

Another issue that academics found unacceptable was Robbins's unabashedly promotion of himself as a consultant, which was a necessity given his position as an archaeologist and a businessman. In 1970, James Deetz volunteered to dig a site for free that Robbins was negotiating to work on for pay, an early example of a scenario repeated in the early years of cultural resource management when university archaeologists could not accept the concept of independent consultants.

Another of his "faults," was his consistent and well thought out use of mechanical equipment to help excavate sites. Although standard today, use of such excavation methods was viewed with great alarm by many of his colleagues. Although his field notes and discussion in *Hidden America* indicate understanding of stratigraphy, his focus upon architectural remains and features, and lack of interest in later occupations at his sites, meant that vertical artifact proveniences were often not recorded, although horizontal provenience was always recorded with a superimposed grid system.

Robbins' reaction to criticism was to disparage academic archaeology and to call himself a treasure hunter (earlier, on the dust jacket of *Hidden America* he identified himself as a "professional archaeologist," a thoroughly appropriate term). A Yankee individualist to the end, he chose not to make basic changes in his approach to sites as the field that he had pioneered changed and put him in a marginal position. Such marginalization might be considered the very heart of the process of professionalization, which involves the creation of standards that some practitioners cannot or will not meet (see examples in Kehoe and Emmerichs 1999). This process may place extremely knowledgeable people in situations where their knowledge is inaccessible or ignored and their past work marginalized. Astute historians of archaeology are aware of such processes and there has been a steady rehabilitation of some of these marginalized scholars into the history of prehistorical archaeology over the last couple of decades. Linebaugh's book is the first to begin this process in historical archaeology and it provides an important case study for those interested in pondering the multifaceted process of professionalization.

References

- Kehoe, Alice B. and Mary Beth Emmerichs (eds.) 1999 *Assembling the Past: Studies in the Professionalization of Archaeology*. University of New Mexico Press: Albuquerque.
- Robbins, Roland Wells and Evan Jones 1959 *Hidden America*. Alfred A. Knopf: New York.
- South, Stanley (ed.) 1994 *Pioneers in Historical Archaeology: Breaking New Ground*. Plenum Press: New York.

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5334/bha.15106>

F. Gracia, J. M. Fullola Pericot & F. Vilanova (eds.) 58 anys i 7 dies. Correspondència de Pere Bosch Gimpera a Lluís Pericot (1919–1974). Barcelona: Universitat de Barcelona.

Reviewed by *Margarita Díaz-Andreu*

Histories of archaeology remind us of the debates that have guided archaeological interpretation to the present. They also allow us to understand the social context in which theories and interpretations were developed. This is particularly true in the case of external historiographical analysis, a recent trend in historiographical studies in the field of archaeology which is unveiling a wealth of information on past practices in the discipline. In

this type of studies the emphasis is not on the actual theories, on the internal dynamics of archaeological thought, but on the interaction between practitioners and the personal and professional framework in which their studies took place. Yet, access to this data are not easy to obtain, especially when most of the protagonists and the people who knew them are no longer alive. It is in this context that research in archives and epistolary correspondence is proving an extremely valuable source of information. Letters and other documents such as minutes of meetings and photographs are providing revealing information about the transmission of ideas between scholars, the existence of academic networks, and the influence that particular non-scientific events may have had in the formation of scientific knowledge.

In the last ten-odd years Spain has developed a tradition in the history of archaeology. From an initial impetus using the internalist approach (Ayarzaguena Sanz 1992; Cortadella i Morral 1992; Martínez Navarrete 1989; Pereira González 2001) together with some biographies (Maier 1999; Ripoll Perelló 1994) and the study of particular institutions (Marcos Pous 1993; Peiró Martín & Pasamar Alzuria 1996), the weight of research has moved to the external analysis, especially since the celebration of the two first conferences on the history of archaeology in Spain during the 18th to 20th centuries (Arce & Olmos 1991; Mora & Díaz-Andreu 1997). In the last few years researchers have recovered a wealth of documentation from archives. In the light of the pioneering research by the historians Gonzalo Pasamar and Ignacio Peiró (Peiró Martín & Pasamar Alzuria 1989–90, see also Pasamar Alzuria & Peiró Martín 2002), researchers have started to look into archives. The recent books on the development of archaeology in the early (Mora 1998) and late modern period (Díaz-Andreu 2002), the works based on information gathered at the Royal Academy of History, mainly relating to the nineteenth century (among others Almagro Gorbea 1999; Maier & Alvarez Sanchís 1999), the analysis of the documentation on funding for excavations and archaeological management in the first decades of the Franco Regime (Díaz-Andreu & Ramírez Sánchez forthcoming 2003), have been followed by Gracia, Fullola and Vilanova's revealing book on the correspondence between two of the major prehistorians of 20th century Catalonia and Spain, Pere Bosch Gimpera and Lluís Pericot. This book stands out because of the volume of documentation, surpassing that obtained in similar undertakings on letters written by the future key archaeologists – including Bosch – during their training period in Germany at the start of the twentieth century (Díaz-Andreu 1995; Díaz-Andreu 1996), or even that of other books published on the correspondence of Bosch Gimpera with political figures of the time (Olivar-Bertrand 1978; Vilanova i Vila-Abadal 1998).

Most of the letters transcribed and discussed in the book by Gracia, Fullola and Vilanova come from an until now untouched archive stored at the Central University of Barcelona. The rest are from the Pericot archive, given to the Biblioteca de Catalunya. They reveal data never explicit in publications such as the practice of clientelism. Already in the second letter transcribed in the book, dated in 1918, there is a case worth mentioning. Professor Bosch Gimpera writes to Pericot, who had graduated that same year but was now in Madrid attending the course necessary in order to undertake postdoctoral studies: "I would imagine that Obermaier [the professor of prehistory in Madrid] has already asked you not to explain anything to the student of Gómez Moreno [the head of archaeology at the JAE, the Council for the Enhancement of Studies also based in Madrid] about what you do on megaliths" (p. 92). This letter reveals not only the existence of different interest groups, each led by a patron, but also the alliances established between some of them, in this case between Obermaier's and Bosch Gimpera's groups. The influence of German archaeology in Bosch Gimpera is also apparent, not only through the wealth of German archaeologists mentioned in the letters, but also because of an apparent Germano-filia, most apparent in his 1921 visit to Germany. This pro-German stance contrasts with Bosch's political ideology which led him into exile after the

Spanish Civil War (for further discussion on this see Díaz-Andreu forthcoming). Yet, the correspondence also shows that political ideology was not a barrier in his relationship with many of his disciples, some of them of marked right-wing tendencies and from 1939 collaborators with the Franco regime. One of the other aspects of this book worth mentioning refers to information revealed by the photographs that illustrate the book. These come from the archive of the family Fullola-Pericot, and, as shown in the volumes recently published from an exhibition on historical photographs of Iberian archaeology (Blánquez Pérez & Roldán Pérez 1999a; Blánquez Pérez & Roldán Pérez 1999b; Blánquez Pérez & Roldán Pérez 2000), they count a story in their own right, which, although not explained in this book, will hopefully be told in a future publication. The correspondence between Bosch Gimpera and Pericot is preceded by extremely useful introductions on Bosch Gimpera, Pericot and the Barcelona School, each written by one of the book's editors.

References

- Almagro Gorbea, M. (ed.) 1999. *El Gabinete de Antigüedades de la Real Academia de la Historia*. Madrid: Real Academia de la Historia.
- Arce, J. & R. Olmos (eds.) 1991. *Historiografía de la Arqueología y de la Historia Antigua en España (siglos XVIII–XX)*. Madrid: Ministerio de Cultura.
- Ayarzaguena Sanz, M. 1992. *La arqueología prehistórica y protohistórica española en el siglo XIX*. Madrid: Universidad Nacional de Educación a Distancia.
- Blánquez Pérez, J. & L. Roldán Pérez (eds.) 1999a. *La cultura ibérica a través de la fotografía de principios de siglo (I). Las colecciones madrileñas*. Madrid: Universidad Autónoma de Madrid; Real Academia de la Historia; Comunidad de Madrid; Caja de Ahorros.
- Blánquez Pérez, J. & L. Roldán Pérez (eds.) 1999b. *La cultura ibérica a través de la fotografía de principios de siglo (II). Un homenaje a la memoria*. Madrid: Librería Portico.
- Blánquez Pérez, J. & L. Roldán Pérez (eds.) 2000. *La cultura ibérica a través de la fotografía de principios de siglo (III). El litoral mediterráneo*. Madrid: Caja de Ahorros del Mediterráneo; Universidad Autónoma de Madrid.
- Cortadella i Morral, J. 1992. *Història antiga en la historiografia catalana*. Publicacions de la Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona. Edició microfotogràfica. Barcelona: Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.
- Díaz-Andreu, M. 1995. Arqueólogos españoles en Alemania en el primer tercio del siglo XX. Los becarios de la Junta para la Ampliación Estudios (I) Pedro Bosch Gimpera, *Madridener Mitteilungen* 36: 79–89.
- Díaz-Andreu, M. 1996. Arqueólogos españoles en Alemania en el primer tercio del siglo XX. Los becarios de la Junta para la Ampliación Estudios e Investigaciones Científicas, *Madridener Mitteilungen* 37: 205–224.
- Díaz-Andreu, M. 2002. *Historia de la Arqueología. Estudios*. Madrid: Ediciones Clásicas.
- Díaz-Andreu, M. & J. Cortadella (forthcoming). Success and failure: alternatives in the Institutionalisation of pre- and proto-history in Spain (Hernández-Pacheco, Obermaier, Bosch Gimpera), in J. Callmer, M. Meyer, R. Struwe & C. Theune-Vogt (eds.) *The Beginnings of Academic Pre- and Protohistoric Archaeology (1830–1930) in a European Perspective*. Berliner Archäologische Forschungen. Berlin: Verlag Marie Leidorf.
- Díaz-Andreu, M. & M. Ramírez Sánchez (forthcoming 2003). Archaeological Resource Management under Franco's Spain: the Comisaría General de Excavaciones Arqueológicas, in M. Galaty & C. Watkinson (eds.) *Archaeology under Dictatorship*. Critical Perspectives on Identity, Memory and the Built Environment. Hingham, MA: Kluwer/Plenum.
- Maier, J. 1999. *Jorge Bonsor (1855–1930). Un académico correspondiente de la Real Academia de la Historia y de la Arqueología española*. Madrid: Real Academia de la Historia.
- Maier, J. & J. Alvarez Sanchís 1999. *Comisión de Antigüedades. Aragón. Catálogo e índices*. Madrid,

- Zaragoza: Real Academia de la Historia; Institución Fernando el Católico.
- Marcos Pous, A. (ed.) 1993. *De gabinete a museo: tres siglos de historia*. Madrid: Ministerio de Cultura.
- Martínez Navarrete, M. I. 1989. *Una revisión crítica de la prehistoria española: la Edad del Bronce como paradigma*. Madrid: Siglo XXI.
- Mora, G. 1998. 'Historias de mármol'. *La arqueología clásica española en el siglo XVIII*. Anejos de Archivo Español de Arqueología 18. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, Polifemo.
- Mora, G. & M. Díaz-Andreu (eds.) 1997. *La cristalización del pasado. Génesis y desarrollo del marco institucional de la arqueología en España. Actas del II Congreso Internacional de Historiografía de la Arqueología en España (siglos XVIII–XX)*. Madrid, Málaga: Ministerio de Cultura, Universidad de Málaga.
- Olivar-Bertrand, R. 1978. *Correspondència 1969–1974*. Barcelona: Barcelona.
- Pasamar Alzuria, G. & I. Peiró Martín 2002. *Diccionario Akal de historiadores españoles contemporáneos (1840–1980)*. Madrid: Akal.
- Peiró Martín, I. & G. Pasamar Alzuria 1989–90. El nacimiento en España de la arqueología y la prehistoria (academicismo y profesionalización, 1856–1936), *Kalathos* 9–10: 9–30.
- Peiró Martín, I. & G. Pasamar Alzuria 1996. *La Escuela Superior de Diplomática (los archiveros en la historiografía española contemporánea)*. Madrid: Asociación Española de Archiveros, Bibliotecarios, Museólogos y Documentalistas (ANABAD).
- Pereira González, F. 2001. Raza e alteridade. A reflexión sobre a diversidade humana na Galicia do século XIX. A Coruña: Diputación Provincial de A Coruña.
- Ripoll Perelló, E. 1994. *El abate Henri Breuil (1877–1961)*. Madrid: Universidad Nacional de Educación a Distancia.
- Vilanova i Vila-Abadal, F. (ed.) 1998. *Viure el primer exili. Cartes britàniques de Pere Bosch i Gimpera 1939–1940*. Quaderns de l'Arxiu Pi i Sunyer, núm. 2. Barcelona: Fundació Carles Pi i Sunyer d'Estudis Autònoms i Locals.

VII. Resources

British Archives On-line

On-line archival access clearly has the potential to revolutionise historiographic research, having, in effect, the possibility of bringing library and archive collections 'home'. In this vein, some recent developments notice. First is *Antiquity*, which with their Premium subscription rate now provides a full electronic archive of all its previous editions, dating back to Crawford's foundation of the journal in 1927. It includes not only the personal 'retrospect' series and the changing perspective of its eminent editors, but also many key papers in the development of the subject which range, for example, from Grahame Clark's and Christopher Hawkes's 'invasionist' debates to the introduction of the techniques of radiocarbon dating (sales@portland-services.com).

Equally noteworthy is that the Society of Antiquaries of London (founded 1707) has just launched on-line access to its catalogue of drawings and archaeological records (http://ads.ahds.ac.uk/catalogue/specColl/SoA_images; note underscore SoA_images; alternatively there is the Society's web-site at www.sal.org.uk). Having more than 4,000 entries and 2,100 images (including 700 of materials within the Society's own museum), this also promises to be a major resource.