

Hypercultural types: archaeological objects in fast times.

Artur Ribeiro

Revision

- I've clarified key-areas of the text where explanations were either ambiguous or poorly-written, as requested by the reviewers.
- I've added just a bit more context to the relationship between typologies and culture, through the concept of "communities of practice".

John Miguel Versluys

- Many of the comments and suggestions by John make a lot of sense, but it does shift the paper from the idea of hyperculture to that of globalization. There is, of course, considerable overlap between hyperculture and globalization because hyperculture is a result of globalization. However, I was trying to talk more about the "hyper" aspects of current material culture, which is why I prefer the term "hyperculture". Furthermore, as John mentioned, there is already so much about globalization already, which I cited, including his work, that I feel like I would be just repeating that work.
- John mentions the historical context of globalization, but that is quite evident in the text, with several references to past periods of globalization and discussion of the current period of globalization (reference to postwar period, flexible accumulation, etc.).
- Glocalization was also referenced in the paper, addressing the Coca-cola example by Miller. John refers to the work of Pieterse and Robertson on glocalization, which was cited in the paper. Not really sure what I'm supposed to do here.
- I'm guessing John wants a more extensive treatment of the subject, but I can't really expand on the topic properly in such a paper.

Anna Beck

- I found Anna's comments very helpful and have attended to them.

Gavin Lucas

- More than anything, I think part of the misunderstandings by Gavin come from my style of writing, more than from any absence in the text. I do address the issues he raises, but I take my time explaining things, leaving the answers more towards the end, rather than providing the answers right after I ask the questions.
- Also, many of the comments don't really apply to the text. Some comments are more metacommentary.

- For instance, Gavin asks for an explanation as to what makes hyperculture cohere? Well, nothing does. The EDC is precisely a demonstration that arbitrary items can be put together to denote an individual's lifestyle. I explained this better towards the end.
- I think Gavin has also missed the point of hyperculture, which is explained throughout, in fact, even in the abstract. Hyperculture exists alongside other forms of culture, not as a replacement to them.
- Gavin also complains that I fail to provide interesting solutions to the issues I raise, but that should be fine, considering that I say, specifically that "The aim of this paper is to address this issue, not with the aim of solving any real or imagined problem with regards to culture and artifact typologies, but rather, to gain a better understanding of them."

Overall, I appreciate the comments by the reviewers but a bit surprised they ignored the two most important points of it – first, that the current way we live and consume has affected *how we think about archaeology* (us being hypercultural today makes us less inclined to accept traditional cultures), and second, the unique aspects of hyperculture as non-territorial, denaturalized, very fast, and flexible, which hasn't really been addressed extensively in archaeology.