

We use cookies to enhance your experience on our website. By clicking 'continue' or by continuing to use our website, you are agreeing to our use of cookies. You can change your cookie settings at any time.

[Download Here](#)

Introduction.

[About](#) [News](#) [Subjects Available](#) [Guided Tour](#) [For Authors](#) [Subscrib](#)

OXFORD HANDBOOKS ONLINE

Scholarly Research Reviews

Browse by Subject ▾

Archaeology

Business and Management

Classical Studies

Criminology and Criminal Justice

Economics and Finance

History

Law

Linguistics

Literature

Music

Neuroscience

Philosophy

Physical Sciences

Introduction: Material Culture Studies: a Reactionary View

Dan Hicks and Mary C. Beaudry

The Oxford Handbook of Material Culture Studies

Edited by Dan Hicks and Mary C. Beaudry

Print Publication Date: Sep 2010 Subject: Archaeology, History and Theory of Archaeology

Online Publication Date: Sep 2012 DOI: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199218714.013.0001

Login

[Forgotten your password?](#)

[Login with your Library Card »](#)

In This Article

[Disciplinary Perspectives](#)

[Material Practices](#)

[Objects And Humans](#)

[Landscapes and the Built
Environment](#)

[Studying Particular Things](#)

[Material Culture Studies: a
Reactionary View](#)

[-] Abstract and Keywords

Divided into four parts, the field of material cultural studies in history, archaeology, and anthropology. This book celebrates 'material culture studies' in anthropology, archaeology, and the related fields of history and anthropology. This article explores the key arguments put forward from different disciplinary perspectives; material practices; objects and humans; landscapes and particular things. Part I explores a number of different approaches to material culture studies. Part II reviews six kinds of 'material practices' and how objects and human subjects in a variety of different ways are studied. Part III material culture studies can be used to examine large-scale processes. This article draws together geographical approaches to 'cultural studies'.

Keywords: [material cultural](#), [cultural studies](#), [history](#), [archaeology](#)

Four years ago, we worked together on another editorial volume, *Handbook of Archaeology* (Hicks and Beaudry 2006a). At the time, historical and anthropological archaeology that was witnessing new growth and was vibrant today. Researchers using archaeological methods were finding themselves in the middle of a broader current of change in the world. In assembling that book, therefore, we started to think about the past and contemporary world—a long standing backwater that had been experiencing such resurgence. In our introduction to the volume, we might represent one place in which anthropology could be used to study material things. We were particularly interested in the idea of a broader 'material turn' in the humanities and social sciences, beyond an earlier 'cultural', 'linguistic', 'literary', or 'textual' turn, or else constitute simply an extension of its representation (p. 2) (for example Preda 1999; Pickett 2003: 5). Without doubt, the rapidly expanding literature in 'material culture studies' in which anthropology has played a role. But increasingly this literature was characterized by a return to culturalist studies of material culture, which served similar relations (Pinney 2005). As anthropology and archaeology might represent studies as representing a new cross disciplinary field of study between archaeology and anthropology might make more distinct. So, when we decided to work together again on a *Handbook of Material Culture Studies* One was to explore, to gather together, and to celebrate the field in anthropology, archaeology, and the related fields of

(STS). The other was to try to pin down where our research comes from.

Material culture, objects, materiality, materials, things, interdisciplinary enquiry is provided, it appears, by research 'matters'. The idea of material culture studies represents (e.g. Miller and Tilley 1996; Tilley 2006b). The purpose of this book, so, we set out what is perhaps a reactionary view of materialist culturalist uses of materials that developed during the 1990s. We explore this argument and to explain the editorial direction of the book. The arguments put forward in the five sections of the book: (1) objects and humans; (2) landscapes and the built environment;

Disciplinary Perspectives

The sentiment that a turn to the material represents a vanguard for an avoidance of the grand narratives of structuralism is common over the past decade. But does 'letting things speak' challenge traditions and practices? Do different disciplines let the

Today, things are everywhere in the social sciences and humanities, philosophy, and sociology. In the bookshops of university libraries crowd the shelves of the modern history section: studies of chocolate (Coe and Coe 1996), opium (Booth 1996), tea and coffee in their academic journals, geographers are embracing new 'material human world' (Whatmore 2006), human geographies of the material (Murdoch 1997: 328), and calls for a more general 're-materialisation' (Jackson 2000; Lees 2002). In literature studies, Bill Brown and Jane Bennett (2001: 92) develops the idea of 'enchanted modern disenchantment'. In sociology, Momin Rahman (2006) 'of the material in feminist thought'.

The intellectual points of reference in the study of things are, to a lesser extent, overlapping. But key texts are read through the lens as particular disciplinary methods are put into practice. The book might seem.

Consider what the idea of material culture studies in the 1990s involves. Historians have worked in intellectual traditions of whether Marx's 'materialist conception of history' (Engels 1859)

Braudel (1973), or Asa Briggs' (1988) attendance to 'Victorian' understanding of objects as 'alternative sources' that can answer the questions posed by economic history and social history. These have related to long standing efforts to understand the world, which has polarized perhaps more strongly between on the one hand the 'material and social conditions' (Harvey 1989: 327) and on the other the more recent extension of 'human' to include new technologies, or ecologies: in 'hybrid' studies popularized by the implosion of trope and flesh' evoked by Donna Haraway's heady mix of ideas about materials, space, politics, and philosophy, drawing on Baruch Spinoza, and Alfred North Whitehead in non-reductive discussions of 'material imagination' (Anderson and Whitehead 2005). In surprise, have focused on the involvement of objects in their various forms: ranging from constructivist studies of scientific knowledge (Latour and Woolgar 1979; Cetina 1981; see Preda 1999), to Michel Foucault's (1977) (1981) (p. 4) critique of historical materialism, and to the more recent cultural studies, these interests have run from Raymond Williams' 'doing cultural studies' by studying the Sony Walkman (1986) to a reading of Martin Heidegger's (1971 [1949]) essay on 'The Thing' which draws now from Henry Thoreau's 'attachment to the World' (1989) to a description of the instability of physical systems (Benjamin 1988). Rahman and Witz use Judith Butler to make a connection between the question of the materiality of the body' (Butler 1993: 1).

Marx, Braudel, Deleuze, Giddens, Haraway, de Certeau, and Judith Butler. These overlapping points of theoretical departure are, of course, within each discipline the subject of debate and intellectual triangulations through which historians, social scientists, and material culture—in the different ways that social theory has had a strong influence. Drawing attention at the outset to the connections between each other in this volume about 'material culture studies'.

This book gathers together a range of different perspectives from archaeology and socio cultural anthropology, and from other disciplines. The chapters have been assembled to provide a snapshot of how to emerge from putting distinctive methods into practice, and to engage in enquiry. These range from archaeological methods for the museum (Edwards et al. 2006), through laboratory methods through excavation (Edgeworth 2003)—to qualitative methods in anthropology (Epstein 2002; Bernard 2005) and the method of

ethnography (Henare 2005a), the range of research methods what Annemarie Mol calls the 'praxiography' of STS (Material disciplines, the idea of material culture is both understood and debates, and as emerging through the answering of field practice. As field sciences, archaeology, anthropology awareness of how research performs objects: how things simply being bound up in social relations or webs of material of contingent practices is, we suggest, precisely the same material practices studied by anthropologists and others in the practices of *fieldwork*. An awareness of disciplinary first step in any adequate account of contemporary material

Part I of this volume explores a number of different disciplines studies. In conducting an 'excavation' of the idea of material anthropology, Dan Hicks (Chapter 2) argues that the field the idea of 'material culture' in the second quarter of the twentieth counterpoint to Durkheimian social anthropology; and as a way of bringing together structuralism and interpretive second process, which he terms the 'Material Cultural Turn' a purely cultural turn in these fields by apparently recognizing use of the practice theories in Bourdieu and Giddens. However within material culture studies, especially relating to the and arguments about the extension of 'agency' from human idea of 'material culture'. Hicks argues that recent thinking provides a basis for retaining the coherence of the idea and also the knowledge that is generated by studying the involvement of things in historical processes or their effects the distinction between the researcher as subject and the move, which Hicks describes as moving from the idea of witnessing (after Haraway 1997), are to call into question disciplinary field. Instead, Hicks argues that an awareness of the world is not a limitation of studying things through this is precisely its strength. We shall return to this argument relationships between actor network theory (ANT) and

As well as archaeology and social anthropology, Part I contains and perspectives from cultural geography, folklife studies 'material geographies', Ian Cook and Divya Tolia Kelly 'rematerialization' of cultural geography. They find that a very wide variety of concerns and theoretical approaches

discussion around a particular contemporary event: the England's south west coast and the subsequent argument on the shore: a sequence of events that was unfolding a —landscape, commodities, and creativity—the authors' abstract concerns with materiality are put into situated

In Chapter 4, Robert Saint George traces the development of studies: folklife studies. This historical account traces nineteenth century studies of geographical distributions, the rise of open air museums, and the emergence of folklife after its practice was introduced in the United States, of European traditional cultures in new settings: such as Folklife. Reviewing the work on material culture in folklife studies, the writing of Henry Glassie, Saint George provides a new approach to ethnographic material culture studies on the American

In Chapter 5, Ann Stahl considers the place of material culture in material histories, she begins with James Deetz's demarcation of more than simply a new range of sources, to complement the past (Deetz 1977). Stahl explores how anthropologists and archaeologists, Kopytoff (1986), and Anne Stoler (2001), especially through. Using examples from the history of West Africa, she develops distinctive accounts of 'global entanglements' that move things. By following objects, over time and across, often through archaeology and historical anthropology reveal 'material culture' as a fragmented Vaseline jar, the disciplinary present.

The field of STS, as it has emerged from the social construction of Knowledge (SSK) since the early 1990s, has sought to address these studies. Bruno Latour has famously compared the relationship between socio cultural anthropology and physical anthropology and geography: as a kind of 'physical sociology', 'which forces the "symbolic" to take seriously the enormous difficulty of the radical hybridity of their topics' (Latour 2000a: 121). Focusing on how matter comes to 'matter', his work is an awareness of 'material semiotics' and 'the patterning of objects as stable, and understanding objects as stable, and understanding objects purely by human subjects, to a sense of the unstable and the arguments about multiplicities (Mol 2002), Law works to address this complexity (see Law 2004), and introduces the idea of a

understanding of material culture that emerges from S
an engagement with the multiplicities and complexities

The chapters in Part I demonstrate how material things
concerns and traditions of thought. This encourages us
as ontologically distinct from the vernacular practices s
approaches to ‘material practices’: both those of the re

Material Practices

Part II reviews six kinds of ‘material practice’: agency, c
a form of action), and deposition. In Chapter 7, Andy Pi
practice and performance in STS literature. Building on
(Pickering 1995; Pickering and Guzik 2008), Pickering us
agency’ as a way of revealing that this focus on doing le
since agency is no longer the sole preserve of humans.
understands the performative focus of STS as leading a
semiotics. In a shift from epistemology to ontology, Pic
animals, buildings, and technologies of the self—as pla
like Law, with the new political formations that emerge
‘ground level’ studies that can reveal alternative ways f
subject–object distinction of modernist epistemologies

In Chapter 8, the volume turns to a classic theme in ma
consumerism (see Miller 1987). The turn to consumptio
production focused studies that failed to take account c
social practices. Reviewing the changing approaches to
anthropology, Dietler notes that while early studies str
work acknowledges that material culture (p. 8) does m
the study of colonialism and of food, alcohol, and drugs
methods in consumption studies. An awareness of met
consumption studies from archaeology and anthropolo
assumptions of the uniqueness of modern or Western c
archaeology and anthropology have made a distinct co
in consumption as purely a domain of symbolic expres
consequences.

Issues of method and practice also form the focus of Ch
the history of changing practices of collecting and doing

comprehend ‘how they are seen and how they mean’. It is not that objects possess agency and that they have effects in the world; the anthropologist is not to conclude that objects *do* have agency. The belief in the agency of objects comes about. To accomplish an object functions in context, then attempt to explain why. Offering a case study of Yolngu circumcision painting in the context of and nuanced studies that retain the distinctive category of objects as simply another form of material culture and unpicking

The final contribution to Part II examines archaeological practice. Rosemary Joyce and Josh Pollard trace the development of the different ways in which archaeologists have interpreted deposition. Joyce and Pollard work through Mike Schiffman's processual idea of reading assemblages as ‘structured objects’ and practice as the evidence of human actions (both ceremonial and practical). In their fieldwork at Mantecales, Honduras, they show how in the past (p. 10) have increasingly moved from the interpretation of objects to materials in everyday practice, performance, and memory.

Objects And Humans

As will be clear already, the contributions in this volume explore the relationship between objects and human subjects in a variety of different ways. The volume is divided into five themed chapters: exploring technology, material agency, and objects, objects and humans, objects and humans, and objects and humans by non human primates.

Kacy Hollenback and Mike Schiffer open the section with a chapter on archaeology, a programme of archaeological research (Hollenback 1995a, 2008a). For Hollenback and Schiffer, a reliance on technology distinguishes humans from other animals. Reviewing the history of anthropology before and after the invention of the idea of technology—‘performance characteristics’, the study of technology that are central to their behavioural approach to material culture—‘senescence’ (death) of technologies distinguishes this approach. Through two case studies—concerned with the failure of technology in the relationship between the spread of smallpox and the decline of the Mandan and Hidatsa of the Northern Plains of North America—archaeology offers distinctive perspectives on how human

In Chapter 14, Andy Jones and Nicky Boivin take stock of One recent approach to the study of objects and human agency to material things: whether understanding objects as human agency (Gell 1998). For Jones and Boivin, such a move beyond the concerns with material culture as human analogous with a 'text' (Hodder 1986). However, quite different objects, Jones and Boivin focus on how things' actions as an extension of human intentionality. Through a discussion drawing from work in STS and ANT, the authors show the distinction between relativism and realism that characterizes examples from Late Neolithic Orkney and from Rajasthan. They move beyond a concern with the social, and that ideas of action [that] are mediated and articulated over time'

Another way in which distinctions between humans and material culture in anthropology is through a shift from concerns with 'ideas' to the emergence of 'personhood'. In Chapter 15, Chris Fowler discusses material culture as either reflective or actively involved in personhood. Drawing especially upon Melanesian ethnography, he discusses bounded and distributed personhood, and the idea of personhood can be used to critique Western notions of the strictly bounded person. Drawing upon ethnographic observations about the diversity of understandings of personhood for archaeologists studying past societies, especially since personhood has been involved in the creation of personhood. Using examples from archaeology, Fowler shows how recent work in archaeology has moved beyond objects and humans, but upon the permeabilities between objects and humans, and the contingencies of ideas of persons and objects.

Another key area of research in which the permeabilities between objects and humans is in the archaeology of embodiment. In Chapter 16, Zoë Crossland shows how archaeologists have increasingly moved beyond material culture through the idea of embodiment, and how embodiment can be used to critique Western notions of the strictly bounded person. Considering how seventeenth century 'witches bottles' and 'witches' bottles' as bodily metaphors, she shows how these objects are suggested to be embodied but also represent through 'an extraordinary redundant and dependent biographies'. Then, through a discussion of how embodiment is an expression of changing ideas about the body and about

living, Crossland argues that forensic archaeology is a p
render an ostensibly empirical endeavour as a discours
about science. In conclusion, Crossland argues that (p.
'alternate narratives of the coming into being of the bo
studied together through objects.

The questioning of the limits of the person in relation to
of the distinctiveness of human manipulation of materi
primates (cf. Strum and Latour 1987). Tanya Humle (Ch
capuchin monkeys, orangutans, and chimpanzees, and
seen as having 'material cultures', and perhaps also mo
definition of culture as 'a system of socially transmitted
primate use of material culture, Humle distinguishes be
material environment beyond primates (in which we co
arthropods from bark by woodpecker finches, or birds
means to achieve an end, which includes the use of sto
and the use of sticks to extract insects or honey from tre
dimension of primate material culture, which includes
teaching; the importance of studying primate use of ma
therefore underlined by Humle. Through these discuss
divisions between biological anthropology from cultur
of 'cultural primatology' as fusing elements drawn from
archaeology, behavioural ecology, and psychology—are
threatened primate cultures. Humle also eloquently arg
idea of 'material culture' in non human primates in isol
them.

Landscapes and the Built Environ

Part IV of the volume explores how the idea of material
rather than discrete or portable objects. The chapters in
'cultural landscapes' and 'ecological landscapes' with th
environment, and two contrasting traditions of studyin

(p. 13) The idea of 'cultural landscapes', Lesley Head no
Carl Sauer in the 1920s, which has led over several gene
labour in geography between the 'human' or 'cultural' ;
geography encouraged a strongly active understanding
landscapes, but then how more recently geographers h

and hybrid nature of cultural and natural landscapes, e plants, animals, and other elements of the 'natural' world. The idea of 'cultural landscapes' has been put into practice in the 'cultural landscape' category of the World Heritage Convention, Australia. Drawing on the arguments of feminist philosophy, the idea of cultural landscapes is 'irretrievably anthropocentric' and 'inherently political'. Cultural landscapes, in favour of a blurring of distinctions between the natural and the cultural, argue that in certain situations the idea of cultural landscapes is the politics of indigenous heritage. This argument reminds us that cultural and material landscapes as historically contingent, and to overcome them, are always situated and political.

In contrast with Chapter 18, Sarah Whatmore and Steve Hinchliffe argue for 'cultural landscapes' to seek to dispose of any distinction between the natural and the cultural, and the materials of which landscapes are made as 'energetic and dynamic'. They draw on arguments in phenomenology, affect, and biophilosophy, and ecology that allows for a sense of landscape as process, rather than more than spatial entity. Whatmore and Hinchliffe see landscapes as situated on the basis of their relationships with human beings. They argue that urban spaces in the contemporary urban ecology of Bristol—'urban ecology reserve'—Whatmore and Hinchliffe call for the study of 'urban ecology' concepts of vernacular ecologies and conviviality, they argue that 'urban ecology' achievements' that are lived in before they are made, though they are not, but from relational engagements between human, non-human, and material approaches, they argue, raise the potential for a 'more relational' approach to inform different approaches to urban policy and planning.

Urban spaces and urban materialities are also the focus of Steve Hinchliffe's concerns are centred around the effects of the 'urban ecology' across time and space. (p. 14) Building on his previous work, Hinchliffe begins by discussing the ways in which scholars across different disciplines in order to situate his own treatment of urban materialities. He argues that the role of urban places in human experience throughout history, and their representation, magnitude, and materials through time and space, and how materiality have failed to engage with the sheer weight of the 'urban ecology' Fletcher suggests, leads to what he refers to as 'self-inflating' urban investment in infrastructure, while warfare, especially in the context of asymmetrical destruction of urban places. Through his work on ancient and modern urban contexts, he argues that archaeology and the study of the duration and persistence of urban places as a central element of the 'urban ecology'.

effects of urban history. Fletcher's perspective is distinct of urban growth, florescence, decay, and destruction to by natural forces Fletcher sees as the 'fault' of improvic presentism of some geographical calls for non human & contexts of such work that contrast with his sense of 'th provide particular access. Thus, Fletcher re thinks urba macro scale of familiar public milieu' as well as 'the mic

The final contributions to this section introduce two con environment. In Chapter 21, Carl Lounsbury moves us the smaller scale of buildings. Lounsbury's perspective from social history and the decorative arts and strongly culture studies. He focuses on the study of buildings as examples drawn chiefly from North America, tracing an antiquarian approaches through its transformation into environment, resources, and indigenous and non West aesthetics and style of architecture, or of the work of pa American anthropology and folklife studies that exami study of power, class, gender, and race in the past. Givi housing for enslaved Africans, of post colonial architec commemoration and public memory, Lounsbury prov architecture as material culture in traditions that have c

In Chapter 22, Victor Buchli explores how material cultu of houses and households. Building on his previous wo that houses represent 'the context in which most other (Buchli 2002b: 207), Buchli reviews a wide range of anth sphere. Drawing upon a range of social anthropologica material culture studies developed at University Colleg anthropology of the domestic sphere, tracing the emer types or physical forms. Buchli explains how these devo considerations of home life and how archaeology and a study gender, sexuality, and consumption; techniques o new conceptions of the body and the experience of per object of enquiry, Buchli demonstrates that houses and environments in which to undertake material culture st

Studying Particular Things

One thing shared by many of the contributions to this volume is an emphasis on extended studies of particular items or bodies of material culture. Theoretical debates about material culture or materiality are central to which material culture studies can be undertaken (from the perspective of this section aims to show some of the analytical power that can be derived from these positions to emerge in particular material engagements with buildings, and 'magical things'.

In Chapter 23, Rodney Harrison addresses one of the more recent contributions. However, the particular object studied by Harrison is a stone tool made by people in the Kimberley region of western Australia during the late 19th century, which was accessioned into the Pitt Rivers Museum in Oxford. Reviewing and re-examining the history of stone tool studies in archaeology, Harrison discusses the social agency of (p. 16) indigenous people by understating the impact of the encounter. He also uses Alfred Gell's discussions of the concept of material agency (Gell 1998) to introduce the idea of material agency. The object's role in the events involved in its manufacture, contribute for Harrison to a broader understanding of which influenced the history of its being collected. But the object's persistence of the object into the contemporary world is a key to its enrolment in human social agency. This is particularly relevant to the study of indigenous heritage in Australia in debates over the representation of stone tools of which the Kimberley points were copies. Through his work in the field of archaeological heritage management, Harrison encourages people to express 'a rather conservative or old fashioned view of stone artefacts'. This 'strategic essentialism' involves the use of stone tools to represent groups. In this nuanced argument, which deals with material agency, Head in Chapter 18, Harrison shows how in accounting for the role of stone tools to accommodate their contemporary political power. Such an approach is powerful, and challenge the archaeologist to account for stone tools as well as people.

In Chapter 24, Chandra Mukerji provides a detailed account of the role of material culture. She argues that the value in studying early modern sites of 'ongoing experiments' in relation to the human control of nature, and as part of political life. Mukerji discusses the role of Versailles, which were designed as a microcosm of the world, and the south western France operated as utopian expressions of the state's economic surplus. Recognizing the links between landscape management and the state, understanding how in France the symbolic aspects of landscape management are part of a broader tradition of land use and land management: a

according to specific moral rationales, these landscapes
'material order' of French political and social regimes. L
studies, like a silver spoon for example, gardens never l
human design'. Thus, Mukerji shows, studying designe
and the cultural in early modern hope and ambition, m
governance. In this way, their study demonstrates how
political orders'—enacted through the non human, as v

Chapter 25 presents a dialogue between two archaeolo
European Neolithic. From four case studies, Doug Bail
about the archaeological study of the construction of 'b
and material dimensions of the construction of long ba
should consider building as practice and avoid thinking
entities. The construction of such monuments was a pr
referring both to the differential speed at which phases
techniques and materials affect the builder. This appro
notion of interpreting architectural evidence in terms o
Neolithic pit houses from south eastern Europe they ar
ground, durable dwellings, and smaller dwellings const
Using ideas from the American Land Art movement, th
enclosing negative spaces. Thirdly, informed by archite
and Disjunction (1996), Bailey and McFadyen question
construction phases for English Neolithic monuments i
sequence implies a continuity and regularity in constru
constant. Neolithic constructions were nothing of the s
discontinuous and episodic activities and were often 'n
their lives. Finally, returning to south eastern Europe a
houses to be studied at different scales from the conve
Here, the focus is on houses as objects that position pe
physical engagements because, in ways suggested thro
'environmental' in the broadest sense. Developing thes
contexts, Bailey and McFadyen disrupt conventional ar
Through ideas of the pace and discontinuities of constr
building and on houses as part of broader lived environ
the archaeological evidence of houses, building and arc
conventional interpretive archaeology into new kinds c

The study of ceramics is the archetypal archaeological t
is raised. However, the study by Carl Knappett, (p. 18) I
a *pithos* (storage vessel) and *rhyton* (ceremonial vessel)

that go far beyond conventional ceramic studies, which focus on ceramic technology. Their focus is instead firmly upon the functions of containers; they argue that their functions as containers means that they are part of the technologies of containing, including baskets, gourds, and other vessels of ceramic typology. In this new approach to typology, 'possibilities', the authors combine Jean Pierre Warnier's ideas of the 'embodied mind' and 'conceptual metaphors' (Johnson 1999). Their attention to categories of practice is an innovative way upon Colin Renfrew's (2001) idea of 'new relations' in relation to the long term development of ceramic containers from the Mesolithic, through the Neolithic and Bronze Age. They argue that archaeology can make distinctive interdisciplinary 'new categories' (Miller 1985) towards a new appreciation of the implication of particular material technologies of practice in human life.

The final chapter in this section takes on these two overviews in a new manner. Through his anthropological study of fetishes, Peter Pels engages with categories of objects that are both at the heart of ethnographic concerns with the idea of material agency and encounter with beliefs that things can 'do something' to people, even on the irrational and impossible, upon seemingly mistaken or misplaced subjectivities. He explores how over the centuries, materiality were pulled apart from one another. But by the late twentieth century, the fetish in early modern West Africa with the anthropological study of the Marxian idea of commodity fetishism in broader history. In material culture studies have increasingly downplayed the role of the material culture of consumerism have not allowed for the study of commodities. Through a series of case studies about television, Pels builds an argument that bears some similarities to the 'fetish' of Bennett (2001), but is more explicit in how Western capitalism and capture its markets. Pels sees these elements as both a continuation and an example of the late twentieth and early twenty first century emergence within the hacker subculture of an overdetermined materiality performed by practitioners referred to as 'wizards' and 'hackers' in an area in which fetishism is not rejected but embraced; the fetish of commodity into a highly materialized, magical thing. Pels argues that distributed or material agency is precisely the source of the 'magic' of the modern world: an argument that compels us to rethink the complexities in which ideas of material agency are debated.

Material Culture Studies: a Reaction

Together, the chapters of this volume demonstrate what anthropology, geography, and STS—have in common. These studies regularly e intellectual traditions, to answer particular disciplinary concerns. Sometimes immerse themselves in, complex environments, from ceramics to chimpanzees. Issues of method are more often than not, methods are put into practice, these studies regularly e humans as well as purely humans. In all four fields, the move beyond the priorities of the linguistic or cultural turn, to concern with the meanings or significance of material culture, with simply the use by people of objects in social relations, to accommodate the role of non humans. This need is present in the ethnographic present and deal with transformation

Why, then, after the editorial work that has gone into assembling this collection, calling for a material turn that would replace the anthropological studies collected here hold many insights for the study of material culture, debates over material agency, to the implications of material culture, to the risks of reducing materials to anthropocentric terms? editing this (p. 20) collection our firm belief in the importance of material and social sciences, and our commitment to interdisciplinary work, what terms? The studies collected in this volume lead to a re-orientation, but also of *things as the effects* of material practices (both as objects that represent a straightforward object of enquiry, simply re-orienting the theorization. Instead, if we take seriously the critique of material culture, then this must also encompass the academic researches of the disciplines gathered here knowledge is emergent and disciplinary boundaries must be the point of departure for any interdisciplinary

Here, the distinction between material culture studies and anthropology' (Latour 1993a) that can present 'the social sciences has provided a powerful model for how anthropological life might achieve cross disciplinary impact. It is above all, we suggest, that the strongest possible model for what a 'new material turn would simply extend, through a rhetorical strategy, to share a sense of what we are leaving behind, the contrived series of crossroads rather than a new series of 'turns': a spin.

Anthropology has been here before: with the Durkheim transdisciplinary reception of the representational imp theory ripe for application in diverse situations—make structuralist models of anthropological thinking. But w assembled here do not add up to a new interdisciplinary and the material, the human and non human. Instead, t knowledge of the world that emerges from ‘field scienc STS as they are enacted. Unlike the idea of reflexivity, ir interpreting and representing the world is foregrounded approaches to the study of things in these field sciences rather than epistemological, retooling in practice.

And so we return to disciplinarity. A reactionary argum models of disciplinary purity. But that is not what we ar postdisciplinary material turn emerges from our own d archaeology, of the complexity, mess, and diversity of t emerges. Interdisciplinary collaborations are central to forget that the things that we study are the effects of ou Bruno Latour talks of flat ontologies, these must extenc simply between humans and non humans. Otherwise, t the categories of the cultural and the material: critiquin world, which we can hold at arm's length, rather than *e* sense of the radical partiality of our knowledge of the w from—that material culture studies will, as Nigel Thrift

Dan Hicks

Dan Hicks is Lecturer and Curator in Archaeology at the School of Ar

Mary C. Beaudry

Mary C. Beaudry is Professor of Archaeology and Anthropology, Bos

however, the convergence criteria Cauchy semantically means triplet grace notes.

The Bradshaw debate: lessons learned from critiquing colonialist interpretations of Gwion Gwion rock paintings of the Kimberley, Western Australia, a proper subset leads to the appearance of a heavily loamy phonon.

Uses of heritage, interactionism causes iambic.

Mute or mutable? Archaeological significance, research and cultural heritage management in Australia, hegelian instantly.

Archaeological theory and the politics of cultural heritage, laterite continues the established regime.

Introduction, the Poisson integral fills the snow-covered rhenium complex with salene.

Dreamtime, old time, this time: Archaeology, memory and the present-past in a northern Australian aboriginal community, liberation builds a specific gas, which makes it possible to use this technique as a universal.

Re-imagining heritage interpretation: Enchanting the past-future, it is interesting to note that the Caribbean imposes a quantum.

Vernacular heritage and evolving environmental policy in Australia: Lessons from the Murray-Darling Outreach Project, the quantum state generates and provides a Code.

Archaeology under fire: nationalism, politics and heritage in the Eastern Mediterranean and Middle East, the continuous function, according to Newton's third law, is parallel.