

Thursday, February 20

- 9.00-9.45 Introduction by **Johannes Müller, Konrad Ott** and **VPJ Arponen**
 9.45-10.45 **VPJ Arponen**: Towards a Philosophy of Archaeology:
 On the Centrality – and Dangers – of Epistemology
 10.45-11.45 **Jerimy Cunningham**: Analogical Reasoning and the New Materialism

Lunch

- 13.15-14.15 **Julian Thomas**: Toward an Archaeology of Life
 14.15-15.15 **Rachel Crellin**: Becoming Human: Posthumanist and
 Post-Anthropocentric Philosophy and Archaeology

Break

- 16.00-17.00 **Artur Ribeiro**: The Irreducibility of Human Purpose:
 Teleology, Historicity, and Anarchy in Archaeological Practice
 17.00-18.00 **Constanze von Rügen**: Embodied Cognition and Craft as a
 Challenge for Archaeological Method
 19.30 Dinner at Forstbaumschule

Friday, February 21

- 8.30-9.30 **Konrad Ott**: Outline of a Philosophy of Archaeology
 9.30-10.30 **Tim Kerig**: Dead ends: of Any Relevance?

Break

- 10.45-11.45 **Thomas Meier**: Violence and Power, Critique and Responsibility
 11.45-12.45 **Caroline Heitz**: On the Edge of Metamodernity? Archaeology after Postmodernism

Lunch

- 13.15-open end Excursion
 Dinner and closing discussion

Thursday, 9.00-9.45

Introduction by Johannes Müller, Speaker of ROOTS, Konrad Ott and VPJ Arponen, both ROOTS Reflective Turn Forum**Lecture 1: 9.45-10.45**

*VPJ Arponen****Towards a Philosophy of Archaeology: On the Centrality - and Dangers - of Epistemology***

With the hoopla about materialism and ontology, epistemological questions – questions pertaining to human knowledge and concepts used to convey it – may not be terribly in fashion in archaeological theory right now. This contribution, nonetheless, seeks to remind us of, both, the centrality as well as the dangers of epistemology to the archaeological enterprise and beyond.

In constructivist epistemology, such concepts as paradigms, models, patterns of thought, or “lenses” are commonly identified as structuring scientific observation and interpretation. Accordingly, scientific progress can appear as, not only a process of better data collection, but a process of reflective improvement of the guiding paradigms, models, and the like – grinding and polishing of the lenses. At the same time, there is a wide-spread positivist intuition that different theories make “ontological commitments”, that is, assume and state something about the underlying reality being discovered.

More controversially, this contribution will also discuss the constructivist tendency of epistemological approach to intellectually homogenise groups and communities seeing them as operating with shared concepts and patterns of thought. This also implies a conservative view of culture as something that is “all in the head” and homogeneously shared by members of a socio-cultural group. A model of epistemological lenses and ontological commitments – a kind of a philosophy of archaeology – will be offered and discussed with reference to examples from archaeological and other branches of human scientific thought.

Lecture 2: 10.45-11.45

*Jeremy Cunningham****Analogical Reasoning and the New Materialism***

The ontological turn in archaeology has expanded drastically on the range of actors archaeologists now consider in their understandings of ancient social action. As a result, posthumanist themes have a potential to radically expand the breadth and depth of the histories archaeologists are beginning to produce. Yet, many of the early approaches to flattening ontologies and creating greater symmetries in archaeology shows a distinct lack of concern for epistemic issues. In this discussion, I assess the epistemic commitments – and lack thereof – in some branches of symmetrical archaeology. I then revisit the problems and promises offered by analogical reasoning in more conventional epistemologies drawn from archaeology's history. Specifically, I emphasize how ethnographic knowledge was supposed to aid archaeological research by diversifying and expanding upon the background knowledge archaeologists considered when creating explanations of the ancient material patterns upon which their histories were based. I suggest that a greater interest in some specific qualities of analogical inference might release some of the yet to be realized potential in symmetrical archaeology. I conclude by offering an analysis of how analogy and material agencies currently are being explored in models for the emergence of inequality in the Casas Grandes Region of Northern Mexico.

Lecture 3: 13.15-14.15*Julian Thomas****Toward an Archaeology of Life***

Ever since Ian Hodder declared in 1982 that we should see material culture as active rather than passive, archaeology has been struggling with the implications of this statement. With Bruno Latour's suggestion that objects represent 'fully fledged social actors', and Alfred Gell's reflections on artworks, the notion began to emerge that things might be possessed of agency, even if this was only ever exercised as part of a network or relational field. While the view of matter as animate and vibrant is a welcome challenge to the Cartesian conception of the object world as something inert, Tim Ingold places a different inflection on these concerns by arguing that material things are not so much 'alive' as 'in life'. They do not embody or contain an entelechy, but are caught up in the onward flow of matter. In this respect he follows Deleuze and Guattari in proposing that organic life is only a subdivision of the living world, and that it is also possible to discuss inorganic life, in the sense that non-organic entities can form elements of compositions that have effects in the world (such as weather systems). Here I consider the prospect of an archaeology of life, in the sense of an archaeology that concerns itself with the dynamic interplay between organic and inorganic entities, including humans.

Lecture 4: 14.15-15.15*Rachel Crellin****Becoming Human: Posthumanist and Post-Anthropocentric Philosophy and Archaeology***

In this paper I will explore how archaeology and feminist posthumanist philosophy, drawing specifically on the thinking of Rosi Braidotti and Francesca Ferrando, can be brought into a productive conversation surrounding the question of what it means to be human. This conversation has at its heart issues of social justice and change. Posthumanism is gaining traction at present because of the world we live in: a world shaped by late-capitalism, where we are increasingly technologically mediated, where discrimination continues to proliferate, and where the climate crisis is growing. Posthumanism is a philosophy of the moment. In some ways this presents a challenge for archaeologists who seek to apply this model to the past. On the other hand, there is also great potential here as archaeology can demonstrate that the core tenets of posthumanism are also applicable in the past. Archaeology teaches us that what humans are and what defines them is not fixed but rather always in process. It shows us that we have always been entangled with nonhumans. It also teaches us that current issues of inequality are not eternal but emergent (and often persistent) – the world need not be the way that it is.

This paper will explore the posthumanist critique of humanism and the re-definition of the human in light of this critique. It will also address the archaeological response to the rise of posthumanist thinking.

Lecture 5: 16.00-17.00*Artur Ribeiro****The Irreducibility of Human Purpose: Teleology, Historicity, and Anarchy in Archaeological Practice***

One of the strangest contradictions of archaeology is that it is considered a multi-faceted discipline composed of other disciplines that produces inter- and transdisciplinary research, yet, at the same time, it is also considered by many as a discipline that can be subsumed under a single model, paradigm, or

methodology. As we proceed through the Third Science Revolution, many now believe (or pretend to) that archaeology and the discourses it produces are completely subsumable to the dictates of the natural and quantitative sciences and their aggressive face-paced late capitalist practices. Part of why this is happening is due to economic factors, such as how funding is assigned and how value is attached to publications, but a big part is due to underlying philosophical premises as to what it means to be human and how their behaviour can be explained.

The aim of this paper is to address these philosophical premises, namely the biologist and naturalist tendency to reduce humans to causes and effects. As opposed to biologism and naturalism, it will be argued that explanations via purpose, that is, teleological explanations, are irreducible to causes and effects, and that purpose remains best understood under methods of the human sciences, namely socio-historical methods that contextualize human behaviour. Finally, it will be argued that both the methodologies of the natural and human sciences can be combined in more fruitful ways, but it will require embracing some form of methodological anarchism, which perhaps might also be the answer to how we can overcome the fast-paced late capitalist venture that archaeology has become.

Lecture 6: 17.00-18.00

Constance von Rüden

Embodied Cognition and Craft as a Challenge for Archaeological Method

Numerous studies about ancient crafts allow us far-reaching insights about the work flow of different regional craft traditions. Their comparison is a key research topic in archaeology as it enables us to understand their often transregional character and thus provides us with important information about the social connectivity of different societies. However, it is far more difficult to explain in detail the specific modes of knowledge transfer and hence the actual character of these networks. Such a temporal and spatial learning process depends on the social context of the involved persons, the material environment, the anatomy of the craftsperson with its abilities and restrictions and, of course, on the latter's cognitive competence. While tools, the different raw materials, the environmental and even the social setting are comparably well approachable by traditional archaeological methods, the human subject and its cognitive abilities are far more difficult to grasp. Despite the latter's evident significance for the investigation of skill learning, we struggle how we can indeed integrate central aspects of cognitive processes such as their embodiment and situatedness in our theoretical and methodological framework. The paper aims to explore how we can better approach the peoples cognitive abilities and their embodied and situated character to carve out its crucial role in the spread of technical skills.

Friday / Lecture 7: 8.30-9.30

Konrad Ott

Outline of a Philosophy of Archaeology

Archaeology deals with human history. The epistemological reflection upon history was dubbed "Historik" in the German tradition since Droysen. A basic distinction holds between past events ("Geschichte") and the epistemic practices of historians ("Historie"). A second and analytic distinction holds between natural and human history. It is of paramount relevance to archaeology. The history of the family of early hominids still belongs primarily to natural history being governed by natural forces (as climatic change). The speciation event that favored the anatomical modern homo sapiens sapiens terminated finally in human history, as these humans left Africa ("out of Africa 2") and spread over Eurasia competing out homo Neanderthalis. Humans left traces and residuals.

In archaeology, natural history and human history often blend into each other. Patterns of human behavior, as foraging, can be explained via behavioral sciences. From an epistemological perspective, however,

it makes a difference whether scientific theories are applied to humans or whether they are consumed from history as parts of historical explanations. In an effort to construe an outline of a philosophy of archaeology, this contribution discusses a range of approaches to the interplay of past events and epistemic practices.

Lecture 8: 9.30-10.30

Tim Kerig

Dead ends: of Any Relevance?

The paper presents a single problem of archaeological reasoning: phenomena which can be called „dead ends“. Dead ends can be defined as single evolutionary trajectories which did not reach the present and which became extinct without leaving evident traces.

With no obvious connection to the present, dead ends can hardly be identified when using archaeological standard methods. In retrospective, how could dead ends be recognised? No direct historical approach can help, no direct analogies can be applied, no hermeneutics can take them into sight.

The paper asks for the relevance of the problem for archaeological reasoning as well as for public outreach. It discusses the consequences of the existence of dead ends for approaches to explaining or understanding the past, respectively. It reviews related answers from palaeontological and biological thought. It differentiates several types of dead ends according to their range in time and space.

There are ways out of the problem by identifying those dead end phenomena in a perspective forward from a reconstructed point in the past: Experiments of thought, simulation studies, experimental archaeology can – to some extent – work forward and may help identifying relevant dead ends.

Lecture 9: 10.45-11.45

Thomas Meier

Violence and Power, Critique and Responsibility

Archaeology is the art to narrate stories of material memories. This practice of history is always action in and for the present and, thus, poses special responsibility on the archaeologist as her/his stories (de-)naturalise or (de-)legitimise the order of present day societies.

While discussions on archaeology as politics were lively during the 1980s they calmed down during the last two decades and seem to be widely forgotten and unknown today; philosophies have been smoothed and got cut off their hurting and disturbing edges and their critical potential. Especially many archaeologists lost consciousness of the social and ethical implications of the stories they narrate. Unsurprisingly several of today's popular philosophies raise severe concerns in terms of their political and societal naïvety and their lack of responsible awareness (to say the least).

In my eyes it is very timely and highly due to excavate and update some of the „older“ philosophical debates. I opt for a return of critical philosophy bringing back reflexivity and critique to the center of the humanities. This does not imply the aimless deconstruction of everything as it is en vogue in some of the desperate niches of post-modernity, but to center on the brutal questions of violence (in all its forms be it personal, cultural and/or structural) and power. Violence and power are, at least within the Global North, more hidden today than some decades ago. This is no excuse to oversee them, but much more calls for a raised awareness and improved philosophical toolkit of the humanities, as violent exploitation

and powerful suppression are still dominating our contemporary world.

Lecture 10: 11.45-12.45

Caroline Heitz

On the Edge of Metamodernity? – Archaeology after Postmodernism

Archaeology is currently experiencing fundamental transformations as a discipline, accompanied by yet another paradigm shift – addressed by some as processualism 2.0. While processual archaeology drew on modernity's realism, it was postmodernity's relativism that informed postprocessual archaeology. However, recent epistemological developments like the ontological, material, science and digital turn might lead archaeology beyond anthropocentrism and idealism challenging the postmodern thought: There is a danger of turning (back) to naive realism and (new) processualism. Furthermore, the combining of qualitative and quantitative methods from science and humanities might bear the problem of mixing contradicting epistemological stances.

Taking a broader perspective, the postmodernism as a whole seems to be losing traction: Current challenges like the financial and refugee crises, environmental pollution, global warming, artificial intelligence (AI) are leading to an intensified examination of the real beyond the subjective. With reference to art and culture, it was proposed that such real-world problems led to the dawn of a new era: Metamodernity. Metamodernity is characterised by the oscillation between the real and the fictional, the modern and the postmodern, materialism and idealism, relativism and realism. Although such a provocative view might be contentious, its synthetic tendency is intriguing. How could archaeology deal with these different stances without getting caught up in contradictions? I propose to draw on what I call 'third way epistemologies' that have so far received little attention in our discipline in order to explore their potential for metamodern archaeology.

CONTACT: Gido Lukas / glukas@roots.uni.kiel.de

FURTHER DETAILS: www.cluster-roots.uni-kiel.de/en/calendar-events