Review of: "One Archaeology of Knowledge Constructs"

Sergio Escribano-Ruiz[1]

1 University of the Basque Country UPV/EHU

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

It took me longer than usual reviewing this text and trying to find worthly and appropriate comments. The paper made me think on archaeological theory, its traditions and mainstream ways of publishing. This is more than most of the papers normally offer.

It is admirable to claim going back to epistemology immersed as we are in the ontological turn, while dancing with new materialisms. We should never leave aside our concern with the construction of archaoelogical knowledge, I agree. Nevertheless, no paper is extemporal and, thus, has to take into consideration its historiographical context. This is particularly the main problem I found in the paper. No reference to the current theoretical debates is given nor seminal works dealing with the central themes considered in the paper are even mentioned. I wondered if giving any reference could be or not appropriate. Nevertheless, I felt that at least I should give some names, of authors with several works related to discussed topics, as Gavin Lucas, Benjamin Alberti, Randall McGuire or even Michael Schiffer.

A synthesis that mixes the theoretical opinions of two underestimated authors is worthwhile, but it should be the empirical data for a paper and not its ultimate goal. I could agree or not with some of the considerations of the author (in my case I am especially against some Cartesian dualisms found along the paper, past/present, object/person…), but for me this is not the problem with the paper. Instead, it is that contributions by Gallay and Gardin must be discussed and put into perspective by the author against any given debate. Why does their work matter for the wider archaeological audience? What is their contribution to current theoretical debates? What problems do they solve? I think the paper should try to answer those questions.

Along with this, I feel that the text requires severe linguistic revision.