



Book of abstracts

XVIII^o CONGRES UISPP PARIS JUIN 2018
18th UISPP WORLD CONGRESS, PARIS, JUNE 2018

Table of contents

XVIIIe congres UISPP Paris.pdf	1
VII-1. Archaeology and interdisciplinarity, from the 19th century to present-day research	5
Interdisciplinarity and institutions. The case of Italian prehistoric archaeology, Massimo Tarantini	6
Luján, l'Abbeville des pampas. Amateurs, traders, and scholars behind the search of the pampean fossil man (1865-1884)., Marcelo Javier Toledo	8
"Culture: the diffusion controversy" (1927) revisited: archaeology, anthropology and the hyperdiffusionists, Maxime Brami [et al.]	10
FROM MINING TO ARCHAEOLOGY. AN AUSTRIAN EXPERIMENT IN TRANSYLVANIA AT THE BEGINNING OF THE 19TH CENTURY, Aurora Peřan	12
Interdisciplinary research of the caves conducted by the the Academy of Arts and Sciences in Krakow at the turn of 19th and 20th centuries., Marzena Woźny . . .	14
" Archéologie, interdisciplinarité et encyclopédisme : l'exemple de l'Exposition universelle de 1878 ", Annick Fenet	15
FLAMING ENTHUSIASM: INTERDISCIPLINARITY IN HUNGARIAN ARCHAEOLOGY FROM THE NINETEENTH CENTURY UNTIL THE END OF THE FIRST WORLD WAR, Laura Coltofean	16
Archaeology and interdisciplinarity in Spain: from the 1950s to the 1970s, Margarita Díaz-Andreu	17
AMATEURS ET PROFESSIONNELS À L'ORIGINE DE L'ARCHÉOLOGIE PRÉHISTORIQUE AU NORD DU MAROC, Enrique Gozalbes	18

The idea of interdisciplinarity, Géraldine Delley	19
In search for the interdisciplinarity in Portuguese archaeology: the role played by the journal ‘Revista de Guimarães’ (60s of the 20th century), Ana Cristina Martins	20
VII-3. From stratigraphy to stratigraphic excavation in pre- and protohistoric archaeology	21
Laying down the law: the formative years of prehistoric stratigraphy between 1860 and 1875., Nathan Schlanger	22
The multiple roots of an exemplary excavation: G.A. Blanc at Grotta Romanelli (1914-1920), Massimo Tarantini	23
Re-examining the stratigraphic work of the British School of Rome in Malta, Rowan McLaughlin	24
Stratification and Stratigraphy: geological metaphors of Angelo Mosso (1846-1910), a physician interested in Prehistory, Cultraro Massimo	25
The abstraction of archaeological stratigraphy: innovation trends in the Pyrenees (1948–2015), Sébastien Plutniak	26
Pioneers of Archaeological Stratigraphical Techniques: Luigi Bernabò Brea (1910-1999) and Giorgio Buchner (1914-2005), Nomi Federico [et al.]	28
Stratigraphy and Pale ethnology in Italy during the XIX century. The role of Gaetano Chierici, Cremaschi Mauro	29
Paul Vouga à La Tène et à Auvernier : la stratigraphie à l’épreuve de la typologie, Gianna Reginelli Servais	30
Démarche d’historien et de préhistorien ou comment pallier les manques dans l’étude de certaines collections ? Exemples de la grotte de l’Observatoire (Monaco) et des Balzi Rossi (Ligurie, Italie)., Elena Rossoni-Notter [et al.]	31
Ethnoarchaeology and Interpretation of formative processes of the archaeological record, Lugli Francesca	33
Caves and Rock-shelther Investigation in Eastern Sicily: Methodologies and Palaeo-ecological Meanings, Italo Biddittu [et al.]	35
VII-4. Epistemology, History and Philosophy of Science: Interdisciplinary Perspectives on the History of Archaeology	36

Epistémologie et histoire de l'archéologie: Une réflexion croisée, Oscar Moro Abadia	37
Interdisciplinary practices and the autonomy of the archaeological research traditions, Gheorghe Alexandru Niculescu	38
Is there a "hidden" agenda of lithic imagery? French and Anglophone 'styles of visualisation' in palaeo-archaeology compared, Shumon Hussain	39
L'Antiquité dans tous ses états: évolutions et révolutions dans les années 1960 en Préhistoire ancienne en Grèce, Giorgos Vavouranakis [et al.]	40
Muséologie et histoire de l'archéologie, Marc-Antoine Kaeser	42
Précurseur, primitif, préhistorique : l'histoire de l'art face à la préhistoire, Rémi Labrusse	43
The physical and the psychical: archaeology between the natural and the moral sciences., Artur Ribeiro	44
Three agendas that linked prehistory, archaeology, and technology: A. H. L. Pitt-Rivers (1827-1900), A. Leroi-Gourhan (1911-1986) and F. Sigaut (1940-2012), Sophie A. De Beaune	45
When two worlds collides, Miriam Andrés Chaín	46
VII-5. Historiographie de préhistoriens français de la seconde moitié du XX^e siècle	47
Annette Laming-Emperaire et l'art préhistorique, Lioudmila Iakovleva	48
Bohumil Soudsky (1922-1976), Jean-Paul Demoule	49
Camille Arambourg, le paléontologue et le préhistorien, Djillali Hadjouis	50
De Roi Mata aux Marae polynésiens : José Garanger, océaniste de la diversité archéologique, Christophe Sand [et al.]	52
Francis Hours (1921-1987), Olivier Aurenche	53
Georges Laplace (1918-2004), Eudald Carbonell [et al.]	54
Henri-Jean Hugot (1916-2014) : un itinéraire saharien, Sylvie Amblard-Pison	55
Henriette Alimen (1900-1996), Jean-Claude Miskovsky	56

Jacques Cauvin (1930-2001), Olivier Aurenche	57
Jacques-Pierre Millotte (1920-2002), Jean-François Piningre	58
Jean Arnal (1907-1987), Jean Guilaine	59
Jean Piveteau (1899-1991), Marie-Antoinette De Lumley	60
L'apport scientifique des ingénieurs à l'archéologie préhistorique, François Djindjian	61
Louis Méroc (1904-1970), Henry De Lumley	62
Max Escalon de Fonton (1920-2013) et la préhistoire ancienne, Gérard Onoratini	63
Max Escalon de Fonton (1920-2013), Jean Guilaine	64
Michel Brezillon, Philippe Soulier	65
Pierre Roland Giot (1919-2002), Jacques Briard (1833-2002) et Jean L'Helgouach (1933-2000), Jean-Laurent Monnier	66
Victor Commont (1866-1918), Pascal Depaepe [et al.]	67

**VII-1. Archaeology and
interdisciplinarity, from the 19th
century to present-day research**

Interdisciplinarity and institutions. The case of Italian prehistoric archaeology

Massimo Tarantini * ¹

¹ Ministero dei Beni Culturali - Soprintendenza Archeologia Belle Arti e Paesaggio Siena (MIBACT - SABAP Siena) – Italy

In order to explore the process of incorporating (or not) other disciplines into archaeology, we address the role of institutional dynamics, with reference to the creation of new university professorships and structures promoting coordination among scholars.

The role of institutions in favoring or obstructing interdisciplinary collaboration is in no way to be underestimated. In fact, institutions are the principal locus of the production, reproduction, and diffusion of scientific knowledge and therefore play an essential role in determining the success of specific research projects. Furthermore, the processes of institutionalization contribute to the definition of disciplinary boundaries and simultaneously to the approval of certain interdisciplinary alliances at the expense of others.

In this paper, we deal with the relationships between institutions, archaeology and interdisciplinarity via the case study of Italy, which we believe is of particular interest. In fact, Italian prehistoric archaeology was for a long time subjected to a powerful tension between the humanistic and the naturalistic approaches; this situation is clearly reflected in all of its institutional vicissitudes.

We begin by showing how this tension arose with the process of the institutionalization of prehistory. In fact, in order to justify the birth of a new academic discipline, in 1875 Luigi Pigorini proposed a definition for "palethnology" which explicitly distanced the field from geology. The question of the definition of "palethnology" in relation to the geo-paleontological sciences surfaced again at the beginning of the 20th century over the dating of several Paleolithic strata on paleontological criteria. Pigorini's firm reaction made it clear that a different research project, directed towards collaboration with the natural sciences, had to develop its own structures for coordination. In 1913 the Committee for Research in Human Paleontology was founded for this precise purpose (in 1927 its name was changed to the Italian Institute of Human Paleontology). Nevertheless, the intense and qualified activities of this entity resulted in the creation of an opposition between one prehistory directed towards the natural sciences and the study of the Paleolithic period, and another prehistory as "pure" archaeology (in other words, essentially based on the study of materials) dealing with subsequent periods. The critical state of this opposition was made explicit by several scholars following the Second World War, and the foundation of the Italian Institute of Prehistory and Protohistory in 1954 was motivated in part to overcome this dichotomy.

*Speaker

Keywords: history of archaeology, institutions, Interdisciplinarity, Italy

Luján, l'Abbeville des pampas. Amateurs, traders, and scholars behind the search of the pampean fossil man (1865-1884).

Marcelo Javier Toledo *† ¹

¹ - - Estomba 1237 CABA, Argentina

Since the first half of the 19th century, the question of "fossil man" and the Somme valley events of 1859, were not unknown by the collectors and traders of Buenos Aires. In 1865 Seguin, a French pâtissier and fossil trader, announced the discovery of the "fossil man" and sent the remains to the Universal Exposition of Paris of 1867. In 1873, the "Paleolithic" controversies were begun in Argentina by Ameghino, who aware of the European debates, embarked upon a systematic search for the "*hombre fósil*" exhuming modified megafaunal bones and scarce lithics. In 1873 he found human remains at Frías creek in deposits that he attributed to the Pliocene, and announced the discovery to Dr. G. Burmeister, director of the Buenos Aires Museum; strongly opposed to the existence of *diluvial man*. Until 1876, Ameghino benefited from the support of the Italian professor Dr. Ramorino, who had played an active role in the European "tertiary man" affair. Still, Ameghino did not obtain any official recognition since, in 1876, a biased field certification of the Sociedad Científica Argentina (SCA) concluded that Ameghino had mistakenly attributed a "diluvian" age to very recent geologic layers, strongly eroding his reputation. Nevertheless, Ameghino tried unsuccessfully to convince the scientific institutions about the discovery of the "fossil man" and its coexistence with the megafauna. Ameghino's manuscripts were rejected or ignored by the Buenos Aires Museum and the SCA. Isolated and disappointed, he sent his collections to the Paris Exposition Universelle of 1878. There he exchanged ideas with Gervais, Cartailhac, Mortillet, Broca, and Cope, who accepted the cohabitation of fossil man with the giant armadillo. Benefiting from the sale of his collections, Ameghino remained in France until 1881, publishing several papers and books, including the *Antiquity of man in the Plata*. In Chelles, he demonstrated for the first time the overlapping of the Mousterian and Chellenian industries. Epistemologically, we cannot dissociate the materials exhumed, the related landscapes, the access to European treatises, the reports in local newspapers, the provincial social context, eventual alliances, and the relation of tensions with the central science social system. Ameghino failed to be part of the official networks, and to have their findings and ideas examined and questioned. This social tension stigmatized for a century the archeological prospection of Pampean plains "paleolithic" sites. We find a parallel with Tournal in relation to the resistance of central institutions to accept his discoveries and particularly to accept *in situ* field certifications. Cuvier was to Tournal what Burmeister was to Ameghino.

*Speaker

†Corresponding author: loessoide@gmail.com

Keywords: Ameghino, pampas, megafauna

”Culture: the diffusion controversy” (1927) revisited: archaeology, anthropology and the hyperdiffusionists

Maxime Brami ^{*†} ¹, false *

¹ Royal Anthropological Institute (RAI) – United Kingdom

This paper focuses on intellectual interactions among London-based researchers through the 1910s to the 1930s who engaged in debates on the origins of early culture, and aims to clarify the implications of the diffusion controversy for the wider academic split between archaeology and anthropology.

The question of whether early culture spread like an epidemic from a single, higher society, or whether, on the contrary, the making of culture was part of the fabric of every society regardless of its place on the social ‘evolutionary ladder’, provided the backdrop for a major split within anthropology in the 1920s. The split, opposing G. Elliot Smith and B. Malinowski, culminated with the publication in 1927 of *Culture: the Diffusion Controversy*, which may be seen as the final act of the British School of Diffusionism before its relegation to obscurity. For not only did Malinowski win the battle of ideas, he appears to have bankrupted Elliot Smith’s University College London (UCL) Anatomy Group, by convincing the Rockefeller Foundation, one of the main sponsors of the UCL Group, to reallocate funding in 1927 to his own branch of anthropology at the London School of Economics (Champion 2003, 125).

Diffusionism was not rendered completely extinct however. As social anthropology under Malinowski became what has sometimes been described as a ”science of acculturation” (Trigger 1998, 134), archaeology under V. Gordon Childe became the torchbearer of moderate diffusionism, through its emphasis on prehistoric migrations and the spread of agriculture. This is particularly evident in Gordon Childe’s early work *The Danube in Prehistory* (1929). The precise extent of Gordon Childe’s involvement with the British School of Diffusionism remains unclear. He is credited for ”help in preparation” in W.J. Perry’s second edition of *Growth of Civilisation* (1926) and he may have been a more active member of the UCL Anatomy Group than is usually reported in the literature (Stout 2008, 93).

References:

Champion T. 2003. Egypt and the diffusion of culture. In: Jeffreys D. ed. *Views of Ancient Egypt since Napoleon Bonaparte*. Institute of Archaeology, UCL: 127-146.

Stout A. 2008. *Creating Prehistory: Druids, Ley Hunters and Archaeologists in Pre-War Britain*. Wiley-Blackwell.

*Speaker

†Corresponding author: maxime.brami@noos.fr

Trigger B.G. 1998. Archaeology and epistemology: dialoguing across the Darwinian chasm. *American Journal of Archaeology* 102(1): 1-34.

Keywords: Archaeology, Anthropology, Culture, Diffusion, Gordon Childe, Elliot Smith, Malinowski

FROM MINING TO ARCHAEOLOGY. AN AUSTRIAN EXPERIMENT IN TRANSYLVANIA AT THE BEGINNING OF THE 19TH CENTURY

Aurora Pețan * ¹

¹ Study Centre of Dacica Foundation – Sat Alun nr. 1, com. Boșorod, jud. Hunedoara, 337095, Romania

The ruins of the ancient site of *Sarmizegetusa Regia*, the capital of pre-Roman Dacia (nowadays Romania) came into attention of the Austrian officialities at the end of the 18th century as a result of some large hoards discovered by local treasure hunters.

The tax authority organized two excavation campaigns at these ruins in 1803 and 1804 with the purpose of discovering the treasures they believed were hidden there. Fortunately, whilst it was set to find gold, this approach turned into a proto-scientific one, thanks to some enlightened minds of the time, who had presumed the scientific value of the site and imposed severe research rules.

The lack of experience and knowledge in digging an ancient site has determined the managers to borrow methods from other disciplines and to innovate. The location of the site in the mountains has led them to appeal to mining and geology. Thus, they brought specialists trained at the Mining Academy in Schemnitz, the first technical university in the world. Mining excavation techniques have been applied and adapted, evolving to a certain extent towards the modern archaeology research techniques. They developed elements of stratigraphy, descriptions of contexts, drawing and mapping. Dozens of periodic reports describing the methods and the results have been elaborated.

Very well trained in geology, mineralogy and metallurgy, the Austrian specialists have determined the rocks used for building the fortress, the metals and ores found in the site, identifying in some cases their sources. They also identified traces of kilns, workshops, and other ancient metal and glass processing activities.

The excavations did not lead to the identification of the sought-after treasures and were stopped for lack of profit despite the opposition of the scholars of the time. The results have never been published and the reports have remained in the archives and have not been exploited until now. For this reason, the gained experience has not been passed on, and this enterprise has remained an experiment. However, the scholars of the 19th and 20th centuries referred often to the Austrian excavations found on the field, contributing indirectly to the progress of the archaeology in Transylvania.

*Speaker

This study explores the information in the Austrian tax reports and highlights the way in which this proto-scientific experiment was carried out.

Keywords: Preroman Dacia, Sarmizegetusa Regia, Transylvania, mining, protoarchaeology

Interdisciplinary research of the caves conducted by the the Academy of Arts and Sciences in Krakow at the turn of 19th and 20th centuries.

Marzena Woźny * ¹

¹ Marzena Woźny – Archaeological Museum in Cracow Senacka 3, 31-001 Krakow Poland
marzenawoz@wp.pl, Poland

Established in 1872, the Academy of Arts and Sciences in Krakow fulfilled a special role in the Polish science and culture at the turn of 19th and 20th centuries. It was a place where numerous scientific branches, both humanistic and natural developed, and its scientific and publishing achievements represented a very high standard. It provided patronage for important tasks in diverse fields of science. One of those, in the field of archaeology, was excavation research in the caves of Galicia (one of the three annexed territories created at the end of the 18th century after the partitions of the Polish Kingdom by Russia, Prussia and Austria. Until 1918, Galicia constituted a part of, first the Austrian, and then the Austro-Hungarian monarchy). The Academy of Arts and Sciences in Krakow became interested in the caves thanks to archaeologists: Count Jan Zawisza (1822–1887), Gotfryd Ossowski (1835–1897) and Włodzimierz Demetrykiewicz (1859–1937). This paper is aimed at presenting the circumstances of the project of interdisciplinary research of the Galicians caves. In that project the archaeologists, geologists, anthropologists, botanists and historians were engaged.

Keywords: history of archaeology, 19th century, interdisciplinary research in archaeology, caves

*Speaker

” Archéologie, interdisciplinarité et encyclopédisme : l’exemple de l’Exposition universelle de 1878 ”

Annick Fenet * ¹

¹ Archéologie et Philologie d’Orient et d’Occident (AOROC) – École normale supérieure - Paris, Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes, Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique : UMR8546 – CNRS : UMR8546 - Ecole Normale Supérieure de Paris - ENS Paris - 45 Rue d’Ulm 75230 PARIS CEDEX 05, France

Hauts-lieux de l’encyclopédisme et de la valorisation du progrès scientifique et technique, les Expositions universelles du XIXe siècle s’avèrent une formidable vitrine d’interdisciplinarité. On s’intéressera ici à l’Exposition universelle de 1878 au sein de laquelle, dans le palais du Trocadéro construit à Paris pour l’occasion, se tint une *Exposition historique de l’art ancien*, à laquelle on adjoignit, selon les termes des organisateurs, ” une *Exposition ethnographique*, pour mettre sous les yeux du public un tableau de la marche de la civilisation à travers les âges et de ses développements successifs dans les différentes contrées du globe ”. Les visiteurs purent y admirer une réunion d’environ 40.000 objets datés depuis la préhistoire (” âge de pierre ”) jusqu’à l’an 1800, répartis sur 15 salles au total, dont 3 concernaient les origines et l’Antiquité. Même si cette exposition suscita quelques critiques, elle connut un grand rayonnement, tant en France qu’à l’étranger, et fut aussitôt considérée comme désormais inégalable. L’étude portera sur la manière dont l’archéologie fut ainsi présente, au travers de cette manifestation mais aussi en d’autres lieux (congrès associés, expositions des pavillons nationaux...), dans cette Exposition universelle. Elle s’attachera en particulier à sa diversité thématique (tant en termes de civilisations évoquées que d’approches scientifiques et techniques) et celle de ses protagonistes. En effet, les objets exposés et les reconstitutions proposées à Paris en 1878 sont le reflet de travaux menés par des acteurs de milieux et de nationalités diverses : scientifiques (conservateurs, archéologues, épigraphistes...), explorateurs, médecins, collectionneurs, militaires, sociétés savantes, etc., œuvrant ou non sur le terrain. Ces artefacts et les discours qui y sont associés témoignent de la complexité des pratiques et des échanges scientifiques à l’œuvre, dans une seconde moitié du XIXe siècle qui voit l’institutionnalisation de l’archéologie et la délimitation de champs disciplinaires.

Keywords: Histoire de l’archéologie, Exposition universelle 1878

*Speaker

FLAMING ENTHUSIASM: INTERDISCIPLINARITY IN HUNGARIAN ARCHAEOLOGY FROM THE NINETEENTH CENTURY UNTIL THE END OF THE FIRST WORLD WAR

Laura Coltofean * ¹

¹ Brukenthal National Museum, Sibiu, Romania – Romania

In the nineteenth century, Hungarian archaeology involved enthusiastic scholars from diverse backgrounds, who shared a common interest for the past and formed a strong and dynamic academic network. This network facilitated the discussion and exchange of theses, research practices from various fields and eventually resulted in interdisciplinary collaborations. These collaborations are best reflected in correspondence and the articles in the main Hungarian archaeological journals of the time, which presented the latest discoveries and theories in the discipline. Moreover, in 1876, an event of major importance for Hungarian archaeology took place in Budapest: the 8th International Congress of Prehistoric Anthropology and Archaeology (CIAAP), which was attended by numerous encyclopaedic scholars and increased the opportunities for building and strengthening international and interdisciplinary collaborations. How and in what cultural and political context did the process of incorporating other disciplines into archaeology begin in Hungary? How did this process evolve in time? What was its impact on the development of archaeology in this country? This paper aims to explore the history of interdisciplinarity in Hungarian archaeology and its role in shaping archaeological research from the nineteenth century until the collapse of Austria-Hungary at end of the First World War.

Keywords: Hungary, nineteenth century, First World War, archaeology, interdisciplinarity, CIAAP 1876

*Speaker

Archaeology and interdisciplinarity in Spain: from the 1950s to the 1970s

Margarita Díaz-Andreu * ¹

¹ Institució Catalana de Recerca i Estudis Avançats; Universitat de Barcelona (ICREA; UB) – Paseo Lluís Companys 23, 08010, Barcelona; Carrer de Montalegre 6, 08001 Barcelona, Spain

In this paper the emergence of new specialisations in the study of the past will be analysed in relation to the third quarter of the twentieth century in Spain. Palynology, radiocarbon dating and zooarchaeology will be the three fields that will be explored. Not much about the development of the methods and techniques in these three fields of knowledge is currently known. Nor do we have much in terms of informed data on who was behind them and what institutions fostered these new forms of enquiry. Some comments will be made on the social base of this changes paying attention to aspects such as gender, nationality and status. How interdisciplinarity was organised in practice and how it changed throughout the years will also be assessed.

Keywords: History of Archaeology, Interdisciplinarity, Palynology, Radiocarbon dating

*Speaker

AMATEURS ET PROFESSIONNELS À L'ORIGINE DE L'ARCHÉOLOGIE PRÉHISTORIQUE AU NORD DU MAROC

Enrique Gozalbes * ¹

¹ Professeur d'Histoire Ancienne – Facultad de C. Ed. y Humanidades UCLM Avda de los Alfares 44
16002 CUENCA, Spain

L'objectif de la recherche est d'exposer le parcours de l'archéologie préhistorique depuis les études réalisés par des amateurs jusqu'aux travaux des chercheurs. Dans le premier cas, au Nord du Maroc, on retrouve de préférence des spécialistes en sciences naturelles, tels que des militaires (Blazquez y Delgado Aguilera), des explorateurs (Montalbán) et des prêtres (Koehler) qui ont intégré leurs imaginaire et expériences dans le sujet de leur étude. Dans le deuxième cas, on observe un développement des études à partir de deux faits fondamentaux : tout d'abord la reconnaissance de la préhistoire en tant que science avec un certain prestige, ensuite la présence de spécialistes dans la connaissance totale ou partielle du matériel archéologique préhistorique. Une étape pouvant être considérée comme intermédiaire entre l'époque des amateurs et celle des spécialistes est l'activité d'Obermaier, professeur à l'Université de Madrid.

L'institutionnalisation et la professionnalisation de l'archéologie préhistorique a eu lieu de façon précoce durant le Protectorat français au Maroc, avec la figure de Ruhlmann (Inspecteur des antiquités préhistoriques). Il y eu un premier essai durant le Protectorat espagnol tout de suite après la guerre civile espagnole (1936-1939) avec les interventions de Martínez Santa-Olalla, responsable de l'archéologie espagnole à l'époque, et une intervention temporaire de la Mission de la *American School of Prehistoric Research*, dirigée par H. Hencken à Tanger. Mais finalement c'est au cours du Protectorat espagnol qu'à eu lieu la transition, vers 1950, avec les activités de Miguel Tarradell, inspecteur des antiquités et directeur du Musée archéologique de Tétouan. Il a été formé à l'Université de Barcelone et a bénéficié de l'aide d'autres chercheurs, comme son maître Luis Pericot Garcia ou des camarades de l'université tels que Arribas et Ripoll Perelló qui ont effectué des études partielles moins connues.

Keywords: paléolithique, Nord marocain, croyances, historiographie

*Speaker

The idea of interdisciplinarity

Géraldine Delley * ¹

¹ Laténium et Institut d'archéologie, Neuchâtel – Switzerland

From the 1920's onwards, private and state public institutions fostering innovative and promising scientific projects were implemented at an international level. These institutions prescribed models of research practices that scientists were urged to reproduce in order to be financially supported. Amongst these models, the exchange of skills and tools between disciplines and the building of blended research teams were particularly encouraged since the 1950s. This model still remains influent today and prehistory takes part in it. Focusing on the 20th century, this paper aims to look at the plurality of motives and behaviours' developed by Swiss and French prehistorians regarding collaborations with other disciplines. What were the mechanisms of these incorporations? What were the methodological, heuristic, institutional and disciplinary motivations? What kind of adjustments and drawbacks scholars had to face in their daily practice? Finally, what does it reveal about the way prehistorians saw interdisciplinarity?

Keywords: history of archaeology, history of science, interdisciplinarity, 20th century, Switzerland, France

*Speaker

In search for the interdisciplinarity in Portuguese archaeology: the role played by the journal ‘Revista de Guimarães’ (60s of the 20th century)

Ana Cristina Martins * ¹

¹ Instituto de História Contemporânea, Faculdade de Ciências Sociais e Humanas, Universidade Nova de Lisboa (IHC-FCSH-UNL) – IHC - Instituto de História Contemporânea Faculdade de Ciências Sociais e Humanas Universidade Nova de Lisboa Av. de Berna, 26-C 1069-061 Lisboa, Portugal

In 1958 took place the 1st National Archaeological Congress in Portugal. Reading its proceedings we find some papers dealing with the relevance of interdisciplinarity in archaeology. Nonetheless, it was by the end of the 60s that a new generation of young archaeologists began to seek for other references, updating bibliography and attending conferences and congresses on this special issue. Contrary of one could expecte, it was not the Faculty of Letters of the University of Lisbon or even the prestigious journal ‘O Arqueólogo Português’ (‘The Portuguese Archaeologist’), published by the National Museum of Archaeology, which took head with this process. Surprisingly, it was the journal belonging to the ‘Sociedade Martins Sarmiento’ (‘Martins Sarmiento Society’), a 19th century erudite association from the northern region of the country that did it. In fact, it was this journal that accepted to publish the first papers signed by young students and professors, such as Vítor Oliveira Jorge, from Lisbon, and Jorge Alarcão, from the University of Coimbra.

It is therefore our purpose to understand the reasons why these two authors responsible, together with other young scholars, for the renovation of archaeology in the country, presented their first works on the need for an interdisciplinary approach in archaeology in such a journal as the ‘Revista Guimarães’ (‘Guimarães Journal’). Was it because it was still difficult for the directors of other journals and institutions to understand the real importance of a subject such as the interdisciplinarity in archaeology? Or was it because the interdisciplinarity was not yet a keyword in science and political science in the country? These are the main questions to which we will try to answer; contextualizing this phenomenon within the different kinds of policies dominant in the country in those times. In the meantime we will emphasise the role played by this journal in the introduction and dissemination of interdisciplinarity in archaeology as a way to develop this science according to international theoretical and methodological standards.

Keywords: Interdisciplinarity, Portugal, 60s, international standards, journal.

*Speaker

VII-3. From stratigraphy to stratigraphic excavation in pre- and protohistoric archaeology

Laying down the law: the formative years of prehistoric stratigraphy between 1860 and 1875.

Nathan Schlanger * ¹

¹ UMR Trajectoires (UMR 8215 Trajectoires) – CNRS : UMR8215 – France

Before becoming so evident as to 'go without saying', the principles of stratigraphic sequence and superposition stirred considerable controversy in the years surrounding the establishment of high human antiquity and the methodological consolidation of the discipline. In between Boucher de Perthes, Eduard Lartet and Gabriel de Mortillet, and involving a host of lesser known figures, the notion that the lower levels of a sequence are the older was hotly disputed, bringing to play such considerations as progress, stone tool typology and technology, ethnographic analogies, hydrological regimes and hygienist urbanism. As this paper will show, accounts of stratigraphy – proclaimed to be the foundational aspect of modern, post-antiquarian archaeology – suffer from a "selective amnesia" characteristic of disciplinary historiography, which narrows attention only to those features retrospectively considered to be "anticipatory" or "validated".

Keywords: Stratigraphy, superposition, human antiquity, Boucher de Perthes, Mortillet, technology, typology

*Speaker

The multiple roots of an exemplary excavation: G.A. Blanc at Grotta Romanelli (1914-1920)

Massimo Tarantini * ¹

¹ Ministero dei Beni Culturali - Soprintendenza Archeologia Belle Arti e Paesaggio Siena (MIBACT - SABAP Siena) – Italy

In 1914 Gian Alberto Blanc (1879–1966), a physicist at the University of Rome and co-founder, in 1913, of the *Committee for Research in Human Paleontology*, conducted an exemplary excavation at the Romanelli cave in Puglia which was published in an equally exemplary fashion beginning in 1920. In that excavation we find, first and foremost, a rigorous application of the distinction of materials by their layer of provenience. But that's not all: we also find use of the Cartesian coordinate system to locate the materials on the plan, with particular attention to the excavation of the hearths which alludes to horizontal stratigraphy. Furthermore, each stratum is analyzed on the pedogenetic level and treated as a bearer of paleo-environmental information.

But how do we explain the development of so much innovation in excavation technique and sediment study procedure?

In this paper the reconstruction of the Romanelli Cave excavation is adopted as a case study to evaluate the multiplicity of factors which reveal the origin of specific methodological innovations. In this case, therefore, the various aspects that are believed to have made the Romanelli Cave excavation possible are emphasized: international relations, institutional features, and development of ideas on ecology and glacial phases, as well as Blanc's own scientific education and social position. Moreover, the role of specific questions in stimulating methodological considerations, even in the case of excavation methods, is also emphasized. Finally, the role of the Grotta Romanelli excavation in the subsequent development of excavation methods in Italian archaeology is highlighted, especially via the activities of the *Italian Institute of Human Paleontology*.

Keywords: stratigraphy, ecology, pedology, Romanelli cave, G.A. Blanc

*Speaker

Re-examining the stratigraphic work of the British School of Rome in Malta

Rowan McLaughlin * ¹

¹ Queens University Belfast (QUB) – United Kingdom

The megalithic 'temple' sites of Kordin III, Malta and Santa Verna, Gozo, are comprised of richly stratified sequences of earth floors and stone foundations. These were first explored scientifically by Thomas Ashby of the British School in Rome in 1909-1911. This campaign pioneered the art of stratigraphic excavation in Malta, and directly influenced a generation of Maltese workers whose achievements are still widely celebrated in Malta today. Records of the Santa Verna excavation in particular contain accurate measured plans and section drawings, and a description of the relative sequence of events inferred from the stratigraphy – including recognition of 'cut' features and the appreciation that some material was in situ whilst other strata were disturbed. As part of an ERC-funded project examining the environmental impact of human settlement in Malta ('Fragus'), in 2015 the opportunity arose to examine Ashby's work at Santa Verna and Kordin III afresh. Re-opening these 100-year old trenches, we encountered the same stratigraphy as Ashby had recorded, providing the project a basis for new Bayesian radiocarbon chronologies for the sites. In this paper, we discuss the early 20th century work in the context of the history of Maltese archaeology before and after, and how modern cutting-edge research is still bound to the conventions and aspirations of archaeologists working over a century ago.

Keywords: Malta, Thomas Ashby, megalithic, stratigraphy, radiocarbon, history of archaeology

*Speaker

Stratification and Stratigraphy: geological metaphors of Angelo Mosso (1846-1910), a physician interested in Prehistory

Cultraro Massimo ^{*†} ¹

¹ Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche (CNR) – Via Biblioteca 4, Catania, Italy

Angelo Mosso (1846-1910) was one of the most important Italian Physiologist well known in the scientific debate about Natural Sciences and the biological domain of Human Beings in the late XIX century. An aspect of the scientific production of Mosso, largely neglected in the modern studies on European Prehistory, is the multivaried activity carried out in many archaeological sites in Sicily, Mainland Italy and Greece. During the activity carried out in the Minoan Palace at Phaistos (Crete), Mosso experimented a new innovative approach in the stratigraphic excavations, focusing on the sequence of strata identified according to specific geological and lithologic features. His first experimental investigative area was the exploration of the Neolithic fortified village at Stentinello (Syracuse), where he investigated the stratigraphy of the ditch. Some months later in the spring of 1906, Mosso moved to Crete and carried out the dig under the Storeroom 28 of the Second Palace of Phaistos, where he identified a long-term and impressive layers sequence from the Minoan ages until the Late Neolithic period. The theoretical dimension of this new approach, which includes either method of excavation and a wider multivaried investigation of the archaeological record, is strictly related to the academic activity carried out by Mosso in the most important Physician laboratories of Italy and Germany. Another significant contribution comes from the close activity carried out by Mosso with some colleagues of the National Institute of Geography working in the field of Natural Sciences and Geology. The edition of the stratigraphic deposit under the Palace at Phaistos is a rare example of a broader theorization of the archaeological stratigraphy, where the human-generated debris (or layer), the diagnostic artefacts and the definition of time and culture represent a cornerstone of this modern set-up. Indeed, this approach has been applied in some prehistoric deposits in Sicily (Cannatello and Caldare near Agrigento), as well as in South Italy (Scoglio del Tonno and Coppa Nevigata in Apulia).

This paper aims at reconstructing the main issues of the Mosso's archaeological studies, which encompass field activity, chemical analyses and works addressed to public of different target.

Keywords: Stratigraphy, Geological stratification, human, generated debris, Neolithic Crete, Stentinello, archaeometry

*Speaker

†Corresponding author: massimo.cultraro@cnr.it

The abstraction of archaeological stratigraphy: innovation trends in the Pyrenees (1948–2015)

Sébastien Plutniak * 1,2

¹ École Française de Rome (EFR) – Italy

² Laboratoire Interdisciplinaire Solidarités, Sociétés, Territoires (LISST) – École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales, Université Toulouse 2, Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique : UMR5193 – Université Toulouse-Le Mirail Maison de la Recherche 5 Allées Antonio Machado 31058 TOULOUSE CEDEX 9, France

Historical accounts of the development of the stratigraphic method in archaeology generally focus on two main aims: identifying pioneer work and examining the spread of the most successful methods. Authors have emphasised the liminal relations between geology and prehistoric archaeology in the 19th century (**Hurel and Coye, 2011**), and have cited landmark propositions, including William Pengelly's work in the Kents Cavern between 1858 and 1880 (**McFarlane and Lundberg, 2005**) and excavations by Marthe and Saint-Just Péquart (**Péquart and Péquart, 1928**, cited by **Groenen, 1994**, p. 109-123) The work of André Leroi-Gourhan is often mentioned when analysing successful methods: his early methodological proposals in his handbook (**Leroi-Gourhan, 1950**) and his excavations at Arcy-sur-Cure (**Leroi-Gourhan, 1961**). Mortimer Wheeler and his excavation method (**Wheeler, 1954**) and Edward Harris for his *Principles of Archaeological Stratigraphy* and his famous "Harris Matrix" (**Harris, 1979**) are also mentioned.

Early scientific propositions in one hand, and those which became hegemonic are of particular interest to historians of science. However, when analysing innovation processes in science a large diversity of propositions on a given topic must be included and historicised. In this paper, I aim to explore the historical trends of some stratigraphic methods in archaeology which challenged the categories of *early* and *hegemonic* propositions: namely, a series of innovations which were developed in the Pyrenean region during the 20th century. These innovations can be considered as "early propositions", but only some of their aspects were adopted by archaeologists. The local diffusion of these methods suggests that scientific success has a geographical aspect. These innovations were also partly integrated into the methods commonly used by archaeologists, although authors were not cited. I discuss how methods standardising archaeological stratigraphy grew locally and spread from the Pyrenees. I refer to publications, unpublished archive materials and interviews with the researchers.

This case study has three objectives. First, to give a historical account of the development of the "cartesian coordinates" ("*coordonnées cartésiennes*") by Georges Laplace (1918–2004) and Louis Méroc (1904–1970) (**Laplace-Jauretche and Méroc, 1954, Laplace, 1971**), and its dissemination in Spanish-speaking countries.

Second, to identify a Pyrenean phylum of methodological innovations related to the description and analysis of archaeological stratigraphy. This phylum includes approaches developed by: (1)

*Speaker

Louis Méroc from 1948 in the Toulouse region, improved by (2) Georges Laplace from 1954 in his excavations in the Béarn and (North) Basque Country and, continued by (3) the *Krei. Círculo de Estratigrafía Analítica* research group from 1996 to 2015 in the Basque Country (**Sáenz de Buruaga, 1996**).

Third, to contribute to an analysis of the conceptual changes in archaeological stratigraphy, including: the abstraction of stratigraphy using a new distinction between "real" and "artificial" stratigraphy; the relationships between *stratigraphic relations* and *time relations*; and the distinction between qualitative and quantitative methods to formalise these relations, including the presence or absence of concepts such as measurement and scale (**Desachy, 2005**).

Keywords: history of archaeology, stratigraphy, standardization, abstraction

Pioneers of Archaeological Stratigraphical Techniques: Luigi Bernabò Brea (1910-1999) and Giorgio Buchner (1914-2005)

Nomi Federico *[†] ¹, Cultraro Massimo *[‡] ², Guidi Alessandro *

¹, Tusa Sebastiano *[§] ³

¹ Università degli Studi Roma Tre – Roma, Italy

² Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche (CNR) – Via Biblioteca 4, Catania, Italy

³ Soprintendenza del Mare – Italy

In the period between the two World Wars, characterized by a general decay in the archaeological practice of the Italian prehistorians, Luigi Bernabò Brea and Giorgio Buchner developed new and advanced methods of documentation and study of the archaeological stratigraphies. While Buchner, born in Naples and son of a Deutsch geologist, developed his skills working on islands like Ischia, Vivara and Capri, Bernabò Brea, after a degree in Law, went to the Italian Archaeological School in Athens, where he participated to the excavation at Poliochni, the largest EBA settlement on the Lemnos island. Both scholars served as functionaries in the State Antiquity Service (Buchner at Naples, Bernabò Brea at Taranto) in the same years also if, contrarily to Bernabò Brea, Buchner never became Head of an Antiquity Office; in their scientific evolution a big role was played by Luigi Cardini, an amateur archaeologist with a solid naturalist background, who directed in 1941 - together with Carlo Alberto Blanc - the excavations of the Grotta delle Felci in Capri where the young Buchner participated, and helped Bernabò Brea between 1941 and 1950 in the exploration of the Arene Candide Cave, in Liguria.

In the late Forties Bernabò Brea (who in those years become Superintendent in Sicily) and Buchner collaborated in some excavations in the Aeolian Islands, in the Fifties while Bernabò Brea explored the big protohistoric settlement of Lipari acropolis and other sites of the archipelago writing an important page in the study of Italian Pre- and Protohistory, Buchner carried out the excavations of the necropolis of the Greek colony of Pithekoussai in the San Montano valley, at Ischia, a site which he devoted himself until his death.

The paper tries to analyze the characteristics of the archaeological approach to the stratigraphy of these two pioneers of modern Italian archaeology.

Keywords: Stratigraphy, archaeology, prehistory, Bernabò Brea, Buchner

*Speaker

[†]Corresponding author: nomifederico@gmail.com

[‡]Corresponding author: massimo.cultraro@cnr.it

[§]Corresponding author: stusa@archeosicilia.it

Stratigraphy and Palethnology in Italy during the XIX century. The role of Gaetano Chierici

Cremaschi Mauro ^{*† 1}

¹ Università degli Studi di Milano-Bicocca [Milano] – Piazza dell'Áteneo Nuovo, 1 - 20126, Milano, Italy

Gaetano Chierici (1819-1886) was a reference figure in the field of the Pale ethnologic movement in nineteenth-century Italy. Although of classical formation, it assimilated the methods and concepts of stratigraphic geology from the cultural environment of pre-unification Italy, of Mittel-European climate. He then transposed these ideas into his archaeological activity by elaborating a multidisciplinary method that had a wide echo in the Europe of that time and was integrated in the concepts of modern archeology. The proposed paper will critically discuss the experience of Chierici in the stratigraphic field on the basis of unpublished archival documents and trough the resumption of some of his most celebrated excavations of the Chalcolithic and Bronze Age periods.

Keywords: Chierici geology stratigraphy

*Speaker

†Corresponding author: mauro.cremaschi@unimi.it

Paul Vouga à La Tène et à Auvernier : la stratigraphie à l'épreuve de la typologie

Gianna Reginelli Servais * ¹

¹ Université de Neuchâtel – Laténium Espace P. Vouga 2068 Hauterive, Switzerland

Au début des années 1920, la pratique de terrain de l'archéologue suisse Paul Vouga (1880-1940) illustre la difficulté que représente l'intégration pleine et entière de la méthode stratigraphique à la panoplie des outils de l'archéologue. D'un côté, en effet, Vouga pose les bases de la typo-chronologie du Néolithique suisse, à partir de la *fouille stratigraphique* de la célèbre station d'Auvernier (Vouga 1920, 1921, 1922). De l'autre, il fouille et étudie le site de La Tène, éponyme du Second âge du Fer européen, en écartant délibérément tout apport stratigraphique (Vouga 1923). Nous analyserons ici cet apparent paradoxe et tenterons de caractériser l'utilisation de la stratigraphie dans la pratique de Paul Vouga à travers la première moitié du 20ème siècle. Des habitats palafittiques aux occupations en grottes, en passant par les tertres funéraires, nous chercherons à mettre en lumière les présupposés qui ont guidé son approche de la stratigraphie archéologique.

Keywords: stratigraphie, typologie, Paul Vouga, La Tène, Auvernier, méthodologie, techniques de fouilles

*Speaker

Démarche d'historien et de préhistorien ou comment pallier les manques dans l'étude de certaines collections ? Exemples de la grotte de l'Observatoire (Monaco) et des Balzi Rossi (Ligurie, Italie).

Elena Rossoni-Notter * ¹, Olivier Notter[†] ², Patrick Simon[‡] ³, Suzanne Simone[§] ³

¹ Musée d'Anthropologie préhistorique de Monaco (MAP) – 56 bis boulevard du Jardin Exotique- 98 000 Principauté de Monaco, Monaco

² Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle (UMR 7194 - CNRS) et Musée d'Anthropologie Préhistorique de Monaco (MNMN /MAP) – Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle (MNHN) – 1 rue René Panhard 75 013 Paris 56bis bd du Jardin exotique 98000 Monaco, France

³ Musée d'Anthropologie préhistorique de Monaco (MAP) – 56bis bd du Jardin exotique, Monaco

L'étude de vestiges mis au jour anciennement nécessite, en amont et plus que toute autre, une démarche épistémologique et historiographique. Ce préalable permet de jauger et préciser le contexte des découvertes, étayer l'historique des travaux menés, en même temps que pallier tout biais inhérent à ce type de collections (*i.e.* données méconnues, manquantes, égarées ou absentes).

Les exemples présentés ici intéressent plus particulièrement les collections paléolithiques de la grotte de l'Observatoire (Monaco) et de certains sites des Balzi Rossi (Vintimille, Ligurie, Italie), fruit de fouilles conduites par le chanoine Léonce de Villeneuve entre la fin du XIXème et le début du XXème siècle. Les méthodes appliquées *in situ* et post-fouilles, reçues du Prince Albert Ier de Monaco, ont été pour l'époque rigoureuses et novatrices : ensembles archéostratigraphiques repérés par altitude et fouillés successivement, levés de coupes (plans, sections), tenue de notes et rapports d'activités, étiquetage des vestiges en fonction de leur provenance spatiale et stratigraphique, conduites d'études pluridisciplinaires par des spécialistes reconnus en sus de dessins, schémas et photographies, conditionnement et exposition des vestiges, publication des résultats de recherches.

Avant d'initier l'analyse critique de ces assemblages mis au jour il y a une centaine d'années, un récolement des archives existantes a été réalisé. Cette exploitation a permis, entre autres, de redistribuer spatialement et stratigraphiquement de nombreuses pièces jusque-là restées indéterminées, corriger la répartition stratigraphique originelle de couches dans certains gisements, ou encore (re)découvrir certains lots d'objets aujourd'hui conservés à l'étranger. Par conséquent, ces recherches préparatoires ont contribué à vérifier et compléter la base de données de ces collections précisant ainsi leur fiabilité analytique. L'interprétation liée à la nouvelle étude de

*Speaker

†Corresponding author: notterolivier@hotmail.com

‡Corresponding author: psimon@gouv.mc

§Corresponding author: suzanne_simone@libello.com

ces artefacts s'en est ainsi trouvée enrichie et plus à même de répondre à la réalité des faits, démontrant que de vieilles collections n'ont pas terminé d'éclairer nos connaissances.

Keywords: Historiographie, épistémologie, Italie, Ligurie, Balzi Rossi, Menton, Alpes, Maritimes, Monaco, Albert 1er, collections anciennes, attribution stratigraphique, pétroarchéologie, technoéconomie, technotypologie.

Ethnoarchaeology and Interpretation of formative processes of the archaeological record

Lugli Francesca * ¹

¹ Italian Association for Ethnoarchaeology (A.I.E. - Onlus) – Via dei Cappellari, 50 - 00186 Roma, Italy

The interpretation and analysis of formative processes of the archaeological record is certainly a crucial problem of archaeology. Over the years the theory and practice of the archaeological excavation have been enriched with various fields of study and archaeologists multiplied excavations all over the world. Therefore, nowadays archaeologists have wide and various interpretative models to apply.

Ethnoarchaeology has certainly been important for the development of theory and practice of stratigraphic excavations. In fact, analysis of formative processes of the archaeological record was the fulcrum of ethnoarchaeological research for a long time, from its beginning to the nineties. Archaeologists tried to use the observation of current traditional societies to better understand the archaeological record. Nowadays ethnoarchaeology has changed and expanded its horizons and is open to different themes which are not directly connected to the stratigraphic problem. But the topic is still crucial for ethnoarchaeological research.

It is important to consider and reconsider the role of ethnoarchaeology in the development of the comprehension of the formation processes of the archaeological record. "Nunamiut Ethnoarchaeology" by R.L. Binford (1978) which is a classic of archaeological theory building, is certainly exemplary for what concerns the importance of ethnoarchaeology and the interpretation of formation process and archaeological record.

But it is important to analyse how ethnoarchaeology has enriched interpretative models over the years and how archaeologists accepted and used it. Because, if it is undeniable that ethnoarchaeological advances have been crucial for archaeology it is not so commonly accepted.

Therefore the author will consider various ethnoarchaeological researches from different countries and chronologies and their influence on archaeology.

Lastly the problem of the archaeological record of pastoralism will be considered. In fact, the study of current nomadic societies can contribute significantly to the reconstruction of models of pastoralism in the past. The ethnoarchaeological research conducted by the authors in Siberia and Mongolia will be presented to stress the role of ethnoarchaeology for and archaeology of pastoralism in Central Asia.

*Speaker

Keywords: Ethnoarchaeology, formative processes, archaeological record, pastoralism, Central Asia

Caves and Rock-shelther Investigation in Eastern Sicily: Methodologies and Palaeo-ecological Meanings

Italo Biddittu* ¹, Giovanni Boschian[†] ², Salvatore Chilardi[‡] ¹, Maria Rosa Iovino ^{§¶} ³, Luca Natali ⁴, Daniela Zampetti^{||} ¹

¹ Istituto Italiano di Paleontologia Umana, Rome (IsIPU) – Italy

² Università di Pisa - Dipartimento di Biologia – Italy

³ Istituto Italiano Paleontologia Umana, Rome (IsIPU) – Italy

⁴ Istituto Italiano di Paleontologia Umana (Is.I.P.U.) – Italy

Luigi Bernabò Brea, during the 1951, a few years after the re-opening of investigation at Corruggi Cave (Pachino, Siracusa), had the opportunity to dig the deposit at the Sperlinga of San Basilio rock-shelter (Novara di Sicilia, Messina). The site "Sperlinga of San Basilio", discovered by Domenico Ryolo di Maria in 1942, was located of about 650 m a.l.m., and showed a deposit characterised by Mesolithic, Neolithic and Chalcolithic cultural features. This site was chosen for stratigraphic investigation by Bernabò Brea also because it had not been "disturbed" by any previous archaeological research. The digging methodology here was based on the principle that each square trench had to be investigated and interpreted by itself. In 1967 and in 1968 Bernabò Brea supported the archaeological investigation at Giovanna Cave (Floridia, Siracusa), a karst formation cave, within a cooperative research between the Cultural Heritage Department of Syracuse and the Italian Institute of Human Paleontology of Rome, because he wished to understand more in detail about site formation processes and site paleoenvironment events. In this contribute we will focus on the excavations problematic at both sites, on the stratigraphic macroscopic features identified from the layers attributed at around 12.000-10.000 BP, and on the practical dimension to identify relevant indicators of the site filling / accumulation processes. Taphonomic observation of fauna remains and of bone and of stone industry were also recorded during the excavation. We will reconsider the association of taphonomic data with findings distribution / frequencies, comparing these data with our interdisciplinary re-analysis of findings, in order to discuss their meaning (s) to interpret stratigraphic agents such as eco-climatic and human activities variability.

Keywords: site formation process, karst cave, rock, shelter, taphonomy, eco, climate variability

*Corresponding author: biddittu@hotmail.com

†Corresponding author: giovanni.boschian@unipi.it

‡Corresponding author: schilar@tin.it

§Speaker

¶Corresponding author: iovinomiarosa@gmail.com

||Corresponding author: daniela.zampetti@uniroma1.it

**VII-4. Epistemology, History and
Philosophy of Science:
Interdisciplinary Perspectives on the
History of Archaeology**

Epistémologie et histoire de l'archéologie: Une réflexion croisée

Oscar Moro Abadia * ¹

¹ Department of Archaeology- Memorial University of Newfoundland – Department of Archaeology
Queen's College Memorial University of Newfoundland 210 Prince Philip Dr. St. John's, NL A1C 5S7
Canada., Canada

L'école épistémologique française a joué un rôle notable dans la constitution de l'histoire critique de l'archéologie qu'a émergé en France à la fin du XXe siècle. À grands traits, que l'on précisera dans mon intervention, on peut d'emblée affirmer que la rénovation historiographique initiée par Alain Schnapp, Noël Coye, Marc-Antoine Kaeser ou Wiktor Stoczkowski s'est constituée autour d'une réflexion critique qui trouve ses premières traces dans les ouvrages de Gaston Bachelard, Georges Canguilhem ou Alexandre Koyré. De cette épistémologie, les historiens de l'archéologie ont surtout retenu les leçons d'une réflexion sur la science libérée des concepts de progrès hérités des Lumières. Dans mon intervention, j'essaierai d'élargir cette réflexion en montrant que, au-delà de la critique du positivisme, les travaux de ces philosophes et épistémologues français peuvent servir de base à une réflexion féconde sur les rapports entre science et histoire, sur la notion de discontinuité dans l'histoire de l'archéologie ou sur l'importance des " obstacles épistémologiques " dans la construction de la connaissance archéologique..

Keywords: Histoire de l'archéologie, Philosophie de sciences, Histoire de Sciences, Epistémologie

*Speaker

Interdisciplinary practices and the autonomy of the archaeological research traditions

Gheorghe Alexandru Niculescu * ¹

¹ The "Vasile Pârvan" Institute of Archaeology – Str. Henri Coandă, nr. 11, sect. 1, București, Romania

The history of archaeology shows how its research traditions have gradually constructed their limited autonomy and their coherent ways of thinking by using internal mechanisms which have oriented the borrowings from other disciplines and have contributed to their transformation into what the archaeologists needed.

Today, the capacity to perceive what is important outside the discipline, receptivity and the willingness to make archaeological research participate in as many "turns" as possible seem more important for the progress of archaeological knowledge than integrative efforts supported by Merton's organized skepticism". Accordingly, the construction of archaeological theory is increasingly replaced with the adoption of prestigious non-archaeological theories, which can only be illustrated by the finds, not invalidated by them.

At the same time, archaeologists are confronted with the scarcity of permanent research position, the only ones which can provide proper conditions for fruitful conversations and many are forced to subordinate their personal scientific development to what is available on the market of short time projects, in which much of the interdisciplinary work is done, or even to suspend it by taking jobs in the administration of cultural heritage.

These phenomena are manifest in various circumstances – I will present those from Romania where the infatuation with interdisciplinarity is associated with the reduction of disciplinary autonomy, with an incapacity to assess the value of archaeological research and with the prevalence of the authorized discourse in matters of cultural heritage – but together they seem to indicate that archaeology risks turning into a materially and technically impressive, but theoretically weak and, therefore, ideologically flexible aggregate, oblivious of its sociogeneses, appropriate for using the past as legitimation for the present. A comparison with what physicists and political scientists think about interdisciplinarity and their disciplines will make visible the peculiar nature of what is happening in archaeology.

Keywords: archaeology, interdisciplinarity, history of archaeology, comparison, Romania, research tradition

*Speaker

Is there a "hidden" agenda of lithic imagery? French and Anglophone 'styles of visualisation' in palaeo-archaeology compared

Shumon Hussain * ¹

¹ Human Origins, Faculty of Archaeology, Leiden University – Netherlands

Scientific images constitute "microcosms" of scientific practice and thought. Images are potent devices to channel ideas, they organise and communicate empirical findings and make visible what otherwise remains implicit. They are important tools to make accessible the objects of study in ways literary practice alone cannot. This originality and authenticity of visual discourses has only recently been recognised (Lynch and Woolgar 1988; Topper 1996; Bredekamp et al. 2008). Historians, philosophers and sociologists of science alike have since begun to realise the epistemic significance of scientific imagery as an *active* participant of the research process. Images do not just "represent," they crucially co-shape various trajectories of knowledge formation (Daston 2014). This paper takes up these important insights and asks for the role of visualisation in the study of lithic technology (cf. Lopes 2009). If scientific images are microcosms of scientific practice and thought, differences in how images are used and in what types of images are mobilised can be exploited to map varying strategies of knowledge production. I use palaeo-archaeology as a case study and show that two species of lithic scholars – French technologists and Anglophone palaeoanthropologists/analytic archaeologists – consistently employ distinct modes of making-visible. These two 'styles of visualisation' reflect distinct cognitive strategies to make sense of the lithic evidence and implicate fundamentally dissimilar standards of knowledge production and evaluation. I discuss the implications of this state of affairs for the nature of lithic knowledge and the consequences for the status of lithic imagery in scientific persuasion and rhetorics in the field. Last but not least, I argue that lithic imagery cannot only provide insights into the community structure of lithic research, but also sheds new light on the often diverging histories of these communities and their research projects.

Keywords: styles of visualisation, lithic analysis, palaeolithic archaeology, pictorial turn, scientific images, epistemology and history of archaeology

*Speaker

L'Antiquité dans tous ses états: évolutions et révolutions dans les années 1960 en Préhistoire ancienne en Grèce

Giorgos Vavouranakis *† ¹, Georgia Kourtessi-Philippakis * ‡ ²

¹ Université Nationale et Capodistrienne d' Athènes – National Kapodistrian University of Athens School of Philosophy Department of History Archaeology University Campus Athens 15784, Greece

² Université Nationale et Capodistrienne d' Athènes – National Kapodistrian University of Athens School of Philosophy Department of History Archaeology University Campus Athens 15784, Greece

Au cours des années 1960 la pratique de l'Archéologie en Grèce a connu un tournant décisif tant du point de vue théorique que méthodologique mais aussi institutionnel. Le Service Archéologique se détache de la tutelle du Ministère de l'Education Nationale et devient davantage autonome ce qui conduit à une meilleure organisation des opérations archéologiques. Les Ecoles Etrangères s'activent dans la recherche des périodes reculées, comme le Néolithique, à travers des programmes de recherche nouveaux tout en introduisant la notion de pluridisciplinarité et des méthodologies modernes (flottation, datations C14...). A coté de l'étude traditionnelle de la céramique, qui se poursuit, va débiter maintenant l'étude des industries lithiques mais aussi des vestiges paléobotaniques et archéozoologiques. Pendant que l'approche de l'archéologie allemande marque un point en Thessalie avec les travaux de Vl. Milošević dont les recherches s'inscrivent dans le débat de la Néolithisation, les principes de la "New Archaeology" atteignent aussi les bords de l'Egée à travers les travaux de C. Renfrew. Ces deux démarches contribuent à l'éloignement de la Préhistoire grecque de la tradition archéologique exprimée essentiellement par la connaissance du passé (*αρχαιωσα*); la première la conduit rejoindre la préhistoire balkanique, la seconde l'orienter vers l'archéologie processuelle. C'est au début des années 1960 également qu'aura lieu en Epire la mission de l'université de Cambridge sous la direction du paléoeconomiste E. S. Higgs et du géoarchéologue C. Vita-Finzi, qui inaugureront les recherches sur le Paléolithique dans la région avec le succès qu'on lui connaît. Cette présence d'un peuplement paléolithique en Grèce - berceau de l'Antiquité - va se conforter par d'autres recherches ciblées et des fouilles systématiques aussi bien que par des découvertes fortuites de haute importance. Ces travaux naissants donneront lieu rapidement à des publications et à la médiation des résultats à travers l'exposition des pièces lithiques dans des musées grecques. En conclusion, il est possible que la pratique de l'archéologie en Grèce ne fasse pas figure de pionnier à cette époque, mais le pays devient le lieu d'une vive fermentation des courants divers qui ont forgé l'identité de la recherche en Préhistoire ancienne en l'autonomisant par rapport aux stéréotypes de l'Archéologie, telle qu'elle était pratiquée depuis la fin du 19e siècle et en l'affranchissant de ce lourd héritage.

*Speaker

†Corresponding author: gvavour@arch.uoa.gr

‡Corresponding author: gkphil@arch.uoa.gr

Keywords: Préhistoire ancienne en Grèce, histoire de recherche

Muséologie et histoire de l'archéologie

Marc-Antoine Kaeser * ¹

¹ Université de Neuchâtel, Institut d'archéologie / Laténium (UniNE) – Laténium Espace Paul-Vouga
CH-2068 Hauterive, Switzerland

Lorsqu'on envisage les rapports entre muséologie et archéologie, on serait mal inspiré de les aborder sous l'angle de l'interdisciplinarité *stricto sensu*, compte tenu du caractère tardif de la disciplinarisation de l'archéologie (tout particulièrement de l'archéologie pré- et protohistorique), sans parler de la muséologie, dont la disciplinarisation académique n'est aujourd'hui encore qu'à peine aboutie.

En revanche, si l'on envisage ces rapports selon des critères non pas institutionnels mais purement cognitifs, cette problématique s'avère extrêmement prometteuse. Il apparaît en effet que dès les prémices des activités antiquaires, dans l'Europe des Temps modernes, la recherche archéologique a joué un rôle essentiel dans la stimulation de la créativité muséologique. Plus tard, lors du tournant majeur qu'a représenté la reconnaissance de la préhistoire dans la seconde moitié du 19e siècle, on peut observer que le projet muséographique se situe même au coeur de l'épistémologie archéologique, qu'il a ainsi contribué à consolider, tant sur le plan socioculturel que dans le paysage scientifique.

Suite aux mutations de l'archéologie au début du 20e siècle, puis en vertu des bouleversements de l'éthique et de l'organisation disciplinaires dont témoigne l'émergence de l'archéologie préventive, ces rapports semblent s'être ensuite largement dégradés.

Notre communication vise à mettre ces développements en évidence, mais également à réfléchir à de nouveaux modes d'interaction entre archéologie et muséologie. Nous estimons en effet que la réflexion muséologique est susceptible de répondre de manière constructive aux renouvellements heuristiques de la discipline archéologique du 21e siècle.

Keywords: muséologie, histoire de l'archéologie, interdisciplinarité, histoire des collections

*Speaker

Précurseur, primitif, préhistorique : l'histoire de l'art face à la préhistoire

Rémi Labrusse * ¹

¹ Histoire des Arts et des Représentations (HAR) – Université Paris Nanterre : EA4414 – Université Paris Ouest Nanterre La Défense 200 avenue de la République 92001 Nanterre cedex, France

Dès l'origine, au tournant des années 1850 et 1860, les représentations figurées (fussent-elles imaginaires comme les "pierres figures" de Boucher de Perthes) ont joué un rôle central dans l'affirmation et le développement de l'idée de préhistoire. Il s'agira donc, pour commencer, de s'interroger sur les raisons, conscientes ou inconscientes, qui ont conduit les premiers préhistoriens (Lartet et Christy, Mortillet, Cartailhac, Piette, etc.) à mettre ainsi en avant la question de l'art, aux côtés de la technique et de l'anthropologie physique, pour caractériser le paléolithique.

A partir de là, on cherchera à comprendre comment et pourquoi l'histoire de l'art et la jeune science de la préhistoire, en se rencontrant dans la seconde moitié du XIX^e siècle, ne se sont pas seulement influencées mais aussi ébranlées l'une l'autre. D'un côté, cette rencontre a renforcé un rêve de totalisation épistémologique, réunissant les démarches archéologique, ethnographique et anthropologique, pour parvenir à une historicisation globale de la nature et de la culture. De l'autre, dans le champ de l'art spécifiquement, cet historicisme triomphant s'est trouvé violemment confronté aux contradictions internes de l'idéologie du progrès, qui lui servait pourtant de fondement. Les ambiguïtés croissantes sensibles dans l'emploi des concepts évolutionnistes de "précurseur", de "primitif" et de "préhistorique" témoignent de ces contradictions. Ce faisant, la rencontre entre histoire de l'art et préhistoire a poussé à son paroxysme un déchirement entre hyper-histoire et anti-histoire qui est l'expression sans doute la plus emblématique de notre rapport moderne avec la temporalité.

Keywords: histoire de l'art, historiographie

*Speaker

The physical and the psychical: archaeology between the natural and the moral sciences.

Artur Ribeiro ^{*† 1}

¹ Graduate School "Human Development in Landscapes" (GSHDL) – Christian-Albrechts-Universität zu Kiel Leibnizstr. 3 24118 Kiel, Germany

There is a strange paradox permeating archaeological theory: on one hand, many archaeologists complain about the existence of theoretical 'gaps' in archaeological reasoning, that archaeology is composed of too many diverse and incommensurable ideas and practices, and that archaeologists should strive towards 'bridging' these gaps; on the other hand, archaeology seems to prosper from diversity, especially from projects combining practices from a diverse range of disciplines, which in turn allows archaeologists to perceive past phenomena through a myriad of theories and techniques.

The current paper argues that there is, in fact, a theoretical gap in archaeology, one that comes from being a discipline that is simultaneously about the physical world and about the psychical world, about how the human acts in accordance to its environment but also of its own volition, a discipline that simultaneously employs causal and teleological explanations. This theoretical gap is not exclusive to archaeology, nor did it start in archaeology: it has a history that goes as far back as Aristotle.

Picking up from the work developed by the 19th century philosopher Franz Brentano's, and following the ground-breaking work on mental philosophy by Vincent Descombes, I will defend the idea that the causal explanations of the natural sciences and the teleological explanations of the human sciences are incommensurable, and that attempts to 'bridge' both causality and teleology is illogical, unnecessary, and counterproductive. The separation of causal and teleological sciences is ultimately a good thing since it allows the sciences to be methodologically plural and in turn, allows interdisciplinarity to thrive. This paper will also elaborate on how this affects archaeological explanation and what this means for the future of archaeological practice.

Keywords: Causality, teleology, explanation, interdisciplinarity, agency

*Speaker

†Corresponding author: aribeiro@gshdl.uni-kiel.de

Three agendas that linked prehistory, archaeology, and technology: A. H. L. Pitt-Rivers (1827-1900), A. Leroi-Gourhan (1911-1986) and F. Sigaut (1940-2012)

Sophie A. De Beaune *† 1,2

¹ Université Jean Moulin, Lyon 3 – Lyon 3 – France

² Maison Archéologie Ethnologie, René-Ginouvès – Université Paris X - Paris Ouest Nanterre La Défense – France

There are numerous bridging links between technology and archaeology. I would like to illustrate some of them by referring to three major figures in the discipline. The ambition of Augustus Henry Lane Fox Pitt-Rivers (1827-1900) was to chronicle the intellectual and technological advances of humanity based on the forms of objects that were created. Being an archaeologist, he understood very early on that the relative position of artefacts in relation to each other could be tied to the chronology of successive levels of site occupations. He therefore contributed to the development of stratigraphic methods. André Leroi-Gourhan (1911-1986) created a general classification of technology before becoming interested in prehistory where he advocated an ethnographic approach for interpretations. He therefore revamped archaeological excavation methods and the interpretation of remains in the ground. François Sigaut (1940-2012) was both a historian of technology and an anthropologist who studied technology. He extolled a *rapprochement* between technologists and archaeologists in order to better comprehend the relation between people and tools, and he proposed a new theory about the origin of human tools. These men represent three different eras and three different ways of approaching the evolution of humans and their technologies.

Keywords: History of prehistory, Technology, Anthropology, Epistemology

*Speaker

†Corresponding author: sophie.de-beaune@mae.cnrs.fr

When two worlds collides

Miriam Andrés Chaín * ¹

¹ Departamento de Prehistoria, Universidad Complutense (UCM), c/Prof. Aranguren s/n, 28040 Madrid – Spain

The current dichotomy between human sciences and natural sciences is relatively recent. This is the consequence of the, in Ortega terms, "barbarism of specialism" growing. We have reached such a degree of specialization that we have lost our overall vision, which, in turn, means less information and knowledge. From the postmodernist archaeological thought that dichotomy is defended, arguing that the object of study and the methods used are opposite in each case. The human sciences could not use the scientific method in their studies on human behavior, since the behavior depends on the will of people and this is something that can not be measured or regulated by natural laws.

This communication is intended to show the idea that this is not entirely true, arguing that what we have to do is not to look for confrontation, but look for points of agreement, because in the words of the philosopher of science L.W.H. Hull "There is no company that is exclusively scientific or exclusively artistic (...) All we can say about any given activity is that it is predominantly scientific or artistic. The distinction is based on motivation rather than on the object or matter "

In archeology, we wonder about human society from the philosophical and historical reflection, but the way we choose to get to find or get as close as possible to these answers must be the scientific method, because our only source of study is archaeological remains. We propose here, on the one hand, to rescue some postulates of the first generation of Annales such as the need to formulate a question or problem that directs the research, the idea of interdisciplinarity and the emphasis on treating history as a process that must be explained and not only described. On the other hand, the use of the scientific method is defended under the approach of scientific realism. The efforts of one side and the other can be combined to create a new way of working without coming into conflict. After all, that is what neo-processualism and dual-inheritance theory do.

References

HULL, LWH. (1973) *Historia y filosofía de la ciencia*. Colecciones Zetein. Ed. Ariel. Esplugues de Llobregat (Barcelona)

Keywords: human sciences, natural sciences, Annales, scientific realism, neo, processualism, dual, inheritance theory

*Speaker

VII-5. Historiographie de préhistoriens français de la seconde moitié du XX^e siècle

Annette Laming-Empeaire et l'art préhistorique

Lioudmila Iakovleva ^{*† 1}

¹ CNRS UMR 7041 Arscan (CNRS) – CNRS UMR 7041 Arscan – France

Cette communication met en évidence le rôle majeur d'Annette Laming-Empeaire dans les études sur l'art préhistorique à partir des années 1950

Keywords: Art préhistorique, historiographie

*Speaker

†Corresponding author: liakovleva@wanadoo.fr

Bohumil Soudsky (1922-1976)

Jean-Paul Demoule ^{*† 1}

¹ Université de Paris 1 Panthéon Sorbonne – Université de Paris 1 Panthéon Sorbonne – France

Cette communication retrace l'apport scientifique de Bohumil Soudsky au Néolithique rubané, d'abord en Tchéquie, avec les fouilles exceptionnelles du site néolithique de Bylany, puis en France, comme professeur associé à l'Université de Paris 1, et initiateur des fouilles archéologiques de la vallée de l'Aisne.

Keywords: Soudsky, néolithique

*Speaker

†Corresponding author: jean-paul.demoule@univ-paris1.fr

Camille Arambourg, le paléontologue et le préhistorien

Djillali Hadjouis *† 1

¹ Anthropologie Moléculaire et Imagerie de Synthèse (AMIS) – PRES Université de Toulouse, université de Strasbourg, Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique : UMR5288 – 37 allées Jules Guesdes -31073 Toulouse, France

Sans être préhistorien le paléontologue Camille Arambourg fouilla d'importants site fossilifères et archéologiques du Tertiaire et du Quaternaire à l'instar de l'Ain Hanech, Ternifine, Afalou Bou Rhummel, Sidi Abderrahmane, Bou Hanifia ... C'est à la faveur d'une sollicitation de ses parents, des notables terriens dans l'Oranie, pour trouver une meilleure irrigation des terres familiales, qu'il se rendit sur ces exploitations pour la première fois. Le sous-sol de la formation qui abritait les exploitations d'Arambourg est situé sur des niveaux géologiques datant de la fin du Miocène au début du Pliocène dont ils avaient conservé un grand nombre de Vertébrés fossiles. La formation bien située chronologiquement était connue sous le nom de " Sahélien " (équivalent du sommet du Tortonien ou de la base du Messinien), un étage marin décrit pour la première fois par Auguste Pomel en 1858. Les taxons d'Invertébrés et de Poissons recueillis par lui dans les niveaux du Sahel d'Oran mais aussi dans la vallée du Chelif (plus de 1500 exemplaires) seront publiés dans sa première monographie en 1927.

Professeur titulaire de la chaire de Géologie de 1920 à 1930, d'abord à l'Institut Agricole d'Algérie de Maison-Carrée, puis de 1930 à 1936 à l'Institut National Agronomique d'Alger, succédant au géologue Lucien Cayeux, il dirigera la chaire de paléontologie du MNHN de Paris de 1936 à 1946. C'est pendant ces années que d'importants sites paléontologiques et archéologiques furent découverts (ou ré-exploités) sur pratiquement tous les continents (Maghreb, Sahel, Ethiopie, Soudan, Angola, Gabon, Proche et Moyen-Orient, Chine, Grèce, France) mais c'est surtout en Afrique du nord et en particulier en Algérie que les recherches sont les plus fructueuses et ininterrompues depuis leurs premières découvertes.

La liste de créations zoologiques nouvelles à tous les niveaux de la classification est impressionnante par son effectif et sa diversité :

Poissons : 3 Familles, 1 Sous-Famille, 16 genres, 122 espèces

Reptiles : 1 genre, 8 espèces

Mammifères : 1 Sous-Famille, 8 genres, 47 espèces, 2 sous-espèces

Oiseaux : 1 espèce

*Speaker

†Corresponding author: djillali.hadjouis@valdemarne.fr

Keywords: Historiographie, paléontologie, Tertiaire, Quaternaire

De Roi Mata aux Marae polynésiens : José Garanger, océaniste de la diversité archéologique

Christophe Sand * ^{1,2}, Frédérique Valentin

¹ Archéologies et Sciences de l'Antiquité (ArScAn) – CNRS : UMR7041 – Maison René Ginouvès Boîte 3 21, allée de l'université 92023 NANTERRE CEDEX, France

² Institut d'archéologie de la Nouvelle-Calédonie et du Pacifique (IANCP) – Portes de fer 65 Rue Teyssandier de Laubarede, 98800 Nouméa Province Sud, New Caledonia

Il a fallu attendre le milieu du XXe siècle pour que l'archéologie scientifique moderne émerge en Mélanésie, faisant de cette partie de l'Océanie une des dernières régions du monde où la science s'est intéressée au passé de peuples longtemps définis comme " sans histoire ". Le professeur José Garanger a été durant 25 ans la figure de proue de l'archéologie française dans cette région. Choisi par A. Leroi-Gouran pour aller " valider " des traditions mélanésiennes aux Nouvelles-Hébrides (Vanuatu) avant de concentrer la majeure partie de ses travaux sur la Polynésie française, il a révolutionné l'approche de la préhistoire des îles en s'appuyant sur les histoires orales océaniques pour " donner chair " aux interprétations archéologiques. Mais J. Garanger doit également être reconnu comme le fondateur d'une véritable " école française " d'archéologie dans le Pacifique, en organisant jusqu'à sa retraite l'émergence de deux générations d'archéologues professionnels, à travers ses enseignements à l'Université et ses positions de direction scientifique. Il a pris ainsi la place de " l'ancêtre fondateur " pour l'ensemble des préhistoriens francophones travaillant aujourd'hui dans cette vaste région insulaire.

Keywords: Garanger, Pacifique, archéologie océanique, traditions orales, formation

*Speaker

Francis Hours (1921-1987)

Olivier Aurenche ^{*† 1}

¹ Maison de l'Orient Méditerranéen – Maison de l'Orient Méditerranéen – France

Cette communication retrace l'apport scientifique du R.P. Francis Hours (1921-1987) sur la connaissance de la préhistoire du Levant.

Keywords: Hours, préhistoire, Levant

*Speaker

†Corresponding author: aurencheolivier@orange.fr

Georges Laplace (1918-2004)

Eudald Carbonell ^{*†} ¹, Robert Sala ^{* ‡} ²

¹ Universitat Rovira i Virgili Tarragone – Spain

² IPHES – Spain

Georges Laplace (1918-2004) fait partie des quelques grands préhistoriens avec A. Leroi-Gourhan et F. Bordes, qui ont contribué au deuxième âge d'or de la préhistoire française des années 1950 à 1980. Ses contributions dans le domaine des fouilles préhistoriques (avec L. Méroc), son concept de typologie analytique, ses synthèses sur le paléolithique supérieur ancien (le synthétype aurignacien) en font l'une des figures les plus créatives de la préhistoire française.

Keywords: Laplace, typologie analytique, préhistoire

*Speaker

†Corresponding author: ecarbonell@iphes.cat

‡Corresponding author: robert.sala@urv.cat

Henri-Jean Hugot (1916-2014) : un itinéraire saharien

Sylvie Amblard-Pison ^{*†} ¹

¹ CNRS UMR 7041 ArScAn – CNRS UMR 7041 Arscan, CNRS UMR 7041 Arscan – France

Henri-Jean Hugot, spécialiste de préhistoire saharienne, fait partie de ces hommes dont la vie fut longue et riche. Né en 1916, en plein conflit mondial, c'est à l'issue de la seconde guerre mondiale qu'il décida de s'installer avec sa femme et ses trois enfants en Haute Kabylie, d'où naîtra son intérêt pour le Sahara et son passé. Suivirent alors plus de vingt années entre Maghreb et Afrique de l'ouest. Parure néolithique au Tidikelt, publié en 1951 dans le Bulletin de Liaison Saharienne, fut le premier écrit d'une longue série qui ne s'achèvera qu'à l'aube de ses 90 ans. Parmi eux, son Essai sur les armatures de pointe de flèche du Sahara (1957) servira de base de typologie à de nombreux étudiants et chercheurs. À l'issue du 6e congrès Panafricain de Préhistoire et de l'étude du Quaternaire (1967), dont il sera secrétaire général, paraît L'Afrique préhistorique, petit manuel à but didactique destiné aux étudiants préhistoriens de l'Afrique francophone. Le Néolithique saharien, thèse soutenue en 1971, confirme son intérêt pour cette période et particulièrement pour les débuts de l'agriculture. Les époques plus anciennes ne sont pas pour autant négligées comme en témoigne, entre autres, l'ouvrage Recherches préhistoriques dans l'Ahaggar nord-occidental, 1950-1957, édité en 1963. Entré au CNRS au début des années soixante, responsable de la section de préhistoire saharienne au musée du Bardo d'Alger, il succède à Raymond Mauny au département d'archéologie et de préhistoire de l'IFAN à Dakar. À son retour en France, il devient sous-directeur au Museum national d'Histoire naturelle de Paris, enseigne à l'université de Nanterre et, parallèlement, cofonde le Groupe de recherche sur l'origine des représentations graphiques et symboliques de l'Homo sapiens. Profondément humaniste, il aimait avant tout transmettre. Homme de terrain, son nom reste associé aux missions scientifiques Berliet-Ténéré-Tchad et à celui du Dhar Tichitt en Mauritanie où il entreprend la fouille et la restauration d'un village néolithique en s'entourant d'étudiants africains et africanistes. L'ampleur de ce dernier chantier, en plein milieu désertique, est à la mesure de l'homme de caractère qu'il fut tout au long de sa vie. Nous nous proposons ici de retracer les grands traits de son oeuvre et le rôle qu'il joua dans la préhistoire saharienne.

Keywords: Sahara, néolithique, historiographie

*Speaker

†Corresponding author: sylvie.amblard-pison@mae.u-paris10.fr

Henriette Alimen (1900-1996)

Jean-Claude Miskovsky ^{*† 1}

¹ MNHN (UMR 7194) – Musée National d’Histoire Naturelle - MNHN (France) – France

Marie-Henriette Alimen (1900-1996) est une géologue et paléontologue française. Sa carrière a été concacrée à la géologie quaternaire de la France et de l’Afrique dans le cadre du CNRS.

Keywords: Alimen, Quaternaire, Afrique

*Speaker

†Corresponding author: jean.claude-miskovsky@mnhn.fr

Jacques Cauvin (1930-2001)

Olivier Aurenche ^{*† 1}

¹ Maison de l'Orient méditerranéen (MOM) – Maison de l'Orient Méditerranéen – France

Cette communication retrace l'apport majeure de Jacques Cauvin dans la connaissance des débuts du néolithique au Moyen-Orient.

Keywords: Cauvin, néolithique, Proche, Orient

*Speaker

†Corresponding author: aurencheolivier@orange.fr

Jacques-Pierre Millotte (1920-2002)

Jean-François Piningre *† ¹

¹ Université de Bourgogne (Artéhis) – Université de Bourgogne-Franche-Comté – France

Jacques-Pierre Millotte (1920-2002) est un des grands spécialistes de la protohistoire française, professeur à l'université de Besançon à partir de 1963, directeur des Antiquités préhistoriques de Franche-Comté, il a initié un pôle franc-comtois de Protohistoire européen. Sa formation de géographe et son attrait pour le paléo-environnement contribuèrent largement à la création du laboratoire de Chrono-écologie de Besançon.

Keywords: Millotte, protohistoire

*Speaker

†Corresponding author: jfrancois.piningre@orange.fr

Jean Arnal (1907-1987)

Jean Guilaine ^{*† 1}

¹ Académie des Inscriptions et belles lettres (aibl) – aibl – France

Jean Arnal (1907-1987) était médecin et archéologue. Pionnier et acteur du renouveau des études néolithiques dans l'après-guerre, ses contributions scientifiques dans les années 1950-1970 à la connaissance du néolithique du Sud-est de la France sont majeures.

Keywords: Arnal, néolithique, historiographie

*Speaker

†Corresponding author: jguilaine@wanadoo.fr

Jean Piveteau (1899-1991)

Marie-Antoinette De Lumley *† ¹

¹ Institut de Paléontologie Humaine (IPH) – Musée National d’Histoire Naturelle - MNHN (France) –
France

Jean Piveteau(1899-1991) a été titulaire, de 1938 à 1970, de la chaire de paléontologie de la Faculté des Sciences de Paris où il a créé le ” Laboratoire de paléontologie des vertébrés et de paléontologie humaine de la Sorbonne ”. Il a été élu en 1956 à l’Académie des sciences, dont il est devenu président en 1973.

Keywords: Piveteau, paléontologie humaine

*Speaker

†Corresponding author: marie-antoinette.malumley@mnhn.fr

L'apport scientifique des ingénieurs à l'archéologie préhistorique

François Djindjian * 1

¹ Université Paris 1 Panthéon Sorbonne UMR 7041 Arscan – Université Paris 1 Panthéon Sorbonne
UMR 7041 Arscan – France

La communication détaille les apports scientifiques majeurs de la communauté des ingénieurs français à l'archéologie préhistorique. Elle évoquera les contributions de Gabriel de Mortillet, Ernest Malinowski, Etienne Harlé, Jacques de Morgan, André Vayson de Pradennes, Jean Vertut, Marie-Roger Séronie-Vivien, Alain Testart parmi d'autres.

Keywords: préhistoire, ingénieurs, historiographie

*Speaker

Louis Méroc (1904-1970)

Henry De Lumley ^{*† 1}

¹ Institut de Paléontologie Humaine (IPH) – Museum National d’Histoire Naturelle - MNHN
(FRANCE) – France

Magistrat et préhistorien, il se consacre à la préhistoire et la protohistoire du Midi Pyrénéen, successeur d’H. Bégouen dans le cours préhistoire de l’Université de Toulouse, directeur de la circonscription Midi-Pyrénées et auteur notamment des fouilles de Montmaurin et de Villeneuve Tolosane.

Keywords: Méroc, préhistoire, Pyrénées

*Speaker

†Corresponding author: lumley@mnhn.fr

Max Escalon de Fonton (1920-2013) et la préhistoire ancienne

Gérard Onoratini *† 1

¹ MNHN – Muséum National d’Histoire Naturelle (MNHN) – France

Cette communication concerne l’apport de Max Escalon de Fonton à la connaissance de la préhistoire ancienne, et tout particulièrement l’identification des cultures paléolithiques du Sud-est de la France.

Keywords: Escalon de Fonton, historiographie, préhistoire, Sud, est de la france

*Speaker

†Corresponding author: anne-marie.moigne@cerptautavel.com

Max Escalon de Fonton (1920-2013)

Jean Guilaine ^{*† 1}

¹ Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres – Académie des Inscriptions et belles Lettres – France

Cette communication retrace l'apport scientifique de Max Escalon de Fonton dans la connaissance du néolithique du midi méditerranéen, et plus particulièrement ses fouilles à Chateauneuf-Martigues (Castelnovien) et à La Couronne (Couronnien).

Keywords: Escalon de Fonton, néolithique, midi méditerranéen

*Speaker

†Corresponding author: jguilaine@wanadoo.fr

Michel Brezillon

Philippe Soulier ^{*† 1}

¹ CNRS UMR 7041 ArScAn – CNRS UMR 7041 Arscan, CNRS UMR 7041 Arscan – France

Cette communication retrace l'influence importante de Michel Brezillon dans la préhistoire française depuis ses débuts au Sahara, son étroite collaboration avec A. Leroi-Gourhan à Pincevent, son enseignement de préhistoire à l'Université de Paris 1 Panthéon Sorbonne, la réalisation du musée de Préhistoire de Nemours et l'organisation de la sous-direction de l'archéologie au ministère de la Culture.

Keywords: Brezillon, préhistoire

*Speaker

†Corresponding author: philippe.soulier@mae.u-paris10.fr

Pierre Roland Giot (1919-2002), Jacques Briard (1833-2002) et Jean L'Helgouach (1933-2000)

Jean-Laurent Monnier *† ¹

¹ Laboratoire Archéosciences (CREAAH) – CNRS-Université de Rennes1 – France

Pierre-Roland Giot (1919-2002), géologue est un préhistorien français, est considéré comme le créateur de l'archéologie armoricaine moderne.

Jacques Briard (1833-2002), élève de P.R. Giot, est le grand spécialiste de l'âge du Bronze armoricain.

Jean L'Helgouach (1933-200), élève de P.R. Giot, est le grand spécialiste du mégalithisme armoricain.

Keywords: préhistoire, protohistoire, bretagne

*Speaker

†Corresponding author: jean-laurent.monnier@univ-rennes1.fr

Victor Commont (1866-1918)

Pascal Depaepe *†¹, Jean-Pierre Fagnart * ‡²

¹ INRAP – Ministère de la Culture et de la Communication – France

² Département de la Somme – Région des Hauts-de-France – France

A l'occasion du centième anniversaire de sa disparition, cette communication retrace l'apport considérable de Victor Commont (1866-1918) à la préhistoire, en particulier ses fouilles dans la vallée de la Somme, ses études sur les terrasses alluviales et ses travaux sur le débitage Levallois.

Keywords: Commont, terrasses alluviales, vallée de la Somme, Levallois

*Speaker

†Corresponding author: pascal.depaepe@inrap.fr

‡Corresponding author: jp.fagnart@somme.fr