

## Chapter 2

# Historical Observations on European Archaeology

Sarunas Milisauskas

In the second half of the nineteenth century, prehistoric archaeology came into existence in Europe (Daniel 1964:9). Since then numerous excavations have been conducted, thousands of publications covering various topics have been published, and new theories and methods have been applied to archaeological research. From a small number of pioneering scholars the profession has grown to include the thousands of men and women who are responsible for the present standing of archaeology in Europe. Unfortunately histories of archaeology do not treat all archaeologists equally. Each archaeologist writing the history of the field chooses his/her examples of events and personalities, so a totally unbiased perspective does not exist. Most archaeologists would agree that Marija Gimbutas (1921–1994) was a famous archaeologist (Milisauskas 2000); however, in Trigger's (1989), *A History of Archaeological Thought*, she was not included. A list of archaeologists associated with greatness may be quite different in England from one in Russia.

It is not surprising that British archaeologists dominate histories written by Anglo-American scholars such as Glyn Daniel (1950, 1975) and Brian Fagan (2003). Even in Tim Murray's (1999) *Encyclopedia of Archaeology: The Great Archaeologists*, out of 58 archaeologists, 21 (36.2%) are English and 14 (24.1%) American. Only three Germans, Gustaf Kossinna (1858–1931), Heinrich Schliemann (1822–1990), and Johann Winckelmann (1717–1768), are included. The three volumes of *Encyclopedia of Archaeology: History and Discovery* by Tim Murray (2001) have short summaries about many archaeologists and the history of archaeology of most countries of this world. For the European archaeologists, the Czech archaeologist's Jan Filip (1966, 1969) publication, the *Enzyklopädisches Handbuch zur Ur- und Frühgeschichte Europas*, contains a treasury of information about archaeologists and sites. It is not my intention to deemphasize the contributions of the British archaeologists that were made to the growth of archaeology in Europe. However, for a variety of reasons we frequently forget to acknowledge the outstanding archaeologists of other nationalities.

Our profession memorializes scholars like Henri Breuil (1877–1961), V. Gordon Childe (1892–1957), Oscar Montelius (1843–1921), and Grahame Clark (1907–1995) whose fame rests on the pan-European achievements such as Clark's (1952) *Prehistoric Europe: The Economic Basis*, translated into several languages. It should be pointed out that the number of pan-European archaeologists is small. Unfortunately, there were no women operating at this level in the past. There are archaeologists, such as the French Paleolithic scholar François Bordes (1919–1981), who are famous for contributions to a specific archaeological period. Sir Arthur Evans (1851–1941) became famous by excavating the spectacular site of Knossos. Scholars from small countries or regional specialists are seldom remembered beyond their homelands. Bohumil Soudský (1922–1976) in the Czech

---

S. Milisauskas (✉)

Department of Anthropology, State University of New York, Buffalo, NY 14261-0026, USA  
e-mail: smilis@buffalo.edu

Republic, Vasile Pârvan (1882–1927) in Romania, Moritz Hoernes (1852–1917) in Austria, János Banner (1888–1981) in Hungary, Miloje Vasić (1869–1956) in Serbia, Józef Kostrzewski (1885–1969) in Poland, V.A. Gorodtsov (1860–1945) in Russia, Albert E. van Giffen (1884–1973) in the Netherlands, Michael J. O’Kelly (1915–1982) in Ireland, Gero von Merhart (1886–1959) in Germany, Sophus Müller (1846–1934) in Denmark, André Leroi-Gourhan (1911–1986) in France, Richard Indreko (1900–1961) in Estonia, Vikenty Khvoika (1850–1914) in Ukraine, Hasan Ceka (1900–1998) in Albania, Christos Tsountas (1857–1934) in Greece, Josip Korošec (1909–1966) in Slovenia, and Jonas Puzinas (1905–1978) in Lithuania are all considered outstanding figures in their own countries, but not across, or outside Europe. Scandinavia provides partial exceptions; Jens Worsaae (1821–1885) and Oscar Montelius (1843–1921) are widely and justly famous. It should be noted that regional archaeologists supplied the material that enabled synthesizers like V.G. Childe (1929) to produce *The Danube in Prehistory*. The Marxist beliefs of V.G. Childe did not prevent him from interacting with falangist (Spanish Fascist) archaeologists in Spain (Martinez Navarette 1997–1998, Diaz-Andreu 2007). For his syntheses he needed information from archaeologists of various ideological persuasions. Sometimes local archaeologists do not get credit for their methodological and theoretical contributions. According to Lech (2004:40–41), the Polish archaeologist Leon Kozłowski (1892–1944) was the first to define an archaeological culture in 1923. He took his doctorate at the University of Tübingen in 1918, and was probably influenced by German archaeologists. V.G. Childe visited Kozłowski’s excavations in Poland in the 1920s and likely discussed with him the definition of archaeological cultures.

Large and rich European countries have much more impact on archaeology than poor, especially small countries. Neustupný (1997–1998) wrote an interesting article about mainstream and minority communities in European archaeology. These communities are mainly based on modern state boundaries. Archaeological power and influence lies with the mainstream communities. “It is difficult to imagine how an archaeological community in a country with several million inhabitants and a poor economy could flourish” (Neustupný 1997–1998:23). Neustupný (1997–1998:14) suggests “that Britain houses a mainstream community, the Czech Republic a minority community, and that Polish archaeology is heading towards mainstream status.” It is not only language problems, i.e., publishing in Albanian, Bulgarian, Estonian, Finnish, Hungarian, Latvian, Lithuanian, Portuguese, Romanian, Serbian, Slovakian, Slovenian etc., that hinder the impact of archaeologists from minority communities. Even if they publish in English, French, or German, their theoretical and methodological contributions are ignored, in favor of factual information. It should be noted that archaeologists from mainstream communities are isolationists when it comes to scholarship; they do not read many publications from other countries. For all its talk about science and theory, archaeology is still very geographically compartmentalized, unlike chemistry or physics.

The theoretical trends and various interpretations of the European past cannot be separated from the historical events that have played such important roles in influencing or even determining the direction of the field in the twentieth century. Archaeologists were involved as volunteers or conscripts in wars of the twentieth century, R.E.M. Wheeler being the best known British example. Memoirs, biographies, obituaries, archive documents, and histories of national archaeologies reflect the vast diversity of interpretations of the events that affected their lives and their profession. And as the time goes by, the various developments in European archaeology are being reinterpreted and rewritten; the past and the role that archaeologists played in creating it keep changing. As Stanisław Tabaczynski (2002:72) has stated, “Archaeologists have always acted within society and for a society. The differences of cultural traditions as well as the changing political situations of these societies had and continue to have no small effect on the investigation of their ancient and more recent past.”

Archaeologists are not saints; they compete for power, positions, funds, sites, publications, etc. (Milisauskas and Kruk 2008). It would be a mistake to consider archaeology as a nonpolitical discipline in the past. Some noted archaeologists were Nazis, Fascists, or Stalinists (Arnold 1990, 2004,

Leube 2002, Galaty and Watkinson 2004). We cannot exclude them from our history and create a myth in which all archaeologists worked for the betterment of all humanity. With the passage of time we tend to forget various misdeeds of archaeologists. Furthermore, we cannot legislate what archaeologists do, or how a society will use archaeology.

The 1930s in Europe can be referred to as the age of dictators; by the mid-1930s there were 18 dictatorships in Europe (Davies 1996:943). Czechoslovakia remained the only democracy in central and eastern Europe until its dismembering by Nazi Germany in 1938. It was an ideal period for archaeologists to advance themselves *via* ideology. Fascist scholars took advantage of the political climate in Germany and Italy to gain great influence over the study of the past (Werner 1945/1946, Härke 1991, Kossack 1999). In Italy, Mussolini was dreaming of recreating the boundaries of the Roman Empire, thus hoping to expand the territory of Italy in the Balkans and Africa. It should be no surprise that classical archaeology played a dominant role in Italy during the Fascist period, 1921–1945 (Guidi 2002). After Franco's victory in the Spanish Civil War in 1939, the falangist archaeologists such as Julio Martínez Santa-Olalla (1905–1972), obtained powerful positions within the scholarly institutions in Spain (Díaz-Andreu 1993, 2007).

Glyn Daniel (1967:222) has pointed out that “without excavation there could be no systematic development of the subject . . .,” i.e., archaeology, and from the 1920s up to 1939, numerous major excavations were conducted in various countries. The amount of archaeological data generated by European archaeologists in the interwar period is impressive and in this short historical overview, I can give only a few examples. Miloje Vasić (*Preistoriska Vinča I–IV*, 1932–1936) conducted excavations at Vinča in the former Yugoslavia. Józef Kostrzewski (1936) excavated the Iron Age fortified settlement of Biskupin in Poland. Danuta Piotrowska (1997–1998) wrote an interesting article on how Biskupin became entangled in the Polish and German nationalistic conflicts in the late 1930s and the early 1940s. Werner Buttler and Waldemar Haberey (1936) dug the Linear Pottery settlement of Köln-Lindenthal in Germany. Mortimer Wheeler (1943) excavated the Iron Age hill fort at Maiden Castle in England and he used innovative field techniques such as the grid system.

Before World War II, German archaeology and the German language in publications were very influential in continental Europe. Many central and southeastern European archaeologists received their academic training at German universities. German archaeologists contributed to the foundations of European “archaeology as a discipline by developing methods of chronology, artefact analysis and excavation” (Härke 1991:188). Prehistorians, such as Gustaf Kossinna (1858–1931), Hans Jürgen Eggers (1906–1974), Carl Schuchhardt (1859–1943), Ernst Wahle (1889–1981), and Paul Reinecke (1872–1958) were frequently cited by archaeologists in the Netherlands, Hungary, Poland, Romania, Denmark, Spain, Sweden, Latvia, and elsewhere. If you had asked European archaeologists in 1930 who were the five greatest living prehistorians, Kossinna's name would have figured prominently. Even V. Gordon Childe respected Kossinna for his scholarly achievements in archaeology (Leligdowicz 1998, 1999). “The early publications of VERE GORDON CHILDE, for example, reveal the strong influence of Kossinna's methodology” (Veit 2001:581).

At the end of World War II, however, most archaeologists wanted to forget him as an embarrassment to our profession. “In Germany, both West and East, Kossinna seemed to have vanished into thin air” (Klejn 1999:245). His racist and nationalistic views had been embraced by Nazi Germany; he had throughout his life emphasized the greatness of Germans in the past, although he died in 1931 before Hitler came to power in 1933. Daniel's (1950) book, *A Hundred Years of Archaeology*, only briefly refers to him; he is not even included in the index (Leligdowicz 1998). But Kossinna, nationalistic and racist though he was, contributed notably to the development of European archaeology, and should be credited with the definition of archaeological cultures, cartography (mapping of archaeological cultures), and cultural historical studies. Kossinna's definition of archaeological cultures was refined by V.G. Childe (Kohl 2002:187). Through his “settlement archaeology” method (*siedlungs-archäologische* method) he tried to give ethnicity an archaeological form, arguing that the

distribution of distinctive artifact types can reflect cultural provinces, which in turn can be associated with the settlement areas of ethnic groups (Kossinna 1911, Härke 1991, Gramsch 2006). Though now discredited this approach was used in the Soviet Union in the 1950s and 1960s (Klejn 1999). As pointed out by Andrejs Vasks (1999:8) during the Soviet rule in Latvia “One of the directions of prehistoric research which did not incur objections from the censors was the study of ethnicity.” Valter Lang (2005:12) has emphasized that in eastern Europe “The fundamental methodology of those works was the same everywhere: the archaeological cultures (treated as internally homogenous) were equated with similarly homogenous ethnic groups, languages and races.” Since Kossinna had little training in archaeology, Klejn (1999:245) raises an interesting question. How did he become so important a figure in European archaeology? Klejn (1999:245) suggests that “Kossinna did see and express some of the really vital questions about the possibilities, uses, and developments of archaeology. The ethnic determination of cultures, the possibility of genetic connections with cultures, culturogenesis (the origin of certain culture), the connection of culturogenesis with the origin of peoples and their languages – all these questions were brought to archaeology by Kossinna.” As time goes by, Kossinna is being gradually “rehabilitated” for his scholarly work (Klejn 1974, 1999, 2001, Smolla 1980, 1985, Veit 1985, 2000, Malina and Vašíček 1990:62–64, Leligdowicz 1998, 1999, Grünert 2002, Brather 2008). C. Becker (1985:117), a distinguished Danish archaeologist, writing some 40 years later after the end of World War II, praises his work: “Today it is easy to overlook the fact that Kossinna’s *siedlungs-archäologische* methods were epoch-making for the whole profession.” J.P. Demoule (2002:477), a leading French archaeologist has noted that “marginalization of Kossinna as has prevailed in Europe for long time doesn’t do justice to his immense influence on the conception of traditional culture-historical archaeology.” But we should not forget that “Kossinna saw archaeology as a means of proving territorial claims – as a weapon of interstate geopolitics and a potential rationale for extended international and national conflicts” (Klejn 2001:776). His archaeology was used to justify territorial claims by Nazi Germany. However, Barford (2002:79) suggests that his influence on the rise of nationalism in archaeology has been overemphasized in the post-Nazi reaction. Some European archaeologists were nationalists, i.e., using archaeological data and theories to sustain nationalist political agenda, long before Kossinna. Nationalism in archaeology is still there in some European countries (Atkinson et al. 1996, Diaz-Andreu and Champion 1996, Kohl and Fawcett 1996).

Traditional archaeology, i.e., culture history, dominated the pre-World War II Europe. In the USA, traditional archaeology is referred to as the culture-history mode. At the end of World War I as the great empires of Austro-Hungary, Germany, and Russia collapsed, the previously suppressed nationalities, Croats, Slovenes, Finns, Poles, Lithuanians, Czechs, Slovaks, Latvians, and Estonians could finally write their own prehistories and histories. Various territorial and boundary problems in Germany, Poland, and Hungary inspired higher levels of nationalism. Some archaeologists, as defenders of national interests, became involved in these disputes. For example, Józef Kostrzewski defended Poland’s territorial rights against Kossinna’s Germanic expansionism. Kostrzewski had received his doctorate under Kossinna in Berlin and he used his teacher’s methods to define Slavic territories in the past. The association of archaeological cultures with specific ethnic groups in prehistoric times is, of course, problematic, but in the early twentieth century “One of the prime functions of archaeology was to provide a history for the regions now occupied by modern states, more the better if it could provide information confirming the antiquity and glorious past of the nation currently living there” (Barford 2002:79).

British archaeologists were not involved in continental nationalistic disputes, thus V. Gordon Childe could be a distant observer. However, Childe and some other British archaeologists became fascinated with Marxism, which influenced their archaeological work. Furthermore, they were attracted to archaeological developments in the Soviet Union.

After the Bolshevik Revolution in 1917, most Russian archaeologists continued their research under the traditional mode. However, it would be a mistake to classify the pre-1930s Russian archaeology as being only empiricist (Platonova 2002, 2008). There were different “schools” of archaeology

such as the Gorodtsov and the paleoethnological schools. In 1928 the first Five Year Plan was imposed on the country and scholarly disciplines were likewise harnessed to the communist party's goals. V.I. Ravdonikas' (1930) publication, *Za marksistskuyu istoriya material'noi kul'tury* (For a Marxist history of material culture), signaled that from then on only Marxism would be accepted as the dogma guiding Soviet archaeology. He criticized the empiricism of the "old" archaeologists and tried to discredit Russian archaeology before the 1930s. Platonova (2002, 2008) stresses that many western archaeologists have accepted Ravdonikas' distorted history of Russian archaeology before the 1930s. Between late 1929 and 1933 many archaeologists were dismissed, exiled to Siberia, or shot. Tikhonov (2007:454) diplomatically states that "almost all researchers were repressed at the St Petersburg University." A new cadre of young archaeologists came to power to dominate Soviet archaeology. As Tallgren (1936:149) wrote after visiting the Soviet Union in 1935, "How rich humanity must be, if it can dispense with such good men! Not all these people have lost their lives, but they have been deported." It should be pointed out that many Soviet archaeologists were doing empirical archaeology by the 1950s and 1960s as their predecessors did in the 1920s.

World War II had a devastating effect on many archaeologists, sites, museums, collections, and libraries. In the discipline, as in so much else, 1939–1945 was Europe's new Dark Age. Destruction of various institutions and killing of archaeologists greatly affected many European countries. Many archaeologists as volunteers or conscripts fought on opposing sides. The Russians S. Anosov, Evgenij Krichevsky, Andrej Kruglov, and Georgij Podgayetski were killed on the Soviet-German front (Miller 1956:160, Filip 1966, 1969). German archaeologists died on eastern and western fronts. Werner Buttler died in France in 1940, Ernst Petersen and Walter Kersten on the eastern front. Some Polish archaeologists were shot by the Germans (Zdzisław Durczewski, Stefan Przeworski), others by the Soviet Stalinist NKVD-secret police at Katyń (Jan Bartys, Jan Fitzke) (Abramowicz 1991, Blombergowa 1992, Gurba 2005). Scholars fled the occupations of their homelands by the Germans or the Soviets. Latvian archaeologist Francis Balodis and Estonian prehistorian Richard Indreko left their countries for Sweden. Lithuanian archaeologists Jonas Puzinas and Marija Gimbutas moved to the USA. The Polish archaeologist Tadeusz Sulimirski escaped to England as did Gerhard Bersu, to avoid antisemitic persecution in Nazi Germany. Bersu returned to Germany at the end of World War II and again became in 1950 the Director of the Römisch-Germanischen Kommission in Frankfurt (Parzinger 2002). The Spanish Civil War (1936–1939) drove archaeologists such as P. Bosch-Gimpera to Mexico to escape Franco's fascist regime.

The murder of millions on account of their ethnicity, religion, or ideology during World War II had a major impact on archaeological interpretations in western Europe. To forget this great human tragedy, many archaeologists tried to ignore the role of warfare in culture change. Ethnic and linguistic interpretations of archaeological data became unfashionable. It should be pointed out that the tragedy of World War I led Sir Arthur Evans to create a utopian Minoan society, pacifist and matriarchal (Gere 2009).

At the end of World War II some countries, such as Germany, Poland, Czechoslovakia, the Soviet Union, Romania and Italy, received new boundaries. The borders of the less fortunate, like the Baltic countries, simply vanished. These boundary changes drove out floods of refugees, who abruptly found they had the wrong ethnicities in the wrong geographies. Some archaeologists had to move; Polish scholars had to leave Lwów (present day L'viv in Ukraine) to the post-1945 Poland. Changes in place names occurred with bewildering speed: for example, German site names in former East Prussia (at present the Kaliningrad district of Russia) were changed to Russian. The famous Zedmar site (Gaerte 1929) became Serov as Zedmar disappeared from the map.

After World War II, Europe was divided into two major ideological blocks: the Soviet Union and its satellites, and the western democracies. Spain and Portugal remained right wing dictatorships until the 1970s. Marxism was imposed as the official state ideology on scholarly fields including archaeology in Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Hungary, Poland, and Romania. Yugoslavia and Albania broke away from the Soviet Union's domination and practiced their own brands of

Marxism. This does not mean that non-Marxist approaches in archaeology disappeared in Poland, Hungary, and other countries. True, the Stalinist period (1948–1955) offered little leeway in archaeological interpretation. This is well illustrated by Jacek Lech's (1999:89) translated passage from W. Antoniewicz and Z. Wartyłowska's (1955:184) article in Polish about the aims of archaeology during the Stalinist period. "Archaeology, therefore, in accordance with J. Stalin's guiding principles for historical sciences, is concerned with the essential problem of the development of primitive, ancient and early class societies, learning about the history of the producers of material goods, the history of the working masses, the history of peoples" (Antoniewicz and Wartyłowska 1955:184). After the mid-1950s, many archaeologists just paid lip service to Marxism by citing Marx and Engels in their bibliographies while actually doing culture-history. In Poland, Hungary, and other satellite countries even Marx and Engels had disappeared from archaeological publications by the 1970s. For example, W. Hensel's (1980) *Polska Starożytna (Ancient Poland)* is written as culture-history without any reference to Marxist saints. It was not easy to force archaeologists to produce Marxist scholarship. Karl-Heinz Otto (1915–1989) and Joachim Herrmann, the leading communist prehistorians in East Germany, championed this approach in archaeological research and produced many publications. However, most of their East German colleagues continued to do culture-history, irrespective of Otto's and Herrmann's push for the Marxist-oriented research (Veit 2001).

In the post-World War II period, most archaeologists in Europe, including the communist countries, continued to do what they had always been doing, culture-history, or traditional, or continental archaeology. Very few European archaeologists looked at archaeological developments from the perspective of the entire continent. Most were regional or local specialists in the prehistory of their own country or region (S.J. Shennan 1987).

After 1950 radiocarbon dating had a great impact on the chronologies of various prehistoric cultures. Dates for innovations such as the origins of metallurgy, wheeled vehicles, and monumental structures became earlier. Though V.G. Childe's (1957) *Dawn of European Civilization* still used the short pre-14C chronology, for example that the Neolithic started after 3,000 BC in central Europe, radiocarbon dates located the earliest farmers around 5,600 BC. Thus in central Europe the Neolithic (including the Copper Age) lasted over 3,000 years. Renfrew (1973), using radiocarbon dates, demonstrated that megalithic monuments in Europe were earlier than the monumental architecture of Near East. At present, accelerated mass spectrometry (AMS) dating is yielding much finer chronologies.

Bone chemistry studies, aerial reconnaissance, and remote sensing techniques have increased our knowledge of the past (Lambert 1997; Renfrew and Bahn 2004). Archaeozoology and archaeobotany have become much more common in field projects. Since the 1980s molecular genetics research has made an impact on our understanding of past European populations. Colin Renfrew's involvement in archaeogenetics has helped to spread its popularity (Jones 2004).

Many major archaeological discoveries were made in the post-World War II period; I can give only a few examples: the cave art at Chauvet in France (Chauvet et al. 1995), the Copper Age cemetery of Varna in Bulgaria (Ivanov 1988, Ivanov and Avramova 2000), the megalithic passage grave of Barnenez in Brittany, France (Giot 1987), the Hochdorf burial in Germany dated to the mid-sixth century BC (Biel 1985, Olivier 1999), and the Iron Age spectacular burial mound of Vix in France (Joffroy 1962). Two German hikers in the Tyrolean Alps found the frozen body of the Copper Age man, the Iceman or Ötzi, in 1991 (Spindler 1994).

As in many other scholarly disciplines, women were under-represented in archaeology for many years. Since the 1950s we have many more women archaeologists and they have made significant contributions to European archaeology. A few examples follow: Ella Kivikoski (1901–1990) of Finland, Ida Bognár-Kutzián (1918–2001) of Hungary, Zofia Podkowińska (1894–1975) of Poland, Tat'jana Sergeevna Passek (1903–1968) of Russia, Regina Volkaitė-Kulikauskienė (1916–2007) of Lithuania, Aleksandra Mano (1924–2005) of Albania, Viera Němejcová-Pavúková (1937–1997) of Slovakia, Elvira Šnore (1905–1996) of Latvia, Hanna Rydh (1891–1964) of Sweden, Johanna

Mestorf (1828–1909) of Germany, Charlotte Blindheim (1917–2005) of Norway, Denise Sonnevile-Bordes (1919–2008) of France, Patricia Phillips (1935–1999) of England, and Hortensia Dumitrescu (1901–1982) of Romania. It is still not easy for women to attain the top positions in archaeological institutions; men continue to dominate the field in most countries. There are some positive examples such as Norway, where in the 1990s out of 11 professors of archaeology, five were women (Dommasnes et al. 1998:105). The current director of the Albanian Institute of Archaeology is Shpresa Gjongjecaj.

As pointed out by John Bintliff (2008:147) about Anglo-American archaeology, “Since the late 1950s the discipline has been rent by endless academic disputes about the ways we should think about the past and its material remains, and how to make deeper sense of earlier societies.” During the late 1960s and 1970s, processual archaeology or the “scientific anthropology of the past” has been championed by Americans like Lewis Binford and some British like David Clarke (1936–1976). Clarke’s (1968) publication the *Analytical Archaeology* had a major impact on some British and Scandinavian archaeologists. Processual archaeologists attempt to explain how and why culture change occurs. There is much greater emphasis on long-term processes in the past.

After 1980, a counter movement, post-processual archaeology appeared in England and later in Scandinavia and other European countries. This embraces a diverse range of post-modern approaches: gender studies, emphasis of ideology and symbolism, Neo-Marxism, critical theory, and the importance of individuals in prehistory. It can be contrasted with the new archaeology in a simple chart (Table 2.1). Although processualist and post-processualist archaeologists disagree on many points, they concur that archaeological research should be theory driven.

The archaeological data remain constant in quality and quantity; only around it swirls a vast cloud of new and old interpretations or reinterpretations. This development is clearly illustrated by Paul Mellars (2009:502) as it relates to the famous Mesolithic site of Star Carr in England, “The repeated re-interpretations of the site have arguably served as a kind of barometer of the successive swings and fashions in archaeological interpretation over the past 50 years, ranging from the strongly ecological and ‘functionalist’ interpretations of Grahame Clark himself and the ensuing generation of equally ecologically/functionally-oriented adherents of the ‘new,’ ‘processual’ archaeology in the 1960s and 1970s, to the current wave of passionately anti-functionalist, ‘post-processualist’ approaches which has increasingly gripped the younger generations of prehistorians from the later 1980s onwards.”

Archaeology borrows theoretical constructs from ethnology, evolutionary biology, the physical sciences, geography, literary criticism, history, sociology, philosophy, and cultural studies. France’s *Annales* historical school has influenced a number of archaeologists (Bintliff 1991), as have the ideas of French historians, sociologists, and philosophers, such as Fernand Braudel (1972, 1981), Pierre Bourdieu (1977), and Michel Foucault (1966, 1969). Other non-archaeologists, such as the Italian Marxist philosopher Antonio Gramsci, likewise have had some theoretical influence. Such Europeans have also influenced American archaeologists as the impact of cultural anthropology on archaeology has decreased in the USA. The World Systems approach championed by the American sociologist Immanuel Wallerstein (1974, 1980) and the structuration theory and reflexivity of the British sociologist Anthony Giddens (1984) have influenced European archaeologists. These competing theoretical

**Table 2.1** New archaeology vs. post-processual archaeology

New archaeology	Post-processual archaeology
Positivism	Relativism
Objectivity	Subjectivity
Seeks explanations	Seeks interpretations
Materialist	Idealist
Environment-centered	Human-centered

approaches have had a greater impact on younger archaeologists, but most European scholars are still doing culture history.

The political map of Europe has changed drastically since 1989 and these changes have mostly been for the better in archaeology. Between 1989 and 1991 the Soviet Union collapsed, leading to the emergence or reemergence of numerous independent states, such as Armenia, Belarus, Estonia, Georgia, Latvia, Lithuania, and the Ukraine. Yugoslavia broke up into Bosnia-Herzegovina, Croatia, Macedonia, Slovenia, and the remainder of old Yugoslavia. Lately the former Yugoslavia totally disintegrated with the separation of Kosovo and Montenegro from Serbia, but not all European countries recognize Kosovo's independence. Now, we have the Czech Republic and Slovakia, instead of Czechoslovakia. East and West Germany have become a unified state. The disappearance of the Iron Curtain created novel opportunities for interaction and research that previously were not possible for most archaeologists (Milisauskas 1990, Bogucki 1993, Marciniak 2007, Lozny 2011). For the first time in many years, archaeologists and historians could write and express their honest views and interpretations in central and eastern Europe without worrying about offending the guardians of a Marxist social utopia or state censors of books. Michelbertas (2001:145) has noted that during the Soviet times in Lithuania, any archaeologist professing processual or post-processual views would have been immediately fired from his/her job. Or again, until the mid-1980s Lithuanian archaeologists could not cite the "bourgeois" archaeologist Jonas Puzinas (Puodžiūnas and Girininkas 1996:252). To be fair, such heavy-handed censorship did not prevail in such Soviet satellites as Poland and Hungary. The number of archaeologists increased greatly during the Marxist period in central and eastern Europe, as, indeed, in western Europe and North America. There were 40 archaeologists in 1947 in Poland and approximately 550 by 1996 (Abramowicz 1991, Tabaczynski 2007). We should not overemphasize the isolation of archaeologists in Marxist countries from archaeologists in western Europe. Although Soviet archaeologists had only little direct contact with the West, such was not the case for most satellite states. Polish archaeologists conducted or participated in archaeological projects in Algeria, Egypt, France, Italy, and Spain (Tabaczynski 2007). A study of citations by Ewa Krupic (2008) in the Polish archaeological journal *Archeologia Polski* between 1957 and 1975 indicates that numerous western European archaeologists were cited. A few American, Austrian, French, German, and British institutions conducted archaeological research in Marxist countries. Archaeological meetings organized by Polish, Czech, Slovak, Hungarian, and Bulgarian scholars brought western, central, and eastern Europeans together. For example, the conference on the Linear Pottery culture in 1981 at Nové Vozokany in Slovakia attracted scholars from Austria, East Germany, France, Hungary, the Netherlands, Poland, USA, West Germany, and former Czechoslovakia (the Czech Republic and Slovakia). There were some problems in obtaining western publications in the so-called socialist countries. However, archaeologists exchanged reprints and books and most European archaeological institutions continue to exchange their publications. By exchanging publications, the Institute of the History of Material Culture, Polish Academy of Sciences, "has built up an archaeological library that is among the best in Europe" (Schild 1993: 146). Now the internet is making it much easier for archaeologists to exchange information, journals, site reports, and discussions.

A number of archaeologists from the former Marxist countries made significant contributions to method and theory in our discipline. Leo Klejn of Russia, Evžen Neustupný of the former Czechoslovakia, and Stanisław Tabaczyński of Poland made contributions to the theoretical debates in archaeology. One of the earliest systematic regional settlement studies in Europe was carried out in the late 1960s by Janusz Kruk (1973, 1980) in the loess uplands of the Cracow region in Poland. He examined the relationship of Neolithic sites to different ecological zones in a specific region and studied changes in land and resource utilization through time. Sergej Semenov (1898–1978), a Russian scholar, pioneered use-wear studies of stone tools that clarified their function in the past. David Anthony (2006:40) mentions that Efremov (1940) of Russia developed taphonomy. The Czech Bohumil Soudský (1922–1976) carried out large-scale horizontal exposures using earthmoving

equipment at Bylany and was one of the first archaeologists to use computers for the recording of ceramics (Midgley 2005). Several distinguished archaeologists, such as Jean-Paul Demoule, Jan Lichardus, Ivan Pavlů, and Ruth Tringham, received training in field techniques at Soudský's excavations. Hungarian and Polish archaeologists have carried out ambitious national surveys (Magyarország Régészeti Topográfia – Archaeological Topography of Hungary, Archaeological Map of Poland – Archeologiczne Zdjęcie Polski) trying to record all archaeological sites in their countries (Barford et al. 2000, Torma 1993). The Polish national survey of sites began in 1978. Hungarian archaeologists conducted microregional research programs (Bánffy 1996, 2006). The spectacular excavations of the Middle and Upper Paleolithic sites by Russian and Ukrainian archaeologists made our field much richer (Vasil'ev 2002).

R. Chapman (1997:279–280) has suggested that since the death of right-wing dictators, Franco and Salazar, Portuguese and Spanish archaeologists should not simply follow the latest theoretical and methodological trends from the English-speaking world. The same might be said of central and eastern European archaeologists. Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Russia, Slovakia, and Ukraine have their own archaeological traditions. The social, cultural, and political conditions were different for archaeology's development in central and eastern Europe (Sklenár 1983). The Slovenian archaeologist Predrag Novaković (2008:42) has pointed out that "Archaeology in central and eastern Europe was, in general much more historical in its approach, simply because this was expected from it in the conditions of continuous competition between nations, religions and states until the mid-20th century, and much of this legacy has pervaded recent times as well." It would be a mistake to replicate the processual and postprocessual debate, by now quite sterile, that dominated Anglo-American and Scandinavian archaeology during the last three decades.

Since the collapse of the Iron Curtain, the former Marxist countries are increasingly influenced by Western intellectual trends including archaeology. Lewis Binford and Ian Hodder became familiar names among the younger archaeologists; for example, Hodder's (1986) *Reading the Past* (*Praeities Skaitymas* 2000) was even translated into Lithuanian. Renfrew and Bahn's excellent book *Archaeology: Theory, Methods, and Practice* has been translated into some 30 languages. As long as local archaeologists do not abandon their research and just try to imitate some western prehistorians, the pan-European influences of Anglo-American archaeologists can have positive results. They can benefit from the delayed exposure to processual and postprocessual archaeology as shown by developments in Spain. The later emergence of processual archaeology in post-Franco Spain was advantageous to Spanish archaeologists as pointed out by Balmuth et al. (1997:XVI): "Spanish archaeology in the 1980s and 1990s is going through a transition from a normativist to a processualist prehistory that resembles the emergence of the New Archaeology in North America and Britain in the 1960s and 1970s. This delay affords Spanish archaeology the opportunity to learn from mistakes of their Anglo-Saxon colleagues." Furthermore, they can skip the processual archaeology and move directly to post-processual.

Stanisław Tabaczynski's (2007:1080) observations about Polish archaeology in the post-communist period are applicable to other former Marxist countries in Europe, "It seems to me that the way forward for Polish archaeology is not to wait for the emergence of some new paradigm, some 'Savior' with a ready blueprint for a new 'ideal' archaeology. Rather we should seek to build the future of our discipline on the basis of reflections, on experiences and efforts, both our own land, those of others, and on frank and open discussion" (Tabaczynski 2007:1080). Polish and Anglo-American archaeology have some similar and different goals. The different goals reflect diverse theoretical approaches. For example, there is little interest in Slavic ethnogenesis in England. At the same time I want to stress that all European archaeologists have many similar goals. This is illustrated by recent conferences and publications, e.g., "The Archaeology of Landscapes and Geographic Information Systems: Predictive Maps, Settlement Dynamics and Space and Territory in Prehistory" conference in 2001 at Wünsdorf in the former East Germany (Kunow and Müller 2003). European, Canadian,

and American scholars with common interests participated in this conference. At this conference, Johannes Müller (2003:29) described how settlement studies evolved in Europe, from the discredited method of Kossinna to a contemporary landscape archaeology that “attempts to understand areas of landscape according to the way emotional significance was ordered by prehistoric communities.” It should be pointed out that German archaeologists Georg Kossack (1974) and Herbert Jankuhn (1976) made significant contributions to landscape archaeology and their studies have influenced continental archaeologists (Bintliff 2008).

Central and eastern European archaeologists understand the multivocality of our field. Thus Russian, Polish, Czech, Hungarian, Romanian, Ukrainian, Estonian, Lithuanian, archaeologists should decide what kind of archaeology they want to pursue. However, post-processualism and processualism can provide possible new interpretations of data. For example, Neolithic figurines are often interpreted as goddesses in eastern Europe. Is it fruitful for archaeologists to continue to ask “Is this figurine a goddess?” in 2009? Goddess represents just one of many possible alternative interpretations of figurines.

Since the late 1990s the eastern and central European countries that were admitted to the European Union benefited from large sums of money allocated for highway construction. These funds benefited archaeology and numerous archaeologists got involved in the “highway archaeology,” what we in North America call cultural resource management (CRM). A number of very successful archaeological projects were carried out in Hungary, eastern Germany, Poland, and other countries.

During the last 25 years, there has been an emphasis on archaeological conservation or heritage management in Europe. This type of archaeology tries to preserve the remains of the past cultures, but at the same time focuses “on historical origins and local histories within the framework of national history” (Kristiansen 2008:10). The local political authorities are in favor of the heritage archaeology since it helps the economy and attracts tourists. The majority of jobs in archaeology are in the heritage sector (Marciniak 2007).

The disintegration of Yugoslavia in the 1990s unleashed nationalistic conflicts that led to the destruction or damage of archaeological heritage in Bosnia-Herzegovina, Croatia, Kosovo, and Serbia (Chapman 1994, Novakovic 2002). It was difficult to imagine for many westerners that extreme nationalism was still alive in parts of Europe.

In the early 1990s the European Association of Archaeologists (EAA) was formed. Some of the aims of this organization include the promotion of archaeological research and the promotion of management and interpretation of the European archaeological heritage. The official language of the EAA is English. Every year it holds meetings and publishes the *European Journal of Archaeology*. There are approximately 20,000 archaeologists in Europe, but roughly only 1,000 (5%) belong to the EAA. There are a variety of reasons for this. Many archaeologists cannot join for financial reasons. The use of English makes it difficult for many archaeologists to participate in conferences. All organizations have hierarchies of membership; English, German, and Scandinavian archaeologists tend to dominate the EAA.

The language issue in European archaeology was discussed by numerous scholars (Lang 2000, Venclová 2007, Bernbeck 2008). Recently Harding (2007) sensibly discussed the positive and negative implications of English as a *lingua franca* in European archaeology. Some archaeologists, such as Bernbeck, are very negative about the dominant role that the English language plays in our discipline. He argues that English forces “non-Anglo” archaeologists “into a pattern of valuations in which the Anglo-American preference for theory over other archaeological concerns reigns supreme” (Bernbeck 2008:168).

We need one or two languages for communication among the thousands of archaeologists of various nationalities. Presently English is the dominant language in scientific fields, thus it is not surprising that it became the most commonly used language by archaeologists. Before World War II German was the dominant language in central, eastern, and northern Europe, but its importance has

decreased since 1945. Ideally English, French, and German could be the three official languages, but since most young Europeans study English as the first foreign language, the three-language solution is unrealistic. European 15–24-year-olds “are five times more likely to speak English as a foreign language than either German or French” according to a Eurobarometer survey (*The Economist*, Feb. 14–20, 2009, p. 64). If archaeologists want to reach a wider audience in the first decade of the twenty-first century they need to publish in English. If there is a choice for archaeologists to publish in German or English, they should choose English. Almost all German archaeologists know English, but only a small percentage of the Anglo-American archaeologists know German. Great ideas can be published in Estonian or Albanian, but at best only a few archaeologists know those languages. Even Slavic languages are known only by a small number of archaeologists in western Europe. If archaeologists wish to contribute to a wider audience their methodological and theoretical ideas or deal with certain topics such as GIS, they need to publish in English. Venclová (2007:213) described how Czech archaeologists deal with a language problem for a wider audience. “English is currently used by the Czechs in international communication in contributions on theory, informatics, spatial and landscape archaeology, and of course, bioarchaeology, partly even in medieval or post-medieval archaeology. For other fields, German is traditional and quite common and French may be used for some aspects of Iron Age archaeology.” Naturally, Czech is used in many publications.

Since the 1960s over 130 Americans have conducted archaeological research in Europe and they have generally had a positive impact (Milisauskas et al. 2010). Americans usually do not conduct research within the framework of national archaeologies in Europe. They are aware of national archaeologies, but frequently apply research models from other continents or regions such as Africa or Mesoamerica. Americans are active participants in various archaeological conferences in Europe and most of them belong to the European Association of Archaeologists.

We can assume that in the future the new generation of archaeologists will be more pan-European in their outlook. There will be much more cooperation and interaction among archaeologists. At present European Union is supporting heritage studies with large sums of money. The generosity of the European Union will probably decrease toward archaeology in the future.

Hopefully, the European archaeological community will remain multivocal and national, and regional traditions will not disappear in the future. Thus, there will continue to be different versions of the European past; only in a totalitarian system can there be one version. This is clearly expressed by a Latvian archaeologist Sne (1999:110) “The past gets its meaning in our interpretations of it, so it is up to us to create pasts, not the past.” European archaeology is entering its golden age in the twenty-first century; archaeology can be practiced at local, national, and international levels (Bartu-Candan 2008). The “Archaeologies East – Archaeologies West: Connecting Theory and Practice across Europe” Conference in 2000, Poznań, Poland shows how far European archaeology has advanced theoretically and how its participants look at national histories without local chauvinisms (Biehl et al. 2002). With the passage of time, the extreme nationalisms and vulgar Marxism will be just a distant memory.

## References

- Abramowicz, A., 1991, *Historia archeologii polskiej, XIX i XX wiek*. Warszawa-Łódź, Instytut Historii Kultury Materialnej Polskiej Akademii Nauk.
- Anthony, D.W., 2006, Three deadly sins in steppe archaeology: Culture, migration and Aryans, in *Beyond the Steppe and the Sown*, D.L. Peterson, L.M. Popova, and A.T. Smith, eds., pp. 40–62. Leiden, Brill, Colloquia Pontica 13.
- Antoniewicz, W., and Warłowska, Z., 1955, Archeologia jej cele i zadania. *Dawna Kultura* 4:180–184.
- Arnold, B., 1990, The past as propaganda: Totalitarian archaeology in Nazi Germany. *Antiquity* 64:464–478.
- Arnold, B., 2004, Dealing with the devil: The Faustian bargain of archaeology under dictatorship, in *Archaeology Under Dictatorship*, M. Galaty and C. Watkinson, eds., pp. 191–212. New York, NY, Kluwer/Plenum.
- Atkinson, J.A., Banks, I., and O’Sullivan, J., eds., 1996, *Nationalism and Archaeology*. Glasgow, Cruithne Press.

- Balmuth, M., Gilman, A., and Prados-Torreira, L., 1997, Preface, in *Encounters and Transformations: The Archaeology of Iberia in Transition*, M.S. Balmuth, A. Gilman, and L. Prados-Torreira, eds., pp. XV–XVII. Sheffield, Sheffield Academic Press.
- Bánffy, E., 1996, Archaeology and settlement history in the Hahót Basin SW-Hungary. *Antaeus* 22:35–196.
- Bánffy, E., ed., 2006, Archaeology and settlement history in the Kerka valley, SW Hungary. *Antaeus* 28.
- Barford, P.M., 2002, East is East and West is West? Power and paradigm in European archaeology, in *Archaeologies of Europe: History, Methods and Theories*, P.F. Biehl, A. Gramsch, and A. Marciniak, eds., pp. 77–97. Münster, New York, NY, München, Berlin, Waxmann.
- Barford, P.M., Brzeziński, W., and Kobylński, Z., 2000, The past and future of the polish archaeological record project, in *The Future of Surface Artefact Survey in Europe*, J. Bintliff, M. Kuna, and N. Venclová, eds., pp. 73–92. Sheffield, Sheffield Academic Press.
- Bartu-Candan, A., 2008, Beyond the pendulum model in rethinking the archaeology of Europe. *Archaeological Dialogues* 15(1):27–30.
- Becker, C.J., 1985, Archaeological retrospect 8. *Antiquity* 59(227):174–182.
- Bernbeck, R., 2008, Archaeology and English as an imperial *lingua franca*. *Archaeologies: Journal of the World Archaeological Congress* 4(1):168–170.
- Biehl, P.F., Gramsch, A., and Marciniak, A., eds., 2002, *Archaeologies of Europe: History, Methods and Theories*. Münster, New York, NY, München, Berlin, Waxmann.
- Biel, J., 1985, *Der Keltenfürst von Hochdorf*. Stuttgart, Konrad Theiss.
- Bintliff, J., ed., 1991, *The Annales School and Archaeology*. Leicester, University of Leicester Press.
- Bintliff, J., 2008, History and continental approaches, in *Handbook of Archaeological Theories*, R.A. Bentley, H.D.G. Maschner, and C. Chippindale, eds., pp. 147–164. Lanham, MD, Altamira Press.
- Blombergowa, M., 1992, Groby archeologów w Katyniu. Uzupełnienia i poprawki biogramów. *Przegląd Archeologiczny* 39:179–181.
- Bogucki, P., 1993, Between East and West: Archaeology in the new Eastern Europe. *Journal of Archaeological Research* 1(2):145–166.
- Bourdieu, P., 1977, *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Brather, S., 2008, Virchow and Kossinna: From the science-based anthropology of humankind to the culture-historical archaeology of peoples, in *Archives, Ancestors, Practices: Archaeology in the Light of Its History*, N. Schlanger and J. Nordbladh, eds., pp. 317–333. New York, NY and Oxford, Berghahn Books.
- Braudel, F., 1972, *The Mediterranean and the Mediterranean World in the Age of Philip II*. London, Fontana-Collins.
- Braudel, F., 1981, *The Structures of Everyday Life*. London, Collins.
- Buttler, W., and Haberey, W., 1936, *Die bandkeramische Ansiedlung bei Köln-Lindenthal*. Berlin, Walter de Gruyter and Company.
- Chapman, J., 1994, Destruction of a common heritage: The archaeology of war in Croatia, Bosnia and Hercegovina. *Antiquity* 68(258):120–126.
- Chapman, R., 1997, All change? A commentary on Iberian archaeology, in *The Archaeology of Iberia: The Dynamics of Change*, M. Diaz-Andreu and S. Keay, eds., pp. 279–292. London, Routledge.
- Chauvet, J.-M., Brunel-Deschamps, E., and Hillaire, C., 1995, *La Grotte Chauvet à Vallon-Pont-d'Arc*. Paris.
- Childe, V.G., 1929, *The Danube in Prehistory*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Childe, V.G., 1957, *The Dawn of European Civilization*. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd.
- Clark, J.G.D., 1952, *Prehistoric Europe: The Economic Basis*. London, Methuen.
- Clarke, D.L., 1968, *Analytical Archaeology*. London, Methuen.
- Daniel, G.E., 1950, *A Hundred Years of Archaeology*. London, Duckworth.
- Daniel, G.E., 1964, *The Idea of Prehistory*. Hammondsworth, Penguin Books.
- Daniel, G.E., 1967, *The Origins and Growth of Archaeology*. Hammondsworth, Penguin Books.
- Daniel, G.E., 1975, *A Hundred and Fifty Years of Archaeology*. London, Duckworth.
- Davies, N., 1996, *Europe: A History*. Oxford and New York, NY, Oxford University Press.
- Demoule, J.-P., 2002, Archäologische Kulturen und modern Nationen, in *Archaeologies of Europe: History, Methods and Theory*, P.F. Biehl, A. Gramsch, and A. Marciniak, eds., pp. 133–143, 476–477. Münster, New York, NY, München, Berlin, Waxmann.
- Diaz-Andreu, M., 1993, Theory and ideology in archaeology: Spanish archaeology under the Franco régime. *Antiquity* 67(254):74–82.
- Diaz-Andreu, M., 2007, Internationalism in the invisible college: Political ideologies and friendships in archaeology. *Journal of Social Archaeology* 7(1):29–48.
- Diaz-Andreu, M., and Champion, T., eds., 1996, *Nationalism and Archaeology in Europe*. London, UCL Press.
- Dommasnes, L.H., Kleppe, E.J., Mandt, G., and Næss, J.-R., 1998, Women archaeologists in retrospect: The Norwegian case, in *Excavating Women: A History of Women in European Archaeology*, M. Diaz-Andreu and M.L.S. Sørensen, eds., pp. 105–124. London and New York, NY, Routledge.

- Efremov, I.A., 1940, Taphonomy: A new branch of paleontology. *Pan-American Geologist* 74:81–93.
- Fagan, B., 2003, *Archaeologists: Explorers of the Human Past*. Oxford and New York, NY, Oxford University Press.
- Filip, J., ed., 1966, *Enzyklopädisches Handbuch zur Ur- und Frühgeschichte Europas*. Verlag der Tschechoslowakischen Prag Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Filip, J., ed., 1969, *Enzyklopädisches Handbuch zur Ur- und Frühgeschichte Europas*. Verlag der Tschechoslowakischen Prag, Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Foucault, M., 1966, *Le mots et les Choses. Une Archéologie des Sciences Humaines*. Paris, Gallimard.
- Foucault, M., 1969, *L'Archéologie du savoir*. Paris, Gallimard.
- Gaerte, W., 1929, *Urgeschichte Ostpreussens*. Königsberg, Gräfe and Unzer.
- Galaty, M., and Watkinson, C., eds., 2004, *Archaeology Under Dictatorship*. New York, NY, Kluwer/Plenum.
- Gere, C., 2009, *Knossos and the Prophets of Modernism*. Chicago, IL and London, The University of Chicago Press.
- Giddens, A., 1984, *The Constitution of Society: Outline of the Theory of Structuration*. Cambridge, Polity.
- Giot, P.-R., 1987, *Barnenez, Carn, Guennoc. Travaux du Laboratoire d'Anthropologie, Préhistoire*. Rennes, Université de Rennes I.
- Gramsch, A., 2006, Eine kurze Geschichte des archäologischen Denkens in Deutschland. *Leipziger online-Beiträge zur Ur- und Frühgeschichtlichen Archäologie* 19:1–18.
- Grünert, H., 2002, *Gustaf Kossinna (1858–1931): von Germanisten zum Prähistoriker, Ein Wissenschaftler im Kaiserreich und in der Weimarer Republik*. Rahden/Westf., Verlag Marie Leidorf.
- Guidi, A., 2002, An Italian perspective, in *Archaeologies of Europe: History, Methods and Theories*, P.F. Biehl, A. Gramsch, and A. Marciniak, eds., pp. 353–360. Münster, New York, NY, München, Berlin, Waxmann.
- Gurba, J., 2005, Straty osobowe archeologii polskiej w czasie II wojny światowej (próba uzupełnień). *Annales Universitatis Mariae Curie-Skłodowska* 60:257–264.
- Harding, A., 2007, Communication in archaeology. *European Journal of Archaeology* 10(2–3):119–133.
- Härle, H., 1991, All quiet on the western front? Paradigms, methods and approaches in West German archaeology, in *Archaeological Theory in Europe: The Last Three Decades*, I. Hodder, ed., pp. 187–222. London, Routledge.
- Hensel, W., 1980, *Polska Starożytna*. Wrocław, Ossolineum.
- Hodder, I., 1986, *Reading the Past: Current Approaches to Interpretation in Archaeology*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Ivanov, I., 1988, Die Ausgrabungen des Gräberfeldes von Varna, in *Macht, Herrschaft und Gold. Das Gräberfeld von Varna (Bulgarien) und Anfänge einer neuen europäischen Zivilisation*, A. Fol and J. Lichardus, eds., pp. 49–66. Saarbrücken, Moderne Galerie des Saarland-Museums.
- Ivanov, I., and Avramova, M., 2000, *Varna Necropolis. The Dawn of European Civilization*. Sofia, Agato Publishers.
- Jankuhn, H., 1976, *Archäologie und Geschichte, Vol. 1. Beiträge zur siedlungsarchäologischen Forschung*. Berlin, de Gruyter.
- Joffroy, R., 1962, *Le Trésor de Vix. Histoire et portée d'une grande découverte*. Paris, Fayard.
- Jones, M., ed., 2004, *Traces of Ancestry: Studies in Honour of Colin Renfrew*. Cambridge, McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research.
- Klejn, L.S., 1974, Kossinna im Abstand von 40 Jahren. *Jahresschrift für Vorgeschichte* 58:7–55.
- Klejn, L., 1999, Gustaf Kossinna, in *Encyclopedia of Archaeology: The Great Archaeologists*, Vol. 1, T. Murray, ed., pp. 233–246. Santa Barbara, CA, ABC-CLIO.
- Klejn, L., 2001, Kossinna, Gustaf (1958–1931), in *Encyclopedia of Archaeology: History and Discoveries*, T. Murray, ed., pp. 775–776. Santa Barbara, CA, ABC-CLIO.
- Kohl, P.L., 2002, Nation-building and the archaeological record, in *Nation and National Ideology, Past, Present and Prospects*, pp. 184–208. Bucharest, New College.
- Kohl, P.L., and Fawcett, C., eds., 1996, *Nationalism, Politics, and the Practice of Archaeology*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Kossack, G., 1974, Zehn Jahre Siedlungsforschung in Archsum auf Sylt. *Bericht der Römisch-Germanischen Kommission* 55:261–427.
- Kossack, G., 1999, *Prähistorische Archäologie in Deutschland im Wandel der geistigen und politischen Situation*. München, Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Kossinna, G., 1911, *Die Herkunft der Germanen. Zur Methode der Siedlungsarchäologie*. Würzburg, Mannus Bibliothek 6.
- Kostrzewski, J., 1936, Osada bagienna w Biskupinie, w pow. Żnińskim, in *Osada bagienna W Biskupinie w pow. żnińskim. Tymczasowe sprawozdanie z prac wykopaliskowych Instytutu Prehistorycznego U.P. w latach 1934 i 1935*, J. Kostrzewski, E. Lubicz-Niezabitowski, and B. Jaroń, eds., pp. 1–20. Poznań, Instytut Prehistoryczny Uniwersytetu Poznańskiego.
- Kristiansen, K., 2008, Do we need the 'archaeology of Europe'? *Archaeological Dialogues* 15(1):5–25.
- Kruk, J., 1973, *Studia osadnicze nad neolitem wyżyn lessowych*. Wrocław, Ossolineum.

- Kruk, J., 1980, *The Neolithic Settlement of Southern Poland*. Oxford, BAR International Series 93.
- Krupic, E., 2008, Archeologia polska w latach 1957–1975 w świetle analizy piśmiennictwa cytowanego w artykułach publikowanych w łamach “Archeologia Polski. *Archeologia Polski* 53(2):169–200.
- Kunow, J., and Müller, J., eds., 2003, *Landschaftsarchäologie und geographische Informationssysteme [The Archaeology of Landscape and Geographic Information Systems]*. Wünsdorf, Brandenburgisches Landesamt für Denkmalpflege und Archäologisches Landesmuseum.
- Lambert, J.B., 1997, *Traces of the Past: Unraveling the Secrets of Archaeology Through Chemistry*. Reading, MA, Addison-Wesley.
- Lang, V., 2000, Archaeology and language. *Fennoscandia Archaeologica* 17:103–110.
- Lang, V., 2005, Archaeological cultures and ethnic history: Some examples from the East Baltic Iron age. *Interarchaeologia* 1:11–28.
- Lech, J., 1999, *Between Captivity and Freedom: Polish Archaeology in the 20<sup>th</sup> Century*. Warsaw, Arwil.
- Lech, J., 2004, Polish-German relations in archaeology in a short outline: A view from Warsaw. *Archeologia Polona* 42:21–64.
- Leligdowicz, A., 1998, Gustaf Kossinna’s Life and Work: The Polish Perspective. *Materialy Archeologiczne* 31: 125–134.
- Leligdowicz, A., 1999, Gustaf Kossinna, jego archeologia, nazizm i Gordon Childe, in *V. Gordon Childe i Archeologia w XX wieku*, J. Lech and F. Stepniowski, eds., pp. 173–221. Warsaw, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Leube, A., ed., 2002, *Prähistorie und Nationalsozialismus. Die mittel-und osteuropäische Ur-und Frühgeschichtsforschung in den Jahren 1933–1945*. Heidelberg, Synchron.
- Lozny, L.R., 2011, Polish Archaeology in Retrospective, in *Comparative Archaeologies: A Sociological View of the Science of the Past*, Lozny, L.R., ed., pp. 195–220. New York, NY, Springer.
- Malina, J., and Vašiček, Z., 1990, *Archaeology Yesterday and Today*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Marciniak, A., 2007, Central European archaeology at the crossroads, in *A Future for Archaeology*, R. Layton, S. Shennan, and P. Stone, eds., pp. 157–171. Walnut Creek, CA, Left Coast Press.
- Martinez Navarrete, I., 1997–1998, The development of Spanish archaeology in the 20<sup>th</sup> century. *Archeologia Polona* 35–36:319–342.
- Mellars, P., 2009, Moonshine over Star Carr: Post-processualism, Mesolithic myths and archaeological realities. *Antiquity* 83(320):502–517.
- Michelbertas, M., 2001, Amerikiečio žvilgsnis Lietuvos archeologijai. Pastabos R. V. Sidrio straipsnio parašėse. *Archeologia Litwana* 2:144–148.
- Midgley, M.S., 2005, *The Monumental Cemeteries of Prehistoric Europe*. Stroud, Gloucestershire, Tempus.
- Milisauskas, S., 1990, People’s revolutions of 1989 and archaeology in Eastern Europe. *Antiquity* 64(243): 283–285.
- Milisauskas, S., 2000, Marija Gimbutas: Some observations about her early years, 1921–1944. *Antiquity* 74:80–84.
- Milisauskas, S., and Kruk, J., 2008, Reflections on the Olszanica and Bronocice archaeological projects, in *Millennia-Environment*, Z. Sulgostowska and A.J. Tomaszewski, eds., pp. 335–343. Warsaw, Polish Academy of Sciences.
- Milisauskas, S., Thurston, T., and Whitlow, R., 2010, American contributions to European archaeology. *Sprawozdania Archeologiczne* 62:35–63.
- Miller, M.O., 1956, *Archaeology in the U.S.S.R.* London, Atlantic Press.
- Müller, J., 2003, Settlement areas, landscape archaeology and predictive mapping, in *Forschungen zur Archäologie im Land Brandenburg, Band 8*, J. Kunow and J. Müller, eds. pp. 27–34. Wünsdorf, Brandenburgisches Landesamt für Denkmalpflege und Archäologisches Landesmuseum.
- Murray, T., ed., 1999, *Encyclopedia of Archaeology: The Great Archaeologists*. Santa Barbara, CA, ABC-CLIO.
- Murray, T., ed., 2001, *Encyclopedia of Archaeology: History and Discoveries*. Santa Barbara, ABC-CLIO.
- Neustupný, E., 1997–1998, Mainstreams and minorities in archaeology. *Archeologia Polona* 35–36:13–23.
- Novaković, P., 2002, Archaeology in five states – A peculiarity or just another story at the crossroads of ‘Mitteleuropa’ and the Balkans: A case study of Slovene archaeology, in *Archäologien Europas/Archaeologies of Europe: Geschichte, Methoden und Theorien/History, Methods and Theory*, P.F. Biehl, A. Gramsch, and A. Marciniak, eds., pp. 323–352. Münster, New York, NY, München, Berlin, Waxmann.
- Novaković, P., 2008, Experiences from the margins. *Archaeological Dialogues* 15(1):36–45.
- Olivier, L., 1999, The Hochdorf ‘princely’ grave and the question of the nature of archaeological funerary assemblages, in *Time and Archaeology*, T. Murray, ed., pp. 109–137. London and New York, NY, Routledge.
- Parzinger, H., 2002, “Archäologien” Europas und “europäische Archäologie” – Rückblick und Ausblick, in *Archäologien Europas/Archaeologies of Europe: Geschichte, Methoden und Theorien/History, Methods and Theories*, Biehl P., A. Gramsch, and A. Marciniak, eds., pp. 35–51. Münster, New York, NY, Berlin, München, Waxmann.

- Piotrowska, D., 1997–1998, Biskupin 1933–1996: Archaeology, politics and nationalism. *Archaeologia Polona* 35–36:255–285.
- Platonova, N.I., 2002, Panorama otechestvennoi arkeologii na “Velkom perelome” (po stranitsam knigi V.I. Ravdonikas “Za marksistskuyu istoriyu material’noi kul’tury) *Arkheologicheskie vesti* 9:261–278.
- Platonova, N.I., 2008, The phenomenon of pre-Soviet archaeology: Archival studies in the history of Russian archaeology – Methods and results, in *Archives, Ancestors, Practices: Archaeology in the Light of its History*, N. Schlanger and J. Nordbladh, eds., pp. 47–57. New York, NY and Oxford, Berghahn Books.
- Puodžiūnas, G., and Girininkas, A., 1996, Nationalism doubly oppressed: Archaeology and nationalism in Lithuania, in *Nationalism and Archaeology in Europe*, M. Diaz-Andreu and T. Champion, eds., pp. 243–255. London, UCL Press.
- Ravdonoi, V.I., 1930, Za marksistskuyu istoriyu material’noi kul’tury. *Leningrad, Izvestiya GAIMK* 7(3–4).
- Renfrew, C., 1973, *Before Civilization: The Radiocarbon Revolution and Prehistoric Europe*. London, Jonathan Cape.
- Renfrew, C., and Bahn, P., 2004, *Archaeology*, 4th ed. New York, NY, Thames and Hudson.
- Schild, R., 1993, Polish archaeology in transition. *Antiquity* 67(254):146–150.
- Shennan, S.J., 1987, Trends in the study of later European prehistory. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 16:365–382.
- Sklenár, K., 1983, *Archaeology in Central Europe: The First 500 Years*, translation by I. Lewitová. New York, NY, St. Martin’s Press.
- Smolla, G., 1980, Das Kossinna Syndrom. *Fundberichte Hessen* 19/20:1–9.
- Smolla, G., 1985, Gustaf Kossinna nach 50 Jahren. Kein Nachruf. *Acta Praehistorica et Archaeologica* 16/17:9–14.
- Sne, A., 1999, Social archaeology in Latvia: A survey, in *Inside Latvian Archaeology*, Vol. 2, O.W. Jensen, H. Karlsson, and A. Vijups, eds., pp. 89–114. Göteborg, Gotarc Series A.
- Spindler, K., 1994, *The Man in the Ice*, translation by E. Osers. London, Weidenfeld and Nicolson.
- Tabaczyński, S., 2002, From the history of eastern and western archaeological thought: An introduction to discussion, in *Archaeologies of Europe: History, Methods and Theories*, P.F. Biehl, A. Gramsch, and A. Marciniak, eds., pp. 67–76. Münster, New York, NY, München, Berlin, Waxmann.
- Tabaczyński, S., 2007, Polish archaeology in my lifetime. *Antiquity* 81:1074–1082.
- Tallgren, A.M., 1936, Archaeological studies in Soviet Russia. *Eurasia Septentrionalis Antiqua* 10:129–170.
- Tikhonov, I., 2007, Archaeology at St Petersburg University (from 1724 until today). *Antiquity* 81:446–456.
- Torma, I., ed., 1993, *Magyarország Régészeti Topográfia*, Vol. 9. Budapest, Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Trigger, Bruce G. 1989, *A History of Archaeological Thought*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Vasil’ev, S.A., 2002, Palaeolithic studies in Russia: Retrospect and prospects, in *Archaeologies of Europe: History, Methods and Theories*, P.F. Biehl, A. Gramsch, and A. Marciniak, eds., pp. 255–270. Münster, New York, NY, München, Berlin, Waxmann.
- Vasks, A., 1999, Latvian archaeology: Research and conclusions, in *Inside Latvian Archaeology*, Vol. 2, O.W. Jensen, H. Karlsson, and A. Vijups, eds., pp. 3–88. Göteborg, Gotarc Series A.
- Veit, U., 1985, Ulrich Veit, Gustaf Kossinna, und V. Gordon Childe. Ansätze zur einer theretischen Grundlegung der Vorgeschichte. *Saeculum* 35(3–4):326–364.
- Veit, U., 2000, Kossinna and his concept of a national archaeology, in *Archaeology, Ideology and Society: The German Experience*, H. Härke, ed., pp. 40–64. Frankfurt, Lang.
- Veit, U., 2001, German Prehistoric Archaeology, in *Encyclopedia of Archaeology: History and Discoveries*, T. Murray, ed., pp. 576–585. Santa Barbara, CA, ABC-CLIO.
- Venclová, N., 2007, Communication within archaeology: Do we understand each other? *European Journal of Archaeology* 10(2–3):207–222.
- Wallerstein, I., 1974, *The Modern World-System, Vol. I, Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World Economy in the Sixteenth Century*. New York, NY and London, Academic.
- Wallerstein, I., 1980, *The Modern World-System, Vol. II, Mercantilism and the Consolidation of the European World Economy, 1600–1750*. New York, NY and London, Academic.
- Werner, J., 1945/1946. Zur Lage der Geisteswissenschaften in Hitler-Deutschland. *Schweizerische Hochschulzeitung* 2:71–81.
- Wheeler, R.E.M., 1943, *Maiden Castle, Dorset*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.



<http://www.springer.com/978-1-4419-6632-2>

European Prehistory

A Survey

Milisauskas, S. (Ed.)

2011, XV, 493 p., Hardcover

ISBN: 978-1-4419-6632-2