Archaeologist at Work

Richard Blanton

THINKING ABOUT THE EVOLUTION OF SOCIETY AND CULTURE

My curiosity about other cultures and how they change slowly germinated until it eventually led me away from my early interests in physics, astronomy, and chemistry, to an undergraduate major in anthropology at the University of Michigan. There, stimulated by courses I took from Professor Leslie White, notably his famous "The Evolution of Culture," and by other courses from the distinguished faculty of that institution, my interests deepened. In particular, I was attracted to questions surrounding the evolution of complex human societies. Why, and how, had our species developed densely populated, technologically advanced complex societies of large scale—at least in some places—out of the simple, small-scale foraging groups of the Pleistocene?

During the 1960s, at the same time I was doing my undergraduate studies, a new environmental awareness swept through this country, bringing with it many concerns related to overpopulation, the negative environmental consequences of modern agriculture, and the long-term sustainability of our industrial way of life.[1] Some of the questions raised by the environmental movement overlapped with questions asked by sociocultural evolutionary theorists. For example, what were the past patterns of human population growth, and why had human populations grown? Had overpopulation and environmental deterioration brought the decline of ancient civilizations? Could learning about past societies contribute to our ability to devise sustainable human-environment relationships and stable population size in today's world? It was already apparent that supposedly scientifically based population and agricultural policies had failed because they were built on faulty assumptions about human behavior and the nature of social change.[2] Clearly, new knowledge was needed about the human past and its relation to present developmental trends, and it seemed to me that sociocultural evolutionary inquiry in anthropology had the potential to contribute to an expanded environmental awareness as well as to problem-solving in today's world.[3] My interests were further intensified as I came to realize that understanding the human past is more than just a fascinating intellectual challenge.

Anthropological inquiry can also provide knowledge relevant to many of the social and environmental concerns we face in the modern world.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL INQUIRY WITHIN ANTHROPOLOGY

Continuing progress in anthropological method and theory enhances the discipline's ability to enrich our understanding of human social change over long time periods, and to draw useful conclusions from this knowledge. To some degree, this progress results from the application of new technologies, ranging from isotopic dating methods to satellite imagery and computerization, to mention a few examples. More importantly, however, it is based on an elaboration of interdisciplinary cooperation in which the research of various kinds of specialists is linked together in a creative synthesis.

The growth of an integrated approach is facilitated by the fact that anthropology, as it is taught in most departments in the United States, is a unified discipline including sociocultural, archaeological, human biological, and linguistic subdisciplines. My interest in change in human societies over time spans counted in thousands of years meant that I would make use of archaeological methods, but the kind of archaeology I was aiming for had to allow me to address the broad questions posed by sociocultural theory and environmental concerns. Fortunately, I was in a department where a strong sense of disciplinary unity was cultivated, and where it was commonly accepted that archaeological research would contribute importantly to the study of sociocultural evolution in a general sense.

Traditionally, from the middle nineteenth century to the present, most of our understanding of long-term change in human societies came not from direct archaeological evidence from the past, but from the use of a "comparative method." This method involves the placement of ethnographically known societies along a continuum from small-scale and simple, to larger-scale and more complex. This continuum is then divided into evolutionary categories (e.g., band, tribe, chiefdom, state), and is interpreted as a

proxy for "stages" of sociocultural evolution that have succeeded one another over thousands of years.[4] The comparative method has been productive in anthropological inquiry, especially so in recent decades, owing to methodological improvements,[5] but it will always suffer from an inability to directly study sociocultural evolution where it actually took place. Ideally, comparative inquiry should complement direct archaeological investigation, but it was not until after World War II that the potential synergism of comparative and archaeological approaches could be fully realized. Anthropological archaeology advanced in its analytical concepts and field research methods, including the development of carbon-14 dating and other chronometric techniques.[6] These developments, coupled with a greater availability of research funding for substantial multidisciplinary, long-term field projects (especially from the United States' National Science Foundation), made it possible to acquire an unprecedented quantity and quality of new information about the human past.

We can add to these developments in archaeological method and funding levels the fact that, beginning around 1950, a "cultural ecological" theoretical orientation began to influence archaeological field research, contributing greatly to its ability to address broad evolutionary issues. Archaeologists were urged to use their data to address questions relating sociocultural change to ecological processes in a way that engaged the interests of a wide spectrum of natural and social scientists. Putting all of these elements together, it was evident that anthropology was on the verge of realizing a greatly expanded understanding of sociocultural evolution, a new synthesis that would be built on the combined efforts of researchers representing its various subdisciplines, including archaeology, as well as researchers from other disciplines.

THE RISE OF CULTURAL ECOLOGY

Anthropologists, including Leslie White, Julian Steward, Elman Service, Karl Wittfogel, and Marvin Harris, and the economist Esther Boserup, among others,[7] proposed theories that connected various aspects of the material conditions of existence—environment, technology, exchange, production, population growth, and competition for resources—to sociocultural evolutionary change.

An admirable feature of this materialist theoretical orientation was that its ideas could be evaluated through anthropological field investigations, including archaeological research. Past environmental conditions can be inferred from archaeological plant and animal remains (by ethnobotanists and ethnozoologists), including remains of pollen (palynology), and through the study of ancient landforms (geomorphology), among other sources of information. Population change could be measured through detailed archaeological surveys of large regions. Ancient production technologies could be reconstructed from the archaeological excavation of activity areas. Testing ecological theories through archaeological field studies is never easy. Problems abound, ranging from difficult working conditions to poor preservation of archaeological sites in some environments. Modern agriculture and construction destroy remains of past societies. And, the new theories placed stringent new demands on the quality and quantity of information that have to be collected by anthropological archaeologists and their colleagues. In spite of these challenges, much progress toward understanding the past can be and has been made within the framework of the long-term, multidisciplinary projects carried out in a cultural ecological theoretical framework.[8]

Most archaeological field research that drew from the cultural ecological theoretical orientation focused on "behavioral regions." Behavioral regions are naturally or culturally bounded territories, such as river floodplains, mountain valleys, or islands. Presumably, within such a region a human population adapted over an extended period to local environmental circumstances. A region-focused approach asks questions like: How have humans adjusted to the environmental features of a region, over time, through technological, social, and cultural changes? What local environmental factors were most important in determining aspects of change in social organization and culture? Has the environment (for example, climate) remained stable over time, or has it changed, and what have been the social consequences of environmental change? What has been the long-term history of population growth in the region? Has population stayed below carrying capacity (the number of people that could be sustained, as calculated from the availability of resources like cultivable soil and water), or has population exceeded carrying capacity? If population levels exceeded capacity, what were the social and environmental consequences?

One of the most stimulating suggestions was made by Julian Steward (Karl Wittfogel had a similar idea). He suggested that irri-

gation agriculture in major river floodplains in arid or semi-arid environments would entail the development of centralized social controls, bringing in their wake the evolution of complex society. Ideas like his spurred research efforts in important riverine regions, including the Nile Valley and Mesopotamia, and influenced the aims of archaeological research in the semi-arid highlands of Mesoamerica.[9]

RESEARCH PROJECTS IN THE VALLEYS OF MEXICO AND OAXACA, MEXICO

One of the most important region-centered cultural ecological projects ever carried out by anthropologists was already underway by the time I started my graduate studies at the University of Michigan. Eric Wolf, William Sanders, Angel Palerm, and René Millon, among others, proposed and initiated a long-term study of an important Mesoamerican region, the Valley of Mexico.[10] There, a succession of powerful states had developed, including one centered at the famous archaeological site of Teotihuacan, and later the Aztec empire, conquered by the Spanish in 1521. These states had been among the most influential social formations in prehispanic Mesoamerican civilization, making the valley an obvious choice for a major long-term research project. Many specialists contributed to the project, but the main research focus was a systematic archaeological settlement pattern survey of the entire region. In semi-arid environments like the Valley of Mexico, remains of ancient habitation sites and other ancient features (defensive walls, irrigation canals, agricultural terraces, public buildings, etc.) are usually visible on the ground surface except where obliterated by subsequent natural geological processes and human activity (especially, in this case, the massive growth of modern Mexico City). Numerous archaeological sites were located and recorded using surface survey methods. The sites ranged from the earliest small farming villages after about 1500 B.C. to the great prehispanic cities of the Classic period and the later Aztec empire. Ancient human communities show up as scatters of pot sherds, building stone, stone tools, plaster wall fragments, and sometimes more massive features such as pyramid platforms. In the best-preserved situations, even house

foundations can be mapped. By analyzing settlement patterns (the spatial distribution of habitation sites), information from stratigraphic excavations, and environmental data, archaeologists can make inferences about many aspects of past social change through three thousand years of settled agriculture life prior to the Spanish conquest, as well as for periods subsequent to the conquest.[11] I spent three valuable, and enjoyable field seasons on the Valley of Mexico archaeological survey, which provided material for my Ph.D. dissertation and helped prepare me for my future research.

The regional study methods developed in the course of the Valley of Mexico project proved gratifyingly productive, and potentially applicable to similar regions elsewhere. Although much work remained to be done in the Valley of Mexico, I decided after three field seasons to apply a similar approach in another important Mesoamerican highland region, the Valley of Oaxaca in the southern highlands of Mexico. This region saw the growth of the Zapotec state, one of the most influential societies of ancient Mesoamerican civilization. There, another long-term, multidisciplinary regional project, Kent Flannery's Oaxaca Human Ecology Project, was in full swing, and clearly would stand to benefit from a systematic archaeological survey like the one I had helped to complete in the Valley of Mexico. Over a period of ten years and six field seasons, my colleagues and I were able to carry out the regional archaeological survey of the core region of Zapotec society, and extensions of the core-zone surveys continue to this day. To date we have located, described, and analyzed the data from more than six thousand archaeological sites in a 2,500 square kilometer area.[12]

ECOLOGICAL THEORY CHALLENGED

The Valley of Mexico Project and the Oaxaca Human Ecology Project have proven to be among the most successful large-scale regional archaeological studies anywhere, providing an unparalleled record of past human occupation of two of Mesoamerica's most socioculturally significant regions. The results of decades of work are important to anthropological archaeology in many respects, but most importantly, from my point of view, in illustrating the complex causal interactions that obtain between political

and economic structure, on the one hand, and patterns of population growth and agricultural intensification, on the other. For example, the massive social system of Teotihucan (roughly 100 B.C. to A.D. 700) concentrated political, economic, and ritual functions of the entire Valley of Mexico, and beyond, primarily in one large capital center. This strongly centered regional structure—called a "primate" system—resulted in the growth of a massive city of more than 150,000 people, but a comparatively underpopulated and disadvantaged rural hinterland. Once this system was established, there was little further overall population growth or agricultural intensification over many centuries. By nearly the end of the prehispanic sequence, however (roughly A.D. 1200 to A.D. 1521), a new arrangement emerged, that we call "Aztec" society, characterized by the growth of a complex system of numerous cities and towns, each providing a variable mix of commercial, political, cultural, and ritual functions.[13] This complex social formation saw a rapid growth in population, to the highest levels of the prehispanic sequence (over one million in the valley alone), and the development of many new agricultural strategies, including sophisticated water-control facilities for large-scale irrigation projects.

How could systems so unlike one another evolve in the same region? I infer from discoveries like these that in our earlier cultural ecological theorizing, we had paid too much attention to how humans cope with the environment of their local region, thinking that the process of environmental adaptation alone would lead us to a better understanding of the nature of sociocultural change. While it is evident that environmental factors provide important constraints and opportunities for human actors, we still need to be attentive to the fact that contrastive social arrangements, such as Teotihuacan and Aztec, themselves generate distinct modes of population distribution, natural resource utilization, and technological development. Further, it is evident from these data that population growth was not a steady, constant factor in human affairs, driving the development of new productive technologies, or bringing about competition for resources, as cultural ecological theory had led us to expect. Differing social structures resulted in differing demographic patterns; some structural arrangements encouraged growth, while others retarded it.

What would explain the evolution of such distinct social systems? One of the most important aspects of society and culture largely ignored by the environmental adaptation theories was the role played by the population of a region in a larger system of

interconnected regional populations. Mesoamerican civilization, a social system that extended all the way from what is now Central America to northern Mexico, was as much a part of the environment of an important city like Teotihuacan as was its local agricultural hinterland. While cultural ecological research had produced a vast quantity of useful information, by the late 1970s it was becoming clear to me and other researchers that a fuller explication of sociocultural change would develop out of a more complete and encompassing theory. A new approach would incorporate the most useful insights and findings of cultural ecology, but go beyond its adaptational and region-centered biases. A more robust theory would have to have the ability to explain how processes of change at the local level (including those found in households, and villages, and regions), influence, and are influenced by, processes of change taking place at larger spatial scales, including intersocietal interactions over long distances at the scale of whole civilizations (e.g., Mesoamerican, Central Andean, Greater Mesopotamian, Chinese). This more ambitious research agenda implies a need for a more broadly conceived method and theory, not to mention new kinds of field research.[14]

NEW DIRECTIONS FOR RESEARCH

Anthropology has tended to see its subject matter as local culturally-defined groups that are relatively isolated, bounded, static, and adapted to their local environmental circumstances. But closer investigation shows that people migrate; groups coalesce or split up; local leaders manipulate concepts of ethnic identity to firm up control of a faction and outside powers create named cultural groups where none existed previously to manage a chaotic periphery.[15] To understand processes of change in a dynamic world, one must know more about the behavior of social actors as they respond to changing circumstances both locally and at larger spatial scales. One of the weak points of the cultural ecological approach, and of anthropological inquiry in general, is the failure to account fully for household behavior.[16] And yet, many fundamental processes of social, cultural, and environmental change in the evolution of early complex societies, as well as in the modern world, are outcomes of household choices concerning such things

as migration, fertility, production intensity, passing on of wealth between generations, education, market participation, and consumption, among many others.

In our research in the Valley of Oaxaca, my colleagues and I noted what appeared to be substantial changes over time in household behavior related to fertility, craft production, food (including production, processing, and consumption), housing (and other aspects of consumer behavior), market participation, and migration. For example, at about the same time as the development of the region's first urban center (about 500 B.C.), households, even in rural communities, intensified agricultural production, built more substantial houses, engaged in more commercial transactions, and even invented the tortilla, indicating a change in everyday habits of food processing and consumption. We thought that changing household activity in this and other periods had important consequences for change in the larger social systems of the valley, and for those beyond its boundaries, and it seemed natural to pursue this line of investigation as a next step to learning more about Zapotec civilization and its transformations. An excavation program concentrating on houses would allow me to investigate change over time in household behavior, but I realized that little in the way of methodological or comparative data were available to aid me in the analysis and interpretation of this class of data. Given this, I decided to make a temporary career detour in order to make use of the possibilities of a comparative and cross-cultural approach. My goal was to gain a broader perspective on household issues before pursuing further research in Oaxaca. While I realized a change in research approach would ultimately benefit my archaeological investigations, I made the change with some reluctance, because I find archaeological fieldwork to be one of the most enjoyable kinds of research. It combines intellectual stimulation with physical challenge, while at the same time allowing me to enjoy the beauty and pleasure of living in Mexico.

Effective interpretation of archaeological remains is dependent on a well-developed understanding of the relationships between human social behavior and material culture. In the case of households, this issue revolves in part around the house itself. What social factors influence household decisions regarding, for example, house size, building materials, and space use? The aim of my comparative project is to relate the formal properties of houses described in published ethnographic reports to household form and function, including household composition (nuclear family,

extended household, etc.) and economic strategies of household members. Formal properties of the house include the use of space (such as gender-specific areas and activity specialization by room), size of the house, spatial arrangements of rooms, costliness and durability of building materials, decorative elaboration of the facade, and internal symbolic aspects of the house (to what degree is the house a cosmological metaphor?). To get at variation, I coded ethnographically and architecturally described rural houses from several localities where peasant houses and households are described in ethnographic works of high quality, including Japan, Java, Thailand, China, Nepal, India, Iran, Iraq, Syria, Turkey, Lebanon, Egypt, Yemen, Mexico, and Guatemala.[17]

There were definitely times when, sitting in my office in West Lafayette, coding data from published reports, I wished I could be back in Oaxaca doing archaeology. Still, I have been very gratified with what came out of this comparative work, and I am even planning to do more in the future. It accomplished exactly what I was hoping for, in that it provided me with a large and varied sample that I can use to better contextualize prehispanic Zapotec households and their changes. I was able to propose hypotheses to explain some aspects of the observed variation in households and their houses by placing the ethnographically-described cases within the contexts of community type and regional market structure.

For example, I found that in certain economic situations, senior generation members of households control the labor and marriages of their children in order to attain desired levels of social status in the community. In these cases, house forms reflect cosmological themes, with potent cultural symbols manifested in shrines and other features in the domestic built environment. Raising children in a house that is a cosmological metaphor evidently conditions them to more readily accept hierarchical social relations, by linking the activities of everyday home life to powerful symbols legitimizing inequality. Now I want to know (among many other questions): To what degree were ancient Zapotec houses cosmological metaphors, and how did this change over time? Although my comparative household research is a small step toward the larger goal of comprehending the evolution of a civilization, this foray into a new methodology has aided me in a pursuit of knowledge about sociocultural evolution, the origins of which can be traced back to Leslie White's courses.

Earlier, I alluded to anthropology's potential to develop a new synthesis that would combine the power of sociocultural and eco-

logical theory with sophisticated archaeological methods. Has this come about? Not yet. But, by and large, we have moved in a direction that allows us to realize that potential. The most important outcome of the synthesis to date, besides an abundance of useful new data, is that we are able to see clearly the shortcomings of the excessively reductionist cultural materialist and population determinist ecological theories. Our data have opened our eyes to the need for more sophisticated approaches that better account for economic, political, and ideational factors in the growth of complex societies.

NOTES

1. For example, Paul R. Ehrlich, *The Population Bomb* (New York: Ballantine, 1968); Garrett Hardin, *Population, Evolution, and Birth Control* (San Francisco: Freeman, 1964); Donella and Dennis Meadows, *The Limits to Growth* (New York: Universe Books, 1972); Taghi Farvar and John Milton, eds., *The Careless Technology: Ecology and International Development* (New York: Natural History Press, 1972).
2. Richard W. Franke, "Miracle Seeds and Shattered Dreams," *Natural History* 83 (1974); Mahmood Mamdani, *The Myth of Population Control: Family, Caste, and Class in an Indian Village* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1973).
3. My training and interests have enabled me to participate in a Purdue University undergraduate program, funded by the Kellogg Foundation, designed to introduce social and humanistic perspectives to agronomic education, so that students develop an awareness of the social, moral, and environmental consequences of industrialized food systems.
4. Kent V. Flannery, "The Cultural Evolution of Civilizations," *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics* 3 (1972): 399–426; Elman R. Service, *Origins of the State and Civilization: The Process of Cultural Evolution* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1975).
5. For example, the special issue titled "Cross-Cultural and Comparative Research: Theory and Method," *Behavior Science Research* 25 (1991).
6. Described, for example, in Colin Renfrew and Paul Bahn, *Archaeology: Theories, Methods, and Practice* (New York: Thames and

Hudson, 1991).

7. Leslie A. White, *The Evolution of Culture* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959); Julian H. Steward, *Theory of Culture Change: The Methodology of Multilinear Evolution* (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1955); Karl A. Wittfogel, *Oriental Despotism* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1957); Marvin Harris, *Cultural Materialism: The Struggle for a Science of Culture* (New York: Vintage Books, 1979); Ester Boserup, *The Conditions of Agricultural Growth* (Chicago: Aldine Atherton, 1965).
8. For example, Frank Hole, Kent V. Flannery, and James A. Neely, *Prehistory and Human Ecology of the Deh Luran Plain: An Early Village Sequence from Khuzistan, Iran* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Museum of Anthropology Memoirs 1, 1969); Douglas Byers, ed., *The Prehistory of the Tehuacan Valley, Volume One: Environment and Subsistence* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1967), and subsequent volumes of the Tehuacan project reports.
9. Karl W. Butzer, *Early Hydraulic Civilization in Egypt: A Study in Cultural Ecology* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1976); Robert McAdams, *Heartland of Cities: Surveys of Ancient Settlement and Land Use on the Central Floodplain of the Euphrates* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981); Angel Palerm and Eric R. Wolf, "Ecological Potential and Cultural Development in Mesoamerica," *Pan American Union Social Science Monograph* 3: 1–37; William T. Sanders, Jeffrey R. Parsons, and Robert S. Santley, *The Basin of Mexico: Ecological Processes in the Evolution of a Civilization* (New York: Academic Press, 1979).
10. Eric R. Wolf, "Introduction," in Eric R. Wolf, ed., *The Valley of Mexico: Studies in Pre-Hispanic Ecology and Society* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1976).
11. Wolf, "Introduction"; Sanders, Parsons, and Santley, *The Basin of Mexico;* René Millon, *Urbanization at Teotihuacan, Mexico, Volume One: The Teotihuacan Map, Part One: Text* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1973). Sites of the "archaic" period previous to about 1500 B.C. have been found and studied but present difficult methodological problems for reconstruction of human social systems.
12. Richard E. Blanton, *Monte Albán: Settlement Patterns at the Ancient Zapotec Capital* (New York: Academic Press, 1978); Richard Blanton, Stephen A. Kowalewski, Gary M. Feinman, and Jill Appel, *Monte Albán's Hinterland, Part I: The Prehispanic Settlement*

Patterns of the Central and Southern Parts of the Valley of Oaxaca, Mexico (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Museum of Anthropology, Memoirs 15, 1982); Stephen A. Kowalewski, Gary M. Feinman, Laura Finsten, Richard E. Blanton, and Linda Nicholas, *Monte Albán's Hinterland, Part II: Prehispanic Settlement Patterns in Tlacolula, Etla, and Ocotlán, The Valley of Oaxaca, Mexico* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, Museum of Anthropology Memoirs 23, 1989).

13. Richard E. Blanton, Stephen A. Kowalewski, Gary M. Feinman, and Laura M. Finsten, *Ancient Mesoamerica: A Comparison of Change in Three Regions,* 2nd rev. ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), chapter 4; Frances F. Berdan, Richard E. Blanton, Elizabeth Boone, Mary Hodge, Michael E. Smith, and Emily Umberger, *Aztec Imperial Strategies* (Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks, in press).

14. The degree to which new theory is needed is currently an issue of contention, as some researchers are unwilling to accept the critiques of cultural ecology; this is discussed in Richard E. Blanton, "Theory and Practice in Mesoamerican Archaeology: A Comparison of Two Modes of Scientific Inquiry," in Joyce Marcus, ed., *Debating Oaxaca Archaeology* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, Museum of Anthropology, Anthropological Papers 84, 1990); cf. Blanton et al., *Ancient Mesoamerica,* chapter 1. In a study combining the Valley of Mexico archaeological data with early colonial Spanish descriptions of the region, I was able to show that the distribution of cities of the last two prehispanic periods is strongly predicted by market location theory, not environmental factors or carrying capacity. See Richard E. Blanton, "The Basin of Mexico Market System and the Growth of Empire," in Frances F. Berdan et al., *Aztec Imperial Strategies.*

15. Eric R. Wolf, *Europe and the People without History* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982).

16. Robert M. Netting, Richard R. Wilk, and Eric J. Arnould, "Introduction," in Robert M. Netting, Richard R. Wilk, and Eric J. Arnould, eds., *Households: Comparative and Historical Studies of the Domestic Group* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984).

17. Richard E. Blanton, *Households and Houses: A Comparative Perspective* (New York: Plenum, 1994).

SUGGESTED READINGS

Blanton, Richard E., Stephen A. Kowalewski, Gary M. Feinman, and Laura Finsten. *Ancient Mesoamerica: A Comparison of Change in Three Regions,* 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993. Compares the evolution of prehispanic Mesoamerican societies in three major regions, the Valleys of Mexico and Oaxaca, and the lowland Maya.

Harris, Marvin. *Our Kind: Who We Are, Where We Came From, Where We Are Going.* New York: Harper and Row, 1989. Broad-ranging overview of human social evolution from a cultural ecological perspective.

Netting, Robert M., Richard R. Wilk, and Eric J. Arnould, eds. *Households: Comparative and Historical Studies of the Domestic Group* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984. A large collection of papers indicating the range of household studies in anthropology.

Renfrew, Colin, and Paul Bahn. *Archaeology: Theories, Methods, and Practice.* New York: Thames and Hudson, 1991. Recent review of developments in archaeological method and theory.

Wenke, Robert J. *Patterns in Prehistory: Humankind's First Three Million Years,* 3rd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990. Summarizes archaeological sequences for all major world areas.

Research TOC