

DISKUSIA / DISCUSSION

• • •

STEPPING OUT OF THE SHADE

Martin Kuna¹ – Anna Kunová²

¹*PhDr. Martin Kuna, Res. Prof. (archaeologist), Archeologický ústav AV ČR, Praha, v. v. i., Letenská 4, 11801 Praha 1, Czech Republic, kuna@arup.cas.cz*

²*Anna Kunová, MSc. (anthropologist), anna.tuik.kunova@gmail.com*

For the greater part of their past, people did not use writing, therefore there are no written accounts of the events in the world around them. A change came about only by the end of the fourth millennium BC, when various places saw the development of the first city states. State administration usually expressed itself by introducing script, of which the production of written documents and narrative accounts was a consequence. This, at first only a marginal cultural element, not only contained the seed of ground-breaking civilization changes, but also created a new situation for our study of the past. Societies disposing over writing suddenly emerge from the anonymity of prehistory and begin to tell us names, dates and events. By means of written sources, the study of which is basically the subject of history, dead societies are given back (at least theoretically) a part of their original dynamics, concreteness and detail, which we would only very hardly recover from the static archaeological record.¹

Naturally, it is impossible to gain similar information for a time period preceding the development of script, but there are certain possibilities offered by the research of structurally similar societies that still exist (or until recently existed) on the periphery of the modern world. These societies are sometimes referred to as archaic, traditional, small or natural; they are subject to a field called cultural or social anthropology (and ethnology as well; henceforth only anthropology). The research of archaic cultures not only offers opportunities for observing cultural elements in the context of living culture (by means of ethnographic observations), but also the recognition of more general relations and regularities that are then to be applied (at least theoretically) to similar cultures in the past.

The Central European tradition of social sciences, contrary, for example, to the United States, does not show such a close relationship between archaeology and anthropology; not only because archaic cultures have become more or less extinct in Europe. Archaeology or prehistory in Europe is mostly understood as a part of a more widely defined history and strongly liable to a discourse led by historians (and not anthropologists) about the past, while archaeologists usually show little interest in living archaic cultures. Without any doubt, it is a pity since the fact that these cultures exist on the other side of the world does not mean they could not be closely similar to societies that once lived in our geographic area. *Minulost, kterou nikdo nezapsal* ('A past that nobody has written down': Květina et al. 2015), a book published at the end of spring 2016, represents an important attempt to overcome this interdisciplinary barrier between archaeology and anthropology.

The aims of this publication (660 pages) seem ambitious. The book can be understood as an appeal for a tolerant intercultural dialogue, as an introduction to the anthropological theory for archaeologists, as a consideration of the relation between individual social sciences concerned with the past and/or a readable presentation of the history of the Neolithic, one of the key periods of European and Eurasian prehistory. The book passes on all of these three levels, although – to say it right from the beginning – something always has remained unanswered and the authors do not con-

¹ Work on this paper has been supported by the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports of the CR within the 'Large Infrastructures' programme (Archaeological Information System of the CR, project ID: **LM2015080**). Czech version of the paper was published as a review in *Archeologické rozhledy* 68, 2016, 576-582.

vince us about everything. It can hardly be different. Undoubtedly, the book is processing a very interesting subject that has remained virtually untouched in the Czech scientific and popular scientific literature and does it (especially in case of the anthropological passages) in a smart and readable way with a broad view of the worldwide development in this field.

We and the others

The starting point of the book is the differentiation between ‘us’ – i.e. our modern Euro-American civilization – and ‘the others’ represented by archaic societies. According to the authors, there should not be much difference between the prehistoric and the modern archaic societies (therefore both groups are referred to as ‘the others’), while there is a principal difference between these cultures and ‘our’ world. This difference should be not only quantitative (archaic societies are smaller, the overall productivity of their economy is comparatively small) but also qualitative, connected to profoundly different perceptions of the world, time, personal aims and values. Until recently, mutual understanding seemed almost impossible for both, and for a long time, a feeling of superiority on part of the Europeans prevailed that justified colonization, religious missions, economic exploitation and in border cases even the annihilation of the inhabitants of far-off parts of the world.

As demonstrated by modern anthropology, to understand ‘the others’ may sometimes be really hard. For example, the British public of the end of the 18th century was outraged by the barbarism of the Hawaii natives who out of incomprehensible reasons killed the expedition leader, Captain Cook, during his repeated visit, boiled his body, ate it partially and distributed his relics among other chieftains. As demonstrated by anthropologist Marshall Sahlins 200 years later, it was barbarian only in the eyes of then British public (and still would be considered by common Europeans today); from the viewpoint of ‘the others’ this was an act of paying divine honors. As mentioned by Petr Květina, if we want to understand ‘the others’ (and not only gain control over them and assimilate them), above all, we have to be able to give up our value judgements and to admit that their views and values have never been principally worse than ours, but simply different. To make it short, we have to step out of the shade of colonial grandfather Léon Rom, whose story in the foreword and afterword provides the punchline for the whole book (in such an effective manner that this story in some places overshadows the other statements).

Calling attention to the need to overcome the limits of one’s own culture and to understand ‘the other’ surely is an utterly important message. However it may seem that Europe has overcome the burden of its colonial past, our ability to empathize with ‘the others’ is still quite limited, as proven, for example, by our relation to refugees of the current immigration wave, by the predominant attitude towards the Roma or towards other, sometimes called unadaptable minorities.

Despite the well-meant and undoubtedly beneficial message of Květina’s book, we have to call attention to an – in a certain sense – insufficiently reflexive approach to the studied subject, which paradoxically weakens Květina’s thesis. It may not necessarily be apparent from the archaeological perspective, but it is clearly visible in view of the current anthropological discourse. Reflexivity as the broader framework for scholarly activity (i.e. for scientific practice) as well as a concrete intellectual or discursive procedure represents a key part of current anthropology and related social sciences. It is based on the finding that there ‘is no other field, no other knowledge structure, no other institution or epistemology that would be independent on social, cultural, historical or political formations bestowing historical periods with specific individuality’ (Said 2011, 184; *Horký-Hlubáň – Profant 2016*, 20). The framework of anthropology, with the help of which every author approaches the societies in question, is not a universal and neutral key to understanding reality. Anthropology as a specific discourse and summary of methods, which enable to produce certain statements, is a biased product of the European realm and at the same time a production tool of specific social and cultural hierarchies. It is the awareness of this inherent ‘bias’ of anthropology that escapes the author(s) of the book reported here.

Petr Květina presents anthropology and archaeology as disciplines studying ‘the others’, which means members of archaic societies differing from the civilized ‘us’ (p. 106). Although he perceives the ethnocentric shifts developing ‘on both sides’ he does not reflect this division by itself as a consequence of the European and also western science (stemming from the milieu of global minority societies that in short are referred to as ‘WEIRD’- Western, educated, industrial, rich and democratic: *Diamond 2014*). An example of these differentiations and hierarchizations is the division made between ‘sociology’ and ‘anthropology’ according to the level of development the studied society has

achieved, whereby it is necessary to become aware that the use of these categories itself continues to reproduce this division (*Horkeý-Hlucháň – Profant 2016*, 21). This does not mean that we necessarily have to give up the extant terminology; a standard way to cope with this issue should be to recognize and to admit the bias of one's own position and to reflect it in the text. Although Květina's thesis is mostly based on the refusal of cultural superiority of the western civilization, the words and terms he uses often betray him and are implicitly directed towards the opposite effect when the described facts are framed with knowledge structured in a European way. This happens, for example, when members of archaic societies are called 'natives' (*domorodci*), the decision of agricultural communities is categorized as 'rational' – with better dwelling opportunities – and 'irrational' – death dream of some of the inhabitants of the houses (p. 237), or when he talks about 'our' and 'their' 'achieved cultural or economic level or advancement' (p. 271). What linguistically may seem as mere clumsiness, on the professional level it points to neglecting Foucault's concept of the interconnection between knowledge and power by discourse.

The way we, the members of the Euro-American cultural sphere, view non-European societies is only insufficiently targeted in this book. By means of several stories (rather than analyses) the author shows that the approaches of the European 'discoverers' towards the original inhabitants of America and Africa were false, distorted, arrogant and cruel; this reflection however closes with a mention of 1930s pulp magazines with American Indian themes (p. 87). So the critical reflection of European attitudes ends at the moment when our Euro-American predecessors, whom we could renounce, become 'we' in a narrower sense of the word, a part of our modern western society, and criticizing it would be self-criticism. Current issues, in which actual relations between 'us' and 'the others' are materialized, for example, the inheritance of colonialism, post-colonialism or the concept of 'development' and 'developing countries', are not touched in this book at all.

This critique is blunted by the fact that the book was written by archaeologists and mainly for archaeologists (and those interested in this discipline), whereby the presented subjects do not feature in the centre of current archaeological interest. It's true that even archaeology witnessed a postmodern deconstruction of some well-established approaches, an attempt to emancipate alternative explanations of the past and to question the claims of European societies to archaeological heritage gained somewhere in the colonies. However, these trends have not dominated the archaeological discourse, and on the theoretical level, they are being rather marginalized today. Květina's archaeological division of societies into 'us' and 'the others' takes on the shape of a distinction between prehistoric (pre-state) and state formations (in Central Europe since the Middle Ages). The generality of this view seems justified, though the question arises of whether all types of pre-state societies have mutually so much in common as to form a conceptual counterpart to state societies.

The authors of this review essentially agree with Květina's distinction between state and pre-state societies as general criterion, which, by the way, is not unique (cf. e.g. *Diamond 2014*). Naturally, it is not the categorization itself which is important but what a given distinction contributes to the study of pre-state societies. Were pre-state societies really fundamentally different, or do they only appear as such as a consequence of differing sources of their study? Is there anything deeper, in which archaic culture differs from our one than on a merely formal level? And if such differences exist, should this fact not influence the research methods, for example, by applying different theoretical models on state and pre-state societies? Is it right to apply models based on 'universal' (actually, however, modern European) economic principles such as expenditure cuts, profit increase etc.? It is not clear whether the authors asked themselves such questions or even considered them important. Anyway, we find it a shame they did not try to compare their standpoints with some previous attempts of our archaeology to solve these questions that were undertaken even at their home institution (Archaeology, History and Time, workshop in 1995: *Kuna 1995; 1997; Vašíček 1997* and others); some of the then presented theses were even more radical (but not necessarily more right) than those presented in the reviewed book.

Structures and events

In an essential way, the study of the past is influenced by the nature of the sources at our disposal. As the reviewed publication understands the situation, archaeological finds mainly reveal structures within the cultures (artefact types, styles and distribution zones), while written sources predominantly tell fragments of stories, of which history, in the traditional sense of the word, is composed. Societies that did not leave over written sources cannot be studied otherwise than by archaeology; 'though they had history, nobody wrote it down', according to Květina (p.

16). That is the reason why (prehistoric) archaeology stands closer to anthropology than to history, and anthropology also studies broader regularities and does not take into account events in the sense they are subject to historical study.

Stressing the role of anthropology as a more general research framework or strategic partner of archaeology is nothing new; it is not a discovery by Czech archaeologists. The starting point of the most important post-war school of archaeology was summarized already in the 1960s in the programmatic article ‘Archaeology as Anthropology’ (Binford 1962), and even before, some American archaeologists claimed that ‘archaeology must be anthropology, or it is nothing’ (Willey – Phillips 1958, quoted according to the above-mentioned). Since that time, the relation between both disciplines has been discussed many times (though, in the Anglo-American part of the world more often than in Central Europe). Therefore it is a shame not to find anything about these connections in the reviewed book; excursions into research history are included, however, only if anthropology is concerned.

Květina’s view of archaeology being concerned with structures, whereas history is devoted to events corresponds to the programmatic article of the founder of processual archaeology (Binford 1981, 231). Among others, Binford states that archaeology is the study of cultural systems (i.e. structures), and should not become a description of specific events (‘we should be seeking to understand cultural systems... rather than generate set pieces of descriptive history’). The question, however, is whether such a pronounced dichotomy of archaeology vs history (or structure vs events) is still valid and whether it is a good basis for modern archaeological investigations. However justified this viewpoint may have been in the 1960s–1980s as a reaction to the culturally historical paradigm in archaeology (which treated archaeological cultures as social units and described their development as a series of quasi-events), by now it appears to be overcome. Today archaeology targets the interpretation not only of social systems (structures) but also of events of the past world (Neustupný 2010). After all, Květina is neglecting himself in some way at this point since in one of the opening chapters he gives a splendid example of how archaeological methods may lead to more trustworthy information about a historical event than written history (example of the Battle at Little Big Horn).

The tempting, colourful world of living people...

Nevertheless, if archaeology is on its own, its possibilities to explore the past world in its inner dynamics are – apart from some exceptions – restricted. Anthropology and history are disciplines that offer something like this, and therefore they are naturally attractive to archaeologists. Since, however, Květina is interested in prehistoric (pre-state, i.e. also pre-literate) societies, history as a partner is out of question, and only anthropology remains. It should be mentioned in passing that Květina simplifies the content of the disciplines beyond the bearable: though common awareness links anthropology and archaeology to the research of archaic societies (as stated on p. 18), it is not their essence. After all, archaeology also examines the most recent past (e.g. the remains of World War II), and anthropology together with sociology takes part in the research of ourselves as well.

Guided by the attempt to open the colourful world of anthropological observations to prehistoric archaeology and to demonstrate its curiosities, Květina gives a general overview of anthropological theory, mostly using concrete examples or stories in the first part of his book (chap. 1–7). Vast parts of this section are readable and they may prove useful even to the professional archaeologist unless he has attended at least a one-year university course on anthropology. We have to appreciate the author’s ability to transmit anthropological theory into a language that is not closed up in itself and therefore it is comprehensible to professionals of other disciplines as well as to readers with a completely different background.

At second glance, also some weaknesses of Květina’s exposition appear. Although the author mentions virtually all classics of anthropology, he does not always mutually associate their conclusions. This part of the book could serve as a textbook, but for this purpose it is too long (do ‘the majority of anthropologists or archaeologists’ really – as stated on p. 106 – ‘have disclosed literary ambitions?’) and too unbalanced. Often the text is descriptive and illustrative instead of explaining and criticizing. For example, there are entire seventeen pages devoted to the testimonies of the witnesses of the sinking of the Titanic, which at the end serves as mere illustration of the short argument that human memories even in modern society are no reliable historical source. The following explanation of Lévi-Strauss’s *bricolage* – one of the more complicated and important terms of anthropology – takes him only about two lines, and, moreover, the term is confused with the principles of constructing epics and myths.

Altogether it seems that Kvěťina wants to draw something completely different from anthropology than processual archaeology once intended. While the last mentioned was looking for a source of interculturally valid structures, applicable to societies known only from archaeological records, Kvěťina follows up anthropological research mainly as a fount of specific details and potentially interesting illustrations. Though we do not mean illustrations literary, it is fit to be mentioned here that the reconstruction drawings by P. Modlitba, concentrated in the anthropological chapters, are excellent and excellently suitable for the given purpose.

Stressing the detail of the visual appearance, Kvěťina's book keeps up with the general trend of the time, which prefers visual information to written explanations and visualizations to a description of the structure. In this regard it could be significant that the publication ends seemingly in an illogical appendix of virtual reconstructions of prehistoric artefacts. Apart from the fact that the book was created within a funded project with this aim, this conclusion may prove the most striking evidence of the above statement that visualization at the expense of structural analysis is getting ever more important in archaeology. Naturally, it would be tempting for all archaeologists to achieve what ethnographic observations and virtual reality offer only in substitute: to see the past world in its concrete and lively appearance. Even if it was possible, would it suffice to understand it? We do not think so... But let us not anticipate.

...and grey archaeology

The second part of the book (chap. 8–10) consists of chapters with archaeological commentaries. Compared to the first part of the publication, this one is somewhat 'greyer'. We have to admit that the authors were facing an extraordinarily uneasy task. From our view, this section had to show that anthropological research and findings are able to change or to enrich the archaeological discourse and contribute new views and interpretation opportunities. This however is thin ice, a still unexplored area of our archaeology. It was a complicated task also because archaeological sources by their very nature are less dynamic compared to anthropological observations (therefore the description of chipped stone typology can hardly compete with the description of tribal wars in New Guinea), and it was necessary to harmonize and mutually connect the views of different members of a larger writing team (seven people have participated in the text).

Let us start with a rather marginal aspect: the somewhat grey explanations in the archaeological part could have been lived up by higher-quality image documentation. An indisputable strength of archaeological publications, making them more attractive to the readers, is the image part. The choice of illustrations in the reviewed work, however, does not attest to this. The reader will hardly understand what is interesting about the portrait of an excavation director across half of p. 342, what he can see on a large but not very clear image of archaeological layers on p. 340 or what the baked poor guinea pig on 331 should demonstrate; less attractive are the photographs on pp. 369–71 and others. The reconstruction drawings of I. Skokanová (e.g. pp. 456–7 or 488) surely are of a certain artistic value, but they contain objectively less interesting and less comprehensible elements.

We are not sure whether it was entirely fortunate to discuss various types of archaic societies (hunter-gatherers, pastoralists, horticulturalists and agriculturalists) in the first part and then to devote the whole second part to the Neolithic, i.e. to horticulturalists only. The only reason for this seems to be the current scholarly interest of the authors. This should not matter, but it would look more effective, then, if the first part of the book was designed as the anthropological view of these very societies, even if in the broader context of this field.

After chapter 8, dedicated to the development of agriculture in various parts of the world, the subject of the presentation narrows even further and takes into account Central Europe only. In the subsequent chapters, the text turns from general subjects to the archaeological description of artefacts, as, for example, wells, their wooden lining, silos, pottery etc. This is the ordinary archaeological agenda; the authors, however, did not escape the usual archaeological descriptiveness, which in the context of this publication is annoying. It seems that the presentation is not structured according to subjects anymore, but according to the availability of sites and archaeological classification systems instead of looking for answers to general questions with the help of anthropology.

This is related to a fact we consider the most serious inadequacy of the reviewed work: the absence of any thought-out methods of the application of anthropological data and theories in archaeology. Actually mere juxtaposition seems more or less the only 'method' of applying anthropological data by the authors. This is done, for

example, by simply ranging a chapter on the tribal wars in New Guinea after the chapters about evidence of violence on Neolithic bone remains and fortified settlements. Dear reader, cope with it yourself! The authors seem to be convinced that anthropological data itself contains the key to the interpretation of archaeological findings, which, of course, is not the case. Where does the conviction come from that the tribal wars in New Guinea are a similar social event as the one, which led to the killing of people at the Neolithic settlement in Talheim? It could have been, but not necessarily, but the authors do not help us with the decision.

Another example, concerned with Neolithic long houses, is suited to illustrate the hopelessness of this approach. This distinctive type of dwelling seems to have been a very important element in the structuring of Neolithic society, but we would need to know how many people (families) occupied them and how long the houses were in use on the average. The corresponding chapters discuss instances of similar buildings in recent cultures, such as the ones of the American Chinook or Iroquois. In both cases, the houses were occupied by a number of families (figures between 5 and 20 are mentioned), but this is generally not assumed for the European Neolithic examples. The authors have avoided the question, or rather, only indirectly we learn from a note on p. 381 that in case of the Central European Neolithic we consign one family to one house. Now, what was the anthropological observation good for?

Even more clearly, the problem of applying anthropological data comes up with the question of the life expectancy of long houses. The Chinook prove a long-term use (allegedly up to 400 years), while the Iroquois are described to regularly move their settlements after about ten years. What does this contribute to the interpretation of European Neolithic houses? Neither the reviewed book nor another contribution on this subject by the main author (*Květina – Hrnčář 2013*) offers any answer.

The problem may consist in the ‘similarity principle’, which the authors themselves address as the key to the questions of the interpretation of archaic cultures (p. 100). Similarities between artefacts indeed play a decisive role in the archaeological method since it allows us to compare products from various periods and places, to determine developmental sequences, styles and chronological sequences. Identical appearances of artefacts, however, do not guarantee identical functions, meaning or the ways of their use in different cultural contexts. This has been known for temporarily and geographically much closer archaeological phenomena and applies all the more to comparisons between societies divided by thousands of kilometres and years. It surely is necessary and possible to compare, but we have to use a method, which takes into account not only individual artefacts and phenomena, but also the context within more complex structures (‘functional context in different operational subsystems of the total cultural system’, see *Binford 1962*, 218). Intercultural comparative studies were a favourite approach by processual archaeology (whether in the shape of intercultural comparative studies or ethno-archaeological research). Today it is necessary to overcome these approaches; the reviewed publication however rather replaces them with a theoretical and methodological vacuum.

According to our opinion, archaeology should look out for more in anthropology than a mere inspiration to reconstruct the unattested parts of archaeological artefacts, as, for example, houses (by the way, even this is not so simple, as demonstrated, for example, by the roof shapes of the Chinook and Iroquois long houses). It is, however, mainly this concept, which the reviewed publication has taken up as a solution (see chap. 10 – artefacts), and this cannot be overshadowed even by ornate but less enlivening formulations (the house was ‘a place of dreaming and disappointments, a place of work and relaxation, a place of prayers and cult’, in which the ‘colourful whirl of everyday life’ was taking place etc.). It is a shame that a book with such a readable first part ends in a dry description of quern-stones...

Step out of the shade

Petr Květina and his team earn the merit for opening the subject of anthropology to archaeologists and introducing the reader to the complex world of this discipline. As said above, to fully benefit from this inspiration, it will obviously be necessary to elaborate on some questions of archaeological theory and method. It is the absence of these topics why the archaeological interpretations in this book (not even with the support of anthropology) have not acquired a comprehensible view and the courage for interpretation. Perhaps, the attentive reader will recognize that the conclusions of most of the chapters on interesting archaeological finds end in the recapitulation of various interpretation possibilities only to close with a question mark. The preconditions for a settled lifestyle and for the

development of agriculture, the character of the natural environment in the Neolithic and the social structure at this time, the function of round sanctuaries – the rondels – or fortified settlements and the explanation of lethal injuries in mass graves on some sites are simply still not clear enough. It is the honour of the authors not trying to hide this fact, however, lessened by not trying to overcome it.

The interpretative timidity of the authors is characteristic of the current state of archaeology, where new finds contribute with new interpretations without challenging the former ones. What today is lacking in general is a unifying theory or paradigm. Perhaps, however, something of this sort will never develop again and all phenomena will for ever be linked to a number of contradictory and equally probable theories. On the other hand, we cannot expect the empirical data (whether archaeological or anthropological) to lead us to a more general conclusion by themselves; this was believed only in the time of traditional positivism. It will apparently be necessary to draw conclusions from historical recognition being based not only on available data but also on general theories, models, attitudes and aims of those who formulate them. The quality of the image of the past will then not be a mere enumeration of potential possibilities, but above all their reasonable choice and arrangement into a certain logical and relevant context.

Central European archaeology has always been liable to the historian's discourse. It tried (especially within the culturally historical paradigm) to keep up with history, its older sister, in such a way, as, for example, to interpret archaeological cultures as ethnic units, by definitions of quasi-events of the migration type, by looking for the archaeological reflection of specific events that were listed in a random choice by the written sources etc. Therefore it is enormously meritorious that the reviewed book tries to relativize this source of inspiration and to add another source. It is however not desirable that archaeology switches from one dependence to another. Archaeology has the ability to formulate its own questions and to build its own methodology of their solution. Although, unlike history, it has no access to specific events of the past, to observations of living society like anthropology, but contrary to these disciplines it can much better envisage the study of social structures in their chronological development. So it has something to offer, even if we are often not aware of it. It should therefore step out not only of the shade of the colonial past of European society, but also of the shade of its sister disciplines...

And yet there is something more. The reviewed book ends in a well written epilogue, once more taking one's breath by describing the bestiality of Belgian colonists in the Congo. It comes full circle; the dramatic plot of the first chapter has been unravelled. If the reader has come so far, he may forget about the weariness from reading some of the preceding chapters and he may be deeply impressed and stimulated to his own thought about the values of this world. Although this seems not to have been the main aim of the authors, we have to be grateful for it.

English by Tomáš Mařík

Bibliography

Binford, L. 1962: Archaeology as Anthropology. *American Antiquity* 28 (2), 217–225.

Binford, L. 1981: Behavioral Archaeology and the 'Pompeii Premise'. *Journal of Anthropological Research* 37 (3), 195–208; quoted after Binford, L., *Working at Archaeology* [selected articles]. New York et al.: Academic Press, 229–241.

Diamond, J. 2014: Svět, který skončil včera [The World Until Yesterday]. Brno.

Horký-Hlucháň O. – Profant T. et al. 2016: Mimo Sever a Jih. Rozumět globálním nerovnostem a rozmanitosti. Praha.

Kuna, M. 1995: Pre-historic prehistory. In: M. Kuna – N. Venclová (eds.), *Whither archaeology? Papers in honour of Evžen Neustupný*. Praha, 36–42.

Kuna, M. 1997: Archaický čas. *Archeologické rozhledy* 49, 209–216.

Květina et al. 2015: Květina, P. – Řídký, J. – Končelová, M. – Burgert, P. – Šumberová, R. – Pavlu, I. – Brzobohatá, H. – Trojánková, O. – Vavrečka, P. – Unger, J.: *Minulost, kterou nikdo nezapsal* [A Past That Nobody Has Written Down]. Červený Kostelec: Pavel Mervart. 656 pp. ISBN 13: 978-80-7465-173-1.

Květina, P. – Hrnčář, V. 2013: Between Archaeology and Anthropology: Imagining Neolithic settlements. *Anthropologie* 51 (2), 323–247.

Neustupný, E. 2010: *Teorie archeologie* [Theory of Archaeology]. Plzeň.

Said, E. W. 2011: *Orientalismus* [Orientalism]. Praha.

Vašíček, Z. 1997: Historicita času. *Archeologické rozhledy* 49, 203–208.

Willey, G. R. – Phillips, P. 1958: *Method and Theory in Archaeology*. Chicago.

Résumé

Ve střední Evropě je archeologie odjakživa poplatná diskurzu historiků: klade si podobné otázky a chápe předmět svého bádání v pojmech analogických k pojmům známým z historických pramenů. Proto např. pojímá archeologické kultury jakožto historická etnika (dříve „národy“), popisuje jejich šíření jako historické události – migrace populací a hledá odraz známých historických událostí v archeologických pramenech. Velmi často se tím ovšem dostává do slepé uličky, z níž jen obtížně nachází cestu ven. Je proto nesmírně důležité hledat i jiné zdroje inspirace a jiné roviny společenského diskurzu, než který nabízí historické bádání; právě o to pokouší kniha P. Květiny a jeho týmu (*Minulost, kterou nikdo nezapsal*, 2015).

P. Květina a jeho tým otevírají pro archeology téma antropologie (ve smyslu kulturní či sociální antropologie) a uvádějí čtenáře do komplexního světa této vědy. Cíle této rozsáhlé publikace (660 str.) jsou široké. Knihu lze chápat nejen jako úvod do antropologické teorie pro archeology, ale též jako úvahu o vztahu mezi různými společenskými vědami zabývajícími se minulostí a přístupnou formou podané líčení středoevropského neolitu, jednoho z klíčových období našeho pravěku. V neposlední řadě lze knihu číst i jako apel vyzývající k tolerantnímu mezikulturnímu dialogu. Na všech těchto rovinách kniha obstojí, i když něco vždy zůstává nedopovězeno a nedořešeno, příp. ne o všem nás autoři přesvědčí. Není však sporu o tom, že kniha zpracovává velmi zajímavou látku, v české odborné a populárně vědecké literatuře dosud prakticky nedotčenou, a činí tak (zejména v antropologických pasážích) vtipně, čtivě a s velkým rozhledem po odborném dění na celém světě.

Pro plné využití inspirace, kterou nám obor antropologie potenciálně nabízí, bude ovšem asi nutné lépe rozpracovat některé otázky archeologické teorie a metody. Právě absence těchto témat je podle našeho názoru největší slabinou knihy a přístupu jejích autorů k dané problematice. Celkově se zdá, že Květina chce z antropologie čerpat něco zcela jiného, než kdysi chtěla procesuální archeologie. Zatímco ta hledala v antropologii zdroj mezikulturně platných struktur, aplikovatelných i na společnosti známé jen z archeologických pramenů, Květina a jeho tým sledují antropologické výzkumy především jako studnici konkrétních zajímavých detailů. V důrazu na detail a jeho vizuální podobu jde Květina kniha s obecným trendem doby, která preferuje obrazovou informaci před písemným výkladem, vizualizaci před popisem struktury. Pro všechny archeology by samozřejmě bylo lákavé docílit toho, co nám v náhražce nabízejí etnografická pozorování a virtuální realita: tedy uvidět někdejší svět v jeho konkrétní, živé podobě. Jenže, i kdyby to bylo možné, stačilo by nám to k tomu, abychom ho pochopili? Domníváme se, že nikoliv.

K aplikaci antropologických dat v knize dochází pouze tím, že kapitoly popisující archeologické nálezy (např. stopy násilí na neolitických kosterních pozůstatcích) jsou prokládány kapitolami s líčením etnografických pozorování (např. kmenových válek na Nové Guinei). Autoři věří, že antropologická data sama obsahují klíče k vysvětlení archeologických situací. Ale tak tomu není. Odkud se bere přesvědčení, že kmenové války na Nové Guinei jsou podobným společenským jevem jako ten, který vedl k zabití lidí na neolitickém sídlišti v Talheimu? Být tomu tak mohlo, ale nemuselo, ale autoři nám v rozhodnutí příliš nepomohou.

Ilustrovat bezvýhodnost této situace lze i na dalších příkladech z referované publikace, např. otázce neolitických dlouhých domů a jejich společenského významu. Problém tkví evidentně v přecenění „principu podobnosti“, o kterém autoři sami píší jako o klíči k otázkám interpretace archaických kultur; stejná podoba artefaktu či jevu však nezaručuje stejnou funkci, význam či způsob použití artefaktu v různém kulturním kontextu. Srovnávat je jistě nutné a je to i možné, avšak s použitím metodiky, která bere v potaz nejen jednotlivé artefakty či jevy, ale i jejich kontext v rámci komplexnějších struktur. Vztah antropologie a archeologie byl častým tématem procesuální archeologie již od 60. let minulého století (o tom však autoři zcela mlčí). Procesuální postupy jistě musejí dnes být v mnoha ohledech překonávány; v recenzované publikaci jsou však spíše nahrazovány teoretickým a metodickým vakuem.

Je nesmírně záslužné, že se referovaná kniha pokouší relativizovat „historický“ diskurz v archeologii a doplnit ho o zdroj jiné inspirace. Nemělo by se však přihodit, aby se archeologie z jedné závislosti ocitla v závislosti druhé. Archeologie má na to, aby si dokázala formulovat vlastní otázky a vlastní metody jejich řešení. Nemá sice přístup ke konkrétním událostem minulosti jako historie, ani k pozorování živých společností jako antropologie, avšak na rozdíl od těchto oborů se může mnohem lépe pokoušet o sledování společenských struktur v jejich dlouhodobém diachronickém vývoji. Má tedy také co nabídnout, i když si to často neuvědomuje. Měla by proto konečně vystoupit nejen ze stínu koloniální minulosti evropské společnosti, ale též ze stínu svých starších sester...