

The project fits into studies of the second Iron Age. It takes advantage of the results of preventive excavations made at La Tène in 2003, as well as of overall knowledge gathered during over the last twenty years, as a result of the highway excavations in the Trois-Lacs area.

Several PhD theses dedicated to the regional second Iron Age are underway.

In collaboration with the Laténium Museum, the European Archaeological Center of Bibracte (Mont Beuvray in Bourgogne) will contribute to an international conference in Neuchâtel, in November 2007.

Last but not least, this year we are celebrating the 150th anniversary of the discovery of the site. Starting in June 2007, numerous events, exhibitions, etc. will take place in the Museum Schwab (Biel/Bienne), in the Laténium (Hauterive/Neuchâtel), and in the Swiss National Museum (Zurich).

Please send any information to: Gianna.Reginelli@ne.ch

New Research Grant

In May 2007 the Getty Foundation approved a grant to the Fondation Maison des Sciences de l'Homme of \$160,000 US for the Collaborative Research Grant Project of Irène Aghion, Tim Murray, Alain Schnapp and Lothar von Falkenhausen: "Traces, Collections, Ruins: Towards a Comparative History of Antiquarianism". The project will be completed in 2009.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.5334/bha.17210>

VIII. Conference reports

The National Museum of Denmark 1807–2007

Report by **Peter Rowley-Conwy**, Department of Archaeology, University of Durham

The National Museum of Denmark dates its foundation from a royal decree issued on 22 May 1807. On 24–25 May 2007 a conference was held in the National Museum to celebrate its 200th anniversary, and was attended by some eighty people and hearing fifteen presentations on a variety of topics. The conference was a present to the National Museum from the publishing house 'Wormianum' (named after the seventeenth century antiquarian Ole Worm), which has produced the popular archaeology periodical *Skalk* since 1957, and was organized by Christian Adamsen. Presentations were in Danish, Swedish and Norwegian, and the proceedings will be published in those languages.

What was actually decreed in 1807 was the formation of the 'Kongelige Commission for Oldsagers Opbevaring', or Royal Commission for the Preservation of Antiquities. The two leading members of this commission were Frederik Münter, Bishop of Zealand, and Rasmus Nyerup, Copenhagen University's librarian. Antiquities began to arrive in Copenhagen in 1807 as a result of the commission's activities, and for lack of anywhere better were initially housed by Nyerup in cases at one end of the library, which occupied a large room above the Trinitatis Church. C. J. Thomsen joined the commission in 1816, and subsequently initiated the rearrangement of the collection into successive eras of Stone, Bronze, and Iron. The conference explored the commission's background, context, and activities.

Karin Lundbeck-Culot discussed the situation in revolutionary France. In 1795 (and lasted until 1816) Alexandre Lenoir established a museum, where he sought to assemble statues and funerary

monuments to protect them from the destructive vandalism of the Paris mob. He arranged them in chronological order with one room for each century from the thirteenth until the seventeenth centuries. The museum was popular and was even visited by Napoleon I, and it is known that Rasmus Nyerup had a copy of its catalogue. The museum was however criticized by Jean-Baptiste Legrand d'Aussy, because it contained nothing pre-Roman: he borrowed the words 'menhir' and 'dolmen' from the Breton language to label categories that were missing. In a lecture delivered in 1799 but not printed until 1824, he proposed three pre-Roman eras based on burial type: first primitive cremation; then cremation in mounds; and finally mounds without cremations. The tradition of dividing the ancient past into cremation and inhumation periods can be traced back to Paul-Henri Mallet's *Introduction à l'Histoire de Dannemarc* of 1755, and before him to the Danish historian Arild Huitfeldt in 1603, and ultimately to the early thirteenth century Icelandic historian, Snorri Sturluson.

Sweden and Norway both played important roles. **Lars Magnar Enoksen** stressed the importance of parallel academic developments in the Swedish city of Lund, just opposite Copenhagen (and in fact a Danish possession until 1658). A historical museum was established there in 1805, and this may have influenced Rasmus Nyerup. Norway was part of Denmark until awarded to Sweden in 1814, and in Trondheim too there were significant developments.

Birgitta Berglund described the foundation of a scientific society there in 1760, under the auspices of the bishop, Johan Gunnerus. This society covered a range of disciplines. One of its co-founders, Gerhard Schøning, established a collection of antiquities. Gunnerus and Schøning both had close scholarly connections with Copenhagen, and the third co-founder, Peter Frederik Suhm, was himself a Dane and returned to Copenhagen in 1765, where he established himself as the most significant historian of his generation.

The commission however drew much of its inspiration from previous endeavours within Denmark. One of its major efforts was the dispatching of a questionnaire to clerical and civil authorities throughout Denmark, requiring information to be sent to Copenhagen. This was not the first such questionnaire – Ole Worm himself had done something similar two centuries earlier, and other attempts were made during the eighteenth century. **Lars Henningsen** discussed Erik Pontoppidan's *Danske Atlas*, the first volume of which was published in 1763. This work owed more than is generally realized to Laurids de Thurah, who had himself planned an *Atlas Danicae*, but after receiving the answers to a questionnaire he sent out in 1754, he died in 1759 without publishing it. Pontoppidan got hold of some of de Thurah's material and made extensive use of it in *Danske Atlas*, alongside material gathered in response to his own questionnaire. Pontoppidan died in 1764 leaving the Jutland volumes unpublished, not least because he did not have de Thurah's reports covering Jutland. Jacob Langebek took on the task of completing the publication, and traced de Thurah's Jutland reports to Schleswig, and incorporated them alongside new material of his own, until he in turn died in 1775. The final volume appeared in 1781.

Flemming Kaul discussed an excavation carried out by Pontoppidan, of a passage grave at Jægerspris. In his 1744 publication of it, Pontoppidan recognized that the bones it contained were those of normal humans, not giants. He also recognized that cremation urns in the upper part of the mound were later than the inhumations in the chamber covered by the mound. This led to his chronological scheme: since Snorri had stated that the immigrant followers of Odin practiced cremation, the inhumation phase must be pre-Odinian. This was apparently a phase not recorded by Snorri, because he had placed the cremation phase at the start. Kaul pointed out that both Thomsen and Worsaae tried to fit the Stone – Bronze sequence to this, by arguing that the Bronze Age was the cremation phase. Bronze Age inhumations were therefore problematic, and it was not until the 1860s that the gradual nature of the change in burial methods was fully understood.

Several speakers focused in the work of the commission itself. **Tove Jakobsen** has examined much of the surviving paperwork (and has recently published a book on the topic: Jakobsen 2007). The periodical *Antikvariske Annaler* was established, and the display cases in the library above the Trinitatis

church constructed in 1813. The commission seemed to lose energy around that date – the number of artifacts received began to decrease from 1812, and the paperwork deteriorated in quality after 1814, though both revived under Thomsen from 1817 onwards.

Christian Adamson described the twelve questions in the commission's questionnaire, which included queries about 'heathen altars' (dolmens), and 'stone, copper and iron weapons'. All replies were numbered and filed by Nye up; Adamson has been instrumental in publishing those covering Denmark in five volumes (Adamson and Jensen 1995–2003). Norway, being part of Denmark at this time, was also surveyed; but the replies had gone missing. It was known that they had been received in Copenhagen, because in 1815 Norway (by then part of Sweden) had requested their return; but Nye up refused. Adamson's relocation of these records is a major triumph: they were in fact returned from Denmark to Norway in 1923 as a little-publicized part of the resolution of a diplomatic spat between the two countries, and turned out to be held in the National Library in Oslo.

Sveinbjörn Rafnsson described the situation in Iceland (also then a part of Denmark). In the later eighteenth century, volcanic eruptions and epidemics had reduced the population by some 20%, but Iceland produced one major historian, Finn Magnussen, who settled in Copenhagen. There was only sporadic contact between Denmark and Iceland during the Napoleonic Wars, and the commission's questionnaire was not circulated until 1817. Most replies were in Icelandic, and were dealt with by Magnussen; ten sites were granted legal protection, six of them being runic inscriptions.

Torben Dehn described the protection of the first field monuments in Denmark. In 1809 and 1811 a total of 208 were scheduled, of which 155 were megalithic graves. **Jørgen Steen Jensen** described the Royal Coin Collection, which under the care of Christian Ramus remained independent of the commission until 1832. After Ramus's death in that year, Thomsen took it under his wing and catalogued the material received after 1826 (which Ramus had failed to do).

Helge Brinch Madsen documented the international connections of the commission. Various foreigners became corresponding members. These included not just antiquarians, but also scientists such as Martin Heinrich Klaproth, the discoverer of uranium, who analyzed the metallurgical content of archaeological materials, and Johan Friedrich Blumenbach the craniologist. Artifacts were used as diplomatic objects: a group was sent to the Royal Irish Academy, which responded with a gift of books. Some of these artifacts were lost in the 1830s, but Worsaae noted that he had seen some of them during his visit to Dublin in 1846–47.

An important point to emerge from the conference was the major importance of Frederik Münter, who has tended to be overshadowed by Nyerup. It was Münter's stimulus and vision that led to the promulgation of the 1807 decree, and he recommended that Adam Hauch, a sympathetic senior official with antiquarian interests, be appointed its head. He was to a large extent responsible for the commission's international connections – he had for example visited Blumenbach and examined his collection of skulls. **Tobias Fischer-Hansen** described Münter's 1784–88 journey through Italy, Dalmatia and Greece, during which he met William Hamilton and Edward Gibbon. He spent a long time in Rome, but also made a journey to Sicily, publishing a book on his travels when he returned to Denmark. He visited various excavations in Sicily, and met Sicilian antiquarians including Gabriello Torremuzza, Ignazio Biscari and Saverio Landolina, some of whom he kept in touch with for many years. He was particularly interested in the Sicilian system of officials, *custodi*, who were paid by the state to record and care for archaeological remains, and this may have played an important part in his later activities in the commission. **Marjatta Nielsen** described his work in 1786 at Nola, near Naples, then being excavated by the brothers Nicola and Pietro Vivenzio. Many beautiful artifacts were found, and housed in the Museo Vivenzio. These included pots, some with 'Egyptian' type decorations that Münter however correctly identified as Greek, because they showed scenes from Greek myths. The Vivenzio brothers were not however just treasure hunters. Their work was never published because of the 1799 revolution in Sicily, but Pietro Vivenzio's unpublished manuscript reveals an understanding of stratigraphy.

The two remaining papers put Münter and the commission into context in a remarkable way. **Nils Bartholdy** pointed out that of the six founder-members of the commission, all except Nyerup were Freemasons. Hauch, the official who headed it, was a very senior Freemason. Three new members who joined in 1810 were also Masons. Münter arranged for the commission to be given a room in the masonic lodge in Kronprindsens Gade, and its early meetings were held there. During his travels in Italy he met many Masons, and he visited lodges all over Europe. This undoubtedly helped him to meet people and acquire contacts that facilitated his travels. He described this in code in his diary, because the Pope had forbidden Catholics to become Masons; but he visited one lodge in Rome whose Master was a cardinal. Bartholdy pointed out that the Enlightenment spirit of enquiry permeated Freemasonry at this time, so it was not surprising that most members of the commission were Masons; they were appointed because of their academic expertise, not because they were Masons. Researchers such as Elias Ashmole in England and Nils Henric Sjöborg in Sweden were also Masons. In 1997 a research lodge was established in Copenhagen, and at Bartholdy's suggestion it was named after Frederik Münter.

Flemming Lundgreen-Nielsen documented the antithesis: opposition to the work of the commission from a completely different group of people, namely Denmark's romantic poets. It is paradoxical that the Danish romantic era traditionally dates its start from the poem written by Adam Oehlenschläger lamenting the theft from the Royal collection and the melting down of the gold horns from Gallehus in 1802. Oehlenschläger and his contemporaries, including the highly influential N. F. S. Grundtvig, however depicted antiquarians as soulless collectors of objects, obsessed with the type and number of artifacts rather than with their meaning. This anti-scientific backlash against the Enlightenment values of the Freemasons remained a force to be reckoned with for some time.

In addition to the papers, the conference involved a walking tour of Copenhagen, visiting Münter's episcopal residence and his grave in St. Peter's churchyard, and (just round the corner) Nyerup's lodgings in 'Regensen', a university hall of residence. Dinner was taken at 'Det Lille Apotek', a restaurant just opposite which has existed since 1720, and where Nyerup and Münter no doubt dined many times. The evening finished with a visit to the room above the Trinitatis Church, where Nyerup ran Copenhagen's university library; and where, in the rounded end over the apse, the commission first established its collection of antiquities.

Adamsen, C. and V. Jensen (eds). 1995–2003. *Danske Præsters Indberetninger til Oldsagskommissionen af 1807* (5 volumes). Højberg: Wormianum.

Jakobsen, T. B. 2007. *Birth of a World Museum*. Oxford: Wiley – Blackwell. (*Acta Archaeologica* 78: 1, Supplementa VIII, Centre of World Archaeology Publication 4).

Report on two meetings held in Durham

Report by Peter Rowley-Conwy, Department of Archaeology, University of Durham

The History of Archaeology Group in the Department of Archaeology, University of Durham, has held two successful meetings so far in 2007. Both were held with the assistance of the AREA project.

The first was entitled *Imperialism and Archaeology: a Historical Perspective*, and took place on 31 January. **Paul Luft** of the Department of Government and International Affairs in Durham started the proceedings with a discussion of the growth of interest in archaeology in nineteenth century Iran, paralleling the emergence of a nascent nationalism. **Sudeshna Guha** of the Faculty of Oriental Studies in Cambridge followed with a discussion of the way the British rulers used archaeology in nineteenth and earlier twentieth century India.

This was followed by three presentations by members of the Department of Archaeology. **Robin**