

bioarchaeology needs a “more balanced vision of the way our human ancestors could plausibly [have behaved] in prehistory” (p. 339) and rightly points out the lack of representation of adults with disabilities in most exhibits of ancient daily life. This outsider perspective is a welcome one, complementing Jane Buikstra’s (Chapter 19) summary of the volume’s themes quite well.

This short review cannot do justice to the book’s content, which ranges from intriguing to groundbreaking. The 19 separate chapters adhere closely to the theme of care in the past and are organized in such a way that the book could easily be adopted as the text for a seminar course. Additionally, the author list ranges from heavy hitters, to early and mid-career academics, to graduate students, uniquely highlighting the depth and breadth that can be achieved through a variety of perspectives. With references to and use of the freely available Index of Care (<http://indexofcare.org>), the collection lays bare the methodology behind the case studies in a way that encourages other researchers to employ it as well. In spite of a number of typos, particularly in the earlier chapters, this volume represents an extremely successful collection of essays that should be on any archaeologist’s bookshelf.

These “Thin Partitions”: Bridging the Growing Divide between Cultural Anthropology and Archaeology. JOSHUA D. ENGLEHARDT and IVY A. RIEGER (editors), 2017. University Press of Colorado, Boulder. x + 300 pp. \$75 (hardcover), ISBN 978-1-607322-541-3.

Reviewed by Michael Smith, Arizona State University

The contributors to this collection would really like archaeology and cultural anthropology to be integrated more closely. Yet two major deficiencies surrounding the authors’ arguments stand in the way of this goal. First, the contributors do not sufficiently distinguish the intellectual question “Would greater integration make sense intellectually?” from the logistical question of whether the two subdisciplines could survive as separate academic departments in today’s university. The second deficiency is a failure to consider that archaeologists might want to integrate intellectually with disciplines beyond anthropology. These deficiencies in the chapters lead to a series of sincere “coulda, woulda, shoulda” arguments, very much like those in a previous edited collection on this topic (*Archaeology Is Anthropology*, ed. Gillespie and Nichols, 2003). I am not convinced.

The book consists of an introduction, 10 chapters, and two conclusions. Most of the bibliographies are current to 2011 or 2012. In their introduction, Englehardt and Rieger pin the blame for the split between archaeology and cultural anthropology on postmodernism and the science debates in anthropology. LaMotta and Monaghan outline the history of subdisciplinary cooperation and separation in Mesoamerican and Southwestern anthropology. Their analysis pushes the split much further back in time and leads me to wonder how anyone could think that the two fields might ever integrate themselves again. Shankman provides another historical account, focusing on cultural evolutionism. Fahlander argues that the fields could be joined through a posthumanist ontology concerning the socialness of things. Rieger documents a case where “archaeological and ethnological settings collide” in Oaxaca, and Englehardt claims that archaeologists go around worrying whether they are still part of anthropology or not (I don’t). He uses an outdated and discredited definition of science—logical positivism—to argue that archaeology is not a science; by this definition, however, none of the social sciences and few of the natural sciences would be sciences.

Hellweg doesn’t like the way two archaeologists use Evans-Pritchard’s ethnography to talk about tribes. Fernandez Souza suggests that a focus on Maya culinary practices can integrate archaeology and cultural anthropology in Yucatán, and Kistler wonders whether adding an archaeological perspective might somehow help her research on Mayan ethnographic biography. Classicist Small uses archaeological models (calling them anthropological models) to argue that classics and anthropology can and should interact more. Fowler and Johnson try to show how an ethnologist and archaeologist can each approach issues of choice and well-being but only convinced me that they both lack the conceptual tools to do so.

In the first of two conclusions, cultural anthropologist Goldstein is the only author to be truly critical of other authors and approaches. She also is the only author to attack head-on the two problems mentioned above. In the second conclusion, archaeologist Parkinson insists that archaeology and cultural anthropology have the same basic goal—“describing and explaining human cultural and biological variation”—and that their work should be seen as complementary rather than overlapping.

With the exception of Goldstein’s, these chapters are rather bland. Authors avoid criticizing specific writers, and few take any stands that have not been taken many times before. The two deficiencies rear their heads in every chapter, although few authors seem to notice. To my mind, the intellectual and logistical

arguments are radically different beasts and need to be examined separately. The inability of the authors to do so leads to some tortured prose and a few errors. They claim, for example, that I have advocated separate departments, whereas in fact I have argued for intellectual independence but never for logistical separation.

Most of the authors seem to think that there is but a single intellectual choice for archaeologists: either to integrate with cultural anthropology or to form a separate discipline. Parkinson even cites approvingly Kent Flannery's odd claim that archaeology has no theory of its own, that all we have is theory from cultural anthropology. With the exception of Goldstein, the authors seem oblivious to the possibility that archaeologists might want to affiliate intellectually with disciplines beyond anthropology. The intellectual potential of such affiliations seems obvious to me, but I now inhabit the apparently foreign territory of interdisciplinary social science research. As I explain elsewhere (<http://www.anthropologiesproject.org/2011/05/why-anthropology-is-too-narrow.html>), if one starts with the idea that four-field anthropology is a good thing, then it may make sense to affiliate with the other subdisciplines. But if one starts by asking, What is the best intellectual context for archaeology?—a question not considered in this volume—one may end up with a radically different answer. Alas, however, this will not solve the problem of convincing clueless deans and administrators of the value of the anthropology department.

Archaeological Perspectives on the French in the New World. ELIZABETH M. SCOTT (editor), 2017. University Press of Florida, Gainesville. 292 pp., 48 figures, 6 tables. \$89.95 (hardcover), ISBN 978-0-8130-5439-1.

Reviewed by Lauren Zych, University of Chicago

This volume, edited and introduced by Professor Emerita Elizabeth Scott, was inspired by the session “Historical Archaeology of French America” from the 2014 meeting of the Society for Historical Archaeology. It draws broadly on francophone research to challenge the perception that French influence in the New World was limited in both scope and duration, having little lasting influence in the wake of Anglo-American expansion. Together, the contributions demonstrate how various communities adapted to new physical, economic, and political environments with strategies that allowed them to maintain distinct identities—even after the loss of French sovereignty.

Scott's excellent introduction is a brief but thorough survey of the themes that have dominated the field in recent years. In it, she emphasizes traits common to French-speaking communities in the New World, including relatively low French populations, heavy reliance on interior waterways, wartime isolation, and extensive dependence on Native American and African forms of knowledge and labor. She avoids producing a caricature of Frenchness with discussions of the many forms of difference—including class, ethnicity, occupation, and religious affiliation—that shaped individual communities. An impressive synthesis of archaeological data supports this narrative of similarity and difference, providing a solid framework for the rest of the volume.

The remaining contributions are studies from diverse historic and archaeological contexts that add nuance to Scott's themes. The volume includes research on the seventeenth through nineteenth centuries, from contexts in North and South America and the Caribbean. The evidence is drawn from a remarkably broad range of sites—temporary rest stops (*posés*), a fort/trading post, a house lot, an elite refugee community, and several plantations—and the resulting data are quite varied. Several chapters analyze complete assemblages, but the majority consider specific material classes and/or artifact types (e.g., pipes, ceramics, faunal remains).

Nearly half the chapters in the volume are plantation studies, as life among the enslaved “remains one of the least understood aspects of French America” (p. 10). Some investigate aspects of daily life, as in Whitson's analysis of class, gender, and ethnicity on a French house lot in Missouri and Kelly's discussion of sugar plantations in Guadeloupe and Martinique. Others explore relations between plantation residents and native people. Morgan and MacDonald, for example, examine Native American traits in a ceramic assemblage from the plantation of a free, slaveholding woman of color in Louisiana. Rousselle and Auger reveal a complex web of power relations on a large plantation where French Jesuits used African labor to support the conversion of French Guiana's indigenous people.

Other essays engage issues of adaptation, integration, and identity among the ethnic French. Nassaney and Martin's faunal analysis emphasizes integration, revealing how native foods and fur processing techniques were successfully incorporated into French colonial identities in the *pays d'en haut*. Pendery, on the other hand, forwards adaptation, pointing out that Acadians maintained community identity despite forced migration. Mann addresses identity more explicitly, arguing that aspects of *voyageur* identity,

A review of arguments waged by scholars within these two sub-fields exposed patterned differences in disciplinary interpretations of the 1970s episode of Dr. James V. Neel's vaccine program in the Amazon with Yanomami tribe members. As a medical anthropologist with strong ties to the growing field of Science, Technology, and Society (STS), I suggested in my article that subdisciplinary assumptions and practices may present us with distinct bioethical. 256 Donna M. Goldstein futures. Cultural anthropologists have debated these questions among themselves and have. I applaud this volume's optimism for a deeper intradisciplinarity between archaeology and cultural anthropology, but I also recommend caution. Article contents. Abstract. These "Thin Partitions": Bridging the Growing Divide between Cultural Anthropology and Archaeology. JOSHUA D. ENGLEHARDT and IVY A. RIEGER (editors), 2017. University Press of Colorado, Boulder. x + 300 pp. \$75 (hardcover), ISBN 978-1-607322-541-3. * Views captured on Cambridge Core between 10th April 2018 - 14th March 2021. This data will be updated every 24 hours. Cited by. These Thin Partitions book. Read reviews from world's largest community for readers. These "Thin Partitions" explores the intellectual and methodologic... Start by marking "These "Thin Partitions": Bridging the Growing Divide between Cultural Anthropology and Archaeology" as Want to Read: Want to Read saving... Want to Read. Book PDF Available. These Thin Partitions: Bridging the Growing Divide between Cultural Anthropology and Archaeology. January 2017. DOI: 10.5876/9781607325420.c000. These "Thin Partitions" explores the intellectual and methodological differences that separate two of the four subdisciplines within the field of anthropology: archaeology and cultural anthropology. Contributors examine the theoretical underpinnings of this separation and explore what can be gained by joining them, both in university departments and in field research.