

University of Nebraska - Lincoln

DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

---

Anthropology Faculty Publications

Anthropology, Department of

---

1995

## Review of *Kalinga Ethnoarchaeology: Expanding Archaeological Method and Theory*

LuAnn Wandsnider

University of Nebraska - Lincoln, lwandsnider1@unl.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/anthropologyfacpub>



Part of the [Anthropology Commons](#)

---

Wandsnider, LuAnn, "Review of *Kalinga Ethnoarchaeology: Expanding Archaeological Method and Theory*" (1995). *Anthropology Faculty Publications*. 21.

<https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/anthropologyfacpub/21>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Anthropology, Department of at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in Anthropology Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

*Kalinga Ethnoarchaeology: Expanding Archaeological Method and Theory.* WILLIAM A. LONGACRE and JAMES M. SKIBO, editors. Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, D.C., 1994. xvi + 250 pp., figures, tables, references, index. \$49.50 (cloth).

Reviewed by LuAnn Wandsnider, University of Nebraska.

In the 1960s, several practitioners (James Deetz, James Hill, William Longacre, and Robert Whallon) of what was eventually called the "New Archaeology" used ceramic stylistic elements to support claims about the postmarital residence of prehistoric populations. In particular, Hill and Longacre argued for two post-A.D. 1000 pueblos in Arizona that the observed lack of variation in ceramic stylistic elements was owed to the practice of matrilineal residence. Anthropologically informed common sense grounded their assumptions that females, schooled by their mothers, were responsible for ceramic production. These interpretations—especially the undersupported assumptions—were criticized on many counts.

Thus stimulated, William Longacre set out to systematically gather information on residential pottery production, which led him to the Kalinga in the northern Philippines. Over the last 20 years, research on pottery production, pot-use lives, pot breakage, and so forth has been carried out by Longacre and a team of Kalinga assistants, students, and colleagues. *Kalinga Ethnoarchaeology* reports some of their findings.

Studies at several different scales—the pot, the household, community, and region—are featured. Kobayashi looks at the conditions under which carbon deposits form on vessels. Skibo considers the performance characteristics of metal and ceramic cooking vessels to understand why metal vessels are replacing ceramic ones in specific contexts. At the household level, Trostel focuses on the differential manifestation of wealth in Kalinga households, finding a positive correlation between wealth and pot volume. Tani explores

the relationship between household population and sherds, reporting that in larger households, with generally larger pots, more vessels are broken because of thermal fatigue (experienced to a greater degree by large vessels) and higher activity levels there. This study is notable for its explicit reference to the boundary conditions of the examined relationship. Focusing on ceramic production and consumption by community, Aronson, Skibo, and Stark compare the qualities desired by potters in their clays and also preferences and purchases by consumers. In a consideration of the archaeological visibility of social boundaries, Graves compares stylistic elements as they occur on pots produced by two different communities. Also at the regional level, Stark looks at the ceramic distribution network. In addition, Neupert and Longacre assess the quality of interview data, discussing implications for pot life histories obtained through oral interview. Silvestre describes the basketry production undertaken by Kalinga males. The introduction by Longacre and Skibo provides historical context and the foreword by Michael Deal places these studies in the context of contemporary ethnoarchaeology.

In this volume, we learn again that the relationship between material culture and human behavior is complex, but, happily, patterned and rational. Here, the reader will find no "archaeological signatures" that could be used to readily translate archaeological observations to interpretations about the past. What is found, however, are cautions about assumptions that are inappropriate, material culture patterns that may serve as references in archaeological analysis, and, importantly, ideas for partitioning and analyzing archaeological variation. Note, however, that some of the ethnoarchaeological results reported here are likely too general to compare with archaeological assemblages. That is, a more detailed depiction of individual contexts (e.g., the communities involved in Stark's study of interregional distribution and the ceramics found there) is required, which may be featured in the more developed works referenced here. And, presented here are provocative findings, such as that pottery forms are more similar by age cohort (Stark, p. 194) and that potter daughters inherit their mother's clients (Stark, p. 178).

*Kalinga Ethnoarchaeology* is a model work in several ways. It demonstrates again the synergy realized when experimental and ethnoarchaeological results are played off against each other, as emphasized by Skibo, Kobayashi, and Aronson and colleagues. The Kalinga Ethnoarchaeological Project represents one of few long-term ethnoarchaeological studies, and the benefits of this long-term perspective are obvious. It is also a stellar example of the ethnoarchaeological study of multiple, interrelated phenomenon at the supra-house-

hold (and smaller) social scale. Finally, most (all?) of the authors are or were University of Arizona students. It is to William Longacre's credit that he afforded students these opportunities for research and publication.

Over the last 20 years, much change has occurred in the Kalinga area: conflict between the Philippine Army and the New People's Army has ceased, intercommunity aggression has peaked and fallen, more infrastructure is present, gold mines have contributed to a cash economy in some places, and landlessness is increasing. These changes resonate in the ceramic sphere. For example, members of a community located near a road (i.e., with easier access to more distant markets) are now engaging in more specialized ceramic production and their pots are widely distributed. There is another cautionary tale here: Can we warrant that the past was any less dynamic than the present? How would these changes play out in ceramic assemblages from "archaeological time?"

Longacre and Skibo make an observation in the preface that invites reflection. The first is the lament that only those archaeologists undertaking ethnoarchaeological research are pressing the fruits and drinking the wine. Is this really surprising? Archaeologists unwilling to admit rich but possibly false inferences about the past compose one (sober) archaeological subpopulation. They cannot countenance undertaking ethnoarchaeological work themselves. Others are willing to risk applying the oftentimes ambiguous patterns derived from ethnoarchaeological research grounded by only partially warranted uniformitarian assumptions. They also comprise the enthusiastic vinciculturalists.

*Kalinga Ethnoarchaeology* is a must-have volume for all archaeologists working with prehistoric ceramics or regional scale archaeological variability. It serves to apprise the archaeological community of other more detailed studies the authors have produced and of the kind of data generated by the Kalinga Ethnoarchaeological Project, to be mined, hopefully, on a continuing basis in coming years. I look forward to those archaeological studies that make use of this ethnoarchaeological information and, in 10 years, another volume on Kalinga ethnoarchaeology.