

Chapter Title: The Household as Analytical Unit: Case Studies from the Americas

Chapter Author(s): JOHN G. DOUGLASS and NANCY GONLIN

Book Title: Ancient Households of the Americas

Book Subtitle: Conceptualizing What Households Do

Book Editor(s): John G. Douglass, Nancy Gonlin

Published by: University Press of Colorado. (2012)

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt4cgr80.7>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



This book is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0). To view a copy of this license, visit <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>. Funding is provided by Knowledge Unlatched.



University Press of Colorado is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Ancient Households of the Americas*

The Household as Analytical Unit

Case Studies from the Americas

JOHN G. DOUGLASS AND NANCY GONLIN

INTRODUCTION

The study of that small, but universal, component of society, the household, is now a global pursuit. Scientists who work in all parts of the world are addressing diverse research concerns for various times and places (see, e.g., Beck 2007; Carballo 2011; Christie and Sarro 2006; Falconer 1994; Fortier et al. 1989; Hendon 2010; Holschlag 1975; Kramer 1979, 1982; MacEachern, Archer, and Garvin 1989; Schwarz 2009; Stanish 1989). Household archaeology, however, is a relatively new field, coming of age in only the past few decades. While household studies in archaeology certainly go back much further than the mid-1980s (e.g., Flannery 1972; Flannery and Winter 1976; Hunter-Anderson 1977; Winter 1976), much of the theoretical and methodological study of households has its place in that decade (e.g., Ashmore and Wilk 1988; Netting, Wilk, and Arnould 1984a; Wilk and Netting 1984; Wilk and Rathje 1982). Fundamentally, household archaeology has its theoretical base set firmly in sociocultural anthropological theory, with the vast majority of contemporary theories of household archaeology having roots in functional analyses of households (e.g., Netting, Wilk, and Arnould 1984b).

This ethnographic framework has been modified and supplemented to fit archaeological contexts, and the contents of this volume are no exception.

The documentation of this analytical unit—whether small or large, rural or urban, commoner or elite—has generally been overlooked by much of the written record. Household archaeology offers insight into both the mundane as well as the unusual, illustrating the social, economic, political, and ideological realms of the most fundamental unit of society. By offering insight into the daily lives of households, archaeologists have been able to make visible the relatively invisible within society. Household archaeology, through excavation, analysis, and interpretation of the material culture of past societies, reveals the hidden transcripts (Scott 1985, 1990) of the diversity of experience, thoughts, and actions of household members.

Although the ethnological and archaeological definitions of the household differ in emphases (Kramer 1982), the household is the most fundamental spatial/activity unit of human society. It is responsive to social, economic, and political change, and it functions as a unit of adaptation. By studying the household through time and space, it can be used as a measure of cultural change and an indicator of social norms. The best way to obtain information on daily life in prehistoric societies is to excavate the remains of houses and their contents, the material correlates of the household. Numerous definitions of the household are employed by ethnographers and archaeologists alike. Those that are most useful to the archaeologist are the ones that relate to the material world and are recoverable in the archaeological record. We do not dig up kin relations or modes of production, but we do excavate houses, their contents, and very often the people themselves. The relation that a house has to a household may or may not be one-to-one. Several households may live in one large house, as among the Yanomamo (Chagnon 1997), or one household may live in several structures, as the Yoruba do (Lloyd 1955).

CONCEPTUALIZING HOUSEHOLDS AND THEIR FUNCTIONS

Netting and colleagues (1984a) and Wilk and Rathje (1982) have contributed substantially to the field of household studies and they are generally credited with popularizing the field of household archaeology. As a fundamental unit of society (Ashmore and Wilk 1988; Netting, Wilk, and Arnould 1984a, 1984b), the household is bound by both social and economic ties. Because of differences and variables among cultures, both across time and space, it is important that we have a pan-cultural definition of households. Following Wilk and Rathje (1982:618), the household is conceptualized here as

the most common social component of subsistence, the smallest and most abundant activity group. This household is composed of three elements:

(1) social: the demographic unit, including number and relationship of the members; (2) material: the dwelling, activity areas and possessions; and (3) behavioral: the activities it performs. This total household is the product of a domestic strategy to meet the productive, distributive, and reproductive needs of its members.

A dwelling, the activities performed by its members, and the members themselves define and create the household. To avoid thinking about households as simply the remains of material goods that might be excavated by an archaeologist, it is necessary to think about households as spheres of activities—that is, viewing them based on what households “do” (Ashmore and Wilk 1988:4–5; Wilk and Netting 1984:5–6). A household, then, can be viewed as an activity area (Ashmore and Wilk 1988:3). More specifically, Wilk (1991:chapter 3) has argued that a household can most readily be functionally defined as the maximal overlap of activities, including the physical shelter, which is generally viewed as a mediating factor for social relationships among household members.

Households are often confused with families (Netting, Wilk, and Arnould 1984b:xix–xxi), which are social units defined by kinship relationships, whereas households are based on behavior (Lightfoot 1994:12). While family members are tied by fictive or actual kin relationships, household members may be related to one another or may be simply acting cooperatively. It is quite possible that all household members are related to one another, but this may not always be the case; if so, it may be more likely in small rather than large households, as larger ones may in part be bigger by attracting non-related household members in a variety of ways. By basing the analytical unit of the household on function and behavior rather than kinship, cross-cultural comparisons are facilitated.

There are five widely recognized functions of the household: production, distribution, transmission, reproduction, and coresidence (Wilk and Netting 1984).

1. *Production* is “human activity that procures or increases the value of resources” (Wilk and Netting 1984:6). This activity can range from farming the land or grinding maize to raising a house or fetching water. Households are not generally passive in their production but, rather, have much to gain from meeting their subsistence needs. As Hirth (2009:19) points out, when households do not meet their subsistence and production needs, their very survival may be threatened. Tasks may be divided according to a gendered division of labor, a cross-cultural universal. The household acts as a corporate group in various activities, but each member need not participate in all activities. There can be several domestic task forces in action simultaneously. Production is closely related to the function of households, or what households do.
2. *Distribution* is another widely recognized activity of the household and involves moving material from producers to consumers. The exchanges

and transactions within and among households fall into this domain, as does consumption of food and goods. Reciprocal behavior best describes exchanges within the household, especially between related individuals, while other types of exchanges may characterize non-kin.

3. *Transmission* of material wealth and non-material items, such as titles or positions in a sociopolitical system, is colloquially referred to as inheritance. Inheritance is affected by such variables as amount of land, degree of agricultural intensification, population density, family preferences, and a host of other criteria.
4. *Reproduction* encompasses the generation of new family members by birth. Although this activity is common to most households, it does not have to occur within the domains of the household, nor does it occur between most members of a household. As Hirth (2009:18) points out, a main objective of households is to increase their economic well-being, which leads to larger households that are able to harness more labor for production. Generally, wealthier households are equated with higher, more successful reproductive rates (Netting 1982). Infant mortality rates directly affect successful reproduction of the household. Subsumed under this functional category is the socialization of children (Baxter 2008; Wilk and Netting 1984). Unlike reproduction, socialization requires participants to be in residence for a period of time. Another meaning of reproduction refers to social reproduction, that is, the continuity of culture (Gillespie 2000a). Generation after generation, traditions are carried out, sometimes with modifications. Evolution of such characteristics is often reflected in the material record. Ritual is a form of social reproduction and can be studied in domestic contexts (Gonlin and Lohse 2007; Plunket 2002).
5. *Coresidence* is not necessary for many functions of the household, though it has previously been assumed to be a criterion of households. Definitions of the family are explicitly characterized by coresidence (Murdock 1966:1), although there are exceptions. The structure of the household relates to family type, and members of the family may live together or apart. Likewise, members of one household may live in separate dwellings, but both families and households do seem to coincide more often than not (Bender 1967). In excavating houses, we assume coresidence of the household based on this general principle, while recognizing that coresidence of the family may not occur (as discussed above in the definition of the household). In fact, coresidentiality is a working assumption for the archaeologist who excavates dwellings. The family unit, much harder to identify, need not be localized since it consists of kinship ties that transcend time and space. As Wilk and Netting (1984) point out, the household is defined on behavioral terms, or how it functions, while families are described in structural terms, or the nature of kin relations. Following Murdock (1966:91), a kinship system is not a social group and does not correspond to an organized aggregation of individu-

als. Through these five functions of households, archaeologists and ethnographers are able to identify what makes the household a valid unit of analysis.

The concept of house societies has gained increased interest since the 1970s, when the concept of house societies (*sociétés à maisons*) emerged as a theme in studying social organization of groups (e.g., Beck 2007; Gonzalez-Ruibal 2006; Joyce and Gillespie 2000; Lévi-Strauss 1982, 1987). Rather than focusing on lineal descent, house societies have their fundamental social and cooperative unit focused on the house, with social relations among individuals and larger social units also focused on the house. Interestingly, Lévi-Strauss still considers house societies as another kinship type (Gonzalez-Ruibal 2006:144). Here, the house “may represent social, economic, political, and ritual relationships among various individuals, who may form a permanent or temporary collectivity” (Gillespie 2000a:6). The corporate body referred to as a “house,” however, is not the same as a household; rather, it is “a corporate body organized by reference to shared practices and common estate (which may or may not include a physical house)” (Robin 2003:333). While this concept is not used in this volume, it has gained importance as a concept for studying ancient societies, such as the Maya (Gillespie 2000b; Hendon 2000, 2001, 2002; Joyce 2000).

While many archaeologists, cultural anthropologists, and other researchers have focused their study on households, the terms used to describe them, or the particular contexts of them, vary a great deal. For example, some researchers have focused on physical aspects of households to describe them, such as houses and dwellings, using such diverse terms as “camp” (Kent 1999), “compound” (Hayden and Cannon 1982; Santley and Kneebone 1993), “courtyard group” (Howard 1985; Roth 2000; Wilcox, McGuire, and Sternberg 1981), “domestic structure” (Manzanilla and Barba 1990), “dwelling unit” (Killion 1987), “house compound” (Killion 1987), “household cluster” (Winter 1974), “house mound” (Clark and Blake 1994), “patio group” (Sheehy 1991), “patio groupings” (McAnany 1992), “patio units” (Tourtellot 1988), “pithouse cluster” (Diehl 1998), and “spatial residential units” (Santley and Hirth 1993) to describe elements of households. Other scholars have taken a more economic approach to discussing households, describing them more in terms of their economic organization and cooperation, using terms like “activity area,” “coresidential work units” (Stanish 1992), “domestic domain” (Smith 1993), “overlapping activity spheres” (Wilk 1991) and “production/ consumption units” (Wilk and Netting 1984). Either way, these scholars are describing varying aspects of households, although the terms perhaps suggest differences in the type of data collected. In the end, however, these various scholars are referring to the household or domestic unit, which refers to behavior-oriented, coresiding social groups that are “the next bigger thing on the social map after an individual” (Hammel 1984:40–41). Certainly,

however, as discussed above, defining households in more economic terms, such as activity areas or overlapping activity spheres, allows for greater cross-cultural comparisons than simply defining them based on the proximity of dwellings or other physical forms.

DWELLING ARCHITECTURE, ECONOMIC ORGANIZATION, AND HOUSEHOLD FORM AND FUNCTION

For virtually the entire history of anthropology, there has been an interest in the form and function of domestic architecture and structures in both undifferentiated and complex societies. As far back as Morgan (1963 [1877]) in the late nineteenth century, the study of domestic space has been seen as intrinsically important to understanding social processes. As he stated in his famous book *Ancient Society*, “House architecture, which connects itself with the form of the family, and the plan of domestic life, affords a tolerably complete illustration of progress from savagery to civilization. Its growth can be traced from the hut . . . through . . . communal houses . . . to the house of the single family” (Morgan 1963 [1877]:5). While current anthropologists would no longer argue for Morgan’s rigid and deterministic developmental stages of cultural evolution, his point that the structure of society can be viewed through the study of domestic architectural forms is clear. This argument is one still used today as a basic premise for studying domestic architecture (Kent 1990, *inter alia*).

Over the past three decades, the issue of substantial architectural change, such as round to square house shapes or other related processes, has been an essential issue to scholars in understanding household size and household social organization, including whether households are nuclear or corporate (e.g., Feinman, Lightfoot, Upham 2000:456–465; Flannery 1972, 2002; Gilman 1987, 1997; Hegmon 1996; McGuire and Schiffer 1983; Rocek 1995a, 1995b; Whalen 1981; Wilshusen 1989). In several parts of the world, including the Levant and the American Southwest, the transition from round to square houses is significant because it links the architecture and economic organization of households to the social and political organization of larger communities (see chapters in this volume by Beaulé, Ciolek-Torrello, Snow, and Varien, among others, for additional discussions of the form and function of household architecture). In essence, the heart of the debate is one of how form follows function, as well as how architecture represents different aspects of society from the viewpoint of the household. Whereas architecture contributes to the integration of society by defining social boundaries and reinforces societal norms, the society will construct a built environment based on historical and social contexts (Hegmon 1989:7).

The shape of structures has been a research theme in archaeology and socio-cultural anthropology for decades, beginning in the modern period with early

researchers such as Morgan. Issues of shape—for example, whether a structure is round or square—were initially thought to have been related to functional characteristics of households and larger groups. Robbins (1966) and Diehl (1992) and Diehl and Gilman (1996), for example, argue that increased investment in structures may relate to increased sedentism. Circular structures tend to be efficient in design and the easiest to produce in a larger volume (Fitch and Branch 1960), whereas rectangular structures tend to have more interior space and, therefore, require more investments in time and labor (Robbins 1966). Although early studies like these were helpful, they were primarily descriptive in identifying relationships, rather than analytical.

Flannery (1972) constructed a much more elaborate understanding of the relationship between architecture and social organization, focusing both directly and indirectly on household organization. He argues that one of the differences between circular and square structures was not only the shape but also the size: circular structures tended, across time and space, to be smaller units occupied by smaller groups of people (households) than rectangular ones. Square or rectangular houses were square-cornered because of this different composition of the household that occupies such units: rectangular houses were easier to add to and partition, enabling households to evolve along with the developmental cycle (Goody 1972; Tourtellot 1988; Wilk and Rathje 1982). The critical point Flannery makes is that the actual form of the house reflects the composition and organization of the household (see chapters by Ciolek-Torrello and Varien, this volume). Flannery (2002) has more recently reanalyzed this problem and concludes that changes in architecture in many early agricultural societies in both the Old and New Worlds resulted from the evolution of household organization from nuclear to extended. He argues this was the case because nuclear households, in the face of increased labor needs associated with sedentism and domestication, were “not a viable economic unit” (Flannery 2002:424). Although there were certainly multiple causes for this architectural shift, according to Flannery, they all relate back to economic organization of the household (see also Feinman, Lightfoot, Upham 2000:463).

Various other archaeologists have built on Flannery’s (1972) initial study over the past several decades. For example, Redman (1982) elaborates on Flannery’s (1972) views, in his study of the early (7300–6700 BC) Coyoenué Tepesi site in Turkey. In studying the group’s increased dependency on domestication, Redman concludes that increased storage needs, along with new patterns of labor organization, led to changes in architecture. Redman (1982) argues, in essence, that economic organization, especially changes in the base of labor organization, is reflected in the household’s architecture. Fundamentally, house form is determined by three variables (Hunter-Anderson 1977): the number of people living in the space, the degree of economic heterogeneity encompassed by household members, and the volume of materials stored in the house. The

higher degree of heterogeneity in the house, the more architecturally complex the space will become (see also Kent 1990). This issue of house shape and structure and the relationship to household configuration and organization has been researched to a great degree in the American Southwest in understanding the pithouse-to-pueblo transition and whether this fundamental change in household architecture was related to demographics (Plog 1978; Whalen 1981), sedentism and land tenure (Ciolek-Torrello, this volume; McGuire and Schiffer 1983), durability of architectural styles (Wilshusen 1988), changes in subsistence (Gilman 1987, 1997; see also Rocek 1995a, 1995b), or the economic organization of the household.

CURRENT HOUSEHOLD RESEARCH ISSUES

Here, a broad review of household research issues is detailed and discussed, including topics related to households as reflections of larger social trends, households as primary producers, gender and social relations within the household, inequality and distinctions among households (including ritual and ideology), and, finally, the organization of production within households.

Households as Portals into Societal Trends

Households, as discussed above, have become recognized as an elemental topic of inquiry in archaeology over the past several decades. As the first order of social organization above the individual (Hammel 1984:40–41), households offer essential information for researchers on not only the internal dynamics of individual households but also larger societal dynamics. Households may be generally conservative in nature and interested in self-sufficiency, but internal household dynamics of labor, wealth, gender, distribution, and other attributes likely are mirrors of the larger society of which they are a part. Households, in essence, are portals to understanding larger communities.

Households are increasingly seen as critical to understanding the rise of social complexity and the organization of societies (see chapters in this volume by Beale, Henderson, González Fernández, and McCormack, among others, for examples). Household studies have been shown to be essential, for example, in studying the transformations and ebb and flow of evolving societies (e.g., Ashmore 1988; Flannery 1976, 2002; Flannery and Marcus 1983). One of the noteworthy aspects of this type of research is the different scales used to identify and study households, including both detailed intrasite analyses of household remains (e.g., Allison 1999), as well as bird's-eye views of households through regional settlement-pattern data (Drennan 1988; Sanders, Parsons, Santley 1979). While the view of settlement-pattern studies (generally viewed through survey data) usually conceptualizes the remains of households as a settlement classifica-

tion that functions in specific ways, the perspective of household archaeology (generally viewed through excavations of remains of households) commonly views these same settlements as having more diverse functions and internal distinctions (see Yaeger and Canuto 2000:4). Both stances offer significant insights that complement one another. At the level of the individual household, numerous studies have shown both the role households play in the transformation of evolving societies as well as how studying individual households mirrors these transformations through time (e.g., Bermann 1994; Manzanilla and Barba 1990; Rice 1988).

As one example of many, Bermann (1994) illustrates the usefulness of applying household data to understanding larger regional trends, such as the political evolution of a society. Through studying the site of Lukurmata in the Bolivian Andes and focusing on households through time, Bermann (1994:253) argues that (1) there was a shift from simple households focusing on a limited range of activities to those with intensified production as they entered the Tiwanaku system; (2) there was a subsequent shift from simple to more complex and differentiated households once the site of Lukurmata became a second-tier center in the Tiwanaku system; and (3) after the collapse of the Tiwanaku state, household units shifted from larger to smaller. He argues that these differences in household size and the range and intensity of production were the result of demands on households for surplus mobilization by the Tiwanaku state. While the rise of the Tiwanaku system had effects on households, Bermann (1994:254) also argues that much of the effect it had on households at Lukurmata appears to correspond to the rise of the Tiwanaku III polity (likely a chiefdom), rather than the subsequent Tiwanaku IV state.

At the level of settlement-pattern data, Drennan (1988) studied the dispersed or compact nature of Mesoamerican settlements across time to understand the relationship between households and larger communities. His results indicate that households in the southern Maya Lowlands were relatively dispersed, whereas higher density could be found at the Aztec center of Tenochtitlan and the city-state of Teotihuacan, among others. Drennan argues (1988:281–284) that possible explanations for nucleation and dispersion of households include community size, agricultural practices (including swidden vs. more intensive forms), defense, political control, and economic central-place functions. He concludes that the most likely explanation for why Late Formative and Classic period Maya households are so much more dispersed than those of other periods and regions across Mesoamerica was because of the intensive nature of their agricultural practices. Drennan's study of regional patterns connects well with case studies of household agricultural production to better understand the underlying reasons for nucleated or dispersed household settlement. Sanders and colleagues (1979) working the Basin of Mexico provide another good example exemplifying the use of settlement-pattern data to better understand household organization

through time as it relates to larger community trajectories. As the Teotihuacan state emerged, households became more interdependent with larger social structures, including production, trade, and interaction (Hastorf and D'Altroy 2001:13). These studies, from a bird's-eye view, allow for useful connections with more intensive studies of individual households to understand the connections to their larger communities.

Households as Primary Producers

First and foremost, households are responsible for providing household members with sustenance (i.e., subsistence) for the continued reproduction and success of the group (e.g., Netting, Wilk, and Arnould 1984b; Wilk and Netting 1984). In many societies, especially those in less rural environments, household members may undertake additional activities other than primary production of food and instead rely on other activities, such as craft production, to manufacture goods for which household members can then trade or exchange for subsistence goods. However, as Hirth (2009) has pointed out, the undertaking of craft production on a full-time basis is an inherently risky undertaking, given the pitfalls of the ebb and flow of supply and demand for items that household members may create. As a result, household members, especially in agrarian societies, may produce crafts on only a part-time basis during agricultural downtimes (e.g., D. Arnold 1975, 1985; P. Arnold 1991; Graves 1991), as has been discussed elsewhere in this chapter. By doing so, agrarian households may be able to create additional income to supplement their primary activity of food production.

There are two basic types of agriculture that households can undertake: extensive and intensive practices. Extensive strategies generally rely on expansive areas of land, where farmers may be able to cultivate plants without much capital improvement. Extensive farming usually requires minimal field preparation and crop tending and normally requires that fields are fallow more often than they are in cultivation. In tropical regions of the world, the most prevalent form of extensive farming is known as slash-and-burn. In extensive agriculture, farmers use the natural surrounding landscape to their advantage with few improvements. In the American Southwest, two types of extensive agriculture are arroyo (or *ak chin*) farming, where rain and runoff are harvested for watering plants, and dryland farming, where fields are prepared ahead to take advantage of seasonal rains. Intensive agricultural practices have a higher labor input per unit of land and utilize intensive agricultural techniques, such as terraces, check dams, raised or drained fields, and other methods to increase output (e.g., Douglass and Pyburn 1995; Dunning and Beach 1994; Fedick 1996; Harrison 1993; Harrison and Turner 1978; Scarborough 1993). Collectively, these methods are known as landscape capital (Brookfield 1972). These types of construc-

tions are viewed as the physical evidence of higher labor investment per unit of input (Farrington 1985) and, thus, are evidence of intensification. Some groups, such as the prehispanic Hohokam and the ancient Maya, used both extensive and intensive systems simultaneously (see chapters by Ciolek-Torrello, Gonlin, Henderson, and Neff, this volume, for examples).

Fields may be located only near settlements or they may be both distant and near, a strategy known as an infield-outfield system (e.g., Netting 1977). A number of ethnographic studies have shown that many outfields are within a 45-minute walk from the residence (Killion 1992; Wilk 1983; *inter alia*). If farmers cultivate fields farther away from their homes, and if this land is heritable, this choice may affect household members' decisions about fissioning and forming a new household elsewhere, which in turn will affect the household's developmental cycle (Douglass 2002:44). In a recent archaeological study, Douglass (2002:44–46) found that because good agricultural land was in high demand in one part of a valley, it is likely that the residents chose to densely occupy adjacent land that was poor for agricultural purposes. Some studies have shown that households in agrarian societies will have a kitchen garden near where they live (Doolittle 1992; Fish, Fish, and Downum 1984; Killion 1992; Sheets 2006; Szuter 1991) and create a variety of features to enhance and protect the garden, such as walls, fences, water-management features, especially if there is a high competition for land. In the American Southwest, Szuter (1991) argues that the abundance of small animal remains at prehispanic Hohokam household sites suggests that hunting small game within the confines of house gardens provided an important food source.

Recent studies of household food production have suggested that this focus is a prime area to explore gender (e.g., Gonlin, this volume; Hendon 2010; Neff 2002, this volume; Robin 2002; Wiewall, this volume). Topics such as the gender division of labor have proven to be highly useful in understanding prehistoric household labor organization. In addition, studies related to household agriculture have contributed to our understanding of differences in wealth and political inequality within a society (e.g., González Fernández, this volume; Hastorf 1993).

Engendered Households

Gender and social relations within the household and society have also become the focus of research over the past few decades. During this time, the sheer volume of publications on gender and social relations within households has greatly expanded (e.g., Arden 2002; Bruhns and Stothert 1999; Brumfiel and Robin 2008; Claassen and Joyce 1997; De Lucia 2008; Goldstein 2008; Gustafson and Trevelyan 2002). Overall, gender research is not perceived as the investigation of only women but, rather, people of all genders (Brumfiel and Robin 2008;

Dean this volume; Gonlin 2007 and this volume; Gougeon, this volume). That is, gender is seen as the intersection of different aspects of people, including their sex, gender, age, and social status and how these different elements of life create larger social processes (Goldstein 2008:39). In the case of gender and household research, it is the exploration of how these different elements compete, complement, and interact within the context of the household unit. It is critical, as well as a distinct challenge, to separate gender from biological sex so that gender can be identified as a social construct (Hendon 1996:49). It is also just as important to understand how gender can be mirrored through material culture. Much of the gender research has focused on the domestic realm and household economies and has emphasized the importance of women's labor to the household (Gustafson and Trevelyan 2002; Hendon 1996:49).

As Brumfiel and Robin (2008:2) argue, there has been a "remedial" recovery of women in ancient societies over the past several decades, identifying women alongside men in complementary ways (e.g., "Man the hunter," "woman the collector"). It is increasingly clear that throughout prehistory, women's and men's roles overlapped and women's roles were well outside the domestic sphere. In prehistoric societies, women played essential roles that were not always incorporated into research questions. At the Maya site of Copán, for example, the elite female ruler buried in the Margarita royal tomb was not documented in written records, though her male counterparts were, yet offered substantial insight into women's roles and activities through the analysis of her burial goods (Bell 2002). By the 1980s, with the rise of household archaeology, it became increasingly clear that perceived "public" and "private" spheres created a false dichotomy. As Brumfiel and Robin argue (2008:4), "[t]he dynamism of the household domestic economy forces us to recognize that the domestic domain was not simply a passive and devalued version of the male public domain but was an integral part of the public and political life of a society." Some of the emphasis on gender in household archaeology, beyond the household economy in general, has focused on food, as it is a fundamental function of households (Henderson, this volume; Neff, this volume; Robin 2002). While food production could be seen as mundane, there is nothing more critical as it not only creates sustenance for household members but is also part of larger political dimensions. Brumfiel's (1991) study of the role of food and weaving during the Aztec period is an excellent example of the type of strength gender analysis plays in understanding households. Many of the chapters in this volume (see, e.g., Arnold, Douglass and Heckman, Gonlin, Gougeon, Henderson, Snow, and Wiewall) incorporate the concepts of gender and household to better understand the division of labor that existed in production of goods and services. As is evident from the chapters in this volume, gender roles are neither static across cultures nor rigid within a culture.

Household Inequality and Differentiation

Social differentiation among and between households has also been a vital topic of research in household archaeology. Fundamentally, household size and composition can have a great deal of influence on, and also reflect, its wealth or status (see, e.g., chapters in this volume by Beaulé, Henderson, González Fernández, McCormack, and Wiewall). Wealthier households generally tend to be larger (i.e., more people) than less fortunate ones (Hayden and Cannon 1982; Netting 1982; Wilk 1983, 1991), perhaps in part because of family members wishing to inherit land (Wilk and Rathje 1982) or the addition of non-family members to the household for additional labor (Hendon 1987, 1991; McAnany 1993, 1995; Wilk and Rathje 1982). In agrarian societies, household size may be determined in part by the ability of households to produce surplus and attract and keep household members (Netting 1982; Wilk and Rathje 1982) (see chapters in this volume by Beaulé, Henderson and McCormack). Wilk and Rathje (1982) have argued that “task simultaneity,” the simultaneous performance of different, diverse domestic activities, is a driving force in the creation of large, complex households. In areas where there may be seasonality of resources, larger households are useful for dividing the household into smaller, task-oriented groups to undertake the various tasks necessary (Coupland and Banning 1996:2). Much of the ebb and flow of household size relates to the developmental cycle of households (Goody 1972; Tourtellot 1988), in which household size grows or shrinks as members stay or fission off, creating new households elsewhere (Pasternak, Ember, and Ember 1976). Archaeologically, the size of the remains of households is generally seen through the differences in the number of structures that constitutes a household, as well as the number of cooking and production areas (Hendon 1991). The social and economic connection among household members may be reflected, in part, in the proximity displayed among structures.

Smith (1987:298), in an important cross-cultural review on this subject of household possessions and wealth in agrarian societies, follows Netting and colleagues (1984b) and Yanagisako (1979) in arguing that household wealth is closely related to family size and structure, occupants of household members, and the development cycle of households. Following Haller (1970), Netting and colleagues (1984b) define wealth as “access to goods and services” and argue that no single measure can adequately define or measure household wealth. However, Smith (1987) argues that, following Haviland (1981) and Rathje (1983), residential architecture, burials, and household artifacts are three types of data that can lead to information on wealth. Smith cautions that household inventories can be influenced by a variety of other factors besides wealth. In addition to these three types of data, Hastorf and D’Altroy (2001:13; see also Hirth 1993) argue that the social and political position of the household will influence and reflect wealth. Smith (1987:308–310) also suggests that furniture, clothing,

tools and household equipment, and utilitarian goods are good indicators of household wealth, as these items may change more quickly than dwelling architecture and may be a more refined set of attributes that will more closely reflect household wealth at any point in time. Blanton (1994:189–190) has pointed out that house architecture may not be a useful indicator for wealth, as he found many residents, both the wealthy and the poor, lived in similar types of simple structures within many agrarian societies. Blanton (1994:190) argues that within highly integrated agricultural communities, wealth may be expressed in other channels besides architecture.

Overall, then, while there may be a particular set of variables to understanding the wealth of a household, no one variable should be a determining factor in analysis, as it is the totality of the data that helps one determine the relative wealth of a household. Hirth (1993:143–144), in a case study of measuring rank and socioeconomic status, agrees with this general conclusion and argues that there are two hurdles to be resolved to help better understand household socioeconomic status: (1) there need to be large, representative samples used to help make inferences; and (2) archaeologists need to create and refine non-arbitrary standards for measuring and interpreting results. By explicitly operationalizing one's definition and criteria of what constitutes "wealth," archaeologists can hope to avoid talking at cross-purposes about this concept. It is equally important, however, to draft a definition particular to each time and place, as each society determines "wealth" on its own terms, and an emic perspective is essential for understanding the past.

What may create situations of wealth differentiation among households? In agrarian societies, many argue that access to good agricultural land is a primary factor in accumulating wealth and or status (e.g., McAnany 1993, 1995; see also discussion in González Fernández's chapter in this volume). In more sociopolitically complex societies, access to prime agricultural land may be restricted, thus allowing some households to have an advantage over others (Fried 1967). McAnany (1995) has argued that founding agrarian households in some areas may settle on the most productive agricultural land, thus creating land tenure rights for future generations of households that create a monopoly on those prime lands. This principle of first occupancy (see Isaac 1996; McAnany 1995) suggests that through migration from other areas, as well as the creation of new households via fissioning, new generations of households may not have the same base for surplus that these other, wealthier households may have. As a result, some of these future generations may choose to join these wealthy households, thus increasing the productive potential of the coresidential unit and creating a heterogeneous household. Heads of wealthier households may attract more members, and thus additional labor, through aggrandizing (Hayden 1992; Hayden and Gargett 1990). While this model appears to work in some parts of the world, it has been shown in other areas that the social hierarchy

among chiefdom- or state-level societies was likely not based on elite control of agricultural land (Douglass 2002; Drennan and Quattrin 1995; see also González Fernández's chapter in this volume). Related to the connection between control of agricultural land and wealth accumulation, there also appears to be a general correlation between households on poorer agricultural soils and intensified craft production to make up any shortfalls in sustenance (D. Arnold 1975, 1985; P. Arnold 1991; Cook 1982; Graves 1991; Hirth 2009; Stark 1995; and see discussion of household production below).

In addition to these types of concepts, Blanton (1995:122–123) has argued that inequality and wealth differentiation among households may have its foundation in symbolic behavior and “its expression in the ritualized everyday behaviors of the *habitus*” (see also González Fernández, this volume). Following Shanks and Tilley (1982), Blanton argues that archaeologists ought to understand the role of symbolic communication as they study household inequality. Blanton (1995:112) agrees with Bell (1986–1987) that at its base, the foundation for the inequality of households is related to ideology. Currently, ideology is often considered as a means by which households may create and maintain a social imbalance through elite manipulation (Joyce and Weller 2007; Mehrer 2007:283). The monopolization of prestige goods or knowledge, for example, which may be required for social reproduction of junior households, lays a foundation for inequality among households. Blanton argues that if, for example, elder members of households either completely control ideology or symbols that are required within society for high status or wealth or share this knowledge only if junior household members remain within the household, there are few opportunities for junior members to fission and create their own households with that same base of wealth or status. As a result, Blanton argues, postmarital residence choices for junior household members are limited. This argument may relate in part to McAnany's (1995) model of founder households; these founder households will, in part, use symbolism and ideology to create a significance of place through such activities as worshipping ancestors buried at that locale. To maintain that same status and wealth accumulation, junior household members will have little choice but to remain in that same location, as the symbolism of the location in part reinforces household status. It is through ritual and *habitus* that “an order of household inequality is made to appear powerful and holy” (Blanton 1995:113).

The role of ritual, ceremonies, and ideology at the household level and higher has been a key focus of researchers of societies of both egalitarian and complex societies (e.g., Blanton et al. 1996; Earle 1997; Fogelin 2007; Gonlin and Lohse 2007; Gossen and Leventhal 1993; Lohse 2000; Lucero 2010; Marcus and Flannery 2004; Masson 1999; McAnany 1993, 1995; Plunket 2002; Wells and Davis-Salazar 2007). Certainly, ritual and ideology were at the heart of societies at many levels, and rulers and elites manipulated rituals to communicate a highly

symbolic system of ideas and meaning while simultaneously maintaining their high status. Elites across societies are generally viewed both as the sources of sacred knowledge and as those who performed them (Lohse 2007:6). As Lohse (2007:5) has pointed out, scholars in general have viewed ideology and religion in similar ways, offering them as common examples of symbolic behavior. Ritual is the common element of the two, the performance and material expression of ideology and religion. Among the ancient Maya and the city-state of Teotihuacan during the Classic period (AD 250–900) of Mesoamerica, iconography across urban centers offered everyday references to these belief systems.

But what about households in non-urban areas? How did household ritual activity differ from those performed by the society as a whole, by rulers instead of commoner households? How did the religious beliefs of commoner households differ from the ruling elite? As noted just over a decade ago by Johnston and Gonlin (1998), we then had a poor conceptualization of commoner household ritual, but today we have a much stronger understanding of household ritual and ideology (e.g., Gonlin and Lohse 2007). Questions regarding differences between household ritual in rural and urban settings and of households in communities/societies of different sociopolitical organizations are important to consider. It is clear, however, that commoner household ritual, at least in Mesoamerica, was primarily focused on three basic realms: (1) burial and ancestor worship; (2) feasting; and (3) dedication and termination rituals (Robin 2003:322). Common types of artifacts across time and space used by households in ritual include different types of censers or other objects used in the creation of smoke, fire, figurines or sculpture, food, mirrors or other types of reflective objects, shell, stones, as well as objects that are both common and unique (e.g., Douglass 2007; Gonlin 2007). Objects used in household ritual originally from other places may be important in understanding how they came to be used as agents in ceremony (Bradley 2000; Spielmann 2004:211). The origin of ritual objects from elsewhere and the particular location of origin are two aspects of this “otherness” of objects that may have been meaningful to household members (Bradley 2000; Spielmann 2004).

Feasting, among all classes of society, according to Robin (2003), allowed connections with supernatural powers, created solidarity among both household members and the greater community, and created and maintained political and ritual connections beyond local communities. To some researchers, however, feasting in general is a social activity that is performed above the scale of the household, at least in the American Southwest (Wills and Crown 2004). There is also debate about whether feasting is solely a ritual activity, or if, since there is such a wide variety of contexts of feasting, this activity should not be considered related to only ritual performance (Dietler and Hayden 2001:3–4). Across both time and space, feasting, at both the household and supra-household level, has been a popular topic of research in the past decade (Cameron 1995; Dean 2001;

Dietler and Hayden 2001; Graves and Spielmann 2000; Grimstead and Bayham 2010; Hayden 1995, 2001; Mills 2004, Mills 2007; Potter 1997, 2000; Spielmann 1998; Van Keuren 2004).

In some state-level societies, it is clear that household-level ritual was different in kind and degree than ruling elites. In the Naco Valley, northwest Honduras, for example, Douglass (2007) argues that rural households differed in kind from elites primarily in access to economic, social, and political spheres. Naco elites emulated certain Maya ritual practices, whereas commoner households were more likely to maintain traditional local practices, using what Douglass refers to as a ritual toolkit (see also Gonlin 2007). Commoner households, while removed from urban elites, still performed supernatural ritual, albeit different than that performed by elites. Overall, household ritual and ideology help create and maintain social identity, are aspects of household differentiation and inequality, and are rich research topics, across both time and space.

Households as Craft Producers

Finally, household production has continued to be a main topic in household archaeological studies for the past several decades. This emphasis can include diverse tasks such as cooking, farming (see Ciolek-Torrello, Henderson, and Neff, this volume), and also craft production and specialization, which are the focus here (see Arnold, Douglass and Heckman, Gonlin, Gougeon, and Wiewall, this volume, among others). A pertinent question to ask within the context of household craft production is what are the scale and degree of production? Within many agrarian societies, household production is classified as ad hoc, part-time, or full-time (Clark and Parry 1990:298–299). Hirth (2009:23) has recently argued that the scale of production (full- or part-time) is less important than understanding how labor was organized in past societies, as most production in societies was performed at the household level rather than in specialized settings, such as elite workshops (e.g., Widmer 2009). Just as critical, however, is the scale of production, which is a continuum from small, informal, kin- or household-based production to large, formal, independent workshops (Costin 1991; see also Arnold, this volume). Although specialization can be defined in a variety of ways, Costin's (1991:3) definition of this term is helpful: "the regular, repeated provision of some commodity or service in exchange for some other." In both degree and scale of production, size is an important variable. Independent craft production (Brumfiel and Earle 1987) may allow households to use small-scale labor surpluses to their advantage (Hirth 2009:20). Because full-time craft production can be a risky venture (Hirth 2006, 2009), many agrarian households undertake craft production on a part-time basis. Along these lines, Hirth (2009:20–21) argues that there are four benefits of domestic craft production to households: (1) large households are able to increase and expand their

productivity during agricultural downtimes; (2) it expands diversification strategies for households that are essential for survival; (3) it allows households to use small-scale labor surpluses in creative ways; and (4) it protects artisans from the ebbs and flows of product demand, as it helps create stability. Households by their nature are generally conservative; performing craft production on a part-time basis allows for flexibility in terms of both household labor and market demand fluctuations. As a result, if households do undertake craft production, they may do it intermittently or engage in multiple crafts within the same household (see Hirth 2009:21–23).

Among many households, especially with independent specialization, there can be diversity within household membership in terms of skill, participation in particular activities, and overall activities and this diversity may lead to increased opportunities for household members. Especially in larger households, there may be different types of specialization occurring at different times of the year, depending on resources, household membership stability, and outside influences. As Mills (1995) points out, for the modern and historical period Zúñi, participation in particular types of craft specialization among household members is partially dependent on outside demand for particular products, as well as the income that different objects create. New types of craft production will likely be related to complementary and intersecting technologies (Hagstrum 1999, 2001) in which household members can use skills already mastered to create related items and technologies. At times, it is possible that craft specialization may be undertaken because it leads to increased social status of individuals (Bennett 2007; Hruby 2007). Craft production at the household level allows households to diversify their production strategy by producing goods that are exchanged and circulated among other households. This distribution also creates social interaction and reciprocal ties between households and the wider community. Overall, then, household production, including craft production, is an ongoing and central issue in current archaeological research on households.

ORGANIZATION OF THE VOLUME

We have chosen to focus the present volume on the role that production played in prehistoric and historic American households. Several methods are used to determine the nature and distribution of activities, the meanings behind those activities, the division of labor responsible for those activities, and answers to larger evolutionary questions. This volume attests to the success of using the household as an analytical unit and the wide range of knowledge we can gain by studying this unit.

The volume presented here brings together archaeologists from across the Americas (including North, Central, and South America) to study the theme of ancient household functions; what Wilk and Netting (1984) have referred to



Figure 1.1. Map of the Americas, showing the location of case studies detailed in this volume; numbers in the map legend correspond to chapter numbers in the volume (map created by Luke Wisner)

as what households “do” (Figure 1.1). Presented as a series of case studies in thirteen chapters, researchers use a variety of methods to investigate household functions and, in particular, production. Household organization of production is fundamental to every society in the Americas and elsewhere, whether pre-Columbian or contemporary.

Commoner or producer households form the largest part of an agrarian settlement system in ancient or modern societies (e.g., Douglass 2002; Webster and Gonlin 1988). By including research from all of the Americas, we hope to foster a wider understanding of the household outside one's own area of specialization or culture area. Chapters are divided into three broad sections: (1) a consideration of the household at the micro-level, or individual household; (2) macro-level household studies; and (3) research of the interaction of households with the greater communities of which they are parts. Section I reflects on the spatial and social organization and context of household production; Section II looks at the role and results of households as primary producers; and Section III investigates the role of and interplay among households in their greater political and socioeconomic communities.

SECTION I: HOUSEHOLD PRODUCTION ORGANIZATION: SPATIAL AND SOCIAL CONTEXTS IN THE PAST AND PRESENT

Household archaeology has a long history of analyzing the spatial and social contexts of household functions, which may include such diverse concerns as architecture, midden deposits, activity areas, and social relatedness among household members. These variables are all the result of household cooperation in production strategies and allow for cross-cultural comparisons. This section draws together some of these fundamental household features to better understand household organization and production variables in the past and present. It is divided into five chapters that cover four specific regions of the Americas: the American Southwest, Northeast and Southeast, and Mesoamerica.

In Chapter 2, Mark Varien examines the changing forms of household residences in the northern San Juan River drainage in the American Southwest during the AD 600–1300 period, focusing on the central Mesa Verde region. He examines the relationship between the length of occupation and the spatial organization of the major cultural features at these residential sites using ethnoarchaeological and cross-cultural studies to understand the changing forms of household residences and to develop a model that describes how increasing occupation span affects site structure. Varien measured the occupation span of household residences in the central Mesa Verde region and found that it increased through time. Changes in the spatial organization of these sites that accompany the increasing occupation span are consistent with the cross-cultural model. In his work, Varien examines the archaeological features associated with household residences and documents the continuity and change in these features over a period of seven centuries. Results indicate that there is continuity throughout this interval in the basic residential site, but Varien also sees considerable change in the form of these residences. Varien measures the occupation span of nineteen residential sites, documenting how their length of occupation

changed through time. His results show that occupation span increased from approximately ten years at sites dating to the AD 600s to over fifty years at sites dating to the 1200s. In sum, Varien concludes that specific features at household residences changed over time and were accompanied by increasing occupation span. Varien determines that the relationship between the form of these residences and their increasing occupation span is consistent with patterns identified by the cross-cultural model.

In Chapter 3, Nancy Gonlin delves into issues of gender at the Classic Maya site of Copán, located in western Honduras. Extensive archaeological research at both urban and rural household sites at Copán allows Gonlin to examine aspects of the low-status component of a hierarchically organized society. Her chapter is a theoretical hybrid of household archaeology and the archaeology of gender and examines the contribution that men and women made at the household level of the rural agriculturalist. Just as the concept of “gender” has no single set of meanings (Conkey 2001), Gonlin argues that the concept of “household” has no single set of meanings to societies in which they exist. From the perspective of an engendered archaeology, Gonlin contends that a household consists of the people within it, for they are the women, men, and children who produce, consume, and perform other activities or, in standard parlance, who live as a coresidential activity group. Gonlin focuses on three main lines of evidence in this chapter: artifacts, architecture, and bioarchaeological studies. In her study, the distribution of likely gender-specific artifacts—such as grinding stones, spindle whorls, celts, and projectile points—is examined to understand if it coincides with expectations of gender ideology and symbolism. Through studying gender among households at Copán, the nature of the relationship between men and women in Late Classic Maya commoner households and whether that relationship was complementary or hierarchical are addressed.

Next, in Chapter 4, Dean Snow studies the internal organization of activities in longhouses in the northeast United States. The Mohawk site of Otstungo, occupied in the period AD 1450–1525, was a compact fortified village containing at least ten classic Iroquoian longhouses. Snow details the results of controlled excavation of one complete longhouse that has revealed architectural details that allow correction of previously misinterpreted historical descriptions of standing longhouses, including wall and roof details, as well as the internal segmentation of space for sleeping berths. In addition, Snow argues that excavations at Otstungo have revealed details of the internal organization of activities in longhouses. Most activities, he argues, were controlled and carried out by women, around whom the matrilineal households were organized. Each six-meter-long longhouse contained a residential area that was partitioned into compartments. Two nuclear families averaging five persons each shared a single fireplace in the aisleway, with sleeping berths, storage shelves, and work areas of each nuclear family occupying one side of the compartment. Areas for food storage were

located in lightly built end sections of the longhouses, where they also served as anterooms to buffer cold weather during winter. Facilities for food preparation were discovered in sections of compartments not taken up by sleeping berths. The evidence included ash scatters, mullers, and post-mold features. Small pit features, which were probably personal storage places, and very large post molds probably reflect male activities. Snow concludes his chapter with a discussion of the household organizational implications of these longhouse details.

Ramie Gougeon studies household remains from the Late Mississippian Little Egypt site in northwest Georgia in Chapter 5. Research reconstructing the route of Hernando DeSoto's 1539–1542 expedition through the Southeast has determined that Little Egypt is the site of Coosa, the capital village of a paramount chiefdom. This chiefdom, a confederate of smaller chiefdoms, extended from eastern Tennessee to northeast Alabama and was visited briefly by the DeSoto expedition. To study household organization, Gougeon reanalyzes data from three house floors excavated in the 1970s to identify where specific activities occurred within each structure. By drawing on ethnographic and ethnohistoric sources, gender-based activities were identified. Many artifacts normally recovered from house floors are associated with female activities. For example, ceramics, often thought to be produced and used almost exclusively by females, are ubiquitous in two of the three structures excavated and are second only in quantity to evidence of lithic production. While originally thought to be an exclusive realm of male activities, lithic production has been recently illustrated to have been undertaken by both men and women. In this light, examination of artifact distributions within these three structures is contrasted with current models of Late Mississippian households, as well as implications of gender-based production models within chiefdom-level societies.

Next, in Chapter 6, Dean Arnold studies contemporary populations of potters in the Yucatán, Mexico, to identify production patterns that transcend both present and past societies. Arnold argues that archaeologists have used ceramics to infer changing patterns of the organization of craft production and distribution. But how precisely does the organization of ceramic production change through time? One way to approach this problem is to examine the changes in the social organization of populations of contemporary potters and see how they change through time. Arnold thus traces the changes in social organization among potters of Ticul, Yucatán, Mexico between 1965 and 1997. During this period, ten visits were made to Ticul and the data from these visits were collapsed into seven different "time events." Since ceramic production occurred in both "household" and "workshop" contexts, and such production contexts are not easily distinguished socially, he uses the concept of the "production unit" as the unit of analysis to assess the changes in those units through time. This study thus details the changes in the populations of potters as a whole and in the composition of the production units and documents the changes along

lines of gender and production units. Arnold concludes that although there are changes because of increased commercialization of the craft over a thirty-two-year period, the producing population is probably the most conservative aspect of the craft even in light of massive technological, social, and cultural changes. This conservatism is the result of what are essentially processes of household continuity, such as the use of the nuclear family as production personnel, the processes of household segmentation and fissioning from patrilineal inheritance of household land, and virilocal post-nuptial residence. These conclusions suggest that even in massive technological change in ceramic production, the composition of the producing population can be very conservative and organized socially by households even with highly specialized production space.

Following in this theme of spatial organization and household function, the final chapter in this section, Chapter 7, addresses questions of community size and household production activities. Here, John Douglass and Robert Heckman examine a small, rural agrarian household located on the northern edge of Black Mesa, in the northern American Southwest, to investigate what activities primarily farming households occupying seasonal homesteads during the Pueblo II period (ca. AD 1000–1150) would have undertaken beyond agriculture. Across time and space, households that were primarily focused on agriculture have been pushed into other activities, such as ceramic production, if they lived in marginal areas. However, in the American Southwest, this relationship has been questioned and argued to have a poor correlation, especially if households are simply producing goods for their own consumption. Research in the American Southwest has focused on identifying the locus of ceramic production and has suggested that ceramic vessels were distributed within and between regions on a regular basis. While ceramic production by households at all levels of settlement is generally accepted, other studies for particular areas of the American Southwest argue strongly in other directions. One recent model proposed for the Black Mesa area, surrounded by what are today Navajo and Hopi Nations, suggests that only large, permanent villages hosted ceramic production, with trade of these vessels for use by smaller, more seasonal habitation sites. Household size and connection to larger social systems in villages appear to be two variables in determining which households will produce ceramics. Douglass and Heckman test these competing models to further understand these relationships between household production and larger social systems and offer a case study with much wider implications than the American Southwest.

SECTION II: HOUSEHOLDS AS PRIMARY PRODUCERS: IMPLICATIONS FOR DOMESTIC ORGANIZATION

In this second section of the volume, households are studied in their role as primary producers in part because food production is fundamental and essential

for household continuity. All households during prehistory, with few exceptions, across time and space are responsible for the production of their own sustenance. As a result of differences in environments and cultures, there is a tremendous amount of diversity in the household organization of production and how this variation is expressed at the micro- and macro-levels. The chapters presented here offer insights into these household processes from numerous cultures across the Americas to better understand this fundamental function. In these three chapters, authors discuss case studies of prehispanic groups in two regions: the Hohokam in the American Southwest and two different Maya communities in Belize.

Richard Ciolek-Torrello in Chapter 8 studies agricultural intensification strategies of the Hohokam. Recent anthropological theories, he argues, have emphasized the economic role of households as the primary units of production and their significance as the basic adaptive unit in human society. These theories have linked changes in the structure and organization of households to economic processes such as agricultural intensification. According to one of these theories, intensification of agricultural strategies influences the degree of sedentism, the make-up of the units of production, and the systems of land tenure in which households participate. Changes in the degree of sedentism and units of production are reflected in household and settlement structure. One popular theory relates mobility patterns, organization of production, and control of key resources to different types of household and settlement structure, as described earlier in this chapter (Flannery 1972, 2002). Flannery's theory has great appeal in interpreting changes in Hohokam household and settlement structure in the Phoenix Basin and surrounding desert valleys of central Arizona. The span of time from the Late Archaic period, around 1000 BC to the Classic period (beginning ca. AD 1200), witnessed the transition from a residentially mobile, broad-based foraging/farming society (with loose arrangements of small circular structures home to small household groups) to one of large sedentary, agriculturally dependent villages (with a highly structured and formalized modular residential system for households). This social transformation was associated with important economic changes, including the development of what is now considered the largest and most technologically advanced irrigation system in North America, in addition to large, dry-farming field systems in the uplands. Both technologies led to more frequent use of farmlands and the construction of physical improvements that left durable evidence of ownership. When viewed from the long-term perspective of the more than 2,000 years of agricultural development in the region, it is apparent that changes in the structure of households and settlements parallel these technological changes and may be causally related. Closer inspection of the prehistoric record, however, reveals a much more complicated picture, suggesting that these social and technological changes may represent independent developmental trajectories. In this chapter,

Ciolek-Torrello explores these relationships using data from the Phoenix Basin and surrounding desert valleys.

Next, in Chapter 9, Hope Henderson evaluates Wilk and Netting's (1984) ethnographic model of household economic organization that predicts how households organize production based on differences in household size. By focusing on the relationship between household size and the production and consumption of staple foods, Henderson directly examines changes and continuity in the ways that lowland Maya farming households from the community of K'axob, Belize, managed labor and resources from the ninth century BC to the ninth century AD. Long-term patterns in staple crop production and consumption are reconstructed by comparing three types of bone isotopes identified from twenty-five adults in twenty-one separate households across time and space. The results of this analysis suggest that larger corporate households, which began to form in the fourth century BC, were able to pool labor and diversify staple crop production and consumption. All other-sized households at K'axob followed a slightly less diverse pattern of production and consumption. These findings support the ethnographic model that envisions the household as a social group that cooperates in a variety of overlapping activity spheres. Henderson's contribution to this volume not only offers insight into fundamental questions of economic organization of households but also questions whether production and consumption are necessarily tied to unity and cooperation within households.

Finally, in Chapter 10, Theodore Neff studies terrace gardening of the Classic Maya in western Belize. Settlement survey in the lowland Maya area has documented numerous agricultural terraces dispersed among residential and civic-ceremonial structures that date to the Late Classic period (ca. AD 550–800). Terraced areas constitute a component of the built environment beyond the residential core. How does terracing fit into the larger agrarian landscape and how are they related to households? Research on preindustrial, small-scale agrarian landscapes indicates that distance from residential structures is the basic factor that conditions land use and artifact patterning. Drawing on this basic premise, researchers in Mesoamerica have proposed models that characterize agrarian land use from the larger top-down landscape perspective as well as from the more focused bottom-up household viewpoint. These perspectives tend to characterize agricultural areas adjacent to and interspersed among households as either areas of permanent or semi-permanent cultivation from the perspective of the larger landscape or as garden areas beyond the structures and cleared areas of the household proper. In this chapter, Neff focuses specifically on these permanently cultivated areas that surround and merge with the structural household. Little research attention has been paid to this context generally and even less to the agricultural terraces that make up large portions of these areas in many parts of the lowland Maya area. In an effort to remedy this lack of

research attention, Neff presents a model of household activity in agriculturally terraced areas of the prehispanic lowland Maya landscape that recognizes a spatial continuum of household gardening activities extending beyond the domestic compound proper. Points along this continuum are defined as “adjacent agricultural space,” “transitional agricultural space,” and “outlying agricultural space.” Neff then evaluates this model using terrace excavation data from areas near Dos Chombitos, a lowland Maya minor center in far west-central Belize, Central America.

SECTION III: INTER- AND INTRAHOUSEHOLD ORGANIZATION OF PRODUCTION: HOUSEHOLDS AND COMMUNITIES

In this last section, larger contexts of household organization and production are developed. Rather than studying households at the individual level, contributors in this section study the broader issue of production organization as it relates to households within larger communities. Household organization, such as nuclear or corporate groups, interaction between rural hamlets and larger villages, the political and economic strength of larger communities, and the imposition of conquering groups have all had varying effects on the organization of household production. By presenting such case studies, the authors offer new insight into the internal and external organization of residential groups of varying sizes.

In Chapter 11, Valerie J. McCormack examines conditions under which multifamily corporate groups formed at the Formative community of La Joya, Veracruz, Mexico. During a 1,500-year span of continuous occupation, community organization alternated between independent household units and multifamily corporate groups. Multifamily corporate groups tend to form during periods prior to chiefdom formation. Their formation may indicate (1) they were an archaic form of social organization, (2) an approach to meet scheduling constraints, (3) a strategy to cement kinship ties ensuring that obligations will crosscut generations, or (4) that they are simply clusters within a site defined by archaeologists. Intrasite settlement analysis at La Joya shows that community organization fluctuated between independent households and multifamily corporate groups. McCormack documents that initial occupation includes individual household units, and this occupation corresponds to a period of shifting subsistence strategies with the adoption of agriculture and environmental stress associated with a volcanic eruption, only to subsequently dissolve just as the frequency of prestige items increase. Multifamily corporate groups form later for a second time during the Late Formative period when a regional chiefdom emerges. In her chapter, McCormack compares these multifamily corporate groups to illustrate that they were ranked and had connections to different trade networks and unique ceramic production techniques. McCormack’s contribu-

tion offers important insight into identifying different organizing principles of multifamily corporate groups and determining why they formed.

Victor González Fernández in Chapter 12 focuses on the relationship between households and larger communities in the Alto Magdalena region of southwest Colombia. Here, the development of communities at the core of small polities has been traced in regional settlement-pattern surveys to around 1000 BC. Since that time, groups of households began to cluster together around locations that were to become central mounded funerary sites of the San Agustín chiefdoms during the subsequent Classic period (AD 1–900). González Fernández focuses his chapter on two key questions: (1) What were the inter-relationships among households within such central communities? (2) What kinds of forces shaped and held these communities together while they became the central places of Classic period chiefdoms? To answer these fundamental questions, he focuses on an archaeological reconstruction of the development of Mesitas, one of the largest mounded prehispanic communities in the region. Results of his study indicate that resource control, population growth, and craft specialization seem not to have been important in bringing about changes in the household sequence at Mesitas. Rather, the development of social differentiation and inequality among households is related to the very early clustering of some households around agricultural activities during a period when these activities were not important economically. A traditional ritual role that some households undertook in the community since very early times may explain, in part, the shape of the community and the greater differences among households later in the sequence.

In Chapter 13, Christine Beaulé studies artifact assemblages recovered from household units, features, and deep excavations at the Bolivian altiplano site of Jachakala (ca. AD 150–1200) to document the gradual development of inter-household wealth differentiation. Beaulé evaluates the origins of complexity with shifts in the domestic economy of these prehispanic Andean households. Changes in artifact patterns are studied in two ways by Beaulé. First, she tests the correspondence among differences in the domestic economy of different households and differential distributions of the markers of social status through an index of assemblage diversity, for which there are ideal data through well-preserved household unit remains. The results of this analysis reveal, however, that few markers of status and wealth correspond with each other or with architectural dimensions of ranking. In fact, house floor assemblages are more likely to consist of materials deliberately left during the structures' abandonment; small, easily overlooked items; or ones accumulated during post-abandonment events. The second approach Beaulé takes is to investigate larger domestic processes and patterns rather than individual household units. Comparing zones of the community, or spatially distinct groups of households, clearly reveals spatial and diachronic differences in domestic patterns corresponding to the origins of

complexity. In contrast to house floors, exterior midden deposits reflect many years of steady accumulation from a range of domestic activities, thereby mitigating some of the idiosyncrasies characteristic of floor assemblages. Beaulé's interzonal comparisons offer analytical advantages in allowing archaeologists to ignore the palimpsest nature of individual house floors and generally document a notable case study for the rise of inequality among households.

Finally, in Chapter 14, the last chapter in Section III and the volume, Darcy Lynn Wiewall creates a predictive model for understanding the political-economic relationship between Maya households and the Spanish colonial regime during the Postclassic-Colonial transition in the Maya Lowlands. In the year 1546, the Yucatán peninsula was officially deemed conquered and claimed for the Spanish Crown. As a result of the limited number of natural resources and the relative abundance of human labor, the Spanish State and Church quickly embraced, and further exploited, the preexisting labor and tribute system established by the Yucatec Maya elite. Current historical research indicates a heavy Spanish reliance on the local Maya tribute economy, which invariably affected Maya household economies much more so than historians purport. Recent archaeological research hints at the real possibility of identifying the degree of continuity and change in proto-colonial Maya household economies. The Spanish colonial tribute economy revolved around Maya labor and production in agriculture, cloth production, and animal husbandry on a cottage-industry level. Wiewall's research suggests that both state and household decisions resulted in the increased importance of household labor and production located within the houselot. As a result, women's labor and products supported the Spanish export economy, while the agricultural surplus of the men mainly fed local indigenous communities and Spaniards through urban markets. Wiewall suggests that Maya women provided the main sources of economic stability for the household. She argues that by identifying and comparing various household activities, one may begin to consider the degree of cooperation and specialization of labor, differential access to resources, and the choices of individual households on how best to allocate resources. By doing so, Wiewall states, one will be better able to understand the complex social and economic relations among households, communities, and the larger society.

REFERENCES CITED

- Allison, Penelope M., ed.
1999 *The Archaeology of Household Activities*. Routledge, New York.
- Arden, Tracy, ed.
2002 *Ancient Maya Women*. AltaMira Press, Walnut Creek, CA.

- Arnold, Dean
- 1975 "Ceramic Ecology of the Ayacucho Basin, Peru: Implications for Prehistory." *Current Anthropology* 16(1):183–205.
- 1985 *Ceramic Theory and Cultural Process*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Arnold, Phillip, III
- 1991 *Domestic Ceramic Production and Spatial Organization: A Mexican Case Study in Ethnoarchaeology*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Ashmore, Wendy
- 1988 "Household and Community at Classic Quirigua." In *Household and Community in the Mesoamerican Past*, edited by Richard R. Wilk and Wendy Ashmore, 153–70. University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque.
- Ashmore, Wendy, and Richard R. Wilk
- 1988 "Household and Community in the Mesoamerican Past." In *Household and Community in the Mesoamerican Past*, edited by Richard R. Wilk and Wendy Ashmore, 1–28. University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque.
- Baxter, Jane Eva
- 2008 "The Archaeology of Childhood." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 37:159–175.
- Beck, Robin A., Jr., ed.
- 2007 *The Durable House: House Society Models in Archaeology*. Occasional Papers no. 35. Center for Archaeological Investigations, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale.
- Bell, Duran
- 1986–1987 "Production and Distribution within Hierarchical Structured Cooperative Groups." *Journal of the Steward Anthropological Society* 16:96–124.
- Bell, Ellen E.
- 2002 "Engendering a Dynasty: A Royal Woman in the Margarita Tomb, Copan." In *Ancient Maya Women*, edited by Tracy Arden, 89–104. AltaMira Press, Walnut Creek, CA.
- Bender, Donald R.
- 1967 "A Refinement of the Concept of the Household: Families, Coresidence, and Domestic Functions." *American Anthropologist* 69:493–504.
- Bennett, Gwen P.
- 2007 "Context and Meaning in Late Neolithic Lithic Production in China: The Longshan Period in Southeastern Shandong Province." *Archaeological Papers of the American Anthropological Association* 17:52–67.
- Bermann, Marc
- 1994 *Lukurmata: Household Archaeology in Prehispanic Bolivia*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.
- Blanton, Richard E.
- 1994 *Houses and Households: A Comparative Study*. Plenum Press, New York.
- 1995 "The Cultural Foundations of Inequality in Households." In *Foundations of Social Inequality*, edited by T. Douglass Price and Gary M. Feinman, 105–28. Plenum Press, New York.

- Blanton, Richard E., Gary M. Feinman, Stephen A. Kowalewski, and Peter N. Peregrine
1996 "A Dual-Processual Theory for the Evolution of Mesoamerican Civilization." *Current Anthropology* 37:1–14.
- Bradley, Richard
2000 *An Archaeology of Natural Places*. Routledge, London.
- Brookfield, Harold C.
1972 "Intensification and Disintensification in Pacific Agriculture." *Pacific Viewpoint* 13:30–40.
- Bruhns, Karen O., and Karen E. Stothert, eds.
1999 *Women in Ancient America*. University of Oklahoma Press, Norman.
- Brumfiel, Elizabeth M.
1991 "Weaving and Cooking in Aztec Mexico." In *Engendering Archaeology: Women and Prehistory*, edited by Janet M. Gero and Margaret W. Conkey, 224–54. Basil Blackwell, Cambridge.
- Brumfiel, Elizabeth M., and Timothy Earle
1987 "Specialization, Exchange, and Complex Societies: An Introduction." In *Specialization, Exchange, and Complex Societies*, edited by Elizabeth Brumfiel and Timothy Earle, 1–9. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Brumfiel, Elizabeth M., and Cynthia Robin
2008 "Gender, Households, and Society: An Introduction." *Archaeological Papers of the American Anthropological Association* 18:1–16.
- Cameron, Judi
1995 "Sociopolitical and Economic Roles of Faunal Resources in the Prehistory of the Tonto Basin, Arizona." PhD dissertation, Department of Anthropology, University of Arizona, Tucson.
- Carballo, David M.
2011 "Advances in the Household Archaeology of Highland Mesoamerica." *Journal of Archaeological Research* 19:133–189.
- Chagnon, Napoleon A.
1997 *Yanomamö*. 5th ed. Harcourt Brace College Publishers, Fort Worth, TX.
- Christie, Jessica Joyce, and Patricia Joan Sarro, eds.
2006 *Palaces and Power in the Americas: From Peru to the Northwest Coast*. University of Texas Press, Austin.
- Claassen, Cheryl, and Rosemary A. Joyce, eds.
1997 *Women in Prehistory: North America and Mesoamerica*. University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia.
- Clark, John, and Michael Blake
1994 "The Power of Prestige: Competitive Generosity and the Emergence of Rank Societies in Lowland Mesoamerica." In *Factional Competition and Political Development in the New World*, edited by Elizabeth Brumfiel and John Fox, 17–30. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

- Clark, John, and William J. Parry
 1990 "Craft Specialization and Cultural Complexity." *Research in Economic Anthropology* 12:289–346.
- Conkey, Margaret W.
 2001 "Epilogue: Thinking about Gender with Theory and Method." In *Gender in Pre-hispanic America: A Symposium at Dumbarton Oaks 12 and 13 October 1996*, edited by Cecelia F. Klein, 341–363. Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, Washington, DC.
- Cook, Scott
 1982 *Zapotec Stoneworkers: The Dynamics of Rural Simple Commodity Production in Modern Mexican Capitalism*. University Press of America, Lanham, MD.
- Costin, Cathy
 1991 "Craft Specialization: Issues in Defining, Documenting, and Explaining the Organization of Production." In *Archaeological Method and Theory*, vol. 3, edited by Michael Schiffer, 1–56. University of Arizona Press, Tucson.
- Coupland, Gary, and E. B. Banning
 1996 "Introduction: The Archaeology of Big Houses." In *People Who Lived in Big Houses: Archaeological Perspectives on Large Domestic Structures*, edited by Gary Coupland and E. B. Banning, 1–0. Monographs in World Prehistory no. 27. Prehistory Press, Madison, WI.
- Dean, Rebecca M.
 2001 "Social Change and Hunting during the Pueblo III to Pueblo IV Transition, East-Central Arizona." *Journal of Field Archaeology* 28(3–4):271–85.
- De Lucia, Kristin
 2008 "Looking Beyond Gender Hierarchy: Rethinking Gender at Teotihuacan, Mexico." *Archaeological Papers of the American Anthropological Association* 18:17–36.
- Diehl, Michael W.
 1992 "Architecture as a Material Correlate of Mobility Strategies: Some Implications for Archaeological Interpretation." *Behavioral Science Research* 26(1–4): 1–35.
 1998 "The Interpretation of Archaeological Floor Assemblages: A Case Study from the American Southwest." *American Antiquity* 63(4):617–34.
- Diehl, Michael W., and Patricia A. Gilman
 1996 "Implications from the Designs of Different Southwestern Architectural Forms." In *Interpreting Southwestern Diversity: Underlying Principles and Overarching Principles*, edited by Paul R. Fish and Jeffrey J. Reid. Anthropological Research Papers no. 48. Arizona State University, Tempe.
- Dietler, Michael, and Brian Hayden, eds.
 2001 *Feasts: Archaeological and Ethnographic Perspectives on Food, Politics, and Power*. Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, DC.
- Doolittle, William
 1992 "House-Lot Gardens in the Gran Chichimeca." In *Gardens of Prehistory: The Archaeology of Settlement Agriculture in Greater Mesoamerica*, edited by Thomas Killion, 69–91. University of Alabama Press, Tuscaloosa.

- Douglass, John G.
- 2002 *Hinterland Households: Rural Agrarian Household Diversity in Northwest Honduras*. University Press of Colorado, Boulder.
- 2007 "Smoke, Soot, and Censors: A Perspective on Ancient Commoner Household Ritual Behavior from the Naco Valley, Honduras." In *Commoner Ritual and Ideology in Ancient Mesoamerica*, edited by Nancy Gonlin and Jon C. Lohse, 123–42. University Press of Colorado, Boulder.
- Douglass, John G., and K. Anne Pyburn
- 1995 "Settlement and Agriculture at Chau Hiix, Crooked Tree Wildlife Sanctuary, Belize." Paper presented at the 60th Annual Meeting of the Society for American Archaeology, Minneapolis, MN.
- Drennan, Robert D.
- 1988 "Household Location and Compact vs. Dispersed Settlement in Prehispanic Mesoamerica." In *Household and Community in the Mesoamerican Past*, edited by Richard R. Wilk and Wendy Ashmore, 273–94. University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque.
- Drennan, Robert D., and Dale Quattrin
- 1995 "Social Inequality and Agricultural Resources in the Valle de la Plata, Colombia." In *Foundations of Social Inequality*, edited by T. Douglas Price and Gary Feinman, 207–34. Plenum Press, New York.
- Dunning, Nicholas, and Timothy Beach
- 1994 "Soil Erosion, Slope Management, and Ancient Terracing in the Maya Lowlands." *Latin American Antiquity* 5(1):51–69.
- Earle, Timothy
- 1997 *How Chiefs Come to Power: The Political Economy in Prehistory*. Stanford University Press, Stanford, CA.
- Falconer, Steven E.
- 1994 "Village Economy and Society in the Jordan Valley: A Study of Bronze Age Rural Complexity." In *Archaeological Views from the Countryside: Village Communities in Early Complex Societies*, edited by Glenn M. Schwartz and Steven E. Falconer, 121–42. Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, DC.
- Farrington, Ian
- 1985 *Prehistoric Intensive Agriculture in the Tropics*. British Archaeological Reports, no. 232. British Archaeological Reports, Oxford.
- Fedick, Scott
- 1996 "An Interpretive Kaleidoscope: Alternative Perspectives on Ancient Agricultural Landscapes of the Maya Lowlands." In *The Managed Mosaic: Ancient Maya Agriculture and Resource Use*, edited by Scott Fedick, 107–31. University of Utah Press, Salt Lake City.
- Feinman, Gary M., Kent G. Lightfoot, and Steadman Upham
- 2000 "Political Hierarchies and Organizational Strategies in the American Southwest." *American Antiquity* 65(3):449–70.

- Fish, Suzanne K., Paul R. Fish, and Christian E. Downum
 1984 "Hohokam Terraces and Agricultural Production in the Tucson Basin, Arizona." In *Prehistoric Agricultural Strategies in the Southwest*, edited by Suzanne K. Fish and Paul R. Fish, 55–71. Anthropological Research Paper no. 33. Department of Anthropology, Arizona State University, Tempe.
- Fitch, James, and Daniel Branch
 1960 "Primitive Architecture and Climate." *Scientific American* 203(6):134–44.
- Flannery, Kent V.
 1972 "The Origins of the Village as a Settlement Type in Mesoamerica and the Near East: A Comparative Study." In *Man, Settlement, and Urbanism*, edited by Peter Ucko, Ruth Tringham, and G. W. Dimbleby, 23–53. Gerald Duckworth and Co., London.
 1976 "Evolution of Complex Social Systems." In *The Early Mesoamerican Village*, edited by Kent V. Flannery, 162–73. Academic Press, New York.
 2002 "The Origins of the Village Revisited: From Nuclear to Extended Households." *American Antiquity* 67(3):417–34.
- Flannery, Kent V., and Joyce Marcus
 1983 *The Cloud People*. Academic Press, New York.
- Flannery, Kent V. and Marcus C. Winter
 1976 "Analyzing Household Activities." In *The Early Mesoamerican Village*, edited by Kent V. Flannery, 34–47. Academic Press, New York.
- Fogelin, Lars
 2007 "The Archaeology of Religious Ritual." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 36:55–71.
- Fortier, Andrew C., Thomas O. Maher, Joyce A. Williams, Michael C. Meinkoth, Kathryn E. Parker, and Lucretia S. Kelly
 1989 *The Holding Site: A Hopewell Community in the American Bottom*. American Bottom Archaeology FAI-270 Site Report no. 19. Charles J. Bareis and John A. Walthall, series editors. University of Illinois Press, Urbana.
- Fried, Morton
 1967 *The Evolution of Political Society*. Random House, New York.
- Gillespie, Susan D.
 2000a "Beyond Kinship: An Introduction." In *Beyond Kinship: Social and Material Reproduction in House Societies*, edited by Rosemary A. Joyce and Susan D. Gillespie, 1–21. University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia
 2000b "Maya 'Nested' Houses: The Ritual Construction of Place." In *Beyond Kinship: Social and Material Reproduction in House Societies*, edited by Rosemary A. Joyce and Susan D. Gillespie, 135–60. University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia.
- Gilman, Patricia A.
 1987 "Architecture as Artifact: Pit Structures and Pueblos in the American Southwest." *American Antiquity* 52(3):538–64.

- 1997 *Wandering Village: Pit Structures, Mobility, and Agriculture in Southeast Arizona*. Anthropological Research Papers 49. Arizona State University, Tempe.
- Goldstein, Robin Coleman
 2008 "Hearths, Grinding Stones, and Households: Rethinking Domestic Economy in the Andes." *Archaeological Papers of the American Anthropological Association* 18:37–48.
- Gonlin, Nancy
 2007 "Ritual and Ideology among Classic Maya Rural Commoners at Copan, Honduras." In *Commoner Ritual and Ideology in Ancient Mesoamerica*, edited by Nancy Gonlin and Jon C. Lohse, 83–122. University Press of Colorado, Boulder.
- Gonlin, Nancy, and Jon C. Lohse, eds.
 2007 *Commoner Ritual and Ideology in Ancient Mesoamerica*. University Press of Colorado, Boulder.
- González-Ruibal, Alfredo
 2006 "House Societies vs. Kinship-Based Societies: An Archaeological Case from Iron Age Europe." *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* 25:144–73.
- Goody, Jack
 1972 "The Evolution of the Family." In *House and Family in Past Times*, edited by Peter Laslett and Richard Wall, 102–24. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Gossen, Gary H., and Richard M. Leventhal
 1993 "The Topography of Ancient Maya Religious Pluralism: A Dialogue with the Present." In *Lowland Maya Civilization in the Eighth Century A.D.*, edited by Jeremy A. Sabloff and John S. Henderson, 185–217. Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, Washington, DC.
- Graves, Michael
 1991 "Pottery Production and Distribution among the Kalinga: A Study of Household and Regional Organization and Differentiation." In *Ceramic Ethnoarchaeology*, edited by William A. Longacre, 112–43. University of Arizona Press, Tucson.
- Graves, William M., and Katherine A. Spielmann
 2000 "Leadership, Long-Distance Exchange, and Feasting in the Protohistoric Rio Grande." In *Alternative Leadership Strategies in the Prehispanic Southwest*, edited by Barbara J. Mills, 45–59. University of Arizona Press, Tucson.
- Grimstead, Deanna N., and Frank E. Bayham
 2010 "Evolutionary Ecology, Elite Feasting, and the Hohokam: A Case Study from a Southern Arizona Platform Mound." *American Antiquity* 75(4):841–64.
- Gustafson, Lowell S., and Amelia M. Trevelyan, eds.
 2002 *Ancient Maya Gender Identity and Relations*. Bergin and Garvey, Westport, CT.

- Hagstrum, Melissa
- 1999 "The Goals of Domestic Autonomy among Highland Peruvian Farmer-Potters in Peasant Craft Specialization: Home Economics of Rural Craft Specialists." *Research in Economic Anthropology* 20:265–98.
- 2001 "Household Production in Chaco Canyon." *American Antiquity* 66(1):47–55.
- Haller, Archibald
- 1970 "Changes in the Structure of Status Systems." *Rural Sociology* 35(4):469–87.
- Hammel, E. A.
- 1984 "On the *** of Studying Household Form and Function." In *Households: Comparative and Historical Studies of the Domestic Group*, edited by Robert McC. Netting, Richard R. Wilk, and Eric J. Arnould, 29–43. University of California Press, Berkeley.
- Harrison, Peter D.
- 1993 "Aspects of Water Management in the Southern Maya Lowlands." In *Economic Aspects of Water Management in the Prehispanic New World*, edited by Vernon L. Scarborough and Barry L. Isaac, 71–120. JAI Press, Greenwich, CT.
- Harrison, Peter D., and B. L. Turner II, eds.
- 1978 *Pre-Hispanic Maya Agriculture*. University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque.
- Hastorf, Christine A.
- 1993 *Agriculture and the Onset of Political Inequality before the Inka*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Hastorf, Christine A., and Terence N. D'Altroy
- 2001 "The Domestic Economy, Households, and Imperial Transformation." In *Empire and Domestic Economy*, edited by Terence N. D'Altroy and Christine Hastorf, 3–26. Kluwer/Plenum, New York.
- Haviland, William A.
- 1981 "Dower Houses and Minor Centers at Tikal, Guatemala: An Investigation into the Identification of Valid Units in Settlement Hierarchies." In *Lowland Maya Settlement Patterns*, edited by Wendy Ashmore, 89–117. University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque.
- Hayden, Brian
- 1992 "Conclusions: Ecology and Hunter-Gatherers." In *A Complex Culture of the British Columbia Plateau*, edited by Brian Hayden, 525–63. University of British Columbia Press, Vancouver.
- 1995 "Pathways to Power: Principles for Creating Socioeconomic Inequalities." In *Foundations of Social Inequality*, edited by T. Douglass Price and Gary M. Feinman, 15–86. Plenum, New York.
- 2001 "Fabulous Feasts: A Prolegomenon to the Importance of Feasting." In *Feasts: Archaeological and Ethnographic Perspectives on Food, Politics, and Power*, edited by Michael Dietler and Brian Hayden, 23–64. Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, DC.

- Hayden, Brian, and Audrey Cannon
 1982 "The Corporate Group as an Archaeological Unit." *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* 1(2):132–58.
- Hayden, Brian, and Rob Gargett
 1990 "Big Man, Big Heart? A Mesoamerican View of the Emergence of Complex Society." *Ancient Mesoamerica* 1(1):3–20.
- Hegmon, Michelle
 1989 "Social Integration and Architecture." In *The Architecture of Social Integration in Prehistoric Pueblos*, edited by William D. Lipe and Michelle Hegmon, 5–14. Crow Canyon Archaeological Center, Cortez, CO.
 1996 "Variability in Food Production, Strategies of Storage and Sharing, and the Pithouse to Pueblo Transition in the Northern Southwest." In *Evolving Complexity and Environmental Risk in the Prehistoric Southwest*, edited by Joseph Tainter and Bonnie Bagley Tainter, 223–50. Santa Fe Institute Studies in the Sciences of Complexity, vol. 24. Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Reading, MA.
- Hendon, Julia A.
 1987 "The Uses of Maya Structures: A Study of Architecture and Artifact Distribution at Sepulturas, Copán, Honduras." PhD dissertation, Department of Anthropology, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA. University Microfilms, Ann Arbor.
 1991 "Status and Power in Classic Maya Society: An Archaeological Study." *American Anthropologist* 93(4):894–918.
 1996 "Archaeological Approaches to the Organization of Domestic Labor: Household Practice and Domestic Relations." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 25:45–61.
 2000 "Having and Holding: Storage, Memory, Knowledge, and Social Relations." *American Anthropologist* 102(1):42–53.
 2001 "Active Households: Identity and Status among the Maya Elite." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association, Washington, DC.
 2002 "Social Relations and Collective Identities: Household and Community in Ancient Mesoamerica." In *The Dynamics of Power*, edited by Marla O'Donovan, 273–300. Occasional Paper 30, Center for Archaeological Investigations, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale.
 2010 *Houses in a Landscape: Memory and Everyday Life in Mesoamerica*. Duke University Press, Durham, NC.
- Hirth, Kenneth
 1993 "Identifying Rank and Socioeconomic Status in Domestic Contexts: An Example from Central Mexico." In *Prehispanic Domestic Units in Western Mesoamerica: Studies of the Household, Compound, and Residence*, edited by Robert S. Santley and Kenneth G. Hirth, 121–46. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL.
 2006 "Modeling Domestic Craft Production at Xochicalco." In *Obsidian Craft Production in Ancient Central Mexico*, edited by Kenneth Hirth, 275–86. University of Utah Press, Salt Lake City.

- 2009 "Craft Production, Household Diversification, and Domestic Economy in Prehispanic Mesoamerica." *Archaeological Papers of the American Anthropological Association* 19:13–32.
- Holschlag, Stephanie L.
 1975 "Pot Creek Pueblo and the Question of Prehistoric Northern Tiwa Household Configuration." PhD dissertation, Washington State University, Pullman. University Microfilms, Ann Arbor.
- Howard, Jerry B.
 1985 "Courtyard Groups and Domestic Cycling: A Hypothetical Model of Growth." In *Proceedings of the 1983 Hohokam Symposium*, edited by Alfred E. Dittert and Donald E. Dove, 311–26. Arizona Archaeological Society, Phoenix.
- Hruby, Zachary X.
 2007 "Ritualized Chipped-Stone Production at Piedras Negras, Guatemala." *Archaeological Papers of the American Anthropological Association* 17:68–87.
- Hunter-Anderson, Rosalind
 1977 "A Theoretical Approach to the Study of House Form." In *For Theory Building in Archaeology*, edited by Lewis R. Binford, 287–316. Academic Press, New York.
- Isaac, Barry L.
 1996 "Approaches to Classic Maya Economies." *Research in Economic Anthropology* 17:297–334.
- Johnston, Kevin, and Nancy Gonlin
 1998 "What Do Houses Mean? Approaches to the Analysis of Classic Maya Commoner Residence." In *Function and Meaning in Classic Maya Architecture*, edited by Stephen D. Houston, 141–85. Dumbarton Oaks, Washington, DC.
- Joyce, Arthur A., and Errin T. Weller
 2007 "Commoner Rituals, Resistance, and the Classic-to-Postclassic Transition in Ancient Mesoamerica." In *Commoner Ritual and Ideology in Ancient Mesoamerica*, edited by Nancy Gonlin and Jon C. Lohse, 123–42. University Press of Colorado, Boulder.
- Joyce, Rosemary A.
 2000 "Heirlooms and Houses: Materiality and Social Memory." In *Beyond Kinship: Social and Material Reproduction in House Societies*, edited by Rosemary A. Joyce and Susan D. Gillespie, 189–212. University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia.
- Joyce, Rosemary A., and Susan D. Gillespie, eds.
 2000 *Beyond Kinship: Social and Material Reproduction in House Societies*. University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia.

Kent, Susan

- 1990 "A Cross-Cultural Study of Segmentation, Architecture, and Use of Space." In *Domestic Architecture and Use of Space: An Interdisciplinary, Cross-Cultural Study*, edited by Susan Kent, 127–52. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- 1999 "The Archaeological Visibility of Storage: Delineating Storage from Trash Areas." *American Antiquity* 64(1):79–94.

Killion, Thomas

- 1987 "Agriculture and Residential Site Structure among Campesinos in Southern Veracruz, Mexico: Building a Foundation for Archaeological Inference." PhD dissertation, Department of Anthropology, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque.
- 1992 "Residential Ethnoarchaeology and Ancient Site Structure: Contemporary Farming and Prehistoric Settlement Agriculture at Matacapán, Veracruz, Mexico." In *Gardens of Prehistory: The Archaeology of Settlement Agriculture in Greater Mesoamerica*, edited by Thomas Killion, 119–49. University of Alabama Press, Tuscaloosa.

Kramer, Carol

- 1979 "An Archaeological View of a Contemporary Kurdish Village: Domestic Architecture, Household Size, and Wealth." In *Ethnoarchaeology*, edited by Carol Kramer, 139–63. Columbia University Press, New York.
- 1982 "Ethnographic Households and Archaeological Interpretation: A Case from Iranian Kurdistan." *American Behavioral Scientist* 25(6):663–75.

Lévi-Strauss, Claude

- 1982 *The Way of the Masks*. Translated by Sylvia Modelski. University of Washington Press, Seattle.
- 1987 *Anthropology and Myth: Lectures 1951–1982*. Translated by Roy Willis. Blackwell Publishing, Oxford.

Lightfoot, Ricky

- 1994 *The Duckfoot Site*, vol. 2: *Archaeology of the House and Household*. Occasional Papers no. 4. Crow Canyon Archaeological Center, Cortes, CO.

Lloyd, P. C.

- 1955 "The Yoruba Lineage." *Africa* 25(3):235–51.

Lohse, Jon C.

- 2000 "Ancient Maya House-lots as Landscapes at Dos Hombres, Belize." Paper presented at the 99th Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association, San Francisco, CA.
- 2007 "Commoner Ritual, Commoner Ideology: (Sub-)Alternative Views on Social Complexity in Prehispanic Mesoamerica." In *Commoner Ritual and Ideology in Ancient Mesoamerica*, edited by Nancy Gonlin and Jon C. Lohse, 1–32. University Press of Colorado, Boulder.

Lucero, Lisa J.

- 2010 "Materialized Cosmology among Ancient Maya Commoners." *Journal of Social Archaeology* 10(1):138–167.

- MacEachern, Scott, David J.W. Archer, and Richard D. Garvin, eds.
 1989 *Households and Communities, Proceedings of the 21st Chacmool Conference*. The Archaeological Association of the University of Calgary, Calgary.
- Manzanilla, Linda, and Luís Barba
 1990 "The Study of Activities in Classic Households, Two Case Studies: Cobá and Teotihuacan." *Ancient Mesoamerica* 1(1):41–7.
- Marcus, Joyce, and Kent V. Flannery
 2004 "The Coevolution of Ritual and Society: New C¹⁴ Dates from Ancient Mexico." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 101(52):18257–18261.
- Masson, Marilyn
 1999 "Animal Resource Manipulation in Ritual and Domestic Contexts at Post-classic Maya Communities." *World Archaeology* 31(1):93–120.
- McAnany, Patricia
 1992 "A Theoretical Perspective on Elites and the Economic Transformation of Classic Period Maya Households." In *Understanding Economic Processes*, edited by Sutti Ortiz and Susan Lees, 85–103. Monographs in Economic Anthropology no. 10. University Press of America, Lanham, MD.
 1993 "The Economics of Social Power and Wealth among Eighth-Century Maya Households." In *Lowland Maya Civilization in the Eighth Century A.D.*, edited by Jeremy Sabloff and John Henderson, 65–90. Dumbarton Oaks, Washington, DC.
 1995 *Living with the Ancestors: Kinship and Kingship in Ancient Maya Society*. University of Texas Press, Austin.
- McGuire, Randall, and Michael Schiffer
 1983 "A Theory of Architectural Design." *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* 2(3): 277–303.
- Mehrer, Mark W.
 2007 "Steps to a Holistic Household Archaeology." In *Commoner Ritual and Ideology in Ancient Mesoamerica*, edited by Nancy Gonlin and Jon C. Lohse, 281–93. University Press of Colorado, Boulder.
- Mills, Barbara J.
 1995 "Gender and the Reorganization of Historic Zuni Craft Production." *Journal of Anthropological Research* 51(2):149–172.
 2004 *Identity, Feasting, and the Archaeology of the Greater Southwest*. University Press of Colorado, Boulder
 2007 "Performing the Feast: Visual Display and Supra-household Commensalism in the Puebloan Southwest." *American Antiquity* 72(2):210–40.
- Morgan, Lewis Henry
 1963 *Ancient Society*. World Publishing Company, New York.
 [1877]
- Murdock, George Peter
 1966 *Social Structure*. Eleventh printing. MacMillan Company, New York.

- Neff, Linda Stephen
 2002 "Gender Divisions of Labor and Lowland Terrace Agriculture." In *Ancient Maya Women*, edited by Tracy Arden, 31–51. AltaMira, Walnut Creek, CA.
- Netting, Robert McC.
 1977 "Maya Subsistence: Mythologies, Analogies, Possibilities." In *The Origins of Maya Civilization*, edited by Richard Adams, 299–333. University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque.
 1982 "Some Truths on Household Size and Wealth." *American Behavioral Scientist* 25(6):641–62.
- Netting, Robert McC., Richard R. Wilk, and Eric J. Arnould
 1984a *Households: Comparative and Historical Studies of the Domestic Group*. University of California Press, Berkeley.
 1984b "Introduction." In *Households: Comparative and Historical Studies of the Domestic Group*, edited by Robert McC. Netting, Richard R. Wilk, and Eric J. Arnould, xiii–xxxviii. University Press of California, Berkeley.
- Pasternak, Burton., Carol R. Ember, and Melvin Ember
 1976 "On the Conditions Favoring Extended Family Households." *Journal of Anthropological Research* 32(2):109–24.
- Plog, Stephen
 1978 "Black Mesa Research Design." In *Excavation on Black Mesa, 1977: A Preliminary Report*, edited by Anthony L. Klesert, 21–42. Center for Archaeological Investigations, Research Paper no. 1. Southern Illinois University, Carbondale.
- Plunket, Patricia, ed.
 2002 *Domestic Ritual in Ancient Mesoamerica*. Monograph 46, Cotsen Institute of Archaeology. University of California, Los Angeles.
- Potter, James M.
 1997 "Communal Ritual and Faunal Remains: An Example from the Dolores Anasazi." *Journal of Field Archaeology* 24(3):353–64.
 2000 "Pots, Parties, and Politics: Communal Feasting in the American Southwest." *American Antiquity* 65(3):471–92.
- Rathje, William L.
 1983 "To the Salt of the Earth: Some Comments on Household Archaeology among the Maya." In *Prehistoric Settlement Patterns: Essays in Honor of Gordon R. Willey*, edited by Evon Z. Vogt and Richard M. Leventhal, 23–34. University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque.
- Redman, Charles
 1982 "Regularity and Change in the Architecture of an Early Village." In *The Hilly Flanks: Essays on the Prehistory of Southwest Asia*, 189–206. Oriental Institute, University of Chicago, Chicago.
- Rice, Don S.
 1988 "Classic to Postclassic Maya Household Transitions in the Central Peten, Guatemala." In *Household and Community in the Mesoamerican Past*, edited by

Richard R. Wilk and Wendy Ashmore, 227–48. University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque.

Robbins, M. C.

1966 “House Types and Settlement Patterns: An Application of Ethnology to Archaeological Interpretation.” *Minnesota Archaeologist* 28(1):3–26.

Robin, Cynthia

2002 “Gender and Maya Farming: Chan Nòohol, Belize.” In *Ancient Maya Women*, edited by Tracy Arden, 12–30. AltaMira Press, Walnut Creek, CA.

2003 “New Directions in Classic Maya Household Archaeology.” *Journal of Archaeological Research* 11(4):307–56.

Rocek, Thomas R.

1995a “Sedentarization and Agricultural Dependence: Perspectives from the Pit-house-to-Pueblo Transition in the American Southwest.” *American Antiquity* 60(2):218–39.

1995b “Pithouse to Pueblo Transitions on Two Continents: Interpretations of Sedentism and Mobility in the Southwestern United States and Southwest Asia.” In *Seasonality and Sedentism: Archaeological Perspectives from the Old and New World Sites*, edited by Thomas R. Rocek and Ofer Bar-Yosef, 199–216. Peabody Museum Bulletin 6. Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, Cambridge, MA.

Roth, Barbara J.

2000 “Households at the Rincon Phase Hohokam Site in the Tucson Basin of Southern Arizona.” *Journal of Field Archaeology* 27(3):285–94.

Sanders, William T., Jeffrey R. Parsons, and Robert S. Santley

1979 *The Basin of Mexico: Ecological Processes in the Evolution of a Civilization*. Academic Press, New York.

Santley, Robert S., and Kenneth Hirth, eds.

1993 *Prehispanic Domestic Units in Western Mesoamerica: Studies of the Compound, Household, and Residence*. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL.

Santley, Robert S., and R. Kneebone

1993 “Craft Specialization, Refuse Disposal and the Creation of Spatial Archaeological Records in Prehispanic Mesoamerica.” In *Prehispanic Domestic Units in Western Mesoamerica: Studies of the Compound, Household, and Residence*, edited by Robert S. Santley and Kenneth Hirth, 37–63. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL.

Scarborough, Vernon L.

1993 “Water Management in the Southern Maya Lowlands: An Accretive Model for the Engineered Landscape.” In *Research in Economic Aspects of Water Management in the Prehispanic New World*, edited by Vernon L. Scarborough and Barry L. Isaac, 17–69. JAI Press, Greenwich, CT.

Schwarz, Kevin R.

2009 “Eckixil: Understanding the Classic to Postclassic Survival and Transformation of a Petén Maya Village.” *Latin American Antiquity* 20(3):413–41.

- Scott, James C.
- 1985 *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance*. Yale University Press, New Haven, CT.
 - 1990 *Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts*. Yale University Press, New Haven, CT.
- Shanks, Michael, and Christopher Tilley
- 1982 "Ideology, Symbolic Power, and Ritual Communication: A Reinterpretation of Neolithic Mortuary Practices." In *Symbolic and Structural Archaeology*, edited by Ian Hodder, 129–54. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Sheehy, James J.
- 1991 "Structure and Change in a Late Classic Maya Domestic Group at Copan, Honduras." *Ancient Mesoamerica* 2(1):1–19.
- Sheets, Payson
- 2006 *The Cerén Site: A Prehistoric Village Buried by Volcanic Ash in Central America*, 2nd edition. Harcourt Brace College Publishers, New York.
- Smith, Michael
- 1987 "Household Possessions and Wealth in Agrarian States: Implications for Archaeology." *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* 6(4):297–335.
 - 1993 "Houses and Settlement Hierarchy in Late Postclassic Morelos: A Comparison of Archaeology and Ethnohistory." In *Prehispanic Domestic Units in Western Mesoamerica: Studies of the Compound, Household, and Residence*, edited by Robert S. Santley and Kenneth Hirth, 191–206. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL.
- Spielmann, Katherine A.
- 1998 "Ritual Influences on the Development of Rio Grande Glaze A Ceramics." In *Migration and Reorganization: The Pueblo IV Period in the American Southwest*, edited by Katherine A. Spielmann, 253–62. Arizona State University Anthropological Research Paper no. 51. Arizona State University, Tempe.
 - 2004 "Communal Feasting, Ceramics, and Exchange." In *Identity, Feasting, and the Archaeology of the Greater Southwest*, edited by Barbara J. Mills, 210–32. University Press of Colorado, Boulder.
- Stanish, Charles
- 1989 "Household Archaeology." *American Anthropologist* 91(1):7–24.
 - 1992 *Ancient Andean Political Economy*. University of Texas Press, Austin.
- Stark, Miriam
- 1995 "Economic Intensification and Ceramic Specialization in the Philippines: A View from Kalinga." *Research in Economic Anthropology* 16:179–226.
- Szuter, Christine
- 1991 "Hunting by Hohokam Desert Farmers." *Kiva* 56(3):277–93.
- Tourtellot, Gair
- 1988 "Developmental Cycles of Households and Houses and Seibal." In *Household and Community in the Mesoamerican Past*, edited by Richard R. Wilk and Wendy Ashmore, 97–120. University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque.

- Van Keuren, Scott
2004 "Crafting Feasts in the Prehispanic Southwest." In *Identity, Feasting, and the Archaeology of the Greater Southwest*, edited by Barbara J. Mills, 192–210. University Press of Colorado, Boulder.
- Webster, David, and Nancy Gonlin
1988 "Household Remains of the Humblest Maya." *Journal of Field Archaeology* 15(2):169–90.
- Wells, E. Christian, and Karla Davis-Salazar, eds.
2007 *Mesoamerican Ritual Economy: Archaeological and Ethnological Perspectives*. University of Colorado, Boulder.
- Whalen, Michael E.
1981 "Cultural-Ecological Aspects of the Pithouse-to-Pueblo Transition in a Portion of the Southwest." *American Antiquity* 46(1):75–92.
- Widmer, Randolph J.
2009 "Elite Household Multicrafting Specialization at 9N8, Patio H, Copan." *Archaeological Papers of the American Anthropological Association* 19:174–204.
- Wilcox, David R., Thomas McGuire, and Charles Sternberg
1981 *Snaketown Revisited*. Arizona State Museum Archaeological Series no. 155. Arizona State Museum, Tucson.
- Wilk, Richard R.
1983 "Little House in the Jungle: The Causes of Variation in Household Size among Modern Kekchi Maya." *Journal of Anthropological Research* 2(2):99–116.
1991 *Household Ecology: Economic Change and Domestic Life among the Kekchi Maya of Belize*. University of Arizona Press, Tucson.
- Wilk, Richard R., and Robert McC. Netting
1984 "Households: Changing Forms and Functions." In *Households: Comparative and Historical Studies of the Domestic Group*, edited by Robert McC. Netting, Richard R. Wilk, and Eric J. Arnould, 1–28. University of California Press, Berkeley.
- Wilk, Richard R., and William J. Rathje
1982 "Household Archaeology." *American Behavioral Scientist* 25(6):617–39.
- Wills, Wirt H., and Patricia L. Crown
2004 "Commensal Politics in the Prehispanic Southwest: An Introductory Review." In *Identity, Feasting, and the Archaeology of the Greater Southwest*, edited by Barbara J. Mills, 153–72. University Press of Colorado, Boulder.
- Wilshusen, Richard H.
1988 "The Pit Structure to Pueblo Transition: An Alternative to McGuire and Schiffer's Explanation." In *Dolores Archaeological Program: Supporting Studies; Additive and Reductive Technologies*, edited by Eric Blinman, Carl J. Phagan, and Richard H. Wilshusen, 703–8. United States Department of Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, Engineering and Research Center, Denver.

- 1989 "Unstuffing the Estufa: Ritual Floor Features in Anasazi Pit Structures and Pueblo Kivas." In *The Architecture of Social Integration in Prehistoric Pueblos*, edited by William Lipe and Michelle Hegmon, 89–112. Occasional Papers no. 1. Crow Canyon Archaeological Center, Cortez, CO.
- Winter, Marcus C.
- 1974 "Residential Patterns at Monte Alban, Oaxaca, Mexico." *Science* 185:981–7.
- 1976 "The Archaeological Household Cluster in the Valley of Oaxaca." In *The Early Mesoamerican Village*, edited by Kent V. Flannery, 25–31. Academic Press, New York.
- Yaeger, Jason, and Marcello A. Canuto
- 2000 "Introducing an Archaeology of Communities." In *The Archaeology of Communities: A New World Perspective*, edited by Marcello A. Canuto and Jason Yaeger, 1–15. Routledge, New York.
- Yanagisako, Sylvia
- 1979 "Family and Household: The Analysis of Domestic Groups." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 8:161–206.