

NATIONALISM AND ARCHAEOLOGY IN EUROPE

Edited by
Margarita Díaz-Andreu & Timothy Champion

ROUTLEDGE LIBRARY EDITIONS:
ARCHAEOLOGY



ROUTLEDGE LIBRARY EDITIONS:
ARCHAEOLOGY

Volume 21

NATIONALISM AND ARCHAEOLOGY
IN EUROPE

This page intentionally left blank

NATIONALISM AND ARCHAEOLOGY IN EUROPE

Edited by
**MARGARITA DÍAZ-ANDREU &
TIMOTHY CHAMPION**

 **Routledge**
Taylor & Francis Group
LONDON AND NEW YORK

First published in 1996

This edition first published in 2015

by Routledge

2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon, OX14 4RN

and by Routledge

711 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

© 1996 Margarita Díaz-Andreu, Timothy Champion and contributors

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

Trademark notice: Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN: 978-1-138-79971-4 (Set)

eISBN: 978-1-315-75194-8 (Set)

ISBN: 978-1-138-81333-5 (Volume 21)

eISBN: 978-1-315-74822-1 (Volume 21)

Publisher's Note

The publisher has gone to great lengths to ensure the quality of this book but points out that some imperfections from the original may be apparent.

Disclaimer

The publisher has made every effort to trace copyright holders and would welcome correspondence from those they have been unable to trace.

Nationalism and archaeology in Europe

EDITED BY

Margarita Díaz-Andreu & Timothy Champion



© Margarita Díaz-Andreu, Timothy Champion and contributors, 1996.

This book is copyright under the Berne Convention.

No reproduction without permission.

All rights reserved.

First published in 1996 by UCL Press.

UCL Press Limited
University College London
Gower Street
London WC1E 6BT

The name of University College London (UCL) is a registered trade mark used by UCL Press with the consent of the owner.

ISBN: 1-85728-289-2 HB

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

Typeset in Bembo.

Printed and bound by

Biddles Ltd, Guildford and King's Lynn, England.

CONTENTS

- Nationalism and archaeology in Europe: an introduction 1
Margarita Díaz-Andreu & Timothy Champion
- The fall of a nation, the birth of a subject:
the national use of archaeology in nineteenth-century Denmark 24
Marie Louise Stig Sørensen
- French archaeology:
between national identity and cultural identity 48
Alain Schnapp
- Islamic archaeology and the origin of the Spanish nation 68
Margarita Díaz-Andreu
- Archaeology and nationalism: the Portuguese case 90
Carlos Fabião
- Nationalism without a nation: the Italian case 108
Alessandro Guidi
- Three nations or one? Britain and the national use of the past 119
Timothy Champion
- Building the future on the past: archaeology
and the construction of national identity in Ireland 146
Gabriel Cooney
- German archaeology and its relation to nationalism and racism 164
Ingo Wiwjorra
- “Drang nach Westen”?:
Polish archaeology and national identity 189
Włodzimierz Rączkowski

CONTENTS

The faces of nationalist archaeology in Russia 218
Victor A. Shnirelman

Nationalism doubly oppressed:
archaeology and nationalism in Lithuania 243
Giedrius Puodžiūnas & Algirdas Girininkas

Is there national archaeology without nationalism?
Archaeological tradition in Slovenia 256
Božidar Slapšak & Predrag Novaković

Epilogue 294
Miroslav Hroch

Index 301

CHAPTER ONE

Nationalism and archaeology in Europe: an introduction

Margarita Díaz-Andreu & Timothy Champion

We have all been surprised by the growth of a series of ideologies in recent years that we thought had been definitively buried after the drama of the Second World War. These ideologies now affect the lives of millions of people. At the same time, countries we felt were eternal are now divided, some happily and others as a result of vicious armed conflicts. On the other hand countries that were divided – in the first place the two Germanies, one of the detonators of the whole process – have been united under one government. Other countries have radically altered their concept of the state. This, for example, is the case in Spain, which has passed from a centralized unitary definition of government to a pluralist one that accepts other national identities, such as Catalan and Basque, along with Spanish. All of this has been done in the name of nationalism, an ideology virtually censored during almost four decades and which no one felt was useful to reconsider.

Archaeology has just passed through a phase in which the application of mathematical techniques and other methods borrowed from the natural sciences led archaeologists to believe in the scientific objectivity of their subject and in its objectivity in respect to political change. However, events of recent years have shown that this is not the case and, in consequence, comments such as the following have become not infrequent:

I think we should drop the pretence of absolute objectivity. Further, I suggest that drawing on present experience and interests is hardly “unscientific” and that it strengthens, rather than weakens, our work. The connection between present and past is a source of power, the power to offer legitimacy or attack. . . . Rather than condemning those who “pervert” the past to their own political purposes, we should acknowledge that there is *no* neutral, value-free, or non-political past – that if we take the present out of the past we are left with a dry empty husk. (Wilk 1985: 319)

And if there is no such thing as a non-political, value-free archaeology, one of the ideologies that has had most influence in its development is nationalism.

Certainly it is possible to see the relationship between archaeology and nationalism in negative terms and, in the words of Wilk, to denounce the attempt to “pervert” the past. For some time now in connection with the rise of nationalism there have been frequent denunciations of the manipulations that, in some places more than others, the archaeological record is suffering. Moreover, this manipulation is being carried out not only by persons outside the profession but in some cases by archaeologists themselves (Kohl 1993, Slapšak 1993). In contrast to the apparent neutrality of previous decades, we are faced with the question of how to interpret this politicization. Is it something new or has archaeology come up against similar situations in the past, which in the optimistic post-war atmosphere were ignored because they were considered unrepeatable? On the other hand, can archaeology be seen as an exception among the sciences in its political involvement? Our disquiet with respect to the present situation and the need to answer these questions is the first reason for having produced the present book.

Reflections on the negative effects of the connection between politics and science, or more specifically between politics and history, is not new. Kühnl’s discussion of science during the Weimar Republic is a good example of this attitude:

A history book is never limited to the aseptic narration of facts or neutral information of events. The simple selection of the facts by itself requires a judgement of what is and what is not essential. All historical exposition contains, explicitly or implicitly, a specific interpretation of the causes, conditioning factors and forces which pushed forward or put a brake on historical development. . . . That is to say, a “purely scientific” historical exposition does not exist, because all discourses and expositions have political implications (Kühnl 1985: 7–8).

It would be an exaggeration to say that archaeologists have totally ignored this relationship. There are several works that analyze the use which the Nazis and to a lesser extent the Italian fascists made of archaeology (Clark 1957: 257–61; Bollmus 1970; Daniel 1985: 323; Losemann 1977; Schnapp 1977, 1980; Guidi 1988: 63–70; Veit 1988; Arnold 1990; Torelli 1991; and other articles cited by Guidi and Wiwjorra in this volume). Himmelman (1976) goes further and adds examples from Israel, Mexico, Turkey, France and the USA, and Sklenář (1981) from Czechoslovakia. In other works on colonialism there tend to be tangential references to nationalism (Bray &

Glover 1987, Kaarsholm 1989, Holl 1990, Petricioli 1990). Reference is in general made to the influence nationalism has had on the interpretations and, on occasion, the development of specific archaeological undertakings in colonial areas. But, from our perspective, these authors still provide a very incomplete account of the relationship between archaeology and nationalism, whose influence has been far more fundamental than has been admitted until now. The appearance of nationalism stimulated the very creation of archaeology as a science, and informed not only the organization of archaeological knowledge but also its very infrastructure. Without the existence of nationalism, archaeology or the study of the past might never have advanced beyond the status of a hobby or a pastime. This profound interconnection between a political ideology and a scientific discipline needs to be recognized by professionals of the discipline in order to be able to understand and contextualize our work.

It is, therefore, the intention of this book to show that nationalism was not only influential in the archaeological interpretations of a specific period of German or Italian history, or in colonial archaeology, but that it is deeply embedded in the very concept of archaeology, in its institutionalization and development. And this has been the case not only in countries such as Denmark, where archaeology developed at a very early date (Daniel 1975: 52; Sørensen 1986), but it can be seen as a generalized phenomenon, affecting each and every country over the past 200 years.

The close tie between nationalism and archaeology is founded upon the concept of the nation. The nation, the idea on which political nationalism is based, is conceived of as the natural unit of a human group, which by its very nature has the right to constitute a political entity. Hence, by definition, the simple existence of nations implies the existence of a past which, for their own good and that of the individuals who belong to them, should be known and propagated. Therefore, the emergence of political nationalism at the end of the eighteenth century converted the production of this history into a patriotic duty. History acquired a considerable political importance. States organized institutions to create and educate citizens, which legitimated state existence on the basis of its identification with a nation. Institutions (museums, monuments commissions, universities . . .), organized on the political territory of the nation-state, served to justify it, as they took this territory as the basis for the history of the nation. The histories produced by their personnel claimed to chart the origins and development characteristic of each individual nation, and its particular spirit at each stage of its evolution. This was a closed circle. The nation was at the same time the basis and the aim of research.

Nationalism as a political ideology owes its strength not only to its impor-

tance as the essence of liberalism, and therefore its adoption as the motor for the functioning of the state – and of its institutions – but also to its popular base. The nation is not only something invented by nationalists, but as Anderson (1991) argues, it is something that is felt or imagined by many citizens. The growing number of intellectuals responsible for the extensive apologetic historical literature produced in each nation certainly saw themselves as patriots. Nationalism was born among intellectuals who searched for a place in a social world dominated by the Monarchy and Church. The decadence of these two institutions was at the same time the cause (Anderson 1991: ch. 2) and the consequence of the success of nationalism as a political doctrine. At first, intellectuals usually organized themselves in groups, but they were isolated and without any prevalent social influence. After a second phase of patriotic agitation, in which these groups acquired a growing importance, the nationalist ideology spread through the whole of the population.

These three phases defined by Hroch (1985: 22–3) can be seen in archaeology. In the first phase only a few individuals centred their interest on the past in a way still greatly influenced by the Enlightenment, that is, not having the nationalist language which was developed afterwards. The first country to enter into the second phase was probably Denmark. The rapid increase in interest in antiquities among lower middle-class individuals at the beginning of the nineteenth century shows the central importance of antiquity in the construction of Danish nationalism. The rest of Danish society followed soon afterwards. Other nationalisms in which antiquity was not so central needed more time to attract the great masses either to the study of or to an interest in the past. But today it is completely accepted that the past – history – is of central importance to the present, a past shaped by the limits of the nation.

The diverse definition of the elements that make up the “nation” gives us a clue to the specific interests that have guided archaeologists in Europe and the rest of the world. The concept of the political nation, which grew out of the French Revolution, had as its root the right of citizens to show their wishes regarding the type of government they wanted (Kedourie 1960: 43). But it was rapidly taken up and transformed by a line of thought developed in the eighteenth century by philosophers such as Johann Gottfried Herder. This was based on the cult of diversity, in the belief that each nation possessed something that made it unique and irreplaceable. But this unique and irreplaceable (i.e. essential) element, which forms the basis of the nation, is not something fixed but, depending on the nation, which can be cultural, linguistic, ethnic or racial. These two last elements are usually closely inter-related, although ethnicity is the weaker term. The former, culture, is an ambiguous and versatile concept, whose appearance is profoundly related to the development of nationalism (Díaz-Andreu forthcoming) and its need to

utilize a wide and non-exclusive term, which made possible the growing complexity of the human component in each nation.

Archaeological interpretations demonstrate the complexity of nationalism and the concept of the nation. Hence archaeologists, above all from eastern European countries, have emphasized the ethnic or linguistic component of their past. In the case of Russia and Poland, Slavic origins have been emphasized and Baltic origins in the case of Lithuania. In the case of Slovenia it was the country's linguistic homogeneity that was pushed to the forefront. In Germany, from the late nineteenth century, the elements of nation, race and language were interwoven through the identification of the archaeological remains found with the original Indo-European race, and this was then used as the basis to justify the superiority of the German nation. The religious element of nineteenth-century Spanish nationalism was taken into account by Spanish archaeologists, when they argued that the Muslims who occupied the Iberian Peninsula for seven centuries were not Spanish.

The versatility of the meaning of the nation in each particular case results in our being able to use works that are not specifically focused on the relationship between archaeology and nationalism in order to be able to understand the problem. A clear example of this is the recent interest in ethnicity (see especially works by Smith 1986, Shennan 1988 and Chapman 1992). This is also the case with works already mentioned in the context of the relationship between colonialism and imperialism and archaeology, such as Evans & Meggers (1973), Lorenzo (1976), Trigger (1984), Bray & Glover (1987), Holl (1990) and Petricoli (1990). The question of nationalism also frequently raises its head in more general works on the relationship between politics and archaeology, such as Canfora (1980), Garlake (1982), Kristiansen (1992), Fleury-Ilett (1993), Fowler (1987) or the books edited by Layton (1988, 1989; see, for example, Mangi 1988) and by Gathercole & Lowenthal (1990). At present there is a renewed interest in the subject of nationalism, and some new publications, some of which have already been cited, deal with the question directly.

Archaeology and nationalism

The relationship between nationalism and archaeology can be studied from different points of view. First, an important question to address is the role of archaeology in the historical construction of national identities. To what degree did prehistoric and historic archaeology contribute to the creation and maintenance of national identities, whether or not the area had been

constituted as a state? Basques and Bretons are examples of peoples in which a state has not been formed.

A second focus of attention is the relationship between the construction of the national state and the institutionalization of archaeology, or, in the case of subjugated nationalisms, the organizations created in order to develop and propagate the consciousness of the existence of a particular nation. Particular issues are, on the one hand, when and why archaeological museums and specialized studies in archaeology in the universities and other educational institutions (e.g. *écoles supérieures*) appeared, and to what extent their appearance had any relation to nationalist ideology. In addition, heritage legislation is another source of possible links; when and why did it appear, which periods and sites were specially protected and enhanced?

A further area of study relates to the public image of archaeology. Nationalism has influenced the version of the past given in education and presented to the public through museum displays, popular literature and other media such as art (paintings, literature, etc.).

The role of archaeology in the reinforcement of linguistic, ethnic and racist elements in the construction of a national identity is another issue to be analyzed; whether there have been identifications of archaeological cultures with particular ethnic, racial or linguistic groups, or whether archaeology has been used as a means of finding ancient human remains to justify the presence of a particular race in a territory. A related approach is the analysis of the territorial origin or ethnic or religious identification of archaeologists. It can be very revealing to look at the area in the country from which came the archaeologists who collaborated in the historical construction of state or regional identities (this can be useful in uncovering an appropriation of the past by individuals from particular regions), or the changes in the level of contribution from individuals coming from a particular region. It could also be interesting to look at the relationship between ethnic minorities and archaeology: the number of archaeologists who belonged to any ethnic minority (e.g. Jewish or Gipsy), the number of excavations on any ethnic minority's past enclave (e.g. a Gipsy camp), or the archaeologist's attitude towards any particular past ethnic or religious presence in a country (e.g. the treatment of Islamic archaeology in Spain).

These are the fundamental questions that will be discussed in this book. The results are synthesized and discussed in the following sections.

The development of the relationship

The changes that nationalism as an ideology has undergone during its history (Hobsbawm 1990) have had an impact on the discipline of archaeology. This has until now not been mentioned in any of the literature on nationalism and archaeology. No work has attempted to systematize the phases through which the relationship between archaeology and nationalism have passed. Our periodization of the relationship between nationalism and archaeology follows in part the periodization laid out by Hobsbawm (1990).

This periodization serves to show that there are two main variants of nationalist archaeology. The first, which is to be found in the nation-states, has become so naturalized that we are hardly conscious of it. The second variant refers to the subjugated nations, where the political importance of archaeology is frequently much stronger and more consciously practised. As Trigger (1984: 360) has argued, nationalist archaeology is strongest among peoples who feel threatened, insecure or deprived of their political rights by more powerful nations. This political use of archaeology is so easy to understand that it often appears that in nations which enjoy greater political security the role of archaeology seems to be politically neutral. However, it is not necessarily the case. It can be argued that by the very fact of being integrated into state and sub-state institutions and in general by adapting its findings to the frontiers of the present states, archaeology is nationalist. Hence, although naturalized and therefore not perceived, archaeology carried out by archaeologists of successful nations can be, in fact, more nationalistic. However, a conscious misuse of archaeological interpretations is less frequent and this is clearly related to the fact that a triumphant nation does not need to be justified. The national character of the archaeology carried out in this kind of nation is not easily accepted by scholars studying the political use of archaeology, and examples of this can be seen in several of the chapters in this volume (Chs 3, 5, 14), where the modern influence of nationalism on archaeology is minimized.

Our history begins with the Renaissance and is closely bound up with the appearance of humanism in the fifteenth century in Italy and in the sixteenth century in the rest of Europe. This change in mentality, in contrast to the Middle Ages, is closely related to the appearance of strong states grounded in monarchies whose powerbase was evidently more solid than in the previous period and supported by a growing bourgeois class in the cities. In Italy in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, the fragmented political mosaic was simplified with the emergence of six states, and the transformation was justified through recourse to the past. Antiquity became a measure of the importance and reputation of things. A city became important if it had a past

and especially if it was rooted in the classical era. Nobles could better symbolize their position if various ancient objects and works of art were on display in their houses. Members of the clerical establishment were also affected and they showed an interest in the past. There is, therefore, a political usage of the past, and this was exemplified by a series of archaeological forgeries. Gascó (1993) gives a good example of these forgeries carried out on inscriptions. Inscriptions were forged to demonstrate that a particular city that was being exalted was the one in the sources, and on occasion these sources were even invented. And these new tendencies found in the printing press a powerful new vehicle to support them.

Political nationalism appeared at the end of the eighteenth century at the time of the French Revolution. In continental Europe the revolution and its aftermath resulted in the replacement of the social organization of the Ancien Régime, which was based on estates (nobles, clergy and Third Estate), by new class divisions within society. A nation was conceived of as “a union of individuals governed by one law, and represented by the same law-giving assembly” (Sièyes quoted in Kedourie 1960: 5). Therefore, the basis of the nation as conceived by the French Revolution was the previous state unit. Nation was seen as equivalent to state, without (at least theoretically) any reference to its cultural origin. Yet Napoleon already used the potential of the term nation, which since Herder had had an essentialist component, in order to divide the enemy states during his colonial drive. He convinced particular regions with a strong identity that they were nations in the new sense of the word, and therefore they could ask for independence. This redefinition of the concept of the nation gives any group of individuals who for whatever reason, be it territorial, ethnic, religious, linguistic or cultural, imagine they belong to the same homogeneous community, the right to call for political self-government.

The demonstration of the existence of a nation requires a past that needs to be described. This totally changed the concept of history. It was only at the end of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth century that history was transformed from an artistic and literary pursuit into a scientific discipline. This re-ordering first took place in Germany, where the foremost figures were Barthold Georg Niebuhr (1776–1831) and Leopold von Ranke (1795–1886) (Moradiellos 1992). The former was the instigator of the “historical-critical method”, which consisted of the examination and critical analysis of the historical documents and materials, and he used them systematically as the basis for the subsequent narration.

The connection with nationalism is a result of the historicist nature of Ranke’s work. Hence, according to Ranke, in contrast to Enlightenment beliefs, “all past historical events and situations are unique and unrepeatable

and cannot be understood through universal categories but only through the study of its own particular circumstances” (Moradiellos 1992). In this manner Ranke rejected universalist rationalism, and maintained that all human phenomena, be they at the level of the individual or of cultural institutions (states, religions, etc.), were guided by a radical historicity. That is to say, they were all unique and unrepeatable in time and space. They evolved in accord with their own principles and, therefore, had to be understood in terms of their singularity and not through recourse to universal laws. The history of each nation became the main aim of historical research.

The connection with nationalism affected archaeology. Until the nineteenth century, archaeology had been merely anecdotal. Antiquities had been studied during the Renaissance, but only in the nineteenth century were they considered important enough to be organized as a discipline. This could be seen in various respects. Museums were created, a professional corps was formed, archaeology entered higher education (universities or *écoles supérieures*) and a body of legislation was put in place to protect antiquities and organize archaeological work.

The creation of museums was closely linked with the opening of archives and libraries, sources which, as we have seen, the German school of Niebuhr and Ranke considered indispensable as the basis for historical knowledge. The object was to store the original documents, considered the pristine sources of knowledge, selected and ordered in accordance with the objective sought: the creation of a national history. Not every country opened national museums at the same pace. This in part depended on the specific symbols adopted as the basis for the definition of the nation. In those countries in which it was related to antiquity, it was not long before museums were built and the infrastructure needed for the study of antiquities set up. This was the case in Denmark where, as Marie Louise Sørensen explains, the farmers formed a new economic and political group following the early nineteenth century agrarian reforms. The farmers identified with the prehistoric monuments common on their fields and transferred their image to the new liberal state. The presence of archaeology was progressively consolidated during the first half of the nineteenth century. Researchers were not unaware of the significance of these developments. As the pioneering Danish archaeologist Worsaae stated in a speech to the Royal Irish Academy in 1846, he thought that the French Revolution had had a great deal to do with the development of archaeology and prehistory in the early nineteenth century; “with a greater respect for the political rights of the *people*, there awakened in the *nations* (our italics) themselves a deeper interest in their own history, language and nationality” (Worsaae in Daniel 1975: 52). He continued by explaining that the Danes had turned to the study of ancient history after

having suffered a series of national disasters “as a time from the contemplation of which their spirit of nationality might gain support and in whose memories they found the hope of a new and equally glorious era” (Worsaae in Daniel 1975: 52).

The consolidation of liberalism in the second half of the nineteenth century ensured the definitive institutionalization of archaeology. It was at this time that the majority of countries created a network of museums, the work of the antiquarian and archaeologist was professionalized and the new discipline entered higher education. Furthermore, the number of congresses multiplied and many journals were set up. At the same time, the erection of statues – for instance of Gauls in France (Pingeot 1982) – gave symbolic expression to the articulation of a new nationalist landscape.

Moreover, nationalism underwent an important change that would also affect archaeology. With the unification of Italy in 1870 and Germany in 1871, the essentialist conception of the nation definitively triumphed. As a result the search for and justification of the ethnic or racist and linguistic roots of the nation were intensified. As Eric Hobsbawm (1990: 102) states, “in consequence of this multiplication of potential ‘unhistorical’ nations, ethnicity and language became the central, increasingly the decisive or even the only criteria of potential nationhood”. This not only affected Europe but could be seen throughout the world (for the case of Argentina see Quijada Mauriño forthcoming). The institutionalization of archaeology served to strengthen these tendencies. Congresses were a case in point. For example, as Shnirelman shows (this volume), nationalism was embedded into the strategy of the organization of the pan-Russian archaeological congresses. The main goal was to search for the most ancient traces of the Russian Slavs and Christianity. Another example was the appearance during this period of associations that related anthropology and ethnology to prehistoric archaeology, such as the Society for Archaeology, History and Ethnography at Kazan’ University, founded in Russia in 1878.

Another consequence of the consolidation of essentialist nationalism was the growth of non-state nationalist archaeologies. It was these years that saw an important increase in the formation of cultural associations, for example archaeological or excursion societies, in cities outside the state capital. These societies had a popular base, and they served to support and foment nationalist movements such as Catalanism in the Spanish case.

It was during the interwar years that the part played by archaeology in the construction of nationalism was most explicit. The examples of German and Italian archaeology are but two cases among many. They are two extreme cases, and therefore they have to be condemned for their role in the justification of territorial invasion and racial extermination. But, as the chapters in

this book demonstrate, in all countries without exception, archaeologists looked to justify the ethnic, racial, linguistic, religious and/or cultural bases of their nation.

As a consequence of the horrors of the Second World War the various scientific disciplines, among them archaeology, tried to wash away the stain of nationalist implications and interpretations and sought refuge in an aseptic objectivity, which was supposedly achieved through publications that were purely descriptive (although on racism, nationalism and archaeology in this period see Schnapp & Svenbro 1980, and Zerubavel 1994 on Israeli nationalism and Masada). However, in reality the problem was never tackled at root. Far from distancing itself from nationalism, archaeology continued to be nationalist in terms of its organization and structuring of the data. It is easy to understand why this should be. The state administered the study, teaching and research of history, and so it remained incorporated within and served nationalist structures. This is something assumed to be so natural that few archaeologists are conscious of it. At the same time, archaeologists continued to classify data according to “cultures”. This term was only adopted during the apogee of nationalism and has, in fact, a clear political significance, and presupposes a specific, politicized – and nationalist – reading of the history of the past 200 years (Díaz-Andreu forthcoming). The uncritical maintenance of this practice has made possible the return to the old abuses in present archaeological thought.

The past few years have witnessed a certain renaissance of nationalism in archaeological interpretations. The scale of this rebirth cannot, at least in the case of Europe, be compared to the situation in the interwar years. This is clear in a European context, where one can criticize certain abuses such as, for example, the invention of a Celtic past and its connection with the construction of a pan-European identity (Champion, this volume), along with other misrepresentations on a more limited geographical scale (Slapšak 1993; see Díaz-Andreu (this volume) for the use of the Islamic past by Andalusian, Valencian and Balearic nationalisms against Catalan and Spanish nationalisms). Outside Europe in some areas the situation is frankly worrying (Kohl 1993) and reminds one of the tone of debates in interwar Europe. However, we now have at hand the possibility of criticizing the past and are conscious of the political implications of this type of manipulation. But, above all, it is the intention of this book to make clear that in no country has archaeology been totally free from nationalist influence, while this has been the dominant theory in the political ordering of the world during the past two centuries.

Archaeology and nationalism in Europe

The aim of the book is to analyze the influence of the political doctrine of nationalism and the structures of the nation-states on the appearance and institutionalization of archaeology, and on its later development: interpretations, public influence, etc. The timespan the book covers is the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. We have chosen Europe as a focus for our study. The reasons for this decision are, first, that Europe was the first place in the world where archaeology developed; it was also in Europe that nationalism first made its mark. Also, European archaeology deals with quite a coherent set of problems, and a broadly similar archaeological record from prehistory to modern times. Therefore, the political use of the archaeological results by the different nations can be easily compared. This is the reason why we have omitted other areas that were closely connected with Europe (e.g. America) and could have been included in the book. Contrary to our initial purpose, this book shows an imbalance in the space dedicated to western and eastern Europe. This is a result of the fact that various potential contributors from eastern Europe did not submit contributions because they feared the effect such publications could have had on their professional careers. This is in itself a further symptom of the present importance of the subject treated in this book.

Each of the chapters deals with a nation-state. This decision can be controversial because a nation-state is not always accompanied by a successful national identity. Besides, there are nation-states where other national identifications exist (e.g. British against English, Welsh, Scottish or Irish; French against Catalan, Basque, Breton; etc.). The degree of success of the different national identifications (state against regional) depends on the countries and even on the different regions in those countries (for instance, the identification of state and nation differs greatly from England to Scotland). In addition, with the exception of a few long-established countries in Europe (e.g. Great Britain, France, Spain and Portugal) the remaining nation-states have appeared in the past two centuries, and this is reflected in the national identifications. Moreover, although ethnic identifications sometimes coincide with nationalist identifications (e.g. Welsh, Catalan), at other times this is not the case (e.g. Jewish, Gipsy, Afro-Caribbean).

The development of archaeology and its relationship to politics have varied greatly from one nation to another. According to Marie Louise Stig Sørensen, there are various aspects to the relationship between archaeology and nationalism. First, archaeology is only institutionalized when it becomes politically useful. Secondly, it is only then that it appears in the public sphere. Thirdly, it attained importance in certain political decisions, and fourthly it

became popularised with the addition of new messages. Sørensen analyzes how, in the Danish case, archaeology became a vehicle for images and objects that served the nationalist discourse. She maintains that the objects and events of the past that filtered through to popular culture had been selected and used to represent national virtues. With the crisis produced by the loss of a major part of the country at the beginning of the nineteenth century, there was a tendency to seek consolation through the search for a prehistoric golden age, which was limited to the remaining territories. This was the reason why Danish archaeology was already being professionalized in the 1820s and became progressively incorporated into the search for a national identity. Hence, although during the Napoleonic Wars only a few intellectuals were interested in the past, by the 1860s archaeological data had been widely diffused and it served as the unquestionable basis of the explanation of the Danish nation. The data were selected to emphasize moments of collective endeavour and to promote the freehold peasantry. In this process, archaeological symbols passed from high culture to low culture, and on occasion their significance was at the same time transformed. As a result, the past became a means of social communication and as such could not be objective and natural, and its emotional charge could make it very powerful and even dangerous.

The birth of archaeology in France was marked by a lack of widespread interest and an unbalanced emphasis on history. The Revolution fostered the appearance of the notion of national antiquities and the spread of the concept of archaeology. However, although the Romantic movement chose an ancient people – the Gauls – and an historical event – the defeat of Gauls by the Romans at Alésia – as symbols of the French nation, these symbols were not successful. As Alain Schnapp states, neoclassic tradition continued to give more importance to Romans than to Gauls. Archaeology was not essential to the construction of the French nation. The first institutions created in order to study the past took into account not archaeology but history and monuments. It was only in the second half of the nineteenth century that archaeology became important. The funding of the excavations at Alésia and Bibracte in the 1860s began a trend of nationalist archaeology increasingly stressed after the French defeat by Prussia in 1870. However, in contrast to the German example, the bulk of intellectuals worked on the construction of a French nationality based not on race or *ethnie* but on history and culture. Perhaps because of this, Schnapp argues that national antiquities were left aside from 1871 to 1939; there was in France no activity corresponding to the creation of museums and archaeological services in Germany or Scandinavia, and even a law on antiquities was not passed until 1941. Even then, the organization of antiquities thus created was deeply embedded in an

authoritarian ideology. French archaeology has continued its institutionalization thereafter and, as is to be expected in France, it is characterized by its centralization. The author ends his chapter by emphasizing the present neutralization of French archaeology.

The relationship between religion and nationalism is the basis of Díaz-Andreu's chapter. The definition of Spain as a Catholic nation led to the alienation of the Muslim past in the narration of her history. The first studies of Islamic archaeology stressed their foreign nature and lack of importance for the Spanish past, thereby producing a poor analysis of the relationship with Christian medieval Spain. One of the major areas of research on the Islamic period was the study of archaeological remains of Christian churches in Islamic territory. However, contradictory nationalisms in the Spanish state, the influence of the admiration of "exotic" Islamic monuments by other Europeans, and colonial activity in North Africa, provided an opportunity for the historical and archaeological study of Islam in Spain. Nevertheless, this was undertaken through a Europeanization and a loss of the religious significance of the Islamic past. Medieval archaeology has been one of the areas that has most clearly shown its weakness when faced with political pressures during the turbulent history in the twentieth century, and the two poles of the Spanish medieval past clearly exemplify this. However, thanks to the secularization of Spanish life, it has become far easier to use images resulting from the Islamic past, and this has converted them into powerful symbols for the creation of pasts and the legitimation of the various nationalisms nowadays present in a quasi-federalist Spanish state.

The Portuguese case serves, as Carlos Fabião suggests, as the opposite of successful national archaeologies. The leading nationalist image of Portugal is of a nation born in medieval times, perceived through the portrait of rural villages and castles. This left previous periods, and therefore archaeology, in an inferior position. This does not mean that archaeologists did not develop various arguments based on megaliths, the northwestern hill-forts, Viriatus and Lusitania in favour of a remote origin for the Portuguese nation. However, their efforts, although to a certain extent productive, did not prove fruitful in practical terms in combating the predominant version. Even if laws for the national archaeological heritage were made, they were scarcely applied, and archaeological proposals had little or no funds. Once the legend had been accepted, it was not useful to invest in order to corroborate or research into it. In short, archaeology was considered as counterproductive for nationalist purposes.

Alessandro Guidi sees the interrelationship between nationalism and archaeology in Italy as clearly negative. Both prehistoric and classical archaeology were powerfully influenced by nationalism. In the first case this

relationship can be seen in the dates at which the profession was institutionalized, in the interest shown by politicians in the new discoveries, and in the interpretations advanced. These stressed that it had been the north of the country (which had also been the supporter of unification) that had civilized the south in prehistoric times. The rise of fascism stimulated the study not of prehistory but of classical archaeology, which then promoted an identification between classical Rome and modern Italy. This interest led to the massive expansion in university professorships and the generous financing of excavations, the most important of which were the Roman forum and others undertaken in Italian colonies. From the Second World War, on the other hand, there has been a tendency towards dispersion which, the author maintains, has accelerated in recent years.

Britain is an example of a country with competing nationalisms, as Timothy Champion explains, but archaeology has seldom been invoked to legitimate them. England has rarely been seriously threatened since its unification in the eleventh century AD, and English nationalism is very weakly developed. As a result, there is little sign of a purely English archaeology; no national museum, no national journal, no single national association, no synthetic reviews. Scotland, on the other hand, showed an early development of archaeology in the eighteenth century, centrally organized and carried out on a national scale. Despite Scotland's political domination by England, Scottish nationalism existed alongside an acceptance of the Act of Union, and national archaeology contributed to Scottish cultural self-awareness rather than to political separatism. Wales was different again; it so far lacked political and cultural institutions that archaeology was scarcely able to take root before the beginning of the twentieth century. In both countries, twentieth-century nationalist movements have focused on political and economic issues, and a separate cultural identity has been established through language and literature rather than archaeology. Overarching these three national identities has been the concept of Britain, particularly from the eighteenth century – a useful concept for emphasizing the cultural identity of the unified kingdom. The late development of the state's involvement in archaeology has meant, however, that an increasingly professional discipline has been less amenable to the political uses of the archaeological past.

In Ireland, by contrast, as Gabriel Cooney explains, the archaeological past has been an important element in the construction of a national identity, and linked in a complex and changing pattern of relationships with political nationalist programmes. A flourishing period of archaeological research in the middle of the nineteenth century provided a wealth of evidence for the cultural achievements of the Irish past, and laid the foundations for a perception of a separate Irish cultural identity; this, however, contrasted markedly

with the misty mythological gloss given to the past in the later nineteenth century Celtic revival. Archaeology has been used as part of the debate about the nature of Ireland and Irish nationalism, and this is still true of the present. The partition of Ireland symbolizes and enforces the existence of conflicting identities within Ireland, and has influenced the way that some archaeological debates have been initiated and perpetuated.

In his chapter on Germany, Ingo Wiwjorra distinguishes two types of archaeology in the nineteenth century, based on philology and anthropology, and three types of authors: professionals, amateurs and pseudo-scientists. The early nineteenth century saw an idealization of German prehistory, knowledge of which came predominantly from written sources that were used to complement the growing archaeological finds. Theories that indicated a “foreign” influence in the German past – whether they stressed the provenance of the Germans from the Caucasus and therefore their barbarism in prehistoric times, or centred their attention on the classical world – were progressively rejected. On the contrary, so-called anthropological archaeology linked the idea of a German race with prehistoric cultures. This connection was already common in the 1880s and it identified the Germans with the pure Indo-European race. Amateurs such as Ludwig Wilser and Will Pastor were at the forefront of this tendency, but it was then professionalized by figures such as Gustaf Kossinna through the methods of settlement archaeology combined with a belief in the superiority of the German race. Contemporaneously archaeology was employed to justify German expansion in the east. During the National Socialist period there was a massive creation of professorships and a justification of National Socialist policies in archaeological circles. After the Second World War a divide has opened up between the arid scientificism of professionals who ignored the previous period and pseudo-scientific ideology in which elements of the pre-war discourse can still be seen.

Interest in the past increased greatly in Poland after her loss of independence in 1795 and antiquarianism became one of the pillars of the Polish national movement, as Włodzimierz Rączkowski illustrates. Archaeological remains were identified with the Slavs. Importance was given to archaeology as a way to fix a territorial border between Germans and Slavs, i.e. between Prussia and Poland. However, because of the might of pan-Slavism, there was no similar attempt in relation to the other borders, as Lithuanians, Byelorussians and Ukrainians were considered as Slavs. The former discussion continued after the independence of Poland in 1918 and had two major representatives, Kostrzewski and von Richthofen for the Polish and the German sides respectively. The Slav past, and its territory, was promoted via newspapers and other popular media, and in popular lectures and courses for

teachers. The Polish past was, furthermore, symbolized by the archaeological site of Biskupin. Archaeology was again used as a way to legitimize the newly created Polish borders after 1945, at least until the late 1960s and early 1970s when the borders were internationally accepted; archaeology therefore lost part of its importance, although dominant views are still present in school manuals and guide books of the site of Biskupin, the key symbol of the Slavic past.

Ethnicity is the main focus of Viktor Shnirelman's chapter on Russia. As the author states, nationalism in Russian and Soviet archaeology expressed itself mainly in ethnogenetic studies. In Hobsbawm's words, archaeologists, like historians, were and are contributing "consciously or not, to the creation, dismantling and restructuring of images of the past which belong not only to the world of specialist investigation but to the public sphere of man [i.e. the human being] as a political being" (Hobsbawm 1983: 13). Russian archaeology changed its object of study from classical remains to local – Slav – antiquities mainly from the 1840s. Slavic–Russian interpretations began to be fostered by other ethnic (i.e. non-Russian) intellectuals from 1917, a trend allowed by the state because of its powerful symbolic opposition to the defeated Old Russia. This situation changed drastically for a short period in the late 1920s and early 1930s, because of the introduction of Marxism to Soviet science and the consideration of previous research as bourgeois. The search for past ethnic roots was forbidden and changes in the archaeological record were considered as socio-economic stages. Soviet nationalism, a nationalism of a theoretical multi-ethnic base, was born by 1934–6 and ethnicity was thereby re-installed. Soviet nationhood was, however, being constructed on the base of a Slavic (Russian) past. This situation led from the 1950s to competing views between Russian and non-Russian archaeologists and to the politicization and mythologization of the ethnic origin of peoples of the former USSR.

Lithuanian archaeology is another good example of the relationship between archaeology and nationalism. As Puodžiūnas and Girininkas explain, after the closure of Vilnius University in 1831, intellectuals turned to the collection of antiquities as a way to prove their right to demand an independent Lithuanian–Polish state. As a result, after the 1863 uprising, one of the actions by the governor of Vilnius was to ban the Archaeological Commission and to take measures to control the Museum of Antiquities. From this date through to the First World War it was mainly Russian and some Polish archaeologists who carried out archaeological work, and this resulted in the bulk of theories pointing to a non-Lithuanian origin of the archaeological remains. The lifting of the ban was followed by the appearance of Lithuanian scientific societies. However, the USSR scientific policy enforced the manip-

ulation of data in order to “Russify” interpretations, although archaeologists were less oppressed than historians. Since independence, the dominant archaeological interpretation has defended the Baltic ethnogenesis of Lithuanians, stressing in this way an origin distinct from that of their more powerful Slav neighbours.

The Slovenian case has been analyzed by Božidar Slapšak and Predrag Novaković. They conclude that there was no indication before the Second World War of the involvement of archaeology in nationalist discourse. In this case, language and not history was the basis of Slovenian nationalism and, accordingly, archaeology only played a secondary role. The history of Slovenian archaeology was therefore one of weakness, poor institutionalization and underdevelopment. Personal matters were also influential. The Museum of Ljubljana was run by a pro-German for almost 30 years from the 1850s to the 1880s, a fact that bestowed on archaeology the stigma of a suspicious discipline in nationalist eyes. The Second World War saw the introduction of ethnic-nationalist theories in the archaeology carried out in Slovenian territory. Ethnicity continued to be linked to Slovenian archaeology after the war, although opposed by the historian Grafenauer and the von Merhard school of prehistoric research. The non-involvement of academic archaeology in the nationalist struggle of the late 1980s and early 1990s has been criticized. The authors conclude that “while academic archaeology can avoid nationalism, nationalism cannot do without archaeology in its myth creation and search for identity, and that can create a lot of pressure”.

The nationalist value of archaeology

Finally, we can ask whether there are any distinctive features of archaeology that predispose it to such a relationship with nationalism. Many of the authors in this volume have emphasized that nationalist ideologies rely heavily, if not inevitably, on the past, and on a particular construction of the past. It is not just that the nation provides a seemingly natural framework and an appropriate scale for archaeological research, or even that the state, as the main sponsor of archaeological work, tends to encourage research that reinforces its own identity. The past provides a mirror image of the future to which the nationalism aspires, whether it is the cultural aim of re-establishing an identity or the political one of regaining territory or autonomy. But the past can be experienced and investigated in many ways, of which archaeology is only one. What is the special character of archaeology that provides such an opportunity for nationalism?

First, archaeological evidence is very versatile. It needs interpretation, and the limits of possible interpretations are often not set very narrowly. As archaeological knowledge has improved, especially about the geographical distribution or chronological range of a particular artefact or cultural practice, but also in respect of our understanding of the nature of pre-modern societies, so the limit of possible or acceptable interpretations has been restricted. It was not until as late as the 1870s that the chronological development of the material culture sequence of later European prehistory was established in any detail; until then, many objects could be attributed to the Slavs, Celts, Germans or Romans indiscriminately and without fear of scientific contradiction. Nationalism did indeed stimulate the development of archaeology in the nineteenth century, but one of the reasons why archaeology was so useful was the comparatively poor state of knowledge about the past, which allowed it to be used very flexibly in social and political debate. But nationalism thus sowed the seeds for the development of knowledge of the past to the point where the more extravagant claims could be confronted by firm archaeological arguments. The growth of a professional archaeology, mostly in institutions established by the nation-states themselves, and the eventual application of new techniques and scientific methods, have created a more robust body of evidence.

Secondly, archaeological evidence can be very old. Outside the classical world of the Mediterranean, the documentary historical tradition does not reach far back in time. If nationalist claims, especially claims to territory once occupied and now lost, were to be based on the antiquity and longevity of occupation, then only archaeology could supply the proof. This demanded a method for fixing the relative sequence of material in order to show antiquity, and a means of establishing a connection with the modern nation. The Three Age system, and the culture-historical tradition more generally, were ideally suited to the first of these aims. The chronological ordering of the evidence, which has supplied the basis for all future work, and the emphasis on continuity and development of material culture, underpinned arguments for the continuity of settlement. But this had to be matched by an identification of certain traits as distinctively those of a nation or its predecessors: Slavic pottery or German burial rites. This identification was the most powerful and most emotive link in the chain of argument, and it is also the one that has suffered most from recent developments in archaeological theory. Our understanding of material culture and its social uses makes us much less ready to accept such simple correlations of an artefact type or a cultural practice with a single ethnic group or nation. Such identifications are, however, very resilient and they tend to survive well in more popular literature, long after they have been questioned by archaeologists.

Next, archaeological evidence is physical. Until the emergence of antiquarian studies in the Renaissance, the status of the written word as the sole authority on the past was unchallenged. By the nineteenth century, however, the growing body of physical evidence collected by antiquarians and archaeologists had begun to offer an alternative source of knowledge, and one that could be experienced in many different ways. Historical knowledge can be transmitted only via the written or spoken word, but the physical evidence offered by archaeology opens up many new possibilities for engaging with the past. Archaeological objects can be more than just an illustration of the knowledge provided by the written word, and can constitute an independent source for understanding the past. Many such collections of objects were originally made by amateur antiquarians, but, from the eighteenth century, state museums were increasingly founded to accommodate them; the collections were transformed from symbols of the enthusiasm, learning and taste of the individual to symbols of the history and achievements of the nation. The visible evidence of the past supplied by museums opened up an important new means of understanding the past, and museum visiting became an important cultural and educational practice for some sectors of society.

Equally important were the opportunities offered by archaeological sites and monuments. In some countries, such as Denmark, the entire landscape became historicized as a metaphor for the nation itself. In others, single sites took on a critical significance for their key role in the nation's history: Tara in Ireland, Numantia in Spain, or Alésia in France, although both the latter were the sites of ultimate defeat. In other cases, a site without specific historical significance was adopted as a sign of the nation, often, like Biskupin in Poland, because of the role it played in the development of archaeology and its role in recent politics.

The potential of such sites can be exploited in many ways. They can be used for political meetings, as was Tara; or for regular ceremonial events to enforce social memory of the nation's history; for archaeological excavations, to improve knowledge and heighten awareness of the past; or for educational visits, whether by individuals, or schools or archaeological societies; more and more in the twentieth century they have been exploited for an increasingly commercialized tourist industry.

The exploitation of these new opportunities depended greatly on technological progress in the nineteenth century. Sites are of little ideological use if they cannot be visited, and improvements in transport were vital in permitting the sort of systematic site-seeing that was the main activity of many archaeological societies in the last century. Both sites and objects also provided many new images that could be disseminated by the rapid improvements in the printing industry. The graphic illustrations of the past, repeated

in books, magazines, newspapers and pictures, took on a power of their own. The rising standards of literacy and education, often sponsored by the state while it was supporting the development of archaeology, ensured that this flood of new material reached a wider audience where its message could be assimilated.

Smith (1986: 192) has identified some of the recurring features in any national mythology or myth of ethnic origins: myths of origins in time or space; of ancestry, migration and liberation; of golden ages, decline and rebirth. Archaeological material and monuments can be very successfully exploited to provide evidence for such myths and to provide them with authenticity; myths can merge into history. Archaeology was particularly good for the documentation of origin myths. Timescales could not be established with any confidence in absolute terms, but archaeology could at least demonstrate that things were comparatively old in historical terms. Origins in space were much easier to show, once the treacherous identification of nation and artefact had been accepted, and were of central importance to modern disputes about territorial control.

Archaeology has also been able to provide the visible evidence for past golden ages. For some nations, these were periods of military and political power, or great territorial domination; for others, technological and artistic achievement; for others again, idyllic rural prosperity. For all these variants, archaeology can be pressed into service to provide the evidence. It can also provide the evidence for heroes and, less frequently, heroines, to populate the golden ages. The earliest years of recorded history have proved a fertile source of named individuals, often associated with great events or important sites, who can be brought to life through archaeology. France has Vercingetorix, Portugal Viriatus, Germany Arminius; all have become national heroes, essential elements in the national myth, historically documented and authenticated by archaeology.

Archaeology has thus for the past 200 years been inextricably intertwined with nationalism. It would be pointless to speculate how antiquarianism would have developed without the influence of nationalism, but one of the consequences of its growth has been its increasing maturity as a professional discipline. Not only can it now survive without nationalist support, but it can, as the authors in this volume demonstrate, turn a self-critical eye on its own development and evaluate its own involvement in 200 years of social and political change in Europe.

Bibliography

- Anderson, B. 1991. *Imagined communities: reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. London: Verso.
- Arnold, B., 1990. The past as propaganda: totalitarian archaeology in Nazi Germany. *Antiquity* 64, 464–78.
- Bollmus, R. 1970. *Das Amt Rosenberg und seine Gegner*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt.
- Bray, W. & J. C. Glover 1987. Scientific investigation or cultural imperialism: British archaeology in the Third World. *Bulletin of the Institute of Archaeology* 24, 109–25.
- Canfora, L. 1980. *Ideologie del classicismo*. Turin: Einaudi.
- Chapman, M. 1992. *The Celts: the construction of a myth*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Clark, J. G. D. 1957. *Archaeology and society*, 3rd edn. London: Methuen.
- Daniel, G. E. 1975. *150 years of archaeology*. London: Duckworth.
- Díaz-Andreu, M. forthcoming. Constructing identities through culture. The past in the forging of Europe. In *European communities: archaeology and the construction of cultural identity*, S. Jones, C. Gamble, P. Graves (eds). London: Routledge.
- Evans, C. & B. J. Meggers 1973. United States “imperialism” and Latin American archaeology. *American Antiquity* 38, 257–8.
- Fleury-Ilett, B. 1993. The identity of France: the archaeological interaction. *Journal of European Archaeology* 1, 169–80.
- Fowler, D. D. 1987. Uses of the past: archaeology in the service of the state. *American Antiquity* 52, 229–48.
- Garlake, P. S. 1982. Prehistory and ideology in Zimbabwe. *Africa* 52(3), 1–18.
- Gascó, F. 1993. Historiadores, falsarios y estudiosos de las antigüedades andaluzas. In *La antigüedad como argumento: historiografía de arqueología e historia antigua en Andalucía*, J. Beltrán & F. Gascó (eds), 9–28. Seville: Junta de Andalucía.
- Gathercole, P. & D. Lowenthal (eds) 1990. *The politics of the past*. London: Unwin Hyman.
- Gellner, E. 1983. *Nations and nationalism*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Guidi, A. 1988. *Storia della paletnologia*. Rome: Laterza.
- Himmelfmann, N. 1976. Die Antike in der Ideologie des nationalistischen Staates. *Utopische Vergangenheit. Archäologie und moderne Kultur*, 119–30. Berlin: Mann.
- Hobsbawm, E. 1983. Introduction: inventing traditions. In *The invention of tradition*, E. Hobsbawm & T. Ranger (eds), 1–14. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 1990. *Nations and nationalism since 1780*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Holl, A. 1990. West African archaeology: colonialism and nationalism. In *A history of African archaeology*, P. Robertshaw (ed.), 296–308. London: James Currey.
- Hroch, M. 1985. *Social preconditions of national revival in Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kaarsholm, P. 1989. The past as battlefield in Rhodesia and Zimbabwe: the struggle of competing nationalisms over history from colonization to independence. *Culture and History* 6, 85–106.
- Kedourie, E. 1960. *Nationalism*. London: Hutchinson.
- Kohl, P. L. 1993. Nationalism, politics, and the practice of archaeology in Soviet Transcaucasia. *Journal of European Archaeology* 1, 181–9.
- Kohl, P. & C. Fawcett (eds) forthcoming. *Nationalism, politics, and the practice of archaeology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kristiansen, K., 1992. “The strength of the past and its great might”: an essay on the use of the past. *Journal of European Archaeology* 1, 3–32.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Kühnl, R. 1985. *Die Weimarer Republik*. Hamburg: Rowolth Taschenbuch.
- Layton, R. (ed.) 1988. *Conflict in the archaeology of living traditions*. London: Unwin Hyman.
- 1989. *Who needs the past? Indigenous values and archaeology*. London: Unwin Hyman.
- Lorenzo, J. L. 1976. *La arqueología mexicana y los arqueólogos norteamericanos*. Mexico: Departamento de Prehistoria, Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia.
- Losemann, V. 1977. *Nationalsozialismus und Antike*. Hamburg: Hoffmann & Campe.
- Mangi, J. 1988. The role of archaeology in the construction of the nation. In *Conflict in the archaeology of living traditions*, R. Layton (ed.), 217–27. London: Unwin Hyman.
- Moradillos, E. 1992. *Las caras de Clío: introducción a la historia y a la historiografía*. Oviedo: Universidad de Oviedo.
- Petricioli, M. 1990. *Archeologia e Mare Nostrum: le missioni archeologiche nella politica mediterranea dell'Italia 1898/1943*. Rome: Valerio Levi.
- Pingeot, A. 1982. Les Gaulois sculptés (1850–1914). In *Nos ancêtres les Gaulois*, P. Viallaneix & J. Ehrard (eds), 255–82. Clermont-Ferrand: Université de Clermont-Ferrand.
- Quijada Mauriño, M. forthcoming. Los “incas arios”: historia, lengua y raza en la construcción nacional hispanoamericana del siglo XIX. In *Historia y universidad: homenaje a Lorenzo Luna*, E. González González (ed). Mexico: UNAM.
- Schnapp, A. 1977. Per una discussione sul classicismo nell’età dell’imperialismo, IV: Archéologie et nazisme. *Quaderni di Storia* 5, 1–26.
- 1980. Archéologie et Nazisme (II). *Quaderni di Storia* 11, 19–33.
- 1981. Les *Annales* et l’archéologie; une rencontre difficile. *Mefra* 93, 469–78.
- Schnapp, A. & J. Svenbro 1980. Du Nazisme à “nouvelle école”; repères sur la prétendue nouvelle droite. *Quaderni di Storia* 11, 107–19.
- Shennan, S. J. (ed.) 1988. *Archaeological approaches to cultural identity*. London: Unwin Hyman.
- Sklenár, K. 1981. The history of archaeology in Czechoslovakia. In *Towards a history of archaeology*, G. Daniel (ed.), 150–8. London: Thames & Hudson.
- Slapsák, B. 1993. Archaeology and the contemporary myths of the past. *Journal of European Archaeology* 1, 191–5.
- Smith, A. 1986. *The ethnic origins of nations*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Sørensen, M. L. S. 1986. “. . . Føje Oldtidens Kraft Til Nutidens Kløgt . . .”. *Stofskifte, Tidsskrift for Antropologi* 13, 35–46.
- Torelli, M. 1991. Archeologia e fascismo. In *Historiografía de la arqueología y de la historia antigua en España (siglos XVIII–XX)*, J. Arce & R. Olmos (eds), 243–9. Madrid: Ministerio de Cultura.
- Trigger, B. G. 1984. Alternative archaeologies: nationalist, colonialist, imperialist. *Man* 19, 355–70.
- 1989. *A history of archaeological thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Veit, U. 1988. Ethnic concepts in German prehistory: a case study on the relationship between cultural identity and archaeological objectivity. In *Archaeological approaches to cultural identity*, S. Shennan (ed.), 35–56. London: Unwin Hyman.
- Wilk, R. 1985. The ancient Maya and the political present. *Journal of Anthropological Research* 41, 307–26.
- Zerubavel, Y. 1994. The death of memory and the memory of death: Masada and the Holocaust as historical metaphors. *Representations* 45, 72–100.

References

The fall of a nation, the birth of a subject: the national use of archaeology in nineteenth-century Denmark

Adriansen, I. 1990. Fædrelandet, folkeminderne og modersmalet. Brug af folkeminder og folkesprog i nationale identitetsprocesser især belyst ud fra striden mellem dansk og tysk i Sønderjylland. Sønderborg: Museumsrådet for Sønderjyllands Amt.

Anderson, B. 1983. Imagined communities: reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism. London: Verso.

Annaler for Nordisk Oldkyndighed (og Historie). 1837-1863.

Dreyer, W. 1901. Danmarks folk. Copenhagen: Det Nordiske Forlag.

Folkelivsskolens Sangbog 1969. 15th edn. Odense: Forening for Højskoler og Landbrugsskoler.

Gellner, E. 1983. Nations and nationalism. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Hobsbawm, E. 1983. Introduction: Inventing traditions. In Hobsbawm & Ranger (1983), 1 - 15).

Hobsbawm, E. & T. Ranger (eds) 1983. The invention of tradition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Klindt-Jensen, O. 1975. A history of Scandinavian archaeology. London: Thames & Hudson.

Kock, H. & A. Falk Hansen (eds) 1946. Dansk Daad. Copenhagen: Steen Hasselbalchs.

Kristiansen, K. 1978. Dansk arkæologi fortid og fremtid. Fortid og Nutid XXVII(3), 279-319.

– 1981. A social history of Danish archaeology (1805-1975). In Towards a history of archaeology, G. Daniel (ed.), 20-44. London: Thames & Hudson.

– 1993. “The strength of the past and its great might” : an essay on the use of the past. Journal of European Archaeology 1, 3-32.

Nordisk Tidsskrift for Oldkyndighed. 1832-1836.

Olwig, K. 1984. Nature's ideological landscape: a literary and geographic perspective on its development and preservation on Denmark's Jutland Heath. London: Allen & Unwin.

Orsnes, M. 1966. Arboger for nordisk Oldkyndighed og Historie. 1866-1966. Arboger for nordisk Oldkyndighed og Historie, 131-4.

– 1969. Forord. In Sonderjyske og fynske mosefund (vol. I). C. Engelhardt, reproduction edition. Copenhagen: ZAC.

Ostergard, U. & V. Wahlin 1984. National identitet o f national sang i Danmark i det 19. arhundrede. NYT, Center for Kulturforskning 20, 38-40.

Petersen, C. S. 1938. Stenalder. Broncealder. Jernalder. Bidrag til Nordisk Arkeologisk Litteratur historie 1776-1868. Copenhagen: Levin & Muunksgaard.

Sorensen, M. L. S. 1986. . . . foie oldtidens kraft til nutidens klogt. . . Stofskifte 13, 35-46.

Sorensen, M. L. S. & D . Uzzell 1993. Constructing and deconstructing national identities: the role o f the past in the present. Paper presented at the conference on “ Changing European identities: social psychological analyses o f social change” , Farnham, England.

Stybe, E. 1972. Idehistorie. Vorkulturs ideerog tanker i historiskperspektiv, 4th edn. Copenhagen: Gyldendal.

Welinder, S. 1987. Arkeologiske bilder. Oslo: Universitetets Oldsakssamling (Varia 14).

Worsaae, J. J. A. 1843. Danmarks Oldtid oplyst ved Oldsagerog Gravhoje. Copenhagen: Selskabet for Trykkefrihedens rette Brug.

– 1849. Primeval antiquities of Denmark. London: John Henry Parker.

French archaeology: between national identity and cultural identity

Barret-Kriegel, B. 1988. *La défaite de V erudition*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

Berce, F. 1986. Arcisse de Caumont et les sociétés savantes. In *Les lieux de mémoire*, vol. II: la nation, 2: le patrimoine, P. Nora (ed.), 533-68. Paris: Gallimard.

Binetruy, M. S. 1994. *De l'art roman à la préhistoire, des sociétés locales à l'Institut, itinéraires de Joseph Dechelette*. Lyon.

Broca, P. 1864. *Bulletin de la Société d'Anthropologie de Paris* 4, 194-5.

Büchschütz, O. & Schnapp, A. 1992. Alesia. In *Les lieux de mémoire*, vol. II : les France, 3: de l'archive à Vernet, P. Nora (ed.), 273-315. Paris: Gallimard.

Chastel, A. 1986. La notion de patrimoine. In *Les lieux de mémoire*, vol. II : la nation, 2: le patrimoine, P. Nora (ed.), 405-50. Paris: Gallimard.

Chevalier, N. 1992. *L'administration de la recherche archéologique française dans le Moyen-Orient du milieu du XVIII^e siècle à la seconde guerre mondiale*. Thesis, Paris.

Daniel, G. & Renfrew, C. 1986. *The idea of prehistory*, 2nd edn. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Denis, F. 1993. *Le comte de Caylus et l'antiquité*. Thesis, Paris.

Digeon, C. 1959. *La crise allemande de la pensée française 1870-1914*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

Drouard, A. 1990. La fondation française pour l'étude des problèmes humains et l'organisation de la recherche en sciences sociales en France. *Cahiers pour l'histoire de CNRS* 1989-89, 9, 107-24. Paris: Editions du CNRS.

Dumoulin, O. 1985. Les sciences humaines et la préhistoire du CNRS. *Revue française de sociologie* 26, 363-74.

Etienne, R. & Mossière, J. C. 1993. *Jacob Spon; un humaniste lyonnais du XVIII^e siècle*. Paris.

Ferembach, D. 1988. A history of biological anthropology in France, Part 3. Occasional Papers 2(3), International Association of Human Biologists, Newcastle upon Tyne.

Fermigier, A. 1986. Mérimée et l'inspection des monuments historiques. In Les lieux de mémoire, vol. II : La nation, 2: le patrimoine, P. Nora (ed.), 593-612. Paris: Gallimard.

Goudineau, C. 1984. Leçon inaugurale, Chaire d'Antiquités Nationales, Collège de France. Paris: Collège de France.

Gran-Aymerich, E. & J. Gran-Aymerich 1990. L'archéologie au CNRS, origine et mise en place. Cahiers pour l'histoire du CNRS 1989-89, 9, 81-105. Paris: Editions du CNRS.

Grayson, D. K. 1983. The establishment of human antiquity. New York: Academic Press.

Grenier, A. 1931. Manuel d'archéologie gallo-romaine: 1ère partie. Paris: Picard.

– 1934. Les monuments antiques, cent ans de conservation et de recherche. Congrès archéologique de France XCVII, 341-79.

Guenee, B. 1986. Chancelleries et monastères. In Les lieux de mémoire, vol. II : la nation, 1, P. Nora (ed.), 5-30. Paris: Gallimard.

Hubert, H. 1932. Les Celtes depuis l'époque de la Tête et la civilisation celtique. Paris: La Renaissance du Livre.

Huppert, G. 1970. The idea of perfect history: historical erudition and historical philosophy in renaissance France. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Klindt Jensen, O. 1975. A history of Scandinavian archaeology. London: Thames & Hudson.

de Laborde, A. 1816. Les Gaulois de la France classés chronologiquement et considérés sous le rapport des faits historiques et de l'étude des arts. Paris: Didot.

Laming-Emperaire, A. 1964. Origines de l'archéologie préhistorique en France. Paris: Picard.

Michelet, J. 1959. Journal, vol. I: 1828-48 [P. Viallaneix, ed.]. Paris: Gallimard.

- Millin, A-L. 1790. Antiquites nationales, ou recueil de monumens pour servir a l'histoire generale et particuliere de l'empirefrancois, tels que tombeaux, inscriptions, statues, vitraux, fresques, etc.; tires des abbayes, monasteres, chateaux et autres lieux devenus nationaux. Paris: Drouhin.
- 1826. Introduction a l'etude de l'archeologie, des pierres gravees et des medailles. Paris: Girard.
- Pinon, P. 1991. La Gaule retrouvee. Paris: Gallimard.
- Pomian, K. 1992. Francs et Gaulois. In Les lieux de memoire, vol. III, part 1: conflicts et partages, P. Nora (ed.), 41-105. Paris: Gallimard.
- Poulot, D. 1986. Alexandre Lenoir et les musees des monuments franais. In Les lieux de memoire, vol. I I : la nation, 2: le patrimoine, P. Nora (ed.), 497-532. Paris: Gallimard.
- de Quatrefages, A. 1871. Histoire naturelle de l'homme, la race prussienne. Revue des Deux- Mondes, 15 February.
- Richard, N. (ed.) 1992. L'invention de la prehistoire: une anthologie. Paris: Presses Pocket.
- Schnapp, A. 1993. La conquete du passe: aux origines de l'archeologie. Paris: Carre.
- Singer, C. 1992. Vichy, l'universite et les juifs: les silences et la memoire. Paris: Belles Lettres.
- Soustelle, J. 1974. Rapport sur la recherche frangaise en archeologie et anthropologie. Paris.
- Strenski, I. & H. Hubert, H. 1987. Racial science and political myth. Journal of Behavioural Sciences 21, 353-67.
- Theis, L. 1986. Guizot et les institutions de memoire. In Les lieux de memoire, vol. II: la nation, 2: le patrimoine, P. Nora (ed.), 569-92. Paris: Gallimard.
- Vaufrey, R . 1933. La prehistoire et les hommes politiques: en Allemagne. L'Anthropologie 43, 205.
- 1941. L'organisation des recherches et des etudes prehistoriques en France. Revue Scientifique 79,

Islamic archaeology and the origin of the Spanish nation

Almagro Cardenas, A. 1879. Estudio sobre las inscripciones arabes de Granada. Madrid.

Amador de los Rios, R. 1875. Inscripciones arabes de Sevilla. Madrid.

- 1880. Inscripciones arabes de Cordoba. Madrid.

Aparisi y Guijarro, A. 1843. Del principio cristiano de Espaha com o elemento de su nacion-

alidad. La Restauracion, 8 Agosto.

Asm Palacios, M. & E. Garcia Gomez 1933. Nota preliminar. Al-Andalus I, 1-5.

Asociacion Espanola de Arqueologia Medieval 1986. Boletin de Arqueologia Medieval.

Balari y Jovany, J. 1899. Origenes historicos de Catalufia. Barcelona.

de Bias Guerrero, A. 1984. Nacionalisimo e ideologias politicas contetupordneas. Madrid: Espasa-

Calpe.

Bosch Gimpera, P. 1980. Memories. Barcelona: Edicions 62.

Callahan, W. J. 1984. Church, politics and society in Spain, 1750-1874. Cambridge: Harvard

University Press.

Canfora, L. 1980. Ideologie del classicistno. Turin: Einaudi.

Caro Baroja, J. 1957. Sobre ideas raciales en Espaha. Razas, pueblos y linajes, 141-54. Madrid:

Revista de Occidente.

Castro, A. 1983 [1948]. Espaha en su historia: Cristianos, tuoros y judios. Barcelona: Critica.

Cirujano Marin, P., T. Elorriaga Planes, J. S. Perez Garzon 1985. Historiografia y nacionalistno

español 1834-1868. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas.

Conde, J. A. 1982 [1817]. Memoria sobre la moneda arabiga, en especial la acuhada en España por

los principes musulmanes, leida en la Real Academia de la Historia en junta de 21 de julio de 1804

[facsimile]. Madrid: Mayrit. [Madrid: Memorias de la Real Academia de la Historia V].

Coderay Zaidin, E 1879. Tratado de numismática arabigo-española. Madrid.

- 1903. Estudios críticos de historia árabe española. Zaragoza: Colección de Estudios Árabes V II.

Costa, J. 1887. Proyecto de expedición arqueológica en el Gorb marroquí. Revista de Geografía

Comercial 11(33) (15 March), 153.

Díaz-Andreu, M. forthcoming, a. Nationalism and archaeology: Spanish archaeology in the

Europe of nationalities. In Nationalism, politics, and the practice of archaeology; P. Kohl &

C. Fawcett (eds). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- forthcoming b. The Past in the Present: the Search for Roots in Cultural Nationalisms.

The Spanish Case. In Os Nacionalismos en Europa: pasado e presente, J. G. Beramendi,

R. Maiz and X. M. Nuez (eds). Santiago de Compostela: Servicio de Publicaciones de la

Universidade de Santiago.

Díez, J. L (ed.) 1992. La pintura de historia del siglo XIX en España. Madrid: Museo del Prado,

Ministerio de Cultura. I S L A M I C A R C H A E O L O G Y
A N D T H E S P A N I S H N A T I O N

Enciclopedia Universal Ilustrada Europeo-Americana 1930.

Madrid: Espasa-Calpe.

de Epalza, M. 1985. Historia arab-balear: un congres
polemic. L/wc(Noviembre-Diciembre),

240-1.

Espadas Burgos, M. 6c J. R . de Urquijo Goitia 1990. Guerra
de la Independencia y epoca

Constitucional (1808-1898). In Historia de Espaha (vol.
11), A. M ontenegro D uque (ed.).

Madrid: Gredos.

Ferret, A. 1980. Cotupendi d'historia de Catalunya.
Barcelona: Claret.

Fouillee, A. 1903. Equissepsychologique des peuples
europeens. Paris.

Gom ez M oreno [Gonzalez], M. 1888. Medina Elvira. Granada.

- 1890. Monumentos romanos y visigoticos de Granada.
Granada.

- 1892. Guxa de Granada. Granada.

- 1911. De arqueologia tuozarabe. Madrid.

- 1928. La novela de Espaha. Madrid.

- 1932. El arte islamico en Espaha y en el Magreb. In Arte
del islatn, H. Gluck & E. D iez

(eds), 63-90. Madrid: Labor.

Guichard, P. 1990. " Depuis Valence et en allant vers l'0 u
e s t . . . " Bilan et propositions pour

une equipe. Melanges de la Casa de Velazquez 31, 163-94.

Hernandez, F. 1923. Excavaciones en Medina Azahara.
Memorias 54, Junta Superior de Inves-

tigaciones Cientificas, Madrid.

Infante, B. 1931. La verdad sobr el complot de tablada y el
estado libre de Andalucia. Sevilla: Juntas

Liberalistas.

Jover, J. M. 1994. La idea de España en la época de la Restauración. Seminars given at the

Residencia de Estudiantes (Madrid) in January and February 1994.

Kedourie, E. (ed.), 1970. Nationalism in Asia and Africa. New York: New American Library.

Lafuente, M. 1850. Historia general de España, vol. III. Madrid.

Lafuente Alcantara, M. 1859. Inscripciones árabes de Granada. Madrid.

Lanon, F. 1987. Privilege, persecution, and prophecy: the Catholic Church in Spain 1875-1975.

Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lopez Garcia, B. 1975. Cartas inéditas de Francisco Codera a Pascual de Gayangos (reivindi-

cación de una figura del arabismo). Miscelánea de Estudios Árabes y Hebraicos 24, 29-39.

- 1979. Orígenes del arabismo español. La figura de Francisco Fernández y González y su

correspondencia con Pascual de Gayangos. Cuadernos de la Biblioteca Española de Tetuán 19

20, 277-91.

de Madrazo y Gayangos, P. 1855. Recuerdos y bellezas de España. VIII Córdoba. Madrid.

- 1858. Prologo. In Leyendas históricas árabes, F. J. Simonet, I-XV. Madrid: J. J. Martínez.

Maravall, J. A. 1991 [1957]. El sentimiento de nación en el siglo XV III : la obra de Fernán. In

Estudios de la historia del pensamiento español siglo XVIII. Madrid: Biblioteca Menéndez.

Marcos Pous, A. 1993. Origen y desarrollo del Museo Arqueológico Nacional. In Degabinete

a museo: tres siglos de historia, A. Marcos Pous (ed.),
21-100. Madrid: Ministerio de Cultura.

Marin, M. 1992. Arabistas en España. Al-Qan{ara XIII,
379-93.

Memoria de Secretaria 1923. Madrid: Junta Superior de
Excavaciones y Antigüedades.

Melida, J. R. . 1926. Ocilis (Medinaceli). Memoria de las
excavaciones practicadas en 1924-25.

Memorias de la Junta Superior de Excavaciones
Arqueológicas 82, Junta Superior de Inves-

tigaciones Científicas, Madrid.

Menendez Pidal, R. . 1947. Los españoles en la historia.
Cimas y depresiones en la curva de su

vida política. In Historia de España (vol. 1), R. . Menendez
Pidal (ed.), ix-ciii. Madrid: Espasa

Calpe.

de Mergelina, C. 1927. Bobastro. Memoria de las
excavaciones realizadas en las Mesas de Villaverde.

Madrid: Junta Superior de Investigaciones Científicas.

Monumentos arquitectónicos de España 1859. Madrid:
Imprenta y Calcografía Nacional.

Moreno Alonso, M. 1979. Historiografía romántica
española. Introducción al estudio de la historia en

el siglo XIX. Sevilla: Universidad de Sevilla.

Moreno Nieto, J. 1864. Discursos leídos ante la Real
Academia de la Historia en la recepción pública

de Don José Moreno Nieto. Madrid.

Monoz Romero, T. 1860. La Edad Media y la necesidad de
fomentar su estudio. Madrid: Real

Academia de la Historia.

Murphy, J. C. 1815. Arabian antiquities of Spain. London.

Nieto Gallo, G. 1985. Without title [inauguration]. Actas del I Congreso de Arqueología Medieval

Espanola I, 9-11 [Colección Actas 7]. Zaragoza: Diputación General de Aragón.

Olmos Enciso, L. 1991. Ideología y arqueología. Los estudios sobre el periodo visigodo en la

primera mitad del siglo XX. In Historiografía de la arqueología y de la historia antigua en España

(siglos XVIII-XX), J. Arce & R. Olmos (eds), 157-60. Madrid: Ministerio de Cultura.

Pavón, B. 1975. El arte hispano-musulmán en su decoración geométrica. Una teoría para un estilo.

Madrid.

Pons Boigues, F. 1952 [1888]. Apuntes de un viaje por Argelia y Túnez. In Estudios breves, 67

158. Tetuán: Instituto General Franco de Estudios e Investigación Hispano-Árabe.

Puigjaner, J. M. 1989. Catalunya: un país trilingüe. Barcelona: Generalitat de Catalunya.

de la Rada y Delgado, J. de D. 1892. Catálogo de monedas árabes españolas que se conservan en el

Museo Arqueológico Nacional. Madrid.

Relación de las excavaciones autorizadas y de las subvencionadas por el Estado 1915. Madrid: Junta

Superior de Excavaciones y Antigüedades.

Ribera, J. 1928 [1910]. El arabista español. Disertaciones y opúsculos I, 457-88.

Rossello Bordoy, G. 1985. Islam andalusi e investigación arqueológica. Estado de la cuestión.

Actas del I Congreso de Arqueología Medieval Española (vol. III), 7-24 [Colección Actas 9].

Zaragoza: Diputación General de Aragón.

- 1986. Les jornades d'estudis histories locals: una versio diferent. L/wr 727, 83-9.

Salvatierra Cuenca, V. 1990. Cien ahos de arqueologia medieval: perspectivas desde laperiferia: Jaen.

Monografica Arte y Arqueologia 7, Universidad de Granada.

Sanchez-Albornoz, C. 1956. Espaha, un enigma historico. Buenos Aires: Sudamericana.

Simonet, F. J. 1867. Discursos leidos ante el claustro de la Universidad literaria de Granada en el acto

solemne de la recepcion del Ldo. D. Francisco Javier Simonet cotno catedratico nutnerario de lengua

arabe en la Facultad de Filosofia y Letras el dia 15 de Setiembre de 1862. Granada.

- 1897-1903. Historia de los mozarabes de Espaha. Madrid.

Torres Baibas, L. 1957. Arte hispanomusulman hasta la caida del califato de Cordoba. In

Historia de Espaha (vol. V), R . Menendez Pidal (ed.), 331-788.

Vallejo Triano, A. 1987. " Madinat al-Zahra" : pasado, presente y futuro. II Congreso de Arque

ologia Medieval Espanola (vol. I), 205-17.

- 1988-90. Cronica anos 1988-1990. Cuadernos de Madinat al-Zahra 2, 183-222.

Vives y Escudero, A. 1893. Monedas de las dinastias arabigo-espaholas. Madrid.

Zozaya, J. 1968. Arqueologia posterior al siglo V III en Espaha. Congreso Nacional de Arqueologia

X I , 846-9.

Archaeology and nationalism: the Portuguese case

- Aguiar, J. 1984. *A Voz dos Deuses. Memórias de um compatriota de artuvas de Viriato*. Lisbon: Perspectivas Sc Realidades.
- Alarcao, J. 1988. *Roman Portugal Warminster: Aris & Philips*.
- Almeida, L. Ferrand 1965. Alguns documentos para a historia da arqueologia em Portugal. *Conimbriga* 4, 103-5.
- Anais 1956. *A m is da revolugdo nacional VPeriodo – o mundo emguerra, Portugal empaz*. Barcelos: Com p. Ed. do Minho.
- Arenas Lopez, A. 1900. *Viriato no fue portugues si no celtibero. Su biograjia*. Guadalajara: Establ- ecimiento Tipografico a Cargo de V. Pedromingo.
- Cardoso, M. T. A. A. 1971. *Antiguidades da Lusitdnia de Andre de Resende (tradugao e notas)*. Thesis, Universidade Classica de Lisboa.
- Chastel, A. 1986. *La notion de patrimoine. In Les lieux de memoire, II; la nation, P. Nora (ed.)*, 405-50. Paris: Gallimard.
- Congresso 1940. *Congresso do Mundo Portugues. Publicagoes: vol 1: Memórias e Comunicagoes apre- sentadas ao Congresso de Pre e Proto-Historia de Portugal* Lisbon: Comissao Executiva dos Centenarios, Sec^{ao} de Congressos.
- Correia, A. A. Mendes 1928a. *A Lusitania pre-Rom ana. In Historia de Portugal, D. Peres (ed.)*, 79-214. Barcelos: Portucalense Editora.
- 1928b. *L'authenticite d'Alvao: reponse a M. Dussaud*. *Trabalhos da Sociedade Portuguesa de Antropologia e Etnologia* 4.
- 1940. *Prefacio. In Viriato (2nd edn), A. Schulten (ed.)*. Oporto: Livraria Civiliza^{ao}.
- Cortesao, J. 1974 [1930]. *Os factores democrdticos na formagao de Portugal* Lisbon: Livros H ori zonte.
- Custodio, J. 1993. *Salvaguarda do patrimnio – antecedentes historicos. De Alexandre Hercu lano a Carta de Veneza (1837-1964)*. *Dar Futuro ao Passado*, 33-71. Lisbon: SEC.

Diaz-Andreu, M. forthcoming. Archaeology and nationalism in Spain. In Nationalism, politics and the practice of archaeology, P. Kohl & C. Fawcett (eds). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fabiao, C. 1989. Para a historia da arqueologia em Portugal. Penelope – Fazer e Desfazer a Historia 2, 9-26.

– 1994. Ler as cidades antigas: arqueologia urbana em Lisboa. Penelope – Fazer e Desfazer a Historia 13, 147-62.

Ferreira, D. V. Sc S. V. Ferreira 1969. A Vida quotidiana dos Lusitanos no tempo de Viriato. Lisbon: Polis.

Franca, J. A. 1974. O Romantismo em Portugal Lisbon: Livros Horizonte.

Garcia, M. M. 1992. Arquivo Salazar. Inventario e indices. Lisbon: Estampa.

Godinho, V. M. 1971. Ensaio III. Sobre teoria da historia e historiografia. Lisbon: Sa da Costa.

Gonsalves, V. S. (ed.) 1993. Historia de Portugal, vo 1.1: Portugal na pre-historia. Amadora: Ediclube.

Guerra, A. Sc C. Fabiao 1992. Viriato: genealogia de um mito. Penelope Fazer e Desfazer a Historia 8, 9-23.

Heleno, M. 1932. The Portuguese nation is already defined in the neolithic age. Didrio de Noticias, 28 March 1932, 1.

– 1965. Programa para a instalaçao do Museu Etnologico do Dr Leite de Vasconcellos na cidade universitaria. Ethnos 4, 63-74.

Herculano, A. 1868. Historia de Portugal desde o começo da monarquia ate ao fim do reinado de Afonso III, 3rd edn. Lisbon: Viuva Bertrand & Filhos.

Lemos, F. Sande 1992. Arqueologia Portuguesa: proximo futuro. Previsoes para a ultima decada do II milenio. Forum 11, 53-64.

Machado, J. L. Saavedra 1965. Subsídios para a historia do Museu Etnologico do Dr Leite de Vasconcellos. O Arqueologo Portugues 5, 51-448.

Martins, O. 1879a. Historia da Civilisagao Iberica. Lisbon: Carvalho.

- 1879b. Historia de Portugal. Lisbon: Livraria Bertrand.

Moreira, I. M. Martins 1989. Museus e monumentos em Portugal (1772-1974). Lisbon: Universidade Aberta.

Nabais, A. 1985. Museus. In Dicionario ilustrado de historia de Portugal, vol. 2, 18-21. Lisbon: Alfa.

Pago, A. do 1959. Novos documentos sobre a batalha de Aljubarrota. Infantaria, 151-2.

- 1965. Escavações de caracter historico realizadas no campo de batalha de Aljubarrota. Bracara Augusta 41-2 , 83-92.

Patrimonio 1993. Patrimonio arquitectonico e arqueologico classificado. Lisbon: IPPAR.

Peres, D. 1928. Historia de Portugal. Barcelos: Portucalense Editora.

Santos, A. E. 1909. Projecto de reforma dos estatutos da Real Associacão dos Architectos Civis e Archeologos Portuguezes. Braga: Imprensa Bracarense.

Sarmento, F. M. Martins 1933. Dispersos. Colectanea de artigos publicados desde 1867 a 1899, sobre arqueologia, etnologia, mitologia, epigrafia e arte prehistorica. Coimbra: Imprensa da Universidade.

Silva, A. Vieira 1944. Epigrafia de Olisipo (subsídios para a historia da Lisboa romana). Lisbon: Camara Municipal.

Silva, H. G. 1935. Boletim da Direcção-Geral dos edificios e Monumentos Nacionais, 5-20.

Torgal, L. R. & J. L. Roque (eds) 1993. Historia de Portugal, vol. 5: O liberalismo (1807-1890). Lisbon: Circulo de Leitores.

Varagnac, A. (ed.) 1963. O homem antes da Escrita. Lisbon: Cosmos.

Vasconcellos, J. Leite de 1897-1913. Religioes da Lusitania [3 volumes]. Lisbon: Imprensa Nacional.

- 1915. Historia do Museu Ethnologico Portugues (1839-1914). Lisbon: Imprensa Nacional.

Veiga, S. P. M. E. 1891. Paleoethnologia: antiguidades
tuonumentaes do Algarve, tempos pre-historicos, vol. 4.
Lisbon: Imprensa Nacional.

Nationalism without a nation: the Italian case

Bianchi Bandinelli, R. 1976. Introduzione all'Archeologia. Roma: Laterza.

Canfora, L. 1980. Ideologie del classicismo. Turin: Einaudi.

- 1989. Le vie del classicismo. Roma: Laterza.

Cederna, A. 1979. Mussolini urbanista. Roma: Laterza.

Cuomo di Caprio, N. 1986. Onde di propagazione della Nuova Archeologia in Italia. Rivista di Archeologia 10, 59-71.

D'Agostino, B. 1991. The Italian perspective on theoretical archaeology. In Archaeological theory in Europe; the last, three decades, I. Hodder (ed.), 52-64. London: Routledge.

Guidi, A. 1987. The development of prehistoric archaeology in Italy: a short review. Acta Archaeologica 58, 237-47.

- 1988. Storia della paleontologia. Roma: Laterza.

- 1992. The Italian pluriverse. Different approaches to prehistoric archaeology. Paper presented at the Theoretical Archaeology Group Annual Meeting, Southampton, England.

Manacorda, D. 1982a. Cento anni di ricerche archeologiche italiane: il dibattito sul metodo. Quaderni di Storia 16, 85-119.

- 1982b. Per un'indagine sull'archeologia italiana durante il ventennio fascista. Archeologia Medievale 9, 443-70.

- 1985. Il piccone del regime. Roma: Curcio.

Patterson, T. 1986. The last sixty years: towards a social history of American archaeology in the United States. American Anthropologist 88, 7-26.

Peroni, R. 1990. "Dottrina e metodologia della ricerca preistorica": contributo alla lettura critica di un'operazione culturale. In Gedenkschrift für Jürgen Driehaus, F. M. Andraschko & R. Teegen (eds), 1-14. Mainz am Rhein: Philipp von Zabern.

- 1992. Preistoria e protostoria: la vicenda degli studi in Italia. In *Le vie dellapreistoria*, 7-70. Roma: Manifestolibri.

Various authors, 1986. *L'archeologia italiana nel Mediterraneo fuo alla Seconda Guerra mondiale*. Catania: Centro di Studi per l'Archeologia del CNR. 118

3 Three nations or one? Britain and the national use of the past

Bowden, M. 1991. Pitt Rivers: the life and archaeological work of Lieutenant-General Augustus Henry Lane Fox Pitt Rivers, DCL, FRS, FSA. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bramwell, A. 1989. Ecology in the twentieth century: a history. London: Yale University Press.

Bruce-Mitford, R. 1971. Envoi. *British Museum Quarterly* 35, 8-15.

Burkitt, M. C. 1921. Prehistory: a study of the early cultures in Europe and the Mediterranean basin. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cant, R. G. 1981. Donald Stewart Erskine, 11th Earl of Buchan: founder of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland. In *The Scottish antiquarian tradition*, A. S. Bell (ed.), 1-30. Edinburgh: John Donald.

Champion, T. C. 1991. Theoretical archaeology in Britain. In *Archaeological theory in Europe: the last three decades*, I. Hodder (ed.), 129-60. London: Routledge.

Chapman, R. W. 1985. The Prehistoric Society, prehistory and society. *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society* 51, 15-29.

Childe, V. G. 1925. *The dawn of European civilization*. London: Kegan Paul.

Clark, J. G. D. 1985. The Prehistoric Society: from East Anglia to the world. *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society* 51, 1-13.

— 1989. *Prehistory at Cambridge and beyond*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Clarke, D. V. 1981. Scottish archaeology in the second half of the nineteenth century. In *The Scottish antiquarian tradition*, A. S. Bell (ed.), 114-41. Edinburgh: John Donald.

Colley, L. 1992. *Britons: forging the nation 1707-1837*. London: Yale University Press.

Colls, R. & P. Dodd (eds) 1986. *Englishness: politics and*

culture 1880-1920. Beckenham: Croom Helm.

Daniel, G. E. 1965. Introduction. In Prehistoric and early Wales, I. L. Foster (ed.), 1-15. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

– 1975. 150 years of archaeology. London: Duckworth.

Dietler, M. 1994. “Our ancestors the Gauls” : archaeology, ethnic nationalism and the manipulation of Celtic identity in modern Europe. *American Anthropologist* 96, 584-605.

Ebbatson, L. 1994. Context and discourse: Royal Archaeological Institute membership 1845-1942. In *Building on the past: papers celebrating 150 years of the Royal Archaeological Institute*, B. Vyner (ed.), 22-74. London: Royal Archaeological Institute.

Evans, J. 1956. *A history of the Society of Antiquaries*. London: Society of Antiquaries.

Fox, C. 1923. *The archaeology of the Cambridge region*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Graham, A. 1975-6. The archaeology of Joseph Anderson. *Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland* 107, 279-98.

– 1981. *In piam veterum memoriam*. In *The Scottish antiquarian tradition*, A. S. Bell (ed.), 212-26. Edinburgh: John Donald.

Harvie, C. 1994. *Scotland and nationalism: Scottish society and politics 1707-1994*, 2nd edn. London: Routledge.

Hewison, R. 1987. *The heritage industry: Britain in a climate of decline*. London: Methuen.

Jenkins, J. G. 1992. *Getting yesterday right: interpreting the heritage of Wales*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press.

Kendrick, T. D. 1951. The British Museum and British antiquities. *Museums Journal* 51, 139-49.

Kruta, V., O. H. Frey, B. Raftery, M. Szabo (eds) 1991. *The Celts*. London: Thames & Hudson.

MacDougall, H. A. 1982. *Racial myth in English history*:

Trojans, Teutons, and Anglo-Saxons. Montreal, Hanover and London: Harvest House and University Press of New England.

Merriman, N. (ed.) 1993. The peopling of London: fifteen thousand years of settlement from overseas. London: Museum of London.

Moore, D. 1976. Cambrian antiquity. In Welsh antiquity: essays mainly on prehistoric topics presented to H. N. Savory upon his retirement as keeper of archaeology, G. C. Boon & J. M. Lewis (eds), 193-221. Cardiff National Museum of Wales.

Morgan, P. 1981. The eighteenth-century renaissance. Llandybie: Christopher Davies.

– 1983. From a death to a view: the hunt for the Welsh past in the romantic period. In *THE BRITAIN AND THE HENATIDONAL USE OF THE PAST* invention of tradition, E. Hobsbawm & T. Ranger (eds), 43-100. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Murray, T. 1989. The history, philosophy and sociology of archaeology: the case of the Ancient Monuments Protection Act (1882). In *Critical traditions in contemporary archaeology: essays in the philosophy, history and socio-politics of archaeology*, V. Pinsky & A. Wylie (eds), 55-67. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nash-Williams, V. E. (ed.) 1949. A hundred years of Welsh archaeology. Cardiff: Cambrian Archaeological Association.

Pezron, P. Y. 1699. *Antiquite de la nation et de la langue des Celtes, autrement appelez Gaulois*. Paris: Marchand.

Piggott, S. 1963. Archaeology and prehistory: presidential address. *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society* 29, 1-16.

– 1974. The origins of the English county archaeological societies. *Transactions of the Birmingham and Warwickshire Archaeological Society* 86, 1-16.

– 1975. *The Druids*, 2nd edn. London: Thames & Hudson.

– 1976. *Ruins in a landscape: essays in antiquarianism*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

- 1989. Ancient Britons and the antiquarian imagination: ideas from the Renaissance to the Regency. London: Thames & Hudson.

Pitt-Rivers, A. 1882. Anniversary address to the Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland. *Journal of the Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland* 11, 488-509.

Samuel, R. 1995. *Theatres of memory*. London: Verso.

Saunders, A. D. 1983. A century of ancient monuments legislation. *Antiquaries journal* 63, 11- 33.

Smiles, S. 1994. *The image of antiquity: ancient Britain and the romantic imagination*. London: Yale University Press.

Stevenson, R. B. K. 1981a. The museum, its beginnings and its development, Part 1: to 1858. In *The Scottish antiquarian tradition*, A. S. Bell (ed.), 31-85. Edinburgh: John Donald.

- 1981b. The museum, its beginnings and its development, Part 2: the National Museum to 1954. In *The Scottish antiquarian tradition*, A. S. Bell (ed.), 142-211. Edinburgh: John Donald.

Tibbies, A. (ed.) 1994. *Transatlantic slavery: against human dignity*. London: HMSO.

Trevor-Roper, H. 1983. The invention of tradition: the highland tradition of Scotland. In *The invention of tradition*, E. Hobsbaum & T. Ranger (eds), 15-41. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Trigger, B. G. 1980. *Gordon Childe: revolutions in archaeology*. London: Thames & Hudson.

- 1989. *A history of archaeological thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wainwright, G. J. 1984. The pressure of the past: presidential address. *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society* 50, 1-22.

Warner, M. 1985. *Monuments and maidens: the allegory of the female form*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicholson.

Way, A. 1845. Introduction. *Archaeological Journal* 1, 1-6.

Weatherall, D. 1994. From Canterbury to Winchester: the foundation of the Institute. In Building on the past: papers celebrating 150 years of the Royal Archaeological Institute, B. Vynner (ed.), 8-21. London: Royal Archaeological Institute.

Wheeler, R. E. M. 1925. Prehistoric and Roman Wales. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wiener, M. 1981. English culture and the decline of the industrial spirit, 1850-1980. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wilson, D. 1849. Synopsis of the museum of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland. Edinburgh: Society of Antiquaries of Scotland.

– 1851. The archaeology and prehistoric annals of Scotland. Edinburgh:

Wilson, D. M. 1989. The British Museum: purpose and politics. London: British Museum Publications.

Worsaae 1849. Primeval antiquities of Denmark. London and Oxford: Parker.

Building the future on the past: archaeology and the construction of national identity in Ireland

Anderson, B. 1991. *Imagined communities: reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. London: Verso.

Andrews, J. H. 1966. Charles Vallancey and the map of Ireland. *Geographical Journal* 132, 48-61.

Avery, M. 1990. Ulster archaeology in 1989. *Ulster Journal of Archaeology* 53, 1-2.

Barry, T. B. 1987. *The archaeology of medieval Ireland*. London: Methuen.

Binchy, D. A. 1954. Secular institutions. In *Early Irish society*; M. Dillon (ed.), 52-65. Dublin: Three Candles Press.

Bowler, P. J. 1989. *The invention of progress: the Victorians and the past*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Boyce, D. G. 1991. *Nationalism in Ireland*, 2nd edn. London: Routledge.

Boyne, P. 1987. *John O'Donovan (1806-1861): a biography*. Kilkenny: Boethius.

Bradley, J. 1992. Archaeology and development in Ireland's medieval cities and towns. In *Environment and development in Ireland*, J. Feehan (ed.), 81-6. Dublin: Environmental Institute, University College Dublin.

- forthcoming. *Urbanization in early medieval Ireland*.

Bradshaw, B. 1989. Nationalism and historical scholarship in modern Ireland. *Irish Historical Studies* 24, 329-51.

Brady, C. (ed.) 1994. *Interpreting Irish history: the debate on historical revisionism*. Dublin: Irish Academic Press.

Briggs, A. 1990. *Victorian things*. London: Penguin.

Butler, H. 1990. Lament for archaeology. In *The sub-prefect should have held his tongue, and other essays*, H. Butler, 170-79. London: Penguin.

Clark, G. 1957. *Archaeology and society*, 3rd edn. London:

Methuen.

Chapman, M. 1992. *The Celts: the construction of a myth*. New York: St Martin's Press.

Cooney, G. 1992. The archaeological endowment. In *Environment and development in Ireland*, J. Feehan (ed.), 70-80. Dublin: Environmental Institute, University College Dublin.

- 1993. A sense of place in Irish prehistory. *Antiquity* 67, 632-41.

- 1994. Sacred and secular neolithic landscapes in Ireland. In *Sacred sites, sacred places*, D. L. Carmichael, J. Hubert, B. Reeves & A. Schanche (eds), 32-43. London: Routledge.

- forthcoming. *Theory and practice in Irish archaeology*.

Cooney, G. & E. Grogan 1994. *Irish prehistory, a social perspective*. Dublin: Wordwell.

Cunningham, B. 1986. Seventeenth-century interpretations of the past: the case of Geoffrey Keating. *Irish Historical Studies* 25, 116-28.

Daniel, G. 1975. *150 years of archaeology*, 2nd edn. London: Duckworth.

de Paor, L. 1986. *The peoples of Ireland: from prehistory to modern times*. London: Hutchinson.

de Paor, M. 1993. Irish antiquarian artists. In *Visualizing Ireland: national identity and the pictorial tradition*, A. M. Dalsimer (ed.), 119-32. London: Faber Sc Faber.

Dillon, M. 1967. George Petrie (1789-1866). *Studies* 56, 266-76.

Duffy, C. G. (ed.) 1845. *Literary and historical essays by Thomas Davis*. Dublin: Duffy.

Eriksen, T. H. 1993. *Ethnicity and nationalism: anthropological perspectives*. London: Pluto.

Evans, E. E. 1968. Archaeology in Ulster since 1920. *Ulster Journal of Archaeology* 31, 3-8.

Foster, R. F. 1983. *History and the Irish question*.

Transactions of the Royal Historical Society (5th series)
33, 169-92.

- 1988. Modern Ireland 1600-1972. London: Penguin.

Friel, B. 1981. Translations. London: Faber Sc Faber.

Garvin, T. 1981. The evolution of Irish nationalistic
politics. Dublin: Gill & Macmillan.

Gellner, E. 1983. Nations and nationalism. Oxford: Basil
Blackwell.

Gibbons, L. 1988. Coming out of Hibernation? The myth of
modernity in Irish culture. In Across the frontiers:
Ireland in the 1990s, R. Kearney (ed.), 205-18. Dublin:
Wolfhound.

Glassie, H. 1982. Passing the time: folklore and history of
an Ulster community. Dublin: O'Brien Press.

Goldring, M. 1993. Pleasant the scholar's life: Irish
intellectuals and the construction of the nation state.
London: Serif. 161 A R C H A E O L O G Y A N D I D E N T
I T Y I N I R E L A N D

Graham, B. J. & L. J. Proudfoot 1993. A perspective on the
nature of Irish historical geogra phy. In An historical
geography of Ireland, B. J. Graham & L. J. Proudfoot (eds),
1-18. London: Academic Press.

Harbison, P. 1988. Pre-Christian Ireland. London: Thames &
Hudson.

Healy, Y. 1994. An Irishwoman's Diary, The Irish Times (12
July), 11.

Herity, M. & G. Eogan 1977. Ireland in Prehistory. London:
Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Hutchinson, J. 1987. The dynamics of cultural nationalism:
the Gaelic revival and the creation of the Irish nation
state. London: Allen & Unwin.

Jackson, A. 1994. Unionist history. In Interpreting Irish
history; the debate on historical revisionism, C. Brady
(ed.), 253-68. Dublin: Irish Academic Press.

Kavanagh, R. M. 1992. Sir William Wilde: his contribution
to Irish archaeology. Co. Roscom mon Historical and

Archaeological Society Journal 4, 1-12.

Lowenthal, D. 1985. *The past is a foreign country*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

MacDonagh, O. 1983. *States of mind: a study of Anglo-Irish relations, 1780-1920*. London: Allen & Unwin.

MacDowell, R. B. 1985. The main narrative. In *The Royal Irish Academy, a bicentennial history 1785-1985*, T. O'Riordan (ed.), 1-92. Dublin: Royal Irish Academy.

MacNeill, E. 1919. *Phases of Irish history*. Dublin: Gill.

Mallory, J. P. & MacNeill 1991. *The archaeology of Ulster*. Belfast: Institute of Irish Studies, Queen's University Belfast.

Mitchell, G. E. 1985. Antiquities. In *The Royal Irish Academy, a bicentennial history 1785-1985*, T. O'Riordan (ed.), 93-165. Dublin: Royal Irish Academy.

Myers, K. 1992. Pat's ark. *The Irish Times* (21 March).

Neill, K. 1993. The Broighter hoard. *Archaeology Ireland* 24, 24-6.

Ní Dhonnchadha, M. & T. Dorgan (eds) 1991. *Revising the rising*. Derry: Field Day.

O'Brien, T. 1992. *Light years ago*. Dublin: Black Cat Press.

O'Connor, B. 1993. Myths and mirrors: tourist images and national identity. In *Tourism in Ireland: a critical analysis*, B. O'Connor & M. Cronin (eds), 68-85. Cork: Cork University Press.

O'Kelly, M. J. 1982. *Newgrange: archaeology, art and legend*. London: Thames & Hudson.

Owens, G. 1994. Hedge schools of politics, O'Connell's monster meetings. *History Ireland* 2(1), 35-40.

Petrie, G. 1837. On the history and antiquities of Tara Hill. *Transactions of the Royal Irish Academy* 18, 25-232.

— 1845. *The ecclesiastical architecture of Ireland, anterior to the Anglo-Norman invasion*. Dublin: Hodges & Smith.

- 1972. An essay on military architecture previous to the English invasion. Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy 72C , 219-65.

Raftery, J. 1951. Prehistoric Ireland. London: Batsford.

- 1972. George Petrie: a reassessment. Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy 72C , 153-7.

Sheehy, J. 1980. The rediscovery of Ireland's past: the Celtic revival 1830-1930. London: Thames & Hudson.

Smyth, W. J. 1993. The making of Ireland: agendas and perspectives in cultural geography. In An historical geography of Ireland, B. J. Graham & L. J. Proudfoot (eds), 399-438. London: Academic Press.

Stout, G. 1993. The Vallancey triangle. Archaeology Ireland 25, 8-9.

Trigger, B. 1984. Alternative archaeologies: nationalist, colonialist, imperialist. Man 19, 355- 70.

- 1989. A history of archaeological thought. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Maddell, J. 1978 The invasion hypothesis in Irish prehistory. Antiquity 52, 121-8.

- 1991. The Irish Sea in prehistory. Journal of Irish Archaeology 6, 29-40.

Wilde, W. R . 1849. The beauties of the Boyne, and its tributary, the Blackwater. Dublin: McGlashan.

- 1857. A descriptive catalogue of the antiquities of stone, earthen and vegetable materials in the museum of the Royal Irish Academy: Dublin: Hodges & Smith.

- 1861. A descriptive catalogue of the antiquities of animal materials and bronze in the museum of the Royal Irish Academy. Dublin: Hodges & Smith.

- 1862. A descriptive catalogue of the antiquities of gold in the museum of the Royal Irish Academy. Dublin: Hodges & Smith.

Woodman, P. C. 1991. Archaeology and the Journal: concern for a disappearing past. Journal of the Cork Historical and Archaeological Society 96, 103-16.

- 1992. Irish archaeology today: a poverty amongst riches.
The Irish Review 12, 34-9.

- 1994. The prehistory of south-west Ireland an
archaeological region or a state of mind? In Past
perceptions: the prehistoric archaeology of south-west
Ireland, E. Shee Twohig & M. Ronayne (eds), 6-15. Cork:
Cork University Press. 163

German archaeology and its relation to nationalism and racism

Ackerknecht, E. 1957. Rudolf Virchow. Arzt. Politiker. Anthropologe. Stuttgart: Enke.

Andree, C. 1969. Geschichte der Berliner Gesellschaft für Anthropologie, Ethnologie und

Urgeschichte 1869–1969. In Festschrift zum hundertjährigen Bestehen der Berliner Gesellschaft

für Anthropologie, Ethnologie und Urgeschichte 1869–1969, vol. I, H. Pohle & G. Mahr (eds),

9–142. Berlin: Bruno Heßling.

Arnold, B. 1990. The past as propaganda: totalitarian archaeology in Nazi Germany. *Antiquity*

64, 464–78.

Baumunk, B.-M. & J. RieB (eds) 1994. Darwin und Darwinismus. Eine Ausstellung zur Kultur-

und Naturgeschichte. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.

Baumler, A. (ed.) 1932. Was bedeutet Herman Wirth für die Wissenschaft. Leipzig: Koehler &

Amelang.

Bieder, T. 1925. Geschichte der Germanenforschung, vol. I II. Leipzig: Theodor Weicher.

Bollmus, R. 1970. Das Amt Rosenberg und seine Gegner. Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt.

Chamberlain, H. S. 1899. Die Grundlagen des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts. Munich: Bruckmann.

Conze, W. & Sommer, A. 1984. Rasse. In *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe*, vol. V, 135–78.

Daniel, G. 1981. *A short history of archaeology*. London: Thames & Hudson.

Ecker, A. 1865. *Crania Germaniae meridionalis occidentalis*. Freiburg: Fr. Wagner.

– 1871. Der Kampf um's Dasein in der Natur und im
Völkerleben, Konstanz: Otto Ammon.

Eggers, H. J. 1986. Einführung in die Vorgeschichte. Munich:
Piper.

Ehrenreich, P. 1904. Review of Wilser, L. 1904 Die
Germanen, Zeitschrift für Ethnologie 36,

706-8.

Filipowiak, W. & H. Gundlach 1992. Wolin-Vineta. Rostock:
Hinstorff.

Franz, L. 1924. Review of Pastor, W. 1922. Deutsche
Urzeit. Wiener Prähistorische Zeitschrift

11, 90-91.

Fritze, W. H. 1961. Slawomanie oder Germanomanie?
Bemerkungen zu W. Stellers neuer

Lehre von der älteren Bevölkerungsgeschichte
Ostdeutschlands. Jahrbuch für die Geschichte

Mittel- und Ostdeutschlands 9/10, 293-304.

Gesellschaft 1937. Die Deutsche Gesellschaft für
Vorgeschichtsforschung. Jomsburg 1, 532.

Gugenberger, E. & R. Schweidlenka 1993. Die Fäden der
Nornen. Zur Macht der Mythen in

politischen Bewegungen. Vienna: Verlag für
Gesellschaftskritik.

Gummel, H. 1938. Forschungsgeschichte in Deutschland.
Berlin: de Gruyter.

Gunther, H. F. K. 1934. Die Nordische Rasse bei den
Indogermanen Asiens. Munich: Lehmann.

HaBmann, H. forthcoming. Archaeology in the Third Reich. In
Archaeology, ideology and

society: the German experience, H. Harke (ed.). Cambridge:
Cambridge University Press.

Herrmann, A. 1935. Die Nordrasse eroberte die Welt. Das
Schwarze Korps 1(11), 10.

Hitler, A. 1937. Mein Kampf 244-58th edn. Munich: Eher.

Hornes, M. 1905. Die jüngere Steinzeit und die Rassenfrage. Politisch-Anthropologische Revue

4, 65-75.

Hunger, U. 1982. Die Runenkunde im Dritten Reich. Göttingen: Lang.

John, G. 1991. 150 Jahre Verein von Altertumsfreunden in Rheinlande. Cologne: Rheinland.

Kater, M. 1974. Das 'Ahnenerbe' der SS 1935-1945. Ein Beitrag zur Kulturpolitik des Dritten

Reiches. Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt.

Kirchner, H. 1938. Das germanische Altertum in der deutschen Geschichtsschreibung des achtzehnten

Jahrhunderts. Berlin: Emil Ebering.

Klaatsch, H. 1903. Note on L. Wilser's lecture "Die Rassen der Steinzeit". Correspondenz-

Blatt der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Anthropologie, Ethnologie und Urgeschichte 34, 187. GERMANARCHAEOLOGY, NATIONALISM AND RACISM

Klemm, G. E. 1836. Handbuch der germanischen Alterthumskunde. Dresden: Walther.

Korell, D. 1984. Bekenntnis zu Gustaf Kossinna. Mannus 50, 161-87.

Kossinna, G. 1895. Über die vorgeschichtliche Ausbreitung der Germanen in Deutschland.

Correspondenz-Blatt der deutschen Gesellschaft für Anthropologie, Ethnologie und Urgeschichte 26,

109-12.

- 1896. Professuren für deutsches Altertum. Die Grenzboten 55, 600-605.

- 1904. Review of Wilser, L. 1904. Die Germanen. Archiv für Rassen- und Gesellschaftsbiolo-

gie 1, 780-805.

– 1911. Die Herkunft der Germanen. Leipzig: Kabitzsch.

– 1912. Die deutsche Vorgeschichte eine hervorragend nationale Wissenschaft. Mannus 4, 17-19.

– 1918. Altgermanische Kulturhöhe. Ein Kriegsvortrag. Jena: Nornen.

– 1919. Das Weichselland, ein uralter Heimatboden der Germanen. Danzig: Kafemann.

Lipp, W. 1987. Natur. Geschichte. Denkmal. Zur Entstehung des Denkmalebewußtseins derburgerli-

chen Gesellschaft. Frankfurt: Campus.

Möde, M. 1992. Altertumswissenschaften und Altertumswissenschaftler unter dem NS-

Regime. Gedanken zum Niedergang deutscher Wissenschaften. In Wissenschaft unter dem

NS-Regime, B. Brentjes (ed.), 156-69. Berlin: Lang.

Montelius, O. 1888. Über die Einwanderung unserer Vorfahren in den Norden. Archiv für

Anthropologie 17, 151-60.

– 1899. Der Orient und Europa. Stockholm: Kungl. Hofboktryckeriet.

Much, M. 1906. Die Trugspiegelung orientalischer Kultur in den vorgeschichtlichen Zeital-

tern Nord- und Mitteleuropas. Mitteilungen der Anthropologischen Gesellschaft in Wien 36, 57

91.

Pastor, W. 1906. Der Zug vom Norden. Jena: Diederichs.

– 1922. Deutsche Urzeit. Leipzig: H. Haessel.

Penzler, J. (ed.) 1897. Die Reden Kaiser Wilhelm II. in den Jahren 1888-1895. Leipzig: Reclam.

Reinerth, H. 1936. Süddeutschlands nordisch-germanische
Sendung. Germanenerbe 1, 2 0 3 -

209.

- 1937. Aufgaben der Deutschen Vorgeschichtsforschung.
Volk und Heimat 13, 89-90.

Richthofen, B. Freiherr von 1929. Gehört Ostdeutschland zur
Urheimat der Polen? Kritik der

vorgeschichtlichen Forschungsmethode an der Universität
Posen. Danzig: W. F. Bureau.

- 1967. Schlesien und die Schlesier, vol. II.
Wolfenbüttel: Grenzland-Verlag.

Rom er, R . 1989. Sprachwissenschaft und Rassenideologie
in Deutschland, 2nd edn. Munich:

Wilhelm Fink.

Schilling, H. 1935. Was bedeutet "Steinzeit"? Das
Schwarze Korps 1(41), 13.

Schliz, A. 1915/16. Rassenfragen. In Reallexikon
der germanischen Altertumskunde, vol. I 1 1 , 4 3 9 -

59.

Schmidt, E. 1899. Die Anthropologie der Badener. Die Umschau
3, 950-03.

Schuchhardt, C. 1926. Alteuropa. Berlin and Leipzig: de
Gruyter.

Schwantes, G. 1939. Der Einfluß der Vorgeschichte auf das
Geschichtsbild unserer Zeit. Kieler

Blätter!, 131-45.

Schwerin von Krosigk, H. Grafm 1982. Gustaf Kossinna. Der
Nachlaß Versuch einer Analyse.

Neumiinster: Wachholtz.

See, K. von 1970. Deutsche Germanen-Ideologie. Vom
Humanismus bis zur Gegenwart. Frankfurt:

Athenaum.

Semper, G. 1860. Der Stil in den technischen und tektonischen Künsten, vol. I. Frankfurt: Verlag

Sieglin, W. 1935. Die blonden Haare der indogermanischen Völker des Altertums. Munich:

Lehmann.

Smolla, G. 1979/80. Das Kossinna-Syndrom. Fundberichte aus Hessen 19/20, 1-9.

– 1991. Archäologie und Nationalbewußtsein. In Zwischen Walhall und Paradies. Deutsches Historisches Museum (ed.), 11-15. Berlin: DHM.

Spanuth, J. 1982. Indogermanen im Vorderen Orient. In Die Nordische Rasse bei den Indo-

germanen Asiens (reprint), H. F. K. Gunther, i-xxxii. Pahl: Hohe Warte.

Stampfuß, R. 1935. Gustaf Kossinna ein Leben für die Deutsche Vorgeschichte. Leipzig: Kabitzsch.

Steller, W. 1959. Name und Begriff der Wenden (Slcavi). Eine wortgeschichtliche Untersuchung. Kiel:

Selbstverlag.

Stern, F. 1986. Kulturpessimismus als politische Gefahr. Eine Analyse nationaler Ideologie in Deutsch-

land. Munich: DTV.

Strzygowski, J. 1932. Herman Wirths vergleichendes Verfahren. In Was bedeutet Herman

Wirth für die Wissenschaft, A. Baumler (ed.), 67-81. Leipzig: Koehler & Amelang.

Tacitus 1975. Germania [translated by W. Peterson]. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University

Press.

Virchow, R. 1872. Prof. Virchow spricht über die Race prussische. In Die dritte Augettene

Versammlung der deutschen Gesellschaft für Anthropologie,

Ethnologie und Urgeschichte zu Stuttgart

am 8. bis 11. August 1872. Addition to Correspondenz-Blatt der deutschen Gesellschaft für

Anthropologie, Ethnologie und Urgeschichte, 49-57.

– 1885. Note on L. Wilser's lecture "Die Herkunft der Germanen". Correspondenz-Blatt der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Anthropologie, Ethnologie und Urgeschichte 16, 122-4.

Volker, W. 1984. Als die Rotner frech geworden . . . Die Schlacht im Teutoburger Wald. Berlin:

Wagenbach.

Vorzeit 1919. Deutsch-polnische Vorzeit. Alldeutsche Blätter 29(21), 163-4.

Wagner, F. A. 1828. Die Tempel und Pyramiden der Urbewohner auf dem rechten Elbufer, unweit detn

Ausfluss der schwarzen Elster. Leipzig: Hartmann.

– 1833. Aegypten in Deutschland oder die germanisch-slavischen wo nicht rein germanischen Alterthümer an der schwarzen Elster. Leipzig: Hartmann.

Wahlc, E. 1932. Deutsche Vorzeit. Leipzig: Kabitzsch.

Weber, E. 1933. Willy Pastor. Nordische Stimmen 3, 105-106.

Weißmann, K. 1991a. Schwarze Fahnen, Runenzeichen. Die Entwicklung derpolitischen Symbolik

der deutschen Rechten zwischen 1890 und 1945. Diisseldorf Droste.

– 1991b. Druiden, Goden, Weise Frauen. Zurück zu Europas alten Gottern. Freiburg: Herder.

Wilde, K. A. 1939. Die Bedeutung der Grabung Wollin 1934. Stettin: Hermann Saran. Wilke,

G. 1921. Archäologische Erläuterungen zur Germania des Tacitus. Leipzig: Kabitzsch.

Wilser, L. 1899a. Germanischer Stil und deutsche Kunst. Heidelberg: Adolph Emmerling.

– 1899b. Herkunft und Urgeschichte der Arier. Heidelberg:
J. Horning.

– 1904. Menschenrassen und Weltgeschichte. Iduna 6, 113-9
and 173-81.

– 1909. Der nordische Schöpfungsherd. Zeitschrift für den
Ausbau der Enttunclungslehre 3, 121-38.

Wippermann, W. 1981. Der ‘Deutsche Drang nach Osten’ .
Ideologie und Wirklichkeit eines poli

tischen Schlagwortes. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche
Buchgesellschaft.

Wirth, A. 1918. Dunkle Urzeiteinflüsse bei unseren
Feinden. Alldeutsche Blätter 28(48), 386.

Wirth, H. 1928. Der A uf gang der Men schheit.}fnx.
Diederichs.

– 1931. Was heißt deutsch? Jena: Diederichs.

– 1933. Ura Linda Chronik. Leipzig: Koehler & Amelang.

Wiwjorra, I. forthcoming. Herman Wirth. Ein gescheiterter
Ideologe zwischen “ Ahnen-

erbe” und Atlantis. In Historische Rassistnuforschung.
Ideologen, Tater, Opfer, B. Danckwortt,

C. Schoningh, T. Q uerg (eds). Berlin: Argument Verlag.

Wolff, K. F. 1916. Zum Streitfall Dr. Wilser gegen Karl
Felix Wolff. Alldeutsche Blätter 26(29),

276.

– 1918. Indogermanen und Deutsche.

Politisch-Anthropologische Monatsschrift 17, 419-26. G E R
M A N A R C H A E O L O G Y , N A T I O N A L I S M A N
D R A C I S M

“Drang nach Westen”?: Polish archaeology and national identity

Abramowicz, A. 1967. Wiek archeologii: problemy polskiej archeologii dziewiętnastowiecznej. Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.

– 1979. Urny i ceramika. Łódź: Ossolineum.

– 1983. Dzieje zainteresowań starożytnych w Polsce, część I: od średniowiecza po czasy saskie i wikingów. Wrocław: Ossolineum.

– 1987. Dzieje zainteresowań starożytnych w Polsce, część II: czasy stanisławskie i ich pokłosie. Wrocław: Ossolineum.

– 1991. Historia archeologii polskiej. XIX i XX wiek. Warsaw and Łódź: Instytut Historii Kultury Materialnej PAN.

Barford, P., Z. Kobylinski, D. Krasnodębski 1991. Between the Slavs, Balts and Germans: ethnic problems in the archaeology and history. *Archeologia Polona* 29, 123-60.

Chłobowczyk, J. 1975. Procesy narodotwórcze we wschodniej Europie środkowej w dobie kapitalizmu. Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.

– 1980. On small and young nations in Europe. Nation-forming processes in ethnic borderlands in East-Central Europe. Wrocław: Ossolineum.

Długosz, J. 1985. Roczniki, czyli Kroniki sławnego Królestwa Polskiego. Księga 11 (1413-1430). Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe. P O L I S H A R C H A E O L O G Y A N D N A T I O N A L I D E N T I T Y

Głuska, N. 1920. Historia powszechna ze szczególnym uwzględnieniem historii Polski, t. 1: Historia starożytna i średniowieczna. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo M. Arcta.

Gellner, E. 1991. Narody i nacjonalizm. Warsaw: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy. [1983. Nations and nationalism. Oxford: Basil Blackwell].

Gieysztor, A. & T. Szczechura 1948. Średniowiecze i czasy nowożytne. Podręcznik historii dla klasy VII szkoły podstawowej. Warsaw: Nasza Księgarnia.

- Godlowski, K. 1979. Z badań nad zagadnieniami rozprzestrzenienia Słowian w V-VII w. n. e. Cracow: Instytut Archeologii U J.
- 1989. Ziemi polskie w okresie wódrowek ludów. Problem pierwotnych siedzib Słowian. *Barbaricum* 1989, 12-63.
- Gomulka, W. 1964. Artykuły i przemówienia, t. II: styczeń 1946-kwiecień 1948. Warsaw: Książka i Wiedza.
- Przemówienia: lipiec 1964–grudzień 1966. Warsaw: Książka i Wiedza.
- Hensel, W. 1946. Potrzeba przygotowania wielkiej rocznicy. Poznań: Księgarnia Akademicka.
- 1947. Kłamstwa nauki niemieckiej o Słowianach. Warsaw: Wiedza Powszechna.
- 1948. Zagadnienie pochodzenia Słowian. *Przegląd Zachodni* 4(1), 64-68.
- 1958. Z przygotowań do polskiego tysiąclecia. *Z Otchłani Wieków* 24(4), 223-9.
- 1959. Archeologia w pracach przygotowawczych do obchodów Tysiąclecia Państwa Polskiego. *Wiadomości Archeologiczne* 26, 85-90.
- 1968. Przemówienie powitalne. In *I Międzynarodowy Kongres Archeologii Słowiańskiej I*, W. Hensel (ed.), 11-14. Wrocław: Ossolineum.
- Holubowicz, W. 1956. Opolo w wiekach X-XII. Katowice: Wydawnictwo śląskie.
- Jamka, R. 1950. Wystawa objazdowa Działu Przedhistorycznego Państwowego Muzeum w Wrocławiu. *Z Otchłani Wieków* 19(1-2), 19-23.
- Jazdzewski, K. 1947. Gdzie była prakolebka Słowian. Warsaw: Wiedza Powszechna.
- Kocka, W. 1949. Znaczenie wykopalisk w Opolu. *Z Otchłani Wieków* 18(9-10), 142-4.
- Koczerska, M. & E. Wipszycka 1993. *Historia 5: świat przed wiekami*. Warsaw: Wydawnictwa Szkolne i Pedagogiczne.
- Kostrzewski, B. 1948. Stosunki plemion polskich z innymi

ludami w okresie wczesnodziejowytn. Warsaw: Wiedza Powszechna.

Kostrzewski, J. 1914. Wielkopolska w czasach przedhistorycznych. Poznan: Wydawnictwo Mariana Niemirkiewicza.

- 1946a. Kultura prasłowiańska. Warsaw: Wiedza Powszechna.

- 1946b. Prasłowiańszczyzna. Zarys dziejów i kultury Praslounan. Poznan: Księgarnia Akademicka.

- 1947. Słowianie i Germanie w pradziejach Polski. Warsaw: Wiedza Powszechna.

- 1949. Dzieje polskich badań prehistorycznych. Poznan: Polskie Towarzystwo Prehistoryczne.

- 1961. Zagadnienie ciągłości zaludnienia ziem polskich w pradziejach (od połowy II tysiąclecia p. n. e. do wczesnego średniowiecza). Poznan: Poznańskie Towarzystwo Przyjaciół Nauk.

- 1970. Z tego tytułu. Przegląd. Wrocław: Ossolineum.

Kowalczyk, J. 1981. Starożytnicy warszawscy połowy XIX w. i ich rola w popularyzacji zabytków ojczystych. In Edukacja historyczna społeczeństwa polskiego w XIX w., J. Maternicki (ed.), 157-202. Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.

Kraszewski, J. I. 1872. Program Polski 1872. Myśl o zadaniu narodowym. Poznan: J. K. Żupański.

Kulczycki, L. 1916. Panstwo i sprawa polska. Cracow: Centralne Biuro Wydawnictw NKN.

Lepkowski, T. 1967. Polska narodziny nowoczesnego turodu (1764-1870). Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.

Marciniak, A. & W. Rączkowski 1991. The development of archaeological theory in Poland under conditions of isolation. World Archaeological Bulletin 5, 57-65.

Maternicki, J. 1974. Dydaktyka historii w Polsce 1773-1918. Warsaw: Wydawnictwa Szkolne i Pedagogiczne.

Okulicz, J. 1989. Próba identyfikacji archeologicznej ludów bałtyjskich w połowie pierwszego tysiąclecia n. e. Barbaricum 1989, 64-100.

Piontek, J. 1991. Anthropological reconstruction of the historical process of ethnogenesis: biocultural model and its exemplification. *Archeologia Polona* 29, 51-69.

Piotrowski, W. 1991. 50 lat badań w Biskupinie. In *Prahistoryczny grod w Biskupinie. Problematyka osiedli obronnych na początku epoki Żelaza*, J. Jaskanis (ed.), 81-105. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

Rajewski, Z. A. 1947. *Biskupin - grod prasłowiański*. Warsaw: Wiedza Powszechna.

Skowronek, J. 1977. Koncepcja narodu w ideologii Helmuta Lamberta i jej konfrontacja z baskijską rzeczywistością. In *Idee i koncepcje w polskiej myśli politycznej czasoporozbiorowych*, J. Gockowski & A. Walicki (eds), 174-200. Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.

Stolpiak, B. 1984. *Rozwój prehistorii polskiej w okresie 20-lecia międzywojennego. Część I: 1918- 1928*. Poznań: Adam Mickiewicz University Press.

Tomaszewski, J. 1988. Kresy Wschodnie w polskiej myśli politycznej XIX i XX w. In *Między Polską etniczną a historyczną*, W. Wrzesiński (ed.), 97-118. Wrocław: Ossolineum.

Tyszkiewicz, J. 1974. *Mazowsze północno-wschodnie we wczesnym średniowieczu*. Warsaw: Mazowiecki Ośrodek Badań Naukowych.

Veit, U. 1989. Ethnic concepts in German prehistory: a case study on the relationships between cultural identity and archaeological objectivity. In *Archaeological approaches to cultural identity*, S. J. Shennan (ed.), 35-56. London: Unwin Hyman.

Wrzesiński, W. 1988. Kresy czy pogranicze? Problem ziem zachodnich i północnych w polskiej myśli politycznej XIX i XX w. In *Między Polską etniczną a historyczną*, W. Wrzesiński (ed.), 119-65. Wrocław: Ossolineum.

Zak, J. 1966. *Poznański ośrodek archeologiczny wobec Tysiąclecia Państwa Polskiego*. *Z Otchłani Wieków*, 209-12.

– 1974. Słowianie i Germanie w prehistorii polskiej i niemieckiej. In *Stosunki polsko- niemieckie w historiografii*. Część I: *Studia z dziejów historiografii polskiej i niemieckiej*, J. Krasuski, G. Labuda, A. W. Walczak (eds), 21-149. Poznań: Instytut Zachodni.

– 1977. Migracje Słowian w kierunku zachodnim w v/VI-VII
w. n. e. *Studia Historica Slavo- Germanica* 6, 3-30. 217

The faces of nationalist archaeology in Russia

Aksenova, Ye. P. & Vasilijev, M. A. 1993. Problemy etnogenii slavianstva i jego vetvej v akademicheskikh diskussijakh rubezha 1930-1940-kh godov. Slavianovedeniye 2, 86-104.

Arnold B. 1990. The past as propaganda: totalitarian archaeology in Nazi Germany. Antiquity 64, 464-78.

Artamonov, M. I. 1940. Spornyye voprosy drevnejšej istorii slavian i Rusi. Kratkije Soobshchenija Instituta Istorii Material'noj Kul'tury 6, 3-14.

– 1950. Proiskhozhdenije slavian. Leningrad: Vsesojuznoje Obshchestvo po rasprostraneniju politicheskikh i nauchnykh znaniy.

Artsikhovskij, A. V. 1934. Arkheologicheskie dannyye o vznikovenii feodalizma v Suzdal'skoj i Smolenskoj zemliakh. Problemy istorii dokapitalisticheskikh obshchestv 11-12, 35-60.

– 1939. Russkaja družhina po arkheologicheskim dannym. Istorik Marksist 1, 193-5.

– 1966. Arkheologicheskie dannyye po variashskomu voprosu. In Kul'tura Drevnej Rusi, B. A. Rybakov (ed.), 36-41. Moscow: Nauka.

Avdusin, D. A. 1949. Variashskij vopros po arkheologicheskim dannym. Kratkije Soobshchenija Instituta Istorii Material'noj Kul'tury 30, 3-14.

– 1952. Gniozdovskaja ekspeditsija. Kratkije Soobshchenija Instituta Istorii Material'noj Kul'tury 44, 93-103.

– 1953. Neornormanistskije izmyshlenija burzhuasnykh istorikov. Voprosy Istorii 12, 114-20.

Ballod, F. V. 1923. Privolzhskije "Pompeii". Moscow-Petrograd: Gosizdat.

Borozdin, I. N. 1926. Arkheologija i sotsiologija. Novyj Vostok 12, 202-13.

Brajchevskij, M. Yu. 1968. Pokhodzhennia Rusi. Kiev: Naukova Dumka.

Chuzhylovich, A. 1923. Mova, narod, rasa. Kryvich 4, 31-4.

Derzhavin, N. S. 1944. Proiskhozhdenije Russkogo naroda. Moscow: Sovjetskaja Nauka.

Dovzhenok, V. I. 1970. Cherniakhovskaja kul'tura v istorii naselenija Srednego Podneprovija. Kratkije Soobshchenija Instituta Arkheologii 121, 39-42.

Florinskij, V. M. 1894. Pervobytnyje slaviane po pamiatnikatn ikh doistoricheskoj zhizni. Opyt slavianskoj arkheologii (i). Tomsk: P. I. Makushin.

Formozov, A. A. 1986. Stranitsy istorii russkoj arkheologii. Moscow: Nauka.

– 1990. Russkoje obshchestvo i okhrana pamiatnikov kul'tury. Moscow: Sovjetskaja Rossija.

– 1993. Arkheologija i ideologija (20-30-je gg.). Voprosy filosofii 2, 70-82.

Fowler, D. D. 1987. Uses o f the past: archaeology in the service o f the state. American Antiquity 52, 229-48.

Gening, V. F. 1987. Arkheologicheskaja kul'tura sotsial'no-istoricheskij organizm -tsel'naja kategorija poznaniya arkheologii (k razrabotke teorii arkheologicheskij kul'tury). In Issle- dovanije sotsial'no-istoricheskikhproblem v arkheologii, S. V. Smirnov (ed.), 6-35 .Kiev: Naukova Dumka.

Gotije, Yu. V. 1930. Zheleznyj vek v Vostochnoj Yevrope. Moscow: Gosizdat. T H E F A C E S O F N A T I O N A L I S T A R C H A E O L O G Y I N R U S S I A

Graham, L. R . 1967. The Soviet Academy of Sciences and the Communist Party; 1927–1932.

Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Gubajdullin, G. S. 1928. K voprosu o proiskhozhdenii tatar. Vestnik nauchnogo obshchestva tatar-

ovedenija 8, 131-42.

Hobsbaum, E. 1983. Introduction: inventing traditions. In The invention of tradition,

E. Hobsbaum & T. Ranger (eds), 1-14. Cambridge: Cam bridge

University Press.

Iskhaki, G. G. 1993. IdeV Ural. Naberezhnyje Chelny: Kamaz.

Jell-Bahlsen, S. 1985. Ethnology and fascism in Germany. *Dialectical Anthropology* 9, 313-35.

Kamenetskij, I. S. 1970. Arkheologičeskaja kul'tu ra je jo opredelenije i interpretatsija. *Sovi- etskaja Arkheologija* 2, 18-36.

Kasparinskaja, S. A. 1991. Muzei Rossii i vlijanije gosudarstvennoj politiki na ikh razvitije (18-nachalo 19 v.). In *Muzej i vlast'*, vol. 1, S. A. Kasparinskaja (ed.), 8-95. Moscow: Ministerstvo Kul'tury RF, RAN, NIIK.

Khodakovskij, Z. Ya. 1839. Otryvok iz puteshestvija Khodakovskogo po Rossii (Ladoga, Novgorod). *Russkij Istoricheskij Sbornik* 3(2), 131-200.

Khudiakov, M. G. 1933. Dorevoliutionsionnaja russkaja arkheologija na sluzhbe ekspluatatorskikh klassov. Leningrad: GAIMK.

– 1935. Oчерк istorii pervobytnogo obshchestva na territorii Marijskoj oblasti. Vvedenije v istoriju naroda mari. Leningrad: OGIZ.

Khvojka, V. V. 1901. Kamennyj vek Srednego Pridneprovija. In *Trudy XI Arkheologičeskogo sjezda v Kijeve 1899* (vol. 1), A. S. Uvarov & S. S. Slutskij (eds), vol. 1, 736-812. Moscow.

– 1902. K voprosu o slavianakh. *Kijevskaja starina* 77(3), 495-505.

– 1913. Drevnije obitateli Srednego Pridneprovija i ikh kul'tura v doistoričeskije vremena. Kiev: Ye. A. Sin'kevich.

Klejn, L. S. 1970. Problema opredelenija arkheologičeskoj kul'tury. *Sovietskaja Arkheologija* 2, 37-51.

– 1978. Archeologie, racisme et nationalisme. A propos de l'interpretation des vestiges archeologiques. *Dialogues d'histoire ancienne* 4, 377-402.

Korichev, S. A. 1924. Zametki k voprosu po istorii melkikh natsionalnostej Povolzhija i Priuralija. Cheboksary: Obshchestvo izuchenija mestnogo kraja Chuvashskoj

Avtonomnoj Oblasti.

Kuznetsov, I. 1930. Protiv natsionalisticheskoy kontscptsii chuvashskoj istorii. Revoliutsionnyj Vostok 9 -10 , 207-32.

Makhno, Ye. V. 1950. Pamiyatki kul'turi poliv pokhovan' v cherniakhovs'kogo tipu. Arkheologija 4, 76-88.

– 1976. Pamiyatki tipu Ditinichiv i Kompaniivs'kij m ogil'nik. Arkheologija 19, 95-101.

Maksimov, E. V. 1990. Migratsii v zhizni drevnikh slavian. In Slaviane i Rus, P. P. Tolochko (ed.), 5-11. Kiev: Naukova Dumka.

McCann, W. J. 1990. "Volk und Germanentum" : the presentation of the past in Nazi Germany. In The politics of the past, P. Gathercole & D. Lowenthal (eds), 74-88. London: Unwin Hyman.

Passek, V. 1839. Kurgany i gorodishcha Khar'kovskogo, Valkovskogo i Poltavskogo ujezdov. Russkij Istoricheskij Sbornik 3(2), 201-29.

Petrov, D. P. 1921. Chuvashskij narod v bor'be za natsionalnoje osvobozhdenije. Kazan' : Chuvashskoje otdelenije Gosizdata.

– 1925. O proiskhozhdenii chuvash. Cheboksary: Chuvash Gosizdat.

Pobol' , L. D. 1970. Pamiatniki Yuzhnoj Bielorusсии. In Ocherki arkheologii Bielorusсии, V. E Isajenko, A. G. Mitrofanov, G. V. Shtykhov (eds), vol. 1, 138-83. Minsk: Nauka i Tekhnika.

Ravdonikas, V. I. 1934a. Pamiatniki cpokhi vzniknovenija feodalizma v Karelii i Yugo-

vostochnom Priladozhije. Izvestija Gosudarstvennoj Akademii Istorii Material'noj Kul'tury 94.

– 1934b. Nekotoryje momenty protsessa vzniknovenija feodalizma v lesnoj polose Vostochnoj Yevropy v svete arkheologicheskikh dannyx. Izvestija Gosudarstvennoj Akademii Istorii Material'noj Kul'tury 103, 102-29.

Ravikovich, D. A. 1970. Okhrana pamiatnikov istorii i kul'tury v RSFSR (1917-1967). Trudy

Nauchno-issledovatel'skogo instituta muzeevedenija i okhrany pamiatnikov istorii i kul'tury 22, 3- 127.

Rybakov, B. A. 1943. Ranniaja kul'tura vostochnykh slavian. Istoricheskij zhurnal 11-12, 73 - 80.

– 1957. Mesto slaviano-russkoj arkheologii v sovjetskoj istoricheskoj nauke. Sovjetskaja Arkheologija 4, 55-65.

– 1958. Predposylki obrazovanija drevnerusskogo gosudarstva. In Ocherki istorii SSSR Krizis rabovladel'cheskoj sistemy i zarozhdenijefeodalizma na territorii SSSR 3-9, B. A. Rybakov (ed.), 733-878. Moscow: ASSR.

– 1981a. Novaja kontseptsija predistorii Kijevskoj Rusi. Istorija SSSR 1, 55-75.

– 1981b. Novaja kontseptsija predistorii Kijevskoj Rusi. Istorija SSSR 2, 40-59.

Rykov, P. S. 1933. Ocherk po istorii mordvy (po arkheologicheskim materialam). Moscow:

Uchpedgiz.

Shaskol'skij, I. P. 1975. Uspikhi i trudncshi u vivchenni normans'koj problemi za ostanni

desiatirichchia. Ukrains'kij Istorichnij Zhurnal 8, 71-80.

– 1983. Antinormanizm i jego sud'by. In Genezis i razvitijefeodalizma v Rossii. Problemy isto- riografii, V. A. Yezhov & I. Ya. Frojanov (eds), 35-51. Leningrad: LGU.

Shnirelman, V. A. 1982. Problema doklassovogo i ranneklassovogo etnosa v zarubezhnojet-

nografii (A problem o f pre-class and early class ethnos in Western anthropology). In Etnos v

doklassovom i ranneklassovotn obshchestve, Yu. V. Bromlej, L. Ye. KubbeP, A. I. Pershits (eds),

207-50. Moscow: Nauka.

– 1992. Nauka ob etnogeneze kak mifotvorchestvo. Paper presented at the conference “ Myth and contemporary world” in the Institute o f High Humanitarian Researches, Russian National Humanitarian University, Moscow, 8-10

December 1992.

– 1993. Zlokliuchenija odnoj nauki: etnogeneticheskiye issledovaniya i stalinskaja natsional'naja politika. Etnograficheskoye Obozreniye 3, 52-68.

– 1994. Etnicheskaya istoriya, konfessionalizm i etnicheskoye samosoznaniye (naprimere tatar Povolzhija). Paper presented at the International conference "Islam and folk culture", Institute of Ethnology and Anthropology, Moscow, 5-8 April 1994.

– forthcoming. From internationalism to nationalism: forgotten pages of Soviet Archaeology of the 1930s-1940s. In Nationalism, politics and the practice of archaeology, P. Kohl & C. Fawcett (eds). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

– n.d. When the past is repressed: the Kazan' Tatar-Chuvash fighting for the farthest ancestors. Unpublished paper.

Silajeva O. A. 1991. Obshchestvo družej istoricheskogo muzeja (1918-1930). In Muzej i

vlast', S. A. Kasparinskaja (ed.), vol.2, 104-23. Moscow: Ministerstvo kul'tury RF, RAN,

NIIK.

Sizov, V. I. 1902. Kurgany Stnolenskojgubernii, Vyp.1: Gniozdovskij tngil'nik bliz Stnolenska.

[Materialy po Arkheologii Rossii 28]. St Petersburg.

Smirnov, I. 1892. Obrusenije inorodtsev i zadachi obrusitel'noj politiki. Istoricheskij Vestnik

47, 752-65.

Smilenko, A. T. 1952. Pro dejaki datujuchi rechi v kul'turi poliv pokhovan'. Arkheologija 6,

51-73. THE FACES OF NATIONALIST ARCHAEOLOGY IN RUSSIA

Smishko, Yu. M. 1952. Rannelslavianskaja kul'tura Podnestrovija v svete novykh arkheolog-

icheskikh dannyx. Kratkije Soobshchenija Instituta Istorii

MateriaVnoj KuVtury 44,67-82.

Smolin, V. F. 1925. Arkheologicheskij ocherk Tatrespubliki. Kazan'.

Spitsyn, A. A. 1899. Rasselenije drevnerusskikh plemion po arkheologicheskim dannym.

Zhurnal Ministerstva Narodnogo Prosveshchenija 324(8), 301-330.

Stalin, I., A. Zhdanov, S. Kirov 1936. Zamechanija po povodu konspekta uchebnika po

“ Istorii SSSR” . Bol'shevik 3, 63-4.

Stankevich, Ya. V. 1941. K voprosu ob etnicheskom sostave naselenija Yaroslavsckogo Povolzh-

ija v IX -X vv. Materialy i Issledovanija po Arkheologii SSSR 6, 56-88.

Symonovich, E. A. 1970. Stranitsy istorii otechestvennykh issledovanij pamiatnikov kul'tury

polej pogrebenij posle Velikogo Oktiabria. Kratkije Soobshchenija Instituta Arkheologii 121,

82-8.

Takho-Godi, A. 1931. Krajevedenije v natsional'nykh respublikakh i oblastiakh. Sovietskoje

Krajevedenije 4, 15-20.

Tikhanova, M. A. 1941. Kul'tura zapadnykh oblastej Ukrainy v pervyje veka nashej ery. Mate rialy i Issledovanija po Arkheologii SSSR 6, 247-78.

Tikhomirov, M. N. 1947. Proiskhozhdenije nazvanij “ R u s” i “ Russkaja zemlia” . Sovietskaja

Etnografija 6 -7 , 60-80.

Tishkov, V A. 1993. MezhnatsionaVnyje otnoshenija v Rossijskoj Federatsii. Moscow: Russian

Academy o f Sciences.

Tolocbko, P. P. 1990. Spornyje voprosy rannej istorii

Kijevskoj Rusi. In Slaviane i Rus,

P. P. Tolochko (ed.), 99-121. Kiev: Naukova Dumka.

Tolstov, S. P. 1930. K probleme akkul'turatsii.
Etnografija 1-2, 63-87.

– 1947. Sovjetskaja shkola v etnografii. Sovjetskaja
Etnografija 4, 8-28.

Tret'jakov, P. N. 1940. Nekotoryje voprosy etnogonii
vostochnogo slavianstva. Kratkije Soob

shchenija Instituta Istorii Material'noj KuVtury 5, 10-6.

– 1941. Severnyje vostochnoslavianskije plemena. In
Etnogenez vostochnykh slavian, M. I. Artamonov (ed.),
9-55. Moscow: ASSSR.

Trigger, B. G. 1984. Alternative archaeologies:
nationalist, colonialist, imperialist. Man 19, 355-70.

U dal'tsov, A. D. 1943. Nachal'nyj period
vostochnoslavianskogo etnogeneza. Istoricheskij Zhurnal
11-12, 67-72.

– 1947a. Proiskhozhdenije slavian. Voprosy Istorii 7,
95-100.

– 1947b. Osnovnyje voprosy etnogeneza slavian. Sovjetskaja
Etnografija 6-7, 3-13.

Verashchaka, Yu. 1923a. Abnajm en'n ja k h -“ Gudy” “
Kryvichy” “ R u s” ’ . Kryvich 1, 17-24 .

– 1923b. Rasijskija vuchonyja ab Kryvichakh. Kryvich 5,
40-5.

Veselovskij, N. I. 1900. Istorija Imperatorskogo Russkogo
Arkheologicheskogo Obshchestva. St Petersburg: Glavnoje
Upravlenije Udelov.

Yefimenko, P. P. 1923. Doistoricheskaja arkheologija, yejo
zadachi i perspektivy v oblastnom izuchenii. Krajevedenije
2, 93-8.

Yegorov, F. Ye. 1927. Marijskaja kul'tura. Marij E l 11-12,
168-86.

– 1928. Drevnije nasel'niki Marijskoj Avtonomnoj Oblasti.

Marij El 11, 32-59.

Zaks, A. B. 1970. Iz istorii ekspozitsionnoj mysli
sovietskikh muzejev (1917-1936). Trudy
Nchno-issledovatel'skogo instituta muzejevedeniya i okhrany
pamiatnikov istorii i kul'tury 22, 128- 65.

Nationalism doubly oppressed: archaeology and nationalism in Lithuania

Avenarius, N. 1890. Drogitchin Nabuzhskii i ego drevnosti. Materialy po archeologii Rossii, izdavaemye Imperatorskiju Archeologitcheskiju Kommissieju, vol. IV. St Petersburg: Sankt.

Bezenberger, A. 1897. O doistoritcheskich drevnostiach vostotchnoi Prussii. Trudy deviatogo archcologitsheskogo s'jezda v Vilnc 1893 g. Protokoly, vol. II. Moscow.

Buga, K. 1961. Rinktiniai raštai, vol. III. Vilnius: Valstybinc politincs ir mokslincs literatures lcidykla.

Engel, C. 1931. Die Kultur des Memellandes in vorgeschichtlicher Zeit. Memel.

– 1933. Führer durch die vorgeschichtliche Sammlung der Domtmuseums. Riga: Brunns.

– 1935. Vorgeschichte der altpreussische Stämme, vol. I. Königsberg: Grafe & Unzer.

Engel, C. & W. La Baume 1937. Kulturen und Völker in Ostpreussen. Königsberg: Grafe & Unzer.

Gaerte, W. 1929. Urgeschichte Ostpreussens. Königsberg: Grafe & Unzer.

Grewingk, C. 1865. Das Steinalter der Ostseeprovinzen Liv-, Est- und Kurland und einiger angrenzenden Landsstriche. Schriften der Gelehrten Etnischen Gesellschaft, vol. IV. Tartu: E. J. Karow.

– 1884. Erläuterungen zur Karte des Stein-, Bronze- und ersten Eisenalters von Liv-, Est- und Kurland. Dorpat.

Gurevitch, F. D. 1981. Drevnii Novogrudok. Leningrad: Nauka.

Kratchkovskii, N. 1897. Pravoslavnyje sviatyni goroda Wilni. Trudy, vol. II. Moscow.

Kruse, F. 1842. Necrolivonica oder Altertümer Liv-, Est- und Curlands. Dorpat.

Kšivickis, L. 1928. Zemaitiu senove. Kaunas.

Kulakauskas, A. 1987. Lenkiškai kalbanti Lietuvos bajorija lenku irlietuviu naciju formavimosi laiko tarpiau.

Vilnius: Jaunuju istoriku darbai.

Kulikauskas, P., R. Kulikauskiene, A. Tautavicius (eds) 1961. Lietuvos archeologijos bruožai. Vilnius: Valstybine politines ir mokslines literatures leidykla.

Makarenko, M. 1910. Zabytkiprzedhistorycznegubernji Kowenskiej. Kwartalnik Litewski, vol. II. Vilnius.

Merkys, V., A. Eidintas, A. Gaizutis (eds) 1987. Lietuviu nadonalinis issivaduojatnasis judejimas iki 1904 metu. Vilnius: Mokslas.

Montelius, O. 1877. Sur le premier age du fer dans les provinces baltiques de la Russie et en Pologne. Congres international d'antropologie et Yarcheologie prehistorique. Cotnpterendu de la huitieme session a Budapest 1876, vol. I. Budapest.

M oora, H. 1938. Die Eisenzeit in Lettland bis etwa 500 n. Chr., vol. II. Tartu.

Puzinas, J. 1938. Naujausiu proistoriniu tyrintjimu duomenys. Kaunas.

– 1983. Rinktiniai raltai. Chicago: Institute o f Lithuanian Studies Press.

Strykowski, M. 1846. Kronika Polska, Litewska, Zmodzka i wszyskiej Rusi, vol. I. Warsaw: Gustav Leon Glicksberg.

Tarasenka, P. 1928. Uetuvos archeologijos med Ziaga. Kaunas: Svietimo ministerijos knygu lei- dimo komisjos leidinys.

Tyszkiewicz, E. 1842. Rzut oka na zrzodla archeologii krajowej czyli opisanie zabytkow niektorych starozytnosci odkrytych w zachodnich guberniach Cesarstwa Rossyjskiego. Vilnius: Zawadzki.

– 1850. Badania archeologiczne nad zabytkami przedmiotow szutki, rzemiosl itd. w dawnej Litwie i Rusi Litewskiej. Vilnius: Zawadzki.

Is there national archaeology without nationalism? Archaeological tradition in Slovenia

Titles in Slavonic languages are followed by English translations.

B ad e, B. 1968. Razvoj Arheološkog muzeja Istre u Puli (Development o f the Archaeological M useum o f Istria in Pula). *Vijesti Muzealaca i Konzervatora Hrvatske* 17(4-5), 5-10.

BaS, E 1953-4. Organizacija spomeniškega varstva v slovenski preteklosti (Organization o f the protection o f monuments in the Slovenian past). *Varstvo Spomenikov* 5, 13-37.

BeloSevic, J. 1980. Materialna kultura Hrvata (Material culture of the Croats). Zagreb: SNL.

Benac, A. 1972. Apport a l'etude des processus ethnogenetiques et a la delimitation territori- ale des tribus Illyriennes. *Studia Albanica* 9, 173-85.

Cunja, R . 1992. Zgodovinski oris arheoloških raziskav na Koprskem (Historical layout o f the archaeological research in the Koper region). *Annales, Anali Koprškega Primolja in Blitnjih Pokrajin* 2, 67-86.

Deschmann, K. 1862. *Das Deutschtum in Krain*. Graz.

– 1881. *Fiihrer durch das krainische Landesmuseum*. Ljubljana.

Deschmann, K. et al. 1880. *Versammlung osterreichischer Anthropologen und Urgeschich- tsforschers in Laibach am 28. und 29. Juli 1879. Mittheilungen der Anthropologischen Gesells chaft in Wien* 10, 163-4.

Dolenc, E. 1994. Obdobje 1919-1941 (Period between 1919 and 1941). In *75 let Univerzev Ljubljani (75 years of the University in Ljubljana)*, 9-11. Ljubljana: University o f Ljubljana.

Dular, J. 1992. Zgodovina raziskovanj zeleznodobnih naselij in poselitve v osrednji Sloveniji (History o f research on Iron Age settlement in central Slovenia). *Arheoloiki Vestnik* 43, 3 7 52.

Forlati Tamaro, B. 1984. *La Societa Istriana nei suoi cent'*

anni di storia 1884-1984. Atti e Memorie della Societa Istriana di Archeologia e Storia Patria (ns) 32, 1-7.

Gabrovec, S. 1971. Stopetdeset let arheologije v Narodnem muzeju (150 years of archaeology in the National Museum). Argo 10, 35-48.

- 1979. Thirty years of prehistoric archaeology in Arheološki Vestnik. Arheološki Vestnik 30, 13-30.

- 1984. Merhartova Sola in njen pomen za slovensko arheologijo. Skica za Studijo (The school of Gero von Merhart and its importance for Slovenian archaeology). Arheo 4, 5-10.

- 1994, Stitna I. Katalogi in Monografije 28, Ljubljana.

Grafenauer, B. 1951. O arheologiji in zgodovini (On archaeology and history). Zgodovinski Casopis 5, 163-74.

Hirschberg, W. 1971. 100 Jahre Anthropologische Gesellschaft in Wien. Mitteilungen der Anthropologischen Gesellschaft in Wien 100, 1-10.

Kastelic, J. 1942. Vodnikova kopija Tabule Peutingeriane (Vodnik's copy of Tabula Peutingeriana). Glasnik Muzejskega Drustva za Slovenijo 23, 98-100.

- 1950. Narodni muzej v Ljubljani in njegovi problemi (The National Museum in Ljubljana and its problems). Zgodovinski Casopis 4, 195-207.

- 1960. Slovanska nekropola na Bledu. Poročilo o izkopavanjih leta 1949 in 1950 (The Slavic cemetery in Bled. Excavation reports 1949, 1950). Dela 13/9. Ljubljana: Slovenska Akademija Znanosti i Umetnosti.

- 1975. Arheologija Slovenije v XIX. stoletju in njene dileme (Archaeology in Slovenia in the nineteenth century and its dilemmas). XI. Seminar slovenskega jezika, literature in kulture, 121-5.

Kastelic, J. & B. Škerlj 1950. Slovanska nekropola na Bledu. Arheološko in antropološko poročilo A R C H A E O L O G I C A L T R A D I T I O N I N S L O V E N I A (The Slavic cemetery in Bled: archaeological and anthropological report). Dela 2. Ljubljana: Slovenska Akademija Znanosti i Umetnosti.

Kedcemet, D. 1966-9. Antidd spomenici Pule na slikama i u

opisima stranih autora od XVI. do XIX. stoljeća (Ancient monuments from Pula as illustrated and described by foreign authors of the sixteenth to nineteenth centuries). *Jadranski Zbornik* 7, 549-90.

Knific, T. 1983. Bled v zgodnjem srednjem veku (Bled in the early medieval period). PhD thesis, Department of Archaeology, University of Ljubljana.

Korošec, J. 1948. Staroslovansko svetilišče na Ptujskem gradu (Early Slavic sanctuary on Castle hill in Ptuj). *Delo* 6. Ljubljana: Slovenska Akademija Znanosti i Umetnosti.

– 1950. Prvo posvetovanje jugoslovanskih arheologov (The First Conference of Yugoslav Archaeologists). *Zgodovinski Casopis* 4, 212-5.

– 1950. Arheologija in nekatere njene naloge (Archaeology and some of its tasks). *Zgodovinski Casopis* 4, 5-22.

– 1957. Opredeleževanje arheološkega gradiva (Characterization of archaeological finds). *Arheološki Vestnik* 8(2), 99-108.

Kos, P. 1983. Numizmatika na Slovenskem. Zgodovinski oris (Numismatics in Slovenia. Historical layout). *Arheološki Vestnik* 33, 235-57.

Lozar, R. 1941. Razvoj in problemi slovenske arheološke vede (Development and problems of the Slovenian archaeological discipline). *Zbornik za Umetnostno Zgodovino* 17, 107-47.

Malusa, M. 1989-90. L'Accademia degli Intraprendenti di Rovigno (1763-1765). *Atti di Centro di ricerche storiche di Rovigno* 20, 243-54.

Marušič, B. 1955. Staroslovanske in neke zgodnjemedievalne najdbe v Istri (Early Slavonic and some early medieval finds from Istria). *Arheološki Vestnik* 6, 97-133.

– 1960. Istra u ranom srednjem vijeku (Istria in the Early Middle Ages). Pula: Archaeological Museum of Istria.

– 1967. Nekropole VII. i VIII. stoljeća u Istri (Cemeteries of the 7th and 8th century in Istria). *Arheološki Vestnik* 18, 333-47.

- MatiCetov, M. 1990 (ed.). Venetovanje. Arheo 10.
- Meister, R . 1947. Geschichte der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien 1847-1947. Vienna: Holzhausen.
- Menessier-Nodier, M. 1866. Charles Nodier, episodes et souvenirs de sa vie. Paris: Didier.
- Mesesnel, F. 1939. Janez in Jurij Subic (Janez and Jurij Subic). Ljubljana: National Gallery.
- Mikl-Curk, I. 1981. Arheološko konservatorstvo na naših tleh v 19. stoletju (Archaeological conservation in our country in the nineteenth century). Varstvo Spomenikov 23, 111-4.
- Petru, P. 1971. Misli ob stoletjesetletnici Narodnega muzeja (Some thoughts at the occasion of the 150th anniversary of the National Museum). Argo 10, 3-34.
- Pittioni, R . 1949. Fünfzig Jahre Lehrkanzel für Urgeschichte an der Universität Wien. Archaeologia Austriaca 2, 1-4.
- Santonin, P. 1991. Popotni dnevnik (Travel diary) [translated and edited by P. Simoniti]. Ljubljana.
- Saria, B. 1944. Die Harigasthelm, das älteste Germanische Sprachdenkmal. Untersteirischer Kalender, 75-77.
- Schmid, W. 1908. Carniola, vol. 1.1: Altslovenische Gräber Krain s. Ljubljana.
- Secoli, G. 1979. I 150 anni dell' Archeografo. Archeografo Triestino, 4th series 39, 5-8.
- Simoniti, P. 1979. Humanizem na Slovenskem in slovenski humanisti do srednjega stoletja (Humanism in Slovenia and Slovenian humanists before the mid-sixteenth century). Ljubljana: Slovenska matica.
- 1966. Simpozij o Ilirijcih v antično dobo (Symposium on Illyrians in antiquity). Posebna izdaja V /2 . Sarajevo: Centar za Balkanološka Ispitivanja ANU BiH.
- Sklenaf, K. 1983. Archaeology in Central Europe: the first 500 years. Leicester: Leicester University Press.
- Slapšak, B. 1993. Archaeology and the contemporary myth of the past. Journal of European Archaeology 1, 191-5.

Split Museum. 1984. Don Frane Bulic: Katalog izlozbe (Don Frane Bulic, Exhibition Catalogue). Split: Archaeological Museum.

Sribar, V. 1952. Arheološka raziskovanja v Istri (Archaeological research in Istria). In Slovenci na Jadranu (Slovenes on the Adriatic), 17-9. Koper: Slovensko-Hrvatska Prosvetna Zveza.

– 1956. Arheološko delo na Koprskem (Archaeological work in the Koper region). Zbornik Primorske Zaloge Lipa, 63-8.

Šumrada, J. 1992. Nekateri temeljni problemati Ilirskih provinc (Some fundamental problems concerning Illyrian Provinces). PhD thesis, University of Ljubljana.

Vodnik, V. 1809. Geschichte des Herzogthums Krain, des Gebietes von Triest und der Grafschaft Gorz. Vienna.

Zwitter, F. 1969. Višje šolstvo na Slovenskem do leta 1918 (Higher education in Slovenia before the year 1918). In Petdeset let univerze na Slovenskem (Fifty years of University in Slovenia), 13-51. Ljubljana.

Zitko, S. 1983. Pokrajinski muzej Koper (Regional Museum in Koper). Argo 22, 3-10.