

The Construction of Knowledge in Archaeology and Art History in Southeastern Europe:
A Research Program (2019-2023), coordinated by the Centre for Advanced Study, Sofia
(Bulgaria) and funded by the Getty Foundation as part of the Connecting Art Histories
Initiative

SPRING SCHOOL 2022

“Local archaeologies and their interdisciplinary practices”

Host: New Europe College - Institute for Advanced Study
Bucharest, Romania

LECTURES

9, 10, 11 May 2022

PARTICIPANTS AND ABSTRACTS

**Adrian Currie / University of Exeter, College of Social Sciences and International Studies
Sociology, Philosophy and Anthropology (UK)**

Adrian Currie is a senior lecturer in philosophy in the University of Exeter’s department of Sociology, Philosophy and Anthropology. He is primarily interested in how scientists successfully generate knowledge in tricky circumstances: where evidence is thin on the ground, targets are highly complex and obstinate, and our knowledge is limited. This has led him to examine the historical sciences – geology, palaeontology and archaeology – and to argue that the messy, opportunistic (‘methodologically omnivorous’) and disunified nature of these sciences often underwrites their success. His interest in knowledge-production has also led him to think about the natures of, and relationships between, scientific tools such as experiments, models and observations, as well as in comparative methods in biology. He also has an interest in how we organize scientific communities, particularly regarding scientific creativity.

Lecture 1: Methodological Omnivory & Archaeological Success

In this lecture, students will be introduced to a set of views regarding method in the historical sciences. Philosophers of the historical sciences often ask whether sciences like palaeontology and archaeology differ from other sciences methodologically. Carol Cleland, for instance, has argued that we can divide prototypical experimental science from prototypical historical science: for her, both approaches are legitimate responses to different challenges in generation knowledge. Others—Derek Turner for instance—disagree: Turner claims that although these are legitimate sciences, experimental sciences can be considered more successful than historical sciences. Adrian Currie has argued that it is the lack of a specific method that underwrites the success of the historical sciences: they are opportunistic, creative and ‘methodologically omnivorous’. Students will navigate these philosophical views together, asking whether their own experiences of archaeological reasoning support or undermine the philosophical views they encounter.

Readings:

Carol Cleland’s Methodological and Epistemic Differences between Historical Science and Experimental Science.

Forber & Griffith’s “Historical Reconstruction: Gaining Epistemic Access to the Deep Past”

Derek Turner’s Beyond Detective Work: Empirical Testing in Paleontology

Alison Wylie’s “Rethinking Unity as a “Working Hypothesis” for Philosophy: How Archaeologists Exploit the Disunities of Science”

Chapter 6 of Adrian Currie’s Rock, Bone & Ruin

Lecture 2: Archaeological Materials & Archaeological Reasoning

Robert Chapman and Alison Wylie place special emphasis on the material, archaeological record “as a ‘network of resistances to theoretical appropriation’ that routinely destabilizes settled assumptions, redirects inquiry and expands interpretive horizons in directions no one had anticipated” (Chapman & Wylie 2016, 6). That is, despite the apparent subjectivity of interpretation, the extent to which archaeological hypotheses and theories could be ruled by our own interests, archaeological objects are capable of disrupting our ideas, and surprising us in productive ways. In this lecture, we’ll ask what it is about archaeological materiality, and what it is about how archaeologists interact with those objects, that enables such productive work. This will involve both examining ‘the paradox of material evidence’, as Chapman and Wylie call it, and also considering how the embodied know-how that archaeologists gain (through experimental archaeology, for instance) might aid—or hinder!—interpretation. Students will be encouraged to reflect upon their own experiences in archaeological research and pedagogy to explore the relationship between archaeological ideas and archaeological objects.

Readings:

Introduction of Chapman & Wylie’s “Evidential Reasoning in Archaeology”

Chapter 2 of Chapman & Wylie: "Archaeological Fieldwork: Scaffolding in Practice"

Sabina Leonelli's "The Time of Data: Timescales of Data Use in the Life Sciences"

Caitlin Wylie's "Overcoming the underdetermination of specimens"

Adrian Currie's "Speculation Made Material: Experimental Archaeology & Maker's Knowledge"

Chris Gosden / University of Oxford, School of Archaeology (UK)

Chris Gosden has been in Oxford for the last 25 years, first as a curator-lecturer at the Pitt Rivers Museum and then as Professor of European Archaeology. Chris Gosden has carried out archaeological fieldwork in Papua New Guinea, Borneo, Turkmenistan and Britain, among other places. He is currently setting up research collaborations with China and Mongolia. While at the Pitt Rivers Museum, Oxford he worked on the history of collections and their relevance to post-colonial relations and identity, including two large projects - Relational Museum Project. More recently he has run research projects on the history of the English landscape published by OUP in 2021 as *English Landscapes and Identities*, and on Celtic art both in Britain and in Europe including Eurasian links. He has recently published a book called *The History of Magic* (Penguin, 2020). He is currently writing a book called *Humans: The First Seven Million Years*. He is a trustee of the Art Fund, Oxford Archaeology and the British Museum, and a fellow of a number of learned societies, including the British Academy.

Lecture 1: Meaning in action: an approach to prehistoric art

A question of asked of art is: what does it mean? Older models of meaning hold that meaning resides as a series of ideas in the mind and objects are a series of representations of ideas and intellectual current. The processes of interpretation are seen as applying ideas to the world, as navigating between two states of the world, the intellectual and the actual. But how does this change if meaning is seen to emerge through our engagement with the world? In this model, meaning stems less from the mind (and indeed the mind may be doubted altogether) and more from the body, its activities, senses and emotions. Understanding and interpretation are processes, with meanings always emerging, but never fixed or final. The notion that meaning emerges through engaged activity sees the relationship between the felt experience of the body and the forms of interpretation deriving from syntactical speech as problematic and one to be thought about.

In the first part of the lecture, I will explore some of the broader theoretical issues raised by the idea that meaning arises in bodily action and in the second part I will apply these to a broad body of material known as Celtic and Scythian art found roughly from 800 BCE to the end of the first millennium.

Readings:

Bahrani, Z. Elsner, Wu Hung, J., Joyce, R. and Tanner, J. 2014. Questions on “world art history”. *Perspective* 2: 181-94.

Bailey, D. 2005. *Prehistoric Figurines: Representation and Corporeality in the Neolithic*. London: Routledge.

Garrow, D., C. Gosden and J. D. Hill (eds) 2008. *Rethinking Celtic Art*. Oxford: Oxbow Books.

Gell, A. 1997. *Art and Agency*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Robb, J. 2015. Prehistoric Art in Europe: A Deep-time Social History. *American Antiquity* 80: 635-54.

Lecture 2: Issues of the global and the local in archaeology

People share some elements of their lives and experience with all other humans: we are able to recognise each other across cultural and historical differences to talk, share and argue. But equally human societies have generated deep differences of culture, action and sensibility. How to balance and navigate the nature of similarity and difference in human life today and in the past is a crucial question for any social scientist. In this lecture, I will briefly present a series of aspects that I think unite us as human being, including a desire to make sense of the world, an emphasis on morality, the ubiquitous nature of politics and the fact that we engage with and change the world as embodied beings. On the other hand, are a series of things that make us different: we develop networks of embodied intelligence appropriate to local circumstances. Our engagements with the world are non-linear and takes us in varied directions, we develop varied models of reality out of which derive local forms of politics. The lecture will explore these general propositions, before exemplifying them in various brief prehistoric case studies.

Readings:

Babic, S. et al. 2017. What is European Archaeology? What should it be? *European Journal of Archaeology* 20: 4-35.

Gosden, C. and L. Malafouris. 2015. Process Archaeology (P-Arch). *World Archaeology* 47: 701-17.

Kristiansen, K. 2008. The dialectic between the Global and Local perspectives in archaeological theory, heritage and publications. *Archaeological Dialogues* 15: 56-69.

Lydon, J and Rizvi, U. 2010. *Handbook of Postcolonial Archaeology (World Archaeological Congress Research Handbooks in Archaeology, Volume 3)*

Dimitris Plantzos / National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Department of History and Archaeology (Greece)

Dimitris Plantzos is a classical archaeologist, educated at Athens (BA, 1982-1987) and Oxford (MPhil, 1988-1990; DPhil, 1990-1993). He is the author of various papers and books on Greek art and archaeology, archaeological theory and classical reception. His Greek-language textbook on Greek Art and Archaeology, first published in 2011 by Kapon Editions, was published in 2016 in English by Lockwood Press in Atlanta, Georgia. He was also co-editor of the volume *A Singular Antiquity. Archaeology and Hellenic Identity in 20th century Greece* (published in Athens in 2008) and the *Wiley-Blackwell Companion to Greek Art* (2012; paperback edition 2018). His latest books are *The Recent Future*, a study of archaeological biopolitics in contemporary Greece (2016, Nefeli Editions), and a study of ancient Greek painting in 2018, also published on both sides of the Atlantic. He is co-director of the Argos Orestikon Excavation Project; he teaches classical archaeology and reception at the National and Kapodistrian University of Athens.

We have always been ancient: ancient DNA and the modern imaginary

The lecture focuses on the archaeological sub-field of archaeogenetics, and the ways it may be deployed in current political discourse in order to substantiate nationalist claims of heredity as a blood-based relationship. A number of case studies are deployed in order to show how, in Modern Greece but also elsewhere, antique skeletal remains are seen as national relics, as well as cultural icons. This generates a politically charged sort of “DNA archaeology”, only partially involving the ideas or actions of archaeology professionals, but strongly affecting public receptions of, and responses to, the past. And this is because archaeogenetic discourse and its results – factual, exaggerated, or plain fabricated – may be deployed by different stakeholders within contemporary societies in order to mobilize certain parts of the population or exclude others to the point of elimination, by means of their symbolic or even biological death.

Readings:

Brown, K. A., & Pluciennik, M. (2001). Archaeology and human genetics: lessons for both. *Antiquity*, 75, 287, 101-106.

Frieman, C. J., & Hofmann, D. (2019). Present pasts in the archaeology of genetics, identity, and migration in Europe: a critical essay. *World Archaeology*, 51, 4, 528-545.

Hakenbeck, S. E. (2019). Genetics, archaeology and the far right: an unholy Trinity. *World Archaeology*, 51, 4, 517-527.

Lazaridis, I. (2017). Genetic origins of the Minoans and Mycenaeans. *Nature*, 548, 214-218.

Mirza, M. N., & Dungworth, D. B. (1995). The potential misuse of genetic analyses and the social construction of ‘race’ and ‘ethnicity’. *Oxford Journal of Archaeology*, 14, 3, 345.

Gheorghe Alexandru-Niculescu / “Vasile Pârvan” Institute of Archaeology (Romania)

Gheorghe Alexandru Niculescu is a senior researcher at the Vasile Pârvan Institute of Archaeology; educated at the University of Bucharest (1974-1978), Ph.D. in history (2000), archaeological training and research at the aforementioned institute (since 1985); teaches archaeological theory at the University of Bucharest; published research on ancient ethnic phenomena and on the impact of nationalism on archaeological research; published research on the politics of cultural heritage in Romania and its impact on the conservation and visibility of the artifacts; currently working on the global asymmetries of archaeological research and on the properties of typological thinking and its flattening consequences on the perception of the artifacts (preliminary findings presented at conferences held in 2016 and 2017).

Interdisciplinary practices and scientism

Learning from what happens outside the discipline of archaeology, especially learning from other disciplines, is crucial for its development, but many current interdisciplinary practices are not working to the benefit of archaeological thinking. Instead of examining whether the 19th century research questions about origins and identities are still worth asking, archaeologists from many research traditions still look for answers to them and believe that this could be done by gathering more data. They choose those disciplines that can offer additional information about their finds and mobilize representations of knowledge in which scientific methods are supposed provide valid answers even if archaeologists are unable to evaluate what they do, thus reinforcing explicit or tacit commitments that are not compatible with a scientific stance towards empirical evidence.

Readings:

Haack, Susan. "Six Signs of Scientism." *Tarka* 10, 2019, 11-30. The lecture on which this article is based can be viewed here: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=v0QmS783Kmw>

Herzfeld, Michael. "Anthropological Realism in a Scientistic age." *Anthropological Theory* 18 (2018): 129-150.

Kidd, Ian James. "Reawakening to Wonder. Wittgenstein, Feyerabend and Scientism". In *Wittgenstein and Scientism*, edited by Jonathan Beale and Ian James Kidd. London, Routledge, 2017.

Kristiansen, Kristian. "Towards a New Paradigm? The Third Science Revolution and Its Possible Consequences in Archaeology." *Current Swedish Archaeology* 22 (2014): 11-34.

van Fraassen, Bastiaan. "Naturalism in Epistemology". In *Scientism: The New Orthodoxy*, edited by Richard N. Williams and Daniel N. Robinson, 63-95. London: Bloomsbury, 2015. [Willi15.b.pdf] The lecture on which this article is based can be viewed here: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kYRcibo_d8&t=1567s

Lisa Nevett is Professor of Classical Archaeology in the Department of Classical Studies at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor and is also co-director of archaeological field projects at the ancient cities of Olynthos and Pella (Greece). She has a B.A. in Classics, an M.Phil. in Archaeology and a Ph.D. in Classical Archaeology, all from the University of Cambridge, U.K. Her research interests include: method and theory in classical archaeology; household archaeology in the Graeco-Roman world; ancient Greek urbanisation and urbanism. Recent and forthcoming books include *Theoretical Approaches to the Archaeology of Ancient Greece* (edited, Ann Arbor 2017), *An Age of Experiment: Classical Archaeology Transformed, 1976-2014* (edited with J. Whitley, Cambridge, 2018) and *Ancient Greek Housing* (Cambridge, in press).

Lecture 1: Changing Research Paradigms in the Archaeology of Ancient Greece: the example of the study of housing

The history of research on Archaic, Classical and Hellenistic Greek housing offers a lens through which to examine some of the changes which have taken place in the study of the archaeology of ancient Greece more generally. Domestic buildings were often neglected in favour of excavating and reconstructing religious and civic structures, which were studied paying particular attention to their formal and decorative elements. Where housing was uncovered, this was sometimes as a by-product of the search for these more prestigious buildings. Nevertheless, during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, houses were uncovered at several sites, including Athens, Delos, Olynthos and Vroulia. In keeping with the established practice in classical archaeology more generally, the excavators focused on study of the architecture and any decorative elements such as mosaic floors or painted wall plaster. Following the typical procedures of classical archaeology more generally, where consideration was given to how these buildings functioned as lived spaces, the ancient literary sources were considered a key element in the interpretation: terms from Classical and Roman authors were adopted as labels for various forms of excavated space. At the same time, a typological scheme was established, based on the layouts of the buildings at different sites, which was used to classify excavated buildings. While the numbers of houses known continued to grow at a modest rate through the twentieth century, it was only in the 1980s that a new way of viewing and interpreting these structures emerged. This opened the way for a shift in the evaluation of the archaeological evidence, from material that could be used to illustrate and visualise the words of Classical writers, to an independent source that can be interrogated to address new questions about a whole range of aspects of ancient society which cannot be approached using texts. In my paper I discuss some of the questions that have been addressed, the interpretative frameworks that have been applied, and the problems still to resolve.

Readings:

J. W. Graham, 1974. *Houses of Classical Athens*. *Phoenix* 28: 45-54.

S. Walker, 1993 [1983]. *Women and Housing in Classical Greece*. *Images of Women in Classical Antiquity*, edited by A. Kuhrt and A. Cameron, 81-91. London: Routledge.

L. C. Nevett, 1994. Separation or seclusion? towards an archaeological approach to investigating women in the Greek household in the fifth to third centuries B.C. *Architecture and Order: approaches to social space*, edited by M. Parker Pearson and C. Richards eds. London: Routledge. 98-112.

R. Westgate, 2007. House and Society in Classical and Hellenistic Crete. *American Journal of Archaeology* 111: 423-457.

L. C. Nevett, 2008. Ceramic typology and activity area analysis: a comparison from Greek domestic contexts. In *Thinking about Space. The potential of surface survey and contextual analysis in the analysis of space in Roman times*, H. Vanhaverbeke et al. eds. Leuven: Brepols-Turnhout, *Studies in Eastern Mediterranean Archaeology* 8. 153-160.

Lecture 2: The Olynthos Project: an example of inter-disciplinary Greek archaeology in the twenty-first century

The Olynthos Project is an inter-disciplinary archaeological research project that was in the field between 2014 and 2019; the data collected is currently being prepared for publication. The work is a collaboration between scholars from across Europe and North America, sponsored by the British School at Athens and the Greek Archaeological Service. Olynthos was the site of a settlement which was founded in the Archaic period and by the end of the fifth century BCE had grown to be an important city, covering an area of ca. 55 ha. and serving as the centre for a political alliance known as the Halkidian League. Historical sources paint a picture of a community caught between the influence of Athens and the rising power of the kingdom of Macedon, before it was obliterated by Philip II in 348 BCE. Olynthos was extensively investigated by an American team between 1928 and 1938, and more selectively during restoration work by the Greek Archaeological Service between 1988 and 1994. A number of important questions nevertheless remained about the city and its inhabitants: what was the total size of the urban area? What was the nature of the interface between the city and its wider territory? When was the community first established and how was the early settlement organised? How similar or different were the lives of the inhabitants in two contrasting neighbourhoods on the North and South Hills? And how did the individual households create their identities in the face of the various political and cultural influences to which they were exposed? These were some of the questions the Project set out to address. In addition, a major goal was to re-think approaches to the archaeology of Greek cities and of their inhabitants, centring human community as the object of inquiry and exploring how new methodologies could furnish a new, more detailed, understanding of Olynthian society at multiple scales (domestic, neighbourhood, civic and regional). In my paper I offer some examples of the questions we have been addressing collaboratively through the use of a range of data-sets acquired and studied by a number of different scholars.

Readings:

W. Matthews, 2005. Micromorphological and Microstratigraphic Traces of Uses and Concepts of Space. *Inhabiting Catalhoyuk: reports from the 1995-1999 seasons*. I. Hodder ed. Cambridge: McDonald Institute for Archaeology. 553-572.

E. Margaritis, 2014. The Kapelio at Hellenistic Krania: food consumption, disposal and the use of space. *Hesperia* 83: 103-121.

C. Robin, 2013. *Everyday Life Matters: Maya Farmers at Chan*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida. Chapter 3.

M. L. Smith, 2014. The Archaeology of Urban Landscapes. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 43: 307-323.

L. C. Nevett et al. 2020. Constructing an Urban Profile: the evidence from Olynthos. *Annual of British School at Athens* 115: 329-378.

Nona Palincaş / “Vasile Pârvan” Institute of Archaeology, (Romania)

Nona Palincaş is a senior researcher with the Vasile Pârvan Institute of Archaeology of the Romanian Academy in Bucharest. Her research interests include both social archaeology (particularly gender, body practices, power, knowledge, agency and creativity in south-eastern European Bronze and Iron Ages and in contemporary archaeology) and archaeometry (primarily radiocarbon dating, stable isotopes for paleo-diet reconstruction and analysis of archaeological ceramics). She is a member and a former co-chair of the Archaeology and Gender in Europe (AGE) working community of the European Association of Archaeologists (EAA). She conducts excavations in the pre- and protohistoric settlement at Popeşti (Romania), the Late Iron Age habitation of which was identified with Argedaon/Argedava, settlement linked to the political activity of king Burebistas. In various publications she has pleaded for stronger development of archaeological theory and archaeometry in Romania and in South-Eastern Europe in general as well as for a closer integration of the two domains.

Lecture 1: On the boundaries of archaeology in relation to interdisciplinary research

The lecture will begin by examining three case studies from the point of view of what is traditionally seen as archaeology and what is defined as interdisciplinary research: a) the analysis of a fragment from an imitation Rhodian amphora, b) ¹⁴C dating and stable isotopes for human diet reconstruction and c) body practices in Middle Bronze Age Transylvania.

It will be argued that:

- A. Archaeological research must resort to knowledge produced in other domains (e.g., social sciences, art history, physics, chemistry, biology) if one is to deliver results of any relevance for archaeologists and the wider public. Consequently, the term ‘interdisciplinary research’ does not make much sense any more, as in the meanwhile this became part of ‘normal archaeology’.
- B. The vast majority of the Romanian archaeologists disagree with the previous stance. They strongly believe that: a) while *natural* sciences (biology, chemistry, physics, geology etc.) are relevant for archaeological research, the duty of archeologists does not go beyond delivering the archaeological material for ‘interdisciplinary research’ while the professionals in those other fields should deliver the results of their research in a form intelligible and usable for archaeologist; b) reject the relevance of *social* sciences for archaeological research (ethnography, anthropology, social theory altogether). Thus, the results of the so defined interdisciplinary research are not integrated in the archaeological studies, but rather appear as annex and do not change the archaeological interpretations

in any relevant way; or, alternatively, the archaeological data appear as annex to studies produced in other domains (see, e.g., the supplementary data for the DNA studies).

Conclusions

Archaeological research gradually integrates concepts and methods produced by a large number of other research field to the point where soon there will be not real justification for the use of the term 'interdisciplinary research/approach' in the sense we use it presently. Because for the vast majority of the Romanian archaeologists the cultural historical paradigm – with its exclusively descriptive aims – is tantamount to archaeology, the interdisciplinary research is not really necessary. The relatively numerous recent publications claiming interest in interdisciplinary research are mostly faking innovation for the sake of funding and academic positions rather than promoting renewal of archaeological research

Lecture 2: Interdisciplinary research in practice: A view from Romania

The lecture analyzes how interdisciplinary research is practiced in Romanian archaeology with the aim of highlighting its main characteristics as well as the consequences for power relations in Romanian archaeology and the further development of the domain.

The following main traits of the interdisciplinary research in Romania were identified:

- a) the most relevant studies are the result of individual initiatives of self-educated archaeologists, physicists, chemists etc., and only rarely of professionals with a higher education in the domain
- b) it has poor institutional support
- c) Romanian archaeologists are usually included in top research projects of old EU countries only with minor tasks (delivering of materials and description of archaeological contexts) and they consider beneficial this practice, which can be termed as neo-colonial
- d) the beneficiaries of the aforementioned neo-colonial structure are interested in precluding the development of a local interdisciplinary research, while, at the same time, they advocate for the value of interdisciplinarity for archaeology
- e) efforts towards the development of a genuine local interdisciplinary research are doomed to fail (for lack of financial and institutional support, the accepted mechanisms of faking innovation, the challenges of meeting requirements specific to different domains – e.g., what counts as a well published article in archaeology does not mean much in physics or chemistry –, lack of capacity to cover complementary domains and, quite importantly, the slowing down of one's career due to the time invested in self-education).

Conclusion: Whatever interdisciplinary research exists in present-day Romanian archaeology is intertwined with power relations. The interdisciplinary research better supported institutionally only marginally aims at advancing archaeological knowledge. It remains unclear how to proceed in a way that would ensure a solid and durable development of local interdisciplinary research, but any reform must start with an analysis.

Readings:

Fahy, G. E., Deter, C., Pitfield, R., Miszkiewicz, J. J., & Mahoney, P. (2017). Bone deep: Variation in stable isotope ratios and histomorphometric measurements of bone remodelling within adult humans. *Journal of Archaeological Science*, 87, 10-16.

Lamb, A. L., Evans, J. E., Buckley, R., & Appleby, J. (2014). Multi-isotope analysis demonstrates significant lifestyle changes in King Richard III. *Journal of Archaeological Science*, 50, 559-565.

Palincaş, N. (2017). Radiocarbon dating in archaeology: Interdisciplinary aspects and consequences (an overview). *Aip Conference Proceedings*, 1852, 1.)

Rye, O. S. (1976). Keeping Your Temper under Control: Materials and the Manufacture of Papuan Pottery. *Archaeology & Physical Anthropology in Oceania*, 11, 2, 106-137.

Duday, H. (1990). L'Anthropologie "de terrain": reconnaissance et interprétation des gestes funéraires. *Bulletins et Mémoires de la Société D'Anthropologie de Paris* 2, 3-4, 29-49.

Whitney Davis / UC Berkley, Archaeological Research Facility (USA)

Whitney Davis is George C. and Helen Pardee Professor of History & Theory of Ancient & Modern Art at the University of California at Berkeley. Previously he taught at Northwestern University, where he was John Evans Professor of Art History and Director of the Alice Berline Kaplan Center for the Humanities. He received his PhD in Fine Arts from Harvard University, where he was a Junior Fellow in the Society of Fellows. Davis's research interests include prehistoric and archaic arts; worldwide rock art; the Classical tradition and neoclassicism in Western art since the later Middle Ages, and especially in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries in Britain; the development of professional art history in interaction with archaeology, philosophical aesthetics, comparative anthropology, and other disciplines; art theory in visual-cultural studies, especially problems of pictorial representation; aspects of modern art history, especially its expression (or not) of nonnormative sexualities; the history and theory of sexuality; queer theory; world art studies; and environmental, evolutionary, and cognitive approaches to the global history of visual culture.

Lecture 1. Fundamental issues in the 'archaeology of art'

Archaeologically known arts have been approached by the methods of both archaeology and art history, which have distinctive interests. In some areas, such as classical archaeology, the interests of art history tend to be dominant; in other areas, such as the study of prehistoric art, the methods of archaeology tend to be dominant. The lecture deals with the ways in which archaeologists and art historians think about 'art', about the relationship between 'the object' or 'artifact' and its aesthetic dimensions, and about the relationship between the artwork and other artifacts and the sites to which it is connected. A brief historiography of the study of the 'archaeology of art' will also be presented.

Readings:

Dan Sperber, 'Culture and Matter', in *Representations in Archaeology*.

W. Davis, 'Finding Symbols in History', in *Replications: Archaeology, Art History, Psychoanalysis* (1996), 35–45.

George Kubler, *The Shape of Time: Remarks on the History of Things* (selection).

Lecture 2. Archaeology, art history, and phenomenology

The central concern of phenomenology is the relationship between the human subject, as the agent of apprehension and intentionality, and the objects to which it directs itself in the world. Phenomenological considerations are sometimes difficult to integrate into archaeological and historical disciplines because the subject's experience of consciousness and sensation does not directly fossilize. But archaeologists and art historians have ways of reconstructing the phenomenological horizons of artifact and image makers in the past. The lecture will specifically consider theories of the human 'standpoint', as they can be employed by archaeologists and art historians. Examples will be drawn from studies of ancient Egyptian and classical Greek art and architecture.

Readings:

Maurice Merleau-Ponty, 'Experience and Objective Thought: The Problem of the Body' and 'The Synthesis of One's Own Body', in *The Phenomenology of Perception*, trans. Colin Smith (London, 1962), 67–72; 148–53.

W. Davis, 'What Phidias Saw', in *Visuality and Virtuality: Images and Pictures from Prehistory to Perspective* (2017), 229–63.