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Abstract
Recently, interest in the archaeology of ethnogenesis has surged. This renewed interest stems from innovations in the historical study of ethnogenesis, theoretical shifts favoring multidirectional agency, and relevant contemporary sociopolitical debates. Theoretical problems surrounding the appropriateness of the social science concept of “ethnicity,” however, have made the comparative study of ethnogenesis difficult. Drawing from past and emergent perspectives adds renewed vigor to comparative studies of ethnogenesis. A methodology that integrates the different types of theory can resolve the theoretical tensions in the archaeological study of ethnogenesis.
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Introduction
In the past generation or so, archaeologists have recognized that boundaries of archaeological cultures, based on material culture traits, do not neatly correspond to how the people themselves perceive social, cultural, and ethnic boundaries. To complicate matters further, the old sense that identities are discrete and long-lived has been seriously challenged. Instead, anthropologists now consider identity to be situational and relational and in the constant process of making, unmaking, and, sometimes, disappearing (Eriksen 1993, pp. 10–12; Gosden 1999, p. 196; Jones 1997, pp. 125–126; Kohl 1998, p. 231; Lucas 2004, p. 198; Meskell 2001; Smoak 2006, p. 5). This constructivist view of identity, specifically ethnic identity, has
generated much heated debate on whether archaeologists can even trace ethnicity through time in the archaeological record (e.g., Jones 1997 contra Kohl 1998).

Whereas many agree that “identity” should be approached historically through tracing social relationships over time, others reject the term’s analytical usefulness altogether (e.g., Brubaker and Cooper 2000, p. 25). Brubaker and Cooper (2000, p. 34) argue that even though the term “identity” is used in daily practice, it encompasses so many contradictory understandings, both fluid and discrete, that it becomes a source of confusion. Even more damaging to the use of “ethnic identity” in the social sciences is that it has been employed extensively to categorize and control people (Scott 1998, 2009). As interest in identity has increased, so has skepticism of its analytical and ethical value.

In archaeology, the theorizing of identity as fluid, contested, constructed, and emergent has made comparative studies difficult. Comparative social science (Tilly 2005; Weber 1949) rests on the conviction that one can have a deeper understanding of social processes through the study of interrelated facts, and that the methods of doing so are reproducible. The particularistic emphasis of postmodern definitions of identity is ill suited to comparative social science (Sabloff 2011, p. xvii; Tilly 2005, 2008, p. 5). Methodologies in comparative archaeology have focused on the categories of material culture that have the most potential of signaling and aiding the reproduction of identities (Emberling 1997, p. 325). Nevertheless, just as different processes underpin language, culture, and genes (Moore 1994, p. 939; Ortman 2012, p. 369; Weber 1949, p. 69), so the processes governing the production of material culture differ from those governing the production of the various kinds of identities. Therefore, we cannot directly infer the character of identities from material culture. Even though most agree that we should be looking instead at the production of social relationships and forms of identification (both etic and emic) over time (e.g., Brubaker and Cooper 2000, p. 30; Royce 1982, p. 23; Voss 2008, p. 15), we still lack methodological and theoretical clarity for undertaking the endeavor comparatively. Should we, then, abandon identity and related terms if we want to do comparative social science?

To avoid confusion, as racial, class, ethnic, gender, and other identities may have different dynamics, the scope of this paper is ethnic identity and ethnogenesis. I adopt Weber’s definition of ethnic identity as a belief in group affinity that is based on subjective beliefs of shared common ancestry drawn from “similarities of physical type or of customs or both” or “of memories of colonization and migration” (Weber 1978, p. 389). According to Weber, this belief in group affinity must “be important for the propagation of group formation.” The genesis, maintenance, and disappearance of ethnic identity are all manifestations of the same process of “ethnomorphosis” (Kohl 1998, p. 232). Ethnomorphosis is the historical process of ethnicity.

I argue that the concepts of ethnicity and ethnogenesis, despite recent dismissals of their analytical value, should not be abandoned in comparative research. The dismissal of social constructions such as ethnicity on the grounds that they are not “real” impedes the progress of “building systematic knowledge of social construction into superior analyses of social processes” (Tilly 2008, p. 5). Instead, I outline an integration of past and emergent perspectives on ethnogenesis that makes its comparative study not only possible but theoretically and
methodologically rich. I do not argue that such an approach is the only possibility. I intend the approach to be a heuristic model to help others generate their own frameworks to get beyond the current theoretical stalemates. Ironically, it may be the careful systematic analysis of “ethnic identity” and “ethnogenesis” that leads to the eventual dissolution of these general terms in favor of more exact concepts in the rigorous analysis of social processes (Tilly 2008, pp. 7, 77; Weber 1978, p. 395). Therefore, we will understand more fully the processes behind ethnicity and ethnogenesis not by arguing against straw-man versions of the older understandings but by using the terms as heuristic devices to understand the many historical manifestations of the social construction of difference.

First, I lay out the theoretical problems with ethnic identity. Second, drawing from various scholars, I outline a methodology for comparative study of ethnic identity and ethnogenesis. Third, I present examples that illustrate the utility of the methodology as well as highlight strengths of archaeology for understanding ethnic identity and ethnogenesis.

The problem of the social “unit”

The modern social sciences, with emphasis on the study of humans as specimens, find their roots in the Enlightenment (Weber 2005, pp. 39–40). The Enlightenment scientists considered New World peoples “uncorrupted” by civilization; therefore, the Americas provided the perfect natural laboratory to carry out systematic and comparative studies of human society (Weber 2005, p. 31). A group normally called themselves “people” in their own language, but outsiders drew lines of group difference very differently (Weber 2005, p. 16). Thus the Enlightenment-inspired classification and naming of peoples echoes the modern practice of assigning ethnic categories in the social sciences.

The term “ethnicity” under the guise of “ethnos” appeared in academic discussions between the end of World War I and the beginning of World War II (Banks 1996, p. 4; Eriksen 1993, p. 3; Glazer and Moynihan 1975, p. 1; Sokolovskii and Tishkov 2002, pp. 290–291; Wade 1997, p. 16). These first discussions coincided with the Nazi and Soviet programs of finding national origins, and ethnicity was seen as a primordial set of traits for each modern nation (Kohl 1998). The invention of the concept of “ethnicity” was part of the various nation-state programs to classify human difference by geographic and cultural boundaries, in addition to racial physical and behavioral traits. By making social complexity more legible to outsiders, the invention of the concept of ethnicity, then, is probably related to what Scott (1998) calls “seeing like a state.” A more detailed treatment of the history of the concepts of ethnicity and ethnogenesis can be found elsewhere (e.g., Banks 1996; Voss 2008).

Seeing social complexity in archaeology

In archaeology, the tension between the analytic outsider’s way of seeing social complexity (etic) and the embedded insider’s way (emic) pervades debates on
identity (Conkey and Hastorf 1990). Conkey and Hastorf (1990, p. 3) argued that the tension is also a source of dynamism in archaeological theory and method debates. Such a tension forces us to be self-reflexive about our archaeological inquiry because culture and our view of it are historically produced (Conkey 1990, p. 12).

How can we avoid “seeing like a state” and gain more of an insider view of social cohesion? How can we avoid oversimplification when we use analytical generalizations such as ethnicity and ethnogenesis? How do we make sure we are not constructing ethnicity around an imaginary academic construct and, worse, perpetuating certain hegemonic narratives of power (Foucault 1979, p. 194; Kohl 1998; Scott 1998)?

A more careful consideration of ethnicity reveals at least three components: (1) how insiders view membership, (2) how outsiders relate to and interact with insiders, and (3) how and why institutions such as state bureaucracies and academia draw boundaries around and classify people, and how those classifications are subsequently used (e.g., Bourdieu 1990, pp. 14, 27; Gosden 1999, pp. 125, 190; Liebmann and Preucel 2007, p. 202; Scott 1998; Verdery 1994, p. 37).

A commonly used solution to represent social relations is Bourdieu’s (1977, 1984) practice theory (Jones 1997, p. 49; Shennan 1989, p. 15; Stark and Chance 2008, p. 15). Feelings of group membership arise from a subliminal awareness of objective, but largely subconscious, commonalities of practice (Bentley 1987, pp. 27, 1991, p. 173). These commonalities of practice arise from dispositions bundled as habitus. The assumption is that people identify with a group with a habitus or set of cultural dispositions similar to their own. Bourdieu’s emphasis (1990, p. 54) on how dispositions generate practices that in turn reinforce those same dispositions explains the durability and cultural aesthetics of group and class. Bourdieu’s (1984) “distinction” provided methodological grounding for his practice theory and dovetails well with the discussions on archaeological style (Conkey and Hastorf 1990; Sackett 1982; Wiessner 1983; Wobst 1977).

Weber presaged practice theory when he emphasized that people gravitate not only toward those who physically resemble themselves but also away from those with “perceptible differences in the conduct of everyday life” (Weber 1978, p. 390). As symbols of ethnic membership, such differences can have an ethnically repulsive effect, reinforcing more insular social interaction among groups, which in turn perpetuates distinctive conducts of everyday life. Not all symbols have to work as an abstraction, though, as even differences in acceptable hair odor can thwart “all attempts at social intercourse” (Weber 1978, p. 391). People often become aware of their shared subliminal conduct of everyday life in times of crisis or to protect group interests. In short, practice theory explains the mechanism of the perpetuation of insularity in social relations.

Why is there insularity in the first place? Ethnic categorizations and identity claims are often, if not always, used in struggles for or legitimizations of power and authority (Jenkins 1994, p. 219; Tilly 2005, p. 8). Therefore, as long as there are inequalities in access to power and status as well as different normative ideals of the political community, insularity in social interaction is present. The difference between in-group and out-group identification implies different political processes (e.g., Bawden 2005; Epstein 2006; Jenkins 2007; Royce 1982; Tilly 2005).
Although many anthropologists have favored in-group identification as more authentic, several authors have argued that one cannot understand in-group identification without also understanding out-group identification, because they are related to each other (Jenkins 2007; Roosens 1989; Voss 2008). In fact, Royce (1982, p. 23) noted the differential rates of change between objective cues and subjective perceptions of identity as especially interesting because they imply competing structures of power and authority (Emberling 1997, p. 309; Jenkins 2007, p. 76; McGuire 1982; Williams 1992).

**What does a methodology for the archaeological study of ethnogenesis look like?**

To understand the significance of ethnogenesis events, a methodology must be theoretically coherent and able to organize the changes in social relations over time. At any given time, a person inhabits many identities, but profound social processes affect which ones become more or less salient (Tilly 2005, p. 8). Because ethnic identity is often latent and becomes salient only in certain situations, we have to understand when and how latent, subliminal, habitual cultural practices and understandings of the world become politicized (Curta 2005; Karner 2007). Arguably, ethnic identity is differentiated from kinship and culture by its role in the formation of an enduring political community (Weber 1978). Furthermore, even when ethnic identity does become salient, different geographic scales of identification may be more or less salient for both emic and etic perspectives (Royce 1982, p. 29).

In this section, I briefly review the main older understandings of how cultural differences become politicized to integrate them into a general scheme. Popular are instrumental versus primordial (Banks 1996; Jenkins 2007; Jones 1997; Voss 2008) and isolationist versus interactionist perspectives (Royce 1982; Voss 2008). The evolution of such perspectives has been ably detailed by others and is beyond the scope of this paper (see Gosden 1999; Lucy 2005; Sokolovskii and Tishkov 2002; Voss 2008; Wade 1997).

According to Royce (1982, p. 38), isolationist perspectives maintain that ethnic distinctiveness can be created and maintained only in the absence of interaction with other cultural groups. Recent perspectives have moved away from isolationist definitions because isolation rarely if ever occurs in the contemporary world (Royce 1982, pp. 38–39). I would add, however, that isolationist perspectives do not require isolation but only emphasize that ethnicity is best maintained and reproduced in isolation from outside influences. Relative lack of face-to-face social interaction with other groups even when in close proximity, such as lack of meaningful social intercourse between elite and commoners, is another isolationist possibility. Interactionist perspectives, on the other hand, stress that ethnic and other group distinctions are heightened and maintained through interaction among groups of difference (Royce 1982, pp. 39–40).

Although Royce’s organization of definitions into isolationist versus interactionist strands is very useful for conceptually organizing the contexts in which ethnic
identity emerges, it is not as useful for explaining why they emerge and are maintained. Primordial and instrumental understandings of ethnicity address why ethnic identity emerges and is maintained (Jenkins 2007; Voss 2008). Primordial perspectives of ethnicity emphasize the deep, long-lived attachments between people: blood, religion, language, customs, and so on (Jones 1997). According to Voss (2008, p. 26), primordial imperatives “draw on psychoanalytical theories of a universal human need for connection and belonging” and are constant throughout a person’s life. Instrumental perspectives, on the other hand, emphasize ethnicity as a tool for a given group to improve its political and economic standing (De Vos and Romanucci-Ross 2006, p. 394; Gosden 1999, pp. 191–192). Cultural practices and symbols are used by people in different political and historical contexts to advance their interests. As such, ethnicity is a means to an end (Voss 2008, pp. 26–27). Instrumental understandings of ethnicity include Marxist approaches, where ethnicity is a product of unequal economic development (Matthews et al. 2002). If there were no economic inequality, there would be no ethnic (and class) differences (Avksentiev and Avksentiev 1993, pp. 13–15; Edelstein 1974, pp. 49–51; Holloman and Arutunov 1978, pp. 11–13, 421–423; Isajiw 1994, p. 10; Jordan 2002, p. 6; Pokshishevskiy 1987, pp. 591–593). According to Marx and Engels (2002 [1848]), the rise of capitalism instrumentalized and simplified all identities through commoditization. Related is the premise that ethnicity is a product of capitalism (Gellner 1983). Ethnicity can be manipulated by rational actors depending on the political and economic situation (Bell 1975; Gosden 1999; Jordan 2002).

Primordial definitions place what motivates people’s actions in kinship, religion, and other kinds of social bonds that emphasize shared history, whereas instrumental definitions place people’s motivations in contemporary political and economic competition. Instrumental definitions treat ethnicity as an aspect of how a group politically maneuvers resources and power, usually in the context of living among other ethnic groups under a state (Bentley 1987; Fried 1967, 1968; Shennan 1989, p. 15). Primordial and instrumental perspectives are not mutually exclusive. How the line is drawn between groups and the choice of traits used to define a group’s essence may seem instrumental and constructed to analytic outsiders, but it is framed as primordial and deeply historical to insiders (Royce 1982; Smith 1986, 2000; Stark and Chance 2008, p. 4). Both perspectives are inherently political, but primordial emphases stress the normative, or how society should be ordered in order to create good human beings, whereas instrumental emphases stress the rational, or how to appropriate the most resources among competing groups.

Combining primordial/instrumental and isolationist/interactionist perspectives

Primordial versus instrumental and isolationist versus interactionist perspectives are one-dimensional. Combining them makes a more inclusive, two-dimensional organizational scheme. The resulting scheme has four quadrants, with each quadrant having a combination of two perspectives of ethnicity (Fig. 1). This scheme accounts for all the major understandings of identity outlined by Brubaker and Cooper (2000, pp. 6–8).
Voss (2008, p. 26) considered the concept of ethnogenesis as a way to bridge the theoretical tension between primordialism and instrumentalism through the introduction of diachronic change. In the four-quadrant scheme, I further this line of reasoning by adding the dimensions of isolation and interaction. The four-quadrant scheme serves as a comparative heuristic device to trace social relations through time. We can trace whether social relations became more insular (isolationist) or interactive through time. In the same vein, we also can trace the relative importance of primordial versus instrumental claims through time. An example of how the history of ethnogenesis could be organized using the four-quadrant scheme is to consider Hill’s description (1996a, p. 3) of the ethnogenesis of the Aluku, which was driven primarily by the common worship of a set of religious oracles. If we trace the history of Aluku ethnogenesis, using the four-quadrant scheme to paraphrase, we see that there is a movement from the primordial/isolationist quadrant (fragmented Maroon communities with deeply historical rituals and myths) to the primordial/interactionist quadrant (interaction between the communities) to finally the instrumental/interactionist quadrant (political unification and ethnogenesis to better resist and adapt to New World historical situations). Even though Aluku ethnogenesis ends in the instrumental/interactionist quadrant, primordial narratives still motivate collective political action.

Breakthroughs to ethnic consciousness

The four-quadrant scheme also highlights the complexity of ethnogenesis. A breakthrough to ethnic consciousness can be caused by or accompany changes in social interaction, as the movement between the different quadrants suggests. The
difficulty, however, is that similar changes in the forms of social interaction may not always manifest as ethnogenesis. There are two possible, not mutually exclusive explanations.

The first is the poststructuralist concept of “overdetermination.” Breakthroughs to ethnic consciousness, so important to ethnogenesis, are overdetermined in that there are multiple causes, none of which are both necessary and sufficient (Voss 2008, p. 4). The second is Tilly’s distinction (2005, pp. 143–144) between “inscription” and “activation.” Tilly and others recognized that people live among multiple social boundaries, not only ethnic, and the salience of such boundaries depends on how activated they are (Laitin 1998, p. 23; Rousseau and van der Veen 2005, pp. 688–689, 692; Tilly 2005, p. 143). According to Tilly (2005, p. 144), “[i]nscription heightens the social relations and representations that comprise a particular boundary, while activation makes that same boundary more central to the organization of activity in its vicinity.” The boundary can be permeable in times of low activation but can become more impermeable and salient during rising activation, especially in response to threats to the group’s survival (Tilly 2005, p. 144). Therefore, ethnogenesis is a form of rising activation of inscribed social relations. Activation may materially manifest as a combination of less variability of symbols, higher frequency of symbols, greater evidence of conflict, and more spatial clustering of material symbols.

The changing nature of social relations across the four-quadrant scheme may not manifest in ethnogenesis unless sufficient activation is involved. If we accept overdetermination, similar changes in social interaction and levels of activation in different historical contexts may lead to ethnogenesis in some situations but not in others. The tipping models of identity formation address the uneven evolution of shared ethnic identity (e.g., Laitin 1998). Despite the uncertainty, by tracing how social relations were organized before and after ethnogenesis as well as the precipitating causes of ethnogenesis, we can effectively compare and contrast the processes and tipping points of ethnogenesis in different social and historical contexts. Especially promising is the study of the relationship between the organization of social relations and its susceptibility to ethnogenesis.

**The types of theory integrated into one methodological framework**

Much of the debate over what “theory” is or should be is fueled by the misunderstanding of theory as a singular “thing”; theory has multiple legitimate meanings and epistemologies (Abend 2008, p. 182). Abend (2008) skillfully mapped out at least seven distinct types of theory. The social sciences would profit from clearer definition of general terms such as theory (Abend 2008, p. 176). The conflation of different meanings of identity also has led to similar semantic predicaments (Brubaker and Cooper 2000). Likewise, Smith (2011a, p. 170) argued that much of the disconnect between theory and method in contemporary archaeology is due to the postprocessual rejection of the distinct levels of analysis and specifically of Mertonian middle-range theory. In this section, I outline a
methodological framework that integrates different understandings of theory described by Abend (2008) (Table 1).

The first level of analysis is the phenomena. Examples of phenomena are artifacts, ecofacts, archival documents, architecture, genes, and ethnographic and ethnohistorical records of language. Because the perception and categorization of phenomena are conditioned by our social memory (Giddens 1984, pp. 48–49), theory type 5, or the “overall perspective from which one sees and interprets the world” (Abend 2008, p. 179), is most relevant. For example, feminist, postmodernist, poststructuralist, functionalist, and Marxist theories are about how to “look at, grasp, and represent [the social world]” (Abend 2008, p. 179–180). At this level of analysis, we should be aware of how knowledge is produced and of biases.

The second level of analysis is the production of observations and data. At this level, the phenomena are measured, counted, identified, described, and formally categorized using specific methodologies. Relevant are theory types 5 and 3, which is “to say something about empirical phenomena in the social world” and to offer a better interpretation of the phenomena (Abend 2008, pp. 178–179).

The third level of analysis is the interpretation of the observations to understand social activities and practices. Because this level is specific to the archaeological concern of interpreting practices from observations about material culture, theory type 7, which refers to the special problems encountered by the different social sciences (Abend 2008, p. 181), is relevant. This level encompasses the interpretation of human activities from data and the diachronic and geographic mapping of such social practices and activities. Theories allowing the interpretation of practices from data come from, for example, ethnoarchaeology, spatial syntax concepts and methods, and experimental archaeology. The end goal of this level of analysis is to map out the history of social and cultural practices and the organization of social interaction diachronically, as well as the active roles material culture played in such social processes. An example of a diachronic map can be found in Sturtevant’s (1971, pp. 94–95) diagram showing the changes in Seminole location, settlement pattern, political organization, economy, relations with Europeans, religion, and population size (see also Ortman 2012, pp. 346–347).

This paper’s contribution to the methodological framework is the fourth level of analysis, which is to trace the character of social interaction and of the emergence of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of analysis</th>
<th>Type of knowledge/analysis</th>
<th>Relevant types of theorya</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Grand theory</td>
<td>1, 5, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mertonian middle-range theory. Four-quadrant scheme to organize and compare social interaction across time and space</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The interpretation of social activities and practices from data</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The production of data from phenomena</td>
<td>3, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Observations and categorizations of phenomena</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Abend (2008)
social difference through time using the four-quadrant scheme. The goal of the fourth level of analysis is to understand the underlying mechanisms (sensu Hedstrom and Swedberg 1998; Merton 1968) behind a particular ethnogenesis. Did the rise of capitalism in area X lead to the instrumentalization of social identities, as Marx asserted? Did the rise of the state in area X lead to the durability of groupings and alliances that previously were temporary and fluctuating? That is, did the rise of states formalize social groups (Fried 1967, 1968; Shennan 1989, p. 15)? Questions such as these guide the inquiry to understand the interplay of proximate causes and long-term social processes of ethnogenesis. This level of analysis is an example of Mertonian middle-range theory, which is between orderly thick description (level 3 of the methodological framework) and the general theories of social systems (Merton 1968, pp. 39–40; Smith 2011a, p. 171). Theory type 2 is “an explanation of a particular social phenomenon” and identifies factors and conditions leading to that social phenomenon (Abend 2008, p. 178). Theory type 2 is most relevant to this level of analysis because the four-quadrant scheme helps organize the social conditions and proximate causes through time.

The final level of analysis actually comprises several distinct theoretical realms. The most basic realms are theory types 1 and 5 (sensu Abend 2008, pp. 177–180). Theory type 1 is a universally quantified “general proposition, or logically connected system of general propositions, which establishes a relationship between two or more variables” (Abend 2008, p. 177). An example of theory type 5 is Bourdieu’s (1977, 1984) practice theory, which was developed through years of empirical research and the aid of a four-quadrant scheme to organize groupings of tastes among the different socioeconomic classes and occupations. Because both theory type 1 and type 5 can have a normative or “how things should be” account of the world, two additional distinct realms of theory come into play. For example, theory type 1 in archaeology often deals with human–environment relationships and, when combined with a normative focus, results in policy recommendations to structure human behavior in ways that are more environmentally sustainable. When theory type 5 has a normative component, it is identified by Abend (2008, p. 180) as theory type 6, which includes critical theory, feminist theory, and postcolonial theory.

Advantages of the methodological framework

The first advantage of the methodological framework I present is that it offers a way to bridge acrimonious divisions in the field of archaeology, most notably between processualists, who believe archaeologists are capable of producing reliable knowledge about the past, and extreme postprocessualists who “deny the possibility of creating objective knowledge about human behaviour” (Trigger 1995, p. 322). Many of the debates were fueled by the different theoretical preferences, with processualists generally favoring theory types 1 and 2 and postprocessualists generally favoring theory types 5 and 6.

The main contrast between processual and postprocessual archaeologies is in the role of ideas in the formation of the archaeological record by past peoples and by
archaeologists in the present. For postprocessualists, the role of ideas is not limited to the past people who are responsible for the archaeological record, it is also relevant to people in the present having a profound effect on the making of the archaeological record (critical approaches). As a tool of self-criticism about the practice of archaeology, the postprocessual emphasis on decolonizing archaeology is helpful. Extreme postprocessualists, however, use critical approaches to delegitimize other epistemologies, unaware that they are often perpetuating the same kinds of social exclusion they seek to redress through their jargon and ontological and epistemological demands (Trigger 1995, pp. 321–322; Watson 1990, pp. 677–679). The methodological framework questions putting different kinds of theories into a hierarchy because each level of analysis is theoretically informed and therefore just as important as the others.

The second advantage of the methodological framework is its emphasis on tracing social organization and relationships through time. Tracing social relationships avoids the common pitfall of, for example, employing the methodologies of biology to directly analyze social phenomena, as if society were a biological entity (Ortman 2012; Terrell 2001; Yanow 2003, pp. 16–17). We should relegate the appropriate methodologies to their respective fields (levels 2 and 3 of the methodological framework), rather than expect that artifact frequencies are indices of acculturation (e.g., Quimby and Spoehr 1951) or that ethogenesis functions like cladistic speciation (Moore 1994, 2001; Terrell 2001). Another pitfall avoided by tracing social relationships and practices as opposed to crystallized ethnic units through time is being able to tease out nuances of history that would otherwise be drowned out by theoretical dogmatism (Gregory and Wilcox 2007).

The next sections review case studies centered on four common themes in ethogenesis: (1) the rise of internal social inequality leading to fissioning, (2) resistance against institutionalized inequalities, (3) legitimization of unequal access to power and resources or the maintenance of social inequality, and (4) frontiers along imperial and colonial borders.

**The rise of internal inequality leading to fissioning**

Several sorts of fissioning lead to ethogenesis. The most common is political factionalism, which can be characterized as instrumental/isolationist because the seeds of division originate from inside the original group. Brumfiel (1994a, pp. 4–5) defined factions as “structurally and functionally similar groups which, by virtue of their similarity, compete for resources and power or prestige,” and whose political goals do not “go beyond winning advantages for their own faction.” Commoners rally around leaders who use their mobilization skills for revenge and to settle personal scores with other leaders as they also advance the claims of the commoners (Brumfiel 1994a, pp. 7–8). Although this model apparently emphasized little or no cultural or primordial differences among the factions to begin with, Brumfiel noted that competition and factionalism may be instrumental in the persistence of ethnic difference. The following examples show that people use primordial claims to bolster their instrumental struggle for power, resources, and
prestige. Therefore, ethnogenesis resulting from factionalism produces cultural
differences that are as long-lived, and sometimes even longer-lived than the political
relationships among factions.

Two possible results of fissioning are (1) that the newly differentiating groups
remain together and interact with one another in an instrumental/isolationist
framework, which in turn constitutes the beginning of class, caste, and racial
inequalities (e.g., Bawden 2005; Bawden and Reycraft 2009), or (2) that the newly
differentiated groups spatially separate or new groups are geographically differenti-
tated by isolation caused by migration and in a primordial/isolationist framework
establish and enforce group distinctiveness through a combination of new
ethnonyms, cultural practices, ritual practices, and political structure (e.g., Levy
2008; Stojanowski 2010; Sturtevant 1971). In regard to the first possibility, as the
social and cultural distances between the groups increase, ethnogenesis can quickly
become instrumental/interactionist. Regarding the second possibility, in Early
Formative Titicaca, Bandy (2001) showed how communities fissioned when they
reached a critical population. This trend reversed in the Middle and Late Formative
period, and nucleated communities began to reach population sizes not previously
achieved. Bandy (2001, 2004) attributed this change to the facilitative role of
religion and ritual in social cohesion. Although Bandy does not explicitly talk about
ethnic identity, the process that he described parallels the primordialist/isolationist
to primordialist/interactionist historical trajectories common in ethnogenesis.

Bawden (2005), employing Marxist perspectives, argued that the end of the Moche
as an ideologically unified entity came about through ethnogenesis triggered by the
breakdown of elite legitimacy and stability and by attendant catastrophic environ-
mental disasters. The Moche rejected long-lived iconography and rapidly abandoned
older settlements. The newly founded large settlement of Galindo showed even more
spatial differentiation between groups of people, interpreted as elite and commoner,
than in previous centuries. Also, the cultural practices and iconography diverged
rapidly between commoners and elites, and the reconstitution of society, as in the case
of Galindo, led to localized innovations in institutions of power and coercive
strategies of control (Bawden and Reycraft 2009, pp. 200–201). Bawden and Reycraft
(2009) interpreted late Moche society as one with major structural contradictions
between elite demand for control of commoner labor and commoner rejection of the
new elite strategies of control. This particular process of ethnogenesis could be
described as resulting from what the Marxists called alienation.

The establishment of hierarchical institutions of control, presumably to deny
certain groups access to resources, prestige, and power, led to spatial segregation
and hierarchy among the groups. The combination of social segregation along
economic hierarchies as well as the elite rejection of traditional symbols increased
the fragility of the Galindo society. Latent cultural, power, and spatial residence
differences can turn into active cultural and ideological differentiation (ethnogen-
esis) if the periods of environmental and sociopolitical stress are sustained and force
people to question formerly taken-for-granted ways of hierarchical social interaction
(Bawden 2005, p. 13). Therefore, a sense of injustice among the commoners that
arose from a combination of institutionalized inequality and systemic stress was
further inscribed by the stylistic differences that resulted from spatial segregation of
the commoners and elites. Among the commoners, ethnogenesis can be further invigorated by the formation of a political community to resist the institutional inequalities; this is the subject of a later section of the paper.

People generally now shun primordial/isolationist explanations of ethnogenesis that emphasize cultural isolation and relatively passive maintenance of habit and custom (Brumfiel 1994b, p. 89). If we consider primordialism on a continuum with instrumentalism, however, we find that although people may still jockey for power and resources, the struggle is intimately tied to what they feel the normative ideal of a political and familial unit should be. The motivations and political language used are deeply primordial. Furthermore, as true isolationism rarely, if ever, existed in human history, we also must treat isolationism as a continuum. The isolationism in these examples stems not from true isolation but from the relative lack of outside hegemonic input in ethnogenesis. Toward a more instrumental side of the primordial/instrumental spectrum is Levy’s (2008) study of Edomite ethnogenesis.

Levy (2008) used three lines of evidence to pinpoint the historical and social contexts of Edomite ethnogenesis: when the name for the land of Edom came into being, when boundary making between groups intensified in the context of cemeteries, and how ethnic group names matched with the textually derived corresponding economic lifestyles of the land of Edom. Levy (2008) argued that Edomite ethnogenesis occurred in the social context of conical clan organization during the Bronze Age (13th–10th centuries BC) in southern Jordan and northwestern Arabia. This period was characterized by the existence of many “brother” groups related by kinship, blood, and marriage that began to distinguish among themselves due to political conflict. The texts provided the dates and the geographical tribal/land association, and archaeological survey and excavation of a cemetery provided crucial evidence for boundary maintenance and economic lifestyles.

Both primordial and instrumental forms of social organization that manifested in conical clan organization were framed as a family affair, which sometimes led to ethnogenesis in times of political conflict between siblings. Although there was interaction with nonkin groups, it was ultimately sibling rivalry that led to ethnogenesis. To insiders, therefore, ethnogenesis was framed as family political tensions as estranged siblings sought their own territory. The association between the sibling groups and their respective territories engendered ethnogenesis. After territories were established, continuing stylistic and linguistic differentiation reinforced group difference.

Toward a more primordial side of the primordial/instrumental spectrum and a more interactionist side of the isolationist–interactionist spectrum are the cases of Seminole (Stojanowski 2010; Sturtevant 1971) and Tewa (Ortman 2012) ethnogenesis. Although Sturtevant (1971) and Stojanowski (2010) believe that geographic separation played an important role in Seminole ethnogenesis, both stressed that the ethnogenesis of the Seminole was a long process that involved successive fissions and fusions. Sturtevant (1971) emphasized that Seminole ethnogenesis was a gradual process of back-and-forth migration from Georgia into the ecological niches of Florida. The migrations were motivated by the jealousies and political divisions engendered by divide-and-rule policies of the British and exacerbated by
the deerskin trade, the introduction of guns, and increased warfare. As communications between the Creek communities in Georgia and the Creek “colonies” in Florida began to be severed, group distinctness of the colonies increased. Seminole ethnogenesis took on a more enduring character after the ethonym “Seminole” was adopted by Europeans and Seminole alike and the process of primordial isolationism continued (Sturtevant 1971, pp. 92–93).

Stojanowski (2010) effectively used biodistance methods, based on variation in teeth, to gauge genetic integration and separation of the various colonial southeastern indigenous groups in protohistorical and historical times (see also Klaus 2008). In a novel interpretation of genetic data, Stojanowski (2010, p. 55) utilized the chaîne opératoire framework, arguing that biological reproduction is informed by the production sequence of “one’s upbringing, heritage, education, early life experiences.” His research showed at least two cycles of biological fission and fusion of Florida populations. In the early 16th and 17th centuries, genetic microdifferentiation resulted from decreasing migration and declining population. In the 17th century, Seminole ethnogenesis was driven by fusion after catastrophic demographic collapse; in the 18th century and onward, it was due to fission. Ultimately, it was the “emigration of disparate communities from Georgia into the vacant lands of the old Spanish missions” that led to a more enduring form of Seminole ethnogenesis (Stojanowski 2010, p. 130). The ancestors of the Seminole originally came from Florida, so their ethnogenesis through geographic and social distancing from their Creek relatives can be seen as a homecoming rather than an invasion (Stojanowski 2010, p. 179). They also were religiously and politically united through their pro-Spanish and Christian sympathies. Others contend that the “destruction, formation, change, and fissioning” that characterized Seminole ethnogenesis were ongoing, and the Seminoles have been and still are internally differentiated culturally (Weik 2009, p. 210). Weik (2009) gave more attention to the internal divisions of the Seminole, stressing the continued practices from multiple origins such as Creek, African, Spanish, English, and Middle Eastern. Also, African Seminoles did not fully integrate with the Seminole Indian by way of shared practices and full acceptance by the Seminole Indians (Weik 2009, pp. 233–234).

Many since Childe have recognized that language, biological affinity, and even the different domains of culture do not necessarily coevolve (Barth 1969; Hill 1996b; Hodder 1978, pp. 4, 12–13; Moore 1994, p. 939; Ortman 2012, p. 2; Renfrew 1993, pp. 23–27; Terrell 2001). Moore (1994, p. 939) reasonably suggested that the lack of coevolution was due to the different domains of human life that are subject to different sets of laws. What are these laws and the social and historical significance of the lack of coevolution?

Ortman (2012) deftly demonstrated how archaeology could address this methodological conundrum and showed that ethnogenesis may be responsible for some of the spectacular disconnects between language, culture, and genetics. Ortman (2012, pp. 2–3) suggested that “[r]ather than correlating independently derived patterns of genetic, linguistic, and cultural variation,” one can “focus on areas where human biology and language intersect the archaeological record directly.” Through a multidisciplinary analysis of linguistic metaphors, architecture, ceramics, oral history, genetics, and settlement patterns, Ortman showed how Tewa ethnogenesis
was likely due to a religious movement and mass migration from the Mesa Verde region. This narrative explained how mass migration could have occurred as Mesa Verde culture was being rejected. Especially compelling are the innovations in material culture and architecture that were actually anachronisms to pre-Mesa Verde Rio Grande traditions of the Tewa Basin. Ortman (2012, pp. 347–348) argued that this surprising phenomenon in material culture was the result of the migrants from the Mesa Verde region interpreting the primordial-seeming cultural practices and linguistic and material culture characteristics of indigenous Tewa Basin populations as a way of life of their ancestors. The metaphor of going back in time as going farther away in space (migration) in oral traditions reinforced this interpretation. Ortman’s interpretation of a religious revolution seeking to go back to a purer way of life by rejecting more recent innovations is consistent with all the social changes: mass migration, abandonment of old villages, burning of kivas and possessions, violence against opposing factions, and public surveillance to ensure compliance in the new behavior. While the proximate causes of dissatisfaction leading to religious revolution are still unknown, latent cultural practices and knowledge of ancestral ways of life in the Tewa Basin provided the ingredients with which to characterize the revolution, mass migration, and recreation of society.

In terms of the four-quadrant scheme, the revolution and conflict in the Mesa Verde region can be characterized as both primordial and instrumental and as more isolationist than interactionist because it was largely an in situ revolution along factional lines. As the desire for mass migration increased, perhaps because of increasing awareness and favorable interpretation of extant ancestral ways of life in the Tewa Basin, Tewa ethnogenesis became more primordial/interactionist. As the migrants settled into their new society, political and religious dissension still existed, activating more instrumental/isolationist dimensions of ethnogenesis. The power of the past cannot be denied in ethnogenesis, and the past as embodied in ritual, oral traditions, cultural practices, and material culture can be tapped in times of political factionalism. In other words, the source of power in instrumental struggles comes not from instrumental narratives but from primordial narratives.

**Resistance against institutionalized inequalities**

In the words of Voss (2008, p. 36), “[e]thnogenesis has become a powerful metaphor for the creativity of oppressed and marginalized peoples birthing a new cultural space for themselves amidst their desperate struggle to survive.” The examples in this section demonstrate that ethnogenesis can overcome fissions and factions through rallying people against institutionalized inequalities.

Generally, the struggle is against a dominant class or caste. Uniformity of practices and material culture increases among members of the ethnogenetic group. Although resistance against institutionalized inequalities is one of the possible later stages of ethnogenesis due to internal factionalism, institutionalized inequalities generally originate from colonization by outsiders of different ethnic origins. As the following examples demonstrate, colonialist powers instrumentalize identity through economically subordinating or creating certain ethnic identities in
hierarchical frameworks of power. The resistance against such instrumentalism prompts the formation of political communities based on primordial narratives. The relationship between colonial ethnic, racial, and class categories and the on-the-ground forms of identification and social cohesion is a common point of departure for the study of colonialism, especially of Spanish colonialism (Cahill 1994). Often, the categorizations of the colonial structure are redeployed against the very same colonial structure (Preucel et al. 2002, p. 84).

Recent archaeological research on the ethnogenesis of the Seminole provides excellent examples of ethnogenesis as resistance (Weik 2009; Weisman 1999, 2007). Weisman (1999, 2007) argued that while the Seminole may have had diverse origins in the precontact Southeast, their modern identity, self-characterized as the “unconquered people,” first took on a persistent and mobilizing character during the Second Seminole War (AD 1835–1842). Weisman believed that the Seminole nativistic resistance movements were ultimately most responsible for Seminole ethnogenesis. Such movements strengthened clan ties through ritual events and giving to the deceased, unification of the anti-European goals of the various Seminole groups, regularized economic exchange, and the general characterization of the Seminole as indomitable warriors (Weisman 2007, pp. 202–209).

The “ethnogenesis as resistance” narrative also was prevalent among studies of African American/Afro-Caribbean and French vernacular Canadien ethnogenesis (Mann 2008; Matthews et al. 2002; Wilkie and Farnsworth 2005). A thread through these studies is the attempt to understand how people created a sense of normalcy, cohesion, and family in a context full of disruption and power, racial, and class hierarchies. Whereas Deetz (1994) saw the number of similarities in the colonoware ceramics from Native American, English, and African traditions as proportional indexes of interaction between these three groups of people, Matthews et al. (2002) stressed that the production of African American colonoware was a conscious act of resistance against the racial foundations of slavery. Wilkie and Farnsworth (2005, p. 308) argued that the primary context for resistance to the senselessness and chaos caused by slavery was the home. Ethnogenesis was creatively produced and reproduced in daily life and practice through the decision to continue shared African practices as well as draw from personal stylistic innovation (Wilkie and Farnsworth 2005). Ethnogenesis was the manifestation of people trying to find strength, comfort, and dignity for the spirit (Wilkie and Farnsworth 2005, pp. 308–309).

Mann (2008) also regarded ethnogenesis as a way of maintaining a sense of dignity. He showed that a conscious reproduction of French vernacular architecture by French-speaking fur traders and conscious rejection and modification of such architecture by the English conquerors led to an ethnic segmentation of the fur trade and fostered the subsequent ethnogenesis of the French-speaking Canadiens. The Canadiens self-identified and became externally identified as those who stubbornly built in the French vernacular style and refused to participate in the fur trade the English way (Mann 2008, pp. 325–334). Canadien ethnogenesis is a good case study of how socioeconomic class and ethnicity are mutually constitutive in contexts of colonialism.

Ethnogenesis, while serving to resist and co-opt the dominant, also can help disparate groups supersede old ethnic, tribal, and religious rivalries, especially in the
cases of revitalization movements (Liebmann 2012; Liebmann and Preucel 2007; Preucel et al. 2002; Smoak 2006). The 1680 Pueblo Revolt displayed many of the same material culture and social changes as Tewa ethnogenesis and may have been a reenactment of the events surrounding Tewa ethnogenesis (Ortman 2012, pp. 361–366). Unity, however, is often short-lived after the immediate political goal of getting rid of the dominant power is accomplished and political difference takes hold again (Preucel et al. 2002, pp. 88–89).

In cases of resistance against institutionalized inequalities, the most salient type of ethnogenesis is instrumental/interactionist overall, but primordial narratives are of utmost importance from the point of view of the resistance. As interaction between the oppositional groups decreases, so does the salience of their ethnic boundary (Tilly 2004, p. 218). Even after the colonial power ceases to exist, the categories imposed by colonial powers still hold much relevance and power (Tilly 2005, p. 139; see also Freire 1970). Therefore, even if resistance is successful and the dominant powers are expelled, colonial categories continue to hold power over daily interactions.

Legitimization of unequal access to power and resources or the maintenance of social inequality

On the other side, ethnogenesis can consolidate economic and social domination over other groups (Bell 2005; Braswell 2003; Metz 1999; Voss 2005, 2008). Perhaps the most instrumental/interactionist of all the categories of ethnogenesis, ethnogenesis as the legitimization of unequal access to power and resources may unfortunately also be the most enduring. Because the ruling or dominant groups in unequal societies also are responsible for the political—legal framework, the categorizations produced by the dominant group have an overarching legitimacy that emic categorizations lack. The categorizations, even if rejected by some of the groups, still serve as a point of reference for oppositional framing as well as provide foreigners with a ready-made framework. Legitimacy in the eyes of foreigners is especially salient if those foreigners come from societies with a similar hierarchy of ethnic groups, thus transferring “shared understandings, practices, and interpersonal relations from setting to setting, making old routines easy to reproduce in new settings” (Tilly 2005, p. 111).

Tilly (2005, p. 139) suspected that the categorical identities imposed by imperialist or colonialist powers often continue after those powers, like the Soviet Union, cease to exist. The longevity of institutionalized inequality, even after the disappearance of the powers that were originally responsible, can be a result of borrowing, when “[p]eople creating a new organization emulate distinctions already visible in other organizations of the same general class” (Tilly 2004, p. 219). In noncolonial contexts, borrowing manifested as elites emulating foreign elites or acquiring luxury items from foreign lands (e.g., Curta 2001, 2005). In colonial contexts, borrowing manifested as the co-optation of the elite culture and ideals (e.g., Voss 2005, 2008). In postcolonial contexts, the formerly subjugated often remake themselves in the image of their former oppressors by borrowing the logic of the previous institutional hierarchies, attitudes, and practices (Freire 1970).
decidedly instrumental ethnogenesis that focuses on maintaining or gaining prestige and power can take place. Ethnogenesis as legitimization of institutionalized inequalities presumably creates widespread dissatisfaction and loss of dignity among the groups at the bottom of the hierarchy because resistance against those inequalities employs strongly primordial narratives. In Late Classic Naco Valley of northwestern Honduras, elite adaptation of foreign symbols to manipulate local social identities for personal economic and political gain was met with uneven enthusiasm as evidenced by subsequent political fissioning and rejection of unifying symbols (Schortman et al. 2001).

Bell (2005) showed how the ethnogenesis of “whites” in the 18th-century Chesapeake crafted a sense of group solidarity and distinction from Native and African groups. The white ethnogenesis was not explicitly for economic profit but to strengthen in-group cohesion and difference from Native and African groups. The integrative practices that reproduced ethnogenesis of whites were distinct from but coexistent with the capitalistic mode of stressing private profit over social obligation (Bell 2005, p. 446). Metz (1999), like Bell, also showed how white ethnogenesis occurred in British colonial America among various ethnic, religious, and national identities through the reproduction of integrative practices among whites and exclusionary, dominating practices toward Native and African groups.

A systematic examination of Spanish colonial white ethnogenesis was carried out by Voss (2005, 2008) in her attempt to understand how the formerly distinct castas, or Spanish colonial castes, became the white californios. Voss’s nuanced treatment of the gendered, ethnic, labor, and governmental dimensions of North American white ethnogenesis demonstrated how castas of Native, Spanish, and African descent remade themselves into californios when transplanted to the Presidio in San Francisco. Voss’s (2008) practice-based approach highlighted that ethnic consciousness was not merely an epiphenomenon of intergroup interaction but an active production and reproduction of difference; in the Presidio, it took the form of utilizing male Native labor, the exclusion of women from craft production and architectural decisions, selection for European wares, and homogeneity in foodways and other cultural practices. The San Francisco Presidio example also calls attention to the variability of Spanish colonial projects, emphasizing that the “cultural and biological cauldron of mestizaje” may not have been as universal in Spanish colonial America as commonly assumed (Voss 2008, p. 301).

In the Canadien ethnogenesis example, the dominant group, the English, had conceptualized the Canadiens as “nonwhite” to justify their exclusion from many segments of the economy (Mann 2008, pp. 319–320). The Canadien example exemplifies borrowing between, in this case, racial hierarchies and economic hierarchies. In the examples of white colonialism, groups wishing to consolidate and legitimize their superior economic and political position take on white ethnicity regardless of blood ancestry (Bell 2005; Mann 2008; Voss 2005, 2008).

Braswell (2003) showed how cultural Nahuaization of the K’iche’an Maya elite in the Late Postclassic facilitated the creation of a class-based society. Instrumental interests of the elite and political factionalism led to a greater social distance between commoners and elites of the different houses, which drove the elite appropriation of exotic symbols, names, titles, and behavior. Braswell argued that
competition between the great houses escalated foreign cultural emulation, probably leading to ethnogenesis. Alignments with the powerful Nahua neighbors were one way of gaining material and strategic advantages against opposing houses. In short, the pragmatic instrumental interests of the elites led to alignments with the Nahua, which also led to the cultural emulation of the Nahua among the elites, which in turn reinforced social distinctions between the K’iche’an elites and commoners. This phenomenon also occurred in the colonial Andes, where factionalism among native elites led not only to emerging class divisions within their *ayllus*, or family networks, but also to a Castilianization of the elites (Stern 1993; see also Guaman Poma de Ayala 1978).

Out of all the different strands of ethnogenesis, ethnogenesis as legitimization of institutionalized inequalities may be the least creative because it heavily relies on borrowing outsider frameworks rather than creating a wholly new vision from the deconstruction of the frameworks. When primordial narratives that equate blood ancestry with quality of character are employed, racial segregation and subordination are ossified under bureaucratic frameworks (Orser 2007; Yanow 2003). Whereas ethnogenesis as resistance often creatively draws from metaphors and narratives of the good life, ethnogenesis as legitimization of institutionalized inequalities borrows effective political—legal frameworks of control as a means of domination (Scott 1998, 2009).

**Frontiers along imperial and colonial borders**

Many argue that frontiers are dynamic areas where social relations crisscross and ethnogenesis is likely to take place (Alconini 2004; Chappell 1993; Gruzinski 2002; Hall 1986; Lightfoot and Martinez 1995; Weber 2005; Willems 1989). Tilly (2004, p. 214) defined a social boundary as “any contiguous zone of contrasting density, rapid transition, or separation between internally connected clusters of population and/or activity.” What mechanisms drive the rise of ethnic difference and similarity in frontier contexts, and why are frontiers so fluid and varying in character? Rousseau and van der Veen’s (2005) excellent treatment of the rise of shared identity or of difference through agent-based modeling shows that the interaction of basic mechanisms such as the size of the repertoire of knowledge about the “other” group, the degree of bias in each group’s normative ideal of identity, and the degree of influence exercised by leaders over their neighbors’ identities leads to radically different boundary patterns. For example, clustering and sharp boundaries are most evident when there are small repertoires (little general knowledge about the other groups), low bias (little positive or negative institutional reinforcement of certain identities), and powerful leaders (Rousseau and van der Veen 2005, p. 708). Rousseau and van der Veen (2005, p. 709) show how simple microlevel processes interacting with one another can lead to a wide variety of macrolevel patterns. Frontiers are fluid because a number of continually changing microlevel processes, related to shifting alliances and dynamism in frontier societies, are at work.

Curta’s (2001, 2005) studies of Slavic and other “barbarian” ethnogeneses emphasized Roman frontiers (*limes*) as social and physical spaces where the creation of ethnic identity occurred. Curta explored both the internal and external
processes of identification and politics that led to the ethnogenesis of the various Danubian peoples. Many scholars believed that barbarian identities were born in the shadow of and in interaction with Rome in the fourth to eighth centuries AD (Brather 2005; Curta 2001, 2005). Roman expansion and the policy of establishing the *limes* meant that barbarian leaders of various tribes rose to power in the context of endemic warfare. Certain Roman policies, such as the economic closure of the *limes*, led to heightened competition among the barbarian elite for access to luxury goods and the rise of barbarian leaders. When interacting with Rome, leaders spoke in the name of their communities, and the development of a distinctive “international” barbarian elite culture using Roman luxury goods as emblematic symbols facilitated intertribal relations. Curta’s primary archaeological strategy to find ethnogenesis was to look for homogenization of tastes and preferences for goods preceding and during the time when many ethnic names appeared in the historical record. An additional line of evidence was how frontier politics favored successful mobilization of groups, which, considering that ethnicity is often described as politicized culture or as goal-oriented identity, facilitated ethnogenesis (Curta 2005, p. 203).

Curta relied heavily on instrumental/interactionist definitions of ethnicity (e.g., Barth 1969; Cohen 1969) but also acknowledged that while the context for ethnogenesis may be instrumental/interactionist, the primordial “kernels of tradition” were important (Curta 2005, p. 201). Curta explicitly argued against theories of Slavic ethnogenesis that outline a primordial/isolationist development of the traits of an ethnicity in a specific locale and crystallization by later migration and interaction with outside groups (e.g., Pogodin 1901; Rostafinski 1908; Schafarik 1844). Curta (2001, 2005) stressed that difference is created through interaction and is not a precondition for ethnogenesis.

Shelach’s (2009) treatment of the material externalization of a wide-reaching ethnic-like identity on the northern frontiers of the expanding Chinese Zhou states in the first millennium BC used Wobst’s (1977, pp. 323–328) distinction between symbols that communicate at short range and those that extend longer distances (Shelach 2009, pp. 78–80). The shift to pastoralism, borrowed symbols from the faraway western steppe, the rise of highly visible symbols on clothing, and increasingly hostile relations with the expanding Zhou states to the south showed that the northern zone had begun to consciously adopt a nomadic steppe-related identity in opposition to their southern neighbors. The conscious symbolic distancing also paralleled relative social-interaction isolation from the Zhou states. Such distancing may have made later open militaristic hostilities more vicious. The adoption of a symbolic militarism may have reinforced tendencies for violent relationships with the Zhou states in the second half of the first millennium BC (Shelach 2009, pp. 149–152).

Rice and Rice (2005) argued that multiple Maya ethnogeneses took place among the various Maya-speaking groups in the Postclassic and colonial periods. They utilized the “frontier as process” approach adapted from Kopytoff (1987) and Comaroff and Comaroff (1991), which emphasizes frontiers as places where conflict, innovation, and ethnogenesis tend to occur: frontiers are “uncharted spaces of confrontation…in which people fashion new worlds” (Comaroff and Comaroff 2005, p. 424).
Rice and Rice (2005) argued that there were at least three frontiers in which Maya-speaking peoples became ever more differentiated from one another. The frontiers were marked by migration, raiding and warfare, and increasing language differentiation. The dynamic and competitive nature of the frontiers increased with the Spanish conquest, which accelerated migration, competition, and cultural differentiation among the different Maya-speaking groups (Rice and Rice 2005, pp. 155–159). Therefore, the various Maya ethnogeneses happened on hostile and isolating frontiers (Rice and Rice 2005, p. 168). Rice and Rice (2005) assumed that during the Classic Maya period, there may have been more overarching identity cohesion than in the Postclassic, and that Mayan ethnogeneses began before but also were accelerated by the Spanish conquest.

These examples highlight that ethnogenesis tended to occur in frontiers or borderlands especially in times of conflict and rupture. Although ethnogenesis along frontiers is highly instrumental and interactionist, primordial narratives are sometimes the strongest in frontier contexts for the very reason that the political stakes are so high. Furthermore, a drive toward autonomy is evident among many ethnogenetic groups in frontier contexts, implicating the isolationist realm as well. Colonialism often created frontiers and boundaries where culture became heavily politicized and ethnogenesis occurred (Lightfoot and Martinez 1995; Weber 2005).

Discussion

What patterns do we see if we roughly plot these themes onto the four-quadrant scheme? How do these different themes of ethnogenesis relate to one another? What kinds of questions do the patterns raise? The overlap among the different themes of ethnogenesis implies a historical relationship among these themes (Fig. 2).

The theme of the rise of internal social inequality leading to fissioning (theme 1) overlaps the most with the theme of frontiers along imperial and colonial borders (theme 4). The theme of frontiers along imperial and colonial borders (theme 4) then shares more with the theme of resistance against institutionalized inequalities (theme 2) than with the theme of legitimization of institutionalized inequalities (theme 3). I argue that we can organize the similarities by the degree of geographical exclusiveness of differentiated groups. Under theme 1 (fissioning), the new groups also generally geographically migrate away from one another (geographically exclusive). In theme 4 (frontiers), the differentiated groups generally maintain and inhabit different geographical territories or imagine territorial exclusivity in contexts of overlap. The overlap between themes 1 and 4 represents this conceptual similarity of geographical exclusivity (or desire for geographical exclusivity). Similarly, theme 4 (frontiers) and the revitalization movements of theme 2 share the desire of geographical exclusivity. However, when theme 1 (fissioning) does not lead to centrifugal migration, institutional inequalities and their legitimization sometimes result, as represented by the overlap of theme 3 (legitimization of domination) with theme 1 (fissioning). The overlap between theme 1 and theme 3 represents the social process characterized by geographical
inclusivity. The colonialism component of theme 3 also shows geographical inclusivity of the ethnically different subjugated peoples.

The affinity of certain possibilities within themes raises several questions. First, does ethnogenesis of one theme have a tendency to turn into ethnogenesis of another theme? Second, what are some of the historical implications of the affinity of certain themes of ethnogenesis? Third, how can the grouping of themes under the four-quadrant scheme help us evaluate theory types 1 and 2? In regard to the first and second questions, while the heuristic affinity of certain themes of ethnogenesis has played out in certain historical trajectories of ethnogenesis, only further comparative and long-term historical research and synthesis can establish the strength of the historical associations of the different themes. Especially important is the study of the overlaps between the different themes to identify the common historical directions, if any, that ethnogenesis takes. I suspect that while the four-quadrant scheme distills some of the basic mechanisms of ethnogenesis, the interaction of concurrent ethnogeneses, such as between elites and commoners or between men and women, will yield surprising results (e.g., Smith 2003). In regard to the third question, we can return to the two questions posed earlier in the paper. Did the rise of capitalism lead to the instrumentalization of social identities, as Marx asserted? Did the rise of the state lead to the durability of groupings and alliances that previously were temporary and fluctuating? That is, did the rise of states formalize social groups?

Archaeology is well equipped to address these questions because of its strengths in tracking long-term changes in social relations and because of its synergy with history. We can begin to evaluate the connection between the rise of capitalism and the instrumentalization of social identities by evaluating how identities in different groups changed with the progress of capitalism in relation to the four-quadrant scheme. What percentage of identities gravitates toward instrumentalism with the
rise of capitalism? From the examples presented here, there does seem to be a relationship between instrumentalism and durable inequalities, especially under colonialism or a state. Therefore, formalized and instrumentalized social relations caused by colonialism or states also may have favored the rise of capitalism. We can begin to evaluate the connection between the rise of the state and the durability of social groups by tracking the durability and uniformity of symbols and types of social interaction after a group comes into contact with or under the dominion of a state.

I emphasize, however, that the patterns are exploratory and serve to encourage the necessary intensive comparative analysis of primary data (Smith 2011b). The trend in making databases widely accessible is a step toward evaluating the reliability of the conclusions of the studies presented and thus the preliminary patterns among them.

Conclusion and future directions

I have argued for the appropriateness of methodological frameworks that incorporate different types of theory to evaluate ethnogenesis. I also presented a four-quadrant scheme to aid the evaluation of theory types 1 and 2. A review of common themes in ethnogenesis and archaeological examples revealed intriguing possibilities for future research as well as vindicated the heuristic utility of the four-quadrant scheme. The four-quadrant scheme also demonstrated the utility of older understandings of ethnicity, such as the primordial perspectives. The surge in doctoral dissertations on the archaeology of ethnogenesis after the turn of the last millennium suggests the continued vitality of and interest in ethnogenesis (Attarian 2003; Borgstede 2004; Bush 2001; Card 2007; Cipolla 2010; Emans 2007; Hamilton 2009; Hardy 2008; Kincaid 2005; Klaus 2008; Liebmann 2006; Mann 2003; Naunapper 2007; Ngwenyama 2007; Ortman 2010; Peeples 2011; Pugh 2010; Rajnovich 2003; Seibert 2010; Stojanowski 2001; Sunseri 2009; Van Gijseghem 2004; Voss 2002; Weik 2002; Wilcox 2001).

Archaeological study of ethnogenesis is inherently political in contemporary contexts. Ethnogenesis studies, especially in archaeology, are of contempoarily contested areas or of identities that are bound up with recent political events (the breakup of the Soviet Union, Israel/Palestine, NAGPRA, and American indigenous movements that are sometimes class struggles as well). Times of conflict lead to critical self-examination, and the recent interest in archaeological studies of ethnogenesis is part of larger struggles for recognition or forgetting of certain ethnic identities in highly charged political contexts. The Old World studies predominantly relate to current nation-state self-determination. The New World archaeological ethnogenesis studies emphasize multidirectional agency and represent a backlash against some of the unidirectional and Eurocentric assimilation and acculturation models (Deagan 1998, p. 23; Foster 1960; Voss 2008, p. 33).

In academia, similar battles are fought over the allocation of resources and the power to define what proper theory is (Abend 2008, pp. 193–194). Exclusivity in language (jargon), different epistemological focuses of many journals and
conference sections, institutionalized inequality of the distribution of power, exploitation of labor, and social insularity within and between departments are sources of dynamism as well as stagnation. Under the conditions mentioned above, many new directions for research emerge. What is lost is a sense of history and appreciation of the utility of competing or older epistemologies. Older concepts like culture are used as punching bags (Watson 1995, p. 690), and people like the Old Timer of the parable of the Golden Marshalltown, who believed in culture (Flannery 1982), are marginalized and sometimes haughtily dismissed despite their valuable contributions to understanding empirical histories. We must become more aware of the unintended consequences of certain practices in archaeology as they can sometimes resemble the legitimization of institutional inequality.

I have emphasized that the integration (and not conflation) of webs of knowledge and different types of theory into our methodologies can further our understanding of ethnogenesis. For example, normative political theory and archaeology are currently disconnected fields. As ethnogenesis and the formation of a political community are intertwined, we should explore the relationship between the political philosophies of a group of people and their social interactions. Archaeology is well suited to the study of the relationships between ideals and practice because of its strengths in the interpretation of past human action. Different types of theory also are applicable to the archaeological study of contemporary societies. For example, spatial syntax is an appropriate methodology in the study of the social logic of space. Treating architecture as a cultural language, Hillier and Hanson (1984) show how architectural patterns can be analyzed to extract the formal principles of, for example, the modes of production or cooperation of any given sector in society. What is particularly useful is that such quantification and systematization can help us identify principles that run counter to the ideal official political philosophy of that society, revealing internal tensions (Hiller and Hanson 1984, p. 48).

Historically, for example, social interactions such as drinking *pulque*, bullfights, theater, *paseos*, and the game of *pelota* were not segregated by caste or class in New Spain (colonial Mexico) during the Hapsburg regime, even though the regime emphasized *de jure* hierarchy and division of different ethnic and racial groups. Widespread social insularity in public places began under the Enlightenment-inspired Bourbons (Viqueira Albán 1999). Because of the disdain for folk culture, penchant for a top-down view of neatness and order, control and education of the masses, and emphasis on rationality and scientific naturalism during the Enlightenment, social distinctions and hierarchies were strictly enforced by naturalized practices, even as they were being done away with on paper. Viqueira Albán (1999) argued that modern “democratic” Mexico is a practical continuation of this Enlightenment project, where class-based spaces are reinforced by day-to-day practices and different tastes in social diversion and not by laws. Archaeology, with its ability to infer social insularity, wealth gaps, integrative urban public spaces or lack thereof, neighborhoods, and differences in stylistic taste can identify historical processes like the one outlined by Viqueira Albán (see Smith 1987, 2011a, b). Archaeology can contribute greatly to the history not only of enduring distinction but also of disdain.
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