Archaeological Ethnography: A Multitemporal Meeting Ground for Archaeology and Anthropology

Author(s): Yannis Hamilakis

Source: *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 2011, Vol. 40 (2011), pp. 399-414

Published by: Annual Reviews

Stable URL: http://www.jstor.com/stable/41287740

REFERENCES
Linked references are available on JSTOR for this article:
http://www.jstor.com/stable/41287740?seq=1&cid=pdf-reference#references_tab_contents
You may need to log in to JSTOR to access the linked references.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at https://about.jstor.org/terms

Annual Reviews is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Annual Review of Anthropology*

This content downloaded from
149.156.74.86 on Sat, 11 Mar 2023 20:14:45 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

Archaeological Ethnography: A Multitemporal Meeting Ground for Archaeology and Anthropology

Yannis Hamilakis

Archaeology, School of Humanities, University of Southampton, Southampton, SO17 1BJ, United Kingdom; email: y.hamilakis@soton.ac.uk

Annu. Rev. Anthropol. 2011. 40:399–414

First published online as a Review in Advance on June 29, 2011

The *Annual Review of Anthropology* is online at anthro.annualreviews.org

This article's doi: 10.1146/annurev-anthro-081309-145732

Copyright © 2011 by Annual Reviews. All rights reserved

0084-6570/11/1021-0399$20.00

Keywords

materiality, temporality, heritage, reflexivity, modernist archaeology

Abstract

Archaeology and anthropology, despite their commonalities, have had a rather asymmetrical relationship, and the periodic attempts at closer collaboration resulted in mutual frustration. As both disciplines have recently undergone significant changes, however, with anthropology embracing more fully materiality and historicity, and archaeology engaging in contemporary research, often involving ethnography, the time is ripe for a new rapprochement. Archaeological ethnography, an emerging transdisciplinary field, offers such an opportunity. Archaeological ethnography is defined here as a transcultural space for multiple encounters, conversations, and interventions, involving researchers from various disciplines and diverse publics, and centered around materiality and temporality. It is multitemporal rather than presentist, and although many of its concerns to date are about clashes over heritage, this article argues that its potential is far greater because it can dislodge the certainties of conventional archaeology and question its ontological principles, such as those founded on modernist, linear, and successive temporality.

This content downloaded from
149.156.74.86 on Sat, 11 Mar 2023 20:14:45 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

WORLDS APART? INTRODUCTION

The time was the mid-1990s; the place, a seminar room at a British University. The discussion had touched on the links between archaeology and sociocultural anthropology when one anthropologist colleague, who was known for his unusually open attitude toward collaborations and engagements with archaeologists, commented, "the thing I like most about archaeology is that, unlike anthropology, people cannot talk back." I was reminded of that comment very recently, as we witnessed the launching of a number of initiatives, meetings, and publications, which seemed to indicate that there is renewed interest among practitioners in both fields to reignite the discussion on the nature and character of their respective scholarly endeavors. The aim in this recent move is not necessarily to bring about any sort of convergence or even closer collaboration. Rather, it is motivated by the need to perform a kind of comparative auto-ethnography, which may lead to a better self-understanding in both fields (see, for example, the 2009 Bristol meeting of the UK's Association of Social Anthropologists, entitled, "Anthropological and Archaeological Imaginations: Past, Present, Future"; see also Garrow & Yarrow 2010, among others). One could say that there is nothing new in these periodic rituals of collective soul-searching among archaeologists and anthropologists, which, more often than not, end in mutual disappointment, retrenchment, and further border policing. Recall, for example, the well-known dismissive comments by Edmund Leach in 1977, at the end of such a meeting:

> The real stumbling block which inhibits useful collaboration between archaeologist and anthropologist seems to me to lie just here. When archaeologists resort to model making, the "structural system" (by whatever jargon you choose to describe it) is ultimately represented by a set of material, lifeless things; when anthropologists engage in a comparable type of operation they are ultimately concerned with patterns of verbal categories; categories which belong to the realm of language and which can have no meaning at all which is independent of the living beings who use that language. (Leach 1977, p. 166)

And also,

> [A]rchaeologists need to appreciate that the material objects revealed by their excavations are not "things in themselves," nor are they just artefacts,—made by men,—they are representations of ideas. (p. 167)

Archaeologists always felt that there is fundamental asymmetry between their field and that of anthropology because they themselves were (and still are) engaging regularly with anthropological ideas, whereas anthropologists, with a few exceptions (e.g., Kirch & Sahlins 1992), would rarely see the need for archaeological input into their work (see Garrow & Yarrow 2010, Gosden 1999). Flannery (2006), in the pages of the *ARA* reminisced, for example, that during his formative years (1960s and 1970s),

> We were never convinced that the ethnologists felt they needed us the way we needed them...we on the other hand, felt that the only conceivable purpose for ethnology was to provide archaeologists with descriptions of living cultures, helping them to interpret the evidence of the past. (p. 5)

Yet there are reasons to believe that the current wave of reflection and thinking holds more hope than similar such attempts in the past. For a start, archaeology and anthropology overall are radically different today compared with 15 or 20 years ago. Most archaeologists today would not recognize themselves in Leach's description, and in view of much current theorizing on the agency of objects and on the properties of materiality (see Gell 1998), they would contest the claim that material objects are static and "lifeless." Moreover, they would counter the idea that anthropology's primary

This content downloaded from
149.156.74.86 on Sat, 11 Mar 2023 20:14:45 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

archaeological use is to provide analogies for the interpretation of past material evidence.

Equally, both fields have left behind representationist, structuralist, and linguistic interpretive schemes, or at least have theorized and problematized their application and usefulness. As recent commentators have noted (e.g., Yarrow 2010), the perceived asymmetry between archaeology and anthropology may have had positive effects because it has forced archaeology to think deeply about the potential and properties of its immediate object, i.e., material things, and on its genealogy, its historical and sociopolitical underpinnings, and its general role and purpose. Anthropologists, on the other hand, have started paying much more attention to material objects (revealing perhaps an unacknowledged debt to archaeology, along with cultural history and microhistory), placing themselves at the center of the emerging field of material culture studies. The trend is an outcome of the general move in humanities and social sciences away from textualism, cognitivism, and constructionism, and toward things and materials and their sensuous properties and effects (see Brown 2004, Domanska 2006, Fahlander & Kjellström 2010, Hamilakis et al. 2002, Henare et al. 2007, Hoskins 1998, Latour 2005, Miller 2009, Myers 2001, Turkle 2007). Anthropologists have also shown a renewed interest in history, following the thriving, at least since the 1980s, tradition of historical anthropology (e.g., Cohn 1990, Comaroff & Comaroff 1992, Sahlins 1985); more pertinently, the exploration of the diverse social modes of popular and vernacular historicization has gained new impetus (see Hirsch & Stewart 2005).

Most importantly, however, and to return to the anecdote above, it is the belief that archaeology deals with dead people who cannot answer back and contest our account of them that has been heavily eroded and problematized. Although even in sophisticated treatments today, we often hear and read that a fundamental attribute of archaeology that distinguishes it from anthropology is absence, the absence of people, that is, who are present only through the material traces they have left behind (e.g., Lucas 2010), scholars are increasingly realizing that such an assumption is a fallacy, and one with serious consequences and not only of epistemological nature (see Zimmerman 2008). The assumption is certainly false in all these cases of the archaeology of the contemporary past (on which more below). This assertion of absence is based on the fact that when archaeologists investigate certain time periods, the ones they call prehistoric for example, they often rely on material traces alone. Leaving aside, for the moment, the assumptions behind this premise (that archaeology is almost exclusively the pursuit of knowledge about the past), one could note that even in those cases our contemporary archaeological practice, more often than not, involves living people, as well as materials: the fellow researchers and other specialists; the people who live near and in some cases within or on the top of what we designate an "archaeological" site; and the people who stake claims on and express allegiances with the material past, which we have named (often problematically) "archaeological record." Even for archaeology, therefore, and not just for anthropology, people are around, and they can and often do answer back, challenging not only the archaeologists' stories and interpretations, but often their legitimacy and their self-proclaimed exclusive right as stewards and interpreters of the material past [see Comaroff & Comaroff (1992, p. 15) for a critique of a similar anthropological misconception of history].

This paper aims to demonstrate that the transformed fields of archaeology and anthropology now have the opportunity for a lasting and much more fruitful rapprochement, in the emerging shared ground and space of archaeological ethnography. At the same time, this transdisciplinary field also constitutes the space for transcultural encounters and provides the arena for the meeting of practitioners from other fields, from history to contemporary art. More importantly, as the invocation of ethnography denotes, this transcultural space facilitates multiple coexistences, encounters, conversations, and dialogues, and also critical

This content downloaded from
149.156.74.86 on Sat, 11 Mar 2023 20:14:45 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

engagements and creative tensions between scholars and diverse publics and social actors. Materiality and temporality are at the center for this transdisciplinary and transcultural space. The methods for this new field are still forming, but they appear to combine both archaeological and anthropological practices. At the same time, practitioners of archaeological ethnography are also experimenting with new methods that have been devised to serve specifically this emerging field. Although archaeological ethnography is my chosen name for this field, several other studies within it have adopted other names, including ethnographic archaeology (Castañeda & Matthews 2008) and ethnocritical archaeology (Zimmerman 2008). This discussion will not review a similar and valuable development, which has been called ethnography of archaeological practice (e.g., Edgeworth 2003, 2006, 2010), the exclusive focus of which is the detailed ethnographic understanding of the workings of the archaeological discipline and profession itself and its ways of producing knowledges as well as material effects. I hope to show below, however, that such a valuable effort cannot fulfill its potential if it is carried out in isolation, if it ignores the multiple encounters between scholars and various publics in and around archaeological spaces.

Likewise, rather than reviewing and commenting on the very wide range of uses and applications of ethnography within archaeology (compare Hollowell & Nicholas 2008), the aim here is to limit the discussion only to the field of archaeological ethnography. This article does not simply review the key ideas and developments within this emerging field (for other reviews and assessments, see Castañeda 2008, Hamilakis & Anagnostopoulos 2009b, Hollowell & Mortensen 2009b, Hollowell & Nicholas 2008). Its ultimate aim is to show that archaeological ethnography, far from being simply an additional method and practice in the already rich armory of archaeology, constitutes a fundamental challenge for both archaeology and anthropology: It forces us both to reconsider their ontological and epistemic certainties and to rethink their foundational charter myths, including their objects of study and their relationships with time and with matter. Furthermore, archaeological ethnography may constitute an appropriate and effective way through which both parent disciplines can contribute to the broader scholarly and public debates on modernity, temporality, and materiality, as well as the intersection among them.

PAVING THE WAY FOR ARCHAEOLOGICAL ETHNOGRAPHIES

Some readers will have already noted that the term archaeological ethnography has a long history. It originates within ethnoarchaeology, the use of ethnography by archaeologists to aid interpretation of past material traces (e.g., Watson 1979, 2009), and is still used by archaeological works that operate within, or originate from, the ethnoarchaeological paradigm (e.g., Forbes 2007, Parsons 2006). Ethnoarchaeology was linked to 1960s and 1970s new archaeology and was seen as a way to animate the "static" remnants of the past, by collecting ethnographic data from communities living near the archaeological sites under investigation or from societies that, owing to their perceived "premodern" way of life, were deemed appropriate to be compared with archaeological contexts. Analogical inferences and the principles of uniformitarianism lie at the basis of ethnoarchaeology, which came under severe criticism by more recent interpretative and critical archaeological approaches on both epistemological and ethical-political grounds. This criticism focused on the epistemic problems with the use of analogy (e.g., Wylie 1985), the allochronization of contemporary people (Fabian 1983), and the ethically problematic, often implicit assumption that the primary archaeological function of contemporary communities is to act as proxies for the people in the past and sources of useful (for the archaeologist) interpretative information (Fewster 2001). Despite or perhaps because of this criticism, some strands of ethnoarchaeology have developed in a more critical and reflexive manner and have

This content downloaded from
149.156.74.86 on Sat, 11 Mar 2023 20:14:45 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

expanded the range of issues to be investigated and the analytical concepts used (see Fewster 2006; and for a more general review, David & Kramer 2001).

More importantly, earlier critics did not appreciate perhaps the diversity of ethnoarchaeological applications and did not anticipate that, despite the epistemic frame and the foundational logic of ethnoarchaeology, the process of engaging with contemporary communities and local people acquires its own dynamic and harbors an immense transformative potential. Archaeologists who engaged in ethnoarchaeological research with the initial aim to solve (with the help of local people) specific archaeological problems came progressively to valorize ethnographic research in its own right and often produced informative and powerful accounts of contemporary social practices that may or may not be of any direct archaeological use (see Fewster 2006; Forbes 2007, 2009; Halstead 1998). In doing so, they also implicitly and perhaps unintentionally challenged the (modernist) epistemic foundations of archaeology, especially the rigid separation between past and present, or between prehistoric and historic periods. This is particularly true for projects operating within the framework of multiperiod, regional surveys. Some key studies and publications carried out within the broader ethnoarchaeological tradition but focusing on the study of contemporary, urban material culture as opposed to "traditional" contexts (e.g., Gould & Schiffer 1981, Rathje 1979) also paved the way for the more recent field of the archaeologies of the contemporary past (see below). Ethnoarchaeology should be seen as one of the ancestral fields of archaeological ethnography, and its history, but also contemporary insights, especially the ones resulting from reflexive and critical engagements with living communities, should be of immense value in constituting the field of archaeological ethnography.

More instrumental in bringing about archaeological ethnography, however, have been other scholarly developments, the most important being the emergence of critical-interpretative or postprocessual approaches in archaeology, the ethnographies of heritage, and the archaeologies of the contemporary past. The diverse intellectual developments of the 1980s and early 1990s known as the interpretive, postprocessual turn are well known by now. One of its largely undeveloped components had been the belief in the political dimension of archaeological practice (Hamilakis 2007a). This belief was not simply a result of the realization that archaeological objects and finds as well as archaeological knowledge are often deployed within various political agendas; more importantly, it was an outcome of the understanding of archaeological practice itself as historically contingent, firmly rooted in the present, and thus inherently political. Internal scholarly developments, however, would not have been enough to force archaeology to confront its political character, and inevitably its colonial and nationalist heritage. Social and political pressures, from the struggles by indigenous peoples resisting their (and their ancestral traces') "scientific" objectification, to calls for the repatriation of ancient objects housed in metropolitan western museums, and for archaeology to align itself with major political battles such as the antiapartheid struggle (Ucko 1987), contributed immensely to the loss of archaeology's political innocence. As a result, various forms of community and collaborative participation in the archaeological process were developed, which involved direct engagement and face-to-face interaction with local communities and indigenous groups (see Colwell-Chanthaphonh & Ferguson 2008, Derry & Malloy 2003, Kerber 2006, Marshall 2002, Silliman 2008a). Studies on the contemporary political economy and sociopolitics of archaeology (e.g., Boytner et al. 2010; Gathercole & Lowenthal 1990; Hamilakis & Duke 2007; Kane 2003; Zorzin 2011a,b) including those on nationalist and colonialist archaeology (Abu El-Haj 2001, Hamilakis 2007b, Lydon & Rizvi 2010, Nicholas & Hollowell 2007, Stefanou 2008), on indigenous perspectives (cf. Allen & Philips 2010, Smith & Wobst 2005, Watkins 2005), and more recently on the involvement of archaeology in contemporary armed conflict

This content downloaded from
149.156.74.86 on Sat, 11 Mar 2023 20:14:45 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

and warfare and in the "war on terror" (e.g., Albarella 2009, Crossland 2009, Emberling 2008, Hamilakis 2009, Myers 2010, Perring & Linde 2009, Price 2009, Silliman 2008b, Stone 2009) have proliferated, challenging further the temporal distanciation upon which modernist archaeology was founded.

Although these intellectual-cum-social developments prepared the political landscape for archaeological ethnography, the ethnographies of heritage and the archaeologies of the contemporary past gave it further impetus. The former foregrounded the contested nature of heritage as a site of selective remembering, whereas the latter valorized the detailed study of contemporary material culture, often involving directly ethnographic research among the social actors responsible for its production (see Dawdy 2010; González-Ruibal 2008; Harrison & Schofield 2009, 2010; Holtorf & Piccini 2009 for some recent attempts, and Buchli & Lucas 2001 for an early pioneering publication). Ethnographies of heritage have been carried out mostly by anthropologists and often involved sites of discord between dominant official apparatuses, such as state heritage and archaeological authorities, and local residents or social groups and individuals who claimed allegiance to a certain iconic monument and projected upon it a discourse and a practice different from the official one. In other cases, an ethnographic study of a major monument and site has investigated its role within the domain of archaeo-tourism and/or exposed its multiple meanings and dispersals in local, regional, and global contexts. And in other cases, the commodification of the material past, and the performance of "authenticity" in the service of the capitalist "experience economy" and of the "heritage industry," became the focus of ethnographic study and critique.

Examples here include the clash between the state archaeological service and local inhabitants of the medieval (Venetian and Ottoman) quarter of the town of Rethymno in Crete, who deployed a series of strategic and tactical moves to cope with state restrictions and regulations while living within a monumental space (Herzfeld 1991), a space that sits uncomfortably in the broader national discourse that prioritizes the classical past (Hamilakis 2007b); the ethnographic study of the most iconic monument of that same Greek national discourse, the Athenian Acropolis, as the embodiment of simultaneously national and global value (Yalouri 2001) and as a purified and purifying space that seeks to displace all "matter out of place" around it, including the dilapidated neighborhood of Anaphiotika on its foothill (Caftantzoglou 2001); the clash between the official projection of that other iconic monument, Stonehenge in England, especially in its landscape connotations, and its unofficial and contested renderings by other groups, from objecting archaeologists to Druids (Bender 1998); the intersection and articulation of colonialism, national imagination, tourism, and local interest in several other prominent sites such as Chichén Itzá and other sites in the Yucatan (Breglia 2005, 2006; Castañeda 1996), Great Zimbabwe (Fontein 2006), and Knossos in Crete (Solomon 2006); and the production of a seamless national past that glosses over power inequities through certain heritage and museum discourses, as in Colonial Williamsburg in Virginia (Handler & Gable 1997) and in the Bronze Age ("Minoan") sites in Crete (Duke 2006, 2007).

A final group of studies that provide a direct link between broader ethnographic approaches and archaeological ethnography as a distinct field is the ethnographies of looting: the attempt to investigate the low end of the phenomenon and move beyond the blanket condemnation by archaeologists of the (often illicit) unofficial engagements with the material past by ordinary people, which do not always involve financial transactions. The aim here is to understand the motivations behind such engagements and the multiple meanings that people often attribute to material objects and to their own actions. Recent examples here include the study among the local residents of St. Lawrence island in Bering Strait, Alaska, who engaged in "mining archaeological sites for artifacts to sell" (Hollowell 2009, p. 218). This detailed and sensitive ethnography showed a distinctive

This content downloaded from
149.156.74.86 on Sat, 11 Mar 2023 20:14:45 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

standpoint on the part of local people, who see these artifacts as gifts from their ancestors and emphasize the strengthening of the connection with the past that the act of digging creates (Hollowell 2004, 2006, 2009); another example is the ethnography among the villagers of Kozani in northern Greece, who illicitly collect antiquities not in order to sell them, but as a way of creating their own material histories outside the official ones produced by the state. These are histories that stress a felt intimacy with material objects and a pride in one's own locality, as opposed to the homogenized national space (Antoniadou 2009; for other studies, see Colwell-Chanthaphonh 2004, Matsuda 1998, Thoden van Velzen 1996).

DEFINING THE SPACE OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL ETHNOGRAPHY

Some recent attempts at archaeological ethnography define it as a novel, hybrid practice, a method that combines archaeological and anthropological procedures and ideas. Such a definition, however, limits the potential of archaeological ethnography and prevents its practitioners from exploring not only the epistemic but also the ontological implications of this emerging field, for both archaeology and anthropology. I argue instead that archaeological ethnography is (and can be) much more than a practice and a method. It is rather a transdisciplinary and transcultural space, a locality and a ground that allows for multiple meetings, conversations, and interventions to take place. The production of this space is possible because of the epistemic and interpretive transformations that its parent disciplines, archaeology and anthropology, have undergone in the past 20 years or so and because of the social interventions upon scholarly work and practice by disenfranchised people and groups. Materiality and temporality are the two defining features of this novel space; archaeological ethnography is constituted at the intersection of these two features.

Elsewhere (Hamilakis & Anagnostopoulos 2009b) we defined in some detail the key properties of this space, and they need not be rehearsed in full here. Briefly, they include its reflexive nature, meant not so much as the individual researchers' self-positioning, as the situation and contextualization of the project as a whole (Castañeda 2008). We have also defined it as total (but not totalizing) ethnography: Although things from various times (and their scholarly and public renderings and meaningful deployments) constitute the core and focus of archaeological ethnography, we have argued that these need to be explored within the broader social context and can be understood only if the researcher is attuned to the materiality and temporality of social life in general. As such, archaeological ethnography requires long-term commitment to and linguistic and social familiarization with the specific context. Such long-term, total ethnography needs to be multisited, given the dispersal of past materiality in diverse, often global domains, but without losing the analytical force that a sustained focus on a defined and delimited space, such as an archaeological site, for example, can offer (Candea 2007). Materiality acts on people through bodily senses and, for an archaeological ethnography to do justice to it, will need to be multisensory and sensitive to the political economy of affect that material things generate and are a key part of (Richard & Rudnyckyj 2009). Political contestations of various kinds are ever present at heritage spaces, and archaeological ethnography cannot but adopt a politically sensitive perspective beyond the managerialism that characterizes much of the scholarly discourse on heritage (Hollowell & Nicholas 2009), working thus against the bureaucratization of ethics in archaeology and anthropology (Hamilakis 2007a, Meskell & Pells 2005). Finally, archaeological ethnography will have to sail between the rock of presentism and homochronism (inherent in ethnographic attempts; see Birth 2008) and the hard place of allochronism and escapism that comes from the archaeo- of archaeology (and can also be found in some earlier anthropological accounts). Archaeological ethnography should be multitemporal, attuned both to

This content downloaded from
149.156.74.86 on Sat, 11 Mar 2023 20:14:45 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

durational and multitemporal properties of matter and to the various social-vernacular modes of temporal perception and historicization. Archaeological ethnographies are designed as such from the moment of a project's inception, rather than being a late add-on to a largely conventional archaeological agenda.

They are also about borders, seen not as fences and separation barriers but as fertile meeting points, as "contact zones" (Pratt 1991, 2008). The borders among scholars from diverse backgrounds and between researchers and various publics may become a point of tension but can also work as a locale where creative negotiations and revelatory performances of various kinds can be enacted (Clifford 1997, 2003). An archaeological site, for example, is a perfect such borderland and an ideal zone of contact. Here, the border very often takes the physical manifestation of a metal fence delineating the expropriated land and defining its heterotopic status. Within it, it can also take the shape of a cordon put up by archaeologists to "protect" sensitive areas, or keep visitors out, so that an active archaeological excavation can go on undisturbed. Yet local people and tourists alike, longing for intimacy and a closer encounter with the materiality of the past, sometimes cross these physical barriers, creating tension and confrontation, but which can also lead to a detailed, sensitive, ethnographic discourse and perhaps subsequent dialogues and collaborations.

WHAT DOES AN ARCHAEOLOGICAL ETHNOGRAPHY MEAN IN PRACTICE?

Rather than listing an exhaustive series of instances and cases in archaeological ethnography, and an equally long array of methods deployed, I instead discuss a few key studies that are paradigmatic of this emerging field. Through this discussion, the kinds of methodological procedures currently in operation will also emerge (for other cases, see papers in Castañeda & Matthews 2008; Hamilakis & Anagnostopoulos 2009a; Hollowell & Mortensen 2009a; Stroulia & Buck Sutton 2010; and Bartu 2000; Bartu Candan 2005; Lane & Herrera 2005; Meskell 2005, 2007; Mortensen 2005; Shankland 1996, 2005; Stroulia 2002).

Castañeda (2009), building on long-term ethnographic research at the archaeological site of Chichén Itzá, has combined his more conventional ethnographic methods of interviewing and participant observation with archival research on the history of archaeological interventions in the area and, more recently, has brought everything together to carry out a series of practices that he calls ethnographic installations: Photographic, archival, and ethnographic material is "returned" to the community in the shape of a series of carefully staged exhibitions. This has been conceived and executed as a performance inspired by, among other things, the "theater of the oppressed" of Agosto Boal. In addition to their ethical role in making public hitherto inaccessible for the local communities materials that were part of their history, these practices also serve as a stage for further ethnographic research and information, leading to a novel process of collaborative knowledge production. Levinasian ethics prioritizing face-to-face interaction were some of the guiding theoretical ideas, and elicitation, evocation, and ethnographic triggers were some of its underpinnings.

Marshall and colleagues (2009) take archaeological ethnography into a different dimension by working through the concept of autoethnography, seen as an in-depth, reflexive, ethnographic exploration of the researcher herself, an exploration which then becomes an integral part of the research process. Their context was the Cold War (1980s), women-only, peace camps at Greenham Common in southern England, at the site where the United States had constructed a military base for nuclear missiles. Some members of the research team were actively involved as peace activists in the camps, whereas others were directly or indirectly implicated in other ways; e.g., one was a daughter of a peace activist. This started as a

This content downloaded from
149.156.74.86 on Sat, 11 Mar 2023 20:14:45 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

conventional archaeological project (within the recent trend for an archaeology of the recent and contemporary past, and the archaeology of the Cold War/"military archaeology"; see Schofield 2009, Schofield & Anderton 2000), but it soon became evident that it had to change course radically. The autoethnographic endeavor helped researchers realize that their propeace, feminist political convictions had to become an essential part of the research enterprise, something that did not sit comfortably with the seemingly "neutral" and apolitical stance adopted by heritage organizations such as English Heritage. In addition to autoethnography, ethnographic interviews with women who were active at the camps convinced the researchers that they should abandon their planned archaeological methods of excavation and collection of artifacts and concentrate instead on surveying and on recording objects and features in situ. In this transformed process, ethnography and oral history, as well as the direct involvement in fieldwork of the women protagonists, became extremely important. As researchers recognized that Greenham Common was not simply a peace camp but rather a feminist space for radical experimentation, they also decided to constitute their project as a space where politics, reflexivity, memory, and archaeology came together.

In one of my own archaeological ethnography projects, the one centered around the archaeological site of Kalaureia (known for its ancient sanctuary of Poseidon) on the island of Poros, Greece (see Hamilakis et al. 2009, Hamilakis & Anagnostopoulos 2009b), I entered a field filled with tension right from the start: The land upon which the sanctuary of Poseidon was located had been expropriated by the state archaeological service through a long and acrimonious process involving the family that, until the start of the recent excavations, was living among the ruins, reusing the ancient buildings for its own, day-to-day needs. State archaeology had also caused much resentment in the area owing to the strict application of antiquities legislation and also because of its inherent bureaucratic problems. Kalaureia was the most important archaeological site for the island, yet there seemed to be an active dismissal of its value among local people, whereas local intellectuals and others seemed to want to promote more the nineteenth-century heritage of the island (which linked it to the Greek War of Independence) rather than the Greek national golden age, the classical past (see Hamilakis 2007b). Our colleagues who were excavating the site and who had invited us to carry out ethnography did everything they could to facilitate our research, but they were at the same time occasionally nervous that they were being "watched," and they could not always understand our insistence in collecting broken glass and rusty nails, the material traces of the farmstead that was demolished to make way for the excavations. Intensive archival and ethnographic research among local communities (including the workmen and workwomen employed by archaeology) and visitors, lasting for three years, and carried out by a team of scholars (archaeologists, anthropologists, photo-ethnographers and photo-bloggers), indicated the existence of a series of parallel and often conflicting discourses about the site. It also revealed a longing for an intimate connection with ancient objects and their materiality, objects that are subject to access restrictions imposed by official archaeology; furthermore, it exposed a desire on the part of our interlocutors to understand the political economy of archaeological practice ("who sponsors you, and why do they pay for all this?") and the inner workings of archaeology. Excavation workmen, for example, were attempting to trace the subsequent social life of the objects they themselves brought to light, and they were disappointed when they could not find them in the local museum, fueling further the mistrust against official archaeology. It soon became clear that, although our ethnography was not designed to investigate archaeological practice and the workings of the discipline as such, it inevitably had to include all social actors who engaged with the site in whatever capacity, including archaeologists and archaeological workwomen and workmen, because their

This content downloaded from
149.156.74.86 on Sat, 11 Mar 2023 20:14:45 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

interaction with various publics was constant, often resulting in many revelatory moments. Furthermore, we staged site tours and school projects on site as ethnographic performances, often choosing objects that embodied different times and ones that were evocative of the diverse social life of the place (e.g., an ancient block with graffiti on it, made by the children of the family who used to play among the ruins).

Within our broad methodological apparatus, photo-ethnography and photo-blogging acquired prominence. In addition to documentary photography, we took many creative photographs, treating the photographic process as an opportunity for ethnographic encounters and as a way of eliciting responses from the archaeological team and from visitors and local people. Our photographs were not representations but evocative material objects that reentered ethnography through local exhibitions and through an ongoing photoblog (**http://www.kalaureiainthepresent.org**), thus constituting ethnographic installations.

The San Pedro Valley ethnohistory project in southern Arizona can be described as another pioneering effort in archaeological ethnography (Colwell-Chanthaphonh 2006, Colwell-Chanthaphonh & Ferguson 2004, Ferguson & Colwell-Chanthaphonh 2006). Its value does not lie simply in bringing into direct dialogue and collaboration archaeologists and Native American people from different tribes, nor in its methodologically innovative practices consisting, among others, of peripatetic dialogues where the land and its features become the primary mediators. Its most important contribution rests in the effort to question long-standing official archaeological premises, including the archaeological-ontological principles that prioritize the linearity of time and the notion of temporal succession, principles that have been at the basis of the western modernist canon.

BEYOND HERITAGE: CONCLUSIONS

The emerging transdisciplinary space of archaeological ethnography does not constitute simply an arena of transcultural encounters among archaeologists, anthropologists, artists, scholars from various disciplines, and diverse social actors and publics, and where the official, modernist archaeology comes into contact with the various alternative archaeologies, defined as multiple discourses and practices on things from another time (see Hamilakis 2008, Hamilakis & Anagnostopoulos 2009b). It does not merely provide a way of confronting and exposing to critical scrutiny conflicts and clashes over heritage and of understanding nonofficial, popular valorizations of the material past. It does not only render archaeological knowledge production a collaborative endeavor, valorizing at the same time dialogic processes and face-to-face, transformative encounters in their own right, rather than seeing them simply as instruments in knowledge production. It does not only confront head-on the fallacy that, unlike anthropology, archaeology deals with absence, the absence of people whose traces are called on to recover, record, curate, and interpret. It does all the above, but its potential is far greater. Archaeological ethnography is not an archaeological methodological tool, nor is it purely a research apparatus within the domain of heritage.

In a recent paper, originally delivered as a keynote speech at the 2009 Bristol meeting on the interface between archaeology and anthropology referred to in the introduction above, Ingold (2010) imagines the fields of archaeology and anthropology in the year 2053. In doing so, he conjures up an image of two closely linked but transformed disciplines, whereby archaeology has abandoned its obsession with the archaeo-, that is with a certain conception of time as genealogical, and the modernist insistence on linearity and temporal succession, whereas anthropology has abandoned the anthropo-, that is its exclusive preoccupation with humans, embracing instead all organisms, humans, plants, animals, as well as material things: in other words, a discipline that has become a "principled inquiry into the conditions and potentials of life in a world peopled by beings whose identities are established not

This content downloaded from
149.156.74.86 on Sat, 11 Mar 2023 20:14:45 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

by species membership but by relational accomplishment" (p. 160).

Archaeological ethnography is an endeavor that can help make this futuristic image become reality. Far from denigrating objects and materials in favor of the ethnographic, as some would fear, it places the thingness of things and the properties of materials center stage. In doing so, it also recognizes, after Bergson (1991), that a fundamental property of matter is its duration, its ability to last, its insistence in disrupting the temporality of the present, and the ontology of linearity and succession (see Al-Saji 2004, Deleuze 1991). Take, for example, an architectural stone block removed from its geological context sometime in the sixth century B.C. and carved in a certain shape to become part of a building in a sanctuary. A modernist, conventional archaeologist would date it in the sixth century, thus prioritizing a specific moment in its life. But the object in question continued to live and became a feature in someone's house in the twentieth century A.D. and a drawing panel upon which children would carve their initials, contributing thus to its ongoing transformation. The carvings would eventually become less prominent, as lichens would colonize their grooves, but being still visible would attract the attention of the twenty-first century A.D. archaeological ethnographers, who would make the stone an object of ethnographic inquiry (creating, based on the carved initials, a genealogical-relational chart of the family who lived there, before "archaeology" arrived), a touchstone and a stop-over point in visitors' tours, a stage for further ethnographic performances and engagements. How old is that stone? Objects and artifacts, owing to their durational qualities, constitute material memories that embody and project time as coexistence rather than as linearity or succession: They are multitemporal (see Hamilakis & Labanyi 2008; Olivier 1999, 2008). As such, they are an anomaly for a modernist conception of time, complicating official archaeology's chronometric devices, which, more often than not, prioritize one moment in the life of the artifact. But this anomaly also constitutes the great transformative potential of objects and things: They throw into disarray modernist temporality, progressive sequential time (see Dawdy 2010).

Although one could claim that such philosophical reflection does not need archaeological ethnography, only the objects and artifacts themselves, I insist that it is through multitemporal archaeological ethnography that such rethinking and reconceptualization acquire potency and import: by witnessing ethnographically multiple, alternative perceptions of materiality and temporality; by making the properties and qualities of objects and things (things that are often arranged in—and thus finished with—chronometric, typological, functional, or formal taxonomies), their thingness and materiality, a fundamental point of inquiry; by attending to the traces of their continuous lives and existences, their patina, their reworking by human and nonhuman agents in different times; by inquiring ethnographically about their agency, today and in the past; and by enabling such presence and agency to be enacted through the staging of contemporary performances, where humans, other beings, and objects and things are all key protagonists.

DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

The author is not aware of any affiliations, memberships, funding, or financial holdings that might be perceived as affecting the objectivity of this review.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am grateful to all my colleagues at the Kalaureia Research Program, archaeologists, workwomen, workmen, and guards, for everything they did to facilitate our archaeological ethnography work; and to my closest collaborators in this endeavor, Aris Anagnostopoulos and Fotis Ifantidis. Above

This content downloaded from
149.156.74.86 on Sat, 11 Mar 2023 20:14:45 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

all, I am indebted to the people of Poros and the surrounding area, and to the countless visitors to the site, for their warm response and the many revelatory moments. An anonymous referee provided helpful comments and suggestions.

LITERATURE CITED

Abu El-Haj N. 2001. *Facts on the Ground: Archaeological Practice and Territorial Self-Fashioning in Israeli Society*. Chicago, IL: Univ. Chicago Press

Albarella U. 2009. Archaeologists in conflict: empathizing with which victims? *Heritage Manage.* 2(1):105–14

Allen H, Phillips C, eds. 2010. *Bridging the Divide: Indigenous Communities and Archaeology in the 21st Century*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast

Al-Saji A. 2004. The memory of another past: Bergson, Deleuze, and a new theory of time. *Cont. Philos. Rev.* 37(2):203–39

Antoniadou I. 2009. Reflections on an archaeological ethnography of "looting" in Kozani, Greece. See Hamilakis & Anagnostopoulos 2009a, pp. 246–61

Bartu A. 2000. Where is Çatalhöyük? Multiple sites in the construction of an archaeological site. In *Towards a Reflexive Method in Archaeology: The Example at Çatalhöyük*, ed. I Hodder, pp. 101–9. Cambridge/London: MacDonald Inst. Archaeol. Res. Brit. Inst. Ankara

Bartu Candan A. 2005. Entanglements/encounters/engagements with prehistory: Çatalhöyük and its publics. See Hodder 2005, pp. 27–38

Bender B. 1998. *Stonehenge: Making Space*. Oxford: Berg

Bergson H. 1991. *Matter and Memory*. New York: Zone Books

Birth K. 2008. The creation of coevalness and the danger of homochronism. *J. R. Anthropol. Inst.* 14(1):3–20

Boytner R, Dodd LS, Parker BJ, eds. 2010. *Controlling the Past, Owning the Future*. Tucson: Univ. Ariz. Press

Breglia L. 2005. Keeping world heritage in the family: a genealogy of Maya labour at Chichén Itzá. *Int. J. Heritage Stud.* 11(5):385–98

Breglia L. 2006. *Monumental Ambivalence: The Politics of Heritage*. Austin: Univ. Tex. Press

Brown B, ed. 2004. *Things*. Chicago, IL: Chicago Univ. Press

Buchli V, Lucas G, eds. 2001. *Archaeologies of the Contemporary Past*. London: Routledge

Caftantzoglou R. 2001. *Sti Skia tou Ierou Vrahou: Topos kai Mnimi sta Anaphiotika* (*In the Shadow of the Sacred Rock: Place and Memory at Anaphiotika*). Athens: Ellinika Grammata/EKKE

Candea M. 2007. Arbitrary locations: in defence of the bounded field site. *J. R. Anthropol. Inst.* 13:167–84

Castañeda Q, Matthews CN, eds. 2008. *Ethnographic Archaeologies: Reflection on Stakeholders and Archaeological Practices*. Lanham, MD: AltaMira

Castañeda QE. 1996. *In the Museum of Maya Culture. Touring Chichén Itzá*. Minneapolis: Univ. Minn. Press

Castañeda QE. 2008. The "ethnographic turn" in archaeology: research positioning and reflexivity in ethnographic archaeologies. See Castañeda & Matthews 2008, pp. 25–61

Castañeda QE. 2009. The "past" as transcultural space: using ethnographic installation in the study of archaeology. See Hamilakis & Anagnostopoulos 2009a, pp. 262–82

Clifford J. 1997. *Routes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press

Clifford J. 2003. *On the Edges of Anthropology*. Chicago, IL: Prickly Paradigm

Cohn BS, 1990. *An Anthropologist among the Historians and Other Essays*. Delhi: Oxford Univ. Press

Colwell-Chanthaphonh C. 2004. Those obscure objects of desire: collecting cultures and the archaeological landscape in the San Pedro Valley of Arizona. *J. Contemp. Ethnogr.* 33(5):571–601

Colwell-Chanthaphonh C. 2006. Memory pieces and footprints: multivocality and the meanings of ancient times and ancestral places among the Zuni and Hopi. *Am. Anthropol.* 108(1):148–62

Colwell-Chanthaphonh C, Ferguson TJ. 2004. Virtue ethics and the practice of history: Native Americans and archaeologists along the San Pedro Valley of Arizona. *J. Soc. Archaeol.* 4(1):5–27

Colwell-Chanthaphonh C, Ferguson TJ, eds. 2008. *Collaboration in Archaeological Practice: Engaging Descendant Communities*. Lanham, MD: AltaMira

Comaroff J, Comaroff J. 1992. *Ethnography and the Historical Imagination*. Boulder, CO: Westview

Crossland Z. 2009. Of clues and signs: the dead body and its evidential traces. *Am. Anthropol.* 111(1):69–80

This content downloaded from
149.156.74.86 on Sat, 11 Mar 2023 20:14:45 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

David N, Kramer C. 2001. *Ethnoarchaeology in Action*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press
Dawdy SL. 2010. Clockpunk anthropology and the ruins of modernity. *Curr. Anthropol.* 51(6):761–93
Deleuze G. 1991. *Bergsonism*. Transl. H Tomlinson, B Habberjam. New York: Zone Books
Derry L, Malloy M, eds. 2003. *Archaeologists and Local Communities: Partners in Exploring the Past*. Washington, DC: Soc. Am. Archaeol.
Domanska E. 2006. The material presence of the past. *Hist. Theory* 45:337–48
Duke P. 2006. Knossos as memorial, ritual, and metaphor. See Hamilakis & Momigliano 2006, pp. 79–88
Duke P. 2007. *The Tourists Gaze, the Cretans Glance: Archaeology and Tourism on a Greek Island*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast
Edgeworth M. 2003. *Acts of Discovery: An Ethnography of Archaeological Practice*. Oxford: Archaeopress (BAR S1131)
Edgeworth M, ed. 2006. *Ethnographies of Archaeological Practice: Cultural Encounters, Material Transformations*. Lanham, MD: AltaMira
Edgeworth M. 2010. On the boundary: new perspectives from ethnography of archaeology. See Garrow & Yarrow 2010, pp. 53–68
Emberling G. 2008. Archaeologists and the military in Iraq 2003–2008: compromise or contribution? *Archaeol.: J. World Archaeol. Cong.* 4(3):445–59
Fabian J. 1983. *Time and the Other: How Anthropology Makes its Object*. New York: Columbia Univ. Press
Fahlander F, Kjellström A, eds. 2010. *Making Sense of Things: Archaeologies of Sensory Perception*. Stockholm: Dep. Archaeol. Class. Hist., Stockholm Univ. (Stockholm Stud. Archaeol. 53)
Ferguson TJ, Colwell-Chanthaphonh C. 2006. *History Is in the Land: Multivocal Tribal Traditions in Arizona's San Pedro Valley*. Tucson: Univ. Ariz. Press
Fewster K. 2001. The responsibilities of ethnoarchaeologists. In *The Responsibilities of Archaeologists: Archaeology and Ethics*, ed. M Pluciennik, pp. 65–73. Oxford: Archaeopress (BAR S981; Lampeter Workshop Archaeol. 4)
Fewster K. 2006. The potential for analogy in post-processual archaeologies: a case study in Basimane ward, Serowe, Botswana. *J. R. Anthropol. Inst.* 12(1):61–87
Flannery K. 2006. On the resilience of anthropological archaeology. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.* 35:1–13
Fontein J. 2006. *The Silence of Great Zimbabwe: Contested Landscapes and the Power of Heritage*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast
Forbes H. 2007. *Meaning and Identity in a Greek Landscape: An Archaeological Ethnography*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press
Forbes H. 2009. Researching *Ekina ta Khronia* [Times Past] in a rural Greek community. See Hamilakis & Anagnostopoulos 2009a, pp. 88–107
Garrow D, Yarrow T, eds. 2010. *Archaeology and Anthropology: Understanding Similarity, Exploring Difference*. Oxford: Oxbow
Gathercole P, Lowenthal D, eds. 1990. *The Politics of the Past*. London: Unwin Hyman
Gell A. 1998. *Art and Agency: An Anthropological Theory*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press
González-Ruibal A. 2008. Time to destroy: an archaeology of supermodernity. *Curr. Anthropol.* 49(2):247–79
Gosden C. 1999. *Anthropology and Archaeology: A Changing Relationship*. London: Routledge
Gould RA, Schiffer MB, eds. 1981. *Modern Material Culture: The Archaeology of Us*. New York: Academic
Halstead P. 1998. Ask the fellows who lop the hay: leaf fodder in the mountains of northwest Greece. *Rural Hist.* 9:211–34
Hamilakis Y. 2007a. From ethics to politics. See Hamilakis & Duke 2007, pp. 15–40
Hamilakis Y. 2007b. *The Nation and its Ruins: Antiquity, Archaeology and National Imagination in Greece*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press
Hamilakis Y. 2008. Decolonizing Greek archaeology: indigenous archaeologies, modernist archaeology, and the post-colonial critique. In *A Singular Modernity: Archaeology and Hellenic Identity in Twentieth-Century Greece*, ed. D Damaskos, D Plantzos, pp. 273–84. Athens: Benaki Mus.
Hamilakis Y. 2009. The "war on terror" and the military archaeology complex: Iraq, ethics, and neo-colonialism. *Archaeol.: J. World Archaeol. Cong.* 5(1):39–65
Hamilakis Y, Anagnostopoulos A, eds. 2009a. *Archaeological Ethnographies*. Leeds, UK/Cambridge, MA: Maney [*Public Archaeol.* 8, (2/3)]

This content downloaded from
149.156.74.86 on Sat, 11 Mar 2023 20:14:45 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

Hamilakis Y, Anagnostopoulos A. 2009b. What is archaeological ethnography? See Hamilakis & Anagnostopoulos 2009a, pp. 65–87
Hamilakis Y, Anagnostopoulos A, Ifantidis F. 2009. Postcards from the edge of time: archaeology, photography, archaeological ethnography (a photo-essay). See Hamilakis & Anagnostopoulos 2009a, pp. 283–309
Hamilakis Y, Duke P, eds. 2007. *Archaeology and Capitalism: From Ethics to Politics*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast
Hamilakis Y, Labanyi J. 2008. Time, materiality, and the work of memory. *Hist. Mem.* 20(2):5–17
Hamilakis Y, Momigliano N, eds. 2006. *Archaeology and European Modernity: Producing and Consuming the "Minoans"*. Padua: Also Ausilio/Bottega d'Erasmo (Creta Antica 7)
Hamilakis Y, Pluciennik M, Tarlow S, eds. 2002. *Thinking Through the Body: Archaeologies of Corporeality*. New York: Kluwer/Plenum
Handler R, Gable E. 1997. *The New History in an Old Museum: Creating the Past at Colonial Williamsburg*. Durham, NC: Duke Univ. Press
Harrison R, Schofield J, eds. 2009. Archaeo-ethnography, auto-archaeology: introducing archaeologies of the contemporary past. *Archaeol.: J. World Archaeol. Cong.* Spec. Issue 5(2)
Harrison R, Schofield J. 2010. *After Modernity: Archaeological Approaches of the Contemporary Past*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press
Henare A, Holbrad M, Wastell S, eds. 2007. *Thinking Through Things: Theorising Artefacts Ethnographically*. London: Routledge
Herzfeld M. 1991. *A Place in History: Social and Monumental Time in a Cretan Town*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press
Hirsch E, Stewart C. 2005. Introduction: ethnographies of historicity. *Hist. Anthropol.* 16(3):261–74
Hodder I, ed. 2005. *Çatalhöyük Perspectives: Reports from the 1995–1999 Seasons*. Cambridge/London: MacDonald Inst. Archaeol. Res. Brit. Inst. Ankara
Hollowell J. 2004. *Old things on the loose: the legal market for archaeological materials from Alaska's Bering Strait*. PhD thesis, Indiana Univ., Bloomington
Hollowell J. 2006. St. Lawrence's legal market in archaeological goods. In *Archaeology, Cultural Heritage, and the Antiquities Trade*, ed. N Brodie, M Kersel, C Luke, KW Tubb, pp. 98–132. Gainsville: Univ. Fla. Press
Hollowell J. 2009. Standpoints of stewardship in a global market for the material past. See Hollowell & Mortensen 2009a, pp. 218–39
Hollowell J, Mortensen L, eds. 2009a. *Ethnographies and Archaeologies: Iterations of the Past*. Gainsville: Univ. Press Fla.
Hollowell J, Mortensen L. 2009b. Introduction: ethnographies and archaeologies. See Hollowell & Mortensen 2009a, pp. 1–17
Hollowell J, Nicholas G. 2008. A critical assessment of ethnography in archaeology. See Castañeda & Matthews 2008, pp. 63–94
Hollowell J, Nicholas G. 2009. Using ethnographic methods to articulate community-based conceptions of cultural heritage management. See Hamilakis & Anagnostopoulos 2009a, pp. 141–60
Holtorf C, Piccini A, eds. 2009. *Contemporary Archaeologies: Excavating Now*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang
Hoskins J. 1998. *Biographical Objects: How Things Tell the Stories of People's Lives*. New York/London: Routledge
Ingold T. 2010. No more ancient; no more human: the future past of archaeology and anthropology. See Garrow & Yarrow 2010, pp. 160–70
Kane S, ed. 2003. *The Politics of Archaeology and Identity in a Global Context*. Boston, MA: Archaeol. Inst. Am. (Colloq. Conf. Pap. 7)
Kerber JE, ed. 2006. *Cross-Cultural Collaboration: Native Peoples and Archaeology in the Northeastern United States*. Lincoln: Univ. Neb. Press
Kirch PV, Sahlins M. 1992. *Anahulu: The Anthropology of History in the Kingdom of Hawaii*, Vols. 1–2. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press
Lane K, Herrera A. 2005. Archaeology, landscapes and dreams: science, sacred offerings, and the practice of archaeology. *Archaeol. Rev. Camb.* 20(1):111–29
Latour B. 2005. From realpolitic to dingpolitic or how to make things public. In *Making Things Public: Atmospheres of Democracy*, ed. B Latour, P Weibel, pp. 14–41. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press

This content downloaded from
149.156.74.86 on Sat, 11 Mar 2023 20:14:45 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

Leach E. 1977. A view from the bridge. In *Archaeology and Anthropology: Areas of Mutual Interest*, ed. M Springs, pp. 161–76. Oxford: BAR S19

Lucas G. 2010. Triangulating absence: exploring the fault-lines between archaeology and anthropology. See Garrow & Yarrow 2010, pp. 28–39

Lydon J, Rizvi U, eds. 2010. *Handbook of Postcolonial Archaeology*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast

Marshall Y, ed. 2002. *Community Archaeology*. London: Routledge (World Archaeol. 34)

Marshall Y, Roseneil S, Armstrong K. 2009. Situating the Greenham archaeology: an autoethnography of a feminist project. See Hamilakis & Anagnostopoulos 2009a, pp. 225–45

Matsuda D. 1998. The ethics of archaeology, subsistence digging, and artifact looting in Latin America: point, mute, counterpoint. *Int. J. Cult. Prop.* 7:87–97

Meskell L. 2005. Archaeological ethnography: conversations around Kruger National Park. *Archaeol.: J. World Archaeol. Congr.* 1(1):81–100

Meskell L. 2007. Falling walls and mending fences: archaeological ethnography in the Limporo. *J. South. Afr. Stud.* 33(2):383–400

Meskell L, Pells P, eds. 2005. *Embedding Ethics*. Oxford: Berg

Miller D. 2009. *The Comfort of Things*. Cambridge, UK: Polity

Mortensen L. 2005. *Constructing heritage at Copán Honduras: an ethnography of the archaeology industry*. PhD thesis, Indiana Univ.

Myers A. 2010. Camp Delta, Google Earth and the ethics of remote sensing in archaeology. *World Archaeol.* 42(3):455–67

Myers FR, ed. 2001. *The Empire of Things: Regimes of Value and Material Culture*. Santa Fe/Oxford: Sch. Am. Res. Press/James Currey

Nicholas G, Hollowell J. 2007. Ethical challenges to a post-colonial archaeology: the legacy of scientific colonialism. See Hamilakis & Duke 2007, pp. 59–82

Olivier L. 1999. Duration, memory, and the nature of the archaeological record. In *Glyfer och arkeologiska rum- en vänbok till Jarl Nordbladh*, pp. 529–36. Göteborg: Dep. Archaeol., Göteborg Univ.

Olivier L. 2008. *Le Somber Abîme du Temps*. Paris: Éd. Seuil

Parsons JR. 2006. *The Last* Pescadores *of Chimalhuacán, Mexico: An Archaeological Ethnography*. Ann Arbor: Mus. Anthropol., Univ. Mich. (Anthropol. Pap. 96)

Perring D, van der Linde S. 2009. The politics and practice of archaeology in conflict. *Conserv. Manag. Archaeol. Sites* 11(3/4):197–213

Pratt ML. 1991. The arts of the contact zone. *Profession* 91:33–40

Pratt ML. 2008. *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation*. London/New York: Routledge. 2nd ed.

Price J (with comments by J. Price, M. Rowlands, L.W. Price, R. Teijgeler). 2009. Relations between archaeologists and the military in the case of Iraq. *Pap. Inst. Archaeol.* 19:2–8

Rathje WL. 1979. Modern material culture studies. *Adv. Archaeol. Method Theory* 2:1–37

Richard A, Rudnyckyj D. 2009. Economies of affect. *J. R. Anthropol. Inst.* 15:57–77

Sahlins M. 1985. *Islands of History*. Chicago: Chicago Univ. Press

Schofield J. 2009. Peace site: an archaeology of protest at Greenham Common Airbase. *Br. Archaeol.* 104:44–49

Schofield J, Anderton M. 2000. The queer archaeology of Green Gate: interpreting contested space at Greenham Common Airbase. *World Archaeol.* 32(2):236–51

Shankland D. 1996. Çatalhöyük: the anthropology of an archaeological presence. In *On the Surface: Çatalhöyük 1993–1995*, ed. I Hodder, pp. 349–57. Cambridge/London: MacDonald Inst. Archaeol. Res./Br. Inst. Archaeol. at Ankara

Shankland D. 2005. The socio-ecology of Çatalhöyük. See Hodder 2005, pp. 15–26

Silliman SW, ed. 2008a. *Collaborating at the Trowel's Edge: Teaching and Learning in Indigenous Archaeology*. Tucson: Univ. Ariz. Press

Silliman SW. 2008b. The "Old West" in the Middle East: US military metaphors in real and imagined Indian country. *Am. Anthropol.* 110(2):237–47

Smith C, Wobst HM, eds. 2005. *Indigenous Archaeologies: Decolonizing Theory and Practice*. London: Routledge (One World Archaeol. 47)

Solomon E. 2006. Social uses of a monumental landscape. See Hamilakis & Momigliano 2006, pp. 145–82

This content downloaded from
149.156.74.86 on Sat, 11 Mar 2023 20:14:45 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

Stefanou E. 2008. *Aspects of identity and nationhood: commemorating, representing and replicating the Greek maritime past*. PhD thesis, Univ. Southampton

Stone PG. 2009. Protecting cultural heritage in times of conflict: lessons from Iraq. *Archaeol.: J. World Archaeol. Cong.* 5(1):32–38

Stroulia A. 2002. On the other side of Kiladha Bay: local perspectives on archaeological sites and on archaeology. *Aegean Archaeol.* 4:101–13

Stroulia A, Buck Sutton S, eds. 2010. *Archaeology in Situ: Sites, Archaeology, and Communities in Greece*. Lanham, MD: Lexington

Thoden van Velzen D. 1996. The world of Tuscan tomb raiders: living with the local community and the ancestors. *Int. J. Cult. Prop.* 5(1):111–26

Turkle S, ed. 2007. *Evocative Objects: Things We Think With*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press

Ucko P. 1987. *Academic Freedom and Apartheid: The Story of the World Archaeological Congress*. London: Duckworth

Watkins J. 2005. Through wary eyes: indigenous perspectives on archaeology. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.* 34:429–49

Watson PJ. 1979. *Archaeological Ethnography in Western Iran*. Tucson: Univ. Ariz. Press

Watson PJ. 2009. Archaeology and anthropology: a personal overview of the past half-century. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.* 38:1–15

Wylie A. 1985. The reaction against analogy. *Adv. Archaeol. Method Theory* 8:63–111

Yalouri E. 2001. *The Acropolis: Global Fame, Local Claim*. Oxford: Berg

Yarrow T. 2010. Not knowing as knowledge: asymmetry between archaeology and anthropology. See Garrow & Yarrow 2010, pp. 13–27

Zimmerman LZ. 2008. Real people or reconstructed people? Ethnocritical archaeology, ethnography, and community building. See Castañeda & Matthews 2008, pp. 183–204

Zorzin N. 2011a. Contextualising contract archaeology in Quebec: political economy and economic dependencies. *Archaeol. Rev. Camb.* 26(1):119–35

Zorzin N. 2011b. *The political economy of a commercial archaeology: a Quebec case study*. PhD thesis, Univ. Southampton

This content downloaded from
149.156.74.86 on Sat, 11 Mar 2023 20:14:45 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms