



**TÜBINGER ARCHÄOLOGISCHE  
TASCHENBÜCHER**

**3**

**Peter F. Biehl,  
Alexander Gramsch, Arkadiusz Marciniak (Hrsg.)**

# **Archäologien Europas/ Archaeologies of Europe**

**Geschichte, Methoden und Theorien/  
History, Methods and Theories**

**WAXMANN**

Archäologien Europas /  
Archaeologies of Europe

# Tübinger Archäologische Taschenbücher

herausgegeben von  
Manfred K. H. Eggert  
und Ulrich Veit

Band 3



Waxmann Münster / New York  
München / Berlin

# Archäologien Europas / Archaeologies of Europe

Geschichte, Methoden und Theorien /  
History, Methods and Theories

Herausgegeben von Peter F. Biehl,  
Alexander Gramsch und Arkadiusz Marciniak



Waxmann Münster / New York  
München / Berlin

Die Deutsche Bibliothek – CIP-Einheitsaufnahme

**Archäologien Europas** : Geschichte, Methoden und Theorien

= Archaeologies of Europe / hrsg. von Peter F. Biehl ....

– Münster ; New York ; München ; Berlin: Waxmann, 2002

(Tübinger archäologische Taschenbücher ; 3)

ISBN 3-8309-1067-3

Gedruckt mit freundlicher Unterstützung  
der Alexander von Humboldt-Stiftung

**Tübinger Archäologische Taschenbücher, Band 3**

ISSN 1430-0931

ISBN 3-8309-1067-3

© Waxmann Verlag GmbH, 2002

Postfach 8603, D-48046 Münster, F. R. G.

<http://www.waxmann.com>

E-Mail: [info@waxmann.com](mailto:info@waxmann.com)

Umschlaggestaltung: Pleßmann Kommunikationsdesign, Ascheberg

Umschlagzeichnung: Holger Singowitz (nach einem Motiv vom  
unteren Tor von Schloss Hohentübingen aus dem frühen 17. Jh.)

Druck: Runge GmbH, Cloppenburg

Gedruckt auf alterungsbeständigem Papier, DIN 6738

Alle Rechte vorbehalten

Printed in Germany

PAUL M. BARFORD

## East is East and West is West? Power and paradigm in European archaeology

“East is East and West is West, and never the twain shall meet.” When Kipling penned this famous aphorism in a colonial era, he had in mind the eastern and western hemispheres; but he probably would not have been so surprised to see a few decades later that the western hemisphere itself would be perceived as divided into two opposite camps, and East and West as firmly divided as the difference between occidental and oriental in his day. The organizers of the conference “Archaeologies East – Archaeologies West: Connecting Theory and Practice across Europe” seem to have assumed (to judge from the pre-conference materials) that the former “Iron Curtain” defined a dichotomy between eastern and western European archaeologies, the latter full of theory, the former concerned merely with methodological issues. They are not alone in this conceptualization of European archaeology; in recent years a number of writers have expressed the view that there is a specific range of phenomena which can be treated as characteristic of “eastern European archaeology” (Milisauskas 1990; 1997; Hodder 1991) now emerging from Communist ideological “enslavement” (Lech 1997-1998) and in some way destined to begin to try to “catch up with” the archaeologies of countries further west from which some of them had been “isolated” (e. g., Marciniak / Rączkowski 1991; Kuna / Venclova 1995, 9). The aim of this brief contribution is to examine the emergence in the latter half of the twentieth century of a “western” archaeology and the degree to which it can be compared and contrasted with a distinct “eastern” archaeology and some of the reasons for the differences.

### Civilized and barbarian Europe

An important division which emerged well before the twentieth century was that between the mode of study of archaeology of the areas of the Classical civilizations and that of the barbarian zone outside this oecumene. The archaeology of the classical world was concerned with the imposing ruins of the structures created by literate civilizations, which were societies imagined as very similar to that of the background of the investigator. The studied remains were to reveal the tangible material aspects of Classical (Greek and Roman) or Biblical pasts which lay at the roots of European civilization and culture. In such a situation, archaeology was the handmaiden of history. Here, the main archaeological remains studied were monuments, artifacts and what may be termed “robust stratigraphy” (such as walls, stone paving, etc). Archaeology fulfilled the antiquarian role of a branch of art history being largely conceived as a producer of buried artifacts and relics to illustrate the written records, a concept of its role which was to remain with it for many years into the twentieth century.

It was, however, also these same regions in which we see by the beginning of the twentieth century a particularly significant development of the techniques of field archaeology (largely under the spades of foreign archaeologists). It was in these regions that archaeology began to learn to read the “soft” elements of the buried record in the same way as a written text and gradually the notion of the context of relics in a stratigraphical sequence began to establish itself.<sup>1</sup> It was with the excavations of such workers as Wilhelm Dörpfeld at Hissarlık/Troy and Olympia, Arthur Evans at Knossos, of Flinders Petrie in Egypt, Raphael Pumpelly and Hubert Schmidt in Ashkabad in Turkestan, Giuseppe Fiorelli at Pompeii and Giacomo Boni in the Roman forum that field archaeology came of age. Archaeology was no longer the handmaid of history, but by establishing means of placing events in a sequence and dating them, it began to participate in the writing of history.

In this period, therefore, the archaeology of the European continent exhibits a north-south division, between the area of the occurrence of relics of the Mediterranean civilizations and the area beyond the classical world. The main east-west division emerging in this period was along the Rhine *limes*, dividing the zone which had participated fully in Roman civilization from that which merely came under its cultural influence. It was in the well-dated context of the forts of the Augustan and Tiberian *limes* of northern Germany that the study of coarse Roman pottery gave rise to a new branch of archaeological study (one in which again the Germans excelled and the British learned), as did the study of imports. It was here that decorated *terra sigillata*, for example, ceased to become a mere ornament of a gentleman collector's cabinet prized for its artistic or curiosity value and became an important dating tool for all contexts where it was found. Techniques learned on these frontier sites were to be applied to the archaeology of all periods and areas.

It was the literate classical world that was to provide the contrast to a world to the north and east which had not yet achieved literacy, for which the concept of ‘prehistory’ was coined, but also bequeathed us passing mentions of the external barbarians which was to allow the notion of ‘protohistory’ to develop. It was largely in this ‘protohistoric’ environment beyond the *limes* with attempts to attach labels derived from the ambiguous and scant written sources (together with other techniques such as philology) that we witness the development of the traditional school of archaeology which has become known, following Trigger (1989, 148-174) as ‘culture-history archaeology’. This became typical of the work of a large proportion of European archaeologists throughout most of the twentieth century.

It is worth considering the social role and context of archaeology in this period. All over Europe, archaeology in the first decades of the twentieth century was primarily an elite pursuit which maintained its status as it advanced from being merely the antiquarian hobby of the rich collector. Even the curator of a humble district museum was a respected figure in bourgeois society. In this period though, very few people were actually employed in archaeology. A few museum posts and lectureships (or at a later

<sup>1</sup> This is not to say that these concepts only emerged in these regions. Przemysław Urbańczyk has drawn attention to certain precocious examples of recognition of stratigraphy in nineteenth century Poland. Similar cases can no doubt be quoted from the archaeology of many regions of barbarian Europe.



period places in an academy) were the most the discipline could offer its adepts. An interest in the past was the hallmark of the educated middle-classes and the village vicars and priests, squires and schoolmasters were among the local pioneers of archaeology. In many countries, local and national archaeological societies were created by these people to facilitate their amateur studies of the past (or they formed part of local scientific societies; see Kunow this volume). Many of them carried out valuable fieldwork and published important material and studies. At the beginning of the twentieth century, much of this concerned the antiquarian aspects of the subject, the archaeology of churches and old houses, the study of documents shedding light on local history. The protection of ancient monuments was concerned primarily with the more visible earthworks, megaliths and ruins, the cultural heritage of the nation and a material glorification of its past. Antiquarian interest was concentrated on specific monuments rather than the landscape they formed. 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.

### “Continental archaeology”

There are a number of studies of the state of European archaeological method and theory in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries (see for example, Klindt-Jensen 1975; Sklenář 1983; Trigger 1989; Härke 2000). What they demonstrate is that by the end of the nineteenth century, European archaeology had created most of the basic tools and concepts and defined a number of the themes which were to dominate the whole of the twentieth century across Europe (Neustupný 1971, 35). The twentieth century was to be the period when these tools and methods were applied and supplemented by others drawn from other disciplines, but the main effort was on different manners of interpreting the data produced by fieldwork and other investigations.

Trigger's characterization of the period as dominated by the “culture-historical” approach is intended to imply that it developed in the period when thought was governed by the *Kulturkreise* of the Vienna school, but the term is doubly appropriate, since the main thrust of archaeological thought at the turn of the twentieth century seems largely to have been concerned with defining and reconstructing the history of individual archaeological cultures. With the development of typological dating, anthropology gradually ceased to be the leading model for prehistory, which became an historical discipline.

A characteristic of the period was the interpretation of archaeological material as the physical remains of particular groups of people and not as mere abstractions. Again, this notion developed in part from the *Kulturkreis* model. This tendency has in recent decades been seen as something reprehensible, leading as it may to nationalistic abuses of history. The importance of this so-called Kossinnism (see Demoule this volume) has, however, perhaps tended to be overemphasized in the post-Nazi reaction. Rather than being the cause of nationalism, these trends were merely a reflection of them. The linking of the datable archaeological groupings – now emerging with clarity from the



recognition of patterns in a previously amorphous mass of antiquarian relics with historically-known groups – was an obvious step in the development of archaeology as an historical science. The fact that these groups were seen at the beginning of the last century as the protoplasts of modern ethnic groups is a natural result of the concerns of those times. Those who condemn Kossinnism and related trends ignore the fact that it is only the same tendency to see archaeological remains as in some way contributing to the self-awareness and the cultural heritage (or patrimony) of modern communities which is the principle justification for their investigation (though prone nowadays to evoke mythical and mystical “*Euroahnen*” rather than national forebears – see the preamble of the 1992 *Valetta Convention* for example)<sup>2</sup>. Many accounts of the development of method and theory in European archaeology mention the so-called Faustian bargain between German archaeologists, who in the period 1933-1945 to some extent owed their positions to the support of the Nazi hierarchy and the contribution of their work to the nationalist and racial policies of that regime. Indeed, some (e. g. Hodder 1991) even take it as their starting point. While much has been written on this subject, it seems we are only now beginning to get some balanced assessments of the processes by which such a situation developed (see for example Fettes 2000).

Of more importance to the subject discussed here is the fact that it would be difficult in our present knowledge to divide the map of early twentieth century European archaeology into different zones occupied by various theoretical (or rather methodological) schools. We see that from one end of Europe to the other, archaeologists were using the same kinds of evidence and handling it in the same ways to come to very similar culture-history interpretations. Some authors, in an attempt to demonstrate the ‘traditions’ of the archaeology of particular regions, have tried to define characteristics of local schools going back to the beginning of the century in isolation from or contrasted with that of adjacent regions. One obvious example is the identification by a number of authors (for example Hodder 1991; Härke 1991, 187-188; Härke 2000, 16) of a “German School” which has influenced the archaeologies of neighbouring areas (Bohemia, Austria, Denmark, the Netherlands, but also the areas which now form part of western and northern Poland). Indeed, even the Russian Imperial Archaeological Institute was modelled on the Prussian one. The closer one examines the concept of a “German school” however, the harder it becomes to actually define what it actually consisted of and the more difficult it becomes to draw a boundary between it and other areas. In fact, it is difficult to distinguish on grounds of theory or methodology, for example, German and English archaeology in 1914. There were some differences of emphasis, but on the whole, they share a common intellectual background and aim. The same may be said for example about French and pre-Revolutionary Russian archaeology and many others. Probably what differentiates the so-called “German School” of the first half of the twentieth century from its contemporaries is its thoroughness and good organization with which (in accordance with their renowned national characteristics) German archaeologists accomplished that which most European archaeologists were doing at this time (Härke 1995). It seems equally difficult to de-

2 We should also bear in mind that it was in the period of continued strong development of European colonialism that Childe (1925) set out to discover by archaeological means just what it was that was so special about European civilization which allowed it to fulfil this role.

fine trends characterizing other 'schools' (Scandinavian, Russian, French or Mediterranean archaeologies). The situation was to change in several respects about the time of the First World War; while western and central European archaeology were to develop along much the same lines as previously for several decades more, clear changes took place in the East.

### The "progressive" archaeology in the East

The Russian Revolution was to challenge the existing archaeological paradigms in more ways than one. The Bolsheviks strove to control the past but also to democratize culture (see Tallgren 1932; 1936). As in Orwell's fable *1984* it was also realized early on that in order to control the future, the past had first to be domesticated. The distant past had important contemporary political consequences for both Lenin's and Stalin's regimes. In the first place, the past was supposed to confirm the idealized picture of the development of human society which had been proposed by Marx and Engels (and which was to prove the inevitability of a transition to Communism at the end of the process). Secondly however, an archaeology which at the beginning of the twentieth century was concerned with ethnic origins had to be controlled. The potentially divisive effects of such considerations were an anathema to the Bolshevik's attempts to consolidate the "Soviet nation". These factors created the background for the events of the first years of the Revolution, in which the old Imperial Commission was replaced by a state-run Institute for the History of Material Culture and the position of the old guard was challenged by a group of young ambitious archaeologists (led by Vladislav I. Ravdonikas) who utilized to the full the new opportunities created by the power and ideology of the new regime (Trigger 1989, 216-227). This "Marxist" archaeology was based on the principles of historical and dialectical materialism and represented a complete break with the traditional manner of doing archaeology. These new progressive ideas created a school of archaeological thought which: "in many ways anticipated the 'New Archaeology' [...] it had the same pious attitude towards theory, the same passion for generalization and for abstracting the laws of the cultural process at the expense of interest in concrete, historical events, the same concept for limited comparative typological studies, the same striving for functional definitions and the consideration of phenomena as a complex, the same militant denial of migrations and influences, the same indifference to ethnic boundaries, the same contrasting of itself with traditional archaeology" (Klejn 1977, 13).

There were at least four reasons for becoming an adherent of the new "progressive" manner of doing archaeology; firstly it was cognitively attractive in several ways, in principle allowing the creation of a totally new and pioneering vision of the past, breaking out of the culture-history paradigm to ask new questions of the evidence; secondly (being allegedly based on 'scientific' principles) it was a means for the young scholar trying to make his way in the authoritarian academic world to challenge the authority of the older generation of scholars on meritorial grounds, but thirdly and perhaps in this particular case probably most importantly, it was also more than just a smart career move to pay lip service to an officially-approved ideology in a state

where particular attention was paid to political correctness of the views of all of its citizens. A fourth factor is that when in a state-funded discipline it becomes understood that certain types of projects or project applications expressed in a certain manner will receive a more favourable response, there is often no lack of scholars who suddenly regard those precise questions worthy of closer examination.

The initial period of the functioning of this brand of archaeology was marked by the adherence to the pronouncements of Nikolay Y. Marr, the first director of the Russian Academy for the History of Material Culture (RAIMK). Another factor was the dogmatism of the vulgarized brand of Marxism preferred by the Bolsheviks (Kořakowski 1978) with which it was certainly unwise to enter into any kind of discussion. This Stalinist version of Marxism was to provide the virtually unalterable framework into which history had to fit, and archaeological material was often reduced to the role of providing decorative detail to an immutable dogma. This led to an unfortunate straight-jacketing of the Soviet Marxist archaeology and considerably reduced its value as a manner of investigating the past. Even in the Stalinist period, however, there were some works which used the new paradigms to create a novel and indeed provocative picture of the past, to investigate aspects of society which were totally unavailable to the 'traditional' archaeology fixed in its own straight-jacket of classification and description. There were, however, many imitators of varying degrees of sincerity who were for several reasons not suited to the task presented by the new paradigms.

The use of the new ideology did not, however, entirely replace other research methods. One may also point to large numbers of reports created in the Soviet Union from the 1920s to the 1990s which merely classify and describe in the manner characteristic of the rest of European archaeology and conform to the typical culture-historical mode. Some of these may or may not have a few more or less carefully chosen quotes from the Marxist classics inserted into the introductory chapter and/or conclusion, but the thoughts behind these quotes had little effect on the contents (Anonymous 1996, 4). Several considerations were directly responsible for a suspicion of and ultimately rejection of the value of theoretical reflection which could be thus constrained. The socio-economic thrust of Marxism was found incompatible with the traditional concerns of the culture-historical model which remains at the heart of Russian archaeology today (The later development of Soviet archaeology is presented by Bulkin / Lebedev / Klejn 1982; Dolukhanov 1995; and a series of papers in *World Archaeological Bulletin*, volume 8).

### The "progressive" archaeology in central Europe

Although the new Soviet archaeology of the first half of the twentieth century was noted by archaeologists in the "West" (Tallgren 1932; 1936), there was little impetus to imitate it. A well-known and oft-cited example is V. Gordon Childe whose writings provocatively contain several concepts and buzz-words from Soviet archaeology, but who in the long run actually distanced himself from it. In general, western and central European archaeology largely carried on in their traditional modes until 1945 when (as a result of the Teheran, Yalta and Potsdam agreements), Stalin was able to gain direct

influence over huge areas of central Europe. Due to this, beginning with the ideological offensive of 1948, a variant of the Soviet-style "Marxist" archaeology arose in most of the satellite states.

This would represent a westward shift in the areas of Europe where a "Progressive" ("Marxist") archaeology may be found. The formation of these schools of archaeology was encouraged by the same factors as in the Soviet Union a decade or so earlier. Here the first two factors (cognitive attractiveness and career advancement possibilities for young scholars just beginning their careers) seem to have been the most important. Apart from some selection of academic cadres, there seems to have been less direct political pressure involved, and many scientists seem to have been able to choose not to get involved in the Marxist interpretation of history (for the situation in Poland see Tabaczyński 1993; Barford 1993; 1995; 1997; Lech 1997; 1997-1998).

There were not only regional differences in the inception and application of Marxism, but also in its fate. In general, the "Marxist" element of the archaeologies of central and east Europe died a slow and lingering death. Soon after Khrushchev's "secret" speech at the 20<sup>th</sup> Party Congress in 1956, many scholars in central Europe felt it safe to drop the declarative style of "Marxism" that some of them had adopted in the years of Stalinism, while others now feeling to a certain degree freed from the most oppressive elements of official dogma discovered new interest in ideas deriving from Marxism. In Poland, it seems one cannot rule out the role of contact with elements in western historiography now beginning to find new stimulus in the writings of the two "bearded sages of the Rhine" (Tabaczyński 1993, 76). In other countries, however (such as the GDR and Soviet Union), as in former decades, the practice of declarative quoting of the Marxist classics continued into the last years of the state (Hodder 1991, 5). One gets the impression that for many archaeologists utilising Marxism in their interpretation of archaeological data in the GDR, for example, it was largely taken as a fixed doctrine not to be explored, but which was to be applied "as received".

An analysis of a sample of the literature produced in one of the central European countries of the Soviet bloc in the years 1945-1975 (Barford 1993, fig. 1; Barford 1995, fig. 2) has shown that the number of Polish publications which exhibit any sort of trace of being influenced by Marxism (either by subject matter or treatment) are in fact very small compared with the total output of the period<sup>3</sup>. In this case, we fail to see a demonstration of the typical stereotype of what "eastern European" archaeological output should have looked like. One suspects that similar analyses of the published output from other central European countries would show a comparable pattern.

Despite the use of Marxist interpretations and vocabulary by some central European archaeologists and sometimes declarative citations (sincere or otherwise) from the Marxist classics in archaeological writings, the mainstream of archaeology in almost all of these areas was firmly in the culture-history mould. In several cases we also can detect strong nationalist overtones to this work. The development of Polish archaeology after 1945 (Marciniak / Rączkowski 1991; Schild 1993; Barford 1993; Rączkowski 1996; Lech 1997-1998) is a good example. Two topics in particular reflect this trend: the use of archaeology to investigate the beginning of the Polish state – in par-

---

<sup>3</sup> It should be pointed out that my interpretation of this material has not met universal acceptance in Poland – see for example Lech 1997 together with my answer to his points (Barford 1997).

ticular in the so-called “Recovered Territories” which had formerly formed part of the German state (a process repeated recently with the project of investigating the millennium and events of the year 1000) and the study of the ethnogenesis of the Slavs. Similar tendencies were seen however in other regions. These tendencies were to link archaeology more closely to the discipline of history rather than bring it closer to anthropology (social or otherwise).

### A “New” Archaeology in the West

The *annus mirabilis* of theoretical archaeology in the West is generally agreed to be 1968, a year which saw the publication of the famous Apollo 8 pictures of the earth from afar. These photos became one of the cultural icons of the latter part of the twentieth century – and reflected a new awareness of the global community. It also saw political unrest, the strengthening of the new Left and the publication of two books: the first was *New Perspectives in Archaeology* (Binford / Binford 1968) and the second David Clarke’s *Analytical Archaeology* (1968), which signaled the creation of a divide which was to become deeper between the theory and practice of archaeology. There had, of course, been books on archaeological theory before (notably Childe 1956), but: “from the early 1970s onwards, explicitly theoretical concerns have become progressively further removed, in language, audience and vehicle of publication, as well as in subject matter, from a traditional, empirical non-theoreticized archaeology” (Champion 1991, 131).

Like the Progressive archaeology of eastern Europe, the rise of the New Archaeology in the 1960s was prompted by the attempt to establish a new orthodoxy in American archaeology by a group of ambitious and bright young archaeologists from several universities who challenged the authority of the older generation of practitioners. Through a series of astute academic moves in a relatively short time, they established themselves as the new vanguard. It was a vehicle for the construction of a career in the lack of an alternative structure within American archaeology. As in the case of the “Progressive” archaeology of eastern Europe four decades before, the rise of the new paradigm was as much the result of a typical generation conflict as it was due to the new cognitive possibilities offered by the new paradigm(s).

The development of the New Archaeology should be seen against the changing background of the wider social context of American archaeology. The 1960s in America were a decade of intensive emphasis on science and technology, but also concerns for nature/ecology. It was also an era of intense social change when the mores of the older generation came under especially intensive attack. These all had their effect on the character of the New Archaeology (Trigger 1989). The New Archaeology (Renfrew / Bahn 1991, 35-37; Johnson 1999, 20-33, and 34-84) set out to explain changes in the past using explicit theory to determine the processes effecting cultural change as opposed to merely describing the change as in the culture-historical mode. The latter had been concerned with using inductive reasoning to ‘piece together the past’ from the accumulation of isolated specific data, while the New Archaeology involved generalization and deductive reasoning and urged research design to answer specific ques-



tions and the construction and testing of hypotheses and models. Another aspect of the New Archaeology was the approach derived from the pure sciences which placed emphasis on the use of quantitative data which allowed computerized statistical treatment and the possibility of using sampling techniques and significance testing. This was in place of the purely verbal descriptions used by the humanism of the traditional approach. In contrast to the pessimism of the traditional archaeology (which tended to regard some aspects of society as beyond the reach of the archaeologist) the New Archaeology brought a new optimism to the study of the past.

The New Archaeology (and in its more mature form, processual archaeology) derived from the systemization of various trends already existing in the historical and environmental sciences in America (Watson 1972, 210-213; Trigger 1989, 294-300). As we have noted, there were a number of similarities between the American New Archaeology and the "Progressive" archaeology of the Soviet Union. These seem more likely to be due to convergence than direct influence (Trigger 1989, 291). One of the leading influences on the New Archaeology was the work of Leslie White, based in a materialist paradigm and directly influenced by the work of the same Lewis H. Morgan who had influenced Engels (Chmielewski 1989; Paluch 1990).

The New Archaeology was not universally accepted over the entire North American continent. It was strong in certain centers such as Michigan, Arizona and later Texas. It then spread to other universities, especially in the southwest and west of the USA. Its spread represents the results of a typical series of strategies for the reproduction of prestige in archaeology (Hutson 1998). Even so culture-history approaches still dominate many academic centers, for example in the southeast and northeast of the USA. The New Archaeology was even attacked by some who were formerly seen as its proponents (for example Flannery's Golden Marshalltown parable of 1982). In general, however, the New Archaeology has had only limited influence on the practice of archaeology, in particular that connected with Cultural Resource Management, when the reports prepared in this milieu demonstrate quite clearly that the predominant paradigm is culture-historical.

The new trends were at first barely comprehended in Britain, linked to American archaeology by a common language but conceptually based in a hybrid continental-insular methodological tradition. One of those who precociously perceived the significance of these changes was the Cambridge scholar David Clarke who presents a famously vivid image of the beginnings of the process: "From time to time, as the primitive Old World archaeologist squats on the shore of the primordial Atlantic, a passing current will wash up at his feet the ideograms of a distant civilization – the baneful signs of distant archaeologists. With curiosity and persistence the aboriginal may laboriously run his finger along familiar signs in unfamiliar and difficult constructions" (Clarke 1967, 237).

These new ideas were slow to catch on in Britain. The 'establishment' (most notably among them the editor of the influential journal *Antiquity*) put up a relatively stiff opposition. As time went on, however, the various possibilities offered by the New Archaeology meant that the 'Young Turks' of the American universities soon found their imitators in Europe; by the 1970s the universities of Britain had become involved in the debates between the protagonists of the new and the traditional archaeology, with at first the same results (Champion 1991, 129-134). Clarke's book *Analytical Archae-*

ology (1968) demonstrates the keenness with which new and more sophisticated quantitative and computer-aided analytical techniques were used and amalgamated with ideas adopted from other disciplines, in particular geography (including the 'New Geography'). We see several trends in the early development of British New Archaeology which show that to a large extent the new ideas were being applied to the customary concerns of the traditional archaeology. We therefore see an interest in numerical approaches to the classification of artifacts (e. g., Clarke 1969; Hodson 1968) which was in effect merely an extension of the taxonomic interests of the traditional archaeology. Geographical approaches (Clarke 1977; Bradley 1978) developed from settlement archaeology and interest in distribution maps of the previous generation. Models derived from American archaeology and the results of scientific analysis of archaeological material were applied to the problems at the heart of traditional archaeology (Renfrew 1973). Some work, however, was more explicitly derived from the themes suggested by the American New Archaeology (Clarke 1972; Renfrew 1973).

Scholars in other European countries tried to emulate the academic successes of the processualists, sometimes by adopting their strategies wholesale, sometimes attempting to adapt them to local traditions. An interesting early application of some of these ideas comes, for example, from Turkey (Dinçol / Kantman 1969). With the acceptance of the new paradigms and opportunities they offered, the New Archaeological fellowship had become by the early 1970s a trans-Atlantic one, and then – as more archaeologists from other centers (in particular in the Netherlands and Scandinavia) joined in – a North Atlantic one. It is, however, notable that the movement gained its most obvious successes in those areas of the Old Continent where young academics were able to use meritorious arguments to release themselves from the censoriousness of professorial authority in a gerontocratic system and 'attack the establishment' (e. g., Nordbladh 1989, 25). This is probably the main reason why the new paradigm failed to develop to any great degree in those central European academic centers largely under the influence of the so-called "German School" of archaeology with its endemic authoritarianism rather than any post-Kossinna mistrust of theory (Härke 1995; Bursche / Taylor 1991, 590).

Two countries, Denmark and the Netherlands, had an interesting position in the process of the spread of the new theories: being by the 1960s anglophone in the majority of their foreign contacts, but by tradition belonging to the area under the influence of German methodology, they formed an interesting bridge between continental and anglophone traditions. The effect was not always one-way. Discussions with Dutch archaeologists on Binford's visit to Amsterdam in the early 1980s to deliver lectures on the New Archaeology resulted in their publication in his *In Pursuit of the Past* (1983), one of the more readable of the New Archaeology manifestos.

In central Europe some of the ideas of the New Archaeology found their echo in work being done in the 1960s to 1980s, but it is sometimes difficult to disentangle the precise origin of these trends. The picture in Poland, for example, is complex (for opposing viewpoints and examples see Kobyliński 1998, 227; Lech 1997-1998, 115-116; see also Marciniak / Rączkowski 1991; Minta-Tworzowska / Rączkowski 1996). To some degree the adoption of some of the new ideas was accommodated by their similarity to certain threads of the "Progressive" archaeology of a few decades earlier and still affecting local traditions. On the other hand, any attempt to simply import foreign



models to Polish archaeology wholesale would be doomed to failure due to the completely different conceptual backgrounds of the two traditions. We return to Clarke's vision of the curious aboriginal wandering the shores of the primordial sea of theory. There is nevertheless one attempted synthesis of this type (Kmieciński 1997) which raises some interesting points, but has so far not received much attention in the literature.

The situation is somewhat different further east, in the former Soviet Union, where the literature reflects mainly a paradoxical mix of declarative Marxist orthodoxy and culture-history archaeology. The Leningrad school, however, was to some extent open to a certain degree of western influence (as evidenced by the publication for example of Klejn's famous 1977 article). Some pieces of Soviet and Russian work may seem to be echoes of the New Archaeology, but it is difficult to determine to what degree we are seeing a continuation of the Progressive model (see for example Kolpakov / Vishnyatsky 1990). Dolukhanov (1995, 333) even goes so far as to claim them as a 'single paradigm'. On the other hand, another writer (Anonymous 1996, 4) emphasizes the self-isolation of Soviet archaeology from outside influences and – in a manner reminiscent of the ideology of the "Third Rome" – states: "Beneath a thick layer of Marxism, the Russian school of archaeology has preserved in practice its dedication to fundamental culture-historical values, to which it would appear scholars in the West will also have to return. Fate decreed that Russian archaeology was not merely to be the inheritor of western European traditions, laid down by Thomsen, Montelius, Åberg, Kossinna and Childe, but also to be their custodian during the period of the Anglo-American archaeological revolution of the 1970s. What appeared old-fashioned in Soviet archaeology to Trigger (1989) – preoccupation with typology and culture-historical systematization – is, in essence, classical archaeology which is just as relevant now as it was a hundred years ago."

One may suspect that similar sentiments concerning the superiority of the source-based traditional archaeology over the new-fangled foreign idea may be heard in more than one continental milieu. The prevailing continental attitudes towards the theorizing of the New Archaeology is well-summarized by the apt remark reported by Madsen (1995, 13), that regards a British archaeologist as "a person with a theory looking for data, whereas a Danish archaeologist is a person with data searching for a theory".

In other parts of Europe, the effects of these attempts at comprehension and presentation of the new foreign trends to native audiences were varied, but in general, the introduction of the new trends in most countries tended simply to produce a situation which may be visualized as 'theoretical gardens' inhabited by handfuls of intellectualizing scholars set in a wild forest of empiricist culture-historical traditionalism. It is this restriction of the debate to a few specialists which has meant that the 'distribution' of theorizing is so uneven between the different subdisciplines of continental archaeology (and thus new concepts of this type may be more familiar to scholars studying classical and Mediterranean societies who regularly come into contact with foreign archaeologists and perhaps those studying one or other period – for example the Polish or German Neolithic – Härke 1991, 193; Barford forthcoming). This phenomenon makes any attempts at generalization even within the archaeologies of individual countries somewhat difficult. It is on the continent that we see more clearly the inherent conflict which arose between the traditionalists and the New Archaeologists through

the appearance of critical essays assessing the different approach (Courbin 1982 but especially Courbin 1988, the latter with a new introduction by the author and another by the translator). Poland, too, had its informed critics of the New Archaeology (Schild 1980).

### Postprocessualism

The next development in the creation of a "western" archaeology focused around a number of philosophical traditions which were evoked as a criticism of the New Archaeology (Hodder 1985; Champion 1991; Thomas 1999; Johnson 1999, 98-115). These trends were especially prevalent among the young academic archaeologists of Great Britain (and in particular the centers at Cambridge and Lampeter and also within the framework of the Theoretical Archaeology Group) and were in part due to dissatisfaction with the New Archaeology. They were also a product of prevailing trends in the development of the humanities in that country. Postprocessualism arose in the period of the Thatcher government in Britain, and reflects the intellectual climate of those times. It is also interesting to note that to some extent the tendency owed something to influences from the Continent, particularly French thought and the Frankfurt School of social philosophy (Champion 1991, 134-151).

The postprocessual tendencies (it is not a coherent school as such) had their genesis in the context of the postmodernism which affected many disciplines as a consequence of the major political and economic processes which have taken place in the nations with advanced economies since the mid-1970s. This created new opportunities for innovative scholars in the universities to attempt to rework the theoretical framework of the discipline (see for example Shanks and Tilley's *Re-constructing Archaeology*, 1987). The result of this process was the rise of a new and powerful vanguard of archaeologists-critical of the processualism of the New Archaeology and its unquestioning practice who declared themselves to be "postprocessual" – a term apparently relegating processual thought to the dustbin of archaeological theory as no longer relevant and outdated. The proponents of the new mini-paradigm practiced the same tactics (such as bibliographic exclusion, Bintliff 1995, 28-29) as the New Archaeologists. Again, one of the factors which led to its rise was the structure of the academic community in Great Britain and in particular the comparative intellectual freedom of the younger generation of British scholars compared to many of their continental counterparts (Champion 1991, 153).

Due to the multiplicity of themes and fractions which may be subsumed under the heading of "postprocessual", and indeed the several phases of its development, it would be hazardous to attempt to summarize these tendencies in a few lines or paragraphs (see for example Champion 1991, 134-44 for the early years, and Johnson 1999, 98-115; see also Bintliff 1991; 1993). Postprocessualism is a reaction away from the excessive concern with nomothetic and the cult of science of the New Archaeology which perhaps reflects a growing pessimism about the ability of science to solve the problems of the world (indeed a growing popular dissatisfaction with science itself), and an interest in alternative technologies. One of the themes concentrates on the ac-

tive role of the individual in the formation of the historical record rather than as a passive element in some societal historical process. As opposed to the 'scientistic' approach of the New Archaeology, postprocessualism tends more to an interest in the work of various (often continental) philosophers (see for example some of the papers in Tilley 1990), some of whom have achieved 'guru-status' within the adherents of postprocessualism. But, one may also note that in the atmosphere of academic one-upmanship certain areas of postprocessualism seem to engender, fashions in this have a habit of changing.

Several reviewers have remarked that the postprocessual was not so much an archaeological school in its own right with its own set of themes, but more a reaction to something else which (in the first stages of its development) dictated the themes that were dealt with. Now that the original rhetoric has died down, it can be seen that in the works of many British academics there is not such a sharp break between processual and postprocessual as one might have thought. There are trends in the work of the early 1980s heralding the rise of postprocessualism, just as there are many references to the earlier paradigms in the work of academic archaeologists of the late 1990s. The processual archaeology has also found some defenders in British academe (see Renfrew 1989). The reason for this is not difficult to find. The New Archaeology focused on problems mainly of the nature of archaeological epistemology (how to gain information about the social past from archaeological evidence), while much of the post-processual archaeology has focused on the relationship between archaeology (archaeologists, archaeological interpretation) and the social present. These are all important questions, no doubt, and a suitable subject for academic discourse, but of little real use to the archaeologist in the field or in local government employment. The break between theory and practice mentioned above has become even more pronounced.

Postprocessual thought aims to see the discipline as part of the wider-understood humanities rather than a natural science and thus it has much in common with continental traditions. For this reason it has found a more sympathetic ear (though not full acceptance) on the Continent than the New Archaeology itself. Indeed there have been several important contributions from archaeologists working in the continental tradition. In general though, we find that postprocessual trends (in the sense that the term is used in British archaeology) are strongest in the same European countries which accepted processualism (that is Scandinavia, the Netherlands), but apart from a few isolated works, have found relatively little echo further afield. A particularly good example is the subject matter of the Dutch journal *Archaeological Dialogues*. We find an informative Scandinavian viewpoint on the influential works of Shanks and Tilley in *Norwegian Archaeological Review* (vol. 22/1, 1-54). A very interesting debate on the postprocessual archaeology was prompted by the visit of Ian Hodder to Prague and was published in *Archeologické Rozhledy* 45 (1993, 365-403). Another important view has been provided by the Polish scholar Arkadiusz Marciniak (1997-1998), though both concentrate on Hodder. The latter author has also produced a book which successfully links the new trends with the traditional source-based concerns of central European archaeology (1996) – in this case faunal remains; such works are as yet however rare.

As we have seen, the perspectives of Anglo-American theorizing have very little in common with the primary concerns of continental archaeology. It is not surprising,

therefore, that a common reaction to what some saw as the specific form of archaeological “theoretical imperialism” of Anglo-American archaeology was its rejection or cool reception in many European countries. In France, for example, archaeological theory had for several decades been developing along entirely different lines (Cleuziou / Coudart / Demoule / Schnapp 1991; Olivier / Coudart 1995, 364-5). This was connected with the rise of the *Annales* school (see Bintliff 1991), but also the continental pre-occupation with questions of national heritage and *Kulturgeschichte* (Olivier / Coudart 1991, 365) rather than the type of questions posed by the Anglo-American schools. In Denmark there have been recent calls for a return to the traditional values of Nordic (continental) archaeology (Olsen this volume). We have seen a similar view has recently been expressed in Russian archaeology.

### Heritage “management”

The development of what is now called “archaeological heritage management” (AHM) in at least part of Europe is again a strategy deriving to a large degree from the need to establish a career structure in archaeology. The lobbying in the USA which led to the establishment of the idea of Culture Resource Management and then “conservation archaeology” (Schiffer / Gumerman 1977; see also Lozny 1998) and the ‘Rescue’ years of British archaeology (Barford 1998) used strong western public concern for the environment to create new funding for archaeology and new posts as a reaction to the new perception of the increased pace of the destruction of archaeological sites by post-War development. In the same way too, climbing on the ‘environmental concern’ bandwagon was a useful step in many academic careers. The majority of European archaeologists are now employed in connection in some way with the management of the archaeological heritage, a trend which is reflected in many university programs.

This trend has also meant a change in paradigm from “archaeology as Culture” to “archaeology as Historic Environment”. The archaeologist now became not (just) the discoverer and creator of Culture, but part of the huge conservation lobby concerned with the degradation of the environment and the management of a finite “resource”. In the latter case, the resource being managed was archaeological information envisaged and presented as a matter of concern not to the academic community, but the whole of society. The switch to heritage management strategies in the framework of land use planning has also meant a move away from thinking about individual sites toward a more holistic approach to landscapes and research problems. It has also focused attention on research which can usefully advance our knowledge. The move to developer funding prompted by CRM has also brought new concern for professional standards and accountability to archaeology.

Taking management decisions based on argued presentation and justification has also led to important changes in the way we see archaeological data and the manner of assessing their significance and value. The concept of “management” (arguably initially formulated as a reaction to the attitudes of the developers who since the 1960s were increasingly expected to finance archaeology) implied, however, a stock-taking of the aims and means of attaining certain goals, the selection of priorities and a holis-



tic approach to the research process. The “resource management” paradigm therefore has its roots in the problem-oriented approach of the processualists. The outright rejection of this paradigm in favor of a fundamentalist retentive “conservationist” one (e. g., Kobyliński 2001) is, however, a notable case of the difficulties of adapting the underlying conceptual apparatus of eastern European archaeology to western models even in such a pragmatic area and of attempts to create an overall European model of practice.

There have been considerable difficulties in the application of western models of AHM strategies in the archaeology of central Europe (Barford / Kobyliński 1998). This area had its own traditions of course in rescue archaeology before 1989 (one may mention the huge amount of work done on the site of the Lenin Ironworks at Nowa Huta near Cracow as just one notable example). The organizational and especially economic changes which the political events brought in their wake have created an entirely new situation involving difficulties which require resolution. One of the primary reasons for the difficulties is the persistence of the “archaeology as Culture” paradigm (which is reflected in the organization in the Ministries of Culture of many of these countries of the services responsible for the care of the heritage, but also how many archaeologists perceive their own role). The politics of archaeology in Poland in the past few years have also produced a very clear example of the struggle for power resulting from the considerable financial resources made available to the discipline by the funding of the comparatively large excavations necessitated by the development of a new network of motorways, again illustrating the connection between the prevailing mode of doing archaeology and the creation of power and prestige.

Another name for this mode of doing archaeology is “public archaeology” (Lozny 1998) which draws attention to the social role of the work of the archaeologist and the relationship between the producer and consumer of archaeological data, one of the concerns of the postprocessualists. The relationship between the heritage industry (‘spawned by the new right’) and politics is one of the topics touched upon by Shanks and Tilley (1987; 1989, 11). Once again, we have come back to the use of archaeological evidence for the creation of the so-called “collective memory” of modern communities. Here though the emphasis is being shifted from continuity of actual communities to perspectives relating to the notion of “power of place”. It would seem that in future years one of the keynotes is going to be the way that the public is brought into the decision-making process of heritage management, but also its role as a consumer of the products of archaeological activity. Advances in information technology have to mean the breakdown of the current elitist attitudes of the professional and enforce greater openness of their activities.

### The fate of the “old” archaeology

We have seen that one strategy adopted by eastern European archaeologists to avoid embroilment in or contributing to the state ideology was to restrict their work to the traditional culture-historical (or art-historical/antiquarian) mode of work differing little from that of the nineteenth century. As a result, despite the official ideology, the majority of work being produced was relatively free of any form of obvious theoretical

infrastructure. Whether or not this means that there is “no theory” or “a kind of special theoretical position” (Klejn 1993, 54) is a matter for further consideration. We have seen that even in the heyday of the Communist states, the number of works which actually had a ‘Marxist’ content might be relatively small in proportion to the whole.

The question of the degree to which the countries of eastern Europe had really been “isolated” from “the West” has been much discussed (e. g., Marciniak / Rączkowski 1991; Barford 1993; Lech 1997-1998), and no attempt will be made to summarize this here (see Barford forthcoming). While in the Stalinist period the very real isolation was encouraged from above, and in later years contacts may have been feared by some individuals as politically incorrect, it is clear that isolation was by no means total or even officially encouraged – in fact in some cases quite the opposite. What is clear is, however, that whatever contacts there were seldom resulted in far-reaching general theoretical development in the central or eastern European homelands of the visiting or visited or well-read scholars. The reasons for this are to be sought in the underlying structures of the archaeologies of these regions rather than simply in xenophobic attitudes.

We have also seen that even in the United States and other countries where the New Archaeology succeeded to a great degree in gaining a foothold in academia, the majority of archaeology being done was still firmly in the culture-historical empiricist traditionalist mode. The latter is only slightly influenced by the new paradigms (often only in the form of the use of specific ‘buzz-words’ used in project designs). Much “conservation archaeology” is done in accord with culture-history traditions.

It is the postprocessual school of thought which many outside scholars see as typical of British theoretical development of the 1990s. In fact, among the 200 or so archaeologists employed in the universities, about half have been estimated (Thomas 1995, 349) to be ‘traditionalists’ (that is largely concerned with the extraction, description, classification and compilation of archaeological evidence relating to a particular period or problem). Outside the academic world, in the units and other areas of heritage management which is by far the greater employer of British archaeologists, we find that the proportion is obviously much higher. This picture is supported by Champion’s analysis (1991, 147-151) which suggests that the actual effect of recent theorizing on the way archaeology was being practiced in Great Britain was relatively slight.

The result of this brief overview leads us to the conclusion that the majority of the archaeology being done across Europe still, despite all the theoretical advances of the last three decades, is “culture-history” based in what is generally regarded as the “traditional” or “continental” mode. We find that the processual and postprocessual archaeologies are mainly being touted by a relatively small number of vociferous academic archaeologists based in universities and scientific research institutions. In that, there is in fact very little difference between “East” and “West”. In a subtle and perspicacious analysis of the current state of European archaeology which deserves wider attention, Evžen Neustupný (1997-1998; Neustupný this volume) has identified the characteristics of ‘mainstream’ and ‘minority’ traditions in European archaeology. His proposal is a viable alternative to the “East/West” model, and seems to me to be an exceptionally valuable contribution to the discussion.

## Conclusions

The general conclusion that can be drawn from this article is that it is a fallacy to see an homogeneous western archaeology which can be compared and contrasted with an homogeneous eastern archaeology. The stereotypical picture of "western" archaeology as theory-driven is an oversimplification. Theory is restricted mainly to a number of universities, while the prevailing mode of doing archaeology is firmly based in the culture-history paradigm. Similarly, the stereotype of "eastern" European archaeology as having been straight-jacketed by the imposition of Marxist dogma has also been shown to be an oversimplification. Far from being split into two blocks, we can see that the reaction to various socio-political, economic, intellectual, institutional and organizational conditions in different regions created a wide variety of local strategies within which archaeology has been practiced. The current state of European archaeology reveals a multiplicity of regional intellectual traditions and social factors, interrelating with each other in many complex ways and providing a rich field for many future studies of this subject. We may also consider whether the present lack of an overall consensus of 'how to do archaeology' in Europe is a benefit or a hindrance. Certainly, if certain preconditions are met, frank and open exchange of ideas resulting from a considered comparison of various local traditions will almost certainly lead to a potentially very interesting and fruitful cross-fertilization of ideas.

## Acknowledgements

Undoubtedly, this contribution owes much to opinions formed by discussion around these topics with many other archaeologists, among them one may perhaps single out Professors Stanisław Tabaczyński, Willem Willems, Jacek Lech and Dr Zbigniew Kobylński, Ludomir Lozny, Włodek Rączkowski, Arkadiusz Marciniak, Geoff Carver, and all who took part in the discussion at Poznań. All of them provided food for thought but none of them are in any way responsible for my use of the ingredients and form in which they have been dished-up here.

## Bibliography

- Anonymous 1996: [V. Trifonov] Preface. *World Archaeological Bulletin* 8, 1996, 3-8.
- Barford 1993: P. M. Barford, *Paradigms lost: Polish archaeology and post-War politics*. *Archaeologia Polona* 31, 1993, 257-270.
- Barford 1995: P. M. Barford, *Marksizm w archeologii polskiej w latach 1945-1975*. *Archeologia Polski* 40, 1995, 7-78.
- Barford 1997: P. M. Barford, *Małowiarygodny? Odpowiedź na polemikę pana Jacka Lecha*. *Archeologia Polski* 42, 1997, 233-248.
- Barford 1998: P. M. Barford, *Wielka Brytania: przeszłość Anglii dla teraźniejszości i przyszłości*. In: Z. Kobylński (ed.), *Ochrona dziedzictwa archeologicznego w Europie*. Warsaw 1998, 143-175.



- Barford 2001: P. M. Barford, Forthcoming Reflections on J. Lech's vision of the history of 'Polish' archaeology'. *Archaeologia Polona* 39, 2001.
- Barford / Kobyliński 1998: P. M. Barford / Z. Kobyliński, Protecting the archaeological heritage in Poland at the end of the 1990s. In: S. Tabaczyński (ed.), *Theory and practice of archaeological research. Vol. 3: Dialogue with the data: the archaeology of complex societies and its context in the 90s*. Warsaw 1998, 461-482.
- Binford 1983: L. R. Binford, *In pursuit of the past: decoding the archaeological record*. London 1983.
- Binford / Binford 1968: S. R. Binford / L. R. Binford (eds.), *New Perspectives in Archaeology*, Chicago 1968.
- Bintliff 1991: J. Bintliff, Post-modernism, rhetoric and scholasticism at TAG: the current state of British archaeological theory. *Antiquity* 65, 1991, 274-278.
- Bintliff 1993: J. Bintliff, Why Indiana Jones is smarter than the post-Processualists. *Norwegian Archaeological Review* 26, 1993, 91-100.
- Bintliff, 1991: J. Bintliff (ed.), *The Annales School and Archaeology*. Leicester 1991.
- Bintliff 1995: J. Bintliff, 'Whither archaeology' revisited, pp. 24-35 in: M. Kuna / N. Venclová (eds.), *Whither Archaeology? Papers in Honour of Evžen Neustupný*. Prague 1995.
- Bradley 1978: R. Bradley, *The Prehistoric settlement of Britain*. London 1978.
- Bulkin / Klejn / Lebedev 1982: V. A. Bulkin / L. S. Klejn / G. S. Lebedev, Attainments and problems of Soviet archaeology. *World Archaeology* 13/3, 1982, 272-295.
- Bursche / Taylor 1991: A. Bursche / T. F. Taylor, A panorama of Polish Archaeology. *Antiquity* 65, 1991, 583-592.
- Champion 1991: T. Champion, Theoretical archaeology in Britain. In: I. Hodder (ed.), *Archaeological theory in Europe: the last three decades*. London 1991, 129-160.
- Childe 1925: V. G. Childe, *The dawn of European Civilization*. London 1925.
- Childe 1956: V. G. Childe, *Piecing together the past*. London 1956.
- Chmielewski 1989: P. Chmielewski, *Kultura i ewolucja*. Warsaw 1989.
- Clarke 1967: D. L. Clarke, Review of K.C. Chang, 'Rethinking Archaeology'. *Antiquity* 41, 1967, 237-238.
- Clarke 1968: D. L. Clarke, *Analytical Archaeology*. London 1968.
- Clarke 1969: D. L. Clarke, *The Beaker Pottery of Great Britain and Ireland*. Cambridge 1969.
- Clarke 1972: D. L. Clarke, A provisional model of an Iron Age society and its settlement system. In: D. L. Clarke (ed.), *Models in Archaeology*. Cambridge 1972, 801-869.
- Clarke 1977: D. L. Clarke (ed.), *Spatial Archaeology*. London 1977.
- Cleuziou / Coudart / Demoule / Schnapp 1991, The use of theory in French Archaeology. In: I. Hodder (ed.), *Archaeological theory in Europe: the last three decades*. London 1991, 91-127.
- Courbin 1982 : P. Courbin, *Qu'est-ce que l'archéologie? Essai sur la nature de la recherche archéologique*. Paris 1982.
- Courbin 1988 : P. Courbin, *What is archaeology ? An essay on the nature of archaeological research*. Translated by Paul Bahn. Chicago 1988.

- Dinçol / Kantman 1969: A. M. Dinçol / S. Kantman (eds.), *Analitik arkeoloji*. Istanbul 1969.
- Dolukhanov 1995: P. M. Dolukhanov, Archaeology in Russia and its impact on archaeological theory. In: P. Ucko (ed.), *Theory in World Archaeology: a world perspective*. London / New York 1995, 327-342.
- Fetten 2000: F. Fette, Archaeology and anthropology in Germany before 1945. In: H. Härke (ed.), *Archaeology, Ideology and Society: the German experience*, Frankfurt/M. 2000, 140-179.
- Flannery 1982: Flannery, The Golden Marshalltown: a parable for the archaeology of the 1980s. *American Anthropologist* 84, 1982, 265-278.
- Härke 1991: H. Härke, All quiet on the Western Front? Paradigms, methods and approaches in West German archaeology. In: I. Hodder (ed.), *Archaeological theory in Europe: the last three decades*. London 1991, 187-222.
- Härke 1995: H. Härke, The Hun is a methodological chap'. Reflections on the German tradition of pre- and proto-history. In: P. Ucko (ed.), *Theory in World Archaeology: a world perspective*. London / New York 1995, 46-60.
- Härke 2000: Heinrich Härke, The German experience, In: H. Härke (ed.), *Archaeology, Ideology and Society: the German experience*, Frankfurt/M. 2000, 12-39.
- Hodder 1985: I. Hodder, Post-processual archaeology. *Advances in archaeological method and Theory* 8, 1985, 1-26.
- Hodder 1991: I. Hodder, Archaeological theory in contemporary European societies: the emergence of competing traditions, In: I. Hodder (ed.), *Archaeological theory in Europe: the last three decades*. London 1991, 1-24.
- Hodder / Orton 1976: I. Hodder / C. Orton, *Spatial Analysis in archaeology: models in prehistory*. Cambridge 1976.
- Hodson 1968: F. R. Hodson, *The La Tène cemetery at Münsingen-Rain*. Berne 1968.
- Hutson 1998: S. Hutson, Strategies for the Reproduction of Prestige in Archaeological Discourse. *Assemblage* 4 (<http://www.shaf.ac.uk/~ssem/4/4hutson.html>).
- Johnson 1999: M. Johnson, *Archaeological Theory: an Introduction*. London 1999.
- Kipling 1889: R. Kipling, The Ballad of East and West (<http://whitewolf.newcastle.edu.au/words/authors/K/KiplingRudyard/verse/volumeXI/eastwest.html>).
- Klejn 1977: L. S. Klejn, A panorama of theoretical archaeology. *Current Anthropology* 18/10, 1977, 1-42.
- Klejn 1993: L.S. Klejn, Is German archaeology atheoretical? *Norwegian Archaeological Review* 26, 1993, 49-54.
- Klindt-Jensen 1975: O. Klindt-Jensen, *A History of Scandinavian archaeology*. London 1975.
- Kmiecinski 1997: J. Kmiecinski, *Rekonstrukcja minionych kultur*, Lublin 1997.
- Kobyliński 1998: Z. Kobyliński, Theoretical orientations in archaeology in Poland (1945-1995). In: S. Tabaczyński (ed.), *Theory and practice of archaeological research. Vol. 3: Dialogue with the data: the archaeology of complex societies and its context in the 90s*. Warsaw 1998, 225-258.
- Kobyliński 2001, Z. Kobyliński: *Teoretyczne podstawy konserwacji dziedzictwa archeologicznego*. Warsaw 2001.

- Kořakowski 1978: L. Kořakowski, *Main currents of Marxism. Its rise, growth and dissolution*. Oxford 1978.
- Kuna / Venclová 1995: M. Kuna / N. Venclová, Introduction. In: M. Kuna / N. Venclová (eds.), *Whither Archaeology? Papers in Honour of Evřen Neustupný*. Prague 1995, 7-10.
- Lech 1997: J. Lech, *Małowierni. Spór wokół marksizmu w archeologii polskiej lat 1945-1975*. *Archeologia Polski* 42, 1997, 175-232.
- Lech 1997-1998: J. Lech, *Between captivity and freedom: Polish archaeology in the 20<sup>th</sup> century*. *Archaeologia Polona* 35-36, 1997-1998, 25-222.
- Lozny 1998: L. Lozny, *Public archaeology or archaeology for the public?* In: S. Tabaczyński (ed.), *Theory and practice of archaeological research. Vol. 3: Dialogue with the data: the archaeology of complex societies and its context in the 90s*. Warsaw 1998, 431-459.
- Madsen 1995: T. Madsen, *Archaeology between facts and fiction: the need for an explicit methodology*. In: M. Kuna / N. Venclová (eds.), *Whither Archaeology? Papers in Honour of Evřen Neustupný*. Prague 1995, 13-23.
- Marciniak 1996: A. Marciniak, *Archeologia i jej Źródła. Materiały faunistyczne w praktyce badawczej archeologii*. Poznań 1996.
- Marciniak 1997-1998: A. Marciniak, *Setting a new agenda: Ian Hodder and his contribution to archaeological theory*. *Archaeologia Polona* 35-36, 1997-1998, 409-426.
- Marciniak / Rączkowski 1991: A. Marciniak / W. Rączkowski, *The development of archaeological theory in Poland under conditions of isolation*. *World Archaeological Bulletin* 5, 1991, 57-65.
- Milisauskas 1990: S. Milisauskas, *People's revolutions of 1989 and archaeology in eastern Europe*. *Antiquity* 64/243, 1990, 283-285.
- Milisauskas 1997: S. Milisauskas, *Archaeology in the Soviet Bloc*. *American Anthropologist* 99/2, 1997, 390-392.
- Minta-Tworzowska / Rączkowski 1996: D. Minta-Tworzowska / W. Rączkowski, *Theoretical traditions in contemporary Polish archaeology*. *World Archaeological Bulletin* 8, 1996, 196- 209.
- Neustupný 1971: E. Neustupný, *Whither archaeology?* *Antiquity* 45, 1971, 34-39.
- Neustupný 1997-1998: E. Neustupný, *Mainstreams and minorities in archaeology*. *Archaeologia Polona* 35-36, 1997-1998, 13-23.
- Nordbladh 1989: J. Nordbladh, *Comments on Archaeology into the 1990s*. *Norwegian Archaeological Review* 22/1, 1989, 24-29.
- Olivier / Coudart 1995: L. Olivier / A. Coudart, *French tradition and the central place of history in the human sciences*. In: P. Ucko (ed.), *Theory in World Archaeology: a world perspective*. London / New York 1995, 363-381.
- Paluch 1990: A. K. Paluch, *Mistrzowie antropologii społecznej*. Warsaw 1990.
- Rączkowski, W. 1996. "Drang nach Westen?" Polish archaeology and national identity. In: M. Díaz-Andreu / T. Champion (eds), *Nationalism and archaeology in Europe*, London 1996, 187-217.
- Renfrew 1973: C. Renfrew (ed.), *The Explanation of Culture Change*. London 1973.
- Renfrew 1973 a: C. Renfrew, *Before Civilization. The radiocarbon revolution and prehistoric Europe*. London 1973.

- Renfrew 1989: C. Renfrew, Comments on Archaeology into the 1990s. *Norwegian Archaeological Review* 22/1, 1989, 33-41.
- Schiffer / Gumerman 1977: M. B. Schiffer / G. J. Gumerman (eds.), *Conservation Archaeology: a guide for Cultural Resource Management Studies*. New York 1977.
- Schild 1980: R. Schild, Preface. In: *Unconventional archaeology. New approaches and goals in Polish archaeology*. Wrocław 1980, 7-10.
- Schild 1993: R. Schild, Polish archaeology in transition. *Antiquity* 67, 1993, 146-50.
- Shanks / Tilley 1987 a: M. Shanks / C. Tilley, *Re-constructing Archaeology*. Cambridge 1987.
- Shanks / Tilley 1987 b: M. Shanks / C. Tilley, *Social Theory and Archaeology*. Cambridge 1987.
- Shanks / Tilley 1990: M. Shanks / C. Tilley, Archaeology into the 1990s. *Norwegian Archaeological review* 22/1, 1990, 1-12.
- Sklenář 1983: K. Sklenář, *Archaeology in Central Europe: the first 500 years*. Leicester 1983.
- Tabaczyński 1995: S. Tabaczyński, A future for the Marxist paradigm in central European archaeology? The Polish case. In: M. Kuna / N. Venclová (eds.), *Whither Archaeology? Papers in Honour of Evžen Neustupný*. Prague 1995, 69-81.
- Tabaczyński 1998: S. Tabaczyński (ed.), *Theory and practice of archaeological research. Vol. 3: Dialogue with the data: the archaeology of complex societies and its context in the 90s*, Warsaw 1998.
- Tallgren 1932: A. M. Tallgren, Zur russischen archäologischen Literatur. *Eurasia Septentrionalis Antiqua* 7, 1932, 202-205.
- Tallgren 1936: A. M. Tallgren, Archaeological studies in Soviet Russia. *Eurasia Septentrionalis Antiqua* 10, 1936, 129-170.
- Thomas 1995: J. Thomas, Where are we now? Archaeological theory in the 1990s. In: P. Ucko (ed.), *Theory in World Archaeology: a world perspective*. London / New York 1995, 344-362.
- Tilley 1990: C. Tilley (ed.), *Reading material culture, structuralism, hermeneutics and Post-Structuralism*. London 1990.
- Trigger 1989: B. G. Trigger, *A history of archaeological thought*. Cambridge 1989.
- Valletta Convention: Council of Europe European Convention on the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage (<http://culture.coe.fr/Infocentre/txt/eng/econ143.html>).
- Watson 1972: R. A. Watson, The 'new archeology' of the 1960s. *Antiquity* 46, 1972, 210-215.