

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). Højbjerg: 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).

<http://dx.doi.org/10.5334/bha.17211>

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**

Coningham described how archaeology was being used in the current context of sectarianism in Sri Lanka. **Penelope Wilson** showed how the destruction of tell sites in the Nile Delta was facilitated by the construction of railways; tell material was often used as fertilizer and applied to agricultural fields, and rail spurs were sometimes built up to the mounds themselves to allow the material to be mined. Finally, **Margarita Díaz-Andreu** discussed the role of French, British and German archaeologists in the creation of an archaeological tradition in Spain in the nineteenth and earlier twentieth centuries. The last paper was by **Andrew Reid** of University College, London, who described the role of historical views derived from archaeology in the recent genocide in the Great Lakes region of Central Africa.

The second meeting was held on 20 June, and was entitled *Prehistory and Prehistorians in Nineteenth Century Britain and Beyond*. **Anne O'Connor** of the Durham Archaeology Department opened the proceedings with a discussion of the subdivisions of the Palaeolithic that emerged in France in the later nineteenth century, and their patchy adoption and use in Britain. She was followed by **Heather Sebire** of Guernsey Museum, who discussed the work of Frederick Corbyn Lukis, member of the nineteenth century dynasty of archaeologists from Guernsey. He conducted a number of excavations, leaving plans and drawings that are in some cases the only record of what particular sites looked like. These records will shortly be published.

This paper was followed by one by **Stephen Briggs**, formerly of the Royal Commission in Wales, who presented a wide-ranging review of early uses of stratigraphy and survey. We tend to associate these with 'modern' archaeology, but Briggs demonstrated that they too have a prehistory going a long way back. **Janet Owen** of the National Maritime Museum discussed the implications of the long-standing friendship between two Sir Johns: Evans and Lubbock. Lubbock was a member of the X Club, the group of nine men who dominated the main societies of British academia from the Royal Society down. The Lubbock-Evans connection was the main link to archaeological societies, which were often dominated by a similar small coterie. A publication is planned in 2008, the centenary of Evans' death.

The final paper was by the writer of this communication, arguing that the Three Age System initially made little headway in England because it was up against the pre-existing short chronology handed down from the discipline of ethnology.

Both meetings were well attended by people from all over Britain, and were followed by lively discussion both in the meeting and (later) in the pub. The history of archaeology is enjoying an upsurge in Britain, and it is gratifying that the meetings in Durham, supported by the AREA project, have been so well attended. More meetings are planned.