

KROEBER ANTHROPOLOGICAL  
SOCIETY, 100(1): 26-37

## **Speaking the Same Language: Bridging the Ever-Growing Disciplinary Divide Between Cultural Anthropology and Archaeology**

*Ivy Hepp and Joshua Englehardt, Florida State University*

### **Introduction**

This article addresses the growing disciplinary divide between cultural anthropology and archaeology. It is inspired primarily by our experiences as a cultural anthropologist and an archaeologist at the 2009 American Anthropological Association (AAA) Annual Meeting in Philadelphia. We wondered why it appeared that so few archaeologists attended the AAA meeting. Upon reflection, we considered that perhaps the reason was that there were too many sessions in which the theoretical focus, language, and conclusions of the papers offered were so obtuse and jargon-filled that we could not understand their message. We found ourselves attending sessions where abstract concepts such as “post-Fordist affect” were used, where confusing terms were not defined, and where theoretical jargon was inappropriately applied to the data being presented. In some cases it was difficult to translate what these sessions were actually about and where the actual “anthropology” resided, thus creating a language barrier that was, in some cases, too high to scale, both for us personally and for many of our colleagues in cultural anthropology and archaeology alike. We were left contemplating the meaning and utility of the ideas presented in these types of abstract sessions to our own research. After we discussed our experiences, we began to feel that a critical lapse in dialogue is creating a schism between our subdisciplines.

We regard these events as symptomatic of an increasing rift between our subfields. Too often, it appears that cultural anthropologists and archaeologists are not speaking the same language, despite a great deal of shared method and theory. To many archaeologists, current cultural anthropological discourse has become so infused with postmodern thought as to become nearly unintelligible and difficult to apply to archaeological research. In contrast, some cultural anthropologists may feel that American archaeology has attempted to situate itself so much as a positivist science that it has little use for cultural anthropology other than as a theory mill. Intradisciplinary dialogue is, thus, in danger of becoming somewhat sterile. Specifically, cultural anthropologists and archaeologists are talking to each other less frequently, thus resulting in a paucity of new research that combines aspects of more than one subdiscipline. In this article, we will engage with current debates regarding the state of holism, detail some of the signs of this disciplinary divide, and offer suggestions on how the relationship may be repaired. We argue that holism, defined as the presence of methodological, theoretical, and interdisciplinary dialogue between the subfields, can persist in anthropology through the active transference of ideas that are produced, nourished, and sustained by

complementary research and speaking the same language, which ultimately can bridge the growing gap within our shared discipline.

### **What's Holism Got to Do with It? Current Debates Regarding the State of Anthropology**

The specialization within and between the subfields has provided the fuel for debates on whether the proliferation of diversity represents the 'doomsday march' of anthropology as a discipline. There are arguments that holism is dead or that it never existed. There have been worries that science with a capital "S" is what is driving us apart (Flannery 1982). Recent debate regarding this issue emerged immediately after the conclusion of the 2010 AAA Meeting when the officers of the AAA changed the mission statement of the organization from a plan of advancing "anthropology as the science that studies humankind in all its aspects" to advancing "public understanding of humankind in all its aspects."<sup>1</sup> This alteration in wording quickly sparked a series of blog opinions, journalistic coverage, and official responses by the AAA executive board regarding the issue. Dr. Virginia Dominguez, the current president of the American Anthropological Association, noted in an interview with *The New York Times* that "the word had been dropped because the board sought to include anthropologists who do not locate their work within the sciences, as well as those who do."<sup>2</sup> Bloggers outside of the discipline such as Alice Dreger of *Psychology Today* concluded that the issue of "science" always appears as a source of division during the AAA annual conference. To this point, Dreger argued that "they [anthropologists] go and meet with their own actual disciplinary types... so that the real scientists don't have to deal too much with the fluff-head cultural anthropological types who think science is just another way of knowing."<sup>3</sup> The varied sentiments of professionals inside and outside of anthropology regarding the status of the term "science" in the mission statement of the discipline reveals the presence of a tense debate regarding attempts to reconcile differences due to the inherent diversity of the field.

In the introductory chapter to *Unwrapping the Sacred Bundle – Reflections on the Disciplining of Anthropology*, Segal and Yanagisako asked cultural anthropologists "when was the last time that research on hominid evolution or primates was helpful to you in thinking about your ethnographic data?" (2005:11). This question was meant to promote reflection on whether, in practice, four-field holism exists. The very need to ask the question itself suggests that the concept of holism represents a shallow philosophy that many American scholars preach, but few, if any, follow. Indeed, the 2010 AAA Annual Meeting in New Orleans and the recent debate about the inclusion of the term "science" in the mission statement of the AAA reflect this sentiment while reiterating that familiar sense of confusion and displacement we encountered at the 2009 meeting. Additionally, the field at large seems torn by the issue of the placement and articulation of its four appendages. We are left wondering whether some of the limbs should be amputated, replanted in other departments, or injected with growth hormones.

Active dialogue between the subfields of anthropology does appear today in undergraduate and graduate course training, where students are typically provided with a series of courses on the four fields. For undergraduates, these courses usually represent

introductory overviews of the specific subfield being taught. At the graduate level, some universities apply the four-field training more rigorously, requiring individual seminar courses on each subdiscipline before the student can advance in their degree program. However, graduate degree programs vary widely in their interpretations of a four-field education. Our own experiences in M.A. and Ph.D. graduate programs at Florida State University and the University of Colorado at Boulder reveal the diversity of graduate training at two major research institutions.<sup>4</sup> At Florida State University, anthropology graduate students were required to enroll in four independent core courses in linguistic, cultural, archaeological, and biological anthropology, respectively. The students were also required to successfully pass comprehensive exams in each of the subdisciplines in order to continue with their degree program. In contrast, a recent change in policy at the University of Colorado at Boulder has resulted in the development of a single semester graduate course, entitled the “Proseminar” which covers the three subfields of biological, cultural, and archaeological anthropology taught at this university. All incoming graduate students must successfully complete this course in addition to one core course specific to their subfield in order to advance in their degree program.

These examples of exposure to four-field (or three-field) knowledge gained at the undergraduate and graduate levels reveals the importance of preserving some measure of dialogue as a fundamental element of anthropological training. It implies that, in Americanist anthropology, a cultural sociocultural anthropologist would theoretically have enough knowledge to tutor students in physical anthropology, and an archaeologist can confidently instruct an undergraduate course on cultural anthropology.<sup>5</sup> However, Segal and Yanagisako noted that the perceived sense of unity espoused in four-field seminar courses is rarely reiterated in actual practice and “students are likely to be socialized into some minimal, yet sturdy, acceptance of the orthodox status of the four-field model” (2005:6), something which cannot be deconstructed or debated. The inundation of this model of unity, they argued, forces all students and scholars into either a full acceptance of the four-field model or into exile if they do not agree. We believe, however, that the application of the four-field model in contemporary American anthropology departments does not force “full acceptance” but instead promotes differential interpretations of the model through dialogue among the subfields as evidenced by faculty projects present in our respective departments.<sup>6</sup>

We equate the concept of holism with the existence and perpetuation of dialogue between the subfields that does not require the complete combination of all four subdisciplines within a single project. Some examples of faculty research prove that inter-subfield dialogue represents a fundamental part of anthropological practice and departmental organization. Frank Marlowe (2007, 2009) of Florida State University, Darna Dufour (1987, 1997) of the University of Colorado at Boulder, and Michelle Sauter (Sauter & Cuzzo 2008, 2009) of the University of Colorado at Boulder utilize cultural anthropological studies related to socioeconomic, dietary, and technological choices among indigenous groups in Africa, South America, and Madagascar. They combine these with biological and physical anthropological methods to approach a variety of research questions related to health, environmental interactions, primate–human relations, food choice, and social organization.

J. Terrence McCabe (2010; May & McCabe 2004) of the University of Colorado

at Boulder utilizes cultural ecological models and biological anthropological methods related to biobehavioral responses to study the culture and social organization of the Turkana and other groups in Africa. Lynne Schepartz (1988, 1995) and Glen Doran (2000, 2001) of Florida State University bridge the subdisciplines of archaeology and biological anthropology in their independent analyses of skeletal remains and material culture based on archaeological evidence from populations in China and Florida. Carole McGranahan (2005, 2010) and Gerardo Gutiérrez (2005, 2008) of the University of Colorado at Boulder enrich their respective analyses of Tibetan culture and prehispanic Mexican ethnohistoric narratives through a utilization of methods and theory borrowed from the discipline of history. These particular combinations of scholarly research reveal that anthropologists, who reside in independent subfields, can be in dialogue with one another through shared anthropological knowledge and their mutual engagement with an external academic discipline.

The debate over the use or disuse of the term “science” in the mission statement of the AAA, the discomfort we felt at the 2009 meeting, and the recent experiences and reported observations of our friends and colleagues at the 2010 meeting do not adequately represent the level of cross-subdisciplinary dialogue we perceive is present in our respective departments. During the 2010 AAA Annual Meeting in New Orleans, however, we knew of a linguist in attendance who noted that the constant relegation of linguistics to the figurative basement of anthropological inquiry was the exact reason that “we broke off and started having our own meeting.” The archaeologists we encountered, including several of those who participated in our session about bridging the gap between the subdisciplines, paradoxically noted that they “did not feel welcome,” “couldn’t find many (or any) sessions of interest to them,” and felt that the meeting environment was “stuck up” or “stiff.” Several of the presenters commented that they greatly preferred the SAA (Society for American Archaeology) meeting, where archaeologist is the primary subdiscipline represented and the environment seemed, in their opinion, more welcoming and jovial.

From these observations, we are left wondering whether we, as anthropologists, are unconsciously splitting the subfields because we are inherently more comfortable among our “own kind.” We wonder what theoretical paradigms or competing methods of inquiry in anthropology place wedges between the subdisciplines. With such a diverse atmosphere in place, we are also curious to whom the AAA meetings actually market and which perspectives are actively represented. It, thus, appears that the “sacred bundle” as it stands in 2011 has not so much been unwrapped as it has been split apart, its various components forcibly extracted and separated from one another resulting in the development of the authority of cultural anthropology in the United States. However, one could certainly make the argument that cultural anthropology has been paramount since the birth of anthropology as an academic discipline in the United States. Furthermore, the cultural branch is also a place where politics reign and certain perspectives, theoretical insights, geographic regions of study, and genres of indigenous and nonindigenous peoples are also disregarded at the meeting. For example, prominent panel themes for the 2010 AAA meeting included “circulation,” “education,” and “migration,” thus representing what are supposed to be “hot topics” right now. A less charitable reading of these choices might suggest, however, that we have failed in our

independent quests to be good or relevant anthropologists if we don't focus on these issues. Although these themes do change each year, the preeminence of cultural anthropology remains, thus fostering an atmosphere of exclusion for other subdisciplines or those cultural anthropologists whose scholarship does not directly relate to the themes of the meeting.

There are no easy answers to the troubling issues questions of holism and sub-disciplinary scholarly belonging in Americanist anthropology. James Clifford noted that anthropology as a field needs to go through a process of "disciplining" that "is less about creating consensus than about managing dissent, less about sustaining a core tradition than about negotiating borders and constructing coalitions" (2005:24). We believe that this view should be embraced in anthropology in order to keep the discipline salient in the coming decades. Furthermore, we agree with Clifford that although there will always be reassignments and shifts within the discipline, there are several tenets that each subfield continues to share, thus keeping the discipline whole. Specifically, the study of materials (cultural, archaeological, linguistic, or biological), the kinds of methods utilized, and the focus on the paradigm of culture each unite anthropology (2005). Therefore, anthropology should not fear sharing information with other disciplines like history, geo-sciences, chemistry, women's studies, religious studies, or modern languages, or utilizing data generated and methods employed within these disciplines.

Robert Borofsky (2002) searched for the presence of holism in American anthropology by conducting an extensive literature review of 100 years of *American Anthropologist* in order to reveal whether holism has, since the time of Boas, truly been practiced by the anthropologists who published in that journal. His answer was a resounding "No." The analysis revealed that, in fact, holism was a "myth" and that "only 311 of 3,264 articles surveyed (or 9.5 percent of the total)" (2002:463) utilized cross-disciplinary data or methods in any significant way. Further, he noted that part of the contradiction inherent in modern anthropological discourse resides in the fact that we (or it, as a discipline) have a penchant for specialization while "aspiring to be an intellectually, holistic discipline" (472). We believe that specialization does not preclude holistic practice and, in fact, encourages scholars in Americanist anthropology to wear many academic "hats" and to freely explore and transfer ideas between subfields in collaborative and constructive ways.

Laura Nader commented on the issue of specialization by noting that "the two tendencies, fragmentation and holism, move us back and forth...with increasing specialization we divide and subdivide and still call it anthropology" (2001:610). The ability to have such diversity and still consider ourselves one discipline speaks again to the unique position of anthropology as an inclusive social science, one that (in theory at least) welcomes multiple perspectives and which "has the capacity to generate the kind of introspection that can influence the future role of human beings on Earth" (617). However, academic opinions remain mixed on the issue of specialization and cohesion in anthropology. For example, although scholars such as Mariza Peirano have argued that the discipline will always maintain a "socio-genetic aim toward an appreciation for, and an understanding of, difference" (1998:105), others such as Susan Gillespie maintain that subfields like archaeology have "never fit well within anthropology" (2004:13). The discussion, then, should not hinge upon arguments of whether or not the discipline

is holistic, but instead encourage the diversity and interdisciplinary dialogue that already exists within anthropology, despite inherent differences in focus and methodology.

### **Diagnosing the Problem**

In our opinion, the primary cause of the rift between cultural anthropology and archaeology appears to be related to the adherence to natural science models in archaeology and the adoption of the postmodern critique in cultural anthropology – and the misapplication of both to anthropological questions. The current schism in anthropology revolves around the continued pilfering of sexy or fashionable theoretical perspectives from a variety of disciplines without regard to their applicability to strictly anthropological inquiry. Critiques of the obtuse jargon often used in popularly cited anthropological literature have already emerged, notably from Catherine Lutz, who defined theory as “a process in which statements are denuded of their origin in a writer and his or her experiences are stripped of their reference to a concrete phenomenal world of specific contexts and history” (1995:253). This process of abstraction results in the illusion of broad applicability which, as anthropologists, we should be wary of because of our close relationship with living human beings whose lives, cultures, and histories we academically represent.

A major point of division between our subdisciplines, based on our own conversations and experiences as a cultural anthropologist and archaeologist at the AAAs, centers on the presence of postmodern theory and its varying, sometimes inappropriate, applications in modern anthropology. It strikes us that too often postmodernism is not adequately defined by its proponents and critics, nor do many consider either the potentiality or limits of the concept in anthropology. For our purposes, we consider postmodernism to be an intellectual current characterized by an analysis of relative truth, whose hallmark is the inclusion of multivocality in the construction of the anthropological text, along with a denial of any metanarrative capable of describing or explaining quotidian reality.

There are various ways in which postmodernism has been effectively applied in cultural anthropology; for example, Ulysse’s (2007) examination of the use of reflexivity in ethnographic prose, or Bruner’s (2005) insistence on the inclusion of the narratives of both visitors and indigenous peoples in the ethnography of tourism. As Jill Dubisch (1995) has noted, postmodern approaches to cultural anthropology have the potential to span the boundary between diverse systems of meaning and to offer solutions to the challenge of “translating” other cultures through the vehicle of our own language. In postprocessual archaeology, Ian Hodder and Scott Hutson (2003) have applied postmodern approaches with success, particularly through the utilization of the concept of contextual analysis. Specifically, Hodder and Hutson argued that “even more than written text, material culture meanings embodies [sic] pragmatic and functional concerns” (2003:205). In this respect, postmodernist anthropological thought encourages archaeologists to move beyond strictly positivist approaches and critically question the dichotomy between subject and object.

Thus, postmodernist approaches to cultural analyses have the potential to engage systems of meaning in ways that can be useful to archaeologists and cultural an-

thropologists alike, but we believe that such approaches, like any theoretical paradigm, can also be caught in a quagmire of jargon that many anthropologists find incomprehensible and inappropriate for the discipline at large. In the book *Fashionable Nonsense: Postmodern Intellectuals' Abuse of Science*, Alan Sokol and Jean Bricmont (1999) illustrated the danger inherent in the specific application of postmodern theory to ostensibly scientific inquiry. Postmodern approaches in anthropology have the potential to radically redefine the notion of "truth," thus necessitating a redefinition of knowledge and a resituation of the potentiality and limits of scientific understanding. However, many scholars may fear that postmodernism will lead us into methodological relativism in addition to philosophical and epistemic relativism. A potential danger of this is that knowledge produced under such relativist methodologies can rest on arguments founded on metaphor or analogy rather than actual evidence. As Sokol and Bricmont (1999) rightly point out, any half-formulated theory cannot be redeemed simply by wrapping it in symbols or formulae. Such arguments warn of a kind of "intellectual terrorism" in which meaningless phrases are manipulated and technical terms shamelessly bandied about, with the aim of impressing and intimidating the reader (Sokol & Bricmont 1999). Therefore, it appears possible to learn from Julia Kristeva and others (1980) that poetic language can be theorized in terms of the cardinality of the continuum, or from Baudrillard and Glaser (1995) that modern war takes place in non-Euclidean space. What does that practically mean for either the cultural anthropologist or the archaeologist? We contend that inaccessible terminologies and inappropriate theory-borrowing from any paradigm results in an alienation from our materials of study, our subjects of study, and our interlocutors. Thus, in order for cross-disciplinary dialogue to flourish, any highly contextualized and historically specific theoretical approaches built for and successful in specific disciplines or ethnographic inquiries should be approached with caution when reframing them for broader application.

When postmodern or postprocessual theoretical paradigms enter archaeological thought, a backlash often occurs because the opinion among proponents of a more positivist, processual archaeology is that such fashionable approaches are not truly scientific or methodologically rigorous. The importation of these concepts, especially in archaeology, may make for provocative reading, but it has the potential to reinforce barriers among the anthropological subdisciplines because of inherent disagreement from camps on both sides as to how, or if, such concepts should be used. This includes, for example, the application of queer theory to the analysis of shipwreck archaeology, where critiques of inherent androcentrism present in maritime analysis seek to include female agency through "queering," which, we contend, actually results in keeping women analytically placed as subalterns by queering them as Others and, thus, does not further archaeological research in this circumstance (Ransley 2005). The same critique applies equally to the importation of many other trendy but ambiguous postmodern concepts in cultural anthropological discourse.

Unfortunately, even when terms or concepts are misapplied, inappropriate borrowing is often rewarded with publication – sexy theory sells in both of our subdisciplines. This may appear desirable in the short term, but in the long term we do our discipline a disservice. Of course, we do not suggest that interdisciplinary theoretical exchange is necessarily objectionable – any productive advances have resulted from

such cooperation, between linguistics and anthropology, for example, but we must recognize inherent limits. We must ask ourselves a) if the theory or concept we borrow is applicable to our various analyses and research goals and b) if we fully understand current debate surrounding the theory itself. If the answer to either of these questions is no, we should perhaps pause in our search for external explanatory paradigms. Failure to do so is simply disguising bad research with the bells and whistles of sexy formulae and unfounded conjecture. For example, Schrodinger's (2008) cat and set theory may sound impressive, but we haven't a clue as to what either of them really means. As such, we doubt that their meaning is actually applicable to anthropological investigation.

The final point we wish to make concerns symptoms related to the increasing trend on the part of archaeologists to consider themselves hard scientists. We would contend that just as some archaeologists are turned off by several postmodern themes found in cultural anthropology, archaeologists are also frequently guilty of inappropriate borrowing from the natural sciences, and employing the same sort of jargon and pseudotechnical language found in some postmodern cultural anthropological discourse. Of course, in spite of some perceived backlash on the part of cultural anthropology against "archaeology with a capital 'S,'" methods and technical approaches borrowed from the natural sciences do have great potential in archaeological investigation, just as the tempered use of postmodern theory in cultural anthropology does – and positivism is not as taboo as some seem to think.<sup>7</sup> However, in our zeal to "quantify" cultural change and utilize the latest methods and techniques, limits must be recognized. Both archaeologists and cultural anthropologists must not lose sight of the human element that remains at the heart of our discipline. Archaeology and anthropology walk a fine line between the "humanities" and the "sciences" that puts us in a potentially unique situation. We should take advantage of the best of both worlds, and not try to gravitate towards one extreme or the other (Kuper & Marks 2011). The position of anthropology astride the divide between the natural and social sciences is one of its main strengths. However, the polarization that we have witnessed firsthand in our own academic experiences and at the last two AAA Annual Meetings is quickly eroding that strength.<sup>8</sup>

## Conclusion

Where do we go from here? To us, the answer is evident. We need to drop the jargon and start speaking the same language. Transferrable ideas useful to both cultural anthropology and archaeology can be and are produced, nourished, and sustained by complementary research, and ultimately have the potential to bridge the gap between us. The current debates regarding the state of holism and the issue of including the term "science" in the mission statement and long-term plan of the American Anthropological Association reveal that both semantics and politics affect policy and interdisciplinary relations. We believe that holism can be defined as the presence of methodological, theoretical, and data-driven dialogue between the subfields. Furthermore, anthropological research does not require the complete use of all four subdisciplines in a single project in order to be considered holistic. While a truly four-field approach may be desirable in the abstract, in practice, few projects require input from all four subfields.<sup>9</sup> Instead, collaboration and complementarity should be the goal of anthropological research, and



debates regarding the issue of holism obscure the presence of intra- and interdisciplinary dialogue, which flourishes in contemporary anthropology. We believe that, although we are approaching anthropological analysis from a variety of angles, we are all, in essence, looking at the same questions. Otherwise, anthropology could not define itself as a cohesive discipline. Therefore, we should actively make a collective effort to work together to produce scholarship that is useful to a wide range of scholars inside (and outside) of our shared discipline, not simply to a select group that shares a particular theoretical perspective that inappropriately barricades the subfields from interaction with each other.

In writing and discussing several drafts of this article, we quickly recognized the severity of the schism between the subfields, and were challenged by this harsh reality to question our own positions and roles in the debate. We found that, in particular, identifying the meaning, role, and potential utility of postmodernism (as a current tangent in anthropological theory) was intractably difficult, especially in terms of establishing who or what defines the use of this paradigm in anthropology as a whole. The accumulation of evidence of negative effects came as a reality check for both of us and made us realize that the division between the subfields is real and tangible. Although paying lip service to the role of postmodernism or the natural sciences in anthropology does not provide a solution to the divide outright, it does illustrate one important basis for the larger problem. That is, when theoretical jargon from any school of thought inappropriately infiltrates anthropological discourse, it becomes increasingly difficult to collaborate between the subfields. Highlighting linkages between subfields in the research of our colleagues offers tangible evidence that dialogue is occurring, and that progress can be made in reconciling intradisciplinary differences.

We owe it to ourselves and our discipline to work together to find a middle ground and reignite a more productive discourse between our fields. As we observed during the recent AAA Annual Meeting, focusing on the differences between the subfields results in the active exclusion of research that does not conform to the current theoretical and methodological perspectives of AAA membership. Furthermore, every subfield except cultural anthropology is grossly underrepresented at what is marketed to be a national meeting of all anthropologists. However, we contend that speaking the same language without an overdose of jargon, as evidenced by faculty research in our departments, is what fosters diversity within the field of anthropology. We, thus, conclude that the conversation and introspection that we shared and experienced in writing this article should be taking place more often between archaeologists and cultural anthropologists (and in the discipline in general) as it is only through such dialogue that we can begin to repair the divide.

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup> For sources on this debate, please reference: "Anthropology a Science? Statement Deepens a Rift" by Nicholas Wade, *New York Times*, [http://www.nytimes.com/2010/12/10/science/10anthropology.html?\\_r](http://www.nytimes.com/2010/12/10/science/10anthropology.html?_r), accessed December 22, 2010 and the Long-Range Plan of the American Anthropological Association, [www.aaanet.org](http://www.aaanet.org), accessed December 22, 2010.

<sup>2</sup> "Anthropology a Science? Statement Deepens a Rift," *New York Times*, <http://www.nytimes.com>.

com/2010/12/10/science/10anthropology.html?\_r, accessed December 22, 2010.

<sup>3</sup>“No Science, Please. We’re Anthropologists,” by Alice Dreger, *Psychology Today*, <http://www.psychologytoday.com/>, accessed December 22, 2010.

<sup>4</sup> For more information regarding these specific graduate programs, refer to <http://www.anthro.fsu.edu> or <http://www.colorado.edu/anthropology>. Of course, the division between cultural anthropology and archaeology plays out differently at different institutions. For example, for a number of years at Stanford University, anthropology was officially split into two separate departments: Cultural and Social Anthropology (CASA) and Archaeological Sciences, with anthropologists who would consider themselves archaeologists residing in both houses.

<sup>5</sup> In such cases, such four-field graduate training may in fact be an asset on the academic job market – which makes another argument for “bridging the gap.”

<sup>6</sup> We understand that teaching positions at smaller institutions may foster (or perhaps require) more familiarity with the various subfields, if not actual collaboration or communication. Faculty at colleges or universities with small anthropology departments, for example, are often required to teach introductory classes for more than one subfield, as well as general courses on the history of anthropological theory.

<sup>7</sup> However, the postmodernism-natural science split may not always cleave exactly along the line between cultural and archaeological anthropology.

<sup>8</sup> Perhaps we are being overly pessimistic. Some more established scholars in the field might argue that the pendulum is indeed swinging back from postmodern extremism and reactionary neoevolutionary approaches.

<sup>9</sup> Even collaboration between two subfields is a commendable step toward a more holistic anthropology.

## REFERENCES

- Baudrillard, Jean and Sheila Faria Glaser  
1995 *Simulacra and Simulation*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Borofsky, Robert  
2002 The Four Sub-fields: Anthropologists as Mythmakers. *American Anthropologist* 104(2): 463–480.
- Bruner, Edward M.  
2005 *Culture on Tour: Ethnographies of Travel*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Clifford, James  
2005 Rarticulating Anthropology. *In Unwrapping the Sacred Bundle: Reflections on the Disciplining of Anthropology*, edited by Daniel A. Segal and Sylvia J. Yanagisako, 24–48. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Doran, Glen  
2000 Windover and the Early Archaic (7,400 BP uncorrected) Adaptations to the Marshlands of South Florida. *In The Archaeology of World Lakes*, edited by A. Matsui and K. Makino, 59–70. Tokyo: Kubapuro Publishing Company.  
2001 The View from Windover. *In Enduring Records*, edited by Barbara A. Purdy, 9–17. Oxford: Oxbow Books.

- Dubish, Jill  
1995 *In a Different Place: Pilgrimage, Gender, and Politics at a Greek Island Shrine.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Dufour, Darna L.  
1987 *Insects as Food: A Case Study from the Northwest Amazon.* *American Anthropologist* 89: 383–397.  
1997 *Living on the Edge: Dietary Strategies of Economically Impoverished Women in Cali, Colombia.* *American Journal of Physical Anthropology* 102: 5–15.
- Flannery, Kent V.  
1982 *The Golden Marshalltown: A Parable for the Archaeology of the 1980s.* *American Anthropologist* 84(2): 265–278.
- Gillespie, Susan D.  
2004 *Training the Next Generation of Academic Archaeologists: The Impact of Disciplinary Fragmentation on Students.* *SAA Archaeological Record* 4(2): 13–17.
- Gutiérrez, Gerardo  
2005 *The Codices of Guerrero and Their Stories of Power.* *Voices of Mexico* 70: 44–47.  
2008 *Classic and Postclassic Archaeological Features of the Mixteca-Tlapaneca-Nahua Region of Guerrero: Why Didn't Anyone Tell Me the Classic Period Was Over?* *In After Monte Alban: Transformation and Negotiation in Oaxaca, Mexico*, edited by Jeffrey Blomster, 367–392. Boulder: University Press of Colorado.
- Hodder, Ian and Scott Hutson  
2003 *Reading the Past: Current Approaches to Interpretation in Archaeology.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kristeva, Julia, Leon S. Roudiez, Alice Jardine, and Thomas Gora  
1980 *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art.* New York: Columbia University Press.
- Kuper, Adam and Jonathan Marks  
2011 *Anthropologists Unite!* *Nature* 470: 166–168.
- Lutz, Catherine  
1995 *The Gender of Theory.* *In Women Writing Culture*, edited by Ruth Behar and Deborah A. Gordon, 249–266. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Marlowe, Frank W.  
2007 *Hunting and Gathering: The Human Sexual Division of Foraging Labor.* *Cross Cultural Research* 41: 170–195.  
2009 *Hadza Cooperation: Second-Party Punishment, Yes; Third-Party Punishment, No.* *Human Nature* 20: 417–430.
- May, Ann and J. Terrence McCabe  
2004 *City Work in a Time of AIDS: Maasai Labor Migration in Tanzania.* *Africa Today* 51(2): 3–32.
- McCabe, J. Terrence, Paul W. Leslie, and Laura DeLuca  
2010 *Adopting Cultivation to Remain Pastoralists: The Diversification of Maasai Livelihoods in Northern Tanzania.* *Human Ecology* 38: 321–334.
- McGranahan, Carole  
2005 *Truth, Fear, and Lies: Exile Politics and Arrested Histories of the Tibetan Resistance.* *Cultural Anthropology* 20(4): 570–600.

- 2010 Narrative Dispossession: Tibet and the Gendered Logics of Historical Possibility. *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 52(4): 768–797.
- Nader, Laura  
2001 Anthropology! Distinguished Lecture – 2000. *American Anthropologist* 103(3): 609–620.
- Peirano, Mariza  
1998 “When Anthropology is at Home: The Different Contexts of a Single Discipline.” *Annual Review of Anthropology* 27: 105–128.
- Ransley, Jesse  
2005 Boats Are For Boys: Queering Maritime Archeology. *World Archaeology* 37(4): 621–629.
- Sauther, Michelle L. and Frank P. Cuzzo  
2008 Somatic Variation in Living, Wild Ring-Tailed Lemurs (*Lemur catta*). *Folia Primatol* 79: 55–78.  
2009 The Impact of Fallback Foods on Wild Ring-Tailed Lemur Biology: A Comparison of Intact and Anthropogenically Disturbed Habitats. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology* 140: 671–686.
- Schepartz, Lynne A.  
1988 Who Were the Later Pleistocene Eastern Africans? *African Archaeological Review* 6: 57–72.  
1995 Paleoanthropological Evidence of Language from East Asia, Africa, and the Pacific. *Acta Anthropologica Sinica* 14(4): 352–359.
- Schrodinger, Erwin  
2008 *My View of the World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Segal, Daniel A. and Sylvia J. Yanagisako  
2005 Introduction. *In Unwrapping the Sacred Bundle: Reflections on the Disciplining of Anthropology*, edited by Daniel A. Segal and Sylvia J. Yanagisako, 1–23. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Sokol, Alan and Jean Bricmont  
1999 *Fashionable Nonsense: Postmodern Intellectuals’ Abuse of Science*. New York: Picador USA.
- Ulysse, Gina A.  
2007 *Downtown Ladies: Informal Commercial Importers, a Haitian Anthropologist, and Self-Making in Jamaica*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.