

## Abstract

Gustafsson, Anders. 2001: *Arkeologihistoria som historia och som arkeologi. Studier i arkeologins egenhistorier. (The history of archaeology as history and as archaeology. Studies in the histories of archaeology)*. In Swedish with an English summary.

The main objective of this thesis is to contribute to the understanding of a central part of our archaeological practice - the ubiquitous historical accounts of our own scientific work. More specifically, the purposes of the thesis can be summarised as follows:

- 1) To present and discuss a set of key concepts related to the historiography of science, especially those relevant to disciplinary history. The concepts are mainly drawn from the field of science studies.
- 2) To analyse different forms in which the history of archaeology is practised, discuss various arguments for its utility, and show how some central historiographical problems have been debated in this field. Concepts such as Whig history, internalism, externalism and the legitimisation of interests are focused.
- 3) To exemplify and illustrate the problems discussed through an analysis of three classic histories of archaeology.

A central point in the thesis is that the histories of archaeology are diverse. Hence we need to discuss the intellectual foundations of different types of such histories. In order to do so, the field is divided into two general parts, 'the history of archaeology in the form of archaeology' and 'the history of archaeology in the form of history.'

The latter term is used to describe studies with the explicit aim of contributing to the history of archaeology, such as biographies and general surveys.

The former term refers to texts which are not intended to add to our historical knowledge, but which nevertheless contain information that is historically relevant. This genre comprises the kind of introductory research history found in academic texts, as well as other instances in which history is used to support the introduction of new theories and/or the promotion of some specific research tradition. Historiographically, it is argued, these two types of history of archaeology are fundamentally different.

In the first case a symmetrical perspective ought to be adopted, which means that analysts should avoid committing themselves to any view whatsoever regarding the validity of the knowledge claims investigated. This position is known as methodological relativism.

In the second case, it should be accepted that historical accounts constitute a resource in the doing of science, making up one of the tools in our methodological toolbox. The asymmetry and Whiggishness of this genre is justifiable, indeed inevitable. Crucially, however, this kind of history - history of archaeology in the form of archaeology, or archaeology in the guise of history - must not be claimed to constitute history proper.

*Keywords:* History of archaeology, historiography, legitimisation, internalism, externalism, contextualism, constructivism, Whig history, symmetry, methodological relativism, Glyn Daniel, Ole Klindt-Jensen, Bruce G Trigger.

*English revised by Neil Tomkinson*

GOTARC Series B. Gothenburg Archaeological Theses No 17

ISSN 02-82-6860  
ISBN 91-85952-57-5