron, bronze, lead and silver. Diverse studies show that in this settlement a socially-complex colonial community was established, with a significant proportion of merchants and craftsmen.

The different buildings excavated in the colony reproduce techniques of construction, manners of distribution and structural configurations similar to those found in the Phoenician cities of the eastern Mediterranean. Orthogonal buildings are distributed along a network of streets and terraces placed in different topographical levels. Houses are composed of several rooms organized around an interior courtyard. Sometimes these buildings consist of two-story stone structures; mostly, adobe and tapial were used for their construction. In addition, lime was used to cover exterior walls, a material that would turn the colony into a visible and noticeable point in the landscape through its intense white colour.

This architectural style expressed in a material way a clear link between the colony and the place of origin of its founders. Through the appearance of their houses, their workshops and stores, the residents created identity ties with the eastern metropolis and with other Phoenician colonies of the Mediterranean and Atlantic coasts. At the same time, this eastern architecture created a significant visual separation
between colonial settlements and native villages, characterized by groups of small circular huts, with walls constructed of branches and mud on stone bases. In their early moments, when some members of the native communities had not yet integrated the eastern style houses into their own settlement, colonial architecture favoured the construction of difference expressed visually in the landscape (Delgado 2005a: 585-594). Architectural visibility thus becomes a material element with an enormous communicative potential for those who built it, inhabited it and saw it (Blanton 1994). This potential turns architectural styles into an active element of social mobility strategies and also an element for the construction of communal or civic solidarities; thus becoming an active element in the creation and negotiation of social identities (Blanton 1994; see also Lightfoot 1995; Van Dyke 1999; Voss 2005).

In the eastern-style houses of Cerro del Villar, as we will see further on, we can find households comprised of members of diverse geographical origins (eastern, local or descendants of native Mediterranean populations) that were possibly based on mixed couples. In this pluriethnic context architecture was one of the central elements in the construction of colonial identity: it created ties with the East and with other colonial communities within this Atlantic-Mediterranean net, homogenizing under the same style all the residents of the colony—leaving social differences to be expressed through structural configurations or through the size of their houses—and generated distance with the traditional native communities.

The members of Cerro del Villar deliberately used the style of their houses to express their aspirations to be recognized as members of this community, independently of their place of origin or their ancestors. In this sense, the architecture of the houses was a crucial strategy in the negotiation of new social identities encouraged by the possibilities of social mobility offered by colonial settings both to the residents of eastern origin and to those of native origin. This intentional use of domestic architecture—as well as other practices and highly visible material elements that we will subsequently analyze—was produced in a social context in which the hierarchies of status had a certain mobility and where social groups were not totally defined by birth or ancestry. In this ethnically dynamic social context, domestic architecture became a crucial strategy in the negotiation and the construction of new identities.

**Cooking Identities: the Handmade Pottery of Cerro del Villar**
The contextual analysis of different spaces excavated in Cerro del Villar provides a clear evidence of a pluriethnic colonial community living in similarly-built houses.
Between the tableware and ceramic vessels found in the different areas of the colony, the presence of handmade ceramics is relatively frequent. These ceramics have similar decorative, technical, and formal characteristics to those found among the traditional tableware of native communities of Iberia (Delgado 2005b: 1249-1260) (FIGURE 4).

The morphology and decoration of these ceramics, as well as the composition of their clays, indicate that they had different origins (Cardell 1999; Clop unpublished). Among the handmade pottery of Cerro del Villar there are some containers typical of the Tartessic area, as well as other ceramics typical of the different native communities of southeastern Iberia. However, most of the handmade pottery maintains morphological similarities with ceramics produced by the native populations of the Guadalhorce area. The analysis of thin sheets and X-ray diffraction points in the same direction: to a variability of origins and a predominance of typical clays in geomorphologic units close to the area of Cerro del Villar. However, we cannot rule out the possibility that some of them were made in Cerro del Villar.

The origin of Cerro del Villar’s handmade pottery offers us information of great interest in understanding the complexity of the social networks created by the entry of the Phoenicians into the markets and networks of exchange in the extreme West. They offer us a totally different vision from the classic dualism of hinterland and colony that still dominates the analyses of Mediterranean protohistoric colonization. In this paper we will focus on how the handmade pottery allows us to identify the presence of peoples of diverse geographical origins among the residents of Cerro del Villar and how these origins were used in the definition of social and cultural identities in a colonial setting.

Whether coming from other communities or manufactured in Cerro del Villar, many of the handmade vessels were for the everyday use of colony residents. In practically all the areas excavated (including poured zones, craft spaces and domestic areas) handmade pottery was found with similar patterns of use and consumption, both clearly marked (FIGURES 5 and 6).
Fifty percent of the handmade pottery are comprised of pots, many of which were used for cooking. Spherical bowls, which could serve for the consumption of certain liquid foods and for the preparation of food, represent almost 25% of the total handmade vessels. The remaining 25% are mainly distributed between large containers for storage, vessels used in metallurgical processes and carinated bowls and cups with elegant surfaces. Open vessels used in the consumption and service of certain foods are totally underrepresented in the colony.¹ Most of these finds were concentrated in a pottery workshop, where we have also documented a large number of other beverage vessels manufactured in non Phoenician areas—Greek cups and Etruscan kantharoi. In contrast to what is observed in the colony, in the local settlements of southern Iberia carinated bowls and cups are the majority of the tableware in the domestic areas. They are vessels that usually feature a similar decoration of geometric motifs or brilliant and intensely polished surfaces. In the colony of Cerro del Villar only one of the handmade ceramics of beverage features this type of decoration.

Handmade pottery in the colony was used mainly for the preparation of food. Many of the cooking-pots have combustion residue on their surfaces, especially on the bottom. This indicates that they were placed directly into the fire, using occasionally a small support. The thickness of their bases and sides and the technical characteristics of their fabrics, with coarse inclusions, make them especially apt for cooking (Bats 1992: 407-424). In Cerro del Villar we do not find wheel-made vessels with similar technical

¹ Specifically, there have been recovered about 10 open vessels over a total of 14 individuals registered in the settlement.
characteristics except in later periods (late 7th century–beginning of the 6th century B.C.E.) when potters created similar ceramics in the colony's workshops, reproducing in some cases the typical incised decoration that characterizes some of the handmade vessels (Curià, Delgado, Fernández and Párraga 1999: 157-277).

The handmade cooking-pots in the different areas of Cerro del Villar correspond to a specific way of cooking: it is different than the traditional eastern cooking methods, but is characteristic of southern Iberia native communities, where we find similar vessels. The ovoid or spherical shape of these vessels suggests that they were used to cook liquid foods like soup, pucheros or gachas. We do not know much about the cooking methods that were practiced in colonial Phoenician and eastern communities, but their ovens and the predominance of plates among the tableware indicate the greater importance of solid food in contrast to the local populations’ tableware. The consumption of these liquid foods among residents of Cerro del Villar could be associated with handmade spherical bowls, which would explain why bowls are the second most represented shape among the handmade potteries of the colony.

In the colony of Cerro del Villar there is another vessel-type used for another way of cooking that does not belong to the tradition of handmade cooking-pots, and is instead connected to eastern Mediterranean customs. Having emphasized the domestic ovens that have been repeatedly found in the Phoenician colonies of southern Iberia during the first decades of the colonies’ creation (Aubet 1974: 94-5; 1985: 141-174; 1999b: 84-5), we would also like to remark upon the baking trays used for bread cooking that the first Phoenician traders and craftsmen took with them when they arrived at Huelva as early as the 9th century B.C.E. (González de Canales, Serrano and Llompart 2004). These baking trays were used by Phoenician communities at least until the 6th century B.C.E., as is shown by the pottery workshop found in zone 3/4 of Cerro del Villar. Although we do not know anything about how food preparation and cooking were practiced in colonial communities, as we mentioned above, the presence of these ovens and baking trays, as well as the predominance of plates among their tableware indicates the greater importance of solid food in Phoenician cooking than is suggested by the local population’s tableware.

Material evidence derived from maintenance tasks in domestic spaces has been considered a very reliable indicator in identifying the origin of the individuals that inhabited them (Deagan 1983; Bats 1992; Dietler 1995: 89; Lighfoot, Martinez and Schiff 1998; McEwan 1992; Voss 2005). Diet, the manner of preparation, manipulation and cooking of food are identified as critical evidence for this purpose. Maintenance activities, such as the daily cooking, are practices that are reproduced daily in repetitive and routine form. They respond to a learned way of how “to do
things,” in the sense that they are mostly unconscious and not directly motivated. Routine or *habitus*, as Bourdieu defines it (Bourdieu 1977), would act as a form of resistance to the adoption of new practices and new ways of doing things. Instruments and cooking sets—ovens, handmade cooking pots—located in different spaces of the colony of Cerro del Villar indicate that different culinary traditions were practiced simultaneously. This would indicate the pluriethnic nature of the settlement. Handmade cooking pots show that native women are present among the residents of the colony, while the ovens located in some of the domestic spaces suggest the presence of eastern people that cooked Phoenician foods in a Phoenician way. Vessels, household sets and equipment for food processing indicate a multicultural setting similar to other historic colonial settlements (Deagan 1983; Lightfoot 1995; Silliman 2005; Voss 2005) and protohistoric *entrepôts*, Greek (Buchner and Ridgway 1993; Curià 2000; Dietler 1995) as well as Phoenician (Martín Ruiz 1995-6; Gómez Bellard and Habibi 2001; López Pardo and Suárez 2002; Mansel 2000).

**Contextual Analysis of the Ceramic Vessels in a Domestic Space: House 2**

Contextual analysis of the domestic spaces within the colony offers us information about each of its households units. It shows us how each one of these units used handmade or wheel-made tableware, and how other household routine artefacts were used in their daily practices. Contextual analyses of domestic spaces also offer us information relating to the cultural origins of their members and help us know how they used, rejected or incorporated these elements of different cultural contexts into a private context, using them in their practices of social interaction and in the construction of their identities. In addition, they not only offer the possibility of taking account of agency in cultural contact processes, but also demand the introduction of gender relations into the analysis of cultural contact, an aspect generally not discussed.

One of the few buildings fully excavated in Cerro del Villar is House 2 (FIGURES 7 & 8). It is a typical eastern construction of modest dimensions (74 m² in floor plan), composed of different rooms whose use and function may be recognized from the analysis of architectural elements, artefacts and another types of deposition and residue (Delgado, Ferrer, García, López, Martorell and Sciortino, Forthcoming).

This house was built and occupied during the 7th century B.C.E., some decades after the foundation of the colony. Its handmade vessels are highly represented in spaces connected to maintenance activities and the consumption of food; rooms 1, 3 and 5.

The household unit residing in House 2 was composed of people of different origins. Its cooking vessels are mainly of local tradition, although there are also some eastern instruments such as iron knives, which are popular among the local population.
of southern Iberia. Other utensils used in Phoenician cuisine are absent: we have recovered no ovens, baking trays, mortars or ceramic tripods. The only evidence for fire usage are elaborate handmade braziers that could serve both as domestic stoves and room heaters. Room 1, the main area of the house, is identified as an area for gatherings as well as food consumption. In this room we have found remains of five Phoenicians red-slip plates, together with two handmade spherical bowls. This tableware indicates that two manners of serving and consuming food, associated with two different culinary traditions, coexist in the same space.

This coexistence of eastern and native tableware in the same residential space is capable of expressing differences at the centre of its domestic group—of gender, age, ethnicity—that are demonstrated through forms of food consumption (Goody 1982; Hastorf 1991). It is necessary to highlight, nevertheless, that the house’s tableware is mainly eastern, which might suggest that the serving and consumption of food was a

2 Those braziers are big handmade open recipients with thick sides and big inclusions, which show clear signs of combustion on its internal sides.
social practice that was taking part in a space where colonial identity was in the process of being constructed. Here tableware acts in the same way as the house’s architecture and ritual practice.

In this domestic space, objects associated with the practice of purification rituals are of entirely Phoenician forms. Bottles and small jugs for aromatic oils, oil lamps that served to illuminate (but also to purify), and an ostrich egg with red ochre in its interior are some of the elements found in House 2 which indicate that its residents carried out ritual practices derived from a Phoenician world vision, shared by great part of the inhabitants of this colony and by other Phoenician communities from the Atlantic and Mediterranean territories. Through ritual practice members of this domestic group actively expressed their membership in the “Phoenician community,” that was understood as an entity extended beyond the limits of this enclave and linked to other Phoenician sites in Atlantic and Mediterranean spaces.

Workshops and Technologies
House 2 has a small room (Locus 6) in which activities related to lead metallurgy were carried out. Although its soil appears essentially clean, we observed on its surface a spot left by combustion activities and small lead drops located close to the burnt pit. There were few ceramic vessels here: only a handmade bowl and a small bottle for aromatic oils, which could be used by the metalworker to purify himself when his daily work was finished.

This bowl has very thick sides and enormous inclusions in its fabric, and also evidence of burning in its interior. There are no metallic adhesions in its interior, but we cannot rule out its use in metallurgical work. In other areas of the site, handmade pottery is frequently present in workshops dedicated to metal manipulation (Delgado 2005b). Also in these metallurgical spaces there are various handmade vessels such as cooking-pots, large jugs of storage and spherical bowls, which seem to suggest a coexistence of domestic activities with craftwork spaces. In the same spaces there were also found handmade ceramics of native morphology that were seemingly used as crucibles. In addition oven-vessels used for small-scale copper production have been located in the colony (Rovira 2005). This technology of limited yields—in comparison to those that characterize eastern metallurgy—has been practiced by the southern communities of Iberia since the third millennium B.C.E.

Primary technologies, sets of instruments, and domestic handmade ceramics all suggest an active participation of individuals of local origin in productive processes. For example, in metallurgical practices we can see how native people could apply their own local knowledge and their own cultural forms to the working of metals that were
already familiar to them, such as copper and bronze. The debate about women’s participation in these metallurgical tasks is still ongoing. Traditional visions of metallurgical work are totally androcentric and do not accept the possibility of women’s participation as active workers. Nevertheless this vision has been criticized by some European Bronze Age archaeologists (Sørensen 1996; Sánchez Romero and Moreno Honorato 2003), who stress the fact that, as happens in some of the metallurgical workshops of Cerro del Villar, in these spaces tools and equipment related to the metallurgical work are mixed together with household goods used in the manipulation and consumption of food, as well as in the development of other maintenance tasks.

Metals constitute one of the main resources that drew Phoenicians merchants to the western Mediterranean. Copper, iron and silver mines in the immediate territory of Cerro del Villar are very scarce, and the ones that do exist are of low yields. The scarce information we possess relating to the exploitation of these mines indicates that the mining activities as well as the first phases of reduction of the mineral were activities that were carried out by the local communities without direct control from the Phoenicians. The latter’s access to minerals, therefore, depends on their relations with these communities. The presence of women of native origin, perhaps of men, alongside the eastern colonists is probably cause of the successful continuity of Cerro del Villar until the 6th century B.C.E. Native women and men were present in this site not only as indicators of reproductive and sexual ties, but also probably provided information about resources, roads and routes, as well as alliances with the communities with which the colonists attempt to negotiate and trade.

The importance of the active participation by individuals of native origin in the operation and the prosperity of Phoenician ‘businesses’ allows us to understand the ‘ethnic’ porosity of the social hierarchies of the colony, and the varied and dynamic nature of social categories during the first decades of life in the settlement. The adoption of a colonial identity by its inhabitants is expressed through the use of architecture, tableware, and certain ritual and technological practices that are clearly eastern. At the same time, some of the inhabitants maintained other learned ways of ‘doing things,’ that linked them to their native populations, thus displaying an identity that was fundamental to the conservation of relations with friends and relatives. This is a basic element through which members of this domestic group could succeed in business and commercial deals.
MOZIA: A PLURI-ETHNIC SITE IN WESTERN SICILY

Cerro del Villar is not the only Phoenician colony of pluriethnic character. The absence of analyses about domestic spaces and the lack of interest in the equipment and tools related to the maintenance activities of Phoenician enclaves, have encouraged the academic dissemination of a cultural homogeneity within the Phoenician colonies that nowadays has been revealed as completely false.

Mozia, one of the Phoenician colonies of western Sicily, was founded in the second half of the 8th century B.C.E., just before the Greeks of Euboea founded the settlement of Naxos in Sicily. Phoenicians chose, as in Cerro del Villar, an uninhabited island close to the coast, in the centre of the Stagnone di Marsala. Salt, fish and clays are the resources with the most exploitative potential in the immediate territory. The native communities settled in high altitude zones that were relatively far from the colony, and available information, while scanty, indicates the existence of low intensity exchanges in the first stages of the foundation (FIGURE 9).

This Sicilian colony comprises, like Cerro del Villar, a commercial strategy with a wide scope. Mozia, with Carthage, controlled the bottleneck that connects the navigation routes of the different communities of the eastern and western Mediterranean. We must also not forget that Sicily is situated centrally in the Mediterranean, acting as a point of connection not only between eastern and western communities, but also northern and southern ones.

Excavations in Mozia (Whitaker 1921; Bevilacqua 1972; Ciasca 1973; Isserlin and du Plat Taylor 1974) begun at the beginning of the 20th century, have mainly focused on the most recent stratigraphical levels (6th–3rd centuries B.C.E.). The first decades of this enclave are less known and the majority of the information comes from the funerary areas: the tophet and the necropolis (FIGURE 10). In accordance with the information available, our study will focus principally on the information derived from one of these funeral contexts.

Mozia’s Necropolis

Funerary areas, situated in the northern area of the colony, were inaugurated a few years after the foundation of the colony. The first tombs are dated to the end of the 8th century B.C.E., which suggests that the inhabitants of Mozia, or rather some of them, intended it from the beginning as a permanent settlement. Necropolis construction responds to an interest in creating a colonial identity quickly, specifically a Mozian identity. This funeral space expressed a link between the colony’s inhabitants and their
ancestors and founders, thus creating memory in a place that was lacking in such references.

In this funerary space, which was in use until the first half of the 6th century B.C.E., only 157 incineration graves have been found together with four *enchytrismoi* (Tusa, 1972: 34-55, 62-79; 1973: 8-62). That is, a low number of burials for a cemetery that was in use for 200 years and that is associated with one of the biggest settlements in the western Mediterranean. By the number of tombs excavated in this cemetery, we can posit that not all the colony’s residents had the right to be buried in the place. This suggests that we are talking about a colonial community with social hierarchies based on the definition of their Mozian colonial identity. The construction and the maintenance of this identity is one of the main mechanisms of colonial control: the access to certain benefits and privileges can be limited to the members of the colonial group (Stoler 1992).

The funerary ritual that we can observe through the tombs excavated at Mozia’s necropolis is characterized by a strong homogeneity. Cremation, as in the Phoenician cemetery of the metropolis of Tyre (Aubet 2004), is the dominant rite (98% of the excavated tombs). The ritual accoutrements are noticeably standardized and again reproduce eastern funeral artefacts: a trefoil jug, a mushroom-rim jug, a food container and, sometimes, a fine drinking vessel. The deposition of this type of grave goods alludes to a funeral ritual in which we can identify acts of imbibing some type of liquid (trefoil jug and beverage vessel), of purification and unction of the dead (mushroom-rim jug) and the offering of certain types of food. As we have seen in Cerro del Villar, ritual acquires a very significant importance in these colonial milieus insofar as they allow individuals to express ties with the original Phoenician community.

At the same time, however, funerary ceremony and deposition practices have characteristics and traits that express a certain distance with respect to the founding metropolis. The creation of new cultural forms is a peculiarity of colonial areas, where inhabitants of these recent settlements create new forms of expression as a result of new social and cultural relations. In Mozia’s cemetery these differences are found, first, in the containers used for deposition of the deceased (amphora, cist or stone monoliths differing from the characteristic funerary urns used in Tyre's necropolis deposition) and second, in the vessel placed with the deceased to receive the gift of food.
Food for the Deceased

In Phoenician funerary ritual food had an importance reflected in the grave goods recovered. Remains of fish and other types of food were burned in the funeral pyres together with the individuals from the 11th to the 8th centuries B.C.E. in Tyre (Aubet 2004: 466). Some of the food remains that were sacrificed in the pyre were deposited in the funerary urn together with the cremated bones of the deceased. Along with the jugs for imbibing and purification, one almost always finds a vessel to offer food to the buried individual. In Tyre’s necropolis, as in other western Phoenicians cemeteries, those vessels are predominantly a red-slip plate. In Mozia, nevertheless, only seven of the 161 tombs have this ceramic form. In their place, most of the tombs feature a cooking-pot. The substitution of the plate by a cooking-pot indicates a change in the type of food offered to the deceased and, perhaps, a change in the individual performing the offering. This substitution also implies a change from a service vessel to another type used in the domestic sphere for the food manipulation and cooking. If women were typically the ones who prepared food using these cooking-pots, possibly they were responsible for presenting the offerings to the deceased (Van Esterik 1998: 86). In Mozia, and in other central Mediterranean Phoenician necropoleis, women seem to have a different role in funerary rituals than the one that we can normally surmise from the grave goods of other Mediterranean Phoenician cemeteries, which would imply a greater prominence of women in negotiating relations between the living and dead.

In Mozia’s cemetery, cooking-pots that were deposited as grave goods can be grouped into different types each presenting morphological and technological differences. The most frequently found vessel is a cooking-pot with one handle (FIGURE 11 n. 1): 101 tombs have this type of pot, representing 62% of the total from the necropolis. It is a wheel-made pot characterized by a globular body, flat base and circular handle. This type of cooking-pot is also found in the settlement (Tusa 1978: 7-98, figs. 2 and 3). It is a cooking-pot that we find in other Central Mediterranean settlements and that expresses direct links among the Phoenician communities located along the triangle formed by the Tunisian coast, Malta, western Sicily and Sardinia (for Tunisia see Lancel 1979: fig. 601 type 16; Vegas 1998: 148 and 157; for Sardinia see Bartoloni 1983: fig. 8d-e, 9f and 10k).

The other types of cooking-pots are handmade pottery. These cooking-pot forms are morphologically linked with geographically distant communities and different culinary traditions. The first handmade form is a pot with a handle (FIGURE 11 n. 2) that is morphologically similar to the previous wheel-made pot. From time to time, these pots feature a small lump also (FIGURE 11 n. 3). Pots of similar morphology...
appear in other Phoenician colonial contexts in the central Mediterranean, and especially in Carthage. Their origin is unknown, though it is likely a native Tunisian cooking vessel form pre-dating the Phoenician arrival (Cintas 1961: fig. VII, type 1, 2 and 3).

A less globular body with two or four lumps in its upper part characterize the second type of indigenous pot (FIGURE 11 n. 4). Although its base is flat too, it presents a greater surface than the previous two. This new form suggests a different type of cooking. Its production area is also unknown—maybe Sardinia, maybe southeast Iberia—and its morphology does not seem to correspond to native Sicilian material culture.

Finally, *pignatta* represents the last form of handmade pot that we find in Mozia’s cemetery (FIGURE 11 n. 5). This pot is characterized above all by its tronco-conical form, presenting straight sides and a flat base of greater surface than the previous ones. This type of pot corresponds to the island’s native tradition, and has been documented in Sicily from the 8th century B.C.E. and until the Middle Ages. *Pignatta* ware is also documented in various local settlements such as Maranfusa (Spatafora 2003: 256-260 fig. 220-224), Montagnola di Marineo (Spatafora 2000: 907) and Morgantina (Leighton 1993: 171, fig. 32, 77 and 99).

Although handmade vessels in Mozia’s necropolis represent a numerical minority (they occur in only 22 tombs of the 161 excavated, 14% of the total), their presence is a clear indicator that Mozia’s women of non-eastern origin played an important role in funerary ceremonies, offering tributes of food to their relatives buried in the cemetery. If the cemetery of Mozia and its burial access rights are expressions of the social hierarchies of the colonial settlement, then the deposition of these handmade vessels would indicate that those categories were not defined primarily through place of origin or ancestors, which we would term nowadays ethnic criteria. The evidence of the necropolis of Mozia indicates that in this context ethnicity was of relatively small importance in the construction of these social hierarchies.

As in Cerro del Villar, the handmade ceramics of Mozia’s cemetery seem to suggest that peoples of various and diverse origins inhabited the colony, a fact that contradicts the traditional trinomial of eastern-native-mestizo. Handmade pots in the cemetery indicate the presence of peoples from diverse Mediterranean areas that traditionally were integrated under the simplistic category of “native.”

CONCLUSIONS
Colonial Phoenicians settlements such as Mozia and Cerro del Villar included individuals from different communities of the western Mediterranean. These lived
together with colonial administrators, merchants, artisans and workers from Phoenician cities. In these colonies, artefacts used in maintenance activities show the coexistence of Phoenician women, together with others from western Mediterranean communities. These interethic household units seem to comprise a relatively common feature, as the frequency of culinary sets related to local traditions demonstrates. Reproductive and sexual ties in these interethic marriages would therefore establish within a few decades a number of ethnically-mixed populations.

The colonists’ diversity of origin was implicated in the construction of new identities in these Mediterranean areas. Material practices such as those associated with architecture, rituals carried out in funerary and domestic spaces, tableware used in the consumption of prescribed foods and beverages and the technologically-novel installation in the western Mediterranean of industries such as iron mining or wheel-pottery, are axes that allowed a particular process of identity construction.

Colonial residents of diverse origins intentionally used these highly visible material practices to create an appearance of homogeneity within these colonies. This type of identity, equivalent to the “aggregative identity” defined by Jonathan Hall (1997) for the ancient Greek world, is the one that we have called colonial identity. Material practices that define this identity reproduce “ways of doing” that are particular to the metropolis, although they are redefined and reinterpreted and thus create new forms, as we have seen in the funeral practices of Mozia’s necropolis. “Metropolitan ways” create a highly visible distance from traditional native communities, at least in the colony’s early existence. But, at the same time, they allow the forging of links amongst the residents of the colony involved in its founding and among members of the “Phoenician community” dispersed at these times throughout different Mediterranean and Atlantic territories. Therefore they play a key role in the creation of a more extensive regional identity.

In both of the contexts analyzed here, colonial identity seems to cut across different “ethnic” categories. Judging by the funeral practices of Mozia’s cemetery, the Phoenician-native-mestizo distinction does not seem to constitute the only axis in the construction of social hierarchies of the colony. Non-Phoenician women had relatives among those that had been buried in the cemetery and, therefore, mestizos were at least acceptable in a space reserved for only some members of the colony. The frequency of mixed couples, from the first moments of these colonial foundations, would result in the presence of a very high number of mestizos that probably would blur the boundaries between social groups based on place of origin and kinship. Therefore, these boundaries would have become totally dynamic and permeable. As
several studies have indicated, ethnicity in antiquity did not have the privileged place that it holds today (Jones 1997; Malkin 2001).

In postcolonial critiques and new perspectives in cultural contact studies the importance given by Mediterranean protohistoric archaeology to ethnicity has continually been trapped in colonist-colonized duality or, in the best of the cases, in the trinominal colonist-native-mestizo. This emphasis on ethnicity has contributed to the erasure of other social identities—of class, of status, of gender, etc.—which are key elements in the construction of social hierarchies in the protohistoric Mediterranean colonies.
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Figure 11. Different types of cooking pots found in Mozia’s necropolis (after Bevilacqua et al. 1972, tomb 4 and 14; Ciasca et al. 1973, tomb 92 and 121).
FLUID FRONTIERS:
Cultural Interaction on the Edge of Empire
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ABSTRACT
This paper will use the northern frontiers of the Roman empire as a case study in the relationships between practice, identity and power in a colonial context. Rather than static barriers between Roman and other cultures, those areas which were on the limits of imperial political control were zones of perpetual contact. In different regions, such as northern Britain and north-eastern Gaul, highly specific sets of interactions between people from diverse communities generated constant re-definitions of the boundaries of identity. Sometimes these emphasised distinctions between ‘colonizers’ and ‘colonized’; at other times, these groups shared more than either had in common with their nominally-related fellows in other regions. In either case, the foundation for the negotiation of particular interactions was practice, and the similarities and differences between the things that people did in the course of their everyday routines. Exploring these routines, and their transformation over time, in practices such as burying, eating, dwelling and dressing will demonstrate that all stories of culture-contact must be grounded in a concern with contextuality. The people at the cutting edge of even the seemingly-mechanistic institutions of the Roman empire were just people, engaged in a range of relationships with others. Attempting to capture some of their specific stories is a necessary counter-weight to the traditional grand narratives of Roman imperialism, and not simply to provide more holistic accounts of the past. Situations such as this are highly relevant to modern debates concerning identity, where over-simplified stories of origins, territoriality and cultural values need to be critically assessed and challenged with more pluralist perspectives, yet with a full awareness of the potential political consequences.
INTRODUCTION: CULTURE CONTACT AND THE ROMAN EMPIRE
The study of the Roman empire has always been concerned, in one form or another, with culture-contact. What has only been a relatively recent development, however, is the realization that the Roman empire is itself a contact-culture: a hybrid, constantly mobile entity which defies generalisation in its own terms, let alone through comparison with other imperial or colonial situations. Nonetheless, much can still be learned by analysing the dynamics of the Roman empire and exploring the roots of their complexity. These are to be found in the many and varied interactions of people in particular places and particular times, which both drew upon and transformed the more abstract institutions that characterize the empire in modern consciousness. Insofar as such interactions can be accommodated within a grander narrative, this will highlight the role of regions that were on the periphery of the empire (cf. Elton 1996; James 1999; Whittaker 1994). Far from being “lines of relative inertia” (Gosden 2004, 110), these frontiers were highly interactive zones, thanks to the presence of diverse indigenous and incoming groups, traditionally characterized as ‘Romans’, ‘Natives’ and ‘Barbarians’. People from inside and outside the Roman empire, and whether members of state organizations or not, were all agents in the creation of that empire. It is from trying to understand this complex process that something can, perhaps, be gained which is of value in the study of other situations of cultural contact, whether in the past or present.

In the main body of this paper, I will elaborate upon how such a process might be explored through the analysis of everyday archaeological material, using examples from Britain and northern Gaul. Before proceeding with this, however, some background on the understanding of cultural contact and change in Roman studies will be useful to situate the field within broader approaches to these themes. The dominant paradigm in the archaeology of the Roman provinces for much of the 20th century has been the concept of ‘Romanization’. This term was partially coined by Theodor Mommsen, a mid-19th century German scholar, but first really applied by Francis Haverfield during the first decades of the 20th century, with reference to the archaeology of Britain, a significant frontier province (Freeman 1996; Hingley 1996, 2000; Webster 2001). At the time, it represented a novel departure from previous interpretations of Roman presence in provincial contexts, which emphasised simple occupation and withdrawal, without any form of cultural interaction. By contrast, Haverfield and his successors in the study of Roman Britain and, indeed, other provinces, argued for a gradual assimilation of the indigenous population to Roman civilization. The more recent variations of this idea, influenced to a certain extent by both post-colonial politics and developments in archaeological theory, have asserted
some indigenous choice or agency in this process, and also recognised that it was not necessarily a benign one (e.g. Millett 1990). In the last decade or so, however, criticism of the rather homogenizing view of culture which the ‘Romanization’ paradigm ultimately depends upon has mounted, fostering a range of alternative approaches.

These have tended to emphasise the cultural diversity within the traditional categories of ‘Roman’ and ‘Native’, and the complexity of the processes by which the empire came into being. One theme in such work has been a focus upon active or passive resistance to the empire among some indigenous groups (e.g. Fincham 2002). Another has been the examination of interaction as a multi-directional process. In this vein, some have argued for the replacement of ‘Romanization’ with terminology which better emphasises diverse hybridities, such as ‘creolization’ (Webster 2001), while others have advocated an even more radical break away from generalizing terms of any kind (Barrett 1997; cf. Mattingly 2002), a view with which I have considerable sympathy. Through debates over these and other issues, Roman studies has belatedly moved away from a concern with contact between Roman and other cultures, to the understanding that Roman culture was itself constantly created through the networks of contact that made up the empire (e.g. Woolf 1998; cf. Gosden 2004, 116). As important as this departure from simplistic approaches to culture is, two significant problems remain, which I hope to address during the course of this paper.

The first is one of temporal focus. Most of the aforementioned debates have occurred within the context of the initial period of Roman occupation in Britain in the 1st and 2nd centuries A.D., and have therefore been concerned with the phase of–from a traditional point of view–greatest potential change. From the perspective adopted in this paper, however, all periods are a mixture of continuity and change and all are therefore important in the maintenance and transformation of an entity such as the Roman empire. The study of changes towards the end of the Roman period have–as with its beginning–typically employed crude mechanisms of cultural contact, particularly invasions and migrations, with little concern for how significant these really were at the level of everyday interactions between people in frontier regions. It is vital to extend our newly critical eye on Roman colonialism to all periods, and I will therefore focus, in my examples, on the 3rd to 5th centuries. Equally, it is important to incorporate in our narratives all of the social actors who potentially participated in the making and remaking of the empire. These included members of state institutions, such as the military, who unfortunately seem to have slipped from one kind of caricature within the traditional paradigm, as the bearers of civilisation (e.g. Webster 1985), to another in more recent work–that of the sinister oppressor (e.g. Faulkner 2000). More
nuanced understandings of the relationship between these kinds of actors and the institutional structures of the empire will be a key part of a more dynamic picture of cultural interaction at the edges of the Roman empire.

**INTERACTION IN THEORY AND PRACTICE**

Building this kind of picture also depends upon particular theoretical insights from the wider social sciences, and some indication of those which I find most useful in examining the relationships between people in this context may already be apparent. In spite, and in some cases because of, the criticisms directed against it within both social theory and archaeology, Anthony Giddens’ structuration theory remains, for me, a rich source of inspiration in social analysis. Various commentators have taken issue with aspects of Giddens’ attempt to unite actors and structures within a non-deterministic framework, often claiming that he fails to do justice to the complexities either of social organisation or of agency and interaction (see e.g. Archer 1995; Gero 2000; MacGregor 1994; Parker 2000). However, in many cases these criticisms take as their starting point precisely the kind of dualistic thinking about the incompatibility of different kinds of social entity that Giddens is trying to get away from. In other cases, critical points about the level of detail which structuration theory allows for in social analysis can be readily built into the conceptual apparatus that Giddens has outlined in his major works on the subject (esp. 1984), by exploiting sympathetic traditions such as symbolic interactionism (e.g. Musolf 2003; cf. Stones 2005). That is the approach adopted in my own work, and here I will focus briefly upon one aspect of this that is particularly important in the case at hand.

One of the central tenets of structuration theory is that social structures are chronically dependent upon the everyday, routine interactions of social actors for their reproduction and transformation over time, while actors are similarly dependent upon structures for creating the possibility of action. While individual actors will be confronted with widely variable opportunities and constraints, and will understand and react to these in different ways, Giddens’ insight accommodates these as it requires us to explore the social and political implications of even the most mundane activities and practices. Even in contexts with distinctly asymmetrical power relations, the interactions of people situated within different institutions and different cultures will reproduce some and reshape others of the practices of all concerned (Musolf 2003, 97-100; cf. Given 2004, 13-7). These interactions may well entail coercion and/or resistance, but these are not the only manifestations of agency in colonial contact situations. Maintenance of some traditional ways of doing things, the absorption of new ones, and the development of hybrids will all occur, with varying degrees of deliberate
intent and with variable significance for the identities of the people enacting them. The Roman empire was the result, not of the intentionality of a few individuals who were senators or emperors, nor of implacable historical forces working through social institutions, but of all the myriad interactions that were connected by, but also shaped and changed the Roman world over time. In the next section of this paper, I will present several vignettes from the north-western frontier provinces. I hope that these will illustrate how the dynamism which is integral to these zones, and is evident in the practices of everyday life, played a key part in the structured transformation of the late Roman empire.

CONTEXTS OF INTERACTION
Fort Communities in Northern Britain
A good starting point for the analysis of long-term cultural interaction on the Roman frontiers is the monument which is most readily associated with the idea of these as linear barriers: Hadrian's Wall. Constructed in the early 2nd century A.D. on an existing line of control, the Wall was used more-or-less continuously throughout the Roman period, and was garrisoned by a number of forts. There has been considerable debate about the function of the Wall (e.g. Breeze and Dobson 2000), though this in itself was almost certainly flexible, as the use of installations attached to it, and others both to the north and south, changed over time. That problem is not my immediate concern here; rather, by looking at the archaeology of certain key sites in the central and eastern sectors of the Wall zone (Figure 1), I will try to demonstrate how this region was one of both fluid interactions and occasionally surprising separations.

For many of the farmers of the northern frontier region, the Roman military presence along Hadrian's Wall does not seem to have had a great deal of material impact. Relatively few farmstead sites in this area have been excavated, but those that have produce little in the way of pottery or other Roman-period artefacts, and limited evidence of architectural transformation (e.g. at Huckhoe; Jobey 1959; cf. Jobey 1960; Shotter 1996, 136-41). This in itself might indicate a confrontational situation, with opportunities for the kinds of material transformation represented by southern Romano-British villas being limited by the military's control of economic and administrative activity in the region (Millett 1990, 100-1), or by cultural resistance to change, and quite possibly a combination of these factors. However, there are other locales of interaction between soldiers and a range of other groups, in the small townships or vici attached to forts which flourished in the middle of the Roman period. These have traditionally been interpreted primarily in terms of the provision of services to the soldiers, and to some extent as residential areas for soldiers' families.
This makes them seem somewhat detached still from the people living inside the fort walls, however, and indeed there is increasing evidence that fort-enclosures were not exclusively occupied by men, even from quite early on in the Roman period, while there were also occasions when detachments of soldiers lived outside the walls (Crow 2004, 79-81; Driel-Murray 1995). That the fort and vicus was an integrated community in which people of diverse origins mixed is indicated by an oft-cited inscription from South Shields, commemorating a southern British woman married to a Palmyran from the eastern empire (Bidwell 1997, 76), and by late Roman laws relating to the recruitment of soldiers’ sons (Codex Theodosianus, VII.1.5, VII.1.8), many of whom must have been raised in this kind of context. Connected by a range of different interactions and activities, and combining both the global and the local aspects of life in the Roman world, the fort/vicus communities of Hadrian’s Wall were at once distinctively military compared to the surrounding farms (cf. James 1999, 23), yet also internally diverse.

These internal dynamics at each particular fort will, by the later Roman period, have also generated distinctive ways of life that created potential identity boundaries between the military communities along the Wall. This is illustrated by the distinctive histories of the forts at Housesteads (Vercovicium) and South Shields (Arbeia) in the later Roman period. The former, in the central sector of the Wall, was apparently occupied from the early 2nd century by the cohors prima Tungorum. Although the presence of one or two irregular Germanic units in the 3rd century is attested by epigraphy and pottery, these seem to have been accommodated outside of the fort, and did not significantly impact upon a more long-term pattern of gradual modifications to the fort’s interior. In the late Roman period, these are manifest in changes to the headquarters building (sub-division of the courtyard, metalworking in the main hall), the commanding officer’s house (alterations in room layout), the barracks (construction of self-contained units), and a store-building (into which baths were inserted; Crow 2004, 89-112). By the 4th century, then, this community had adapted the standard institutionally-designed fort to its own purposes. Interestingly, this occurred at a time when the many of vicus buildings began to be abandoned, suggesting perhaps that the whole of the fort community was now more resident within the walls.

By contrast, the early 4th century phase at South Shields was much more in keeping with contemporary imperial trends. This fort, at the mouth of the river Tyne and always an important communications node between the Wall and coastal supply routes, was largely rebuilt at the beginning of the 4th century to accommodate a unit transferred from the eastern empire, the numerus barcariorum Tigrissium. The commanding officer’s house was constructed in a contemporary Mediterranean style,
and the overall plan of the fort was also adapted to a novel cruciform pattern, again reflecting trends in some other parts of the empire (Bidwell 1996; Bidwell and Speak 1994; Hodgson 1996). While the pattern of occupation changed (and arguably ‘localised’) later on, 4th century Arbeia was built and initially inhabited in ways reflecting a different set of ‘military’ practices to those lived by the people of Vercovicium, and members of these communities would have therefore been able to find dimensions of difference, as well as some common threads of soldiers’ experience. This highlights the complexity of contacts even within the military as an institution, and of the lives of its members as subalterns (in the original sense of the word) in the process of colonialism.

**Fortress and Civitas in South Wales**

A different set of contacts and interactions is indicated in the evidence from another region within Britain. The area of modern south Wales was not on the frontier ‘line’, but did contain diverse communities who were part of a broader frontier ‘zone’ within the empire. In particular, the links between the fortress of Caerleon, the town of Caerwent, and the surrounding rural landscape offer further scope for considering the multiple agents in the creation of ‘Roman’ Britain. In the 1st century A.D., the area of the people known to the Romans as the Silures saw considerable military activity, culminating in the establishment of both military and administrative instruments of control, only a few miles apart: the legionary fortress at Caerleon (Isca), and the district or civitas capital at Caerwent (Venta Silurum). From this point on, interaction between soldiers, local members of the elite involved in civic administration, and farmers proceeded in a more eclectic fashion, and again gave rise to distinctive local trajectories of cultural change.

Some of this story can be told from the artefactual evidence. The military community at Caerleon was initially distinguished by, among other things, its use of coinage, and in the late 1st and early 2nd centuries this marked it out even from the townsfolk at Caerwent (Figure 2). Although legionaries from the fortress may well have travelled the 9 miles to Caerleon to spend their money there, exchanging practices involving Roman coins will perhaps have been more commonplace in the settlement around the fortress (the canabae). Over time this dimension of difference changed as the use of coinage became more socially widespread, and by the later 2nd century such distinctions of practice had disappeared. Coin-use was delayed—or resisted—for even longer on farmsteads, but in other respects there were similarities between the kinds of artefacts used, and therefore perhaps some kinds of activities, across most sites in this area, irrespective of whether the farms changed architecturally.
With pottery, for example, the dominant ware in the 4th century at both Caerleon and Llandough, a farmstead site near Cardiff, was Black-Burnished ware (BB1), which had indeed been a ubiquitous ware in western Britain for some time but which was produced using traditional Late Iron age technology in Dorset (Figure 3). While the uses to which the popular BB1 cooking-vessels were put need not have been the same in the two locations, the common material culture between these communities (reflected also in the spectrum of small-finds types in use) suggests more potential for interaction than between the equivalent groups in northern Britain.

The extent to which the boundaries between ‘conquering’ and ‘conquered’ communities remained in the 4th century in this region are unclear. This is partly because the continued presence of soldiers at Caerleon after the end of the 3rd century has been disputed, with occupation at sites like that illustrated in Figure 3 often being ascribed to ‘squatters’ (e.g. Boon 1972). However, from analysis of the finds across this site, and consideration of their ambiguity in terms of clear ‘military’ or ‘civilian’ identities, I have concluded elsewhere that the military probably was in residence at Caerleon still, but that the boundaries between these groups might only be marked in some kinds of interactions (Gardner 2002). These might involve contextually-specific uses of widespread material culture, as with the pottery mentioned above, or patterns of practice which do not need to involve much material culture at all, such as violence. At the same time, it seems clear from the ways in which the ‘official’ spaces of Caerleon (and indeed Caerwent) were being used for more diverse purposes in the 4th century (see Gardner, forthcoming) that the lifestyles of soldiers, administrators and farmers had impacted upon each other in this area, creating a common hybrid culture (for which there is no better term than ‘Roman’) within which boundaries had to be defined in new ways.

Travellers and Contacts in Britain and Gaul
The final kind of contact within the northern Roman frontier zone that I want to discuss is manifest primarily in burial evidence from southern Britain and northern Gaul in the 4th and 5th centuries. The cemetery of Lankhills, outside the Roman town at Winchester (Venta Belgarum), has attracted a good deal of attention within late Roman archaeology because of its two groups of supposedly ‘intrusive’ burials (Clarke 1979). Although one of these groups, a rather loosely-defined series of ‘Saxon’ graves, has been effectively dismantled (Baldwin 1985), the other does seem to represent a small immigrant community of both men and women. While dress artefacts associated with the men, including specific kinds of brooch and belt-fitting believed to be symbolic of late Roman imperial authority (either military or administrative) tie these
people in to some aspect of state service, it is the costume of the women which allows the group to be identified as probably Pannonian in origin. It is from this region, in modern Hungary, that the only parallels for the particular kinds of beads and extensive left-arm bracelets worn by the younger women within the group come (Swift 2000, 69-77). Associations between the burials link this group much more coherently than the 'Saxon' graves.

This case represents, therefore, an important continuity of mobility within frontier contexts, where people (and not just male soldiers or officials) travelled quite long distances in connection with imperial business. The artefacts that these particular people were wearing when they were buried were distinctive to frontier culture. While some of the items belonged to a specific regional tradition, these and the more generic items with imperial associations have stylistic affinities on both sides of the Continental frontiers, attesting to interactions in those regions which were similar to those we have examined in Britain so far. However, within a generation or so this small community seems to have been absorbed into the broader population of Winchester, as the distinctiveness of the rite is diminished within later graves in the sequence and then disappears. Again, therefore, the results of the contact situation were not predictable, and led to the emperor’s servants from another part of the empire changing their way of ‘being Roman’.

Similar kinds of evidence can be found in the rural cemeteries of northern Gaul. At Frénouville, in Basse-Normandie, a change in burial orientation and diversification of the range of grave-goods in the mid-5th century was associated with the appearance in the region of Frankish allies brought in by the Roman state as a way of harnessing Germanic immigration to imperial defence (Pilet 1980). However, the biological anthropology of the skeletal remains was not, according to the excavators, indicative of any kind of population influx or change. In this case, then, the dynamic nature of the later Roman frontiers in the lower Rhine region apparently led the local population to make their own decisions about appropriate cultural practices. By contrast, an immigrant population is attested at the nearby cemetery of St.-Martin-de-Fontenay in the later 5th century, both through some burial goods and evidence of skull-deformation. This practice is believed to have been used by allies of the Huns to imitate their appearance (Pilet 1994). While this example relates to the collapse of the late Roman frontiers rather than to their fluid character within the Roman period proper, it does perhaps represent an extreme case of how flexible the identities of those associated with military expansion could be, and of how they could still be absorbed within the continuity of burial practice at a particular site which had been in
CONCLUSION: INTERACTION, IDENTITY AND MULTI-VOCALITY

The main purpose of this paper has been to demonstrate that empires, particularly at their edges, are culturally dynamic places. This fluidity is not confined to the earliest phases of ‘contact’, nor does it entail one-way cultural transformation. Rather, the empire is created by these interactions—in the Roman case, it is through the diverse cultures of the empire that ‘Roman’ is created, defined, and transformed. I have also tried to show, however, that this is not an abstract social process, but something that emerges from the routine interactions of people living in areas like Britain and northern Gaul. This is an important point if we are to understand the differentials of power within the empire, and situate the agency of different people within their particular circumstances. It is clear, at a general level, that the kinds of interactions which I have described on the frontiers—not all of which were harmonious—were important in the transformation and fragmentation of the Roman west. The late Roman period is, in many ways, defined by the increasing cultural marginalization of Italy and the redefinition of Roman-ness in provincial contexts (see e.g. Swift 2000; cf. James 1999, 21-3 on the role of the military). This was the result, though, not of a teleological historical force, but of people deciding how to cook, what to wear, and who to talk to in countless interactions all across the Roman world. The (largely unintended) consequences of this may have been fragmentation or even collapse, but the process was fundamentally one of structuration—of people shaping structures simply by inhabiting them.

This point is vital because it highlights the fact that there were lots of agents involved in the transformation of the Roman empire, with very different motives and very different experiences of what this meant. This, I would argue, is something that will be true in many culture-contact situations. Equally, contact is not necessarily a short-lived process, but can involve a prolonged interchange and interaction, with seemingly paradoxical results. In many cases, indigenous people in the areas conquered by Roman armies were subjected to violence and exploitation, yet over time the interactions between these groups, and even with those outside of imperial control, undermined the structures of the empire. Cultural contact in the Roman world, therefore, involved highly complex local negotiations of identity, which would have been viewed differently by all those participating. As with such situations in other past, and present, contexts, it is essential not to over-simplify their complexities if we are to understand them. We can, however, work with these complexities if we pay attention
to the subtle ways in which practices change or stabilise over time, and their likely significance in terms of identities. This is because it is through the mundane ways in which people adapt or perpetuate their daily lives in new situations that identities are actively shaped.
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Figure 1. Location map of British sites discussed in the text.
Figure 2. Coin-use in south Wales. The patterns of coin-loss are plotted following methods devised by Richard Reece (1995), and intrinsically involve comparison with a mean pattern for Britain. Whether a site is above-average, average, or below-average at a particular time is indicated by its curve’s direction relative to the x-axis (i.e. Caerleon is strongly above-average in the early period). [Data from Boon 1988(a) and (b); Gardner 2001].
Figure 3. Pottery supply at Caerleon and Llandough in the later Roman period. [Data from (Caerleon:) Greep 1986 (Llandough:) Hartley 1988: 171; Webster 1988].
EXHIBITING CULTURES OF CONTACT:
_A Museum for Benishangul-Gumuz, Ethiopia_
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ABSTRACT
A group of archaeologists from the Complutense University of Madrid has been carrying out archaeological and ethnoarchaeological research in the autonomous region of Benishangul-Gumuz, in western Ethiopia since 2001. Since 2005, the project includes the cooperation with the local authorities in the creation of a regional museum. However, this is not an easy task: Benishangul-Gumuz is a region traditionally occupied by a complex mosaic of different Nilo-Saharan cultures, which have suffered for centuries the encroachment of the Abyssinian and Sudanese states. The Nilo-Saharan populations have been dispossessed of their lands and enslaved by Sudanese slave traders and Ethiopian Highlanders. With the creation of the Federal Republic of Ethiopia in 1991, the former slaves have been granted power: they have regained autonomy and they are eager to rewrite the history of the region. As part of the reinforcement of their new political identity, they have planned to build an ethnographic and archaeological museum in the near future. But, which is the narrative to be displayed there? Some of the former dominated cultures helped to enslave people from neighbouring communities; other groups, previously belonging to the politically dominant population, are now completely disempowered and will not be represented in the museum, because they are considered foreigners. Archaeology, oral history and material culture, on the other hand, prove the scant time-depth of the occupation of some “real” indigenous populations. As European archaeologists, our presence is neither free from—maybe surprising—political implications. The situation, thus, is highly controversial and it is surrounded with political difficulties. Yet this is an ideal place to reflect on the intersection between archaeology, material culture, ethnicity, identity and politics in a complex post-colonial world.
INTRODUCTION

In this paper, we would like to describe some of our post-colonial dilemmas in relation to the construction of a local museum in the region of Benishangul-Gumuz in western Ethiopia. Rather than propose solutions—that we hardly have at this moment, we will show the problems that we face in this particular context.

It is increasingly obvious that Third World nations are not only concerned with their economic and technological development. African, Latin American and Asian countries are more and more interested in preserving and enhancing their symbolic capital in the form of cultural heritage, both as an essential means of nation-building and as a way of facing the West on equal terms (Diagne 2000, 87). The aggressive, destructive and humiliating behavior of Europe towards Africa since the late 15th century has, on the one hand, actively contributed to the present chasm of poverty and war (Rodney 1981) and, on the other, it has deprived Africans of their history. European philosophers, historians and art historians, such as Hegel, Trevor-Roper or Gombrich, to mention but a few, have utterly dismissed African history and culture, which are conceived as the shallow and dark reverse of Western achievements. Africa is the land of the ethnographer: there is surface, not depth. The Other does not change and is fossilized in another time (Fabian 1983).

Until recently, then, only those “civilizations” that could be compared to Euro-Asiatic developments were deemed worthy of attention (Connah 2001). This usually meant—and for many still mean—societies that have been in contact with “core civilizations”, such as the Swahili in the Eastern African coast, strongly influenced by Arabian merchants (Horton 2000), or those that have developed powerful state polities, such as the Meroitic kingdom in Sudan (Török 1997). In any case, those cultures that are considered worth studying are those that have produced large monuments and have historically suffered dramatic changes. Many Africans now feel that the West has not only a political and economic debt with the continent, but also a symbolic (or cultural) one. They want their history back, all their history, not just the one that Westerners find remarkable—“great civilizations” or the origins of humankind. This implies restoring cultural heritage to their moral owners but also rewriting history together under a new, post-colonial light.

The way to a post-colonial, ethically-conscious history and archaeology, which collaborates with Africans in the restoration of their past and their historical agency, may seem deceivingly straightforward. We only have to work with local communities for recovering their voices and listen to their way of telling things, instead of imposing a Western scholarly view. After that, we ought to inscribe the subaltern as the main character in African history and depict Europeans as evil (which they were), though not
as powerful and secure as colonial historians wanted (Bhabha 1994), thus enabling resistance and local creativity. As many post-colonial thinkers, historians and archaeologists have found out, however, both in Africa and in the West, things are not so easy.

Firstly, we have the problem of how to recover subaltern voices. Spivak’s (1988) pessimistic insight is well known and very pertinent in the African case. Here we do not only have to face the problem of overwhelmingly Eurocentric and androcentric stories, like in India and everywhere else, but also the fact that the native history is fundamentally based on ephemeral oral sources.

Secondly, modern Western scholars are not pure beings untouched by the filth of colonialism, irrespective of the hatred and shame that it may awaken in them. We—the authors of this paper—are Europeans and our mere presence in Africa is always entangled in a series of ambiguous political meanings and conflicting moral values. Our research is also shadowed by an original sin, perpetuated in a current situation of injustice and domination. Acknowledging this unbridgeable asymmetry between foreign researchers and local hosts is essential in any cooperative work, be it related to heritage or any other field.

Thirdly, post-colonial nations are very complex realities. Recovering multiple voices (multiple ethnic voices usually) is a practice fraught with difficulties and privileging one voice or another, no matter how sound and ethically correct our intentions are, can turn out to have very sinister outcomes. It suffices to remember Rwanda and the blind support of a subaltern majority called the Hutus by certain Europeans (Gourevitch 1999, 64-70).

A team from the University of Madrid, sponsored by the Spanish Ministry of Culture, has been working in the region of Benishangul-Gumuz since 2001. We have conducted several archaeological surveys and excavations, we have gathered a certain amount of ethnographic data and we have been able to elaborate a culture-historical framework for the area (Fernández 2004; González-Ruibal 2006a). Our intention now is to contribute to the construction of a local museum, which will be located in the town of Asosa, the regional capital. Our collaboration will include the gathering of ethnographic and archaeological materials to be displayed in the museum, the elaboration of a digital catalogue of the collections and the setting up of a store, a library, a laboratory and a permanent exhibition.

In 2004 a project for the regional museum was finished by the local authorities (FIGURE 1). The plot of land where the museum will stand has now been acquired by the regional government; the budget for the building (around US$ 350,000) has already been calculated (although not obtained), and a model has been prepared. The
idea is to show ethnographic, historical and archaeological collections that portray the cultural diversity of the area, as well as its historical vicissitudes. With regard to the historical materials, they include the belongings of important local sheikhs of the late 19th and early 20th century. All archaeological remains will come from our surveys and excavations, since there has been no previous archaeological work in Benishangul-Gumuz. Ethnographic artifacts will be the bulk of the exhibition, given the enormous richness of the region: the museum will display pottery, gourds, adornments, agricultural implements, musical instruments and other artifacts belonging to the five official ethnic groups of Benishangul-Gumuz: Bertha, Gumuz, Komo, Mao and Shinasha. Some of the artifacts have already been collected by the staff of the Ministry of Culture and are now in storage (FIGURE 2). The exhibition will be complemented with photographs, information signage and documents.

FEDERALISM AND HERITAGE IN ETHIOPIA

Why does a predominantly rural region and an off-the-beaten-track capital want to build a museum in the first place? The creation of regional museums and cultural institutions in Ethiopia is being fostered by the federal policies of the present government. After the fall of the communist regime in 1991 Ethiopia has been reorganized as a federal republic, thus putting an end to several centuries of real or theoretical centralism (Young 1996; Marcus 2001). Autonomous regions are now endowed with significant power, including—at least in theory—the right to secession. This has led to a reaffirmation of those local ethnic identities that had been traditionally subdued by the central state, represented by the Amhara and Tigrean ethnic groups of northern Ethiopia.

Some historical monuments, such as the Axumite stelae in Tigray (AD 4th c.), the royal palaces of Gondar (AD 17th-18th c.) or the medieval churches of Lalibela (AD 13th-14th c.), all in northern Ethiopia (FIGURE 3), are still presented as essential landmarks in Ethiopia’s history as a unified, proudly independent and long-lived nation (the “Ethiopia of the 3,000 years” that nationalists advocate), and they are the object of most tourist advertising undertaken by the central government (FIGURE 4). The practice of nation-building by means of specific local elements was very characteristic of many African nations in the 1960s and 1970s and it has not yet disappeared. As Cooper (2002, 89) says “this entailed a blending of symbols that were not national at all
and separating them from their local logic, to dilute the power embodied in forms of dress or music or art that were ‘Igbo’ or ‘Kongo’ into something that could be considered ‘Nigerian’ or ‘Zairois’. The great celebrations and extensive media coverage that accompanied the recent return to Ethiopia of an Axumite obelisk stolen by Mussolini is good proof of this kind of centripetal nationalist practices—the same, by the way, that have been taking place in Europe since the 18th century (FIGURE 5).

Nevertheless, the monumental heritage only appeals to a small percentage of Ethiopians, the northern Highlanders and the educated urban elites (irrespective of their ethnic origins); other major groups, such as the Oromo, that number around 30 million people, feel completely alienated from this past that is not theirs (Asafa Jalata 1998). Their kingdoms and chiefdoms were mostly conquered by the Ethiopian state in the 19th century (Bahru Zewde 2002, 60-72). The incorporation of other areas of Ethiopia, such as Benishangul-Gumuz, only became effective during the early 20th century. They all lie outside the national historical routes and the tourist landmarks considered by the central authorities.

Thus, not only the central state and the old rulers, but also the regional governments have now understood the relevance of culture and history for revaluing local identities. Local languages are taught in the school with Amharic—the official language of Ethiopia; local issues are being introduced in primary and secondary school syllabi; there are radio and television spaces for each of the major languages spoken in the country, and programs showing different local customs and music are regularly broadcasted. There is a renewed interest in local history and culture, a fact which is especially clear among the Oromo, who have set out to rewrite their history challenging the centripetal state accounts (Mohammed Hassen 1994; Asafa Jalata 1996). As Negaso Gidada (2001, xi), an Oromo historian and former President of Ethiopia, notes "the writing of a history of a people can be an important contribution to its liberation and emancipation". In this case, however, the emancipation is not from a European power, as it is usually the case, but from an African one. The new pluralism is unleashing an array of repressed memories and competing visions of the past and is questioning the "centralized archive of memory", that characterized the hegemonic idea of nation for centuries (Triulzi 2001). The setting up of a museum in Asosa is part of these trends of more respect and sensitivity toward local groups.
WRITING THE HISTORY OF BENISHANGUL-GUMUZ

Benishangul-Gumuz is a vast region (50,000 sq. km) in the western frontier of Ethiopia (FIGURE 6). As other frontier regions (see Andrew Gardner this volume), this is a fluid zone of contact and interaction—both peaceful and violent—between different groups and large cultural traditions. Most of the territory, which is crossed by the Blue Nile, is an unhealthy and warm lowland, called the Corridor of Death by anthropologist Evans-Pritchard (1970). This fact, as well as its seclusion from the central Abyssinian state, has turned the area into a refuge for different groups of Nilo-Saharan populations escaping from the encroachment of the Sudanese and Abyssinian kingdoms and their slave raids. As a cul-de-sac and frontier area, Benishangul hosts all kinds of cultures, including half a dozen Nilo-Saharan groups (Berta or Bertha, Gumuz, Mao, Kwama, Gwama, Shita, etc.), once called “pre-Nilotes”, by their so-called archaic cultural features as compared to other Nilotic groups (Grottanelli 1948). In addition, there are Semitic Amhara, Cushitic Oromo and Agaw, and Omotic Shinasha. These latter groups originally inhabited the Ethiopian Highlands and were alien to Benishangul-Gumuz until recently. They have been slowly encroaching on the area, some groups as early as the mid-18th century, such as the Oromo (Negaso Gidada 2001).

Unlike the Nilo-Saharans, the people from the Highlands do have a long tradition of written records, starting during the 1st millennium BC. Therefore, most of our knowledge about the history of the indigenous communities of the borderland comes from their slavers, the Ethiopian Highlanders (Pankhurst 1977; Abdussamad Ahmad 1999). Only during the last three decades have some authors started to explore the recent history of the native inhabitants of Benishangul-Gumuz, although never venturing beyond the late 18th century (e.g. Triulzi 1981; James 1988; Abdussamad Ahmad 1999, 2001).

As archaeologists, we are in a privileged position to explore the deeper past. Our research has contributed to shed light on the long term history of Benishangul-Gumuz, and archaeology and modern material culture studies have been quite successfully interwoven with oral history and traditions (Fernández 2004). With the data that we have been able to gather since 2001, we have provisionally defined two different cultural traditions in the area, that we will call Komuz and Bertha.

The Komuz tradition (FIGURE 7) is characterized by archaeological sites that date to the late 1st millennium BC or early 1st millennium AD. The modern descendants of this archaeological tradition are the Koman (Kwama, Komo, Mao) and Gumuz-speaking groups, once called Komuz by philologists (Bender 1994; 2000, 46)
due to their linguistic affinities (now two different groups are recognized). The pottery from Komuz sites bears important resemblances with that of the modern Kwama, Nilotic Mao and Gumuz (thus the label chosen), as well as with other Nilotic traditions of the 1st and early 2nd millennium AD (Lynch and Robbins 1979; Joussaume 1995, figs 101, 311-12). Archaeological sites usually lie in flat, cultivable land, in open valleys. Related to this cultural tradition are some painted rock-shelters, whose geometric motives (ladder-shaped, squares, segmented rectangles) are redolent of the Komuz groups’ modern scarifications (Fernández and Fraguas in press). Finally, a style of domestic architecture characterized by large open round huts has been identified, that is shared by all Komuz groups (González-Ruibal 2006a).

With regard to the Bertha tradition (FIGURE 8), the modern Bertha belong to a specific linguistic family to which no other language in the region relates. They currently produce a very particular kind of pottery (González-Ruibal 2005, 46-47), which also appears on the surface of recent archaeological sites (AD 18th-19th c.), but never in stratified contexts. This pottery shows interesting connections with the neighboring Sudanese pottery, both from prehistoric (Neolithic) and historic times (Meroitic, Funj) (Addison 1949-51; Fernández 1985, 1222, 1231-32, etc.; Welsby 2003). The Bertha have no memory of having painted rock shelters (Fernández and Fraguas in press) and their scarifications are three simple straight lines in each cheek, very different to motifs depicted in rock paintings. As opposed to the Komuz tradition, Bertha archaeological sites are dated to ca. 17th to 20th century and tend to appear in mountains, hills and rocky outcrops, with good defensive conditions. After the mid-20th century, the settlements located in elevations were abandoned for lowland locations, due to the end of internecine hostilities and slave raids.

The panorama that has been briefly adumbrated fits remarkably well with local beliefs. The Bertha claim to have originally lived in Sudan, where they played a role in the Funj Sultanate (Triulzi 1981). The Funj Sultanate was the most important state organization in the Sudan between 1500 and 1800 (Crawford 1951). According to various Ethiopian and Sudanese written sources, they seemingly arrived to what is now western Ethiopia some time around the late 17th c. AD (Triulzi 1981, 25) and they displaced other ethnic groups in the region, that the Bertha themselves identify with the Komo and Mao, both belonging to the Koman group of the linguists (Triulzi 1981, 23). Due to tensions that arose among the newcomers regarding the distribution of land, war among the different clans broke out and the Bertha decided to establish their
villages in high places—but also due to slave raids conducted by Sudanese “Arabs”. With regard to the Gumuz, we know that they lived in the same region they occupy today, north of the Blue Nile, since the Middle Ages, thanks to the documents and chronicles of the Abyssinian state, as well as their own memory.

We know that the so-called “Shankilla” from Metekel (the area to the north of the Nile) were already paying taxes to the king Yeshaq in the 14th century (Huntingford 1989, 93) and their customs were depicted in the 18th century by the Scottish explorer James Bruce (Pankhurst 2001, 363-66). Their presence south of the Nile, however, is probably not prior to the 19th century, according to oral data gathered by James (1980).

In relation to history after 1800, the Berthas have been the dominant ethnic group in the region. They established three main chiefdoms and were deeply influenced by Muslim and Sudanese customs (Triulzi 1981). The negotiation of some of these foreign elements was key for some people to achieve power in otherwise egalitarian communities. All the Nilo-Saharan groups suffered from slave raids until the 1940s. However, some Berthas and a few Gumuz profited from the situation enslaving both other Nilo-Saharans and their own kinsfolk. Benishangul-Gumuz was finally incorporated to the Ethiopian state officially in 1897, with the collaboration, in the case of Benishangul, of one of the Bertha sheikhs (Khoyle al-Hassan). Finally, In the late 1970s and 1980s many people coming from the famine-beaten areas of Ethiopia were resettled in Benishangul-Gumuz by the communist government that ruled the country at the time. This has added more problems to an area already characterized by complex inter-ethnic relations.

EXHIBITING CULTURES OF CONTACT IN BENISHANGUL-GUMUZ: POST-COLONIAL DILEMMAS

How should this long and complex multi-ethnic history be represented in a museum? The local authorities of Benishangul, now predominantly Bertha and to a lesser extent Gumuz, have their own ideas about it. Our own problems as scholars have to do with concepts of ethnicity, power, history and ethnography.

Ethnicity
First of all, the local authorities want to organize the museum along ethnic lines, something that may seem paradoxical, given the discredit of the concept of ethnic group (and the sibling “tribe”) in recent anthropology, due in large part to its negative colonial implications. It is generally considered that ethnic groups, as described by
ethnographers, are basically a by-product of colonial administration. In this particular region, as James (1979, 7-8) has pointed out, the ethnic groups themselves usually do not recognize the labels imposed by anthropologists, colonial administrators and other foreigners: “The Gumuz” do not call themselves “Gumuz”, “The Koma” do not call themselves “Koma”, “The Ingessana” do not call themselves “Ingessana”, and “The Uduk” do not call themselves “Uduk”. Nonetheless, the regional government of Benishangul-Gumuz wants to showcase the five official groups that inhabit the region today: Bertha, Gumuz, Mao, Komo and Shinasha, which comprise about two thirds of the current population. Other major ethnic groups, such as the Amhara (numbering around 100,000 people) and the Oromo (around 60,000) will not be represented at all, due to their later arrival to the area and their dominant role over the other groups in the recent past. The concept of ethnic group in Benishangul, as elsewhere in Africa, is controversial, complex and mutable (Jedrej 2004).

In what follows, we will describe the elusive ethnic characterization of four groups in Benishangul-Gumuz.

Mao and Komo

Mao and Komo are two minor Nilo-Saharan societies (around 6,000 individuals). Mao is an external denomination historically used by the expanding Oromo to identify those groups they entered into contact with and with whom they maintained relations—mainly trade (James 1980; Negaso Gidada 2001, 78-84). Therefore, under the same label we have very different groups, speaking mutually unintelligible languages (belonging to the Omotic and Nilotic families respectively). We can distinguish at least three groups of Mao: the Southern Mao (Grottanelli 1940), the Begi Mao and the Bambasi Mao. The Southern Mao and the Bambasi Mao speak Omotic languages, whereas the Begi Mao are related to the Nilo-Saharan Kwama. For the deeply “Oromized” Begi Mao, the ethnic name today has pejorative connotations (such as rude, wild, savage). When Mao children are naughty and misbehave, for example, their parents say “you look like a Mao”.¹ The culture of the Begi Mao now mimics that of their Oromo invaders (FIGURE 9). On the contrary, those living around the town of Bambasi are reluctant to be incorporated to the dominant Oromo culture and maintain many of their traditional customs, even if they

¹ Information gathered in Tongo in 2003. The informants were administrative staff at the local administration.
cohabit with Oromos in the same villages (FIGURE 10). Finally, there is a third group, located far away to the south, also called Mao (Grottanelli 1940), which has particular institutions (including traditional paramount chiefs absent in the north), strongly influenced by the Oromo.

Among the Mao, then, we could distinguish not only two large linguistic groups, but also three different identities, ranging between mimicry and resistance. From the point of view of material culture, it seems that they use a heterogeneous assemblage of items from other groups, which makes it very difficult to define a single Mao material culture (FIGURE 11). This is consistent with the hybrid character of the groups, but it poses serious problems in simple museographic terms. Could this extremely complex situation be displayed in a single showcase in a museum? Are we not accepting a colonial category (though African), if we use the problematic umbrella concept “Mao”? Are not we betraying and dangerously simplifying a multiplicity of culture contacts with very diverse political implications?

With regard to the Komo they are really two groups if not more, which do not call themselves Komo, but Kwama and Gwama, and speak different languages. At least in the case of the Kwama there is a peculiar material culture that could be associated with them (González-Ruibal 2005, 45-6, fig 2), although we are still not sure if it is Kwama or Gwama! (FIGURE 12). The Shita, living further south, are probably also part of the Komo group. Linguists are still not very sure about the classification of these communities (Siebert et al. 2002; Andreas Neudorf pers. comm. June 2005). The Komo or Koma, on the other hand, are a fourth related group living in Sudan (Theis 1995). Should we display three different cultures in the museum, then?

The historical vicissitudes of the area have propitiated the ethnic fragmentation, the assimilation of some groups by others and the mixing up of different communities who have come into contact through time. The creation of an administrative region for those minor groups identified as Mao and Komo is now leading to the creation of a new entity that comprises all of them under the label Mao-Komo, and they will probably
resort more and more to this invented identity to defend their interests as a minority. The musealization of these two groups, without previous in-depth study of their cultural variability and identities, will certainly contribute to their artificial entification.

**Bertha and Gumuz**

Even those cultures that apparently present less problems, such as the predominant Bertha and Gumuz, are not free from trouble. The Bertha are distributed in several sub-groups—former sheikhdoms, such as Asosa, Fadasi/Bambasi, Komosha and Kurmuk (Triulzi 1981). Those among them that have lighter skin and are more devout Muslims despise other communities: they call themselves Mayu or Bani Ummaya, “from the alleged descent line claimed by the Funj to prove their Arab origin” (Triulzi 1981, 188) and use the term Bertha as a pejorative label for the rest (FIGURE 13 and 14), to whom they also refer as “Blacks” (Andreas Neudorf, pers. comm. June 2005)—a similar situation, as we have seen, occurs with the Mao of Tongo. The Bertha speak different dialects, mutually understandable, and some elements of their material culture—especially architecture—varies regionally (González-Ruibal 2006a). Thus, Bertha houses from the interior are more similar to Komuz houses (Gumuz, Mao and Komo) than to Bertha houses from the Sudanese borderland (FIGURE 15).

Finally, the Gumuz speak several different dialects (Bender 1979), identify themselves with different ethnic names (Ganza, S’es’e, etc.), and are organized as clans which have conducted feuds traditionally—even today inter-clan relations are far from peaceful. Some Gumuz in the Kamashi area (south of the Blue Nile) have been profoundly affected by the encroachment of the Oromo, and their culture now shows many features adopted from this group. Unlike the Bertha, who are massively Islamic (despite the greater or lesser degree of traditional practices among them), the Gumuz are divided in their religious beliefs. Most of them practice traditional religions (Wolde-Selassie Abbute 2005, 72-76). Some are Muslim and a few Christian worshippers, although their beliefs are deeply rooted in traditional practices. Muslims cluster around the Sudanese frontier and Christians (Orthodox, Protestants and
Catholics) live in the south and east. The adoption of Islam and Orthodox Christianity is the result of contact with neighboring Sudanese and Highland Amharas. To a certain degree, as we have been able to find out, conversion plays a strategic role, allowing individuals to acquire a higher status in the local society.

Religion poses important problems with regard to the musealization of ethnic identity. Both Bertha and Muslim Gumuz, but especially the Bertha, are reluctant to publicize their traditional pre-Islamic customs. This includes something as inherent and relevant to their cultures as the consumption of beer and its rich material culture. An exhibition on the Bertha without their big beer pots (awar), bamboo sievers (thasa) and calabashes (agu) would be a misrepresentation of their culture (FIGURE 16). But considering the fabrication and consumption of beer as pivotal to Bertha community life will probably enrage many strongly Muslim Berthas, particularly the Mayu sub-group. Meaningfully, the Bertha authorities (that mainly belong to the Mayu tribe) prefer to use the coffee jar (jebena) and the water jar (al-brik) as material symbols of their identity (FIGURE 17)—symbols that associate them to their neighboring Islamic Sudan (González-Ruibal 2005, 62). For those Bertha that live far from the frontier, Islam and the Sudan are less relevant references for their identity, unlike the brewing and sharing of local beer.

The problem with material culture and ethnic identity is manifold: while some artifacts can be deemed specifically Gumuz or Bertha, others are much less clearly so. For example, the sharakarak, a traditional wooden jar used for preparing coffee among the Bertha, was adopted from the Oromo, although today it is an essential part of the Bertha culture (FIGURE 18). The Bertha have adopted other foreign artifacts, such as large ceramic plates (met’ad) from the Amhara in some areas, or wooden mortars (moña) from the Oromo. A similar case in point is that of the Gumuz, who use a wide variety of artifacts adopted from the Amhara, Agaw, Sinasha and Sudanese. The opposite case is equally common: the Agaw that live among the Gumuz, for example, use a large amount of pots, baskets and tools acquired
to their Gumuz neighbors. By displaying in the museum only those artifacts that can be considered particular to a certain culture, we would offer a very biased image of the daily experience of that group. The problem of ethnicity, then, collides with the politics of authenticity.

**Ethnic Hierarchies**

From a post-colonial point of view, the museum should be a space where the concept of ethnic group, ethnic identity and its material correlates should be problematized, rather than readily accepted and displayed. But what happens when the people themselves want to use a traditional concept of ethnic group? Furthermore, what happens when this concept has become necessary for the local population to define themselves and to defend their culture (Meskell 2005)? We can—and we should—accept the concept of ethnic group. After all, we may say that what it is actually happening is an appropriation and renegotiation of a colonial category, which is ultimately subverted. Instead of being used to control the natives, ethnic categories are used as a means to empower them, to grant them political visibility not only at the local level, but at the federal one as well. Ethnic identification is fundamental in claiming political and territorial rights. Although not exactly the same, the case of the native Latin-Americans that have decided to call themselves indios as a symbol in their struggle for emancipation or the Kanaks, who have reshaped the old colonial term Canaque come to mind (Clifford 2001). This is a good example of “the gaze of the discriminated back upon the eye of power”, as Bhabha (1994, 112) would put it. But then different ethnic groups are not politically the same: there are important issues regarding asymmetries between ethnic groups, as we have seen. Also, there is a problem with the idea of which ethnic groups should be represented; again, this is an issue of authenticity (and power): who is the authentic aboriginal (Clifford 2001)?

By giving too much power (both real and symbolic) to the once enslaved, we may be replacing one form of tyranny with another, a reason why cultural identity cannot be scripted too tightly—as Lynn Meskell (2005, 77) has pointed out. Different authors have suggested that “the names of ethnic groups [in the Sudan-Ethiopia borderland] are less likely to indicate different ways of life and more likely to mark positions in a ranking of status and prestige (…). So Ja’alayin, Watawit, Jabalawiin, Funj, Hamaj, Berta, and Burun come to represent points on scales between urban and rural, Muslim and pagan, superior and inferior, and master and slave…” (Jedrej 2004, 720). Thus, at the end of the day, it is all a matter of power. The traditional ethnic hierarchy of the region could be described as follows: historically the most oppressed and disempowered groups are those labelled Mao and Komo. Some groups related to
this ethnic cluster were probably wiped out by slave raids in the late 19th century and nowadays only their ethnic names and some dispersed and confusing data are preserved in the literature (Negaso Gidada 2001, 61-91). The Mao and Komo were continually expelled from their lands and today they inhabit the most inhospitable and marginal frontier areas of Benishangul. They were the prey of neighboring groups, namely the Bertha and Oromo. The Gumuz have also been traditionally dispossessed of their lands and chased by other groups, mainly Amharas, Agaw and Shinasha, since the Middle Ages (Wolde-Selassie Abbute 2005). Unlike the Mao and Komo, however, they have posed more fierce resistance and they have been able to preserve large tracts of land and a strong cultural identity. Finally among the Nilo-Saharans, the Bertha have been both victims and tyrants. Among the Nilo-Saharan groups of Sudan, such as the Uduk, they are infamous for their slave raids and attacks. They are equated to other aggressive groups: the “Arabs” (Baggara, Shukriyya) and the Nilotes (Nuer and Dinka). Nevertheless, some of the enslaved groups, such as the Inessana, admit a cultural bond to the Bertha (Jedrej 1995, 3) and most Berthas have also been victims of enslavement, whether from Sudanese slave merchants or by their own half-caste leaders—once called Watawit, because, like the bats (watwat), they are hybrid beings. As a matter of fact, the Bertha were known as *abid*, “slaves” by the Sudanese Arabs (McHugh 1995, 173).

Among the invaders and traditional oppressors we find the Amhara and the Oromo. The latter do not have an old tradition of statehood, as the Amharas have, and their approach to the groups they contacted has been based on politics of integration, rather than ruthless oppression (Negaso Gidada 2001; Endalew 2002). In turn, they have been conquered by the Amharas and incorporated to the Greater Ethiopia, a process that came to its end by the late 19th century.

This pyramid has been partially subverted after the fall of the communist regime in 1991. The reality now is that some traditional dominants, such as the Amhara, are now in a political inferior position, with regard to the former slaves, especially the Bertha and Gumuz. Thus, the Amhara and Oromo do not have political representation at the local government and their claims cannot be heard. In consequence, a liberating narrative that settle scores with the past may be contributing to a situation of inequality and ethnic exclusivism in the present. How can we find a narrative that accounts for the injustices of the past without endorsing new unfair politics in the present?
Power and the (Real) Subalterns’ Voice

Although largely egalitarian, the border communities of Ethiopia did not lack powerful individuals that, in some cases, tyrannized their own subjects. Local authorities, for example, are eager to display the artifacts that once belonged to the mighty Sheikh Khoyele and his large family, including portraits, documents, garments and thrones (FIGURE 19). As we have said, Sheikh Khoyele is, at best, an ambiguous character. He collaborated with the Ethiopian state in the annexation of Benishangul in 1897 (Bahru Zewde 2002, 66, 68); he fought against other Bertha sheikhs; he enslaved “pagan” Berthas, Mao, Komo and other Nilo-Saharan communities in Sudan, such as the Uduk and Ingessana; he offered Benishangul to be colonized by Britain (Bahru Zewde 2002, 68), and with the revenues of the slave trade he built himself a palace in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia’s capital (Triulzi 1981, fig 12).

By enhancing the image of Sheikh Khoyele, we may be offering a counterpart from the margin to the well-remembered heroes of the central state (including other dubious characters, such as the kings Tewodros, Menelik or Haile Selassie), but we can hardly consider Sheikh Khoyele to be among the subaltern. If we want to hear other voices, we should perhaps try to recover those of the people Khoyele enslaved. As is usual with subaltern voices, whereas we have many documents about the slave merchant, we have few, if any, from the slaves. A similar problem arises with the Gumuz counterpart of Khoyele, the Sheikh of Gubba, Hamdan Abu Shok. As Abderrahman Khoyele, he conducted slave raids and collaborated with different state authorities to strengthen his power (Garretson 1980; Abdussamad Ahmad 1999). The remains of their palaces (Abu Shok’s and Khoyele’s) are among the very few historical monuments visible in Benishangul today, which poses important question with regard to their musealization. For the Mao, Komo, Uduk or Ingessana, an uncritical display of Khoyele’s memorabilia, would be the equivalent of legitimating ethnic aggression in the past.

Post-colonial museums all over Africa face similar problems related to personal power. Many of them revolve around noble families, chiefs and kings, and some are located in the premises once occupied by local rulers—that usually enjoyed the approval of the colonial authorities (Sylla 2000; Sheriff 2000, 160; Ahonon 2000, 165). The situation is especially thorny when it comes to kings that conquered other kingdoms and enslaved their people. The Musée Historique d’Abomey, for example, housed in the former Danxome royal palace, witnesses all kind of reactions from the public: some visitors belonging to the royal family reacted violently sometimes and rejected what is shown—a critical evaluation of their political role, whereas visitors from those kingdoms beaten by the kings of Danxome have a “feeling of revolt, an
impulse of vengeance” (Ahonon 2000, 168). A museum, then, instead of a vehicle for reconciliation, remembrance and social cohesion, can become a very controversial locale.

Accepting a hagiography of Sheikh Khoyle—or the Gumuz slave trader Hamdan Abu Shok—for exhibition at the Museum of Benishangul may ingratiate us with the local authorities, but it may not be helpful to promote a critical and fair vision of the past. Those in power today (some of them related to Khoyle) by choosing this cultural hero, could impose a nationalist and hierarchical narrative over the majority of the population, who suffered, rather than enjoyed, Khoyle’s rule. As Duah (2000, 116) has pointed out “We [Africans] should not replace one set of myths and stereotypes concocted by non-Africans with another set formulated by Africans”. Other authors have also criticized those museums centered on chiefs to the detriment of the common population (Ouattara 2000, 111). By producing uncritical descriptions of an idealized past in which only important persons exist, we may protract colonial injustices in modern times.  

However, as Europeans, we are not in a particular good position to criticize unequal power relations in Benishangul-Gumuz or elsewhere in Africa. Issues of power, international relations and colonialism are extremely controversial in Ethiopia. On the one hand, Ethiopia had a feudal monarchy until 1974, which showed an aggressive behavior toward the neighboring populations, not dissimilar to that of contemporary colonial powers. This is something that has repercussions today. Thus, the Oromo Liberation Front representative, Fido Ebba (2006) maintains that “Ethiopia/Abyssinia stands alone as the only Black power that participated in the colonial scramble for Africa”. It is enough to look at the “Oromo” entry in the Wikipedia to witness the strong controversy surrounding Ethiopia’s relationship to its ethnic components. On the other hand, Ethiopia has been—and to many still is—a strong symbol of independent Africa: despite having been ignored, despised and attacked by European countries in several occasions, Ethiopia managed to be the only African nation never to be occupied by a foreign army (except the brief and unfulfilled Italian lapse). Today the country still hosts the African Union’s headquarters. Nevertheless, Ethiopia has been ambiguous with regard to Afro-centric movements and the relations between Haile Selassie and the African-American activists were strongly contentious, with many representatives of the Ethiopian state refusing to be characterized as blacks in the 1920s and 1930s (Sbacchi 1988).

---

2 The troubled politics of the postcolony have been aptly dissected by Achille Mbembe (2000).
Any criticisms of Ethiopia’s internal colonialism may be perceived as an attack against African independence and against its struggle for freedom. Worst, it can be deemed imperial nostalgia, according to Rosaldo’s (1989) apt concept. Usually, colonialism was presented as an attempt to impose order on the injustice and chaos in which African societies lived, whether due to internecine wars, Arab slavery or local tyrants. All colonial powers resorted to the protection of minor ethnic groups as an ideological justification for their colonial enterprise: the praise of the San in 20th century South Africa is a well known example; the idealization of the fragile San communities (Van der Post and Taylor 1984) was presented as a justification (sometimes unwittingly) for the oppression of the Bantu populations. The Spaniards themselves resorted to this trick in their colonial enterprise: they set the Berber against the Arabs in Morocco, and the Bubis against the Fang in Equatorial Guinea. A more recent example, in Ethiopia, is Kaplan’s (2002) attack to the central government in 1980s, which slips from political accusations to ethnic ones (the Amhara are condemned as evil just for being Amhara), thus reproducing the Italian discourse from Mussolini’s time (e.g. Lauro 1949, 135). One of the justifications for the invasion of Ethiopia in 1935 was the existence of slavery in the country and the oppression by the Ethiopian kings of the small peripheral communities annexed during the 19th century. Are we not reproducing the same scheme by narrating a tale of resistance that sets the Kwama against the Bertha or the Bertha against the Amhara?

Power and nationalism are never easy matters in post-colonial nations, but in Ethiopia they are a particularly knotty issue. Who are we, descendants of former colonizers and still members of a neocolonial society, to judge Ethiopia’s oppressors and oppressed? It is too easy to trespass the thin line that separates good post-colonial intentions from imperialist nostalgia.

History and Ethnography
One of the obvious problems the museum of Benishangul will face is the concept of history (or historiography) and ethnography. Meaningfully, both concepts imply the idea of writing, which are inherent to each discipline, while in this case we are dealing with oral societies.

The first problem with ethnography, and particularly with museum ethnography, is its beginnings as an imperial science (Shelton 2000). The idea in the 19th century was to display the variety of groups controlled by a certain colonial power and at the same time show the need for those groups to be surveilled by technologically and morally advanced people. Evolutionary schemes were prevalent in ethnological
museums well after the paradigm was overcome by functionalism in anthropology (Shelton 2000, 175).

Museum ethnography is a paradox. Ethnography makes reference to the living, present and transient, whereas the museum freezes in time a certain culture; it either portrays a particular historical moment in that culture’s life and presents it as characteristic of the whole history of that culture, or blends different moments in an anachronistic display. The case is more serious in a context like Benishangul-Gumuz, were traditional communities (those displayed usually in ethnological museums) are still alive and in perpetual change. This leads to other questions: what should we do with Indonesian T-shirts, Chinese flashlights or plastic jerrycans? They have become intrinsic to many cultures in Benishangul. A showcase with only pottery, calabashes and wooden implements would be a beautiful but unreal representation of Benishangul’s ethnographic present (FIGURE 20). Once again, the problem of authenticity arises. In the Museum of the Institute of Ethiopian Studies new artifacts and western influences have been acknowledged in a remarkably progressive exhibit, set up in 2004. This museum has also opted for a thematic display instead of one based on ethnic groups, although the ethnic ascription of each artifact is clearly shown (Pankhurst 2002; Porras 2003).

The very idea of showing everyday objects, which is inherent to ethnographic museums, may be problematic. Chinua Achebe (1984) says that the Igbo do not like ethnographic collections because the Igbo do not give any importance to finished objects. They are more interested in the processes that lead to them. After all, the idea of a museum is an extremely modernist one. Can we use a modernist concept in a non-industrial context? Is it legitimate? Is it useful? Moreover, for whom is the ethnographic museum of Benishangul? Is it intended for the population of Benishangul represented in it? For their cultivated elites as a means to portray difference with regard to the central state and consolidate local power? For foreign visitors interested in exotic cultures? An ethnographic museum portraying other’s culture has a clear function, controversial but clear; an ethnographic museum portraying a local culture is much more problematic.

With regard to history, different problems arise. They have to do with two issues: first, the prevalence of a mythic perception of the past that does not fit with Westernized conceptions of time, and, second, the representation of troubling events, mainly slavery (James 1988; Abdussamad Ahmad 1999), and, more recently, communist dictatorship (Donham 1999) and civil war (for examples of negative recent heritage elsewhere see Audrey Horning this volume). The recent past is currently the object of many museographic initiatives in Africa, and especially in South Africa, where the discussion of Apartheid and colonialism is considered essential to the construction
of a new civil society (Hall 2000). In the case of Benishangul, both communism and civil war have had a tremendous impact in the ethnic and political organization of the region and they should ideally be taken into account. Both, too, have left important material (archaeological) traces in the landscape (González-Ruibal 2006b). The remains of the most recent past, however, are still too controversial and potentially disruptive, among other things because of the entanglement of politics and ethnicity. Thus, in 1988 guerrillas belonging to a separatist Oromo group killed hundreds of people belonging to the Amhara community in Asosa (Young 1999, 327) and there were also clashes among Oromo and Bertha, after the former demanded the latter to identify themselves as “Black Oromos” in order to pursue their fighting against the Derg (the communist government). The Berthas obviously refused the idea. We talked before about the necessity to incorporate both Amhara and Oromo in the museum narrative, but how could this be done without referring to the troubled political context in which their arrival took place (FIGURE 21)? The outcomes of the past are still very alive in the present, especially among the Gumuz of Metekel, who feel marginalized with regard to the Highland settlers (Wolde-Selassie Abbute 2005).

Slavery poses another kind of question. Slavery cannot be ignored in a museum of history in Benishangul-Gumuz. According to Wendy James (1988, 131) “not only the consciously transmitted oral tradition of such peoples but also their patterns of social and cultural practice, indeed their very categories of understanding the world today, are in part the legacy of those former slaving systems which they have in some sense survived” (Jedrej 2004, 710). Nevertheless, the history of slavery can be considered a shameful reality for the current autonomous state, a phenomenon better forgotten, especially due to the active cooperation of some indigenous leaders in the sinister trade, as has been pointed out. Also, the history of slavery makes visible the traditional ethnic hierarchy with all its complications.

DISCUSSION: POST-COLONIAL SOLUTIONS TO POST-COLONIAL DILEMMAS?

Lynn Meskell (2005, 77) reminds us that “Local communities are not passive constituencies that are there for our intellectual mining, nor are they there awaiting our theoretical insights into their situations or histories. They are directly enmeshed in their own critical reformulations, political negotiations and interpretations”. Through this paper, we have tried to avoid any imposition of ideas on the local context, a patronizing attitude so common among Westerners (especially those engaged in development projects). This is why no clear solutions have been offered to the issues we have dealt with so far. We have underlined all the problems and intricacies that we
face in the creation of a local museum in an ethnically complex area like Benishangul-Gumuz. However, as Meskell (2004, 127) herself reminds, “relinquishing our power to intervene in the affairs of others may have uncomfortable repercussions”. We certainly do not want to espouse an ethical doctrine of laissez-faire.

To conclude the paper, rather than offering answers to the questions raised by ethnicity, power and history described here by means of ready-made post-colonial recipes, we will underline the positive aspects of creating a museum in the region, as well as the things that we can learn from the cultures of contact in Benishangul-Gumuz. Listening to and learning from others, instead of teaching and representing them, is for us one of the quintessential post-colonial principles.

1) The problem of freezing in time cultures that are still alive may have a positive aspect: by seeing their culture on display, people, especially young people that have already been subjected to Western influences through school and media, could learn to appreciate their cultural heritage and mitigate the fast and sudden collapse of many traditional practices and artifacts that comes with the impact of modernity. One of the problems that plague many traditional cultures under the pressures of modernity (through education, media or tourism) is the fading authority of elders and their role as knowledge bearers and mediators. A museum can be a place to revalue and enhance their knowledge in the eyes of the younger generations.

2) The coincidence of archaeological, linguistic and historical narratives with local history is an asset for the production of an acceptably harmonious narrative at the museum, one that can be understood by many indigenous groups and at the same time by visiting foreigners. It is also a good starting point to negotiate other more complicated issues related to ethnicity and power. History does not always have to be a place of contention: it can be a place for mutual understanding and for creating links between cultures.

3) The fact that origins are not necessarily a question of territorial conflict among the Nilo-Saharan is something from which we, as archaeologists and Westerners, can learn. Unlike in nationalism-ridden Europe, claims to aboriginality in sub-Saharan Africa do not necessarily lead to war with latecomers. Many groups acknowledge their late arrival to an area and the existence of previous groups in their new homeland. As Igor Kopyttof (1987, 54) states: ‘This is not an uncommon theme in African oral traditions: “We came and found the such-and-such, and they fled.”’ Emigration and movement are regarded as normal, not as a shameful fact to be erased by claiming a
fictitious aboriginality. Therefore, it is possible to construct historical narratives that do not necessarily offend the present groups. That is to say, it can be asserted that the Bertha arrived at a region already populated by the Kwama’s ancestors, without this provoking a political cataclysm. The same would be unthinkable in Kosovo or Israel, where the fight over the territory usually starts with the question of origins (Scham 2001). Besides, this opens the possibility of introducing into the narrative the latest people to arrive—the Amhara settlers—by appealing to a long-lived local tradition.

4) Local institutions aimed at conflict resolution should occupy a prominent place in the museum. Most groups living in the area have developed throughout history different strategies to cope with internal and external violence, conflict and alterity. Be it the Gumuz mangima or the Oromo michu (Wolde-Selassie Abbute 2005, 242-263; Tsega Endalew 2002), these institutions rest upon the concept of coming to terms with others, without anybody being completely victorious or defeated, and also upon the idea of absorbing different cultures into one’s own, accepting difference. Again, rather than teach the people of Benishangul-Gumuz, we can learn from them: about how to deal peacefully with cultures in contact. Institutions aimed at conflict resolution have been recently incorporated to some African museums, such as those of Botswana (Mackenzie 1990). In the exhibition The Heritage of Peace and Reconciliation presented at the Museum of Nairobi, elders and ritual specialists of the Maasai and Pokot groups were invited to explain to the public their traditional methods for restoring peace (Abungu 2001). Similar performances can take place in the museum of Benishangul.

5) In relation to the previous point, there are very positive signs of reconciliation among the indigenous populations and the recent settlers (Wolde-Selassie Abbute 2005). Thus, the ethnic problem and its representation in the museum could be less problematic than thought previously if things do not worsen by external political conditions (the situation in Ethiopia is somewhat volatile). Many villages belonging to different ethnic groups are establishing relations with members of other communities, not only through conflict resolution strategies, but also through trade, land and cattle renting, collective celebrations, cooperative work, schools and so on. Unlike in other situations of culture contact, people belonging to different ethnic groups here acknowledge the improvements brought by others and this usually refers to material culture. Thus, some immigrants say that local houses and large pots are better, whereas locals appreciate the immigrants’ abilities in brewing liquor and using the plow.
6) As some authors have pointed out local museums can be a means to promote regional cooperation (Ekpo 2000, 149). Thanks to the frontier location of Benishangul and to the fact that the cultures represented in the museum transcend political boundaries and are continually crossing frontiers, the museum of Benishangul could be a way of enhancing international relations with the neighboring Sudan and minimizing the relevance of artificial nation-state boundaries. The authorities of Benishangul have had meetings already with Sudanese authorities in order to strengthen friendship and cooperation. Also, cooperation can be established with the Museum of Oromo Culture in Nekemte and with the museums at Addis Ababa. Federal politics, when applied to heritage and museums, can turn out to be a means of improving ethnic relations and fostering cultural exchange, thanks to their symmetrical character. Ethnic federalism may be a solution not only for keeping the diverse cultures of Ethiopia together (Kidane Mengistieab 1997), but for solving ethnic problems elsewhere in Africa.

7) Finally, Benishangul-Gumuz offers a wonderful opportunity to counter-attack conservative historical narratives that praise powerful states and ranked societies as evolutionary successes. The stubborn resistance of frontier cultures through centuries if not millennia against the encroachment of the state (Fernández 2003), their ability to preserve and reconstruct their cultural identities and their social organization under all sorts of pressures can be considered a true historical achievement from a post-colonial and democratic perspective. Most Nilo-Saharan communities have cohabited in peace for long periods of time and have freely adopted cultural elements from each other. A museum in Benishangul-Gumuz can be a praise of the frontier, of cultural coexistence and resistance, non-essentialist identities, societies against the state and egalitarian ethics, as opposed to ruthless states, ethnic exclusivism, political centers and hierarchical and aggressive polities (cf. Clastres 1987; Graeber 2004). This does not mean that the area is a political utopia, for sure—there are other sorts of inequalities, mainly those that affect the relationship between women and men. However, there are traditional political elements in Benishangul-Gumuz that clearly demonstrate a fact: cultures in contact can coexist.
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THE BISHOP'S BEEF:
*Improved Cattle in Eighteenth Century Skálholt, Iceland*

George Hambrecht
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ABSTRACT
The excavations at Skálholt, the cathedral/farm of the Bishop of southern Iceland, afford an excellent case study of a culture of contact in an archaeological context. A dump of cattle (Bos taurus) bones from the turn of the 17th/18th centuries at Skálholt has revealed what was a radical new attitude towards agriculture, diet, law, fashion, and ideology. In this case, a culture of contact was not formed among radically different ethnicities or civilizations but among ideologies and fashions, reflecting on one hand the “Enlightenment” movements of continental Europe, and on the other, the medieval Norse culture of Iceland which contained many elements of continuity going back to the 9th century Settlement Period. The Bishops tried, and ultimately failed, to introduce a beef cattle economy to Iceland, an exceptional situation in the North Atlantic region during almost any period. A new breed of cattle, visibly different from the native Icelandic cattle, was introduced specifically for this purpose. Alongside this new breed, Icelandic cattle were themselves physically altered to look like the newcomers (possibly in an attempt at Lamarckian breeding). A hybrid faunal landscape was thus produced, based not on traditional Icelandic economic and social value, but on the ideologies and fashions of Enlightenment Europe. Though a failure, most likely due to climatic conditions, this hybrid landscape is a physical manifestation of a culture at the meeting points of medieval and early modern husbandry, diet, fashion, and ideology.
Skálholt was one of two principal cultural and religious centers in Iceland from its foundation as an Episcopal see in the late 11th century until its destruction by earthquake in 1784. Preliminary analysis of a dump of cattle (Bos taurus) bones from an 18th century context at the bishop’s farm at Skálholt has revealed a new attitude towards agriculture, diet, law, fashion and ideology. The cattle represented by these bones were a new introduction to early modern Iceland, one that would have broadcast cultural difference. These cattle were not only being raised for a different purpose than typical Icelandic cattle, they were also morphologically different. The majority were naturally polled (without horns) and a smaller number had their horns artificially removed. Seen in the context of Iceland’s early modern history, these cattle exemplify a divergence from animal husbandry norms and the attitudes towards nature which underpinned them. Contrary to the classic colonial encounter of the 18th century, this situation was enacted not among radically different ethnicities or civilizations, but within a homogenous population sharing the same language and religion as well as a common historical heritage. Cultural differences manifested themselves in terms of ideologies and fashions, reflecting on the one hand, elements of the Enlightenment then flourishing in continental Europe, and on the other, the early modern culture of Iceland containing many elements of continuity going back to the 9th century Settlement Period, known as Landnám.

Animal husbandry is as much a reflection of culture as architecture, ceramics, or jewelry. Zooarchaeology in Iceland has made significant contributions towards understanding culture and contexts behind decision making in Iceland from Landnám into the early modern era (Vésteinsson et al. 2002; McGovern et al 2001, for example). Domestic animals have always been dynamic elements within culture. We can breed them to our needs and desires. In the 18th century the level of random chance in animal breeding in Europe dropped dramatically as breeding technologies advanced (Russell 1986). This increased ability to manipulate animals through breeding came at the same time as Enlightenment thought was at its height in the European world. The cattle from Skálholt reflect the impact of the technological innovations in animal breeding made during the 18th century but even more powerfully the impact of Enlightenment attitudes towards nature.

After the earthquake in 1784, the Bishop’s residence was moved to Reykjavik and the manorial complex—which consisted of the Bishop’s quarters, a school, and considerable infrastructure devoted to the household—was partially abandoned, and a

---

1 The Bishop returned to Skálholt after having bought the property from the crown and lived there until his death in 1796.
prosperous farm took its place. Skálholt was a major livestock farm in its own right, based in a highly fertile region (relative to Iceland) in the southern part of the island that had, according to an early 18th century land register, one of the largest cattle herds in the country (Edvardsson, in progress). Church documents, early maps, geophysical survey, and early modern travelers’ accounts all indicate the unusual size and intricacy of the complex of buildings currently being exposed by excavation. Skálholt can be regarded as a settlement of possibly the highest year-round density in Iceland until it was replaced by the expansion of Reykjavik beginning at the end of the 18th century (Lucas 2005).

The zooarchaeological assemblage recovered so far is extensive, but this paper only addresses one particular midden, context 454, found in a test pit to the southeast of the main complex. This midden is no older than the 18th century and should be contemporary with the largest and final phases of the manor and its complex household. There is no absolute date for the midden yet the depth of the midden, over one meter, and finds discovered above and within the midden, such as a late 17th century Dutch pipe bowl, strongly suggest a date within the 18th century. Another trench roughly 15 meters along the same slope as unit 454 and in a similar position has a terminus post quem of 1758 for the units above 80 centimeters deep. Another hint comes from Joseph Banks, an eminent British naturalist who visited Iceland and stayed at Skálholt in 1772. His traveling companions included illustrators, one of whom included some clearly polled cattle in his portraits of the settlement.

Throughout the North Atlantic region, defined here as the North Atlantic Scandinavian cultural sphere, the standard domestic-mammal zooarchaeological assemblage reflected economies that concentrated on dairy production. Three elements make Skálholt’s unit 454 unique within this North Atlantic context. The first is the overwhelming presence of cattle in the assemblage. To my knowledge, no other known archaeofaunal context from Iceland or the North Atlantic region is so dominated by cattle. The second is a zooarchaeological profile indicating large-scale beef production, the first among non-modern archaeofauna from Iceland. Finally, the cattle represented by this assemblage were a new breed either brought in from Europe or bred from Icelandic cattle. Any of these conditions alone in an Icelandic context in any period would be exceptional (McGovern et al 2001). To find all three is remarkable and merits further consideration. Cattle with these characteristics are not found in any of the later strata so far excavated at Skálholt or elsewhere in Iceland to date.

The midden containing context 454 was, judging from contemporary maps, close to and possibly associated with a meat store room. Among the butchery-related
artifacts were a piece of whale bone butcher block and a possible whale bone knife handle. The midden is located along the edge of a road that ran through a complex of outbuildings south of the Bishop’s residence. It was formed via a series of dumps of refuse, ash and fill over the edge of the road. Context 454 was the only stratum in this midden associated with large quantities of well-preserved, whole animal bones. It is an extremely dense deposit, with very little sediment present among the closely packed and entangled bone fragments. Because the adjacent thin peat ash deposits interdigitate with it, context 454 seems to represent an accretion of multiple dumps occurring over a fairly short time period.

Table 1 presents a count of the identified specimens (NISP 4,227) and the less well identified categories of “Large Terrestrial Mammal” (LTM), “Medium Terrestrial Mammal” (MTM), and “Small Terrestrial Mammal” (STM) as well as unidentified mammal bone fragments contributing to the overall bone count (TNF) of 20,554.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific Names</th>
<th>English Common Names</th>
<th>NISP Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bos taurus dom.</td>
<td>cattle</td>
<td>887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equus caballus</td>
<td>horse</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canis familiaris</td>
<td>dog</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sus scrofa</td>
<td>pig</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ovis aries</td>
<td>sheep</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ovis/ Capra sp. Indet.</td>
<td>caprine</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cetacea sp.</td>
<td>whale species</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alopex lagopus</td>
<td>arctic fox</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish sp to be determined</td>
<td></td>
<td>2203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NISP total</td>
<td></td>
<td>3243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Large Terrestrial Mammal</strong></td>
<td>888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Medium Terrestrial Mammal</strong></td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Small Terrestrial Mammal</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Unidentified mammal fragment</strong></td>
<td>15,294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TNF total</td>
<td>19,519</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 presents the count of fragments (NISP) and relative percentage of domestic mammals. Cattle dominate the domestic mammal assemblage; caprines (sheep and goat) together make up less than 15% of the deposit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domestic Mammals</th>
<th>% NISP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cattle (Bos taurus)</td>
<td>84.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horse (Equus caballus)</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog (Canis familiaris)</td>
<td>present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep (Ovis aries)</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caprine (Sheep and Goat)</td>
<td>11.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Caprines</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the unidentifiable mammal bones, LTM make up a similar majority in proportion to MTM as cattle to caprines in the NISP. Considering that equids are represented by only three elements, and that the proportions between bos versus other mammals and LTM versus MTM are similar, it is not too risky to associate LTM with cattle.

Finding cattle at a high-status site such as Skálholt is not out of the ordinary, but to find an assemblage so totally dominated by cattle is. No other currently known archaeofaunal context from Iceland has such a high percentage of cattle bone. In comparison, archaeofaunal assemblages from the medieval farm sites of Sveigakot and Hofstaðir in the north of Iceland exhibit far higher numbers of caprines, with cattle routinely representing between 15-20% of the archaeofaunal assemblages in the early period after Landnám, and then falling to 10-15% later in the early medieval period (McGovern et al 2001; Perdikaris et al 2004). The archaeofaunal assemblage from a lower ranking 18th century site in NW Iceland, Finnbogastaðir, has cattle making up roughly 10% of its assemblage (Edvardsson et al 2004). Both the early modern southern farm of Storaborg and the high status farm of Bessastaðir near Reykjavik had cattle making up roughly 20% of their assemblages (Sveinbjarnsdottir 1988).

The element distribution for the cattle strongly suggests that they were slaughtered onsite. Elements from across the whole animal are present. If the beef represented by this archaeofauna was being imported from surrounding farms or regions, our element distribution would most likely contain a majority of heavy-meat bearing bones, such as the femur and humerus.
The cattle in the context 454 collection are almost all adults or older juveniles (table 3). This, too, is atypical. Neonatal bones, barely represented in this assemblage, normally make up 20-40% of most Icelandic farm collections from all periods.

Adult/Juvenile and Neonatal Cow bones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cattle Bones</th>
<th># of bones</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult &amp; juv</td>
<td>887.00</td>
<td>99.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neonatal</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tooth eruption patterns observed on both maxillary and mandibular cattle tooth rows, (figures 1 and 2), indicate that the majority came from young adult animals.

![Cattle M3 Wear](image)

**Figure 1**
Figure 2 presents the mandibular wear state for the available cattle jaws, making use of the Grant (1982) method, with age estimates relative to tooth eruption and wear from Grigson (1982).

Light and medium wear account for roughly 84% of the sample of maxillary tooth rows (out of 44 samples). This strongly suggests that these cattle were slaughtered when they were three years old or older (Grigson 1982). The significantly smaller number of M3 showing heavy wear implies that there were few older animals, meaning older than four to eight years, represented in this dump. The mandibles tell a similar story, suggesting that the majority of the cattle represented by unit 454 lived until sometime after their third year, yet not into old age, eight years or more. Due to the much larger sample size of maxillary tooth rows, the M3 maxillary tooth wear data should be emphasized over the mandibular tooth wear data, with its much smaller sample size of seven tooth rows. It’s important to note that dental wear is only a relative indicator of age. Different levels of erosion and plant composition, for example, can either inhibit or increase the levels of tooth wear in a cow. In order to lessen the “noise” from such possible variables the fusion state of selected long bones must be examined as well. These long bones reinforce the idea that these cattle lived beyond their third year, but not much longer than their fifth year (figure 3).
As can be seen from the chart above, 62% of the cattle femurs in this assemblage had fused distal ends by the time they were slaughtered. 38% were unfused, the largest proportion of long bone fusion in this assemblage. As this end of the femur does not fuse until the second half of the animals’ third year of life, this pattern of long bone fusion suggests that the majority were killed off somewhere around that age.

Both the bone fusion and tooth wear data strongly point to cattle that were slaughtered within their third and fifth years of life. This mortality pattern is more indicative of a beef cattle economy than of a dairy economy. A lifespan between three and five years would usually take them to or near the peak of their growth curve, before they could become effective milk producers but close to the point where further feeding produced little or no increase in carcass size (Trow-Smith 1951). In contrast, in zooarchaeological assemblages of less wealthy, though by no means poor, farms in Iceland, one finds a large amount of bones from neonates and then again from older
animals, past their prime (McGovern 2003). This is a typical zooarchaeological representation of a dairy economy, in which a population of milk cows is maintained at a level determined by the amount of pasture and fodder available and neonates are slaughtered in order to save their mother’s milk for human consumption. This is not to suggest that there was no dairy economy at Skálholt, only that a dedicated beef economy was present for at least part of the 18th century.

That these Skálholt cattle were being raised for beef is exceptional in the Scandinavian North Atlantic during any period. A dairy economy is in pure economic terms the most cost effective way to raise cattle. A beef economy costs far more in terms of time and fodder. For each animal, a farmer achieves only a one-time return for all their effort as opposed to the steady return of a dairy cow once it has reached a productive age.

The presence of beef on the Bishop’s table for at least a significant period of time during the 18th century would have broadcast a message of distinction and wealth. This beef would have been of a very different quality than most individuals in Iceland might have been used to before, because it was the meat of mature, rather than elderly or neonate, animals. It is obviously difficult to characterize how this quality difference would have specifically affected an individual at the Bishop’s table, but I think the experience would have been a significant one regardless of the cooking method used. Virtually the entire population of 18th century Iceland was made up of pastoralists. Livestock was, and still is, one of the primary elements of the Icelandic landscape, and cattle were the highest value units on this landscape. Therefore, a beef cattle economy within the traditional dairy economy would have been easily distinguishable to any Icelander both on the pasture and on the plate.

It would have also been seen as a luxury. Until the 19th century, and even later, few cultures around the world had made the choice to create and sustain dedicated beef cattle economies. The Bishop’s slaughtered beef, eaten presumably by some members of his household and his guests, would have proclaimed evidence of contact with a new and different culture than that of the great majority of Iceland. It would have been a strong cultural marker separating Skálholt from lower status households.

There are other examples of prime beef cattle in Icelandic zooarchaeology, but on a much smaller scale such as at the early medieval farm of Hofstaðir (McGovern 1999) and at the high medieval trading site of Gásir (Harrison 2005). There is also at least one 18th century documentary mention of steers in Iceland, so Skálholt is likely not to be the only place engaging in a prime beef economy (Vésteinsson, personal communication). Yet relative to current zooarchaeological knowledge in Iceland this
beef economy looks to have worked on a much larger scale than anything seen previously.

What makes these cattle even more exceptional is that all of the cattle crania (ten skull elements in which the horn core area was intact) recovered from context 454 are polled (without horns). Eight of these crania were naturally polled (figure 4), and two were artificially polled. In one of the artificially polled examples, infection set in after the removal of the horn (figure 5).

There was a very low frequency of naturally polled cattle occurring in the Icelandic cattle population from the Settlement Period to the introduction of new breeds in the 19th century, so it is statistically extremely unlikely that these polled cattle were the product of this very rare mutation. It follows that this particular breed of cattle of unit 454 were either introduced from continental Europe by the Bishop’s household or bred by them from Icelandic cattle.

Codified in Icelandic law from the high Middle Ages, horned cattle had legal status as units of valuation and exchange. They were used to value property and pay debts and legal sanctions, and were central to Icelandic culture from the first settlement to the development of a dedicated fishing economy in the 19th and 20th centuries. The horns are an explicit part of the definition of cattle in Icelandic law (Grágás 2000: 208). Moreover, horn itself was a valuable raw material for crafts productions on an island with a limited supply of wood and no utilized source of ceramic quality clay.2

Skálholt’s naturally and artificially polled cattle are different from the vast majority of previously encountered cattle archaeofauna in Iceland—different in function and legal definition. In a strict reading of Icelandic law they were worth much less. I would argue that the introduction of cattle that did not fit into the traditional views of what the highest-value cattle should be by one of the highest status settlements on the whole island was a dramatic and public statement of difference. To both utilize cattle as a high-status, one-time return investment while also taking them out of the traditional legal and economic system, is a vivid demonstration of power and wealth.

Artificial polling of existing horned cattle also shows a strong impulse on the part of the powers at Skálholt to change the Icelandic landscape not only through

---

2 Whether or not there is ceramic quality clay in Iceland is still an issue under discussion but regardless there is no evidence of any ceramics production in pre-modern Iceland.
introduction of a new breed of animals but through the physical alteration of native cattle. This deliberate alteration of natives to resemble the newcomers, I believe, moves the agency behind these cattle into the realm of fashion and ideology. There was no practical reason to artificially poll these animals other than to create a uniform faunal landscape that reflected the ideologies and pastoral fashion pretensions of the Bishop of Skálholt.

All the more interesting was the extreme epidemiological, climatic, and geological context in which these cows were displayed. The 18th century began with the smallpox epidemic of 1707-09 (Vasey 1996). Due to their relative isolation from Europe, Icelanders were highly vulnerable to smallpox; an estimated one-quarter to one-third of the total population died in the epidemic.

Additionally, this century was on average (relative to the total time of settlement) a period of extreme climatic variation. Such unpredictability at the edge of sustainable European-style agriculture had dire effects on the abilities of Icelandic farmers to support themselves. The middle decades of the 18th century were also colder on average, killing off large numbers of domestic animals and increasing sea-ice. Famine is estimated to also have killed off roughly ten thousand Icelanders, out of an estimated total population of roughly sixty thousand, in the decade of the 1750s. Average temperatures dropped again and sea ice increased beginning in the 1780s (Ogilvie 2001). Although Skálholt lies within one of the most robust regions of Iceland, in terms of climate stability, the stress from increased climatic variability and the cold periods in the middle and end of the century would have exerted significant pressures on the Skálholt economy (Jennings et al 2001).

The disasters continued into the last quarter of the 18th century, when Iceland experienced the Famine of the Mist from 1783-1784. This was the result of the Lakagígar eruption whose effects were felt throughout Eurasia. A thick fog of toxic volcanic gases and dust blanketed the island for the greater part of a year. Many livestock on the island and an estimated quarter of the population died (Demarée and Ogilvie 2001). As if the island had not suffered enough, a final blow was dealt in 1784, with the earthquakes that destroyed Skálholt and leveled structures across the south of the island.

Finding a balance between the precise needs of new breeds and the environments of their new homes was a process that often failed in the 18th century (Van Bath 1966). What is remarkable is that these polled beef cattle were introduced during a century of such crisis.

Where did these cattle come from? It is impossible to say with any great certainty at this point, but it is the case that during the 18th century Europeans were
developing some of their first polled breeds of cattle, including the Scottish Galloway and the Aberdeen-Angus breeds that were created and raised solely for beef production (Van Bath 1963). It is also accepted by livestock and agrarian historians that the first dedicated beef economies in Europe were formed at this time. Scotland supplied Galloway, Angus, and Highlander beef cattle in large numbers for the Edinburgh and London markets (Trow-Smith 1951: 151-153), while the Danish nobility supplied the Netherlands with large numbers of beef cattle (van Bath 1963: 286). The latter may have been the source of the bishop’s polled cattle as there was already a precedent for a beef cattle economy coming from Denmark, Iceland’s colonial power. It is also likely that Denmark imported new varieties of beef cattle after the cattle plague of the 1740’s destroyed as much as half of the Danish cattle population (Kjærgaard 1994: 27-28). It is entirely possible, though not yet investigated, that the Bishop of Skálholt or one of his household might have encountered this beef enterprise and new breed imports through the Danish nobility. Though the Scottish polled beef breeds would also seem to be good candidates for the cattle of unit 454, this would be pure speculation at this point. Regardless of the individual country of origin, it is overwhelmingly likely that these cattle or the breeding technology that created them were an import from continental Europe.

Early modern Icelandic culture and elements of early modern continental European culture came together in the Bishop’s residence. The cows indicate that Skálholt was differentiated from the rest of early modern Iceland by more than just wealth. It was also culturally differentiated through its intellectual connections to Europe, at this time to Enlightenment-era Europe. Obviously the breadth and details of such a connection is beyond the scope of this paper, but I will attempt to briefly link the Bishop’s beef cattle to a few of the larger intellectual and ideological currents coming from continental Europe at that time.

The Agricultural Revolution is an obvious inspiration for the appearance of these cattle at Skálholt. Most agricultural historians agree that the essence of the Agricultural Revolution was the major increase in new agrarian technologies, crops, and commercial animal breeds that appeared mainly during the early modern period in Europe, especially in England. There is also a consensus that these new technologies and breeds led to increased agricultural production (Overton 1996: 1-9). Less agreed-upon is when this revolution began, though it is generally agreed that it was in full development throughout much of Western Europe by the second half of the 18th century.

The Agricultural Revolution is closely intertwined with Enlightenment thought. The two movements do not cleanly overlap in time yet they did have
enormous influence on each other. In terms of nature, Enlightenment thought is broad, but there is an overall concentration on harnessing and controlling nature. These themes go well beyond the biblical precedent of the creation story in Genesis by emphasizing the ability to engineer nature and cull the unproductive elements from it (Worster 1994). In the context of agriculture this engineering was most often termed “improvement,” a term in which both movements meet and combine (Dalglish 2003). Though the nature of improvement changed according to the point of view of the agents involved, generally speaking land, crops and animals were being manipulated in order to increase their value and productivity. Icelanders in the 17th and especially the 18th century were not strangers to this improving impulse. Alongside the 1780 Icelandic manual of agricultural improvement, Atli, by Bjorn Halldorsson, there are 18th century private “improving” journals of farmers from throughout Iceland (Ogilvie, McGovern, personal communication).

Yet what we see in unit 454 at Skálholt is a far more dramatic form of innovation and a greater break from traditional pastoral economies than has yet been seen in any other archaeological context in the North Atlantic. Carolus Linnaeus, the father of modern taxonomy and one of the brightest stars of the Enlightenment, epitomized a more radical end of the improving ideal when he stated as one of his goals the commercial growth of tea, saffron, and rice in Swedish Lapland. Turning this sub arctic region into a fertile agricultural zone producing cattle, wheat, and exotic spices (Koerner 2000: 79-81) was one of his dream projects. The audacity of his vision reveals the extent to which the agricultural improvement impulse represented thinking that had gone far beyond the biblical commandment to utilize the beasts of the earth for their benefit. One’s ability, and right, to alter God’s creatures, just as one would a farm implement, was grafted onto the original commandment of Genesis (Worster 1994: 39-41).

The idea of the inheritability of externally imposed traits, transformism, predates Jean-Baptiste Lamarck and was one of many potentially legitimate branches of natural science in the 18th century (Corsi 1988). The possibility that the artificial polling of the horned cattle was an attempt at a transformist or Lamarckian breeding program is another intriguing possibility. In any case, cattle associated with Skálholt were re-ordered in a way that reflected new attitudes towards the organic world espoused by Enlightenment figures such as Linnaeus and Lamarck.

The idea of improvement is often associated with the rise of capitalism and the profit motive, but in this sense, the Bishop’s beef cattle are a difficult fit. It would be hard to understand the introduction of these polled beef cattle and the artificial polling of native cattle as motivated by profit and the accumulation of capital. It is possible that
the Bishops might have intended to stimulate a market for beef in Iceland, but this is very unlikely, especially in 18th century Iceland. It is far more likely that these moves were inspired by, on one hand, the desire to reinforce the high status of Skálholt through the beef economy, and on the other, Enlightenment fashion and ideology through polling, that sought to enhance social rather than financial capital.

The Enlightenment movement reverberated through the parlors and universities of Europe, and, I would argue, amid the paddocks and pastures of Iceland through Skálholt. I believe that the zooarchaeological assemblage of unit 454 is a product of an improving impulse brought to Iceland by the Bishop of Skálholt or one of his household. The creation of a new faunal landscape had an ideological foundation, based on a new understanding of the plasticity of nature and our own potential agency within it.
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ABSTRACT
Contemporary implications and memories of ‘colonial’ entanglements vary wildly and remain contested in historical, political, economic, and popular understandings of the past. In Northern Ireland, present-day identities remain rooted in dichotomous understandings of the impact of British expansion in the 16th and 17th centuries. Heritage sites are invariably implicated in the construction and maintenance of the remembered histories that reify these contemporary identities. Employing case studies from Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland, the potential of a critical, inclusive archaeology to positively impact upon a divided society is considered, along with the ethical implications of acknowledging and challenging historical narratives. Incorporated is an analysis of how professional archaeologists make decisions about inclusivity and exclusivity, as well as a critique of the simplistic application of postcolonial theoretical approaches to analyses of the convoluted history of Anglo-Irish relations in the early modern and modern periods.
INTRODUCTION

Current trends in the archaeology of formerly colonized regions specifically highlight the concerns of indigenous and descendant communities in addressing the ethics of archaeological practice in the modern world. In most formerly colonized regions, there is clearly an imbalance of power yet to be addressed, and in places like Australia and South Africa in particular, archaeologists have immersed themselves in efforts to validate the concerns of historically disenfranchised communities, and in some instances, to promote their agendas (eg. Harrison 2002; Harrison, Greer, and McIntyre-Tamwoy 2002). The ethics of practice, while hardly straightforward, have a clear focus. Such advances in indigenous rights and involvement in archaeology are critically important and of significant import and impact for 21st century archaeological practice. But the situation in Northern Ireland is not quite so ‘black and white.’

Contemporary identity in Northern Ireland is fragile, complicated, and fragmented. The modern division of society into two ‘traditions’, Roman Catholic/nationalist and Protestant/unionist, is rooted in the fraught interactions of native Irish, English, and Scots during the 17th-century Plantation period when British control was made manifest by importation of loyal Protestant settlers. Archaeological evidence from the period readily contradicts essentialist notions of ‘the two traditions,’ yet in terms of self perception both communities currently view themselves as constituting a distinct and threatened minority. What do we do when faced with a paradoxical situation where all communities self-identify as potentially marginalized and dispossessed? Arguably, by focusing on the ambiguity and complexity inherent in contemporary Irish society as rooted in the relations of the last 500 years, there are lessons for other contested places where contact breeds conflict and creates culture(s).

In looking at the ethics of archaeological practice in Northern Ireland, and also in the Republic of Ireland, I want to reflect not only on the potential of a critical, inclusive archaeology to positively impact upon a divided society, but I also want to analyze more explicitly how we, as professionals, make decisions about inclusivity and exclusivity. Not just how we select ‘passive’ audiences, but how we aim to identify those active groups generically and awkwardly labeled ‘stakeholders.’ To what extent do these stakeholders (be they real or constructed) determine, direct, constrain, or broaden our practice? How do we address the validity of competing historical narratives while acknowledging our own biases? Before addressing these issues, however, it is necessary to examine the tangled roots of contemporary conflict in Northern Ireland and to evaluate the advantages and disadvantages of applying postcolonial theory (broadly defined as approaches which seek to redress historic imbalances) to its interpretation.
BACKGROUND
The roots of contemporary conflict in Northern Ireland lie in the expansion of English, and subsequently British, control over Ireland in the 16th and 17th centuries. While England maintained a degree of political and economic control over Ireland since the Anglo-Norman invasions of the 12th century, the Reformation, fears of Spain, and the increasing commodification of nature inherent in what Immanuel Wallerstein's labeled the capitalist world system (Wallerstein 1974), conspired in the strengthening of England's grip on the island. After a prolonged war in Munster which ended in 1583, Queen Elizabeth instituted a policy of planting English settlers on 400,000 acres of forfeited land, building upon earlier efforts to secure protection for Dublin through the creation of English enclaves in what are today Counties Laois and Offaly. The remainder of Ireland, however, did not submit to English authority until the defeat of Hugh O'Neill in 1603 (Canny 2001).

When James VI of Scotland ascended to the English throne in 1603, England was well positioned to profit from its authority over Ireland. The “flight of the earls” of Tyrone and Tyrconnell in 1607 resulted in the forfeiture of the six counties of Armagh, Cavan, Coleraine, Donegal, Fermanagh, and Tyrone to the Crown. James I (VI) began to plant the newly acquired lands, along with nearby Antrim and Down, in an effort to replace the native population with loyal British subjects. Land grants were made to individual ‘undertakers,’ often loyal soldiers. To help fund this Ulster Plantation initiative, James compelled the Livery Companies of London (the medieval merchant guilds) to finance part of the effort, repaying the companies with grants of land in the newly created county of Londonderry. By 1630, the Companies had collectively contributed between £60,000 and £70,000 to build and protect their settlements, located in what was considered to be the wildest and most vulnerable part of Ulster (Bardon 1992; Canny 2001; Curl 1986; Gillespie 1993; Loeber 1991; Moody 1939; Robinson 1984).

The ambitious aims of the Ulster Plantation, however, were never fully achieved. Native Irish residents were never wholly displaced, and the incoming British settlers never constituted a powerful, unified elite. Political uncertainty and involvement in the War of the Three Kingdoms (better known by the wholly inaccurate label of the English Civil War) in the mid-17th century ensured that the ambitious goals of the plantation scheme, in terms of landholding and urban development, were never achieved. Protestant control over the affairs of Ireland was not assured until after the Williamite Wars of 1688-1690, when the Catholic James II was unsuccessful in challenging the royal claim of the Protestant William of Orange (Canny 2001; Kennedy 1996; Ohlmeyer 1993).
Yet historical memories of the 17th century are invoked by both traditions to illustrate and underscore ongoing conflict, as reflected in the internationally recognized tradition of mural painting (Jarman 2002). Loyalist murals employ images and memories of symbolic events such as the ‘massacre’ of Protestant settlers during the Irish Rebellion of 1641, the 1689 Siege of Derry, and the subsequent victory of King Billy at the Battle of the Boyne in July of 1690. Polemical tracts celebrate the achievements of “peace-loving and industrious” Protestants, who introduced “habits of order and industry” to Ireland during the Plantation, “where before there had been only robbers’ castles, miserable huts, and mud cabins” (Dunleath 1914). By contrast, Republican communities lament the Flight of the Earls (sometimes termed Flight of the Gaelic Nobility to lessen the emphasis upon the English title of Earl), and recall with bitterness the ‘massacre’ of Catholic Irish in Drogheda and Wexford by Cromwell’s soldiers in 1649.

Moving beyond the 17th century, nationalist murals employ imagery from the Great Hunger of the 1840s to suggest a deliberate policy of genocide on the part of the British government (a perception encouraged largely by the persistent Famine memory of the Irish American Diasporic community). Representations of these events serve to justify the violence that characterized the most recent conflict, which began in 1968 and is colloquially termed ‘The Troubles.’ Over 3,000 deaths have been attributed to the Troubles. In light of the overall population size of Northern Ireland—approximately 1.7 million people—the ratio is roughly equivalent to half a million deaths in the United States (O’Leary and McGarry 1992 in McLernon et al 2003). Adding a further level of complexity to understandings of contemporary Northern Irish society is the often downplayed reality that a disproportionate amount of Troubles-related violence was suffered by Protestant and Catholic working class communities. For example, examination of the 2,763 deaths that occurred in the first 20 years of the Troubles reveals that “areas of the Province that are materially disadvantaged have also experienced disproportionately high levels of violence” (Coulter 1999: 72, based on McKeown 1989: 50). Scholarly as well as political debate over whether or not ‘The Troubles’ are best understood as the result of economic, social, or religious tensions is heated, ongoing, and unlikely to be resolved. However the contemporary conflict is understood, its legacy has left an indelible mark upon the people of the province and particularly upon how they are perceived externally.

While the distinct nature of the two traditions is open to question, it is clear that in terms of self perception, both communities view themselves as constituting a threatened minority. As the Catholic population continues to rise in the North, unionist fears of the inevitability of a united Catholic Ireland increase, exacerbated by
the growing alienation of unionists from the remainder of the United Kingdom. While strong links still exist between Scotland and Northern Ireland, some English people seem to be unaware that Northern Ireland remains part of the United Kingdom (by way of anecdotal evidence, when I moved to England I was repeatedly told when trying to open a bank account that the fact I already had a Northern Ireland bank account was irrelevant to my application as the account was in a ‘foreign’ country). Forty-seven percent of Northern Ireland’s population self-identify as British (74 percent of Protestants and 12 percent of Catholics self-identify as British, 2004 Northern Ireland Life and Times Survey, www.ark.ac.uk/nilt/2004/) yet would be labeled as Irish or perhaps Northern Irish outside the boundaries of the province (Nic Craith 2002: 131-132).

By contrast, Catholic Northern Irish may be increasing numerically, but they themselves are often viewed suspiciously by many in the Republic of Ireland (Nic Craith 2002: 145). Despite the ambiguities experienced by both communities, the majority of works purporting to explore the topic of Irish identity—scholarship which draws heavily upon postcolonial theory—is the assumption that the historical and contemporary experiences of the Catholic nationalist community equate to subalternity (e.g. Garner 2004; Graham 2001; Graham and Kirkland 1999; Kiberd 1997; cf. Gramsci 1971; Spivak 1988). But to identify any community as somehow more subaltern than another effectively constitutes a political statement. Arguably, if anyone in Northern Ireland could be classified as subaltern it is the working class communities on both sides of the community divide which truly qualify.

IRELAND AS POSTCOLONIAL?
To analyze the potential contribution of postcolonial approaches to Ireland’s historical archaeology necessitates a critical examination of basic concepts, as well as considering who benefits from the imposition of postcoloniality on the Republic of Ireland and Northern Ireland. To be postcolonial presumably requires first being colonial. So, how do we define colonialism, and is it the best framework for understanding the archaeology of early modern and modern Ireland? To answer these questions requires balancing the disparate and often heated arguments of scholars in the fields of Irish history, anthropology, cultural theory, geography, politics, and economics, while also considering the broader Atlantic context—especially in light of the trend towards an ideology of a global historical archaeology (e.g. Orser 1996). It has not been difficult for scholars to make the case that the Republic of Ireland is ‘postcolonial’ by its own definition following the struggle for independence in the early 20th century. The potential of understanding the archaeology of the 26 counties of the Republic through the lens of colonialism is being tested by Charles Orser’s work in Roscommon and
Sligo (Orser 1996; 2004), the work of postgraduate students in Dublin, Galway, and Cork, and Jim Delle’s attempt to draw parallels with Jamaica (Delle 1999). Elsewhere I have critiqued Delle for drawing stark, simplistic parallels between the experience of enslaved Afro-Jamaicans and Irish Catholics in his effort to ‘outline a spatial theory which can be used to compare the material culture of colonial episodes in disparate temporal and spatial contexts’ (Horning 2006a; cf. Delle 1999: 115).

While comparative colonialism may be a useful framework for examining the archaeology of the Republic of Ireland, in any application of colonialism to Irish history the elephant in the room is inevitably Northern Ireland. Imposing the rhetoric of postcolonialism on the North merely drives the wedge of dichotomization between the ‘two traditions’ deeper. In the North, unionists and some historians employ the close relationship between medieval England and Ireland in questioning a colonial past. By contrast, ‘de-colonization’ remains a central platform of Sinn Féin ideology, which therefore places the incendiary label of ‘colonizer’ or ‘settler’ onto present day Ulster Protestants, a problematic label that is often uncritically accepted by social scientists (e.g. D. Miller 1998). Not only does the label imply a straightforward colonial history, but it also ignores the perspective of those who point to the strong connections between the western isles of Scotland and the north of Ireland stretching back into the Neolithic period. Some of the more extreme claims promote the idea of the Scots as the original Irish (based upon a loose reading of Iron Age evidence relating to a tribe named the Cruthín) to promote the greater claims of the Ulster Scots protestants to the land of the north of Ireland. According to one such tract, “the ancient people of Ulster—the Cruthín—began a migration to Lowland Scotland after their defeat at the hands of the Gaels at the battle of Moira in 637 AD” (Hume 1986: 12). By this logic, Scots who participated in the Plantation were reclaiming their ancestral lands. While I am not particularly sympathetic to some of these claims, I very much believe that as practitioners, we have an ethical responsibility to the people we study and the communities in which we work that includes recognizing the power and seriousness of multiple narratives. The interests of local communities may not be well served by an overemphasis upon simplistic models of colonialism and postcolonialism, coupled with the muting effects of a global historical archaeology, which assumes an often adversarial and always uneven relationship between colonized and colonizer. Not only are the interests of contemporary populations not well served by stark models, neither are those of the original participants in what was a murky process riven with uncertainty, insecurity, and incompleteness.

While Declan Kiberd (1997: 81) overtly celebrates the Irish as “the first English-speaking people… to attempt a programme of decolonization,” the Republic of
Ireland’s active participation in the European Union has concomitantly spurred a rejection of the colonial model of Irish history in favor of models of European state development (cf. Ruane 1992). In asking “How does this [Irish] self-image of exceptional suffering and victimhood, which belongs primarily to the nationalist community in Ireland, look when viewed in comparative terms?”, historian Liam Kennedy finds little evidence to support the postcolonial formulation. Kennedy clearly enjoys his role as a revisionist, celebrating the fact that “historians have a tendency to spoil a good story” (Kennedy 1996: 187). Yet it is the tenacity of the stories, and the strength of perceptions of colonialism that nevertheless remain paramount in the construction of contemporary identities, and therefore must be recognized and potentially deconstructed in public discourse.

To use colonialism as a lens requires that we recognize the spotty, complicated, non-inevitability of the process, and to view colonialism, in the words of Stephen Howe (2000: 110) as “a patchwork quilt, an enormously varied set of forms of rule and domination, largely the product of improvisation and full of internal contradictions and strains, rather than a deliberately constructed global system.” Static treatises on the nature of colonialism presume a binary opposition between colonizer and colonized (not unlike the two traditions model), which offer little to considerations of the complexity of Irish identities. Recognition of the ambiguous structures of early modern colonialism centuries takes us closer to addressing the ambiguities of identity formation. Any examination of colonialism has to acknowledge that social relations are never purely colonial, in the sense of being firmly rooted in exploitation.

EDUCATION, MEMORY, AND MULTIPLE HISTORIES
Over the last decade, I have taught the archaeology of British expansion—‘colonialism’—in the United States, Northern Ireland and most recently and currently, England. In each land, historical understandings of the colonial process, and more critically, its legacy, vary wildly. The word ‘colonial’ in America’s Chesapeake region is swaddled in patriotic rhetoric, the violence, uncertainties, and unresolved conflicts deliberately forgotten. In suggesting back in 1993—on the basis of pretty incontrovertible archaeological evidence—that Virginia’s 17th-century capital Jamestown was actually a bit of a non-functioning dump filled with garbage and abandoned buildings, I did not endear myself to tradition-minded Virginia archaeological patrons (Horning 1993; 1995; 2000; 2006b; 2006c). Supporting the notion that Jamestown and its scant citizens were actually more English in culture and outlook than proto-American also seems to have fallen on deaf ears, as official rhetoric associated with the 2007 anniversary of Jamestown’s founding emphasized the site as the ‘birthplace of
America’—exactly as celebrated in 1957. Despite calls by native and African American leaders to consider the multiple legacies of the Jamestown settlement, President George Bush overtly employed the word ‘celebrate’ in his keynote speech at the 13 May, 2007 commemorative assembly at Jamestown Island, stating “…we celebrate the 400th anniversary of Jamestown to honor the beginnings of our democracy” (www.dailypress.com May 13). Given the current political climate in the United States, with its intensification of nationalism and protectionism, this is hardly surprising—but it does not bode well for the ongoing struggle of some of Virginia’s First People to gain Federal recognition and thus a degree of empowerment through the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA).

Academic discussions of the colonial process in the Chesapeake (outside of Jamestown) have begun to focus on creolization, emphasizing shared elements and creativity within colonial society (eg. Mouer 1993; Mouer et al 1999). Similar emphasis upon cultural creativity can be found in Chris Gosden’s general examination of the archaeology of colonialism (Gosden 2004). American students find this relatively ‘positive’ view of the creativity of the colonial encounter far more palatable than one that emphasizes the violence and discord of colonial entanglements, such as those presented by Carmel Shrire (1996) and Martin Hall (2000) for South Africa. It is not difficult to ascribe these contrasting views of the colonial encounter to contemporary politics and historical memories in both lands.

By contrast, I have found English students to be uncomfortable with discussing any aspect of colonialism, initially unable to disassociate themselves from feeling implicated in the process. Lacking a diachronic conception of the process of European expansion over the last 500 years, owing to the theme-based approach of secondary school history curricula, the students struggle to break away from their episodic knowledge of Victorian imperialism to consider the ambiguities of Elizabethan and Jacobean exploration and colonization. Furthermore, unlike American and Irish students, they are wholly unaccustomed to considering a linkage between early modern British expansion and the unsettled socio-political realities of the 21st century. In discussing history teaching in Northern Ireland, Barton and McCully note that “teaching history in a society that has experienced violent and on-going conflict, at least partially as a consequence of contested views of national identity, presents significant challenges for educators” (Barton and McCully 2003: 107). Oddly, in my experience, teaching history where people have no sense of it at all may be more of a challenge, particularly when introducing concepts such as memory, identity, multiple histories, and the inextricable linkage between past, present, and future.
Northern Irish students from both traditions at the University of Ulster had a far more sophisticated, critical, and, perhaps unfortunately, realistic approach than either the English or American students that I have taught. The Northern Irish students politely listened to my fervent efforts to introduce concepts such as creolization and Gosden’s ‘creativity,’ and they readily accepted the archaeological evidence for the sharing of a material culture by ‘natives’ and ‘newcomers’ and the significant daily relations that implies. They saw it all, they recognized it all, they could even intellectually situate themselves as products of this process. Yet they also understood that in contemporary Northern Ireland, the reality of a shared material culture in the 17th century, and by extension the lack of clearly definable cultural differences between the two traditions, seemingly matters very little. In a land where only four percent of schoolchildren are educated in an integrated environment, sectarian narratives of the past remain deeply rooted (Barton and McCully 2003; Nic Craith 2003). Ingrained, externally imposed patterns of belief about social relations concurrently bolster and dismiss a colonial past.

More unfortunate is the fact that the students’ understanding of the irrelevancy of the complexity of past experiences in considering modern dichotomous identities is reflected in the astonishing lack of historical knowledge prevalent in a range of sociological writings about the Northern Ireland ‘problem.’ By focusing solely on the contemporary conflict, the potentially subversive impact of a deeper historical understanding is ignored. For example, in an otherwise sophisticated discussion of memory in Northern Ireland, McLernon et al completely misconstrue the history that is being remembered. The authors state “…after the emergence of Protestantism in England, the controlling English swamped the Catholic faith in Ireland and the identity of the Irish people. …by the 18th century the colonists occupied 95 percent of the land which they had confiscated from the natives…” (McLernon et al 2003: 126). This statement may resonate with a particularly nationalist view of the past, but it is factually incorrect and in the charged climate of Northern Ireland, is dangerous. English control over Ireland was never absolute, nor was Catholicism ever obliterated, nor did the complex of multivalent Irish identities ever diminish in the absolute fashion implied.

If we are ever to go beyond merely assessing the importance of historical memory to altering its results, surely we need to re-examine the efficacy or inefficacy of the remembered histories. Here at last is a socially-engaged role for archaeology, an opportunity to capitalize upon the often inherent interest of the public in the idea of archaeology, which can lead to a surprising exchange of information and interpretation. Unlike most social scientists immersed in studying contemporary Northern Ireland,
our work is physical and publicly visible. In the seeming tangibility of archaeological data, in the incontrovertible physicality of Irish-made pottery found in an 17th-century English village, lies the power to spark a rethinking of narratives. The power is held not by the archaeologists interpreting the significance of the material, but by the non-specialist and how they choose to account for the physical evidence in front of their eyes. It is not for us to control this process, while at the same time judicious, respectful direction may be the course most appropriate for the past and for the present.

TOWARDS ETHICAL ENGAGEMENT IN UNCOMFORTABLE HISTORIES

Negotiating the landscapes of identity and politics in both Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland within the framework of comparative colonial archaeology is dependent upon the development and implementation of an ethical and publicly-inclusive practice. An ethical and nuanced archaeology of early modern Ireland must not only acknowledge but must prioritize the role of archaeology in fostering positive and informed discourse to challenge the assumptions which reify a deeply divided society. Our challenge as academic archaeologists is to not only be well-versed in our intellectual familiarity with the writings of postcolonial theorists, or our knowledge of primary documentary sources and material culture, or our understanding of stratigraphy and construction sequences, but to possess a willingness and an ability to engage disparate publics in a discourse. Furthermore, as I have argued elsewhere, we must recognize the valid concerns of private sector field archaeologists and accept the responsibilities of our ‘privileged’ position as researchers (Horning 2006a). We must put our time into developing a nuanced and inclusive practice—an effort that is often denied to even our most concerned and self-aware compatriots in the time-pressured and constrained environment of development-driven rescue archaeology.

Part of the process, as everywhere, is to embark on the difficult process of identifying ‘stakeholders’ and interested/affected communities, and consider the relevance and role of the ‘audience’ in determining the archaeological agenda. I have chosen to prioritize the relationship with local communities in my work in the case studies to follow. However, it has to be acknowledged that throughout the Republic of Ireland (in contrast to Northern Ireland), the audience for ‘heritage’ is not only local communities, but also tourists. Specifically, American tourists. More specifically, the millions of Americans who claim Irish ancestry. As the peace dividend pays out in Northern Ireland, this trend is likely to creep past the border, with a concomitant effect on the character of local history presentations. Already the voyeuristic practice of ‘Troubles Tourism’ attracts many foreign visitors, who cruise along in black taxis or
minibuses through the embattled neighborhoods of working-class Belfast. Armed with their assumptions as well as their cameras, visitors are treated to the spectacle of murals, ‘peace’ lines, the Holy Cross primary school, and the graves of Hunger Strikers in Milltown cemetery (Jarman 2002). The significance of memory amongst Diasporic groups has long been acknowledged by scholars, some of whom celebrate the connections, and some of whom lament the connections—witness the oft-repeated satirical phrase coined by Kerby Miller regarding “the loud communal whine” of Irish American politics (K. Miller 1985).

In considering the audience for his studies of Famine-era rural life in the west of Ireland, American historical archaeologist Charles Orser acknowledges the influence and role of the Irish Diasporic community: “The descendant community encompasses a global cohort of thousands of people who were forcibly evicted from their homes as a direct result of landlord power. Many of these men and women find themselves living in North America and elsewhere simply because their ancestors were dispossessed in Ireland” (Orser 2004: 174). Yet motives for emigration are always complex. This characterisation of the Famine-period emigration to North America (according to one estimate, approximately eight million Irish emigrated between 1801 and 1892 [Fitzpatrick 1984; see also Foster 2002 for a critique of Famine scholarship]) as wholly derived from landlord evictions ignores the movement of urban residents as well as small landholders, overstates the numbers of evictions, and does not take into account the historiography on wider European population movements during the 19th century. As a characterisation of the entirety of Irish emigration to North America, it overlooks the movement of substantial numbers of Ulster Protestants during the 18th century. No matter how solid an Irish American’s genealogical associations may be, in terms of daily life and identity, the actual connections of fifth and sixth generation Irish Americans to the Famine-era Irish sites are at best visceral and at worst imagined. Irish Americans already approach Ireland from a position of privilege. Shouldn’t their external, Diasporic concerns be secondary to those of the people currently in the ‘homeland’?

Like Delle, Orser (1996; 2005) also endeavors to draw parallels between the Irish experience and that of the African Diaspora in referencing his experience working at Palmares in Brazil, and in considering the racialization of the Irish in the 19th century. However, the experience of enslavement, and the psychological impact of being classed as property, cannot be viewed as equivalent to the experience of a rural peasant, no matter how difficult the life of an Irish tenant farmer may have been, how much economic and political inequity they suffered, and however they may have been described by contemporary chroniclers. Despite the clever arguments of Ignatiev
(1996), discussing the experiences of enslaved Africans as articulating with the experiences of the Irish Diaspora runs the risk of being unself-reflexive and potentially deeply offensive. While in no way equating the experiences of the African Diaspora with that of the Irish, I would also argue against prioritizing the concerns of African American visitors to Ghana who are uncomfortable with the preservation of the Elmina slave trading post—while acknowledging the validity of the visitors’ complaints (see Kahnpeyeng and DeCorse 2004). In the end, their economic power and hence louder voice should not overturn the local decision to commemorate the complex occurrences at a site which undeniably witnessed much bloodshed, heartache, and unresolved cultural anxieties.

While I can question Orser’s choice of stakeholders for his archaeological projects, at least he identifies them. A quick scan of publications produced by the well-funded Discovery Programme for archaeological research in the Republic of Ireland reveals no consideration of the audience for these projects, reliant instead on a presumption of value rather than sailing into the uncharted territory of asking ‘why’? Elsewhere, it would appear that heritage professionals intentionally decry the power of a public, any public, as witness the rather astonishing statement in the poorly-illustrated, densely-packed 713 page tome ‘The Heritage of Ireland’ which baldly states on the first page that “the interests of Ireland’s heritage are perhaps best served …[by entrusting] its advancement to people suitably equipped to discharge this responsibility” (Buttimer, Rynne and Guerin 2004: vii). Bolstered by exceptionally strong legislation protecting historic sites, few seem to outwardly question the public value of heritage, although this debate is beginning to occur in the Republic of Ireland owing to public interest in the impact of a motorway scheme on the archaeological landscape of the Hill of Tara, itself a potent nationalist symbol.

POSTCOLONIALISM AND THE PRESENTATION OF HERITAGE IN THE REPUBLIC OF IRELAND

Before returning specifically to the ethics of practice in Northern Ireland, I would like to tarry a little longer in the Republic of Ireland to illustrate the power of a nationalist-derived, Irish American voice. The abandoned cottages which dot the landscape of the west of Ireland serve as an ever-present reminder of the impact of emigration and concomitant memories of poverty, discord, and to some, cultural oppression. Emotive survivals such as the Deserted Village of Slievemore (FIGURE 1), on Achill Island, Co. Mayo, appeal to visitors infused with Kennedy’s MOPE (Most Oppressed People Ever) syndrome (Kennedy 1996: 121), while more locally the site inspires discomfort and disinterest. Surprisingly little documentation seems to exist about those who dwelt in
the village following its 18th-century establishment. The Deserted Village has been archaeologically investigated since 1991 under the aegis of the Achill Archaeological Field School, founded by Achill native Theresa McDonald, who began the project initially more interested in the Neolithic activity underlying the post-medieval village. In 2004 and 2005, I directed fieldwork in the village for two twelve-week training excavations principally attended by paying American students. We took a household archaeology approach, focusing specifically upon the potential of the material culture associated with the 19th-century village to inform our understandings of daily life during a period of undeniable political, economic, and social turmoil, and instituted a series of public open days (McDonald and Horning 2004; Horning and Brannon 2005).

Probably the most intriguing aspect of the village is the disjuncture between presumptive memory and archaeological reality. Visitors to the village encounter the stark and empty husks of long-abandoned houses. No great leap of imagination is required to visualize the depopulation as a direct result of the Great Hunger. Indeed, Famine memory is strong on Achill, particularly in relation to the activities of the Protestant Achill Mission at Dugort, established at the foot of Slievemore Mountain. The Mission and its founder Reverend Edward Nangle are popularly understood as buying converts (derided as ‘jumpers’ or ‘soupers’) with food relief (McDonald 1997, 1998; McNally 1973). Whatever the truth of these tales, Achill undoubtedly was hit hard by the Famine. However, archaeological evidence from the Deserted Village makes it clear that occupation continue throughout and following the Famine period. Despite perception and even memory, the Deserted Village was not deserted until the end of the 19th century, with continued use (albeit seasonal) into the 1940s.

Over the two seasons, we excavated one half of a single unit byre dwelling along with its adjacent garden. Evidence for daily practice is plentiful. Sandy patches in the well-turned soils in the potato rigs suggests the enrichment of the soil through the use of seaweed and provide testament to the routine labor of women. Investigation of the interior of the dwelling revealed how the past occupants altered the original uniform house plan to suit their own purposes (Horning and Brannon 2005). While 18th- and 19th-century descriptions of the west of Ireland expound upon the dearth of material possessions and a lack of interaction with a so-called outside world, the piece-plotted artifact assemblage is replete with decorated tea wares (principally English and Scottish spongewares), manufactured glass, and commercial food jars and cans. Such findings from Slievemore give the lie not only to the 19th-century commentators, but also to mythical notions about the west of Ireland existing in some sort of arrested medieval Gaelic manner until the policies of the British government conspired to eradicate the last vestiges of the true Irish through starvation. I hasten to add that
possession of tea wares does not ameliorate the genuine economic and political inequities at play on Achill, but it should force us to re-evaluate our black and white understanding of the rural Irish experience, putting some color and complexity back into the lives of the Slievemore villagers even if it is not what people who come to the site today expect to find.

In his excavations at Ballykilcline, Co. Roscommon, Charles Orser encountered similar ceramic assemblages, noting that “such a large relative percentage of English-made ceramic vessels at the house sites of the Narys was unexpected.” Orser suggests that “the purchase of English ceramics may have been conceptualized as an act of covert resistance on the part of the Ballykilcline tenants,” to explain why “they willingly bought into the economic system being pressed around the world under the auspices of the same colonial power that sought to dominate them” (Orser 2004: 74-75). Given the documented acts of resistance to rent-paying attempted by these tenant families, perhaps that was indeed their motivation for buying decorated teawares. But is the consumption of tea in the 19th century inherently a colonialist imposition? A century after its introduction to Ireland, it must have become something quite different. Like ‘new’ habits and material culture anywhere, it is subsumed and subverted into an operational vocabulary. Why couldn’t the Slievemore villagers have conceived of teawares—mainly produced in the potteries of Glasgow (and thus arguably Scottish)—not as alien or foreign, or ‘English’, but as familiar and desirable? Given the outward similarity of their stone cabins, perhaps variety and color on the table served to demarcate individuals and families, and to highlight each family’s ability to share hospitality. I have yet to be convinced that the most efficacious means of interpreting the archaeology of 19th-century Ireland is the black and white, adversarial rhetoric of resistance predicated upon essentialised notions of cultural identity and traditional folklife, which themselves are based upon dominant nationalist narratives of Irish history.

Such nationalist narratives impact upon the interpretation of material culture beyond the very few excavations which examine the 19th century. Not far from Achill Island, the National Museum of Ireland recently opened up the Museum of Country Life, highlighting its impressive folklife collections, in the market town of Castlebar, Co. Mayo. Located in the former Turlough House Park, once owned by the Fitzgerald family, the Museum of Country Life aims to “portray the lives of ordinary people who lived in rural Ireland in the period 1850 – 1950. Emphasis is placed on the continuity of lifestyles, which were established for several hundred years and which lasted well into the 20th century.” One of the permanent exhibits addresses Romanticism and Reality and is described in museum publicity as follows: “Life in rural Ireland is popularly
portrayed as simple and romantic. The reality was different. Life was a struggle and survival depended on a detailed knowledge of landscape and environment, on craft, skill and ingenuity. This way of life changed little over many hundreds of years and continuity is evident in the similarities between recently-made objects and their counterparts made long ago” (http://www.museum.ie/countrylife/overview.asp). The hard if inventive lives of the country folk are presented in clear contrast with those of the Fitzarelgals (descendants of twelfth-century Anglo-Norman ‘colonizers’) in the high Victorian gothic Turlough House. Displays highlight crafts such as furniture making, thatching, vernacular boat construction, and basketry, with images from windswept Achill Island and other west coast locales providing a backdrop which emphasizes isolation. Hardship is overtly defined in light of the colonial relationship with Britain, with the underlying theme of an essential Irishness that ultimately triumphed through Independence.

While the museum’s interpretation is geared, in part, to remind today’s materially-rich Irish population of the sacrifices of their ancestors, the interpretation is also readily understood by a Diasporic visitor, weaned on stories of oppression tempered by eventual triumph on the golden shores of America. Like a superficial reading of the Deserted Village, the exhibits play into accepted histories and memories. Sadly, the complexities of the lives of now deceased Irish rural families and communities have been intentionally erased in favor of this one-dimensional portrayal, a calculated useable past which dehumanizes and obliterates. Irish country folk, we must believe, never even had the choice to buy English and Scottish teawares, regardless if such an act exemplified a desire to engage in rituals of hospitality, or rituals of resistance. The archaeological records of 19th-century Slievemore and 19th-century Ballykilcline might as well not exist at all.

HERITAGE AS SOCIAL ACTION IN NORTHERN IRELAND
Archaeologists practicing in Northern Ireland who aim to question similarly stark, dichotomous histories do so while operating in a world marked by political uncertainties with Plantation-era roots, where public discourse over colonialism can entail genuine personal risk. Drawing immediate and overt links between past and present risks losing the attention of a public hyper-sensitized to even the slightest hint of partisanship, in a land where even the name you choose to use for one of Northern Ireland’s largest settlements, Derry/Londonderry, is construed as a statement of political allegiance. As noted by one archaeologist in response to a questionnaire I sent out to colleagues in Northern Ireland, some archaeologists try to avoid the period altogether: “many practitioners barely register the post-medieval period as being of
archaeological interest, or are nervous of the historical and political baggage that comes with it” (anon. 2001). In such a climate, those archaeologists who are interested in post-medieval sites often opt to privilege the archaeological process or local history in site interpretation. This approach should be seen as intentional and sensitive; a means of ensuring maximum cross-community engagement in a non-threatening fashion and in a manner where the door is at least opened for further critical discourse (Horning 2006a).

While never overtly political in expression, texts relating to the archaeological heritage of Northern Ireland often evoke an intended audience and a hoped-for outcome. For example, in the Foreword to the monumental study of the maritime archaeology of Strangford Lough, then Minister of the Environment Dermot Nesbitt wrote “our archaeologists have developed the theme of maritime archaeology in a holistic way to examine not just wrecks but all aspects of maritime culture, social, political, economic, and religious” (Nesbitt in McErlean et al 2003: xix). Emphasis on holism and religions is intentional, as Nesbitt continues on to recall how the visit of the tall ships to Belfast in 1991 “gave us a glimpse of normality in those troubled times and what life might be like if we work together as a society” (ibid.). Heritage in this instance is viewed, perhaps naively, as a means of encouraging inclusion and cooperation, and the audience is clearly that of Northern Ireland.

Encouraging cross-community interest and participation in archaeology in Northern Ireland is aided by the general public interest in heritage, whatever role that heritage plays in community narratives. In directing the Movagheer Village Project in 1998, an excavation at an abandoned 17th-century Londonderry Plantation village, I was encouraged if initially surprised by the level of public interest as well as the ready cooperation of the media. Having unearthed evidence for significant interaction between native Irish and English and Scots settlers in what was designed to be an exclusive plantation village, we were able to invite local schoolchildren and adults from both communities to consider the evidence for themselves. Radio and television were employed to reach a wider audience. One of the more notable findings was evidence for a partially-earthfast Irish vernacular dwelling exhibiting a subrectangular plan, central open hearth, and swept floor located within the village (Horning 2001). Material culture found in association with this structure included English border ware and North Devon gravel-tempered utilitarian ceramics alongside hand-built Irish everted rim ware, suggestive of daily interaction. That such interactions were complicated and clearly not always benign is evident in the presence of spent lead shot and musket balls.
Whatever the meaning of the Movaghan material culture in the past, it must be remembered that these plantation sites continue to exist in the present, with their meanings and associations renegotiated and reconsidered by each generation. In Co. Tyrone, the stark walls of the ruinous Castle Caulfield tower above the small village bearing the same name. Constructed by an optimistic Sir Toby Caulfield between 1611-1616, Castle Caulfield was an ambitious H-plan Jacobean mansion boasting wide windows (even at ground level) and massive, soaring chimney stacks, defended only by a previously existent late medieval guardhouse (Jope 1958; Brannon 1999). The choice of style over defense was soon regretted, as rebel forces laid waste to the structure in 1641. Today, the site is maintained by the Department of the Environment, who face an uphill battle to combat the spraying of loyalist graffiti in hidden spaces within the ruin (FIGURE 2). Does this graffiti indicate that the site is being reclaimed as a protestant bastion? Or are the taggers unaware of the history of the site, content to spray their slogans on any conveniently concealed location—where its significance lies more in accomplishing a forbidden act than in making a publicly visible statement?

Elsewhere, continuity of association is more overt. Situated just outside of the village of Dungiven, Co. Derry/Londonderry, lie the impressive ruins of a 12th-century Augustinian Priory, itself built upon the site of an early medieval monastery. Adjacent to the site of the priory (FIGURE 3), in state care, is a holy well (the central depression in a bullaun stone, and referred to as the wart well), and rag tree where each fluttering strip of cloth attests to the seeking of a ‘cure’ for a variety of ills, a living tradition presumed to be of great antiquity. Little seems to have changed at this site, sacred to the Gaelic population for over one thousand years: continuity of Gaelic life made materially manifest? Looking more closely at the site, however, a series of unusual foundations are appended to the south and east. Unearthed in excavations in the 1980s, these walls are the remains of an O’Cahan tower house and the later bawn and castle of Sir Edward Doddington, designated ‘first farmer’ of the Skinner’s Company Proportion within the Londonderry plantation (Brannon and Blades 1980). While the pre-plantation, pre-Reformation history of the site appears reclaimed, the muted but nonetheless highly visible traces of Doddington’s stronghold may provide the first spark for a meaningful discourse about history, identity, and memory. In the meantime, however, local tourism brochures and initiatives emphasize only the pre-plantation history of the site, even though government signage at the site clearly addresses its plantation history (see for example http://www.loughfoyleferry.com/dungiven_priory.htm).

A nearby plantation monument that has been recognized and recast by a local community is the Vintner’s Company bawn and manor house at Bellaghy (Horning
Public outreach during the excavation and restoration of the bawn encouraged locals from the predominantly nationalist community to reconsider the role and meaning of the site, long perceived as Protestant territory (Brannon 2002). Through a government and local partnership, the restored Bellaghy Bawn now houses the Seamus Heaney Centre, celebrating the life and poetry of the local hero, while incorporating exhibits acknowledging the Plantation history of the site and the village. This conscious, locally-determined re-imagining of the bawn’s appropriate function, coupled with the multiplicity of meanings inherent in the physical and spatial realities of the site, exemplifies the dynamism which characterizes colonial entanglements.

Finally, another archaeological project which is endeavoring to reinstate and investigate the complexity of the process and personal experiences of the Ulster Plantation is an ongoing investigation of an upland landscape in Goodland Townland, Co. Antrim. On this windswept site above the waters of Murlough Bay lie the traces of what may have been a plantation village occupied not by Protestant settlers, but by Roman Catholic Scots from Islay and the Mull of Kintyre in Scotland, part of an effort by the Catholic grant holder Randall McDonnell to maintain his power in north Antrim during the reign of James I (Horning 2004; Horning and Brannon 2004).

CONCLUSION
Current trends in historical archaeology emphasize the centrality of capitalism and colonial discourse in examining commonalities in the archaeologies of fictive worlds such as the British Atlantic. Yet far from informing archaeological practice, overly simplistic incorporation of postcolonial approaches in comparative archaeologies can impede our ability to disentangle the complexities of the colonial experience. Contemporary implications and memories of ‘colonial’ entanglements vary wildly and remain contested in historical, political, economic, and popular understandings of the Irish past. With the exception of a brief, and to some degree unsuccessful, period in the early 17th century, the development of Ireland does not truly adhere to a colonial model as it would be understood in North America, Africa, or India. At the same time, ideas of colonialism pervade and structure identity, north and south. In the Republic of Ireland, the pace of development is bringing destruction of the post-medieval heritage in direct contravention to the aims of the National Monument Act and despite the hard work of individual archaeologists and organizations such as the Irish Post-Medieval Archaeology Group (Brannon and Horning 2005; Donnelly and Horning 2002; Horning and ÓBaoill 2000). As clearly illustrated by the nationalist tone of the displays at the National Museum of Country Life, assumptions about a colonial past not only infuse daily life in the Republic, but also reify the beliefs of the Diasporic community.
The insights of postcolonial scholarship can aid in our understanding of modern Ireland, but only if we approach such scholarship with a nuanced, fulsome understanding of Irish historiography and a recognition of the potential of visible, physical archaeological practice to not only deconstruct simplistic models of colonizer versus colonized, but to engage an Irish public who are in danger of sacrificing the experiences of their ancestors to the insecure and myopic machinations of postcolonial political posturing.

By contrast, the unsettled nature of social relations in the north of Ireland is reflected in the ongoing debate over how to treat the built heritage of the Troubles. Should Army bases be destroyed and all traces removed? What ought to be the fate of the Maze prison, scene of the Hunger Strikes and arguably, the centre of the cooperation between Republican and Loyalist prisoners which permitted the Belfast Agreement of 1998 (Brannon 2001; McAtackney 2005). Like the power sharing executive, decisions will have to strike a balance, with the preservation of a perceived nationalist monument balanced by the preservation of a unionist monument (Brannon 2001; Jarman 2002). However fallacious the divisions may be, the maintenance and continued existence of these discursive sites at least contain the seeds for negotiation, remembrance, and reconciliation.
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ILLUSTRATIONS
Figure 1. Deserted Village, Slievemore, Achill Island, Co. Mayo. Although the archaeological record indicates that these dwelling were still in use into the 20th century, the site evokes received memories about the Famine and the trauma of 19th-century emigration amongst visitors. Public open days associated with the Achill Archaeological Field School aimed to challenge these perceptions employing the archaeological evidence. Photograph by the author.
Figure 2. Loyalist graffiti (Ulster Volunteer Force, a paramilitary organization) on a gatehouse door lintel of the 17th-century Castle Caulfield, Co. Tyrone. Does the graffiti signify ownership and association with the plantation history of the building, or is it merely a convenient locale for sectarian expression? Photograph by the author.
Figure 3. Rag tree and holy well at Dungiven Priory and Bawn, Co. Derry/Londonderry. Although there are substantial traces of the plantation-period occupation of this site, local community understandings of the site emphasize the pre-Reformation history of the priory and the evidence for continuity of Gaelic folk traditions. Photograph by the author.
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ABSTRACT
Here I explore the role of Inca-ness in the current conception and expression of identity among the Saraguro people of Ecuador and the potential role of archaeology in examining, expressing, and exploiting the connections between them and their past. As an ethnic group, the Saraguros have developed through a process of ethnogenesis in which members of several disparate groups forged a new identity in the context of Inca and Spanish colonialism. In the current construction of their ethnicity, the Saraguros express a close link to the Incas in numerous ways, including belief in common descent from the Incas.

This strong connection with an Inca past has implications for the relationships between the Saraguros, archaeologists, archaeological sites, and archaeological research. Saraguros have become increasingly interested in learning about the past through archaeology, especially about the local Inca presence. Likewise, they are interested in preserving Inca sites and in their potential for stimulating tourism. In turn, archaeologists have the potential to contribute to the Saraguros’ understanding of and relationship with the past. Saraguro is a case that, in line with SAA ethical principles, presents a very favorable opportunity to consult actively with local descendants and establish working relationships that can be mutually beneficial.
INTRODUCTION
Up to the present, the Saraguro region in the southern highlands of Ecuador (FIGURE 1) has been the subject of relatively few archaeological investigations. Accordingly, there has been little opportunity for contention between archaeologists and the indigenous people of the region, the Saraguros, regarding the investigation, interpretation, and presentation of the past. Yet current trends foretell an increase in the level of archaeological investigation in the area, and such issues will soon have to be addressed in some form, which makes essential an assessment of the relations between archaeologists, Saraguros, and the past. In many ways, Saraguro conceptions of their ethnic identity and origins may play the greatest role in conditioning these relations. At present, the pre-Inca ethnic affiliations of Saraguros are somewhat unclear to both Saraguros and scholars. As a result, the indigenous people only assert a chronologically shallow link with the past, emphasizing links with Inca society and culture as a focus for self-identification. This situation has direct ramifications for how they may interact with archaeology and archaeologists.

The following is a discussion of the development and nature of Saraguro ethnic identity and their links with an Inca past, and how those conceptions and the evolving social and economic circumstances allow for the goals of archaeologists and indigenous people to be complementary rather than adversarial. Much of this paper arises from interactions and observations made in the course of conducting my fieldwork, beginning in 1994, and from anthropological literature dealing with the Saraguros. Because my experiences have been limited in time and space, and because the lives and attitudes of individual Saraguros are quite varied, I make no claim that I am presenting here all of their views. Instead, I am drawing mostly from interactions with a number of community leaders and other politically active Saraguros, who are among those with the most formal education and are the most active in maintaining and expressing an indigenous ethnic identity. Without a doubt, these are the people most concerned about the investigation, interpretation, and presentation of the past. To a great extent, they will determine the future course of public expressions of indigenous identity and the nature of archaeological research in Saraguro.

THE SARAGUROS
The Saraguros have traditionally resided in the northern section of the province of Loja in the southern highlands of Ecuador, with a population of perhaps around 30,000. Their major economic focus has been on subsistence farming; in the 20th century, many Saraguros branched out into raising cattle. This has integrated them more into the cash economy, but has required an expansion of their land holdings into the
lowland rain forests to the east (Belote 1984; Tual 1979). In contrast to many other native Andean groups, the Saraguros managed to retain most of their ancestral lands, and as a result of this, as well as their success in cattle raising and other pursuits, as a group they are among the most prosperous indigenous people in Ecuador, perhaps second only to the Otavalos of the northern highlands.

As the town of Saraguro is located along the Pan-American Highway, the Saraguros are by no means isolated from the greater Ecuadorian society, and their lives and circumstances are rapidly changing with the rest of the nation. For example, many Saraguros are frequent computer and internet users, and as of 2005, cell phone service became available and was widely adopted. While a large proportion of Saraguros still make their living through agriculture and cattle raising, many are now attaining higher levels of education, including university degrees and beyond, and are branching out into new occupations such as law, education, and medicine. Along with changes in their economic well-being, the Saraguros are becoming politically active, seeking to play a greater role in issues that directly affect them. On the local stage, Saraguros have formed a number of political organizations, and the indigenous community is having a greater impact in the government of the canton of Saraguro. Saraguros are also visible on the national political stage, with a notable highlight being the election of an indigenous Saraguro, Luis Macas, to the national legislature in 1996. Recently, Macas was elected to serve another term as head of the Confederación de Nacionalidades Indígenas del Ecuador (CONAIE), the national indigenous organization. Still, in the face of all of these major changes, the Saraguros are determined to assert their independence and maintain their ethnic identity.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF SARAGURO ETHNIC IDENTITY
As with all other indigenous groups in the former realm of the Incas, the nature of Saraguro ethnic identity has undergone a long process of change from the time of the Incas to the present, subjected to an array of both internal and external pressures. The process of Saraguro ethnogenesis has been complex, entailing the development of a distinctive new, cohesive ethnic identity that arose from a collection of people of diverse origins (synthetic ethnogenesis) and the on-going definition and re-definition of Saraguro ethnic identity (transformative ethnogenesis). Here, the intent is to limit the discussion to the aspects of the development of Saraguro ethnicity that are most relevant to how they conceive of and relate to the past.

1 Synthetic and transformative processes of ethnogenesis were defined in Belote and Belote (1993). Transformative ethnogenesis among the Saraguros was examined in that work and in Belote (1984), while synthetic ethnogenesis in Saraguro has been explored by Ogburn (forthcoming).
Pre-Inca and Inca Times
The seminal event in the history of the Saraguros was the arrival of the Inca Empire in the southern highlands of Ecuador. The Inca army, under command of Topa Inca, the tenth emperor, conquered the region during the reign of his father, Pachacuti, the ninth emperor and initiator of the Inca campaigns of conquest (Cabello Balboa 1945 [1586]: 305; Cieza de León 1985 [1553]: 163; Murúa 1946 [1605]: 51; Rowe 1985: 224; Sarmiento de Gamboa 1942 [1572]: 119). According to the chronology put forth by Rowe (1946: 203), the Inca conquest of Saraguro occurred between the years 1463 and 1471. By the end of effective Inca rule in the 1530s, the area had been subject to the Inca Empire for over six decades. Though it is a short period in archaeological terms, sixty years was certainly long enough for the Incas to consolidate their control over the natives and integrate the area into the empire by imposing their own administrative, economic, and religious systems.

Most importantly, the Incas instituted resettlement projects in Saraguro, as they did in nearly every province of their empire. As a standard method of consolidating their control over newly conquered territories, the Incas forced many thousands of their subjects to relocate to provinces up to 2,000 km from their original homes, replacing them in turn with subjects from elsewhere in the empire. People permanently relocated by the state outside of the land of their ethnic origin were known in Quichua as mitmaqkuna (mitmaq in the singular). The chief aim of this policy was to pacify newly subjugated peoples by breaking them into smaller, more isolated groups, over whom control could be maintained by severely curtailing their ability to organize resistance to their conquerors. However, some resettlements were also carried out for economic, religious, or other ends, depending on the needs of the empire.

In their resettlement projects, the Incas did not simply make even exchanges between two provinces, but instead moved people in from and out to numerous areas, significantly increasing the ethnic diversity within each. As a result, a province may have contained people from a dozen or more ethnic groups, where there had formerly been perhaps three at the most. For example, the Inca placed mitmaqkuna from up to fifteen different ethnic groups in the region of Abancay in Perú (Espinoza Soriano 1973: 232). The proportion of people replaced in each province varied greatly, ranging between perhaps 10% to 80% of the total population (Rowe 1982: 107). In some cases, such as Ayaviri and Paria near Lake Titicaca, the entire original population may have been removed (Julien 1993: 187). In the end, these massive resettlement projects had a drastic effect on the ethnic landscape of the Andes, which is still evident today.
According to local oral traditions, the Incas subjected the Saraguro region to such resettlements, bringing in mitmaqkuna who were either ethnic Collas from the Lake Titicaca region of Bolivia, or inhabitants of the Cuzco area, the capital of the Inca Empire. Historical sources do not provide much information specific to the Saraguro region, so the ethnic affiliation of the inhabitants in pre-Inca times has been unclear, as has the proportion of the population removed by the Incas. Some documentary sources (e.g., Cabello Balboa 1945 [1586]; Cristóbal de Albornoz 1967 [late 16th century]) associate Saraguro with the Paltas, who are thought to have inhabited much of the central and southern sections of the province of Loja. In contrast, evidence from archaeological remains (Ogburn 2001), the distribution of toponymic elements (Belote and Belote 1994a), and historical documents (Truhan 1996) suggests the people were more closely affiliated with the Cañaris, who lived to the north of Saraguro in what are the modern provinces of Azuay and Cañar.

With the extensive mixing of populations perpetrated by the Incas, the maintenance and expression of ethnic divisions and identities ceased to be solely a local process determined by each individual group in relation to its neighbors. Instead, the dynamics were conditioned by the dominant society, whose main interest was in measures that could be used to control its subjects. The Incas saw advantages in enforcing the maintenance of distinct identities of the dozens, if not hundreds, of different ethnic groups that comprised their empire. They instituted a number of policies toward that end. For example, all subjects were required to maintain the outward markers of their group affiliation, specifically clothing and headgear, and were not allowed to assume the costume of any other ethnic group (Cobo 1979 [1653]: 206). While many Inca policies, such as the imposition of the Quichua language and the state religion, did serve to culturally unify the empire (Rowe 1982), this strategy of forced maintenance of ethnic divisions shows that the Incas were definitely not trying to create a melting pot. Instead, the Incas were pursuing a policy that helped to control the provinces; the maintenance of ethnic distinctions helped perpetuate traditional animosities between neighboring groups and fueled suspicions of mitmaqkuna in their new lands, thus inhibiting the formation of alliances (Rowe 1982: 111).

Therefore, whatever the ethnic make-up of the Saraguro region under the Incas, whether it included Collas, Cuzcos, Cañaris, Paltas, or others, members of each group would have maintained separate ethnic identities, most likely living in separate settlements, and serving different roles for the state.
Spanish Rule to the Present
When the Spaniards arrived in the Andes, they too found ethnic differences to be helpful to their cause. During their conquest of the Incas, the surviving traditional divisions actually helped the Spaniards, as it inhibited native groups from uniting and organizing a successful resistance, while other groups were all too ready to join the Europeans to throw off the Inca imperial yoke (Rowe 1982: 94). But once the Spaniards had consolidated their control over the former Inca realm, their attitude toward maintaining ethnic diversity changed significantly; they were no longer interested in the continuation of traditional rivalries or ethnic divisions (Rowe 1982: 94).

This shift occurred because economics came to play a larger role in indigenous identity than did political control. As under the Incas, the natives were required to serve the state by providing labor or goods. But now, local ethnic distinctions made no difference to the dominant society; they only had an interest in maintaining a general class of indigenous people based on Spanish conceptions of race; this was the class whose members were subject to forced labor and tribute because of their racial status as *indios*. Thus, with such motivations, the Spaniards to a large extent imposed the maintenance of a generic indigenous identity on the native people (Belote and Belote 1993: 3). Conditions under the Spaniards began to create “new pressures both for cultural unification and for the development of a sense of common identity” (Rowe 1982: 94), leading to the consolidation of small ethnic entities, and an overall cultural homogenization within the category of indigenous people. These processes were further encouraged by the *reducciones* of the late 16th century, in which the Spanish government forced many people to move from their scattered settlements into concentrated towns; in many cases people of diverse ethnic backgrounds were forced to live together (Murra 1946: 814).

There were many other trends that led to a more homogenized indigenous identity and the lessening of the importance of pre-Inca ethnic distinctions during the early Spanish period. For instance, many people moved outside of their home provinces to escape the heavy tribute burden imposed upon property-owning natives, while many others were shuffled around to provide labor for such economic endeavors as gold mining. On the other hand, during the chaos of the early years after the fall of Atahualpa in 1532, many *mitmaqkuna* returned to the homelands from which the Incas had removed them, thus re-affirming their original ethnic membership, and reducing the ethnic diversity in some of the provinces. Within the context of this mixture of peoples and the external pressures to maintain only a generic indigenous identity, many
smaller ethnic groups disappeared, others survived, and still others coalesced and forged distinct new identities.

The indigenous people of the Saraguro region were certainly immersed in these processes. The town of Saraguro itself was most likely founded by the Spaniards, as there is no evidence of prehistoric settlement within the town itself (Ogburn 2001). During the Spanish period, the major obligation of the Saraguro natives was to maintain the town's *tambo*, which was an important way station for travelers passing through the southern sierra. This uncompensated labor service was required of the Saraguros up until the 1940s (Belote and Belote 1993: 9). It may be that because the dominant society from the Spanish to the republican periods was most concerned with keeping a supply of free labor to maintain the *tambo*, the Saraguros were not greatly affected by the hacienda system, which would have diverted their labor to the control of wealthy land owners (Belote and Belote 1993: 9). Thus while the Saraguros were subjected by the state to a significant burden, they were left in control of their own lands.

As was the case elsewhere in the Andes, the identification of the Saraguros as indigenous was to some extent enforced from the outside. But the native people of the Saraguro region did maintain an identity separate from their traditional neighbors, the Cañaris to the north, who managed to flourish, and the Paltas to the south, who have effectively vanished as a distinct group. However, the pressures from outside apparently led to a consolidation within the Saraguro region, among people with various ethnic affiliations, from various mitmaqkuna groups to whatever local people remained, and with some inter-marriage with mestizos and people of European descent, forging a single more or less homogeneous group of Saraguros (Belote and Belote 1993: 8).

In recent decades, the situation of the Saraguros has been changing significantly. Most importantly, they were freed from their uncompensated labor obligations to the state in the 1940s, and have been able to devote their efforts to expanding their own economic base. As was noted above, many Saraguros have taken up cattle raising to participate in the cash economy, while others are engaging in non-traditional careers ranging from teaching to law. The Saraguros are also benefiting from many national and international programs designated for indigenous peoples, and they are becoming more politically active, forming organizations to express their views and preserve their culture on a local level, while participating in pan-Ecuadorian indigenous organizations on the national level.

At this juncture, the changing economic and social conditions are such that external pressures (i.e., policies and attitudes of the dominant society) have much less influence on the maintenance of distinct indigenous ethnic identities. The process has
become chiefly an internal matter (Belote and Belote 1993: 5-15), and the Saraguros are now very actively seeking to maintain their identity as an indigenous ethnic group on their own terms.

SARAGURO IDENTITY AND THE PAST
With this strong desire to maintain their ethnicity, there has been a conscious effort among Saraguros in recent decades to preserve certain aspects of their culture that outwardly express their identity as Andean natives. Foremost among these are the use of the Quichua language, the prevalence of which had been waning but is now the focus of significant revival efforts (King 2001), and their distinctive traditional clothing and hairstyle (Belote 1984: 55). On another level, links with the past have become an essential element in how the Saraguros distinguish themselves as a group from all others, native and non-native. However, in Saraguro, expressing that link with the past is problematic because that past is very poorly known. As noted above, the identity of the pre-Inca natives of the region has been unclear, and the affiliation of the mitmaqkuna brought into the region by the Incas is likewise ambiguous. Additionally, while a majority of the forebears of the Saraguros were undoubtedly indigenous, it may never be determined what percentage represent mitmaqkuna, the descendants of the pre-Inca inhabitants, or forasteros, who were those who left their homes during Spanish rule to avoid the high tribute requirements of the landed natives.

Despite all this ambiguity, when their origins are discussed, in their oral traditions the Saraguros emphasize their descent from mitmaqkuna, either Collas from Lake Titicaca, or Cuzcos from the center of the Inca Empire. Unfortunately, there is a lack of known ethnohistorical documentation to either supplement or contradict the oral history, although available sources have certainly been examined for relevant information (especially by Belote 1984; Belote and Belote 1994b; Ogburn 2001). One tantalizing piece of evidence is a document reported from a Spanish archive, which states that the Saraguro mitmaqkuna were elite troops in the Inca army (Belote and Belote, eds., 1994: 11-12). Otherwise, very few of the earliest chronicles mention Saraguro by name, and those that do yield little data. When mitmaqkuna are mentioned, it is only in the larger context of the province of Loja. This dearth of description prevails despite the location of Saraguro along the main north-south Andean highland route between Quito and Cuzco. Most likely, this situation arose from the hostility of the natives of the Saraguro region toward the Spaniards and other indigenous people (Cieza de León 1984 [1553]: 250, 1994 [1554]: 174; Arias Dávila 1897 [1582]: 178); this hostility seems to have made Spaniards avoid the area for at least 15 years after the toppling of the last independent Inca ruler in the 1530s.
On the whole then, the past of the Saraguros is primarily informed through oral history, which presently does not provide much specific detail. Their knowledge of their origins is somewhat vague and does not seem to satisfy those Saraguros with whom I have discussed the issue. Even the suggestion that their mitmaqkuna ancestors came from Cuzco or Lake Titicaca appears to be another point of ambiguity, as if there should have been only one source group, and having two candidates means that the certainty of either is questionable to them. But when considered in the context of Inca policies of resettlement, the presence of multiple ethnic groups is actually the most likely scenario; the mitmaqkuna ancestors were probably from both regions, and could have come from other provinces as well.

Belief in a shared origin is a common and often essential component of ethnic identity. How then, in lieu of having a firm understanding of their mitmaqkuna origins, do the Saraguros express their common connection to the past, such an important aspect of their identity? Currently, I see them addressing that question by actively linking their identity directly to the Incas, a people and culture who are well-known to the outside world. While little is known of whether any ethnic Incas were ancestors of the Saraguros, ethnohistorical and archaeological data leave no doubt that the Incas were present and in control of the region. Of course, many contemporary highland Andean indigenous groups exhibit some cultural relationships to the Incas, such as the use of the Inca language, Quichua, but many of these links are remnants of former Inca domination rather than expressions of affinities for the Inca past. But for the Saraguros, the expressed associations are more explicit, and take a variety of forms.

The traditional clothing of the Saraguros (FIGURE 2) is the most visible link to the Incas; it is commonly said that they wear black as a sign of mourning for the death of the last Inca, Atahuallpa. It would be difficult to determine whether this notion actually dates back to the death of Atahuallpa in 1533, or to more recent times (and perpetuated in part through tourist guidebooks). The connection between the Saraguros’ black clothing and the death of Atahuallpa was being expressed in the early 20th century, as noted by Presbítero Ignacio Landívar Argudo (1996 [1946]). Earlier, Pedro Fermín Cevallos (1986 [1886]: 270), in his late 19th century history of Ecuador, noted that the black was a sign of mourning for the Saraguros’ lost independence. Though Cevallos’ account does not refer directly to Atahuallpa, the sentiment of mourning was present, and leads one to wonder whether the explicit mention of Atahuallpa is a modern addition or was present in Cevallos’ time as well. As a recent addition, it would show a more conscious effort to link with the Inca past, but if the belief dates farther back, then it would suggest much more of a historical connection with the Incas. One also might speculate that the wearing of black as a sign of mourning
was a European custom introduced to the Andes. In that case, this Saraguro custom could not date to the actual death of Atahualpa because there would have been little time for indigenous people to adapt such a foreign practice within the short period between the arrival of Pizarro in 1532 and Atahualpa’s execution the next year. However, Rowe (1946: 246) describes the wearing of black during mourning as an Inca custom, so the wearing of clothes of mourning by the Saraguros could indeed have great antiquity. No matter the age of the practice, the relevant point is that the Saraguros are in the present actively associating the Incas with the traditional Saraguro style of dress, which is a source of pride and an important marker of their ethnic identity (Belote 1984: 55).

Direct Inca connections have also been made through the naming of schools in the rural communities of Saraguro and business establishments in the town itself. For example, the schools in the communities of Tambupamba and Oñacapac have been named for two of the Inca Emperors, Huayna Capac and Tupac Yupanqui, respectively, while the school in Pichic is named for Rumiñahui, a famous Inca general who resisted the Spanish conquest. Others directly incorporate the word Inca in their names, as with ‘Inca Samana’ in Ilincho, and ‘Inca Huasi’ in Ñamarín. The school in Las Lagunas is named for the Inca festival of the sun, Inti Raymi, replacing the previous name ‘Benito Juárez.’ In the more remote community of Ciudadela, the school was given the Quichua name “Amawta Hatari” and decorated with Inca related pictures (FIGURE 3). Of all of the possible names that could be chosen, it is striking that so many of the Saraguro schools, which are important community institutions, are explicitly linked by name to the Incas. The trend to give Inca-related names to rural schools has been going on since the 1980s; more recently Saraguros have begun to give Inca-related names to businesses within the town of Saraguro. For example, in the past few years, the Inkapirka restaurant was opened on the main plaza, and elsewhere some Saraguros have begun a tour guide business named Inka Tours.

On a personal level, some Saraguros are now giving Inca and Quichua first names to their children instead of the traditional Spanish names that have been commonly used for centuries. For example, a number of boys have been named Atahualpa, a very assertive expression of Inca-ness. In a different vein, a friend of mine named his daughter Inti Takatina, which means “she chases the sun.”

In addition, the Incas are evoked through the performance of traditional music in Saraguro, which is also being actively preserved and used in the expression, definition, and assertion of Saraguro ethnic identity (Volinsky 1996). The link with the Incas is expressed in two ways. First, one of the young groups of Saraguros involved in the revitalization of traditional music have named themselves Grupo Rumiñahui, after
the Inca general. Secondly, song lyrics of at least a few recent compositions have included the names of Incas and other references to things Inca.

Furthermore, the Saraguros are connecting themselves to an Inca past through public ceremonies. For example, there has been a revival of the celebration of Inti Raymi, the Inca festival of the sun that takes place during the June solstice. During this festival, a large number of Saraguros gather to perform re-created rituals at the Baño del Inca (‘Bath of the Inca’), a basin located within a waterfall next to a cave overlooking the Pan-American Highway. Local lore holds that the Incas used to bathe in the Baño del Inca, where there is supposedly a seat carved into the bedrock from which the basin is formed. The site does exhibit evidence of modification by the Incas, and caves and waterfalls were sacred places in Inca religion, so it is likely that the Baño del Inca was actually used by the Incas for ceremonies. The revival of Inti Raymi began over a decade ago on a local level, centered in the community of Las Lagunas, and featured performances of school children dressing up in Inca costumes and the focal ceremony at the Baño del Inca. Inti Raymi is now developing into a major tourist event, with a calendar of events lasting four days, and is advertised in the city and province of Loja via posters and brochures (FIGURE 4). The events are now drawing many spectators from Loja and show the potential to draw increasing crowds in the future. Inti Raymi seems to be simultaneously putting Saraguro on the tourist map and proclaiming the Inca-ness of the Saraguros to the outside viewer.

Another ceremony, conducted in October of 1994 by one of the Saraguro political organizations, had a very explicit Inca connection, involving a procession to and ceremony at the Inca imperial site of Ciudadela. Also known as Tambo Blanco, this is the best known archaeological site in the region, as it has been visited and described for centuries (Cieza de León 1984 [1553]: 180; Uhle 1923: 11; Villavicencio 1858: 445-6). These events were held on October 11, the day before Columbus Day, referred to as the Day of Resistance, and were held to protest the more than 500 years of lost independence that began with the arrival of Columbus. At the head of the procession to Ciudadela was a flag carrier with a rainbow flag, which is the modern symbol for Andean indigenous people; notably, it was also a symbol used by the Incas. The ceremony at Ciudadela was held in the ruins of a large structure, of the type commonly known as a kallanka. The ceremony included a speech in Quichua, which referred to the presence of the Incas at the site in the past, and how such important leaders as Rumiñahui and Atahualpa had gazed upon the very same stones that we saw before us.

Perhaps the most conspicuous examples of explicit links to the Inca past being expressed by the Saraguros are found in community signage and in public architecture.
For example, on a large sign painted at the northern entrance of the town of San Lucas, where it can be clearly seen by everyone passing by on the Pan-American Highway, the town name is written along with the phrase ‘Inca Culture’ in Spanish. This proclamation is no doubt related to the fact that the town is located near two Inca sites, Ciudadela, and Inkapirka (not to be confused with the much publicized Ingapirca to the north of the city of Cuenca), which is a ceremonial site constructed of the famous Inca style of cut-stone architecture. But neither of those Inca sites has been developed for tourism and the casual traveler would have no knowledge of them. The indigenous people of the area are planning to develop the sites and attract visitors, but at the moment, the sign does not appeared to be aimed at generating interest in the local ruins. It seems more likely that the local indigenous residents are declaring that they are the living heirs of the Inca culture that is so evident in the nearby sites. More recently, there has been a sign erected at the entrance from the Pan-American Highway to the community of Las Lagunas, emphasizing that the community is the home of the Inti Raymi festival. On one level, this sign is oriented toward outsiders who may be interested in coming to see the activities hosted during Inti Raymi. But on another level, it is almost as if the residents of Las Lagunas are declaring themselves to be the most “Inca” of all the Saraguro communities.

On a grander scale, a large new portal with Inca-style architectural elements has been erected at the central upper entrance to main plaza in the town of Saraguro (FIGURE 5). Interestingly, such a project had to be approved by and funded by the municipal government, in which the Saraguros have had little influence until recently, being historically the domain of the mestizo population that has been the predominant population in the town. Moreover, the portal does not actually contain any direct references to the indigenous population. This may suggest that the portal was erected as a symbol recognizing the indigenous people of Saraguro as an important component of local society, most appropriately represented by references to Inca culture. Alternatively, the Inca gateway could be a way of asserting or appropriating a level of Inca heritage for the entire population of the town and surrounding region, which in part could be oriented towards the development of tourism.

With these rather visible expressions of connections, the Saraguros are to an extent appropriating the past of the Incas in order to make it their own. Yet why would the Saraguros link their identity to a group with which the original relationship was one of domination and colonization? It is likely to serve several purposes. First, it is a connection with a known and venerated culture of the past, through which the Saraguros become linked with the respect and admiration now associated with the Incas. This is rather ironic in that the reign of the Incas was not at all a benevolent or
paternalistic one. All the subjects of the empire were required to labor for the state, and many of them resented the loss of their sovereignty and the punishments meted out by the Incas during their wars of imperial conquest and their suppression of rebellion. In fact, native rancor was a major reason why Francisco Pizarro was able to topple the Inca regime, as many indigenous groups were quite willing to side with the Spaniards in the hope of throwing off the yoke of oppression. But time has been kind to the memory of the Incas, and the popular conception of their empire, in the Andes and abroad, is one of a majestic, noble, and benevolent state, to which many people attach a sense of mystery. Furthermore, compared to the excesses of the Spanish regime, the Andean people were probably, on the whole, better off under Inca control. In any case, an expressed link with the Incas gives outsiders ready-made images to associate with the Saraguros, which are more easily digestible than vague references to ancestors from Cuzco or Lake Titicaca.

Additionally, an association with the Incas gives the Saraguros a solid link with the prehispanic past, which is necessary because a prehispanic origin is in effect the defining element of indigenous ethnicity. While a tie with the reign of the Incas may pre-date the arrival of the Spaniards by fewer than 100 years, and does not allow claims for long tenure on the land as may be claimed by other indigenous groups, the important aspect of the relationship is that it pre-dates the arrival of the Europeans, thus affirming the Saraguros' status as original inhabitants as compared to mestizos or whites. The chronometric shallowness of their connection to prehispanic times is of little import because there are no neighboring indigenous groups who might dispute claims to the land.

This phenomenon of indigenous Andean peoples expressly identifying with the Incas has been referred to as "Inca-ism" (in contrast, here I have used the term "Incaness" to describe similarities between a group and the Incas, which are not necessarily consciously expressed as linked with an Inca identity). Inca-ism is by no means a recent phenomenon, nor is it limited to the Saraguros; it has its roots in the period of Spanish rule. As John Rowe described:

With growing resentment of Spanish oppression and the decline of old local loyalties, the Inca tradition emerged as the obvious symbol shared by the native peoples, which marked their common difference from the Spanish and represented their opposition to foreign domination. Ironically, it was Spanish policies as much as Inca ones that gave the former subjects of the realm a sense of Inca national identity and a degree of cultural unification in the native tradition that we are only just beginning to appreciate (Rowe 1982: 114).
Salomon (1987) has also discussed the roots of Inca-ism among the Cañaris of Ecuador, which he sees arising in the 16th century in reaction to Spanish practices. In the 19th and 20th centuries, the phenomenon has often been more overtly political, as in Perú, where Inca-ism has been a major element in defining the identity of indigenous people and their place in society (Molinié 2004). In recent times, Inca-ism is something of a pan-Andean phenomenon, where the rainbow flag, an Inca symbol, is used to represent and unify modern highland indigenous groups. In Ecuador, claims of Inca heritage are a major element of the indigenous political movement in the country, and many indigenous groups specifically claim descent from the Incas (Benavides 2004: 48; Salomon 1987).

Thus the Saraguro identification with Inca culture and history is in part a manifestation of a phenomenon of the late 20th and early 21st centuries, but also of a process that dates back to the Spanish period. But beyond that, the connection between the Saraguros and the Incas has roots in the policies of the Inca Empire itself. What sets the Saraguros apart is that the Saraguros acknowledge their non-local origins in linking to an Inca past, while many indigenous groups stress their local origins (i.e., “we were here before the Incas”) at the same time they express their Inca heritage.

On another front, appropriating the past of other societies in the realms of art, dance, architecture, etc., for commercial purposes is becoming increasingly common. This is certainly true in the Central Andes, where archaeological tourism is a huge industry, and references to the Incas can be used in many ways to gain tourist dollars. This is not yet the case with the Saraguros, as most of their expressions of Inca-ness have served instead the ends of expressing and reinforcing identity. They have only begun to draw on Inca heritage in realms in which they could directly benefit economically, as with the Inti Raymi festival. Otherwise, tourism has a minor impact on the region, as the few travelers who come to visit stay for the short duration necessary to visit the Sunday market, and most of their business transactions, including the purchase of indigenous souvenirs, is done through mestizo-run businesses in town. But it is not the case that the Saraguros are ignoring such a market; a number of them have opened restaurants, others are actively working to establish tour guide businesses, and there is much interest in developing ecological and archaeological tourism in the region. It will be interesting to see how the Saraguros promote themselves and their businesses if such plans move forward.

Saraguro expressions of an Inca past are a major component of defining and re-defining themselves as they assert their position in the wider world. Many of these expressions, while quite visible, are nonetheless not primarily intended for projecting an image to the public; few outsiders ever pass by the schools in the rural communities,
and one would have to participate in the ceremonies to perceive their Inca connections. Thus these expressions are to a large extent internal, re-affirming the Saraguros' sense of group identity and membership. In the future, as the Saraguros further assert themselves in Ecuadorian society, connections to an Inca past may become more pronounced and aimed at the general public, but for the present the external presentation may not be as important as the internal.

SARAGUROS, ARCHAEOLOGY AND THE PAST
Within the context of the nature of Saraguro ethnic identity and how they relate to the past, we can more readily understand how the set of relations between indigenous people, archaeology, and the material remains of the past are currently manifested, and how these may be addressed in future archaeological projects.

Saraguros and Cultural Remains
Perhaps the relationship that is most conditioned by the nature of Saraguro ethnic identity is that between the Saraguros and prehistoric materials. First of all, there are no known sites that are recognized as being mitmaqkuna settlements from the time of the Incas. Because of this situation, there is no tangible link between the indigenous people and prehistoric cultural remains. There are no archaeological materials that, to the Saraguros, directly represent their past as mitmaqkuna.

Second, Saraguros value Inca remains, as components of their expressed connection with an Inca past. As mentioned above, the Saraguro region is home to some notable Inca sites, such as Inkapirka and Tambo Blanco near San Lucas, and Willkamarka (a.k.a. Paredones or Villamarca) near the town of Paquishapa. The first two sites are the most widely known in the region, and are often referred to when Inca ruins are discussed. There is also a recent move to preserve and protect these sites from looting, coming mainly from the community leaders who see value in these sites as part of their heritage. The Day of Resistance ceremony conducted at Tambo Blanco clearly illustrated the importance that Inca sites are attaining among the Saraguros.

Third, the Saraguros perceive no relation to the pre-Inca inhabitants of the region, who are known as the gentiles, a generic term commonly used to refer to prehispanic peoples in the Andes. As a result of this lack of kinship with the gentiles, the Saraguros view the pre-Inca archaeological sites and artifacts with little concern for the preservation or protection of the settlements or material remains. Many Saraguros use the lands comprising such sites for habitation, farming, and pasture, and have been actively destroying prehistoric terraces for these pursuits. Most people are aware of the locations of large sites, and certain artifacts, such as axes and mace heads, are collected...
when encountered while working fields or clearing vegetation. Such artifacts are probably valued as objects of curiosity, possibly having a monetary value, but there does not seem to be any open trade in them. Also, one category of artifact, the legs of polypod ceramics, which are referred to as gentil bisha, are valued for medicinal purposes and are collected from sites and kept for future use (Lanclos and Ogburn 1996).

There are other situations where pre-Inca remains are willfully looted or destroyed. There are actually some local huaqueros (looters), who intentionally dig in gentil sites in search of artifacts for collection and sale, yet the pursuit is not widespread because most artifacts of the region are undecorated and are not sought after by outsiders. Other looting is opportunistic, spawned by the folk belief that when one sees a flame coming out of the ground at night that it is the location of some sort of treasure. Finally, graves of gentiles are seen as a source of an illness known as mal aire, and they are often dug up and the bones burned to prevent further outbreaks of the disease (Lanclos and Ogburn 1996). However, there are a few Saraguros, mainly several community leaders, who are interested in preserving the local pre-Inca remains as a valuable resource that is part of the local patrimony. Yet the effort to protect those sites is a greater task than preserving the smaller and less numerous Inca sites, and would have a larger economic impact on landowners if they were restricted in the use of lands where pre-Inca sites are located.

Archaeologists and Cultural Remains
Compared to other regions in the Andes, relatively little archaeology has been conducted in the Saraguro region, either by Ecuadorians or foreigners. In the 19th century, a number of scholars (e.g., Caldás 1912; Villavicencio 1858) passed through the region, providing only basic descriptions of sites and little more. Even Vernau and Rivet, who produced the most detailed and valuable early work on Ecuadorian archaeology, *Etnographie Ancienne de l'Equateur* (Vernau and Rivet 1912), only provide a brief description of remains in the Saraguro region, and that is primarily a summary of information synthesized from earlier sources. Scholarly archaeological work in Saraguro began with Max Uhle's (1923) investigations at the site of Tambo Blanco. Two decades later, Collier and Murra (1943) passed through the region during a larger survey project, collecting data and reporting on a few local sites and the corresponding pre-Inca ceramics.

More recently, James and Linda Belote have investigated Saraguro archaeology, even though their interest has been an offshoot of their cultural anthropological studies. Nonetheless, they have visited a number of sites in the region (Belote and
Belote 1996) and produced a general outline of the area’s prehistory (Belote 1984: 88-93). Kevin Leonard (1993) also did a limited exploration of Inca storage rooms near San Lucas. To the north of Saraguro, Mathilde Temme (1981, 1982) has been conducting work for a number of years, but mostly outside Saraguro territory. In the 1990s, a program of excavation and restoration was undertaken at a pre-Inca site to the south of Saraguro, led by the Ecuadorian archaeologist Jaime Idrovo (1996). My own fieldwork included an investigation of the Inca occupation and the effects of their resettlement projects that was the first systematic survey in the region (Ogburn 2001). Finally, a number of other archaeologists, both foreign and Ecuadorian, have passed through the region and visited the more notable sites, without producing any reports or returning for more involved work.

However, this low level of archaeological investigation may soon give way to increased fieldwork including large-scale excavations and restorations of certain sites. Much of the pressure for undertaking archaeology may come from the Ecuadorian government itself, which, through the Instituto Nacional de Patrimonio Cultural (INPC), has in recent years been seeking sites as candidates for developing archaeological tourism. For decades, Perú has benefited from the draw of its spectacular and well-known prehispanic sites, especially such Inca settlements as Cuzco and Machu Picchu, while the archaeological attractions in Ecuador have drawn far fewer visitors. The Ecuadorian situation results simply from the fact that none of the country’s prehistoric sites approach the grandeur or renown of those of Perú, and the material culture is likewise lacking in impressiveness. Unfortunately, the Inca site that would have had the most potential, the Inca center of Tomebamba, was destroyed in the Inca civil war for succession, and is now buried underneath the modern city of Cuenca. Many other Inca sites have been stripped of their cut stone for local building projects. As it stands, the only Inca site open for tourism that is comparable to sites in Perú is Ingapirca, in the province of Cañar to the north of Cuenca. With few other exceptions, there has not been a great effort to develop tourist-oriented archaeological sites in Ecuador, where tourism has been based instead on ecological, geographical, and cultural attractions.

Given the economic potential of its archaeological resources, the Ecuadorian government has a vested interest in controlling the investigation of major archaeological sites and how they are presented to the public. All archaeological materials, as part of the national patrimony, are property of the state, and the government controls the conduct of archaeological fieldwork by requiring investigators to obtain permits from the INPC. The government has veto power over any project, and therefore has the ability to push its own agenda. Furthermore, the direction of
major archaeological projects could be subject to the whims of the director of the INPC, who may have little, if any, archaeological background. As an example, on one occasion after I completed a season of fieldwork, the then-head of the INPC urged me to come back to investigate the site of Tambo Blanco. On the spot, he called a friend of his on the Fulbright Commission to lobby for Fulbright funding for my return. This was without a clear understanding of what such a project would involve or how the Saraguros would perceive it. Lastly, because its director is appointed by the nation's president, and many employees could be replaced with a change in government, the INPC is by nature subject to political machinations and the agenda of whatever party is in control of the presidency. Currently, much of the work of the INPC is focused on CRM-type projects funded by multi-national corporations operating in the country. Nonetheless, the long-term trend is likely to involve a drive toward tourist-oriented archaeological work, with Inca sites as a major focus, and Saraguro, with its location along the Pan-American Highway, may be high on the agenda.

Saraguros and Archaeologists
The Saraguros' expressed origins as mitmaqkuna means that the subjects of much local archaeology (the pre-Inca people) are not the ancestors of the indigenous people, and that they have little stake in how that culture is interpreted and presented by outsiders. Those who do express an interest in such research are more concerned with actually having access to reports produced in order to learn about the prehistory rather than with contesting specific points of content or interpretation.

The situation may be somewhat different regarding learning about Inca remains, because the Saraguros have more interest in them. But while their expressed connections with the Inca past may be strong, I have not heard the investigation of Inca sites explicitly equated with the study of the ancestors of the Saraguros. But because it is implicit, future investigations and representations of things Inca are likely to be closely watched and have the potential to become subjects of contention.

Given this context, the relationship of Saraguros and archaeologists is not and will not be one of outside investigator and passive native observer. A number of Saraguros, including many community leaders and others active in politics, have an active interest in the local archaeology, both as a subject inherently worthy of investigation and as a possible avenue of investigating their own past. Like other people in the area, many of these interested Saraguros have collected artifacts, but more with an interest in preserving them than to collect curiosities for keepsakes or for possible sale. Not only are they interested in the Inca Period archaeology that would have a
direct connection with their people, they are also becoming concerned with investigating and preserving the pre-Inca sites.

Beyond this interest in archaeology, many of these Saraguros have actually participated in archaeological fieldwork, from the organized excavations of Mathilde Temme, to the more informal investigations of the Belotes, to my own survey projects. As participants, they not only gained knowledge about the results of fieldwork conducted in the region, but have gained practical experience that can allow them to interpret archaeological information and assess other cultural resources. These Saraguro men and women will be the ones most involved in future archaeological investigations in the region. Perhaps because of their exposure to archaeology in the field and through formal education, and because there has been little contention with archaeologists over the right to investigate the region's past or the legitimacy of interpretations, these Saraguros have a favorable view of archaeology.

Of course, there are Saraguros who harbor different attitudes toward archaeologists, attitudes mostly centered on issues of exploitation and land ownership. For example, mainly for fear of robbery, some Saraguro land owners do not wish foreigners (or even other indigenous people) to set foot on their land for any reason. Many would rather not have people conducting fieldwork on their property, for fear of damage to valuable pasture or farmland. It does not seem to be an issue yet in Saraguro, but Ecuadorian laws regarding patrimony allow the state to appropriate land containing archaeological sites, so Saraguro landowners may understandably resist any investigations within their land holdings. Finally, archaeological projects may be suspect because many Saraguros fear commercial exploitation that does not compensate them for the resources extracted or for any damage to the environment. Many indigenous people throughout Ecuador are fully aware of and alarmed at the extraction of petroleum in the lowland rain forests, which has devastated the environment while contributing little or nothing to the people whose land is being exploited.

People with such objections to archaeological investigation, whatever their basis, may contest future fieldwork, but it is the Saraguros with an active interest in archaeology who will have a greater say in determining the course of future archaeology in the region. Members of the latter group do not conceive of archaeology as simply the pursuit of outsiders who come to exploit their past or the local cultural resources, but rather perceive it as a tool that can serve their own ends. Namely, it can be used to investigate their own past, to finally shed light on the many questions about their origins. Outside archaeologists, then, become potential sources of funding and expertise, and can provide work, experience, and information. For their part, the
Saraguros have the desire to participate for both the knowledge and the training archaeology can provide.

Future Archaeological Investigation
Under these circumstances, with little contention between indigenous people and archaeology, and a primarily favorable attitude toward participation and investigation on the part of the Saraguros, there are a number of ways that the academic goals of future archaeological projects can complement the interests of Saraguros regarding the past. Moreover, this is a case where there is a clear opportunity for archaeologists to consult actively with local groups and establish working relationships beneficial to the discipline and all involved, in line with the ethical principles of the Society for American Archaeology (Kintigh 1996: 17).

Perhaps the most important question that could be pursued archaeologically is the matter of the \textit{mitmaqkuna} origins of the Saraguros. Specifically, could there be any evidence of whether their ancestors were actually \textit{mitmaqkuna}, and if so, to which ethnic group(s) did they belong? What roles did they play in the Inca government, economy, and religion? Where are their settlements in the Saraguro area, and what was their material culture like? My current research addresses many of these questions, yet the results from the survey are mostly suggestive rather than definitive. Further fieldwork, especially excavations, will be needed to provide more solid answers to these questions, and must deal critically with the thorny issue of identifying ethnic groups in the archaeological record.

Secondly, investigations at the local Inca sites and survey of the Inca road system could complement the Saraguros' links to the Inca past by expanding knowledge of what the Incas did in the region. Excavations could provide information on site plans and functions, material culture, and increase understanding of local economics and government under the Incas. Inca sites, such as Inkapirka and Tambo Blanco, could also be excavated and preserved for tourism, though the ramifications of such plans should be carefully considered before implementation. Many people, including Saraguros and mestizos from inside and outside the area have expressed interest in undertaking such projects.

Finally, archaeological fieldwork can contribute to the local museum that is being constructed by the municipal government in the center of Saraguro, in part to promote tourism. Archaeology could provide specimens for display and information useful for presenting the history of the region, and in this case, artifacts from the pre-Inca culture would be as useful as would Inca or \textit{mitmaqkuna} materials. Excavations at
the pre-Inca sites would also be of interest to those Saraguros who wish to learn about all of the region’s prehistory.

Research goals that incorporate such investigations could easily be formulated by archaeologists to meet academic goals. For example, the mitmaqkuna question is important in the context of Andean archaeology, because the forced resettlements carried out by the Incas had a drastic effect on the ethnic landscape in all of the Inca realm, and it is essential for archaeologists to understand the issue if they wish to comprehend regional systems during the Inca Period. Investigations at provincial Inca sites can be used to address any number of issues related to imperial expansion and maintenance.

In the end, almost any problem that can be addressed in the archaeological record of Saraguro could complement the desires of its indigenous inhabitants, provided they are included in the process of investigation and have access to the results. Future projects, especially long-term or large-scale research programs, could be developed in direct consultation with the Saraguros most concerned with learning about the past, including leaders of indigenous organizations, people involved in the museum, and those with the most active personal interests in archaeology. Saraguros should be involved in as many aspects of the research as is feasible, including planning, fieldwork, laboratory work, publication, etc. Access to formal archaeological training would also train future archaeologists to develop and carry out projects as well as help preserve local archaeological resources.

CONCLUSIONS

As in any other region where archaeologists and the descendants of their subject of study interact, the relationships between the indigenous Saraguros, archaeology, and the past are complicated. Yet, in Saraguro the nature of indigenous ethnic identity, with a strong expressed connection to the Incas, tempered by a dearth of fieldwork in the area, has not led to a state of contention about the investigation, interpretation, and presentation of the past. Instead there is a favorable environment where the goals of each side can be seen to be complementary and amenable to future work. It would be beneficial to have a similar situation throughout the Andes, but the circumstances of the Saraguro region are not likely to pertain to many other situations, and they certainly cannot be artificially created. Furthermore, the situation is likely to change as fieldwork in Saraguro increases. Instead of presenting a difficult problem of conflict between indigenous people and archaeologists, Saraguro offers the challenge of sustaining a state of favorable relations between both sides and how they deal with the past. Above all, “it is important that archaeologists incorporate the process of
consultation and cooperation” in future archaeological research, as Watkins et al. (1995: 37) urge for archaeology in general.
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ABSTRACT
The impulses and concerns underlying this paper have to do with my uneasiness, discomfort, and fascination—as a scholar, researcher, and teacher—regarding two unusual monuments, both of which are deeply embedded in their surrounding ideational environments and the debates that arise from them. The first is located in the occupied area of Cyprus and takes the form of a huge flag, a national symbol, which is conspicuously unfolded on the side of a mountain and is accompanied by a commensurably large inscription that proclaims a strong nationalistic message. The second is located on the highest mountain of Crete—not far from the legendary birthplace of Zeus and on a site laden with memories from the occupation of the island by the Nazis and the ensuing guerrilla struggle against them by the British and the native Cretans, an event which it celebrates and commemorates. Inherent in the Cypriot monument is a condition of visibility that links it typologically with grandiose monuments such as Behistun or Mount Rushmore. The Cretan example might be seen as a distant descendant of Nasca plain, the Sicilian Santoni at Pallazollo Atreide, or even Smithson’s Spiral Jetty. In terms of their positioning, scale, visual nature, iconography, material, motives, aesthetics and intentions these monuments constitute themselves as ideal sites of violent contact, iconic galvanizers of their subjects and students. As such they raise numerous issues—ethical as well as practical—of cognitive accessibility, decipherment, translation, and literal and/or metaphorical vantage points. Based on the fact that our world is increasingly becoming home to sites or monuments of trauma and memory (e.g. Ground Zero, Bamiyan, Gaza), my paper focuses on these two monuments in order to address a number of questions/problems: What is the precise nature of the visual rhetoric at work in these monuments? Is this rhetoric part of a universal language? What is the nature of their relationship with their immediate physical and perceptual environments, that is, the archaeologically laden cultural landscapes of Crete and Cyprus? What is implicated in the translation of these monuments to the discursive frequencies of Western academia? Is their reification as “objects of study” a legitimate strategy of access and translation?
INTRODUCTION
This paper is concerned with two unusual monuments, both of which are dramatically embedded in their surrounding physical and ideational landscapes, that is, landscapes “both ‘imaginative’ (in the sense of being a mental image of something) and emotional (in the sense of cultivating or eliciting some spiritual value or ideal” (Ashmore and Knapp 1999: 12). One is an earthwork titled “The Immortal Partisan of Peace,” on Mount Ida, Crete (FIGURE 1). The other is an earthwork in the form of an enormous flag that occupies the south slope of Mount Pentadaktylos, Cyprus (FIGURE 2). Earthworks are usually monumental interventions in remote landscapes (Premble and Premble 1994: 466) in which they are meant to establish multiple dialogues. They are closely akin to the well known category of “geoglyphs,” such as the Nasca lines or the figures in the deserts of north Chile (Aveni 2000; Briones 2006). Compared to the vast time scales that challenge and fascinate the preoccupations of contemporary archaeological enterprise, both monuments are very recent as they were both created in the last thirty years. This, however, does not entail that the problems and questions that they pose or answer as material objects or as objects of perception have to do only with the topicality of the motivations that underlie their existence. Quite the opposite is true. In order to fulfill their communicative purposes both monuments have put to work a materiality and a visual rhetoric that is programmed to activate behavioral responses, the nature of which defies their cultural specificity and the constraints of their specific time and place.

To begin with, they are both characterized by a gigantism that programmatically clashes with and subverts the scale of their surrounding environments. I suspect that this trait is in part symptomatic of the recent globalization of communicational phenomena. You increase the volume or intensity of your message, so to speak, when you want it to be heard as far away as possible.1 Second, they both offer themselves as ideal subjects for study and thought as they are equipped (to a certain extent) with a sufficient package of answered questions of archaeological or hermeneutical nature: we know by whom, when, and how they were constructed; we can place them relatively easily in wider contexts of interconnections; and questions regarding their purposes and function are easily apprehended—this is the case even if we take into account that such purposes and functions are not reified or solid ingredients of their make-up but are continuously generated and negotiated in the actuality of their social life. Consequently, these two monuments are ideal text-book

---

1 It is no accident that the 9/11 attacks targeted the twin towers in New York, the physical scale of which was matched by their international iconic status. A manifestation of the same phenomenon was the destruction of the colossal Buddhas at Bamiyan, Afganistan by the Taliban regime.
foils to a large number of comparable monuments all around the globe that are studied by various archaeologies but have so far remained resistant to any attempt for even a basic understanding of their nature as visual signs (Aveni 2000: 212-234; Briones 2006). In this respect, the cognitive package of these two monuments challenges us to reconsider the nature of the questions we pose as scholars and curious human beings regarding numerous monuments and the phenomena they entail.

Finally, both monuments are situated in heavily-laden archaeological and historical contexts bound by their nature to condition and dictate any stance and methodological approach towards them. One is embedded in the midst of Crete, an island in which scientific archaeology came of age as part of an effort to substantiate archaeologically a very influential myth of European origins (MacGillivray 2000; Andreou 2005). The other monument is in Cyprus, the large island of the Eastern Mediterranean, home to various archaeologies that since the 1950’s have sought to redress a long history of neglect and dispersion induced by a long colonial past (Knapp and Antoniadou 1998). In this respect, the practice of archaeology in Cyprus is inextricable from the continuous forging and reinforcing of a national identity that roots itself into a very carefully researched past. The case of Cyprus is not unique. Since the nineteenth century, archaeology has provided nationalism with hard evidence, ideas, and symbols upon which the foundational myths of numerous states have been elaborately constructed (Meskell 1998; Smith 2001; Yalouri 2001; Abdi 2001; Yahya 2005; Andreou 2005). I will be suggesting below that the scale of archaeological research on Cyprus, its results, and their import, have in part contributed to the incommensurably enormous scale of the Cypriot monument at hand in this paper.

In diametrically-opposed ways, both monuments are inspired by and thematize violent contact as part of the life and history of the landscapes and the transcendental realities in which they are placed and which they aim to reshape and redefine. Below I explore various dimensions of this function. It is my view that in order to achieve their goals, both monuments are meant to elicit emotional and psychological reactions that are proportionally commensurate not only to their physical scale but also to the enormous intensity of the worldviews and circumstances that motivated them. In this respect, both monuments may be viewed as ideal, emotional galvanizers of their intended audiences. In the face of recent debates regarding the empathetic involvement of subjects in the production of historical discourses it may even be argued that the monuments cannot be cognitively understood unless one is subjected to the emotional force they incorporate in their nature (Hodgkin and Radstone 2003: 1-23). This emotional charge is in and of itself a problematic aspect of their nature since it
generates a very basic problem of approach or translation: to what extent is the student/teacher/researcher allowed to surrender to their rhetoric in order to test experientially their efficacy and import? Is their reification as “objects of study” a legitimate strategy of a meaningful and adequately productive engagement with them?

These questions become all the more urgent given that as the author of this paper I experienced many frustrations and dilemmas in my various preoccupations with them. I came across these monuments in the process of travelling and researching the subject of a course on the archaeologies and visual cultures of three Mediterranean Islands: Sicily, Cyprus, and Crete across the ages. I soon came to the realization that the history of archaeology in all three islands is part and parcel of their recent past and that this past involves their role as arenas of violent contact. How can this experience be meaningfully translated? To what extent is one able to tune into the violent-contact theme of monuments, sites, and landscapes without being experientially entangled in it? To what extent is my cultural profile of Greek origins allowed to inform my teaching and scholarly teaching about them? These questions may sound personal but I believe they address concerns of a more general order as they pivot around the problem of the translation and mediation of meaning and memory across cultures, time, and people (Le Goff 1992; Bradley 2002: 82-111; Van Dyke and Alcock 2003; Hodgkin and Randstone 2003; Makdisi and Silverstein 2006; Young 2003).

In the following pages, I discuss these monuments in terms of the particulars of their various contexts (physical, contextual, social, political). I will then proceed to address hermeneutical questions in terms of the capacity of these monuments to enlighten similar phenomena in other areas of the world. As these monuments are virtually unknown in western academia, I will try to be as explicit in my effort to consider them in their physical and historical frameworks.

THE IMMORTAL PARTISAN OF PEACE, CRETE
This monument is essentially an earthwork or a geoglyph, a two-dimensional image laid out on the ground and made exclusively by boulders assembled from its immediate physical environment. These stones take the shape of an easily recognizable human figure that seems to move to the right with an arm extended in this direction. There are no immediately perceptible attributes except for what seems to be a wing or perhaps a pair of wings very prominently springing out of its back. The head lacks the usual diagnostic details of mouth or eyes. Despite its plain character, the figure is richly textured as the irregular stones that comprise it are loosely set to allow the interplay of

---

2 The figure is 32 m. long and 10 m. wide.
light and shadow to animate its surface. Formally, this is a very rudimentary two-
dimensional image that defies traditional conventions regarding proportions and scale.
It could have emerged out of any prehistoric figurative tradition anywhere in the
world. In this respect our figure is intentionally timeless and non-specific as it blends
inobtrusively with the surrounding landscape.

The Partisan is situated on the small plateau of Nida, a small mountain plain at a
high altitude on Mount Ida, or Psiloritis, in Crete. This site is home to an extremely
sparse environment of rocky mountains, quietness, and beauty. It was consciously
chosen by its creator, the contemporary German artist Karina Raeck, who conceived of
the monument after having lived in the nearby village of Anoyeia for a few years in the
early 1990's (Raeck 1995; Endlich 1995). Raeck became aware of the significance of
the site, both because of her own research and because its local conceptualizations are
part and parcel of the lifeworlds of the people of Anoyeia. The Nida plain has always
been a valuable pasture and source of livelihood for the numerous flocks of sheep and
goats of this pastoral community. An immensely rich oral tradition has preserved a
large archive of memories of epic wars fought over rights of pasture against the rival
community of Vorrizia on the south foothill of Mount Ida. As late as the 1950's oral
bards were able to perform a small epic (The Song of Nida) that chronicles the bravado
of the Anoyeians during a victorious battle that decided the fate of the plain circa 1870
(Marinatos 1956/1957: 245-248). This valuable source allows a rare glimpse into the
various trajectories that connected the plain with Anoyeia, a charter myth, so to speak,
with detailed references to toponyms and significant sites that mapped out this arena as
an integral part of local memory, identity, and morality.

As elsewhere in Crete and the Mediterranean islands, the ecological history of
this microcosm is a veritable and unique wonder (Rackham and Moody 1996: 27-29).
Equally wondrous is its capacity to resist the intrusion of any aspect of modernity or
“progress”—this despite the recent asphalt road and a tourist pavilion built during the
period of the junta that governed Greece from 1967 to 1974. The plain is overlooked
by the Idaean Cave. This is the famous cave in which Zeus was born, raised, and came
of age. This most sacred site of ancient Crete enjoyed a long and uninterrupted history
as a site of pilgrimage and cult already from the Bronze Age onwards. Extensive
excavations in the nineteenth century and then again in the twentieth century
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1 The song was performed orally for Marinatos and his colleagues in the mid-fifties, while they were on
their way to the Idaean cave in order to conduct excavations. Marinatos saw to it that this little epic was
recorded and transcribed for the first time. The performer, Marinatos reassures us, was an illiterate bard
named Kourkoutis, who followed the oral performative mode of recitation in the company of his Cretan
lyre.
produced a plethora of finds that often take pride of place in histories of Crete and Greek art but also in the mentalities of the people of Anoyeia (Sakellarakis 1988; Sakellarakis 1985). A few hours walk from the cave is the summit of the mountain, a site of contact between king Minos of myth and his god but also a site of contact between contemporary pilgrims who make their way to the chapel of the Holy Cross (Timios Stauros) in order to continue the primeval tradition of cult at peak sanctuaries—this is only to be expected in Crete where this type of cult is preserved by a millennia-old tradition. Not far from the cave is a little chapel in which the Anoyeians congregate on a yearly basis to celebrate the festival of the Ascension of Christ, another cult with celestial associations.

This is a brief and, to my view, insufficient description of this conceptualized landscape, that is, a landscape characterized by “powerful religious, artistic or other cultural meanings invested in natural features rather than in material culture or monuments...” (Ashmore and Knapp 1999: 11). In its long history the Nida plain has witnessed few human interventions in the form of monuments or other forms of material culture. A notable exception is the impressive altar that has been carved out of the precipitous rock right outside the entrance to the cave. This is, however, a cultic installation that was not meant to be seen from afar unless one considers the smoke from burnt sacrificial victims in antiquity. Today the altar is almost indistinguishable from its surroundings: its surface has eroded, cracked, and been sculpted back to its original ruggedness by the elements. Equally unobtrusive are the cylindrical sheep-sheds (mitata), whose vaulted interiors have often been linked to well-known categories of the Aegean Bronze Age (Warren 1973). Consequently, the Partisan of Peace may be claimed to be the first truly monumental intervention in this multi-layered context. In this respect, its introduction ushered in a new order of unprecedented experiences. One wonders, therefore, what motivation warranted this “undoing” of a primeval situation and what its impact has been so far among those whose lives and identities are inextricably connected with the plain.

In local memory and identity the plain of Nida and its various inflections epitomize a perception of life as the continuous struggle against a rough and productively unyielding, yet deeply cherished environment. As we saw above, the plain has traditionally been at once a disputed resource and the stage on which the disputation was resolved by means of violent conflict. These experiences have shaped a very distinct sense of pride, toughness, and independence that feeds on centuries-old memories of resistance to foreign invaders and defense of local autonomy and freedom at all cost. During the Second World War Anoyeia played a leading role in the organization and implementation of the resistance against the occupying force of the
Nazis. In retaliation the Nazi forces instigated typically terrorist tactics, that is, they executed most of the male population along with many women and children. The whole village was burned down as well in August 13, 1944 (Beevor 1991: 316). The trauma of these events still looms large over the collective consciousness of the local population (Kiriakopoulos 1995).

The plain of Nida is also remembered and celebrated by means of local folk songs and extensive narratives for its role as the stronghold of the local and Cretan resistance against foreign occupation during the Second World War. I experienced this myself as a young student, when I lived and worked for two summers at the Idaean Cave (1985-86). Vividly remembered and proudly recounted, there were heroic stories of partisans who sought refuge and a hideout in the wilderness of the plain and the cave-holes of the surrounding mountains. A highlight of these memories involved the kidnapping of general Kreipe, the German commander of the occupation force in Crete, and his subsequent confinement on Mount Ida (Psychoundakis 1998: 263-271; Beevor 1991: 301-311). During the Second World War, Nida may have not witnessed an epic clash or bloody fighting but still it was implicated in a wider epic of resolute resistance, heroic acts, and just causes. This time its actual and symbolic role was that of a polar opposite of violent conflict as the Nida plain became a sanctuary or refuge from the insanity and cruelty of the war and the German occupation of Crete. It is in this context that the physical landscape of the plain witnessed an unprecedented transformation in its nature. In order to hinder the landing of enemy aircraft, the local partisans spread out rocks and boulders throughout the plain, which were cropped out of the local materials of the surrounding landscape (Raeck 1995: 46; Endlich 1995: 140). Labor-intensive and far-reaching as it was in scale and effect, this heavy gesture of defiance and strategic cunning was commensurate with the historical charge of the place. It also makes sense as an adoptive tactic aimed at preserving the physical and conceptual values invested in the landscape that was so drastically, but not irreversibly, affected by it.

It is against this subtly nuanced background that Karina Raeck chose to materialize her conception. Motivated by the well-known trauma that sits heavy on the consciousness of post-World War II Germans, she conceived this monument as a means of appeasement, conciliation, and as a tribute to peace and its value. Her creative idea is grand and far-reaching as it seeks to materialize the negotiation of a problematic situation in terms of a substantial symbolic statement. Moreover, Raeck wrote an entire book in which she chronicled the creation of the monument as a personal engagement with the people of Anoyeia and their memories (Raeck 1995). A major aspect of her creative process was that she boldly confronted and commemorated...
numerous massacres and other atrocities perpetrated by the German occupying force against innocent civilians all over Crete. Her rationale was as complex as it is easily understandable, but its wider implications regarding the shifting attitude of contemporary German generations towards a disturbing past cannot be fully discussed here. To be sure, Raeck belongs to a generation of German artists and intellectuals who seriously problematized or even negated the traditional functions of public monuments as containers of essentialized memories or as gestures redeeming the tragic loss of human lives (Young 2003: 238-241). It is important, therefore, to stress that in order to fulfill her vision as an environmental intervention, Raeck consciously opted for a scale of expressive means that defied those of the Nida Plain and yet acknowledged, respected, and paid tribute to its conceptual charge. In other words, she sent out a big message in a big package that upturned the primeval norms of the physical landscape but attuned itself to the breadth of its symbolic significance. In doing so, she conceived the monument as an integral link to a multidirectional historic continuum. The materiality of the monument, its placement as a naturalized element in a perennial landscape of multiple social and ethical values, predicate its role as a bearer of multiple universal messages.

From a different point of view, it may also be useful to consider that Raeck’s Partisan of Peace resulted in the restoration of a landscape created during the Second World War, as many of the rocks incorporated in her figurative geoglyph were the very same boulders that the anti-occupation partisans had used to prevent the landing of aircraft on the plain. Thus, the making of the monumental figure literally dissolved the historical impact of the Second World War on the plain while at the same time it established a permanent dialogue between past and present but also between the topicality of the plain and the universality of the noble message generated by it. This is so whether those engaged in the dialogue are the Anoyeians or the various visitors to this unique land and the international tourists to this part of Crete.

As its title and historical background indicates, The Partisan of Peace on the Nida plain celebrates peace as an ultimate value generated and maintained by means of acts of defiance. The monument symbolically embodies all those who have actively fought against tyranny, oppression, and violence. It is possible to think of it also as a memorial that negotiates the psychological trauma of the generation of its maker. At the same time, it makes amends for the trauma of the collectivity in which it belongs, that is, the community of the village of Anoyeia whose memories and sense of identity pivot

---

4 In the wake of traumatic events such as the terrorist attack of 9/11, there is an intense debate over what constitutes a monument/memorial. In this context, the relevance of the critiques and insights of this German “counter-monument” movement cannot be emphasized enough.
around the burning of the village in 1944 and the various massacres of innocent civilians at Anoyeia and all around the island. It is not accidental that Raeck, a foreigner and a woman engendering a role that defies traditional local stereotypes, managed to gain the confidence, understanding, approval, and cooperation of the community of Anoyeia for carrying out this project. Under Raeck’s direction, the making of the Partisan involved the “undoing” of the constructed landscape of Nida by the very descendants of those who two generations ago had been compelled by the war to modify it. This was, of course, partly the result of practical necessity but the fact is that the contemporary Anoyeians were implicated once more in the “re-construction” of the landscape of the Nida plateau. This fact became part and parcel of the ideas and values that tie even more strongly the community of Anoyeia to the plateau of Nida, to its history, and to its place in a wider universe of ideas and values. The end result, the Partisan of Peace, is one that responds to various motivations. Here the individual creativity of one artist encapsulates the uneasy preoccupations of a distant nation and culture that is historically bound to carry the burden (and the concomitant responsibility) of a difficult and traumatic past on a global level. On the other hand, the monument enshrines the moral precepts of an entire community that is physically and conceptually connected with its surrounding landscape. Because of this, the community is ready to see the landscape of Nida transformed into an arena for the negotiation of wider, universal concerns. This cohabitation of the local and the universal, the individual and the collective, the past and the present, provide interesting insights into the capacity of places, environments, and monuments to map out active orders of collective experience that address worldviews, ideologies, and cosmological precepts. In this particular case, the actual size of the Partisan is commensurate with the historical charge of its physical context and the range of ideas that informed its conception and reception. Consequently, this well-documented monument may provide a good index against which similar but less well-understood monuments all around the globe may be understood. Moreover, the Partisan points to the multiplicity of strands that must always underline the monumentalization of various people’s connectedness to their ideational landscapes.

In some ways, engaging in a contemplative dialogue with the Partisan of Peace perpetuates and rekindles the gravity of the historical situations it necessitates, if only because it actively points backward in its function as a memorial and a site of contact or pilgrimage. But in its commemorative role, this monument—as with many others like it—preserves in a state of unaltered suspension the intensity of the horror and cruelty that it negotiates. An immediate implication of this function is that the monument does not fulfill its role unless it somehow keeps the trauma it addresses alive as much as it
seeks to heal it. This is a paradoxical conflict of functions, especially in respect to the following two considerations: on the one hand, I believe this conflict or incongruence of functions affects its translation or discussion in various contemporary discourses. Reducing it to a case study among others against the framework of an “objective,” and therefore distant, methodological approach (anthropological, art historical, etc.) entails the danger of making banal the magnitude of its moral content—this is the case, however culturally-conditioned this content is. On the other hand, in order to tune in to the “frequencies” the concept of the monument/site of trauma entails, whoever enters into a dialogue with it has to surrender to its function as a galvanizer of intense or often negative emotions. At first glance, this black-or-white schematization of reception may sound too abstract but it conveys the dilemmas and frustrations of those involved in cultural mediation (archaeologists, art historians, anthropologists, historians etc.).

THE FLAG ON THE MOUNTAIN, CYPRUS

Equally problematic in its function as a galvanizer of intense emotions is another “traumatic” earthwork, one that occupies a position of physical and symbolic prominence in the occupied part of the island of Cyprus. Like the Cretan Partisan, this monument is gigantic in size, two-dimensional in nature, constructed of fieldstones (these painted in white and red), and deeply anchored to the ground. All these qualities are certainly constitutive of its significance and its active agency, but overall they are secondary to several traits that set it apart from the Cretan example discussed above.

First, in iconographic terms this geoglyph is much more specific than the Partisan of Peace. It takes the form of a huge flag that has been unfolded on the south slopes of Mount Pentadactylos (or Keryneia Mountains), the mountain range that runs along the north side of the extended central plain which, since 1974, forms the spine of a politically, ethnically, and culturally divided island. Since 1983 this flag has been the symbol of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus, which views itself as an autonomous state, one, however, that has not been recognized by any other state except for Turkey. Its unilateral declaration is an outcome of the tragic division of the island in 1974. Until that moment the island had been home to the Republic of Cyprus, a bi-communal state (Greek-Cypriots and Turkish-Cypriots) that came into existence in 1960 following a long period during which Cyprus was a colony of the British.

---

5 It is impossible to survey or acquire precise information on this monument. It certainly postdates the unilateral declaration of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus in 1983. It was already there when I first visited the island in 1988.
In July and August of 1974, an organized invasion of Turkish forces against the Republic of Cyprus ended in occupation, partition, displaced populations, and a tremendously problematic situation that so far has not been resolved and which cannot be fully addressed in this context (Markides 1977; Dodd 2001).

Second, unlike the Partisan of Peace, the flag on the mountain is accompanied by an equally prominent inscription in Turkish, which reads “it is a happiness to be a Turk” (NE MUTLU TÜRKÜM DIYENE), a famous pronouncement by Kemal Atatürk, the political founder and reformer of modern Turkey. The verbal rhetoric of the inscription is enhanced by the crescent-and-star motif, a quintessential symbol of national Turkish identity. This has been placed on the bare ground immediately above the inscription, thus reflecting the very same symbol that features prominently on the nearby flag. In these contextual circumstances of prominence and visual redundancy this telling inscription clearly spells out and complements the obvious message of this nationalistic monument that purportedly represents the Turkish-Cypriots of the island, a population element with roots that go back to the Ottoman period.

Third, unlike the Cretan monument, which is well documented in a book authored by its creator, Karina Raeck, the origins of the flag of the mountain are not easily or verifiably traceable in trustworthy publications or sources. The most commonly heard account of it in occupied Cyprus, which is also found in multiple pages on the web, views the monument as a memorial of a traumatic event, a massacre purportedly perpetrated by nationalist Greek irregular troops against Turkish civilians in August 1974. I have not been able to verify the veracity of this account. The theme of massacre is a topos of the collective accounts, rhetoric, and monuments of both sides. However, it is significant for the purposes of this essay that the flag of the monument is made to commemorate and continuously constitute a traumatic or violent contact.

Finally, the flag on the mountain differentiates itself from the Partisan in terms of its visibility and its directionality. It is carefully placed immediately north of the divided capital of Nicosia and on the line of a notional axis that connects Nicosia with the famous port of Kyrenia, a predominantly Greek city until the invasion of 1974 and now the capital of the authorities in charge of the north part of the island. The same axis may be extended all the way to Turkey forty or so miles across the sea. Interestingly enough, this is precisely the strategic line followed by the invading military forces of Turkey in 1974. By means of its altitude, its size, colors, and sharp contrast with the surrounding landscape, this flag is intentionally visible—at times even
phosphorescent—from miles away.\(^6\) It was undoubtedly meant to send a very strong message both within northern Cyprus and, what is more important, across the so-called “green” line, the buffer zone that divides the island since the intercommunal strife of 1963. Within the occupied territory of northern Cyprus, it signals an origin and an identity, a future and a legitimate status. The origin is that of the numerous Turkish settlers that were brought in from Turkey to use the land and houses of the displaced Greeks that fled to the south in the wake of the 1974 events (Turkish-Cypriots fled north from the south as well). The identity is that of the Turkish-Cypriots who are thus made to define themselves more in terms of a connectedness with whatever constitutes Turkishness rather than with the truly local experience of the historically Turkish element of the island. The future is the temporal dimension for the fulfillment of an untroubled, autonomous, and legitimate statehood. In this respect, the flag on the mountain may be understood also as a vision, a specter of a desired ideal condition that is constantly in the making.\(^7\) The gigantism of the flag, I propose, is inversely proportional to the status of a collectivity that enjoys an uneasy condition of non-existence in the international arena. But what is a dreamy vision for one ethnic element of the island is certainly a constantly existing nightmare for the other, the ethnically-Greek population of the island across the dividing line. The huge flag, splendidly isolated as it is, sends a simple and perhaps intentionally insulting message: it asserts, like a loud cry, the political and ethnic presence of the Turkish “other” in the occupied territory as a timeless and irreversible given. It does so by becoming year after year a natural and irreversible element of a landscape, which it proudly “brands” as an inalienable possession.

This “branding” of a landscape is literal and metaphorical. It derives its referential capacity from the actual branding (notation by means of a sign) of possessions, like cattle or enslaved human beings in the past (Caplan 2000; Schildkrout 2004). It is inherent in the symbolic function of a flag to signal possession of identity. It is also important to consider that in this case the “branding” becomes effective by means of a somatic association, which is made possible by local conceptualizations of land and landscape, at least for the Greeks of the island. In many cultures various features of physical environments are cognitively registered in terms of corporeal metaphors

\(^6\) Obvious parallels are monuments like the so-called Candelabra of the Andes at Pisco bay, Peru (NW from Nazca), the formidable Giant of Atacama in north Chile, or even Darius’ inscription and relief at Behistun, Iran.

\(^7\) As long as the Cyprus problem is unresolved, the function of the Flag is unstable. It is either a very “loud” slogan or a memorial-to-be of a foundational moment (of a state and an identity). For the latter function see the interesting discussion in Bradley 2002: 82-111.
(Guthrie 1993; Tilley 2004: 19-24; Pei-yi Guo 2003: 202). This is evident in the ancestral Greek name of the mountain with the flag, for Pendadactylos literally means “with five fingers” and owes its origin to a natural formation of the mountain. The bodily association is also inherent in the ethnic Greeks’ conceptualizations of the division of the island in terms of an image of the map of the island with a bleeding wound along the dividing line of the island. This is not simply a rhetorical effect in visual form but an actualization of a deeply felt experience of land as a human body. Since 1960 the map of the Republic of Cyprus (the non-occupied, south part of the island) is the main feature of its official flag, a symbol of state and local identity that combines corporate identity, both conceptual and physical. This corporate identity defines the body of an ethnic group that identifies itself with its land and its history. It is precisely as a foil to this collective sense of connectivity to the land conceived as state (and vice versa) that the Turkish-Cypriot flag on the mountain acquires its intended efficacy in its immediate context. In other words, the actual flag on the land is the navel of a body of state and people that have increased excessively the volume of their expressive means to cry out (to themselves and to everybody else) their uneasy sense of identity and lack of recognized statehood. This is a grandiose gesture but its monumental character does not necessarily imply power or confidence. As Joyce Marcus has recently argued, the emphasis on monumentality in the visual domain or architecture often derive from insecurity, lack of confidence, and the ensuing need for legitimation (Marcus 2003). This need for gigantism as an inextricable element of a “constructed” physical/conceptual landscape may also make sense in other ways. In particular, it might suggest an awkwardness or uneasiness of the Turkish-Cypriots of the occupied part of the island when confronted with a vast archaeological landscape which is replete with material testimonies of a long, undisputed, and prominent Greek past that is alien and perhaps not understood. More than anywhere else, archaeology in the Mediterranean has been traditionally in the service of the construction of national identities and the conceptual environments that reinforce and legitimize them (Knapp and Antoniadou 1998; Smith 2001; Leriou 2005; Yahya 2005; Andreou 2005). Archaeology in north Cyprus can not play this role. As a result, alternate pathways that tie the population to the landscape must be construed and the flag on the mountain may be one of them.

CONCLUSION
I have presented two cases of constructed landscapes with monuments that shape their environments as much as they are shaped by them. Both monuments date to the last
quarter of the twentieth century but they are very little known outside their immediate environments. I have singled them out because they are both embedded in contexts heavily marked by archaeologies and histories that hinge upon the mythical foundations of western civilization. This dimension of the monuments has certainly shaped their nature as both of them are in constant dialogue with the historical trajectories that frame them. I have tried to suggest that the conceptual content of both monuments is constitutive of “traumatic” experiences. This is the case despite the fact that both employ figurative tropes (an angel and a flag) that in and of themselves do not directly suggest the extreme emotional intensity/violent contact that they are meant to generate. Finally, I have proposed that the gigantism of both monuments may derive from the fact that they are both at the service of a visual rhetoric that encodes and emits perceptions of cosmological significance. The Cretan Partisan of Peace may be seen as an angel/fighter that is deeply anchored in the historicity and physicality of its surrounding landscape while facing the heavens and its atemporal otherness. Its conception and referentiality derive from and address concerns that are individual and collective, local and universal, past and present. I would argue that precisely the same concerns are inherent in the conception of the Cypriot monument. The enormous flag on the mountain is supposed to give substance to a national dream or vision of collective existence. It appropriates a landscape already claimed by a rival vision, one constituted by the multiple archaeological and monumental threads that form the fabric of a long historical record. The multiple responses the enormous flag generates as object of vision and memory are equally and sadly traumatic on both sides of the dividing line that separates the island of Cyprus.
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8 A similar phenomenon of appropriation is documented in Israel, where the memory of physical presence, life, landmarks, and monuments of Palestinians has been systematically obliterated since the late 1940’s (Benvenisti 2000). As I was able to verify during a visit in June 2004, the case of occupied north Cyprus does not involve obliteration of monuments but systematic suppression of any explicit references to historical Greekness.
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Figure 1. The Partisan of Peace, Crete. (Photo from Raeck 1995)

Figure 2. The Flag on the Mountain, Cyprus. (Photo by N. Papalexandrou)
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ABSTRACT
This paper explores the relationship between the idea of “protection” and the idea of “ownership” in the case of historical objects marked as “cultural property,” by focusing on the controversy over plans for an exhibition of Roman mosaics discovered at Zeugma, the site of an ancient city on the Euphrates near Gaziantep, southeast Turkey. Focusing on a discrepancy found in the claims for protection and control of the mosaics, this paper attempts to elicit the relationship between the notions of protection, ownership and place in debates over objects considered “cultural.” In discussions of the issues concerning cultural property, the notion of protection and the idea of ownership are generally considered to overlap and reinforce each other. However, the ways in which the locals in Gaziantep, the Turkish state and an international organization that supported conservation works for the Zeugma mosaics used the notion of protection to claim control of the mosaics, suggest that these ownership claims are not only opposed but also are differentiated by mobilizing the notion of protection.
INTRODUCTION
This paper explores the relationship between the idea of “protection” and the idea of “ownership” in the case of historical objects marked as “cultural property,” looking at a case of Roman mosaics found at Zeugma near Gaziantep, southeast Turkey. Recent anthropological discussions concerning “cultural property” point out that the notion of property is deployed in the discourse of protection of tangible and intangible manifestations of an individual culture, which works to reify the culture as if it was a thing to be owned (see e.g. Brown 2004; Handler 1988). Reciprocally, this also designates a group, usually a nation or an ethnic group, as the owner of such cultural objects. In this context, it is often claimed that such cultural objects should be protected in the place where they were originally found.

In Turkey, controversies over state development projects and the protection of archaeological sites affected by such projects have increasingly drawn public attention since the late 1990s. In 2000, international as well as Turkish media attention focused on the rescue excavations conducted at Zeugma, an ancient city on the Euphrates, where archaeologists found a number of extremely well-preserved Roman mosaics. Zeugma and its mosaics were recognized as important to the cultural heritage of the country by both the Turkish state and the local inhabitants of Gaziantep. However, there were tensions between the two. This was particularly evident when these locals opposed the Turkish state’s plan to exhibit the mosaics in Istanbul in 2004, arguing that they should not be transferred outside Gaziantep (see Gaziantep Anadolu Ajansı, 11 March, 2004).

Based on the media coverage on this controversy over the exhibition plan of the Zeugma mosaics in Istanbul, this paper examines what it means for different groups involved in this case, specifically Turkish state agencies and local people, to protect things considered “cultural property.” It explores how the language of ownership is related to the idea of protection of cultural objects. It also considers the role of the idea of place in relation to the discourses concerning the protection of cultural property in showing how and why the locals in Gaziantep opposed the exhibition plan in Istanbul. It suggests that the notion of place of origin helps to construct an essential link between cultural property and those who make claims for its protection using the language of ownership.

CLAIMS OF CULTURAL PROPERTY AND THE IDEA OF PROTECTION
Terms like “cultural property” and “heritage” are now commonly used to refer to all cultural expressions both tangible and intangible, such as artifacts and sites of historical importance, and practices considered “traditional.” Several scholars have studied the
role of the concept of cultural property in constructing representations of the past and history, highlighting that the notion of property is used to denote phenomena related to the appropriation of culture and history in the name of “identity,” such as in the case of “cultural revival” movements (Brown 2003 and 2004; Foster 1991; Handler 1988; Lowenthal 1985 and 1997; Walsh 1992). These studies have suggested that the notion of property works to reify a “culture” in a materialized form, as it “encompass[es] all manifestations of an individual culture, both material and intangible” (Brown 2004: 53). Moreover, a culture reified through the concept of property works reciprocally to designate a community as the rightful owner of cultural objects, usually identified with a nation or an ethnic group, both by international organizations like UNESCO and by nation-states. Through such reification, the relationship between cultural property and the owners of that property is often described by anthropologists as “inalienable” (Welsh 1997; Weiner 1985; 1992).

This relationship between cultural property and their owners involves the notions of time and place. Objects considered “cultural property” often acquire a particular symbolic value for a nation or an ethnic group as their owner. In such a context, cultural objects are considered to be inseparable from the group of people who claim their possession as their “heritage.” This “inalienable” nature of cultural objects is indicated for example in the claims for repatriation of cultural property. Those who ask the return of cultural objects (i.e. some nation-states and indigenous peoples) often claim that they have inherited such objects from their ancestors. This then entails that these people have to verify their link with the originators of the objects in question. For example, in the case of the Parthenon/Elgin Marbles debates between Greece and the United Kingdom, the Greek state has stressed the continuity between ancient Greeks and the modern Greek nation (see Greenfield 1996; cf. Herzfeld 1987; Yalouri 2001).

In addition to invoking the idea of the past through terms like “inheritance” and “heritage,” disputes over cultural property suggest that ownership of such objects is also strongly connected with the idea of place. What is often problematised in repatriation disputes is the fact that the objects in question are outside their place of origin. Words

---

1 Annette Weiner (1985 and 1992) discusses a special value attached to particular objects, which is generated through resistance against mechanisms of exchange, emphasising the role of the idea of the past and the way in which these objects have the power “to define who one is in an historical sense” (Weiner 1985, 210). Objects that are “inalienable possessions” act to bring the past into the present. The histories or titles of previous owners or past events, including mythological ones, become part of the identity of their current owner. Peter H. Welsh (1997) argues that the debates surrounding cultural property should be seen as conflicts over Weiner’s idea of “inalienable possessions.”
such as “return,” “restitution” and “repatriation” themselves imply the move of objects from one place to another, and in practice, claims of repatriation of cultural property are often based on the assumption that an object’s place of origin is self-evident. The idea of place of origin already reifies “place” as an essential reality assuming that things marked as cultural property have a well-defined singular place of origin as such. In this context, the place of origin emerges as a distinctly bounded space in which cultural property should most legitimately belong. Thus, through involving the notions of place and the past, an “inalienable” value of cultural property is generated. This is also in accordance with the idea that the nation or ethnic group, the supposed owner of cultural property, is thought to be bounded spatially as well as temporally (cf. Anderson 1991).

It is important to note here that the significance of cultural manifestations, both tangible and intangible, is articulated by evoking the necessity of their protection through the conservation and restoration of historic sites, monuments and artifacts, the preservation of cultural landscapes, and the safeguarding of “traditional” practices (like rituals and music) and “indigenous” knowledge. Protection, that is the bid to save cultural property from destruction, is in fact one of the focal points in the discussions of heritage management and other cultural property related phenomena such as the illicit trade of antiquities (Carman 2001; Daifuku 1968; Renfrew 2000; Tubb 1995). The protection of cultural property is also the key objective of the laws and regulations for such objects, which are formulated by international organizations like UNESCO as well as nation-states (Magness-Gardiner 2004).

However, the idea of protection does not simply mean safeguarding objects considered cultural property from destruction. The notion of protection is also used to denote protecting the owner’s right to control cultural property. What is often at stake in cultural property debates (e.g. disputes over repatriation) is where and by whom such objects should be protected, and who can decide where such objects are protected and displayed. This provokes rivalry between different claimants for the ownership of cultural property at international, national and local levels. The “allocation” of cultural property is contested among these groups (Lowenthal 1997: 269). Given that objects considered cultural often play a key role as symbols of identity, control over cultural products works to authorize a particular group’s objectification of “culture” in the sense of self-identification and self-determination (see Neller 2002).

Claims to protect a

2 Conversely, this also means that nations claiming repatriation have to show the proof regarding the object’s origin.

3 Angela Neller (2002, 129) points out that traditional Hawaiian objects have acquired a symbolic meaning for the recovery of cultural practices in the context of the revitalisation of “Hawaiian Culture”
culture through its products are seen as claims to protect the identity of the group in this respect (Bray 1996; see also Strathern 2004: 93). Thus, ownership claims for objects designated cultural property are entwined with the idea of protection, and these two notions reinforce one another. However, the following case-study of the controversy over the Gaziantep Roman mosaics suggests a more complicated relationship between the idea of “ownership” and the idea of “protection.”

**DISCOVERY OF ONE OF THE BEST ROMAN MOSAICS COLLECTIONS**

Since the 1960s a number of archaeological and historical sites in Turkey have been submerged because of dam constructions and many more will soon be underwater. Most affected are the country’s southeastern regions, where a number of dams have been constructed on the basins of the Tigris and the Euphrates as part of the state’s regional development project. Archaeological projects to record the archaeological remains which would be inundated by the dam water have also been conducted (e.g. the “Keban Project”). From the end of the 1990s especially, dam constructions and the protection and conservation of archaeological and historic sites attracted much public attention (Süler 2000: 3). In 2000, international as well as the Turkish mass media highlighted several issues involving Zeugma.

Zeugma was a Hellenistic and Roman city whose remains are today found in the village of Belkıs on the Euphrates, 60 km east of Gaziantep, southeast Turkey.

---

4 The project is named “Southeastern Anatolia Project (Güneydoğu Anadolu Projesi)” (Southeast Anatolia Project Regional Development Administration 31 March, 2006). The GAP started in the late 1970s, aiming for regional development of the southeastern part of Turkey through a large-scale irrigation scheme as well as hydro electronic power production through constructing a number of dams in the basins of the Tigris and the Euphrates rivers.

5 In his article on Archaeology in Turkey in the *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ansiklopedisi* (Encyclopaedia of Turkey during the Republican Period), Güven Arsebüük wrote that the Keban Project was a rescue excavation project for archaeological sites found in the regions which were to be submerged through the construction of the Keban Dam on the Euphrates basin in eastern Turkey. The project was carried out at more than 20 sites by Turkish and foreign archaeologists from the mid-1960s, and continued for a decade.

6 In the 3rd century BCE, Seleucus I Nicator, one of the commanders of Alexander the Great and the founder of the Seleucid Empire, founded twin towns on the Euphrates: Seleucia on its west bank named after himself, and the other on the east bank, which was named Apamea after his queen. Since these towns were connected by a bridge over the Euphrates, Seleucia came to be known as “Zeugma” meaning “span” or “bridge.” As a junction linking Syria and Mesopotamia, Zeugma consequently gained military as...
Archaeological excavations at the site started in the late 1980s, although it was already known in the early twentieth century to locals and to some Europeans who visited the region as the site where Roman mosaics and inscriptions were discovered. Some of the excavated mosaics are said to have found their way to museums in Turkey as well as Europe and the United States, and also to private collections (Kennedy 1998: 11-13). By the 1960s, some locals discovered the monetary value of the mosaics, and are said to have been involved in clandestine excavations for the international art market (Ergeç 2000: 20). Archaeologists who began excavation at Zeugma have reported that many of the mosaics found in Zeugma had been damaged by such “illegal” excavations (Campbell and Ergeç 1998; Ergeç 2000: 21). When I interviewed Turkish journalist Özgen Acar about issues of illegal digging in Turkey, he told me about his suspicion that many of the Roman mosaics in various museum catalogues, whose place of origin is described as “East Mediterranean,” or “said to be from East Turkey,” or “near Syria,” are probably excavated from Zeugma.7

One notable example is the mosaic of Dionysus and Ariadne. In 1992, a local guard for Zeugma noticed a tunnel, which led to the remains of a Roman villa. Archaeologists based at the Gaziantep Museum excavated the site and uncovered a mosaic depicting the wedding of Dionysus and Ariadne (Başgelen and Ergeç 2000: 18). They decided to preserve it in situ. However, a large part of this mosaic was cut out by looters on 15 June 1998 (Acar 2000b: 7), and has been missing since then.8 Archaeologist Rifat Ergeç, who was the director of the Gaziantep Museum between 1989 and 1999, notes that the name of Zeugma became known for the first time to the locals in Gaziantep through the news coverage of the discovery of this mosaic piece (Ergeç 2005: 52). He also mentions that the villagers living near Zeugma started to visit the site showing an interest in the Dionysus and Ariadne mosaic, and also began to appropriate the motifs of the mosaic for the designs of their handicrafts (e.g. carpets) (Ergeç 2000: 52).

From the late 1990s when the construction of the Birecik Dam on the Euphrates commenced, a rescue excavation at Zeugma was also started by the

---

7 The interview with Acar was conducted in July 2004. He made this point in one of his articles about the plundering of Roman mosaics from Zeugma (Acar 2000a).

8 The remaining part of the mosaic is currently exhibited in the Gaziantep Museum.
Gaziantep Museum and a team of foreign archaeologists. At first, the excavation did not seem to attract much public attention (Acar 2000: 7; Başgelen 2000: 13-14; Ergeç 2000: 22-3.). However, as the construction of the Birecik Dam neared completion in 2000, the Turkish press started to bring up the issue of Zeugma after a huge number of extremely well-preserved Roman mosaics and frescoes were discovered through the rescue excavations (see Figure 1) (Gaziantep Sanay Odası 21 June, 2000). Eventually, these finds came to be regarded as “one of the greatest collections of ancient mosaics anywhere in the world” (see Gorvet 31 May, 2004). After the Birecik dam went into operation in April 2000, a large number of articles on the development of the rescue excavations began to appear in the international media (e.g. New York Times, The Economist) as well as in the Turkish national and local press.

The fact that these articles appeared in the foreign press had the effect of further attracting the attention of the Turkish media: that of the mosaics was a story which “shook the world first, and only then the Turkish media, intellectuals, the Ministry of Culture, and politicians like a big earthquake” (Acar 2000b: 8). The media coverage also attracted financial support for the excavation project from the Packard Humanities Institute (PHI) in the United States (Başgelen and Ergeç 2000: 46). The PHI gave $5,000,000 for a three-month archaeological rescue operation from July to the beginning of October 2000. It also agreed to support post-excavation works, such as the construction of a laboratory for the conservation of the finds.

Through this national and international attention, the Roman mosaics excavated from Zeugma have come to be recognized as one of the finest in the world both in size and in quality. Declaring that the South Anatolia Project (SAP) “assigns special importance to the protection, conservation, tourism industry, related promotion of the cultural heritage of the region” (Southeast Anatolia Project Regional Development Administration 6 November, 1999), SAP now presents the management

---

9 Jonathan Gorvett (31 May 2004) published an article for Aljazeera, which focuses on the controversy over the exhibition plan of the Zeugma mosaics. In the article he also discusses the rescue excavation conducted at Zeugma in 2000. The controversy over the exhibition plan will be analysed on in the following sections.

10 On 29 April, The Economist published an article about the rescue excavation at Zeugma entitled “Watery Grave,” while Stephen Kinzer’s article ‘Dam in Turkey May Soon Flood a “2nd Pompeii’” with a photograph of the mosaic depicting Perseus and Andromeda appeared in the first page of the New York Times on 7 May (see The Economist 2000; Kinzer 2000).

11 The project was an international archaeological project that focused on excavation and on site conservation, involving specialists from Turkey, Britain, France, and Italy. It was directed by the Ministry of Culture in coordination with the state administration office of SAP (see Southeast Anatolia Project Regional Development Administration, 16 March 2006).
of Zeugma’s heritage as essential to its policy on “cultural sustainability,” by which it means “the transfer of cultural heritage to future generations” (Southeast Anatolia Project Regional Development Administration, 28 December, 2006). Highlighting the significance of the site as national heritage, the local government in Gaziantep also uses images of the excavated objects as one of the symbols of the city. Images of the mosaics have proliferated in the city, and can even be found in the central reserve of the main street in the city centre (see Figure 2). Turkish archaeologist Rıfat Ergeç notes in his article written for a local business magazine that “Zeugma” is sometimes used as a synonym for the Roman mosaics discovered at the site (Ergeç 2005: 53.). Given such a situation, questions such as who controls the mosaics, where they are protected, and by whom, have become focal points of discussion. Roman mosaics of Zeugma were thus featured again by the Turkish (and some international) mass media in 2004.

“MOVABLE” OR “IMMOVABLE” CULTURAL PROPERTY?
In the spring of 2004, authorities of the Turkish government, Gaziantep Museum and the PHI planned a temporary exhibition of the Zeugma mosaics at the Topkapı Palace in Istanbul during the NATO summit was to be held in Istanbul in June. According to Turkish media coverage, the mosaic panels were to be displayed first in Gaziantep in April, and then to be transferred for the exhibition in Istanbul. The aim was to exhibit them to a wider public, especially to the foreigners attending the NATO summit.

However, this plan faced strong oppositions from local people in Gaziantep. The Gaziantep Zeugma Platform (GZP), a group of local organizations and individuals applied to the local court to stop the exhibition plans at the Topkapı Palace. At the press conference, the GZP claimed that it aimed to protect objects considered “cultural

---

12 In 1999, the SAP administration office adopted the idea of sustainable development (Southeast Anatolia Project Regional Development Administration, 6 November, 1999). Its master plan referred to restoration, conservation, salvation, and the documentation of cultural property as part of its framework of sustainable development. “Cultural sustainability” seems to be articulated in this context.

13 A similar situation is reported in the case of Çatalhöyük near Konya, central Turkey (Bartu 2000: 105; Hodder 1998, 129). As Ayfer Bartu (2000, 105) notes, the image of a naked female figurine found from Çatalhöyük was used in the front page of the nearest local town’s promotion brochures.

14 At the beginning of February 2004, Turkish media reported for the first time that the authorities of Gaziantep Museum, the Ministry of Culture and Tourism and PHI were planning a temporary exhibition of mosaics from Zeugma in the Topkapı Palace from June when the NATO summit was held in Istanbul (Gaziantep Anadolu Ajansı, 2 February, 2004; and 4 February, 2004).

15 GZP originally consisted of 23 local organisations such as Gaziantep Artisans Associations Union, Gaziantep Lawyers Association, Friends of Gaziantep Museum, Gaziantep Tourism Association, Architects Society Gaziantep Office, but the number of participating organisations increased later (see Gaziantep Anadolu Ajansı, 11 March, 2004; and 12 March, 2004).
properties (kültür eserleri)" found in the Gaziantep province, notably the mosaics from Zeugma; to support further excavations at Zeugma; and to construct a new building for Gaziantep Museum to house the Zeugma mosaics. Litigation continued until May 2004 when the judge concluded that the Ministry of Culture and Tourism had the authority to transfer and exhibit cultural property in Turkey. However, as the court’s decision came out just one week before the NATO summit, the Ministry of Culture and Tourism cancelled the exhibition (Gaziantep Anadolu Ajansı, 25 May, 2004).

The focus of dispute over the exhibition plan in Istanbul was whether the mosaic pieces would be damaged in their transfer between Gaziantep and Istanbul. Those who joined the GZP emphasized that the objective of the GZP was to prevent damage to the mosaics (NTV, 17 March, 2004). In this context, they brought up their suspicions about the conservation work. In particular, the team led by Roberto Nardi, a conservation expert who was hired by the PHI, was accused by the GZP of causing the mosaics harm (Gaziantep Anadolu Ajansı, 23 March, 2004).

This claim against the exhibition in Istanbul was made by questioning who should protect the mosaics and where they should be kept. Notably, the GZP created a slogan saying that “We will claim ownership of culture (Kültüre sahip çıkalız),” by which they meant that the mosaics retrieved from Zeugma should be kept and protected in Gaziantep. Many locals expressed their fear that the mosaics would never return once they were taken outside Gaziantep. For instance, the Architect’s Society Gaziantep Office (Mimarlar Odası Gaziantep Şubesi), which also joined the GZP, claimed that PHI’s ultimate intention was to take the Zeugma mosaics outside Turkey as well as Gaziantep (Mimarlar Odası Gaziantep Şubesi, 14 May, 2004). Thus, the locals in Gaziantep, who took a stand against the state’s exhibition plan, were not simply concerned about physical damage that the mosaics might suffer, but even more importantly perhaps, they were concerned about the mosaics’ removal from Gaziantep. Gaziantep emerged as a distinct place where the mosaics should be protected, as the site where the mosaics were discovered had already been submerged.

The local claim to protect the Zeugma mosaics relied on current Turkish cultural property legislation, which declares state ownership of cultural property found in Turkey. In particular, it referred to Article 6 of Law No.2863 on the Protection of Cultural and Natural Property (Kültür ve Tabiat Varlıklarını Koruma Kanunu No.

---

16 In Turkish, the phrase “sahip çıkmak” means “to claim the ownership of something” or “to get something under control,” and is often used in a context where one claims the ownership of something that he/she has no right to claim (Redhouse 1997, 637-8).

17 In fact, the theme of state ownership of cultural objects discovered within the state territory has been the leitmotif of legislation from Ottoman times to the present (see Blake 1994; Özsunay 1997).
2863, the 2863 law), which defines mosaics as immovable cultural property (*taşınmaz kültür varlıklar*). The law states that objects defined as immovable cultural property should be protected in the place where they are found unless there is a need to protect such objects in a museum close to their place of discovery. Transfer of such objects without necessary justification is a violation of the law (Article 20). Based on these articles, the GZP criticized the Turkish state and the way in which it sought to control the mosaics (NTV 17 March, 2004). They even brought a lawsuit against the Ministry of Culture and Tourism arguing that the exhibition was against the 2863 Law. They thus acknowledged the state’s superordinate ownership of the mosaics by invoking its status as “immovable cultural property.” From this point of view, transferring the mosaics was a violation of the state law by the state itself. This criticism of the state’s mishandling of the mosaics seems to imply that the locals knew better how to deal with the mosaics, such knowledge being the basis of their claim to the right to safeguard them.

By contrast, those involved in planning the exhibition in Istanbul emphasized that the mosaics from Zeugma are recognized as one of the best-preserved Roman mosaic collections in the world. When the GZP brought a lawsuit to the local court in Gaziantep, the Ministry of Culture and Tourism made a written statement to justify its plan for the exhibition in Istanbul and its treatment of the mosaics (Gaziantep Anadolu Ajansı 16 March, 2004). In this statement, the ministry claimed that the exhibition was going to provide an important opportunity to show Turkey to the political leaders who were to gather for the NATO summit. It also stressed that the expert conservators would take special care of the mosaics and they would not be damaged during their transfer and the exhibition in Istanbul. In addition, it mentioned that they would be returned to and displayed at Gaziantep after the exhibition and underlined that the exhibition in Istanbul would not permanently remove the mosaics from Gaziantep.

Criticizing the GZP’s lawsuit as a mistake, Erkan Mumcu, Minister of Culture and Tourism at that time, said “Zeugma is a heritage of humanity (bir insanlık mirası),” and “must not be made to belong to one province (taşrâhlaştırmamalıdır)” (Radikal, 10 April, 2004). As mentioned previously, according to the 2863 law (Article 5), the Turkish state is the sole owner of cultural objects found in the country. In fact, the court decision that the state could transfer the mosaics for the exhibition in Istanbul was made based on this legislation. However, the press coverage of this controversy, notably of Mumcu’s comment, suggests that the Turkish state claimed its right to the mosaics through emphasizing that they were a “world heritage” of sorts, belonging to the much wider public, even that beyond the nation-state.
On the other hand, in responding to the GZP accusation, the PHI issued “an Open Letter to the People of Gaziantep” in national Turkish newspapers on 9th April 2004 “to correct certain inaccurate public statements made by the GZP.” In the first place, the letter emphasised that it had no intention of taking the Zeugma mosaics away from Gaziantep, saying that “if PHI had believed that there was any chance that the Zeugma mosaics would not return to Zeugma, PHI would never have offered to sponsor this Istanbul exhibit” (Packard, 9 April, 2004). However, the letter made a point that “the question of a permanent home for the Zeugma mosaics, however, has nothing to do with the merits of a temporary exhibit in Istanbul” (Packard: ibid). Quoting some examples of international loans of mosaics for exhibitions, he made a point that “shipping mosaics is neither uncommon nor irresponsible, if it is done with professional care” (Packard: ibid). The PHI saw the exhibition in Istanbul as an opportunity to make the mosaics of Zeugma known to the wider public, saying that “showing mosaics to NATO leaders has never been a motivation for PHI,” but “a NATO visit could generate international news coverage, which could stimulate future tourism to Zeugma” (Packard: ibid). Based on this, the PHI highlighted that the exhibition was for the benefit of the Turkish nation.

Arguably, this letter was written because the GZP doubted the return of the mosaics after the exhibition outside Gaziantep. The PHI emphasised a point that the mosaics should be exhibited where they were found, and that the exhibition was planned mainly by the Turkish state authorities. Through this, it distanced its standpoint from the Turkish state. In so doing, it did not claim the right to control the Zeugma mosaics. Conversely, such an attitude suggests that what was at stake in the controversy over the exhibition plan in Istanbul was claiming the right to dispose of the mosaics.

OWNERSHIP, PROTECTION, AND PLACE
As this paper has described, different groups appeared in the media coverage of this controversy (i.e. local people in Gaziantep, the Turkish state, and the PHI). These groups deployed two different interpretations of the mosaics as cultural property in order to articulate their views on where and by whom the mosaics should be protected: the mosaics as the heritage of the community of Gaziantep; and the mosaics as the

---

18 The letter was written in the name of David Packard, the director of the PHI, and its English version is available online (Packard, 9 April, 2004).
19 Asked to comment on this controversy by Aljazeera, Richard Hodges, an archaeologist who worked as a coordinator of the excavations at Zeugma from PHI, answered that Packard “reluctantly” agreed with the exhibition plan at Istanbul (Gorvett, 31 May, 2004).
“common heritage” of humanity. Marilyn Strathern (2004), examining the discourse of scientific knowledge, points out that debates over cultural property tend to echo Euro-American conceptions of property and the commons. “Knowledge belongs to (can be claimed by) communities near and far”: both scientists who produced it (the near) and “mankind” (Strathern 2004: 91-92). Similarly, cultural manifestations both tangible and intangible are also often considered to belong to two collective or communal entities “near” and “far,” i.e. “heritage” of a particular community and “world heritage”. While as “world heritage” cultural manifestations are accessible to the much wider community (the community far) as a “non-exclusive, distributable resource,” the community near restricts the use or, more precisely, the commodification of cultural property as “their” own resource (Strathern: 92). Objects labeled “cultural property” are implicated in general in the constitution of a nation or an ethnicity. In the case of the Zeugma mosaics, the Turkish nation-state appears to stand as a particular community to which cultural property belongs, as opposed to the wider community i.e. “mankind” to which “world heritage” belongs. This is in fact legally recognized (the 2863 law). However, the materials presented above suggest that this framework does not work in a straightforward manner.

The locals in Gaziantep, who opposed to the exhibition plan, used the idea of the community near, through which they made their claim to keep the mosaics in Gaziantep. The GZP opposed the exhibition by emphasizing a link between the mosaics and the community of Gaziantep as their place of origin. Moreover, their claim was based on the state’s legal framework on cultural property that categorizes the mosaics as “immovable.” Being “immovable cultural property,” the mosaics are “legally” linked with Gaziantep as their place of origin, through which they are claimed to belong to the community of Gaziantep. However, what is intriguing is that this state legislation also defines the state, not the community of Gaziantep, as the legitimate holder of rights to protect cultural property. Relying on state law, these locals paradoxically claimed control of the mosaics based on a legally authorized link between the object and their place of origin.

On the other hand, the state and the PHI who planned the exhibition stressed that the Zeugma mosaics belong to the community far in the sense that they were recognized as one of the best-preserved Roman mosaic collections found in the world. In responding to the locals’ claim to protect the mosaics, they argued for the importance of making the mosaics accessible to the wider public through the exhibition in Istanbul. In order to justify the exhibition plan, the Turkish state and the PHI repeatedly claimed that transferring the mosaics between Gaziantep and Istanbul was safe. Thus, they considered the mosaics to be “movable” in opposition to the people in
Gaziantep. Since the locals stressed that the mosaics were “immovable,” this suggests
that such emphasis meant to detach the objects from Gaziantep as their place of origin.
The movable aspect of the mosaics was deployed as part of a counter argument against
the local claim. In so doing, the state tried to destabilize the naturalized link between
the mosaics and the nearby community of Gaziantep, which the locals attempted to
establish.

However, the state and the PHI did not seem to share the same interests
regarding the exhibition in Istanbul. As PHI attempted to distance itself from the issue
of ownership claim, it emphasized that the Zeugma mosaics were “heritage of
humanity,” implying that as a non-exclusive and distributable resource, they belong to
“mankind” (see Strathern 2004). For the Turkish state, by contrast, given that it is the
legally authorized owner of cultural property in Turkey, an exhibition of the mosaics in
Istanbul highlighting the significance of the mosaics as “world heritage” was meant to
exercise its right to control the mosaics against the counter-claim of Gaziantep locals.

CONCLUSION
Focusing on the contest between claims concerning the protection of Roman mosaics
found in Zeugma, this paper has attempted to elicit the relationship between the
notions of protection, ownership and place in debates involving objects considered
“cultural.” In the discussion of the issues concerning cultural property, the notion of
protection and the idea of ownership are generally considered to overlap and reinforce
each other. However, the ways in which the locals in Gaziantep and the Turkish state
used the notion of protection to claim their ownership of cultural property, suggest
that the language of protection works to produce different ownership claims.

In the controversy over the exhibition of the Zeugma mosaics in Istanbul, the
Turkish state stressed that it was safe to transfer the mosaics and it would protect them.
Its right to dispose of the mosaics included transporting them from one place to
another. On the other hand, the locals in Gaziantep insisted that protection meant
keeping the objects fixed in a certain place. They emphasized a sort of relation between
the mosaics and place relying on a category of the state legislative framework, i.e. the
mosaics as “immovable cultural property.” In other words, they constructed their claim
of ownership of the mosaics around and through the legally authorized notion of
“place,” drawing on the notion of protection to constitute a close association with the
mosaics in a particular place (Gaziantep). This was deployed to override the state’s
superior right to dispose of the mosaics.

Thus, these ownership claims are not only opposed but also can be
differentiated by mobilizing the notion of protection and the idea of place, which
reflects a political relationship between local/regional community and the state in dealing with the items of cultural property. In this particular case, it is important to note that the objects in question were present in their place of origin (Gaziantep) from the time when their significance as “heritage” came to be recognized internationally as well as nationally. For the local community of Gaziantep, the state’s ownership claim for the mosaics (the exhibition in Istanbul) did not simply mean their removal from Gaziantep, but also affected negatively its recently constructed relationship with the mosaics as the symbol of the city. This helps to explain why place was called into play as a signifier of local interests in order to redefine the notion of protection.
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ILLUSTRATIONS

Figure 1. “Gypsy Girl,” one of the mosaics discovered through the rescue excavation at Zeugma (Photo by E. Tanaka).

Figure 2. Images of the Zeugma mosaics found in the central reserve of the main street in Gaziantep (Photo by E. Tanaka).
COLONIALISM, COLLECTIVE ACTION, AND THE ANALYSIS OF TECHNOLOGICAL STYLE
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ABSTRACT
This paper recognizes two problems in recent studies involving technological analyses and contact period archaeology. In colonial studies, the application of the concept of technological style typical in prehistoric research contexts (i.e., as an expression of cultural identity) becomes problematic due to the shifting assignations and appropriations of class, ethnic, and racial identities within colonial social structures. In such research contexts an ambiguity of interpretation often emerges between whether an observed technological style is reflective of degrees of cultural continuity, or a practitioner’s agency in confronting colonial regimes of practice. Secondly, discussion of such practices as modes of acculturation, creolization, or hybridization unnecessarily categorize social relationships embedded in technological practice in terms of a post-colonial discourse rooted in nationalist politics from which these terms emerged. This paper argues that instead of applying the observation of technological style to interpretations based on categories of identity, it may be more informative for the understanding of the social dynamics and politics of resistance within colonial interactions to situate such observations in terms of how they reflect mobilizations of collective action.

The paper explores the intersection of colonial mission and mining interests and Puebloan mineral use in the early colonial period of New Mexico. Archaeological and archaeometric data from the excavation of the early 17th century metallurgy facility within the Pueblo of Paa-ko (LA 162) are combined with ethnohistoric data on the organization of labor in both colonial work environments and in the production and exchange of materials involved with Puebloan ritual paraphernalia to argue that resulting ‘syncretic’ technologies reflect competing mobilizations of collective action that offer loci for resistance by resonating with pre-colonial material practices.
INTRODUCTION

Bridging the gap between prehistoric and historic archaeology involves not only a rapprochement of data sets but also a reassessment of common theoretical constructs applied to each research context (Lightfoot 1995). Having spent most of my graduate career ‘tacking’ back and forth between pre-historic and historic projects in the United States, and in the process of grant submissions and re-submissions, I have come to realize how difficult it is to transfer certain concepts between prehistoric and historic archaeology, particularly when one’s proposals are reviewed by scholars with experience in only one of these fields. In this paper I would like to critically review two concepts, widely used in prehistoric archaeology, that I have found useful in my past research on early colonial encounters but regard as problematic in this context.

My first critique involves the application of the concept of technological style as developed by researchers tracing their intellectual history from Heather Lechtman’s work on Andean metallurgy (Lechtman 1977). This approach is most often applied to prehistoric, or pre-colonial, technologies, and has allowed for nuanced interpretations of the culturally specific ways in which technologies develop, yet few studies bridge the gap between pre-colonial and colonial practices. Due to a focus on cultural-specific structures, the analysis of syncretic aspects of technology, material forms viewed as a synthesis of cultural influences typical of early colonial contexts, often remains unaddressed.

My second critique is of the concept, within historical archaeology, of “cultural hybridity,” a second problematic aspect of research concerning early colonial assemblages. Early colonial material culture studies that recognize syncretic practices have tended to create narratives that substitute older acculturation models based on a duality (dominant vs. passive cultures) with various ‘mixings’ or ‘hybridity.’ These concepts tend to flatten historically situated social relationships by suggesting a pattern of interaction based on ethnically-static entities. This paper takes a different approach and seeks to view apparent syncretic technologies as representative of conflicting meanings, meanings that were perhaps transitively applied. Rather than representing a static cultural ethos I argue that such meanings reflect the relationships of artisans in networks of collective action.

A STRUCTURALIST DILEMMA: TECHNOLOGICAL STYLES IN THE COLONIAL PERIOD

Stylistic analyses in archaeology have advanced the practice of technological analysis through a re-incorporation of a concern for meaning in the creation of material culture. The ‘technological style’ approach was first defined by Heather Lechtman, but has
roots in the pivotal work of Cyril Stanley Smith, a metallurgist by training, who sought to combine a detailed understanding of the material properties of artifacts with an intuitive sense of the aesthetic experience of their making (Lechtman 1977; Smith 1981). The ‘technological style’ approach has been effective in exposing underlying structural properties of technologies that are culturally-specific. This approach recognizes that the cultural meaning and use of artifacts are bound to the ways in which material properties and production processes are structured. Two of the primary practitioners of this approach, Heather Lechtman and Dorothy Hosler, have systematically identified what could be termed ‘material metaphors’ that structure creative action in the technologies they investigate (Hosler 1994; Lechtman 1977: 1984). Hosler’s analysis of the metallurgy of pre-colonial West Mexico identifies symbolic associations of color and sound as major structuring elements in the production of a range of metallic artifact types creating what she identified as “a sacred domain of experience” (Hosler 1994: 227). Similarly, Lechtman’s analysis of metallurgical surface enrichment techniques in the Andes suggested a link between weaving technologies and metallurgy through the employment of a concept linking visual appearance to structural composition that reflected basic Mochica concepts concerning the unity of appearance and character (Lechtman 1984).

This approach is informative for pre-colonial contexts because of its ability to link technological choices with cultural meaning. Yet few studies of colonial period technology exist that adopt this approach effectively, and many of the studies of pre-colonial technology in the Americas fail to address changes in indigenous practices in as detailed a manner when dealing, however briefly, with the colonial period. I feel that this has to do with the structural fixity of meaning placed upon material objects in such studies. If the meaning of an object becomes fixed due to an observed cultural ethos, how does one account for technologies that cross perceived cultural boundaries? It seems that if one fixes meaning on the object too rigidly, the only model of technological change available through the colonial period is one where indigenous structures of meaning are obliterated. Lechtman’s otherwise excellent stylistic analyses of pre-colonial metallurgy seem be trapped in this dilemma, unable to extend such analyses beyond the divide between the prehistoric and historic periods. This is evident in comments regarding Andean metallurgy as “…on the threshold of assuming a much more important role in Andean life when Andean civilization was cut down by Spanish invaders in search of the rich gold and silver deposits of the land” (Lechtman 1984: 36). Yet historical documents indicate that the Spanish mining and metal industry was reliant upon indigenous skill and labor (Barrett 1987; West 1949; 1994). If practice is recursively linked to the production and re-production of cultural structures then at
which point is an industry homogenized as ‘colonial’ losing its pre-colonial meanings? If the same social groups are making the same materials, how and/or why, has the significance of them changed?

The persistent involvement of indigenous communities in colonial production suggests that the meanings given to objects and materials from such practices are historically contingent. To develop an understanding of colonial period technologies we need to look past the apparent truncation of an applied cultural ethos with the imposition of colonial production regimes, and begin to look at the specific choices that practitioners make in relation to colonial structures of power. Kathleen Ehrhardt has addressed some of these questions by combining a stylistic approach to technology with a concern for situating technology within a larger context of practice that she terms the “technological system,” as defined by David Kingery (Ehrhardt 2005; Kingery 1993). Her research on the incorporation of European copper metals into Illinois metal-working technology emphasizes the dynamic nature of technological practice. Ehrhardt recognized that when Illinois incorporated European goods into their systems of representation, such systems were not truncated by colonial practices or material meanings. Rather, practitioners’ creative responses to the new materials and networks of distribution made them meaningful in their own terms. Ehrhardt’s approach departs from traditional analyses focused on the definition of cultural norms to a concern for the agency of practitioners. Ehrhardt adopts “a view of technology in which all technological activity is viewed as potentially innovative, creative, and imbued with multiple levels of social and ideological significance which can be revealed through detailed, fine-grained, finely textured analysis” (Ehrhardt 2005: 197). Sensitivity to the potential multiplicity of meanings layered within technological action is key to developing an approach that can begin to address the social construction of technological syncretism during the early colonial period.

Concepts such as Kingery’s notion of the technological system, Leroi-Gourhan’s concept of the chaîne opératoire (Lemmonier 1993), and Schiffer’s system of ‘behavioral chain analysis’ (Schiffer 1992), all stress the interconnectivity of technological practice. I refer the reader to Dobres (2000) for a more thorough review of this literature. Through the interconnectivity of technological practice, the agency of practitioners can establish social and material links between: 1) themselves and the landscape of procurement and associated concepts of ‘place;’ 2) related technological practices linked to the production process and their associated values and meanings; and 3) between other practitioners in diverse fields of practice. Viewed in this light, technological practice can be perceived as a form of collective action, and has the
potential to express the agency of communities of practice, communities that may or
may not be defined by a specific spatial locus or defined cultural ethos.

BETWEEN DYNAMISM AND STASIS: THE PARADOX OF CULTURAL
HYBRIDITY
Concepts of cultural hybridity, such as the recognition of processes of mestizaje or
creolization have been useful in critiquing the concept of acculturation which dominated
the literature on the early colonial period during the structural-functionalist period of
American Anthropology (Cusick 1998; Deagan 1983; 1998). Their primary value can
be said to rest in the recognition of agency on the part of colonized and subjugated
individuals in the formation of the multi-ethnic communities typical of the early
colonial period. Yet, as with the tacit assignment of observed technological style to a
fixed meaning related to a ‘cultural ethos,’ cultural hybridity concepts similarly and
unnecessarily categorize technical choices into categories of identification that may not
be the most relevant for understanding the historical contexts in question.

I recognize two potential problems with the unqualified use of terms of
cultural hybridity in early colonial studies, following critiques of the concept developed
by Alonso (2004) and Dean and Leibsohn (2003). First, terms of hybridity prioritize a
concept of ethnic identity as the main shaping factor in syncretic material culture,
therefore disregarding other factors of personal and social history, and, by doing so,
un-necessarily group diverse social and historical factors into a category of meaning
based on current political discourse. Dean and Leibsohn argue that current
conceptualizations of culture generally recognize its unbounded and dynamic nature
due to the recursive borrowing and reformulating of ideological, material and social
elements by agents in the formulation of social forms. Yet, when such mixings are
viewed in a colonial context, they appear to take on an added significance. The
recognition of hybridity in such contexts, they argue, is a product of a history of
discourse concerning the homogenization of difference into opposing entities:

The descriptive term “hybrid” therefore performs a double move: it
homogenizes things European and sets them in opposition to similarly
homogenized non-European conventions. In short, hybridity is not so
much the natural by-product of an “us” meeting a “them”, but rather
the recognition—or creation—of an “us” and a “them.” (Dean and
Leibsohn 2003: 6)

The formulation of hybridity as a concept is intimately tied to colonial discourses on the
nature of ethnic difference. These set conceptualizations of cultural purity regarding
European culture against a similarly applied notion of purity applied to pre-colonial
indigenous cultures. Integral to the formation of colonial social hierarchies, these discourses contributed to creating categories of identity based on degrees of mixing. Use of hybridity concepts are problematic because they are rooted in a taken-for-granted duality and thus tend to create narratives linking the agency of individuals to an unspoken struggle between opposed and homogenized ethnic identities.

This observation ties into the second part of the critique, namely that such terms are part of a post-colonial discourse involved with the attempt at fabricating a homogeneous national identity and retain the ‘taste’ of such nationalist meanings despite their use in resistance ideologies. As Alonso notes, particularly in the case of concepts of mestizaje in modern representations of Mexican history, hybridity is often used to promote a post-colonial national identity based on the equitable mixing of indigenous and European people and culture. This both masks the historical realities of subjugation and disenfranchisement experienced by various indigenous groups through the development of the modern nation state, and creates a further distinction between a perceived modern identity of hybridity versus a view of indigenous peoples as static and backward (Alonso 2004: 460).

The use of terms of hybridity, seen in this light, seems diametrically opposed to current archaeological research that is conceptualized as practice (sensu Bourdieu). Despite the apparent dynamism, a conceptual undercurrent of a normative and static culture concept is present in such terms. As in the case of applications of notions of technological style, rather than look at static cultural entities, it is perhaps more informative to look toward what Pfaffenberger has called the “meanings” of technological choices when attempting to understand the processes by which syncretic technologies are formulated. As he argues concerning the adoption of western technologies in post-colonial contexts:

This focus allows for a much more fine-grained analysis than one which assumes a cultural “variable” that is generally diffused throughout a culture, and for one very simple reason: meanings can vary without losing their potency. If we must assume that a “social ethos” is powerful only if it is held by all members of a culture, then it will be very difficult indeed to find any social ethos which is powerful enough to override all other considerations. If we assume that people act according to the meanings they ascribe to situations, however, and that these meanings vary from group to group within a culture, we can speak of a variety of behavioral responses to a situation, all of which are engendered by meanings, and all of which can potentially override other considerations—even though they contradict one another. To
take such a view is to see patterns of human action as a discourse, a cultural framework in which a variety of behavioral strategies are constructed from the ideological bricolage of a historical moment (Pfaffenberger 1993: 344).

Pfaffenberger, like Ehrhardt, recognizes that meanings and values constituent to a technology are dynamic, situational and related to a particular historical context. This dynamism can be one of contradiction and conflict as well as one of negotiated synthesis. Technological syncretism may be less associated with a mixing of practices, as it reflects a transient layering of relationships. This theme will be explored below in regards to the development of the early Spanish colonial mining industry in New Mexico and its intersection with Puebloan technologies of mineral procurement, processing and use.

THE SPANISH COLONIAL MINING INDUSTRY IN NEW MEXICO, 1540–1700

The establishment of the colony of New Mexico in 1598 was directly related to the expansion of the Spanish colonial silver-mining frontier. Many of the early attempts at colonization were motivated by the search for mineral wealth (Jones 1988). The technology and scale of early colonial mining and metallurgy in New Mexico are not well understood, though recent work conducted at the Pueblo of San Marcos and in the Cerrillos mining district is beginning to remedy this situation (Ramenofsky and Vaughan 2003; Vaughan 2001). The practice of metallurgy was introduced by the Spanish in the regions that are now the southwestern United States, and hence the context for technology transfer differs from those explored by Ehrhardt or those that existed in Mexico at the time of conquest, where traditions of metallurgy had a considerable time-depth (Ehrhardt 2005; Vargas 1995).

Of equal importance to the investigation of the processes by which metallurgy became adopted by indigenous groups in the southwest, is the investigation of the processes by which Spanish colonial technology became established in the remote region of New Mexico. The establishment of the mining industry in New Spain is not a self-evident process. Despite the unbelievable wealth of mineral deposits present in places like Zacatecas and Parral, the effective exploitation of those resources depended upon both the intricate mobilizations of capital, labor and the interrelationship of ancillary industries with the equally intricate social and legal systems of the Spanish colonial world (Couturier 2003; Sheridan 1992; Stein and Stein 2000). Historical and material records of the mining industry attest to the great effort expended on the transformation of European technology to meet the requirements of both the dry and
woodless environments of northern New Spain, and to the challenging peculiarities of the ore sources encountered there.

The viability of the mining industry was dependent upon the incorporation of indigenous practices and labor in both the formation of the technology and the practice of mining and smelting (Flores 1994; West 1949). The profitability of colonial silver mining depended upon the availability of indigenous labor, which was made possible through systems of tribute appropriated by colonial elites from pre-colonial state systems (Stein and Stein 2000). In some instances, ownership of mines and smelting facilities were retained by indigenous communities in Central Mexico into the 17th century, a century after conquest, suggesting that traditional skill developed by these communities played as much a part in the initial mining industry as the appropriation of labor (Barrett 1987).

Based on the historical development of the mining industry in New Spain in general, incorporation of Native American labor and skill must have been of key importance for the development of mining and metallurgy in New Mexico. The way that explorers and colonial officials attempted to assess the worth of potential mining regions within New Mexico sheds light on this dynamic. From the documentation of the Coronado Expedition in the 1540’s through to the re-conquest of New Mexico by Diego de Vargas in 1692, the perceived intersection of mineral resources, compliant Native American communities, and abundant wood and water resources, provided both a template and a motivation for continued attempts at the establishment of the industry and the colony.

HISTORICAL RECORD OF MINERAL EXPLORATION
Richard and Shirley Cushing Flint’s recent re-translation of the documents pertaining to the Coronado expedition stresses the importance of indigenous labor to colonization, recognizing that:

…the Coronado expedition and scores of others like it that took place during the 1500s were not primarily exploring parties bent on simply charting the unknown. Empty land was of little interest to them, regardless of its mineral or agricultural potential. Instead, they sought out people—specifically, people who possessed or produced high-value goods that might be appropriated by means of a kind of taxation (Flint and Flint 2005: 381).

This search for an integrated landscape of producers, goods and products placed a priority on the value of Native American labor. This is succinctly stated by Castañeda
de Nájera, one of the members of the Coronado expedition, in his assessment of the expedition as a failure:

I state that in a space of seventy leagues across that settled land and of a hundred and thirty leagues lengthwise along the Rio de Tiguex, no more peoples or settlements were seen or found than those already related. There are repartimientos in Nueva España with a greater number of people, and not just one but many. In many of those pueblos along the Rio de Tiguex there was a silvery metal, which they had in order to glaze pottery and paint their faces (Flint and Flint 2005: 422).

In this statement Castañeda de Nájera links mineral resources with the poverty of settlement along the Rio Grande in comparison to the densely populated areas of central Mexico. Rather than an indication of wealth, in relation to the economic dynamics of 16th century encomienda claims, this passage seems to suggest the improbability of an encomienda-based mining industry.

By the last decades of the 16th century, the nature of the mining industry in New Spain had changed. The mercury amalgam method of smelting silver ores was replacing the earlier technologies of smelting ores and extraction of precious metals with lead (West 1994). The abundant silver mines of Zacatecas (discovered in 1546), Guanajuato (1557) and Santa Barbara (1567) had pushed the mining frontier beyond central and west Mexico into the arid regions of northern New Spain (Sanchez-Crispin 1994). These mines had grown into large multi-ethnic settlements drawing resources from a wide area. This change in the nature of the mining industry is reflected in the renewal of claims of mineral wealth in New Mexico and the expeditions that followed.

The Espejo expedition of 1582, sent to New Mexico to recover two Franciscan Priests who went to evangelize the southern Tiwa as part of an earlier Chamuscado expedition, provided some of the first fairly detailed assessment of mineral resources in the region. Diego Pérez de Luján, the chronicler of the expedition, based on the way in which he approached the description of resources, must have held both a working knowledge of the mining industry and a familiarity with mineral deposits. Throughout his account he weights the availability and quality of potential ores with the proximity and availability of labor and wood resources. This is evident in his association of potential mineral wealth with his assessment of the population around Zuni:

Having received news of mines, God willing, we are going to discover them. I shall give an account of whatever takes place. At present I merely wish to say that if there are good mines this will be the best
land ever discovered, because the people of these provinces are industrious and peaceful (Hammond and Rey 1966: 184).

From Hopi, the expedition was led to mines west of the mesas. These were sources for the blue-green pigments noticed at Zuni and Hopi, yet upon being assayed they were shown to have no silver content and interest in the area waned. In his account, the recognition of a possible labor source that is both “industrious and peaceful” is given as much weight as the potential discovery of ore sources.

After the establishment of the colony in 1598, expeditions were sent out to areas reported to have mineral resources. The area visited by Luján was re-examined by an expedition led by Marcos Farfan de los Godos, the captain of the guard of the colony. Again proceeding from Zuni to Hopi, the expedition headed west, over the Little Colorado and past the San Francisco peaks, into what later became the copper mining district of northern Arizona in the American period. Relying upon Hopi guides, the expedition encountered rancherías within the mountains of non-Pueblo people, who were apparently processing minerals for pigments. After establishing contacts with leaders within each group, Farfan proceeded from settlement to settlement, being presented with “powdered ores of different colors” along with other gifts of food and animal hides. They were subsequently led to a mine “from which the Indians extracted the ores for their personal adornment and for the coloring of their blankets, because in this mine there are brown, black, water colored, blue and green ores (Bolton 1963: 224).”

Both the Farfan and the Luján documents are striking in their repeated reliance upon Native American informants for the location and assessed value of minerals. This begs the question: how, particularly in the early contact period, was this value established? How were Pueblo concepts of mineral qualities and values interpreted/translated into Spanish held values of mineral wealth and vice versa? It is apparent from both the route of exploration, and explicitly in the Farfan document, that ore bodies were being found based on the mineral procurement and processing techniques of Pueblo pigment technologies.

ETHNOGRAPHIC AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL DATA ON MINERAL USE
Moving between historical documents related to mineral prospecting by members of the entradas into New Mexico, ethnographic accounts of mineral use and significance by Pueblo artisans from the end of the 19th and early 20th centuries, and archaeological data for the use of minerals (particularly in the production of painted and glazed ceramic traditions), places the intersection of Spanish mining interests and Puebloan pigment processing into a larger social and technological context. The historical
documents cited above suggest that the early colonial mining and metallurgical industry in New Mexico was a result of the intersection of these two technological traditions. Approaching the intersection of Pueblo and Spanish mineral interests from a stylistic analysis suggests two research questions. To what degree were Pueblo individuals responsible for mineral procurement and processing in the new industry? How were the meanings ascribed to each technology negotiated or contested under the new colonial system?

One way to approach this issue is to refer to the ethnographic data gathered on mineral procurement from ethnographies of the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Elsie Clews Parsons, Ruth Bunzel, and Frank Hamilton Cushing all gathered data on mineral procurement and use, in part because of its close association with Pueblo ritual and the creation of Katchina masks. Due to the spiritual significance of pigments, mineral procurement and processing was found to be under the proprietary rights of Kiva societies. Parsons notes that mineral processing was conducted in a similar manner as parties conducted for the grinding of prayer-meal. Minerals that Parsons documents include the use of kaolin clay for a white pigment, copper ores such as malachite and azurite for a blue green color, hematite for red and pink colors, pyrolusite for black, and yellow hematite for yellow (Parsons 1966: 352-353). In addition to Parsons’ account, Cushing notes the use of both a lead and zinc rich mineral and specular hematite as a shiny black pigment (Cushing 1979: 92). Minerals collected from certain regions retained their geological association with the landscape, both Parsons and Cushing documented that color was also a symbolically imbued attribute of place, linked to aspects of the four directions. The importance of pigment was stressed by Parsons in her claim that “the pigments are what make the mask sacred” citing Bunzel’s remark that it also made them “valuable” (Bunzel 1929; Parsons 1966: 341).

These associations of meaning for pigment use are also indicated archaeologically, particularly in the development of glaze paint technology. Recent research on the ceramic technology of the proto-historic period in the Southwest has indicated that mineral use played a significant role in the expression of aspects of social identity on many levels. The use of glaze and paint design and mineral inclusions as temper may have played a role in establishing both inter- and intra-community identity, regional identity and religious ideology (Adams 1991; Crown 1994; Duff 2002; Graves and Eckert 1998; Habicht-Mauche 1993; Mills 2002). Glaze ware in particular played at least a materially significant role in the establishment of community identity in both the Eastern and Western Pueblo areas. The development of glaze ware styles in relation to wares derived from Mesa Verdean traditions appear to mark distinct regional associations to place and ideology. Habicht-Mauche, in her stylistic
analysis of Pueblo IV ceramics has argued that this trend can be conceptualized as a “localization” of production, begun in the thirteenth century, coupled with a “commodification” of crafts and raw materials that produced a shift away from an emphasis on local production and consumption, to local production for trade (Habicht-Mauche 1993: 96).

The commodification of crafts and raw materials appears to be linked to the increasing importance of the Katchina religion and the Southwest Regional Cult (Crown 1994). Snow suggests that the trend towards community specialization is driven by the need to obtain materials for ritual paraphernalia (Snow 1981). Following Adams (1991), many researchers have interpreted this phenomenon as related to the functioning of the Katchina religion, linking communities at a regional level. Similarly, through an analysis of decorative elements, Graves and Eckert argue that distinctions between glaze ware ceramics and the black-on-white traditions of the Biscuit Wares and Jemez Black-on-white reflect regional variations in belief systems (Graves and Eckert 1998). Rio Grande Glaze Ware, in their analysis, reflects a more Western Pueblo-derived ideology related to the spread of the Southwest Regional Cult.

Mineral procurement and processing for ceramic production can be viewed as intimately related to the creation of both community and regional ritual associations to place. Andrew Duff’s (2002) analysis of the production and consumption of wares in the Little Colorado region, in close proximity to the area explored by both Luján and Farfán, suggests that migrant households in the Pueblo IV period maintained historical associations to place through the crafting of specific wares. Duff presents a pattern of ceramic distribution which suggests that production and exchange of ceramics linked migrant households to the establishment of regional ideological associations. Such associations are ultimately related to the locations of mineral resources within the landscape and created metaphorical associations establishing the meaning of place through the practice of mineral procurement technologies.

TECHNOLOGICAL SYNCRETISM: LATE GLAZE CERAMICS AND THE EARLY COLONIAL MINING INDUSTRY
At the time of colonization, Pueblo IV lead- and copper-glazed wares were no longer being produced by the Western Pueblos. The Spanish mining industry apparently followed the trail of former mineral procurement for lead glaze to the east in finding ore bodies to exploit. Mining and smelting operations were established in proximity to the source of the minerals used for the Eastern Pueblo glaze ware traditions in the Galisteo basin, adjacent to the Cerrillos Hills source for lead and silver ores, and in the San Pedro Valley, adjacent to the copper and lead ores of the Sandia and San Pedro...
Mountains. After the establishment of the colony, glaze ware reappeared in the Zuni area with the manufacture of Hawikuh Black-on-red and Polychrome types. This ware is similar to Eastern Pueblo glaze ware ceramics suggesting a re-introduction of the tradition into the area from the center of Spanish mining interests. This reintroduction of glaze ware can be viewed in some ways as a technological syncretism both in the fact that its re-introduction was through colonial networks, and in its elements of visual design. Hawikuh glaze ware is distinctive in its incorporation of Roman cross motifs as well as eagle feather motifs associated with warfare. Katchina imagery typical of the proto-historic period also becomes both less prevalent and less visible on the ceramic design field perhaps in response to Franciscan attempts at suppression of ritual practice (Mills 2002). Similar changes occur on Eastern Pueblo ceramics as well, particularly in the increased obliteration of design elements through the use of copious amounts of runny glaze and through similar shifts in the placement of religious imagery to a more hidden location in the design field.

The establishment of the Spanish mining industry at the source of minerals needed for glaze manufacture suggest a link to these trends in ceramic production. Three archaeological sites within this area containing evidence for the continuity of proto-historic Puebloan mineral procurement and processing strategies appropriated by Spanish mining practices have recently been excavated: the Bethsheba Mine, San Marcos Pueblo, and Paa-ko (Bice et al 2003; Lycett 1997; 2001; 2004; Thomas 2002; Vaughan 2001). The Cerrillos Hills sources, including the Bethsheba Mine, have been recognized as the primary sources for lead material forming the basis of glaze paint recipes in both the pre-colonial and early colonial periods (Habicht-Mauche et al 2000). Excavation and survey of the Bethsheba mine has indicated a continuity of workings, where Spanish influenced mining proceeded from the exposure of ores created by pre-colonial Puebloan mining practices (Bice et al 2003). San Marcos Pueblo, the closest pueblo to the Cerrillos Hills, most likely played a large role in the distribution of this material in both periods and during the colonial period became one of the major Spanish mission sites in the Galisteo basin. The San Pedro Valley, where Paa-ko is located, though known to contain lead ores, contains pre-colonial mines for the extraction of copper minerals that date back to the 14th century (Cordell 1980). Both San Marcos and Paa-ko fit well within the criteria for the establishment of a mining district on the Spanish model, in that both are settled agricultural communities adjacent to ore, wood and water resources.

The historical component of Paa-ko was inhabited from the middle of the 16th century, before colonial occupation, and through the middle of the 17th century, possibly the 1670’s, at which point it was abandoned for residential purposes. Over the
last ten seasons, research conducted by the University of Chicago Field Studies Program has documented changes in plaza maintenance and use, patterns of change and continuity in open air work areas and corral systems linked to the incorporation of domestic animals into the pueblo’s economy, the establishment of a small church superimposed on one of two historic period Kivas, and the development of a metallurgical workshop adjacent to the historic plaza. The workshop, dated to the first half of the 17th century, is over 136 m² in area and appears to have been re-built, or re-modeled, at least seven times. My own research involving the metallographic and petrographic analysis of raw materials, products and byproducts of the manufacturing processes present at the site indicate a wide range of metallurgical techniques including the smelting of copper and lead ores, an attempt at lead-refining possibly for silver extraction, the forging of copper and iron artifacts, and the recycling of brass and bronze alloys obtained from other locations in the Spanish colonial mercantile system.

The excavations at Paa-ko indicate that there was a shifting emphasis on different minerals over time. Throughout the use life of the facility, certain remodeling episodes were associated with the shift in focus from copper bearing ores to lead bearing ores. The earliest working surface of the industrial terrace at Paa-ko is heavily embedded with ground copper carbonate ore and copper slag, a byproduct of the smelting operation. Stratigraphically, this surface is immediately capped by another use episode containing features, ores and byproducts primarily associated with metallurgical processing of lead sulfate ores. By the end of the use life of the facility, the excavated material again is dominated by copper carbonate ores and associated smelting debris.

Other aspects of the metallurgical terrace suggest the inclusion of Puebloan technological practice within the facility. Within one of the surfaces associated with lead ore processing, features associated with lead glaze ceramic production were encountered. These consisted of a series of tabular cobble pedestals within a bed of wood charcoal containing fragments of lead ore, reminiscent of ceramic firing platforms encountered at sites in the Galisteo Basin and documented ethnographically (Plog 1997). Puebloan masonry and adobe construction techniques composed most of the smelting terraces walls and features. Adobe used at the site is both puddled, a traditional indigenous technique of adobe manufacture in the Southwest, and made into bricks, a Spanish technological introduction. Both techniques for manufacture use a fabric containing a high sand content and straw or grass inclusions that is different in composition from pre-colonial period adobe recovered from excavations at the site. Of particular interest is the apparent inclusion of ventilation systems reminiscent of Kiva ventilation shafts within the open air combustion features of the terrace. These features
are adobe and stone lined shafts linking ventilation openings with bin-like features most likely used for the reprocessing of metals and the forging of iron (Lycett 1999).

This evidence for syncretism in the technology at Paa-ko, interpreted in light of the historical documents of prospecting expeditions, can be viewed as representing the inclusion of Pueblo individuals into the basic operations of the smelting and metal processing technology. The shift in ore use over time may represent a shift in the relationship between the technological system at Paa-ko and the resources within the landscape of the San Pedro Valley. The relationship between landscape and mining technology, as demonstrated in the historical and ethnographic data sets, was often mediated by Pueblo people. The switch from copper ores to lead ores and back again can be read as a process of negotiation between Puebloan and Spanish colonial knowledge and values concerning ore types. As indicated from the ethnographic record, a demand for particular minerals probably directly affected the preparation of ritual material. As most likely the proprietary rights of Kiva societies, Spanish mineral demands would have directly conflicted with the organizational and political structures of the Pueblo.

DISCUSSION AND POST-SCRIPT

The continuity exhibited in Puebloan practice concerning mineral use through the early colonial period, as evidenced by the continuation of mining practices in the Bethsheba mine, in the distribution and production of lead glaze at San Marcos Pueblo, and in the incorporation of pre-colonial practices and mineral preferences in the metallurgical technology at Paa-ko, not only demonstrates a penchant for Spanish colonial industry to develop along pre-colonial roots, but also a direct involvement of Puebloan technological knowledge within one of the primary industries of early colonial New Mexico. This syncretism highlights the position of Puebloan agency within two spheres of collective action: 1) the production of ritual paraphernalia under the auspices of Kiva societies and the signaling of such association on the design fields of glazed ceramics, and 2) the Spanish colonial mining industry and associated systems of value, linking qualities of minerals to wealth acquisition and social mobility. Occupying a space between the two, Pueblo artisans participating in metallurgy and mining technologies could potentially join both spheres of action. This could allow for communities of practitioners to mobilize traditional networks of social relationships within the newly established colonial technological system in order to manipulate the system to a community’s advantage. Such collective actions would allow for communities to use traditional knowledge to gain benefits within the colonial system such as access to livestock or colonial exchange relationships, as evident at Paa-ko. It could also allow for
The effective mobilization of resistance through collective action that crossescuts indigenous and colonial networks is documented in the historical record of Pueblo rebellion to Spanish rule. Many of the individuals linked to the organization of rebellion in the last half of the 17th century occupied such spaces, working within both collectivities. Esteban Clemente, a Spanish appointed governor of the Salinas pueblos, instigated revolt in the 1660’s through bridging Catholic and traditionalist communities. His dual involvement in the Spanish government and Kiva societies most likely gave him both authority and the ability to mobilize action between the two social networks (Kessell 1987; Knaut 1995). Clemente’s rebellion was short lived and unsuccessful, but similar mobilizations occurred in the successful rebellion of 1680. Based on a re-vitalization of Katchina imagery and symbolism, coupled with the appropriation of Spanish symbols of power, disparate Pueblo groups joined in rebellion through exploiting the networks of communication present between Kiva societies and within mission communities.

The revolt of 1680 also marked the end of the glaze ware tradition. Glaze ware was no longer made in either Western or Eastern Pueblos and was replaced by matte-paint polychromes. As Barbara Mills has demonstrated for Zuni, these wares replace pre-revolt wares, such as Hawikuh Glaze Ware, and demonstrate striking similarity in decorative style between different pueblos. Significantly, Katchina imagery is also absent from the new decorative medium. Mills suggests that at Zuni, the break with glaze paint technology was due to its association with its introduction in the mission system (Mills 2002: 93). This also suggests that the layering of meanings within glaze paint technology became either unnecessary or unwanted. The extraction of lead minerals from the Bethseba mine also appears to have ceased until well into the re-establishment of the colony in the 1750’s. The use of these minerals are disassociated from Katchina imagery in ceramic production and yet are used to express the visual effect of revolt in their use in face paint by the rebels and in the directive by the leaders of the revolt to re-institute the painting of Katchina masks.

CONCLUSION
The technological syncretism recognized in both metallurgical practices and the glaze painting technology of the early colonial period in New Mexico can be viewed as an uneasy layering of meaning and practice specific to its historical moment. The apparent mixing of cultural elements recognized from our distanced perspective as investigators...
of material culture belies the underlying historical tensions and processes of negotiation that led to the creation of such industries. Viewing these resultant practices as a nexus for the mobilization of collective action that crosscuts the diverse social networks present within early colonial communities places an emphasis on understanding the conflicting meanings embodied by the material culture of colonialism. Similarly, this shifts our focus in the attempt at understanding resistance to colonial domination from a model that posits competing static cultural entities engaged in individual struggles of resistance, to a model that recognizes the shifting associations and mobilizations of collective action linking communities of practice across seemingly opposed cultural institutions.
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ABSTRACT
A consideration of ‘cultures of contact’ for contemporary archaeological practice necessarily involves engagements with non-archaeologists or local stakeholders. These discussions in the literature tend to revolve around ethics. That is, the ethical responsibility on the part of archaeologist to increasingly involve a public that has strong associations with sites that archaeologists study and work at. This paper assays the burgeoning literature devoted to the topic, and makes the claim that ethics is not the right trench to be digging in. This is because the fundamental issues which fuel the debate over whether to involve local stakeholders are at core epistemological dilemmas. Operating according to the deeply ingrained epistemological tradition of correspondence theory, archaeology faces a crisis of ‘doing the right thing’ ethically and incorporating ‘subjective’ values into archaeological representations or retaining objective representations and circumscribing non-archaeological participation. The paper fills out this assessment by examining two archaeological projects from two different contexts: a Traditional Cultural Property in the United States; and the UNESCO World Heritage site of Teotihuacán, Mexico. Pragmatic principles of knowledge justification, a ‘third-party’ philosophical tradition eschewing correspondence theories of objectivity, are discussed as a neither/nor solution to the current ethics-epistemology crisis. Implementing a ‘mediating archaeology’, based upon pragmatic justification of archaeological knowledge, is discussed in relation to an ongoing project at Teotihuacán.
IS THERE A DILEMMA OF CONTACT?

As way of introduction, I think it first important to explain what this ‘dilemma’ is all about. Such a ‘full-stop’ word does wonders in academia by underscoring the importance of inconsistencies in reasoning which were overlooked; or, more likely, felt to be satisfactorily dealt with as to not warrant such a red-light signifier. And the very reaction of audiences to dropping ‘dilemma’ in a title quickly breaks down the range of reactions to a full spectrum. Yet, as we might expect, the spectrum refracts between two poles: those immediately put off by such words in a mature archaeology where intractable problems have long been mused over (and solved?); and those curious as to what the ‘dilemma’ could represent for archaeology—for me to explain myself.

With currency of talk in the human sciences leaning away from binaries, unification or such ‘poles of reaction’, why might I still insist upon the divisiveness of a two-horned dilemma? Though my approach is aware of the entire spectrum of sentiments, I am going to argue from the premise that unless the concerns of the two extremes are addressed, the middling reactions tend to ignore inconsistencies and go about business as usual. Analogous to a bi-partisan political system, there simply rests the reassurance that pulls in two directions inexorably compromise for the ‘middle’. With statistics, a mode, medium or mean of data are incalculable without defined limit values on either side of a distribution. And like the predictable reactions to the term ‘dilemma’, I will argue that there are two limit-defining reactions in current archaeological discussions of ‘stakeholder groups’, or ‘non-archaeological interest groups’, that a social or anthropological archaeology engaged with ‘cultures of contact’ ought to consider more closely. (At the outset, I must disclaim that I am going to assume the necessity of such discussions themselves, particularly in countries such as Australia, Canada, the United States, and New Zealand, as such informing predilection was the inspiration for the current volume).

In this paper, I want to suggest a third party, and outline the tenements of a third movement which, though wider than and gaining momentum outside of archaeology, has yet to be seriously discussed in the discipline. While such a sensibility or ‘third party approach’, what I am tagging ‘mediating archaeology’, must be discussed later, at the outset I want to identify its legacy of crossing well-worn, extradisciplinarian divides between analytic-continental philosophy, science-humanities, objectivism-subjectivism, fact-value and so forth. Such pragmatic thought has derived from a curious imbroglio of post-positivist philosophy and ethnography and has been applied in the trenches of the science wars with science and technology studies (STS). Acknowledging my influence at the beginning will aid in anticipating the movement I
am wanting to push for, highlight my intellectual debts and, critically, mobilize historical case studies for why I feel such recent thinking not only is appropriate for archaeology and its most divisive issue, but why archaeological practice is form-fit to contribute to such thinking as well. Indeed, archaeology has historically and continues to sit atop a humanities-natural science split and, as a consequence, has developed a unique sensibility of practice that cannot be properly located in either camp or in a hybrid of the two. As I will draw out, this archaeological sensibility is a pragmatic sensibility. As the discipline has little discussed pragmatic thought, the time is right for an identification of this unique sensibility against the backdrop of a contrastive problem.

My conclusion that there exists an ethics-epistemology crisis fracturing archaeology along reactive lines is based upon the burgeoning literature addressed to such anxiety (Bender 1998; Bray 2001; Carmichael 1994; Hodder 2004; Lynot and Wylie 1995; Meskell 1998; Kehoe Nelson 1990; Nicholas and Andrews 1997; Patterson Schmidt 1995; Swidler et al. 1997; Vitelli 1996; Zimmerman et al. 2003. The more acrimonious exchanges tend to constitute ‘manifestos’ for or against such inclusion and are lime-lighted in the flurry of scholarly journal articles: Anyon and Ferguson 1995; Fotiadis 1993; Goldstein and Kintigh 1991; Green et al. 2003; Hale 2002; Hemming 2000; Hodder 2002; Marshall 2002; Mason 2000; McGuire 1992; Meighan 1992; Meskell 2002; Mulvaney, 1991; Oyuela-Caycedo et al. 1997; Politis 2001; Powell et al. 1993; Shepherd 2003). I will briefly discuss my own work with governmental archaeology in the United States, as well as my on-going project at Teotihuacán, Mexico. For academics what better diagnostic is there than literary output? Such output has revolved centripetally around topics of ‘archaeological ethics’ and ‘indigenous’ or ‘non-archaeological stakeholders’. This is the archaeological-scape of post-NAGPRA familiar to many of us, encompassing the horizon of even those archaeologists not directly working in compliance with mandatory statutes or in highly politicized contexts. Why might this be so? Why is recent discussion of ethics so visible in professional society debates, at conference proceedings and in the literature? Is this evidence of the dilemma of which I am trying to convince you?

I want to put forward that it is not ethics per se that grabs our attention and preoccupies us. Ethical conduct certainly is an admirable compass point for orienting professional paths. Yet what the discussions of ethics rarely directly address, but which drives the more public debates, is epistemology, or questions over a theory of knowledge for archaeological reasoning (although notable exceptions include Mason 2000; Watkins 2000; Watkins 2001; Wylie 2002; Zimmerman 2001). Epistemology is as troubling as it sounds. A mention of the word conjures stuffy, abstract reasoning and
worse, rules of logic. None of which would square very well with the idea of 
archaeology as a hands-on (and dirty) activity ‘out there’ in some remote location. 
What would archaeology have to do with this hallowed specialization of philosophy, 
with the study of the nature of knowledge and justification? However, archaeology, 
more than most other disciplines in either the sciences or humanities, has many hurdles 
to jump in getting from the down and dirty of field work to accepted knowledge claims 
of just what happened ‘out there’ in the past. There are all sorts of epistemological 
warnings which flash when archaeological reasoning goes about bridging past and 
present, from objects in ruin in the present to subjects in the past. All of this 
complicated further by the fact that archaeology, unlike the experimental sciences or 
textual humanities, ‘destroys’—or at least transforms—the tenuous remnants of 
evidence it does have in its pursuit of explaining this tattered evidence. So while many 
archaeologists, even those who have contributed to epistemological debates in the 
discipline, feel its time to get-on with the doing of archaeology (Cowgill 1993, 
Flannery 1973, 1982), or at the least to merge the rampant theorizing with the dirt and 
field of practice (e.g. Hodder 1991, 8, 1999; Watson 1991, 272-3), the deflection to 
ethics will, I argue, only deepen divides amongst archaeologists as core inclinations 
formed by epistemological leanings only get buried. Particularly when the discipline is 
involved not only in internal, ‘theoretical’ wranglings, but, as it increasingly operates 
in a post-colonial or postmodern setting, is mandated from external interests to 
incorporate equally imbedded, non-western or local ideas about what counts as 
knowledge.

While there were early, pre-NAGPRA cooperative projects that placed 
priority on consultation and inclusion of non-archaeologists, it was the binding 
legislation of 1990 which sparked such a controversy. And some of those involved in 
the legislation, such as Echo-Hawk and Trope (2000) as well as early commentators 
(Mason 2000), pin-pointed the divisive issue at the root: NAGPRA, particularly 
section 7, paragraph a (25 U.S.C.A.§7(a)4) mandates the consideration of folklore, 
kinship and ‘oral history’ in establishing ‘cultural affinity’ for claims to repatriate 
cultural material and/or human remains. Additionally, the following section 8 
(ibid.§8(b)a-c) prescribes punitive damages to insure compliance. Now, NAGPRA’s 
full statutes have already been discussed somewhat, and I leave full exegesis to those 
more qualified (see esp. Echo-Hawk and Trope 2000; Mihesuah 2000). My point in 
citing this particular section of the binding legislation is to underscore that, yes, 
NAGPRA demands consultation with archaeological stakeholders—Watkins’ 
‘legiethics’—but, fundamentally, it sets up as an outcome for such consultation the 
altering of standards of evidence in archaeological reasoning. I believe this is what
Wylie (2002, 243-4) presciently (and optimistically) acknowledges when she sees ‘non-scientific goals’ requiring ‘productive transformation’ of the discipline; and Zimmerman (2000, 2001) when he sees the development of a ‘new and different archaeology’. A few other scholars on both sides of the spectrum I mentioned earlier also anticipate the epistemological challenges and adjustments for the discipline (Mason 2000; Echo-Hawk 2000; Zimmerman 2001, 170).

It is not the consultation process with the public interested in archaeology which is the source of anxiety (though some may abjure even from this). I believe most archaeologist have an inherent interest in communicating to the public about their research. And some, stemming from familiarity of the debate in archaeology concerning ethnographic analogy and ethno-archaeology, would probably agree that consultation with stakeholders, at a minimum, may in fact helpfully expand the range of models and potential hypotheses for testing (more of this later). So while there is ‘more work’, particularly of a bureaucratic kind, there may be pay-offs for archaeological reasoning as conceived in deductive or inferential modes. Additionally, with ethical codes of professional societies (such as Society of Professional Archaeologists (SOPA) or Society of American Archaeology (SAA)) setting the expectation for consultation as professionally respectable, there really seems little point in debating the need for ethics in archaeology. What still may be usefully debated, with respect to ethics of inclusion, is the degree or scope of involvement based upon underlying ethical models utilized (Intuitionism, Formalism, Contractarianism, Teleological, etc) and this, contrary to how it is framed, rests on issues of epistemology. So, to convince you of this, I want to turn attention to the ‘epistemology-engine’ (cf. Ihde and Selinger 2005) driving the discipline and why it has broken down. Reparations are in order, but not in first order to ‘the Other’ of archaeology. Following the sage maxim “put your own house in order before attending to your neighbor’s”, fixing the engine will drive the ethical change necessary down the road.

DRIVING THE GREAT DIVIDE: REPRESENTATION AND ITS TWO-LANE HIGHWAY

Now, to demonstrate I am not just a ‘post-ism anthro-apologist’ hooking onto a bit of legislation to wield deconstruction of traditional standards of practice, let us get specific. An exploration of the dominant reactions to non-archaeological inclusion will prompt an appeal to the alternate-party approach I stated above. An anticipation of the change to the discipline may take two tracks depending upon the received-view that is dominant in particular archaeological camps.
The controversy over the status and admissibility of ‘oral history’ within alternate patterns of argument in archaeology is a good place to begin. In a series of exchanges in *Antiquity*, Roger Echo-Hawk (2000) and Mason (2000) debated the evidential status of such history, and how/if it should be incorporated into archeological models of past mechanisms and processes. Mason argued vehemently that oral history and other established lines of archaeological evidence were simply ‘irreconcilable’ due to oral history lacking several key, shared characteristics: ‘rational’, ‘open to verification’, ‘search for order via reductionism’ (Mason 2000, 240). The scientism in Mason’s dismissal is apparent if unsurprising. The crux for Mason is that oral history cannot be demonstrably related to physical, real processes. Thus it is relegated to ‘entertainment’ (Mason 2000, 263). Though he does not explicitly state his position on analogical reasoning, his argument indicates that oral history would fall short in either the additional capacities of building potential hypotheses (use in abduction) or as a converging form of evidence for more robust, causal claims. For Mason, therefore, we can say that he launches an epistemological argument against the mandated inclusion of oral testimony that authors such as Echo-Hawk are proposing.

Echo-Hawk disputes the discrediting of oral history as particularistic, subjective and lacking causal relation to identifiable physical processes. He cites the Arikara testimony as long-term history of North America (2000, 267-70). In the paper, he does two things which are of immediate interest. One, he assumes the veridical nature of the oral account and re-designates it ‘oral record’; and two, as a record, he advocates its complementary usage with the archaeological record for reconstruction of the past. It is less for analogical reasoning than as a ready-made parallel account useful for bolstering other lines of evidence in explanation by convergence. Roger Echo-Hawk (2000, 270-2) suggests a similar realist stance to oral history as a ‘complimentary’ source of evidence.

The debate over how to integrate stakeholder participation, in this case the status of oral history, revolves around not ethics, but around the informing epistemological positions and their mutual compatibility. Such discussions that attend to the details of how to incorporate non-archaeological stakeholders turn not on what is ethically right, but on what is right. Additionally, the oral history debate refracts a general prism for viewing one of the lanes (of the two I alluded to earlier) the discipline

---

1 Others have contributed assessments concerning the status of oral history and its place in archaeological explanation, particularly Anyon et al 1996; Anyon et al 1997; Ferguson et al 1997. Two commentators draw explicit and reasoned accounts for and against the incorporation of oral history in archaeological explanation (see Mason 2000; Echo-Hawk 2000).
is taking over the dilemma. I will call it realist-circumscription. Debated in epistemological terms, those tending towards a realism hold that, irrespective of the specific (and usually multiple) tactics of argument employed—whether nomothetic-deductive, inferential model building, statistical modeling, analogical reasoning, etc.—the goal of archaeological inquiry will be to approximate the actual, preferably causal, conditions which obtained in the past. It is a reconstructive effort to mirror in arguments the selected-for conditions responsible for the archaeological record. Obviously there will be a range of diversity with respect to both scale and scope of these causal factors, depending upon the informing position. So they may range from large syntheses aiming high for general and widespread covering-laws, or they may start inductively, building from more local and ephemeral details, to posit less subsuming factors.

For involvement of non-archaeological audiences, a sweep of the literature establishes a coherent pattern of involvement of stakeholders via induction to normative archaeological methodology and theory based upon this overall stance to reconstruction. Thus participation, even if untoward such as the proposal of an alternate (oral) history, is incorporated into a realist framework for sharpening the archaeological image of the past. Such a response to stakeholder participation makes historical sense as the discipline already has an extant body of theoretical literature going back to the early 20th century discussing methods for enriching the ‘source-side’ of models for testing. A common thread to such positions, whether aligned specifically with deductive and inductive positions, is the ability for non-archaeological record ‘sources’ to add robustness to the interpretation of the record. Among such positions, ethnoarchaeology, ethnographic analogy, and standpoint theory may be identified as practices oriented towards enriching ‘source side’ parameters for subsequent testing against the ‘subject side’ of the record (Wylie 1989, 1992). Some may even propose radically unexpected ‘models’ for testing. The overall goal is a better, more objective representation of past.

This seems common-sensically sound, but such a realist-circumscription approach begins to break down when apparently incommensurable conceptual schemes for determining ‘desired knowledge’ and evaluative principles are warranted, as with Traditional Cultural Properties (TCP’s) and sacredness as a ‘causal’ explanation for and criterion of ‘significance’ (King 2003; developing from Bulleting 38 of the National Park Service, see Parker and King 1990). Such post-NAGPRA amendments to the
National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA)\(^2\) problematize such an incorporative approach where stakeholder participation is limited to an application of, and education in, this normative archaeological framework—a ‘confined’ participation as trained-archaeologist. As Parker and King (1990) outline for identification and evaluation of TCPs in the States under new National Park Service (NPS) guidelines, a site may be ‘a-archaeological’ under normative definitions lacking even—as with the case of Mount Shasta for instance—substantive archaeological material. Nevertheless, Bulletin 38 stipulates the consideration of TCPs as significant and amenable to National Register protection, despite the acknowledgement that the criteria for establishing significance does not necessarily entail the presence of artefacts. Instead, the criteria discuss the local valorization and usage of locales that hold significance for cultural practices.

A case in point is a site documented by myself for the US Forest Service on the Commanche National Grasslands (Webmoor 2003). The paucity of diagnostic surface material and lack of sub-soil deposits all, under standard NHPA section 106 criteria, lead to a determination of the site as ‘unlikely to contribute significantly to an understanding of prehistory’ and thus ‘insignificant’ and not eligible for inclusion on National Register for protection (FIGURE 1). However, when told by representatives from the Comanche Tribal Council of Oklahoma that the ephemeral site was a vision-questing locale, ‘significance’ could be conferred based upon local attribution of ‘sacredness’. Additionally, subsequent documentation proved contentious as even the disclosure (GPS coordinates) of the ‘site’ on State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) forms was contested. In the literature, such incongruous valorizations of ‘the past’ may border on outright acrimony, with charges of ‘scientific imperialism’ (White Deer 1997) or further ‘co-optation of alterity’ by ‘western discourse’ (Gnecco 1999), not to mention the more mainstream media commentary by Vine Deloria Jr. (1997). As counter-productive as such outright declarative characterizations seem to most archaeologists, there is legal leverage (particularly in the United States under NAGPRA and NHPA amendments) for demanding determination and control of archaeological sites.\(^3\) Again, as with issues of oral history, the controversy revolves not around ethical

\(^2\) The National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966 (Public Law 89-665) established the framework for conducting archaeology in the United States on public land or with public funds which is still utilized in its rudiments today. Expansion of the National Register of Historic Places, establishment of an Advisory Council to adjudicate compliance, and detailing the Section 106 process for insuring compliance—regulated through 36CFR 60 and 36CFR 800—were all ushered in under the sweeping legislation.

\(^3\) Kennewick Man provides the complementary example to archaeological sites, where vituperative exchanges vocalize the gravity of the stakes for scientific-sovereignty negotiation, see Watkins 2001; Watkins 2003.
issues of whether to consult with local tribal councils or not (as it is mandated for section 106 compliance), but the epistemological wrangling of how to correlate or mitigate the at times intractable frameworks for knowing a site such as a TCP.

Dissimilarly, however, to the conglomerate of responses within an archaeological framework to an issue such as oral history which I have adumbrated, another course-of-action taken by some archaeologists, where such ‘ethno-philosophies’ abut, tacks an alternate but well established response. These move along the spectrum of types of understanding coined by Wilhelm Dilthey away from *erklärun* towards *verstehen*. From a cultural and social perspective, such moves away from compatibility of frameworks, far from threatening epistemic soundness, provide the subjective and personally mediated, and so all the more humanistic, insight into the human experience. Subtle existential details are precisely what tend to be glossed in *realist-circumscrib* programs. So the other direction on the two-lane road I am using as a metaphor tends toward an anthropologizing of archaeology, placing interpretive goals on a more nuanced, personal and socio-political context.4

A PRAGMATIC NOTION OF HUMAN INQUIRY AND MEDIATING ARCHAEOLOGY

While the majority of negotiations lie along the spectrum between these general poles I have identified, such as descriptive accompaniment to more quantitative data on causal factors, the impasse in operating assumptions and goals for archaeological knowledge is apparent—particularly for those here at Stanford. As I assay the contemporary situation, we inherit the following consequence: our neo-liberal values of the academy urge us to be inclusive (and of course ethical) while retaining our inherited adherence to epistemological safeguarding. Such a personal and intellectual inconsistency places us in a compromising position. Let me again summarize the resulting maneuvers along the circumscribed spectrum: 1) archaeologists outright confine rational inquiry to epistemological standards to ensure objectivity and so exclude stakeholder opinion; 2) more middling-way and less conflict producing is to ‘include’ stakeholders in rational inquiry albeit circumscribed by adherence to standards of archaeological practice developed according to the correspondence (objectivity) goal in mind; or 3) (less common in discipline) move to anthropological inclusion where descriptive inclusion on the part of stakeholders is included alongside more traditional archaeological

---

4 Hacking 1999 draws the keen insight that there may be more similar ontological maneuvering than expected, with ‘social constructivism’ replacing ‘external reality’ with ‘society’ as the bedrock of causal determinism. For a parallel questioning of the premises of ‘social archaeology’, see Witmore and Webmoor 2007.
accounts of archaeological material. I would argue that all three adjustments are negative in the sense that they want to minimize the hybridization of results which would, under the belief in correspondence, relegate such archaeological inquiry to ‘biased’, ‘politically motivated’ or value-laden.

So while not black and white—with a range of re-formulations of practice based upon external mandates and ethical recognition—along the spectrum, all three approaches falter upon the still dominant worry to produce ‘Representationalist’ account of ‘the Past’. Why is this not productive? My thesis is this: the apparent conflict between ethics and epistemology is only driven by a correspondence theory of truth—old Platonic distinctions between knowledge and rhetoric/opinion, reality and appearance, and fact and value. Such defining conditions regarding what constitutes beneficial knowledge lingers from the vestiges of an epistemological tradition most forcefully convened by logical-positivists with the ‘cognitive significance’ demarcation criterion. These dichotomies must be re-threaded in order to operate with a more common endeavor in archaeology without the fracturing tension pulling in two centrifugal directions.

The shift that I am arguing for—with influences of pragmatism, in the American tradition—is not entirely new to the discipline (e.g. Gaffney 1987); but it requires an abeyance of inherited notions of correspondence as being the definition of ‘truth’ in human inquiry, and the re-framing of what we believe is the desired end result. What difference does the notion of ‘right representation’ do? Thinkers such as James (1907) and Peirce (1955) suggest that a representationalist account just does not go very far:

Grant an idea or belief to be true [but] what concrete difference will its being true make in anyone’s actual life? How will the truth be realized? . . .What, in short, is the truth’s cash-value in experiential terms? (James 1907, 114).

As James continues,

…the fact that the possession of true thoughts means everywhere the possession of invaluable instruments of action…and that our duty to gain truth, so far from being a blank command from out of the blue…can account for itself by excellent practical reasons. . . [truth] passes from cold-storage to do work in the world, and our belief in it grows active (Ibid., 115).

Truths do work in the world; they pay. Analogous to health, strength, happiness and other processes connected with getting-on in life, ‘truth’ from the pragmatist account is simply a collective name for processes that are made in an on-going negotiation with
experience. We can think of it as something possessed or inherent, but this abstracts the phenomena under inquiry and cuts the life-ties to in-action that gives truth its recognizable functions. Rather than static or essentialist, justification is a process that helps us deal, both practically and intellectually, with our articulations in the world. And because of this active-quality, ‘truth’ is a ‘leading-to’, or a becoming, which integrates us better and more fully with experience. It is a tool for fulfilling functional purposes, however diverse these purposes are defined.5

Rethought in Dewey’s (1957) and Rorty’s (1979) metaphor as adaptive tool, ‘truth’ makes no claim to the accurate mirroring of ‘nature’ or ‘external reality’. Building upon the failure of positivist-led analytic philosophy to tag particularistic bits of reality with bits of language as direct correlation—such as Russell’s atomistic program—thereby laying a correspondence foundation for more complex (synthetic) statements about reality, the pragmatists emphasize that truths do work. This move obviates the skeptical gap (long historically established) that opens between words, representational media, knowledge claims and ‘external reality’. Instead of ‘fit’ to reality as representation, the question is (pragmatically) reformulated. If a knowledge claims is ‘good’, it is kept as an operating principle not because of axiomatic reasoning or non-falsification by hypothetico-deductive testing, but because it aids our various endeavors in negotiating experience.

As the methodological touchstone of archaeology, let us consider mapping as a case in point. There have been debilitating critiques, particularly from post-colonial quarters, of the inherent bias of western cartography and its representational ‘scopic regime’ (Harley 1992 for the most strident critique). Yet would any archaeologist step into the field without a map? Even a phenomenologist wandering the moors of England and looking for non-textually inscribable relationships between material remains and landscape carries a map. I daresay otherwise s/he would get lost. So why universally utilize the map despite being a relative (i.e. ‘western’) medium which cannot irrefutably establish its correspondence to ‘out there’. Because our experience with maps is that, more than any other navigating or organizing tool, they work. The map works like a cognitive and sensory prosthesis in the hands of a map-user (Webmoor 2005 on ‘mapwork’). Without it, the archaeologist cannot perform the same work as

5 Pragmatism is not a ‘relativism’ as there is no skeptical questioning of the causal relations to world, Putnam 1995. If anything, pragmatism assumes from the outset—as it considers the legacy of Descartes’ methodological doubt to be a mistaken precedent—direct, casual enmeshment with the world, cf. ‘retrodiction’ in Rescher 2005. It is Davidson himself who offers a ‘triangulation’ notion of language and understanding directed at undercutting the relativism of conceptual schemes and paradigms of scientific research, Davidson 1985.
with it. And a map (of course) does not work as a navigating and orienting tool except when associated with a located map-reader. Having a map will enable not only certain decisions (such as where to survey, where to excavate, where to predict subsoil deposits), but will likely ‘suggest’ these possibilities. The map is a pragmatic tool par excellence. Like a Heideggerian ‘tool-to-hand’, when thought about in a course-of-action, the map confounds any traditional epistemological discussions of representational accuracy. It is a cyborg-like mixture of people/things which in action cannot be purified out (for mixtures in archaeology, see Webmoor and Witmore 2007).

So, far from relativism, pragmatists divest themselves of the realist’s positing of a skeptical ‘gap’ between words and things, and discard the realist-idealist distinction in epistemology that was misguided from the outset. Instead, the ‘cash value’ is placed upon practical efficacy in obtaining specific goals. If such a characterization smacks of common-sense, it should. When we stand back from our theoretical positionings there is therapeutic recognition of how archaeologists routinely operate in the field, in the planning of projects, or in the laboratory. If it was once said that archaeological interpretation is ‘data-led’ (cf. Hodder 1999), it seems more appropriate to say that archaeological practice is in fact goal-led. We can say there is an irreducible theory-data relationship, but to say so is only meaningful in the context of archaeological work; and in-action, all pursuit is practical pursuit geared towards immediate and long-term goals. We hold our practical goals much more intimately than our theoretical ‘biases’. While simplistic (though not a simplistic instrumentalism), there is much to be gained from acknowledging our pragmatic sensibility.

Updating Dewey and James, Rorty (2000) and Putnam (1995, 2002) push the image of truth as tool, not as ‘mirror of nature’. In doing so, their emphasis links-up with a host of students of science such as Hacking (1983, 1999) who, involved in experimentation, acknowledges that truth of things is assumed (not questioned from the outset) if they are instrumentally useful (the veracity of his sprayed sub-atomic particles). Ideas are not judged on terms of their supposed picturing capacity—in fact, Hacking would disavow (along with his positivist predecessors) such theoretical realism. Truths are kept if they fulfill goals and practical tasks. And much the same movement has taken shape in Science and Technology Studies (particularly Actor-Network-Theorists and notables such as Latour) where the epistemological gap raised by skepticism is closed as a result of not being useful in characterizing the increasingly inter-connected networks of people-things (such as the archaeological map) (e.g. Callon 1997; Latour 1999; Law and Hassard 1999). Instead of these representational goals for knowledge, pragmatic thinkers emphasize identifying multiple, practical goals
and setting to work to see, through the causal constraints of reality, which will function best in meeting these values. Thus, there is a Darwinian/naturalized characterization to knowledge which intersects with the idea of stakeholder participation: the more courses-of-action undertaken with various practical goals in mind, the more democratic the inquiry process, the more likely that broadly useful truths serving the practical needs of society will emerge (cf. Dewey 1925, 1957 and his democratic inquiry).

As a case in point in global heritage, there are over 69,000 denizens of the Valley of Teotihuacán, Mexico, with several thousand more each year emigrating from Mexico City 45 km to the southwest. Situated at the border (at the boundary of federal property) of five growing pueblos is the UNESCO World Heritage site of Teotihuacán itself (FIGURE 2). The recent construction of a Wal-Mart within the site’s peripheral zone garnered much national and international media attention and mobilized local residents, valley merchants, and spiritual leaders (FIGURE 3), as well as Mexico City intellectuals, around the debate pitting transnational, economic interests versus values of national and symbolic ‘origins’ and prehispanic pride. What was to be the middle-American mogul’s impact upon cultural heritage and Teotihuacán’s role as a spiritual center (FIGURE 4); especially with the Wal-Mart visible (just 1.4 km from the main gate) from the summit of the pyramid of the sun?

Interviews with these local leaders and activists conveyed the impression that Wal-Mart’s economic impact upon traditional markets, as well as the blatant abutment of ‘pre-modern’ with ‘high-modern’ symbols, formed the focus of the valley’s angst. But what, in total, were the values held for Teotihuacán, and what were the goals for its future? Five over-riding goals were identified through statistical sampling and an ethnographic survey of 471 locals and Mexican national visitors to the site: Heritage, Archaeological Science, Economic Interest, Diversion/Entertainment and Spirituality/Religion (Webmoor 2007). While interest in further archaeological production of ‘scientific knowledge’ contributed to valorizations of the zone, the study identified at least four other desired goals, not normally considered by archaeologists for future endeavors at the site. Indeed, even the row over the Wal-Mart had not brought to light some of the values held by locals and visitors. In particular, the strong statistical correlations between scale scores compiled for each of these goals suggest that non-archaeological goals for research cannot be separated out from economic and heritage related goals (FIGURE 5). ‘Inheritage’, combining the mutually involved associations of these three broad goals for Teotihuacán as an archaeological site, better conveys the integration of activities all carried out through the nexus of a single site. These may or may not overlap with those parameters of research identified as goals for archaeological investigations, but the question from the outset must be: what is to be gained from
archaeological understanding?; and is there the basis in local contexts for such goals as well? If not, in conjunction with archaeological research, there may now be formulated alternate goals of research at Teotihuacán that are rooted in the practical goals of the surrounding population. From a pragmatic perspective, the more diverse the goals identified in planning and implementing multiple courses-of-action, the more likely that beneficial knowledge on a complete societal level will emerge. Such diversification of research at Teotihuacán would be undertaken to meet a democratic range of purposes. As the survey identified, these would specifically involve economic benefits to the local and national economy, contribution to national identity, and a continuance of archaeological research which enervates and feeds-into these primary goals. Spiritual and diversionary values, though held by a minority of the respondents, nonetheless associated very strongly with Teotihuacán and must be considered as well. In all, Teotihuacán envelops a loose set of interacting, ‘associative niches’ which span the range of archaeological and non-archaeological goals and values.

Now the next question arises: why should we do this? There is not enough space to do justice to the supporting arguments, but they should be familiar from extra-disciplinarian literatures: 1) history and philosophy of science; 2) lesson (failure) of analytic philosophy and positivism—now post-analytic movements in philosophy; 3) ‘external mandate’—‘legiethics’ that the discipline cannot ignore; 4) trajectory in archaeological theory and practice. In this paper I have attempted to sketch the latter two as they are intertwined with the moral: we are no longer insular in the global heritage context. In response, I feel the lead is to consult these two promptings—external and internal to academia—and usefully combine them.

Where are we and where do we want to go? What is our goal: stakeholder participation in global heritage? What is our goal: to be ethical. A pragmatic frame-of-mind then asks how to attain such a goal, what will make a difference? A pragmatic approach to inquiry is ethical from the ground-up, and so does not present the awkward band-aid maneuvers to include non-archaeological participation in an attempt to still dawn the legitimizing results of ‘objective’ correspondence. Giving up on the discredited notion of representation will aid in this goal to include alternate interests in global heritage, as without representationalism there is no longer the fact-value distinction, and the goals of stakeholders are incorporated from outset to define distinct courses-of-action for a mediating archaeology.

I have addressed the consequences of recent thinking in Science and Technology Studies (STS) and its departure from Philosophy and History of Science as just such a movement to bypass the stalemate in the latter with respect to Representationalism/Epistemology, see Webmoor 2007.
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**ILLUSTRATIONS**

Figure 1. Traditional Culture Property (TCP) documented by the author for the U.S. Forest Service on the Commanche National Grasslands.
Figure 2. Satellite image of the central, 'ceremonial' precinct of Teotihuacán, Mexico. The surrounding towns may be seen, particularly San Martín on the northeast edge and San Juan de Teotihuacán to the southwest.

Figure 3. Traditional leader of the Teotihuacán Valley, and organizer of the Civic Front for the Defense of the Valley of Teotihuacán, conducting a springtime ritual for rain just outside the site's fenced perimeter.
Figure 4. Gathering of 'Aztec bailadores' or dancers in the plaza of the pyramid of the sun to commemorate Teotihuacán as the place where the gods sacrificed themselves to bring the world into existence in Nahua belief.

Figure 5. Box-plot of the frequency distributions of scale scores summarizing the relative (standardized 1-10) strength of Teotihuacán's principal associations.