

伊安霍德教授访谈录

(请提供个人**CV**及一张照片)

1. 请介绍一下您的学术经历，是何原因让您选择将考古学作为终身职业？

Could you make an introduction of your academic experience? Why do you choose archaeology as your life-work?

I became interested in archaeology at high school and I started going on excavations in Britain and Europe before attending university. I enjoyed the travel and the social life and the intellectual puzzle of working out the layers and how they could be interpreted. So I then studied archaeology in London where I was an undergraduate and in Cambridge for my PhD.

2. 在您的师辈中，哪些人对您的影响最大？

Among the older generation, who influenced you the most?

Certainly Gordon Childe was an important early influence, both in terms of his focus on cultures and his Marxism. Later I started to read archaeologists such as Collingwood and Grahame Clark but it was Childe who had the most impact.

3. 当年您的博士论文题目是什么？为何作这样的选题？

What's the theme of your doctoral thesis? How did you choose the topic?

My doctoral thesis was on the application of techniques of statistical geographical analysis in archaeology, especially to Roman Britain. This work was published as 'Spatial Analysis in Archaeology' (Cambridge University Press, with Clive Orton in 1976). I chose the topic because it offered new ways of rigorous analysis of the types of cultural maps that had been of such interest to Childe and others.

4. 您似乎并不同意考古学就是人类学的观点，为什么？你如何评价“新考古学”（或“过程考古学”）？如何评价Lewis Binford？如何评价David Clarke？他们有没有给我们留下还值得我们关注的学术遗产？

It seems that you do not agree with the view of "Archaeology as anthropology", why? What's your comment on "new archaeology" (or Processual

Archaeology?) , Lewis Binford and David Clarke? Are there any academic heritage left by them that still worthy of our special attention?

I have never accepted the view that 'archaeology is anthropology' because such a view seems to contrast anthropology with history. In Europe archaeology is more closely tied to history and of course there are many historians such as Marx or Weber or Braudel who have described general historical processes. I agree with processual archaeologists that archaeologists need to generalize, but these generalizations need to be formed by historical sensitivities as well as by anthropological comparisons. Archaeology deals in deep time. It is wrong to subsume this temporal dimension into cross-cultural comparison. There is much in processual archaeology that has remained and is of value, especially the careful scrutiny of how archaeologists make hypotheses about the past. Processual archaeology has allowed a much broader and more sophisticated approach in the discipline, but the focus on archaeology as anthropology has limited the scope of archaeology.

5. 在考古学界，提起您的名字便会与“后过程主义考古学（PPA）”、“情境考古学（Contextual Archaeology）”等概念和理论相联系。请问，是什么让您对“过程主义考古学（PA）”进行反思？并提出了“后过程主义”学说？当初您提出这个学说在学术界产生了很大的反响，我们想知道，您遇到过什么麻烦吗？您如何看待反对意见？

Your name is always connected to the concepts and theories of “Processual Archaeology”, “Contextual Archaeology” and so on. Could you let us know what caused your rethinking the Processual Archaeology, and raised the theories of Post Processual Archaeology, which met tremendous response within the academic circle. Did you meet any trouble and how do you see the different voices?

The main problems with Processual Archaeology, as I saw them, derived from the rejection of history, as I have described above. By taking an exclusively and narrowly anthropological perspective, Processual archaeologists sought to

explain all human behavior in terms of universal laws or generalizations. But it quickly became apparent that few such laws could be identified, and those that could be isolated were very simple, dealing with depositional and post-depositional practices. The approach seemed to be taking all the interest out of archaeology. A historical approach that paid close attention to the ways in which specific ways of life unfolded seemed to have more potential, even if that meant dealing with issues such as meaning, experience and embodiment.

The Post Processual Archaeology (PPA) that developed also embraced history in the sense that it developed a critique of the objectivity and universality of the archaeological record. Each age writes its own archaeology and a mature archaeology needed to be able to engage in critique and reflection on the production of knowledge.

Both these sets of ideas dealing with history in archaeology were met with a good amount of criticism when PPA started. The ideas came to be more readily accepted within Britain and northern Europe than in America. Processual Archaeology had a stronger hold in the United States, and in addition a comparative cross-cultural approach seemed more relevant there. The main reason for the latter is that historical ties to the distant American past are those of native Americans. As native Americans have increasingly taken control of their own archaeology in recent decades so here too a collaborative and participatory archaeology has gradually emerged, linked to the growth of indigenous archaeologies worldwide.

6. 据说您在给年轻学生们讲授考古学方法论时，往往会将传统考古学、“过程考古学”和“后过程考古学”三种理论体系加以对比。您认为这种三分法目前还合适吗？

We heard that you often compare the three systems of traditional archaeology, “Processual Archaeology” and “Post Processual Archaeology”, when give lectures on the methodology of archaeology to young students, do you think the division is still proper at the moment.

I do not think it has much contemporary relevance but I do think it is important

to understand the historical development of contemporary approaches in archaeology. Many current approaches are influenced by one side or the other of the Processual – Post Processual debates. Some current approaches remain more universalist and others more contextual, some focus on behavior and others on agency, some focus on the natural and anthropological sciences and others on the social construction of the past. In the bewildering proliferation of approaches in contemporary archaeology the clear divides between Processual and Post Processual have largely disappeared, but it is important for students to understand the main themes and tensions that lie within the diversity.

7. 您在挖掘Çatalhöyük遗址时，曾采用“后过程”理论解释一些考古现象，这个方法成功吗？如今您如何看待这个学说？它是否已经过时了？

When excavating the site of Çatalhöyük, you used Post Processual explanation to interpret some archaeological phenomenon. Is it successful? Now how do you see the theory? Whether it has been out-of-time?

At Çatalhöyük we have been using a series of reflexive methodologies in the excavation, and analysis of data. These methods include emphasizing ‘interpretation at the trowel’s edge’, multivocality, the documenting of the documentation process, and the use of new media techniques. We have certainly had many difficulties introducing the new techniques, mainly because most field archaeologists are very loathe to change the way they do things. Some of our attempts have not been successful. But recently we have made several breakthroughs in our methods and I am very pleased with the results. I do think it is possible to argue that reflexive methods lead to fuller and more thorough recording of archaeological materials, leading to results that are more open to scrutiny and more useable by future generations of archaeologists. I think especially the addition of diary writing in addition to codified forms, the use of daily sketches that record the excavation process, the integration of multiple types of specialist on the site as excavation proceeds, the use of video and 3D visualization – all these have proven very

useful and productive techniques.

8. 您长期从事近东考古，并连续在Çatalhöyük遗址进行发掘研究，能多谈谈这个遗址吗？它在哪些方面特别的吸引您？您希望通过对这座遗址的考古发掘和研究达到哪些目的？

You work with the Near East Archaeology for a long time, especially doing the excavation and research on the Çatalhöyük site continuously, could you talk something about the site? Which parts of it attract you the most? What are the expected aims for the digging and the archaeological research?

I continue to be totally fascinated by Çatalhöyük and am glad that I devoted 25 years of my life to excavating there. It is an incredibly rich site with very detailed preservation and stratigraphy. But it also has wonderful art and symbolism that are endlessly intriguing. It is a Neolithic village settlement in Turkey but it seems to have little evidence of social differentiation or ranking or specialization of production. So how was it organized and why did so many people (perhaps 8000 at the period of maximum occupation) decide to live closely packed together for so long? Perhaps the main interest is that all the wonderful art and symbolism were not produced by an elite, but by ordinary people in their own houses. This was a total way of life in which economic and technological acts were embedded in complex symbolic worlds. I think our work is showing that it is possible for archaeologists to make sense of those worlds.

9. 您是在英国受的教育，也曾在剑桥大学执教多年，后来却去了美国，在您的印象中，这两个国家的学术文化有何不同？您觉得一个中国学生在哪里能受到比较好的训练？

Your received education in Britain and taught in the Cambridge for many years , then left for America, what are the differences of the academic culture between the two countries? In your eyes, which is better for Chinese students to receive good training?

The main difference is that most prehistoric archaeology in America is taught within anthropology, rather than being in separate Archaeology Departments

as is common in the UK and Europe. So in this way it may be better for Chinese students to go to Europe. On the other hand in America a PhD takes longer and involves coursework as well as writing a dissertation – whereas in the UK a PhD student just writes a thesis. So America is better if there is a desire to take more courses.

10. 您长期在西方大学任教，也是著名的考古学家，您对考古学教育有些什么好的经验和建议？

As a famous archaeologist who also lectures in the Western universities for long, do you have any good experience and suggestions on the education of Archaeology to share?

I think the most important thing is to take a broad view of archaeology and to understand its social role. Archaeologists make the past. They make heritage. But heritage is of the greatest importance to people, their identities and livelihood. Archaeology matters to people. So it is important that as students you learn about the roles and responsibilities of archaeology in the modern world. Archaeology is no longer just about the past. It is also about the present.

11. 史前考古学在考古中占有怎样的位置？它跟历史时期考古学有哪些研究方法上的差异最为值得强调？

What is the position of the prehistorical archaeology in Archaeology? Compared with the historical archaeology, for research what are the most prominent methodological differences that need to be emphasized?

As I argued earlier, it is important that the emphasis on history is retained even in prehistoric periods. Of course, historic archaeologists have to deal with the information from texts, but this does not make historical archaeology a different discipline. I believe very much in the integration of different types of archaeology under the same umbrella. We all have to deal with the same duties and responsibilities to contemporary society.

12. 您如何看待欧美考古学的现状和发展趋势？

How do you like the present situation of the archaeology in Europe and the America, and their trends of development?

Many of the current developments I see as very healthy, such as the increased focus on collaborative and participatory archaeology, the greater emphasis on integrating archaeology and heritage, the linking of archaeology with human rights issues. Certainly there are many archaeologists who refuse to accept that they should absorb a broader role. And these broader roles are often contradicted by the state bureaucracies and funding restrictions within which we all have to work. Especially in America the impact of a relatively deregulated contract archaeology has been very negative – better models that integrate contract archaeology and the state have emerged for example in France.

13. Stanford大学人类学系曾一度被分为两个系，后来又合并回来，您对这个过程及其背后的学术理念有怎样的体会（是何态度）？

The Anthropology Department of the Stanford University once was divided into two departments and later merged together. What are your attitudes towards these events and the academic conception reflected?

The split at Stanford occurred before my time there. It was motivated at least partly by divisions in anthropology similar to those between Processual and Post Processual Archaeology in the United States. I am very glad the two sides of anthropology are back together again and trying to find ways of working together. But the differences between universalistic and contextually embedded approaches remain deep and difficult to navigate.

14. Stanford大学最近成立了一个考古学中心，这个中心是怎么一个机构？有怎样的发展前景？中国考古学在该中心占有一个什么位置？该中心和Stanford大学的博物馆是什么关系？该博物馆有没有研究中国考古或者东亚艺术史的专家？

A new **Archaeological Center** was established recently in the Stanford University, what kind of organization is it? what is the expected future? What is the position of the Archaeology of China in it? What is its relation with the Museum of Stanford University? Does it have stuff focusing on the Archaeology of China or the art history of Eastern Asia?

The Archaeology Center is an inter-disciplinary center that brings together the archaeologists from the various different departments at Stanford – such as Anthropology, Classics, East Asian Languages and Cultures. The Center has labs for all the faculty (professors) that teach archaeology and it provides space for about 40 PhD students that work on a wide variety of topics including the archaeology of China. The Center also hosts lectures, seminars and workshop series and invites and hosts visiting speakers, including several from China over recent years. It is a lively and productive place that has grown enormously over the last 10 years, and we hope to continue building and adding staff and research over the next 10 years.

15. 去年Stanford大学聘请了一位出色的中国考古学专家，为何将这位专家放在东亚语文系而没有放在人类学系？据说，在Stanford大学就读中国考古学的研究生要通过教授汉语语言课程来挣奖学金，却不能在人类学系当TA？真是这样吗？

An excellent expert of Archaeology of China was invited to the Stanford University last year, but was put to the Department of East Asian Languages and Cultures, instead of the Department of Anthropology. It says that, Chinese archaeology major post-graduate students have to earn the scholarship by teaching Chinese, for they are refused to be the TA by the Department of the Anthropology, is that true?

Will send response later

16. 由于语言隔阂，中国考古学在世界上的影响力被大大低估，对此您是怎么看的？近些年来，您数次前来中国，能谈谈您对中国考古学的看法吗？与西方相比，它有何独特之处？西方学术界如何评价中国考古学？您本人呢？

Due to the language barrier, the influence of Chinese Archaeology to the world is far underestimated, how do you see it? As you have visited China several times in recent years, could you tell us your view on Chinese Archaeology? Compared with the West, what is uniqueness of it? What does the academic circle of the West comment on the Chinese Archaeology and what is your own view?

Yes I think it a great shame that archaeologists in the West know so little about Chinese archaeology, its theories, methods and data. In my visits over recent years I have been very impressed by all the new developments taking place, the marvelous and exciting excavations, the new institutes and the new openness to ideas and changing perspectives. A fuller dialogue would be of great value. I would be especially interested in understanding more about the methods used in Chinese excavation and about the very strong role that archaeology and museums seem to play in local and regional political processes. Heritage seems to have very strong support in China and I would like to understand more fully how it is organized and where it gets its impetus from. As a Neolithic specialist I am also of course very fascinated by the very different cultural sequence from the end of the Pleistocene into the early Holocene. So, there is much to learn from China and I wish there was more available in English – though the recent book by Li Liu and Xingcan Chen is very helpful and a wonderful account.

17. 作为一位有影响的考古学家，您著作等身。但在中国仅仅翻译出版了您的《Reading the Past》这一部书，您如何评价这部著作？假若让您推荐下一部代表作，您希望是哪一部？

As an influential archaeologist, you have a lot of works published. However, only *Reading the Past* was translated into Chinese and was published in China, what's your comment on this book? If let you recommend the next work to be translated, which one would you choose?

There have been three editions of 'Reading the Past' and the third edition is of course the more up to date. But in many ways the first edition is the clearest and best to read – at least as an historical account of how archaeology had become divided in the West in the 1980s. The book in the first edition sets out the arguments between Processual and Post Processual archaeology quite clearly. So it is more of historical interest now. My earlier book with Orton on 'Spatial Analysis in Archaeology' was also published in Chinese. I would recommend my recent book called 'Entangled. An archaeology of the

relationships between humans and things' published by Blackwell. This new book attempts to be more inclusive and to incorporate ideas from several different perspectives in archaeology including evolutionary approaches.

18. 中国现在盗掘文物、破坏考古遗迹的问题很严重，对此，欧美考古学界是如何看待的？有什么办法解决这个问题吗？在考古学界应该怎样推动和加强学术道德的教育？对此您有什么好的建议？

At present, clandestine excavation and damage of archaeological sites are serious problem in China. How does the Western academic circle treat this? Do you have good solution to this? How to enhance the education and reinforce the academic moral in the field of archaeology? Do you have any advice?

This is a major problem everywhere. The only solution in my view is to engage and involve people so that they take ownership of the past and protect it themselves. But people have to see that they gain more from not looting sites than they do from looting them. This will only happen through education and community involvement. All archaeological projects should have a duty to educate and involve diverse communities, to involve people so that they feel they can benefit from the past – socially, culturally, politically or economically. But archaeologists need to be trained to do this type of work – it is not easy to do well. Just as one example, very few studies have worked out the full economic income that can be gained from an archaeological site – from tourism, shops, hotels, museum visits, buses, taxis and so on. Archaeologists need to be trained in cultural economics so that they can say 'if you allow this site to be looted each member of the community will gain x yen; but if you protect the site and develop it as a heritage site each member of the community will gain y yen'.

19. 能否谈谈您的下一步研究计划？有没有想过来中国进行考古发掘和研究？

Could you talk something about the following plan of your research? Do you ever think about digging in China or do some research?

I hope to continue digging at Çatalhöyük until I retire; and in terms of

theoretical ideas I am keen to develop an evolutionary approach that escapes the problems associated with applying Darwin to cultural and social change. China has a wonderful rich and complex history and prehistory. At this stage in my life I sadly do not feel that I could ever learn enough of the language and archaeology to really contribute to Chinese archaeology in the way I would want. It would take too long to embed myself into all the intricate details of the distinctive historical trajectory that is China.