A World History of Nineteenth-Century Archaeology

Nationalism, Colonialism, and the Past

MARGARITA DÍAZ-ANDREU

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Great Clarendon Street, Oxford OX2 6DP

Oxford University Press is a department of the University of Oxford.
It furthers the University's objective of excellence in research, scholarship,
and education by publishing worldwide in

Oxford New York

Auckland Cape Town Dar es Salaam Hong Kong Karachi
Kuala Lumpur Madrid Melbourne Mexico City Nairobi
New Delhi Shanghai Taipei Toronto

With offices in

Argentina Austria Brazil Chile Czech Republic France Greece
Guatemala Hungary Italy Japan South Korea Poland Portugal
Singapore Switzerland Thailand Turkey Ukraine Vietnam

Oxford is a registered trade mark of Oxford University Press
in the UK and in certain other countries

Published in the United States
by Oxford University Press Inc., New York

Reprinted 2010

ISBN 978-0-19-921717-5

Printed in the United Kingdom by
Lightning Source UK Ltd., Milton Keynes

11

The Early Search for a National Past in Europe (1789–1820)

In the nineteenth century, the allure of the past of the Great Civilizations was soon to be contested by an alternative—that of the national past. This interest had already grown in the pre-Romantic era connected to an emerging ethnic or cultural nationalism (Chapter 2). However, its charm would not be as enticing to the lay European man and woman of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, who were much more under the influence of neoclassicism (Chapter 3). The Western European nations had no monuments comparable to the remains of Greece, Rome or Egypt. Before the Roman expansion into most of Western Europe in antiquity, there had been few significant buildings, apart from unspectacular prehistoric tombs and megalithic monuments whose significance was unrecognized by the modern scholar. Roman remains beyond Italy were not as impressive as those found to the south of the Alps. Because of this it seemed much more interesting to study the rich descriptions the ancient authors had left about the local peoples and institutions the Romans had created during their conquest. Throughout the eighteenth century the historical study of medieval buildings and antiquities had also increasingly been gaining appeal. In Britain their study instigated the early creation of associations such as the Society of Antiquaries of 1707, but even this early interest did not lead to medieval antiquities receiving attention in institutions such as the British Museum, where they would only receive a proper departmental status well into the nineteenth century (Smiles 2004: 176). In comparative terms, the national past and its relics were perceived by many to be of secondary rate when judged against the history and arts of the classical civilizations. During the French Revolution and its immediate aftermath, for example, the national past would not be as appreciated by as many people and antiquarians as that of the Great Civilizations (Jourdan 1996).

This situation, however, started to change in the early nineteenth century. There were three key developments in this period, all inherited from Enlightenment beliefs, which were the foundation for archaeology as a source of national pride. The effects of these would be seen especially from the central

decades of the century. Firstly, museums were created that focused on the exhibition of national antiquities. This transformation was exemplified by the Museum of French Monuments opened in Paris in 1793, an institution which would be extremely influential all over continental Europe, even if it did not survive Napoleon's downfall. Secondly, the promotion of prehistoric remains began at this time leading, later in the century, to their full integration into the account of the national past. This was made possible, on the one hand, by the aesthetic romantic interest in the natural and the unknown which rendered them attractive and worthy of good taste and, on the other, by their chronological organization which allowed them to become conceptualized into the temporal framework so essential for national histories. For the period under discussion in this chapter, however, not the prehistoric remains, but mainly those from the medieval period were those attracting most attention. Romanticism thrived in its interest for medieval antiquities and history, and this led to the increase in the number of scholars fascinated by it. Their studies set the ground for future debates in the century, although the imperfections of their techniques became apparent by their acceptance of fakes which had already appeared in the previous period. The Gaelic epics of the *Works of Ossian* first published in 1760 (Leersen 1996; Sweet 2004: 136–7; Williams 2004: 218), and others which followed their tradition such as the Czech poems in the *Dvur Králové* and *Zelená Hora*, 'discovered' in 1817 and 1819 (Sklenár 1983: 66), are typical examples. Not all literature was fake, for in 1818 the Anglo-Saxon epic poem of Beowulf was first studied (Sweet 2004: 217). At the same time, medieval art became a focus for collecting (Fritzsche 2004: ch. 3). The third key development to be discussed in this chapter is related to the last point. During the early years of the nineteenth century there was a transformation in the historical methodology which brought a renewed interest in the critical study of original sources, not only manuscripts and other documents, but also inscriptions, coins and statues. These sanctioned the entry into the university curriculum of the fields of epigraphy, numismatics and history of art, all three using material retrieved through archaeology.

THE FRENCH REVOLUTION AND THE MUSEUM OF FRENCH MONUMENTS

In the early days of the French Revolution the attention to France's own past was strikingly different from that referred to in Chapter 3 in relation to the ancient Great Civilizations. In an attempt to wipe out the presence of the monarchy and the Church in the modern French state, a systematic campaign was waged to

eradicate tradition: the names of streets and of the months were changed, and churches were either desecrated and used for other functions or demolished. The result was plunder and devastation, a condition to which the army also contributed, for bronze statues and leaded windows were used as a cheap source of metal for weapon manufacture (Haskell 1993: 236–8). Both medieval and early modern monuments suffered the most from this situation.

Decrees were issued mainly in 1792 and 1793 that ordered the destruction of every monument related first to the monarchy and later to the Church. By 1797 eighteen buildings had been pulled down in Paris (Réau 1994: 292–5, 379–95). In the midst of all this chaos, several depots to store what was being dismantled were set up in Paris, including one at the nationalized convent of the Petits Augustins. The man in charge of it, Alexandre Lenoir (1761–1839), inspired the first museum of national monuments. As it turned out, religious objects in the museum were converted into national symbols. Yet, not surprisingly, given the circumstances in which the museum was born, the objects it exhibited, together with the political difficulties it faced and its ultimate closure, provide a good example of the way in which the balance between the antiquity of the Great Civilizations and a national past was still weighted towards the former. Nevertheless, the very existence of such a museum and the large number of visitors it attracted also shows that the national past, especially that of the medieval and post-medieval periods, was not totally rejected and that it was indeed making a place for itself on the intellectual scene.

The Museum of French Monuments (Musée des Monuments Français) was first opened in 1793, although it was only established on a permanent basis after 1795 under the name of the National Museum of French Monuments (McClelland 1994: 165). It is worth noting that the term 'national antiquities' was being used in a novel way from only a few years earlier, from Aubin Louis Millin's publication of his 1790 *National Antiquities* (with the full title of *Antiquités nationales, ou recueil de monuments pour servir à l'histoire générale et particulière de l'empire français, tels que tombeaux, inscriptions, statues, vitraux, fresques, etc; tirés des abbayes, monastères, châteaux et autres lieux devenus domaines nationaux*) (Schnapp 1996: 52).[1] He insisted on the historical value of monuments as national antiquities, while being one of the first to apply the methods normally followed in classical archaeology for the analysis of France's own past (Gran-Aymerich 1998: 37–8). The institution required a politically astute director—as Lenoir proved to be—to ensure its survival.

[1] The term 'national antiquity' was being used earlier, since at least the sixteenth century (Mora 1998; Sweet 2004), but in the context of the French Revolution, its meaning took a more political tone.

As one antiquarian noted in 1852, with regard to successive editions of the museum catalogue, 'the earliest are written in a heathen, democratic language; succeeding ones in an imperial, philosophic style; and the most recent in a devout, monarchical prose. These variations, dictated by circumstance, lend the different editions a genuine fascination' (quoted in McClelland 1994: 194). Lenoir could not have done otherwise if the museum was to survive through the changing circumstances. The material exhibited was considered at times counter-revolutionary[2] (Haskell 1993: 241). Thus, he had to convince others that his intentions were not political, but still very much informed by the enlightened mood. He had to write petitions like the following to the Committee of Public Instruction in 1794:

> Please believe me, Citizens, that it is not in order to honour the memory of François 1^er^ that I ask permission to rebuild the monument I am about to describe to you. I forget his morals along with his ashes. I am concerned only with the progress of art and education.
>
> (Lenoir in Haskell 1993: 241).

The exhibition started in an introductory room, where some 'Celtic' altars were displayed. Nevertheless, pre-medieval antiquities were the exception. The inclusion of prehistoric monuments in the display demanded by prestigious scholars such as Pierre Jean Baptiste Legrand d'Aussy (1737–1800) (Pomian 1996: 41) did not actually take place, despite Legrand's disappointment at the lack of knowledge of 'the monuments that lie at the core of our archaeology, of the primitive history of our nation, our country, and our arts' (in Pomian 1996: 39). Legrand was a member of the National Institute of Sciences and Arts, an institution that replaced the old academies. He had suggested the need for a permit to excavate archaeological sites, and the establishment of a national inventory, an initiative that would only be realized much later. Despite the paucity of pre-medieval items, the museum did not oppose their study, as shown by the loan of its premises for the inaugural meeting of the Académie Celtique in 1805 (Haskell 1993: 367). This academy, in addition to the study of French ethnography, had as its aim 'to describe, explain, and have engravings made of the ancient monuments of the Gauls' (in Pomian 1996: 39). The increasing importance of the study of

[2] Yet, images were used and perceived in contradictory ways. Jill Cook (2004: 187–8) mentions the development of the image of the noble aboriginal patriot (a mirror image of the noble savage used beyond Europe) during the periods of the American and French revolutions and the Napoleonic Wars. This figure, always a man, represented a patriot either fighting for the liberty of the fatherland against foreign aggressors or submissive at the feet of St Paul or, even, in repressive counter-revolutionary stance (the latter in William Blake's *Jerusalem, the Emanation of the Giant Albion*, 1804–20).

archaeology in the society led to the change of its name to the Society of Antiquaries of France (Société des antiquaires de France) in 1814, publishing its *Mémoires* from 1817, setting the example for many other academies founded throughout France from 1824 (Belmont 1995; Pomian 1996: 29).

Except for these minor incursions into the prehistoric period, the Museum of French Monuments mostly focused on the medieval and post-medieval past, from the thirteenth century onwards (McClelland 1994: 178, 187). In spite of being deprecated by the revolutionary leaders and not being Lenoir's favourite part of the exhibition (McClelland 1994: 181), it was the medieval section specifically which most attracted the public (Haskell 1993: 249) and eventually became key in the new archaeological studies. Painters, sculptors, architects and decorators visited the museum to look for models (*ibid.* 249). The medieval section, however, received a major blow in 1795, when the decision was taken to transform the Louvre into the only true museum of French sculpture, which meant the forced transfer of most of the exhibits of this period from one museum to the other (McClelland 1994: 169).

The task of organizing the physical remains of the Middle Ages—especially those of buildings—had, in fact, a history of scholarly research which went back to the previous century (see for example the English case (Frew 1980 and Miele 1998: 112). In eighteenth-century France authors such as Montesquieu had already pointed to the Frankish origins of the nation (Hannaford 1996: 201). An early example of the teaching of medieval archaeology which emphasized the historical value of monuments to national archaeology can be found in Aubin-Louis Millin's (1759–1818) course on 'Roman and medieval monumental archaeology' first taught in 1795 (Gran-Aymerich 1998: 37–8). The narrative behind the exhibition of the Museum of French Monuments had been inspired by Winckelmann's *History of the Art of Antiquity*. A chronological arrangement of objects established a progression of French art from the primitiveness of the medieval period to the Renaissance. Lenoir's national narrative painted an ascendant development of French arts that had only been blocked by absolutism (the form of government where the monarch had all power to rule, with nothing to limit his rule) in the seventeenth century, an obstacle that the revolution and its institutions had overcome (Haskell 1993: 242; McClelland 1994: 181, 190, 193). Significantly, Greek art—the focus of Winckelmann's dissertation—had been substituted by the arts of the French nation, something difficult to imagine occurring a few decades earlier. Lenoir argued that this art embodied the values and politics of the age when it had been created (McClelland 1994: 167). The exhibition was perceived by most as an evocation of national history, as the ideal museum, the sort of nationalist museum which would become the norm later in the century. As the historian Michelet stated years later, 'for the first time

a powerful order reigned among them [the objects], a true order, one that reflected the sequence of ages. The perpetuity of the nation was revealed by them' (quoted in Haskell 1993: 279). The impact of the museum was also considerable as a teaching tool for history, as a comment by a frequent visitor in his childhood explained:

> As children we had become intimately acquainted with all those marble personages: kings, warriors, prelates, writers, poets, artists. We could hardly read, but already we were familiar not only with their features but also with their histories... [Going to the Petits Augustins] was a good preparation for reading Augustin Thierry, Barante and all that cluster of historians who soon afterwards were to throw light on those parts of our national history that were still covered in darkness
>
> (in Haskell 1993: 250).

The museum was also thought of as a gallery of great men. As Peyre, the architect in charge of building work in the museum (McClelland 1994: 178), said in 1797, the museum contained 'the images and the monuments raised to the glory of great men' (in McClelland 1994: 263), a perspective confirmed by Lenoir himself when, in relation to the seventeenth-century room, he proposed 'to include busts of the great men of France... who are, I believe, essential to historical narrative' (in McClelland 1994: 179).

Despite its relative success, the Museum of French Monuments enjoyed a short life. As explained, in 1795 the government decided that all sculpture had to be transferred to the Louvre. After this, the museum was further affected by the official reinstatement of religion after the 1802 Concordat. Demands by the Church and by the nobility for their monuments to be returned also had a great impact on the museum (McClelland 1994: 194, 196). Eventually, Napoleon's downfall led to its sudden closure in 1816 and to the final dispersal of its collections—some of which went to the Louvre (Haskell 1993: 348–9; McClelland 1994: 197). In spite of its apparent ultimate failure, the ethos of the Museum of French Monuments survived much longer. The spirit of the museum endured in the conviction of the need to exhibit and protect monuments and other works of art belonging to the national past. Already, during its life, this museum had inspired the creation of others, such as the Museum of Nordic Antiquities in Denmark (see below), which would become crucial for the development of archaeology. It also inspired the National Museum in Budapest, founded in 1802 with a donation of his private collection made by Count Ferenc Széchényi explicitly to arouse nationalist feelings among the Hungarians (Nagy 2003: 31–2); the Bruckenthalsche National Museum für Siberbügen in 1803; the Joanneum in Graz in 1811; the Landesmuseum für Böhmen un Mähren in Brünn in 1817; and the Vaterländisches Museum in Prague in 1818 (Bjurström 1996: 42).

THE SCANDINAVIAN AND GERMANIC COUNTRIES: THE NATIONALIZATION OF PREHISTORIC ARCHAEOLOGY

The nationalization of monuments and artistic objects, so crucial to the study of Roman, medieval and post-medieval archaeology, only partially affected prehistoric archaeology, and when it did so it mostly concerned protohistory (i.e. the period covering the centuries before the Romans). On rare occasions monuments from even earlier periods, such as the most outstanding megalithic structures, were considered of national interest. The main reason given for the difference in treatment of prehistoric and historic remains was the considered inadequacy of prehistoric objects and buildings for the classical artistic canon. Initially, this resulted in a widespread lack of interest in prehistoric archaeology as a source of historical knowledge. One should, however, distinguish between enquiry, on the one hand, into the stages of later prehistory, where the finds included pottery, polished stone axes and metals, and, on the other, into that into earlier periods. The former developed in Scandinavia. An attempt to understand the developments here necessarily takes us back to our discussion of the search for the roots of the nation in the medieval period in the previous section. In a context of long-standing interest in antiquities (Chapter 2), the lack of a break between the medieval and the prehistoric periods helped Scandinavian archaeologists to push back their work into earlier eras. However, few countries were eager to follow this northern example, a situation which, as we shall see, would only change later in the century, when elements of race and language became central to nationalism. This transformation will be discussed below and in Chapter 12. The archaeology of the most remote periods, which became identified as the Stone Age or Palaeolithic, and to which we can now add the Mesolithic, developed mainly in France and England. Yet, this interest was stimulated more by geological than historical concerns. Only with the rise of evolutionism in the last decades of the century was intellectual space for these periods created in the historical narrative.

Scandinavian antiquities

In Scandinavia, the interest in prehistory took off much earlier than in most European countries. In 1806 the Danish Professor, Ramus Nyerup (1759–1829), proposed to emulate the Museum of French Monuments. His initiative included not only rooms dedicated to the Middle Ages but also, linked to them by a so-called runehall, an area in which prehistoric objects were

displayed (Klindt-Jensen 1975: 47). The relationship between both periods is further explained when we note that in Scandinavia the Viking period is included in the Iron Age. Thus Worsaae, who is usually described as a prehistorian, was also very interested in the Viking past and travelled to England and Ireland in 1846–7 thanks to royal funding to study remains of Danish (Viking) occupation in Britain (*ibid.* 71; Briggs 2005: 9–13). In Sweden, where the Romantic movement centred on the Gothic League, a society was set up to revive Gothic ideals—'Gothic' meaning the late Iron Age in Scandinavia. Prehistoric antiquities were also integrated into museum exhibitions usually belonging to universities (Klindt-Jensen 1975: 61–2). The key issue that allowed this easy acceptance of the prehistoric period was mainly related to the lack of the Roman presence in Scandinavia, which allowed a relatively smooth transition from prehistory to the medieval period. Another area of Europe in which a similar uninterrupted transition had taken place was in England's geographical periphery: Wales, Scotland and Ireland. The upsurge of Celticist interest started around the 1760s, and foundations such as the Royal Irish Academy in 1785 have been linked to this (Cooney 1996: 152). Although only in Ireland does it seem to have been connected to some national agenda (Champion 1996: 67; Leersen 1996: 11–17), the religious schism between the medieval and the prehistoric periods made difficult—although not impossible (Hutchinson 1987: 85–6)—the integration of the most remote periods into the national history.

Returning to Scandinavia, research into antiquities had a long tradition. As seen in Chapter 2, in a political context of continuous tension between Denmark and Sweden, seventeenth-century antiquarians had been sponsored to research runic inscriptions and other archaeological finds. This development was partly halted for about a century due to economic and political decline. Nevertheless, the eighteenth century was not a complete desert; the learned academies founded from the 1740s onwards included the study of antiquities among their activities. Some new legislation was passed and a few cabinets of antiquities were opened to the public (Klindt-Jensen 1975: ch. 3). The economic and social decline ended in the 1780s. The redistribution of land radically transformed agriculture, creating wealth, and led to an extensive transformation of the landscape and, consequently, to an ever-increasing destruction of archaeological sites. In line with the liberal mood of the period, in 1792 the archaeologist and theologian Frederik Münter (1761–1830) proposed the establishment of a

> collection of all the Nordic monuments and prehistoric objects which were either extant or on which there existed accurate and reliable reports—a task whose urgency was enhanced by the destruction overtaking these monuments at the hands of peasants, and through public works as well; since many ancient burial-mounds, assembly places, and sacrificial sites had been destroyed by road construction in Zealand, and that even those examples renowned in tradition should not have been spared is universally acknowledged and deplored.
>
> (in Klindt-Jensen 1975: 45).

In addition to the negative effects of the development of agriculture on existing ancient remains, several other factors contributed to the success of Nyerup's proposal for the opening of a new museum. In the first place, Denmark's alliance with Napoleon proved catastrophic both economically and politically. Her fleet was destroyed, Copenhagen was devastated and her trade seriously affected. To these misfortunes the state's financial bankruptcy in 1813 and the loss of Norway in 1814 were later added. At the same time, the theft and destruction of the Gallehus gold horns from the Royal Cabinet of the Kunstkammer in 1802 was lamented not only by antiquarians: more importantly perhaps, it inspired the Danish Romantic, Adam Oehlenschläger (1779–1850), to write the first poem of the movement, *Guldhornene* (The Golden Horns). As a result, prehistory would be at the centre of the Romantic Movement in Denmark. Indeed, megalithic sites became the chief attraction of walking tours by Romantics as early as 1808 eager for exciting encounters and keen to experience the mysterious power of the past (Klindt-Jensen 1975).

In 1807, following Münter's advice, recommendations were made by the Chancellery for the preservation of prehistoric and medieval remains and monuments. A Committee for Antiquities (Oldsagskommisionen) and a state museum were created, institutions which were quickly emulated by the other Scandinavian countries: in Norway, for example, the Antiquities Commission was set up in 1810 and in Sweden the post of Inspector of State Antiquities was established in 1814. In Denmark the committee set up to select monuments had to decide which three hundred should be protected and also distributed information to farmers explaining that it was seldom worth digging for gold in burial-mounds. However, until the 1840s the committees, inspectorates and museums only indicate a proto-professionalization of prehistoric—and medieval—archaeology in Scandinavia. During the pre-professional period, all the posts related to archaeology were filled by voluntary workers. Indeed, the fact that Christian Jürgensen Thomsen (1788–1865) did not need a salary was one of the major reasons behind his selection as the first keeper of the museum in Copenhagen. To begin with even his few assistants had no salary. The same appears to have happened in Norway, where the museum in Bergen also depended on unpaid workers (Klindt-Jensen 1975). Moreover, the museum's initial official name was Museum for Nordic Antiquities. The title Royal was only conceded in 1832, when it moved to the royal

castle of Christiansborg (Jørgen Jensen, pers. comm.), and it only became 'national' in 1892[3] (despite the fact that in 1807 Nyerup had called it the National Museum in his writings (Bjurström 1996: 43)). This seems to indicate that, at least in its early years until the arrival of Worsaae, the emphasis was not on its nature as a national institution, and the symbolic weight of the title 'national' was not perceived as essential.

In the first years the museum, administered by the Committee for Antiquities, was still modest. The collections were closed to the public and stored in the loft of a church belonging to the university library. They were first open to the public in 1819 for two hours a week—although this was not very different from other institutions, such as the British Museum discussed in Chapter 2 (Miller 1973). Nevertheless, Thomsen's endeavours were successful in neighbouring countries. The Danish example was followed in Norway and Sweden, where universities either opened museums or refurbished their old cabinets and staged more modern exhibitions. In Norway the universities of Christiania (present-day Oslo) and Bergen opened in 1810 and 1825. In Sweden Bror Emil Hildebrand (1806–84), a young scholar from Lund who had been trained partly by Thomsen, reorganized the collection of the cabinet of his home university and opened it to the public for—again—just two hours a week in the 1830s (Klindt-Jensen 1975: 48–65).

The prominence acquired by the Copenhagen museum in its early years was due to the organization of the collections by Christian Jürgensen Thomsen, the curator from 1816. Perhaps in an attempt to imitate the chronological ordering of the exhibition of the Museum of French Monuments—Nyerup was a member of the commission—Thomsen wished to produce a scheme for sequentially arranging the collections. He devised the Three Age System—Stone Age, Bronze Age and Iron Age, which would become a crucial tool for the chronological classification of prehistoric material throughout Europe and elsewhere. Thomsen's endeavours, however, seem to be more closely associated with the Enlightenment than the nationalistic era. This was not the case with his heir in the post, Worsaae (Chapter 12), whose nationalistic stance is evident in many of his writings. Not surprisingly, Worsaae saw the exploits of the early years of Danish prehistory from a nationalist perspective. Explaining Thomsen's achievements, Worsaae proudly stated that '[through] the excellent material of national antiquities collected by Thomsen and

[3] In 1892, probably following the proposal of Worsaae's successor, Sophus Muller (1842–1934), the Royal Museum of Northern Antiquities was reorganized and unified with others, such as the Ethnographical Museum, the Antique Cabinet and the Royal Coin Collection under the name 'The National Museum' (Jørgen Jensen, pers. comm.). The absence of the 'national' in the Royal Society of Northern Antiquaries (Kongelige Nordiske Oldskift-Selskab) founded in 1825 should also be noted in this context.

arranged at an earlier date than in any other country in Europe, Denmark has achieved a considerable advantage, which it was a matter of maintaining, and, if possible, extending' (in Gräslund 1987: 15). Worsaae also rightly noted that the lesser interest of other countries, such as France, England and Central Europe, in prehistoric archaeology was possibly related to their current attraction to Roman monuments.

Prehistoric antiquities in Germany

Beyond Scandinavia, the acceptance of prehistoric archaeology encountered more opposition. Pre-unified Germany (map 5) was a different case altogether. Explorations into local antiquities had witnessed a short-lived boom during the Napoleonic era. They practically came to a halt with the conservative reaction of the 1820s and only reappeared after the unification of 1871. To start with, the link between France and Rome, propagated by Napoleon and maintained thereafter because of the tensions between France and Prussia, had served to reinforce German identity along with philhellenism (Chapter 4). Napoleonic interference in the German territories had brought a significant reduction in the number of states and had induced administrative and legal reforms as well as the introduction of constitutional rule. Yet, as a reaction to French hegemony, a sense of nationality emerged. Individualism, national particularism and Protestantism were juxtaposed to Latin corporatism, universalism and Catholicism, a divide which was expressed geographically in terms of northern as against southern Europe (Marchand 1996a: 159–60). The religious schism would only serve to create an image of Rome and the Catholic world in the Protestant areas as the antithesis of what was 'truly German'. Gradually the barbaric descent began to be invoked with pride rather than embarrassment, a sentiment which spread through novels, operas and scientific books alike (*ibid.* 161–2).

This early nationalism was driven by anti-French sentiment and coloured by Romantic ideals. Vereine (societies) with an interest in the local past were founded in practically all German-speaking states from 1810. Their members came from a wide range of professions and included intellectuals such as Goethe and the brothers von Humboldt and Grimm. These societies not only published journals and newsletters but also formed archaeological and ethnological collections which gave rise to the opening of some museums, such as the ones founded in Breslau in 1818 and in Bonn in 1820. The latter initially received official support from the Chancellor. Similarly, in Prussia the king, Friedrich Wilhelm III (r. 1797–1840), lent a gallery in one of his castles in Berlin, the Monbijou Palace, for the display of 'national' antiquities. All of

them were considered patriotic collections. Thus, the Bonn museum director was instructed to improve the collection 'so that it will serve the purposes of youth education, historical research, and preservation of valuable monuments [and] will inspire and nurture the sense of the significance of our fatherland and the history of the past' (in Marchand 1996a: 165). Similarly, in a *Handbook of Germanic Antiquarianism* (*Handbuch des Germanischen Altertumskunde*) published in 1836, the author, Gustaf Friedrich Klemm (1802–67), explained that 'it is necessary to spread the knowledge of prehistory among the people and to create respect for it as the safest way to patriotism' (in Wiwjorra 1996: 166).

Yet, after the fall of Napoleon, at the Congress of Vienna of 1814–15—a congress in which Germanic countries had a central role and in which post-Napoleonic national boundaries were codified—a series of reactionary measures were put in place which intended to suppress liberalism and the type of nationalism created by the French Revolution. In many German countries these measures were effective, with the effacement of liberalism in the early 1820s. As a result, the early state interest in prehistory was greatly affected. In contrast, classical philology and history gained in importance in secondary schools and universities. In fact, in many German states the study of national antiquities was discouraged (Marchand 1996a: 165). The museum in Bonn fell out of favour and the university professors appointed as advisers indicated that it should remove all non-classical artefacts, which they saw as large and ugly. The deposed director later explained that 'people then had . . . no sympathy for national antiquities; they dreamed only of art works, of museums of Greek and Egyptian antiquities' (Dorow in Marchand 1996a: 166). In contrast, the Altes Museum, which displayed classical antiquities (Cullen & von Stockhausen 1998), was opened in Berlin (Prussia) in 1830. The state's contribution to the societies was reduced and, on occasions, even frozen. By and large the study of antiquities in universities focused on the philological analysis of classical sources. Archaeology—even that of the Roman period—was considered a field for amateurs. This state of affairs was to persist for some time (Sklenár 1983: 64–5). The Professor of Greek Philology, Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1848–1931), recalled that during his days as a student in the late 1860s, 'only dilettanti troubled about German antiquities of Roman date' (in Marchand 1996a: 168). The anthropologist, Rudolf Virchow, thought in 1874 that 'Prehistory is not an academic field (Fach) and it will probably never be' (in Veit 1984: 328). Yet, where extraordinary findings were unearthed, such as those made by the engineer Johann Ramsauer (1795–1874) in the Austrian Alpine village of Hallstatt from 1846, the archaeological authorities—in this case the custodian of the Imperial Cabinet of Coins and Antiquities, the Baron Eduard Freiherr von Sacken

(1825–83)—duly paid attention. Swedish archaeologists were quick to include the new material into their chronological scheme (Romer 2001: 29–31).

MEDIEVALISM IN THE EARLY NINETEENTH CENTURY

As seen in the Scandinavian case, the early nineteenth century inherited from the years of the Enlightenment not only a taste for the classical, but also for the medieval (Chapter 2). This fascination for the Middle Ages would continue throughout the nineteenth century. In the early years this produced a series of works that would come to influence the perceptions the European learned classes had of their own past. The image created was not fuelled only by antiquarians but mainly by writers and artists. The Danish poet, Adam Oehlenschläger, mentioned above, had not been the only author looking for inspiration in the remains of the past. In fact, medieval monuments and ruins became a common stimulus for artists at the time. In England writers such as Sir Walter Scott drew inspiration from Gothic monuments in novels such as *The Lady of the Lake* (1810), *Ivanhoe* (1819) and *The Monastery* (1820). In Germany, Johann Wolfgang von Goethe (1749–1832) wrote a large number of literary works dealing at least in part with the medieval period. In France the writer Victor Hugo (1802–85) started to defend the preservation of historic monuments, and pursued this interest in his historic novels, such as *Notre-Dame de Paris* (1831). It seems significant that architects such as the Prussian, Karl Schinkel (1781–1841), who had designed buildings such as the Schauspielhaus (Theatre) and the Museum on the Lustgarten (the Altes Museum), which followed the classical style, became very interested in the Gothic which he saw as the national style (Snodin 1991).

This enthusiasm for the medieval period in general, and the Gothic in particular, was obviously shared by the antiquarians. They inherited much from the previous generation. The classificatory mood associated with the development of the natural sciences by Carl Linnaeus (1707–78), Georges-Louis Leclerc Count of Buffon (1707–88) and Jean-Baptiste Lamark (1744–1829) had been taken up in archaeology by authors such as Johann Joachim Winckelmann (Chapter 2) and in museum exhibits like, for example, those of Alexandre Lenoir in the Museum of French Monuments. The initial establishment of categories and their arrangement into hierarchies translated into chronological sequences. In England this had already started with works such as James Bentham (1708–94) *History and Antiquities of the Conventual Church of Ely* in 1771 and continued in the early nineteenth century with others such as *Architectural Antiquities* and *Cathedral Antiquities* published by John Britton

(1771–1857) in 1807–26 and *An Attempt to Discriminate the Styles of Architecture in England from the Conquest to the Reformation* by Thomas Rickman (1776–1841) of 1814–35 (Miele 1998). These would be the first in a long line of antiquarian works and exhibitions defining terminology and classifying medieval styles. In 1824, *Essay sur l'architecture du Moyen Age*, written by the French antiquarian, Arcisse de Caumont (1801–73), was published in which Gothic monuments were compared. In 1819 the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica* was produced in Germany, containing data on the German people, including folk-tales, literature, charters and manuscripts. This initiative would soon be followed in France by the *Collections de documents inédits sur l'histoire de France* (Bentley 1999: 44). Following previous traditions, archaeological investigations in the early nineteenth century were essentially artistic, devoted to the study of monuments, inscriptions and coins although some authors focused their studies on particular towns or areas, such as Richard Colt Hoare's (1758–1838) *History of Ancient Wiltshire* (1810–21) in England. Increasingly, small examples of material culture such as ceramics and metal implements were included in collections and typologies of them were published. A few excavations of medieval sites were also undertaken in this period, ten in the Wessex region of England between 1800 and 1850, four of which were monasteries (Gerrard 2003: 47).

The bourgeoisie—as well as the landed elite and aristocracy—became increasingly attracted to the historical appeal of the ruins and objects of the past. Books explaining the country's monumental heritage were produced. Some of the earlier ones, such as those of the French author, Alexandre de Laborde's (1733–1842) *Voyage pittoresque et historique en Espagne* (1806) and *Itinéraire descriptive de l'Espagne* (1809), may have been more connected to the routes of the Grand Tour. Yet, significantly, there were soon translations of the first work into Spanish, and high demand justified several editions. This interest in the national past was more acute in countries where wealthy classes represented a relatively high proportion of the population. The early Gothic revival in Bruges (Belgium) from 1816–20 has been connected to patriotism and the need of repair of churches damaged by the French Revolution as well as its discovery by the British on their way to visit Waterloo (van Biervliet 2000: 100). In Britain internal tourism was also important. This was nothing new, however, for from the eighteenth century travel within Britain was frequently mentioned in the topographical literature, and visits to monuments such as Stonehenge and Hadrian's Wall and interest in Roman roads became common (Sweet 2004: 36, 134, 141, 161). In 1825–6 Warwick Castle pulled in six thousand visitors and the Tower Armouries in London expected forty thousand visitors a year after they were opened to the public in 1828, a figure that more than doubled over the following decades. Thornton Abbey, bought in 1816 by Lord Yarborough to stop its walls being quarried for the building of a road, was opened to visitors two decades later (Gerrard 2003: 31, 36). This interest in the medieval period also had an impact in the creation of university chairs such as that of Johann Gustav Gottlieb Büsching (1783–1820), who had a chair for History of Medieval Art and Diplomacy in Breslau (Sommer & Struwe 2006: 25). It also explains how others with chairs aimed at the study of classical archaeology also include in their teaching national archaeology. An example of this is that of the Dutch Caspar J. Reuvens (1793–1835), appointed in 1818 (Brongers 2002).

THE REVOLUTION OF THE HISTORICAL METHOD AND OF HIGHER EDUCATION

The interest in the national past as opposed to that of the Great Civilizations became important not only to the groups mentioned in the previous section—individuals in the arts, antiquarians and tourists—but also to those who worked in universities or other higher education institutions. In the latter, the impact of the French Revolution was also important. In Prussia and the other German principalities the ensuing political events produced alarm, leading to the growth among the intellectuals of a pan-German feeling of nationalism. Thus, if the German philosopher Johann Gottfried Herder (1744–1803) had argued in his *Reflections on the Philosophy of the History of Mankind* (1784–91) that the Volk, the people, should be the basis of historical analysis, the French threat convinced him that the time had come for the German people to feel like a nation. Significantly, he did not allude to the Great Civilizations, but to the national past when he said in 1793 that

> I do not believe that the Germans have less feeling than other nations for the merits of their ancestors. I think I see a time coming when we shall return more seriously to their achievements and learn to value our old gold.
>
> (in Bentley 1999: 18).

Herder would be a key precursor of this shift towards growing interest in the national past in contrast to that of the Great Civilizations. He postulated a unique human race divided into nations, each with its own character. 'Every nation', he observed, 'is one people, having its own national form, as well as its own language' (Herder 1784–97 (1999): 49). He became involved not only in the search for early German culture, but was highly interested in Slavic, Hebrew, Celtic and other primitive nations. He believed past and present were connected. Thus, he argued in relation to the Germans that their character

'still resembles in many leading features the picture drawn by Tacitus' (Herder in Ergang 1931: 95), and strove to discover early Germanic culture (Marchand 1996a: 152). Following Rousseau's ideas, expressed in *On the Social Contract* (1762), he maintained that each nation was a product of nature whose laws regulated the national growth (Herder 1784–97 (1999): 52–7). In this way, the idea of evolution and progress became linked to that of the nation, a link that would become crucial to the archaeology of the mid and late nineteenth century. Herder's exaltation of the native and the national made him a forerunner (and indeed his writings acted as one of its motive forces) of the Romantic movement, whose influence in archaeology will be discussed in the following chapter.

Younger than Herder, the other two intellectuals who acted as a hinge between eighteenth and nineteenth-century Germany were the Humboldt brothers, Karl Wilhelm (1767–1835) and Alexander (1769–1859), whose ideas would be extremely influential in the long-term development of the different fields of archaeology. Both followed a similar method of study—induction and reasoning—but their interests differed. Alexander von Humboldt focused on the natural sciences and his contributions helped to establish geography as a scientific pursuit and greatly inspired the unfolding of a related field, anthropology. Of especial significance in the historical development of geography were Ritter and Ratzel (Holt-Jensen 1999), authors that nowadays are also identified as anthropologists in the history of the discipline. Alexander von Humboldt's protégé, Carl Ritter (1779–1859), would act as a bridge, linking the first third of the nineteenth century to its final decades and the development of the Kulturkreise school in the twentieth century (Zwernemann 1983). Ritter, who was the first Professor of Geography in the University of Berlin, began to investigate the relationship between nature and human history. Ritter argued that a people's character, the peculiarities of a nation, was a product of its history and, following Herder's ideas, that it was influenced by the environment. Indeed, he went as far as to defend geographical determinism. He maintained that 'the customs of individuals and nations differ in all countries, because man is dependent on the nature of his dwelling-place' (1863 in Bunzl 1996: 41). He also became interested in migrations as a way to explain cultural vestiges and change. Ritter's ideas contrasted in their emphasis with those held by contemporary and late nineteenth-century French and British anthropologists and prehistoric archaeologists, who believed in universalism. In practice, however, the latter group's practice of building teleological accounts of the nation, region or empire made their positions closer, at least at this level. Ritter's interest in migrations was later developed by Ratzel and would become an extremely popular explanation for cultural change in archaeology during the early twentieth century.

Karl Wilhelm von Humboldt,[4] Alexander's older brother, on the other hand, was far more relevant to the development of the historical method in the first two decades of the nineteenth century. He was a politician, man of letters, a translator of classical Greek authors and a philologist, whose interest in the latter field brought to scholars' attention the Basque language and its non-Indo-European character. He was also significant in the development of history and of Völkerpsychologie, the study of folk psychology, i.e. the psychology of a people. He maintained that through its study, together with that of history and languages, an understanding of particular peoples and of their character—manifested in traditions, customs, religion, language and art—could be reached (Bunzl 1996: 19–36). Importantly, as Minister of Public Instruction in Prussia, Karl Wilhelm von Humboldt backed the appointment of university professors such as the Danish-born Barthold Niebuhr (1776–1831), a Classicist, and the Professor of Roman law, Friedrich Karl von Savigny (1779–1861). He introduced the critical study of sources of ancient legislation, publishing the ancient text by Gaius that had recently been discovered by Niebuhr. In 1815 he launched his *History of Roman Law in the Middle Ages* (*Geschichte des romischen Rechts im Mittelalter*) in which he demonstrated the continuation of Roman law through the post-Roman period in local and ecclesiastical customs and legislations until its resurgence in the Italian cities. He also argued that law was inextricably linked with the formation of the nation.

Niebuhr was explicit about the effect of contemporary political events. As he explained, the Napoleonic threat had been felt at 'a time when we were experiencing the most incredible and exceptional events, when we were reminded of many forgotten and decayed institutions by the sound of their downfall' (in Marwick 1989: 39). In his *History of Rome*—first published in 1812–13 and completely revised in 1827–32—he advocated the benefits of a text-based historical analysis, in which he included philological and epigraphical sources. He focused his history on institutions rather than individuals and finally separated history from mythology. His method would dominate Roman scholarship until Mommsen's work. He also influenced historians specializing in later periods such as Leopold von Ranke, a modern historian and professor

[4] There were parallel figures to Karl Wilhelm von Humboldt in other countries. In England, it is necessary to point to Edward Gibbon (1737–94). In works such as his *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* he combined the traditional historical narrative and the methods of antiquarian research—palaeography, epigraphy and the study of objects—(Ceserani 2005: 414–15; Levine 1987: ch. 7). In addition to Gibbon, Haskell mentions in his chapter about the dialogue between antiquarians and historians scholars such as Montfauçon, Montesquieu, Giannone, Lodovico Antonio Muratori, Maffei, Caylus, Robert Adam, Seroux d'Agincourt (Haskell 1993: ch. 6).

at the University of Berlin from 1824. More than anybody else, Ranke is the scholar who has been identified by later historiography—especially that produced by modern historians—as the main protagonist of the renewal of historical method. The admiration awakened by his thorough treatment of primary sources represented a revolution in the historical method and this gained him many followers. He also inaugurated the practice of the seminar in which students critically studied historical sources under the supervision of a tutor. Ranke's history tried to narrate events 'Wie es eigentlich gewesen', that is, showing how history really was. Yet, despite his empiricism and scientific approach to documentation, national history was his aim. Ranke's object of study was the history of the nations—France, England or Prussia—and of their national spirit. Ranke considered each event unique and maintained that no universal laws were able to explain events.

Whereas the Prussian revolution in higher education took place in the universities, in France the preferred option was the creation of specialized colleges or schools, although in neither institution (universities or colleges) did the archaeology of the national past become successfully integrated until the 1840s. Without this development, however, the institutionalization of the teaching of archaeology would have been difficult. In France the school founded for historical study was the École de Chartes, opened in Paris in 1821. It focused on teaching the use of primary sources for historical investigation. Its founder, the baron Joseph-Marie de Gérando (1772–1842), was a savant with many interests, ranging from languages to the study of primitive customs and history and archaeology. During a stay in Rome in 1810, he had been one of the creators of the Free Roman Academy of Archaeology (Libera Accademia Romana di Archeologia). Despite this, in the École de Chartes, the subject of archaeology was initially considered as of secondary importance. In an address made to the first students, the director of the Royal Archives stated:

> Gentlemen, the documents that will be the object of your studies are justly seen as the torch which lights up chronology and history. They supply the information that coins, inscriptions and other similar monuments do not provide. Without the documents, everything is dark, all is doubt about the Middle Ages. Without them, the genealogies are no more than problems and fables. Without them, the origins of our main institutions could not be but wrapped in darkness. In a word, every historian, every chronologist who does not use documents as a guide throughout the labyrinth of ancient times risks getting lost.
>
> (in Bercé 1997: 25).

The purpose of the school was to teach students to handle ancient French documents as a means to recover the national historical and philological past.

Philology, the study of documents in all their aspects, was the focus of the school (Bercé 1997). Teaching about material culture produced in the past, and then only that of medieval and post-medieval archaeology, would start in 1847 (Thirion 1997).

CONCLUSION: TOWARDS THE LIBERAL REVOLUTIONS

This chapter has explored how the national past was regarded during the revolutionary period of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. As indicated in Chapter 2, the concerns over the past had been key elements in the emergence of eighteenth-century pre-Romanticism and continued at the turn of the century at least until the 1820s. This is the reason why, in accounts about the history of archaeology in Central Europe, authors such as Karel Skenár include the early years of the nineteenth century in a chapter, dealing with the Enlightenment. The connections between the Enlightenment and the revolutionary age are indeed very strong. Issues discussed in this chapter, such as patriotism and the search for the roots of what made each nation unique, were already present in the eighteenth century (Chapter 2). Authors like Peter Fritzsche (2004: 13) have also indicated that a difference between the Enlightenment and the years of the French Revolution was the wider spectrum of people acquiring a historical consciousness; it was no longer restricted to an elite class but was shared by people of modest means such as artisans, soldiers and travellers.

The growing and widening antiquarian interest in the national past, therefore, must be considered as an exacerbation of previous trends. Connected to this, it is important to note that in the first years of the nineteenth century it would have been difficult to establish a clear-cut division between those dealing with the antiquities of the ancient Great Civilizations and those dealing with the material remains of their own country. This had been the case of Bernard de Montfauçon (1655–1741) a century before, for whom the interest in the classical civilizations led to his involvement in the study of French antiquities (Chapter 2). This example can be mirrored by many more in the period under analysis in this chapter, though two examples suffice to illustrate this point. In Britain Sir Richard Colt Hoare (1758–1838), who studied classical antiquities while travelling the Grand Tour, later focused his attention on his native Wessex (Marsden 1983: 15). In Russia, Count Nikolai Petrovich Rumyantsev (1754–1826), who subsidized the excavation of Scythian burials, then supported the investigation of Slavic antiquities. In other cases the value of prehistoric antiquities was entirely based upon their supposed

connection with the Great Civilizations. Thus for the scholar Charles Vallancey (*c.* 1725–1812), many of the antiquities in Ireland were of Phoenician origin (Waddell 2000: 79). Interestingly, a few prestige objects found in other countries provided the clue to understanding the past of one's own nation: thus, the Polish explorer Zorian Dolega Chodakowsky (1784–1825) argued that the kurgans of Ukraine had been created by the Slavs.

Perhaps the greatest contrast between the interest in the national past in the early nineteenth century with respect to previous endeavours lay in the role the state acquired in the administration of antiquities. This did not happen in Britain, where, as explained in the case of the Great Civilizations, the utilitarian model would prevail until the last decades of the nineteenth century (Chapter 1 and others in this book). Private sponsorship was the preferred option in Britain and, during the period examined in this chapter, the situation described there was unparalleled in continental Europe. In continental Europe the financial backing of the state was established during this time. The development of state funding for the study of national antiquities started in Scandinavia, but many other nations followed suit. This pattern matches the opening of museums dedicated to the display of the national antiquities. Of special importance was the Museum of French Monuments, cited by many as the inspiration for later museums including that of Nordic Antiquities in Denmark, the National Museum on the Pest side of Budapest, and others in Central and Eastern Europe, as well as, beyond Europe, the National Museum of Mexico. The creation of these institutions was of key importance because, in contrast to earlier ones, those set up under the aegis of the state were intended to be permanent, as their existence did not depend on the impulse of a single benefactor. Another type of institutions that established links—albeit still weak—with the study of national antiquities were those related to teaching. The revolution in the methods of historical analysis in the late eighteenth century led to the encouragement of original material and although to start with documents were given priority over the study of antiquities, in the long term the latter would be integrated into the curricula of higher education.

The liberal revolutions of the early 1820s, 1830s, and 1848, and the conservative reaction against them, encouraged greater interest towards national archaeology, at a time, as will be seen in Chapter 12, that was closely related to Romanticism and to the new appeal of the concepts of race and language. Even if archaeology was barely institutionalized, the appeal of antiquities found in each European country inspired artists and writers. In every European nation the historical imagination became linked to representations that were placed in the medieval past. Europe's economic expansion, partly paid for by the colonies, provided the finances for expanding the institutionalization of

the study of the past. This, in fact, did not happen as yet in utilitarian Britain, but it definitely did in France, whose example was emulated throughout continental Europe. This process further assisted the gradual appearance of a body of professionals who continued to feed the appeal of the discovery of one's national past and the formation of national identities for a growing middle class.

12

Archaeology and the Liberal Revolutions (*c.* 1820–1860): Nation, Race, and Language in the Study of Europe's Past

THE POLITICAL BACKGROUND: THE LIBERAL REVOLUTIONS OF THE EARLY 1820s AND 1830s AND 1848[1]

There was no return to the Ancien Régime after Napoleon's downfall in 1815. Firstly, the early nineteenth-century economy was increasingly strengthened by the industrial, imperial and trading expansion of the European powers throughout the world (Chapters 5 to 10), which helped to stimulate Western Europe's financial growth. Adding immeasurable impetus to this movement was the territorial expansion of Russia and the US, and later in the century other countries such as Japan contributed by broadening their frontiers manifold (Chapters 9 and 10). Factors such as these accelerated the enlargement and aspirations of the middle classes, who were precisely the group leading most of the revolutionary activity in the first half of the nineteenth century. Secondly, the reforms in administration made the state machine more efficient than that of the Ancien Régime and this impeded a full restoration of the old order. Also, for the efficient functioning of the state, the enthusiasm with which educated individuals identified with the nation was extremely important to ensure their loyalty. The late eighteenth and early nineteenth-century socio-political revolutions had brought a series of new meanings to concepts such as conservatism, liberal, democrat, party, and the distinction between left and right (Roberts 1996: 21). For example, liberalism was a doctrine that favoured 'progress' and 'reform'. It was also linked with the type of nationalism that the French Revolution had promoted with the sovereignty of nations and the belief that all citizens were equal in the eyes of the law (although at this time 'citizenship', as propagated by the proponents of this doctrine, mainly meant the prosperous classes and male citizens). For progressive liberals, it was not only the established states that had the right

[1] This section is largely based on Roberts (1996).

to be a nation. The nationalist sentiments and claims by Greeks, Slovaks, Czechs, Brazilians, Mexicans, Hungarians, and a myriad of would-be nations, illustrate the growth of the widespread notion of nationhood that reached to other people with distinctive pasts and cultures. Liberals also had to confront, or negotiate with, the reactionary forces that brought down Napoleon in 1815. They were mainly made up of the nobility, and also supported by conservative intellectuals. For several decades they were to impose themselves through international accords, starting with the Congress of Vienna of 1814–15. Some of the agreements attempted to reinstate the pre-1789 status quo. Others, such as the German Zollverein, or customs union, were inspired by economic and political ambitions. It was, for example, agreed that a German Confederation of thirty-nine states should be established under the presidency of Austria while Prussia enlarged its territories. Furthermore Britain obtained overseas colonies (Malta, Heligoland in the North Sea, and the Cape of Good Hope in South Africa); the Papal States were returned to the Pope; Sweden gained Norway and Russia absorbed Finland and, finally, Switzerland became independent. Furthermore Russia, Austria, and Prussia, the three most powerful reactionary regimes, would form the Holy Alliance, keeping Central and Eastern Europe under surveillance.

After Napoleon's downfall, the allies initially formed in Vienna managed to crush three liberal revolutions in the 1820s and 1830s and in 1848. International forces rapidly suppressed the revolutions in the early 1820s in countries such as Spain, Portugal, and Naples, Tuscany and other parts of Italy. In 1825 a group of liberal military officers rebelled against Tsar Nicholas I in the Decembrist revolt. After their defeat new regulations were implemented to stop any further spread of progressive liberal movements in that country. Apart from France, the only uprisings to be successful were those which took off in Greece and the Latin American countries, where after the initial reluctance of the Powers to get involved, especially in the case of Greece, the geopolitical advantages of the dismemberment of the Ottoman and Spanish empires convinced them to help rather than impede the revolutions. In both cases the past had an important symbolic role to play in the revolutions, as liberals made claims to it to argue for their right to independence (Chapter 4).

A second wave of revolutions occurred in the 1830s. There was a first attempt to unite Italy under the Risorgimento (meaning Resurrection), but after initial failure, the 'Young Italy' movement was founded by Mazzini in 1831. A rebellion in Belgium resulted in its independence (1831), but the Polish uprising against Russia (in 1830 and again in 1846) did not succeed. In France political turbulence brought down the absolute monarch Charles X and ushered in the reign of Louis Philippe. Disorder was prevented in Britain when the British Parliament passed the Reform Bill of 1832, an electoral reform that changed the basis of

Parliamentary representation. A few years later, in 1839, the People's Charter was presented to the British Parliament. In the US the abolitionist movement emerged from the liberal agitation of the 1830s. Within this movement, women's rights stirred up hot debate, as some of the main advocates claimed that the fight should be for human rights and not only for the rights of men. Yet, most male abolitionists thought that this was not the proper time to stress women's rights. In other countries such as France the earliest feminists were connected with utopian socialists (McElroy 1991; Moses 1984).

In 1848 the third wave of revolutions started. They took place mainly in Europe although they had echoes in other parts of the world, such as Brazil. As had been the case in the two previous revolts, their influence in the United States was minimal in the short term. In Europe only Russia and Britain were left unharmed, the former because of its lack of a strong middle and proletarian class and the latter because of a series of measures that defused unrest among the workers and middle classes (Roberts 1996: 25). France led the way, when the February revolt forced King Louis Philippe to flee. The revolt's success precipitated insurgencies throughout Europe. In Germany these were led by crowds of students, members of the progressive, liberal middle class and also of the working classes. The unrest was especially important in Vienna and Berlin. The Austrian Chancellor Metternich (1773–1859), a key player in Austrian politics for several decades, had to go. In Germany a Parliament was formed in Frankfurt with the aim of drafting a charter for all of Germany. However, German unification was put on hold when the Prussian monarch, Frederick William IV, refused to be crowned by the liberals. In Italy revolutions exploded in Milan, Venice, and Rome. In the latter city, Garibaldi and Mazzini proclaimed the Roman Republic and social reforms that bettered the status of the poor were implemented. French troops allowed the restoration of papal authority with the result that Garibaldi fled to the US and Mazzini to England. The Italian nationalist movement, the Risorgimento, had again failed, while in Ireland the movement Young Ireland launched a rebellion in July but was crushed by British troops.

In Eastern Europe the revolutions, led by Lajos Kossuth, produced a separate constitution for Hungary. A republic was briefly declared in 1849, but events took a turn for the worse. No concessions to the national minorities within Hungary were granted, leading to further unrest. One of these national minorities were the Slovaks. A Slovak National Council had already drafted the 'Demands of the Slovak Nation' in May 1848, but their claims were rejected. Worse yet for Hungary, the refusal to help Austria against the Italians resulted in war in which the Russian armies brought the Hungarian revolution to a rapid and bloody end. In Bohemia Czechs quarrelled with Germans over whether to unify with Germany or with other Slav peoples. In June 1848 the Czechs convened the first Slavic Congress to discuss the possibility of the political consolidation of Austrian Slavs, including Czechs, Slovaks, Poles, Ruthenians (Ukrainians), Slovenes, Croats, and Serbs.

Despite the apparent fiasco of the 1848 revolutions changes were discernible, and they would have consequences in the following two decades. Perhaps because of this 1848 has been justly called the 'springtime of nations'. Both the Italians and the Germans had only two more decades to wait to unify successfully. In 1861 (annexing Rome in 1870) and 1871 both nations would respectively be recognized as independent states. Feudalism was finally eliminated in Austria and Prussia. Serfdom was abolished in Russia in 1861. Universal male suffrage started to be imposed in many countries, although this process would only end well into the twentieth century. Hungary obtained a higher degree of autonomy in 1867. Disaffected German bourgeois liberals, who had migrated to the United States after 1848 taking with them their fortunes, and also their ideals, were one of the factors influencing politics leading to the American Civil War (1861–5). Their distaste for slavery, among other things, led them to support the Union, formed by the states in the North, as against the Confederacy, constituted by the seceding Southern States. After the end of the American Civil War, the new US would continue enhancing its economic power which would position it among the emerging world powers.

Major factors contributing to the changing socio-political climate during this period were driven by industrialization and capitalism. These forces were already evident in Britain during the eighteenth century, but the same processes would only make a big impact on the continent from the 1830s. Banks were regulated and actively encouraged economic development. By 1840 railways, already an important means of communication in Britain, were being built in France, Germany, and The Netherlands. Canals and maritime shipping also enhanced transport by water. Trade was bolstered, especially after protectionist measures were lifted. The development of the industrial sector deeply transformed the economy and led to a profound change in the social composition of the Western world, converting an increasing number of peasants into industrial proletariat and leading to a significant growth in the social and political power of the middle classes. This was the context in which the study of national antiquities continued to grow.

NATION-BUILDING AND THE MEDIEVAL PAST

The process of nation-building during this era of the revolutions led to the development of the historical enquiry, a task undertaken on the basis of texts

and documents and also of ancient material culture. Throughout the century historiography became politicized in the name of the national interest (Berger *et al.* 1999a: 6). Increasingly, there was a process of essentializing what a nation was, so that it could be described as an individual with a character. The proper understanding of the national character could not be acquired but through a higher understanding of its past. The well-known Danish archaeologist, Jens Jacob Asmussen Worsaae (1821–85), put it this way:

> A nation which respects itself and its independence cannot possibly rest satisfied with the consideration of its present situation alone. It must of necessity direct its attention to bygone times, with the view of enquiring to what original stock it belongs, in what relations it stands to other nations, whether it has inhabited the country from primeval times or immigrated thither at a later period...; so as to ascertain by what means it has arrived at its present character and conditions. For it is not until these facts are thoroughly understood, that the people acquire a clear perception of their own character, that they are in a situation to defend their independence with energy, and to labour with success at the progressive development, and thus to promote the honour and well-being of their country.
>
> (Worsaae 1849: 1).

Worsaae was in this way linking the knowledge about the past with freedom, independence and progress. In a different part of Europe, in Central Europe, as early as 1843 Jan Erazim Vocel (1803–71) had proposed to call archaeologists' practice by the term 'Czech national archaeology' (Sklenár 1983: 69).

The interest in the past was not new (Chapters 2 and 11), but during this period it grew and became an essential tool in the process of nation-building. Key components in nation-building at this time were national histories, historical paintings, the construction of historical townscapes and the practice of novel professions such as that of archaeologist. Regarding national histories, a series of them were published in the central decades of the nineteenth century. Interestingly, most of them referred back to the medieval period as the glorious origin of the nation, and only a few delved deeper into the past. An early example of these histories was Guizot's *Histoire de la civilisation en Europe* (1829–32), in which Europe mainly meant France, which identified feudalism with the forging of the French nation. Published more than twenty years later, Michel Hennin's *Monuments de l'Histoire de France* (1856) began with Childéric in 481 CE (Haskell 1993: 302). The Middle Ages were also the point of departure for Macaulay's *History of England* (1849); Kliuchevskij's Russian, and Oliveira Martins' Portuguese national histories (Fabião 1996: 93; Shnirelman 1996: 224). Historical painting, so fashionable during most of the nineteenth century, also sought inspiration from history, often using a selection of themes taken from the Middle Ages. Examples can be found in most

European countries including England (Banham 1984), France (Pomian 1996), and Spain (Díez 1992). In Ireland, also, the medieval period was key in the writings (especially his 1845 *Ecclesiastical Architecture of Ireland*) and paintings of George Petrie (1790–1866), who emphasized the 'Celtic' medieval landscape of Ireland (Cooney 1996: 150–1; Hutchinson 1987: 81–3; Waddell 2005: 103–13). Somewhere in between the national histories and historical paintings lay a series of publishing ventures of picture albums depicting the main monuments of the nation. In the 1820s the production of the *Voyages pittoresques et romantiques dans l'ancienne France* started, a project only completed in the 1870s (Fritzsche 2004: 125). This and other similar ventures were copied all over Europe. Thus, in Spain three different undertakings can be mentioned as its inheritors: *Recuerdos y Bellezas de España* (1839–72), *España Artística y Monumental* (1842–50), and *Monumentos Arquitectónicos de España* (1859–81).

The importance of the medieval as a major constituent of the spirit of the nation led to its style being copied in newly built edifices that regulated the civic and religious life of towns. Administrative buildings and churches were erected in a neo-medieval style and furnished inside with furniture taking on Gothic forms (De Maeyer & Verpoest 2000). This fashion would endure for several decades throughout Europe. Architects, however, not only designed new structures, they also dealt with buildings put up in the medieval period that needed restorations and improvements. While in previous centuries this would have been done in the style of the contemporary period, in the middle years of the nineteenth century the aspiration was to restore medieval buildings following medieval rules. Yet, the description of what these were was a task undertaken by architect-antiquarians. These organized a series of taxonomies inspired by systems of classification in other fields as diverse as botany and philology (Frew 1980; Miele 1998: 112). Once these schemes were in place, they took precedence over the diversity of structures and forms that, as a matter of fact, had been the norm built in the medieval period. In this way restorations followed the new standards of what a medieval building of a particular century were thought to have looked like, either by newly building sections that had been ruined or even substituting original pieces that did not fit expectations (Miele 1998; Ordieres Díez 1995: 119). There are precedents for this practice in countries such as England in the eighteenth century (Miele 1998: 112–19), which by the nineteenth century was utilized by architects such as Gilbert Scott (1811–78). In France, the architect who would have a huge influence all over Europe in spreading this architectural style was Eugène Viollet-le-Duc (1814–79), who started to put these ideas into practice in the mid 1830s in the Romanesque abbey of Vézelay (Choay 2001: 102–6). In the middle decades of the nineteenth century this way of doing things would

become the norm all over Europe (De Maeyer & Verpoest 2000; Leniaud 1993; Miele 1998; Ordieres Díez 1995). Yet, not everybody agreed with these methods of restorations, and promoted a less interventionary approach, a position romanticized in England by William Morris (1834–96) and John Ruskin (1819–1900) (Banham 1984).

The study of the medieval was fostered by the spread of societies. In France the Society of Antiquaries of Normandy (Société des antiquaires de Normandie) was founded in 1824 by Arcisse de Caumont (1801–73). The society had as one of its main aims to study medieval antiquities and publish about them in the journal *Normandie*. A few years later, in 1833–4, the threat of destruction of the baptistery of Poitier led Caumont to organize the Society for the Conservation and Description of Historical Monuments (Société pour la conservation et la description des monuments historiques, later called the Société Française d'Archéologie). Among its activities was the publication of a bulletin—the *Bulletin Monumental*—and the organization of an annual conference (Congrès archéologiques de la France) (Gran-Aymerich 1998: 114, 135). Caumont has been considered one of the founders of modern archaeology in France. He had not studied architecture, but law, but his publications were vital for the scholarly study of the medieval period. Among those to be highlighted are his *Essai sur l'architecture du Moyen Âge* (1823), *Cours d'antiquités monumentales* (six volumes published between 1830 and 1841), which covered from pre-Roman to medieval architecture, his *Histoire de l'architecture religieuse au Moyen Âge* (1841), and his *Abécédaire ou rudiment d'archéologie* (1842), on church ornaments.

In England, the Cambridge Camden Society was created in 1839 'to promote the study of Ecclesiastical Architecture and Antiquities, and the restoration of mutilated architectural remains'. Its aim was to 'impose near laboratory conditions on the study and description of medieval architecture' (Miele 1998: 120). For members of the society, Gothic architecture was the national visible manifestation of the Christian faith. Soon after, the Oxford Society for Promoting the Study of Gothic Architecture was set up. In Scandinavia two names spring out from others: the Swede P. Härnquist and the Danish Niels Lauritz Andreas Høyen (1798–1870). The latter established the Nordic Art Society (Selskabet for Nordisk Kunst) in 1847. His teaching was key in the development of medieval art history, first as an occasional lecturer in many venues and from 1856 as the first Professor in Art History at the University of Copenhagen. The influence of these societies would filter through to other European countries. Thus, in Portugal the Real Associação dos Architectos Civis e Archeologos Portuguezes (Royal Association of Civil Architects and Archaeologists of Portugal) was created in 1863. Its founder was the Portuguese architect Possidónio da Silva (1806–96). He had been trained in Paris by Caumont. Back in Portugal, he was made responsible for many of the restorations of the period. He single-handedly began teaching archaeology (including palaeography, epigraphy and philology) from 1847. He also wrote a catalogue on the great medieval Portuguese buildings, which included photographic documentation (Martins 2003).

HUMAN MORPHOLOGICAL DIVERSITY, PHRENOLOGY, AND CRANIOLOGY

Arguably one of the most original research programmes developed in the nineteenth century related to the study of the morphology of the human body, and the significance of the variability in its form. Among the various perspectives, three will be discussed below: racial studies, phrenology, and craniology. The scientific classification of races had originated in rationalism during the Enlightenment. In his *Systema Naturae* (1735) Linnaeus had clustered humans within the order of quadrupeds, breaking with the religious interpretation that, after Genesis, had placed human beings in a special position between animals and God. In a second edition he went further, separating humans into five races according to skin colour, all of them springing from a single, original group. A division that became more popular, however, was undertaken by Johann Friedrich Blumenbach (1752–1840). In the third edition of his work *On the Natural Variety of Mankind*, he distributed humankind into five races, one of them the 'Caucasian' of white skin colour (Liebersohn 1998: 135–6; MacMaster 2001: 12–13), although many alternative variations were established by other scholars (Banton 1988). Throughout the nineteenth century, however, it became clear that colour had to be supplemented by other measurements, and physical taxonomy became popular.

One of the pseudo-sciences developed at the turn of the century was that of phrenology which maintained that 'a particular form of brain is the invariable concomitant of particular dispositions and talents, and this holds in the case of nations as well as of individuals' (Anonymous 1825: 7). This viewpoint was first developed in Vienna by the German Swabian physician Franz Joseph Gall (1758–1828), but his ideas were soon condemned. His theories, nonetheless, spread in the 1820s to other countries in Western Europe and the US, being key in its introduction to Britain the figure of the German Johann Gaspar Spurzheim (1776–1832), and in the acceptance of one of its forms, phrenological naturalism, that of George Combe (1788–1858). The reception of

phrenology in Britain was varied: accepted by many, but opposed by the established academia, later on in the century it was generally dismissed as quackery and charlatanry (van Wyhe 2004). In 1828 George Combe published *The constitution of man considered in relation to external objects*, a book that, despite the adverse reaction by evangelical Christians who considered it subversive of the Christian faith, years later would even outsell Darwin's *Origins* (van Wyhe 2004: ch. 5). In the 1820s phrenological societies were established in London, Edinburgh, and Wakefield, followed in the 1830s by those of Manchester, Paris, Boston, Aberdeen and others (Drouin-Hans 2001: 30–1; van Wyhe 2004). In Britain, the exclusion of phrenology from the British Association for the Advancement of Science produced as a reaction the creation of the (British) Phrenological Association, which first met in Newcastle in 1839. In Scotland phrenology was followed by the Edinburgh publisher and antiquarian Robert Chambers (1802–71). Chambers published anonymously *Vestiges of the natural history of creation* in 1844, in which a universal theory of progressive development to explain changes in nature throughout time was proposed (van Wyhe 2004: 177).

Chambers would be one of the main influences on Daniel Wilson, the Scottish archaeologist who moved to Canada in 1853 (Chapter 10), and who invited the Danish Worsaae to visit Edinburgh in 1846 (Kehoe 1998: 14–17). Wilson would describe a fieldtrip with Chambers in 1851:

> On a bright day in the early summer of [1851] ... I set out, in company with my old friend Dr. Robert Chambers, on an exploratory expedition [to a] rude stone cist ... I had been busy with the supposed evidences of pre-Celtic races, as shown in certain strange types of head found in bog and barrow; and had experienced the utmost difficulty in obtaining the needful materials for any adequate test of the theory, set forth before the end of that year in one of the sections of the British Association as an 'Inquiry into the evidence of the existence of Primitive Races in Scotland prior to the Celtae.' ... Primitive British crania were in special request, and here was a disclosure which revealed undreamt-of affinities between those of the Old and the New World. [Here he describes what sounds like a Beaker grave.] ... We started homeward with our new-found treasures [skull and pot].
>
> No pleasanter companion could have been selected ... than Robert Chambers ... we had a theme now in view which excited his keenest interest ... Only the year before there had been added to the English vocabulary the convenient term prehistoric ... The ... skull ... disclosed a special feature which had not attracted my attention before. The occiput was flattened, precisely as in some of the skulls figured in Morton's *Crania Americana*. What if it were traceable to the same cause? Here was a theme pregnant with all the charms of a novel discovery; and our evening's talk led us through many a curious speculation on ethnical affinities, evolutionary development, perpetuated peculiarities, backward to the very origin of man.
>
> (Wilson 1878: 140–7, in Kehoe 1998: 17–18).

Despite these influences, Wilson would not become an explicit phrenologist. Yet, if the rejection of phrenology by academia grew throughout the century, the parallel development of craniology took the opposite direction. There was a certain overlap between the two for both claimed the possibility of making inferences of personal traits and intelligence. Craniology came to be defined as the science which studied skulls, measuring the brain to quantify sexual and racial differences in intelligence. Measurements of the skull were being undertaken probably in the 1830s by the anatomist and Professor of Physiology at the University of Copenhagen, Daniel Friederich Eschricht (1798–1863), who has been described as a craniologist. He quantified the dimension of skulls unearthed in barrows to test whether there were significant differences between the three ages developed years earlier by Thomsen (Chapter 11) (Morse 1999: 2). The work of another Scandinavian scholar, the Swedish Professor of Anatomy in Stockholm, Anders Retzius (1796–1860), was of key importance for craniology. In his critique to phrenology, he developed the cephalic index in 1845. With this index the very influential distinction between dolichocephalic (long skulls) and brachycephalic (wide skulls) type was created. Its significance became understood in racial terms, for dolichocephalic people were identified with the Scandinavians, the Germans, the English and the French (at least those from Northern France), who were considered intelligent as opposed to the more retarded brachycephalic types represented by peoples such as the Lapps, the Finns or Finno-Slavs and the Bretons (Poliakov 1996 (1971): 264).

Racism became entangled with the debate between monogenists and polygenists. Blumenbach had been a monogenist, a term that, as mentioned on page 312, was used for those who believed that all human races derived from a common origin. Blumenbach was not an exception as monogenism was the prevailing belief held during the eighteenth century. This, however, changed in the following century. Monogenism was still maintained in the *Researches into the Physical History of Man* (1813) published by the then young James Cowles Prichard (1786–1848).[2] Soon, however, the balance would change towards polygenism. From a generalized belief in human progress, signs of a more intolerant form of racism emerged in the mid nineteenth century. Boundaries between races became unbreakable and change became difficult if not impossible. Racism became directed towards the 'Other' beyond one's frontiers and especially beyond Europe as discussed in Chapter 10, as well as towards aliens inside, which meant towards minorities such as the Jews

[2] In a later edition (1841) he quoted Eschricht's work (Morse 1999: 3), and through this example and others it becomes clear that the acceptance of the Three Age system in Britain became linked with craniology, at least until the appearance of Lubbock's *Prehistoric Times* in 1865.

(MacMaster 2001: ch. 3). An increasing number of scholars defended the thesis that different groups of people had separate origins. Among the polygenists Samuel G. Morton (1799–1851), the author of both *Crania Americana* (1839) and *Crania Aegyptica* (1844), should be mentioned.

Racist overtones were also expressed by the polygenist Robert Knox (1791–1862), who considered that the Saxon or Scandinavian race was destined for dominance, and that the Saxons' principal enemies were the Celts, among whom he included the Irish Celts whom he defined as inferior colonial subjects (Biddiss 1976: 249; Morse 1999: 11). In France craniology was followed and developed by the polygenist Paul Broca (1824–80), his Parisian school and his association, the Société d'anthropologie de Paris (1858) (Banton 1987; Blanckaert 2001). He distinguished two main races in French prehistory:

> the monuments alleged to be Celtic twenty years ago are of two different periods: the stone age on one hand, and the bronze age on the other. Yet others, even more recent, contain some iron objects. Comparative studies... have shown that the primary inhabitants of Europe belonged to the stone age, while the use of bronze was introduced by more civilized man, probably of Asiatic origin... The Celtic period begins with the bronze age; the stone age period is pre-Celtic...

and added:

> The Celts of History are a confederation of peoples in Central Gaul. The Celts of Linguistics are the people who have spoken and are still speaking the so-called Celtic languages. The Celts of Archaeology are the people who inaugurated the bronze age in Europe. The Celts of Craniology finally, are the people who brought dolichocephaly to the native brachycephalic European population, according to Retzius; whereas according to Thurnman they are, on the contrary, the people who brought brachycephaly to the native dolichocephalic British population.
>
> (Broca 1864 in Schiller 1979: 145–6).

Following in the steps of the Parisian society, the Anthropological Society of London was organized by James Hunt in 1862. The social tensions between this and the Ethnological Association have been described by Stocking (1971). In Germany the anatomist Alexander Ecker (1816–87) argued in 1865 that the long skulls found in post-Roman cemeteries represented Germanic types, whom he thought were also present in prehistory (Wiwjorra 1996: 170). The German anatomist, Rudolf Virchow (1821–1902), would become the principal representative of this trend (Poliakov 1996 (1971): 264).

Whether made by a polygenist or not, the distinction between dolichocephalic and brachycephalic (i.e., long and short) skulls created by Retzius became extremely popular for decades to come. It was used by John Grattan, a member of the Belfast Natural History and Philosophical Society who, although he never managed to finish his promised *Crania Hibernica*, published some skulls in 1858 (Waddell 2005: 121). The same view was also used by the craniologist and antiquarian Sir William Wilde (1815–76) who was working in the same period (Morse 1999: 5–6; Waddell 2005: 131–6). Another 'Crania' book published in this period was that of *Crania Britannica* in 1865 by John Thurnam (1810–73) and Joseph Bernard Davis (1801–81). It put together data collected for more than a decade, results of excavations such as those of Davis who as early as 1851 was digging barrows to collect skulls for his racial studies. Interestingly, very much in tune with his time, his interests had turned from local folklore, churches, cemeteries, and brass-rubbing to digging barrows and collecting skulls (Stocking 1971: 374–5; 1968: 375; 1987: 66).

Whereas no racial connection between present and past was expected in respect of the very earliest inhabitants of Europe, this was not the case for the latest prehistoric periods. Thus, the protohistoric period was being claimed as part of the national past. As well as Broca with the Celts in the quotation above, Worsaae was an example of this. He concluded that in the Bronze Age the inhabitants of Denmark were a Gothic tribe and that those living in Scandinavia during the Iron Age could be regarded as the same people as the present Swedes and Norwegians (Worsaae 1849: 144).

RACE AND LANGUAGE

During the nineteenth century, race and language became two crucial—and for the most part interrelated—notions in nationalist thought. A nation's common history and culture became central to the concept of nationalism. Individual nations were increasingly seen as the products of nature, and distinguished by character, race, and language. These were not seen as separate elements. Language was perceived as the conscious expression of racial uniqueness, being the visible emblem which distinguished one race, that is, one nation, from another (Kedourie 1966: 64). All this meant a change in the definition of a nation. Individual rights and the sovereignty of the people within the nation remained central to liberalism, especially that of the left, but for all liberals the understanding of what the nation was signified a discussion of its racial and linguistic origins. The rise of this type of nationalism, called by experts ethnic or cultural nationalism (Chapter 1), changed politics forever. It was no longer the case that only long-established states tried to reinforce the sense of identity of their citizens by appealing to nationalism. Now, there were also communities which, perceiving themselves to be

members of the same ethnic (or racial, in the vocabulary of the time) group, demanded political independence. As Eric Hobsbawm indicates, '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' (Hobsbawm 1990: 102). The triumph of this essentialist notion of the nation resulted in an intensification of the search for and legitimization of the nation's ethnic and/or linguistic roots, a search in which archaeology, as seen in the previous section, became deeply implicated. This was no politically innocent search. The growth of racism already mentioned in the previous section was steadily becoming successful among many of the learned classes. Literature about national identity became available, and among the many publications of these years perhaps one needs to highlight the work by one who has been later considered as the 'father' of racist ideology, Joseph-Arthur, Count de Gobineau (1816–82), his *Essai sur l'inégalité des races humaines* (*The Inequality of Human Races*) (1853–5).

For most people race, language, and nation became synonymous. There were, however, dissonant voices. During these central decades of the century, as well as later on, some nationalists, such as the Irishman Thomas Davies (Hutchinson 1987: 94), rejected the importance conferred on race for the formation of the nation. So did the French scholar Ernest Renan (1823–92) (Chapter 6), when he stated: 'On what criterion is this national right to be based? ... Many will boldly reply, from race ... This is a very grave error, and if it should prevail, it would spell the ruin of European civilization' (Renan 1999 (1882): 147). Looking at the racial mix of nations, he argued against the simple equation of race and nation. He explained that, historically, 'France is Celtic, Iberian and Germanic. Germany is Germanic, Celtic, and Slav...' (Renan 1999 (1882): 148). With regard to language, he then contended 'what we have said about race, applies also to language. Language invites union, without, however, compelling it' (Renan 1999 (1882): 150). There were also classical historians who opposed the identification of race, language, and nation. The French historian, Numa Denis Fustel de Coulanges (1830–89), challenged Theodor Mommsen (1817–1903) in this respect:

> I am amazed that a historian like you [Mommsen] affects not to know that it is not race or language which make nationality. It is not race: cast your eyes on Europe, and you will see clearly that peoples are almost never constituted on the basis of their primitive origins. Geographical convenience, political or commercial interests are what has formed populations and founded states. Each nation is thus formed little by little, each fatherland emerges without anyone being preoccupied with these ethnographic matters which you would like to bring into fashion.
>
> (Schnapp 1996: 56–7).

Not even Paul Broca, the Professor of Medicine held to be the initiator of physical anthropology in France, agreed, asking in 1864:

> Whence come, in fact, the races who people Europe? From Europe. Whence come the languages spoken in Europe? From Asia.... This is the reason why I could not agree with a doctrine which, starting from too close an assimilation of language and race, would posit in principle that conformity of language indicates unity of stock.
>
> (Schnapp 1996: 57).

But despite these warnings, repeated throughout the years (although with apparent inconsistencies in Broca's case, see page 348), the majority of scholars and lay people came to believe that race and language were *the* elements which bound together the nation. The past served to explain the formation of particular races and languages. The discovery of the Indo-European language branch by the Sanskritist Sir William Jones (1746–94) in the late eighteenth century would encourage the connection between language and race in the following decades. In 1813 Indo-Europeans were described as Aryans, and the racial component of the concept became more dominant in the following decade. The connection between race and language can be found in thousands of texts. The *Addresses to the German Nation*, published in 1807–8 by the German philosopher Johann Gottlieb Fichte (1762–1814), one of the most influential figures in German nationalism, is only one example among many:

> In the first place, the German is a branch of the Teutonic race... The first and immediately obvious difference between the fortunes of the Germans and the other branches which grew from the same root is this: the former remained in the original dwelling-places of the ancestral stock, whereas the latter emigrated to other places; the former retained and developed the original language of the ancestral stock, whereas the latter adopted a foreign language and gradually reshaped it in a way of their own.
>
> (Fichte 1807–8 in Baycroft 1998: 21–2).

The growing importance of the concepts of 'race' and 'language' would influence—and at the same time be reinforced by—most historians and archaeologists. In Germany and France, the historians Barthold Niebuhr (1776–1831) and Augustin Thierry (1795–1856) were essential for the incorporation of the concept of race into historical studies. Their work encompassed not only the national past, but also that of the Great Civilizations. This showed the extent to which race had become a scholarly commonplace. In his *History of Rome*, Niebuhr, the pioneer of text-based historical study (Chapter 11), saw the disputes between patricians and plebeians and those between Latins and Etruscans as stemming from differences of race and blood. He transformed the history of the Graeco-Roman world from a history of politics and political ideas into a history of races (Hannaford 1996). Yet, the

presumption that the Latin races were inferior to the northern ones, sometimes personified in the Aryans (to which the Greeks were linked (Bernal 1987; Leoussi 1998; Marchand 1996a)), reinforced the difficulties scholars had in maintaining a positive view of the Roman period. Historians of the national past also considered race a key concept for their interpretations. This was the case of the French author Thierry, who envisaged France as occupied by an aboriginal population racially formed by Gaulish and Frankish types (Hannaford 1996: 240–1). Thierry's work is an early example of what would become common later in the century: the study of the proto-historical period and, above all, the Middle Ages, in order to discover the roots of the nation. Both Niebuhr and Thierry, like many after them, understood race in a deterministic way, therefore considering physical features to be a reflection of mental and cultural characteristics.

As in history, the study of race and language became pivotal to archaeology. Language groups became connected with races, and both with particular types of material culture. An example of this equation was the linkage made between the Indo-European language and the Aryan race (Bernal 1987: 226–33; MacDougall 1982: 120–3; Stocking 1987: 58–60). The widely held belief in the superiority of the Aryan race became a central issue in archaeological debate. Changes in material culture through time were used as proof of movements of peoples or races across territories. Thus, in relation to the Middle Ages, in England medieval specialists attempted to trace the arrival of the three main tribal migrations of Anglo-Saxons, who—so the theory went—had either exterminated or pushed the original Celtic population towards the west (MacDougall 1982: chs. 6 and 7). The belief in the unity of the northern Germanic nations, as opposed to the previous occupants of the country, the Romano-Celts, was commonplace by the second half of the century. Such ideas were reinforced by comparative philology's linking of the Anglo-Saxons to their German ancestors within the Indo-European language family (Stocking 1987: 62). Intellectuals from Latin and Slav countries—the latter belonging to the third major European race according to Germaine de Staël's (1766–1817) proposal formulated in 1813 (Marchand 2003: 158)—saw things differently. In Russia archaeologists proudly reconstructed the history of the ancient and medieval Slavs and searched for the most ancient traces of Christianity (Shnirelman 1996: 225). Further to the southwest, the archaeology of the Latin nations also regarded the linguistic and racial components of their medieval populations as central to archaeological interpretations, and in cases such as that of Spain they were inseparable from the religious opposition between Christians and Muslims (Díaz-Andreu 1996). Judging by the interests of learned societies, language was a major concern in prehistoric archaeology. Thus, as seen in Chapter 11, the French Académie Celtique, founded in 1804, had as its aim to research the Celtic language and the ancient monuments of the Gauls, setting the example for many other academies organized throughout France from 1824 (Pomian 1996: 29). Similarly, the Danish Royal Society of Northern Antiquaries was at first a literary society, which only became more archaeological from the 1840s (Jørgen Jensen, pers. comm.).

Classical archaeologists, as well as Egyptologists, also became interested in linguistic and racial studies. Discussions of race and ancient Egypt and the connections of the ancient Egyptians with prehistoric populations of Europe and America occupied an important part in the literature of scholars, especially those with links to anthropology (Champion 2003). In Germany, Niebuhr's and Ranke's rigorous methods would be emulated by the ancient historian Theodor Mommsen (1817–1903). He was a liberal nationalist who identified, like Niebuhr before him, race, language, and nation. His involvement in the revolution of 1848–9 had led to his dismissal from his post of Professor of Law at the University of Leipzig in 1850. He was later appointed to the chair of Ancient History at the University of Berlin in 1858. Mommsen based his *History of Rome* of 1854–5 on epigraphical, numismatic and archaeological sources. In contrast to Ranke, however, Mommsen did not believe in the historian's objectivity, but thought that historians should engage with the politics of their time. This identification became intermingled with the feeling, held by many, that the Roman presence in Germany had been antithetic to the national essence, a belief expressed as early as the fifteenth century (Marchand 1996a: 156–62). A similar tension between the prestige conferred by both the classical past and the national indigenous past was felt in Britain. As Lord Acton (John Emerich Edward Dalberg-Acton, 1st Baron Acton, 1834–1902), the renowned British liberal historian and philosopher, stated in around 1859:

> Two great principles divide the world and contend for the mastery, antiquity and the Middle Ages. These are the two civilizations that have preceded us, the two elements of which ours is composed. All political as well as religious questions reduce themselves practically to this. This is the great dualism that runs through our society.
>
> (Lord Acton in Turner 1981: xi).

In his 1854–5 *History of Rome* Mommsen saw civilization as passing from the Mediterranean world to the Aryans. He also introduced the idea of history as guided by evolutionist cycles, an idea that will be explored in the next chapter. As he put it, at the end of antiquity the cycle of Thebes, Carthage, Athens, and Rome

was accomplished. New peoples who hitherto had only loved the territories of the states of the Mediterranean . . . overflowed both its shores, severed the history of its south coast from that of the north, and transferred the centre of civilization from the Mediterranean to the Atlantic Ocean. The distinction between ancient and modern history, therefore, is no mere accident, nor yet a mere matter of chronological convenience. What is called modern history is in reality the formation of a new cycle of culture, connected at several epochs of its development with the perishing or perished civilization of the Indo-Germanic stock, but destined, like that earlier cycle, to traverse an orbit of its own. It too is destined to experience in full measure vicissitudes of national weal and woe, periods of growth, of full vigour, and of age, the blessedness of creative effort.

(Mommsen 1864 (1854–5): 4).

Perhaps even more than medieval and Roman archaeology, it was prehistoric archaeology that greatly benefited from the emphasis on race and language, as the exploration into the roots of modern linguistic and racial groups inevitably moved back into the most remote periods. This is not to say that the prehistoric period suddenly became fully accepted as part of the national past, but events in the period discussed in this chapter as well as the next allowed that, at the end of the nineteenth century, it was finally about to secure for itself a place in the professional realm. From an early stage the study of the origins of language would be accompanied by that of race. To begin with, racial speculation was closely dependent on philology and had the effect of linking—indeed, almost binding—the two nascent sciences, archaeology and anthropology/ethnology. Thus, in his *Analysis of the Egyptian Mythology* (1819), one of the founding fathers of ethnology active in the first half of the nineteenth century, James Cowles Prichard (1786–1848), tried to fill in the period between the confusion of languages in the Tower of Babel, the dispersal of Noah's descendants throughout the world, and the appearance of the first historical records of the current 'nations', 'peoples', or 'races'. Later, in 1831, the same author published his *Eastern Origin of the Celtic Nations* in which he established the western boundaries of the Indo-European family. Prichard was not an exception for at the time comparative philology was considered to form the basis of the study into a race's past, and terms such as 'linguistic palaeontology' were coined to describe it (Stocking 1987).

THE SCIENTIFIC RECOGNITION OF HUMAN ANTIQUITY

One of the major developments in the central years of the nineteenth century was the scientific recognition of human antiquity. This would lay

the foundations for the reception of Charles Darwin's *Origin of Species* (1859).[3] 'God is eternal, but man is very old', had said Jacques Boucher de Perthes (1788–1868) in his *Celtic and Antediluvian Antiquities* (1857). As Donald Grayson remarks, if not many influential scientists agreed with him then, the situation completely changed over the following two years (Grayson 1983: xi). The debate about the human presence on the earth had been lingering for several decades. The general understanding was that human existence was a recent event, by which some meant about six to eight thousand years, and others a shorter period. It was in the 1840s that discoveries made by natural historians interested in geology and palaeontology and by antiquarians were combined by the French officer of customs and amateur geologist, Jacques Boucher de Crèvecœur de Perthes (usually referred to as Jacques Boucher de Perthes). He benefited from several developments: the early eighteenth-century recognition of the stone tools as human-made, the acceptance of the stratigraphic method, and, a century later, of the dating of strata on the basis of fossil remains, including already extinct animals. Boucher de Perthes' finding of stone tools in very ancient layers had been preceded by that made by John Frere (1740–1807), a high sheriff of Suffolk and later a Member of Parliament. A letter he had sent to the Society of Antiquaries in 1797 was published three years later in its journal, *Archaeologia*. In it he described his discovery of a site in eastern England with flint implements beneath very ancient deposits. The scholarship at the time was not ready, however, to receive this publication and it went unnoticed for almost sixty years (Grayson 1983).

The main impediment for the acceptance of human antiquity was the consideration of the Bible as a historical account, and the discussion about this, especially about the significance of the Flood in the light of the new data provided by geologists and palaeontologists, led to many debates in the first half of the nineteenth century. The scholars in these early years included, in Britain, the geologist William Buckland (1784–1856), who indicated that the pre-Deluge peoples were to be found in central or southern Asia and opposed Boucher's ideas. As a reader in geology in Oxford, he trained Charles Lyell (1797–1875). Lyell's *Principles of Geology* (1830–3) would be very influential, but his deep religious beliefs seem to have prevented him from accepting humans' antiquity until the 1850s. He considered

[3] The debate about human antiquity and that on the evolution of species, however, were not connected events. Antiquity did not imply evolutionism. Creationists also believed in the antiquity of man. As Grayson explains, 'The length of the human existence and the transformation of species were the burning issues of life history during the late 1850s and early 1860s, but at the time that a deep human antiquity was established, they were fully separable issues' (Grayson 1983: 5).

the associations between human remains, extinct mammals, and the Flood as accidental or, at least, unproven (Cook 2004: 180–1; Grayson 1983: ch. 4).

In France research was undertaken by Casimir Picard (1806–41) and François Jouannet (1765–1845), whose work formed the basis of some of the discussion about the Celtic era in Arcisse de Caumont's (1801–73) first volume of his *Course of Monumental Antiquities* (1830) mentioned earlier in this chapter (Coye 1997: ch. 3; Grayson 1983: 118–19; Groenen 1994: ch. 1). Picard's work encouraged Boucher de Perthes' investigations in the Somme valley near Abbeville, published in his first volume of *Celtic and Antediluvian Antiquities* in 1847 (the second and third volumes appeared in 1857 and 1864 respectively). This first volume produced a negative reaction among academic circles mainly because of its amateurish nature and its inclusion of many mistakes, but became popular among those working on the fringes of the scientific community. One of those was Marcel-Jérôme Rigollot (1786–1854), a physician from Amiens, a town also located in the Somme valley, and someone connected to the Society of Antiquaries of Picardy. In 1854 he published new finds he had made in St Acheul, then cited as evidence in the second volume of Boucher de Perthes' *Celtic and Antediluvian Antiquities* three years later. This volume showed Boucher's much better command of contemporary geological approaches, for he argued his theories in the framework of the debate about the geological imprint of the Deluge and of its effects. He proposed that transformation had been the mechanism by which morphological changes throughout geological time could be explained (Grayson 1983: ch. 8).

In Britain, Boucher de Perthes' second volume was received at the time when the results of the excavation of Brixham Cave near Torquay in southwest England were becoming known. It was dug by the geologist and educator William Pengelly (1812–94), who wanted to find specimens for the Torquay Museum, and the palaeontologist Hugh Falconer (1808–65). The latter's visit to Boucher de Perthes in 1858 was then followed by the geologist Sir Joseph Prestwich (1812–96) and then by that of others, including Lyell, who was convinced by the evidence and accepted humans' great antiquity. Once he and the other major academics in Britain and France had admitted this, scholars in other countries joined the search for data. One of those was Casiano de Prado, a geologist who had been working for the Spanish Ordnance Survey (Comisión del Mapa Geológico de España) since 1849. He discovered remains of Elephas in the site of San Isidro near Madrid in 1850, but only after his visits to Paris and London in 1851 and 1852, and after having become aware of the work of the Danish naturalist, Peter Wilhelm Lund (1801–80), in Brazil (Chapter 4), did he go back to look for more. In 1862 his visit to the site with the French geologists and palaeontologists, Louis Lartet (Édouard Lartet's son) (1840–99) and Édouard de Verneuil (1805–73), facilitated the

communication about its existence to the wider academic community in Europe (Ayarzaguena Sanz 2002). Research on human antiquity would then be continued mainly in Western Europe during the following decades.

INSTITUTIONALIZING THE NATIONAL HERITAGE

Institutionalization is a wide concept, which includes institutions for both those earning a living from archaeology and those who do not. In the latter category the institutions par excellence are the learned society and the academy, both of which had existed for more than a century—or two—by the period under discussion in this chapter. Institutions for professional archaeologists today can be divided into four categories: museums, universities, heritage offices, and commercial archaeology units. Discarding the last one because of its very recent appearance in the history of the discipline, jobs whose title explicitly mentioned either antiquities or archaeology were created from the start of the nineteenth century. From the handful of jobs so described before 1820 (which included, for example, the German Georg Zoëga, and the Italian, Carlo Fea, as Commissioner of Antiquities, mentioned in Chapters 2 and 3), a small but significant number of newly created posts were added in this period. Yet, as the discussion in previous sections shows, there were many others working in cognate disciplines who also dealt with archaeological material. This issue will be analysed in more detail in Chapter 13. Most institutions mentioned in this section will explicitly focus on antiquity or archaeology.

Starting with positions created for what we would define nowadays as heritage management, after the early appointment of Carlo Fea cited above, it would be the French government that pioneered the creation of a post of a first civil servant explicitly dealing with archaeology. The new position was that of General Inspector of Antiquities, created in 1830 and filled in 1834 by Prosper Mérimée (1803–70). His office's aim was to control the increasing activity related to antiquities and excavations. In accordance with the mood of the time, a systematic cataloguing of artistic monuments was announced. A questionnaire was distributed throughout France. The difficulties that ensued showed the huge problems faced by any of these novel initiatives: to start with only a few city councils bothered to respond to the questionnaire. Moreover it soon became obvious that the office was not properly resourced for the magnitude of the work to be done and the specialists sent to check the information were rapidly overwhelmed by the task. In 1837 a Commission of Historical Monuments was set up to implement legislation and prevent the destruction of historical and archaeological monuments (Choay 2001;

Schnapp 1996: 53–4). In a short time this institution had been copied in other European countries. As the French Education Minister proudly stated in 1847:

> Commissions are being formed in Belgium, in Spain, in Italy and in Germany after the example of our Historical Committees... We would be right to congratulate ourselves for having, in this as in many other fields, taken the lead over other nations.
>
> (in López Trujillo 2006: 178).

The Historical and Artistic Monument Commissions established in Spain in 1844 were intended to protect buildings, monuments, and artistic objects which, either for reasons of the beauty of their construction, or their age, their origin, the use made of them or their historical importance, were considered worth preserving. Of the Commissions' three departments, one was devoted to architecture and archaeology (Tortosa & Mora 1996: 201–3). The Imperial Archaeological Commission set up in Russia in 1859 seems to have also dealt with Slavic antiquities (Dolukhanov 1995: 327), in addition to colonial archaeology (Chapter 9). In contrast, the earlier Archaeographical Commission of 1834 seems to have focused on the collections amassed in expeditions (Whittaker 1984: 187).

The construction of an administrative frame for the modern state directly affected archaeology in the creation of posts in heritage, museums and societies. Its influence, however, went beyond that, for jobs in other offices also had an impact in archaeology. This is exemplified by creations such as that of Ordnance Surveys in several parts of Europe, from Germany to Ireland (1824) and, later on, to other countries such as Portugal (1848) and Spain (1849). One of the earliest ones, the Irish Ordnance Survey, was founded in 1824 with the aim of acquiring a better knowledge of land distribution to allow the reform of the country's local taxation system (Waddell 2005: 97). In the newly produced maps archaeological sites were located, thus making available an enormous amount of archaeological information.

While there were only a few jobs in heritage, many more were created in museums. Throughout Europe the role of museums in nation-building became accepted, and, although their title as 'national' would only become the norm in the last four decades of the century (Chapter 13), it became common in all capitals and important cities to have the best museum of the whole nation. Invariably, in these star institutions archaeological displays were exhibited. In 1818 the National Museum in Pest was established, opening in 1823 (Sklenár 1983: 80). This, and the museum in Prague, would be the largest 'national' museums in Central Europe at the time. In 1835, shortly after Belgium's independence, the Musées Royaux d'Art et d'Histoire were created. It was then subdivided and part of the collections became the basis of

the Royal Museum of Armours, Antiquity, and Ethnology (Musée royal d'armures, d'antiquité et d'ethnologie) (Schotsmans 1985). In Vienna the Imperial Cabinet of Coins and Antiques was the major institution. In Spain the creation of a professional body dealing with archives, libraries and museums in 1858 made, from 1868, the term 'antiquarian' official for those dealing with museums (the title would be substituted by that of 'archaeologist' in 1900).

The first example of a museum as explicitly 'national' and exclusively specializing in antiquities may have been the 1867 Museum of National Antiquities (Musée des antiquités nationales) in France. There was a long history behind this creation. The idea of a national museum had started in Paris with the Museum of French Monuments, called by some the National Museum of French Monuments (McClelland 1994: 165). After its closure in 1816 (Chapter 11), the idea of a national museum of antiquities had been raised again after the revolution of July 1831. In 1843 the politician François Arago (1783–1853), who had supported the bill in the Assembly, declared:

> Gentlemen, we find in various institutions around Paris Greek collections, Roman collections, Egyptian collections. Not even the savages of Oceania have been neglected. It is high time that we gave some thought to our ancestors. Let us see to it that the capital of France also includes a French historical museum.
>
> (in Pomian 1996: 43).

A similar concern was expressed in Britain. In 1845 in his *Archaeological Album*, the English antiquarian and writer, Thomas Wright (1810–77), one of the founders of the British Archaeological Association, had complained, 'in the British Museum, our native antiquities appear to be held in very little esteem... It is discreditable to the Government of this country that we have no museum of national antiquities' (MacGregor 1998: 127). Finally a Department of British and Medieval Antiquities and Ethnography was opened, in 1866, in the broadly philhellenist (and classicist) British Museum (*ibid.* 136). After the rejection by the British Museum to buy some British antiquities, however, a private museum was formed with the name of Museum of National and Foreign Antiquities. Opened in Liverpool in 1867, its existence was anecdotal, as it closed after a few months (MacGregor 1998: 133–4).

In still non-unified Germany, the opening of the Central Roman and Germanic Museum (Römisch-Germanisches Zentralmuseum) was decided in Mainz in 1852. It was considered that the centralization of the collections would make it easier to determine the boundaries between Germans, Slavs and Celts in antiquity (Marchand 1996a: 169–70). The museum not only contained some prehistoric but also Roman and early medieval archaeology. Jealousy felt by provincial collectors, however, partly obviated these goals

(*ibid.* 169). Another museum, the German National Museum (Germanisches Nationalmuseum), organized by the Union of German Historical and Antiquarian Societies, opened its doors in Nuremberg in 1853 (Bjurström 1996: 42; Haskell 1993: 282; Marchand 1996a: 169). It exhibited Christian German arts and aimed to establish a 'well-arranged repertoire of the sources of German history, literature and art from the earliest periods until 1650', or, as expressed a few years later,

> to make known through its collections as true and as complete as possible a picture of the life and activities of our ancestors, and in its halls to recall to memory the most important moments of the history of the fatherland and to honour the memories of the most outstanding men and women of Germany.
>
> (in Haskell 1993: 283).

Other museums were established in the provincial cities. Others would now join the early examples from Austria mentioned in Chapter 11 like the Joanneum in Graz (1811): the Ferdinandeum in Innsbruck (1823) and the Oberösterreichische Landesmuseum (Upper Austrian Regional Museum, 1833) (Sklenár 1983: 80; Urban in Murray 2001: 127). In territories belonging to the Austrian Empire national museums were also opened, one of them being that of Belgrade in 1844 (Babic 2002: 311). The dissolution of the monasteries in Spain and Portugal in the 1830s brought many archaeological and artistic objects into circulation. In Portugal, some were sent to museums in the largest cities, Lisbon and Oporto, and exhibited from around 1833 in their respective Fine Art Academies. In the case of the coin collection which had belonged to the Alcobaça Monastery, the Museu da Casa da Moeda (Mint Museum) was created. In Spain, museums were opened even in small provincial towns such as Castellón, Girona and Huesca, to cite just three examples (Díaz-Andreu 1997). In 1848 the Museum of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland (founded in 1780) was organized. To begin with it opened two days a week, and was 'acknowledged' (i.e. funded) by the state from 1851 (MacGregor 1998: 127).

Regarding the third professional area mentioned at the start of this section, the teaching of archaeology in higher education, examples can be found in the eighteenth century and early in the nineteenth century. The examples of Christian Gotlob Heyne, Johann Gustav Gottlieb Büsching, and Caspar J. Reuvens have been cited earlier in the book (Chapters 2, 5, 11). The first chairs of archaeology in Uppsala in 1662 and in Kiel in 1802 have also been mentioned (Chapter 2). Except for these two (and perhaps others to be discovered), most of the earliest chairs specifically mentioning archaeology appeared around 1850. In 1847 some provision for the teaching of archaeology was made in Ireland in the Queen's Colleges established in Belfast, Cork and Galway, and in 1854 a professor of Irish History and Archaeology was appointed at the Cardinal Newman's Catholic University in Dublin (Cooney 1996: 155; Waddell 2005: 114–15). In the Austro-Hungarian Empire chairs were established in Vienna (1849) and Prague (1850). The first was created for the Slovak archaeologist specializing in the Slavs, Jan Kollár (1793–1852), and the second for the Czech Vocel (Sklenár 1983: 83). A course on 'Archaeology and arts of the Middle Ages' was also organized in the Parisian École de Chartes in 1847 (Thirion 1997). In Spain, an institution set up in the image of the École, the Escuela Superior de Diplomática (Higher School of Diplomacy (i.e. Documents)), opened in 1856, and archaeology was taught in it from the start (Peiró Martín & Pasamar Alzuria 1996). The French model was not apparently followed in Britain. A first chair of archaeology, the Disney Chair, was created in Cambridge in 1851, but its occupant, the Reverend John Marsden (1803–70), has been described as a little known clergyman with some interests in antiquity (Wiseman 1992: 83–4).

In the mid 1800s instruction in archaeology mainly took place in universities under the umbrella of a wide range of collateral disciplines: history, architecture, philology, medicine, the natural sciences, geography, and, increasingly, anthropology. In Spain, for example, in addition to being taught in the Higher School of Diplomacy, instruction concerning Islamic archaeology was the responsibility of the chairs of Arabic language at the Universities of Madrid (chair created in 1843 for Pascual Gayangos (Pascual de Gayangos y Arce, 1809–97)) and Granada (1846, José Moreno Nieto (1825–82)) (Díaz-Andreu 1996: 70). As academic disciplines, philology and history were much more successful in gaining acceptance than archaeology. The greater sophistication achieved in the analysis of written sources compared to the study of the material remains of the past meant that the former method was still considered preferable. This accounts for the relatively high number of chairs of ancient and medieval history—and not of classical or medieval archaeology—in countries such as France and Germany at the beginning of the twentieth century (Keylor 1975: 219).

The number of different jobs mentioned in the paragraphs above may, however, be misleading if we take it as a direct measure of the number of professionals in the discipline. In this period, as would be the case later on, it was not uncommon that a series of new professional posts were occupied by the same person. The Danish archaeologist Worsaae exemplifies this. He was Inspector and later Director for the Conservation of Antiquarian Monuments from the late 1840s, director of the Royal Collections at the Rosenborg castle from 1857 to 1885, and museum director at the Oldnordisk Museum (the Museum of Northern Antiquities) from 1866. He also lectured in prehistoric archaeology at Copenhagen University, although his role as a

lecturer may have been overstated. He was only part-time and only taught from 1855 to 1866 (Klindt-Jensen 1975). When he left, teaching in prehistoric archaeology did not start again until 1880, and the sudden death of the lecturer the following year meant a vacancy for this discipline in Danish universities that would last for many years (Wiell 2006).

Another issue that should be commented on in relation to Denmark is the excavations of mounds of shells interpreted as Kitchen Midden or, in Danish, Kjokkenmoeding, towards the end of the 1840s and the emergence of an interdisciplinary research group for their study, the First Kitchen Midden Commission of 1849–69. This was formed by Worsaae together with the zoologist Japetus Steenstrup (1813–97) and the geologist Johan Georg Forchammer. The commission based its work in carefully documented observations of stratigraphy, context and typology made on the bases of primary data obtained in field investigations (Kristiansen 2002). Their research was made public in the International Congress of Prehistoric Anthropology and Archaeology (Congrès International d'anthropologie et d'archéologie préhistorique, CIAPP), especially during its fourth meeting in Copenhagen in 1869 (Chapter 13).

At a different level, including professionals and non-professionals, antiquarians' interest fostered the creation of new learned societies and journals.[4] A number of societies dealing with medieval archaeology have been discussed in the section about nation-building. A few associations previously founded had been exclusively centred on archaeology. The difference now was that some focused their interest on their own regions. This led to a significant multiplication in their number, with only a few having their headquarters in the state capital. There are many examples of regional associations. One of them was the Belfast Natural History Society founded in 1821, which had within its remit the study of antiquities (Waddell 2005: 116). In Britain, between 1834 and 1836, twelve new antiquarian societies were set up, many with their own scholarly journals (Banham & Harris 1984a: 66). 1836 saw the launch of the *Proceedings of the Numismatic Society of London* and of John Yonge Akerman's *Numismatic Journal*, which were later fused as the *Numismatic Chronicle* (Wetherall 1998: 27). From the 1840s the rising interest in archaeology led to the creation of societies in most British regions. The first County Society was that of the Norfolk Archaeological Society inaugurated in 1845, soon followed by the Cambrian and Sussex societies of 1846, a move in which Ireland also participated with the creation of the Kilkenny Archaeological Society in 1849.

[4] Another type of institution which could perhaps be included in this section is that of the Great Exhibition, that held at the Crystal Palace in 1851 in London and the Great Industrial Exhibition in Dublin in 1853, the latter containing an important display of antiquities (Waddell 2005: 124).

In 1843 the Austrian Geschichtsverein für Kärnten (Kärnten Historical Society) was established and the publication of a scholarly journal, *Carinthia*, started soon after (Urban in Murray 2001: 127). In the Austrian part of Poland a society of the Friends of the Sciences was created in Poznan in 1857 (Sklenár 1983: 78, 80). The Moscow Archaeological Society seems to have appeared around these years (Klejn & Tikhonov 2006: 198). Some authors have stressed the importance of the new means of transport in the proliferation of new finds that bolstered interest in membership of regional societies and facilitated communication between them (Hudson 1981; Van Riper 1993; Vernon 1998). The importance of this would, however, increase later in the nineteenth century (Chapter 13).

The interests in the region were complementary to those of the nation. Consequently the aim of the promoters of the regional institutions was to highlight the specific contributions of their own region to the nation. Among the national associations one has to speak about those created in the eighteenth century—including, for example, the Czech Society in Prague (Sklenár 1983: 77), and others established in these years such as the Austrian Imperial Academy of Sciences of 1847 (*ibid.* 77). Interestingly, some of the associations mentioned in this paragraph were created in countries which only later would become independent such as Ireland, Czechia, and Norway. Thus, in 1840 the Irish Archaeological Society was created. It would join the Celtic Society founded a few years later and formed the Irish Archaeological and Celtic Society in 1854 (Waddell 2005: 114). The Czech Archaeological Committee started to function in 1843, funding excavations and, from 1852, publishing its own journal (Sklenár 1983: 81). Almost every archaeologist in the country was a member. A final example of a national association is the Society for the Preservation of Norwegian Antiquities founded in 1844 (Mytum in Murray 2001: 865).

Another national association was that founded in Britain in 1843 as a reaction to the apathy of the Society of Antiquaries. Its name was the British Archaeological Association for the Encouragement and Prosecution of Researches into the Arts and Monuments of the Early and Middle Ages. The new association decided to hold a congress in Canterbury in 1844. This would be one of the first archaeological congresses ever organized in the world.[5] Discussions were arranged into four sections: Primeval, Medieval, Architectural, and Historical and a barrow-digging expedition and excursions were also planned. The meeting finished with the spectacle of an Egyptian mummy

[5] I have not been able to find the starting date for the annual conferences organized by the Société Française d'Archéologie created with the name of Société pour la conservation et la description des monuments historiques in 1833–4 (Gran-Aymerich 1998: 114, 135).

being unrolled. In the following months the association became prey to internal fights and divided up into two rival groups, one changing its name to the Archaeological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland (Marsden 1983: ch. 5; Wetherall 1994). Most of these societies had their own journals such as the British *Archaeological Journal*. In 1849 the Sociedade Archeologica Lusitana (Lusitanian Archaeological Society) was founded in Portugal (Fabião 1997). The flurry of new societies indicated that the former dominance of classical archaeology in learned societies was clearly giving way to an interest in the national past. A clear illustration of this process is the example of the Russian Archaeological Society, founded in 1846, whose initial emphasis on classical archaeology was overturned as early as 1851, when Russian nationalists managed to take control of it and declared that the study of Russian antiquities should be its aim (Shnirelman 1996: 222).

MID NINETEENTH-CENTURY ARCHAEOLOGY IN EUROPE: FINAL REMARKS

The contrast between the early and the mid years of the nineteenth century in terms of the interest towards the past is striking: the sheer numbers of people, associations, and museums that have cropped up in these pages are staggering in comparative terms. Yet, this is but an intermediate period, for in the final years of the century numbers would again show an increase—and this trend would continue later. An analysis of the social composition of those doing archaeology is revealing. Firstly, the balance between professionals and non-professionals still favoured the latter, as in fact would be the case well into the twentieth century. Secondly, in contrast to earlier centuries and even the first two decades of the nineteenth century, the individuals dealing with archaeology mainly originated from the middle classes: not from the aristocracy or those with sufficient means not to have to work, but from individuals—mostly men—in a very wide range of professions. Thus, Theodor Mommsen commented at some point in his life (despite his role for the discipline) that archaeology was a harmless but useless hobby 'for regional doctors and government officials, retired army officers, village teachers and superannuated village priests' (in Sklenár 1983: 114). Eric Hobsbawm aptly reminds us that the romantic passion sweeping Europe since the last years of the eighteenth century led many to the quest for the pure, uncorrupted peasantry and its customs and folklore, and, I would add, to the remote and romantic past. He indicates that in some parts of Europe those involved in these studies did not belong to the same ethnic group as the peasants. This was the case of Swedes

in Finland and of Germans in many parts of Central Europe. As he explains, the organizers of the Finnish Literature Society in 1831 were Swedes, and the data recorded by them were in Swedish (Hobsbawm 1990: 104). Hobsbawm's view is most probably right in that not all archaeologists were nationalists as yet, but the example he proposes may be misleading: it is easy to see a correlation between this and practices in the colonies which in Parts II and III of this book have been connected to nationalism. This is because the data collected by the Swedes allowed a better understanding of the Finns, who were, for the Swedes, the 'Other' (in this case, the 'Other' to be re-conquered, for Finland had passed from being under Swedish control in the seventeenth century, to be under Russian influence in the eighteenth century. Later Finland had become an autonomous Grand Duchy in the Russian Empire after the Finnish War between Sweden and Russia in 1809). Societies such as the Finnish Literature Society also contributed to the modelling of an ethnic map of Europe which produced a type of knowledge key for the creation of national identity.

Many of the individuals who have been mentioned in this chapter had been born around the years of the French Revolution and some had been influenced by its ideals. Despite the conservative reaction, the number of revolutions in Europe shows that the national argument was gradually becoming accepted as the basis of the nation-state by a wider spectrum of the population. There was an awareness that claims for national identity had been used to rationalize the independence of new countries such as Greece and many in Latin America (Chapter 4). As a nation needed a past to legitimate its existence, the creation of most learned societies dealing with subjects such as archaeology might be seen as one more means by which educated elites expressed their political will and desires to further promote a sense of national identity—either a separatist national identity or an integrative one, also including regions as part of the nation—among a wider population. This process happened in countries such as Ireland and Czechia which were not independent at that time, but where ambitions for national independence were high. Learned societies were not groups of individuals with one voice but loci where discussions and negotiations about national identity took place.

As mentioned in several chapters of this book, discourses about the past are not static, but throughout the different periods of world history have been an arena of interaction, something to be remodelled and agreed on. Europe, of course, is no exception. During these years there was a change of emphasis on the main periods and themes being studied. The new emphasis of ethnicity and the national tongue in the definition of a successful nation compelled scholars towards the study of race and language, something that would increase in tempo until the Second World War (see Chapter 13 for the last

decades of the nineteenth century). It also encouraged intellectuals to give preference to the study of the medieval period, for it was then, after the failure of the Roman Empire, that most nationalists considered that the roots of the nation were to be found. The interest in the medieval led to more searches and discoveries, novel classifications and a wider knowledge about the Middle Ages, but it also came together with a fresh evaluation of old buildings, many of those in need of repair. Restorations of old churches were undertaken while new buildings purposely looking old were built. This emphasis on the medieval period does not mean that Roman archaeology in Europe was left behind: it was not. This is apparent in the number of finds written about in the learned journals. It also becomes clear from the high number of classical themes in historical paintings. Yet, there are many issues for future investigation, including how archaeologists studying the Roman period justified their endeavours in the era of race and language and whether the absence of societies specifically dealing with Roman remains found beyond Italy is significant. The latter, I suspect, will only be known when an analysis of the endeavours of the long-established societies is undertaken. The impression is that the way in which Roman antiquities were perceived indicates the versatility with which archaeological evidence is treated: Roman finds were associated with ideas of civilization and superiority, aspects every nation also wanted to be linked with, but also with notions of national defeat and foreign domination.

In spite of the emphasis on the medieval and, to a lesser extent, the Roman periods, those investigating prehistoric remains seem not to have found the Roman presence a major problem. Prehistorians had no doubts that the roots of the nation could be observed at least in the first millennium BCE, during the protohistoric period. Yet, there were difficulties in the creation of a coherent discourse about this period, and these were mainly due to lack of data and the insufficient development of archaeological method. This resulted, importantly, in pre-Roman times being generally ignored in national histories. As we will see in Chapter 13, this would change to a large extent in the following decades. As the previous pages show, part of the reason for this was that the scarcity of data, instead of discouraging scholars, may in fact have served as an encouragement, for feelings of patriotism led many to deal with those periods in which knowledge was slim and many more data needed.

Some imbalances have been observed in this chapter regarding the geographical development in the discipline in Europe. There are issues that were discussed earlier in some countries than in others. A clear example of this is the debate on human origins, which took place in Britain and France in the 1850s and was only later received elsewhere in Europe. This impression is also obtained regarding the discussions related to phrenology and craniology. It can be argued that the reason for this was colonialism. The imperial

encounter of British and French scholars with areas of the world populated by people of other colours, political organizations and tongues led them to discussions about race, language and origins that did not seem so pressing in other parts of Europe. Also, the colonies brought wealth, and therefore the possibility of either the state or private individuals sponsoring a higher number of scholars to deal with these matters. Empires, however, do not explain everything, for a strong tradition of scholarship existed in other parts of Europe like Germany and Central Europe, and in Scandinavia. For other aspects like environmental archaeology, intriguingly, developments in the latter area are remarkable and with no apparent parallel elsewhere in Europe.

Archaeologists' concern for the past does not mean that they did not believe in the power of the Classics and the archaeology of the Great Civilizations. Indeed the discourse of civilization still remained very powerful in the nineteenth century, as explained in Part II of the book, and this arguably influenced the study of the Roman archaeology in the own nation. Yet, for most of those with interests in the past it was simply not sufficient to engage with the archaeology of the Great Civilizations to the same extent that they could become involved in the search for their own past. Their commitment illustrates how, in the first half of the nineteenth century, the discovery of a country's own past devolved from being controlled by the higher strata in society to the middle classes. It is worth emphasizing that this interest rose at a time, first, when through liberalism and economic wealth, the middle classes were accessing political power and, second, when the history of Europe was a complicated one in which many views competed over the existence and exact location of national frontiers. Archaeologists could not avoid being part of this contest. On the one hand, their experiences as individuals sometimes had a critical impact on their social and intellectual lives. On the other, they often contributed with their opinions to the on-going political debates.

13

Evolutionism and Positivism (*c.* 1860–1900)

INTRODUCTION

It is not least in the great art auctions that a phenomenon has become visible that has hitherto been confined to the sphere of politics. The trade in antiquities has become affected by a national movement insofar as every country endeavours to buy their own pieces of art. Whereas in the past the English or French used to buy anything they liked in other countries, irrespective of the origin of an object, there has been a clear shift in both England and France towards [national] antiquities, even in those cases where these are undoubtedly of a lower artistic value than available foreign ones. The Englishmen tend to buy the English, the Frenchmen the French, the Germans the German, and the Belgians and Dutchmen the Dutch old works of art. This is not true merely of historical museums but applies to private collectors.

(Zimmer 2003a: 197).

This was the way that one of the executive members of the Swiss National Museum phrased, at the end of the nineteenth century, the changes that had taken place in the previous decades: the interest in the national past was replacing the former emphasis on the Great Civilizations. Another transformation that had occurred was that the study of prehistory, rather than the history of the Roman and medieval periods, was definitively on the agenda. This change of emphasis, which took place between the 1860s and 1880s, had been in motion throughout the century but had finally crystallized in the last two decades of the century. By then, nationalism had transformed its character into a predominantly conservative doctrine. Another adjustment was also apparent. The acceptance of evolutionism had emerged as a major scientific theory to explain change. Issues of nationalism, regionalism, and imperialism became intertwined with scientific theory and further nourished the interest in the remote past. The development of methods to study evolution in the natural sciences promoted a scientific approach to the prehistoric period. At the same time, this affected attitudes towards the Roman and the medieval past. In this chapter, therefore, I reject the view expressed by other historians of archaeology such as Trigger (1989: 148) and

to a certain degree Sklenár (1983: 123–6), who think that nationalism constituted a threat to cultural evolutionism and its eventual dismissal. This, they think, took place when scholars moved towards the adoption of the culture-historical perspective in the first decades of the twentieth century. The following pages will reveal, however, that the belief in evolutionism was not contrary to the nationalist cause. Late nineteenth-century archaeologists believed in the evolutionary theories to a greater or lesser extent. Despite this, they also became deeply implicated in the construction of their national past, to a degree not seen in previous decades. Culture-history did not oppose evolutionism; it accepted its tenets and moved beyond them.

Several caveats are needed at this point. To start with, it is important to realize that not all of those who we would nowadays refer to as evolutionists perceived themselves as such. In this light it may be worth establishing a distinction between evolutionists *sensu latu* and evolutionists *sensu strictu.* The former group had faith in positivism, believed in both progress and decadence, and had confidence in the superiority of the white race. Evolutionists *sensu strictu* went further and assumed that an inevitable linear evolution of human cultural and physical development followed similar stages everywhere. Unless the latter is mentioned, in this chapter the term evolutionist will refer to the former. It should also be clear that evolutionism did not equate with Darwinism, an evolutionary theory that stood for the arbitrary character of natural selection to explain the transformation of species through time. Another issue is that of positivism and its relation to evolutionism and nationalism. The positivist philosophy held that scientists should not theorize beyond the basic evolutionist parameters. The role of the scientist was to develop the methods and analytical tools to study objects scientifically and rationally through observation and logical comparison with similar objects. Positivism began to affect the way in which archaeology was written. Personal accounts were largely abandoned and substituted at this time by texts written in a more impersonal and distant style with a greater use of passives. The majority of the scholarly community subscribed to positivism, to the idea of progress and, therefore, to a certain evolutionary understanding of the historical process. Yet, positivism did not oppose nationalism, in the sense that nationalism deeply influenced the object and scope of archaeological study. This could be a topic intimately involved in the national cause such as the scientific search for a particular race in the past—the Goths, Romans, Slavs, and so on. A main concern was the search for their geographical location, an issue that was rationally investigated in an area which very frequently only covered the precise territory demarcated by the modern frontiers of the researcher's nation.

A BACKGROUND: NATIONALISM, SOCIALISM, FEMINISM, AND THE ECONOMIC CRISIS OF 1873

In 1861 Italy became a united state (map 3), although the process of unification was only completed after the acquisition of Rome in 1870. Moreover, after more than half a century of attempts at German unification, following the Franco-Prussian War, thirty-nine of the German states were unified in 1871. From 1878 a number of European states, which had hitherto been integrated into the Ottoman Empire, achieved independence after the war between Russia and Turkey. These political reshuffles marked the establishment of the nation-state as the dominant form of political organization in Europe (a form that would attain world-wide recognition in 1918 (Lynch 2002)). Yet, only a few national movements for independence were successful at this stage: in Ireland and many countries in Eastern Europe the national liberation struggles were still in progress at the end of the century. Regarding the existing nation-states, despite declaring their unity rooted in the past as well as in their racial and linguistic homogeneity, the reality of both the newly created and the long-established countries was that they were neither linguistically nor culturally homogeneous. In Italy and Germany, as well as France and Spain, several languages and dialects were spoken that were mutually incomprehensible. The situation was embodied by a remark attributed to the nationalist leader Massimo d'Azeglio (Massimo Taparelli, marquis d'Azeglio, 1798–1866), in 1861: 'We have made Italy, now we must make the Italians.' Traditions differed widely within the national territory and in some countries there were important minorities some of which became politically aware during this period. The dramatic improvements in the means and speed of transport had a universal impact, and their effect was especially noticeable in less developed countries. Their growth and even the state nationalization of services such as the postal networks, schooling (particularly with the teaching of geography and history), the police, and military conscription, served to reproduce the nation in everyday life and, therefore, in making adherence to the nation the norm (see Weber 1976; 1991 for data on this related to France). These changes were the outcome of the state's efforts to foster the feeling of nationhood among its people, as well as the result of private initiative. An example of the latter is the lobbying of train operators for the state to unify the time for the whole of the national territory. Their success meant that not only the nationalization of geographical space was solidified with the mapping and fixation of national frontiers, but that of time also became a reality. Both became powerful means to make the nation identifiable, real as well as imaginable.

During the second half of the nineteenth century, nationalism altered its character, transforming itself from an ideology of reform to one of conservatism. This was partly the result of changes within progressive liberalism. Once the belief in nationalism became widespread, liberalism adjusted its objectives. Romanticism was replaced by realism, an ideology that paid attention to detail, then description in the pursuit of authenticity (understood as the reflection of the real, crude, daily experience) would come to the fore. The most social-minded liberals now embraced the demands of the increasingly powerful trade unionism movement, together with the ideas put forward by Karl Marx (1818–83) and Friedrich Engels (1820–95), the latter overtly hostile to nationalism. In 1848 they jointly published the *Communist Manifesto* urging the workers to unite, regardless of their nationality, against the moneyed classes. As a matter of fact, however, internationalism did not play against nationalism, but was juxtaposed to it: representatives of each nation travelled to meet others in the international meetings. In any case, there were several attempts to unite the proletariat in the first (1864–76) and second (1889–1917) international working men's associations. For Marx and Engels, development could only be understood by analysing economic and social class. Marx outlined the real social content of political struggles, framing them in terms of different social interests. As he explained in his *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Napoleon* (1852), the French Revolution had been a war of the bourgeoisie, and not of the nation as a whole, against the king.

Marx never wrote much about the remote past, but he read a lot of anthropology (Allen 2004: 85). Some of his notes on *Ancient Society* (1877), by the American anthropologist Lewis Henry Morgan (1818–81), were found after his death by Engels. *Ancient Society* dealt with the Iroquois of North America. Engels used these notes for his subsequent book *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State* (1884). In it he followed Morgan's adoption of the enlightened analytical categories of savagery, barbarism, and civilization, which served to describe the periods of human history. The author hypothesized about the emergence of a class of society based on private property from a previous primitive community. *The Origin*... soon had several editions and was translated into most European languages. The direct influence of this book on archaeologists was most probably minimal in this period, given the bourgeois background of most professionals and amateurs. Nevertheless, it no doubt popularized evolutionism and the idea of a white 'man's primitive past among many late nineteenth-century working-class autodidacts, who until then had been oblivious to the developments occurring in archaeology, especially those of the study of the prehistoric period.

One of the reformist ideologies that gained strength in the late nineteenth century was feminism. As briefly mentioned in Chapter 12, the battle for

human rights had started with movements such as abolitionism and utopian socialism which had operated under the umbrella of liberalism. From an early stage the latter had been supported by feminists, but feeling that they had not received a similar degree of support in return, they eventually created a movement of their own, with several contradictory strands. Some of these were 'radical' for the standards of the day, as they argued for complete equality with men. Others supported the patriarchal system while asking for some legal amendments that gave women more autonomy over their own affairs, as well as allowing them to have the educational opportunities still reserved for men alone and to be economically independent (Allen 2004; Moses 1984: 83). Within the feminist movement those who lobbied for women's voting rights were called the Suffragettes. The development of feminism as an ideology can be connected to the fact that during the late nineteenth century the first women started to work as professional archaeologists. Most of these women and their followers during the pioneering period up to the First World War belonged to the well-off classes. Although they could be referred to as feminists by the very fact that they had chosen to work, given their class background many would have been horrified by this identification. Some of these early professional women archaeologists were outspokenly opposed to suffragism and even defended the need for women to remain at home as mothers and wives (Díaz-Andreu & Sørensen 1998b: 20, 35).

As professionals these women, as their male counterparts, played an active role in the elaboration of national identity. Johanna Mestorf's role as curator of the Museum of National Antiquities (Museum Vaterländischer Alterthümer) in Kiel, and, later, professor at the university of the same city, is an example of this. To be a professional archaeologist in institutions located in a disputed borderland between Germany and Denmark necessarily required her to take a political stance (Díaz-Andreu & Sørensen 1998a: 11). Professional women had several challenges to overcome. First, their place in society—and therefore their possible contribution for the national cause—was still believed to be inferior. Evolutionism had proposed biological explanations for the inferiority of women. In most cases, evolutionist scholars such as Henry Maine (1822–88), John Ferguson MacLennan (1827–81), Sir John Lubbock (1834–1913) and Herbert Spencer (1820–1903) justified the patriarchal system. The Swiss Professor of Roman Law, Johann Bachofen (1815–87), had proposed in his book *Mutterrecht* in 1856 that there had been a transformation from a prehistoric matriarchal society, the Earth- or Mother-Goddess (Kuper 1988: 5–6), to a patriarchal society with male gods. This widely accepted evolutionary theory was taken to explain women's inferiority. An exception in this respect was Oscar Montelius (1843–1921), a famous

Swedish archaeologist and also a supporter of the suffragette movement. In his articles 'For how long has woman been considered as the property of man?' (1898) and 'The women's issue in Sweden' (1906), he criticized the widespread belief that the regulation of sexual roles and common rights had been constant throughout history and was therefore innate to human nature. Instead, he saw these regulations as a social resource (Arwill-Nordbladh 1989). Secondly, the very idea of the nation reinforced women's inferiority: nationalist ideology naturalized their subjugation by defining rival nations as feminine, by which it was meant that they were weak and a failure. Further examples could be cited here, but one will suffice. In 1872, in the journal *The Dark Blue* a certain W. Turley claimed that 'a nation of effeminate enfeebled bookworms scarcely forms the most effective bulwark of a nation's liberties', while also identifying the English with the masculine (Dodd 1999: 91) (see discussion on this in Yuval-Davis & Pryke 1998 and Anthias 1989).

Nationalism increasingly left behind its reformist character to become a useful mechanism for governments to bind the population to the state machine. This does not mean that nationalism was exclusively encouraged from above. Its value for the state was that people willingly, and in some cases even wholeheartedly, believed in it by identifying with their nation (Chapter 14). If in the early years nationalism had been the cause of anti-clericals and left-wingers, now, without completely losing the loyalty of most progressive liberals, its main thrust was conservative, anti-liberal, and right-wing. The rise of parliamentary democracy continued. Despite this, discrimination against minorities—blacks in America, minority ethnic groups such as gypsies and peoples speaking other 'non-national' languages in many parts of Europe—remained the norm. Racism and xenophobia were on the increase (for a brief discussion on anti-Semitism see Chapter 6). Indeed, it also affected how Europeans (and Euro-Americans) saw each other. It was generally believed that the English, Germans, and other North Europeans belonged to a superior race of Nordics or Aryans. In contrast, peoples of Mediterranean and Eastern Europe were inferior breeds (Kidd 1999: 249; Livingstone 1984: 181).

Nationalism found outlets in the pursuit of glory and empire. Ideology and economics would work hand in hand to this end. The transformation of the creed of nationalism from a progressive liberal to a conservative creed has also been partly explained by some as one of the effects of the economic depression that took place after 1873. Economic expansion became more difficult because of overproduction and the reduction of profits. New markets were required to overcome the crisis and the colonies would provide them. The colonial expansion of Europe, Euro-America (and of Japan) intensified in the period with which this chapter is mainly concerned, from the 1860s to the 1890s, and would continue until the First World War. As explained in Part III

of this volume, large areas of the world—especially the African continent, but also parts of Asia and the Pacific—were partitioned by the powers, and the expansion of white settlers displaced native populations in countries as far apart as the US, Argentina, South Africa and Australia. The appropriation of the informal colonies' Great Civilizations has been discussed in the chapters in Part II of this book. Chapter 10 looked at how the colonial encounter with the uncivilized in the framework of increasingly exultant nationalism brought a new perspective to contemporary 'primitive' societies. This chapter will examine how this situation influenced the view of the non-state societies which had settled in Europe in prehistoric times. The discussion will also cover the developments in both classical and medieval archaeology in Europe.

EVOLUTIONISM, RACISM, AND NATIONALISM

Political persuasions and racism in archaeology

Some commentators have linked the radical approach of many French archaeologists to their upbringing during a period when the European liberal revolutions of 1848 were either in progress or their memory was still very much alive (Fetten 2000: 171). This may explain the selection of the title of 'history of labour' as the theme of World Exhibitions, such as those in Paris in 1867 and in Vienna in 1873 (Müller-Scheessel 2001b; Sklenár 1983: 108). In the case of German archaeology, the overlap between Virchow's liberal and left-wing politics and his interest in the human sciences has also been noted (Smith 1991b: 54). Yet, not all archaeologists—indeed perhaps only a minority of archaeologists—in the last four decades of the century were left-wingers. Nor was evolutionism a theory that can be classified as such (or, in fact, the other way round, a right-wing theory). It is true that evolutionism, the assumption that things evolve through time, usually from the simple to the complex, became, from the 1860s (Grayson 1983: ch. 7), a radical theory which directly challenged the biblical interpretation of human existence. Yet, the increasing prestige of science among individuals of all political persuasions and the search for intermediate doctrines on human origins led even the most conservative scholars and members of the general public to rethink and eventually overcome their initial rejection of it. The connection between evolutionism, revolution, and liberalism does not appear to have operated in countries such as Britain, where conservative ideologies seem to have been prevalent in academia. General Pitt Rivers is a good example—albeit perhaps an extreme one—of a conservative mind in British archaeology. Despite his

application of the theories of evolution to organize his collections of material culture chronologically, one of the main aims of his work was to teach the unnaturalness of social revolution and he explicitly held that archaeological museums should serve to inculcate 'sounder' (i.e. conservative) views on social questions (Bradley 1983: 7). Even in France, Hammond (1980) notes, as the resistance to evolutionary doctrines ceased, so did the doctrine's revolutionary character.

Liberal or conservative, most evolutionists unashamedly believed in the superiority of the white race and in the superiority of their own nation (Barkan 1992: 17). From today's perspective, nineteenth-century racism appears to be a clear illustration of an extremely conservative political attitude. At the time, however, it was an issue upon which the great majority of intellectuals agreed. Exceptions to the rule were few and far between. The study of anthropology—and of prehistoric archaeology—was at first linked, in the case of some individuals, with anti-authoritarian and anti-clerical attitudes, but not with a conviction in the equality of the races. As evolutionism advocated progress, primitive peoples were considered to belong to the past, to convention, tradition and irrational belief (Chapter 10). As discussed in Chapter 12, during the first half of the century a series of techniques had been developed to measure the differences between the races, and, whereas some theories such as phrenology had been rejected by academia, others like craniology had been widely accepted. Differences in the skull form of distinct human groups had been one of the common arguments used to maintain polygenism, the theory that sustained that not all human races had the same origin. In the last four decades of the century craniology continued developing and refining its methods. In Germany, for example, in 1883 craniologists rejected Darwinism and a consensus was reached in the so-called Frankfurt Agreement. This also resulted in a consensus about the appropriate measurements to be taken so that data produced by different scholars could be compared. As Zimmerman (2001: 88, ch. 4) explains, this agreement also had the effect of creating a collective identity among those doing research in craniology. The success of craniology would carry on during the last decades of the century, indeed to continue well into the twentieth century (Poliakov 1996 (1971): 264; Zimmerman 2001: ch. 4). In Britain, craniologists were represented by men such as George Rolleston (1829–81), Linacre Professor of Anatomy and Physiology in Oxford from 1860 (Price 2005–6). During this period, practising barrow-diggers felt that a discussion of the skulls found in the graves was part and parcel of what a good antiquarian should do (Giles 2006).

In 1869 Sir Francis Galton (1822–1911), a first cousin of Charles Darwin (1809–82), published *Hereditary Genius: An Inquiry into its Laws and*

Consequences. He suggested that the principles of 'natural selection' could be applied to improve the human race. Race, for him, was equated with levels of intelligence and other mental abilities that could be measured. Galton argued for the establishment of a hierarchy of racial groups that distinguished between the 'superior' and the 'inferior' races on the basis of criteria such as intelligence, moral character, ambition and creativity. He also maintained that interbreeding between superior and inferior races led to degeneration. In order to prove his hypothesis, Galton created an 'anthropometric laboratory' at the South Kensington Science Museum in London and hired the then young Flinders Petrie (1853–1942), who is more known to archaeology as an Egyptologist and the first Edwards Professor of Egyptology in London (1892–1933) (Chapters 5 and 6). As a result of this collaboration, later in his life, in 1887, Petrie published a book, *Racial Types from Egypt*, in which he applied many of Galton's ideas (Ramsey 2004; Silberman 1999b: 73). Darwin's opinions, however, seem to have differed from those of his cousin. In *The Descent of Man and Selection in Relation to Sex* (1871), he argued that races 'graduate into each other, and that it is hardly possible to discover clear distinctive characters between them' (in Barkan 1992: 18). Thus, in his opinion, racial differences were not of evolutionary importance. However, as Barkan points out, Darwin's views were mostly ignored by his contemporaries. Theories on racial inequality became extremely popular and later in the century would be the basis for a racial doctrine known as 'eugenics', which would be in favour until the Second World War. The followers of eugenics believed in the racial differences of human groups and advocated intervention to improve races in aspects such as intelligence (Barkan 1992; MacMaster 2001: ch. 1; Massin 2001; Shipman 2004).

As seen in Chapter 12, earlier in the century the interest in racial studies had had an impact on classical and medieval archaeology. This continued for several decades as can be illustrated by particular examples from Britain and France. In Britain, the English solicitor and historian, Henry Charles Coote (1815–85), criticized in his book *The Romans in Britain* (1878) those who believed that the Anglo-Saxons had made a *tabula rasa* of Roman Britain. He argued that the Anglo-Saxons had had neither a racial nor a cultural impact, given that racially the population had been Teutonic (by which he meant German and Aryan) since pre-Roman times and that the laws and customs observed under Anglo-Saxon rule were of Roman origin. The Roman period had only signified the arrival of civilization, not a mixing of races. The Anglo-Saxon period had, therefore, been a Dark Age, which only ended with the Normans. His ideas reflected those of many of his contemporaries and were repeated well into the twentieth century (Hingley 2000: chs. 7–8). In France, many archaeologists also claimed that, despite the adoption of Roman and later Germanic institutions, the pre-Roman Gaulish race had basically remained untouched (Carbonell 1982: 392–3).

Nationalism

Evolutionism supported universalism, the belief that human societies function and change by following rules that are common to all. In a similar way to flora and fauna, humankind was, therefore, seen as amenable for scientific analysis and classification. Thus, General Pitt Rivers argued that:

> Human ideas, as represented by the various products of human industry, are capable of classification into genera, species, and varieties in the same manner as the products of the vegetable and animal kingdoms, and in their development from the homogeneous to the heterogeneous they obey the same laws.
>
> (Lane Fox [i.e. Pitt Rivers] in Thompson 1977: 38).

Belief in universalism, however, did not mean that evolutionists denied the specificity of the particular national past. In practice, universal schemes were applied to each country stressing, in teleological accounts, the particular stages of its development. One of the leading voices at the time, the French prehistorian Gabriel de Mortillet (1821–98), argued for a historical continuity in France rooted in early prehistory leading towards the ulterior national unity (Richard 2002: 182). The idea of a national past, on occasions with a chauvinistic slant to it, was also present in international venues. The latter were precisely what the name says, places where several nations met (i.e. not where a melting-pot of nations resulted). Thus, in the displays of prehistoric archaeology organized on the occasion of the Universal Exhibitions held in Paris[1] in 1867, 1878, and 1889, nationalist ideology came through in the ways the various nations interpreted the objects on display. As Nils Müller-Scheessel has pointed out, 'much of the motivation for staging international exhibitions drew from the desire to outdo other nations' (2001: 400).

[1] Universal and colonial exhibitions were common in the last decades of the century. They started with the Great Exhibition at the Crystal Palace (1851), and the Great Industrial Exhibition in Dublin (1853). As MacMaster points out, they proliferated between 1878 and 1914, during the height of the colonial era. The major locations were Paris (in 1867, 1878, 1887, 1889, 1891, 1893, 1900) and London (1886, 1892, 1897, 1899, 1903, 1908, 1924), but other international exhibitions were held in Moscow (1872), Vienna (1873), Italy (1888), Germany (1891), Antwerp (1894) and Brussels (1897, 1910), as well as in major provincial cities like Glasgow (1901) (see about others Kinchin and Kinchin (1988)), Cork (1902), Wolverhampton (1902, 1907), Bradford (1904), Liège (1905) and Marseilles (1906). They were very popular and MacMaster gives the figure of 39 and 50 million people attending the Paris World Fair of 1889 and 1900 respectively (MacMaster 2001: 74) (but is he translating from French and he means 39 and 50 thousand people?).

Evolutionist schemes were also put into effect in the permanent exhibitions on display in national museums, at least in its simplest formulation. This was done through the use of chronological criteria in the organization of the displays which allowed visitors to experience both visually and spatially the evolutionary ages of their own nation. In Rome, the Royal Museum of Antiquity was reorganized on the basis of chronology and geography by Luigi Pigorini (1842–1925) in 1867 (Skeates 2000: 25). The creation of a sub-department in the British Museum to deal specifically with British antiquities has also been seen in the light of evolutionism, contextualized in the friendship between its inspirer, the curator Augustus Wollaston Franks (1826–97), and leading evolutionists such as General Pitt Rivers (1827–90), Sir John Lubbock (1834–1913) and Sir John Evans (1823–1908) (Chapman 1989: 157). The French Musée des Antiquités Nationales (Museum of National Antiquities), established in Paris in 1867, followed a chronological order, as did the Museo Arqueológico Nacional (National Archaeological Museum) opened in Madrid in the same year. In Sweden, an exhibition set up in the Museum of National Antiquities in the early 1870s arranged objects into two parallel series, one according to typology (and, therefore, chronology), although the other, based on find location, went along a system conceived by Hans Hildebrand (1842–1913). A similar chronological arrangement was adopted in the Museum of Scandinavian Prehistory in Copenhagen (Almgren 1995: 27). In the field of prehistory the opposition to the Three Age System devised much earlier in the century (Chapter 11) was finally overcome. The scheme became widely accepted partly through the spread of the typological method developed by Oscar Montelius (Morse 1999; Rowley-Conwy forthcoming; Sklenár 1983: 111, 118). This way of doing things was not unique to Europe and specific examples have been mentioned in Parts II and III of this volume, particularly in Chapter 10 in respect to national museums in America and Australia.

The creation of accounts about the past based on the geographical boundaries of the nation derived not only from the scholars' willingness to contribute to the national cause but also from the administrative framework and the legislation that was being put in place in each country. The growth in state institutions mentioned in Chapter 12 for the central years of the century continued in the last four decades: the monuments commissions formed in many countries in the 1840s continued to work in this period. Their efforts were complemented by those of other offices of new creation. In 1868, a Hungarian Commission for Monuments was founded, and in 1873 the Austrian Central Commission with jurisdiction over Bohemia included a section dealing with prehistoric and classical archaeology (Princ 1984: 14–15; Sklenár 1983: 116). One of the important issues to be tackled was cataloguing.

In 1865 Worsaae, from his post as director of the Danish National Museum, launched a systematic field survey of all visible monuments in the landscape (Kristiansen 1984: 22). Regarding legislation, in the second half of the nineteenth century much lobbying took place with the result of new laws put into effect especially from the 1880s. It is interesting to note that not everybody was happy about this move: some archaeologists had initially rejected legislation, as was the case of the Swiss, Edouard Desor (1811–82), in the early 1860s (Kaeser 2004: 327). However, in most cases this initial reluctance soon diminished in view of the benefits provided the systematic study and collection of antiquities. The Ancient Monuments Act was passed in Britain in 1882. Similarly, in 1887 a law protecting historical monuments was issued in France and the organization of archaeology into inspectorates was established in Italy (Breeze 1996; Choay 2001: 98; d'Agostino 1984). In other countries such as Spain, catalogues and legislation would have to wait until the early years of the following century (Díaz-Andreu 2004b: section IV). Finally, it is interesting to note the promptness with which newly independent European countries created academic chairs in archaeology. An example of this is Romania, where in the very year of the country's independence, 1877 (although it was only internationally recognized in 1878), a chair of Archaeology and Antiquity was created at the University of Bucharest for Alexandru Odobescu (1834–95) (Babes 2006: 237).

Another issue worth commenting on with respect to the relationship of evolutionism and nationalism is a practical one. One of the knowledge-making practices of archaeology, which helped in the visualization of the nation through archaeology, was that of drawing maps. Maps were originally produced to register the distribution of particular types of objects, but in practice they helped to make the territorial perspective observable, allowing scholars to visualize the physical dispersal of objects. Although this trend may have originated in Germany in fields such as geography, anthropology, and philology (see discussion on biblical topography in Chapter 6, see also Chapter 10), maps were promptly adopted by other scholars. Together with the use of names to identify typological series which showed specific geographical distributions, maps paved the way for the theoretical shift which occurred at the turn of the century: the introduction of culture history in archaeology. Thus, terms which seemed to have already been in use at the end of the nineteenth century, such as the Lausatian culture and the Únetice culture, and the understanding of Hallstatt and La Tène periods as cultural entities, were further reinforced with the typological series established by the German archaeologist Otto Tischler (Sklenár 1983: 110–11). The issue of maps and the coordination of the symbols used in them made possible the comparison of different areas. This issue was discussed at congresses as early as the

International Congress of Prehistoric Anthropology and Archaeology (CIAPP in its French initials) held at Copenhagen in 1869. Two years later at the CIAPP in Bologna the Polish archaeologist Count Aleksander Przezdziecki proposed the creation of an international committee for type maps but, although set up, no successful work came from it. A very different story resulted from the organization of a parallel working group at the meeting of the German Anthropological Society in Swerin also in 1871. This was led by the keeper of the Royal Cabinet of Naturalia (Königlichen Naturalienkabinett) in Stuttgart from 1855, Oscar Fraas (1824–97), with work by E. von Tröltsch. After only two years the committee was working on 142 distribution maps that covered the whole of Germany at a scale 1:200,000. However, only fifteen—those related to Bavaria—were finished in the end and the committee was disbanded in 1889 (Sklenár 1983: 112).

Although the transmission of ideas, as illustrated in the examples mentioned above, was common, it is also important to acknowledge that on many occasions national rivalries led to a reluctance to accept theories coming from other countries and this even led to the marginalization of those scholars considered to be too sympathetic to other nations' ideas. This had an effect in many areas: from archaeological practice and interpretation, to the organization of congresses and museum displays (Massin 2001: 305–9). The rivalry between France and Germany after the Franco-Prussian war of 1870, for example, led to two major international congresses of prehistory being developed in parallel. Central and Eastern European archaeologists met in the congresses organized by the German and the Vienna anthropological societies (Sklenár 1983: 107).[2] Western European archaeologists met in the International Congresses of Prehistoric Anthropology and Archaeology (Congrès International d'anthropologie et d'archéologie préhistorique, CIAPP).[3] In them the imperial overtones of French nationalism became clear. Despite

[2] I am unaware of in-depth analysis of the participants in the German-speaking congresses. It would be interesting to see whether the interest in the Aryans and the belief in the superiority of the Nordic race encouraged Scandinavian and British archaeologists specializing in periods from proto-history onwards to attend the German-speaking congresses. Yet, it may well be the case that most of them attended other types of congresses than those organized under the umbrella of anthropology.

[3] There is some confusion about when and where the first congress took place and under what name. The congress organized in La Spezia (Italy) in 1865 was that of the Italian Society of Natural Sciences (Richard 1999: 105). In 1866 the congress in Neuchâtel (Switzerland) had the title of International Palaeo-Ethnological Congress (Clermont and Smith 1990: 98). It is from the following congress, held in Paris in 1867, that the meetings received the name of International Congress of Anthropology and Prehistoric Archaeology. The meetings moved venue from Italy (1865, 1871) to France (1867, 1889, 1900), England (1868), Denmark (1869), Belgium (1872), Hungary (1876), Portugal (1880), Russia (1892) and Monaco (1906). Participants included scholars from most European countries and, exceptionally, from elsewhere in the world such as Japan and Argentina (Richard 1992: 194).

their parallel use in the nationalist arena (as argued by Coye and Provenzano (1996) for the case of the meeting of Bologna in 1871), others have persuasively argued that these congresses merely represented anthropology and prehistory as viewed by French scholars, who managed to institute French as the official language in the discussions and proceedings, especially in opposition to German (Müller-Scheessel 2001a; Wiell 1999: 141–2). Paris hosted three of the fourteen meetings, and Frenchmen got the main positions within the organization (Richard in Murray 1999b: 93–107). It has been argued that a reason for the dearth of conferences at a national level was that prehistory had been institutionalized at an international level (Kaeser 2002). There are, however, exceptions to this; the Congress held in Canterbury as early as 1844 mentioned in Chapter 12, and, during the period under discussion, the Czech anthropological–archaeological conferences held in Prague in 1880 and 1882 (Sklenár 1983: 107) and the Russian Archaeological Congresses (Klejn & Tikhonov 2006: 199). It may be more appropriate to see this absence as the result of the still relatively small number of scholars working in each country, making national meetings nonsensical. It would only be in the twentieth century, with the increase in the number of archaeologists, that national meetings started to be held in many countries. Moreover, as against the apparent neutral internationalism of the CIAPPs, its French imperialist overtones became clear when the dates of its meetings are plotted against the power balance between France and Germany. The CIAPP declined in the late nineteenth century and was eventually substituted by the International Congress of Prehistoric and Protohistoric Sciences led by Germany, by then the centre of the scientific world (Müller-Scheessel 2001a).

In addition to the meetings of the German Anthropological Society and those of the CIAPP, a third set of international congresses dealing with national archaeology in Europe were the Slavic congresses. The first one had been organized in Prague in 1848 and in it there were discussions about the feasibility of political consolidation of Czechs, Slovaks, Poles, Ruthenians (Ukrainians), and Southern Slavs including Slovenes, Croats, and Serbs. All of the latter were still under Austrian rule with the exception of the Serbians, who had gained effective autonomy from the Ottoman Empire in 1867 and being internationally recognized as a country in 1878. Interestingly, however, some authors indicate the conference in Moscow in 1867 as the starting point of the Slavic congresses (Klejn & Tikhonov 2006), and this may be a good indication of the tensions, negotiations and national rivalries within pan-Slavism (Geyer 1987: 59–61).[4] Slavic archaeology became increasingly popular in many

[4] Interestingly some authors contrapose pan-Celticism to pan-Germanism and pan-Slavism (Leersen 1996). It would be interesting to see whether this schema fits into the three major international congresses discussed for the last decades of the nineteenth century.

Eastern European countries, with events such as the Slavic Congress in Moscow of 1867, and excavations of 'Slavic' sites in countries such as Russia and Poland (Geyer 1987: 59; Raczkowski 1996: 197–9; Shnirelman 1996: 222–5).

Regionalism and some emerging nations

A similar trend of constructing teleological accounts based on evolutionary ideas for a country's past took place in most European regions. In contrast to the assumptions of some authors, regionalism did not contradict nationalism; the opposite was usually the case. In most cases regionalism was—and still is—part and parcel of nationalism. Regional identity does not conflict with national aspirations, but is complementary and, in fact, furnishes the corresponding national identity with local roots (Storm 2003: 252). Cultural revivalism in the regions originated in the eighteenth century and crystallized in the creation of many local learned societies in the 1840s, as seen in Chapter 12, a process which continued and expanded from the 1860s. Membership of local societies became not only a means of satisfying personal intellectual curiosity, but was also a way to climb up the social and academic ladder through personal contacts, and it is the latter fact that may explain societies' popularity. In Western Europe examples from different countries such as Spain and Switzerland and the Czech area in Eastern Europe illustrate this. In Spain, after the first societies were founded in Madrid (Numismatics 1837) and Tarragona (1844), others came along later in the century, such as Seville (1870), Valencia (1871), Mallorca (1880), Carmona (1885), Osuna (1887), Barcelona (1878, 1888), Mataró (1888), and Cádiz (1893) (Díaz-Andreu *et al.* forthcoming). In Switzerland a historical and archaeological society was founded in Neuchâtel in 1864 (Kaeser 2004: 334). In Eastern Europe, societies appeared in Cáslav (1864), Kutná Hora (1877) and Prague (1864, 1888) (Princ 1984: 13). Other examples could be added here from Britain (Hudson 1981: chs. 1–2; Piggott 1976), France (Duval 1992), Germany (Marchand 1996a: ch. 5), and Russia (Shnirelman 1996: 222). The regionalist revival could also be seen as parallel, to a certain extent, to similar movements in the colonies as mentioned in Part III of this volume.

The archaeological section of most learned societies aimed to retrieve information about the ancient past of the region undertaking excavations and building collections, which would then be a tool for education through their display in local museums. Some of the latter institutions followed the pattern already seen for national museums, in the sense that for the organization of the displays inspiration was sought from evolutionist principles. In 1865 in France, for example, Toulouse's Museum of Natural History

devoted one room to finds from caves that completed its palaeontological narrative. In the Archaeological Museum of Tarragona in Spain, from the 1870s if not before, displays were also organized along the lines of prehistory, the Roman and medieval periods (Jaume Massó, pers. comm. 18.3.2004). In addition to learned societies and local museums, the shift towards the provinces was also to an extent seen in journals—many published by the learned societies—and also in university teaching. In Southern France, for instance, Émile Cartailhac directed the journal *Matériaux...*[5] from 1868–9, as well as started teaching at the University of Toulouse in 1882 (Richard 1992: 199). In the revolutionary atmosphere of the first Republic in Spain (1873–4), prehistory was taught at the University of Seville, but abolished with the re-establishment of the monarchy (Ayarzaguena 1992: 20). In the part of Poland belonging to Russia, Professor D. Ya. Samokvasov started to teach archaeology within his remit of history of law in Warsaw University from 1873 and unsuccessful attempts were made in the eleventh Russian Archaeological Congress in Kiev (1898) to make archaeology a proper university subject (Klejn & Tikhonov 2006: 199).

In the regions archaeology was the result of societies as well as the labour of a few individuals, some of whom have already been mentioned. A final example is that of Vasilij Ivanovich Zausailov in Kazan, Russia. As one of his contemporaries explained:

> His collection was started at the end of the 1870s. This was one of the most splendid periods in the history of science and learning at Kazan. Ever since the times of the Fourth All-Russian Archaeological Congress, scholarly interests were very much revived here. A society of archaeology, history and ethnography was founded... In those years, Kazan was the work place of Professor S. M. Shpilevskij [Shpilevsky], Professor N. P. Zagoskin, Professor A. A. Stuckenberg... By 1884, his collections were already so vast that he started publishing a pictorial atlas of them... Zausailov increased his collection mainly by means of purchases from Tartar merchants, who traded in this business professionally. But in some cases V. I. Zausailov himself conducted small-scale excavations (for instance at Aisha in 1891). V. I. Zausailov primarily collected objects representing primitive culture...
>
> (in Salminen 1994a).

In a few cases regionalism turned into nationalism: the discovery of the country's tradition aimed to emphasize not so much the peculiarities of the national character in a particular region, but rather to demonstrate how opposed its character was to that of the state into which it had been forced

[5] *Matériaux pour l'Histoire naturelle et primitive de l'homme.* The original name of the journal edited by Gabriel de Mortillet was *Matériaux pour l'histoire positive et philosophique.* It changed in 1869.

by historical state circumstances. The peculiarity of the area character was interpreted as proof of being a distinctive nation and consequently, for nationalists, the territory had a right to independence. It is significant in this respect that regions with a growing national sentiment tended to create learned societies encompassing the whole area of the new small nation. See for example the early case of Ireland (1840) in Chapter 12, page 363. In this period, two emergent nationalist movements in Spain, in Catalonia and Galicia, are a case in point. In the former, for example, some societies did not limit themselves to a single Catalan province (Barcelona, Girona, Lleida, or Tarragona) but tried to represent the whole of Catalonia. Examples of this are the Catalanist Association of Scientific Excursions, founded in 1876 and its offshoot, the Catalan Association of Excursions (1878). Presidents of the first society declared the study of antiquity as an essential condition for the renaissance of the fatherhood, and requested official funding for archaeological excavations (Cortadella 1997: 278–9). In terms of museums, the founder of the Central Archaeological Museum of Galicia (1884), Leandro Saralegui y Medina (1839–1910), published books inspired by both evolutionism and nationalism, such as his studies about the Celtic period in Galicia (1867). In this and other works he wrote about the history of the whole of Galicia, not limiting himself to one of its provinces as was usually the case in other parts of Spain, and adopted a narrative of progress subdividing the territory's prehistory into the Stone, Bronze, and Iron Age (Pereira González 1996).

Similar processes occurred elsewhere in Europe, especially in the East, in countries such as Romania (then part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire), where a National Museum of Antiquities was created in Bucharest in 1834. It was funded under the Russian cultural and political patronage, with most antiquarians being Russian officers, and renovated in 1864 under French influence. The museum had been preceded by a museum in Sibiu (1817) and followed by the Historico-Natural Museum in Iasi (1834) (Anghelinu 2002–3: 31; 2003: 87–8; Comsa in Murray 2001: 1116). Also in Bulgaria the Bulgarian Academy was founded in 1869 (Todorova in Bailey 1998: 91), although most developments seem to have occurred after independence from 1878 (Velkov 1993). The trend towards the regionalization of journals and institutions discussed above also became even more marked in those areas with aspirations of total political independence such as Finland. In Helsinki the first chair of archaeology was the Professor Extraordinarius Johan Reinhold Aspelin (1842–1915) (chair 1878–85), a Finnish historian who had been trained in archaeology in Sweden by Oscar Montelius and Hans Hildebrand in 1867–8. Aspelin's ideas were informed by nationalism. In his doctoral dissertation he dealt with Finno-Ugri archaeology, declaring in its foreword that his aim was the tracing of the Finnish people back to prehistoric times. Aspelin founded the Finnish Antiquarian Society in 1874 and under its umbrella organized several expeditions to Siberia, aiming to uncover Ugro-Finn antiquities (Salminen 1994b).

The switch of nationalist ideology from civic to ethnic nationalism had made it possible for new nationalisms to come to the fore. Thus, in Catalonia the consideration of the Romans as a superimposed, but separate, race had already been put forward by archaeologists such as Buenaventura (Bonaventura in Catalan) Hernández Sanahuja (1810–91)—the excavator of many sites in Tarragona, the ancient Tarraco. Yet, a clear link between this theory and Catalan nationalism was established from the late 1860s, when many writers alluded to the struggle against the Romans by the ancient leaders Indivil and Mandonio as the origin of the separatist Catalan spirit. Nationalism was clearly on the agenda, as can be illustrated by comments by the Catalan politician, historian and archaeologist, Salvador Sanpere i Miquel (1840–1915), in his book on *Origens i fonts de la Nació Catalana* (*Origins and sources of the Catalan Nation*) (1878):

> If nationality reappears in a more favourable place and time... it is because 'the people' who formed it have not died. If it were dead, the aboriginal race would also have died and the nationality would not have been able to reappear because the differential element would have been missing.
>
> The Catalan race, therefore, is for us today well known. It travelled without fainting through Roman and Gothic times, [for these were] completely alien to its aboriginal character... Hence, there is a Catalan race, a Catalan people... Yes, a Catalan people made of Iberian stock with a strong Semitic component.
>
> (Sanpere in Cortadella 1986: 85).

Colonialism

In Chapter 10 it was argued that collectors in the colonies commonly looked at the sequences established in European prehistoric archaeology as a model to organize their archaeological and ethnographical findings and that this further contributed to the image of natives as backward. Yet, this was not a one-way process. As recent studies have suggested, colonialism triggered changes in the metropolis that would have long-lasting effects, such as the creation of passports and other symbolic paraphernalia of the nation. In archaeology the encounter with the 'Other' influenced the image of Europe's own past. In this way, the archaeology of the uncivilized, both in the colonies and in prehistoric Europe, became closely intertwined. On the one hand, the catalogues created by European prehistoric archaeologists served as an essential tool to

build chronologies of both present and past native populations, and also to legitimize the colonial occupation. On the other, however, the reports on the customs of the tribal groups and their material culture had an impact on the discourses about prehistoric archaeology in Europe. The colonial experience provided an important means for archaeologists to visualize the inhabitants of prehistoric Europe, and the functionality of the objects found in excavations. Yet, one should not forget that this vision was not completely independent from the images created from the early modern period based on discussions on the classical authors. This was a baggage that anthropology had for years to come. The link between the colonial experience and the study of prehistoric Europe was made explicit by the British archaeologist, John Lubbock, who explained in his celebrated *Pre-Historic Times*, which was subtitled: *As Illustrated by Ancient Remains and the Manners and Customs of Modern Savages*:

> As regards the Stone Age in Europe both history and tradition are silent... Deprived, therefore, as regards this period, of any assistance from history, but relieved at the same time from the embarrassing interference of tradition, the archaeologist is free to follow the methods which have been so successfully pursued in geology—the rude bone and stone implements of bygone ages being to the one what the remains of extinct animals are to the other... in the same manner if we wish clearly to understand the antiquities of Europe, we must compare them with the rude implements and weapons still, or until lately, used by the savage races of other parts of the world. In fact, the Van Diemaner [i.e. Tasmanians] and South Americans are to the antiquary what the opossum and the sloth are to the geologist.
>
> (Lubbock 1913 (1865): 430).

THE PLACE OF ARCHAEOLOGY AMONG OTHER COGNATE DISCIPLINES

Prehistoric archaeology

Evolutionism placed humans at the same level as other living creatures, robbing them of their special divine character. A key figure in this radical change in the way humans were perceived was Charles Darwin. His ideas had a tremendous impact after the publication of his *Origin of Species* in 1859. As explained earlier in the chapter, they were applied to human prehistory by Ernst Haeckel (1834–1919) in his 1868 *History of Creation* and subsequently developed by Thomas Henry Huxley (Shipman 2004: 52–3, chs. 2–4). Yet, evolutionism was not a new theory. It had been present in intellectual circles

since the Enlightenment (Trigger 1989: ch. 3). Darwin had been particularly inspired by Sir Charles Lyell (1797–1875), whose book *Principles of Geology* (published in two volumes in 1830 and 1832) he had taken with him on his scientific expedition around the world on the HMS Beagle. Lyell had challenged the geological understanding of the world, denying the authority of the Old Testament Genesis as a historical source. Instead, he proposed that the geological past should best be understood in terms of gradual natural processes. As discussed in Chapter 12 (page 356), Lyell, however, did not follow the same logic with regard to living species which he thought to have been fixed. Darwin would be the scholar to put forward the theory regarding evolution of species, including humans. The key distinction between Darwin and some of his contemporaries who were proposing similar ideas was the mechanism by which change occurred: natural selection. Despite being Darwin's mentor, Lyell refused to support him in print, as became apparent in his book *The Antiquity of Man* (1863). Darwin would later publish *The Descent of Man and Selection in Relation to Sex* (1871). Darwinian evolutionary theory produced heated debate and brought with it a new way of scientific reasoning. Although not everybody took on board the implications of Darwin's theories—the arbitrary character of natural selection—they persuaded many to accept one of the basic evolutionist tenets, that of the transformation of species through time. In contrast to Darwin, many people related changes in animals to those taking place in the environment, a theory that had been proposed half a century earlier by Jean-Baptiste de Lamark (1809). Lamark's proposition that qualities acquired or learned by an organism during its lifetime could be passed on to its offspring would ultimately be proved wrong, but at this time it was widely accepted.

As seen in the case of Darwin and Lyell, natural scientists' work on the evolution of geological strata, fauna and flora took them closer to anthropologists and prehistoric archaeologists to the extent that the boundaries of these still emerging disciplines became blurred. In addition, all of these scientists shared a range of interests with another newly emerging discipline, geography. In today's literature, it is not uncommon to find someone introduced as a geographer described as an anthropologist elsewhere. Geographer or anthropologist, their research could have focused on the study of past remains and historical origins, something that under current disciplinary boundaries would fall under the field of archaeology. This interconnection between prehistoric archaeology and the natural sciences was institutionalized as cartographers, geologists, and archaeologists fused in institutions dealing with the elaboration of maps, such as the Ordnance and Geological Surveys and Commissions. In the universities, prehistoric archaeology became part of the curriculum in Science faculties together with anthropology,

geology, and biology.[6] Sklenár (1983: 105–8) has also pointed out that one of the main characteristics of archaeology at this time was to produce an anthropological approach, and he provides many examples of the convergence between archaeologists and anthropologists in Germany and other parts of Central and Eastern Europe, many of those mentioned in previous sections.

Yet, while centripetal forces were bringing the four disciplines—natural sciences, geography, anthropology, and prehistoric archaeology—together, increasing specialization would pull them apart. Fractures began to emerge from the mid nineteenth century, especially in the relationship between the natural sciences and the other disciplines. This can be illustrated in the change of name of the chair obtained in the mid 1850s by the French scholar (and *sensu strictu* anti-evolutionist) Jean-Louis-Armand de Quatrefages (1810–92) (Laming-Emperaire 1964: 180), from 'Natural History of Man' to 'Anthropology' (Fonton 1993: 70).[7] This initial detachment, between the natural sciences on the one hand and anthropology and prehistoric archaeology on the other, became more apparent in museums. The diverse nature of the collections also meant that museum curators decided their display either in separate museums or at least different sections within a single museum. Thus, the Prehistoric Collection of the Viennese Society of Anthropology, created in 1878 under the direction of Ferdinand Ritter von Hochstetter (1829–84), was later moved to the Austrian Imperial Museum of Natural History founded in 1889, where it remained curated by the Department of Anthropology and Ethnography (Urban 2006: 266). The division of various archaeology and anthropology collections was also the case when the Pitt Rivers Museum was founded in 1884 (Ovenell 1986).

In contrast to the incipient rupture with the natural sciences, the human base of both anthropology and prehistoric archaeology kept them together for much longer. Rather than a separate discipline, prehistoric archaeology was initially seen as a sub-field of anthropology. The vocabulary used at the time reflects this subordination well. In 1872, for example, an anonymous reviewer, probably the famous French archaeologist Émile Cartailhac (1845–1921), explained that 'Italians and Spanish use the word "prehistoric". In adopting the term prehistorians, we are just translating... but perhaps it would be better to employ a periphrasis or just keep the name anthropologists' (1872 in Clermont & Smith 1990: 97). 'Palaeoethnology' was also employed as an

[6] Although not often an option, in some cases, such as at Cambridge University, philology and prehistoric archaeology were also combined (Fagan 2001: 17).

[7] Although other sources explain that Quatrefages had replaced Etienne Serres in the chair of Human Anatomy in 1856, a chair which later changed its name to that of 'Natural History of Man' and subsequently to 'Chair of Anthropology' (Fonton 1993: 70).

alternative term to Prehistory (Richard 1992: 195), and its use is still popular in Italy. In Romania the teaching of Professor Odobescu included geography, language, ethnography, and religion to introduce the set of lectures on the Iron Age (Babes 2006: 238). In fact, as the content of journals shows, in countries such as France and Germany the disciplinary separation between anthropology and prehistoric archaeology only began from the early twentieth century (Richard 1992: 195). In England, as late as 1903, a document calling for the study of anthropology at Cambridge still viewed archaeology as a branch of anthropology (in addition to ethnology, and physical and mental anthropology) (P. J. Smith, pers. comm.).

In the last third of the nineteenth century the marriage of anthropology and prehistoric archaeology was not only apparent in institutions such as societies, conferences, university teaching, and museums, but it could also be seen in the personal biographies of many of the protagonists at the time.[8] Most prehistoric archaeologists and colonial anthropologists belonged to the same learned societies and some individuals acted as experts in both fields. A summary review of two key archaeologists, representing Britain and France, the two major pre-1870 imperial powers, illustrates this. The Englishman, John Lubbock (later Lord Avebury) (1834–1913), was considered one of the leading figures in both prehistoric and anthropological studies. The regard in which his work was held by anthropologists led to his election as the first president of the Anthropological Institute of Great Britain, founded in 1871. In *Pre-historic times, as illustrated by ancient remains, and the manners and customs of modern savages* (1865) he included information about prehistoric archaeology and about modern tribal societies, despite the fact that the link was almost entirely based on his belief that the latter could shed light on the understanding of the former (Trigger 1989: 115). He also amassed both prehistoric and anthropological items, although the latter only accounted for about a tenth of his whole collection. The overlap between archaeology and anthropology can also be seen in the case of the Frenchman, Gabriel de Mortillet (1821–98). As one of the founding fathers of French prehistory and a combatant evolutionist (Hammond 1980), Mortillet was behind the establishment, in 1866, of one of the international fori where both archaeology and anthropology were jointly debated—the International Congress of Prehistoric Anthropology and Archaeology (Richard in Murray 1999b: 105). He was also a very active member of the Society of Anthropology and he taught Prehistory at the Parisian School of Anthropology (École d'anthropologie) founded in 1875 and which he had helped to create (Gran-Aymerich 2001: 475; Richard 2002: 178).

[8] Many of them had also an interest in folklore. An example of this is the Irish archaeologist William Gregory Wood-Martin (1847–1917) (Waddell 2005: 143).

Roman and medieval archaeology

In Parts I and II of the book it was pointed out that the image of the archaeology of the Great Civilizations—and especially that of the Roman Empire—was used to legitimize the modern European empires. This led to the creation all over Europe of university chairs to research the antiquities of Italy, Greece, Turkey and elsewhere. Yet, it is less clear how this affected institutionalization of the Roman antiquities found within national territory. Further analyses of the effect of the emphasis on Celtic, Slavic and Germanic archaeology in Roman archaeology are still needed. The data seem to indicate that Roman archaeology was indeed supported by the state, perhaps pointing at several discourses about the past running parallel to each other. An example of this is the admiration by the French Emperor Napoléon III (1808–73, r. 1848–70) for Caesar which led him to promote excavations of the Roman sites connected to the siege of Alésia (Mont Auxois) besieged by Caesar in 52 BCE—the main reason behind its excavation was not it being Vercingetorix's hillfort (King 2001: 115). Also, Theodor Mommsen, the writer of the influential *History of Rome* of 1854–6 and the Professor of Ancient History at the University of Berlin from 1858, had the idea of the RLK or Reichslimeskommision (the Imperial Commission for the Study of the Roman Frontier) in 1892. The debate that surrounded its creation exemplifies the confusion over Roman archaeology in Europe. In the case of the RLK, the question was whether it should be controlled by the German Archaeological Institute—the body that managed excavations abroad, including those in Italy—or be kept independent of it? In the end the first option was chosen and the RGK or Römisch-Germanische Kommission was created (Marchand 1996a: 173–4, 177–9).

The number of university chairs for the teaching on the Roman and medieval antiquities went on growing in this period. Teaching on them already existed in institutions such as the French École de Chartes and the Spanish Escuela Superior de Diplomática (Chapter 12). There were newly created chairs for numismatics, epigraphy, and history of art. New chair holders were, for example, the numismatist Giuseppe Fiorelli (1823–96) in Italy in 1861 (Barbanera 1998: 19) and Mihailo Valtrovic (1839–1915) in Belgrade in 1881 (Babic 2001: 172–3; Milinkovic 2006). In Britain, although the teaching of archaeology in universities such as Cambridge and Oxford seems to have been more linked to the study of the archaeology of the Great Civilizations (Beard 1999; Medwid 2000: passim), some of the professors spent some of their time on Roman Britain. This was the case of Robert Carr Bosanquet (1871–1935), who was the Director of the British School at Athens (1900–6) and later Professor of Classical Archaeology in Liverpool (1906–20). While in Liverpool he devoted his energies to the excavation of the Roman fort of Housesteads by

Hadrian's Wall in northern England (Gill 2004: 237–9; Gill in *Oxford Dictionary*: vol. 6, 695–6). In addition to these professionals, there were many others rightfully considered as experts but whose main occupation was elsewhere. There were architects such as the Frenchman, Viollet-le-Duc (1814–79), the Englishman, Sir George Gilbert Scott (1811–78), and the Spaniard, Eduardo Saavedra (1829–1912); clerics such as Father Fidel Fita (1835–1918) in Spain; travellers such as the Hungarian-born Austrian, Felix Kanitz (1828–1904) who published extensively on Roman Serbia (Babic 2001: 173–6); and men—practically no women—from other professions such as the military and medicine. In England the Mathematics fellow at Cambridge, Robert Willis (1800–75), who published on monumental architectural history in England, and the Oxford modern historian, Edward Freeman (1823–92), who published about Norman archaeology and history, are examples of this (Cocke 1998). In addition to the scholars in parallel disciplines, the increasing strength of learned societies meant that amateurs continued to play an important role in the archaeology of all periods (Levine 1986). Yet, it seems revealing that by the end of the century the first voices against the quality of the archaeology undertaken by the societies were being voiced by professionals (Marchand 1996a: 178–9).

THE METHODOLOGICAL REVOLUTION

The rationale behind evolutionism was explained by the Swedish archaeologist, Oscar Montelius, in the following way:

> When studying a specific question we will find that evolution has passed many stages, before it reached its present state... [we can] also see all the stages still represented, since an old form does not always disappear when a new form rises... Often there will be no difficulty to see the successive order of the different forms
>
> (in Arwill-Nordbladh 1989: 138).

The growing acceptance of evolutionary theory in archaeology led scholars to embrace methods among which stratigraphy, typology, and seriation are especially important for prehistoric archaeology, and for the archaeology of other periods. These methods were used to confirm scientifically sequences of events and change through time. These crucial improvements in the scientific method paved the way for prehistory to be accepted as proper science. The connection with the natural sciences enabled archaeologists to borrow methods from palaeontology, such as the stratigraphic method, which, although at this time it was not applied to the extent that it would be

after the First World War, was essential for the acceptance of human antiquity in Europe (Grayson 1983; Van Riper 1993). Stratigraphy was also key to confirm the established typological sequences. The antiquarian pursuit of study collections started to give way to the retrieval of data through excavation. Early examples in which stratigraphy was considered were in the first and second Kitchen Midden Commissions (1849–69 and 1885–1900) (Kristiansen 2002). During this period stratigraphy was included in publications such as the handbook written by A. Voss in 1888 issued by the Prussian Ministry of Education on the excavation and protection of antiquities (Sklenár 1983: 114). Stratigraphy was also used by Wilamowitz in his excavations in Italy (Ceserani forthcoming) and the collaboration between Romanists and the natural sciences has been mentioned for the case of Hungary (Nagy 2003: 15). Yet, most classical and medieval archaeologists used the practice of searching for walls and, once found, excavating the contents of rooms usually without any stratigraphic control and often in an unsystematic way. In contrast, the excavations by the English General Pitt Rivers between 1890 and 1900 are among the best examples of how thorough the work of the field archaeologist was becoming.[9] Importantly, he followed his method regardless of the established chronology of the site. Examples of his excavations extend from the prehistoric (Cranborne Chase), Roman (Rushmore Park) and also medieval (Caesar's Camp in Kent) periods (Lucas 2001: ch. 2.1). In this respect, Pitt Rivers was ahead of his time. Most archaeologists were less systematic than he was and the impact of the techniques being developed in prehistoric archaeology on the latter periods would only be visible later, in the twentieth century.

In typology, the lead was taken by French prehistorians and by Scandinavians. The system proposed by Gabriel de Mortillet for the Palaeolithic in 1869, for example, was based on technical progress: from Acheulean, to Mousterian, Solutrean, Magdalenian, and Robenhausian and other periods later added. This single evolutionary scheme would soon be contested in its details, but not in its substance, by scholars from other nations as well as other French regions. Another scientific method adopted by evolutionists was typological seriation. Montelius would state in this respect:

> The type for the prehistoric archaeologist is the same thing as the species is for the scientist . . . Concerning the product of nature—it has long been known—one form can emerge from another. But not until recently, has it been possible to show the same kind of evolution concerning the products of human work.
>
> (Arwill-Nordbladh 1989: 138).

[9] In the early twentieth century Pitt Rivers' excavation techniques would be followed by others, laying the groundwork for the excavations by Mortimer Wheeler and Alexander Keiller (Fagan 2001; Lucas 2001; MacGregor 2000; Murray 1999a; Stone 1994), and with other archaeologists important later in the century: Stuart Piggott and Grahame Clark (Fagan 2001: 10–11).

When establishing a typological series it was important 'with the greatest possible accuracy', he said, 'to try to analyse the find context' (*ibid.*).

Typology was also a key method in the description and the establishment of chronological sequences of Roman and medieval monuments, inscriptions, coins, and other objects that had already been a major preoccupation throughout the nineteenth century. Thus, in Vienna the Austrian art historians Franz Wickhoff (1853–1909) and Alois Riegl (1858–1905) approached typologically the Roman and 'Barbarian' collections of the Imperial Museum with the aim of organizing them and to analyse the connections between the Roman and later medieval art. Riegl's work resulted in the publication of *Spat-römische Kunst-industrie* (*Late Roman art industry*) in 1901 (Bianchi Bandinelli 1982 (1976): 142). In Hungary, the proximity of the celebrations in 1896 of the millenary of the Hungarian conquest of the country led to a flurry of archaeological activities in which those related to Conquest and Migration period grave finds received most attention. The cataloguing of the museum collections by Professor József Hampel (1849–1913) covered all archaeological periods (Nagy 2003: 19). Cataloguing became one of the obsessions in the last decades of the nineteenth century. A good example of catalogues are the corpora, some of which dealt with archaeology beyond Europe and have been mentioned throughout the book. In Europe the monumental project organized by Theodor Mommsen in 1862, the positivist *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinorum* (Moradiellos 1992: 81–90), an exhaustive catalogue of Latin epigraphical inscriptions, should be mentioned.[10]

The new methods allowed archaeologists to deal in much more effective ways than ever with issues of chronology in the prehistoric period. Starting with the most ancient epoch, once the great antiquity of humanity had been acknowledged by the scientific community (see Chapter 12), work had to be done in the organization of the oldest period of human occupation in Europe. The Stone Age was accordingly segmented into Old—the Palaeolithic—and New—the Neolithic, and both were subsequently further subdivided into subperiods (Van Riper 1993: ch. 7). Work was undertaken in other parts of Europe by others such as the Russian Vasily Gorodtsov, the Frenchmen

[10] Another similar positivist and descriptive project organized between the 1860s and the 1890s, but referring to Greek art, was the *Inschriften Griechischer Bildhauer*, published in 1885 by the Austrian-born professor at the University of Rome, Emanuel Loewy (Bianchi Bandinelli 1982 (1976): 131–9).

Édouard Lartet (1801–71) and Gabriel de Mortillet, the Britons General Pitt Rivers and John Lubbock and the German Rudolf Virchow (1821–1902) (Daniel 1963: table 1, passim). Nomenclature was also developed to define the implements of each period. This process was not undertaken without a great amount of debate and argument, for contenders were competing not only in the scientific sphere, but also for academic leadership and power. The authority of French archaeologists was manifested in their ability to direct the tone of Palaeolithic studies. Mainly under the control of archaeologists based in Paris, Southern France became the focus of Palaeolithic studies because of the typologies devised from flint implements found in the area (Groenen 1994). Excavations also unearthed decorated bones and stones dating from that period and served as proof of the artistic qualities of ancient 'man' (Groenen 1994).

The Bronze Age was also subdivided by rival schema, but, in contrast to the previous periods, an overall application to the whole territory of Europe proved difficult. For many areas of Europe it seemed that an early Copper Age could be distinguished. Schliemann's excavations in Mycenae between 1874 and 1879 provided a link to Egyptian archaeology (see Chapter 5). This allowed the building of Bronze Age chronologies, first between Egypt and Greece, and then between Greece and the rest of Europe. Of key importance would be Montelius' 1885 subdivision of the Scandinavian Bronze Age into several phases. Even more than when dealing with the Bronze Age, archaeologists examining the Iron Age connected their discussions to issues of language and race, as ancient sources provided archaeologists with descriptions of the people that inhabited Europe at this time. The Iron Age was split into two periods on the basis of the excavations of Hallstatt and La Tène in Austria and Switzerland respectively. Greatly inspired by the nationalist ethos, some excavations with important Iron Age strata were undertaken starting, in the 1860s, with the digs at Mont Auxois (Alésia) in France and at Numantia in Spain.

Evolutionism was not opposed to diffusionism, at least not in the case of non-Darwinist evolutionists. The movement of objects and peoples from region to region was widely accepted at the time by most. Yet, archaeological remains from prehistory to later times were sometimes identified with known historical peoples. The latter were also defined as races, as discussed earlier in this chapter, such as the Slavs or the Celts. The way in which archaeologists attempted to demonstrate the expansion of the Indo-Europeans or Aryans clearly illustrates the link between evolutionism and diffusionism. This example allows us to join together several threads running through this book. As seen in Chapter 8, in 1813, the Aryans had been described as Indo-Europeans and both concepts—Aryan and Indo-European—had gained racial overtones in the 1820s. It was unclear when the Aryans, a people for whom experts

stipulated an original homeland in Central Asia, had arrived in Europe and several theories competed (Mallory 1989). In any case, archaeologists increasingly tried to trace their movement throughout Eurasia. In 1835, the Asiatic Society of Bengal sent two bronzes found after a landslide near the village of Niora in the province of Etaweh (India) for metallurgical analysis to Copenhagen. Their analysis showed that they contained very little, if any, tin in the alloy. In 1877 Worsaae, who, as we have seen, was an evolutionist and an explicit believer in the usefulness of archaeology for the national cause (see Chapter 12), gave a lecture to the Nordic Society for Antiquarianism and History. In it he undertook an overview of world prehistory. He presented a list of non-tin alloys mainly from Europe among which he included the two pieces from India. The reason for grouping these together was made explicit in his *Nordens Forhistorie* (*The Prehistory of the North*) (1881). When talking about the Bronze Age of Scandinavia he stated that 'here, too, evidence more and more points to the age-old cultures and countries in Asia and first and foremost to the copper- and tin-rich India' (in Sørensen 1985: xiii). Worsaae concluded 'that India, if not the proper or only cradle of the Bronze Age, was then at least one of the earliest and most important points for its beginnings' (*ibid.*). These ideas would later be taken up by his younger Swedish colleague, Oscar Montelius, and, more generally later in the early twentieth century, by the culture-historical school. So, for him, as well as for many others in this period, the creation of national accounts, that distinguished one nation from the rest, was not incompatible with the belief that objects, and for some even people, had moved across space in prehistory and later periods. In sum, evolutionism, diffusionism, soft racism, and nationalism could go hand in hand, although conversely they could contradict one another, and could be used against one another.

CONCLUSION

At the turn of the century, professional archaeology increasingly became less of a gentleman's pastime in which one dug a hole in a few hours to discover a national treasure, and more an enterprise in which meticulous techniques were being imposed both in the field and in the analysis of the data. Many significant events had happened in the last four decades of the nineteenth century. The nationalist cause had been accepted in the political imagination of most Europeans and this meant that the study of history and of archaeology increased its appeal even more than earlier in the century. One of the most remarkable transformations was that gradually national histories pushed

the nation's origins back in time to include evidence from the most remote past, although the allure of the medieval period remained dominant in the national historical discourse. The growth in the amount of professionals and amateurs took place in the context not only of an expansion throughout the world of the imperial powers (see Part III of this book), but also of an increase in the number of powerful nations in Europe: some of the new countries such as Italy and Germany resulted from the unification of previously divided states, whereas others such as Serbia and Romania were formed when their territories gained political independence from their old masters. New philosophies—mainly positivism and evolutionism—replaced the Romantic approach that had dominated the early decades of the nineteenth century.

Evolutionism, the belief of things changing through time from the simple to the complex, was not new, but in this period became the backbone of the organization of historical discourse. Importantly, scholars now insisted in following scientific methods, which also meant being rational and impersonal. However, this should not deceive those not familiar with archaeological practice at this time: positivism came together with an ample acceptance of an essential division of humanity into races which were not of equal value and whose difference could be measured by increasingly sophisticated techniques such as craniology. Evolutionism also agreed with universalism, as there was general conformity about a series of stages all humans, i.e. each nation, went through throughout time. This concept was made visual in exhibitions at all scales: local, regional, national, and international. It was also made apparent in the distribution maps that scholars started to include in their publications. Scholars looked for these stages within the frontiers of their nations, a practice that led to circular argumentations: the geographical extent of the nation was taken as given but also became part of the conclusion. This practice was mainly voluntary but became increasingly crystallized through funding—only projects that conformed to the sponsor, either the state or a private source, received subsidies—and legislation, which obviously conformed to the national boundaries.

The wide diversity of material culture dealt with by archaeologists led to a parallel variety in the way it was institutionalized. The situation described at the start of this book as the 'sheer lack of homogeneity' of what archaeology is today, of its multivocality, has roots mainly in this period, although it has much earlier precedents that go back to the early modern period. Two major divisions became established: monumental and non-monumental archaeology. The latter mainly referred to prehistoric material, and was institutionalized within the natural sciences, geography and/or anthropology. Monumental archaeology was shared by philologists, historians of art, classicists, and others specializing more narrowly in epigraphy and numismatics.

Within monumental archaeology a major distinction was made between the archaeology of the Great Civilizations, that of other civilizations—in America and Asia—and national archaeology. Despite these divisions which have deeply marked the discipline, in the years under discussion in this chapter there were commonalities in the way in which material culture was treated. The method of typology was widely accepted during this period to the extent that for some it became an end in itself. Seriation was recognized as one of the most useful tools to establish chronology. Less widespread, the stratigraphic method timidly started to be imposed as one of the common practices in excavation.

Histories of archaeology dealing with the early years of the twentieth century have shown a quasi-obsession with the figure of Gustaf Kossinna (1858–1931). He supported the concept of national archaeology, and looked for the geographical spread of the Germanic race, whom he thought was superior to any other. The preceding pages have shown, however, not only that there is much more to archaeology than prehistoric archaeology—Kossinna's main field of research—but, more importantly, that many of the revolutions supposedly started by him were very much present in the preceding period. If there was anything which characterized the archaeology of the last four decades of the nineteenth century it was its emphasis on race and national archaeology. The analysis of how this continued in the early decades of the twentieth century has been partly impeded, in some countries, by an unwillingness to accept that the belief in racism and its offshoot, eugenics, which was widespread at this time (Barkan 1992), could have affected the study of the past in other countries than Germany and, perhaps, Italy. Equally needing analysis is the extent to which some early twentieth-century archaeologists may have become part of the fight against the manipulative and speculative hypotheses that had flourished in the name of science.

The example of Kossinna, however, illustrates an aspect that has not been widely analysed in the history of archaeology: that of scientific networks. Once the number of academics had grown to the extent it had at the end of the nineteenth century, the relationship between nationalism and archaeology became naturalized and, therefore, gradually less important. In its place there were, increasingly, other considerations: one of them the establishment of academic networks some of whose precedents have been mentioned in the previous pages (mainly, the competing international congresses). It would not make sense, therefore, for a book on twentieth-century archaeology to take as the main focus of discussion nationalism and imperialism. These were influential up to the Second World War and in the period following decolonization, but they were less part of the story than in the period this volume has dealt with, the nineteenth century.