



**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

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

ISABEL MARTÍNEZ NAVARRETE

Archaeological thought and practice in Spain (1939-2000)

Preliminary remarks: about the history of science

This article is indebted to various perspectives on the investigation of science (Lafuente / Saldaña 1987). On the one hand, it is influenced by traditional humanistic perspectives, such as the philosophy of science and the cultural history of science. On the other hand, it considers aspects of the program of 'studies of science' (López Piñero 1987), such as the sociology and social history of science¹, including some use of quantitative methods (bibliometric indices).

The argumentation is based on two complementary axes. It maintains that social and political conditions do not determine in a direct manner the academic practice of archaeology (Marchand 1996; Kohl 1998, 242; Farro / Podgorny / Tobías 1999), but, inversely, that science is a form of knowledge connected with the social structure and specific features of a culture. The scientific and personal biographies of archaeologists (Taton 1987) are the result of the intersection of both these axes. Thus, given certain historical conditions, knowledge of these biographies may be relevant for comprehending the structure of the discipline.

Archaeologists, like any other professional groups, have corporate interests and social influences that are often dependent on their connections with political power. But, simultaneously, their survival after revolutionary situations permits the perpetuation of archaeological approaches appropriate to the old regime (Klejn 1993, 16). In turn, the institutions essential for the reproduction of academic power live on through changing historical developments with their scientific activity put to different purposes. Similarly, intellectual traditions (Renzong 1987, 97) and the corporate and affective relations of archaeologists determine their choice and maintenance of a particular theory more than scientific advances.

Conversely, the investigation of science cannot ignore the concrete historical situation that sustains it. The socioeconomic level of a country, the literacy of its population and the external relations of its state are all essential for understanding the degree of institutionalization of archaeology and the specific configuration of universities, museums and centers of investigation, as well as the means of diffusion of science and the breadth and variety of the publications that appear in its libraries.

As a consequence, the article attempts to overcome the tension between internal and external factors in the history of the science (Renzong 1987). This study will show that

¹ Works of sociologists of functionalist and Marxist orientation concerning the scientific community, the position of scientists in the society, and the sociopolitical function of science; investigations on the socioeconomic, political and cultural conditions of scientific activity (López Piñero 1987, 10).

this multidisciplinary approach is essential for understanding the trajectory of Spanish archaeology during the last sixty years.

General features of Spanish archaeology

Spain has experienced profound and contradictory changes during the last sixty years. The first was the replacement of the Second Spanish Republic (1931-1936) after the Civil War (1936-1939) by a dictatorial regime led by General F. Franco. The second was the restoration of democracy after Franco's death (1975) and the approval of a new constitution in 1978 that led to a wide decentralization of the state. Perhaps one of the reasons the Spanish case has been presented in recent books on the relationship between archaeology and politics (Díaz-Andreu 1995, 1996) is that Spain was one of the first European countries after the end of World War II to undergo such transformations.

The most obvious problem in assessing the history of the relationships between archaeology and politics in Spain is the difficulty of fitting that history into the evolution of the country's successive political regimes. Spanish archaeology during Franco's time was not something uniform and immutable (Díaz-Andreu 1993, 80) and the same might be said about the development of Spanish archaeology after Franco's death. On the other hand, the organization of the state into seventeen autonomous regions after the adoption of the 1978 Constitution had a clear and immediate impact on archaeological practice; its effect on theory, however, is only now being felt.

The specific situation of Spanish archaeology just after the Civil War, which was the period of highest ideological control and more intense political violence, illustrates this point as well. At that time, political commitments had clear personal consequences for archaeologists. The careers of some were cut short, while those of others were favored (Díaz-Andreu 1993, 76).

Nevertheless, generally speaking, before the 1970s three factors reduced the impact of these political changes on Spanish archaeology. First and perhaps most important was the continuity in archaeological activity due to the common theoretical and methodological practices of Spanish archaeologists. Members of the profession were few and, irrespective of their political differences, they agreed in all significant respects on how the archaeological record should be interpreted. "The changes in theory, if any existed, were so superficial as to demand no change in practice" (Gilman 1995, 3, 5; see Díaz-Andreu 1997).

Second, archaeology never had a decisive role in Spanish nationalist legitimations, even after the Civil War (Díaz-Andreu 1993, 75). Although Spanish archaeology was an element in all 19th and early 20th centuries legitimations (Ruiz Zapatero 1993, Quesada 1996, Dupla / Emborjo 1991, Guitart / Riu 1989, 28), unlike in other countries the '*españolista*' oligarchy did not use archaeological data to search for the pre-Roman origins of the Spanish nation (Kohl / Fawcett 1995; Díaz-Andreu / Champion 1996). On the contrary, in line with traditionalist historical thinking, the '*españolistas*' defended the essential continuity of 'the Spanish people' as defined by Catholicism and established a trajectory from the Late Roman Empire to the Catholic Kings and the Habsburg empire by way of the Christian 'Reconquest' of the Iberian Peninsula from the Arabs (Salvatierra

1990, 72-73). The claim for the long life of Spanish nation was not based on archaeological sources.

Third, Spanish archaeologists shared a social background that overcame their political differences (Vicent 1994, 218). Most of them – and all of the most visible ones – were aristocrats, capitalists, or influential representatives of the middle class. There were disagreements among them concerning the nature and organization of the state (monarchy vs. republic, centralism vs. federalism), but their economic and educational level placed them in a social position from which most of the population was excluded².

Since political considerations exercise little direct influence on archaeological theory and practice in Spain, factors affecting the composition of the profession are relevant for linking archaeology to its sociopolitical setting (Gilman 2000, 266). The most crucial factor in this respect is the strong state tutelage over archaeological management and academic institutions. That tutelage is a fourth explanatory factor for a continuity in archaeological activity that began from the moment of its institutionalization and persists into the present.

The successive liberal and Francoist public administrations sought to consolidate their interests by defining a historical heritage common to the whole national territory through its promulgation of protective legislation and by its academic recruitment policy, both of which have remained cornerstones of political philosophy and practice until the present day. Thus, the intent and spirit of the first heritage legislation, promulgated in 1911, have been preserved in its most recent revision (the *Ley de Patrimonio Histórico Español*, 16/1985) (García Fernández 1989; Querol / Martínez Díaz 1996).

The Spanish state has recruited new members to its bodies of functionaries by a system of public examinations known as *oposiciones* since C. Moyano's *Ley de Educación*, published in 1857 (Villacorta 1989, 50). The tribunals that make the selections are themselves composed of members of the body of functionaries whose training corresponds to the job in question. This mechanism has survived every political change. The usual state control over officials was – and is – based on the subversion of the mechanism by selecting tribunals favorable to its interests (Ruiz Zapatero 1991, 6). That subversion – together with the patronage that is an essential feature of Spanish political, academic, social and cultural life – reinforces the general connection between social and political interest groups and the academic institutions in which their members establish themselves (Gilman 1995, 5; 2000, 266).

The *oposiciones* are particularly important in universities because these are (with only a few exceptions) public institutions and because of the relatively small number of professors and their social prestige. These factors are even stronger in the case of archaeology. Public universities are uniquely responsible for the training of archaeologists and consequently for the reproduction of archaeological theory and practice.

Two final points are necessary to complete this summary of the general trends of Spanish archaeology: 1) its inclusion in faculties of philosophy, arts and letters, history, or geography; 2) the dominant role played by prehistoric archaeology (Classical, Medieval and

2 In 1940, 23.1 % of the population of ten or more years of age was illiterate and in 1950, 14.2 % though the regional differences were very strong: in the southern half of Spain between 30-50 % of the population was net illiterate (Viñao 1990; Moreno 1992, 115).

other archaeologies formed only a minor part of university departments). Thus, the leading role of prehistorians in the discipline's methodological modernization and (of course) the fact that I am myself a prehistorian explain why I focus on that historical subdivision of archaeology to talk about archaeological practice, its methodologies and theories.

Archaeological thought and practice

In any science, theoretical production is a minority activity. The positivist conception of prehistory that pervades archaeological practice in most European countries reinforces that trend. Few archaeologists, western or eastern, were concerned with the methodological, theoretical and ideological principles they used to understand history (Hodder 1991). Very few considered the education and background of the observer (Böhm 1953, 2-3 in Furmanek 1980, 117) as additional factors for that comprehension.

As far as I know, there were no Spanish representatives among the few pioneers who pointed out that archaeological science is not a neutral matter. Before the late 1970s, with very few exceptions, archaeology oscillated between cultural history and antiquarianism. A not very rigorous empirical methodology organized archaeological materials. Archaeological practice was centered on collecting and on poorly controlled excavations; it was elitist in its execution and in its dissemination. This situation was the result of the country's slow recovery after the Civil War and of an international context defined by the effects of World War II. This panorama has changed markedly during the last two decades due to the confluence of functional and Marxist critiques of the inherited disciplinary traditions with the political change in the country.

Interest in the divide between theory and practice became an identifiable trend in Spanish archaeology as a result of the continuing development of archaeologists' self-consciousness about the development of their discipline (e. g. Rivera Dorado 1972; 1981; Alcina 1975; 1991; Vicent 1982; 1984; 1985; Chapa 1988; 2000; Martín de Guzmán 1988; Martínez Navarrete 1989, 57-120; 1990; 1998; Arce / Olmos 1991; Hernando 1992; Ruiz-Zapatero 1993 a; Ruiz-Zapatero / Álvarez-Sanchís 1995; Díaz-Andreu / Mora 1995; Mora / Díaz-Andreu 1997; Oria Segura 2000, 11). Marxists (Gilman 1988; 2000; Ruiz Rodríguez / Molinos Molinos / Hornos Mata 1986; Ruiz Rodríguez 1989; 1993; Vicent 1990; 1994; Díaz del Río 2000) have played a determining role in the recognition of the need to make explicit scientific premises, hypotheses and methods. V. Lull's research team at the *Universidad Autónoma de Barcelona* has been unceasingly active in this respect (Lull 1988; 1991; González Marcén / Risch 1990; Lull / Micó / Montón / Picazo 1990; Risch in Vázquez Varela / Risch 1991; Castro / Micó / Lull 1996; Lull / Micó 1997, 109; 1998; Micó 1998).

In tandem with this theoretical self-consciousness, there have been fundamental changes in the organization of archaeology. Since 1978, regional autonomous governments have created their own archaeological administrations with their own policies. As a result, salvage archaeology has become dominant. The number of regional universities throughout Spain has sharply increased and competition for financial resources to conduct archaeological research has become much more open.

The diversity of current alternatives has provoked very diverse reactions among archaeologists: 'identity crisis', active resistance, negotiation, immobilism and adaptations (at times very successful). But what deserves emphasis here is how the spectrum of theoretical and practical alternatives intensified reflection on archaeology as a form of knowledge and as a professional activity. That concern has become so widespread in Spain during the last two decades that today it is commented upon in monographs on excavations and on synthetic works treating specific periods and regions (Micó 1998, 20). Allusions and references are made that recall, albeit inversely, the strategies of Soviet archaeologists who felt compelled to cite the Marxist classics in order to protect their freedom of thought (see Klejn 1993, 128). In other words, theory has become fashionable in Spanish archaeology. This represents a totally new development in Spanish archaeology.

The transition from an archaeology that was monolithic in its objectives, methodology and social support to a competition among conceptualizations of archaeological practice supported by very diverse social agents cannot be understood without considering the recent history of Spain. The country began this period as a society with a pronounced rural base, with ideological control exercised by the Catholic Church and with a centralized and authoritarian state controlled by monied interests. At present, except perhaps for its degree of decentralization, Spain is a state whose social, political and economic characteristics are homologous with those of the other countries in the European Union.

A centralized and isolated archaeology: the post-war stagnation of Spanish archaeology (1939-1959)

This period comprises the interval between the end of the Civil War and the late 1950s, when a new technocratic policy led to an opening of the country towards the world and to economic expansion (Spain-U.S.A. treaty, 1953; stabilization program, 1959; tourism; emigration). The so-called 'grey years' of Spanish history express the catastrophic consequences of the Civil War in every aspect of life³. The international context after World War II did not help to improve the Spanish situation.

Individual purge and institutional continuity after the civil war

The Franco regime suppressed institutions of regional self-government and the centers of debate these had fostered, but maintained other organizations (the network of provincial museums, universities) once their membership had been purged. All state employees had to pass review to exonerate their responsibilities with respect to the republican government and to affirm their loyalty to the new regime (Moure 1996, 39, 42). Archaeologists such as J. M. Barandiarán and P. Bosch Gimpera, who had directed prehistoric research in the Basque country and Catalonia respectively, became exiles. It may be debatable whether the former's archaeological and ethnographic theory and practice reflected

³ It was only in the 1950s that the country returned to the economic conditions of 1936 (Seco Serrano 1974, 384).

Basque nationalism (Altuna 1990, 14,16), but the latter's commitment to Catalan autonomy and distinctiveness was explicit (Aymerich / Aymerich / Batista-Noguera 1993, 62).

The case of Bosch Gimpera is especially relevant for evaluating the nature of the relationship between politics and archaeology in this period. He was one of the most important Spanish archaeologists of the 1930s and probably the best known abroad as a result of holding offices in UNESCO (1948-1952) and the UISPP (1953-1966) (Alcina 1998, 137-138). He had developed the Catalan *Generalitat's* global and coherent archaeological heritage policies and had served as its minister of justice (1936) (Dupré / Rafel 1991, 174). After the war Francoist policy and, later on, his own personal beliefs⁴ and career abroad made it impossible for him to come back to Spain. In any event, he maintained great influence on Spanish archaeology thanks to his students, A. del Castillo and, most importantly, L. Pericot. It was Bosch Gimpera, who introduced the latter to the international scientific and academic world (Cebrià 1999, 12; Tarradell 1970, 32-34). Pericot always tried to maintain a balance between the leaders of official Spanish archaeology, M. Almagro Basch and J. Martínez-Santa Olalla, both of them students of H. Obermaier⁵ and exiles like Bosch Gimpera himself (Cebrià 1999, 13)⁶. Almagro Basch (who took over Bosch Gimpera's professorship at the University of Barcelona and his directorship of the Museum of Archaeology in Barcelona) and Pericot became the most important figures in Catalan and Spanish archaeology. Their ongoing collaboration on various projects in the following years had a positive impact on Catalan and Spanish archaeology.

The administration of Spanish archaeology was centralized through the *Comisaría General de Excavaciones Arqueológicas* (CGEA 1939-1956), "a poorly functioning state institution supported by provincial and local branches ... virtually without official economic support" (Díaz-Andreu 1993, 76-77). Its director from 1939 to 1956 was Martínez Santa-Olalla, who maintained control over its operations by employing amateurs rather than fellow academics (Beltrán 1988, 76 contra Díaz-Andreu 1993, 77).

In Catalonia, Almagro Basch took advantage of the organization established by Bosch Gimpera. This organization relied on a strict control over the territory through local amateurs and soi-disant experts. He replaced them by *comisarios locales* overseen successively by *comisarios provinciales* and a *delegado de zona*. Almagro Basch's role was to purge the institutions founded by Bosch Gimpera of their regionalist aspirations so as to use them as a national and international platform for Francoist service (Dupré / Rafel 1991, 175). His energetic leadership combined programmatic declarations with a profound pragmatism and opportunism that propelled archaeological activity effectively under the difficult conditions that existed after the Civil War (Dupré / Granados / Junyent / Nieto / Rafel / Tarrats 1986, 64).

4 Some of his colleagues thought Bosch Gimpera was "in voluntary exile" (Jordá Cerdá 1980, 277): "...in Spain ... we always were waiting for him and invited him to return..." (Almagro Basch 1974, 7).

5 From 1922 to 1936 Obermaier held the first chair of prehistory (the 'Primitive History of Mankind') to be established in Spain, at the Central (now Complutense) University in Madrid.

6 Although Bosch Gimpera was stripped of his Spanish citizenship by the new regime, he had international recognition as a representative of Spanish Republican archaeology thanks to his position at UNESCO (Palol 1994, 13).

Continuity with pre-Civil War academic institutions is also indicated by I. Ballester's ongoing direction of the important center for prehistoric research in Valencia (Martí Oliver / Villaverde Bonilla 1997, 159-160), by Barandiarán's return from exile in 1953 to resume the leadership of Basque archaeology (Díaz-Andreu 1993, 80) and by Almagro Basch's replacement by Bosch Gimpera's pupil, Pericot, when the former moved to the chair in Madrid in 1954.

To conclude, although the post-Civil War period saw changes in the handful of persons in charge of Spanish archaeological institutions, the common background of the new leaders and the training they had received before the war, the limited character of intellectual debate and the rudimentary state of research caused a substantial continuity in the theory and practice of archaeology (see Martí Oliver / Villaverde Bonilla 1997, 159).

Archaeological theory in the post-civil war period

The 'concept of Prehistory' characteristic of the national Spanish tradition combines an idealist approach to historical causation with the adoption of a positivist methodology (Gilman 1995, 2). The former comes basically from the cultural-historical approach of German anthropogeographers (F. Ratzel, W. Schmidt...) that pervaded the theory and practice of Spanish pre- and protohistory (Pasamar / Peiró 1991, 75-76) without competition until the mid-1970s. The positivism has French roots (Sackett 1991) connected with Palaeolithic research in Cantabria financed by Prince Albert I of Monaco (Moure 1993).

The German School had an enduring influence because both the new organizers of Spanish archaeology and their masters had, as part of their training, been awarded scholarships to study in Germany or Austria (Díaz-Andreu 1993, 75; 1995 a; 1996 a). German influence was reinforced by the prestigious scholars (such as A. Schulten) who worked in Spain (Grünhagen 1979; Marcos Pous 1993, 80). That German influence is shared with the archaeological traditions of other European and American countries (Vázquez León 1999). Even Childe, whose historical optimism and critical perspective are generally recognized (McNairn 1980, 106), was once influenced by this perspective (Trigger 1998, 358; Veit 1984). It is pointless to try to give a specific derivation to ideas which formed part of a general climate of opinion. The strong attraction of spiritualist and diffusionist theories among European intellectuals "deeply suspicious of evolutionist ideologies and of a progressive image of history" (Pasamar / Peiró 1991, 75; Fontana 1982, 132-133) was nearly universal.

The syntheses of Obermaier (Obermaier 1916), Bosch Gimpera (Bosch Gimpera 1932) and Pericot (Pericot 1934) characterize this ideological background. These authors taught the immediate post-civil war generation of archaeologists and their books were assigned in university courses well into the 1950s. Their content reflects the diversity of influences that were combined in the definition of archaeological cultures. Thanks to German ethnography the initial conception of chronological periods as a unilineal evolutionary sequence of morpho-technological 'type fossils' was soon superseded. By using ethnographic parallels, Obermaier (Obermaier 1926, 17-20) converted prehistory into palaeoethnology. To do this he combined the contributions of both Adolph Bastian and the cultural-historical school. Thanks to his closeness to the latter, he "essentially equated

culture with race and 'explained' particular archaeological phenomena in any given region with reference to supposed 'invasions' or 'migrations'" (Straus 1996, 196).

For their part, Bosch Gimpera and Pericot reduced the racial component of cultural groups, calling attention to the persistence of previous populations and to the importance of crossbreeding. The racial aspect of ethnicity was counterbalanced, furthermore, by living conditions and other economic factors. These, however, did not contribute to cultural change, which was attributed to movements of whole peoples, colonists and mercenaries (Bosch Gimpera 1932, XIII-XV). This framework was completed by a political, narrative historiography based on Schulten" (Pasamar / Peiró 1991, 75).

I stress that the naturalist component of ethnic groups is a descriptive trait that is on a level with cultural traits as pottery or funerary ritual. These authors did not support racial explanations. Obermaier's double role as geologist and Catholic priest⁷ helped reduce the prejudices of the more fundamentalist Catholics against the study of fossil man. The rejection of racial determinism by Obermaier and Bosch Gimpera is coherent with their idealist approach to historical causation. At the same time, their palaeoethnology involved profound incoherences: on the one hand, ancient cultures were thought to share a universal, unchanging way of life; on the other hand, their creativity in developing new artifact styles formed the basis for their classification (Vila 1998, 76).

The Francoist victory had two main effects on the matter. It reinforced the culturalist goals of the archaeology of the time, which agreed perfectly well with the nationalist and traditionalist ideological basis of the regime. It also prevented any possibility for a different development (Vicent 1994, 218): the evolutionist and materialist alternatives that had arisen in the nineteenth century were excluded from the academy because of their political associations (Estévez / Vila 1999).

R. Menéndez Pidal (Menéndez Pidal 1947) in his emblematic *Historia de España* (Gilman 1988, 47-48) – that included chapters by Almagro Basch, Castillo and J. Maluquer de Motes⁸ – proposed a 'history of human spirit' that resulted in a second paradox: the adoption of a positivist methodology to studying that unobservable topic. The procedure chosen was to interpret taxonomic categories in historical and cultural terms (Vicent 1982, 23, 30). The absence of any criteria that would restrain such interpretations multiplied the opportunities for subjective speculation, however. The use of *ad hoc* explanations was characteristic both of how the archaeological record was developed (in particular with respect to the choice of parallel cases) and of how it was interpreted historically and anthropologically. At the same time, arguments from authority were used indiscriminately as a means of corroboration, a practice that attained the level of methodology thanks to the force of patronage in intellectual life (see below).

Toward the end of this period, Almagro Basch (Almagro Basch 1957, 72, 80) published one of its few doctrinal pronouncements. In it he conceded to 'natural science' veracity in the analysis and exposition of facts and urged historians and ethnologists to use its procedures. At the same time he denied the possibility of studying the human phenomenon, defined as a 'way of life', in a rational manner. The specificity of these 'cultures' or 'circles' led him to "confess to an uncomfortable predicament ...: we know well what Universal

7 He served for a time as chaplain to the sixteenth Duke of Alba.

8 A student of Almagro Basch and Pericot.

History is not, but we do not know how to write about what we have managed to learn about our past". In full accord with Cold War anti-communism, the only choice was to struggle "against the error represented by other, false historical constructions" (Almagro Basch 1957, 145-146).

Patronage and academic politics

The ideological, political and theoretical-methodological context was supported by an authoritarianism that also preceded the Francoist regime. The respect of the students for the authority of their master would, in turn, commit the latter to promoting their careers. There was little difference between 'authority' and 'authoritarianism' irrespective of the specific political position of the master. The concentration of responsibility in the hands of a dozen archaeologists may seem to us disproportionate today, but it responded to "the discipline's situation in this period, with its scarcity of professionals with modern training" (Dupre / Rafel 1991, 175) and its financial and infrastructural deficiencies.

This concentration had positive effects. It checked the provisionalism of archaeological activity by requiring institutional cooperation that would make best use of the scarce means available and by giving greater public visibility to what was then very much a minority enterprise (Marcos Pous 1993, 86, 93). Its main negative effect was an excessively personalized leadership that lent itself to administrative confusion and made institutions dependent on the academic careers of their directors and on the plans these leaders had for them after their retirement (see below).

The restriction of scientific discussion promoted by the political situation exacerbated the personalism resulting from the already mentioned force of patronage in Spanish life. The attitude towards Bosch Gimpera exemplifies this. According to one of Pericot's collaborators, his attachment to the unchanging interpretations of his old teacher Bosch Gimpera was "a tribute rendered" to their friendship (Jordá Cerdá 1980, 278). Pericot himself explicitly expressed his "respect and veneration" for his master (Pericot 1976, 36). Generally speaking, the importance given to the work of Bosch Gimpera in the Catalan-speaking archaeological community can be more emotional than reasoned (Cebrià 1999, 10). His importance as a political symbol impedes critical distancing (Martínez Navarrete 1989, 226).

The history of the archaeological research in the *Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas* (CSIC, Higher Council for Scientific Research) (1939-present) shows the interrelations between personal and institutional trajectories and the process of scientific specialization (Cacho Quesada / Martínez Navarrete 2000). This institution was founded by combining the facilities and material of the *Fundación Nacional para la Investigación Científica* (National Foundation for Scientific Research, 1931) with that of the defunct *Junta para la Ampliación de Estudios e Investigaciones Científicas* (Board for the Broadening of Study and Scientific Research, 1907). In 1939, when Almagro Basch replaced Bosch Gimpera as director of the Museum of Archaeology of Barcelona, he was appointed as director of the Barcelona branch of the *Instituto 'Diego Velázquez' de Arte y Arqueología* (CSIC), located in the Museum. In 1951 the Instituto Diego Velázquez split, with A. García Bellido, another of Obermaier's students, becoming the director of the new *Instituto de Arqueología y Prehistoria 'Rodrigo Caro'*. Almagro Basch became its subdi-

rector in Madrid and director of its Department of Prehistory in Barcelona (García y Bellido 1951, 165). In 1954 Almagro Basch obtained Obermaier's former chair in Madrid. His transfer implied transferring the seat of the prehistoric branch (Ripoll Perelló 1984, 7-10). In 1956 Almagro Basch became curator of the *Museo Arqueológico Nacional* and transferred the prehistoric department to it. In 1957 the *CSIC* split its archaeological institute into the *Instituto Español de Prehistoria* and the *Instituto Rodrigo Caro de Arqueología*, directed by Almagro Basch and García Bellido respectively⁹. Thanks to Almagro Basch's trajectory, the *CSIC*'s holdings of books on prehistory became incorporated to the library of the museum, which thus became (and still is) the most important Spanish library in prehistory.

The libraries were the fundamental and generally the only scientific infrastructure in the humanities, so the first initiative after founding an institution – be it in a museum, university, research center, or local institute – was its provision. Then a journal was published to guarantee through its exchange with analogous publications the growth and updating of the library, as well as the national and international dissemination of the research of the members of the institution. Its director was the editor. The thirteen journals and series that were founded in this period are ranked among the 48 most frequently cited in a recent publication (Rodríguez Alcalde / Sánchez Nistal / Martínez Navarrete / San Millán 1996, 58).

In 1945 A. Beltrán organized the *Congreso Arqueológico del Sudeste Español (CASE)* (Beltrán 1947, 5; 1988 72-76). In 1949 these became *Congresos Nacionales de Arqueología* and have met every other year since. For many years these meetings were the only point of general contact and their proceedings constituted the chronicle of Spanish archaeology (Ruiz-Zapatero 1993 a, 49-50). Almagro Basch, Pericot and Beltrán also organized summer courses of prehistory and archaeology that combined methodological and technical training with activities for archaeological popularizing (Maluquer de Motes 1954, 214-215; 1960, VIII). In terms of training archaeologists and promoting research, the most important of these were the 'International Courses of Prehistory and Archaeology' at Ampurias, begun by Almagro Basch in 1947 in collaboration with the *Istituto Internazionale di Studi Liguri* (Bordighera). The latter's director, N. Lamboglia, is credited with introducing the 'Wheeler method' of stratigraphic excavation to Spain (Dupré / Granados / Junyent / Nieto / Rafel / Tarrats 1986, 65).

By this time criticisms were emerging of the system of archaeological excavations overseen by Martínez Santa Olalla from the *CGEA* (Díaz-Andreu 1993, 77). At the IV *CASE*, Castillo denounced the situation, warning he did not seek to promote "the split that divides Spanish archaeologists" (Castillo 1949, 72): field archaeology was undertaken by untrained excavators operating alone; excavations were not well recorded (photographs, field diaries, sieving frequently were lacking) and often did not reach the bottom of the site; the huge amount of objects recovered were stored without restoration or publication. Dele-

9 Their successors, the *Dpto. de Historia Antigua y Arqueología* and the *Dpto. de Prehistoria*, are still the most important branches of the *CSIC* specifically dedicated to archaeological research, and their journals, *Trabajos de Prehistoria* (1960) (Rodríguez Alcalde / San Millán / Sánchez Nistal / Chapa Brunet / Martínez Navarrete / Ruiz Zapatero 1993) and *Archivo Español de Arqueología* (1939) have established themselves as points of reference in their respective specialities (Chapa 2000).

gates sent Castillo's declaration to the *Ministro de Educación Nacional* after that congress and the following one. It proposed the establishment of a collective organism for the management of archaeological excavations that would promote teamwork between archaeologists and other scientists at a limited number of important sites. Excavations would be suspended until existing collections were restored and studied. This was a rationalist project that would have encouraged the training of archaeology students (Beltrán 1950, 25-26).

Pericot (in Castillo 1949, 77) and B. Taracena¹⁰ (in Beltrán 1947, 29) opposed Castillo's proposed national plan because it would not recognize the interest of local scholars in the archaeology of their home districts. Their answer to the modern question, "who owns the past?", was clear: practically anyone with private funds and local sponsorship whose love for their locality would encourage voluntary contributions.

For his part, Martínez Santa-Olalla justified keeping excavations outside of academic control on the grounds that in Spain it was impossible to obtain a degree that would guarantee adequate technical training in archaeology. Only the Ministry – he himself – could authorize excavations (Martínez Santa-Olalla 1953, 6). In the event, the reorganization of the *Servicio Nacional de Excavaciones Arqueológicas* (1956) overturned this conception, by submitting excavations to the mandates of research. The reform dictated that the Inspector General would be a professor of archaeology, prehistory, or art history, that there would be twelve regional delegations corresponding to university districts, that these delegations would also be headed by professors and that provincial and insular delegates would be, preferably, the directors of the corresponding archaeological museums (Dupré / Granados / Junyent / Nieto / Rafel / Tarrats 1986, 65-66). This institutional structure remained in force until the democratic reforms that began in 1975.

International collaboration

The activity of foreign colleagues in Spain as teachers in the above-mentioned summer courses (Cortadella Morral 1997, 554; Beltrán 1988, 85-87) or as directors of fieldwork contributed to reinforcing this professionalization. In 1954, the Spanish branch of the German Archaeological Institute was established in Madrid on a permanent basis (Grünhagen 1979, 143)¹¹. This institutionalized the active relationship between Spanish and German archaeology that had existed before the Civil War. In the same year the William L. Bryant Foundation (U.S.A.), "primarily devoted to research in the Greek and Roman phases of Spanish history", began work (Tarradell / Woods 1958) in Catalonia, the *País Valencià* and Mallorca. Its excavations strengthened links between students at the universities of Valencia, Barcelona and Madrid in subsequent decades (Llobregat 1995, 22, 26). The international, multidisciplinary collaboration that was traditional in Palaeolithic research was renewed in Cantabria (El Pendo) and in Mediterranean Spain (Cueva Ambrosio, Cova Negra, El Parpalló), in the latter area with the first participation from the United States (Maluquer de Motes 1958, 250).

¹⁰ Taracena was director of the *Museo Arqueológico Nacional* from 1939 to 1951.

¹¹ The *Escuela Francesa de Arte y Arqueología* (French School of Art and Archaeology) or 'Casa de Velázquez' was established in Madrid in 1928 (Gran Aymerich / Gran Aymerich 1991, 17).

In turn, Spanish archaeological activity abroad involved two major initiatives, one at the beginning, the other at the end of this period. In 1947 the *CSIC* established the *Escuela Española de Historia y Arqueología* in Rome as a successor to the institute founded in 1910 by the *Junta para la Ampliación de Estudios*. In 1959 the Ministry for Foreign Affairs sponsored the international project that is still the most visible example of Spanish archaeology abroad: the archaeological mission to Nubia (Egypt and the Sudan) was part of the UNESCO campaign to save monuments that would disappear underneath the water of the Aswan Dam. It was important in terms of gaining international recognition for Spanish archaeology and it also obtained concrete results and developed the Spanish interest in establishing a presence in Egypt. Five years of excavation, all directed by Almagro Basch, began in 1960 and resulted in the publication of eleven monographs (Pérez Die 1998, 312-313).

The end of the post-war period

As this period ended, the balance of archaeological activity was unequal. The inclusion of prehistory as a required course in degree programs in philosophy and letters (1955) was a key step in gaining separate recognition for the discipline. In some departments, however, prehistory remained linked to the chairs of ancient and medieval history. In general, field archaeology did not involve stratigraphic controls or detailed recording of data but the number of publications increased. Modern techniques demanding specific laboratories (environmental, composition and provenance analysis etc.) were known only "in theory" and used very occasionally (Maluquer de Motes 1954, 215-216). Maluquer de Motes pointed out the absence of a coordination and organization of archaeologists that could join forces, establish priorities and guarantee that research on fundamental historical problems would continue. His organization of the successive *Symposia de Prehistoria Peninsular* I (1959)-VI (1972) was intended to remedy this deficiency. The organization of the first one broke with previous precedents: twelve lectures were commissioned that would address common problems, thanks to "a certain uniformity among the participants" (Maluquer de Motes 1960, VI). Significantly, Pericot, "the master of us all ... and unquestionably the leading figure in Spanish prehistory" (Navascués 1960, XII), was not invited.

Pericot (in Beltrán 1988, 209-211) addressed a letter to the organizers asking himself whether the old masters merited this censure. Pericot's admirable affirmative responses, expressed in the first person, can serve to close this section: the old masters took possession of too much and kept it too long. They made others feel the weight of their scientific authority too much. They appropriated the work of others without adequate recognition. They may not have known how to administer efficiently the scarce resources available for research. They were not capable of organizing modern research teams. But, above all, they gave "a fatal example of unlimited ambition and ruthless battles among those whom age and circumstance had placed as leaders of research". Pericot considered that, thanks to the conflicts in which all the 'old' archaeologists had participated, virtually all public officials were indifferent to the backwardness and disorganization of prehistoric research. Pericot frankly recognized that the infrastructure and methods of archaeology were antiquated and that its organization was excessively bureaucratic. He thought, however, that a just evaluation would require one to remember the disturbances the country had undergone, the need

for improvisation and the example that 'young' archaeologists had received from their elders, who had already been entangled in such bitter factionalism. The most important factors, however, were the ambitions engendered in the aftermath of the Civil War and the "natural Spanish tendency towards bossism and neofeudalism". On the other hand, Pericot recognized that the younger generation appreciated "how much their teachers had done, without exception, to help them find their place in Science and in Life". Fortunately, Pericot's "paternal advice" (Maluquer de Motes 1960, XII) coincided with an improving economic and social context that gradually permitted Spaniards to escape from their 'natural' tendencies.

Academic expansion and the 'science of archaeology' in the 1960s and 1970s

Spain's general economic development in the 1960s and 1970s had very positive consequences for archaeology: the expansion of university education as the first members of the baby boom of the 1950s and 1960s came of age and with it an increase in funding both for university personnel and for archaeological field and laboratory research.

Two internal processes converged in the development of the discipline of prehistory: academic specialization intensified and financing and control of archaeology by state institutions increased. The strengthening of international ties acted as an external catalyzer. Archaeological activities were steadily modernized in all areas, although at a pace that depended on financing in each case. Chairs and university departments became increasingly specialized and published new journals that reinforced this tendency. Towards the end of this period the larger universities established degree programs in Prehistory or Prehistory and Archaeology (Ruiz Zapatero 1993 a, 51). New museums were inaugurated and the archaeological exhibits in existing ones were renovated. Field archaeology, dating, artifact typology and the identification of animal and plant remains approached international standards. Multidisciplinary approaches to documenting the archaeological record became, at last, not just 'a theory', but a reality.

Centralism and professionalization

The loss of political and academic influence by some of the most important archaeologists of the previous phase also promoted the professionalization of the discipline. The replacement of Martínez Santa-Olalla by G. Nieto Gallo¹² as the policy director in the state archaeological administration was critical and representative of the substitution of the more doctrinaire and authoritarian elements of the Franco regime by more efficient managers. In his first public statement Nieto Gallo (Nieto Gallo 1962, 51; 1964) described "the situation of archaeological studies in Spain [as] anarchic without palliatives": he and his regional delegates could neither enumerate the excavations that had been carried out

¹² From 1960 to 1968 Nieto Gallo was Director of *Bellas Artes*, the first archaeologist to serve in that position and the only to do so until the 1980s.

nor locate where the finds and other documentation has been stored; many excavations either remained unpublished or were partially disseminated in unspecialized, often local, journals. His new, rationalizing program was intended to impose, not obstacles, but order (Nieto Gallo 1962, 57). The National Excavation Plan, financed by the state, prohibited unauthorized excavations, determined where finds were to be stored and demanded that excavations be documented and published in full (after the presentation of brief reports of the results that had been obtained). The important monograph series, *Excavaciones Arqueológicas en España* (1962-1996) began to be published, alongside of the previous series, *Noticiario Arqueológico Hispánico* (1953-1988).

Nieto Gallo also sought to create a hierarchical network of local and provincial archaeological museums, headed by the *Museo Arqueológico Nacional* in Madrid. As a result, museums were revitalized formally and functionally. Almagro Basch's directorship (1968-1981) of the MAN exemplifies the consequences of this policy (Marcos Pous 1993, 95). Nieto Gallo's program was completed in 1968 with the creation of the *Instituto Central de Conservación y Restauración de Arte y Objetos Arqueológicos* and its subsidiary, the *Escuela de Artes Aplicadas*, that trained the necessary professional technicians¹³. The advance this represented can be gauged by the fact that in 1949 Taracena, then director of the MAN, was satisfied by adding a single chemist to his staff in order to restore archaeological finds from the whole country (Beltrán 1950, 24).

This policy was supported by the centralism of the regime and by academic archaeologists who benefitted from their positions of leadership and, consequently, from the public monies. Pericot and Beltrán were the only ones to express public reservations (as they, along with Taracena, had done in 1949; see above). Pericot (Pericot 1962, 15-16) expresses a measure of support for regional autonomy in heritage management and Beltrán (Beltrán 1961, 10; 1962, 5-6; 1964, 16) successfully resisted having the CNAs he had organized taken over by the authorities in Madrid¹⁴, but otherwise in this period a centralized and professionalized archaeology became dominant.

The key factor governing archaeological policy in this period was the ongoing dominance of academic institutions that had been instituted by the reforms in 1956. Thus, the successive directors of antiquities (Nieto Gallo, Almagro Basch, A. Blanco, Maluquer de Motes) were all professors of archaeology. Their power to guide policy was increased when F. Pérez Embid, the *Director General de Bellas Artes* and Almagro Basch introduced a specific budget allocation that consolidated investment in archaeology during their 1968-1974 term in office.

International relations and modernization

International ties contributed directly to the scientific modernization of Spanish archaeologists both in the field and in the laboratory. The opportunities offered by traditional collaborators such as the German Archaeological Institute or the *Istituto Internazionale di*

¹³ Nieto Gallo directed both centers from 1968 to 1971, subsequently becoming a *catedrático* in the newly created Universidad Autónoma de Madrid (Bendala 1988, XII).

¹⁴ Beltrán balanced his position in favor of decentralization and broadening archaeology's public support by having the congresses take up matters that mainly interested university professors.

Studi Liguri were broadened by the commitment undertaken by foreign missions to incorporate a Spanish delegate in their excavations (Nieto Gallo 1962, 52). Spaniards, furthermore, went abroad increasingly, especially during the 1970s. Students of the Palaeolithic trained in France with F. Bordes, G. Laplace and H. de Lumley, completing their field training with C. Howell, K. Butzer and L. G. Freeman from the USA (Moure 1993, 217; Straus 2000). Students of later prehistory learned to dig with H. Schubart, E. Sangmeister, W. Schüle (Almagro Gorbea 2000) and Lamboglia. Foreign collaboration also increased use of the natural sciences in archaeology thanks to the role of biologists (Arl. Leroi-Gourhan, M. Hopf, A. von den Driesch, J. Boessneck) and metallurgists (S. Junghans, M. Schröder) from France and Germany. Most of the results were published in the journal *Madriider Mitteilungen* (1960-present) and the series *Studien über frühe Tierknochenfunde von der Iberischen Halbinsel* (1969-1990).

The advances in radiocarbon and pollen analysis are representative of the progress made in incorporating the sciences into archaeology. In 1960 Almagro Basch (1962, 26) complained that Spain had no dating laboratory. Ten years later his son would announce its establishment (Almagro Gorbea 1969), publishing the date lists for the archaeology of Iberia in *Trabajos de Prehistoria* from 1970 to 1976. In 1978 the *Fundación Juan March* sponsored the first – and only – meeting on *C-14 y Prehistoria de la Península Ibérica*. Also in that year Almagro Basch created a pollen laboratory in the *Instituto Español de Prehistoria (CSIC)*. Directed since then by P. López García (trained at the *Musée de l'Homme* by Arl. Leroi-Gourhan), its work extended to archaeological sites the studies of geologic contexts undertaken in the 1960s by J. Menéndez-Amor (López García 1978). This laboratory has become a reference point for archaeological palynology in Spain (Vicent 1993, 31-32).

While new foreign missions excavated in Spain, the Spanish archaeological mission in Egypt continued its work. The governments of Egypt and the Sudan reciprocated the Spanish government's commitment to the UNESCO campaign at Aswan by giving Spain an important collection of archaeological objects, the Temple of Debod (now in Madrid) and permission to dig at Heracleopolis Magna, a capital of the 9th and 10th dynasty in Upper Egypt. That work has continued, uninterrupted except by war, under the direction first of Almagro Basch (1966-1984) and then of C. Pérez Die (Pérez Die 1998, 314-316).

All this information was disseminated in an academic and specialized manner through journals¹⁵ and scientific meetings that continue to be points of reference (Chapa 1988, 137), as well as through museum exhibits that have the same mode of discourse¹⁶.

Theoretical stagnation

In contrast with the revitalization of international collaboration and the broad modernization of fieldwork, laboratory analysis and publication, methodological debate was tardy and scanty (Gilman 1995, 3-5). The sole and rather limited exception to this tendency was

¹⁵ Seventeen of the 48 journals most cited in the study referred to above (Rodríguez Alcalde / Sánchez Nistal / Martínez Navarrete / San Millán 1996, 58) began publication during this period, of which six are among the first sixteen.

¹⁶ That is to say, the presentation is by site and chronological period.

provided by Maluquer de Motes and his associates. In 1959 he became the holder of the chair in prehistory at the University of Barcelona and founded its *Instituto de Arqueología*. He was admired by his students for his synthetic and analytic capabilities, inspired by Childe (Dupré / Granados / Junyent / Nieto / Rafel / Tarrats 1986, 69). He organized the successive *Symposia de Arqueología Peninsular* and, in 1970, the *Diploma de Arqueología Hispánica* for a non-university public. In 1970 M. Tarradell and P. Palol joined Maluquer de Motes in the department at Barcelona. These two, A. Arribas and Maluquer de Motes, had begun their personal and academic association in 1940 as students of Almagro Basch and Pericot and maintained sporadic relations with Bosch Gimpera, who continued to be “the inspirational model” in Barcelona (Palol 1994, 14).

The new initiatives of this group took the form of courses, publications and meetings. All four participated in the first *Symposium* (1959) (*vide supra*) and in the *I Reunión de Historia de la Economía Antigua* (Valencia 1969)¹⁷, organized by Maluquer de Motes and Tarradell, respectively. Between these events Arribas published *The Iberians* (1964) in the prestigious Ancient Peoples and Places series directed by G. Daniel. For decades this was the only synthesis published abroad by a Spanish archaeologist.

In his prologue to the Spanish edition Maluquer de Motes underlined the radical change in the reconstruction of historical processes involved in substituting “the simple problem of ‘origin’...by the ‘formation’ of a particular people or culture” (Maluquer de Motes 1965, 9-10). He also praised how the work’s emphasis on the environment as a limiting and shaping force on the adaptive capacity of societies in the process broke with the complete neglect by previous research of the geographic context of ethnogenesis. His own work reflected such concerns only in part (Maluquer de Motes 1972).

The purpose of the *Reunión* in Valencia was precisely to awaken interest in the subjects of economy and society, on the one hand and in “the geographic settings that are the background to historical phenomena” (Tarradell 1968, 10), on the other. The problems of chronology and of routes of ‘influences’ had made sense in the early stages of research, but by the mid-20th century the knowledge of historical structure was sufficient “for one to be able to escape the chronological and typological obsessions of ‘orthodox’ prehistorians” and to approach the historical questions of the time (Tarradell 1968, 8-9)¹⁸. Considering the subject, the seventy persons that attended was a very satisfactory number. Two-thirds of these were immediate colleagues of the organizer and his associates, but there were also members of foreign institutions and of the Complutense University (Tarradell 1971, 10-11). One of these was M. Fernández-Miranda, a fellow of the Bryant Foundation, who would become a leading figure in the following period (Fernández-Miranda 1978; Querol / Chapa 1996).

The innovations of this group had their best results on the strictly orthodox ground of cultural (Arribas 1964) and regional (Tarradell 1962) syntheses, however. Examples of these are the excavations sponsored by the Bryant Foundation and co-directed by Tar-

¹⁷ Published by Tarradell in 1971; see Martin 1995.

¹⁸ The proceedings of the *Reunión* were dedicated to Pericot, who was retiring that year.

radell, Arribas and D. E. Woods and the sequences established in eastern Andalusia¹⁹ by Arribas and his colleagues in the German Archaeological Institute.

In any event, the *Escola Catalana d'Arqueologia* had a limited impact on Spanish archaeologists in other regions. One factor was the generally higher value placed upon empirical progress in relation to any form of reflection, but perhaps in this case we should consider another one of a more sociological character: the cohesiveness of the Maluquer de Motes group was partly the result of their Catalanism, as nuanced as it was (Llobregat 1995, 23). For both political and scientific reasons, Bosch Gimpera did not constitute an "inspirational model" for all of Spanish, nor even for all of Catalan, archaeology (Dupré / Granados / Junyent / Nieto / Rafel / Tarrats 1986, 47).

Generally speaking, the dichotomy between empirical progress and theoretical stagnation had the advantage of accommodating Spanish archaeology to international standards without questioning its own heritage. The culture-historical perspective was taught using an avowedly descriptive and atheoretical literature. Theory was equated with speculation, while at the same time academic prestige was linked to an increasingly multidisciplinary, technologically sophisticated archaeological practice. Initially, neither the updating of methods nor the mass of data this updating generated led to a change in the discipline's conceptualization of the past. The new results were either attached to the main text as self-explanatory appendices or remained unpublished (since it was hard to see how they could be integrated with the comparative study of artifact styles). All the same, they helped make a new generation of archaeologists aware of the frustrating disproportion between the technical means of the discipline and the historical knowledge it had attained.

Beginnings of the transformation

The dichotomy between advancing methods and stagnant theory in archaeology had its counterpart in the situation of the Spanish state in the last years of the Franco regime. The unquestionable advances in culture and economy occurred against a background of social and political repression. Lull²⁰, a baby boomer himself, has published a direct testimony of the years in which, as a Marxist, he committed himself to the transformation of Catalan archaeology. The visibility of opposition within the discipline was low because among militants denunciation of the general social situation took precedence over opposition to the state of the discipline (Lull 1991, 234).

Although protest against the political regime was widespread in universities, this did not result in protest against the power structure within archaeological institutions. Partly this was because of patronage ties: archaeologists who were functionaries had no strong desire for change, while students and part-time faculty saw that their only chance to get such jobs themselves was with the support of their masters (Lull 1991, 234). At the same time, both junior and senior archaeologists shared a positivist conception of their discipline that provided them with a framework that allowed them to develop their ideas without undue constraints. The only public effort to restructure archaeological institutions, the *Assamblea*

19 These continue to be essential reference points for the later prehistory and protohistory of Iberia (Almagro Gorbea 2000, 306).

20 Since 1992 chair of prehistory in the *Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona*.

d'Arqueologia de Catalunya (1977-1980), arose after the transition to democracy and had little practical impact (see below).

At the end of the 1970s increasing awareness of approaches to archaeology that were critical of traditional, normativist culture history led to a reconsideration of the disciplinary tradition and laid the ground for future debate. Research on the Palaeolithic of Cantabria once again led the way in the reconsideration of approaches to earlier prehistory in which the ethnographic approach to excavation (Leroi-Gourhan / Brezillon 1972), the presence of disciples of L. Binford (Straus 2000) and awareness of the British palaeoeconomy school (Higgs 1972; see Bernaldo de Quirós 1980 [1974], Gómez Fuentes 1979) all played a role. More generally, editorial work by members of the Department of American Anthropology and Ethnology of the Complutense University of Madrid (Dupré / Granados / Junyent / Nieto / Rafel / Tarrats 1986 a, 70; Martínez Navarrete 1989, 71-76) and by Mexican and Argentine publishing houses (Farro / Podgorny / Tobías 1999, 227) made available translations into Spanish of critical texts of the New Archaeology, as well as of French and British anthropological and archaeological works, that were highly influential. C. Renfrew's criticism of the Orientalist paradigm facilitated, for the first time, the alternative explanation of the Iberian Peninsula's archaeological record (Renfrew 1967, 1973). The increasing number of radiocarbon dates demonstrated the inadequacy of traditional archaeological chronologies and weakened the authority of the theoretical approaches these embodied. A more parsimonious and satisfactory reading of the record that integrated the new multidisciplinary evidence began to be developed by a British student of D. Clarke, R. Chapman (Chapman 1975) and an American reader of Childe, A. Gilman (Gilman 1976), but it was only in the next period that their further work (Chapman 1990, Gilman / Thornes 1985), facilitated by collaboration with Spanish archaeologists, would lead to a new vision of the Peninsula's later prehistory.

Finally, the greater intellectual freedom resulting from the end of the Franco regime and the transition to democratic government and the generational turnover involved in the expansion of the university system favored a critical attitude towards the strongly positivist research orientation and generally conservative positions of the academic authorities. The only movement in all of Spain that overtly sought to overturn the Francoist order in archaeology occurred in this context. The above-mentioned *Assamblea d'Arqueologia de Catalunya* addressed the assumption of heritage management by the newly reestablished regional government of Catalonia (see below). Its proposals on the organization of archaeology were not adopted (Dupré / Granados / Junyent / Nieto / Rafel / Tarrats 1986 a, 48; Lull 1991, 234-237; Riu 1992), but its criticisms and suggestions have enriched the debates on the position of archaeology in Spanish society, debates that define the current period.

Decentralization and the popularizing of archaeology in the 1980s and 1990s

The restoration of democracy and the approval of a new constitution in 1978 led to a decentralization of the Spanish state. This liberalization culminated with Spain's incorpora-

tion into the Common Market (1985) and NATO (1986) and coincided with period economic prosperity and social well-being. This new regime has had a pervasive effect on archaeological activity. From 1978 to 1984 responsibility for archaeological policy was transferred to the seventeen autonomous communities into which Spain was divided²¹. The new *Ley de Patrimonio Histórico Español*, 16/1985 (LPHE) ratified this new political reality. As *Subdirector General de Arqueología* (1979-1982) and *Director General de Bellas Artes* (1982-1984), Fernández-Miranda drew up the legislation and was responsible for spreading the idea of heritage management throughout the country (Delibes de Castro 1994, 3).

'Research' vs. 'management' archaeologies

Regional policies have been quite different (Querol 2000; 2000 a), but they all make their first priority the management, protection and conservation of the archaeological heritage (*Jornadas* 1991), particularly in urban areas (*Primeras* 1983; *Arqueología* 1985). Until this time, these goals had never taken precedence over strictly scientific ones. This led, for the first time, to an institutional conflict between governmental authorities and academically employed archaeologists, a conflict that dominates the current situation. The clash is rooted in the contradiction between the effect of prior policies on the archaeological heritage and the new commitments that the LPHE requires from the authorities. It is the archaeological manifestation of the tensions produced by a political transition that respected predemocratic elements. These tensions are interwoven with the increased competition between different conceptions of the discipline and of the archaeological heritage. Forming the background of these tensions were a dynamic economy (producing intensive urban construction and zoning changes) and a more educated society (with greater interest in archaeological assets).

Traditionally, surveys, mapping, cataloguing and restoration projects and salvage excavations had been rare (Fernández Martínez / Ruiz Zapatero 1984; Jimeno Martínez / Val / Fernández 1993). Archaeological work had always concentrated on excavation, with little notion that the setting of or relationship between sites were significant variables for archaeological interpretation. Since knowledge was equated by the direct discovery of the finds, excavation was the way in which professional standing was legitimized and scientific prestige was acquired. In the past as in the present, furthermore, the personal fame and social recognition of archaeologists was amplified by their discoveries. In the 1980s this resulted in what was humorously described as a biographical version of the Three Ages, which assigned "the exact place of a researcher in the scientific process by his age and academic level" (Ruiz Rodríguez 1989, 11-12). The young and inexperienced took on the search for sites so that their senior colleagues might accede to them by excavation.

In my opinion, the institutional conflicts of the 1980s can be better understood as a reaction to the Franco-era combination of public financing of archaeology (Querol / Martínez Navarrete / Hernández / Cerdeño / Antona 1995) with lack of planning and oversight. Getting excavation permits basically depended on the academic standing of the applicant, a

21 The transfer occurred later in Ceuta and Melilla.

standing that until the end of the Franco regime was determined by the closeness²² of the archaeologist to the responsible authorities in Madrid. These authorities simply endorsed the research goals presented to them²³ and did not establish priorities for or coordination of the directors of excavations. The state's administrators were supposed to see to it that the conditions required for permits – the deadlines for giving collections to museums, publishing results and accounting for expenses – were met, but to judge by the results this supervision was not exercised efficiently²⁴. As far as the presentation of the past is concerned, the consequences of identifying the interests of heritage management with those of academic institutions were that few sites (generally Roman) could be visited by the public and that books popularizing archaeology were left to poorly prepared authors. As A. Ruiz (Ruiz Rodríguez 1989, 14, 17) has commented, “once the encounter with the object of knowledge had occurred, the scientist abandoned the scene of the crime”. The importance given to collecting and exhibiting artifacts made their restoration seem essential, but the conservation of archaeological sites was considered to have been achieved by their publication. Because archaeologists remained unconcerned by site conservation, the authorities left such matters to technicians who were not excavators and the people living in the vicinity of sites lost the opportunity to know and enjoy them. In reality publication was a doubly inadequate alternative to the material conservation of sites: it did not meet scientific expectations²⁵ and its narrow descriptiveness did nothing to save the public either from a romantic view of archaeology or from undervaluing historical evidence.

As a result, when the LHPA was approved in 1985, Spain's archaeological heritage was, after decades of archaeology policy directed towards ‘knowledge of the past’, very unevenly documented both spatially and temporally. The international context, the political, cultural and economic implications of archaeological activities and the discipline's own change of orientation reinforced (and reinforce) the unquestionable desire of regional governments to take charge of heritage management.

Indeed, partly due to Spain's joining the European Union, in recent years several items have been added to Spanish legislation that, in addition to regulating public works and zoning, include the historical heritage and require the protection, documentation and even the restoration of sites that have been officially declared to be historically significant (Querol / Martínez Navarrete / Hernández / Cerdeño / Antona 1995, 234-235)²⁶. Thanks to its increasing integration into the market economy, archaeology does not just produce heritage values (Vicent 1994, 221). As part of the constructions costs paid for by the state or by real estate developers (and ultimately by consumers), it is part of the creation of sur-

22 This proximity was institutional and personal as much as geographic and political.

23 One should recall that the reform of 1956 established that excavations should be subject “to the initiative and advice of those who need them as an essential research laboratory” (B.O.E. 2-I-1956).

24 The authors of every publication surveying any question always emphasize the number of sites that remain unpublished, the partial or incomplete nature of what is published, and the difficulty that exists in getting access to museum collections.

25 See note 24.

26 The Environmental Impact Decree (1988) and the Law of the Soil (1992) have this aim.

plus value²⁷. In this context, the archaeologist becomes more a technician at the service of the construction industry than a researcher committed to producing knowledge.

The regional governments addressed their new managerial responsibilities by creating permanent administrative structures staffed by a small number of functionaries and by hiring contract archaeologists to work on surveys and the increasing number of salvage excavations (Querol / Cerdeño / Martínez Navarrete / Contreras 1994). This employed the many university graduates who had scant hope of public employment now that the universities were fully stocked by members of the baby boom. The contract archaeologists constitute an unstable and fragmented group whose survival depends on the factors that brought them into being: the dynamics of the real estate market and a preservationist political conception of the archaeological heritage that currently is, but need not be, unchallenged generation (Díaz del Río 2000, 211).

A few university-based research teams are participating in their institutional capacity in the programs of mitigation and salvage set up by the regional governments (Velasco / Mena / Méndez 1987; Criado 1996). Most academic archaeologists have tried to continue their own scientific programs with a better balance between excavation and survey (Martín / Fernández-Miranda / Fernández-Posse / Gilman 1993). The scanty funding available for long-term research projects did encourage archaeologists to participate in agreements with governmental entities in charge of culture and labor to excavate large sites in economically depressed regions so as to provide as much employment as possible to unskilled workers²⁸. Here political necessity in many cases won out over the scientific goals of research and publication and sometimes over the immediate demands of consolidating what had been uncovered (Dupré / Granados / Junyent / Nieto / Rafel / Tarrats 1986 a, 50). These consequences were doubly paradoxical. On the one hand, these projects did not follow academic principles (that sites should be selected for excavation for scientific reasons) or the priorities of regional archaeological policy (that endangered sites should be excavated, that excavated sites should be prepared for public visit). On the other hand, they undermined the criticisms academics made of the contract archaeologists they themselves had trained (that their work lacked scientific goals, was conducted with an unsatisfactory ratio of trained archaeologists to unskilled workmen and so on), criticisms aimed to question their professional existence (Díaz del Río 2000, 12).

In the last decade archaeologists have also financed their research by undertaking projects to conserve sites and prepare them for public visitation (Cacho Quesada / Martínez Navarrete 2000). This has partly occurred because regional ministries of education do not finance research projects in the humanities and social sciences at a level that permits the fieldwork and specialized studies demanded by modern archaeology.

This panorama exhibits the contradiction between the interests of so-called 'management' archaeology and 'research' archaeology that had already made itself manifest in

27 The principal that who destroys pays, initially adopted by the Madrid regional government, has spread to the other autonomous communities and is supported by the Council of Europe's "Recommendation to Member States Relative to the Protection and Development of the Archaeological Heritage in the Context of Construction Projects in Both Urban and Rural Settings" in 1985 (Strasbourg, 13/4/1989) (Domínguez / Fernández / Herce / Menasanch / Presas 1994, 91, n. 8).

28 In recent years the European Union has provided funds for such unemployment relief (Cacho Quesada / Martínez Navarrete 2000, 8).

other Western countries (Hodder 1991, 7). In the end, a basic question has come to dominate discussion: who has the legitimate right to determine the validity of archaeology and its financial priorities? The three social sectors involved – government officials, archaeologists and citizens – all have legitimate goals for archaeology (González Méndez 2000, 9-10). Politicians primarily look to the socio-economic utility of archaeology and its potential for reinforcing a national or regional social identity. Archaeologists want to know about the past, a knowledge that justifies their professional existence. Ordinary citizens are interested in archaeology, not so much for its intrinsic qualities (antiquity, beauty, identification with the past), as for its capacity to entertain and to generate economic activity (e. g., education and leisure). All these interests involve a radical change in the traditional concept of the monument. It serves as a means not to study and present the past but to transform it into a dynamic resource that will promote culture and the economy.

New theoretical trends

The pressures on archaeologists to change their static, academic view of archaeological resources in favor of one more attuned to politics, leisure and business occurred at the same time as a theoretical renewal of the discipline. This reconsideration of theory and practice did not involve, however, taking up the administrative and popular agendas for the past. Only a few leaders of the theoretical change took part in the design of regional archaeological policies (Ruiz Rodríguez / Chapa / Ruiz-Zapatero 1988; Ruiz Rodríguez 1989; Salvatierra 1990, 1994). The interaction was mainly indirect and consisted of the adoption of some of the new theoretical strategies by heritage administrators.

The *Ministerio de Cultura* and the universities sponsored these strategies through six congresses on method and theory celebrated between 1981 and 1989. Fernández-Miranda (†) organized the *Primeras Jornadas de Metodología de Investigación Prehistórica* (Soria, 1981) and F. Burillo (Universidad de Teruel) the *Coloquios sobre Arqueología Espacial* (1984-2000). Citation analysis of the six proceedings reveals the principal tendencies: interdisciplinary studies (16.7 %), theory (8.8 %), palaeoeconomy (7.6 %), spatial archaeology (5 %), social archaeology (3.7 %), chronology and excavation (2.6 %) (García Santos 1998). References to Anglo-American processual archaeologists are always predominant, especially in the contributions on theory (81.3 % of the total)²⁹. In the context of this volume, the 4.4 % citation rate of the Russian scholar L. S. Klejn is worth noting.

The significance of the scarcity of references to Marxist and postprocessual perspectives is quite different. Marxist authors of various nationalities are cited in relation to all subjects³⁰. From the 1980s on they have inspired research projects ranging from the Palaeolithic to the Medieval period in various parts of Spain. In contrast, the postprocessual approach was restricted to a theoretical debate contextualizing and criticizing the work of

29 Binford and Clarke, the overwhelming leaders, are followed by I. Hodder (Spatial Archaeology), P. J. Watson, S. Leblanc, C. Redman, K. C. Chang, F. Plog, I. Rouse, M. Schiffer, and B. Trigger (García Santos 1998).

30 P. Vilar, E. Terray, L. F. Bate, J. Montané, V. Lull, J. M. Vicent, A. Gilman, M. Spriggs, B. J. Price and M. Leone are among those most frequently cited (García Santos 1998).

I. Hodder (Lull / Micó / Montón / Picazo 1990; see Ruiz Rodríguez / Chapa / Ruiz-Zapatero 1988; Vicent 1990). Its influence on the Spanish archaeological practice has been hard to detect up to now (Díaz Andreu 1997 a, 26; Colomer / González Marcén / Montón / Picazo 1999, 17). Recent phenomenological (rather than hermeneutic) interpretative approaches (Barrett, Shanks, Tilley, Thomas) (Criado 1999, 7-8) have been equally uninfluential.

The autodidactic character of the methodological renewal had negative consequences, such as the disorientation and lack of clear criteria of many of the prehistorians involved. But it also had positive consequences, such as a greater critical sense in evaluating the various alternatives (Gilman 1988, 61). In general, in the two decades that have passed since the *Primeras Jornadas*, prehistorians have incorporated "science in archaeology" with no restrictions except for budgetary ones. The use of scientific methods and the contextualization of the record at different scales using approaches such as site catchment analysis or mortuary sociology (Vicent 1995) are the current hallmarks of professionalism.

This common standard and the correct idea that all archaeology is theoretically charged (Micó 1998, 20; Klejn in Ruiz Zapatero / Vicent García 1992) blur the borders between the various theoretical/methodological orientations (culture-historical, marxist, functionalist, structuralist) even among those who defined their approaches at the outset of the debate. Collaboration between researchers of different persuasions also demonstrates the flexibility of these positions.

We still for the most part do culture history, but the above-mentioned reconsideration of the composition of the archaeological record and the use of neo-evolutionist or neo-marxist interpretative schemas make it inappropriate to call this culture history "traditional archaeology" (contra Micó 1998, 26), in spite of the emphasis on the chronological order and regional interrelations of archaeological cultures. The integration of broadly functionalist approaches into culture history has begun to produce an archaeological record of genuinely high quality.

Historical materialism has influenced various prehistorians dedicated to the renewal of the discipline, but it is the hallmark of the work of Ruiz Rodríguez, Lull and J. M. Vicent. Ruiz Rodríguez and Lull were politically active at the end of the Franco era. Their university positions (Jaén and *Autónoma de Barcelona*, respectively) enabled them to form research teams. Vicent's trajectory is the result of personal intellectual commitment channeled through the national research organization (*Departamento de Prehistoria, Instituto de Historia, CSIC*) and developed by collaboration with colleagues in his department, the *Universidad Complutense*, the California State University (Gilman 1991, 25) and the Institute of Archaeology of the Russian Academy of Sciences (Chernykh 1993). All three are interested in archaeological theory and Vicent, in particular, in the discipline's epistemological foundations (Vicent 1982; 1984; 1985) (see above).

The Jaén team takes its inspiration from the Italian school (Bandinelli, Carandini) and scholars such as E. P. Thompson, M. Leone, R. Chapman, A. Gilman, M. Tosi and L. F. Bate (Ruiz Rodríguez / Molinos Molinos / Hornos Mata 1986, 44). It has studied the historical dynamics of social formations from the Copper Age to the Medieval period in eastern Andalusia (Nocete 1989; 2001; Salvatierra 1990; 1997; Ruiz Rodríguez / Molinos 1998), relying on systematic surveys to define political and economic territories. The Jaén group stands out in Spain for its emphasis on the social dimension of the historical heri-

tage (Hornos in Ruiz Rodríguez / Molinos Molinos / Hornos Mata 1986, 108-109; Ruiz Rodríguez 1989). This (and the socialist regional government in Andalusia) permitted the team, at a certain moment, to define and direct the "Andalusian model for archaeology". This was the only regional archaeological policy in Spain to combine a sound theoretical foundation with a coherent heritage program, but its development is currently under revision (Salvatierra 1994; Rodríguez Temiño / Rodríguez de Guzmán 1997). Recently, F. Hornos Mata and C. Rísquez have incorporated feminism into the team's concerns (Rísquez / Hornos 2000).

The team at the *Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona* has concentrated on the later prehistory of southeast Spain (Castro / Chapman / Gili / Lull / Mico / Rihuete / Risch / Sanahuja 1999) and the Balearic Islands (Gasull / Lull / Sanahuja 1984; Lull / Micó / Rihuete / Risch 2001), with particular attention to chronology (Castro / Micó / Lull 1996), the environment (Castro / Chapman / Gili / Lull / Mico / Rihuete / Risch / Sanahuja 1998; 1999), the archaeology of death (Lull 2000) and metallurgy (Stos-Gale / Hunt-Ortiz / Gale 1999). It also includes Palaeolithic specialists with independent research goals such as ethnoarchaeology and critical historiography (Vila 1998, 78; Estévez / Vila 1999). This team participated actively in the *Assamblea d'Arqueologia de Catalunya* (Lull 1991, 234-237, 242; see above) and its social commitment continues to be reflected in its concern for Critical Theory, archaeological pedagogy (González Marcén 1998) and feminism (Colomer / González Marcén / Montón / Picazo 1999). Given that background and their indubitably correct position that all archaeology is theoretically charged (Micó 1998, 20), the team's strong orientation towards basic science can only be explained by their opposition to the archaeological policies adopted by the *Generalitat*, as well as by the university employment of its members and their desire to gain international attention for their research. The dichotomy they (e. g., Micó 1998, 28) draw between basic science/Critical Theory, on the one hand and heritage politics/trivialization, on the other, makes manifest their position in the institutional conflict.

Vicent is an indispensable source for conceptualizing the origins of peasant societies (Vicent 1988; 1995 a; 1997) and for landscape archaeology (Vicent 1991). He used satellite remote sensing techniques to define environmental transformations and land use changes in southeast Spain (Chapa / Vicent / Rodríguez / Uriarte 1998) and Russia (Vicent / Rodríguez Alcalde / López Saez / Zavala / López García / Martínez Navarrete 2000; Rovira 1999), as well as for the study of post-Palaeolithic rock shelter paintings. This study of Levantine rock art from a landscape archaeology perspective, innovative for eastern Spain, benefits from the experience gained in Northwest Iberia (Bradley / Criado / Fábregas 1994). At the same time, the use of remote sensing techniques to rock art begins a new line of investigation with important implications for documenting, studying, conserving and publicizing prehistoric rock art in general (Vicent / Montero / Rodríguez Alcalde / Martínez Navarrete / Chapa 1996; Montero / Rodríguez Alcalde / Vicent / Cruz 2000). The heritage potential of this research is being realized through the EuroPreArt project³¹.

31 Past signs and present memories. European prehistoric art: inventory, contextualisation, preservation and accessibility. European Commission. Programme "Culture 2000". Project code: A1/P-643. Provisional web page <http://rupestre.net/europreart>.

Structuralist approaches to theoretical renewal are identified by C. Martín de Guzmán (†) and F. Criado Boado. The former defined his “lax and ambiguous structuralism” as an “eclectic arrogance” (Onrubia 1995, 10-11) with influences ranging from structural neo-Marxism and neo-positivism to cultural ecology and historicism of the Vienna School (Martín de Guzmán 1984; 1988; Lull 1991, 244-245). He studied the prehispanic period in the Canary Islands, insisting on its important relation to Morocco. For a short time he participated in the heritage program of the regional socialist government and in the project to protect Cueva Pintada (Gáldar, Gran Canaria), the most important rock art complex on the islands.

Beginning in the 1980s Criado Boado (*Universidad de Santiago de Compostela*) participated in teams whose goal was to “discover the settlement pattern of megalithic communities” (Criado / Aira / Díaz-Fierros 1986, 17) as part of an ambitious plan to study the occupation of northwest Iberia from prehistoric times through the Middle Ages (Bello / Criado / Vázquez Varela 1987, 20-21). This interdisciplinary project was one of the most comprehensive carried out up to then. Basing himself on Foucault, Clastres and Lévi-Strauss (Criado 1995, 2000) and operating in the context of a consideration of modern social theory and the theory of science, he has developed an approach that emphasizes “the dark side of the world” as opposed to the “narrow empiricism” of cultural ecology (Criado 1999, 5-6). He conceptualizes the landscape as a socio-cultural creation produced by social action both real (work, technology, rites etc.) and imaginative. Landscape archaeology becomes a research program oriented to studying the environmental, social and symbolic aspects of space over the course of history (Criado 1993). In his own research Criado Boado has fully developed this program with respect to megalithism (Criado 1989; 1989) and rock art (Bradley / Criado / Fábregas 1994; Criado 1999, 23-28). He has directed single-period projects on a regional scale (Méndez 1998; Parcero 2000) and diachronic projects on a district scale (Criado 1991).

Landscape archaeology's proximity to the sensibilities and preoccupations of society today and the character of Criado Boado's research strategy has enabled him to apply his work to cultural resource management (Criado 1996; González Méndez 2000). In 1991 he formed the *Grupo de Investigación en Arqueología del Paisaje* through an agreement with the *Xunta de Galicia*. This committed his university to evaluating the impact of public works on the archaeological heritage. In 1998 his group became the *Laboratorio de Arqueología y Formas Culturales* assigned to the *Instituto de Investigaciones Tecnológicas* of the USC, its work being conceived of as Research and Development on Cultural Heritage and published through the *Criterios y Convenciones en Arqueología del Paisaje* (CAPA) and *Trabajos de Arqueología del Paisaje* (TAPA). This initiative, the only of its kind in Spain, permits methodologically consistent archaeological operations that are published quickly and give the sponsoring academic institution significant resources and public visibility.

Criado Boado and Vicent (together with F. Nocete) demonstrated the interest of archaeological theory (and of their own work) by organizing the *Reunión de Arqueología Teórica* (RAT, Santiago de Compostela, December 1993), modelled on the British TAG conferences. It was not repeated and its proceedings were never published, but those who attended particularly noted its session (the only one to date) on the archaeology of women (Colomer / González Marcén / Montón / Picazo 1999, 14, n. 1), a line of investigation that

is in its infancy in Spain, but shows great promise (Díaz-Andreu / Sanz Gallego 1994; Querol 2002).

These initiatives gained international visibility through the English publications of some of the participants, the organization of sessions on Spanish archaeology at international congresses (Díaz-Andreu 1997 a, 26) attended by some of the Spanish Marxist archaeologists and through the First Meeting of the European Association of Archaeologists (Santiago de Compostela 1995), organized by Criado Boado.

The strengthening of Spanish archaeology's links to the outside world is another important characteristic of the past decades. Apart from the activities mentioned above, the Spanish institutional presence in Egypt (Pérez Die 1998) and Italy (Dupré 2000) continues and is complemented by collaborative university projects in France (Almagro Gorgea / Gran Aymerich 1991) and by Spanish university expeditions to Syria (Molist 1996), the Lebanon (Aubert 1999), the Sudan (Jimeno / Fernández / Menéndez / Lario 1996), Tanzania (Dominguez-Rodrigo / Serrallonga / Tresserras / Alcalá / Luque 2001) and the Congo (Mercader / García-Heras / González-Alvarez 2000), as well as by ethnoarchaeological projects in Guatemala (Hernando 1999, 26-28) and Morocco (González / Ibáñez / Zapata / Peña 2001).

Two Spanish research projects in particular have attracted international attention (Straus 1996 a): the origins of humans in Europe and Palaeolithic rock art. The first involves the exceptional sites of the Sierra de Atapuerca (Burgos) with remains of a putative new species, *Homo antecessor* (800.000 years old) and of *Homo heidelbergensis* (250.000-300.000 years old), excellently preserved and with good chronological, environmental and industrial associations (Arsuaga / Bermúdez de Castro / Carbonell 1997). In 2000 this led to its inclusion in the UNESCO World Heritage listings. The second involves the discovery on the Meseta of open air rock art sites (Balbín / Alcolea / Santonja 1995; Ripoll / Municio 1999) similar to those of the Côa valley (Baptista 1999).

All this torrent of information is published primarily in the ever more numerous publication series that have multiplied as a result of Spain's decentralization and in ever more specialized meetings. Synthetic collections organized by period or region attempt to deal with the situation, as does an increasing use of the internet (Chapa 2000). At the same time, the *Congresos de Arqueología Peninsular* (Porto 1993; Zamora 1996; Vila Real 1999) encourage dialogue between Spanish and Portuguese researchers. Remodelled museums and temporary exhibits (Marti Oliver 2000, 30-34), some that have attracted great attendance (Nicolás / Márquez / Rodríguez 2000), also are playing an increased role in the dissemination of archaeology. How all of these messages are being received by society will be the object of my closing considerations

Spanish archaeology in the twenty-first century: closing considerations

In my opinion the future of archaeology in Spain depends on the understandings that may arise between archaeologists, governing agencies and the public about how to define the historical heritage and its role in society. Over the last sixty years state control over ar-

chaeology has been a constant, as different as that control may have been before and after the democratic transition (1975).

The Franco dictatorship left it to archaeologists to define what goods constituted the historical patrimony: in this as in much else, citizens had no voice. The small number of researchers and their common background posed no threat to a state whose first priority was to deal with the economic and social consequences of the Civil War³². Thus, archaeological policy was set by the ministry, but was carried out by persons who, after the reorganization of the national archaeological service in 1956, were basically chaired professors.

The steady and growing modernization of the country – and of archaeological activity – would increase the overlap between the interests of the states and of academic archaeologists. Unfortunately, the social visibility the latter had as ‘experts’ legitimized by the state did not increase interest about the past among other citizens. On the contrary, the specialized discourse of the professionals was incomprehensible and dissuasive for most of the public.

The consolidation of democracy and the decentralization of the state after the approval of the new constitution in 1978, accompanied as it was by a period of economic and social prosperity and a general improvement in public education, greatly broadened archaeology’s social base. The spread of science and public education was combined with popularizing efforts that answered the desire of many people to enrich their knowledge or simply to fill their free time. Archaeological excavations, important exhibits, the creation or redesign of museums and the preparation of sites for the public to visit all have acquired great social visibility. The evident economic and political implications of activities related to leisure and cultural tourism have led the state to take over the effective leadership of archaeological policy.

This has had particular repercussions on professional archaeologists: we have lost our monopoly over the use and interpretation of the past³³. Sometimes those responsible for alternative discourses – these are mainly in temporary exhibits and popularizing works – are not professors or even archaeologists, sometimes the popularizers are the academic archaeologists themselves. In each case the social actors escape the dichotomy between basic science/Critical Theory and heritage politics/trivialization.

At the same time that archaeologists were losing their position as the only authorized voice concerning the past, their professional collectivity was becoming fragmented. Acceptance of greater theoretical and methodological pluralism increased academic prestige by introducing multiple, even critical readings of the past. This reinforced academic legitimacy. On the contrary, public demand for archaeological technicians undermined aca-

32 In this context, where the force of patronage in all aspects of life was reinforced by the authoritarian political regime, the occasional pronouncements by prominent archaeologists to the effect that the social base of archaeology needed to be broadened can be understood as reflecting their own interests or those of their clients.

33 Another aspect of the ‘liberalization’ of the past has to do with the claims of Jewish and Moslem religious minorities. Excavations inside the historic cores of cities are uncovering a legacy of remains prior to the expulsion of 1492. In the case of cemeteries, this has led to conflicts. As a result, a reconsideration of how the Spanish heritage should be defined is occurring that is similar to what has taken place in other countries (Endere 2000, 10; Díaz-Andreu 1998, 49).

demic legitimacy by showing that professional survival was possible outside traditional institutions by dedication to different goals. For the moment the precarious working conditions of most of these archaeologists means that they pose no threat to academic institutions. The situation has genuinely revolutionary potential, however, because it calls into question the traditional forms of professional advancement and, thus, the patron/client relations that have been the foundation of archaeological employment. The discomfort that university professors feel at receiving instructions from young functionaries who only yesterday were their students and are now in charge of regional heritage institutions is symptomatic.

Such changes require readjustments, particularly when, as in the Spanish case, the starting point is monolithic unity in politics, culture and religion. The transformation of archaeological activity has been correspondingly broad and deep. In many respects, it would not overstate the case to say that the result has been more a revolution than a transition. For the first time, the interpretation of the past is subject to the conflicts and negotiations that affect other aspects of Spanish life. For the first time, archaeology has a real possibility of broadening its public support. I hope that this essay has made it clear what obstacles were overcome to reach this situation and how many promising initiatives are under way.

Acknowledgements

My thanks go to A. Gilman for a translation that has been a debate and for his friendship; to A. Gramsch for his interest, trust and advice; to F. Contreras, F. Criado, T. Chapa, X. Dupré, M.^a D. Fernández-Posse, Ph. Kohl, P. López, B. Martí Oliver, I. Podgorny, N. Querol, C. Varela and J. M. Vicent for information, comments and support; and to T. del Río, A. Gómez Pumares and V. Serrano for help in gathering data.

Bibliography

- Alcina 1975: J. Alcina, *En torno a la antropología cultural*. Madrid 1975.
- Alcina 1991: J. Alcina, *La arqueología en España: una revisión crítica de sus planteamientos teóricos*. *Trabajos de Prehistoria* 48, 1991, 13-28.
- Alcina 1998: J. Alcina (ed.), *Diccionario de Arqueología*. Madrid 1998.
- Almagro Basch 1957: M. Almagro Basch, *El hombre ante la historia*. Madrid 1957.
- Almagro Basch 1962: M. Almagro Basch, *El carbono 14 en la Prehistoria*. In: A. Beltrán Crónica del VII Congreso Nacional de Arqueología. Zaragoza 1962, 25-41.
- Almagro Basch 1974: M. Almagro Basch, *El Profesor D. Pedro Bosch Gimpera*. *Trabajos de Prehistoria* 31, 1974, 7.
- Almagro Gorbea 1969: M. Almagro Gorbea, *Un laboratorio de Carbono 14 en el Instituto de Química Física 'Rocasolano'*, del Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas. *Trabajos de Prehistoria* 26, 1969, 309-312.
- Almagro Gorbea 2000: M. Almagro Gorbea, Wilhelm Schüle (1928-1997). *Complutum* 11, 2000, 305-307.

- Almagro Gorbea / Gran Aymerich 1991: M. Almagro Gorbea / J. Gran Aymerich, El estanque monumental de Bibracte (Borgoña, Francia). Madrid 1991.
- Altuna 1990: J. Altuna, D. Jose Miguel de Barandiarán. In: *Odisea en el pasado. Homenaje a D. José Miguel de Barandiarán*. San Sebastian 1990, 2-24.
- Arce / Olmos 1991: J. Arce / R. Olmos (eds.), *Historiografía de la Arqueología y de la Historia Antigua en España. Siglos XVIII-XX*, Madrid 1991.
- Arqueología 1985: *Arqueología de las ciudades modernas superpuestas a las antiguas*. Madrid 1985.
- Arribas 1964: A. Arribas, *The Iberians*. London 1964.
- Arsuaga / Bermúdez de Castro / Carbonell 1997: J. L. Arsuaga / J. M. Bermúdez de Castro / E. Carbonell (eds.), *The Sima de los Huesos hominid site. Special issue of Journal of Human Evolution* 33, 2/3, 1997.
- Aubert 1999: M. E. Aubert, Une nécropole récemment découverte à Tyr. In: *Catalogue Liban. L'autre Rive*. Paris 1999, 132-135.
- Aymerich / Aymerich / Batista-Noguera 1993: E. Aymerich / J. G. Aymerich / R. Batista-Noguera, A propósito de Pere Bosch i Gimpera y de su correspondencia inédita conservada en el Musée des Antiquités Nationales. *Empúries* 48-50/1 (1986-1989), 1993, 60-63.
- Balbin / Alcolea / Santonja 1995: R. de Balbín / J. J. Alcolea / M. Santonja, El yacimiento rupestre paleolítico al aire libre de Siega Verde (Salamanca, España): una visión de conjunto. *Trabalhos de Antropologia e Etnologia* 35/3, 1995, 73-102.
- Baptista 1999: A. M. Baptista, No tempo sem tempo. A arte dos caçadores paleolíticos do Valle do Côa. Vila Nova de Foz Côa 1999.
- Bello / Criado / Vázquez Varela 1987: J. M. Bello / F. Criado / J. M. Vázquez Varela, La cultura megalítica de la provincia de La Coruña y sus relaciones con el marco natural: implicaciones socio-económicas. La Coruña 1987.
- Beltran 1947: A. Beltran, Crónica del II Congreso Arqueológico del Sudeste Español. *Boletín Arqueológico del Sudeste Español* 4-7, 1947, 1-14.
- Beltran 1950: A. Beltrán, Crónica del I Congreso Nacional de Arqueología y del V Congreso Arqueológico del Sudeste. Cartagena 1950, 7-38.
- Beltran 1961: A. Beltran, Crónica del VI Congreso Nacional de Arqueología. Zaragoza 1961, 9-38.
- Beltran 1962: A. Beltran, Crónica del VII Congreso Nacional de Arqueología. Zaragoza 1962, 25-41.
- Beltran 1964: A. Beltran, Crónica del VIII Congreso Nacional de Arqueología. Zaragoza 1964, 9-79.
- Beltran 1988: A. Beltran, *Ser arqueólogo*. Madrid 1988.
- Bendala Galan 1988: M. Bendala Galan, Prof. Dr. D. Gratiniano Nieto Gallo. *Cuadernos de Prehistoria y Arqueología* 11-12/1, 1988, XI-XIII.
- Bernaldo de Quirós 1980: F. Bernaldo de Quirós, *Notas sobre la economía del Paleolítico Superior*. Madrid 1980.
- Böhm 1953: J. Böhm, Studie o periodisaci pravěkých dějin, *Pam. Arch.* 44, 1953, 1-32.
- Bosch Gimpera 1932: P. Bosch Gimpera, *Etnología de la Península Ibérica*. Barcelona 1932.

- Bradley / Criado / Fábregas 1994: R. Bradley / F. Criado / R. Fábregas, Rock art research as landscape archaeology. A pilot study in Galicia, north-west Spain. *World Archaeology* 25/3, 1994, 374-390.
- Cacho Quesada / Martínez Navarrete 2000: C. Cacho Quesada / M^a I. Martínez Navarrete, Prólogo: presentando el pasado. *Arqueología y turismo cultural. Trabajos de Prehistoria* 57/2, 2000, 5-8.
- Castillo 1949: A. del Castillo, El sistema actual de excavaciones arqueológicas y su reforma. *Crónica del VI Congreso Arqueológico del Sudeste Español*. Cartagena 1949, 72-77.
- Castro / Chapman / Gili / Lull / Micó / Rihuete / Risch / Sanahuja 1996: P. Castro / R. Chapman / S. Gili / V. Lull / R. Micó / C. Rihuete / R. Risch / E. Sanahuja, Teoría de las prácticas sociales. In: M.^a Querol / T. Chapa (ed.), *Homenaje al profesor Manuel Fernández-Miranda*. Madrid 1996, 35-48.
- Castro / Chapman / Gili / Lull / Mico / Rihuete / Risch / Sanahuja 1998: P. Castro / R. Chapman / S. Gili / V. Lull / R. Mico / C. Rihuete / R. Risch / E. Sanahuja, *Aguas Project. Paleoclimatic reconstruction and the dynamics of human settlement and land-use in the area of the middle Aguas (Almería)*. Luxembourg 1998.
- Castro / Chapman / Gili / Lull / Mico / Rihuete / Risch / Sanahuja 1999: P. Castro / R. Chapman / S. Gili / V. Lull / R. Mico / C. Rihuete / R. Risch / E. Sanahuja, *Proyecto Gatas 2. La dinámica arqueocológica de la ocupación prehistórica*. Sevilla 1999.
- Castro / Micó / Lull 1996: P. Castro / R. Micó / V. Lull, *Cronología de la prehistoria reciente de la Península Ibérica y Baleares (c. 2800-900 cal ANE)*. Oxford 1996.
- Cebrià 1999: D. Cebrià, Lluís Pericot i García (1899-1978): eclecticisme, sociabilitat i bonhomia. *Valoració, des del present, d'una figura clau de l'arqueologia i de la prehistòria de la meitat del segle XX*. *Pyrenae* 30, 1999, 9-14.
- Chapa 1988: T. Chapa, *Perspectivas actuales de la arqueología española*. *Revista de Occidente* 81, 1988, 135-142.
- Chapa 2000: T. Chapa, *Archaeological publications in Spain*. *European Journal of Archaeology* 3/2, 2000, 267-269.
- Chapa / Vicent / Rodríguez / Uriarte 1998: T. Chapa / J. M. Vicent / A. L. Rodríguez / A. Uriarte, *Métodos y técnicas para un enfoque regional integrado en arqueología: el proyecto sobre el poblamiento ibérico en el área del Guadiana Menor (Jaén)*. *Arqueología Espacial* 19-20, 1998, 105-120.
- Chapman 1975: R. W. Chapman, *Economy and society within Later Prehistoric Iberia: a new framework*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Cambridge 1975.
- Chapman 1990: R. W. Chapman, *Emerging complexity. The later prehistory of south-east Spain, Iberia and the west Mediterranean*. Cambridge 1990.
- Chernykh 1993: E. N. Chernykh, *Laboratory of Natural Science Methods in Archaeology in the Institute of Archaeology of the Russian Academy of Sciences (main lines of research)*. In: M.^a I. Martínez Navarrete (ed.), *Theory and Practice of Prehistory: views from the edges of Europe*. Cantabria 1993, 257-273.
- Colomer / González Marcén / Montón / Picazo 1999: L. Colomer / P. González Marcén / S. Montón / M. Picazo (eds.), *Arqueología y teoría feminista. Estudios sobre mujeres y cultura material en arqueología*. Barcelona 1999.

- Cortadella Morral 1997: J. Cortadella Morral, El Profesor Nino Lamboglia (1912-1977) y la Arqueología Clásica Española. In: G. Mora / M. Díaz-Andreu (eds.), *La cristalización del pasado, génesis y desarrollo del marco institucional de la arqueología en España*. Málaga 1997, 553-563.
- Criado 1989: F. Criado, We, the post-megalithic people... In: I. Hodder (ed.), *The Meaning of Things. Material Culture and Symbolic Expression*. London 1989, 79-89.
- Criado 1989 a: F. Criado, Megalitos, espacio y pensamiento. *Trabajos de Prehistoria* 46, 1989, 75-98.
- Criado 1991: F. Criado (dir.), *Arqueología del Paisaje. El área Bocelo-Furelos entre los tiempos paleolíticos y los medievales*. Santiago de Compostela 1991.
- Criado 1993: F. Criado, Límites y posibilidades de la arqueología del paisaje. *SPAL* 2, 1993, 9-55.
- Criado 1995: F. Criado, The visibility of the archaeological record and the interpretation of social reality. In: I. Hodder / M. Shanks / A. Alexandri / V. Buchli / J. Carman / J. Last / G. Lucas (eds.), *Interpreting archaeology. Finding meaning in the past*. Oxford 1995, 194-204.
- Criado 1996: F. Criado, La Arqueología del futuro, ¿el futuro de la Arqueología? *Trabajos de Prehistoria* 53/1, 1996, 15-35.
- Criado 1999: F. Criado, Del Terreno al Espacio: Planteamientos y Perspectivas para la Arqueología del Paisaje. *CAPA* 6, 1999.
- Criado 2000: F. Criado, Walking about Lévi-Strauss. Contributions for an Archaeology of Thought. In: C. Holtorf and H. Karlsson (eds.), *Philosophy and archaeological Practice. Perspectives for the 21st Century*. Göteborg 2000, 277-303.
- Criado / Aira / Díaz-Fierros 1986: F. Criado / M.^a J. Aira / F. Díaz-Fierros, La construcción del paisaje: megalitismo y ecología en la Sierra de Barbanza (Galicia). Santiago de Compostela 1986.
- Delibes de Castro 1994: G. Delibes de Castro, Manuel Fernández-Miranda (Gijón, 8 octubre 1946 – Madrid, 16 de julio 1994). *Trabajos de Prehistoria* 51/2, 1994, 3-4.
- Díaz-Andreu 1993: M. Díaz-Andreu, Theory and ideology in archaeology: Spanish archaeology under the Franco régime. *Antiquity* 67, 1993, 74-82.
- Díaz-Andreu 1995: M. Díaz-Andreu, Nationalism and Archaeology. Spanish Archaeology in the Europe of Nationalities. In: P. Kohl / C. Fawcett (eds.), *Nationalism, Politics and the Practice of Archaeology*. Cambridge 1995, 39-56.
- Díaz-Andreu 1995 a: M. Díaz-Andreu, Arqueólogos españoles en Alemania en el primer tercio del siglo XX. Los becarios de la Junta de Ampliación de Estudios (I) Pedro Bosch Gimpera. *Madrider Mitteilungen* 36, 1995, 79-89.
- Díaz-Andreu 1996: M. Díaz-Andreu, Islamic Archaeology and the Origin of the Spanish Nation. In: M. Díaz-Andreu / T. Champion (eds.), *Archaeology and Nationalism in Europe*. London 1996, 39-56.
- Díaz-Andreu 1996 a: M. Díaz-Andreu, Arqueólogos españoles en Alemania en el primer tercio del siglo XX. Los becarios de la Junta de Ampliación de Estudios (II). *Madrider Mitteilungen* 37, 1996, 205-224.
- Díaz-Andreu 1997: M. Díaz-Andreu, Prehistoria y franquismo. In: G. Mora / M. Díaz-Andreu (eds.), *La cristalización del pasado, génesis y desarrollo del marco institucional de la arqueología en España*. Málaga 1997.

- Díaz-Andreu 1997 a: M. Díaz-Andreu, Conflict and innovation. The development of archaeological traditions in Iberia. In: M. Díaz-Andreu / S. Keay (eds.), *The archaeology of Iberia: the dynamics of change*. London 1997, 6-33.
- Díaz-Andreu 1998: M. Díaz-Andreu, Identitats i el dret al passat. Del nou al vell món. *Cota Zero* 14, 1998, 41-52.
- Díaz-Andreu / Champion 1996: M. Díaz-Andreu / T. Champion (eds.), *Archaeology and Nationalism in Europe*. London 1996.
- Díaz-Andreu / Mora 1995: M. Díaz-Andreu / G. Mora, Arqueología y política: el desarrollo de la arqueología española en su contexto histórico. *Trabajos de Prehistoria* 52/1, 1995, 25-38.
- Díaz-Andreu / Sanz Gallego 1994: M. Díaz-Andreu / N. Sanz Gallego, Women in Spanish Archaeology. In: M. C. Nelson / S. M. Nelson / A. Wylie (eds.), *Equity Issues for Women in Archaeology*. Washington 1994, 121-130.
- Díaz del Río 2000: P. Díaz del Río, Arqueología comercial y estructura de clase. In: M.^a del M. Bòveda (ed.), *Gestión Patrimonial y Desarrollo Social*. CAPA 12, 2000, 7-18.
- Domínguez / Fernández / Herce / Menasanch / Presas 1994: R. M.^a Domínguez / A. Fernández / J. L. Herce / M. Menasanch / M. M.^a Presas, Empresas de Arqueología y Arqueología urbana: investigación, negocio, profesión. *Arqueología y Territorio Medieval* 1, 1994, 83-91.
- Dominguez-Rodrigo / Serrallonga / Tresserras / Alcalá / Luque 2001: M. Dominguez-Rodrigo / J. Serrallonga / J. J. Tresserras / L. Alcalá / L. Luque, Wood working by early humans: a phytolith analysis on Acheulian stone tools from Peninj (Tanzania). *Journal of Human Evolution* 40, 2001, 289-299.
- Dupla / Emborujó 1991: A. Dupla / A. Emborujó, El Vascocantabrismo: mito y realidad en la historiografía sobre el País Vasco en la antigüedad. In: J. Arce and R. Olmos (eds.), *Historiografía de la Arqueología y de la Historia Antigua en España. Siglos XVIII-XX*, Madrid 1991, 107-111.
- Dupré 2000: X. Dupré (ed.), *Scavi archeologici di Tusculum. Rapporti preliminari delle campagne 1994-1999*. Roma 2000.
- Dupré / Granados / Junyent / Nieto / Rafel / Tarrats 1986: X. Dupré / J. O. Granados / E. Junyent / X. Nieto / N. Rafel / F. Tarrats, L' Arqueologia catalana II. De la postguerra als anys setanta. *L'Avenç* 91, 1986, 64-71.
- Dupré / Granados / Junyent / Nieto / Rafel / Tarrats 1986 a: X. Dupré / J. O. Granados / E. Junyent / X. Nieto / N. Rafel / F. Tarrats, L' Arqueologia catalana- i III. Reorganització i nous impulsos, 1975-1985. *L'Avenç* 92, 1986, 47-53.
- Dupré / Rafel 1991: X. Dupré / N. Rafel, La política arqueològica de la Generalitat de Catalunya durante la República. In: J. Arce / R. Olmos (eds.), *Historiografía de la Arqueología y de la Historia Antigua en España. Siglos XVIII-XX*, Madrid 1991, 173-176.
- Endere 2000: M. L. Endere, Patrimonios en disputa: acervos nacionales, investigación arqueológica y reclamos étnicos sobre restos humanos. *Trabajos de Prehistoria* 57/1, 2000, 5-17.
- Estévez / Vila 1999: J. Estévez / A. Vila, Piedra a piedra. Historia de la construcción del Paleolítico en la Península Ibérica. Oxford 1999.
- Farro / Podgorny / Tobías 1999: M. Farro / I. Podgorny / M.^a D. Tobías, Notas para un ensayo sobre la recepción de la 'Nueva Arqueología' en la Argentina. *Rev. Do Museu de Arqueologia e Etnologia* 3, 1999, 221-234.

- Fernández Martínez / Ruiz Zapatero 1984: V. Fernández Martínez / G. Ruiz Zapatero, Análisis de territorios arqueológicos: una introducción crítica. *Arqueología espacial* 1. Coloquio sobre distribución y relaciones entre asentamientos. Teruel 1984, 55-71.
- Fernández-Miranda 1978: M. Fernández-Miranda, *Secuencia cultural de la Prehistoria de Mallorca*. Madrid 1978.
- Fontana 1982: J. Fontana, *Análisis del pasado y proyecto social*. Barcelona 1982.
- Furmánek 1980: V. Furmánek, Periodisation in the Central European Bronze Age. *Bulletin of the Institute of Archeology* 70, 1980, 117-125.
- García y Bellido 1951: A. García y Bellido, Noticiario. *El Instituto de Arqueología y Prehistoria 'Rodrigo Caro'*. *Archivo Español de Arqueología* 24, 1951, 161-168.
- García Fernández 1989: J. García Fernández, The new Spanish archaeological heritage legislation. In: H. Cleere (ed.), *Archaeological heritage management in the Modern World*. London 1989, 182-194.
- García Santos 1998: J. C. García Santos, La transformación de la arqueología española en la década de 1980. Análisis bibliométrico de los congresos sobre teoría y método. *Complutum* 9, 1998, 213-227.
- Gasull / Lull / Sanahuja 1984: P. Gasull / V. Lull / E. Sanahuja, *Son Fornés I: la fase talayótica. Ensayo de reconstrucción socio-económica de una comunidad prehistórica de la isla de Mallorca*. Oxford 1984.
- Gilman 1976: A. Gilman, Bronze Age dynamics in southeast Spain. *Dialectical Anthropology* 1, 1976, 300-319.
- Gilman 1988: A. Gilman, Enfoques teóricos en la arqueología de los ochenta. *Revista de Occidente* 81, 1988, 47-61.
- Gilman 1991: A. Gilman, Condiciones sociales bajo las cuales el cambio tecnológico es la causa inmediata de una evolución cultural. In: P. López García (ed.), *El cambio cultural del IV al II milenios a. C. en la Comarca Noroeste de Murcia*. Madrid 1991, 17-26.
- Gilman 1995: A. Gilman, Recent Trends in the Archaeology of Spain. In: K. T. Lillios (ed.), *The Origins of Complex Societies in Late Prehistoric Iberia*. Ann Arbor 1995, 1-6.
- Gilman 2000: A. Gilman, Book marks – guest editorial. *European Journal of Archaeology* 3/2, 2000, 265-267.
- Gilman / Thornes 1985: A. Gilman / J. B. Thornes, *Land-Use and Prehistory in South-East Spain*. London 1985.
- Gómez Fuentes 1979: A. Gómez Fuentes, *Formas económicas del Paleolítico Superior Cantábrico*. Salamanca 1979.
- González / Ibáñez / Zapata / Peña 2001: J. González / J. J. Ibáñez / L. Zapata / L. Peña, Estudio etnoarqueológico sobre la cerámica Gzaua (Marruecos). Técnica y contexto social de un artesanado arcaico. *Trabajos de Prehistoria* 58/1, 2001, 5-27.
- González Marcén 1998: P. González Marcén (ed.), *Actes del II Seminari d'Arqueologia i Ensenyament*. Bellaterra 1998.
- González Marcén / Risch 1990: P. González Marcén / R. Risch, Archaeology and Historical Materialism: outsider's Reflections on Theoretical Discussions in British Archaeology. In: F. Baker / J. Thomas (eds.), *Writing the Past in the Present*. Lampeter 1990, 94-104.
- González Méndez 2000: M. González Méndez, Memoria, Historia y Patrimonio: hacia una concepción social del patrimonio. *Trabajos de Prehistoria* 57/2, 2000, 9-20.

- Gran Aymerich / Gran Aymerich 1991: E. Gran Aymerich / J. Gran Aymerich, Les échanges franco-espagnols et la mise en place des institutions archéologiques (1830-1939). In: J. Arce / R. Olmos (eds.), *Historiografía de la Arqueología y de la Historia Antigua en España. Siglos XVIII-XX*, Madrid 1991, 117-124.
- Grünhagen 1979: W. Grünhagen, Zur Geschichte der Abteilung Madrid des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts von 1929 bis 1979. *Das Deutsche Archäologische Institut. Geschichte und Dokumente* 3, 1979, 117-170.
- Guitart / Riu 1989: J. Guitart / E. Riu. Arqueologia i cultura a la Catalunya contemporània. *L'Avenç* 124, 1989, 26-31.
- Hernando 1992: A. Hernando, Enfoques teóricos en arqueología. *SPAL Revista de Prehistoria y Arqueología* 1, 1992, 11-35.
- Hernando 1999: A. Hernando, Percepción de la realidad y Prehistoria. Relaciones entre la construcción de la identidad y la complejidad socio-económica en los grupos humanos. *Trabajos de Prehistoria* 56/2, 1999, 19-35.
- Higgs 1972: E. S. Higgs (ed.), *Papers in economic prehistory*. Cambridge 1972.
- Hodder 1991: I. Hodder, Preface, *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, VII-XI, 1-24.
- Jimeno / Fernández / Menéndez / Lario 1996: A. Jimeno / V. M. Fernández / M. Menéndez / J. Lario, The Mesolithic / Neolithic of the Blue Nile (East Bank): chronological seriation and settlement patterns. In: L. Krzyzaniak / M. Kobusiewicz (eds.), *Interregional contacts in the Later Prehistory of Northeastern Africa*. Poznań 1996, 335-345.
- Jimeno Martínez / Val / Fernández 1993: A. Jimeno Martínez / J. Val / J. J. Fernández, *Actas, Inventarios y Cartas Arqueológicas. Homenaje a Blas Taracena. 50 Aniversario de la primera Carta Arqueológica de España. Soria 1941-1991*. Valladolid 1993.
- Jordá Cerda 1980: F. Jordá Cerdá, Luis Pericot García 1899-1978. *Zephyrus*, 30-31, 1980, 277-278.
- Jornadas 1991: *Jornadas Internacionales. Arqueología de Intervención*. Bilbao 1991.
- Klejn 1993: L. S. Klejn, La arqueología soviética. Historia y teoría de una escuela desconocida. Barcelona 1993.
- Kohl / Fawcett 1995: P. Kohl / C. Fawcett (eds.), *Nationalism, Politics and the Practice of Archaeology*. Cambridge 1995.
- Lafuente / Saldaña 1987: A. Lafuente / J. J. Saldaña, *Historia de las ciencias*. Madrid 1987.
- Leroi-Gourhan / Brezillon 1972: A. Leroi-Gourhan / M. Brezillon, *Fouilles de Pincevent: essai d'analyse ethnographique d'un habitat magdalénien (la section 36)*. Paris 1972.
- Lillios 1995: K. T. Lillios (ed.), *The Origins of Complex Societies in Late Prehistoric Iberia*. Ann Arbor 1995.
- López García 1978: P. López García, Resultados polínicos del Holoceno en la Península Ibérica, *Trabajos de Prehistoria* 35, 1978, 9-44.
- López Piñero 1987: J. M.^a López Piñero, Los estudios sobre la ciencia. *Saber leer* 10, 1987, 10-11.
- Lull 1988: V. Lull, Hacia una teoría de la representación en arqueología, *Revista de Occidente* 81, 1988, 62-76.

- Lull 1991: V. Lull, La prehistoria de la teoría arqueológica en el Estado español. In: A. Vila (ed.), *Arqueología*. Madrid 1991, 231-250.
- Lull 2000: V. Lull, Death and society: a Marxist approach. *Antiquity* 74, 2000, 576-580.
- Lull / Micó 1997: V. Lull / R. Micó, Teoría arqueológica I. Los enfoques tradicionales: las arqueologías evolucionistas e histórico-culturales. *Revista d'Arqueologia de Ponent* 7, 1997, 107-128.
- Lull / Micó 1998: V. Lull / R. Micó, Teoría arqueológica II. La arqueología procesual. *Revista d'Arqueologia de Ponent* 8, 1998, 61-78.
- Lull / Micó / Montón / Picazo 1990: V. Lull / R. Micó / S. Montón / M. Picazo, La arqueología entre la insoportable levedad del ser y la voluntad de poder. *Archivo de Prehistoria Levantina* 20, 1990, 461-474.
- Lull / Micó / Rihuete / Risch 2001: V. Lull / R. Micó / C. Rihuete / R. Risch, La cuevas de Es Càrritx y Es Mussol (Ciutadella, Menorca). La Prehistoria de las Baleares a la luz de las tinieblas. In: *Y acumularon tesoros. Mil años de historia en nuestras tierras*. Alicante 2001, 86-101.
- Llobregat 1995: E. Llobregat, Miquel Tarradell: nacionalista, arqueòleg i historiador. *Saguntum* 28, 1995, 21-27.
- Maluquer de Motes 1954: J. Maluquer de Motes, La investigación prehistórica española después del Congreso de Ciencias Prehistóricas y Protohistóricas de Madrid. *Zephyrus* 5, 1954, 213-217.
- Maluquer de Motes 1958: J. Maluquer de Motes, Las actividades de la Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research, en relación con España. *Zephyrus* 9, 1958, 250.
- Maluquer de Motes 1960: J. Maluquer de Motes, Presentación. In: *Primer Symposium de Prehistoria de la Península Ibérica*. Pamplona 1960, V-X.
- Maluquer de Motes 1965: J. Maluquer de Motes, Prólogo. In: A. Arribas, *Los iberos*. Barcelona 1965, 9-20.
- Maluquer de Motes 1972: J. Maluquer de Motes, Proceso histórico económico de la primitiva población peninsular. Barcelona 1972.
- Marchand 1996: S. L. Marchand, *Down from Olympus. Archaeology and Philhellenism in Germany, 1750-1970*. Princeton 1996.
- Marcos Pous 1993: A. Marcos Pous, Origen y desarrollo del Museo Arqueológico Nacional. In: *De Gabinete a Museo. Tres siglos de historia*. Museo Arqueológico Nacional abril-junio 1993, Madrid 1993, 21-99.
- Martí Oliver 2000: B. Martí Oliver, Arqueologia i Museus: del Gabinet d'Antiguitats a la recreació del passat. *Canelobre* 41-42, 2000, 25-34.
- Martí Oliver / Villaverde Bonilla 1997: B. Martí Oliver / V. Villaverde Bonilla, El Laboratori d'Arqueologia de la Universitat de València a la dècada del 1940. *Saitabi* 47, 1997, 153-171.
- Martin 1995: G. Martin, Miquel Tarradell en Valencia. *Saguntum* 28, 1995, 13-20.
- Martín / Fernández-Miranda / Fernández-Posse / Gilman 1993: C. Martín / M. Fernández-Miranda / M. D. Fernández-Posse / A. Gilman, The Bronze Age of La Mancha. *Antiquity* 67, 1993, 23-45.

- Martin de Guzman 1984: C. Martin de Guzman, Nociones epistemológicas y arqueología prehistórica. Primeras Jornadas de Metodología de Investigación Prehistórica. Madrid 1984, 35-64.
- Martin de Guzman 1988: C. Martin de Guzman, Arqueología y paradigma: tendencias y resistencias. *Revista de Occidente* 81, 1988, 27-46.
- Martínez Navarrete 1989: M.^a I. Martínez Navarrete, Una revisión crítica de la prehistoria española: la Edad del Bronce como paradigma. Madrid 1989.
- Martínez Navarrete 1990: M.^a I. Martínez Navarrete, La Prehistoria española en los últimos cincuenta años: teoría y práctica. *Hispania* L / 2, 175, 1990, 439-457.
- Martínez Navarrete 1998: M.^a I. Martínez Navarrete, The development of Spanish archaeology in the 20th century. In: J. Lech (ed.), *Archaeology in the 20th Century. Ideas – People – Research*. *Archaeologia Polona* 35-36, 1997-1998, 319-342.
- Martínez Santa-Olalla 1953: J. Martínez Santa-Olalla, *Noticiario Arqueológico Hispánico* 1 (1952), 1953, 5-9.
- McNairn 1980: B. McNairn, The method and theory of V. Gordon Childe. Economic, social and cultural interpretations of Prehistory. Edinburgh 1980.
- Méndez 1998: F. Méndez, Definición y análisis de poblados de la Edad del Bronce en Galicia. In: R. Fábregas (ed.), *A Idade do Bronce en Galicia: novas perspectivas*. Coruña 1998, 153-189.
- Menéndez Pidal 1947: R. Menéndez Pidal (ed.), *Historia de España*. Madrid 1947.
- Mercader / García-Heras / González-Alvarez 2000: J. Mercader / M. García-Heras / I. González-Alvarez, Ceramic Tradition in the African Forest: Characterisation Analysis of Ancient and Modern Pottery from Ituri, D.R. Congo. *Journal of Archaeological Science* 27/2, 2000, 163-182.
- Micó Pérez 1998: R. Micó Pérez, Arqueologia teòrica o només arqueologia. *Cota Zero* 14, 1998, 19-29.
- Molist 1996: M. Molist, (ed.), *Tell Halula (Siria): un yacimiento neolítico del valle medio del Eufrates, campañas de 1991 y 1992*. Madrid 1996.
- Montero / Rodríguez Alcalde / Vicent / Cruz 2000: I. Montero / A. L. Rodríguez Alcalde / J. M. Vicent / M. Cruz, Técnicas analíticas basadas en el proceso de imágenes multispectrales. In: A. Rosa Cruz / L. Oosterbeek (ed.), *ARKEOS – perspectivas em diálogo* 7, *Tomar* 2000, 13-34.
- Mora / Díaz-Andreu 1997: G. Mora / M. Díaz-Andreu (eds.), *La cristalización del pasado: génesis y desarrollo del marco institucional de la arqueología en España*. Málaga 1997.
- Moreno 1992: P. L. Moreno, De la alfabetización a la educación de adultos. In: A. Escolano (ed.), *Leer y escribir en España: doscientos años de alfabetización*. Madrid 1992, 111-140.
- Moure 1993: A. Moure, The Spanish Palaeolithic: scientific structure and present problematics. In: M.^a I. Martínez Navarrete (ed.), *Theory and Practice of Prehistory: views from the edges of Europe*. Cantabria 1993, 205-227.
- Moure 1996: A. Moure (ed.), *‘El Hombre Fósil’ 80 años después. Homenaje a Hugo Obermaier*. Santander 1996.
- Navascués 1960: J. de Navascués, Crónica abreviada. In: *Primer Symposium de Prehistoria de la Península Ibérica*. Septiembre 1959 (Ponencias). Pamplona 1960, XI-XV.

- Nicolás / Márquez / Rodríguez 2000: E. Nicolás / B. Márquez / J. Rodríguez, Divulgación de las investigaciones en Atapuerca (Burgos). *Trabajos de Prehistoria* 57/2, 2000, 21-39.
- Nieto Gallo 1962: G. Nieto Gallo, Discurso de clausura. In: A. Beltran, *Crónica del VII Congreso Nacional de Arqueología*. Zaragoza 1962, 49-62.
- Nocete 1989: F. Nocete, *El espacio de la coerción*. Oxford 1989.
- Nocete 2001: F. Nocete, Tercer milenio antes de nuestra era. Relaciones y contradicciones centro / periferia en el valle del Guadalquivir. Barcelona 2001.
- Obermaier 1916: H. Obermaier, *El Hombre fósil*. Memorias de la Comisión de Investigaciones Paleontológicas y Prehistóricas 9, Madrid 1916.
- Obermaier 1926: H. Obermaier, La vida de nuestros antepasados cuaternarios en Europa. In: A. Ballesteros y Beretta (ed.), *Discursos leídos ante la Real Academia de la Historia en la recepción de Don Hugo Obermaier el 2 de Mayo de 1926*. Madrid 1926, 7-101.
- Onrubia 1995: J. Onrubia, Celso Martín de Guzmán, historiador de la cultura. *Trabajos de Prehistoria* 52/2, 1995, 5-14.
- Oria Segura 2000: M. Oria Segura, El estado de la arqueología clásica en España: propuesta para un debate necesario. *Spal* 8, 1999, 9-19.
- Palol 1994: P. de Palol, Dr. Miquel Tarradell i Mateu. *Pyrenae* 25, 1994, 13-14.
- Parcero 2000: C. Parcero, Tres para dos. Las formas del poblamiento en la Edad del Hierro del Noroeste ibérico. *Trabajos de Prehistoria* 57/1, 2000, 75-95.
- Pasamar / Peiró 1991: G. Pasamar / I. Peiró, Los orígenes de la profesionalización historiográfica española sobre Prehistoria y Antigüedad (tradiciones decimonónicas e influencias europeas). In: J. Arce / R. Olmos (eds.), *Historiografía de la Arqueología y de la Historia Antigua en España*. Siglos XVIII-XX, Madrid 1991, 73-79.
- Pérez Die 1998: M.^a C. Pérez Die, Arqueología en Egipto y Sudán. El proyecto de investigación de Ehnasya el Medina (Heracleópolis Magna), Egipto. *Arbor* 635-636, 311-326.
- Pericot 1934: L. Pericot, Epocas primitiva y romana. In: *Historia de España* 1. Barcelona 1934.
- Pericot 1962: L. Pericot, Discurso inaugural. In: A. Beltran, *Crónica del VII Congreso Nacional de Arqueología*. Zaragoza 1962, 8-17.
- Pericot 1976: L. Pericot, Algunos de mis recuerdos de Bosch Gimpera. In: J. Comas (ed.), In: *memoriam Pedro Bosch Gimpera (1891-1974)*. México 1976, 23-37.
- Primeras 1983: *Primeras Jornadas de Arqueología en las Ciudades Actuales*. Zaragoza 1983.
- Querol 2000: M. A. Querol, Protection of archaeological heritage in Spain. *Archaeologia Polona* 38, 2000, 175-190.
- Querol 2000 a: M. A. Querol, La gestión del Patrimonio Arqueológico: un futuro abierto para Navarra. *Cuadernos de Arqueología de la Universidad de Navarra* 8, 2000, 207-236.
- Querol 2002: M. A. Querol (ed.): *La mujer en el Origen del Hombre*. Barcelona 2002.
- Querol / Chapa 1996: A. Querol / T. Chapa (eds.), *Homenaje al profesor Manuel Fernández-Miranda*. Madrid 1996.
- Querol / Martínez Díaz 1996: A. Querol / B. Martínez Díaz, La gestión del patrimonio arqueológico en España. Madrid 1996.
- Querol / Cerdeño / Martínez Navarrete / Contreras 1994: M. A. Querol / M.^a L. Cerdeño / M.^a I. Martínez Navarrete / F. Contreras, El ejercicio profesional de la arqueología en España. *Trabalhos de Antropologia e Etnologia* 35/1, 1994, 485-500.

- Querol / Martínez Navarrete / Hernández / Cerdeño / Antona 1995: M.^a A. Querol / M.^a I. Martínez-Navarrete / F. Hernández / M.^a L. Cerdeño / V. Antona, The value of archaeological heritage: an analysis by the Professional Association of Spanish Archaeologists (APAE). *Journal of European Archaeology* 3/1, 1995, 233-246.
- Quesada 1996: F. Quesada, La Imagen de la antigüedad hispana en la plástica española del siglo XIX. In: R. Olmos (ed.), *Al otro lado del espejo. Aproximación a la imagen ibérica*. Madrid 1996, 211-238.
- Renfrew 1967: C. Renfrew, Colonialism and megalithism. *Antiquity*, 41, 1967, 276-288.
- Renfrew 1973: C. Renfrew, *Before Civilisation*. London 1973.
- Renzong 1987: Q. Renzong, Sobre la tensión entre internalismo y externalismo en la historia de la ciencia. In: A. Lafuente / J. J. Saldaña, *Historia de las ciencias*. Madrid 1987, 25-39.
- Ripoll Perelló 1984: E. Ripollo Perelló, Prof. Dr. D. Martín Almagro Basch (1911-1984). *Boletín del Museo Arqueológico Nacional* 2/1, 1984, 6-13.
- Ripoll / Municio 1999: S. Ripoll / L. Municio (ed.), *Domingo García. Arte Rupestre Paleolítico al aire libre en la Meseta castellana*. Salamanca 1999.
- Risquez / Hornos 2000: C. Risquez / F. Hornos, Paseando por un museo y buscando el lugar de la mujer. *Arqueología Espacial* 21, 2000, 175-186.
- Riu 1992: E. Riu, Preàmbul. La mobilització dels arqueòlegs. Catalunya, entre assemblees i jornades (1978-1987). In: *I Jornades sobre la situació professional en l'arqueologia*. Barcelona 1992, 9-15.
- Rivera Dorado 1972: M. Rivera Dorado, Introducción. *Cuadernos de Antropología Social y Etnología* 5, *Arqueología Teórica*, 1/II, I-IV.
- Rivera Dorado 1981: M. Rivera Dorado, Opiniones sobre arqueología: su definición y sus relaciones. *Revista de la Universidad Complutense* 2, 1981, 97-100.
- Rodríguez Alcalde / San Millán / Sánchez Nistal / Chapa Brunet / Martínez Navarrete / Ruíz Zapatero 1993: A. Rodríguez Alcalde / M.^a J. San Millán / J. M.^a Sánchez Nistal / T. Chapa Brunet / M.^a I. Martínez Navarrete / G. Ruíz Zapatero, Análisis bibliométrico de Trabajos de Prehistoria. *Trabajos de Prehistoria* 50, 1993, 11-37.
- Rodríguez Alcalde / Sánchez Nistal / Martínez Navarrete / San Millán 1996: A. Rodríguez Alcalde / J. M.^a Sánchez Nistal / M.^a I. Martínez Navarrete / M.^a J. San Millán, Análisis bibliométrico de las revistas españolas de Prehistoria y Arqueología en los últimos diez años. *Trabajos de Prehistoria* 53/1, 1996, 37-58.
- Rodríguez Temiño / Rodríguez de Guzmán 1997: I. Rodríguez Temiño / S. Rodríguez de Guzmán, Excavaciones arqueológicas en Andalucía: 1984-1995. *Trabajos de Prehistoria* 54/1, 1997, 57-70.
- Rovira 1999: S. Rovira, Una propuesta metodológica para el estudio de la metalurgia prehistórica: el caso de Gorný en la región de Kargaly (Orenburg, Rusia). *Trabajos de Prehistoria* 56/2, 85-113.
- Ruiz Rodríguez 1989: A. Ruíz Rodríguez, De las arqueologías a la Arqueología. In: 1978-1988 Andalucía: diez años de cultura. Sevilla 1989, 11-17.
- Ruiz Rodríguez 1993: A. Ruíz Rodríguez, Present panorama of Spanish Archaeology. In: M.^a I. Martínez Navarrete (ed.), *Theory and Practice of Prehistory: views from the edges of Europe*. Cantabria 1993, 307-326.

- Ruiz Rodríguez / Chapa / Ruiz-Zapatero 1988: A. Ruiz Rodríguez / T. Chapa / G. Ruiz-Zapatero, La arqueología contextual: una revisión crítica. *Trabajos de Prehistoria* 45, 1988, 11-18.
- Ruiz / Molinos 1998: A. Ruiz / M. Molinos, *The Archaeology of the Iberians*. Cambridge 1998.
- Ruiz Rodríguez / Molinos Molinos / Hornos Mata 1986: A. Ruiz Rodríguez, M. Molinos Molinos / F. Hornos Mata, *Arqueología en Jaén. Reflexiones desde un proyecto arqueológico no inocente*. Jaén 1986.
- Ruiz-Zapatero 1991: G. Ruiz-Zapatero, *Arqueología y Universidad. La 'reproducción del sistema'*. *Revista de Arqueología* 12, 118, 1991, 6-7.
- Ruiz-Zapatero 1993: G. Ruiz-Zapatero, El concepto de Celtas en la Prehistoria europea y española. In: M. Almagro-Gorbea and G. Ruiz-Zapatero (eds.), *Los Celtas: Hispania y Europa*. Madrid 1993, 23-62.
- Ruiz-Zapatero 1993 a: The organisation of the archaeology in Spain. In: M.^a I. Martínez Navarrete (ed.): *Theory and Practice of Prehistory: views from the edges of Europe*. Cantabria 1993, 45-73.
- Ruiz-Zapatero / Alvarez-Sanchís 1995: G. Ruiz-Zapatero / J. Alvarez-Sanchís, Prehistory, story – telling and illustrations: the Spanish past in school textbooks (1880-1994). *Journal of European Archaeology* 3/1, 1995, 213-232.
- Ruiz-Zapatero / Vicent García 1992: G. Ruiz-Zapatero / J. M. Vicent García, Todo arqueólogo tiene algo de teórico... Una entrevista con Leo S. Klejn. *Trabajos de Prehistoria* 49, 1992, 11-25.
- Sackett 1991: J. R. Sackett, Straight Archaeology French Style: the Philogenetic in Historic Perspective. In: G. A. Clark (ed.), *Perspectives on the past: theoretical biases in mediterranean hunter-gatherer research*. Philadelphia 1991, 109-139.
- Salvatierra 1990: V. Salvatierra, Cien años de Arqueología medieval: perspectivas desde la periferia. Jaén 1990.
- Salvatierra 1994: V. Salvatierra, Historia y desarrollo del modelo andaluz de Arqueología. *Trabajos de Prehistoria* 51/1, 1994, 1-13.
- Salvatierra 1997: V. Salvatierra, The origins of Al-Andalus (eight and ninth centuries). Continuity and change. In: M. Díaz-Andreu / S. Keay (eds.), *The archaeology of Iberia: the dynamics of change*. London 1997, 265-278.
- Seco Serrano 1974: C. Seco Serrano, Época contemporánea (La Segunda República- La Guerra Civil- La España actual). In: L. Pericot (ed.): *Historia de España*. Barcelona 1974.
- Stos-Gale / Hunt-Ortiz / Gale 1999: Z. Stos-Gale / M. A. Hunt-Ortiz / N. Gale, Análisis elemental y de isótopos de plomo de objetos metálicos de Gatas. In: P. Castro / R. Chapman / S. Gili / V. Lull / R. Mico / C. Rihuete / R. Risch / E. Sanahuja, *Proyecto Gatas 2. La dinámica arqueocológica de la ocupación prehistórica*. Sevilla 1999, 347-358.
- Straus 1996: L. G. Straus, Hugo Obermaier and the Cantabrian Solutrean. In: A. Moure (ed.), 'El Hombre Fósil' 80 años después. Homenaje a Hugo Obermaier. Santander 1996, 195-209.
- Straus 1996 a: L. G. Straus, El estudio de la Prehistoria del Viejo Mundo en los Estados Unidos de América. *Trabajos de Prehistoria* 53/1, 1996, 5-13.
- Straus 2000: L. G. Straus (ed.), An American in Stone Age Spain. Homenaje de sus Alumnos al Prof. L. G. Freeman. *Journal of Anthropological Research*, 56/1, 2000.
- Tarradell 1962: M. Tarradell, *El País Valenciano del neolítico a la iberización*. Valencia 1962.

- Tarradell 1968: M. Tarradell, Presentación. In: M. Tarradell (ed.), *Estudios de economía antigua de la Península Ibérica*. Barcelona 1968, 7-10.
- Tarradell 1970: M. Tarradell, Pericot como africanista y americanista. In: A. Beltran, *Crónica*. XI Congreso Nacional de Arqueología. Zaragoza 1970, 31-34.
- Tarradell 1971: M. Tarradell, *Actas de la Primera Reunión de Historia de la Economía Antigua de la Península Ibérica*. Valencia 1971.
- Tarradell / Woods 1958: M. Tarradell / D. E. Woods, Excavations in Mallorca. *Archaeology* 11/4, 1958, 282.
- Taton 1987: R. Taton, Las biografías científicas y su importancia en la historia de las ciencias. In: A. Lafuente / J. J. Saldaña (ed.), *Historia de las ciencias*. Madrid 1987, 73-85.
- Trigger 1998: B. Trigger, Childe as a moralist. In: J. Lech (ed.), *Archaeology in the 20th Century. Ideas – People – Research*. *Archaeologia Polona* 35-36 (1997-1998), 1998, 357-362.
- Vázquez León 1999: L. Vázquez León, Graebner y la estructura teórica subyacente en la 'Meso-america' de Kirchhoff. *Relaciones* 80, 1999, 207-238.
- Vázquez Varela / Risch 1991: J. M. Vázquez Varela / R. Risch, Theory in Spanish archaeology since 1960. In: I. Hodder (ed.), *Archaeological Theory in Europe. The Last Three Decades*. London 1991, 25-51.
- Veit 1984: U. Veit, Gustav Kossinna und Gordon Childe. *Ansätze zu einer theoretischen Grundlegung der Vorgeschichte*. *Saeculum* 35, 1984, 326-363.
- Velasco / Mena / Méndez 1987: F. Velasco / P. Mena / A. Méndez, Excavaciones de urgencia y Carta Arqueológica. In: *130 Años de Arqueología Madrileña*. Madrid 1987, 189-195.
- Vicent 1982: J. M. Vicent, Las tendencias metodológicas en Prehistoria. *Trabajos de Prehistoria* 39, 1982, 9-53.
- Vicent 1984: J. M. Vicent, Fundamentos para una investigación epistemológica sobre la Prehistoria, Primeras Jornadas de Metodología de Investigación Prehistórica. Madrid 1984, 71-87.
- Vicent 1985: J. M. Vicent, Un concepto de metodología: hacia una definición epistemológica diferencial de Prehistoria y Arqueología. *Actas de las Segundas Jornadas de Metodología y Didáctica de la Historia, Prehistoria y Arqueología*. Cáceres 1985, 55-72.
- Vicent 1988: J. M. Vicent, El origen de la economía productora. Breve introducción a la Historia de las Ideas. In: P. López García (ed.), *El Neolítico en España*. Madrid 1988, 11-58.
- Vicent 1990: J. M. Vicent, El debat postprocessual: algunes observacions 'radicals' sobre una arqueologia 'conservadora'. *Cota Zero* 6, 1990, 102-107.
- Vicent 1991: J. M. Vicent, Fundamentos teórico-metodológicos para un programa de investigación arqueo-geográfica. In: P. López García (ed.), *El cambio cultural del IV al II milenios a. C. en la Comarca Noroeste de Murcia*. Madrid 1991, 31-117.
- Vicent 1993: J. M. Vicent, Department of Prehistory of the Centre for Historical Studies (C.S.I.C). In: M.^a I. Martínez Navarrete (ed.), *Theory and Practice of Prehistory: views from the edges of Europe*. Cantabria 1993, 19-35.
- Vicent 1994: J. M. Vicent, Perspectivas de la teoría arqueológica en España. In: *6 Congreso Hispano-Ruso de Historia*. Madrid 1994, 215-223.
- Vicent 1995: J. M. Vicent, Problemas teóricos de la arqueología de la muerte. Una introducción. In: R. Fábregas / F. Pérez / C. Fernández (ed.), *Arqueología da Morte na Península Ibérica desde as Orixes ata o Medievo*. Xinzo de Limia 1995, 13-31.

- Vicent 1995 a: J. M. Vicent, Early Social Complexity in Iberia: Some Theoretical Remarks. In: K. T. Lillios (ed.), *The Origins of Complex Societies in Late Prehistoric Iberia*. Ann Arbor 1995, 177-183.
- Vicent 1997: J. M. Vicent, The Island Filter Model Revisited. In: M. S. Balmuth, A. Gilman and L. Prados-Torreira, *Encounters and Transformations. The Archaeology of Iberia in Transition*. Sheffield 1997, 1-13.
- Vicent / Montero / Rodríguez Alcalde / Martínez Navarrete / Chapa 1996: J. M. Vicent / I. Montero / A. L. Rodríguez Alcalde / M.ª I. Martínez Navarrete / T. Chapa, Aplicación de la imagen multiespectral al estudio y conservación del arte rupestre postpaleolítico. *Trabajos de Prehistoria* 53/2, 1996, 19-35.
- Vicent / Rodríguez Alcalde / López Saez / Zavala / López García / Martínez Navarrete 2000: J. M. Vicent / A. L. Rodríguez Alcalde / J. A. López Saez / I. de Zavala / P. López García / M.ª I. Martínez Navarrete, ¿Catástrofes ecológicas en la estepa? *Arqueología del Paisaje en el complejo minero-metalúrgico de Kargaly (Región de Orenburg, Rusia)*. *Trabajos de Prehistoria* 57/1, 2000, 29-74.
- Vila 1998: A. Vila, Arqueologia per imperatiu etnològic. *Cota Zero* 14, 1998, 73-80.
- Villacorta 1989: F. Villacorta, Profesionales y burócratas. Estado y poder corporativo en la España del siglo XX, 1890-1923. Madrid 1989.
- Viñao 1990: A. Viñao, The History of Literacy in Spain: Evolution, Trends and Questions. *History of Education Quarterly* 30/4, 1990, 573-599.