

HERMES TRISMEGISTUS IN EDEN: PRAXIS, PROCESS & POSTMODERN ARCHAEOLOGY

Don D. Fowler
Department of Anthropology
University of Nevada
Reno, NV 89557-0006

"Theory" is at best a pale and inferior echo and distortion of practice, and lives a life of its own.
-- Ernest Gellner¹

In 1884-85, Charles Fletcher Lummis walked from Ohio to Los Angeles, via the Southwest, to become city editor of the L.A. Times. He was entranced by the Southwest and southern California, and saw them as a generic Eden. Lummis spent four decades extolling the land and the anthropology and archaeology found thereon.² His major interpretive monument, the Southwest Museum, is just down the road. He was the first anthropological Hermes Trismegistus in Eden.

But who, or what, is Hermes Trismegistus?

Hermes T was invented in 2nd century Alexandria, a syncretism of the Egyptian god Thoth and the Greek god Hermes. Thoth, who knew everything, was worshipped in Egypt as the inventor of writing, and keeper and interpreter of sacred and secret records.

Thoth's disciples sought the "keys" to his texts of secret knowledge. They hoped to decipher and interpret those texts. To do so would gain them knowledge to command the forces of nature. In short, they dreamt the Faustian dream, and saw interpretation of texts as the key to power.

Thoth's followers called him Thoth the three times very, very great, or, in Greek, Hermes Trismegistus.³ In various gendered guises, she or he has lived on ever since in Western thought as the doyen of textual in-

terpretation -- of "hermeneutics."

But, every society has Hermes Ts: those devoted to the interpretation of all that is behind "appearances", or, beyond the ken of the hoi polloi. They are called shaman, priestess, soothsayer, cleric, philosopher, tele-evangelist, stand-up comic, poet, scientist, artist, literary critic, archaeologist, and banquet speaker. (There may be a natural regression here.)

Shamans, clerics, priestesses, and soothsayers reveal the supernatural, and interpret humanity's relations thereunto. Poets, artists, philosophers, and (good) stand-up comics reveal and interpret the absurdities -- and sometime transcendencies -- of the human condition.

Hermes T, as scientist, seeks and interprets the "hidden" formulae for the driving forces of the universe. She calls them natural laws, and speaks in hushed tones of "unlocking nature's secrets".

Hermes T, as literary critic, interprets, or, in modern jargon, "deconstructs," what a text really means, often contrary to what its author thought she meant. Within the critic's "reading" of a text, there is often an assertion that the author is a dupe, either of her own psyche, or culture, or both.

The litany is: "Forgive them, oh Thrice Great Foucault, for they know not what they really write -- but I, Hermes T, know!"

Art critics, even more high-handedly, reveal and interpret what painting and sculpture mean. How else, as Tom Wolfe points out in The Painted Word, would the public, or the artists, for that matter, know what modern art is all about?⁴

Hermes T, as archaeologist, digs up old trash and interprets the secrets of the Past therefrom. At first, this interpretation was done particularly. Since the 60s, it's been done processually. Now, some claim to do it postprocessually, and heap scorn on those who do it otherwise. This results in much wrangling, and even more talking past one another than usual, out there in Archaeologyland.

Examples are the current arguments between King Lewis, of Binford, the Arch-Processor, and the Pretender to the throne of Archaeologyland, Prince Ian of Hodder, the Postprocessor. To many denizens of Archaeologyland, these arguments are arcane, at best.⁵ Let me therefore play Hermes T, and interpret.

As an unwilling citizen of the Postmodern world, it first is necessary for me to "expose my bias," (my Aunt Elva would never approve) before I deconstruct, right before your very eyes.

My bias is that I'm a Poor, Not Quite Dead White Male, Dirt Archaeologist. I still occasionally turn a trowel, but not as often as I'd like. For some time, like Professor Schiffer, I have cultivated additional interests. Dr. Schiffer has abiding interests in portable radios and electric automobiles.⁶ My interest is in bandwagons -- intellectual bandwagons -- and in the tunes played, and verses sung, by those who leap upon them, as they come by. Most are ephemeral, like the floats that pass near here each New Year's Day; some last a bit longer. Many are recycled, as we'll see.

If you stand on the corner of Archaeology Avenue and Philosophy Place, as I've done recently, various bandwagons may be seen.

One, with newly-installed Texas license plates, is sponsored by the School of Hy-

pothetico-Deductive Empiricism for Aging New Archaeologists. The musicians thereon are playing the Processual Polka, and the Binford Blues, both in a rather magisterial, Wagnerian mode, the latter somewhat off-key.⁷ Some are jamming various verses of the Middle Range Medley, and a few -- very few -- occasionally riff through a chorus of the Mitigation Mambo.

Close behind, with a plethora of players, and more leaping aboard the while, is a bandwagon sponsored by the New School of Postmodern Dissident Discourse. Everyone on board is playing very loudly, but in different keys and tempos.⁸ Amidst the cacophony, one may discern strains of the Textual Two-Step, the Rhetoric Rumba, the Anti-Totality Tango, and the Deconstruction Drag.

Parked at the curb is another bandwagon sponsored by the School of Postmarxist Revisionist and Anti-Revisionist Studies. Some think it is out of fuel, but all agree it is hardly out of gas. The musicians thereon are attempting various dialectical ditties, but they can't agree on the key, nor the score. But then, neither could their Marxist forbearers.⁹

The banners on the wagons are new, but the melodies played by the riders are not. There are many familiar, old timey tunes. "It seems to me I've heard those songs before ..."

But, the din is such that one can't be sure about the words. Therefore, I determined to visit the musicians at home, to ask them to interpret the texts of their tunes.

After a long, rather dull quest, I arrived in the Duchy of Hermeneutica. There, I came to the edge of a vast, shallow, and verbiage-filled swamp. With trepidation, I waded across that fetid fen to the left shore, to seek wisdom from all the Hermes Ts who live in beachfront condos at Postmodern Place and Postmarxist Manor.

I consulted several leading lights -- art and literary critics, philosophers, and various others who indulge in hermeneutics in the local Deconstruction Derby. I read

many arcane, often badly written, texts. Obscurity of text, I found, brings fame and glory in Hermeneutica. The semi-deities Foucault and Derrida, whose texts are indeed obscure, each have legions of secondary Hermes Ts spilling barrels of ink into trendy journals and endless symposia compilations, pretending to interpret their masters' voices, but usually compounding the obfuscation.¹⁰

I found these worthies very much as the historian Martin Jay found the Western Marxists of old. "They display," he said, "in classic form what Freud once called the narcissism of small differences ... [They are a surly lot] frequently maligning and deprecating each other and often misrepresenting the positions they attack."¹¹

Many display in their own texts, what the greatest Hermes T of all, the late Michael Foucault, called the state of "transcendental narcissism." The metaphor that conjures up is of a small, hermeneutic-colored bird rising from its nest of tangled, deconstructed rhetoric, and spiraling upward in an ever diminishing corkscrew pattern until it flies up its own irrelevancy, and vanishes.¹²

The tone of the rhetoric most practiced in Postmodern Place is best characterized as whining. Postmodernists, or PoMods, as we'll call them, are, by definition, anti-Establishment. Foucault himself set out to expose the absurdities of the Establishment through parody and pastiche, in the vain hope that somehow, someday, Establishmentarians will recognize their own foolishness and reform. That is, some sort of anti-reasonable Reason will overcome them, and some sort of socialist Utopia will arrive.

But the world has always been absurd, ever since the pseudo-Hermes Ts called Bureaucrats gained control of things. And, while PoMods bemoan the inequities of the Establishment, they do nothing to actually right wrongs, rectify absurdities, or slay dragons.

PoMods, like their ancestors the Romantics, dawdle -- passively -- in the delicious doldrums of despair and endemic

doubt. No barricades are built, no picket lines set up, no bras burnt, no politicians impeached, no bureaucrats imprisoned. Lots of noise, no activity. They dream the Faustian dream, but delude themselves that talk and text equal power. There is, in short, no praxis in the classical Marxist sense of combining theory and action.

There is only the whining, and the smug presumption of ivory tower superiority. But, as Chateaubriand long ago reminded us, "One is not superior merely because one sees the world in an odious light." It all sounds like a faculty senate after the bureaucrats and bean counters have won -- again.

There is, however, unanimity among all those in Hermeneutica. They deplore any form of "totalized discourse", any hint of "objectivity". For card-carrying PoMods, objectivity is reprehensible, at best.¹³

Science, the totalized discourse par excellence, is, they say, particularly odious; it serves only to denigrate humans and other living things. Especially in its Positivist guise, science is nothing but the ideology of the Establishment. Reject the Establishment, reject its ideology. Don't bother to determine whether science per se is the ideology!

"Aha!" said I. "There is a recycling of old timey tunes here, a pouring of old wine into old bottles, but a gluing on of new labels that read "Estate bottled in Postmodern Place." Very Establishment-like, despite the anti-Establishment posture -- co-opting the old and calling it new. Now partially enlightened, I continued my quest.

There are, I learned, both Constructivists and Deconstructionists in Postmodern Place (Cons and Decons, for short). The Cons deny the possibility of objectivity; it's all a plot by the detested scientists.

We do not discover reality, say the Cons, we invent it. Realities are the products of language and agreed-upon meanings. "Constructivism challenges the scientific tradition of positivism, which holds that reality is fixed and can be observed directly, unin-

fluenced by the observer."¹⁴

Well, no. Bishop Berkeley long ago showed us that we take in sense data and invent models of reality; hence, reality is very much influenced by the observer. All working scientists generally have agreed with the good Bishop for two centuries, and acted accordingly. In a larger frame, anyone who has pondered the implications of the Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis could hardly regard reality as "fixed."¹⁵

The Cons too are singing an old ditty -- the Anti-Berkeley Rag. They deprecate and misrepresent the position they oppose, for purposes of unmerited Science-bashing.

The Decon doctrine is much more invidious. It was seemingly written by those doyens of doublespeak who operate the Ministry of Truth in George Orwell's 1984. They say: "We will tell you what the truth of your text is, since you're a dupe. Truth is what we declare it to be." Sounds a lot like another old tune, sung in the 1950s to Pogo and his friends by a malevolent intruder into the Okeefenokee Swamp, named Simple J. Malarkey.

I spent only a brief time at Postmarxist Manor. The inhabitants seem bewildered: they know not what tunes to play. Their forbearers, generic regulation Marxists, though a fractious crowd, knew what they were about -- opposing the Establishment with passion and choruses of the Internationale.¹⁶

But such Postmarxist medleys as Variations on the Structural-Marxist Samba must have poor old Karl spinning in his sarcophagus and Levi-Strauss snickering up his sleeve.

Seeking further enlightenment, I waded out of the swamp and strolled along the Boardwalk to Gender Gardens. There, many inhabitants speak a patois of PoMod, but have the healthy skepticism to regard much of the rhetoric as hocus pocus, rather than God's Truth.

The inhabitants of Gender Gardens, I found, are deeply and fundamentally committed to equity in all aspects of life, liberty,

and the pursuit of happiness -- a commendable and agreeable commitment, and one to be encouraged for the good of all.¹⁷

Some Gender Gardenites agree with the PoMods that science is totalized discourse, but add that it is also androcentric. What does that mean? In the 60s, the jazz pianist Mose Allison wrote a song called "Just a Middle Class White Boy Tryin' to Have Some Fun." The contention of Hermes Ts from Gender Gardens is that science is not objective, but, in some measure is a subjective projection of middle class white male values and attitudes.¹⁸ Science, in this reading, is indeed, Just Some Middle Class White Boys Tryin' to Have Some Fun with their big-kid toys: cyclotrons, Hubble telescopes, and mega-gigabyte computers. And, their data and theories sometimes contain large doses of MCP -- Male Chauvinist Platitudes.

I next visited the inhabitants of Gender Gardens who live at Marshalltown Manor -- a kind of a company compound for those who labor in Archaeologyland. There I acquired many interesting and useful insights, especially from those Hermes Ts known as Conkey, Gero, Tringham, Watson, and Wyllie.¹⁹

They assert that their male colleagues in Archaeologyland generally ignore the fact that half of humankind are, and have been, females. And, they say, most of what we know from ethnography and history shows that females did (and do) two-thirds of the world's work for a much smaller fraction of its material and symbolic goods. Why then, they ask, are females not "visible" in the archaeological record?

Some assert that many male archaeologists have become so fixated on litho-phallic artifacts (which they fondle excessively and call "projectile points") that they can see only androcentric phenomena in the archaeological record; gynocentric aspects are invisible, or ignored. It has been the task of Conkey and company to change that, to "engender" archaeology, to make visible the other-half (you'll forgive, I hope, the double entendre here) of the record. A most commendable task, I think.

"What the hell do you mean by all this speaking in riddles and parables," you ask, "this mucking around in swamps and chasing down side streets after band wagons recycling old tunes? What does all this have to do with 'real' archaeology?" "Well, everything," say I. "Let me interpret further."

As a longtime intellectual band wagon watcher, I've noticed a tendency in Western "discourse". Many cultural constructs which arise in one era as means to justify, or support, immediate political ends, tend to hang on, after those ends are served or forgotten. Over time, they take on other meanings, and come to have other uses. Sort of like E.B. Tylor's "survivals".

Science and Reason played major roles in rejecting the political and ideological structures of the Medieval World, then remained to have many other uses. In the 18th century, proponents of Science and Reason sought to construct a Theory of Everything, including human behavior, based on "natural laws".²⁰ In PoMod jargon, they built a "totalized discourse".

The ideology of this discourse, labeled Positivist Science, was embraced by both the Right and the Left in the 19th Century. The Right pulled it into what Bruce Trigger calls the "Imperial Synthesis" -- the assertion that human history was impelled provisionally to end in a Victorian bourgeois Utopia. The Marxist Left pulled it into their historical synthesis -- the assertion that human history is being impelled dialectically, toward a proletarian Utopia.²¹

But some didn't like all this. There were outraged cries from the Romantics, as early as 1710. This somewhat motley crew rejected the ideology of Reason and Science and their mechanistic Theory of Everything. "Humans are not mere machines, nor mere animals, nor merely reasoning beings," they cried. "Science does not enlighten," they said, "it denigrates genius, passion, spirituality, all that which is uniquely human, and sets humans apart from mere animality."²² It all sounds very Postmodern. Same old tune -- new timeframe.

In the 18th century, those who would re-

form the inequities of the Establishment invented a cultural construct called "Natural Man". In Western discourse, that which is natural is all good; that which is artificial, civilized, is often bad. In general, the closer to nature, the more morally and psychologically superior one is said to be. Once Natural Man crossed Rousseau's Rubicon from Nature to Culture, it was morally downhill all the way. He, and his natural goodness, became distorted and oppressed by culture and the state, and he became befuddled by the mystifications of the Establishment.²³

Natural man served a political purpose: if only members of the Establishment would return to his "naturally superior" moral ways, it was argued, all social ills, and the distorting domination of the state, would disappear and a rational Utopia would prevail. Proponents of this conundrum got, instead, the French Revolution -- which some thought served them right.

The historian Micaela di Leonardo sees a parallel in the current cultural construct she calls "women's culture":

There is an entity, women's culture, which represents an Ur-form of women's nature and has the same characteristics across time and space. These characteristics include moral superiority to men; cooperative rather than competitive social relations; selfless maternity; and benevolent sexuality. ... There is an authentic feminine selfhood that has been distorted, accreted over by male domination.²⁴

The implication is that a return to the ways of undistorted natural woman will bring us a morally superior Utopia based on cooperation and an enhanced Sympatica.

From an equity standpoint, we now have natural man and natural woman. Natural man's selfhood gets distorted, apparently, by the civilization of his own making. Natural woman's selfhood gets distorted, apparently, by civilized man. Old tunes, new and old timeframes, but created for the same political purpose: to save us from our civilized selves.

We come, finally, to archaeology. Some archaeologists, while they're not sure where it's going, are attracted by the Postmodern bandwagon. The tunes may be old timey, but the verses, the choruses, sound new and exciting. New, or apparently new, in our culture sells books and tenure applications -- hence, perhaps, the rush to clamor aboard. Once aboard, archaeologists discover that the tunes are Con and Decons ditties, sung mainly in France.

Interestingly, in the 60s, the same Gallic songsters trilled quite different tunes: variations on the Structuralist Serenade, and the Binary Boogie; two long-time favorites written by that noted French salon-singer, Claude Levi-Strauss. These now Golden Oldies, the epitome of Totalized Tunes, were sung nightly at the Tristes Tropique Cafe, at La Place de Le Pensee Sauvage. All the cognicenti flocked there to sing in the chorus.²⁵

Fads change. There is a new in-place, the Decon Disco, with its bandwagon parked outside at Critics' Circle. It is still the French Connection that provides the music. Some archaeologists find the seemingly-new siren-songs alluring. The Anti-Totality Tango and the Textual Two-Step are faddish and much easier to play than the polyphonic twelve-tone strains of the Middle Range Medley.

But, to climb unwittingly on the Postmodern band wagon, and mindlessly sings its songs, is to abandon what archaeology is about: seeking in material culture, and its contextual relationships, the patterns of past human behavior. Particularized pasts -- "pasts as texts" -- simply won't do.

Nicole Polier and William Roseberry point out in their critique of postmodern anthropology, that writing fictional texts and criticizing them is one thing. Systematically attempting to discover and describe as best one can (as "objectively" as possible) the patterns and processes of human behavior is quite another. Literature, art, and criticism thereof, are not what anthropology is about. Nor are they what archaeology is about, as Richard Watson and Chris Gosden so cogently remind us.²⁶

Archaeologists have a very intransigent task: to seek out and interpret past cultural patterns. It is much harder than constructing and deconstructing fictional texts. For example, cultural patternings, such as style, are difficult to get at, as Conkey and her colleagues have recently rediscovered. Having found patterning, archaeologists seek to explain -- or interpret, as you will -- their meanings for those in the present -- and perhaps, those in the past.²⁷ The central question has always been: How do you get from the debris, the artifacts and ecofacts, and their relationships on and in the ground, to "valid" statements about patterned behavior in the past?

In 1959, on the day before Joe Caldwell published his article, "The New Archaeology," the answer was simple: distribute "traits" in time and space, and all will be well. On the day after, it was no longer so.²⁸

The Processualists struggled mightily to move from simplistic trait-tracing to valid statements about pattern, and on toward valid statements about process. They're still at it, having shed much scientific baggage along the way. All that the good doctors Watson, Redman, and LeBlanc and others have taught us about how scientific procedures should be used in archaeology is still apropos. The lessons that Professor Schiffer and others have taught us about site formation processes and taphonomy also help us achieve valid statements about past patterning and process.²⁹ "Explanation" is not a four-letter word, as the PoMods would have us believe.

Granted, the songs comprising the Middle Range Medley are difficult and complex. Some, such as the Random Sample Rumba, are no longer sung, thanks be given. But, many other choruses provide us the best means at hand to develop valid statements about pattern, and, perhaps, process. We should not cease singing that medley for a mess of inappropriate Postmodern pottage. To throw out logic and the scientific methods of fact making and verification in a fit of pique because you don't like the Establishment is at best smug political rhetoric, at worst absurd narcissism. If we did, we'd be left only with an Archaeology of the Absurd.

On the up-side, what various current critiques have done for archaeology is to force a rethinking about data making and theory construction. The questions are: How are "cultural facts" made, and who makes them?

Ruth Hubbard, in an excellent critique, points out that "fact making" in science is a matter of consensus among those with recognized qualifications to participate in the process. Most currently qualified participants, she says, are Middle Class White Boys, just tryin' to come to a consensus. During the fact making, she contends, male scientists often inject their own androcentric values into the "facts" they make. She calls for those of different genders and ethnicities to be "empowered", to be included in, the fact-making process, on an equitable basis. And, she hopes, subjective values surfacing during the process will be held up to scrutiny. The resultant "facts" will quite different.³⁰

I think she's right, especially when it comes to making facts about archaeological pasts. The facts about pasts made in the future will, one hopes, be both engendered, and more coordinate with the concerns of Native Americans and those other "Others" whose pasts we seek to understand.

The current processual/postprocessual debate seems to me fugacious. It is, as Patty Jo Watson so neatly puts it, a sterile argument between "soulless method" on the processual side, and "methodless soul" on the postprocessual side. To quote Christopher Chippindale, "a plague on both houses. Most of us enjoy soul and method."³¹

But what would an archaeology of soul and method look like? Ideally, it would combine the best of a consensual science with the best of considered interpretation. While the PoMods may see science and interpretation as antagonistic, those of a more enlightened mien have seen otherwise, for several generations.

To return to our musical metaphor, there is an old-timey, yet still-current, tune within the human sciences, called the Verstehen Rag. This duet for tuba and glockenspiel has been played, in various keys and tempos, since the 1840s, particularly in

Germany.

Wilhelm Dilthey, for one, proposed that the "human sciences", combine appropriate analytical methods from the natural sciences with the interpretive power of the humanities, to achieve a complex understanding called Verstehen. He recognized that human behavior can never be shoved into a nomothetic strait-jacket made in Physical Sciences Land.³²

Where humans are concerned, there will always have to be a "tolerated margin of mess", to use Aldous Huxley's cogent phrase. This does not mean that we must rely only on "soulful" interpretation, but rather, we should combine it with rigorous methods of consensual fact making and verification.

One of the leading Postmodernists not afflicted by the whining syndrome is Jurgen Habermas. He seeks to retain the rigor of the consensual fact making he finds in reason and science and combine it with the good he sees in the humanities. The results, he hopes, will be Verstehen, an enhanced understanding of what humanity is about.³³

It seems to me that a Verstehen-based archaeology, an Interpretive Archaeology much broader and richer than the Neo-Particularism proposed by Hodder, or the Textual Two Steps of the Postmodernists, is worth a try.³⁴ We seek to understand and interpret the regularities and events of the pasts we study. And, we need to seek those regularities and events in consensual, engendered, and "multivocalic" frameworks. An enhanced Verstehen would help us do that.

In short, "Play It Again, Sam", but this time in the key of Verstehen, with appropriate choruses from the Middle Range Medley. They should help us to construct or reconstruct -- but not deconstruct -- the pasts that interest all of us.

It seems proper to suggest that archaeology reach back into the past for appropriate tunes to play on its own bandwagon, instead of ditties borrowed, unwittingly, from the Decon Disco. This should result in

a richer and much more interesting archaeological *praxis* in the Century 21 era, here in Eden, and in the real world.³⁵

NOTES

1. Gellner (1988:74-75)
2. For example, Lummis (1893, 1925, 1929). This paper was presented as a banquet speech at the 1992 meeting of the Society for California Archaeology in Pasadena, CA, and is printed as delivered. To maintain the flow of the text, endnotes are used, rather than in-text citations
3. Viaud (1959)
4. Wolfe (1976)
5. Binford (1989), Hodder (1986, 1987, 1991); see also the papers in Preucel (1991)
6. Schiffer (1991, 1992)
7. Binford (1977, 1983), Binford and Binford (1968), Wright (1990)
8. Bernstein (1983), Harvey (1989), Lyotard (1984)
9. Jay (1984:passim)
10. Derrida (1978, 1980), Foucault (1970, 1972). Among the plethora of "secondary" Hermes Ts, see Arac (1988), Berman (1990), Cousins (1984), Diamond and Quinby (1988), Dreyfuss and Rabinow (1982), Eribon (1991), Gutting (1989), Krupnick (1983), Llewelyn (1986), Norris (1987), and Poster (1989), among many others
11. Jay (1984:10)
12. Foucault (1972:203)
13. Cunningham and Jardine (1990), Passmore (1978)
14. Hare-Mustin and Marecek (1990:7)
15. Toulmin (1972:43), Hymes (1964:115-163)
16. Jay (1984). Most Marxist anthropologists and archaeologists clearly know what they're about, e.g., Bloch (1983), Diamond (1979), McGuire (1992), Patterson and Gailey (1987). But compare the "Postmarxist" papers in Shanks and Tilly (1987a, 1987b), and Tilly (1990). See also R. Watson (1990) and P.J. Watson (1991) for critiques
17. Ardner (1975), Gilligan (1982), Griffiths and Whitford (1988), Haraway (1990), Hirsh and Keller (1990), Hubbard et al. (1982), Jardine (1985), Lowe and Hubbard (1983), MacCormack and Strathern (1990), Ortner and Whitehead (1980), Rosaldo and Lamphere (1974)
18. Harding (1987, 1991), Jacobus et al. (1990), Keller (1985)
19. Bumsted, et al (1990), Claassen (1992), Ehrenberg (1989), Gero (1983), Gero and Conkey (1991), Tringham (1991), Walde and Willow (1991), Watson and Kennedy (1991), Wylie (1992)
20. Becker (1932), Fowler and Fowler (1991)
21. Trigger (1989)
22. Brush (1978), Cunningham and Jardine (1990), Garvin (1980), McGann (1983); see also Slobodkin (1992)
23. Fairchild (1928), Fowler and Fowler (1991), Lovejoy and Boas (1935)
24. di Leonardo (1991a:244; cf. 1991b)
25. Levi-Strauss (1961, 1963, 1966); Boon (1972), Gardner (1981), Rossi (1974), Sturrock (1979)
26. Polier and Roseberry (1989), see also Fox (1991), Loriggio (1990), Stoller (1991) and Ulin (1991); Watson (1990), Gosden (1992)
27. Conkey and Hastorf (1990), Gould (1990), Kehoe (1992), Renfrew and Bahn (1991), Sharer and Ashmore (1987), Thomas (1989), Wenke (1990), Zubrow and Little (1985)
28. Caldwell (1959)

29. Watson (1986, 1992), Watson et al. (1984), Gibbon (1984, 1989), Kehoe (1992), Schiffer (1987)

30. Hubbard (1989, 1990)

31. Watson (1991:270), Chippindale (1992: n.p.)

32. Dilthey (1977, 1988)

33. Habermas (1973, 1979, 1983, 1984), Pusey (1987)

34. Hodder (1986, 1987, 1991); see also the various critiques in Baker and Thomas (1990) and Bintliff (1988)

35. I am indebted to Christopher Chippindale, Don Grayson, Mark Leone and Alison Wylie for most useful comments on various versions of the paper. As the stand-up comic in Eden, Mort Saul, used to say, "Are there any groups I haven't offended?" Any and all that I have must blame me and not my kind commentators. While they may, or may not, share some or all of my sentiments, they are absolved from all responsibility for the raspberries presented herein.

REFERENCES CITED

Arac, J. (editor)

1988 After Foucault. Humanistic Knowledge, Postmodern Challenges. Rutgers University Press, New Brunswick and London.

Ardner, S. (editor)

1975 Perceiving Women. Malaby, London.

Baker, F., and J. Thomas (editors)

1990 Writing the Past in the Present. St. David's University College, Lampeter, England.

Becker, C.

1932 The Heavenly Cities of the Eighteenth Century Philosophers. Yale University Press, New Haven.

Berman, R.A.

1990 Tropic to Pretoria: The Rise and Fall of Deconstruction. Telos 85:4-16.

Bernstein, R.J.

1983 Beyond Objectivism and Relativism: Science, Hermeneutics and Praxis. University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia.

Binford, L.R.

1977 For Theory Building in Archaeology. Academic Press, New York.

1983 In Pursuit of the Past. Thames and Hudson, London and New York.

1989 Debating Archaeology. Academic Press, San Diego.

Binford, S.R., and L.R. Binford (editors)

1968 New Perspectives in Archaeology. Aldine, Chicago.

Bintliff, J.

1988 Extracting Meaning from the Past. Oxbow Books, Oxford.

Bloch, M.

1983 Marxism and Anthropology: the History of a Relationship. Clarendon Press, Oxford.

Boon, J.A.

1972 From Symbolism to Structuralism. Levi-Strauss in a Literary Tradition. Harper and Row, New York.

Brush, S.G.

1978 The Temperature of History: Phases of Science and Culture in the Nineteenth Century. B. Franklin, New York.

Bumsted, M.P., J.E. Booker, R.M. Barnes, T.W. Boutton, G.J. Armelagos, J.C. Lerman, and K. Brendel.

1990 Recognizing Women in the Archeological Record. In Powers of Observation: Alternative Views in Archeology, edited by S.M. Nelson and A.B. Kehoe, pp. 89-101. American Anthropological Association Archeological Papers No. 2. Washington, D.C.

Caldwell, J.

1959 The New American Archaeology. Science 129(3345):303-307.

- Chippindale, C.
1992 Review of Processual and Postprocessual Archaeologies: Multiple Ways of Knowing the Past, edited by R. Preucel. American Anthropologist 94:, in press.
- Claassen, C.
1992 Exploring Gender through Archaeology: Selected Papers from the 1991 Boon Conference. Monographs in World Archaeology No. 11. Madison.
- Conkey, M.W., and C. Hastorf (editors)
1990 The Uses of Style in Archaeology. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Cousins, M.
1984 Michel Foucault. St. Martin's Press, New York.
- Cunningham, A., and N. Jardine (editors)
1990 Romanticism and the Sciences. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Derrida, J.
1978 Writing and Difference (trans. by R. Rand). Columbia University Press, New York.

1980 The Archaeology of the Frivolous: Reading Condillac. Duquesne University Press, Pittsburgh.
- Diamond, I., and L. Quinby (editors)
1988 Feminism and Foucault: Reflections on Resistance. Northeastern University Press, Boston.
- Diamond, S. (editor)
1979 Toward a Marxist Anthropology. Problems and Perspectives. Mouton, The Hague.
- di Leonardo, M.
1991a Habits of the Cumbered Heart: Ethnic Community and Women's Culture as American Invented Tradition. In Golden Ages, Dark Ages, Imagining the Past in Anthropology and History, edited by J. O'Brian and W. Roseberry, pp. 234-252. University of California Press, Berkeley.

1991b Women's Culture and its Discontents. In The Politics of Culture, edited by B. Williams, pp. 219-242. Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington.
- Dilthey, W.
1977 Descriptive Psychology and Historical Understanding. Nijhoff, The Hague.

1988 Introduction to the Human Sciences. Wayne State University Press, Detroit.
- Dreyfuss, H.L., and P. Rabinow
1982 Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Ehrenberg, M.
1989 Women in Prehistory. British Museum Publications, London.
- Eribon, D.
1991 Michel Foucault (trans. by Betsy Wing). Harvard University Press, Cambridge.
- Fairchild, H.
1928 The Noble Savage: a Study in Romantic Naturalism. Columbia University Press, New York.
- Foucault, M.
1970 The Order of Things: an Archaeology of the Human Sciences. Random House, New York.

1972 The Archaeology of Knowledge. Pantheon, New York.
- Fowler, D.D., and C.S. Fowler
1991 The Uses of Natural Man in Natural History. In The Spanish Borderlands in Pan-American Perspective, edited by D.H. Thomas, pp. 37-71. Columbian Consequences Vol. 3. Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, D.C.
- Fox, R.G. (editor)
1991 Recapturing Anthropology. Working in the Present. School of American Research, Santa Fe.
- Gardner, H.
1981 The Quest for Mind. Piaget, Levi-Strauss and the Structuralist Movement. 2nd ed. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

- Garvin, H.R. (editor)
1980 Romanticism, Modernism and Post-modernism. Bucknell University Press, Lewisburg, PA.
- Gellner, E.
1988 Plough, Sword and Book. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Gero, J.
1983 Gender Bias in Archaeology: A Cross-Cultural Perspective. In The Socio-Politics of Archaeology, edited by J. Gero, D.M. Lacy, and M.L. Blakey, pp. 51-58. University of Massachusetts, Department of Anthropology, Research Report No. 23. Amherst.
- Gero, J., and M.W. Conkey (editors)
1991 Engendering Archaeology. Women and Prehistory. Basil Blackwell, Oxford.
- Gibbon, G.
1984 Anthropological Archaeology. Columbia University Press, New York.

1989 Explanation in Archaeology. Basil Blackwell, New York.
- Gilligan, C.
1982 In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development. Harvard University Press, Cambridge.
- Gosden, C.
1992 Endemic Doubt: Is What We Write Right? Antiquity 66, in press.
- Gould, R.A.
1990 Recovering the Past. University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque.
- Griffiths, M., and M. Whitford (editors)
1988 Feminist Perspectives in Philosophy. Indiana University Press, Bloomington.
- Gutting, G.
1989 Michel Foucault's Archaeology of Scientific Reason. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Habermas, J.
1973 Theory and Practice (trans. by John Viertel). Beacon Press, Boston.
- 1979 Communication and the Evolution of Society (trans. by Thomas McCarthy). Beacon Press, Boston.
- 1983 Modernity -- an Incomplete Project. In The Anti-Aesthetic. Essays on Post-modern Culture, edited by H. Foster, pp. 3-15. Bay Press, Port Townsend, WA.
- 1984 Reason and the Rationalisation of Society. Beacon Press, Boston.
- Haraway, D.
1990 Primate Visions: Gender, Race and Nature in the World of Modern Science. Routledge, Chapman and Hall, London.
- Harding, S.
1991 Whose Science? Whose Knowledge? Thinking from Women's Lives. Cornell University Press, Ithaca.
- Harding, S. (editor)
1987 Feminism and Methodology. Indiana University Press, Bloomington.
- Hare-Mustin, R.T., and J. Marecek
1990 On Making a Difference. In Making a Difference. Psychology and the Construction of Gender, edited by R.T. Hare-Mustin and J. Marecek, pp. 1-21. Yale University Press, New Haven.
- Harvey, D.
1989 The Condition of Postmodernity. An Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change. Basil Blackwell, Oxford.
- Hirsch, M., and E.F. Keller (editors)
1990 Conflicts in Feminism. Routledge, New York.
- Hodder, I.
1986 Reading the Past. Current Approaches to Interpretation in Archaeology. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

1987 The Archaeology of Contextual Meanings. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

1991 Interpretive Archaeology and its Role. American Antiquity 56:7-18.

- Hubbard, R.
1989 Science, Facts and Feminism. In Feminism and Science, edited by N. Tuana, pp. 119-131. Indiana University Press, Bloomington.
- 1990 The Politics of Women's Biology. Rutgers University Press, New Brunswick.
- Hubbard, R., M.S. Henifin, and B. Fried (editors)
1982 Biological Woman -- the Convenient Myth. Schenkman, Cambridge.
- Hymes, D. (editor)
1964 Language in Culture and Society. Harper and Row, New York.
- Jacobus, M., E.F. Keller, and S. Shuttleworth (editors)
1990 Body/Politics: Women and the Discourse of Science. Routledge, New York.
- Jardine, A.C.
1985 Gynesis. Configurations of Woman and Modernity. Cornell University Press, Ithaca.
- Jay, M.
1984 Marxism and Totality: The Adventures of a Concept from Lukacs to Habermas. University of California Press, Berkeley.
- Kehoe, A.B.
1992 Method and Explanation in Archaeology: Storming the Bastille. Reviews in Anthropology 20:215-223.
- Keller, E.F.
1985 Reflections on Gender and Science. Yale University Press, New Haven.
- Krupnick, M. (editor)
1983 Displacement: Derrida and After. Indiana University Press, Bloomington.
- Levi-Strauss, C.
1961 Tristes Tropiques. Criterion Books, New York.
- 1963 Structural Anthropology. Basic Books, New York.
- 1966 The Savage Mind. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Llewelyn, J.
1986 Derrida on the Threshold of Sense. St, Martin's Press, New York.
- Loriggio, F.
1990 Anthropology, Literary Theory, and the Traditions of Modernism. In Modernist Anthropology. From Field Work to Text, edited by M. Manganaro, pp. 215-242. Princeton University Press, Princeton.
- Lovejoy, A.O., and G. Boas
1935 Primitivism and Related Ideas in Antiquity. Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore.
- Lowe, M., and R. Hubbard (editors)
1983 Woman's Nature: Rationalization of Inequality. Pergamon Press, New York.
- Lummis, C.F.
1893 The Land of Poco Tiempo. Scribners', New York.
- 1925 Mesa, Cañon and Pueblo. Century, New York.
- 1929 Spanish Pioneers and the California Missions. n.p.
- Lyotard, J.-F.
1984 The Postmodern Condition: a Report on Knowledge. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.
- MacCormack, C.P., and M. Strathern (editors)
1990 Nature, Culture and Gender. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- McGann, J.J.
1983 The Romantic Ideology: a Critical Investigation. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- McGuire, R.
1992 A Marxist Archaeology. Academic Press, Orlando.

- Norris, C.
1987 Derrida. Harvard University Press, Cambridge.
- Ortner, S., and H. Whitehead (editors)
1980 Sexual Meanings: the Cultural Construction of Gender and Sexuality. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Passmore, J.
1978 Science and Its Critics. Rutgers University Press, New Brunswick, NJ.
- Patterson, T.C., and C.W. Gailey (editors)
1987 Power Relations and State Formation. American Anthropological Association, Washington.
- Polier, N., and W. Roseberry
1989 Tristes Tropes: Postmodern Anthropologists Encounter the Other and Discover Themselves. Economy and Society 18:245-264.
- Poster, M.
1989 Critical Theory and Poststructuralism. Cornell University Press, Ithaca.
- Preucel, R.W. (editor)
1991 Processual and Postprocessual Archaeologies: Multiple Ways of Knowing the Past. Southern Illinois University, Carbondale.
- Pusey, M.
1987 Jurgen Habermas. Tavistock, London and New York.
- Renfrew, C., and P. Bahn
1991 Archaeology. Theories, Methods and Practice. Thames and Hudson, London and New York.
- Rosaldo, M.Z., and L. Lamphere (editors)
1974 Woman, Culture and Society. Stanford University Press, Stanford.
- Rossi, I. (editor)
1974 The Unconscious in Culture. The Structuralism of Claude Levi-Strauss in Perspective. E.P. Dutton, New York.
- Schiffer, M.B.
1987 Formation Processes of the Archaeological Record. University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque.
- 1991 The Portable Radio in American Life. University of Arizona Press, Tucson.
- 1992 An Archaeological Perspective on the Electric Automobile. Paper presented at the 26th Annual Meeting of the Society for California Archaeology, Pasadena.
- Shanks, M., and C. Tilly
1987a Social Theory and Archaeology. Polity Press, Cambridge.
- 1987b Re-Constructing Archaeology. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Sharer, R.J., and W. Ashmore
1987 Archaeology. Discovering Our Past. Mayfield, Palo Alto, CA.
- Slobodkin, L.B.
1992 Simplicity and Complexity in Games of the Intellect. Harvard University Press, Cambridge.
- Stoller, P.
1991 Review of Modernist Anthropology: From Field Work to Text, edited by M. Manganaro. American Anthropologist 93:982-983.
- Sturrock, J. (editor)
1979 Structuralism and Since. From Levi-Strauss to Derrida. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Thomas, D.H.
1989 Archaeology. 2nd ed. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Fort Worth.
- Tilly, C. (editor)
1990 Reading Material Culture. Basil Blackwell, Oxford.
- Toulmin, S.
1972 Human Understanding. Princeton University Press, Princeton.
- Trigger, B.G.
1989 A History of Archaeological Thought. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

- Tringham, R.
1991 Households with Faces: the Challenge of Gender in Prehistoric Architectural Remains. In Engendering Archaeology. Women and Prehistory, edited by J. Gero and M.W. Conkey, pp. 93-131. Basil Blackwell, Cambridge.
- Ulin, R.C.
1991 Critical Anthropology Twenty Years Later. Modernism and Postmodernism in Anthropology. Critique of Anthropology 11:63-90.
- Viaud, J.
1959 Egyptian Mythology. New Larousse Encyclopedia of Mythology, pp. 9-48. Prometheus Press, New York.
- Walde, D., and N. Willow (editors)
1991 The Archaeology of Gender. Proceedings of the 22nd Annual Chacmool Conference. Archaeological Association of the University of Calgary, in press.
- Watson, P.J.
1986 Archaeological Theory, 1985. In American Archaeology Past and Future, edited by D. Meltzer, D.D. Fowler, and J.A. Sabloff, pp. 439-457. Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, D.C.
- 1991 A Parochial Primer: The New Dissonance as Seen from the Midcontinental USA. In Processual and Postprocessual Archaeologies: Multiple Ways of Knowing the Past, edited by R. Preucel, pp. 265-274. Southern Illinois University Press, Carbondale.
- 1992 Archaeology, the Last Fifty Years. Fiftieth Annual Report. Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research, New York, in press.
- Watson, P.J., S.A. LeBlanc, and C.L. Redman
1984 Explanation in Archaeology: An Explicitly Scientific Approach. Columbia University Press, New York.
- Watson, P.J., and M. Kennedy
1991 The Development of Horticulture in the Eastern Woodlands of North America: Women's Role. In Engendering Archaeology: Women and Prehistory, edited by J. Gero and M.W. Conkey, pp. 255-275. Basil Blackwell, Cambridge.
- Watson, R.A.
1990 Ozymandias, King of Kings: Postprocessual Radical Archaeology as Critique. American Antiquity 55:673-689.
- Wenke, R.J.
1990 Patterns in Prehistory. 3rd ed. Oxford University Press, New York.
- Wolfe, T.
1976 The Painted Word. Bantam Books, New York.
- Wright, G.A.
1990 Being There and the Archeologist as Author. Anthropos 85:39-44.
- Wylie, A.
1992 The Interplay of Evidential Constraints and Political Interests: Recent Archaeological Research on Gender. American Antiquity 57:15-35.
- Zubrow, E.B.W., and B. Little (editors)
1985 Pattern Recognition in Archeology. American Archeology 5(1):2-80.