New Horizons in the Archaeology of the Viking Age
The All-Inclusive $^{14}$C Dating Service for Bones

Now included FREE with $^{14}$C Dating on bone collagen

C:N, %C, %N, $\delta^{15}$N, $\delta^{13}$C (IRMS)

Radiocarbon Dating
Consistent Accuracy, Delivered on Time

Beta Analytic
www.radiocarbon.com
**SPECIAL SECTION: NEW HORIZONS IN THE ARCHAEOLOGY OF THE VIKING AGE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Viking Phenomena: Current Archaeologies of the Early Medieval Scandinavians</td>
<td>Neil Price</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Gamla Uppsala and Valsgärde: Deconstructing the Vendel-Viking Transition</td>
<td>John Ljungkvist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>The ‘Great Army’ at Repton and the New Archaeology of Viking Campaigns</td>
<td>Cat Jarman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Were They All Men? Viking Colonial Women in England</td>
<td>Jane Kershaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Women At War? The Birka Female Warrior and Her Implications</td>
<td>Charlotte Hedenstierna-Jonson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Raiding, Slaving, and the Economies of Unfreedom in the Viking Diaspora</td>
<td>Ben Raffield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Into the Outlands: Networks of Marginal Trade and Resources in the Viking Age</td>
<td>Andreas Hennius</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Calendar** 27

**SAA 2019 Call for Nominations** 31

**Report from the SAA Board of Directors** 39 Emily McClung de Tapia

**Society for American Archaeology 83rd Annual Business Meeting** 41

**2018 Awards** 44

**In Memoriam: Michael Harner** 52 Aaron M. Wright

*On the cover: (Hedenstierna-Jonson, Figure 3) Reconstruction of grave Bj 581, Birka, Sweden, drawn by Dórhallur Þráinsson, © Neil Price.*
EDITOR’S CORNER

Anna Marie Prentiss

Anna Marie Prentiss is a professor in the Department of Anthropology at the University of Montana.

Our May 2018 issue features a lengthy special section titled “New Horizons in the Archaeology of the Viking Age,” guest edited by Neil Price. While articles focus empirically on Late Iron Age and Early Medieval time frames within a western and northern European context, they are worthy of study by archaeologists of the Americas and elsewhere for a number of reasons. First, the Vikings appear to have been the first Europeans to establish colonies in North America and thus, they have direct bearing on the history of many indigenous populations in the Eastern Arctic, Subarctic, and Northeastern regions. Second, as noted by Price, Viking archaeology is in a period of remarkable growth with a range of new insights that are dramatically enhancing our knowledge of this critical time and cultural phenomenon. Third, methodological and theoretical insights drawn from specific topics of study, whether exchange, individual mobility, gender identity, subsistence economy, war and raiding, social change, or diaspora are relevant to nearly all archaeologists.

Specific contributions to the special section illustrate the wide range of research underway in Viking archaeology. Price provides an introduction to the section highlighting major themes in Viking research, including the Boat Grave culture and the concept of “Viking economics.” Ljungkvist examines dramatic boat burials at the early transition to the Viking age. Jarman explores archaeological evidence for large Viking camps associated with Viking military campaigns in east-central England. Kershaw assesses evidence for Viking women in England, noting that artifactual evidence for women’s presence is substantial despite a limited mortuary record. Hedenstierna-Jonson presents the Birka female warrior and considers the implications that some women were likely not only warriors, but very high-status warriors. Raffield reviews archaeological indicators of slavery among the Vikings and associated Early Medieval societies. Finally, Hennius considers the complexities of commodity production and exchange among the Vikings.

There are many other contributions in our May issue. Shelby Anderson provides our Volunteer Profile. Mitchell Allen offers timely advice regarding predatory journals. We include the annual report of the SAA Board of Directors, the reports of the Annual Meeting (Minutes and President’s Remarks), and review of the 2018 awards. Last but not least, outgoing Executive Director Tobi Brimsek offers her final column to the membership. I think we can all agree that Tobi has made an extraordinary contribution to the Society for American Archaeology over the past 22 years. We wish her all the best in retirement!
As I announced at the Annual Business Meeting in Washington, DC, I will be retiring from SAA at the end of this September after 22 years as your executive director. I want to take this opportunity in my last column to the membership to share my remarks from the Annual Business Meeting and to again express my thanks to all of you at SAA for having entrusted me with the stewardship of this organization. Thank you.

Remarks:

“Good evening—I would like to start this evening with the age-old question that is asked at every Passover seder by the youngest child—why is this night different from all other nights? My answer tonight is not the historical one but a very personal one. It is because this is the 22nd and last time I, as the executive director, will address the membership of SAA, as I will be retiring at the end of September. But, as Robert Frost put it in “In the Home Stretch,” “Ends and beginnings—there are no such things. There are only middles.”

But what does it mean to be in the middle? I think it means you’ve taken steps towards where you’re going but still have a full path ahead of you. I think it means you’re heading in the right direction. And I think it means you’ve chosen a journey worth continuing. So in that sense, we are truly in the middle.

In the middle of a complete redesign of SAA’s website, headed up by SAA’s manager, Information Services, Cheng Zhang, with our consulting web developers in conjunction with our 20-member strong SAA task force. The rollout of the website will be in December 2018. Prepare to be dazzled. We are in the middle of a rebirth of The SAA Press, with production humming along by the manager, Publications, Marnie Colton. Marnie came on board literally in the middle of the first-year transition to our publishing partner, Cambridge University Press.

We are in the middle of retooling our database and membership and data collection forms to meet the new strict European Union General Data Protection Regulation for EU residents, with a watchful eye from SAA’s manager, Membership and Marketing, Cheryl Ardovini. Cheryl is also in the middle of expanding the SAA marketplace, having sold out the DC exhibit hall earlier than ever before, along with having increased vendor exposure in SAA’s final meeting program. We are in the middle of our manager, Communications and Fundraising, Amy Rutledge’s quest for expanding our use of targeted social media campaigns as well as increased use of video in social media, which in turn grows SAA’s social media presence.

We are in the middle of transitioning more of the behind-the-scenes prep work for the Annual Meeting to our coordinator, Membership and Meetings, Solai Sanchez, a staffer with whom many of you are very familiar. While her role in membership is not changing, her role relative to the meeting is increasing.

We are in the middle of transitioning more and more administrative responsibilities to our manager, Financial and Administration Services, Jonathon Koudelka. Jonathon’s operations serve as a strong and critical backbone to the Society, and he is always in the middle of seeking new and improved approaches.

We are in the middle of turning the reigns of our online seminar program exclusively over to SAA’s full-time manager, Education and Outreach, and staff archaeologist, Elizabeth Pruitt. Beth is in the middle of using the Public Education Initiatives Fund to reach out to local communities to build a platform for science engagement. We are also putting the Public Education Endowment to work in having recently conducted a new public perceptions poll on archaeology, which is being released at this meeting and the results of which will be available online. 93% of Americans say that the work that archaeologists do is important, which is a critical—as well as an expected—finding that needs to be brought to the attention of our legislators. Through data collected by this Ipsos poll, it is clear that the funding, protection, and preservation of archaeological sites should be a priority of the US government, as expressed by a majority of the Americans surveyed.

And that brings us to government affairs, as we are in the middle of reminding US legislators that Americans care a lot about their cultural resources and want to see them preserved. SAA’s manager, Government Affairs, David Lindsay, is working alongside SAA’s sister organizations, the Coalition for American Heritage, and our outside consultants to ensure that archaeologists’ voices are heard loudly throughout the chambers of Congress. We will be heard on both sides of the aisle.

And now a moment to look back. SAA has and continues to go through enormous and wonderful change and growth. We
have matured as an organization, expanded our programs, and garnered our resources to a position from hanging on in 1996 when I arrived, to being incredibly fiscally sound in 2018—no small feat, accomplished by all of you and the sage leadership of your Board. As Charles Darwin has said, “It is not the strongest of the species that survives, nor the most intelligent that survives. It is the one most adaptable to change.” I believe that given what I have seen over the past 22 years, SAA is incredibly adaptable to change, albeit some of it more evolutionary than revolutionary. The only reason I wanted to use this moment to look back is truly to let us reflect on how far we have come as an organization in the past two-plus decades. Looking back also allows you to chart a course for the future. When I arrived we were trying to turn the large ship, close to hitting the rocks, around. As I leave, you will simply be setting the compass for a new and exciting direction, with lots more to come.

Despite our growth, challenges and opportunities, changes, and strides, there has been and always will be a constant. That is the shared passion for archaeology and the member commitment to this Society. You heard it from Lynne Sebastian, former SAA President, that SAA is “all of us.” It is not some deus ex machina. The leadership, staff, and membership are all part of what that “us” is.

I would like to thank you for the trust, sincerity, and opportunity to play a small role in the development of this organization. I appreciate that you entrusted me with the stewardship of SAA. I am forever grateful to have had your company on this part of my own life journey, along with our shared experiences, which are indelibly imprinted into my memory. I’ll harken back to my educational roots and share something a Galician romanticist poet, Rosalia de Castro, wrote that expresses my thoughts: “I know my path, but I don’t know where it leads. Not knowing where I am going inspires me to travel it.”

Good night and good luck. Enjoy Albuquerque 2019 and beyond! And finally, thank you, thank you so much for everything.”
I am an associate professor in the Anthropology Department at Portland State University (PSU). Over the years I have worked in a variety of settings (e.g., tribal, federal, private) in Alaska, Washington, Oregon, Utah, Colorado, and the Russian Far East. Volunteering presents opportunities for new knowledge and experiences, connections, and the positive feeling of giving back to the public, communities, and our profession.

My first experience as a volunteer was in 1999 as an undergraduate assisting with recovery of human remains and funerary items on the Lummi Indian Nation Semiahmah project in northwest Washington. My advisor, Dr. Sarah Campbell (Western Washington University), encouraged her students to volunteer and we were joined by professional archaeologists and tribal members from across the state. While my participation in the multi-year recovery project was small, it was a transformative experience. I realized that I could use my archaeological skills to make a difference for descendant communities living today.

As a University of Washington graduate student I volunteered at Burke Museum outreach events. Most often, I was asked to help identify artifacts that members of the public brought from private collections. I continue to do this as a volunteer at the annual PSU Archaeology Roadshow, organized by Dr. Virginia Butler. The Roadshow brings together Portland-area archaeologists and cultural specialists to share archaeology with the community. Working at the artifact identification table with other experts is always exciting as we never know what objects people will bring us. Will it be a curious, but not-culturally modified, stone? Or, a 7,000-year-old leaf-shaped point? We see it all at these outreach events, which are a unique opportunity to engage with the public.

Various Native Alaskan communities have invited me to talk about my work and to engage with youth in schools and in the field. Young students are my most critical audience, as kids have little patience for long, drawn-out explanations. This has encouraged me to distill concepts and activities for young audiences; these experiences inform my university teaching. In 2009, the regional Native Alaskan culture camp brought a large group of students to our field site. Our team led the students in a series of site survey, documentation, and mapping activities. Although our field exercise was a bit chaotic, everyone came away with new knowledge about the past and how archaeologists do our work. I appreciated the chance to learn more about the students’ perspectives on our work and the culturally important place we were working. It was also an opportunity to give back to our community hosts in a small way.

Other recent volunteer experiences include serving on the Arctic Horizons project steering committee, volunteering as a board member for the Alaska Anthropological Association, and assisting with the Northwest Anthropological Conference student paper award reviews. Arctic Horizons is a multi-institution effort to bring together members of the Arctic social science and Indigenous communities to reassess the goals and needs of these diverse communities and Arctic social sciences research within the context of a rapidly changing circumpolar North.

Together, these opportunities have taught me the importance of sharing archaeology outside of the academy. I owe it to the public and communities who support my work. Volunteer experiences push me to think differently about the past and what archaeology can contribute to the present. Last, volunteering brings connections that I appreciate and will continue to seek out through service.

I am grateful to the many communities that invite me to share my work. I look forward to future collaborations that grow from these volunteer efforts, and to volunteering for the SAA in the coming years!
You've just tracked down the final two references and rewrote your abstract when a surprising message drifts into your e-mail inbox: an invitation to submit the article to a journal you've never heard of but with an impressive-sounding name. It promises quick publication—only a couple of weeks—strong peer reviews, and open access to maximize circulation of the best piece you've ever written. With tenure in the back of your mind, you note on the website that the journal has an impressive impact factor, one that will wow your senior colleagues. If you read carefully enough, you discover that they want you to pay an Article Processing Charge (APC), but it's only $150, less than a night at the SAA conference hotel. You upload your article and hit the Submit button. If it sounds too good to be true, that's because it probably is. You've just been scammed and given your best article to a predatory journal.

The phrase “predatory journals” was popularized by university librarian Jeffrey Beall in a now-defunct website he launched in 2012, scholarlyoa.com. It describes one of the less-desirable by-products of the move toward open access journals, journals that the reader can access and read online for free. Predatory journals take advantage of scholars' need to publish by offering an online publication for a small fee. The predatory nature relates to the fact that they provide a false front to convince the author that they operate like legitimate research journals, promising traditional rigorous peer review from respected scholars and the credit awarded a typical academic publication. In fact, there is no quality filter. The peer review provided by predatory journals will be either cursory or completely absent. They will accept anything submitted to them as long as you are willing to pay their fee.

Until fairly recently, journals survived on income from library subscriptions. With the open access movement promising that scholarship would become available at no cost to the reader, some other way was needed to pay the costs of publishing. Some journals used a committed group of volunteers, some found grants, libraries, or other third parties to pay the costs, and some sought to cover costs from authors seeking to be published. This last approach is the “Gold Open Access” model, where the author of the accepted article pays, or finds a third party to pay, an APC to defray the journal's costs, and the article, once accepted, is freely accessible to anyone with an Internet connection. These charges can range from a couple of hundred dollars to many thousands depending on the journal and are often waived for students and authors from less-developed countries. Some of the subscription-based journal publishers have adopted a “hybrid” model as a way of increasing their income and give authors the option to make their paper freely available to readers by paying an APC. These journals still charge for subscriptions, but if you are willing and able to pay for it, your article can be available as open access, even if the rest of the journal is sequestered behind the publisher's paywall. SAA's own journals are hybrid through our publications agreement with Cambridge University Press (http://saa.org/AbouttheSociety/Publications/tabid/113/Default.aspx). This model was developed in the physical and biological science fields where the often-substantial APC costs could simply be added to your multimillion dollar National Institutes of Health grant. The model works less well in social sciences where there are rarely third parties to subsidize the publication charge, particularly for independent scholars or graduate students.

A second kind of open access, the Green OA Model, allows scholars to publicly post free versions of their article in personal, institutional, or disciplinary repositories no matter what its original source of publication (Marwick et al. 2017). In some cases there are limitations on which version of the manuscript is allowed—almost never the edited and typeset publisher version—and often after an embargoed period of time. Those limitations vary from publisher to publisher and have been aggregated for many journals in the online SHERPA/RoMEO database (http://www.sherpa.ac.uk/romeo/). Cambridge University Press Green OA policies, including for SAA journals, are here: https://www.cambridge.org/core/services/open-access-policies.

Beall’s website, however, identified a particular kind of Gold OA journal that charged an APC but ignored the standard academic peer review process. These journals were given names that made them sound like legitimate publications, like a hypothetical Global Journal of Historical Archaeology or Open Journal of World Archaeology. Charges were often much less than what more established...
BEWARE THE PREDATORY JOURNAL

journals were asking, usually in the couple hundred dollar range. You could have your article published in a professional-sounding journal in a very short time frame without having to work through the peer review process, and at a very modest cost. Beall labeled these journals as predatory because, while they mimicked standard academic journals, they simply posted your article for a fee without any peer assessment of its quality. In order to look like a standard academic journal, they often invented nonexistent editors and editorial boards (or listed reputable scholars without their knowledge), made up bogus impact factors, and falsely created a list of places where the journal was indexed. When knowledgeable tenure committees or funding agencies assessed publications in these journals, they disregarded them as vanity publications due to the lack of rigorous peer review. Nor was this a trivial problem. A study conducted in 2015 showed that over 400,000 articles had been published in predatory journals in the previous year (Shen and Björk 2015).

Beall’s List, as this blacklist of predatory journals and publishers came to be called, became the source that scholars, librarians, university administrators, grant officers, and tenure committees checked to ascertain the academic validity of an otherwise-unknown journal. It was also noticed by the companies who launched these journals; his list was a clear threat to their financial success. The result was threats, harassment, and lawsuits against Beall and against his employer, the University of Colorado Denver, from these predatory publishers. The endless attacks eventually took their toll. Abruptly, in January 2017, Beall’s List disappeared from the Web, to be found only at mirror sites (https://beallslist.weebly.com/), frozen at the date of the list’s disappearance (Straunsheim 2017). Beall has kept a low profile since, stating only “They kept sending the emails to the university chancellor and others, hoping to implement the heckler’s veto. They tried to be as annoying as possible to the university so that the officials would get so tired of the emails that they would silence me just to make them stop” (Beall, cited in Ravindranath 2017).

But Beall’s List was too important to scholars to be lost. A large indexing service, Cabells International (http://www.cabells.com/about-blacklist), relaunched the list in June of 2017, promising a more transparent set of criteria in listing journals on their blacklist, and, equally, creating a whitelist of journals, ones that a scholar could feel safe in submitting to. Initial reviews of Cabell’s list were favorable, but the list is unfortunately available only through paid library subscription (Anderson 2017a). Although Cabell’s blacklist is a commercial product, there are a number of freely accessible reputable whitelists, such as the Directory of Open Access Journals (https://doaj.org/) and the Clarivate Analytics Master Journal List (http://mjl.clarivate.com/).

With the rapid growth of predatory journals, the scholarly community launched a concerted effort to educate researchers on how to identify these journals and how to better inform themselves on how to select an appropriate journal for their work. A consortium of scholarly and publishing organizations created ThinkCheckSubmit.org (https://thinkchecksubmit.org/) with suggestions for scholars in need. A Centre for Journalology (http://ohri.ca/journalology/) exists at the University of Ottawa Hospital providing similar information. Table 1, based on these two sources, summarizes the questions you should ask to help determine if a journal or publisher is predatory or not. In short, if you’re not familiar with the journal, you need to do some research before submitting an article to it.

Scholarly community pressure recently led the Federal Trade Commission to obtain the first injunction against one of the largest and most aggressive predatory journal companies, OMIC, for “unfair and deceptive practices with respect to the publication of online academic journals and organization of scientific conferences.” This charge is still in litigation, but OMIC’s business in the United States has been stopped temporarily (Anderson 2017b).

One well-known historical archaeologist was listed on the editorial board of one of these predatory journals. When I asked him about it, he noted that the journal was based in India (many of them are), and he thought he would be helping scholarly publications in the Global South by agreeing to serve on the editorial board. He was never consulted about the journal’s content and focus, and he started to receive highly unsuitable articles to review. He became more concerned when he found it difficult to contact or obtain information on other editorial board members and asked to be removed from the masthead. As of this writing, more than a year later, they have not done so despite his repeated requests. While he himself was not harmed by this, other scholars might see his name on the editorial board, assume the journal is legitimate, and submit articles to it.

A similar story is told by another friend of mine, a well-known communications researcher. Invited to serve on the editorial board of an anthropology/archaeology journal, he demurred, noting that he was not in that field. That was the last he heard from the journal until I saw his name on their editorial board while researching this article. One pissed-off Australian scholar even proposed his dog for the editorial board of some of these journals. Dr. Olivia Doll, a Staffordshire terrier, now sits on seven of them (O’Leary 2017).

I could end this article here with the simple admonition of “investigate an unknown journal before you submit an article.” But, like most things in life and scholarship, it’s not quite that simple. Our colleague’s instinct to want to assist the academic communities in parts of the world where it is not as refined as in neoliberal America is not a misplaced one. There are journals in Latin America, South Asia, and elsewhere that don’t work with the efficiencies
or resources of those run by major Western scholarly organizations or global media conglomerates. It doesn’t make them predatory; Euroamerican sensibilities might just consider them inefficient. A scholar, particularly one new to the publication process, may not be able to easily discern the difference. Steps are being taken to assess and ensure the legitimacy of journals outside the Euroamerican orbit, but the process is a long one (Harris 2017).

Nor is peer review always a hurdle to be overcome. One publications expert points out that in some countries, the only requirement for academic “credit” is that the article be published outside the scholar’s native country (Crotty 2017). Predatory can also apply to scholars who publish in these journals, some of whom knowingly submit numerous substandard articles to make up for deficiencies in their publications record, hoping that their colleagues will accept that these are legitimate academic sources without researching further. In an era where the authority of scholarly work is regularly challenged by those outside the academy, a set of journals that offer a home for large quantities of unvetted, potentially shoddy research only lends credence to the critics of academia. Hiring and promotion committees need to be alert for unscrupulous candidates who pad their resumes with junk publications in predatory journals.

Even within the traditional academic infrastructure, the rules of the game are changing rapidly. The growth of megajournals like Public Library of Science (PLOS ONE), which published as many as 28,000 articles in 2015 in almost every discipline (Davis 2017), has been mimicked by many of the commercial presses who now have their own pan-disciplinary journals, soaking up hundreds of

Table 1. A Checklist of Questions to Ask When Choosing a Journal to Submit Your Work To. Adapted from https://thinkchecksubmit.org/ and http://ohri.ca/journalology/.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you or your colleagues know the journal?</td>
<td>Have you read any articles in the journal before?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is it easy to discover the latest papers in the journal?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Can you easily identify and contact the publisher?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is the publisher name clearly displayed on the journal website?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Can you contact the publisher by telephone, e-mail, and post?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is the journal affiliated with a professional society (e.g., American Antiquity is affiliated with the Society for American Archaeology)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the journal clear about the type of peer review it uses?</td>
<td>Common types include single-blind (identity of the reviewer is anonymous, but the author’s name is available to the reviewer) and double-blind (neither the reviewer nor the author see each other’s name).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are articles indexed in services that you use?</td>
<td>Reputable archaeology journals are often indexed in the Arts &amp; Humanities Citation Index and the Social Sciences Citation Index. Google Scholar does not apply any quality filters, and is not a useful indicator of journal quality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is it clear what fees will be charged?</td>
<td>Does the journal site explain what these fees are for and when they will be charged? Reputable Gold OA journals usually charge their fee after peer review is complete and the paper has been accepted for publication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you recognize the editorial board?</td>
<td>Have you heard of the editorial board members? They should be established scholars with public profiles who have published their research in reputable journals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do the editorial board members mention the journal on their own websites?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the journal website provide proper information?</td>
<td>Does the website target potential authors more than potential readers?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are the website graphics fuzzy, possibly snipped from other websites?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the website contain many spelling and grammatical errors? These are the people who will be editing your work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is the contact e-mail generic (e.g., gmail.com) rather than affiliated with the journal or scholarly host?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the publisher a member of a recognized industry initiative?</td>
<td>Do they belong to the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If the journal is open access, is it listed in the Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If the journal is open access, does the publisher belong to the Open Access Scholarly Publishers Association (OASPA)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is the journal hosted on one of INASP’s Journals Online platforms (for journals published in Bangladesh, Nepal, Sri Lanka, Central America, and Mongolia) or on African Journals Online (AJOL, for African journals)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is the publisher a member of another trade association?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
articles a year. Some of these journals are managed by scholars; others use scholarly reviewers but leave the final decision on publication to staff members who work for the press. With the economic success of the publisher based on increasing the number of articles published and therefore the APC income, the instinct is to say yes to marginal pieces. In the case of traditional journal publishing, where the perception of rigor was often tied to the percentage of articles rejected, many of these articles would have been denied publication. Even without predatory journals, there are many more options for publishing archaeology research than ever before, though reliable assessment of the quality of any given journal and its articles are harder to come by.

This warning notice to archaeologists is not in any way a condemnation of the movement toward open access journals in our field. The Directory of Open Access Journals lists almost 100 serious, legitimate open access publications in archaeology and related disciplines. If hybrid journals were included, it would more than double that number. Internet Archaeology (http://intarch.ac.uk/), based at University of York and possibly the oldest open access archaeology journal, has been in existence over 20 years and boasted about 80,000 visitors to their website in 2017. When the Society for Archaeological Sciences recently launched a new society journal, STAR: Science & Technology of Archaeological Research (http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/y斯塔0), they chose an open access model for it.

The existence of predatory journals is a fact of academic existence that scholars didn’t have to be concerned with a decade ago. The attractive invitations that most published scholars regularly receive via e-mail or social media are a tempting alternative to the traditional struggle to get published. Your research no longer ends with the completion of your article, but should include a careful examination of the journal to which you plan to submit it, if it is not a journal you’re familiar with. Consider it another use for your skill as a researcher.

Acknowledgments: This article was inspired by discussions with in the SAA Publications Committee, of which the author is a current member. I thank Teresita Majewski, Marnie Colton, Ben Marwick, Sarah Herr, and an anonymous reviewer for their comments on the draft manuscript. A second thanks to Ben for compiling Table 1 from various sources.
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The past five years of SAA Annual Meetings have been busy for Viking archaeology, with multiple sessions (a total of more than 100 papers from 2013–2017) presenting new insights into the lives of the early medieval Scandinavians. Given the Society’s natural emphasis on the Americas, why is this relatively small and highly specific field of European studies experiencing such an expansion in international focus?

The Vikings of course enjoy a public recognition common to few other ancient cultures: put simply, almost everyone is familiar with at least some aspect of the Scandinavians’ remarkable movement into the North Atlantic and Eurasia over just three centuries between circa AD 750 and 1050. By the same token, the Vikings and their time have also been subject to a rare degree of stereotyping, also unfolding over an extended period from the National Romanticism of the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries to the racist distortions of the Third Reich, and beyond into contemporary genres of fantasy and popular culture. These clichés are also deeply gendered, from the androcentric image of the Viking raider, to his female counterpart in the ‘strong Viking woman’ as lady of the hall; both of these constructions contain elements of truth but are also strongly flawed.

One key to the upsurge of Viking research in recent decades has been a greater determination to engage with the demonstrable multiculturalism and variation in Viking Age societies, which moreover is best accessed through an explicitly interdisciplinary approach. In addition to fruitful collaborations with historians of religions, literary and saga specialists, runologists, and scholars in other humanities fields, archaeologists have also begun to integrate the natural and physical sciences into their analyses at a level unprecedented for early medieval studies (Brink and Price 2008; Price 2015a, 2015b).

Not least, one consequence of the new understandings of the regional and fragmented nature of the Vikings’ activities has been a major paradigm shift in terminology. Where academics once routinely wrote of a Viking ‘expansion’, with all its connotations of process and directed purpose, we now tend to speak of a diaspora—the complex result of numerous interconnecting and somewhat serendipitous factors that changed over time, with accordingly different regional impacts (Jesch 2015; Figure 1).
Viking scholars have examined issues of state formation, the early rise of royal power and later a unified Church, and their manifestation in the development of towns and other central places. Warfare and landscapes of conflict form integral components of these investigations, along with emerging nodal networks of trade and exchange, and the handicrafts that fuelled them. The eastern slave trade, with contacts as far as the Middle East and beyond, has been a particular focus, while in the west there have been major studies of North Atlantic colonisation and environmental impact. Rural settlements and assembly places have also been intensively studied. As a unifying matrix behind all these processes, issues of identity, ethnicity, and world-view have been placed centre-stage. The Viking mind has also been explored through studies of religion, ritual and magic, and by extension burial and the realm of mortuary behaviour. Not least, explicitly gendered readings of the Viking Age are now, at last, the norm.

The websites of some major ongoing projects are listed below, while new monographs and PhD theses (which in the Nordic countries are automatically published as books) appear constantly. This ‘new’ Viking archaeology, and the pluralism of the Viking worlds that it represents, has also been the subject of several recent surveys (Cambridge and Hawkes 2017; Eriksen et al. 2015; Glørstad and Loftsgarden 2017), charting the sheer variety of pasts on offer, especially from early career researchers whose work is radically changing the discipline. This includes the ways in which it has also spun out into the public narratives mentioned above, not simply reflected in popular syntheses and exhibitions (e.g., Williams et al. 2014), but also in high-impact dramatized entertainments such as History’s internationally successful Vikings series (Price 2018a; World-Tree website below).

The Viking Phenomenon

The various projects mentioned above have together attracted a very high level of investment from the government funding bodies of the Nordic countries, from private foundations, and from corporate sponsorship, to the tune of tens of millions of dollars. It is rare to see national commitment to a single time period of the past in precisely this way, and with the award of such grants also comes a keen awareness of the socially and politically situated nature of Viking research (e.g., Andersson 2016; Hauptman 2014; Svanberg 2003). Against this charged background, we can mention another new initiative launched in 2016 by the Swedish Research Council, in the form of the largest single grant ever made to an individual archaeological project. Some 50 million kronor (c. 6 million dollars) was awarded to the author and Uppsala University to establish a centre of excellence under the title of The Viking Phenomenon, with the mission to explore and more deeply understand the beginnings of the social process that make up what we call the Viking Age. Running for 10 years (2016–2025) and employing at present 10 researchers, the project provides a rare opportunity not only to critically illuminate a crucial period of European history (with world implications), but also to do so in the context of its contemporary impact.

This first requires an acceptance that the sociopolitical processes of the Viking Age had an empirically testable reality that can be illuminated by theory: the later appropriations of the Vikings and their time provide a cautionary tale and sometimes an obscuring filter, but in themselves they say nothing at all about the actual period in question. The question of origins is key here, not in the sense of an illusory ‘smoking gun’ that ‘started it all’, but looking instead to a deeper time perspective that blurs the artificial distinctions between the so-called Vendel period (c. 550–750) and the Viking Age that followed. While the latter is often characterised by the outward movement of Scandinavians for a variety of purposes, it may be that this in fact represents only a new external projection of strategies and processes that had long been underway within the homelands. The project is designed as an umbrella programme that shelters several sub-strands of research, but the key focus of attention is on the critical century from AD 750 to 850 and the decades either side, embracing the early Viking Age and its foundations.

The six contributions to this special issue of The SAA Archaeological Record present important facets of this new venture in Viking archaeology. Most of the authors are based either in Uppsala or Stockholm in central Sweden, and working within the orbit of the Viking Phenomenon project, but we also present essays from other leading scholars at the forefront of the new Viking archaeology. Inevitably selective, they nonetheless provide a point of entry into several vital themes that run through current research.

Boat Grave Culture

At the heart of the project is one of Sweden’s greatest archaeological treasures, the largest cemetery of ship burials ever found, the classic site of Valsgärde in Uppland (Figure 2). For more than 400 years, each generation interred its prominent people of both sexes here in magnificent boat graves and cremations, filled with objects and animals. Excavated by Uppsala University from the 1920s to the 1950s, together with the nearby sites of Gamla Uppsala, Vendel, and Ultuna, they tell the story of Sweden and its growth from the heart of the Mälar Valley. However, the very richness and complexity of the Valsgärde graves has meant that they have never been fully researched and published. The definitive analysis of the cemetery and the society behind the burials is one of our
Because the cemetery was in use throughout the later Iron Age, it provides us with a superb lens through which to view the gradual social changes that led up to the Viking Age. The graves—more than 80 of them in all—were deliberate material statements, preserving the ideas and aspirations of the time in physical form. Although the ship burials have attracted most attention, interspersed among them are the cremations and chamber graves of women, and it is only modern bias that sees one set of gendered burials as being more important than another; we must study them all. At Valsgärde we see an emerging kingdom creating itself, and signalling its identity through the relationship of the living to the dead—an example to stand for the many other comparable small polities throughout the North.

As a crucial counterpart to this work on an old find is the exploration of a new one: the extraordinary remains...
of a Scandinavian raiding party, buried in two ships on the Estonian seashore where they came to grief at the very start of the Viking Age (Figure 3). These excavations, undertaken at Salme on Saaremaa in 2008 and 2010–2012, arguably represent the most significant Viking discovery of the last hundred years (Peets 2013). Crucially, it has been possible to identify the origin of the Salme raiders: strontium isotope analyses of their teeth show that they most likely came from Swedish Uppland (T. Douglas Price et al. 2016), with a considerable probability that they actually were the people either from Valsgärde itself or from nearby power centres.

The Salme burials are still under post-excavation analysis, but current thinking dates them to around 750. Crucially, the Salme expedition, whatever it really was, occurred nearly half a century before the classic beginning of the Viking Age, the famous raid on the monastery at Lindisfarne in 793. This implies that the origins of raiding might well lie within the Baltic sphere, with a focus on the east, not looking westwards as the traditional models would have it. This is actually what we should expect, and is also supported by later written sources, hard though they are to interpret with confidence. Metaphorically speaking, the Salme men were some of the ’first Vikings’ and provide a great opportunity to more deeply explore these issues. As part of the Viking Phenomenon project we are happy to be able to provide substantial funding support to the Estonian team working on the Salme finds, led by Dr Jüri Peets at Tallinn University. His team of three researchers, together with Dr Marge Konsa from Tartu University, will work together with us to explore our shared goals.

Viking Economics

Underpinning these early Scandinavian enterprises was what we have chosen to call ‘Viking economics’. We mean this literally, as the economics of Vikings, in the exact sense of that word, rather than referring to the general economic systems of Viking Age Scandinavia. In contrast to the widespread exploration of the silver trade, a genuine study of raiding economics has never been undertaken—and yet this must have provided a prime motor for the developing social processes that embody our definition of the entire time period and which are so clearly reflected in places like Valsgärde.

Here we see the Vikings as actors in wider arenas, ones that involved all members of society. Our interpretations strive to include all the Viking Age people of Scandinavia equally, regardless of their gendered identities, which we have long known went far beyond the binaries of biological sex; Charlotte Hedenstierna-Jonson (also project co-Investigator) explores a topical example. New research is suggesting that women played far more active roles in the Viking colonial missions than has previously been supposed, as Jane Kershaw discusses with reference to the important contributions of genetic analyses.

Another neglected issue is the fundamental importance of slavery and slaving, not only to Viking economics but to the very fabric of society; the unfree have been left out of our models for too long, something which Ben Raffield addresses here, with related work by Andreas Hennius on the possible local and regional impacts. A vital thing to understand is that activities that were once discussed separately were in fact part of the same process: raiding was slaving, and this in turn was trading, in a loop of social feedback.

Figure 3. A reconstruction of the smaller of the two Swedish boat burials at Salme on the Estonian island of Saaremaa, excavated in 2008 and dated to circa AD 750. Apparently casualties of a raiding expedition gone wrong, seven men had been buried sitting up at the oars, the vessel filled with objects and animal sacrifices. Drawing by Þórhallur Pradinson, © Neil Price.
powered by maritime violence and movement. Cat Jarman discusses a range of exciting new material that has emerged from the winter bases of Viking armies on the move. Piracy is another key element in this complex picture, and a field of specialist study that has much to offer Viking scholars (e.g., Price 2016).

International, cross-cultural comparative studies will add a further dimension to these investigations, drawing on the historical archaeology of early modern colonial contexts in the Atlantic, the Caribbean, the Pacific, and the Far East (Price 2018b). Of course, we do not simply take interpretations from these distant time periods and drop them onto the Viking Age—but they provide useful platforms from which to think, new ways of seeing the eighth to eleventh centuries in the North.

It is important to understand that this and the many other ongoing Viking projects will not provide ‘the Answer’ to ‘the Question’ of the Viking Age, but rather a particular set of responses to the questions that we think to ask. Other scholars choose quite different lines of approach, and this is to be welcomed. All this work represents a living endeavour, situated in our own times, as it must be. The future of the Viking past has never looked so bright, and we look forward to providing more illumination over the coming years.
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GAMLA UPPSALA AND VALSGÄRDE:
DECONSTRUCTING THE VENDEL-VIKING TRANSITION

John Ljungkvist

Most articles in this special section are dealing with a time when the Viking expansion had gained pace and the footprint of Scandinavians had increased throughout Europe, militarily as well as culturally and economically. This contribution focuses on two places in middle Sweden where material and social changes can be traced before, during, and after AD 790 and the traditional start of the Viking Age. The places are intimately related to discussions on the structure of Scandinavian societies and the specialists of war and its leaders, as well as the centers and landscapes of power in the late first millennium AD.

Gamla Uppsala and Valsgärde are located barely two kilometers apart in the middle Swedish province of Uppland, north of Lake Mälaren, and were mostly likely closely related for centuries. Gamla Uppsala was the large regional and royal center, mentioned in numerous Old Norse sagas and in early medieval historical sources. Valsgärde was a major farmstead but most of all a burial ground, used for over 1,000 years, for half of which time it saw the deposition of the boat burials for which it is now best known.

Uppland province is characterized by valleys of fertile clay soils, surrounding estuaries, lakes, and rivers. Every valley was a community and a small region of its own, separated from others by meagre and forested moraine heights. Largest among the regions was the Uppsala plain, situated by the northernmost bay of Lake Mälaren where seven separate valleys met and formed large, fertile, and densely populated flatlands.

Already in the sixth century, the cultures of the region took their first steps towards the social characteristics that can be most clearly recognized in the Viking Age. The transformations in Late Roman and Migration Period societies are preceded by a cold period, probably caused by tropical volcanic eruptions in AD 536 and 540, in a time that saw major convulsions in the power balance of Europe during the middle of the century. This is manifested in a multifaceted mix of changes in burial rituals, relocation of settlements, the introduction of a new animal art style (Salins style II), and a strong reorientation of trade from central Europe to the North Sea sphere.

Valsgärde, famous for its 15 boat burials, is the only almost-intact and completely excavated burial ground of its kind. All the other similar sites, such as those at Vendel, Ultuna, or Tuna in Alsike, are more damaged, excavated in a lesser degree, and not as well documented. The Valsgärde burial ground, located by the river Fyris, first emerges as a small but high-status chamber burial site in use between the third or fourth to sixth centuries AD (Ljungkvist 2008a). It undergoes a major change in the last decades of the sixth century as the number of burials increases significantly. At this time a new burial form, the boat grave, is introduced both here, in Vendel, and at Ultuna. Initially, the boat grave is an exclusive burial form reserved for a small group of richly equipped warriors. Almost all other members of the society, whether royal or common folks, are cremated.

All of these boat burials at Valsgärde (5 from the Vendel period and 10 from the Viking Age) have their individual characteristics, but there are some principal common traits that remained for nearly 500 years. The deceased was placed in the aft part of the boat, on a wagon body, in a coffin, or simply laid down on grass, hay, or textiles. Around the body were placed weapons, some personal items and glass beakers, or drinking horns. Shields covered the entire body or parts of it. In front of the feet we generally find a helmet, a fine horse harness, or a gaming board with gaming pieces and dice, as well as various pottery or wood vessels. In the stern lay larger metal vessels, cooking equipment, and domesticated mammals and birds, but also wildfowl, hunting birds, and fish. By or outside the boat rail lay the animals most closely associated with the deceased, usually hunting dogs and horses.

It is in Valsgärde that we see the beginnings of a burial custom that is perhaps now most famous from the magnificent Viking ship burials of Oseberg and Gokstad in Norway, dated to the...
ninth and tenth centuries. However, there are sharp differences between the boat burial customs of the Vendel period and the Viking Age. An early example is Valsgärde 7, which contained at least 20 animals, excluding numerous birds and fishes (Arwidsson 1977), along with a helmet, shields, and numerous weapons. The high number of animals and prestige objects reflects a time when the elite deposited not only a substantial amount of portable wealth, but also objects symbolizing the basic capital for an agrarian society. The last of the graves with extraordinary animal depositions is Valsgärde 13, dated to around AD 750. After this time, the practice of depositing helmets ceases, and in contrast to earlier burials the number of swords and shields decreases (see Figure 1). However, the biggest difference lies in the number of deposited animals. It becomes standard among Viking Age boat burials to deposit only a single horse, a dog, and in some cases a hen or game bird. Animals could be placed inside the boat or before the stern.

Valsgärde provides a clear example of a society with groups that manage to hold on to a specific burial rite and maintain a long continuity of local history, despite shifts in the regional power structure. Each boat burial forms a part of a deliberately nurtured story that probably goes back to the late Roman Iron Age and the first chamber graves of the site.

Gamla Uppsala is the largest pre-urban center of middle Sweden, centered on a gravel ridge overlooking the surrounding landscape. From the fourth or fifth centuries, here we find the royal manor and the necropolis of the rulers with a concentration of monumental burial mounds unparalleled in Scandinavia (Ljungkvist et al. 2011). Excavations in 2017 revealed traces of a large, burnt building beneath two generations of younger great hall buildings dated to the Vendel and early Viking period. In parallel with the establishment of the Valsgärde boat burials and their elaborate depositions of objects and animals, in the late sixth century Gamla Uppsala transformed into a truly monumental place, with a large village containing clear clusters of farms and associated grave fields that covered around 60 hectares (Figure 2). Large burial monuments were raised across the landscape in a way that had not been seen since the Bronze Age. These graves are almost exclusively cremations, with highly fragmented bones and objects. However, qualitative analyses of the material reveal that the contents are comparable with the contents of the boat burials. The great mounds of Gamla Uppsala were investigat-

---

The graves contained gold, silver, and imported objects of significantly higher quality than those found in the boat burials, making it plausible to define the buried persons as princely or royal (Ljungkvist 2008b).

In parallel with building numerous large mounds, of which the eight largest measure between 30 and 70 meters in diameter, substantial efforts were made to create a palace-like manor complex that formed a physical unit with the burial ground (Ljungkvist and Frölund 2015). This was complemented by long rows of raised timber pillars lining the roads leading into the center of the village, perhaps as markers of its borders towards the outside world (Figure 3).

These intensive activities continued for up to 150 years. They eventually seem to decrease in the eighth century, as the building activities slow down and the grave monuments decrease in size. The manor area continues to be in use, but new royal burials seem to be relocated elsewhere. In general, we can observe that the complex no longer expands, but is instead maintained. In different ways, the people of Gamla Uppsala and Valsgärde begin to abandon their spectacular expressions of status and wealth a few decades before the Viking raids begin in the 790s. It is interesting that this situation does not change when the economic boom of the Viking Age starts and continues into the late ninth and tenth centuries. This suggest an urgent need for greater understanding of how shifts in international contacts, influences, and economy are related to internal changes of a society—particularly in the form of burial expression, monuments, settlements dynamics, and so on.
As can be seen from the above, there is a strong element of continuity during the Vendel and Viking periods, with most status settlements and central places occupied throughout. The principles of funerary ritual and the continuity of burial grounds are also constant from the late sixth to eleventh centuries AD. Furthermore, settlement location remains generally stable over this time span. Similarly, the iconography of art and design, entwined with myths and religion, continues thematically for centuries.

Several articles in this theme issue relate to warriors and warfare, something highly related to both the sites dealt with here. Valsgärde has been seen by many as a burial ground for the Gamla Uppsala warriors. However, this picture has changed considerably as both weapon burials and numerous weapon fragments have turned up in most excavated parts of the village, signaling a strong martial presence. Some finds have parallels in the boat grave artefacts, indicating the material status of the Gamla Uppsala warriors that lived next to the royal estate. There are, however, clear differences between the warriors of Gamla Uppsala and Valsgärde. One is the dominance of the cremation ritual at Gamla Uppsala, signaling a different burial identity; another is that the village farms of Gamla Uppsala are considerably smaller than the manor-like character of the Valsgärde settlement.

The Uppsala region as a whole holds the largest concentration of monumental mound burials in middle Sweden. A strong majority of the excavated examples date between AD 550 and 700. These are all cremation graves that are equivalent to or even richer than the Valsgärde boat burials. It actually seems that a rather high percentage of the villages are related to graves that were once seen as very exclusive. These burial monuments decrease in size during the Viking Age, but the density of high-status warrior graves, often containing horses, continues and even increases over the same period.

The fertile plain around Uppsala seems to be an area where a military presence, or rather the presence of highly equipped warriors, is more evident than in other areas of Uppland. In relation to earlier perceptions of what defines high-status burials, there is almost an overabundance of them in the region. This pattern challenges our perception of rich burials as representatives of elites, and of the ways in which these individuals held leading roles in society. The warriors of ‘Valsgärde status’ were not necessarily always local leaders in a community, or from a military perspective, commanders of units. It is perhaps valid to discuss the evidence for specialized formations of warriors, concentrated in a region surrounding royal seats and central places such as Uppsala. On the basis of known excavated warrior burials, correlated with the numbers of known mounds and the probability of their date and what they contain, it seems likely that several dozen fully armored Valsgärde-style warriors lived simultaneously within a 10 km radius of Uppsala.

If this is possible, we might have archaeological evidence of something equivalent to what early medieval texts describe as a hird or huscarls, the oath-sworn core units of Viking Age kings mentioned in several sources.

The Uppsala region seems to bear evidence of an advanced pre-Viking military system that challenges the traditional and simplistically hierarchical view that sees first-millennium armies as being led primarily by kings, with the remaining elites as unit leaders and free peasants as foot soldiers. It is perhaps valid to discuss more complex structures where major centers were associated with a concentration of more or less dependent specialist warriors in the surrounding landscape, mixed with traditional elites with a similar material expression of status. A related pattern has been noticed at the Viking Age market center of Birka, where evidence of a garrison has been found (Hedenstierna-Jonson 2009). Warriors around Uppsala lived in an area that saw at least one major battle around AD 980, and numerous conflicts in the Old Norse saga material that may be just stories. But even fiction needs inspiration and Uppsala was an arena that drew conflicts. This is hardly surprising for an area where seven valleys met and with a name synonymous with royal and religious power.
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THE ‘GREAT ARMY’ AT REPTON AND THE NEW ARCHAEOLOGY OF VIKING CAMPAIGNS

Cat Jarman

Dr Cat Jarman recently completed her PhD in Archaeology at the University of Bristol and is currently working with the Repton excavations and archive.

In its entry for the year 865, the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle (ASC) introduces the micel here, the Great Army, with the following statement: “And the same year a great raiding-army came to the land of the English and took winter-quarters in East Anglia and were provided with horses there, and they made peace with them” (Swanton 2000:68). In what appears to be a marked step-up from previous raiding campaigns, where Viking forces had overwintered in England from 850, this apparently new and larger entity becomes critically involved in military and political campaigns against the Anglo-Saxon kingdoms in the following decade. Yet despite the presence of documentary sources attesting to its presence in England, physical evidence for this transient Great Army remained elusive until the 1970s. Excavations at Repton in Derbyshire (Figure 1)—the location of the 873–874 winter camp in the ASC—uncovered evidence of fortifications along with individual and communal burials with Scandinavian grave goods in the grounds of a high-status Anglo-Saxon monastery (Biddle and Kjølbye-Biddle 2001). The burials were hypothesised to be those of the Great Army war dead. More recently, another two sites likely to be associated with the Great Army have been uncovered: at Torksey in Lincolnshire (Hadley et al. 2016), where the Army overwintered in 872, and a site known under the acronym ARSNY—‘A Riverine site in North Yorkshire’—whose precise location is protected over ongoing fears of looting (Williams 2015). Together, these three sites offer considerable scope for understanding the archaeology and materiality of the early Viking campaigns in England. However, the interpretation of Repton as a burial site of the Great Army dead has been called into question due to confounding radiocarbon dates and apparent disparities between the size and nature of the camps at Repton and Torksey.

Repton Reassessed

Repton was the site of an Anglo-Saxon monastery founded in the seventh century, and the burial site of several Mercian Kings. The ASC states that the Great Army took up wintersel—winter camp—there in the year 873, forcing the Mercian king Burghred into exile and installing a puppet king in his place. Excavations by Martin Biddle and Birthe Kjølbye-Biddle in the 1970s and 1980s uncovered evidence of a large ditch abutting the Saxon crypt of St Wystan’s church, cutting through earlier Saxon burials. Traces of a similar ditch were identified through geophysical surveys in the neighbouring grounds of Repton School. Along with further ditches discovered at the edge of a bluff by the Old Trent water, a former tributary to

Figure 1. Location of Repton, with the reconstructed ‘D-shaped’ enclosure, the charnel mound, and some of the most significant individual Viking graves marked. Source: Martin Biddle.
the River Trent, the excavators reconstructed a D-shaped enclosure encompassing the church in its centre, as a gatehouse (Figure 1). This was thought to be reminiscent of fortifications at Scandinavian towns such as Aarhus and Hedeby, albeit on a smaller scale (Biddle and Kjølbye-Biddle 1992:49). Within and outside the ditch, a number of burials with grave goods of distinctly ‘Scandinavian’ types were found. In the vicarage garden adjacent to the church, a shallow mound was found to contain a charnel deposit of at least 264 people, along with Viking weapons and coins dating to the period 872–874. The bone assemblage consisted largely of men aged 18–45, of greater physical stature than the remaining Repton burial groups. These were hypothesised to have been members of the Great Army, although an initial set of radiocarbon dates appeared to refute this; while some of the remains dated to the ninth century, others fell as early as the eighth and seventh centuries (Biddle and Kjølbye-Biddle 2001).

As part of my PhD research, I corrected a new set of radiocarbon dates from Repton for Marine Reservoir Effects (MREs), whereby the consumption of marine foods impact on radiocarbon dates by incorporating carbon of relatively older ages than the terrestrial equivalents. This has been demonstrated in both the Viking Worlds and elsewhere to have the effect of making radiocarbon date determinations seem artificially old. The results showed that all samples predating the Viking Age were, in fact, those of individuals whose diets were characterised by relatively larger amounts of seafood (Jarman et al. 2018). Consequently, it can now be demonstrated that all dated individuals are fully consistent with burial in the late ninth century, hence supporting their possible identification as a Great Army population. While isotope and genetic analysis of the material is still ongoing, strontium isotope results show that the individuals from the charnel are of diverse geographical origins, with few consistent with childhoods spent in the local Repton region. Similar heterogeneity appears to be a feature of other burial groups thought to be Viking army populations, such as the late tenth- or early eleventh-century mass graves in Weymouth (Loe et al. 2014) and St John's College, Oxford (Pollard et al. 2012). This echoes current scholarship on the ways in which early Viking forces were formed and maintained, as composite groups that may have combined and coalesced when beneficial (Raffield et al. 2016). The bioarchaeological evidence to date, then, while unable to conclusively attribute the Repton remains to the Great Army, certainly supports this hypothesis. Currently, the individual burials at Repton remain the only graves in England that can be securely connected to the late ninth-century Viking campaigns.

In 2016 and 2017, I directed new excavations in Repton with Mark Horton (University of Bristol), focusing on an area to the south of the charnel mound in the vicarage garden and outside the D-shaped enclosure. Ground Penetrating Radar surveys indicated possible structures that were targeted by small-scale excavation; these proved to be gravel deposits with a number of pits and stone features incorporating fragments of broken-up Anglo Saxon quern stones and a fragment of a finely carved sandstone cross shaft. These contexts also included evidence for metalworking in the form of slag, and woodworking tools. Fragments of an iron arrow and the tip of an axe-head typologically consistent with a Viking attribution, as well as two clinker ship-nails (Figure 2c), were found in association with the same deposits. The new excavations also yielded four lead gaming pieces (Figures 2a and 2b), identical to types discovered in large quantities at Torksey and ARSNY, recently also discovered by
metal detectorists in northern Germany, Denmark, and Norway. This is an artefact category that may be largely—if not exclusively—associated with the Great Army or other early Viking campaigns. Ongoing analyses of artefacts from the previous excavations in Repton can now also be attributed to the Vikings, including an iron shield boss of the ‘Irish Sea’ type A (Harrison 2000) and several more ship-nails. It is significant that much of what appears to be evidence for winter camp activities is found outside the D-shaped enclosure, suggesting that the Viking presence in Repton may have been on a larger scale than previously assumed. The enclosure may have formed a smaller, inner defensive structure, or it may have related to an earlier phase of activity. There may also have been an outer enclosure, for instance the monastic vallum, a boundary typically separating an early medieval monastery from the outside world.

The Nature of the Viking Camps

Recently, archaeological research into the early Viking presence in England has focused on the archaeological recognition of the Viking winter camp, in particular its nature, form, and not least its size. Repton, with its defensive ditch, was long considered a ‘type site’ for Viking overwintering camps, leading to a search for similar D-shaped enclosures elsewhere. Distinctive fortifications have been considered the essential hallmark of a Viking camp, and contemporary historical accounts certainly mention the construction of defensive structures, such as that of the winter camp in Reading in 870–871 described in Asser’s Life of King Alfred. However, a review by Ben Raffield (2013) concluded that there is not enough homogeneity from which a model fortification can be defined. This is not surprising, as the campaigns of the Great Army should not be considered to be structured, centrally organised ventures.

The discovery and interpretation of the 872 Great Army winter camp in Torksey (Hadley et al. 2016) has led to a paradigm shift in discussions of how to recognise these transient and ephemeral sites. Located on a raised area of land, formerly an island in the river Trent, the Viking camp at Torksey was identified through artefacts discovered by metal detectorists. Alongside distinctive objects like a Thor’s hammer pendant nearly identical to one found at Repton, the site has yielded several object groups that can be associated with the Viking presence, including a large number of Islamic Dirham coins; polyhedral, spheroid, and lead weights; and precious metal ingots and hack-silver (indicative of a bullion economy). Anglo-Saxon coinage appears to date the majority of the assemblages to no later than the early 870s. In addition, the finds from Torksey include large numbers of lead gaming pieces, spindle whorls, fishing weights, and evidence of metalworking. Similar artefact assemblages have been discovered by detectorists at ARSNY. It has been pointed out that both Torksey and ARSNY occupy far larger areas than the D-shaped enclosure at Repton, suggestive of armies of a larger size than previously envisaged. However, our recent excavations in Repton demonstrate that the enclosure was certainly not the camp in its entirety, making it consistent with this new interpretation. Importantly, all three sites, along with the recently published ninth-century Viking camp and subsequent settlement at Woodstown in Ireland (Russell and Hurley 2014), have emphasised the wide range of activities taking place during these Viking campaigns. The inclusion of craft-working, trade, and other nonmilitary functions suggest that we should perhaps consider these camps as proto-urban settlements (Hadley et al. 2016) with considerable implications for understanding their social and economic impact on early medieval England.

Finding the Great Army

The new evidence from the winter camps in England is paving the way for exciting new opportunities to trace the movements of the Great Army and other Viking campaigns. While fortifications may be present at these sites, it now seems clear that they may by no means be necessary, as the natural topography may have been strategically utilised instead. Repton, Torksey, and ARSNY are all situated at significant river locations and the ship-nails discovered in the Repton camp may testify to the importance of being able to transport people and/or supplies by boat. LIDAR imagery, freely available for most of the UK through the Environment Agency, is particularly helpful in tracing former river courses and recognising floodplains as well as identifying hidden topographical features. In addition, the Portable Antiquities Scheme (PAS) discussed by Jane Kershaw in this issue, provides an extensive database of metal artefacts that can be used to identify potential sites for further investigation. Artefact types like the lead gaming pieces described above, Dirhams, or polyhedral weights can be plotted geographically and cross-referenced with LIDAR imagery and historical sources. For instance, using this methodology, a possible new site can be identified at Catton in Derbyshire, approximately 10 miles south of Repton: PAS data shows a collection of artefacts similar to that found at the other Viking camps, including a number of lead gaming pieces, a silver ingot, and an Islamic Dirham. Situated on a hilltop near the confluence of the rivers Trent and Tame, and possibly near a Roman road, this site would also fit the expected location.

Despite this considerable new potential, however, several challenges remain. It is very difficult to date these sites other than through coinage, which itself can be problematic, and radiocarbon dating is unlikely to allow for sufficient precision. In this regard, we must also take care not to overly rely on the historical records, and for example allow for extended use...
of a site beyond a single wintersetl. In this context, it would also be beneficial to consider how to separate what the ASC considers the ‘Great Army’ as an entity from other, transient raiders. While the evidence from Torksey has seen a welcome departure from the search for D-shaped enclosures, we should take care not to fall into the trap of making Torksey a new ‘type site’, with its comparatively greater size and lack of fortifications, allowing instead for variability and adaptation to localised and temporal circumstances. A further challenge lies in protecting these sites against looting whilst also encouraging the reporting of metal-detecting finds to the PAS. Nevertheless, these new approaches show considerable promise of finding new evidence for Viking campaigns and perhaps in the future, further evidence of the elusive Viking war dead.
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WERE THEY ALL MEN?

VIKING COLONIAL WOMEN IN ENGLAND

Jane Kershaw

Dr Jane Kershaw is a Leverhulme Early Career Research Fellow at the Institute of Archaeology, Oxford University.

There’s a lot we still don’t know about the Vikings who raided and then settled in England. The main documentary source for the period, the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, tells us in detail about the Viking raids that afflicted Britain’s coastline from the late eighth century. These led to the Scandinavian takeover of three of the four major Anglo-Saxon kingdoms and, eventually, to settlement in a part of eastern and northern England that later sources refer to as the Danelaw. But the nature of that settlement is poorly elucidated, both in written accounts and in the traditional archaeological record. As a result, we know little about how, where, or on what scale the Vikings settled. We know even less about who the settlers were.

In the past, archaeologists and historians have viewed the Viking settlement in England as a largely male affair. The Viking settlers, the story goes, were members of the Great Army, who, following years of military campaigning, settled down to farm, taking wives among the local population. A straightforward case of moving from sword to plough. This androcentric view stems in part from the dearth of documentary references to female Scandinavian settlers. It also reflects the small number of excavated female Viking burials, which archaeologists have traditionally identified by the inclusion of female Scandinavian grave goods, in particular oval brooches, worn in pairs on the lower shoulders to fasten the straps of a traditional Scandinavian apron-like dress (Figure 1).

It is certainly true that Viking women are poorly represented in the funerary record. The number of Viking burials from England is not large: around 40 individual inhumations are known (compared with approximately 130 in Scotland and just over 100 in Ireland). Even within this small corpus, the tally of women’s graves can be counted on one hand—and these come mainly from areas of England settled principally by Norwegians via Dublin and the Irish Sea, rather than the Danelaw region settled principally by Danes. Stone sculpture decorated with Scandinavian art styles was produced in northern England, and surviving examples sometimes depict armed, male warriors (Kopár 2012; Figure 2). By contrast, de-
pictions of secular women are notable for their near-absence. The physical evidence for Scandinavian female colonists thus appears circumscribed. But were Scandinavian settlers in the Danelaw really all men?

Finding Female Scandinavian Settlers—A New Archaeological Source

In recent years, the evidence for female Scandinavian colonists in England has been growing—and growing at a tremendous rate. This new evidence comes from an unlikely source—not new discoveries of burials, or new genetic studies, but finds of female artefacts, lost or discarded by their wearers over a thousand years ago. Hobby metal-detecting has been practiced in England since the 1970s. From around 2000, metal detectorists throughout England and Wales have been able to record their finds with the Portable Antiquities Scheme (PAS)—a voluntary recording scheme networked through regional finds liaison officers. The effect has been to create a vast online ‘archive under the plough’. Just under 50,000 artefacts dating to the early medieval period alone have been recorded by the scheme, and numbers continue to rise.

Surprisingly prominent within the new finds is female jewellery in Scandinavian styles: brooches and necklace pendants worn by women in everyday dress (Figure 3). To date, over 150 diagnostically Scandinavian jewellery items have been found, scattered across large swathes of rural England; an even larger number of items were made locally in imitation of Scandinavian styles (Kershaw 2013). While native Anglo-Saxon women also wore jewellery, the new finds being recovered represent something different, being directly comparable to jewellery found in female graves and on settlements in Scandinavia, particularly southern Scandinavia (modern-day Denmark). There are disc, trefoil, square, and oval brooches, decorated with twisting and gripping animals in Viking art styles known as Borre and Jellinge. The similarity to brooches from Scandinavia isn’t merely in the eye of the beholder—even the pin fittings and metal alloys reflect Scandinavian traditions, rather than Anglo-Saxon ones.

Some writers have suggested that these finds represent gifts or merchandise intended for local women. Yet there are strong grounds for believing that the diagnostically Scandinavian jewellery arrived in England with female Scandinavian settlers. A striking feature of this material is that it is found widely dispersed throughout rural areas settled by the Scandinavians—especially the modern-day counties of Yorkshire, Lincolnshire, and Norfolk. This is not the pattern we would expect for objects of import, which would have likely clustered at urban centres. What is more, it’s a highly diverse assemblage, reflecting the full range of brooch styles fashionable in Denmark at the time. The jewellery gives us a snapshot of prevailing dress fashions in late ninth- and tenth-century Denmark, not the standard stock of a Danelaw merchant. The more convincing explanation is that these items arrived in England on the clothing of female colonists from Scandinavia. In this context, it is noteworthy that most artefacts are not made of precious metals, but of base metals: copper and lead alloys. They would have been worn by women of middling social status.

The date of the jewellery chimes exactly with written accounts of the settlement (c. 870–950). However, it is not lim-
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...ited to a single ‘pulse’ in the late ninth century. The jewellery keeps up-to-date with changing dress fashions in Denmark through the first half of the tenth century and beyond. New styles of women’s jewellery continued to arrive in England, in reduced numbers, even after the Danelaw was ‘conquered’ and brought under Anglo-Saxon rule by West Saxon kings in the 920s. Scandinavian migration to England was not a once-and-for-all event.

What can we learn about the possible scale of female migration from the number of items recovered? One-hundred-fifty is a large number, yet it includes only those items that were lost in the Viking period and not recovered by their owners/wearers; that survived in the soil for over 1,000 years; that were recovered only in the last few decades—most likely via metal-detecting: and that were reported to the relevant bodies (rather than, for instance, being immediately sold on the private market). It will thus represent just a tiny fraction of the total number of items originally in circulation. Some back-of-the-envelope estimates suggests that perhaps 3,000–5,000 items of female jewellery circulated in the Danelaw over a hundred-year period. Of course, not all female settlers would have had jewellery. The inescapable conclusion is that a substantial number of women, thousands rather than hundreds, were involved in the Danelaw settlement.

Other Evidence for Viking Women

The discovery of such artefacts is unexpected, not only because such jewellery was unknown in England a generation ago, but also because it helps to elucidate a population group which has, until now, been largely invisible. Yet other sources also hint at a female Scandinavian presence. A small number of place-names from Danish-settled regions, first documented in the medieval period, merge Scandinavian female names with the words ‘by’ and ‘thorpe’, the Scandinavian terms for ‘farmstead’ and ‘secondary settlement’ respectively. Examples include Gunby (Gunnhildr), Yorkshire; Raventhorpe (Ragnhildr), Lincolnshire; and Ingerthorpe (Ingiridr) in Yorkshire, suggest landholding by Scandinavian-named women. More commonly, we encounter Scandinavian feminine names in minor place-names, referring to fields, streets, and rivers: names that are likely to have been coined by local Norse-speaking farming populations. Examples include Hildr in Hilderholm, Lincolnshire; Gerdr in Gerdeswelle, Norfolk; Ingus in Ings Beck, Yorkshire; and, interestingly, from the perspective of Scandinavian women in towns, Gudrún in Goodramgate, York (Hough 2002; Jesch 2008). The corpus is not large, but place-name surveys for three potentially rich sources of Scandinavian female names (Leicestershire, Lincolnshire, and Norfolk), are ongoing, and a thorough review of the evidence may yet reveal more examples.

A further, indirect, source of evidence for Scandinavian female colonists in England lies in evidence for the sustained use of the Scandinavian language (Old Norse) following settlement in England. Recent research on Scandinavian place-names in the east of England has pointed to the existence there of sizeable Scandinavian speech communities (Abrams and Parsons 2004). Old Norse had a heavy influence on the English language, in terms of vocabulary, grammar, and pronunciation. For instance, loanwords from Norse include the third-person plural pronoun set ‘they, them, and their’: central language elements that are rarely transformed between languages. Such influence is likewise indicative of a substantial population of Norse speakers (Kershaw and Røyrvik 2016). It appears that Norse continued to be spoken in the Danelaw for several generations, in some regions, into the eleventh century. Since individuals typically acquire language at a very young age from their mothers (their primary caregivers), a prerequisite for the preservation and influence of Norse in the Danelaw must have been the presence of Norse-speaking women, using Scandinavian speech in the home and passing their language on to their children. The alternative scenario—that Scandinavian male settlers married local, English-speaking women, who then learned Old Norse and raised their children in that language, or bilingually—is far less likely to have happened systematically.

It therefore seems extremely likely that the Scandinavian settlement of England, rather than being an all-male event, involved substantial numbers of women from the homelands, migrating to rural areas, primarily as part of family groups. This model of migration and settlement has also been proposed for other Scandinavian diasporic movements westwards. Recently, DNA researchers have surveyed variation in both Y-chromosomal and mitochondrial DNA (inherited through the male and female lines respectively) in modern populations in the North Atlantic. They have reached the striking conclusions that roughly equal numbers of Norse males and females settled Shetland, Orkney, and mainland northwest Scotland from Norway during the mid-to-late ninth century (Goodacre et al. 2005). By contrast, settlement further west, in Iceland, the Faroes, and Western Isles involved disproportionally fewer females from the Scandinavian homelands, consistent with a scenario in which, in these more pioneering settlements, Norse males outnumbered Norse females by 2:1 (Als et al. 2006; Helgason et al. 2000a, 2000b, 2001). While these results require nuanced interpretation, they point to the importance of family units within broadly contemporaneous Norse migration events.
Future Directions

Questions about female Scandinavian colonists in England nonetheless remain. In particular, why are there so few identifiable female Scandinavian burials? The small number of known examples seems at odds with the high numbers of female settlers postulated here, especially given the tangible evidence for female Scandinavian dress items—the type of finds we might expect to be interred with the dead.

One distinct possibility is that female, and male, Scandinavian settlers are buried in unfurnished, Christian cemeteries also used by the native population, that is, with burial rites that make them indistinguishable from the local Anglo-Saxons. In these cases, the only means of identifying potential Scandinavian migrants is through scientific methods. In recent years, isotope studies have been carried out on human remains from several suspected Viking-Age burials from locations across the western Viking settlements (e.g., Buckberry et al. 2014; Montgomery et al. 2014). These work on the principle that oxygen and strontium isotope values laid down in teeth and bone during childhood will reflect an individual’s uptake of drinking water and food. Since these will vary regionally, according to local weather and geography, isotope values have the potential to reveal where an individual grew up and can thus be used to highlight migration.

While small in scope, a few isotope studies have successfully identified individuals of likely Scandinavian origin among Late Anglo-Saxon unfurnished burials. Two or three individuals—both male and female—from an unfurnished churchyard cemetery in Masham, North Yorkshire, have oxygen and strontium isotope values consistent with origins in southwest Norway. They could, potentially, be Viking Age migrants, although the broad dating of the burials in this instance (from the seventh to eleventh centuries) makes this impossible to confirm (Buckberry et al. 2014:428–429). On the basis of combined oxygen and strontium values, a similar place of origin has been suggested for a female skeleton buried in an unfurnished east-west aligned grave within the settlement at Coppergate, York. In this case, radiocarbon dates derived from bone collagen place the burial in the period 880–1030 AD (Buckberry et al. 2014:Table 1).

Yet while these approaches can prove very helpful, isotope values from Britain and western Scandinavia can overlap, meaning that it is often difficult to rule out British origins entirely. At Adwick-le-Street near Doncaster, an adult female was buried with classic Scandinavian grave goods, including oval brooches, a latchlifter (key), and an iron knife (Figure 4). She returned oxygen and strontium isotope values consistent with the Trondheim area of Norway, but also with some areas of northeast Scotland.

Despite these limitations, it is clear that new archaeological methods generating fresh data are transforming understanding of the Viking settlements in England. They are bringing into focus a population group long written out of history.
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WOMEN AT WAR?
THE BIRKA FEMALE WARRIOR AND HER IMPLICATIONS

Charlotte Hedenstierna-Jonson

It has been said that although war may be everyone’s business, it has usually been men’s work. Perhaps this corresponds particularly well to the general perception of the group of people we have come to know as Vikings. Even though most people in the Viking world were farmers, like their contemporaries in other parts of Europe, concepts of war and violence were intrinsically linked to society and to the life and worldview of all. Viking Age society can be characterised as warlike, based on martial ideals and a view of the world that made no distinction between military and civilian life. But how did women fit into this picture? What part did they take in the various aspects of this society? Women have usually been considered as taking an active part in upholding the structure of martial society. They educated new generations of warriors, conveying norms and ideals. They could act as instigators of conflicts or enforcers when it came to revenge. But the role of women has generally been regarded as indirect, their actions related to rather than within the martial arena. Is it at all possible that women could have taken a more active part in warfare? The question became even more relevant with the recent discovery that one of the most iconic warrior graves from the Viking Age turned out to be the burial of a woman: grave Bj 581 in Viking Age Birka (Hedenstierna-Jonson et al. 2017).

The Viking Town of Birka

Birka is one of the best-known archaeological sites of Viking Age Scandinavia. Situated on the small island of Björkö in Lake Mälaren, now in the backwaters of Stockholm, it was once on the crossroads of communication in eastern central Sweden. Established in the mid-eighth century, Birka quickly developed into a major centre of crafts and trade, both in the surrounding region and beyond. Throughout the following century (750–860 AD) Birka was part of a network centred round the coastline of the Baltic that included other urban settlements. In the latter part of the ninth century, the significance of these connections declined as Birka became an important node in the Eastern trade network, sharing close contacts with similar sites in today’s Russia and the Ukraine, with the Byzantine metropolis of Constantinople, and even with people of the Eurasian steppes. Specialised workshops produced jewellery, textiles, and other valuables, that together with slaves were possible to trade for silver and prestigious and exotic goods. The wealth gathered in Birka was likely to be exposed to constant threats. Fortifications on land and in water were constructed along with the town and then further strengthened and enhanced as the trading network expanded. In the early tenth century a permanent garrison of troops was placed directly outside the fort, overlooking the town and the harbour (Hedenstierna-Jonson 2016). The garrison consisted of a number of houses of different functions, including a smithy and storage houses, within an area enclosed by ramparts and wooden constructions. The most extensive feature was a great hall, approximately 200 m², with slightly bow-sided walls and short end facing the waterfront. Within, the large open space held the remains of a high seat and two long hearths, as would be expected in a hall. But in this particular case it was also a house made of weapons, as hundreds of knives had been incorporated into the fabric of the structure. In addition, stored in wooden chests and hanging along the walls were spears, arrows, and shields. The building was at last the actual scene of a battle, with traces of fighting and fragments of more weapons scattered throughout the interior, before the hall was destroyed by fire. It is in the context of the fort and the garrison that we find the burial of the female warrior (Figure 1).

The Burial of a Female Warrior

The grave is one of approximately 3,000 identified burials in Birka (Arbman 1943). Together they form what is perhaps the most striking archaeological feature of the island. In the late nineteenth century, archaeologist Hjalmar Stolpe excavated more than 1,100 of the graves, and in doing so developed the methodology of burial archaeology in Sweden, by introducing...
scientific methods, such as field documentation and a stratigraphic approach. Stolpe had excavated well over 500 burials when he started with the warrior grave in 1878. It was labelled Björkö 581 and Stolpe described it in 1879 as “perhaps the most remarkable of all the graves in this field”. The burial, situated on a promontory and highly visible both from the town and the surrounding waters, was marked by a large stone boulder. Constructed as an underground wooden chamber, it measured 3.45 x 1.75 m. Within the burial, the deceased had been dressed in exclusive garments with silk and silver thread decorations and propped up in a seated position. The body was surrounded by weapons and framed by one shield at the head end and one at the foot end of the chamber. Most known types of Viking Age weapons were present, making the collection a complementary set providing maximum efficiency in battle. Apart from the shields, it included a sword, an axe, two spears, a fighting knife, and a set of 25 arrows of an armour-piercing type (Figure 2). The bow, made of organic material, has since deteriorated, but there is an empty space alongside the body, next to the arrows, indicating where it may have been placed. A set of 28 gaming pieces and 3 dice were located in the lap of the deceased, and the possible remains of an iron-fitted gaming board alongside the body. In the foot end, and outside the actual chamber, two horses had been placed on a platform. Both were bridled for riding.

**Analysing the Grave**

The grave immediately caught the attention of Viking scholars. The contents were spectacular, and the grave stood out even compared to other chamber burials in Birka in its explicitly martial character. It was interpreted as the burial of a high-status warrior and consequently sexed as male. The emphasis was on the warrior, the sex an assumption based on that interpretation. In the 1970s an inventory of the skeletal material from Birka was made. In connection with this, the bones from the grave were osteologically assessed as female but were not then compared contextually with the grave goods, so the implications of the discovery remained unrecognised (Hedenstierna-Jonson et al. 2017, supporting information).

Renewed interest in Birka’s bones arose with an osteological project examining health-related issues in the Viking Age (Kjellström 2016). The bones from Bj 581 were taken from the archives once more. The remarkable combination of objects and biological sex was recognised and a new study was launched, including DNA and strontium isotope analyses (the ATLAS project). The questions concerned various aspects of who this person was during life, and a possible confirmation of the osteological sex assessment was only one part of the study. Others concerned the heritage of this evidently important individual, and her geographical movement. DNA proved the body to be biologically female, with a genetic background in the Viking World at large. It also showed that she was not local to the region in which Birka is located, but rather from southern Scandinavia. Strontium isotope strengthened this picture, also showing that she had lived an itinerant life during her childhood and youth. Through osteology, we know that she was in her thirties when she died, a tall woman (1 m 70 cm), without visible trauma to the bones. Archaeology, in turn, shows a high-status individual dressed in a manner to suggest close connections to the eastern part of the Viking World, with parallels in present-day Ukraine. An interesting
picture starts to emerge when all the pieces of data are combined. But is the standing interpretation of the grave as that of a high-status warrior still valid?

**Identities and Practices in Viking Age Warfare**

Not everyone in Viking society was a warrior. Even the warrior collective included several shades of identities. There were armed free men, participants in military followings, and members of extended households, but also professional warriors. The armed free man divided his affiliations between his kin and his military leader. For the professional warriors, their identity was lodged with the group, which took on the responsibilities and obligations not only of martial activities but also of the family. During an era when violence in different forms remained constantly present, the life of the warriors was admired, and their lifestyle and identity set the norm and formed guidelines for others in society. Martial ideals like honour, glory, and loyalty were highly valued, as were bravery and generosity, but also a strong sense of group affiliation (Raffield 2016).

It is easy to dismiss Viking warfare as brutal, savage, and chaotic. In fact, warfare was the most exclusive form of violence, and required planning, practice, and organisation. It was conducted through set-piece battles according to set rules, dispositions, and formations in line. Weapons were used in combination with each other and following alternate and well-rehearsed actions. In warfare of this type, physical strength was not the most important feature. There was strength in experience, endurance, and self-control as keeping the battle-line often was the single most important action in order to be successful. To anticipate your opponent’s actions and adjust your response accordingly was a winning strategy that required tactical knowledge as well as practice (Hedenstierna-Jonson 2006).

**Women at War—The Implications of the Warrior Grave**

So, the question remains—is the female warrior grave at Birka evidence of women taking a more active part in warfare? It depends on how we interpret the grave. Weapons alone do not make a warrior. The established interpretation is based on the overtly martial character of the grave, and the location and burial practice, which together with the objects points towards the high status of the deceased. The fact that the grave was placed in direct contact with the garrison and the fort only emphasises this. It is an exceptional burial of an exceptional person, and the interpretation is well founded and reasonable. So, is the biological sex reason enough to exclude the possibility that the deceased was a warrior? Female warriors appear in the Old Norse texts as shield maidsens and Valkyries. But the texts are much later than the Viking Age and these narratives are legendary in nature. In a manuscript by John Skylitzes, compiled in 1057, there is, however, an account of women in armour among the fallen Scandinavians after a battle against Byzantine Imperial troops in 971 (Wortley 2010).

In light of the style and organisation of warfare with its emphasis on strategy and tactics, the possibility of women taking an active part on the battlefield cannot be ruled out. And in its immediate context, the woman in Bj 581 aptly reflects what we know of tenth-century Birka. At this time, trade had reached a more extensive level than before and the main inter-
ests lay towards the far-reaching eastern trade routes. Professional warriors accompanied the high-risk trade expeditions, and returned not only with foreign weaponry but also with new knowledge in warfare techniques. The closest parallels to the chamber grave burial custom and the costume displayed in the grave can be found in and outside Kiev, in present-day Ukraine (Movchan 2005). So the established interpretation of the grave is still the most likely: that it contains the remains of a high-status warrior, put to rest in the environment where she had been active, at least during the end of her life (Figure 3).
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In 921, while on a diplomatic mission to the Bulgars, the Arabic envoy Ahmad ibn Faḍlān encountered a group of Rūs merchants somewhere on the banks of the Volga River. An eclectic group whose ethnic identity incorporated Slavic, Scandinavian, and other Eurasian cultures, the Rūs were the primary operators of the riverine trade routes in what is now Eastern Europe following their emergence during the ninth century. In describing the Rūs merchants and their cargoes, ibn Faḍlān noted that they brought with them, among other goods, a number of young women destined to be sold as slaves, whose treatment at the hands of their captors he describes in great detail. Although his account smacks of more than a little voyeurism (Karras 1988), ibn Faḍlān’s observations provide a unique, first-hand insight into the treatment of captives during the Viking Age. In this case, it is clear that the girls (the text suggests they were in their mid-teens) were valued primarily as sexual objects, to be abused at the whim of their owners. Later, ibn Faḍlān would provide an equally detailed account of a Rūs chieftain’s funeral, during which another slave girl who volunteered to be sacrificed as part of the rite was drugged, repeatedly raped, and eventually killed by strangulation and stabbing (Lunde and Stone 2012).

The captives described by ibn Faḍlān represent just a few of the countless women, children, and men who were taken, transported, and sold as slaves across the early medieval world during the eighth–eleventh centuries—the period commonly known as the Viking Age. In Northern and Western Europe—in the British Isles, the Carolingian Empire, and the Iberian Peninsula—slaving was synonymous with Viking activity from the very outset of the period. As early as 793, the English monk Alcuin, living on the Continent in the court of Charlemagne, wrote to the Bishop of Lindisfarne in order to commiserate with them following a Viking attack on the monastery located there in June of that year—the first recorded on English soil. In his letter, he promised that he and the emperor would do all that they could to secure the return of ‘the boys who have been carried off by the pagans as prisoners’ (Whitelock 1955:778–779). While the number of captives that were taken as part of the early Viking attacks could not have been great, in the years following the initial raids the scale of slaving greatly increased. Soon, documentary sources from across Europe would record Viking groups as taking hundreds and even thousands of captives during raiding expeditions. In a raid on Seville in 844, for example, a Viking raiding fleet is recorded as spending seven days sacking the city, ‘killing the men and enslaving the women and children’ (Lunde and Stone 2012:106). This trend would continue, almost unbroken, through the tenth and eleventh centuries.

What became of the individuals taken during these attacks is, of course, ultimately unknown, but it is almost certain that the vast majority of captives were funneled into extensive maritime trade networks that fed the demands of distant markets. European and medieval Scandinavian sources provide fleeting glimpses of these individuals and their lives in captivity. The biographies of two successive ninth-century archbishops—Anskar and Rimbert—of the diocese of Hamburg-Bremen mention enslaved groups living at or being transported through the major Scandinavian market places at Birka, Sweden, and Hedeby, Germany, while in the Icelandic Laxdæla saga we see an Irish princess named Melkorka being sold as a concubine at a seasonal market in Norway. While many captives were probably transported to the east and perhaps to colonies such as Iceland (Clover 1988; Raffield et al. 2017), there is good evidence to suggest that at least some were exploited, in many different roles, within the Scandinavian homelands themselves. Although their exact numbers are subject to debate, it is likely that unfree groups formed a sizable proportion of the population—as much as 25% by some estimates (see discussion in Brink 2008, 2012). Whatever the true number, it is certainly not unreasonable to suggest that perhaps tens of thousands of people living in Scandinavia might have been enslaved.
Slaves were central to the economies and social structures of Scandinavian societies during the Viking Age. The most explicit evidence for the enslaved and their roles can be found in written sources from medieval Iceland. Although these are fraught with limitations and biases, they nevertheless clearly situate slaves (Old Norse fjósnæ) at the bottom of the social pyramid. According to an anonymous medieval poem Rígsþula, which postdates the Viking Age but ostensibly describes earlier social structures, we see that the enslaved were tasked with the most menial and dirty responsibilities, such as tending to pigs and goats, spreading dung on the fields, digging peat, and working as domestic servants. Their physical and personal traits are caricatured in the poem by their names, such as Bowler, Byreboy, Dumpy, Servingmaid, Sluggish, Stinker, Stooper, and Stumpy. Extensive legislation concerning unfree individuals can also be found in the earliest Icelandic law codes (the Grágás laws), which explicitly stated that slaves were the property of their owners, who were free to punish and even kill them as they saw fit (Brink 2008; Dennis et al. 1980; Karras 1988).

The archaeological evidence for slave raiding and trafficking by Viking groups, in addition to that for the exploitation of captives within Scandinavia itself, is limited. Given that archaeological research favours the study of the monumental architecture, high-status burials, and elaborate material culture of elite groups, it is not surprising that slaves are often described as ‘invisible’ or ‘unseen’ among past societies. Indeed, within Viking studies previous research has focused overwhelmingly on the lives of the elite, to the detriment of the study of semi-free and unfree groups. At present, we have little archaeological knowledge of how captives were acquired and transported, where and how they were sheltered, provisioned for, or what conditions they had to endure. While some notable archaeological studies have sought to better understand the lives and roles of these groups among Scandinavian societies (e.g., Lindkvist and Myrdal 2003; Naumann et al. 2013; Roslund 2007), scholarly interpretations are inevitably limited by the ambiguity of material evidence. As a case in point we might take a number of double- and triple-burials, identified in Viking Age contexts across Scandinavia, in which a ‘primary’ body was apparently accompanied by one or more individuals who had been subjected to a violent death. The latter are often interpreted as enslaved individuals who were sacrificed in order to accompany their masters to the afterlife (see discussion in Brink 2012; Karras 1988; Naumann et al. 2013). Examples include the decapitated individuals identified in a cemetery at Flakstad, Norway (Naumann et al. 2013), and those deposited on top of a cremation grave at Bollstanäs, Sweden (Hemmendorff 1984). The attribution of slave status to the individuals within these and similar graves is often made based purely on the atypical treatment of a corpse in relation to that of the ‘higher-status’ individuals that they accompany, and probably reflects the influence of ibn Faḍlān’s account of the Rūs chieftain’s funeral, noted above. While isotopic studies of burials at Flakstad have shown discrepancies in the diet between the ‘enslaved’ and the higher-status individuals that they accompanied, the fact that the diets of the former were found to be similar to individuals considered to represent the common, free population of the cemetery (Naumann et al. 2013) means that this in itself cannot be taken to indicate that these individuals were unfree.

Studying the life course of enslaved groups is an equally challenging task. Although it is currently difficult to estimate the proportion of the Viking Age population that was unfree, it is likely that Scandinavian economies relied extensively on slave labour, and there is some evidence to suggest that enslaved groups were exploited en masse in certain contexts. Excavations at a tenth-century agricultural site at Sanda, Sweden, found a number of pithouses, arranged around a high-status hall, which were likely used for craft activities (Zachrisson 2003). At a time when expansionist raiding, colonisation, and trade were taking place, farms needed to produce additional materials to those that they would have normally required for daily subsistence, and slave labour might have been used to meet these demands. One major use of the enslaved might have been in the production of sails—an activity that required a huge investment in labour and materials (Bender Jørgensen 2012). No conclusive archaeological signature for slaves or slave labour at Sanda or any other site, however, has yet been identified. Unlike in some early-modern settings, for example in North America, where it is possible to locate and excavate the dwellings of enslaved groups on agricultural sites, in Scandinavia it is likely that these individuals often lived under the same roof as their owners, or alongside animals in byres. Potential evidence for this, albeit in a much earlier context, has been found during excavations at Nørre Tranoders, Denmark, where a longhouse was found to have burnt down in the first century AD. The structure was covered by a mound after the burning, entombing the animals and five humans who had died in the byre. One, a man, had died by the northeast door, while another man and three children found at the gable end of the building may have died in their sleep. Although it is difficult to say with any certainty, perhaps these were byre-dwelling thralls (described in Rígsþula as fjósnæ), whose task it had been to take care of the animals (Herschend 2009).

Despite the difficulties in identifying the enslaved within the material record, recent years have seen a burgeoning focus of scholarly research on unfree groups, as well as the development of new studies that have sought to explore the
institution of Viking Age slavery from various perspectives. There have now been several attempts, for example, to identify proxies for slave trading as they manifest archaeologically, allowing scholars to map and examine the networks through which captives were likely transported (e.g., Delvaux 2016; Jankowiak 2016). In other cases, scholars have sought to detect evidence for cultural transmission and hybridity within archaeological assemblages, allowing the potential identification of groups who had been forcefully relocated from their home communities (e.g., Roslund 2007). Comparative approaches to the archaeological record, harnessing the wealth of research that has taken place into slavery in other contexts, also offer a means of constructing models that can be tested against the available material from Scandinavia (e.g., Raffield 2018). Further scientific studies of burial assemblages, such as that conducted by Naumann and colleagues (2013), noted above, will similarly allow scholars to obtain more detailed insights into the links between food consumption and social inequality while shedding light on past patterns of migration and mobility. In time, these and other targeted studies of unfree groups have the potential to ascribe historical agency to thousands of otherwise marginalised individuals who were living in and moving around the early medieval world, and through this to reshape our knowledge of Scandinavian societies during the Viking Age.
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hat the Vikings were traders as well as raiders is well
known, dealing in commodities such as furs, hides, ant-
lers, walrus ivory, beeswax, soapstone, and iron. These
are all examples of nonagrarian products originating from ar-
eas beyond the arable land and pasture of the settlements, com-
ing from the parts of the landscape called in Swedish Utmark—
the Outlands. Unfortunately, many of these materials do not
preserve well and do not survive in the archaeological material.
Even though there are suggestions that these products were of
great importance for Viking Age economics, we still have only
limited knowledge of their procurement, distribution, and use
within a social system of resource exploitation. In my doctoral
thesis I am trying to shed some light on this nonagrarian pro-
duction and raw material exploitation in the Outlands, during
the Viking Age as well as the centuries either side.

The Concept of the Outlands
The historical farmstead was divided into Inmark—the area
literally inside the fence—and Utmark—what lay outside the
fence. This division probably evolved early and is reflected in
the pre-Christian mythology with Midgard and Utgard as the
realms of humans and the powers of the wild, respectively.
Even if the latter was both scary and dangerous, there were po-
tential natural resources there that could be profitably refined
for those with courage and knowledge of how to exploit them
(Steinsland 2005:137, 143).

Inmarken was the core area of the settlement with houses,
fields, pasture and, in pre-Christian times, also the burial
grounds. The opposite—Utmarken—lacks a direct equiv-
alent in English terminology but has the sense of natural-
geographical environments such as forests, moorlands, and
mountains, combined with their economic, social, and cul-
tural aspects as complementary components of the agricul-
tural system (see Figure 1). The Scandinavian term Utmark
is also connected to resources, use, and production in areas
beyond the core settlement. In the English literature, terms
such as Hinterland, Outfields, Wasteland, Rural Areas, or
Marginal/Liminal Landscapes are sometimes used. Confu-
sion with the vocabulary means that the word is sometimes used without translation—Utmark—or in a direct translation—Outlands (Øye 2005:9). The concept of Inmark/Utmark has also been applied to the coastal zone. In Norway, the inland waters of a farm extended as far ashore as the subtidal slope, over which the inhabitants had exclusive rights of utilization. Further offshore were the marine Outlands, which could be used in common (Lindquist 1994:57, 59).

As discussed in the article by John Ljungkvist, the foundations for Viking Age society emerge domestically in the Vendel period, well before the Vikings enter the international arena. The archaeological material shows large-scale and important societal changes already in the fifth to seventh centuries, when settlement patterns change from sparsely scattered and regularly relocated farmsteads towards more stable habitations with new building types and a more regulated use of land. At the same time, there is a development towards more specialized handicrafts, increased imports, a more hierarchical society, and new burial traditions, including large mounds or boat burials like the ones from Valsgärde.

Simultaneously with the changes and reorganization in the infield settlements, there is a notable expansion in dated production sites and other features in the outland landscapes, which in earlier centuries show only marginal use. An increased exploitation of nonagrarian outland resources can also be identified in the material culture at settlements and graves in southern Scandinavia, where artefacts and raw materials change and not only include southern imports but also items of north Scandinavian origin.

Outland Archaeology and Research

In my PhD thesis I use a double perspective, looking both at artefacts and raw materials from outland resource areas, found at settlements, burials, or marketplaces, but also at excavated production sites and other registered monuments in the areas beyond, to reconstruct the networks connecting the outlands with the interregional trade. Eva Svensson was a pioneer within outland research, in her writings on medieval forest-agrarian systems (Svensson 1998). Concerning nonagrarian production in the outlands, iron is one of the products with a long history of research, and an extensive production process has been identified in northern Sweden from the beginning of the Vendel period onwards (Berglund 2017:94–95). Lindholm and Ljungkvist (2016) have contributed with important research in a study of bear-claws, artefacts originating from the outlands but found in the central agrarian areas. These are frequently found in the southern part of Sweden, in burials dated mainly as early as the Migration period. The bears are assumed to have an original habitat in the north, showing intensive trading connections between the different areas. Another example of such trade networks is the research conducted by Ashby and colleagues on antlers found in Denmark. Reindeer are among the species represented, showing trade connections from northern Scandinavia to urban centres in Denmark already in the beginning of the eighth century (Ashby et al. 2015).

Another example is the production of tar (Hennius 2018). Swedish tar production was extensive in the early modern period, but the prehistory of the craft has been unknown. New excavations show that during the period AD 200–400, tar was produced in small, funnel-shaped features, about 1 m in diameter, which are found within the settlements. In the Vendel period, a new way of organising production appears. From then on, we see not only small-scale production at the settlements but also large-scale production situated in the forests, close to the raw materials. Features up to 10 m in diameter suggest a significant increase in the quantity of tar produced (see Figure 2). More important, however, is the fact

Figure 2. In Swedish prehistory, tar was produced in funnel-shaped pits without an outlet pipe, as known from later periods. In the Vendel period, the character of the production changed, from a small-scale production at the settlements to a large-scale production in the forest (pictures courtesy of Andreas Hennius, 2018).
that this shift also involves fundamental changes in the organisation of production and labour. It becomes necessary to plan production in another way than merely collecting small amounts of wood and firing a tar pit in a courtyard. The requirements of the larger, outland pits would instead have included massive and time-consuming labour, cutting trees, chipping wood, piling it, and controlling the firing. Furthermore, there would have arisen a need for barrels to transport several hundred litres of tar to a place of use after production. The excavations of the large tar production pits in the forested region did not reveal any contemporary archaeological indications, such as settlements or graves, in their vicinity. The lack of other remains suggests that the production was organized from the agrarian settlements, located some 1–8 km away. This would mean that people would need to be freed from working in agrarian production to spend time in the forest on the production of tar, and perhaps other activities. The increased production of tar also coincides with fundamental changes in boat-building technology, including the introduction of the sail as well as an increased focus on maritime travels. Most probably the increased amounts of tar were used within shipping just as in later periods. There are also indications that tar was a trading commodity. At emporia around the Baltic Sea, for example Birka, Ribe, Hedeby, or Schleswig, traces have been found from the handling of tar, including barrels, troughs, and brushes, with indications that the tar was imported. These large marketplaces probably received the tar from reloading sites at the river mouths along the Baltic coast linking the outland forested production-areas with the interregional trade in complex networks.

Another study considers the hunt for marine mammals and is based on gaming pieces found in burials in southern Sweden (Hennius et al. 2018). The study demonstrates that large numbers of gaming pieces made of whalebone were deposited in graves across large parts of Sweden, from the middle of the sixth century AD and onwards (see Figure 3). These gaming pieces are larger than earlier examples, and hemispherical. In the initial phase, the objects are found in elite burials in eastern-central Sweden but soon become common in non-elite burials and over wide areas with a distribution comparable to that of combs or glass beads. Whales occasionally appear in the Baltic Sea, but not frequently enough to sustain a regular handicraft. The gaming pieces were probably produced in northern Norway and are interpreted as a by-product of the active hunting of whales, initiated at the beginning of the Vendel period, an argument supported by the presence of pits for blubber processing and, later on, by other whalebone artefacts. A ninth-century account of a visiting Norwegian at King Alfred’s court also corroborates this. The suggested whaling is consistent with a more intensified marine focus, indicated in advances in boat-building technology and in the building of boathouses. The single species determined by ZooMS analysis is the now-endangered North Atlantic right whale (Eubalaena glacialis), which suggests the deliberate selection of a preferred and relatively easy catch, as opposed to a reliance on occasional stranded whales. The discovery of whalebone as raw material in gaming pieces adds another trading commodity to the pre-Viking northern Scandinavian networks.

As seen, the exploitation of the outlands includes different resources in different types of environment. This nonagrarian production could obviously also be arranged in different ways. In densely populated and agrarian-based areas we can see the development of specific seasonally used outland

Figure 3. The raw material of the gaming pieces dictates the design. Bone and antler gaming pieces like the ones to the left are often small and the height rarely exceeds 10 mm. Whalebone gaming pieces, like the ones in the middle, can be much bigger. However, the porosity of whalebone restricts the possibility of creating items with more elaborate designs. The compact homogenous walrus tusk is well suited for manufacturing intricate onion-shaped gaming pieces, like the one to the right (photos, Andreas Hennius and Rudolf Gustavsson, with permission from Ålands landskapsregering och Ålands museum, Inv. No. ÅM45:32).
sites, shielings as well as hunting/fishing camps, probably owned and controlled from a single farm or groups of farms in cooperatives where production of tar or other refined products could be combined with, for example, animal husbandry. In the less populated hunting grounds of northern Scandinavia, far-reaching pitfall systems for hunting moose or reindeer suggest a more intensified hunt, following the same chronological pattern. In these areas, the exploitation was less structured or controlled, but nonetheless closely connected to events and markets in the south and further out into the European continent.

Conclusion

The outlands and outland resource exploitation have previously often been considered a marginal, late Viking Age complement to the inland agrarian production, and furthermore, the different parts have been studied separately. I suggest that the outlands are part of an economic, social, and cultural system that includes the inlands—different parts of large resource areas, filling different needs but totally dependent on each other.

In addition, a growing amount of research suggests an increasing exploitation of the outland landscapes already in the centuries before the Viking Age. This could indicate that the nonagrarian products from the outlands were a driving force for the economy, and that they are fundamental for our understanding of the emergence of Viking Age trade and interregional trade networks. From an outland perspective, the Viking Age explorations across the seas have a predecessor in the exploitation of the domestic Scandinavian wilderness. Understanding the Vendel period outland exploitation is thus of crucial importance for our understanding of the emergence of the Viking Age.
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REPORT FROM THE SAA BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Emily McClung de Tapia

Emily McClung de Tapia is the secretary of the Society for American Archaeology.

The SAA Board of Directors met on April 11 and 14, 2018, at the Annual Meeting in Washington, DC. SAA President Susan Chandler chaired both meetings. On April 11, President Susan Chandler, Secretary Emily McClung de Tapia, Treasurer Deborah Nichols, Treasurer-elect Ricky Lightfoot, and Directors John Douglass, Gordon Rakita, Patricia Garcia-Plotkin, Jaime Luis Castillo, Eva Jane Baxter, and Steve Tomka were in attendance. SAA Executive Director Tobi Brimsek attended ex officio. Guests included President-elect Joe Watkins, Secretary-elect Teresita Majewski, and incoming Directors Heather Lapham and Lynne Sullivan. President Chandler, Secretary McClung de Tapia, Secretary-elect Majewski, Treasurer Lightfoot, Directors Castillo, Douglass, Garcia-Plotkin, Baxter, Tomka, Lapham, and Sullivan attended the April 14 meeting. Executive Director Brimsek attended ex officio.

President Chandler provided a written report to the Board summarizing SAA activities during the last year, including details about ways that SAA’s advocacy efforts have intensified in response to the current administration’s focus on eliminating or bypassing regulations safeguarding environmental and cultural resources, significantly reducing funding for agencies, suspension of review panels (e.g., Repatriation), failure to appoint agency heads, and threats to the Antiquities Act. She also reported that the 2017 Task Force’s Resources for Preventing Sexual Harassment are now posted on SAAweb and emphasized why it is important for SAA members to become Registered Professional Archaeologists.

Executive Director Tobi Brimsek presented a written report to the Board and updated program activities, including the SAA communications program, the successful SAA Online Seminar Series, the IPSOS poll on Americans’ perceptions of archaeology, and participation during the summer of 2018 in Girls, Inc. and the STEM and Leadership Program, among numerous other education and outreach activities. The 2017 audit, investment management services, work of the Task Force on Web Redesign, site visits for future SAA meetings, and publications were also mentioned, as were the potential impacts of DC employee leave legislation. The General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) in accordance with European Union standards has been implemented. The database will be refined to reflect compliance as well. Executive Director Brimsek informed incoming Board members of her plan to retire from SAA at the end of September 2018.

Secretary Emily McClung de Tapia reported the results of the election. Joe Watkins is President-elect, Teresita Majewski is Secretary-elect, and Heather Lapham and Lynne Sullivan are Board members. Erin Baxter and Scott Van Keuren were elected to the Nominating Committee.

Outgoing Treasurer Deborah Nichols reported on the SAA’s current fiscal position and summarized her written report. The Society continues to be in a strong financial position with close to $9,200,000 total assets for 2018, an increase of 9.1% over 2017. Financial liquidity continues to be strong, and SAA is working with its new investment advisor, DiMeo Schneider & Associates, to develop policies to increase growth and channel endowment funds to projects. The Board assigned FY 2017 unallocated funds ($970) to the Government Affairs Fund ($65,000), the Technology Fund ($18,398) and $15,000 to the staffing fund.

The Executive Director now serves as liaison to all Interest Groups. The Board appointed chairs to the Task Force on Revisions of the SAA Principles of Archaeological Ethics: Stage One. The Task Force for a search for the next co-editors for Latin American Antiquity was also established.

The Board approved the document Best Management Practices: Rock Art Principal Investigators and Recommended Guidelines for Rock Art Documents, proposed by the Rock Art Interest Group, and approved the document Best Practices for No-Collection and In-field Analysis in the United States. The Board approved the Policies and Procedures for the Organization and Operation of the Council of Affiliated Societies of the Society for American Archaeology. The final report from the Task Force on Promotion and Tenure was approved as well. The Board approved the Statement on Collaboration with Responsible and Responsible Stewards of the Past. In addition, the Board accepted the revised and updated “Editorial Policy, Information for Authors, and
The Board took advantage of the DC location for the Annual Meeting and met with SAA’s investment advisor and audit partner, as the opportunity had not arisen in the past. SAA’s RPA representative Kay Simpson also joined the Board to explore ways to further promote the benefits of RPA among SAA’s membership and to give an update on RPA’s revision of the Code of Conduct concerning Sexual Harassment and standards for Field School Certification. During lunch on April 14, the Board met with Lynn Gamble, editor of *American Antiquity*; María Gutiérrez, co-editor of *Latin American Antiquity*; Anna Prentiss, editor of *The SAA Archaeological Record*; Sarah Herr, Christina Reith, and Sjoerd van der Linde, co-editors of *Advances in Archaeological Practice*; Michelle Hegmon, editor of the SAA Press; and Lynne Goldstein, chair of the Publications Committee.

Other visitors to the Board included Scott MacEachern, chair of the International Government Affairs Committee, who commented on the World Bank’s new integrated program to incorporate environmental and social issues through Cultural Heritage Guidance Notes, as well as the importance of more frequent meetings between SAA and Bank representatives and SAA’s potential role in training Bank Heritage Managers in countries where projects are underway. Donn Grenda, chair of the Government Affairs Committee, and David Lindsay, manager, Government Affairs, discussed with the Board the Society’s intensified efforts to advocate for the protection of cultural remains within the Americas as well as the visits of SAA members to Capitol Hill during the spring meeting. Barbara Roth, chair of the Committee for Women in Archaeology (COSWA), visited with the Board to discuss ways for SAA to lead outreach efforts for mentoring women, providing inclusive professional and learning environments, and increasing nominations of women for SAA awards. The Board also met briefly with Evelyn Savage, representing Vetted Solutions, the firm that SAA has hired to find a new Executive Director. Mark Zadrozny, Executive Publisher for SAA’s journals at Cambridge University Press, met with the Board to discuss the first year as publishing partners.

The Board thanked outgoing committee and task force chairs and SAA representatives for their service to the Society. President Chandler acknowledged the contributions of outgoing Treasurer Deborah Nichols and Directors John Douglass and Gordon Rakita and thanked them for their exemplary service and contributions to the Society.
President Susan Chandler called the Society for American Archaeology’s 83rd Annual Business Meeting to order at 5:15 p.m. on Friday, April 13, 2018, after the secretary determined that a quorum was present. The president asked that the minutes of last year’s Annual Business Meeting in Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada be approved. The motion was moved, seconded, and approved by the members who were present.

President Chandler recognized and thanked the Nominating Committee, the outgoing members of the Board of Directors, the Program and Local Advisory Committees, the SAA staff, and the outgoing committee and task force chairs for their service to the society and noted that SAA’s success is the result of the dedication and commitment of its members. The president then highlighted a number of initiatives that SAA has been working on this past year. Her report is published in full in this issue.

Outgoing Treasurer Deborah Nichols reported that the SAA’s financial health remains sound, with total assets for the year of approximately $9,200,000, an increase of 9.1% over 2017. Funds are available to support programs including the website redesign, the contract with Clark/Hill, and the Coalition for Heritage Preservation. Technology is an area where SAA must be prepared to invest in order to meet the needs of the membership.

Secretary Emily McClung de Tapia announced the results of the election: Joe Watkins, President-elect; Teresita Majewski, Secretary-elect; Heather Lapham and Lynne Sullivan, Director positions; and Erin Baxter and Scott Van Keuren, members of the 2019 Nominating Committee. Ballots were distributed to 8,758 members in January 2018, and 1,957 (22.04%) ballots were returned.

Executive Director Tobi Brimsek, at her twenty-second anniversary with SAA, announced her decision to retire at the end of September 2018. She provided a brief summary of SAA initiatives in progress in 2017, announcing the redesign of the SAA website and the advantages it will offer to the membership and its other audiences, the rebirth of the SAA Press, restructuring of the SAA database to guarantee data privacy in compliance with European Union standards, the Ipsos poll and its role in alerting legislatures to the public’s positive perception of archaeology, and, finally, restructuring administrative roles and coordination activities of SAA’s staff to delegate greater responsibilities to Managers.

President Chandler thanked Tobi Brimsek for her 22 years of service to the Society during which she strengthened the society through excellent management, forward thinking, and sound financial practices, stressing her commitment to SAA and to archaeology. She then outlined the procedures established by the Search Committee, chaired by her and composed of Deborah Nichols, Joe Watkins, Jeff Altschul, Barbara Arroyo, and Scott Simmons, in conjunction with Vetted Solutions, in order to hire a new Executive Director who will start work in September 2018.

President Chandler acknowledged the hard work of the Committee on Awards and the individual awards committees and presented the awards and scholarships while President-elect Joe Watkins read the citations (listed elsewhere in this issue). President Chandler concluded with the presentation of the 2018 Lifetime Achievement Award to Martin McAllister in recognition of his many key contributions to the protection of cultural resources.

Dean Snow, chair of the Ceremonial Resolutions Committee, read the ceremonial resolutions. He first thanked the retiring members of the Board of Directors, Treasurer Deborah Nichols, and Directors John Douglass and Gordon Rakita. He then thanked the SAA staff and especially Tobi A. Brimsek, Executive Director, who planned the meeting, and all the volunteers who worked at registration and other tasks. He continued by acknowledging Ariane Burke, Chair of the Program Committee; Dario Guiducci, Program Committee Assistant; and members of the Program Committee. Snow also thanked Torben Rick, Chair of the Annual Meeting Local Advisory Committee, as well as other committee chairs and members completing their ser-
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vice and the many members who have served the Society on its committees and in other ways.

Snow offered sincere wishes that those members of the Society who are now serving in the armed forces return safely.

Snow presented a resolution of sympathy to the families and friends of Carroll L. Riley, Margaret Lyneis, Alexander J. Lindsay, Jr., Richard E. Ross, Thomas Pleger, Mary E. Vandermeulen, Kathleen Schamel, Mark Harlan, Michael Kyte, Steadman Upham, Stephen L. Mulholland, Louis Carl Kuttruff, Jr., Mark Smith, Frances Ahern, Per Falkenström, Lawrence H. Keeley, Harvey Bricker, Alan Walker, Martha Struvever, Joan E. Freeman, Charles McNutt, Robert McCormick Adams, Patricia Núñez Henríquez, Roger T. Grange, Jr., John P. Cook, Leonard C. Ham, Robert Wilson, Marco Giardino, Ruthann Knudson, Alison Weisskopf, Scott Zeleznik, Janet Ford, Stephen Williams, and Denise Pahl Schaaf. The members in attendance rose for a moment of silence in remembrance of our departed colleagues.

President Chandler asked for new business from the floor. None was presented.

A motion to adjourn was presented at 6:10 p.m. The motion was seconded, and the meeting was adjourned.

PRESIDENT’S REMARKS

Susan M. Chandler

Good evening and welcome to our nation’s capital and to the 83rd Annual Business Meeting of the Society for American Archaeology. I am pleased to announce that, as of noon today, 4,381 persons have registered for this year’s Annual Meeting. We would like to thank Program Chair Ariane Burke and her program committee for the excellent program. Thanks are also due to Local Arrangements Chair Torben Rick for his preparations and for his work in setting up field trips, and to the SAA staff and volunteers who are handling all of the logistics for the meeting.

I would like to thank the 2018 Nominating Committee, chaired by Jeffrey Altschul, for an excellent slate of candidates. Special thanks are due to all of those who agreed to run for office.

I have enjoyed working with outgoing Treasurer Deborah Nichols and outgoing Directors John Douglass and Gordon Rakita. Their hard work and dedication to the Society are greatly appreciated.

Although only the elected SAA leaders are sitting on this podium tonight, SAA has hundreds of members who serve on SAA’s committees and task forces. These volunteers work behind the scenes, devoting their talents and energies to accomplish the important goals of the Society. If you are or have been a committee or task force member, I thank you. In particular, I wish to thank the following committee and task force chairs who are cycling off tonight:

Rani Alexander
Jeffrey Altschul
Leslie Aragon
Richard Busch
Ariane Burke
Larry Cohen
Andrew Duff
Patricia Gilman
Kelley Hays-Gilpin
Deborah Huntley
Shereen Lerner
Teresita Majewski
Rolfe Mandel

Thomas McGovern
Jayur Mehta
Paul Minnis
Natalie Munro
Nell Murphy
George Nicholas
Barbara Mills
Torben Rick
Daniel Sandweiss
Michael Shott
LuAnn Wandsnider
Gabriel Wrobel
Willeke Wendrich

Thank you for your service to SAA.

I would like to note that SAA now has 25 Interest Groups that are also active and engaged, with the numbers of interest groups and interest group members increasing at a rapid pace.

In addition to our member volunteers, SAA is proud to have a dedicated staff of nine persons who work year-round to keep the Society running smoothly and to ensure that our Annual Meeting comes together without a hitch. I would like to recognize SAA’s Executive Director, Tobi Brimsek; the manager of Publications, Marnie Colton; the manager of Membership and Marketing, Cheryl Ar dovini; the manager of Administrative and Financial Services, Jona than Koudelka; the manager of Government Affairs, David Lind say; the manager of Education and Outreach, Elizabeth Pruitt; the manager of Communications and Fundraising, Amy Rutledge; the coordinator of Membership and Meetings, Solai Sanchez; and the manager of Information Services. Cheng Zhang.

SAA is proud of our publication program, which includes our journals published in partnership with Cambridge University Press as well as The SAA Archaeological Record and SAA Press.

I would like to acknowledge the co-editors of Advances in Archaeological Practice: Sarah Herr, Christina Rieth, and Sjoerd van der Linde, who have agreed to serve a second term. I would like to thank outgoing American Antiquity editor Robert Kelly and welcome incoming editor Lynn Gamble. I wish to also acknowledge the co-editors of Latin American Archaeology: María Gutiérrez and Geoffrey Braswell. Our thanks also go to Anna Marie Prentiss, editor of The SAA Archaeological Record. Finally, our thanks to Michelle Hegmon, SAA Press editor.
I would like to highlight a few of the initiatives that SAA has been working on this past year:

1. Forefront on our agenda has been responding to what seem to be the never-ending attacks on archaeology. These attacks are happening on two fronts: the pro-development front, which attempts to dismantle historic preservation legislation, and the anti-science front, which attempts to eliminate or reduce funding for the social sciences. SAA has been working diligently with our partner organizations in the Coalition for American Heritage to provide timely and comprehensive responses to proposed legislation and regulatory reform measures. SAA is working on an amicus brief for a lawsuit challenging the Trump administration’s drastic cuts to Bears Ears and Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monuments. We have also hired a lobbying firm to help SAA get appointments with key Republican legislators and agency heads. My thanks to all of the members who have participated in our calls to action and a special thanks to the scores of SAA members who visited their Members of Congress this week.

2. After several years of attempting to engage with global development banks about the need to establish guidance for protecting cultural resources, SAA was pleased to host a joint SAA/World Bank workshop in conjunction with this Annual Meeting.

3. SAA recently conducted a public poll regarding perceptions of the importance and value of archaeology. These data, which are available at the SAA booth in the exhibit hall, will be used to make the strongest case for preservation and outreach efforts going forward, both in the political arena and for the use of our members when applying for grants.

4. A task force, chaired by Tobi Brimsek, is working with SAA staff and outside consultants to redesign SAAWeb. It is expected that the new website will be rolled out before the end of this year.

5. In addition to the three SAA task forces that are working with federal agencies on cultural resource management issues (Amity Pueblo, Desert Renewable Energy Conservation Plan, and the Mancos Shale Development Plan), task forces this past year have been working to
   - compile resources for members on how to deal with sexual harassment issues, which is part of SAA’s increased focus on preventing sexual harassment within the profession;
   - determine how to better communicate the value of archaeology to people outside of our profession; and
   - develop guidelines for principal investigators on projects involving rock art.

The Board has also established a task force to recommend a process for revising and updating the current SAA Principles of Archaeological Ethics that will engage, gather input from, and inform the membership.

Following the work of last year’s task force, SAA has approved a guidance statement on archaeologist-collector collaboration.

We have approved new guidelines for tenure and promotion as well as a best practices document for no-collection surveys.

We will be setting up an online platform to engage members in a discussion about “big picture” issues and to ask what problems members see facing archaeology.

Before I go into the details about the search for a new Executive Director, I want to thank Tobi for her 22 years of dedicated service to SAA. Her professionalism and commitment have served SAA well. We are a stronger, financially sound organization because of her excellent management and her forward thinking. Although she will be difficult to replace, she leaves the Society in an excellent position for a new executive director. Thank you, Tobi, for putting up with all of us archaeologists for over two decades!

I am chairing the SAA search committee composed of Deb Nichols, Joe Watkins, Jeff Altschul, Barbara Arroyo, and Scott Simmons. SAA has hired the search firm Vetted Solutions to lead the search for the new executive director. Our timeline is as follows:

- The search committee has approved a draft position profile.
- Immediately following the Annual Meeting, Vetted Solutions will e-mail a brief stakeholder survey to over 100 SAA members regarding their thoughts about what SAA should be looking for in a new Executive Director. Many of you will be receiving that survey and I hope that you will respond as soon as it arrives in your inbox.
- The position opening will be posted by the end of next week.
- The search firm will screen applicants and will provide an initial slate of candidates to the search committee by the end of June.
- The search committee will conduct two rounds of interviews in July and will make a recommendation to the Board by the end of the month.
- Contract negotiations will take place in August.
- The new Executive Director will start work in September.

I urge anyone who has any questions about the Executive Director search or who might know of a good candidate for the position to contact me.
2018 AWARDS

SAA award recipients are selected by individual committees of SAA members—one for each award. The Board of Directors wishes to thank the award committees for their hard work and excellent selections, and to encourage any members who have an interest in a particular award to volunteer to serve on a future committee.

Public Service Award
SUPERVISORY SPECIAL AGENT TIMOTHY S. CARPENTER AND THE FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION ART CRIME TEAM

We proudly present this award to Supervisory Special Agent Timothy S. Carpenter and the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) Art Crime Team for their unique collaborative approach to repatriating objects and human skeletons from over 200 countries in a landmark case involving an Indiana collector. The FBI created the Art Crime Team in 2004 as a rapid deployment unit to respond to theft, looting, and trafficking of cultural property. The team has grown to 16 special agents. In 2014, Supervisory Special Agent Timothy Carpenter took on a case involving an elderly individual in rural Indiana who had amassed more than 40,000 objects and a large number of human skeletons from over 200 countries.

The FBI conducted a recovery, and is now working with academics, museum professionals, members of Native American nations, and international repatriation specialists. Agent Carpenter’s approach assures that recovering cultural property, collaborating with descendant communities, and repatriating ancestral remains continues to be done with respect and transparency. This landmark case, with its unique collaborative approach, is a replicable model for agencies that investigate antiquities cases.

Gene S. Stuart Award
 Nicholas St. Fleur

Nicholas St. Fleur, writing for The New York Times, is the winner of the 2018 Gene S. Stuart Award for archaeological journalism. St. Fleur won for his excellent coverage of archaeological topics including mummies, pyramids, and shipwrecks. His engaging style invites and encourages the public to understand archaeology in the digital age. His article “Medical Tales from a Crypt in Lithuania” explored the archaeology and bio-anthropological aspects of ancient life in preserved mummies. He also noted the unanticipated consequences of modern epidemic fears from ancient catacombs. His reporting helps the field of archaeology remain vibrant in the minds of all who read about the past.

SAA Student Paper Award
MICHELLE BEBBER and MIKE WILSON

Michelle Bebber and Mike Wilson’s paper “Untapped Potential – Why weren’t ceramic arrowheads invented? Theoretical Morphology for Understanding the Human Past” provides fresh perspective by integrating concepts from theoretical morphology with a textbook example of experimental archaeology. Their elegant research design is flawlessly executed to draw thoughtful conclusions about technological pathways that were never taken.
SAA Student Poster Award

MARK AGOSTINI

This year’s SAA Student Poster Award is presented to Mark Agostini of Brown University for his poster “Becoming Tewa on the Pajarito Plateau and in the Rio Grande Valley: A Compositional Study of Ancestral Pueblo Pottery in the Tewa Basin, New Mexico.” Agostini’s research models continuities and changes in networks of pottery production and exchange among communities in two neighboring regions in northern New Mexico. Specifically, he utilized quadrupole inductively coupled plasma mass spectrometry (ICP-MS) to precisely measure trace elemental concentrations in clay paste to identify local and nonlocal ceramics, finding that over time reliance on trade wares decreased. Agostini suggests that increasingly localized production and design at these sites is consistent with the emergence of novel Tewa community identities that are still maintained in descendant communities.

Institute for Field Research Undergraduate Student Paper Award

BRITTANY NOTTERPEK FLETCHER

For her paper “Processing Personhood: Middle Woodland Mounds and Mortuary Activity in the Lower Illinois River Valley.”

Institute for Field Research Undergraduate Student Poster Award

JAKOB HANSCHU

For his poster “Quantifying the Qualitative: Locating Burial Mounds in North-Central Kansas.”

Paul Goldberg Award (formerly the Geoarchaeology MA/MS Interest Group Award)

ZAAKIYAH CUA

For her research, Loyalhanna Lake: A Geoarchaeological Approach to Understanding the Archaeological Potential of Floodplains, we proudly present the Paul Goldberg Award to Zaakiyah Cua (Indiana University of Pennsylvania).

Ethics Bowl

CORNELL UNIVERSITY

The Cornell Ethics Bowl team is made up of four first-year MA students, Elizabeth Bews, Lindsay Petry, Elizabeth Proctor, and Danielle Vander Horst. They were coached by Dr. Dana Bardolph, who was a member of the winning team at the 2011 SAA Ethics Bowl in Sacramento.

Dienje Kenyon Memorial Fellowship

ASHLEIGH ROGERS

Ashleigh Rogers, a PhD student at the University of Queensland, is the recipient of this year’s Dienje Kenyon Memorial Fellowship for her research project investigating prehistoric human conservation and sustainable exploitation of the Hawaiian limpet (‘opihi, Cella-na). She will be using midden deposits spanning 500 years from several archaeological sites situated along the windward coast of Moloka‘i, Hawaiian Islands. Modern biological transect recording will be conducted on basalt and limestone shorelines adjacent to the archaeological habitation middens at Kealapupuakiahi. This research will be conducted in cooperation with Mac Poepoe, a recognized master of traditional Hawaiian fishing methods. The incorporation of modern shoreline data to archaeological interpretations at Kealapupuakiahi will also further illuminate how prehistoric Hawaiians sustainably managed and conserved important marine resources, potentially identifying conservation practices and further illuminating the kapu system and concepts of sustainability and conservation during Hawaiian prehistory.

Fred Plog Memorial Fellowship

R. J. SINENSKY

R. J. Sinensky is the recipient of the Fred Plog Memorial Fellowship. Sinensky’s research explores how and why diverse foodways and land tenure systems developed in early Southwestern farming societies by comparing and contrasting the ways in which groups cultivated, collected, prepared, and consumed foods in areas with varying productivity under maize agriculture. Similar to Plog’s focus on socioeconomic transitions in regions that exhibited “weak patterns” of material culture, Sinensky examines variability in foodways of
contemporary communities within the Western Puerco region of east central Arizona. This region was home to a culturally diverse population that likely employed a range of economic practices within the confines of a relatively small geographic area. Both productive/population dense and marginal/lower population areas were continuously occupied between 400 BC and AD 1125. Occupational continuity, cultural diversity, and environmental variation make the Western Puerco region an ideal location to investigate the development of diverse socioeconomic systems in small-scale societies.

Douglas Kellogg Fellowship for Geoarchaeological Research

RACHEL CAJIGAS

For her research, *The Interaction of Long Term Canal Irrigation and Wetland Development at the La Playa Site, Sonora, Mexico*, we proudly present the Kellogg Fellowship to Rachel Cajigas (University of Arizona).

Arthur C. Parker Scholarship for Archaeological Training for Native Americans and Native Hawaiians

JAY RAPOZA

NSF Scholarship for Archaeological Training for Native Americans and Native Hawaiians

ASHLYN WEAVER

SAA Native American Undergraduate Archaeology Scholarship

BARRY BAUSMAN

SAA Native American Graduate Archaeology Scholarship

RAQUEL ROMERO

Historically Underrepresented Groups Scholarship (HUGS)—Undergraduate

LUISA DONOSO

ANGELICA SANCHEZ

Historically Underrepresented Groups Scholarship (HUGS)—Graduate

JOSÉ MERRERO ROSADO

Cheryl L. Wase Memorial Scholarship for the Study of Archaeology

HEATHER HENDRICKSON

MIRANDA LAZAR

MELISSA PEREZ

JAMIE STEVENS

**Dissertation Award**

KATHERINE L. CHIOU

The dissertation, “Common Meals, Noble Feasts: An Archaeological Investigation of Moche Food and Cuisine in the Jequetepeque Valley, Peru, 600-850 C.E.,” by Katherine L. Chiou is a transformative contribution to research well beyond the region in which this study was situated. This body of work exemplifies archaeology’s best empirical and comparative strengths in its investigation of the foodways of contrastive social entities at the household and regional scales, across space, and over time. Katherine Chiou draws on a battery of analytical methods (ethnobotany, spatial analysis, household archaeology) to generate a model of class conflict, growing inequalities, and a “gastropolitical” contribution to regional collapse. Dr. Chiou’s prose, self-defined as a “microhistorical narrative,” is also exceptional for its exquisite craftsmanship, which brings to the surface deep interdisciplinary archaeology at its finest.

**Book Award: Scholarly**

TOM DILLEHAY

*Where the Land Meets the Sea* presents the results of an astonishingly complex and comprehensive long-term research project at one of the most significant sites in South America: Huaca Prieta, Peru. Tom Dillehay and his colleagues conducted pathbreaking investigations that set an exceptionally high standard for multidisciplinary, integrated archaeological field research, and publication. The site is extremely interesting, and, together with nearby Paredones and surrounding Preceramic houses, establishes that the Andes were among the earliest global examples of emergent complexity in the world. The fieldwork and laboratory analyses of assemblages from Huaca Prieta and surrounding areas exemplify the state-of-the-art in empirical archaeological research that is guided and informed by an explicit theoretical framework. This work documents the beginning of South American cultural patterns that persisted for another 14,000 years. The impact of this study will endure, and its rich data and substantive content will be considered by current and future scholars.
Book Award: Popular

PETER BOGUCKI

Peter Bogucki offers a concise and clearly written summary of the archaeology of “prehistoric” Europe in his book titled The Barbarians: Lost Civilizations. The focus on less acknowledged European groups and their numerous complex life-ways serves as a counterpoint to the well-known ancient Greeks and Romans. The introduction in the book is particularly valuable for educating popular readers on the techniques of archaeology and it offers a brief account of its history in Europe. Subsequent creatively titled chapters include vivid descriptions of numerous sites and their inhabitants’ diverse cultural practices. The “Reference” notes in the back of the book provide useful supplementary information on bibliographic sources that are useful for more inquisitive readers. The color photographs in the book were selected with great care and their quality is exceptional. This engaging book comes highly recommended for those who want to learn more about the ancestors of present-day Europeans.

Award for Excellence in Archaeological Analysis

JOSEPH W. BALL

For his lifetime of significant contributions to the study of Maya ceramics, his global influence on ceramic studies, and for sharing his knowledge with students and colleagues, we proudly present the Award for Excellence in Archaeological Analysis to Joseph W. Ball. In addition to overseeing important excavations at sites in Mexico and Belize, Joseph Ball dedicated his career to the meticulous study of Maya pottery classification systems, their theoretical underpinnings, and their implications for better understanding ancient sociocultural systems. Dr. Ball’s signature emphasis on the type:variety-mode method of ceramic analysis and classification has remained foundational in studies of prehispanic Maya pottery for well over fifty years. Dr. Ball has been instrumental in encouraging Maya archaeologists to think beyond ceramic typology, using their analyses to answer larger questions about ancient Maya society and lifeways. His contributions and influence will be felt for many lifetimes to come.

Award for Excellence in Cultural Resource Management

MYLES R. MILLER III

Myles Miller has earned the Award for Excellence in Cultural Resource Management for his contribution over three decades to CRM. Myles developed innovative approaches to analyzing and interpreting CRM-gathered collections which resulted in research and publications that have impacted Southwestern archaeology. Using collections, Myles’ contributions include: (1) analyzing Mimbres B/W pottery from Jornada Mogollon sites to address how Jornada people acquired Mimbres pottery and the movement of Mimbres people; (2) examining collections from Jornada sites and interviewing those who conducted the excavations to interpret the ritual termination of Madera Quemada pueblo; (3) ascertaining a connection between shrine caves and speleothem deposits in residential sites; (4) establishing the age and significance of Tlaloc rock art sites by dating perishable Tlaloc images; (5) amassing chronometric dates to refine Jornada chronology; and (6) analyzing obsidian projectile points from Fort Bliss to illuminate lithic procurement and trade patterns in the region.

Award for Excellence in Public Education

KENTUCKY ARCHAEOLOGICAL SURVEY

The Kentucky Archaeological Survey and the Davis Bottom History Preservation Project is awarded SAA’s Award for Excellence in Public Education for their combination of advocacy and curriculum development in the field of archaeology. Their extraordinary contributions to documenting the archaeology of an entire working-class neighborhood have included historic preservation, conservation archaeology, cultural resource management, and broad outreach strategy including curriculum development. They have produced an outstanding body of work on Davis Bottom, including curriculum directed towards “Project Archaeology: Investigating a Kentucky Shotgun House.” This award recognizes the work and
long-term service to the discipline by the Kentucky Archaeological Survey and their contributions to the field of public archaeology. Their work and dedication to advocacy and education is an admirable model for all archaeologists and organizations to follow.

**Crabtree Award**

**JAMES WARNICA**

James Warnica has spent a half-century documenting prehistoric sites and conducting archaeological research in New Mexico and the adjoining states. As a teenager he began collecting artifacts near Portales, NM. As Mr. Warnica’s interests matured, he became a bridge between the region’s avocational and professional communities, particularly on Paleoindian research. Co-founder of the El Llano Archaeological Society, he guided it in collaboration with two generations of Paleoindian archaeologists and was instrumental in preservation of threatened collections and records from Blackwater Draw, the Clovis type site. Mr. Warnica published seven scholarly papers between 1961 and 2017 (two in *American Antiquity*), culminating in a major co-authored monograph on Blackwater Draw. He has reported dozens of archaeological sites in New Mexico. Overall, James Warnica’s range of efforts and committed engagement with the professional archaeological community and general public on behalf of Paleoindian and later prehistory make him a deserving recipient of the Crabtree Award.

**Fryxell Award for Interdisciplinary Research**

**VANCE T. HOLLIDAY**

It is our great pleasure to award Vance T. Holliday the 2018 Fryxell Award for Interdisciplinary Research, with an emphasis in Earth Sciences. Vance is extraordinarily deserving of this honor, having contributed over the last several decades substantially and substantively to archaeological research and understanding, particularly of North American Paleoindians but also of Pleistocene peoples elsewhere, as well as to our broader understanding of the soils, sediments, and geomorphic processes that provide the context of archaeological sites. Vance’s last geoarchaeological contributions were made on the Southern High Plains of North America, where he has been instrumental in developing our understanding of the late Pleistocene climate and environment of the region.

**Award for Excellence in Latin American and Caribbean Archaeology**

**MARÍA VICTORIA CASTRO ROJAS**

Maria Victoria Castro Rojas is honored for her remarkably prolific and influential scholarship, notable for both its breadth and innovative contributions. Recognizing from the start that social, ritual, economic, and ecological aspects of human life are inseparable, Victoria defined an interdisciplinary approach that integrated archaeology with ethnohistory, ethnobiology, and cultural anthropology, and drew on descendant communities to incorporate their knowledge of the past. Throughout her career, she has fought to gain recognition for the achievements of prehispanic indigenous people and their modern descendants, serving as guiding member of the UNESCO international committee designating the Qhapaq Nan (Inka road) World Heritage Site, and as adviser for the Great Inka Road exhibit at the Smithsonian’s National Museum of the American Indian. She has mentored generations of archaeologists, who have gone on to prominent careers in Chile and abroad. For these reasons, we proudly give Victoria her richly deserved Award for Excellence in Latin American and Caribbean Archaeology.

**Lifetime Achievement Award**

**MARTIN MCALLISTER**

Martin McAllister has earned the Lifetime Achievement Award for his many key contributions to the protection of cultural resources. Among his many accomplishments are his preparation of *Archaeological Resource Damage Assessment: Legal Basis and Methods*, which established professional standards and methods for all aspects of archaeological damage assessment, and his development and instruction of three-day and five-day “Archaeological Damage Assessment” classes, the only classes in existence that train archaeologists in all aspects of the preparation of archaeological damage assessment reports for *Archaeological Resources Protection Act (ARPA)* cases. He also led the effort to create the “Professional Standards for the Determination of Archaeological Value” that were adopted by the SAA in 2003 for use by professional archaeologists in ARPA cases, and organized and co-chaired the SAA conference that developed these standards. This award celebrates his life’s work, which has been dedicated to the protection of our nation’s cultural heritage.
2018 State Archaeology Week Poster Award

FIRST PLACE: ALASKA

"12,000 years before us in Alaska, there was Paleoarctic"
SECOND PLACE: WYOMING

SHOSHONE ENCAMPMENT AT SOUTH PASS

Wyoming Archaeology Awareness Month

THIRD PLACE: OKLAHOMA

OKLAHOMA ARCHAEOLOGY MONTH

Many pathways to stewardship of Oklahoma’s past and present.
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CEREMONIAL RESOLUTIONS

The Resolutions Committee offers the following resolutions:

Be it resolved that appreciation and congratulations on a job well done be tendered to the

Retiring OFFICER
Treasurer Deborah Nichols

and the retiring BOARD MEMBERS
John Douglass and Gordon Rakita

To the Staff, and especially to Tobi A. Brimsek, the Executive Director, who planned the meeting,
and to all the volunteers who worked at Registration and other tasks;

To the Program Committee, chaired by
Ariane Burke
Assisted by
Dario Guiducci

and to the Committee Members of the Program Committee

Sonia Alconini
Joaquín Arroyo-Cabralas
Paul Backhouse
William Balco
Melissa Baltus
C. Michael Barton
Michael Bisson
Lindsay Bloch
Luis Borroto
Alexis Boutin
Marley Brown
Adrian Burke
Stacey Lynn Camp
Douglas Campana
Milena Carvalho
Pam Crabtree
Lisa DeLance
Florencio Delgado Espinoza
Matthew Des Lauriers
Luc Doyon
Amy Fox
Claudia García-Dés Lauriers
Zenobie Garrett
Christian Gates St-Pierre
Charles Golden
Christina Halperin
Siobhan Hart
Alvaro Higuera
Rachel Horowitz
Nicola Howard
Scott Hutson
Kristina Killgrove
Scott Kirk
Todd Koetje
John Krigbaum
Yin-Man Lam
Ben Marwick
Juliet Morrow
Marit Munson
Olivia Navarro-Farr
Eduardo Neves
Lisa Overholzer
Sneh Patel
Francis Robinson
Erika Marion Robrahn-Gonzalez
Christopher Rodning
Melissa Rosenzweig
Kristin Safi
Jon Spenard
Travis Stanton
Clare Tolmie
Cara Tremain
Christine VanPool
Bradley Vieria
Colin Wren
Dagmara Zawadzka

To the Annual Meeting Local Advisory Committee, chaired by
Torben Rick

And to other committee chairs and members completing their service and to the many
members who have served the Society on its committees and in other ways;

And sincere wishes that those members of the Society who are now serving in the armed forces return safely.

Will the membership please signal approval of these motions by a general round of applause.

And be it further resolved that thanks again be given to those who inform us of the deaths of colleagues, and finally,

A resolution of sympathy to the families and friends of

Carroll L. Riley
Margaret Lyneis
Alexander J. Lindsay, Jr.
Richard E. Ross
Thomas Pleger
Mary E. Vandermeulen
Kathleen Schamel
Mark Harlan
Michael Kyte
Steadman Upham
Stephen L. Mulholland
Louis Carl Kuttruff, Jr.
Mark Smith
Frances Ahern
Per Falkenström
Lawrence H. Keeley
Harvey Bricker
Alan Walker
Martha Struerer
Joan E. Freeman
Charles McNutt
Robert McCormick Adams
Patricio Núñez Henríquez
Roger T. Grange, Jr.
John P. Cook
Leonard C. Ham
Robert Wilson
Marco Giardino
Ruthann Knudson
Alison Weisskopf
Scott Zeleznik
Janet Ford
Stephen Williams
Denise Pahl Schaan

Will the members please rise for a moment of silence in honor of our departed colleagues.
Respectfully submitted,
Dean Snow
on behalf of the Ceremonial Resolutions Committee,
April 13, 2018
Michael Harner  
1929-2018

Dr. Michael Harner, a pioneer of Patayan archaeology who later became one of the foremost scholars of shamanism, passed away peacefully on February 3 at the age of 88. Among archaeological circles, he is best known for his excavation of a walk-in well in western Arizona, from which he defined Bouse Phases I and II of the Lowland Patayan cultural sequence along the Arizona/California border.

Michael was born in Washington, DC. In 1948, while an undergraduate at the University of Illinois at Champaign/Urbana, Michael attended the University of New Mexico’s archaeological field school in Tijeras Canyon outside of Albuquerque, under Stanley Stubbins and Fred Wendorf. That same summer, as a member of the Upper Gila Expedition of the Peabody Museum of Harvard University, he assisted in Herbie Dix’s excavation at Bat Cave. Following field school, Michael transferred to the University of California at Berkeley, where he earned his B.A. under the tutelage of Alfred Kroeber and Robert Heizer in 1953. Michael stayed at Berkeley to pursue graduate education, but changed his focus from archaeology to ethnology. The germs of his 1963 dissertation were subsequently published as the influential *The Jívaro: People of the Sacred Waterfalls* (1972).

From 1958 to 1961, Michael was an assistant professor of anthropology at Arizona State University. From there he returned to Berkeley to serve as Senior Museum Anthropologist at the Robert H. Lowie Museum of Anthropology, followed by promotions to Assistant Research Anthropologist in 1963 and Assistant Director in 1965. In 1966, Michael left the museum and Berkeley for what would become a two-decade stint in the New York area. The transition began with a seat as a visiting associate professor of anthropology at Columbia University, which blossomed into a full associate professorship from 1968 to 1970. Michael also served as a visiting associate professor of anthropology at Yale University in the spring of 1970.

Michael left Columbia for the Graduate Faculty at the New School of Social Research, where he served as associate professor (1970–1973), professor (1973–1987), and Chair (1973–1977) of the Anthropology Department. While there, he maintained ties to his former institutions through a research associateship at Columbia (1971–1973), and by teaching as a visiting professor at Berkeley in the summers of 1971, 1972, and 1975. By the late 1970s, Michael was fully devoted to New York’s nuanced anthropological world, highlighted by his service as Co-Chair of the Anthropology Section of the New York Academy of Sciences from 1979 to 1981.

Michael founded the Center for Shamanic Studies in 1980, a non-profit dedicated to studying and preserving traditional cultural knowledge of shamanism from indigenous communities the world over. That endeavor reorganized as the Foundation for Shamanic Studies (FSS) in 1985, at which time Michael’s role transitioned from Founder/Director to President. In 1987, Michael left academia to devote himself fully to the FSS. His dedication to shamanism led to the acclaimed books *Hallucinogens and Shamanism* (1973), *The Way of the Shaman* (1980), and *Cave and Cosmos* (2013). He also co-authored (with Alfred Meyer) the anthropological novel *Cannibal* (1980). Among numerous scholarly achievements, Michael was recognized in 2003 with an honorary doctorate from the California Institute of Integral Studies.

Although best known for ethnological and experimental research on shamanism, Michael’s first love was archaeology. While an undergraduate, he participated in excavations outside Santa Barbara, California with the Smithsonian Institution’s River Basin Surveys Program in 1951. Between 1951 and 1953, he conducted archaeological surveys and excavations in the vicinity of the lower Colorado River under the auspices of the University of California Archaeological Survey (UCAS). That fieldwork led to four publications in the *University of California Archaeology Survey Reports* series between 1953 and 1958 and co-authorship (with Alfred Kroeber) of *Mohave Pottery* (1955). In 1954, Michael undertook a reconnaissance in Grand Gulch of southeastern Utah as a joint venture between UCAS and the Museum of Northern Arizona. Later, as a graduate student, he conducted test excavations in the Rio Upano Valley of eastern Ecuador (1957) and surface collected sites near Imaria Cocha in Peru (1961) for the Lowie Museum.

Michael’s archaeological legacy endures in myriad ways. His field notes from Grand Gulch, for instance, have proven to be foundational pieces of research within the 1.35 million-acre Bears Ears National Monument established December 28, 2016, by then-president Barack Obama. Michael is survived by his wife, daughter, two sons, and the many thousands of students he taught and mentored in both his academic and nonprofit positions. Although gone in body, Michael’s spirit lives on in the many lives he touched.

—Aaron M. Wright
OUT OF THE COLD: ARCHAEOLOGY ON THE ARCTIC RIM OF NORTH AMERICA

BY OWEN K. MASON AND T. MAX FRIESEN

The Arctic rim of North America presents one of the most daunting environments for humans. Cold and austere, it is lacking in plants but rich in marine mammals—primarily the ringed seal, walrus, and bowhead whale. In this book, the authors track the history of cultural innovations in the Arctic and Subarctic for the past 12,000 years, including the development of sophisticated architecture, watercraft, fur clothing, hunting technology, and worldviews. Climate change is linked to many of the successes and failures of its inhabitants; warming or cooling periods led to periods of resource abundance or collapse, and in several instances to long-distance migrations. At its western and eastern margins, the Arctic also experienced the impact of Asian and European world systems, from that of the Norse in the East to the Russians in the Bering Strait.

Recent Developments in Southeastern Archaeology from Colonization to Complexity

BY DAVID G. ANDERSON AND KENNETH E. SASSAMAN

This book represents a period-by-period synthesis of southeastern prehistory designed for high school and college students, avocational archaeologists, and interested members of the general public. It also serves as a basic reference for professional archaeologists worldwide on the record of a remarkable region.

CALIFORNIA’S ANCIENT PAST: FROM THE PACIFIC TO THE RANGE OF LIGHT

BY JEANNE E. ARNOLD AND MICHAEL R. WALSH

California’s Ancient Past is an excellent introduction and overview of the archaeology and ancient peoples of this diverse and dynamic part of North America. Written in a concise and approachable format, the book provides an excellent foundation for students, the general public, and scholars working in other regions around the world. This book will be an important source of information on California’s ancient past for years to come.

NOW AVAILABLE: THE SAA PRESS ARCHIVE!

The Archive is housed on the Members’ Section of SAAweb and features electronic versions of select out-of-print titles. It is an exclusive benefit of SAA membership.
CALL FOR SUBMISSIONS

SOCIETY FOR AMERICAN ARCHAEOLOGY

84th ANNUAL MEETING

April 10–14, 2019 • Albuquerque, NM

The 2019 Call for Submissions is now available on SAAweb:
www.saa.org/call

Visit this page to find a letter from SAA’s President, information on submission policies and guidelines, and directions on how you can access the user-friendly, web-based submission system. View, download, and/or print the Call for Submissions today. We hope you consider participating in SAA’s 84th Annual Meeting!

Posters After Hours – will be back for 2019!

QUESTIONS?
E-mail us at meetings@saa.org
or call us at +1 (202) 559-7382