

Anthropology 2070a: Archaeological Method and Theory

Fall 2015

Monday 1:00-4:00 pm

Tozzer 102

Professor Rowan Flad

Van Serg Hall 104A

Office Hours: Wednesday 2-4 pm or by appointment

rflad@fas.harvard.edu

Course Description: This graduate-level seminar considers the varied ways in which archaeologists make inferences about human behavior from the archaeological record. The course will review the principal interpretive frameworks that influence archaeological practice in the Anglo-American world. Beginning with an overview of major debates in the discipline during the past half-century, Anthro 2070a will go on to consider diverse topics that shape the field of archaeology today, including the use of analogy, Middle Range Theory, symbolism and meaning, social and cultural evolution, cognitive archaeology, feminist critiques, practice theory, and postcolonialism. The intent is to provide graduate students with a solid foundation in archaeological theory, resulting in an ability to understand, critically assess, and contribute to debates concerning the construction of contemporary archaeological discourse.

Prerequisites: Graduate or advanced undergraduate standing in the Department of Anthropology or permission of the instructor.

Grading: Grades will be based upon four criteria: general seminar participation, including Presentations and attendance (including summaries, questions and short papers during discussion-leading weeks, 40%); a 5-page paper on the culture concept in archaeology, due October 12 (20%); and a final position paper concerning science, archaeology and epistemology related to a specific topic or set of topics in archaeology (40%).

Seminar Format: Each week we will discuss a selected group of writings (to be read before class). All students are required to produce short (1 paragraph) summaries of each article, which will highlight the major points, problems, benefits, and contributions of that reading, as well as identifying the primary questions/issues raised by the article. Students will print out hard copies of these summaries and questions and turn them in at the end of class each week. Things to consider while reading include:

- What is the main point or key argument?
- What are the key concepts? How are key words defined?
- What are the author's assumptions, both explicit and implicit?
- How does this author criticize or praise other authors' works?
- How does this author propose to overcome perceived shortcomings?
- How does this article relate to the other readings assigned for this week or previous weeks?

Additionally, each week one student will be assigned to lead discussion on that week's topic. This will entail the composition of a 2 page paper investigating the larger themes raised by that week's readings for contemporary archaeology. THESE PAPERS ARE NOT ARTICLE SUMMARIES, but should identify common themes and/or areas of debate among the articles AND provide the discussion leader's critical evaluation of the articles and their importance (or lack thereof) to the practice of archaeology (i.e. you must give your opinion about what you've read). These papers must be emailed to the rest of the class (through the course website) by 5 pm on the SUNDAY preceding that class. Each member of the class is then responsible for responding to this essay by formulating 2 questions/issues for discussion raised by the essay. The discussion leader will begin class by making a short (<5 minute) presentation based on her/his essay, and is in charge of leading discussion on the assigned readings.

Because this class meets only once a week and discussion is essential, attendance is compulsory. Missing class will prove detrimental not only to your final grade, but more importantly to your understanding of the material (as well as that of your classmates) and ultimately, to your development as a professional archaeologist. In the event of an emergency, students should make every effort to contact the instructor prior to class.

Recommended Texts:

Johnson, Matthew

2009 *Archaeological Theory: An Introduction*. 2nd ed. Blackwell, Oxford.

Trigger, Bruce G.

2006 *A History of Archaeological Thought*. 2nd ed. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge

Course Schedule and Reading List

Week 1 (Sept 2 - WEDNESDAY): Course Orientation – READ BEFORE CLASS IF POSSIBLE

Readings for Discussion (Approximately 258 pages):

Kuhn, Thomas S. (1962). *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Feyerabend, Paul (1975). *Against Method*. London: Verso. Pp. 17-33, 295-309 (plus the titles of each of the intervening chapters).

Dubin, Robert (1978). *Theory Building*. New York: The Free Press. Pp. 14-33.

Popper, Karl (1981). The Rationality of Scientific Revolutions. *Scientific Revolutions*, edited by I. Hacking. Oxford: Oxford University Press: 80-106.

Week 2 (September 14): Culture History and Processual Archaeology

Discussant: _____

Background Readings:

Trigger Chapter 6 - pp. 211-313; Chapter 8 - pp. 386-444

Readings for Discussion (Approximately 212):

Taylor, W. W. (1948). Chapters 1-4. In *A Study of Archaeology*, pp. 3-110. SIU-Carbondale, Center for Archaeological Investigations, Carbondale, IL.

[Hudson, Cory (2008). Walter Taylor and the History of American Archaeology. *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* 27:192-200.]

Hawkes, Christopher (1954). Archaeological Theory and Method: Some Suggestions from the Old World. *American Anthropologist* N.S. 56(2):155-168.

Wiley, Gordon R., and Philip Phillips (1958). *Method and Theory in American Archaeology*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. Pp. 1-57. (Intro, Part I = Chapters 1&2)

Binford, Lewis R. (1962). Archaeology as Anthropology. *American Antiquity* 28:217-225.

Binford, Lewis R. (1966). Archaeological Systematics and the Study of Culture Process. *American Antiquity* 31:203-10.

Flannery, Kent (1972). Culture History vs. Culture Process. In *Contemporary Archaeology: A guide to Theory and Contributions*, edited by M. Leone, pp. 102-107. SIU Press, Carbondale.

Flannery, Kent (1973). Archaeology with a Capital "S." In *Research and Theory in Current Archaeology*, edited by C. Redman, pp. 47-53. John Wiley and Sons, New York.

Watson, Patty Jo, Steven A. LeBlanc and Charles L. Redman (1974). The Covering Law Model in Archaeology: Practical Uses and Formal Interpretations. *World Archaeology* 6: 125-132.

Week 3 (September 21): Behavioral Archaeology and the Nature of the Archaeological Record

Discussant: _____

Readings for Discussion (Approximately 215 pages):

Reid, J.J., M.B. Schiffer, and W.L. Rathje (1975). Behavioral Archaeology: Four Strategies. *American Anthropologist* 77:864-879.

Binford, Lewis R. (1981). Behavioral Archaeology and the "Pompeii Premise." *Journal of Anthropological Research* 37:195-208.

Flannery, Kent (1982). The Golden Marshalltown: A Parable for the Archaeology of the 1980s. *American Anthropologist* 84:265-278.

Patrik, Linda E. (1985). Is there an archaeological record? *Advances in Archaeological Method and Theory* 8:27-62.

Hodder, Ian (1989). This is not an article about material culture as text. *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* 8(3):250-259.

Watson, Patty Jo and Michael Fotiadis (1990). The Razor's Edge: Symbolic-Structuralist Archeology and the Expansion of Archeological Inference. *American Anthropologist* 92: 613-629.

Dunnell, Robert C. (1992) The Notion Site. In *Space, Time, and Archaeological Landscapes*, edited by Jaqueline Rossignol and LuAnn Wandsnider, pp. 21-41. Plenum Press, New York.

Lamotta, Vincent, and Michael B. Schiffer (2001). Behavioral Archaeology: Toward a New Synthesis. In *Archaeological Theory Today*, edited by I. Hodder, pp. 14-64. Polity Press, Cambridge.

Bird, Douglas, and James O'Connell (2006). Behavioral Ecology and Archaeology. *Journal of Archaeological Research* 14:143-188.

Week 4 (September 28): Postprocessual Critiques and Responses

Discussant:

Background Readings:

Johnson, Chapters 7 and 12
Trigger pp. 444-483

Readings for Discussion (Approximately 229 pages):

Hodder, Ian (1982). Theoretical Archaeology: A Reactionary View. In *Symbolic and Structural Archaeology*, edited by I. Hodder, pp. 1-16. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Binford, Lewis R. (1982). Objectivity--Explanation--Archaeology--1981. In *Theory and Explanation in Archaeology*. Edited by C. Renfrew, M. Rowlands, and B. Segraves, pp. 125-138. Academic Press, New York.

Shanks, M., and C. Tilley (1987). Theory and Method in Archaeology. In, *Social Theory and Archaeology*, edited by: University of New Mexico Press. Pp. 1-28.

Shanks, M., and C. Tilley (1987). Archaeology and the Politics of Theory. In, *Social Theory and Archaeology*, edited by: University of New Mexico Press. Pp. 186-208.

Shanks, M., and C. Tilley (1987). The Present Past; Positivism and the 'New Archaeology'; Facts and Values in Archaeology. In, *Re-Constructing Archaeology: Theory and Practice*, edited by Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Pp. 7-67.

Watson, Richard A. (1990). Ozymandias, King of Kings: Postprocessual Radical Archaeology as Critique. *American Antiquity* 55(4): 673-689.

Redman, Charles (1991). In Defense of the Seventies: The Adolescence of New Archaeology. *American Anthropologist* 93:295-307.

Hodder, Ian (1991). Interpretive Archaeology and its Role. *American Antiquity* 56(1): 7-18.

Hodder, Ian (1992) The Domestication of Europe. In *Theory and Practice in Archaeology*, pp. 241-253. Routledge, London.

Engelstad, Ericka (1991). Images of Power and Contradiction: Feminist Theory and Post-Processual Archaeology. *Antiquity* 65: 502-514.

Preucel, Robert (1995). The Postprocessual Condition. *Journal of Archaeological Research* 3:147-175.

Week 5 (October 5): Analogy and Middle Range Theory

Discussant: _____

Background Readings:

Johnson, Chapter 4

Readings for Discussion (Approximately 211 pages):

Ascher, R. (1961). Analogy in archaeological interpretation. *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology* 17:317-325.

Binford, Lewis R. (1967) Smudge Pits and Hide Smoking: The Use of Analogy in Archaeological Reasoning. *American Antiquity* 32:1-12.

Lathrap, Donald W. (1983). Recent Studies of Shipibo-Conibo Ceramics and Their Archaeological Implications. In *Structure and Cognition in Art*, edited by Dorothy Washburn, pp. 25-39.

Raab, L. Mark, and Albert C. Goodyear (1984). Middle Range Theory in Archaeology: A Critical Review of Origins and Applications. *American Antiquity* 49:255-268.

O'Connell, J.F. (1995). Ethnoarchaeology needs a general theory of behavior. *Journal of Archaeological Research* 3:205-255.

Saitta, Dean (1992). Radical Archaeology and Middle-Range Theory. *Antiquity* 66:886-897.

Stahl, Ann (1993). Concepts of Time and Approaches to Analogical Reasoning in Historical Perspective. *American Antiquity* 58(2):235-260.

Kelly, Robert L. (2011). Why Did Binford's Middle-Range Program Outcompete Schiffer's Formation Process Program? *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory* 18(4): 284-290.

Peregrine, Peter N. (2001). Cross-Cultural Comparative Approaches to Archaeology. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 30: 1-18.

Wylie, Alison (2002). Archaeological Cables and Tacking: Beyond Objectivism and Relativism. In *Thinking from Things*, pp. 161-167. University of California Press, Berkeley.

Wylie, A. (1985). The reaction against analogy. In, M. Schiffer (ed.) *Advances in Archaeological Method and Theory*. Vol. 8. Academic Press: 63-111.

Culture Concept Paper Due OCT. 12, 5:00 pm

Week 6 (October 19): Typology and Classification

Discussant: _____

Readings for Discussion: (Approximately 226 pages)

McKern, William C. (1939). The Midwestern Taxonomic method as an Aid to Archaeological Culture Study. *American Antiquity* 4: 301-313.

Spaulding, Albert C. (1953). Statistical Techniques for the Discovery of Artifact Types. *American Antiquity* 18(4): 305-313.

Ford, James A., and Julian H. Steward (1954). On the Concept of Types. *American Anthropologist* 56: 42-54.

Spaulding, Albert C. (1954). Reply. *American Anthropologist* 56: 112-114.

Ford, James A. (1954). Comment on A. C. Spaulding, "Statistical Techniques for the Discovery of Artifact Types". *American Antiquity* 19(4): 390-391.

Spaulding, Albert C. (1954). Reply to Ford. *American Antiquity* 19(4): 391-393.

Ford, James A. (1954). Spaulding's Review of Ford. *American Anthropologist* 56: 109-111.

Ford, James A. (1961). In Favor of Simple Typology. *American Antiquity* 27(1): 113-114.

Binford, Lewis (1965). Archaeological systematics and the study of cultural process. *American Antiquity* 31:203-221.

Whallon, Robert (1972). A new approach to pottery typology. *American Antiquity* 37:13-33.

Wobst, Martin H. (1977). Stylistic Behavior and Information Exchange. In, *For the Director: Research Essays in Honor of James B. Griffin*, Vol. 61, edited by Charles E. Cleland. Ann Arbor, MI: Museum of Anthropology, University of Michigan. Pp. 317-342.

Sackett, James R. (1977). The Meaning of Style in Archaeology: A General Model. *American Antiquity* 42(3): 369-380.

Dunnell, Robert C. (1978). Style and Function: A Fundamental Dichotomy. *American Antiquity* 43(2):192-202.

Cowgill, George L., and James A. Brown (1982). Clusters of Objects and Associations Between Variables: Two Approaches to Archaeological Classification. In, *Essays on Archaeological Typology*, edited by Robert Whallon. Evanston, IL: Center for American Archaeology Press. Pp. 30-55.

Miller, Daniel (1982). Artefacts as products of human categorization process. In *Symbolic and Structural Archaeology*, edited by I. Hodder, pp. 17-25. New Directions in Archaeology. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

- Wiessner, Polly (1985). Style or Isochrestic Variation? A Reply to Sackett. *American Antiquity* 50(1): 160-166.
- Binford, Lewis R. (1989). Styles of Style. *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* 8: 51-67.
- Cowgill, George L. (1990). Artifact classifications and archaeological purpose. In, *Mathematics and Information Science in Archaeology: A Flexible Framework*, edited by Albertus Voorrips. Bonn: Holos Verlag. Pp. 61-78.
- Sackett, James R. (1991). Straight archaeology French style: The phylogenetic paradigm in historic perspective. In *Perspectives on the Past*, edited by G. A. Clark, pp. 109-139. University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia.
-

Week 7 (October 26): Evolutionary Approaches

Discussant: _____

Background Readings:

Johnson, Chapters 9 and 10

Readings for Discussion (Approximately 206 pages):

- Flannery, Kent (1972). The Cultural Evolution of Civilizations. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics* 3:399-426.
- Johnson, Allen W. and Timothy K. Earle (1987). *The Evolution of Human Societies: From Foraging Group to Agrarian State*. Stanford: Stanford University Press. Pp. 1-37.
- Mithen, Steven (1989). Evolutionary Theory and Post-Processual Archaeology. *Antiquity* 63(240):483-495.
- Crumley, Carole L. (1995). Heterarchy and the Analysis of Complex Societies. *Heterarchy and the Analysis of Complex Societies*, edited by Robert M. Ehrenreich, C. L. Crumley and J. E. Levy. Arlington, VA. 6: 1-6.
- Shennan, Stephen (1996). Cultural Transmission and Cultural Change. In *Contemporary Archaeology in Theory*, edited by R. Preucel and I. Hodder, pp. 282-296.
- Lyman, R. Lee and Michael J. O'Brien (1998). The goals of evolutionary archaeology. *Current Anthropology* 39:615-52.
- Boone, J.L. and Smith, E.A. (1998). Is it Evolution yet? A Critique of Evolutionary Archaeology. *Current Anthropology* 39 (Supplement): S141-S173.

Boyd, Robert and Peter Richerson (2009). Culture and the evolution of human cooperation. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B* 364: 3281-3288.

Neitzel, Jill E., and Timothy Earle (2014). Dual-tier approach to societal evolution and types. *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* 36(0): 181-195.

Andersson, Claes, Törnberg Anton, and Petter Törnberg (2014). An Evolutionary Developmental Approach to Cultural Evolution. *Current Anthropology* 55(2): 154-174.

Week 8 (November 2): Practice and Agency

Discussant: _____

Readings: (approximately 197 pages)

Bourdieu, Pierre (1970). The Berber House, or the World Reversed. *Social Science Information* 9:151-170.

Pauketat, Timothy (2001). Practice and History in Archaeology: An Emerging Paradigm. *Anthropological Theory* 1(1):73-97. (Reprinted in P&M, pp. 137-155)

Smith, Adam T. (2001). The Limitations of Doxa. *Journal of Social Archaeology* 1(2):155-171.

Silliman, Stephen (2001). Agency, Practical Politics and the Archaeology of Culture Contact. *Journal of Social Archaeology* 1(2). pp. 190-209.

Gillespie, Susan D. (2001). Personhood, Agency, and Mortuary Ritual: A Case Study from the Ancient Maya. *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* 20(1): 73-112.

Dornan, Jennifer (2002). Agency and Archaeology: Past, Present, and Future Directions. *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory* 9(4): 303-329.

Gardner, Andrew (2008). Agency. In *Handbook of Archaeological Theories*, edited by R. Bentley, H. Maschner, and C. Chippendale, pp. 95-108. Altamira Press, Lanham, MD.

Crossland, Zoe (2014). The Anthropocene: locating agency. *Journal of Contemporary Archaeology* 1(1): 123-128.

Munson, Jessica (2015). From Metaphors to Practice. *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory* 22(2): 428-460.

Overholtzer, Lisa (2015). Agency, practice, and chronological context: A Bayesian approach to household chronologies. *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* 37(0): 37-47.

Week 9 (November 9): Social Networks

Discussant: _____

Readings for Discussion (Approximately 201 pages):

Granovetter, M. (1973). The Strength of Weak Ties. *American Journal of Sociology* 78: 1360-1380.

Wynne-Jones, Stephanie and Sheila Kohring (2007). Socialising Complexity. *Socialising Complexity: Structure, Interaction and Power in Archaeological Discourse*, edited by S. Kohring and S. Wynchane-Jones. Oxford: Oxbow Books: 2-12.

Chapman, Robert (2007). Evolution, Complexity and the State. *Socialising Complexity: Structure, Interaction and Power in Archaeological Discourse*, edited by S. Kohring and S. Wynne-Jones. Oxford: Oxbow Books: 13-28.

Brughmans, Tom (2013). Thinking Through Networks: A Review of Formal Network Methods in Archaeology. *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory* 20(4): 623-662.

Pailes, Matthew (2014). Social Network Analysis of Early Classic Hohokam Corporate Group Inequality. *American Antiquity* 79(3): 465-486.

Borck, Lewis, Barbara J. Mills, Matthew A. Peeples and Jeffery J. Clark (2015). Are Social Networks Survival Networks? An Example from the Late Pre-Hispanic US Southwest. *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory* 22(1): 33-57.

Collar, Anna, Fiona Coward, Tom Brughmans and Barbara J Mills (2015). Networks in Archaeology: Phenomena, Abstraction, Representation. *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory* 22(1): 1-32.

Golitko, Mark and Gary M. Feinman (2015). Procurement and Distribution of Pre-Hispanic Mesoamerican Obsidian 900 BC–AD 1520: a Social Network Analysis. *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory* 22(1): 206-247.

Mills, Barbara J., Matthew A. Peeples, Jr. Haas, W. Randall, Lewis Borck, Jeffery J. Clark and Jr. Roberts, John M. (2015). Multiscalar Perspectives on Social Networks in the Late Prehispanic Southwest. *American Antiquity* 80(1): 3-24.

Week 10 (November 16): Materiality

Discussant: _____

Readings for Discussion (Approximately 203 pages):

Kopytoff, Igor (1986). The Cultural Biography of Things: Commoditization as Process. In *The Social Life of Things*, edited by A. Appadurai, pp. 64-91. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Brown, Bill (2001) Thing Theory. *Critical Inquiry* 28(1):1-22

Latour, Bruno (2005). "Third Source of Uncertainty: Objects Too Have Agency." In *Reassembling the Social*, pp. 63-86.

Cerulo, K. A. (2009). Nonhumans in social interaction. *Annual Review of Sociology* 35: 531-552.

Knappett, Carl (2013). *Network Analysis in Archaeology: New Approaches to Regional Interaction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Pp. 149-213

Van Oyen, Astrid (2015). Actor-Network Theory's Take on Archaeological Types: Becoming, Material Agency and Historical Explanation. *Cambridge Archaeological Journal* 25(01): 63-78.

Preucel, Robert and Alex Bauer (2001). Archaeological Pragmatics. *Norwegian Archaeological Review* 34:85-96.

Preucel, Robert (2015). Archaeology and the Limitations of Actor Network Theory. Unpublished Manuscript.

Week 11 (November 23): Theory and Ethics

Discussant: _____

Background Reading:

Johnson, Chapter 12

Readings for Discussion (Approximately 149 pages):

Trigger, Bruce (1984). Alternative Archaeologies: Nationalist, Colonialist, Imperialist. *Man* 19:355-370.

Atalay, Sonya (2006). Indigenous Archaeology as Decolonizing Practice. *American Indian Quarterly* 30(3&4):280-310.

Watkins, Joe (2007) The Repatriation Arena: Control, Conflict, and Compromise. In *Opening Archaeology*, edited by T. W. Killion, pp. 161-177. SAR Press, Santa Fe.

Conkey, Margaret W. (2007). Questioning Theory: Is there a gender of theory in archaeology? *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory* 14: 285-310.

Wylie, Alison (2007). Good Science, Bad Science, or Science as Usual? Feminist Critiques of Science. In *Women in Human Evolution*, edited by L. D. Hager, pp. 29-55. Routledge, London. (Reprinted in P&M, pp. 226-243)

Liebmann, Matthew (2008) Introduction: The Intersections of Archaeology and Postcolonial Studies. In *Archaeology and the Postcolonial Critique*, edited by M. Liebmann and U. Rizvi, pp. 1-13. Altamira Press, Lanham, MD.

Alberti, Benjamin and Yvonne Marshall (2009). Animating Archaeology: Local Theories and Conceptually Open-Ended Methodologies. *Cambridge Archaeological Journal* 19(3): 344-356.

Sabloff, Jeremy A. (2010). Where have you gone, Margaret Mead? Anthropology and Public Intellectuals. *American Anthropologist* 113(3): 406-416. (see also: <http://vimeo.com/17850878>)

Week 12 (November 30): Contemporary Issues and Debates

Discussant: _____

Background Reading:

Trigger, Chapter 10

Johnson, Chapters 3, 13

Reading for Discussion (Approximately 161):

Spaulding, Albert C. (1988). Distinguished Lecture: Archeology and Anthropology. *American Anthropologist* 90: 263-271.

Fuller, S. (1992). Being there with Thomas Kuhn: A parable for postmodern times. *History and Theory* 31(3): 241-275.

Wylie, Alison (1992). On Scepticism, Philosophy and Archaeological Science. *Current Anthropology* 33: 209-213.

Wylie, Alison (1992). On 'heavily decomposing red herrings': Scientific method in archaeology and the lading of evidence with theory. *Metaarchaeology: Reflections by Archaeologists and Philosophers*, edited by L. Embree. Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishing: 269-288.

Fogelin, Lars (2007). Inference to the Best Explanation: A Common and Effective Form of Archaeological Reasoning. *American Antiquity* 72(4):603-626.

Pollard, A. M. and P. Bray (2007). A Bicycle Made for Two? The Integration of Scientific Techniques into Archaeological Interpretation. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 36: 245-259.

Dawdy, Shannon Lee (2009). Millennial Archaeology: Locating the Discipline in the Age of Insecurity. *Archaeological Dialogues* 16(2):131-142.

Longacre, William A (2010). Archaeology as Anthropology Revisited. *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory* 17(2): 81-100.

Peregrine, Peter, Yolanda T. Moses, Alan Goodman, Louise Lamphere and James Lowe Peacock (2012). What Is Science in Anthropology? *American Anthropologist* 114(4): 593-597.

Kintigh, Keith, Jeffrey Altschul, Mary Beaudry, Robert Drennan, Ann Kinzig, Timothy Kohler, W. Frederick Limp, Herbert Maschner, William Michener, Timothy Pauketat, Peter Peregrine, Jeremy Sabloff, Tony Wilkinson, Henry Wright and Melinda Zeder (2014). Grand Challenges for Archaeology. *American Antiquity* 79(1):5-24.

Cobb, Charles R. (2014). The Once and Future Archaeology. *American Antiquity* 79(4): 589-595.