

20. Sayce [1845-1933] "traveled extensively in Egypt where he spent many winters in his own boat on the Nile copying inscriptions, etc.; he had a wide circle of friends among Egyptologists..." (WWE, p.375).
21. Lacau [1873-1963] would be the director of the Antiquities Service during 1914-1936 (WWE, pp.233-234).
22. Though most archaeologists of today would consider the burning of ancient coffins planks to be outrageous, there was certainly precedent for such behavior in Hogarth's day. In a letter home written from Kafr Ammar, Egypt in the year 1912, T.E. Lawrence wrote: "Even our very firewood comes from 24th dynasty coffins, and our charcoal brazier first performed that office in the days of the fall of Carchemish" (Lawrence 1954, p.185). Lawrence was writing from the camp of one of Hogarth's mentors, none other than Petrie himself!
23. In his Narrative (1820 p.157), Belzoni describes a similar atmosphere: "Once I was conducted from such a place to another resembling it [a tunnel with mummies], through a passage of about twenty feet in length, and no wider than that a body could be forced through. It was choked with mummies, and I could not pass without putting my face in contact with that of some decayed Egyptian; but as the passage declined downwards, my own weight helped me on: however, I could not avoid being covered with bones, legs, arms, and heads rolling from above."
24. Letter to Budge, 6 March 1907.
25. Ibid.
26. See, for example, several coffins from the excavation described in Edwards (1938, pp. 23-24, 26).
27. Édouard Eropain [1852-1929] was a wealthy Belgian engineer involved in a variety of industrial projects in Europe and Egypt and a benefactor to Egyptological institutions in Belgium (WWE, p.141).
28. Hogarth (1910, plates opposite pages 155 and 158).
29. Objects from the excavation in the British Museum Catalogue of Egyptian Antiquities can be found in Andrews (1981 pp. 47-48, 50), Cooney (1976 pp.49, 131, 154), Dawson and Gray (1968 pp.6), and Glanville (1972 pp.27-37).

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5334/bha.05203>

## History of Latin American Archaeology

by

David L. Browman  
 Department of Anthropology  
 Washington University - St. Louis

Two recent contributions (Oyuela-Caycedo 1994 and Politis 1995) to analyses of the intellectual development of archaeology in Latin America provide us with new perspectives. A theme shared by both is the perception by the authors of a need to distance the development of archaeology in Latin American countries from the overweening influence of Europe, and especially U. S., archaeologists. Politis argues that U. S. influence has been tantamount to 'cultural imperialism' (1995:226). He sees U.S. archaeologists as having a history of appropriating and manipulating the knowledge of the past which ignores the local peoples own traditional perceptions of their patrimony, and argues that the U. S. perspective is designed to satisfy the needs of western scholarship but fails to enter a dialog with the legitimate concerns of the subject countries. Oyuela-Caycedo's introductory essay in his book "Nationalism and Archaeology" carries a very similar message. He faults U. S. archaeologists for failing to locate their studies in the areas social and local context, which he sees as leading the U. S. scholars to employ a model derived from "dependency theory" (1994:5), resulting in an overly simplistic perception of the context for the development of archaeological disciplines in respective Latin American countries.

Politis strives to discuss the history of intellectual development of all of South America from the perspective of Argentina. This endeavor is the article's extraordinary strength as well as its weakness, for on the one hand the intellectual development of other countries in South America are cast in the Argentine model, which leads to some provocative new insights, but on the other hand, this leads to a reconstruction that is heavily biased toward Argentine developments. Oyuela-Caycedo approaches the issue from another tact: he is the editor of a volume which contains contributions on the intellectual heritage of archaeology in seven countries, by natives of those countries, which gives the volume specific authenticity in covering those countries, but on the other hand ignores the intellectual trajectory of the score of other Latin American countries, as well as suffering from the typical edited

volume syndrome, wherein each contributor writes alone and none of the contributions are integrated or even follow the same theme.

Specific presentations in Oyuela-Caycedo's volume are the papers on national development patterns in Brazil (Pedro Schmitz), Chile (Mario Rivera and Mario Orellana), Colombia (Luis Jaramillo and Oyuela-Caycedo), Mexico (Luis Vazquez), Panama (Carlos Fitzgerald), Peru (Ramiro Matos Mendieta), and Venezuela (Rafael Gasson and Erika Wagner). In addition there are some commentaries on trends in maize research (Christine Hastorf), lithic studies in Northwestern South America (Jack Wolford), ethnoarchaeology (Peter Roe), and Donald Lathrap (Scott Raymond), so the volume is a rather eclectic aggregate of studies. The communality in a general sense is that the contributors are either former students or colleagues of the late Dr. Lathrap.

For the most part, the individual country summaries provide over-arching phases or periodization for the local sequence. While it is difficult to cast all of the models into a single gestalt, there is a proclivity to identify a period of intensive European (primarily German, Austrian and French) influence from the 1880s through World War I, a shift to dominant U. S. influence from World War I through the Vietnam War, and the first flowering of strong independent local traditions beginning in the 1970s and 1980s. This is the generic pattern that Politis (1992, 1995) also identifies for Argentina and its neighbors in his review of South American archaeology. However, of particular interest is Politis's characterization (1995:219) of a "Latin American Social Archaeology School", informed by such notables as Bate, Choy, Lumbreras, Sanoja, Tabio, and Vargas. While this movement started out with explicitly Marxist theoretical orientation, the ideological fervor cooled for many of its adherents, and rather its clear separation from the domination of U. S. archaeological thinking provided the political platform from which several of the more recent nationalistic schools of Latin American archaeology have evolved.

For the most part, these contributions are seeking to identify broad, over-arching patterns, so their authors have stepped back metaphysically from their homelands to attempt to perceive and characterize broadly painted intellectual traditions or influences. Vazquez's paper on the institutionalization of Mexican archaeology from 1885 to 1942 involves a different approach. Vazquez has narrowed his focus to specific individuals alone, traced their political influences, to identify the significant contributions of particular individuals to the wider picture. There is rich detail on how Capt. Leopold Bâtres' interest in architectural reconstruction projects as specific public history open air museums for the national patrimony developed into the idea of "archaeological zones". The presently recognized 157 archaeological zones of INAH structure the study of prehistory today in Mexico, and the focus on reconstruction means that still (as of 1994) architects and restorers outnumber the archaeologists in this agency. The counter-balancing influence of Manuel Gamio, the first archaeologist in Mexico with professional training, is highlighted in a discussion of the development and functioning of the short-lived Escuela Internacional de Arqueología y Etnología Americanas (1911-1914), and the political basis that Gamio developed there that he and his associates were able to employ afterwards to champion his view of archaeology in Mexico in competition with that of Bâtres and his adherents. Vazquez has gone to the next deeper layer; in addition to outlining the general pattern of development of Mexican archaeology, he has uncovered some of the competing political motives behind the personalities involved, that ultimately resulted in the specific configurations observed. One comes away with appreciation of different components of the history of development of archaeological institutions and agendas in Latin America from the edited volume of Oyuela-Caycedo and the summary paper by Politis. Both provide rich recitations of essentials in the exegesis of archaeology in Latin America.

#### References Cited

Augusto Oyuela-Caycedo, editor

1994 *History of Latin American Archaeology*. Aldershot, Hampshire, UK: Avebury

Gustavo G. Politis

1992 "Política Nacional, Arqueología y Universidad en Argentina." In: Gustavo G. Politis, ed. *Arqueología en America in Hoy*, pp. 70-87. Bogota: Biblioteca BancoPopular.

---

1995 "The Socio-Politics of the Development of Archaeology in Hispanic South America." In: Peter J. Ucko, ed. *Theory in Archaeology: A World Perspective*, pp. 197-235. London: Routledge.