

Conclusions

Anthropological Pasts and Futures

DONNA M. GOLDSTEIN

When I agreed to write a commentary for this ambitious collection, I was uncertain about what I would encounter. I knew that in terms of anthropological theory, some key contemporary areas of interest have already led to productive intradisciplinary conversations among cultural anthropologists and archaeologists: for example, questions related to history and temporality, forensic evidence, materiality, ontology, and posthumanism. I hoped that scholars from the two subdisciplines named in the book's title would address and partially extend the conversation of Segal and Yanagisako (2005a) in their widely cited introduction to *Unwrapping the Sacred Bundle: Reflections on the Disciplining of Anthropology*, providing new insights into possibilities for future collaborations and shared intellectual dreams. Yet I also worried that the volume might rehearse another version of the science wars of the 1990s, which debated the question of whether the discipline of anthropology belongs to the sciences or the humanities. This debate was most recently revived in 2010, when the American Anthropological Association dropped the word *science* from its long-range plan—to the ire of members in at least two of its subfields—and then reinstated it. The introduction to this volume by Joshua Englehardt and Ivy Rieger lays out their editorial perspective as born from the pain and duress of the dissolution of their own department at Florida State University in 2009. Although the details remain a bit vague as to what transpired, their sense that new lines of communication need to be forged is a good one. This volume and its contributions are seeking a new civility among cultural anthropologists and archaeologists, pointing to their

common history and spaces of relevance to one another rather than to differences. I look forward to a potential bright future.

I should begin by disclosing that I am not bothered by the intensive specialization going on within the subfields of anthropology. We seem to be pushing forward in many new directions simultaneously, but coming together on occasion within new sorts of conversations. This seems to be a sign of a mature field, and perhaps the best way to cohabitate is to give up the idea of one subdiscipline attempting to characterize the entire intellectual trajectory of another subdiscipline. I should also admit that not long ago I found Segal and Yanagisako's (2005b) edited volume provocative and on-target, particularly their introductory remark that cultural anthropologists who "raise questions" about the four-field approach had to be willing to be seen as "difficult" (Segal and Yanagisako 2005a:1). This may explain my own initial reticence to write for this volume, for the question of our intradisciplinary cohabitation is both complicated and political, particularly as we become more specialized and interested in nurturing and developing ideas that perhaps seem specific to only one subfield. We should nurture and celebrate that sort of intellectual freedom and trust our subdisciplinary colleagues. And when moments of communion take place, I think it is important to celebrate those alliances rather than to expect them.

I have found it personally enriching to read how some archaeologists and cultural anthropologists now articulate their perspectives almost a decade after the publication of *Unwrapping the Sacred Bundle*. The chapters in the present collection have been eye-opening for me in many ways: I learned a great deal not just about archaeological interests, but also about how productive collaborations are taking place and how there is some reason to believe that cultural anthropologists and archaeologists may find shared theoretical grounds for exploration in the future. I am also pleasantly surprised with some of the expressed admiration for cultural anthropology by many of the archaeologists who contributed chapters to this volume, and this knowledge has been transformative for me.

The current volume points to some refreshing points of contact where archaeologists and cultural anthropologists are in productive intellectual dialogue. The volume asks how archaeologists and cultural anthropologists might contribute to one another's projects and offers examples of some useful pathways for such collaborations and conversations. Nevertheless, we should be aware that many cultural anthropologists and archaeologists are now asking questions driven by specialized conversations within their own subfields that require *other* collaborations with *other* disciplines. In some ways, therefore, the specific interest of the volume to the greater anthropological enterprise may be somewhat limited, since the number of contemporary cultural anthropologists working in collaboration with archaeologists is

relatively small. On the other hand, the future may present opportunities for new collaborations and the volume speaks suggestively to that possibility.

Some topics that remain out of the scope of this volume ought to be referenced. I am compelled to mention these issues briefly here since their treatment might have provided a place for honest discussion about some of the underlying tensions among subfields in anthropology. For instance, I would have liked to hear from cultural anthropology colleagues who find themselves in joint sociology and anthropology departments (with no archaeology) or in anthropology departments that have for a time “divorced” and then “reunited,” as is the case at Stanford, the home of one of the authors of *Unwrapping the Sacred Bundle* (Yanagisako). What do these earlier “breakups” mean intellectually for members of both of these subfields, and what do any subsequent reunifications mean for colleagues in the new departments created at the time of reconciliation? Relatedly, while the current volume provides examples of how cultural anthropology has provided important insights into archaeological work, there is little engagement in these chapters with some of the more mundane details of everyday academic life. The authors do not, for example, address intradepartmental issues including divergent approaches to grant funding, graduate education, mentorship, collaborative research, citation practices, and the systems of professional reward that continue to divide our practices and create new inequalities. Englehardt’s chapter 5 (this volume), titled “Archaeological Boundaries and Anthropological Frontiers: A View from South of the Border,” argues strongly that the practice of archaeology in Mexico—where archaeology is practiced without cultural anthropology—provides a vision of an archaeology without social theory, technocratically oriented, generating descriptive, atheoretical reports. I appreciate Englehardt’s message and his cautionary tale from a place where archaeology is free of a broader anthropology.

My own work on the intradisciplinarity of anthropology has focused on ethical and epistemological differences that divide approaches to research across subfields. Not long ago, I wrote an article that addressed relations between cultural anthropology and biological anthropology that emerged from the contentious *Darkness in El Dorado* debates that took place within the American Anthropological Association (Goldstein 2012). A review of arguments waged by scholars within these two subfields exposed patterned differences in disciplinary interpretations of the 1970s episode of Dr. James V. Neel’s vaccine program in the Amazon with Yanomami tribe members. These fracturing moments within the larger discipline reveal divergent epistemological and methodological assumptions that undergird subdisciplinary research practices. As a medical anthropologist with strong ties to the growing field of Science, Technology, and Society (STS), I suggested in my article that subdisciplinary assumptions and practices may present us with distinct bioethical

futures. Yet these same differences may also be beneficial for us as we encounter a new generation of science research and turn to our own intradisciplinary colleagues for insights. In *Unwrapping the Sacred Bundle*, Rena Lederman (2005:50) suggests that we embrace our “cross-subfield accents” and use them to identify “affinities and openings that make strategic cooperation possible among subfields.” For Lederman, these accents can be a distinctive disciplinary resource for addressing important scholarly and public issues. Her essay perceives a need for anthropologists to participate together in countering public and media representations on a range of issues dealing with “humanity” (see Englehardt and Rieger, Introduction, this volume; Parkinson, Conclusion, this volume). Ultimately, she suggests that we should continue to draw on the strength of the four-field tradition even as we contest its orthodoxy, a position I can also appreciate. Certainly, Lederman’s “strategic” approach may take on new meaning in this moment of shifting resources, particularly as we witness intensified neoliberal economic patterns of reward and punishment within the university setting.

For example, the archaeologist Tom Patterson (2001:146–156) writes of the neoliberal restructuring process that took place between 1974 and 2000, focusing on the professional reorganization of the American Anthropological Association between 1983 and 1993. Patterson usefully reminds us that each of the subfields has had to prioritize the acquisition of technical knowledge needed for the production of professionals. For him, it is this development, more than anything else, that is responsible for the creation of distinct intellectual islands, or in his words, “four thoroughly insulated, self-sufficient silos” (Patterson 2001:164). But his archaeologically accented review of the way globalization has been theorized in cultural anthropology is, in my view, unreasonably critical of a body of scholarship he refers to as “postmodern anthropology”—a perspective he links to neoliberal thinking, divisiveness in the profession, and even “romantic” narratives of social life. While I can to some degree appreciate Patterson’s critiques of a small corner of cultural anthropological theorizing, his reduction of all theory that fails to speak to his own Marxist-inflected interests as “postmodern” may be precisely what inspired Segal and Yanagisako (2005a) to offer an alternative view in *Unwrapping the Sacred Bundle*. For them, “postmodern anthropology” has become a phantom enemy for archaeologists like Patterson who would prefer cultural anthropologists to have fewer conversations with colleagues in the humanities and more with those in the natural sciences. Segal and Yanagisako assert that cultural anthropologists have a right to create theoretical alliances wherever they are productive, even if viewed by their colleagues as promiscuous. In fact, they suggest that anthropology’s idea of a shared four-field past is itself more myth than substance. Whatever the case, the catch-all designator “postmodern” certainly obscures the rich diversity of theoretical

perspectives that have been voiced in cultural anthropology over the last 40 years. Cultural anthropologists have debated these questions among themselves and have quite readily and productively moved forward and benefited from the debate.

Yanagisako (2005) additionally acknowledges the potential for a “flexible disciplinarity” that might bring new collaborations and shared interests among scholars in the four quadrants of the field and beyond. The current volume takes up this vision to some degree by providing compelling examples of archaeological uses of cultural anthropological theory. In line with Yanagisako’s concept of “flexibility,” the contributors suggest that there is room to imagine a productive cohabitation. Their examples seem to be consistent with Yanagisako’s (2005:96) more general proposition that “flexible disciplinarity” will “enable scholars in each of the four fields to forge innovative intra- and interdisciplinary alliances, assembling a multiplicity of new bundles.” Yet the sacred bundle addressed by these contributors is for the most part limited to archaeology and cultural anthropology and thus excludes the extradisciplinary alliances that are so important to Yanigasaki. For her, such alliances provide an important counterpoint to intradisciplinary work, since “fruitful work can proceed in the absence of agreement over methods, theories, epistemologies, or even disciplinary goals” (Yanagisako 2005:96). I applaud this volume’s optimism for a deeper intradisciplinarity between archaeology and cultural anthropology, but I also recommend caution. I suggest that some of our most pressing future challenges may not be directly in the hands of subfield participants but rather in the ever-evolving forms of knowledge production taking place in each of our silos and the new interdisciplinary arrangements that are emergent from interested individual scholars and a neoliberalizing twenty-first century university environment. Without the necessary intellectual freedom to forge creative alliances in multiple directions, including those with scholars outside our immediate discipline, cultural anthropologists may very well lose interest in the idea of cohabitation. To be very direct: many of my cultural anthropology colleagues have grown tired of the demonization of work not perceived as relevant to four-field unity as “postmodern anthropology,” and feel that some archaeologists misunderstand the elements of the debate as it transpired. I would assert that for cohabitation to truly work, we must embrace Yanigasaki’s much broader idea of creative alliance, even when these new relationships may take us out of our comfort zone.

SHARED FUTURES

The essays in this volume set forth potent arguments about a shared future, none of which, I am pleased to say, include divorce as an option. Let me begin to think aloud about shared futures by first addressing the essays written by two of the

cultural anthropologists writing for the volume, Paul Shankman and Ivy Alana Rieger. Both of these cultural anthropologists are colleagues of mine, situated at career points temporally distinct from my own. My friend and colleague Paul Shankman is retiring this year after an accomplished career, while Ivy A. Rieger, one of the coeditors of this volume and just embarking on her anthropological career, recently completed her dissertation and is teaching in Mexico. I am a cultural and medical anthropologist at mid-career and have always been at institutions that have strong archaeology as well as cultural anthropology programs. Both the University of Colorado, Boulder (my present institution), and the University of California, Berkeley (where I completed my doctorate), exhibit cordial attitudes about cohabitation, although faculty members within each subdiscipline determine the program's intellectual content and direction. As a graduate student at Berkeley in the 1990s, I had friends—fellow students and faculty—in the archaeology subdiscipline, but the reigning intellectual sociality could be characterized as that of “live and let live,” approximating Patterson's silo structure, rather than some sort of active and ongoing intellectual exchange about research. In the case of Berkeley, the silos have evolved over time into a separate but equal grouping of “houses,” with cultural anthropology in one house and archaeology in another.

Rieger, initially trained in four fields at Florida State University and then moving to the University of Colorado, tracks her own growing recognition that four-field training has become obsolete in most academic environments, even if there is sometimes shared coursework across the subdisciplines. I agree with her assessment. Yet I would also counter that when departments have the opportunity to increase faculty lines, they often do away with the remnants of four-field training in order to move the subfields in creative intellectual directions and develop more depth in individual programs. I would additionally suggest that graduate students benefit from having the curricular freedom to pursue strategic alliances that they need for their particular projects in order to best answer the research questions they are generating. I appreciate that Rieger's engagement with archaeology in Oaxaca has been productive for her particular project, both in providing depth to her own evolving research questions as well as pointing to the ways in which “local volunteers” interact with archaeological projects and material objects found at field sites and are themselves knowledge producers. But I would insist that not every cultural anthropology project would benefit from this particular engagement; more realistically, each project develops points of contact with extended intellectual areas that are specific to that project. Whereas the relationship between cultural anthropology and archaeology may be at times interpreted to have waned over these years, cultural anthropology's engagement with other disciplines has grown, as has that of archaeology. In my view, this is a productive direction rather than something to lament.

Rieger's witnessing of the process of revaluation of archaeological objects in the local setting of Oaxaca importantly enhances her understanding of the labor process and the particular forms of commodity fetishism taking place there. Yet it also puts her in the position of detailing the role that "foreign archaeology" plays in the San Juan Mixtepec region, where rumors circulate about an archaeologist who took stones without permission only to be hit by lightning. Her description of an archaeological field site where local manual laborers get paid to uncover their own archaeological heritages seems to be not a unique situation but rather one of the commonplace features embedded in archaeological practice. For instance, the documentary film *Incidents of Travel in Chichén Itzá*, directed by Himpele and Castañeda (1997), similarly (although satirically) explores the relationship of archaeological heritage sites to local populations, in this case to the vendors and artisans employed at the site of Chichén Itzá, Yucatán. The kinds of manual labor required at archaeological field sites creates these locations as points of local labor participation and illustrates how archaeological practices in the field are tied to both local and global capitalist labor economies (see, for example, Gordillo 2014). Rieger's essay thus gently prods archaeologists to consider their relationship to local populations. She urges them to consider laboral and social relationships in reflexive terms, as is done in cultural anthropology. But is this asking too much? And is this suggestion really a call for collaboration or something else?

Paul Shankman, the senior cultural anthropologist who contributes to the volume, asks the intriguing question of why anthropologists have abandoned interest in cultural evolution when archaeologists still consider it central. He considers the cultural subfield's current lack of interest in cultural evolution as inextricably connected to the larger intellectual shift that cultural anthropologists have taken during the last 40 years—which, in his understanding, is away from the epistemological guidelines of a natural science and toward an unwanted reflexivity. According to Shankman, this shift was finalized when the subfield embraced the work of Clifford Geertz in the 1970s. For Shankman, Geertz's ascendance and then extension of influence in the field was a Pyrrhic victory, in that it took cultural anthropology away from its grounding in scientific empiricism and corresponding interest in cultural evolution. Yet I would assert that the majority of scholars in cultural anthropology do not share Shankman's nostalgia for a more scientific anthropology of the pre-Geertzian era. I am among those scholars, for I find the current moment in cultural anthropology to be an exciting one, even if our work may no longer share as much obvious overlap with work in archaeology. This does not mean that I am hostile to the intellectual interests of my colleagues in archaeology, nor that I rule out the potential of future shared intellectual projects that may bring some of us closer again. When I consider, for example, the work of forensic anthropologist

Clyde Snow (his biography brings physical anthropology and its expertise into this picture as well), I find renewed enthusiasm for a shared future. Snow worked closely with archaeological teams that brought the science of forensics to human-rights investigations in Guatemala, Chile, and Argentina (see Joyce and Stover 1992), providing evidence of abuse that also became important to research in cultural anthropology. There are other excellent examples of cultural anthropological and archaeological collaborations that are even more overt, including the two-volume discussion of Hawaiian history coauthored by Patrick Kirch and Marshall Sahlins (Kirch and Sahlins 1992, 1994). To return to Shankman's essay, I should point out that this collaborative project took form long after cultural anthropology's (and Sahlins's) movement away from questions of cultural evolution.

For now, I am pleased to celebrate the academic freedom that defines cultural anthropology and to wait and see where the possibilities for future collaborative intellectual projects with archaeology may lead us. Shankman's nostalgia for an anthropology that envisions itself as a positivistic science overlooks our subfield's more recent inquiries into the scientific process. This includes a provocative set of studies undertaken by cultural anthropologists in Science and Technology Studies and medical anthropology, both of which are equipped to take the process of science as the object of study (e.g., Latour and Woolgar 1986). Such work, by illuminating the manner in which particular discourses move between scientific and nonscientific communities of knowledge (e.g. Foucault 1978), has made cultural anthropology, at least for this anthropologist, an engaging and ambitious field of scholarship. With the recent turn to areas of research identified as posthumanism, among them Bruno Latour's actor-network theory (ANT), I can readily imagine a wide range of future projects that again forge links between cultural anthropology and archaeology—projects that go far beyond simple cohabitation.

This leads me to Fredrik Fahlander's "Ontology Matters in Archaeology and Anthropology: People, Things, and Posthumanism" (chapter 3, this volume). Fahlander's chapter recognizes that in the European context where Fahlander is located (Sweden), the institutional locations of archaeology and cultural anthropology are differently mapped than in the North American context. He suggests that movement in both of these areas toward a neomaterialist theory might bring the two fields intellectually closer together. Fahlander understands posthumanism as "an attempt to break from the idea of the human as a natural point of departure and instead pursue less anthropocentric perspectives of the world," as well as a rethinking of our relations with objects, materials, nonhumans, and animals. He points to the nonanthropocentric element in Latour's (2005) ANT and a number of other theoretical directions that may fuel future conversations among archaeologists and cultural anthropologists. The direction of posthumanism might indeed

help to see the relations among humans, animals, and things in radically new ways. I greatly enjoyed this essay, particularly because it recognizes and speaks to the “trade deficit” between the two subdisciplines: that is, the sense that there is more enthusiasm from archaeology for maintaining a four-field holism than there is from cultural anthropology. Fahlander acknowledges the complex narratives that currently animate cultural anthropology and rightly suggests that recent theoretical developments have perhaps made this subfield “less easy to use as a basis for analogies in archaeological research.” Nevertheless, I share Fahlander’s optimism for the potential of posthumanism to provide a unique and possibly fresh basis for anthropology and archaeology to encounter one another again, this time with new projects in mind.

Fahlander cites some notable work within cultural anthropology that develops this position, including a 2004 article by Eduardo B. Viveiros de Castro (2004), a Brazilian anthropologist working in the Amazon. Viveiros de Castro (2012:46) has recently expanded his ideas of Amerindian perspectivism as distinct from relativism as well as a corrective to the sorts of Cartesian dualisms that have led the cultural anthropological theorization of modernity away from multiplicity, or what he refers to as “multinaturalism.” Fahlander interestingly notes that while it is hard to know what a “full-fledged posthumanist anthropology or archaeology would look like,” archaeologists are perhaps even better positioned to embrace a nonanthropocentric viewpoint than their cultural anthropology counterparts. I look forward to seeing what potential shared interests this theoretical direction may bring, and I eagerly await word from my colleagues Arthur Joyce (archaeology) and Carla Jones (cultural anthropology) who have co-taught a semester-long graduate seminar titled, “Bridging Seminar on Material Culture.” The seminar, in keeping with the theme of this volume, is meant to forward the conversation on materialism and materiality and to incite productive theoretical exchange across the archaeology and cultural anthropology divide.

Joshua Englehardt, a co-editor of this volume and another graduate of Florida State University’s four-field program, supports the four-field approach from a less traditional perspective. He questions those who situate archaeology as a science that should be distinct from anthropology and argues instead for an archaeology that is “both anthropology and a (humanistic) science.” Englehardt reasons that archaeology contains elements of subjectivity, humanism, and the “arts” within its very practice, a characterization that would no doubt please many cultural anthropologists. He thus refuses to accept the claims of some of his colleagues that archaeology’s employment of techniques such as laser ablation and X-ray fluorescence fulfills the classification requirements of a natural science. Instead, he points out that both archaeology and cultural anthropology are interested in explaining

sociocultural change, and both are dependent on a larger autonomous body of theory that is independent of each subdiscipline. Most significantly and as mentioned earlier, he suggests that archaeology in the US context has benefited from its intradisciplinary relationship with cultural anthropology. Englehardt's description of Mexican archaeology is a critical one; Englehardt cautions us that an archaeology separate from anthropology is intellectually stymied.

This insight brings me to the other chapters that attempt to connect the cultures of the distant past studied by archaeologists with the living contemporary cultures studied by cultural anthropologists. Chapter 1, by Vincent La Motta (an archaeologist) and John Monaghan (a cultural anthropologist), discusses research collaborations in Mesoamerica and the Pueblo Southwest. It begins with the premise that "today's people maintain significant social and cultural links to the past." In their view, this continuity has extensive material expressions, "ranging from art and iconography to technologies." The authors note the rich historical connections and overlaps of interest between archaeologists and cultural anthropologists within Mesoamerica and the Pueblo Southwest, but are also realistic about the contemporary situation: "The ethnographic work that is cited by archaeologists tends to be work that focuses on material culture, religion, and cosmology. For areal cultural anthropologists, the archaeological work on societies that existed thousands of years ago, while interesting, has little relevance for understanding the lives of people today." La Motta and Monaghan also note that even 75 years ago, "well-informed observers at the center of the discipline felt that archaeology and cultural anthropology were 'growing apart' for theoretical and methodological reasons." In contrast to Shankman's assessment about the reason cultural anthropology and archaeology have grown apart (chapter 2, this volume), their insight leads La Motta and Monaghan to conclude that it may not be any particular conceptual scheme that has drawn us to this waning. Rather, they ask why a significant level of collaboration between archaeology and cultural anthropology characterizes scholarship in the Pueblo Southwest while in Mesoamerica this collaboration faded. They suggest that the answer lies in the "gaps that exist in the temporal foci of archaeological, ethnographic, and, to some degree, historical research in Mesoamerica" as compared with the Pueblo Southwest, where there seems to be more continuity between groups in different time periods. Their research suggests that in areas where the temporal foci has more continuity, we might expect more collaborations.

Lilia Fernández Souza (chapter 7, this volume) asks what food can tell us about society and about what the continuity in the object of the *metate* tells us about food, labor, and humankind. Her methods approach archaeological, ethnographic, and ethnohistoric research in a manner that makes use of multiple subdisciplinary strengths. She points out that some precolumbian techniques for food preparation

and traditional ingredients, for example, may have survived into the present in regions such as the Yucatán. Fernández Souza notes that “the deep history of these techniques [e.g., the use of the *metate* and the roasting in underground ovens] provides clues for the archaeological identification and interpretation of domestic Maya kitchen assemblages.” Fernández Souza recognizes that these translations of ethnographic data—collected in the present and yet connected to the distant past—are tricky: “[it is] clearly erroneous to assume that modern rural food directly parallels precolumbian Maya cuisine.” Fernández Souza’s chapter suggests that thematic continuities—food and materiality—have the potential to bring archaeology and cultural anthropology into productive conversation, and that this conjunctive inclusionary approach has provided her with clues to the past. For me, her suggestion that people over the age of 30 express food nostalgia could very well be a starting point for further cultural analysis.

Cultural anthropologist Ashley Kistler (chapter 8, this volume) describes how in working with Q’eqchi’ communities to recover and instantiate the history of the sixteenth-century hero, visionary, and “grandfather” of all Chamelqueños, Aj Pop B’atz, in the aftermath of Guatemala’s 36-year civil war, she became inspired to collaborate with archaeologists of Mayan societies who could supplement the contemporary ethnographic work with excavations at historical sites throughout the region. Kistler’s project came to fruition as a cultural revitalization project of a historical figure. Her reach for archaeological collaboration and verification makes a great deal of sense and led to a productive interdisciplinary collaboration.

Another potential starting point for collaboration among cultural anthropologists and archaeologists is suggested in David Small’s essay (chapter 9, this volume). While Small points to the understanding of economics in ancient Greek polities to seek connections to the organization of Postclassic Mayan polities, it could be argued that this methodological line of argument could produce useful insights across distinct temporalities. One would obviously have to be very careful with such claims, however. Kent Fowler (archeologist) and Derek Johnson (cultural anthropologist) seek in chapter 10 of this volume to compare practices of fishing in Gujarat and potting in South Africa as locations to apply the theorization of “choice” and “wellbeing.” While they engage contemporary cases as a means of gaining insight into historical conditions, they also note that “the translation of wellbeing into archaeology raises all sorts of tricky questions because archaeology can most easily conceive of wellbeing in terms of material assets and consequences, but it is more difficult to infer social relations and particularly perceptions of resources in both material and immaterial terms.”

Cultural anthropologist Joseph Hellweg’s essay (chapter 6, this volume) revisits archaeological and ethnographic work related to ideas of the “tribe” and to

descent theory in order to offer a reappraisal. Recognizing the work of his colleague William Parkinson (2002a, 2002b) and the archaeologist Severin Fowles (2002) as involved in a conversation with cultural anthropologists about the concept of “tribe,” Hellweg seeks to “critique the assumption that ethnographic insights only pertain to short-term timespans.” Revisiting Evans-Pritchard’s classic ethnographic work on the Nuer (e.g., Evans-Pritchard 1940, 1951) and McKinnon’s (2000) critique of that work, Hellweg argues that “the dynamics of kinship, alliance, and gender that regulated ‘tribal’ life did so well into the *longue durée*.” Drawing on the work of cultural anthropologists in the field of kinship studies, Hellweg identifies the concept of “the house” (instead of the notion of lineage) as possibly leading to a mutually beneficial and fruitful collaboration between archaeologists and cultural anthropologists in the analysis of social systems. Hellweg thus also perhaps helps to explain the use of the term *house* to describe the two remaining branches of anthropology represented at the department at the University of California, Berkeley—my alma mater. Hellweg further suggests that “we must reformulate or abandon notions of lineal descent and tribal organization to remain faithful to both the ethnographic and archaeological records.” His work suggests “that each ‘house’ formation in a given context is a material manifestation of a particular ideology of kinship and alliance rather than constituting a universal, one-size-fits-all typology.” Hellweg thus concludes his essay by celebrating the possibility of a conversation between archaeologists and ethnographers that would begin with the notion of “the house” as a critical starting point.

CONCLUSIONS

The chapters that constitute this volume are focused on a relatively short history of anthropology as a discipline, exploring contemporary possibilities for collaboration across the subfields of cultural anthropology and archaeology. While we may not all share Segal and Yanagisako’s (2005a) idea that anthropology’s four-field past is more mythical than real, we would perhaps all agree that an earlier period in our field’s history produced more enthusiasm for a four-field approach than is experienced today. The contributions in this volume seek to reinvigorate this enthusiasm by pointing to areas of current scholarship where the work of archaeology is animated by cultural anthropological theory and by displaying a few examples of cultural anthropology drawing insight from the archaeological record. By indicating strong interest in a continued cohabitation, the described projects instantiate at least one corner of Yanagisako’s notion of a “flexible disciplinarity”—that is, a sensibility that respects creative alliances across intra-, inter-, and transdisciplinary boundaries and that seizes on intellectual alliances

in the context of a still-extant academic freedom. For example, many of the authors featured in this volume express the idea that an archaeology without cultural anthropology would be intellectually stymied. To that end, many of the authors, including myself, specify a variety of burgeoning theoretical areas in cultural anthropology that have the potential to inspire a new set of collaborations, among them studies related to history and temporality, materiality, forensic evidence, ontology, and posthumanism, as well as the field of STS. But these creative alliances must grow organically rather than by decree. The facilitation of a kind of freedom that will allow members of all four subfields to seek creative alliances of their choosing will be healthy, not harmful, for the discipline. It will ultimately enable stronger forms of collegiality and collaboration across subfields, perhaps even battling the widespread notion that cultural anthropologists and archaeologists are together only because of historical accident. But this means that restricted visions of intradisciplinarity and the characterization of all post-Geertzian cultural anthropological theory as the denigrated “postmodern anthropology” will have to cease.

In conclusion, I feel it is important to remind readers that cohabitation will present challenges that unfortunately are also inflected by the neoliberalizing effects of university-level politics. These are the politics that increasingly reward certain forms of economic thinking above other forms of intellectual development. In the age of Big Data, research seen as having the potential to produce large-scale grants and multiple collaboratively authored publications is valorized as superior to other kinds of intellectual pursuits, among them the single-authored ethnographic book projects that are still definitive in the subfield of cultural anthropology. Because anthropology departments typically involve scholars at both ends of this valuation scale, it is important to come to agreement about how to recognize excellence in these very distinct models. While Yanagisako’s (2005) reference to “flexible” disciplinarity did not necessarily include its potential post-Fordist meanings, future musings on cohabitation among the subfields of anthropology—whether two, three, four, or more—will have to consider the differential valuations of our subdisciplines by those on the outside as well as inside.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my gratitude to coeditors Joshua Englehardt and Ivy A. Rieger for inviting me to comment on the chapters in this collection. Special thanks to Joshua Englehardt for his patience and to Magda Stawkowski for her excellent comments. I am also entirely grateful to Kira Hall for her brilliant insights on the matters I discuss here and for her ability to inspire clarity in the written form.

REFERENCES

- Evans-Pritchard, Edward Evan. 1940. *The Nuer*. Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- Evans-Pritchard, Edward Evan. 1951. *Kinship and Marriage among the Nuer*. Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- Foucault, Michel. 1978. *History of Sexuality*. vol. 1. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Fowles, Severin. 2002. "From Social Type to Social Process: Placing 'Tribe' in a Historical Framework." In *The Archaeology of Tribal Societies*, ed. William A. Parkinson, 13–33. Ann Arbor: International Monographs in Prehistory.
- Goldstein, Donna M. 2012. "Experimentalité: Pharmaceutical Insights into Anthropology's Epistemologically Fractured Self." In *Medicine and the Politics of Knowledge*, ed. Susan Levine, 118–151. Cape Town, South Africa: HSRC.
- Gordillo, Gastón R. 2014. *Rubble: The Afterlife of Destruction*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1215/9780822376903>.
- Himpele, Jeffrey, and Quetzil E. Castañeda. 1997. *Incidents of Travel in Chichén Itzá*. Video, 90 minutes.
- Joyce, Christopher, and Eric Stover. 1992. *Witnesses from the Grave: The Stories Bones Tell*. New York: Ballantine Books.
- Kirch, Patrick V., and Marshall Sahlins. 1992. *Anahulu: The Anthropology of History in the Kingdom of Hawaii*. vol. 1. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kirch, Patrick V., and Marshall Sahlins. 1994. *Anahulu: The Anthropology of History in the Kingdom of Hawaii*. vol. 2. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Latour, Bruno. 2005. *Reassembling the Social: An Introduction to Actor-Network Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Latour, Bruno, and Steve Woolgar. 1986. *Laboratory Life: The Construction of Scientific Facts*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Lederman, Rena. 2005. "Unchosen Grounds: Cultivating Cross-Subfield Accents for a Public Voice." In *Unwrapping the Sacred Bundle: Reflections on the Disciplining of Anthropology*, ed. Daniel A. Segal and Sylvia J. Yanagisako, 49–77. Durham, NC: Duke University Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1215/9780822386841-003>.
- McKinnon, Susan. 2000. "Domestic Exceptions: Evans-Pritchard and the Creation of Nuer Patrilineality and Equality." *Cultural Anthropology* 15(1):35–83. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1525/can.2000.15.1.35>.
- Parkinson, William A., ed. 2002a. *The Archaeology of Tribal Societies*. Ann Arbor: International Monographs in Prehistory.
- Parkinson, William A. 2002b. "Introduction: Archaeology and Tribal Societies." In *The Archaeology of Tribal Societies*, ed. William A. Parkinson, 1–12. Ann Arbor: International Monographs in Prehistory.

- Patterson, Thomas C. 2001. "Anthropology in the Neoliberal Era." In *A Social History of Anthropology in the United States*, ed. Thomas C. Patterson, 135–164. New York: Berg.
- Segal, Daniel A., and Sylvia J. Yanagisako. 2005a. "Introduction." In *Unwrapping the Sacred Bundle: Reflections on the Disciplining of Anthropology*, ed. Daniel A. Segal and Sylvia J. Yanagisako, 1–23. Durham, NC: Duke University Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1215/9780822386841-001>.
- Segal, Daniel A., and Sylvia J. Yanagisako, eds. 2005b. *Unwrapping the Sacred Bundle: Reflections on the Disciplining of Anthropology*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1215/9780822386841>.
- Viveiros de Castro, Eduardo Batalha. 2004. "Exchanging Perspectives: The Transformation of Objects into Subjects in Amerindian Ontologies." *Common Knowledge* 10(3):463–484. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1215/0961754X-10-3-463>.
- Viveiros de Castro, Eduardo Batalha. 2012. *Cosmological Perspectivism in Amazonia and Elsewhere*. Masterclass Series 1. Manchester: HAU Network of Ethnographic Theory.
- Yanagisako, Sylvia J. 2005. "Flexible Disciplinarity: Beyond the Americanist Tradition." In *Unwrapping the Sacred Bundle: Reflections on the Disciplining of Anthropology*, ed. Daniel A. Segal and Sylvia J. Yanagisako, 78–98. Durham, NC: Duke University Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1215/9780822386841-004>.

