



**HAL**  
open science

## Introduction (Part II)

Sophie A. de Beaune, Oscar Moro Abadia

► **To cite this version:**

Sophie A. de Beaune, Oscar Moro Abadia. Introduction (Part II). Sophie A. de Beaune; Alessandro Guidi; Oscar Moro Abadía; Massimo Tarantini. *New Advances in the History of Archaeology*, Archaeopress Publishing, pp.94-95, 2021, Proceedings of the session organized by the history of archaeology scientific commission at the XVIII world Congress of the International Union of Prehistoric and Protohistoric (UISPP) held in Paris, 4-9 juin 2018. halshs-03822390

**HAL Id: halshs-03822390**

**<https://shs.hal.science/halshs-03822390>**

Submitted on 24 Oct 2022

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

# Introduction

Sophie A. de Beaune<sup>1</sup>, Oscar Moro Abadía<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Jean Moulin University – Lyon 3, Lyon & UMR 7041 ArScAn, Nanterre – France  
sophie.de-beaune@univ-lyon3.fr

<sup>2</sup>Memorial University of Newfoundland – Canada  
omoro@mun.ca

Over the past 25 years, archaeologists have shifted from rejecting and trivializing the history of archaeology (traditionally considered as a harmless amusement for their leisure hours) to considering that this discipline plays a central role in the understanding of archaeological research. This resurgence has been spurred by the emergence of a new generation of scholars who have met modern historiographical standards and practices. In this setting, historians of archaeology have benefited a great deal from a growing dialogue with historians, philosophers and sociologists of science. It is not by chance, for instance, that most of the French-speaking historians who have played a role in the reinvigoration of the history of archaeology in the last two decades are historians and epistemologists of science. However, there are still few studies on the many epistemological, philosophical and sociological facets of archaeological knowledge. In this setting, this session seeks to explore the relationships between the history of archaeology and other disciplines, include history, epistemology and sociology of science. In the first place, we invited historians of archaeology and historians of other sciences to think about the relationships between their disciplines. This dialogue sought to explore how historians of archaeology can enrich their work with a better understanding of the *methods*, *techniques* and *concepts* used in the history of science. In the second place, we seek to promote an interdisciplinary dialogue beyond the limits of historiographical studies. To do so, we invited specialists in the epistemology and philosophy of science to consider how recent debates on their disciplines may intersect with the study of the history of archaeological knowledge.

*Sophie A. de Beaune* explores the many links that can be established between technology and prehistoric archaeology through the work of three major figures that have largely marked French archaeology from the second half of the 19th century to the end of the 20th century, Augustus Lane Fox Pitt Rivers, André Leroi-Gourhan and François Sigaut. All three developed an interdisciplinary approach to material culture. However, no matter how close their interests were, the three of them were marked by their different historical contexts.

*Oscar Moro Abadía* examines the tragic fate of heroic precursors in the history of archaeology with reference to the case of Boucher de Perthes. As it is well-known, Jacques Boucher de Perthes is often celebrated for being the first to establish the prehistoric antiquity of humankind. However, as Moro Abadía examines in his paper, these hagiographical approaches are problematic. Without denying that Boucher de Perthes made significant contributions to the history of archaeology, an entirely different picture of this ‘heroic discoverer’ emerges when we put him in his historical context.

*Rémi Labrusse* wonders about the reasons that led the first prehistorians (Lartet and Christy, Mortillet, Piette, etc.) to put forward the question of art, alongside technique, to characterize the Palaeolithic. In so doing, he explores the encounter between art history and prehistory in the second half of the 19th century.

*Giorgos Vavouranakis* and *Georgia Kourtessi-Philippakis*’ paper focuses on the early Prehistory, which is here taken to include the whole Stone Age, from the Palaeolithic to the Neolithic. In the 1960s’,

Greece became the place of a lively fermentation of the various currents that forged the identity of research in ancient Prehistory by making it independent from the stereotypes of Archeology, as it had been practiced since the end of the 19th century, and by freeing it from this heavy heritage. More generally, the authors examine the impact of new (or processual archaeology) upon European archaeology in the same years.

*Shumon T. Hussain* uses the French-Anglophone divide in Palaeolithic stone artefact analysis as an example to show that identified differences in approach and conceptualization between the two involved communities of practice can be recovered by comparing the 'image worlds' they promulgate. Examining the pictorial structure of these worlds and the frequency of certain image types therein sheds new light on the distinctive nature of French and Anglophone styles of reasoning in lithic research.