OPHIUSSA

REVISTA DO CENTRO DE ARQUEOLOGIA DA UNIVERSIDADE DE LISBOA

ISSN 1645-653X
E-ISSN 2184-173X

CENTRO DE ARQUEOLOGIA
DA UNIVERSIDADE
DE LISBOA
uniarq

9 - 2025

OPHIUSSA

REVISTA DO CENTRO DE ARQUEOLOGIA DA UNIVERSIDADE DE LISBOA

OPHIUSSA REVISTA DO CENTRO DE ARQUEOLOGIA DA UNIVERSIDADE DE LISBOA

PUBLICAÇÃO ANUAL · ISSN 1645-653X · E-ISSN 2184-173X

Volume 9 - 2025

CAPA
Estela de Villafranca de los Barros.
Desenho de Pablo Paniego Díaz

https://ophiussa.letras.ulisboa.pt
Dezembro de 2025

ISSN 1645-653X / E-ISSN 2184-173X
DEPÓSITO LEGAL 190404/03

EDIÇÃO
UNIARQ – Centro de Arqueologia
da Universidade de Lisboa,
Faculdade de Letras de Lisboa
1600-214 Lisboa.
www.uniarq.net
https://ophiussa.letras.ulisboa.pt
uniarq@letras.ulisboa.pt

Revista fundada por Victor S. Gonçalves (1996).
O cumprimento do acordo ortográfico de 1990 foi opção de cada autor.
Esta publicação é financiada por fundos nacionais através da FCT – Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia, I.P., no âmbito do projecto UID/00698/2025 (https://doi.org/10.54499/UID/00698/2025) - Centro de Arqueologia da Universidade de Lisboa

ÍNDICE

OPHIUSSA · Volume 9, 2025, páginas 187–200. Submetido a 01.07.2024. Aceite a 10.03.2025. (CC/BY/NC/ND 4.0). https://doi.org/10.51679/ophiussa.2025.168

The Writing of Archaeological Theory

A Escrita da Teoria Arqueológica

ARTUR RIBEIRO
University of Kiel
aribeiro@roots.uni-kiel.de
ORCID iD: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5608-4336

ABSTRACT: Throughout the years there have been complaints that theory is written in a very complicated manner, relying on obscure terms and metaphors, leading the more practical archaeologists to the perception that theorists are privileged and pretentious. There is some truth to these complaints – archaeological theory could indeed be considerably simpler and more accessible. The aim of this paper is to explain what factors have influenced theorists to write in a complicated and impenetrable manner, pointing out how the social, economic, and cultural context of the twentieth century have influenced theory and its production.
KEYWORDS: Theory; theoretical; buzzwords; jargon; language; literacy.

RESUMO: Ao longo dos anos, tem havido queixas de que a teoria é escrita de uma forma muito complicada, baseando-se em termos obscuros e metáforas estranhas, deixando a impressão de que os arqueólogos teóricos são privilegiados e pretensiosos. Estas queixas têm alguma justificação – a teoria arqueológica poderia, de facto, ser consideravelmente mais simples e mais acessível. O objetivo deste artigo é explicar os factores que influenciaram os teóricos a escrever de uma forma complicada e impenetrável, apontando como o contexto social, económico e cultural do século XX influenciou a teoria e a sua produção.
PALAVRAS-CHAVE: teoria; criatividade; denso; complicado; acessibilidade.

1. INTRODUCTION

For someone who writes primarily in archaeological theory, one of the common refrains I hear is that archaeological theory is remarkably difficult to understand, that it evokes concepts that are hard to follow, often relies on cryptic metaphors, and is too abstract for the nitty-gritty empirical archaeologists to make use of. As Matthew Johnson describes in his *Archaeological Theory: an introduction*, theory is often perceived as a dirty word, and the surge of theorists in academia in the 1980s and 1990s has left a bad taste in some people's mouths (Johnson 1999: x). More often than not, theory is seen as an unnecessary part of science, where practices such as experimentation, modelling, and hypothesis-testing are viewed as more productive and useful for society. Additionally, as Koji Mizoguchi has pointed out, there is a resentment from more practical archaeologists, especially those working in contract archaeology, towards archaeological theorists, who often highlight the limitations of archaeology, rather than its potential (Mizoguchi 2015: 16).

The usual counter-refrain from archaeological theorists is that there is no archaeology without some degree of theory, that everything that archaeologists engage with, whether it is the basics of stratigraphy or the study of genetic material, must have involved some degree of theorization and conceptualization. Someone, at some point, must have theorized what a stratigraphic unit must be, what typologies represent, what a past society is, etc., in other words, all archaeology is to some degree theory-laden (Wylie 1989). Furthermore, despite common sense being a crucial part of how we reason in archaeology (see Dunnell 1982), it does have its limitations when interpreting archaeological realities, since what might be common sense to us in the modern world, might not have been to the peoples of the past. On this issue, theory is often of help in the interpretation of past social and anthropological contexts.

With this being said, the argument that theory is, in fact, very complicated remains true. Those who can engage in archaeological theory are generally in a privileged position, usually associated to an academic context, have access to other theorists with whom they can share ideas, have free access to a library, and in most cases, access to online publications, which are hidden behind a paywall for the rest of the population. To read, study, reflect upon, and ultimately, produce theory, is in fact a privilege, usually reserved to those in academia. To read both Deleuze's and Guattari's 400- and 600-page *Anti-Oedipus* (1983) and *A Thousand Plateaus* (1987), for instance, requires considerable amounts of time, and even though academic jobs are incredibly busy, involving long workdays, the academic world does nevertheless provide a better and more comfortable space to read and inquire theoretically than the field.

Thus, it is unsurprising that many students and those working in more practical areas of archaeology struggle with the reading and writing of archaeological theory and have come to recognize some theoretical texts as being intentionally cryptic, dense, and of course, pretentious. As Gavin Lucas points out, much of theory teaching relies on just listing a bunch of schools of thought, the several -isms that archaeology has embraced throughout history, without recognizing that students go into archaeology with interests such as fieldwork and artefacts, instead of theory (Lucas 2021: 2). For the student, it is hard to understand how all these abstract -isms are supposed to help us in archaeology. Some progress in that regard has been made, such as with Harris and Cipolla's *Archaeological Theory in the New Millennium* (2017), which is considerably more accessible to the average reader than usual. However, barring some exceptions, theory remains fairly difficult to understand, and I oftentimes struggle with some theory texts myself, and once I do understand what is being conveyed, I ask why was it not written in a much simpler manner. There is, of course, considerably variation in terms of density when it comes to theoretical content in archaeology, and there are reasons for that, but little has been said on this subject, with comments on the difficulty of theory writing in archaeology remaining somewhat superficial.

The aim of this paper is to unpack the writing of theory, providing a socio-economic history that can elucidate why and under what conditions the writing of theory operates. The aim is not to provide a complete historiographical background of archaeological theory nor provide a manual of archaeology theory, since those can already be found elsewhere (e.g. Harris – Cipolla 2017; Trigger 2006), but rather to provide

historical and cultural notes that are clues as to why theory is written in the way it is. It also should not be confusing as to why the current paper is itself written in English, but published by a Portuguese national, in a Portuguese journal of archaeology – immigration and the use of English as the main international language and the dominant language of archaeological theory are all part of this story.

2. SOCIO-ECONOMIC NOTES ON WRITING THEORY

Reading and writing, in general, are particular skills, not unlike knowing how to drive, how to play the piano, how to farm, etc. Literacy is a skill that is acquired at home, from one's parents, but also something that is improved and honed at school. Being able to go to school in order to learn how to read and write is a privilege that the vast majority of people have nowadays, in the modern West, but prior to the Enlightenment, literacy rates in Europe were below 20% (Eskelson 2021). To this day, there are still many regions that have fairly low literacy rates, such as sub-Saharan Africa, where literacy levels remain roughly between 20% and 60% (Roser – Ortiz-Ospina 2018). Even though literacy rates are fairly high today, it should not surprise us that there are still people, especially senior people, who never learned how to read and write – I have had construction workers ask me to help them fill out administrative forms, elder women asking for help to read out public transport signs, or just people asking for help to pay their bills.

As a skill, reading and writing holds immense variation. Knowing how to write a grocery list requires considerably less skill than writing an award-winning novel. Similarly, writing a philosophy book, a journalistic report, an academic manual for chemistry, or a legal document, all require specific competencies. So, imagine all the writing one is faced with during the day-to-day, from tweets and WhatsApp messages, to subway signs, to newspapers, to work emails, to strip comics and mangas, to electricity bills, bank statements, and supermarket leaflets – all of these require some competency in reading, but in general, these tend to be fairly easy to read. In terms of density, on the other side of the spectrum, you have academic books, scientific publications, and legal documents, as examples of remarkably difficult texts to read and write. Knowing how to read and write does not mean that one can read medical research or a legal document.

When it comes to reading and writing, we must understand that there is writing that is directed towards an audience, sometimes towards as wide an audience as possible, such as tweets, publicity, and public announcements, but there is also writing that is directed to a specific audience. Some novels are written following some form of dense literary style with the aim of appealing to a specific audience, such as *Infinite Jest* by David Foster Wallace, *The Melancholy of Resistance* by László Krasznahorkai, or *The Inquisitors' Manual* by António Lobo Antunes. There are also books that can be read more easily, that appeal to a more mainstream audience, such as Dan Brown's *The Da Vinci Code*, J. K Rowling's *Harry Potter* books, and Paulo Coelho's *The Alchemist*. But in science, the writing is directed to specific disciplinary audiences, with economics using jargon and acronyms that only economy specialists are supposed to understand. Similarly, philosophical research, for instance, operates on concepts that require specific learning and discussion, such as "ontology", "immanence", "sublation", "solipsism", and "qualia". All of this is also true of the legal sphere, where many legal documents are intentionally written in a complicated manner. This has been called the magic spell hypothesis, where lawmakers write in an intentionally cryptic way in order to convey a ritualistic and spell-like authority (Martínez – Molica – Gibson 2024). In summary, there are several types of writing, ranging from more accessible to more impenetrable, to appeal to different qualities and quantities of audience.

This tension between accessible and impenetrable language can be seen throughout history and in different parts of the world, but it has been particularly noticeable during the second half of the twentieth century, and in the first decades of the twenty-first century. There are multiple reasons why writing has become a contentious issue during this period, and I will first focus on socio-economic reasons.

The first has to do with the increase in literacy itself, which throughout the centuries was a symbol of prestige, separating those who could not read and

write from those who could. The landscape of literacy changed throughout the twentieth century, especially in the postwar period, with the rise of and dominance of neoliberalism in the West (Fukuyama 1992; Harvey 2005). In a study of the working class in the UK during the twentieth century, Selina Todd points out that the most common working-class professions in Britain in the early twentieth century were servant, mining, farming, and factory work (Todd 2015), all professions that did not necessarily require reading and writing. While these professions were very common among the populace during the first decades of the twentieth century, after the two world wars, they gradually lost their importance, partly due to automation, and partly due to their transferral to Asia.

What we witness in the postwar period is a rapid increase of the middle-class, most of which relied on professions that required literacy, at first through the use of a typewriter, and eventually, through the use of the computer (Duffy 2009: 34). Naturally, in a world where middle-class professions were becoming the dominant form of employment, paying considerably better than manual labour jobs, families came to recognize how important it was to have an education, especially one that would allow access to permanent employment in an office context.

Today, there is a widespread revulsion against office jobs, expressed in movies such as *Office Space* and TV shows like *Workaholics*, with the cubicle becoming a symbol of authoritarianism and dehumanizing workspace. But decades ago, from the 1950s to the 1990s, the transition from manual labour, such as farming and construction, to an office space was seen as an upgrade – it meant a transition to a physically easier job, one that paid better, and also, in most cases, involved living in a city, and benefiting from all the amenities one can access there. Furthermore, during this time, Asia went from its agricultural roots to become a powerhouse in factory production, which is where most manufacturing jobs shifted to. Thus, in a way, reading and writing, and associated skills, such as typewriting and using a computer, were essential skills for a western middle-class urban lifestyle.

So, during the second half of the twentieth century we witness a decrease in traditional manual labour in favour of an educated, middle-class form of white-collar work. But as years went by and illiteracy became suppressed, with most people coming out of school with the skills for office jobs, other avenues of professional distinction had to be created. Whereas the first half of the twentieth century was marked by Fordist modes of production, the second half shifted towards a post-Fordist phase (Boltanski – Chiapello 2018). Fordist production is a way of organizing labour in a streamlined, quicker, and more effective manner. While traditional manufacture sees the worker go through the whole process of designing and producing commodities, for instance, a chair, a sweater, or a basket, Fordist labour breaks down the working process into separate tasks, which follow an assembly line, and workers are spread out across different tasks, rather than working individually on all tasks. This made production processes considerably faster and less resource intensive, allowing workers to receive higher pay while working fewer hours. The Fordist mode of production operated very well in the industrial context up until the two world wars. But when factory work started shifting to the Asian market, it made little sense to follow the Fordist model of production.

It is within changes in labour that we find some of the reasons why writing has changed during the second half of the twentieth century. As Luc Boltanski and Eve Chiapello recognize, office work in the 1960s still operated according to a hierarchical system, that is to say, it was organized in the form of a pyramid, with the CEO at the top, the middle-management in the middle (what they call *cadres* in French), and with general workers at the bottom, but this changed throughout the years, with the pyramidal hierarchy gradually collapsing to give way to teams that form *networks* (Boltanski – Chiapello 2018). During this transition, work teams started incorporating *specialized knowledge*, or as Boltanski and Chiapello explain, "[e]xperts are necessary, for they possess the information about innovation and the highly specialist knowledge that must be mastered to embark on technological competition. They can be internal to the firm — a full-time researcher, for example, or a specialist in computer systems or in administrative control" (Boltanski – Chiapello 2018: 79).

This historical overview of labour in the West is important in order for us to understand how language was a way of distinguishing types of work and the social classes we associate to them. As more people

came to be able to read and write, literacy gradually lost its power as a form of distinction, therefore language had to become more complex in the later decades of the twentieth century, more specialized, so that it could remain as a form of differentiating oneself professionally. As Bourdieu explains, language and writing are themselves ways of distinction – they are forms of cultural capital, of showing wealth, not that different from driving a sports car or going on holidays to Monaco (Bourdieu 2010 [1984]). The difference is that rather than showing off your wealth through physical objects, cultural capital is shown through forms of culture – education, what music one listens to, what languages one speaks, and what museums one visits. The writing of archaeological theory cannot be disconnected from this history (Ribeiro – Giamakis 2023).

In the same way that one prides oneself for consuming high-brow culture, much of which the lower classes have not learned to appreciate, many scholars at the time, who belonged to the middle and upper classes, were immersing themselves in theory that is particularly hard to grasp, such as the work of Martin Heidegger, Michel Foucault, and Jacques Derrida. These thinkers also eventually gained popularity in archaeology, coinciding roughly with the period of transformations in labour we described above, and with the 1980s and 1990s marking a period of transition in archaeology where more generalized knowledge became replaced by more specialist subjects, although it took a bit longer in archaeology than it did in the corporate world. In the 1970s and 1980s, archaeologists were distinguished primarily by region and time period, with most archaeologists being specialized, for instance, in the Palaeolithic of Southern France, the Roman period of Southern Spain, or the Iron Age of Germany, and so on, and while many still subscribe to this region/time period way of thinking specialization, the 1990s and 2000s have witnessed the rise of specialists in isotopes, in Bayesian modelling, in agent-based modelling, in radiocarbon dating, etc., giving impulse to interdisciplinary combinations of a technological science and archaeological data (Ribeiro 2022). Among these specializations, we find one of particular interest, and that is archaeological theory. As Ian Hodder himself recognized "[i]t has become possible to exist in archaeology largely as a *theory specialist*, and many advertised lecturing jobs now refer to theory teaching and research" (Hodder 2001: 1, emphasis mine).

Like all specializations, theory must follow its own functional language – it must contain concepts and terms that make sense but require some deep learning. Certainly, archaeological theory has existed since the beginning of the discipline (Trigger 2006), with processual archaeologists for instance, engaging with it in some depth from the 1960s to the 1980s (e.g. Binford 1962; Flannery 1972; Schiffer 1988). Furthermore, although not as prominent, archaeological theory has also been written in other parts of the world as well. However, it is in the West, especially in the UK, USA, and Scandinavia where theory seems to have its strongest foothold, and this became noticeable from the 1980s onwards. Theory has always been somewhat complicated, but that really became magnified with postprocessual archaeology, in the 1980s, with the difficulty of archaeological theory of this period sometimes associated to postmodernism (Fahlander 2012; Johnson 1999; Ribeiro 2023). The connection between the way we write archaeological theory today and postmodernism does, in fact, exist, but will be discussed in the next section.

3. CULTURAL-HISTORICAL NOTES ON WRITING THEORY

During the 1990s, the journal *Philosophy and Literature* launched a bad writing contest, where people could submit what they believed was the previous year's most impenetrable and cryptic passage in academic writing. The award was attributed a total of four times, and in its last year, in 1999, they awarded it to Judith Butler for the following passage:

> "The move from a structuralist account in which capital is understood to structure social relations in relatively homologous ways to a view of hegemony in which power relations are subject to repetition, convergence, and rearticulation brought the question of temporality into the thinking of structure, and marked a shift from a form of Althusserian theory that takes structural totalities as theoretical objects to one in which the insights

> into the contingent possibility of structure inaugurate a renewed conception of hegemony as bound up with the contingent sites and strategies of the rearticulation of power" (Butler 1997: 13).

This is certainly a very difficult passage to understand, and the whole text from which this is taken from is just as hard to follow. Judith Butler, and similar authors of the time, were grouped together as "postmodernists", a group following topics of research such as gender, race, postcoloniality, poststructuralism, etc. who were seen as leading cultural and literary theorists at the time by the academic elite but were also perceived as a pedantic group and were often derided by many within and outside academia.

During those same years, a computer program called "Postmodernism Generator" was created, which could reproduce texts that were not dissimilar to those written by most postmodernists of the time. This was to show that postmodern writing did not have to follow any coherent logic; that any computer could come up with nonsense that was indistinguishable from postmodern texts. And of course, who can forget the Sokal Hoax? In 1996, the physicist Alan Sokal submitted and published the paper "Transgressing the Boundaries: Towards a Transformative Hermeneutics of Quantum Gravity" to the journal *Social Text*, a journal that published cultural theory. The text was filled with nonsense and Sokal's aim was to prove that as long as one used the right buzzwords and supported the same ideologies as the editors, then any nonsense could be published in cultural and literary journals (Sokal 2008).

It is true that postmodern writing was very difficult to follow, as evidenced by Butler and the Sokal hoax, however, to think that *only* postmodern writing is impenetrable is also nonsense. For instance, the bad writing contest's first award went to the philosopher Roy Bhaskar, for the following passage:

> "Indeed dialectical critical realism may be seen under the aspect of Foucauldian strategic reversal – of the unholy trinity of Parmenidean/Platonic/Aristotelean provenance; of the Cartesian-Lockean-Humean-Kantian paradigm, of foundationalisms (in practice, fideistic foundationalisms) and irrationalisms (in practice, capricious exercises of the will-to-power or some other ideologically and/or psycho-somatically buried source) new and old alike; of the primordial failing of western philosophy, ontological monovalence, and its close ally, the epistemic fallacy with its ontic dual; of the analytic problematic laid down by Plato, which Hegel served only to replicate in his actualist monovalent analytic reinstatement in transfigurative reconciling dialectical connection, while in his hubristic claims for absolute idealism he inaugurated the Comtean, Kierkegaardian and Nietzschean eclipses of reason, replicating the fundaments of positivism through its transmutation route to the superidealism of a Baudrillard" (Bhaskar 1994: 163).

Anyone who has read Bhaskar, the author of the seminal *A Realist Theory of Science* (Bhaskar 2008 [1977]), knows that there is nothing postmodern about his work. In fact, the ideology underlying his work could be considered the opposite of that of most postmodernists.

Impenetrability goes considerably beyond postmodern texts; it can be found pretty much in all of philosophy. In Germany, the work of Niklas Luhmann, for instance, was infamous for its difficulty, with translators having struggled immensely to interpret his books and many German sociologists never having fully understood his work (Luhmann 1995: xxvii). In North America, notorious for its analytical philosophy, we find completely impenetrable texts such as those of Ted Sider, which contain passages such as these:

> "There is room for disagreement over what exactly 'reconstruction' amounts to, but at a minimum: when a metaphysical theory reconstructs ordinary sentences φ_1 … as replacement sentences ψ1 …, ordinary and scientific evidence must not refute the view that, strictly speaking, it is ψ1 … rather than φ1 … that are true. The metaphysician needs reconstruction in order to face the tribunal of experience" (Sider 2008: 129).

The question is why this type of writing would ever be necessary in the first place, and this question applies to both postmodern and non-postmodern writers. Now, multiple things can be true at the same time, since several factors are involved in the context

of these types of writing. Firstly, as discussed in the previous section, theory is a specialized text and primarily for an educated audience, preferably someone who also reads and writes theory. Secondly, also addressed in the previous section, this type of writing is a form of cultural capital, it serves as a way to denote wealth of education. Thirdly, among all these complicated theory texts, especially those of the 1990s, there are instances of just bad writing – of poor grammatical construction, the overuse of buzzwords, and deliberate obscurantism. And fourthly, and what we want to elaborate on in this section, this type of writing was not only condoned, it was *incentivized*.

The writing of theory during most of the twentieth century is an attempt to explain a period of our history, that at face value, does not really make much sense historically (Badiou 2007). The morals and motivations of people changed drastically during this century, with nationalism being the main form of sovereignty in the beginning and the context in which archaeology emerged (Díaz-Andreu – Champion 2015 [1996]; Thomas 2004), for it to shift to a global form of empire towards its end (Hardt – Negri 2000; Ribeiro 2023). We see technology develop at an exponential rate, with the Wright brothers embarking on the first sustained flight in 1903, and in a less than a lifetime, we had our first successful moon landing in 1969. In the meanwhile, our mobile phones have gained so much computing power that they dwarf the computers that were used during the moon landing. In addition to all this, we see the colonial paradigm of exploitation being replaced by more complex global forms of power in the postwar period, and some decades later, we witness the collapse of the Soviet Union, marking the end of any viable communist project.

Of concern to us is precisely the period a couple of decades after the second world war. As Ronald Inglehart remarks, the 1960s and 1970s are a period of silent revolution, where western societies shift from a preoccupation with well-being and physical security to a preoccupation with quality of life (Inglehart 1977). It is a period where identities associated to land and blood are replaced by identities built upon lifestyles (Lordon 2022). Consumerism played a big role in this transition – with the growth of the economy in the postwar period, disposable income became accessible to larger swathes of the population, allowing people to denote their identity through clothes, hairstyles, hobbies, food preferences, etc. (McCracken 1988).

Not all revolutions were silent during this time. Recognizing the role that imperialist and authoritarian forms of capitalism had over its citizens, French students and workers went out to the streets to protest during the May of 1968. In the United States, protests against the war in Vietnam took unprecedented salience in the late 1960s, a time that was also marked by Woodstock, a music festival that was pivotal in how we think music and festival culture.

Despite the apparent randomness of these events and phenomena, they all make sense as a moment of transition. This was a period of economic transformation, from imperialist capitalism to late capitalism (Mandel 1975), with capitalist accumulation becoming considerably more flexible from this point onwards (Harvey 1989). It is also a period where control, hierarchies, and the patriarchy start giving way to liberation, creativity, and authenticity.

It is precisely according to these terms – liberation, creativity, and authenticity, that we must think about when it comes to the writing of theory. At first sight, it might seem that the impenetrability of postmodern writing was an isolated event, something that was inspired by a small elite within the university context, but when you zoom out, postmodern writing cannot be disconnected from a much larger context where all forms of culture also manifested tones of liberation, creative energy, and authenticity.

Modernism is marked by a rational logic – it views human history as progressive and modernist culture follows a similar logic, by providing people with better functional needs and wants. This logic, however, was constraining – it required docile and well-behaved citizens, following strict rules and dogmas. This constraining perception of cultural society is best represented in the middle-class suburban life of the US during the 1950s, with husbands commuting into the city for work, wives at home, organizing domestic life, and the houses all following a cookie-cutter layout. In France, the theorist Henri Lefebvre was instrumental during the 1960s in critiquing this soulless, fake, and authoritarian way of living (Lefebvre 1991). His work, especially his texts on the use of urban space, pointed out how governmental authorities and capitalism used urban design to constrain the actions of people,

keeping them well-behaved and segregated based on class and race.

In 1972, we witness the first instances of rejection of this constraining rational logic in architecture and urban design, with the demolition of the Pruitt-Igoe estate in St. Louis, Missouri. This estate, built during the 1950s, was designed to accommodate the local ghetto population of St. Louis, with two separate buildings, one to house the black population, and the other the white. As a project to "modernize" the poorer populations of St. Louis, it failed spectacularly, with the white population refusing to live next to the black population, and the estate falling into disrepair and becoming a hive of criminality and just overall misery (Jeffries 2021: 9). After the demolition of Pruitt-Igoe, architecture and urban design became gradually, like the economy, much more flexible, growing and developing organically, with cities developing neighbourhoods that were less segregated. This was also reflected in architecture, with postmodern buildings less concerned with formality and uniformity, such as those of Frank Gehry and Tadao Ando, marking a new age in architectural design. Rather than living the perfect life designed by governments, people wanted to live lifestyles of their own choosing. This is why liberation, creativity, and authenticity became such crucial slogans of the postmodern life – to live free from authority is to be oneself, to find meaning in one's own life. That is why, as Boltanski and Chiapello note, during the second half of the twentieth century, we see work going from more formal and logical structures to becoming more cooperative, communicative, and affective (Boltanski – Chiapello 2018).

This transition can be witnessed also in art, literature, movies, music, etc., that is to say, pretty much all forms of culture (Jameson 1991), including academic writing. Whereas writing of the modernist style was based on the idea of an author rationally directing his thoughts towards a reader, postmodern writing needed to kill the author and recognize that the reader could read and recompose the text in whatever way possible (Barthes 1967). Like architecture, writing needed to be liberated and reflect the concerns of the time, rather than the concerns of some outdated enlightened logic as to what a building or text should be.

Liberation meant several things, but in academic writing, it meant not having to rely on fixed meanings, producing texts that were infinitely interpretable, always shifting, and unstable. Thus, for many writers, this meant writing in ways that did not have to rely on rigid rules, with words representing different things to different readers. To follow strict readings was to supress the free circulation of ideas, free manipulation, free composition, decomposition, and recomposition of words (Jeffries 2021: 5). This might sound eccentric at first but bear in mind that this was what other forms of culture were already doing, with architecture combining styles of different periods, music becoming "mashed up", movies adopting tropes of multiple genres, and different food cultures becoming "fused". Rather than distinct cultures, separated by barriers, the global economy and postmodernism inaugurated a period of complete liberation, where everything, everywhere, all at once (to quote the title of a recent movie), could be experienced. Distinct cultures became a hyperculture – or as Byung-Chul Han has explained it, a culture that is mobile, fast, and exists everywhere (Han 2022a).

The liberation of writing was not only something that many academics welcomed, it was something that was demanded. In an economy that profits from creativity, the most valued worker is the one who is most creative (Suarez-Villa 2009). Writing in a clear and concise manner was viewed as being too rational and logical, and above all, uncreative. What was needed was to push the boundaries of writing to the utmost limits of comprehension, and sometimes, even beyond it.

This made sense to some extent in archaeology since we came to realize that humanity and its history were not as rational as we originally thought. The desires and wants of people vary immensely and oftentimes veer into the realm of the irrational. This "disenchantment", that is, the recognition that there is no ultimate purpose for humanity, no universal utopia that we can all partake of, was not immediately recognized with cynicism, but was rather, recognized as liberating. Thus, writing had to reflect not just the rationality of humanity, but also its irrationality – it had to express realities that, no matter how hard we try to rationalize them, do not always make sense. Linguistic styles flourished in academic settings in accordance with this liberation – poetic allusions and flowery metaphors became more common in academic writing, including archaeology.

Archaeological theory was no exception to this practice, even though it might not have gone to such extremes as some of the texts of cultural and literary theory. The association of postprocessual archaeology with postmodernism does make sense, when we see their programme as one that was seeking liberation as well, but in their case, from the constraints of processual social-evolutionary schemes, the structuralism of thinkers like Claude Levi-Strauss, and the increasingly technical discourse of processual archaeology (Hodder 1982; Shanks – Tilley 1987). At face value, there might not seem to be a connection between the postmodern critique and the postprocessual one, but there is. In the same way that contemporary peoples do not necessarily follow strict behavioural and societal logics, we should assume that past peoples must not have done so either. Therefore, social evolutionary schemes and behavioural models that assume people will behave rationally at all times could not possibly be accurate. This is an argument that remains incredibly important to this day (Graeber – Wengrow 2021).

Thus, more important than trying to find a guiding logic by which societies develop, postprocessual archaeologists found it considerably more important to highlight the immense historical variation of human history. As the horrors of the two world wars taught us, there is no linear narrative from barbarism to civilization (Adorno 1973: 320), in fact, there probably is no unifying grand narrative that unites all of humanity (Lyotard 1984), so perhaps it is best to avoid grand narratives altogether. Postprocessual archaeology sought to liberate archaeology from grand narratives, pointing out the importance of history in understanding the immense variability of human culture (Hodder 1986). During this time, thinkers of varying difficulty were introduced into archaeology – Roland Barthes, Michel Foucault, Paul Ricoeur, Anthony Giddens, Louis Althusser, Martin Heidegger, Maurice Merleau-Ponty, and Pierre Bourdieu, to name only a few. The contribution of these thinkers varies considerably, but it is safe to say, that archaeology has nonetheless benefitted from them, with concepts such as agency, practice, ideology, etc., of crucial importance to our understanding of societies past and present.

At the same time, these thinkers have made theory quite difficult to follow, since many of the concepts borrowed from these thinkers are remarkably abstract. A good example is the concept of "agency", which does not have translation in most other languages, and which archaeologists could simply not agree on (e.g. table in Dobres – Robb 2000: 9). In fact, in less than a decade, many archaeologists decided to override the concept of agency altogether, by changing its definition to include animals and objects as well (see Ribeiro 2016; Sørensen 2016). For a student or someone who is generally unfamiliar with archaeological theory, it becomes hard to justify the use of concepts that theorists seem to have a lot of trouble understanding themselves.

Until recently, the popularity of theory among the academic elite meant that many scholars were willing to subject themselves to impenetrable texts that perhaps could advance their career. However, in the meanwhile, theory has lost some degree of popularity, and students speak openly on how certain ideas do not make sense, are conveyed very poorly, or are simply terribly written. This is to be expected: alongside the modern and postmodern movement of the twentieth century, we are witnessing a new social, economic, and cultural phenomenon that has made itself felt very strongly in our new century, which is what we will be discussing in the third and final section.

4. NOTES ON WRITING THEORY TODAY

At a large-scale, modernity and postmodernity are the cultural manifestations of capitalism, regardless of the fact that they represent two different types of capitalist exploitation (Jameson 1991; Mandel 1975). At a smaller scale, postmodernity and late capitalism continue on, but they have manifested some slight developments that have become quite noticeable. As Timotheus Vermeulen and Robin van den Akker argue, many postmodern styles have now been replaced, although it is not yet entirely clear what these new styles actually are (Vermeulen – Van der Akker 2010; Radchenko 2024). Nonetheless, the writing styles of postmodern authors have fallen considerably out of fashion. Granted, it was never particularly popular outside academic circles, but the decrease in very dense theoretical texts in academia seems to be happening at the time of writing.

In 1987, a book titled *After Philosophy: End or Transformation*, edited by Kenneth Baynes, James Bohman,

and Thomas McCarthy, and involving commentary from famous philosophers from both sides of the Atlantic, was published with the intention of discussing what felt like an endpoint in the discipline of philosophy (Baynes – Bohman – McCarthy 1987). Decades later we can now say that philosophy has not ended but the tone of philosophical discourse does in fact seem like it has been transformed. One of the changes is that when we hear of philosophy today, it is not in the form of classic texts, such as those of Wittgenstein, Heidegger, or Kant, but rather, as social commentary of world events, cultural contexts, and geopolitics.

This change is best represented by Slavoj Žižek, a very popular philosopher who never misses the opportunity to write about current events, such as the covid-19 pandemic, immigration into Europe, and Big Tech (e.g. Žižek 2018; 2020). Žižek is not by any means an easy philosopher to understand, with constant references to thinkers such as Friedrich Hegel and Jacques Lacan, notoriously difficult philosophers in their own right, but he does do something very well – Žižek knows how to connect very deep philosophical thoughts with contemporary events, illustrative examples, and music and film, which facilitate the comprehension of his work. Underlying this change in philosophy is the idea that theory cannot be an abstract and isolated practice anymore, where thoughts and concepts only make sense in relation to each other. Introspection is out of fashion. For many thinkers today, to be a theorist is to talk about the world, from Starbucks to climate change, to celebrities, and mobile phones – theory should be about actuality (Descombes 1993).

For a while, the way capitalism worked allowed for very creative theoretical writing to explode onto the scene, and consequently, this provided a legitimate way of advancing one's career. Liberated writing, as described in the previous section, made sense in the last decades of the twentieth century – it was profitable and warranted as an expression of creativity and authenticity. Back in those days, one would have to go to a library or buy a book that contained the work of deep thinkers, and one would have to sit down and reflect upon the ideas contained within their books and articles. The library is a symbol of control and discipline – it requires the reader to be quiet and follow the rules of the library (Foucault 1995). Eventually, in the new millennium, not only did writing become liberated, but so did social space itself, with the library becoming replaced by the internet. Today, students do not need the library in the same way people did in the 1980s and 1990s, since students today can simply download books and articles online, in the comfort of their own home or the café.

The liberation of the intellect also meant that scholars could more easily traverse the world. Back in the 1980s and 1990s it was seen as productive to learn some foreign languages, with scholars spending time in France or Germany as an intellectual rite of passage. This type of labour mobility is even more important today, with some professions actively demanding it. Today, scientists travel considerably more than before, with many having worked in multiple countries, sometimes even multiple continents. However, this increasing intensification of travel has not necessarily meant an increase in the intensification of language learning, much on the contrary, to those who now travel intensively, there is a desire that everyone speak and write in English (Sloterdijk 2013: 260).

Rather than learning multiple modern languages, and maintaining their proficiency, it makes sense to just have one universal language, preferably English, that everyone can read, speak, and write in. There is a long history as to why English became the language of science (Gordin 2015), but English is much more than that – English is the *lingua franca* of the global economy, with it being the second language at airports, restaurants, and embassies. As Peter Sloterdijk points out, it is possible to buy many things – when travelling, one can buy or rent a jeep, one can buy a holiday house, but one cannot buy the knowledge of the language of the country one is visiting (Sloterdijk 2013: 260).

But beyond travel, the most effective form of connection today is the internet. While the library is limited in what it can offer, the internet is not. On the internet, everything, everywhere is available, all at once. It is a place of *excess*, consumerism at its most pure and extreme form. In a way, the internet is the ultimate postmodern expression – it is a place where every subject can be their authentic selves, where every person can be the perfect version of themselves. It is precisely this freedom that makes the internet what it is. This freedom manifests as people voluntarily going online and posting about themselves, whether

it is pictures of brunch, personal poetry, unboxing videos, you name it. This excess of information is what capitalism exploits today.

As Han explains, the capitalist technologies of power today are not repressive, much on the contrary, they want the subject to be as free as possible, because freedom means more people will post more content online, such as through social media, but also because freedom means more consumerism. In other words, today's form of power does not restrict freedom, *it exploits it* (Han 2022b: 7). In this world of excess, the rational logic of modernity is long gone, not because it was critiqued by postmodernists, but simply because people do not have enough time for it. So, how is this expressed in media? For instance, publicity, instead of explaining why a certain beer is better than another, advertises its beer as happy moments, as friends, as celebration. Rather than arguing that a beer is better than its competitors, advertising companies associate a beer to certain emotions – the advertising is designed to *affect* you, not inform you (Han 2022b: 19). Instilling an emotion, through a combination of music, images, and a few words is considerably faster, easier, and cheaper than trying to convince you of something through rational argument. Wars do not need to be debated in terms of geopolitics and economy – all one needs is to show pictures of wounded children in order to gain support for your side. The excess of information has made the most exciting and shocking information prevail instead of the smartest or most logical.

In a study of the management and perception of time in late capitalism, Jonathan Crary has pointed out that today's society sleeps an average of 1.5 hours less than a generation ago, and almost 3 hours less than in the early twentieth century (Crary 2013: 11). Through technologies that allow for the day to continue longer beyond daylight, the heavy consumption of coffee and other stimulants, and the blue light emitting from computer and phone screens, we have suppressed the need for sleep, since there is so much one must do nowadays. The late capitalist lifestyles demand constant attention towards your work, your family, your health, your diet, your hobbies, world politics, holidays, all forms of contemporary culture, and so on. This has been made possible through the creation of a 24/7 economy, where we can now enjoy the existence of 24-hour supermarkets, 24-hour gyms, and 24-hour workdays, and of course the internet, which never sleeps and never forgets. The collapse of the natural day-night rhythm and its rituals is motivated by a desire to be always alert, connected, and aware. That is why the most prevalent form of anxiety today is FOMO, or Fear of Missing Out. In such a world, our attention becomes a valued commodity.

This constant vying for attention has led to the rise of the main disease of the twenty-first century – the burnout (Han 2015). In a world where attention spans have been burnt to a crisp, the economy will favour those things that can affect people's attention most effectively and most quickly. Immediate gratification is a response to this – fast food, Tik Tok videos, Amazon prime deliveries need to provide you with a service or content as quickly as possible, since everyone is constantly distracted (Fisher 2009). In such a world, theory, which often requires slow and deliberate reflection becomes irrelevant.

Just as philosophy needed to adapt to the demands of the twenty-first century, it seems reasonable to say that theory, in general, needs to adapt as well, since very dense texts and cryptic metaphors cannot capture people's attention anymore. Archaeology, in particular, has a wide variety of specializations today and students, for example, can simply "shop" for the specializations that they find easier to learn, more interesting, and more profitable. Theory cannot simply be imposed from above – there is already an excess of books and articles on a wide variety of subjects, so if a student refuses to learn theory, there is nothing one can do. In the attention economy of today, Foucault and Heidegger have stopped being sexy – they are simply burdens one must submit to in order to obtain a degree in the humanities. To be fair, many theory books and articles are still written and published today, but how long will this last? Publishers make a profit by selling books and articles to students, but if those books and articles become too complicated for shortened attention spans to follow, publishers will simply stop publishing them.

Furthermore, in a diverse and multicultural world, it was expected that there would be multiple schools of archaeological theory, dispersed across various countries, embracing multiple languages. While some countries do have an active theory school, the

dominant language of theory is still English – anyone who wants to be taken seriously and discuss theory across borders has to write in English. In a way, this forces theory to be simpler, since not everyone writes in English with the same degree of competency.

In archaeology, the intellectual inheritors of post-processual archaeology are the posthumanists, who have published and gained some degree of popularity in recent years. In terms of writing, it does not seem that the posthumanists differ markedly from postmodern writers. As Terry Eagleton points out, the difference between postmodernists and posthumanists is that they have simply replaced the concept of "text" with the concept of "object" (Eagleton 2016: 11). Like postmodern writing, posthumanist writing is often riddled with difficult jargon. For instance, in a popular posthumanist book, "materiality" is described as "always something more than 'mere' matter: an excess, force, vitality, relationality, or difference that renders matter active, self-creative, productive, unpredictable" (Coole – Frost 2010: 9). These difficult to follow texts are, of course, also present today in archaeology, with Alexandra Ion calling out the poetic language in which some topics are discussed, such as climate change and the Anthropocene (Ion 2018). Ion does have a point; archaeology, including archaeological theory, could be a powerful tool in providing today's society with long-term insights on how societies dealt with climate change, but this can never happen if we wrap our discussions of these topics in lyrical and cryptic metaphors (Ion 2018: 198). To an extent, the writing style that Ion is critiquing is also a reaction to the fast-paced world of today, hiding some very complicated topics behind the buzzwords *du jour*, rather than explaining them fully (Ribeiro – Giamakis 2023: 16). But when faced with the dilemma of acceleration, of having to produce at a much faster rate than usual, would it not be easier to just write more simply rather than through jargon and buzzwords? This is also a complaint made by Alf Hornborg, who is unsatisfied with the fact that many in the humanities only seem to be able to comment on real world issues through evocative allusions, poetic metaphors, and unbridled associations (Hornborg 2017). Like Ion, Hornborg is largely right – ultimately, climate change is a real issue that requires us to discuss financial investments, fossil fuels, sea temperatures, government policies, all things that need to be very clear and unambiguous.

Naturally, it is not nice that archaeological theory needs to simplify its language to some degree because of the fast-paced and attention-grabbing world of today, but at the same time, it is good that it is happening at all. Ultimately, a simpler way of writing and disseminating theory helps raise its popularity, making it easier for students and non-theoretically inclined scholars to embrace it. Also, by being less abstract, it becomes easier for theorists to address concerns of today, such as the rise of authoritarianism across the world, the war in Ukraine, and the aftereffects of the covid-19 pandemic. No matter how useful one thinks Latour, Deleuze, and Heidegger can be, their work was not explicitly designed to deal with these specific historical events. We cannot simply expect the non-theory population to spend years of their lives learning the ins-and-outs of theory. That is elitist. For outsiders to embrace theory we must make it relatable – we must be able to describe both the past and present in ways and through terms they can understand, while simultaneously keeping it intellectually rich and clear.

5. CONCLUSION

Despite my own opinions on the writing of archaeological theory, some of which shone through in parts of the paper, my aim was to understand why theory is written in the way it commonly is. Central to that aim is an underlying idea that remains underexplored in archaeology – the way we structure our research, archaeology departments, funding proposals, and above all, our writing, is influenced by the socio-economic contexts we live under. As Fredric Jameson once put it, our imagination is often held hostage by our modes of production (Jameson 2007: xiii).

The naïve idea that archaeological theorists simply wake up one day and a new idea just pops into their heads is obviously nonsense. The ideas that "pop into our heads" come from somewhere – from our economy, our society, and historical context. As Hodder pointed out, "much of archaeology uses the past to play out the contemporary preoccupations of dominant groups and to regurgitate the present in their interests" (Hodder 2018: 43). It is no surprise that theoretical ideas, like actor-network theory, relationality, and globalization theory appeared in a period

of global network expansion, the appearance of the internet, and the mainstream use of social media. Similarly, the obsession with things and materiality cannot be disconnected from an economic phase dominated by consumer choice. Also, it should not be surprising that posthumanism (or postanthropocentrism) became popular precisely when technology like computers and mobile phones came to dominate our lives. Finally, all the talk about affect and affective behaviour is due to the fact that we now have shortened attention spans. In short, theory does not exist outside of contemporary social and economic influences.

This does not mean, of course, that we are defined exclusively by our socio-economic context, rather, it is precisely that same context that provides the elbow room in which we write. At a time of increasing political awareness, one where we can see through the spectacle that is social life today (Debord 1992 [1967]), theory should not be an obscurantist practice produced in ivory towers, because we are not superior to those we describe through our theories. Theory, above all, should be about people and for the people – something that, to a degree, everyone should be able to understand and relate to.

Funding Information

This contribution was written in the framework of the Excellence Cluster ROOTS — Social, Environmental and Cultural connectivity in Past Societies, with funding from the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) under Germany's Excellence Strategy — EXC 2150–390870439.

Bibliography

ADORNO, T. W. (1973) – *Negative dialectics.* London and New York.

BADIOU, A. (2007) – *The Century.* Cambridge.

BARTHES, R. (1967) – La mort de l'auteur. *Aspen*, 5-6: s/p.

BAYNES, K. – BOHMAN, J. – MCCARTHY, T. (1987) – *After philosophy: end or transformation?* Cambridge, MA.

BHASKAR, R. (1994) – *Plato Etc. Problems of Philosophy and their Resolution*. London and New York.

BHASKAR, R. (2008 [1977]) – *A Realist Theory of Science.* London and New York.

BINFORD, L. R. (1962) – Archaeology as Anthropology. *American Antiquity,* 28: 217-225.

BOLTANSKI, L. – CHIAPELLO, E. (2018) – *The New Spirit of Capitalism.* London.

BOURDIEU, P. (2010 [1984]) – *Distinction: a social critique of the judgement of taste.* London and New York.

BUTLER, J. (1997) – Further Reflections on Conversations of Our Time. *Diacritics*, 27(1): 13–15.

COOLE, D. H. – FROST, S. (2010) – *New materialisms: ontology, agency, and politics.* Durham, NC.

CRARY, J. (2013) – *24/7: Late Capitalism and the Ends of Sleep.* London and New York.

DEBORD, G. (1992 [1967]) – *The Society of the Spectacle.* London.

DELEUZE, G. – GUATTARI, F. (1983) – *Anti-Oedipus: capitalism and schizophrenia.* Minneapolis, MN.

DELEUZE, G. – GUATTARI, F. (1987) – *A Thousand Plateaus: capitalism and schizophrenia,* Minneapolis, MN.

DESCOMBES, V. (1993) – *The Barometer of Modern Reason: On the Philosophies of Current Events*. New York and Oxford.

DÍAZ-ANDREU, M. – CHAMPION, T. (2015 [1996]) – *Nationalism and Archaeology in Europe.* London and New York.

DOBRES, M.-A. – ROBB, J. E. (2000) – Agency in archaeology: Paradigm of Platitude? In DOBRES, M.-A. – ROBB, J. E. (eds.) - *Agency in archaeology.* London and New York: 3-17.

DUFFY, E. (2009) – *The speed handbook: velocity, pleasure, modernism.* Durham, NC.

DUNNELL, R. C. (1982) – The Harvey Lecture Series: Science, Social Science, and Common Sense: The Agonizing Dilemma of Modern Archaeology. *Journal of Anthropological Research,* 38: 1-25.

EAGLETON, T. (2016) – *Materialism.* New Haven, CT and London.

ESKELSON, T. C. (2021) – States, Institutions, and Literacy Rates in Early-Modern Western Europe. *Journal of Education and Learning*, 10(2): 109-123.

FAHLANDER, F. (2012) – Are We There Yet? Archaeology and the Postmodern in the New Millennium. *Current Swedish Archaeology,* 20: 109-129.

FISHER, M. (2009) – *Capitalist realism: is there no alternative?* Ropley.

FLANNERY, K. V. (1972) – The cultural evolution of civilizations. *Annual review of ecology and systematics,* 3: 399-426.

FOUCAULT, M. (1995). *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. New York.

FUKUYAMA, F. (1992) – *The End of History and the Last Man.* New York.

GORDIN, M. D. (2015) – *Scientific Babel: how science was done before and after global English.* Chicago and London.

GRAEBER, D. – WENGROW, D. (2021) – *The Dawn of Everything*. New York.

HAN, B.-C. (2015) – *The Burnout Society.* Palo Alto, CA.

HAN, B.-C. (2022a) – *Hyperculture: culture and globalization.* Cambridge.

HAN, B.-C. (2022b) – *Infocracy: digitalization and the crisis of democracy.* Cambridge.

HARDT, M. – NEGRI, A. (2000) – *Empire.* Cambridge, MA.

HARRIS, O. J. T. – CIPOLLA, C. N. (2017) – *Archaeological Theory in the New Millennium.* London and New York.

HARVEY, D. (1989) – *The condition of postmodernity: an enquiry into the origins of cultural change.* Oxford.

HARVEY, D. (2005) – *Brief History of Neoliberalism.* Oxford.

HODDER, I. (1982) – Theoretical archaeology: a reactionary view. In HODDER, I. (ed.) – *Symbolic and Structural Archaeology*. Cambridge: 1-16.

HODDER, I. (1986) – *Reading the Past*. Cambridge.

HODDER, I. (2001) – *Archaeological theory today.* Cambridge.

HODDER, I. (2018) – Big History and a post-truth archaeology. *The SAA Archaeological Record,* 18: 43-45.

HORNBORG, A. (2017) – Dithering while the planet burns: Anthropologists' approaches to the Anthropocene. *Reviews in Anthropology,* 46: 61-77.

INGLEHART, R. (1977) – *The Silent Revolution: changing values and political styles among western publics.* Princeton, NJ.

ION, A. (2018) – A taphonomy of a dark Anthropocene. A response to Þóra Pétursdóttir's OOO-inspired 'Archaeology and Anthropocene'. *Archaeological Dialogues,* 25: 191-203.

JAMESON, F. (1991) – *Postmodernism, or, The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*. Durham, NC.

JAMESON, F. (2007) – *Archaeologies of the future: the desire called utopia and other science fictions.* London.

JEFFRIES, S. (2021) – *Everything, all the time, everywhere: how we became post-modern.* London.

JOHNSON, M. (1999) – *Archaeological theory: an introduction.* Oxford.

LEFEBVRE, H. (1991) – *A critique of everyday life.* London.

LORDON, F. D. R. (2022) – *Imperium: structures and affects of political bodies*. London.

LUHMANN, N. (1995) – *Social Systems*. Palo Alto.

LUCAS, G. (2021) – *Archaeological Situations*. London and New York.

LYOTARD, J.-F. (1984) – *The postmodern condition: a report on knowledge.* Manchester.

MANDEL, E. (1975) – *Late capitalism*. New York.

MARTÍNEZ, E. – MOLLICA, F. – GIBSON, E. (2024) – Even laypeople use legalese. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 121(35): e2405564121

MCCRACKEN, G. D. (1988) – *Culture and consumption: new approaches to the symbolic character of consumer goods and activities.* Bloomington, IN.

MIZOGUCHI, K. (2015) – A future of archaeology. *Antiquity,* 89: 12-22.

RADCHENKO, S. (2024). Are We Metamodern? The Structure of Today's Archaeology from the Perspective of Cultural Studies. *Norwegian Archaeological Review*, 57(2): 145–162.

RIBEIRO, A. (2016) – Against object agency. A counterreaction to Sørensen's 'Hammers and nails'. *Archaeological Dialogues,* 23: 229-235.

RIBEIRO, A. (2022) – Methodological Anarchism Against Interdisciplinary Archaeology. *Forum Kritische Archäologie,* 11: 93-105.

RIBEIRO, A. (2023) – Postmodernity: Archaeology in Late Capitalist Times. *Norwegian Archaeological Review,* 56: 123-139.

RIBEIRO, A. – GIAMAKIS, C. (2023) – On Class and Elitism in Archaeology. *Open Archaeology,* 9: 1-22.

ROSER, M. – ORTIZ-OSPINA, E. (2018) – *Literacy*. Published online at OurWorldInData.org. Retrieved from: 'https://ourworldindata.org/literacy' [Online Resource, consulted on 01/11/2024]

SCHIFFER, M. B. (1988) – The Structure of Archaeological Theory. *American Antiquity,* 53: 461-485.

SHANKS, M. – TILLEY, C. (1987) – *Re-constructing archaeology: theory and practice*. London and New York.

SIDER, T. (2008) – Monism and Statespace Structure. In LE POIDEVIN, R. (ed.) – *Being: Developments in Contemporary Metaphysics.* Cambridge: 129-150.

SLOTERDIJK, P. (2013) – *In the World Interior of Capital: for a philosophical theory of globalization*. Cambridge.

SOKAL, A. D. (2008) – *Beyond the hoax: science, philosophy and culture*. Oxford and New York.

SØRENSEN, T. F. (2016) – Hammers and nails. A response to Lindstrøm and to Olsen and Witmore. *Archaeological Dialogues,* 23: 115-127.

SUAREZ-VILLA, L. (2009) – *Technocapitalism: a critical perspective on technological innovation and corporatism.* Philadelphia.

THOMAS, J. (2004) – *Archaeology and Modernity.* London and New York.

TODD, S. (2015) – *The People: The Rise and Fall of the Working Class, 1910-2010*. London.

TRIGGER, B. G. (2006) – *A History of Archaeological Thought*. Cambridge, 2nd Ed.

VERMEULEN, T. – VAN DEN AKKER, R. (2010) – Notes on metamodernism. *Journal of Aesthetics & Culture,* 2: 5677.

WYLIE, A. (1989) – Matters of fact and matters of interest. In SHENNAN, S. (ed.) – *Archaeological Approaches to Cultural Identity*. London and New York: 94-109.

ŽIŽEK, S. (2018) – *Like A Thief In Broad Daylight: Power in the Era of Post-Humanity*. London.

ŽIŽEK, S. (2020) – *Pandemic!: COVID-19 Shakes the World*. Cambridge.

POLÍTICA EDITORIAL

Objectivos

A Ophiussa – Revista do Centro de Arqueologia da Universidade de Lisboa foi iniciada sob a direcção de Victor S. Gonçalves em 1996, tendo sido editado o volume 0. A partir do volume 1 (2017), a Revista Ophiussa converteu-se numa edição impressa e digital da UNIARQ – Centro de Arqueologia da Universidade de Lisboa (ISSN 1645-653X / E-ISSN 2184-173X). Em 2025, a revista deixou de ser publicada em formato impresso, passando a disponibilizar-se exclusivamente em versão digital, em acesso aberto, em https://ophiussa.letras.ulisboa.pt

O principal objectivo desta revista é a publicação e divulgação de trabalhos com manifesto interesse, qualidade e rigor científico sobre temas de Pré-História e Arqueologia, sobretudo do território europeu e da bacia do Mediterrâneo.

Periodicidade

A Ophiussa – Revista do Centro de Arqueologia da Universidade de Lisboa publicará um volume anual. O período de submissão de trabalhos decorrerá sempre no primeiro semestre e a edição ocorrerá no último trimestre de cada ano.

Secções da revista

A revista divide-se em duas secções: artigos científicos e recensões bibliográficas. Excepcionalmente poderão ser aceites textos de carácter introdutório, no âmbito de homenagens ou divulgações específicas, que não serão submetidos à avaliação por pares. Isentas desta avaliação estão também as recensões bibliográficas.

Os autores / editores que pretendam apresentar uma obra para recensão devem enviar dois exemplares para a direcção da Revista Ophiussa: um para o autor/autora da recensão que será convidado para o efeito e outro para a Biblioteca da Faculdade de Letras da Universidade de Lisboa. Aceita-se igualmente a apresentação de propostas de recensões espontâneas.

Aceitam-se trabalhos redigidos em português, inglês, espanhol, italiano e francês.

Processo de avaliação por pares

Os artigos submetidos são sujeitos a um processo de avaliação por parte de revisores externos (double blind peer review).

Todas as submissões (artigos e recensões) serão avaliadas, em primeira instância, pela Coordenação Editorial, no que respeita ao seu conteúdo formal e à sua adequação face à política editorial e às normas de edição da revista. Os artigos que cumprirem estes requisitos serão posteriormente submetidos a um processo de avaliação por pares cega / double blind peer review (mínimo de dois revisores). O Conselho Científico, constituído pela direcção da UNIARQ e por investigadores externos, acompanhará o processo de edição.

Esta etapa será concretizada por investigadores externos qualificados, sendo os respectivos pareceres entregues num período não superior a três meses. Os revisores procederão à avaliação de forma objectiva, tendo em vista a qualidade do conteúdo da revista; as suas críticas, sugestões e comentários serão, na medida do possível, construtivos, respeitando as capacidades intelectuais do(s) autor(es). Após a recepção dos pareceres, o(s) autor(es) tem um prazo máximo de um mês para proceder às alterações oportunas e reenviar o trabalho.

A aceitação ou recusa de artigos terá como únicos factores de ponderação a sua originalidade e qualidade científica.

O processo de revisão é confidencial, estando assegurado o anonimato dos avaliadores e dos autores dos trabalhos, neste último caso até à data da sua publicação.

Os trabalhos só serão aceites para publicação a partir do momento em que se conclua o processo da revisão por pares. Os textos que não forem aceites serão devolvidos aos seus autores.

A lista dos avaliadores será publicada em ciclos de 3 anos, indicada no final da Revista Ophiussa (versão impressa e digital).

Ética na publicação

A Revista Ophiussa segue as orientações estabelecidas pelo Commitee on Publication Ethics (COPE, Comité de Ética em Publicações): https://publicationethics.org/

Apenas serão publicados artigos originais. Para efeito de detecção de plágio ou duplicidade será utilizada a plataforma URKUNDU (https://www.urkund.com/pt-br/). Serão rejeitadas práticas como a deformação ou invenção de dados. Os autores têm a responsabilidade de garantir que os trabalhos são originais e inéditos, fruto do consenso de todos os autores e cumprem com a legalidade vigente, dispondo de todas autorizações necessárias. Os artigos que não cumpram com estas normas éticas serão rejeitados.

As colaborações submetidas para publicação devem ser inéditas. As propostas de artigo não podem incluir qualquer problema de falsificação ou de plágio. As ilustrações que não sejam do(s) autor(es) devem indicar a sua procedência. O Conselho Científico e a Coordenação Editorial assumem que os autores solicitaram e receberam autorização para a reprodução dessas ilustrações, e, como tal, rejeitam a responsabilidade do uso não autorizado das ilustrações e das consequências legais por infracção de direitos de propriedade intelectual.

É assumido que todos os Autores fizeram uma contribuição relevante para a pesquisa reportada e concordam com o manuscrito submetido. Os Autores devem declarar de forma clara eventuais conflitos de interesse. As colaborações submetidas que, direta ou indiretamente, tiveram o apoio económico de terceiros, devem claramente declarar essas fontes de financiamento.

Os textos propostos para publicação devem ser inéditos e não deverão ter sido submetidos a qualquer outra revista ou edição electrónica.

O conteúdo dos trabalhos é da inteira responsabilidade do(s) autor(es) e não expressa a posição ou opinião do Conselho Científico ou da Coordenação Editorial.

O processo editorial decorrerá de forma objectiva, imparcial e anónima. Erros ou problemas detetados após a publicação serão investigados e, se comprovados, haverá lugar à publicação de correções, retratações e/ou respostas.

Serão considerados os seguintes princípios éticos:

1) RESPONSABILIDADE
A Revista Ophiussa através dos editores e autores tem a responsabilidade absoluta de aprovação, condenando todas as más práticas da publicação científica.

2) FRAUDE CIENTÍFICA:
A Revista Ophiussa procurará detectar manipulação e falsificação de dados, plágio ou duplicidade, com os mecanismos de detecção adequados.

3) POLÍTICA EDITORIAL E PROCEDIMENTOS
a) Os autores devem ter participado no processo de investigação e do processo de revisão, devendo garantir que os dados incluídos são reais e autênticos e estando obrigados a emitir retracções e correcções de erros de artigos publicados;
b) Os revisores devem efectuar uma revisão objectiva e confidencial e não ter conflitos de interesse (investigação, autores ou financiadores), devendo indicar obras publicadas relevantes que não foram citadas;
c) Na detecção de fraude ou má prática em fase de avaliação deve ser indicada pelos revisores e na fase de pós publicação por qualquer leitor.
d) Em caso de detecção de más práticas em fase de avaliação ou de detecção de artigos publicados previamente, o Conselho Editorial remeterá a ocorrência ao autor estabelecendo um prazo de 7 dias para esclarecimento, sendo posteriormente avaliada pelo Conselho de Redacção. Em fase de pós publicação, o Conselho Editorial poderá arquivar ou determinar a retratação num número seguinte, indicando-se os trâmites prévios.

Política de preservação de arquivos digitais
A revista garante a acessibilidade permanente dos objectos digitais através de cópias de segurança, utilização de DOI, integrando a rede Public Knowledge Project's Private LOCKSS Network (PKP-PLN), que gera um sistema de arquivo descentralizado.
Relativamente ao auto-arquivo, a revista integra também o Sherpa/Romeu
(https://v2.sherpa.ac.uk/id/publication/41841).

Política de acesso aberto
Esta edição disponibiliza de imediato e gratuitamente a totalidade dos seus conteúdos, em acesso aberto, de forma a promover, globalmente, a circulação e intercâmbio dos resultados da investigação científica e do conhecimento. A edição segue as directrizes Creative Commons (licença CC/BY/NC/ND 4.0).
A publicação de textos na Ophiussa – Revista do Centro de Arqueologia da Universidade de Lisboa não implica o pagamento de qualquer taxa nem dá direito a qualquer remuneração económica.

Para mais informações contactar:
ophiussa@letras.ulisboa.pt

EDITORIAL POLICY

Objectives
Ophiussa – Revista do Centro de Arqueologia da Universidade de Lisboa started under the direction of Victor S. Gonçalves in 1996, with the edition of volume 0. After Volume 1 (2017) it became a printed and digital edition of UNIARQ – Centro de Arqueologia da Universidade de Lisboa (ISSN 1645-653X / E-ISSN 2184-173X). In 2025, the journal ceased to be published in print format and became available exclusively in digital, open-access form at https://ophiussa.letras.ulisboa.pt
The main objective of this journal is the publication and dissemination of papers of interest, quality and scientific rigor concerning Prehistory and Archeology, mostly from Europe and the Mediterranean basin.

Periodicity
Ophiussa – Revista do Centro de Arqueologia da Universidade de Lisboa will publish an annual volume. The submission period will always occur in the first quarter of each year and the edition will occur in the last quarter.

Journal sections
The journal is divided into two sections: scientific articles and bibliographic reviews. Exceptionally, texts of an introductory nature may be accepted, in the context of specific tributes or divulgations, which will not be submitted to peer-review evaluation. Exemptions from this evaluation are also the bibliographic reviews.
Authors / editors wishing to submit a book for review should send two copies to the direction of Revista Ophiussa: one to the author of the review who will be invited for the purpose and another to the Library of the School of Arts and Humanities of the University of Lisbon. Spontaneous proposals are also accepted.
Papers written in Portuguese, English, Spanish, Italian and French are accepted.

Peer review process
Submitted articles are subject to a double blind peer-review evaluation process.
All submissions (articles and reviews) will be considered, in the first instance, by the Editorial Board, regarding its formal content and adequacy in face of the editorial policy and the journal editing standards. Articles that meet these requirements will subsequently be submitted to a blind peer-review process (minimum of two reviewers). The Scientific Council, constituted by UNIARQ direction and external researchers, will follow the editing process.
This stage will be carried out by qualified researchers, and their feedback will be delivered within a period of no more than two months. The reviewers will carry out the evaluation in an objective manner, in view of the quality and content of the journal; their criticisms, suggestions and comments will be, as far as possible, constructive, respecting the intellectual abilities of the author(s). After receiving the feedback, the author(s) has a maximum period of one month to make the necessary changes and resubmit the work.

Acceptance or refusal of articles will have as sole factors of consideration their originality and scientific quality.
The review process is confidential, with the anonymity of the evaluators and authors of the works being ensured, in the latter case, up to the date of its publication.
Papers will only be accepted for publication as soon as the peer review process is completed. Texts that are not accepted will be returned to their authors.
The list of reviewers will be published in 3-year cycles, indicated at the end of *Ophiussa* (printed and digital version).

Publication ethics

The Journal Ophiussa follows the guidelines established by the Commitee on Publication Ethics (COPE, the Ethics Committee Publications): https://publicationethics.org/
Only original papers will be published. For the purpose of detecting plagiarism or duplicity, the URKUNDU platform (https://www.urkund.com/pt-br/) will be used. Practices such as the deformation or invention of data will be rejected.
Authors are responsible for ensuring that the works are original and unpublished, the result of the consensus of all authors, and comply with current legality, having all necessary authorizations. Articles that do not comply with these ethical standards will be rejected.
Contributions submitted for publication must be unpublished. Article submissions can not include any problem of forgery or plagiarism. Illustrations that are not from the author(s) must indicate their origin. The Scientific Council and Editorial Board assume that the authors have requested and received permission to reproduce these illustrations and, as such, reject the responsibility for the unauthorized use of the illustrations and legal consequences for infringement of intellectual property rights.
It is assumed that all Authors have made a relevant contribution to the reported research and agree with the manuscript submitted. Authors must clearly state any conflicts of interest. Collaborations submitted that directly or indirectly had the financial support of third parties must clearly state these sources of funding.
Texts proposed for publication must be unpublished and should not have been submitted to any other journal or electronic edition.
The content of the works is entirely the responsibility of the author(s) and does not express the position or opinion of the Scientific Council or Editorial Board.
The editorial process will be conducted objectively, impartially and anonymously. Errors or problems detected after publication will be investigated and, if proven, corrections, retractions and / or responses will be published.
The following ethical principles will be considered:

1) RESPONSIBILITY:
Ophiussa through its editors and authors has the absolute responsibility for approval, condemning all bad practices of scientific publication.

2) SCIENTIFIC FRAUD
Ophiussa will seek to detect manipulation and falsification of data, plagiarism or duplicity, with the appropriate detection mechanisms.

3) Editorial policy and procedures:
a) Authors must have participated in the research process and in the review process, and must ensure that the data included is real and authentic and are obliged to issue retractions and corrections of errors of published articles;
b) Reviewers must carry out an objective and confidential review and have no conflicts of interest (research, authors or funders), and must indicate relevant published works that were not cited;
c) In the detection of fraud or malpractice in the evaluation phase, it must be indicated by the reviewers and in the post-publication phase by any reader.
d) In case of detection of bad practices in the evaluation phase or of detection of previously published articles, the Editorial Board will send the occurrence to the author, establishing a period of 7 days for clarification, which will be subsequently evaluated by the Editorial Board. In the post-publication phase, the Editorial Board may file or determine the retraction in a subsequent issue, indicating the previous procedures.

Digital file preservation policy

The journal guarantees the permanent accessibility of digital objects through backup copies and use of DOI, integrating the Public Knowledge Project's Private LOCKSS Network (PKP-PLN), which generates a decentralized file system.
Regarding the self-archiving, the magazine also includes Sherpa/Romeu
(https://v2.sherpa.ac.uk/id/publication/41841).

Open access policy

This edition immediately and freely provides all of its content, in open access, in order to promote global circulation and exchange of scientific research and knowledge. If follows Creative Commons guidelines (license CC/BY/NC/ND 4.0).
The publication of texts in *Ophiussa* – Revista do Centro de Arqueologia da Universidade de Lisboa does not imply the payment of any fee nor does it entitle to any economic remuneration.

For more information contact:
ophiussa@letras.ulisboa.pt

OPHIUSSA
REVISTA DO CENTRO DE ARQUEOLOGIA DA UNIVERSIDADE DE LISBOA
9 - 2025

ÍNDICE