

The Current State and Future Prospects of Theory in European Post-Medieval Archaeology

Paul Courtney

Introduction

When the present writer wished to study post-medieval archaeology at university in the 1970s, he found that there were no courses available in Britain. During the last decade, most of the larger British archaeology departments have acquired a specialist in this period. This resulted from an expansion in the university system coinciding with the fashionability of new theoretical approaches espoused by university-based scholars who have emerged since the 1980s, including Matthew Johnson (1995) and Sarah Tarlow (1999). The introduction of developer-funded archaeology in Britain in 1991 has also led to a considerable increase in the amount of post-medieval archaeology investigated ahead of destruction. In Britain and Sweden, post-medieval archaeology has also become heavily influenced by post-modernist theory, resulting in a convergence of approaches and a considerable dialogue with American historical archaeology (Ersgård et al., 1992; Tarlow and West, 1999). Elsewhere in Europe, explicit theory has had little impact on the archaeology of the post-medieval period. This chapter will first examine the varied intellectual traditions that affect post-medieval archaeology as it is currently practiced in Continental Europe, especially the potential for theoretical diffusion from allied disciplines like history and ethnology. Second, it will consider the prospects for a distinctive European (including British) approach to post-medieval archaeology in the face of the global impact of American historical archaeology.

P. Courtney e-mail: paul.courtney2@ntlworld.com

The Weight of Tradition or Unreleased Potential?

Germany

Against the background of first the enlightenment and later German unity, the expansion and modernization of the German university system provided a model for many other countries. The German-speaking areas of Europe saw major developments in a wide range of academic disciplines that have been crucial to the development of historical archaeology. Of particular importance were German ideas of culture that arose out of the late-eighteenth-century enlightenment and influenced individual researchers in a number of distinct disciplines (Burke, 2004:6–19). German universities saw history develop as a distinct academic profession characterized by an emphasis on the careful analysis of original texts and a belief that the past could be studied scientifically and objectively. This approach was especially associated with the German political and constitutional historian, Leopold van Ranke (d. 1888). He emphasized a synchronic and antitheoretical approach that stressed the specificity of historical events (Burke, 1988; Mawick, 1970:34–38). German and Austrian universities also saw the emergence of art history as a distinct discipline.

The modern academic study of the Italian Renaissance was established by George Voigt and Swiss-born Jakob Burckhardt (Burke, 2004:7–9; Ferguson, 1948:195–289). The nineteenth century also produced two giants of socio-historical, grand theory: Karl Marx (d. 1883) and Max Weber (d. 1920). The latter's *The Protestant Ethic and the*

Rise of Capitalism published in German in 1905 proved to be an important, if highly controversial, landmark in cultural history (Giddens, 1973; Green, 1959; Weber, 1958 [1905]). The German-born and educated sociologist and cultural historian Norbert Elias (d. 1990) was noted both for the diversity and the unique theoretical slant of his work. He spent much of his career outside Germany but emerged from the tradition of German historical sociology epitomized by Max Weber. Of special relevance to archaeologists is his early work on state formation, court culture, and the rise of civilized behavior or “the reformation of manners” in current parlance (Elias, 2000; Mennell, 1999). Elias influenced such major historico-sociological studies of material culture as Stephen Mennell’s (1985) comparative analysis of British and French cuisine and Chandra Mukerji’s (1997) analysis of the gardens of Versailles depicting them as a symbol of power of the absolutist and territorial state.

Professional geography was yet another product of the nineteenth-century German university system, beginning with the work of Alexander von Humboldt (d. 1859) and Carl Ritter (d. 1859). The German concepts of cultural and anthropological geography and landscape (*landschaft*) influenced the development of archaeology, anthropology, and geography in many other countries (Dickinson, 1969:22–185; Hartshorne, 1976 [1939]:48–83, 149–174). The distribution map, another development of this tradition, has been central to European landscape archaeology, historical geography, and ethnology. Initially this approach was closely linked to the dominant paradigm of cultural diffusion that pervaded European archaeology and folk studies in the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries (Stoklund, 1983; Trigger, 1989:148–186). The emigration to the United States in 1886 of Franz Boas (d. 1942), a German geography Ph.D., was instrumental in establishing the early theoretical direction of American cultural. He saw cultural traits as the products of both diffusion and local adaptation and was a major critic of unilineal evolution, the concept that all societies evolve through the same stages from savagery to civilization (Kuper, 1999:13–14; Moore, 1996:44–52).

An overlap between geography and ethnology is also evident in the work of Friedrich Ratzel (d. 1904), a major pioneer of modern cultural and political geography. His Darwinian-influenced

concept of *lebensraum* (living space) proposed political territories naturally tended to expand into surrounding space (Dickinson, 1969:62–76; Smith, 1980). The sociobiological and nationalistic aspects of Ratzel’s *geopolitik* approach were subsequently distorted by Nazi academics to justify Aryan superiority and ethnic cleansing. As a result, academics in post-World War II Germany were slow to adopt ideas of “social space,” because of the Nazi resonances of *lebensraum* and geopolitics. Such approaches, utilizing the ideas of scholars like the German sociologist, Georg Simmel (d. 1914) and the French social theorists, Henri Lefebvre (d. 1991) and Pierre Bourdieu (d. 2002), are now widely used by German social scientists (Löw, 2001).

Volkskunde (folk studies) or “European ethnology,” as it is now more commonly termed, is a well-established subdiscipline of anthropology in the German-speaking world (Gingrich, 2005). Current academic scholarship tends increasingly to be concentrated on the sociological and modern rather than the everyday life of peasants, though folk museums continue to curate early modern and contemporary material culture. New areas of research include ethnicity, identity, and urbanization (Göttsch and Lehmann, 2001). However, research by academics on material culture still persists, as illustrated by Ruth-Elizabeth Mohrmann’s (1990) work on housing culture, based on probate inventories, and Gabriele Mentges et al.’s (2000) edited monograph on gender and material culture. Nineteenth-century German archaeology was split between the study of Central European prehistory and ancient/classical studies. Prehistorians, as elsewhere in Europe, concentrated on trying to define cultures geographical and chronologically, by mapping specific culture traits. This culture-history approach was exemplified by the work of Gustav Kossina (d. 1931), who believed in a crude correlation between cultural and ethnic groups (Fetten, 2002; Veit, 2002). This now-derided approach was further developed by Nazi archaeologists obsessed with Aryan superiority and purity (Hassmann, 2002; Kater, 1974). The legacy of Nazi theorizing led to a rejection of the theory in the post-war decades by German archaeologists. The discipline, at least in the west, developed an overriding emphasis on empirical data collection, a tradition rooted in

the Rankean school of nineteenth-century “objective” history (Arnold and Hassmann, 1995; Wolfram, 2002).

Other German disciplines like history and ethnology/folk studies had similar problems to archaeology in the immediate post-war era. Many academics who had espoused Nazism returned to their posts, and debate on Nazi historiography was muted. However, the very focus of their subject meant that ethnologists and historians had to eventually come to terms with both studying and explaining the Nazi period. This helped provide a catalyst for revisionist self-assessment during the general intellectual and political ferment that spread through western European universities in the 1960s (Dow and Lixfield, 1986; Eley, 1989). A new theoretical approach with particular relevance to historical archaeology arose in German historical studies in the 1970s and 1980s. This was *alltagsgeschichte*, or the history of everyday life, a concept that evolved from the work of Hans Medik, Alfred Lüdtkke, and others at the Max Planck Institute for History in Göttingen (Lüdtkke, 1995). It had its origins in a reaction to 1960s’ modernization theory (influenced by the American sociologist, Talcott Parsons), which emphasized the role of the state and large-scale social structures in explaining social change. *Alltagsgeschichte* drew on many theoretical strands, including British and Althusserian Marxism, French structuralism, and the work of anthropological theorists such as Pierre Bourdieu (1990) and Clifford Geertz (1973). It emphasizes the experience of ordinary people and looks for meaning in the mundane actions and negotiations of everyday life. Lüdtkke (1993), for example, coined the term “Eigen-sinn” for industrial workers creating their own personal space, a process existing outside of class resistance.

The concept of proto-industrialization devised by the American economic historian, Franklin Mendels (1972) was also influential in German history, inspiring both proponents of everyday history and of “big structures” (Kriedte et al., 1981). This theory sought to explain the impact of rural industry on the household economy of traditional European “peasant” societies. Proto-industrialization was seen by its proponents as a key transitional stage toward full industrialization, a proposition that was seen by many as highly controversial. Subsequently, an increasing

emphasis has been placed on the regional nature of European development and the diversity of pathways to modernization (Ogilvie and Cerman, 1997). The literary-influenced, new culture history has recently become more popular in German history, and *alltagsgeschichte* has probably had its greatest impact outside Germany. The interconnectedness of “national” trends is also illustrated by the fact that one of the most substantial and innovative works to incorporate an *alltagsgeschichte* approach is *Ordinary Prussians*, written by an American scholar, William Hagen (2002).

Despite a rich background in the cognate disciplines of social and material culture studies, German-speaking practitioners of post-medieval archaeology have often been reluctant to undertake any kind of wider interpretation, let alone to theorize. Much of the development of post-medieval archaeology in Germany springs from urban rescue archaeology and from studies of its ceramic and glass industries. There is also a strong tradition of archaeometry (scientific analysis of materials). Even with such an internationally important area as the proto-industrialized stoneware industries of the Rhine, there has been a tendency to concentrate on typology, dating, and production technology (see Gaimster, this volume). Limited work by ethnologists, though, points to the need for more socio-historical analysis on the organization of these industries (Kuntz, 1996). Since the late 1980s, German archaeologists have paid considerable attention to reevaluating the impact of the Nazi regime on their discipline (Härke, 2002). This has not been accompanied by any major theoretical upheaval as occurred, for example, in ethnology in the more revolutionary and idealistic climate of the 1960s (Eley, 1989; Wolfram, 2002). Nevertheless, a climate has evolved in archaeology that is beginning to encourage a wider range of approaches and more discussion on the future direction of the subject.

Post-medieval archaeology is now being taught formally at Bamberg, although aspects are sometimes covered by courses labeled just as medieval archaeology (Ericsson, 1999). Some more interdisciplinary and discursive work by medieval and post-medieval archaeologists is now beginning to emerge, mainly drawing on social and cultural history and folk studies (*volkskunde*) as a background (Ericsson, 1995, 2002). A few academic ethnologists

have also shown an interest in a dialogue with medieval and post-medieval archaeologists, and cooperation between the two disciplines is likely to be a fruitful field for future theoretical development (Seidenspinner, 1986/1987). Recent examples of more interpretive work in post-medieval archaeology can be found in the newsletter, *Mitteilungen der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Archäologie des Mittelalters und der Neuzeit*. Special themes have recently included the links between archaeology and historical events (MDGAMN, 2005) and transport infrastructure (MDGAMN, 2003). A substantial recent study is Atzbach's (2005) monograph on the leather and fur finds found in wall linings of houses in Kempten. This was based on a doctoral thesis at Bamberg, completed as part of an interdisciplinary archaeological/historical team, and the author examines changes in technology and fashion against a social-historical (*altagsgeschichte*) backdrop. The work of the English archaeologist David Gaimster (1997, 2005) on both Rhenish ceramics and German and Baltic archaeology should also be noted, for example, his study of material culture and Hanseatic identity. In addition, a few German-speaking scholars, though mostly prehistorians, are now tackling the implications of Anglo-American theory for the Central European tradition of archaeology. They are also absorbing aspects of these traditions into their own work, albeit critically and selectively (Biehl et al., 2002; Veit, 1998).

France

A factor limiting the influence of current Anglo-American theory, notably postprocessualism, has been the influence of idealist philosophies of knowledge in several European countries, as opposed to a tradition of empiricism. In particular, one can point to the influence of the philosophers, René Descartes (d. 1650), creator of Cartesian idealism in France, and of Georg Hegel (d. 1831) and Benedetto Croce (d. 1952) in Italian scholarship. Idealist philosophies of knowledge emphasize the subjective nature, or unreliability, of the observer and interpreter of data. This has led to an emphasis on solving problems by collecting more data rather than by retheorizing (Coudart, 1999; Guidi, 2002; Scarre, 1999).

Geography has played an important role in French historical and archaeological studies. Particularly important was the work of Paul Vidal de la Blache (d. 1918), who was influenced by the development of regional geography in Germany (Dickinson, 1969:208–228). He emphasized interaction between humans and environment and the significance of small, physically defined regions, or *pays*, as the basis for studying human geography. This school had a deep impact on the *Annales* school of history, founded by Marc Bloch (d. 1944) and Lucien Febvre (d. 1956), which started as a fusion of history, geography, and Durkheimian sociology. The concept of the region also played a central part in the work of Fernand Braudel (d. 1985), while his concept of different conceptions of historical timescale, especially the history of the long term or *le longue durée*, has been hugely influential (Burke, 1990; Friedman, 1996). After a period of neglect, the region (as in the Anglophone world) saw a second revival as a geographical concept from the 1980s onward, linked with an influx of theoretical ideas from the social sciences (Gilbert, 1988). Modern French geography was initially less influenced by phenomenological approaches (emphasizing perception and memory of place and space) than Anglophone geography but is increasingly exploring ideas of social space or *l'espace social* (Claval, 2003; Di Méo and Buléon, 2005).

Strong regional identities have persisted in France, despite the centralist agendas of Napoleon and many subsequent French governments. The persistence of the division between *langue d'oc* and *langue d'oïl* is reflected in the publication of a specific journal on the medieval archaeology of southern France, *L'archéologie du midi médiéval*. The great regional monograph written by a French historian, often born and raised in his chosen territory, has a long and proud history. The *Annales* school has long lost any coherence it had, mutating into various schools of social and cultural history: microhistory, feminist history, and histories of mentalities, national memory, and the family to name just a few (Charle, 2003). In social history, the 1980s fashion for the history of individuals has been since enlarged by studies of the social dynamics of the group (community, profession, class, etc.). French regional history still flourishes, even if it is not as fashionable as it once was, for example, recent

conference volumes, respectively, on the rural landscape and the Renaissance architecture of Normandy (Beck et al., 2004; Hervieu et al., 2003).

Certainly a highpoint of French medieval and post-medieval archaeology is the local/regional monograph, for example, long-term studies of potting industries from the medieval to early modern eras (Faure-Boucharlat et al., 1996; Flambard Héricher, 2002); and the great exhibition catalog like those on the Renaissance archaeology in the Ile du France (Musée Val-d'Oise, 1998). National syntheses seem to take second place, though, and examples include those by Jean Rosen (1995) on French faïence and Danièle Alexandre-Bidon's (1986, 2005) studies of medieval and later ceramic consumption. Urban studies, in its widest sense, has produced a vast literature on the topography and fabric of French towns and cities, while fortification studies also has a voluminous, albeit atheoretical, literature. Urban archaeology has been sporadic in France despite long-term programs at Lyons, Douai, Tours, and St. Denis. There has been a major growth in this field since 1980 and especially since the creation of a national archaeology service (Institute national de recherches archéologiques préventives [INRAP]), funded by a developer tax (Demoule, 2004; Gamay, 1999). Open-area excavation was initially introduced to France ca. 1970 by the Czech prehistoric archaeologist, Bohumil Soudsky, and is now widespread in both town and country. The British style of single-context recording developed in urban centers such as Winchester and London is also widely used (Audouze and Leroi-Gourhan, 1981:177–178; Demoule et al., 2005). Unfortunately, as elsewhere in Europe, the sporadic production of excavation reports hampers an appreciation of the results of urban archaeology.

Medieval and post-medieval archaeology (one often cannot separate them in France) also has strong institutional links with medieval history and art history. The history of taste (*goût*) in the sense both of a history of civilization or aesthetics and of a history of cuisine is another recurrent influence (Abel et al., 1993; Alexandre-Bidon, 2005). A related theme has been the diffusion of technology and styles, especially from the Islamic-influenced Mediterranean (Abel et al., 1993; Vieille Charité, 1995). Ethnological work in France and its colonies has also influenced archaeological

research, especially in the field of ceramics, for instance, a recurring interest in technological innovation, the organization of workshops, and the genealogies of artisans. Examples of such archaeological studies include Jean-Louis Vayettes's (1987) study of the potting village of Saint-Jean-de-Fos in the Languedoc and Anne-Marie Flambard Héricher's (2002) monograph on the Bessin (Normandy) potteries. The founding of the ceramic analysis laboratory at the University of Caen in the 1960s established a strong tradition of archaeometry in French medieval and later archaeology, especially in regard to ceramics and glass.

The Renaissance has played a central role in French historical thought, and it is generally perceived as being at the conceptual center of the transition between the medieval and post-medieval worlds rather than the Reformation. This is reflected in the existence of a national museum for the Renaissance in the chateau at Écouen just outside of Paris and the sizeable Centre d'Études Supérieures de la Renaissance founded in 1956 at the University of Tours. The enormous open-area excavations at the Louvre from 1983 to 1998, which were associated with major renovation of the buildings, have highlighted the importance of early modern French court culture (Bresc, 2001; Van Ossel, 1998). A restoration program also resulted in the recent monograph on the sixteenth-century, pentagonal chateau of Maulnes in Burgundy, which represents the collaboration between an architectural historian and an archaeologist (Chatenet and Henrion, 2004). Studies by architectural historians have also centered on the everyday life and use of space in palaces and chateaux (Chatenet, 2002). The archaeologist Nicholas Faucherre is best known for his work on the fortifications of Marshal Vauban, but he has also cowritten a study on the alchemical symbolism of the Renaissance facade of the chateau of Crazannes in the Charente region (Faucherre and Pellerin, 2003). However, the study of courtly architecture in France is dominated by empirical analysis of fabric, plans, and archives rather than post-modernist concepts of space, such as those used by Bourdieu (1990:271–283) to study Berber housing. There is also a strong tradition of theoretical-oriented work on early modern France by British and especially American historians (Musgrave, 1997; Zemon Davis, 2001).

Despite the long tradition of landscape analysis, this field in the post-medieval period has been largely left to academic historical geographers and historians. An exception is the work of the archaeologist Antoine Paillet (1999, 2005), who has applied a multidisciplinary approach to the agricultural landscapes of the Bourbonnais (Massif Central). Professional and academic boundaries, however, have little relevance to the interdisciplinary nature of studies on rural landscapes and material culture. One can point, for example, to the archaeological relevance of the publications of the historical geographer, Jean-René Trochet (1987, 1997, 2006) on vernacular architecture, farming implements, and regionalism. Rural excavations have focused on deserted medieval villages, but Françoise Piponnier (1986) has excavated a post-medieval settlement in the Monts du Forez in the Central Massif. The journal *Ramage* (14 issues from 1982 to 2002) was published by the former Centre d'Archéologie Moderne et Contemporaine at the Sorbonne. It was edited by Philippe Bruneau and Pierre-Yves Balut and included many short papers on post-medieval and contemporary archaeology/material culture. Examples include a long series of articles on the material culture of French Catholicism in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries (Bruneau, 1986, 1990).

Industrial archaeology, military archaeology, and vernacular architecture are also well established in France as distinct disciplines. A number of theoretically oriented works concentrating on the symbolic meanings of historical-period gardens have been published by French and foreign scholars (Mariage, 1998; Mukerji, 1997). The Flemish academic, Frans Verhaeghe (1999), has also contributed theoretical overviews on the archaeology of the medieval and later periods to many French publications. Marie-Teresa Penna (1999) has published an excellent book that outlines the theory and practice of American historical archaeology for a francophone audience. Nevertheless, for political and philosophical reasons, French archaeology is not easily open to the adoption of theoretical ideas from the Anglo-American world, though it has been more likely to adopt innovations in field and laboratory methods (Audouze and Leroi-Gourhan, 1981; Demoule et al., 2005).

The Mediterranean

University-based archaeologists from northern Europe and America have played an important role in Mediterranean archaeology. This has been partly through the establishment of institutions like the British Schools in Rome and Athens, which are government-funded institutions designed to provide research facilities for visiting scholars. In addition to excavation, they have specialized in undertaking large-scale pedestrian surveys. Increasingly, geophysics and environmental analysis have been added as essentials of such surveys. There is also a growing tendency, though far from universal, to include the study of medieval and later landscapes within these multiperiod projects, sometimes explicitly incorporating a Braudelian *longue durée* perspective extending from the prehistoric to the present. Examples include the Biferno Valley project in Italy (Barker, 1995) and the Boeotia Project in Greece (Bintliff, 1997), all of which included the prehistoric to post-medieval periods within their remit. Mark Pluciennik et al. (2004) have also used archaeological data collected during a multiperiod survey in central Sicily alongside documentary research to examine power relations in the nineteenth- and twentieth-century agrarian landscape.

Foreign projects increasingly work with local archaeologists, even offering an alternative career route for research students, notably in American universities. The Internet-based group Squinch (<http://www.und.edu/dept/squinch/Homepage.html>), dedicated to medieval and post-medieval archaeology in Greece, is American-based, and many of its listed members are expatriate Greeks in American universities.

Recent studies on Greece include Joanita Vroom's (2003) work on the medieval and post-medieval ceramics from the Boeotia Project and Athanasios Vionis's (2005) study of the post-medieval material culture of the Cyclades Islands, both based on doctoral research at the University of Leiden. A project with a particularly strong focus on the recent past was the study by a team of British and Spanish researchers, based at the University of Leicester, of upland pastoralist farming in the Sierra de l'Altmirant region of Spain. This combined archaeological, historical, and ethnological research methods

(Christie et al., 2004). The Dutch archaeologist Antoon Mientjes et al. (2002) has compared upland pastoral economies in post-medieval Sicily and Sardinia. His work stresses the importance of local social and political structures in understanding the historical development of agrarian societies and the impact of modernization.

Post-medieval archaeology is still barely acknowledged as an academic discipline in Mediterranean Europe, though a few archaeology departments now teach it, notably Pisa and Venice in Italy and Seville in Spain. Mediterranean academics also tend to be heavily involved in excavation rather than the extensive landscape surveys undertaken by the foreign schools. The growth of urban rescue archaeology has been a major force in promoting post-medieval archaeology. In addition, heritage- and tourist-related archaeology of monuments is another field of potential growth, though excavation is often left out of conservation strategies (Amores, 1997; Milanese, 1997; Represa, 1996). Ceramic (and to a lesser extent glass) research has long played a central role in Mediterranean archaeology of this period, initially reflecting their importance in art history, especially the Renaissance and the transmission of Islamic ideas to Europe. Research on production and trade has been long established, but more recent studies have begun to extend to the consumption and social meaning of artifacts. The changing emphases can be seen in the proceedings of the quaterennial Congrès International sur la Céramique Médiévale en Méditerranée, founded in 1978.

Italy

Italy is the only European country outside Britain to have an annual journal solely dedicated to the general archaeology of the post-medieval period, *Archeologia Postmedievale*, founded in 1997 by Marco Milanese. In Italian academia, Croce's idealist emphasis on aesthetics and antiempirical stance impacted the post-World War II study of both history and archaeology. It equally affected Marxist and Catholic academics, the two main opposing strands of intellectual thought in the immediate post-war years. Idealism inhibited the

consideration of broader theoretical approaches and also slowed the adoption of scientific methods. As economic and technological modernization remolded Italian society from the 1950s, idealism tended to be replaced in academic life by a positivist philosophy that favored scientific and quantitative approaches. In recent decades, postprocessualism (an idealist philosophy) has tended to suffer from the backlash against both the politicization of Italian academia and against Crocean idealism (Guidi, 2002). Italian history has long abandoned the bipartite struggle between Catholic and Marxist wings and is now highly eclectic if still politicized. An important Italian contribution to the new history of the 1970s was the study of microhistory, which emphasized the small-scale study of individuals, events, or places but often relating them to large-scale social and cultural trends (Ginzburg, 1980; Levi, 1991; Muir and Ruggiero, 1991). The creation of new alignments in Italian history saw a fight between social and cultural historians centered around the microhistory journal *Quaderni Storici* in the 1980s (Pomata, 2000).

The excavations in Genoa, by Italian and British archaeologists from the 1960s onward, were especially influential in promoting the study of the post-medieval period (Andrews and Pringle, 1977; Gardini and Milanese, 1979). Publication of post-medieval urban archaeology is also beginning to be more common at least in some regions (Fozzati, 2005; Melli, 1999; Milanese, 1997). Urban archaeology also played a major role in encouraging the study of everyday ceramics (Blake, 1993). Not surprisingly, the study of the Renaissance and urban culture in general has been a major focus of study for both Italian and foreign historians who have generated a huge literature. Architecture, fortifications, gardens, ceramics, and glass have all been studied as part of Renaissance history.

Among recent trends in cultural and art history of significance to archaeology is the new attention being paid to the social and political contexts of art, studies of the household and consumption, and international networks of cultural exchange (Burke, 1998; Goldthwaite, 1989, 1995; Jardine, 1998; Ruggiero, 2002; Sarti, 2002). The 2006 exhibition at the Victoria and Albert Museum in London on the interior of the Italian Renaissance house typifies the consumerist approach to art history,

albeit limited to the upper and middle classes (Ajmar-Wollheim and Dennis, 2006). There has been a strong interest by Italian archaeologists in technology and trade, not only of ceramics but also of metals, glass, and marble (Blake, 1980; Mannoni and Mannoni, 1985; Mannoni and Giannichedda, 1996; Milanese, 1993). The ability of medieval and post-medieval ceramics to shed information on the relative social status of rural sites was revealed by the work of Luciana and Tiziano Mannoni (1975) in Liguria. An example of the emerging use of material culture perspectives is Sauro Gelichi and Mauro Librenti's (1998:107–138) analysis of the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century artifacts from the excavations of the urban nunnery of S. Chiara in Finale Emilio, near Bologna. Italian archaeology is, however, highly regional in its organization, and research on the post-medieval period thus tends to be highly uneven in its distribution (Blake, 1993:4).

There is a strong tradition of agrarian studies in Italy. Emilio Sereni's (1997) classic work, *History of the Italian Agrarian Landscape*, was published in Italian in 1961. This outlined many of the enduring themes of the Italian countryside. Its Marxist philosophy has tended to be replaced in more recent work by a less deterministic view of human–environment relationships, which sees humans and the physical environment as part of a single ecosystem. Revisionist work is also seeing the agrarian economy (notably in southern Italy) as less static and unchangeable than previously thought. Yet, Sereni's concerns for long-term human adaptation to change, landscape design and the interaction of physical geography with social and tenurial systems remain important. The late survival of peasant society and the rapid modernization of the countryside since World War II have also encouraged links with an active rural conservation movement (Lucia, 2005; Malvoti and Pinto, 2003; Mazzino and Ghersi, 2003; Pinto et al., 2002), as well as ethnographic and ethnoarchaeological research (Milanese, 2000). Italian archaeologists are beginning to study post-medieval rural landscapes, for example, through work on deserted settlements (Quirós Castillo, 1997) and urban hinterlands (Milanese, 2004).

A conference entitled “Constructing Post Medieval Archaeology in Italy: A New Agenda” was held in November 2006 at the University of Venice, organized by Sauro Gelichi and Mauro Librenti. It

brought together Anglo-American and Italian scholars to discuss theoretical approaches to historical archaeology. As elsewhere in the Mediterranean, there is unlikely to be a huge explosion in academic historical archaeology because institutions change slowly, and resources are limited. Nevertheless, the increasing cooperative nature of academic research between indigenous and external scholars is creating a climate that should produce theoretical debate and hybridization and result in an increasing number of innovative theses and research projects in Italy and the wider Mediterranean.

Scandinavia

Scandinavian archaeology has a long pedigree of indigenous development, but the multilingual nature of its population has made it aware, if not always receptive, of outside traditions. Certainly, a number of British archaeologists and historians have found employment in its universities or state archaeology services where they exist. It is therefore unsurprising that Scandinavia has proved the area of Europe most receptive to Anglo-American theory, though there are considerable variations between countries. Norway and Denmark have favored processual approaches, whereas Sweden has been particularly receptive to postprocessualism (Olsen, 1991, 2002).

Scandinavia has played a key role in the development of modern European ethnology, beginning with the foundation of the first open-air museum at Skansen in Sweden in 1891 (Stoklund, 1983). Academic ethnology in Scandinavia has also been at the forefront of theoretical developments in material culture studies from the use of distribution maps and diffusion models early in the twentieth century to applying post-modern, phenomenological, and feminist ideas in recent decades. Scandinavian ethnologists remain remarkably eclectic and interdisciplinary in their methodological and theoretical approaches. There has been a move since the 1970s for academic ethnology to concentrate increasingly on modern societies and for material culture studies to be less fashionable. Nevertheless, the work of Scandinavian ethnologists continues to be highly significant in material culture research, both

regionally and internationally (Löfgren, 1997; Olsen, 2003; Rogan, 1996).

Post-medieval archaeology has mostly grown out of urban excavation programs, for example, long-established projects in Trondheim in Norway and Lund in Sweden (Carelli, 1997; also see Gaimster, this volume). The subject is at its most developed and theoretical in Sweden where medieval archaeology absorbed many new methodological and theoretical ideas from the 1980s, for instance, the use of the Harris matrix and the analysis of social space. A range of this new work was made available in two English language collections published by the Central Board of National Antiquities (Riksantikvariämbetet) and the University of Lund to showcase this work at successive Medieval Europe conferences in York and Bruges (Ersgård et al., 1992; Andersson et al., 1997). It is often difficult to separate medieval from post-medieval studies as much fieldwork is multiperiod in nature. However, post-medieval rural farmsteads, field systems, and industrial sites have been excavated and surveyed by the Riksantikvariämbetet (Karlenby, 2003; Lindman, 2004). Christina Rosén's (2004) recent book, based upon her doctoral dissertation at the University of Lund, compares the urban and rural material culture (especially housing and ceramics) of Halland from the Middle Ages to the nineteenth century. Such a study would be impossible in most other northern European countries because few rural sites dating to these periods have been excavated. Rosén notes a clear distinction between urban and rural material culture especially in the period from around 1750 to the early nineteenth century. In particular, she argues that peasants create their own distinctive material culture as an act of resistance to the European-wide attempts by the elite to reform popular cultures in the period after 1650, as described by the historian Peter Burke (1994). In the nineteenth century, Rosén (2004) argues that the increasing penetration of inexpensive, mass-produced consumer items begins to erode rural distinctiveness.

Low Countries

The Low Countries are notable for their rich documentary sources and the many sophisticated studies by economic and social historians on town,

countryside, and increasingly the links between them. The dense urbanization of these countries makes them particularly significant for the understanding of the origins of consumer culture. Much pioneering work on material culture using probate inventories has been carried out in the Netherlands, including recent monographs by Schuurman et al. (1997), Kamermans (1999), and Dibbits (2001). Specific studies on ceramics in inventories include those by Hester Dibbits and Aart Noordzij (2000) on Doesburg and Lichtenvoorde and by the Belgian historian, Bruno Blondé (2002) on tableware in Antwerp. Other related work of high relevance to archaeology includes research on the material culture, organization and social space of the household (Schuurman and Spierenburg, 1996), and on the social space of townscapes (Boone, 2002).

There is a tradition of studying landscape and environmental history, though archaeology has made little contribution yet to the post-medieval period, apart from the polder wrecks (see Gaimster, this volume). (Polders are former bodies of water that were drained and are now low-lying tracts of land enclosed by embankments, or dikes, where buried wrecks are often found.) The role of water as a threat and a resource is a central issue, for instance, in the work of historians, Petra van Dam (2002) on Dutch hydraulic engineering and Chlöe Deligne (2003) on the role of the River Senne in the development of Brussels. Recent Low Countries colloquia, for instance, the "contact days" (annual gatherings) for Belgian landscape studies, established in 2005, suggest that theorized and interdisciplinary landscape research is an emerging growth area.

Linguistic proficiency means that Dutch archaeologists are very aware of the debates in neighboring countries. Anglo-American theory has had some impact on prehistory in the Netherlands but little on medieval and later archaeology, which remains poorly represented in academia. In the Low Countries, post-medieval archaeology has largely grown out of urban rescue excavation. In the Netherlands, about 50 towns have some professional archaeological presence, although regular excavation takes place in a much smaller number. Recording of standing buildings is also well established in many towns. The rich bourgeois culture and the use of brick-lined cesspits from the fourteenth century onward have produced a

profusion of rich artifact groups often with near complete ceramic and glass vessels. The publication of such groups dominates the literature.

Despite prolific publications from some towns, such as Zwolle and 's-Hertogenbosh, the growing backlog of urban excavations is a major problem (Sarfatij, 1990, 1999). A certain amount of synthetic and comparative work, especially on material culture, has been carried out by archaeologists employed in the urban municipalities or by the state heritage service, the Rijksdienst voor het Oudheidkundig Bodemonderzoek (ROB) (Baart, 1990; Bartels, 1999, 2005; Clevis, 1995). In addition, there have been rare doctoral theses, for example, Cora Laan's (2003) published work on the material culture of drinking in the eighteenth-century Netherlands, which uses cesspit finds, inventories, and paintings as sources. She notes the significance of drinking depended on its social context, which reflected divisions of class and gender and the distinction between private and public spaces. Even inns had public spaces where alcohol was drunk separated from more private areas where coffee and tea were consumed.

Unfortunately, the lack of a university framework for post-medieval archaeology and the increasing commercial pressures in the applied sector do not bode well for the expansion of either synthetic or theoretical work in the immediate future. Yet, the Netherlands will probably continue to produce a steady stream of publications on urban excavations, finds, and standing buildings of the post-medieval period.

In Belgium, archaeology is split between Flemish and Walloon state archaeology services and the two regions have distinct archaeological cultures. Numerous towns, most notably Namur, Courtrai, Ghent, Antwerp, Bruges, and Brussels, have their own archaeology units. After international criticism that the archeology of military sites from World War I was left to licensed but untrained amateurs, the Flemish Institute for Heritage (VIOE) has recently set up a specialist unit to tackle this new field of study. There is a strong record of publishing inventories of architectural remains and industrial sites in both language zones. Some post-medieval archaeology is taught as a part of the combined art history and archaeology degrees at the Flemish Free University in Brussels (VUB) and the francophone

University of Liege. Frans Verhaeghe, who taught at the VUB until his retirement in 2005, was a mentor to many younger post-medievalists across Europe. His publications combine an international and interdisciplinary approach to historical archaeology with an eclectic appreciation of theory (Verhaeghe, 1991, 1997, 1999).

Central and Eastern Europe

Prior to World War II, archaeology was most advanced in the richer countries of this part of Europe such as Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Poland. The German school of prehistory, with its emphasis on the chronological and geographic delineation of distinct cultures, was influential in Central Europe prior to 1940. Communism brought both Marxist and Pan-Slavic ideologies to Central and Eastern Europe, though an interest in national origins survived as an undercurrent (Barford and Tabaczyński, 1996; Coblenz, 2002). Some awareness of western archaeology was also maintained through journal exchanges, at least at the larger institutions. Polish medieval archaeologists also worked abroad, for example, in the 1960s on a series of Wheeler-influenced excavations of deserted medieval villages in France (École Pratique, 1970). Such contacts, however, only had a superficial impact on the general practice of Polish archaeology at home (Lozny, 2002). Since the fall of Communism, archaeology in Central and Eastern Europe has been transformed intellectually by the democratic revolutions and ongoing debates. However, still torn between the strong influence of traditional approaches and the eclectic impact of new ideas, its future theoretical directions are far from clear and may be diverse (Biehl et al., 2002).

As elsewhere in Europe, the growth of urban archaeology, especially in East Germany and Poland, was important in the post-war recognition of post-medieval archaeology, though lack of publication was a major problem (Urbanczyk, 1996). Nawroński's (1983) paper on the Renaissance planned town of Zamość in Poland was one of the few syntheses. The Czechs produced an edited volume specifically on post-medieval archaeology, which was submitted for publication on the eve of

the “Velvet Revolution.” This showed both a tradition of pragmatic research and knowledge of comparable work in the West (Smetánka and Žegklitz, 1990). The study by Matoušek et al. (1990) of the siege of an eighteenth-century fortification, for example, was influenced by Leland Ferguson’s (1977) pioneering work on the distribution of excavated artifacts at Fort Watson, South Carolina, in the United States. This volume, intended to be the first in a series, has not been followed up; but various publications relating to ceramics and glass, and the Prague Castle excavations, have appeared (see Gaimster, this volume). Hungarian archaeologists are increasingly studying Turkish-period remains, though largely from excavations focused on medieval sites such as the Palace of Buda (Holl, 2005; Laszlovszky, 2003). East German archaeology was quickly integrated into the federal system and Marxist theory administratively expunged (Gringmuth-Dallmer, 1994; Jacobs, 2002).

In many Eastern European countries, there is a strong ethnographic tradition of relevance to post-medieval archaeology. Originally the two disciplines were united by a common Marxist concept of “material culture,” reflected in such bodies as the Institute of Archaeology and Ethnology (originally the Institute of the History of Material Culture) in Warsaw (Schild, 1993). A recent project on burial grounds from the thirteenth to eighteenth century in southern Estonia represents a continuing tradition of hybrid archaeological/ethnological research (Valk, 2001). Archaeologists and especially ethnologists in the former Communist Bloc have reestablished links with their German and Scandinavian colleagues. Nevertheless, there is a danger that the lure of international grants will create a vacuum in material culture studies, especially of the early modern period, as ethnologists increasingly work on modern sociological topics. The main growth area for post-medieval archaeology in Central and Eastern Europe, as in the past, is likely to come from urban excavation as economic development progresses (Barford and Dzieduszycki, 1999). There is also potential in the heritage sector as tourism expands. Resources for research and publication are likely to remain problematic in these sectors. A rising interest in local history, which has followed the fall of Communism, may bode well, though, for the public support of archaeology and conservation.

Overview

The above brief overview has defined some of the key structures and intellectual trends that have molded the use of theory in continental post-medieval archaeology. As has been seen, post-medieval archaeology is still largely entwined with medieval archaeology. The main driving force for post-medieval archaeology has tended to be from urban archaeology and a desire to make sense of the large groups of ceramics and other artifacts recovered, often from rubbish pits and cesspits. Rural archaeology has been relatively undeveloped apart from manufacturing, with ceramic and glass production at the forefront. The intellectual roots of post-medieval archaeology across Europe also clearly lie in history, though anthropological influences have grown in recent decades.

Explicit theoretical discussion on the Continent has been limited, though archaeologists clearly work in specific academic traditions. There is also a rich and largely untapped reservoir of theory in closely related disciplines such as history, geography, and ethnography. Already a degree of diffusion of ideas exists and these influences will probably increase and become more explicit as post-medieval archaeology evolves. However, post-medieval archaeology badly needs to be included in the new transnational research projects funded by the European Economic Community (EEC). A single archaeologist, David Gaimster, did contribute to the recent Cultural Exchange in Europe, 1400–1700: The Formation of a European Identity research program funded by the European Science Foundation; but this is the exception rather than the rule.

It is also clear that the current nature of post-medieval archaeology has been largely shaped by the methodologically obvious, whether Renaissance chateaux and fortifications, kiln sites, or bourgeois artifact assemblages from urban cesspits. New methods and concepts need to be applied to extract information, for example, about rural populations and the urban poor. Even the Low Countries had its urban underclass and outsiders. This will be by no means easy because of the biased nature of deposit formation, problems of residuality on long-occupied sites, and a lack of research-driven excavation (Courtney, 2006; Newman, 2006). The concerted archaeological search for known ethnic populations

in London, for example, has proved extraordinarily difficult (Jeffries, 2001). However, it is essential that we continue to proactively develop our discipline despite the constraints increasingly posed by a commercial environment.

Europe and the Wider World

Can America and Europe be United by a Global Archaeology?

A number of historical factors, as well as contrasts in the physical character of the archaeological record, contribute to the differences between American and European (including British) archaeologies of the period after 1500. Among the major intellectual differences is that European archaeology is closely linked to history and related humanities disciplines such as classics, history, geography, and art history (Courtney, 1999, 2007). By contrast, in America, historical archaeology has largely developed as a subbranch of cultural anthropology, hence the much-quoted dictum: "Archaeology is Anthropology or nothing" (Willey and Phillips, 1958:2). This should, of course, read "American anthropology," but it is doubtful that many Americans realize the irritation this minor ethnocentrism can provoke in foreign scholars. The adoption of anthropological theory by social and cultural historians on both sides of the Atlantic and the worldwide spread of the anti-empirical perspectives of postmodernism have also blunted the intellectual differences between disciplines and continents. As a result, theory is increasingly being used in both a selective and an eclectic manner on both sides of the Atlantic (Hodder, 1991, 2001; Preucel and Hodder, 1996). In everyday practice, many American archaeologists have long worked skillfully with documents, and many Europeans have made use of anthropological theory. Nevertheless, the intellectual divide between cultural anthropology and history still continues to be important in understanding key differences between approaches in the United States and in Britain and Continental Europe (Hodder, 2003).

As has been said of scientists, most historical archaeologists that have ever existed are now alive and working in the United States. More interaction between European "post-medieval" and American "historical" archaeology is therefore inevitable. Can we, though, really be united by the subjectivity of postmodernism or the big questions of a global archaeology (Orser, 1996)? Is the spread of American archaeological theory a much-needed intellectual refresher for parochial and jaded "old" Europeans, the spread of yet another form of cultural fascism by the world's superpower, or part of the growth of a rich international kaleidoscope of ideas that opens up personal choice? The American archaeologist Charles Orser (1996:22) has put forward the concept of a global archaeology united by the four "haunts" of colonialism, Eurocentrism, capitalism, and modernity. He has also coined the aphorism "Dig locally, think globally" for his approach. Orser's model is essentially a worldview centered in American cultural anthropology. For many archaeologists trained in the European tradition, a central problem is the leap from local to global without regional or national analysis as an intermediary. In Europe, the main conclusion of the recent work on feudalism, the development of the nation state, industrialization, and modernization, is that each of these phenomena followed multiple and diverse paths that need to be first analyzed at the regional level (Courtney, 1996; Hudson, 1989, 1999; Reynolds, 1994; Tilly, 1993).

In a paper delivered at the Medieval Europe conference in Bruges, Orser (1997) noted some marked differences of approach in European archaeology, for instance, a concern with the transition from medieval to post-medieval. However, he suggested that this too can be incorporated within the bigger picture of his four "haunts." In particular, he cites Robert Bartlett's (1994) work on medieval Europe, stressing the role of medieval colonialism in spreading a European blueprint of social organization. However, the concept of a common European blueprint can be taken too far. A Cistercian monk may have traveled from Ireland to Poland speaking Latin, connecting during his journey with others of a common monastic order. For the rural peasantry, the overwhelming bulk of the population, a few score miles could mean very different agrarian system, inheritance patterns, and dialect.

If we take the case of Wales (the current author's area of specialization), the Norman invasions of the eleventh and twelfth centuries did indeed introduce towns, a monetary economy, and Romanized the existing church system, though the economic elements may have developed in any case. Politically it created a country split between numerous and largely, autonomous feudal, lords. This produced a flat urban hierarchy of small towns that profoundly affected the cultural and economic development of Wales. Despite new opportunities, uneven economic development and growing problems of ethnic and religious inequality persisted in the modern period. Integration into a wider British economy and culture was only ever partial, and the twentieth century saw a revival of Welsh identity fed by the success of its rugby team. Colonialism indeed changed and helped mold the modernization of Wales, but its history and character remained resolutely different from that of England (Courtney, 1994, 2005; Hechter, 1975; Williams, 1985). The creation of distinctive local identities was thus as major an outcome of medieval colonialism as the spread of a Catholic-mercantile worldview. It should be stressed that this argument is not a call for parochialism but a different perception of how we conceive the linkages between local and international perspectives. Regardless, a mature discipline ought to be able to encompass studies of all scales from the individual and household to international comparison.

Colonialism and Beyond

The comparative study of colonialism as a concept across time has recently become popular (Given, 2004; Gosden, 2004; Orser, 1999). Such studies are useful in that they can inspire new questions and approaches. However, ultimately there are no laws of history. As Gosden (2004) has argued, the colonialism of the last 250 years was marked by a particular set of power relations associated with the European nation state. One might also argue that the feudal or lordly power structures of medieval colonialism made it equally distinctive. As a historically trained archaeologist, the current author would argue that the most penetrating insights are

likely to come from studying the dynamics of specific colonial societies in their nexus of political, economic, and cultural power relations, or by synchronic comparison that emphasizes difference as much as similarity. Certainly, the archaeology of the so-called "Celtic" fringe of Britain is ripe for comparative work, even if its ultimate potential is unclear.

Many American archaeologists have privately expressed to the current author their surprise at the lack of interest in colonialism by European, and especially British, archaeologists. Part of the answer lies in the fact that post-medieval archaeology was until recently largely practiced outside the academy by field and museum archaeologists. Low pay, lack of access to funding, and pressures not to do "research" have hampered wider perspectives of all kinds. In addition, there has often been a collective amnesia and embarrassment about colonialism in Europe. In Britain, for example, anyone over 60 was probably brought up on the history and glories of the British Empire. Anyone younger has probably gone through their education without the barest mention of empire and colonialism. There has been a growth of interest recently stemming from the growth of a multicultural society in Britain, and other former colonial powers, from the 1960s onward. This has been heightened by the emergence of postcolonial studies, inspired by such works as Edward Said's (1978) *Orientalism*.

A recent tendency to apply postcolonial theory in any context of dominance, for instance, Prussia, has been criticized as being reductionist (Reisenleiter, 2002). It can also provoke a reaction in the colonized that their achievements are always seen as responses to the colonizer. Nevertheless, despite limitations, the concepts of colonial and postcolonial theory still have usefulness in discussing the colonized parts of Europe, for example, Ireland and Wales. However, competing theories of neocolonialism, uneven development, center vs. periphery, and marginality also offer overlapping explanations. Yet, the histories of all regions and countries are surely too complex, dynamic, and multifaceted to be fully explained by a single theoretical perspective.

The often subtle impact of colonial expansion on European economic and cultural development should undoubtedly be high on the research agenda

of European post-medieval archaeologists (Berg and Clifford, 1999; Mukerji, 1983). However, one must beware of glibly ascribing every European development to outside influence without solid research. Colonialism did play a role, for example, in the shaping of the European nation state, but numerous indigenous factors were also at work in its evolution (Tilly, 1993). The role of court cultures, the wars of religion and the Huguenot diaspora, the Hanseatic trade network, and diffusion of Islamic influences from the Mediterranean, for example, all had roles in cultural transfer. The acceptance of historical archaeology by the academy has enabled younger British scholars in particular to explore colonialism abroad, for example, research by Gavin Lucas (2004) on the Dwars valley in South Africa or Dan Hicks (2000) on the Caribbean. One can also note the work of Harold Mytum (2002, 2004) and Alasdair Brooks (1997) on postcolonial identity in Wales and Ireland. European state funding has also allowed a few Continental archaeologists to work in surviving colonies, for example, the French research program in Guyane (Piaux and Philippe, 1997). This trend is to be welcomed, but for most European archaeologists, especially beyond the major ports, colonialism is not likely to be a central question of the research agenda.

In a city like Leicester (the writer's hometown), the prospect of an Asian-British majority population within the near future means that dialogue is essential. One can, of course, point out the international connections of tea drinking and Chinoiserie (to an audience only too aware of this already), but this can only be developed so far by archaeologists working in a commercial environment in a landlocked city. Perhaps the best prospect of making archaeology and heritage relevant is not through stressing the genetic base of cultural heritage but through emphasizing the "power of place" (Hayden, 1997). We all share a common environment, which modern immigrant communities are shaping, as did our medieval and early modern predecessors. Historical archaeology through its interest in the recent and contemporary has a special place in such an educational role. In addition, we need to be constantly aware of the dangers of archaeology and heritage (the "blood and soil" syndrome) being used to fan nationalist and xenophobic extremism in an emerging multicultural Europe.

Conclusion

It is fairly clear that there will not be a theoretically united European archaeology in the foreseeable future. Important and deep-seated differences of culture and philosophy remain, and these affect the way various Europeans excavate sites as well as their attitudes to theory. Anglo-American theory is also unlikely to suddenly become a dominant force, though its ideas will undoubtedly spread. Even the growing number of sympathetic theorists on the Continent have tended to argue for a critical borrowing of ideas, whilst also being cautious of an Anglo-American intellectual hegemony (Biehl et al., 2002; Eggert and Veit, 1998; Olsen, 1991). Many of the same basic theoretical ideas, however, are already available across Europe in the theory of cognate disciplines such as history and ethnology. A multiplicity of European-style archaeologies, but sharing some common methodological and theoretical characteristics, is thus the most likely outcome.

The growth of the Internet and inexpensive airfares, the expansion of the EEC, and various international research and student exchange schemes are breaking down national barriers to intellectual discourse. In 1992, the revised European Convention on the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage (commonly known as the Valletta Convention) attempted to raise standards of heritage protection across the Continent, though it was only ratified by the United Kingdom in 2000 (Council for British Archaeology, 2006). Archaeologists are increasingly being brought together by international conferences like the European Archaeological Association yearly meeting, Medieval Europe, and the Lübeck colloquia on Hanseatic urbanism. It is therefore inevitable that European archaeology will become increasing eclectic and less tied by national tradition. Nevertheless, the development of post-medieval archaeology in Europe faces a number of problems. Specialist post-medieval posts in universities are still rare or nonexistent in most European countries, and opportunities for students to obtain advanced degrees in the field are usually limited. The bulk of post-medieval archaeology continues to be practiced in the rescue (salvage) excavation and heritage sectors. Commercial and bureaucratic pressures mean that research is becoming more and more difficult in these areas. Low

wages mean that for many archaeologists, especially those with families, even going to a national conference may be a major financial problem. There is also a danger of increasing competition for grants in academia, leading to a dull conformity of fashionable approaches.

A dialogue with international anthropology (including ethnology), and more particularly with American historical archaeology, is essential for the future development of European (including British) post-medieval archaeology. One cannot but acknowledge the sheer diversity of approaches and perspectives within American historical archaeology and as reflected in the other chapters in this volume. There is much that Europeans can learn both methodologically and theoretically. However, we need to adopt new ideas critically, not merely because they are novel. Ideas are not neutral but reflect specific political and philosophical traditions of which we need to be conscious. As Europeans, we have distinctive physical landscapes, histories, and cultures, and these are bound to influence our approach and priorities, however, international we may be in outlook. Much of Western Europe, at least, shares strengths in stratigraphic excavation, a strong tradition of local/regional/landscape history, and in developed ideas of material culture. We need to build upon these, especially our deep roots in a historical tradition, but we also need a discipline that is open to new ideas and marked by both variety and the intellectual freedom to tolerate dissent.

European post-medieval archaeologists should seek to tackle the minute nuances of *terroir* and region and the everyday actions and choices of farmers, merchants, and industrial workers. We need to research the structure and economy of the household as a focus of both production and consumption. The further study of rural landscapes and farming is a high priority, and we should also seek to better integrate landscape and material culture studies. Nor should we neglect the study of the large structures at the regional, national, and international levels if we are to develop a rounded subject. Archaeology will undoubtedly increasingly contribute to the study of the rise of the nation state, colonialism, regional, and international trade structures, and the tensions between an increasing homogenization of European material culture and the continued creation of localized identities. One area

where European archaeologists still lag miserably behind our American colleagues, despite some recent interest in England and France, is in taking the archaeology of the last 200 years seriously (Balut and Bruneau, 1986, 1997; Buchli and Lucas, 2001; Tarlow and West, 1999). Increased trans-Atlantic dialogue and cooperation should be warmly welcomed but is likely to be more successful if based on a mutual understanding and appreciation of our differences.

Acknowledgments I am grateful to Yolanda Courtney, Deirdre O'Sullivan, Michiel Bartels, Mark Pluciennik, Marco Milanese, Neil Christie, Ian Whitbread, David Barker, and Audrey Horning for comments, discussion, or loan of books and to the editors for their suggestions and hard work.

References

- Abel, V., Amouric, H., and Kauffmann, A., editors, 1993, *Un goût d'Italie. Céramiques et ceramists italiens en Provence du Moyen Âge au XXe siècle*. Ville d'Aubagne, Aubagne.
- Audouze, F., and Leroi-Gourhan, A., 1981, France: A Continental Insularity. In *Regional Traditions of Archaeological Research I*, edited by B. Trigger and I. Glover, pp. 170–189. *World Archaeology* 13(2).
- Ajmar-Wollheim, M., and Dennis, F., editors, 2006, *At Home in Renaissance Italy. Art and Life in the Italian House 1400–1600*. V and A Publications, London.
- Alexandre-Bidon, D., 1986, Le métier de potier en terre (XIIIe–XIXe siècle): Histoire, iconographie et archéologie. *Ramage* 4:61–97.
- Alexandre-Bidon, D., 2005, *Une archéologie du goût*. Picard, Paris.
- Amores, F., 1997, La arqueología postmedieval en España. Panorama y perspectivas. In *Archaeologia postmedievale: Società - ambiente - produzione. L'esperienza Europa e L'Italia*, edited by M. Milanese, pp. 51–68. All'Insegna del Giglio, Florence.
- Andersson, H., Carelli, P., and Ersgård, L., editors, 1997, *Visions of the Past. Trends and Traditions in Swedish Medieval Archaeology*. Riksantikvarieämbetet Arkeologiska Undersökningar Skrifter 24 and Lund Studies in Medieval Archaeology 19. Riksantikvarieämbetet and Institute of Archaeology, University of Lund, Lund.
- Andrews, D., and Pringle, D., 1977, Lo scavo dell'area sud del Convento di San Silvestro a Genova (1971–1976). *Archeologia Medievale* 4:100–161.
- Arnold, B., and Hassmann, H., 1995, Archaeology in Nazi Germany: The Legacy of the Faustian Bargain. In *Nationalism, Politics, and the Practice of Archaeology*, edited by P.L. Kohl and C. Fawcett, pp. 70–81. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

- Aatzbach, R., 2005, *Leder und Pelz am Ende des Mittelalters und zu Beginn der Neuzeit. Die Funde aus dem Mühlberg-Ensemble in Kempten (Allgäu)*. Bamberger Schriften zur Archäologie des Mittelalters und der Neuzeit 2. Rudolf Habelt, Bonn.
- Baart, J., 1990, Ceramic Consumption and Supply in Early Modern Amsterdam: Local Production and Long-Distance Trade. In *Work in Towns: 850–1850*, edited by P.J. Corfield and D. Keene, pp. 74–85. Leicester University Press, Leicester.
- Balut, P.-Y., and Bruneau, P., 1986, L'archéologie moderne et contemporaine. *Dossiers Histoire et Archéologie (Archéologie et Industrie)* 107:78–81.
- Balut, P.-Y., and Bruneau, P., 1997, L'archéologie moderne et contemporaine en France. In *Archaeologia postmedievala: Società - ambiente - produzione. L'esperienza Europa e L'Italia*, edited by M. Milanese, pp. 69–74. All'Insegna del Giglio, Florence.
- Barford, P., and Tabaczyński, S.W., 1996, Polish Archaeology. Reality and Changes of the 1990s. *World Archaeological Bulletin* 8:153–176.
- Barford, P., and Dzieduszycki, W., 1999, Poland, In *Council of Europe, Report on the Situation of Urban Archaeology in Europe*, pp. 163–172. Council of Europe Publishing, Strasbourg.
- Barker, G., 1995, *A Mediterranean Valley: Landscape Archaeology as Annales History in the Biferno Valley*. Leicester University Press, Leicester.
- Bartels, M., editor, 1999, *Steden in Scherven/ Cities in Sherds. Finds from Cesspits in Deventer, Dordrecht, Nijmegen and Tiel (1250–1900)*. 2 vols. Stichting Promotie Archaeologie, Zwolle and Rijksdienst voor het Oudheidkundig Bodemonderzoek Amersfoort.
- Bartels, M., 2005, The Van Lidth de Jeude Family and the Waste from Their Privy: Material Culture of a Wealthy Family in 18th-Century Tiel, the Netherlands. *Northeast Historical Archaeology* 34:15–64.
- Bartlett, R., 1994, *The Making of Europe: Conquest, Colonization and Cultural Change, 950–1350*. Penguin, London.
- Beck, B., Bouet, P., Étienne, C., and Lettéron, I., editors, 2004, *L'Architecture de la Renaissance en Normandie*. 2 vols. L'Office Universitaire d'Études Normandes and les Éditions Charles Corlet, Condé-sur-Noireau.
- Berg, M., and Clifford, H., editors, 1999, *Consumers and Luxury: Consumer Culture in Europe, 1650–1850*. Manchester University Press, Manchester.
- Biehl, P.F., Gramsch, A., and Marciniak, A., editors, 2002, *Archäologien Europas; Archaeologies of Europe*. Tübinger Archäologische Taschenbücher 3. Waxmann, Münster.
- Bintliff, J.L., editor, 1997, *Recent Developments in the History and Archaeology of Central Greece*. BAR International Series 666. British Archaeological Reports, Oxford.
- Blake, H., 1980, Technology, Supply or Demand? *Medieval Ceramics* 4:3–12.
- Blake, H., 1993, No Sex, Some H-M and Lots of Fine Trade: Medieval Ceramic Studies in Italy. The Tenth Gerald Dunning Memorial Lecture. *Medieval Ceramics* 17:3–11.
- Blondé, B., 2002, Tableware and Changing Consumer Patterns. Dynamics of Material Culture in Antwerp, 17th–18th Centuries. In *Majolica and Glass from Italy to Antwerp and Beyond*, edited by J. Veeckman, S. Jennings, C. Dumortier, D. Whitehouse, and F. Verhaeghe, pp. 295–312. City of Antwerp, Antwerp.
- Boone, M., 2002, Urban Space and Political Conflict in Late Medieval Flanders. *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 32:621–640.
- Bourdieu, P., 1990, *The Logic of Practice*. Polity Press, Cambridge.
- Bresc, H., 2001, *Quartier du Louvre au XVII^e siècle*. Reunions des Musées, Paris.
- Brooks, A., 1997, Beyond the Fringe: Nineteenth-Century Transfer Prints and the Internationalisation of Celtic Myth. *International Journal of Historical Archaeology* 1:39–55.
- Bruneau, P., 1986, Études d'archéologie du Catholicisme français, IV: Les Grottes de Lourdes. *Ramage* 4:151–165.
- Bruneau, P., 1990, Études d'archéologie du Catholicisme français, VI: Le jouet catholique. *Ramage* 8:59–72.
- Buchli, V., and Lucas, G., editors, 2001, *Archaeologies of the Contemporary Past*. Routledge, London.
- Burke, P., 1988, Ranke the Reactionary. *Syracuse Scholar* 9:25–30.
- Burke, P., 1990, *The French Historical Revolution: Annales School, 1929–1989*. Polity Press, Cambridge.
- Burke, P., 1994, *Popular Culture in Early Modern Europe*. Revised reprint. Scolar Press, Aldershot.
- Burke, P., 1998, *The European Renaissance: Centres and Peripheries*. Blackwell, Oxford.
- Burke, P., 2004, *What is Cultural History?* Polity Press, Cambridge.
- Carelli, P., 1997, The Past and Future of Archaeology in Lund. In *Lübecker Kolloquium zur Stadtarchäologie im Hanseraum I: Stand, Aufgaben und Perspektiven*, edited by M. Gläser, pp. 429–440. Verlag Schmidt-Römhild, Lübeck.
- Charle, C., 2003, Contemporary French Social History: Crisis or Hidden Renewal? *Journal of Social History* 37:57–68.
- Chatenet, M., 2002, *La cour de France au XVI^e siècle: Architecture et le vie sociale*. Picard, Paris.
- Chatenet, M., and Henrion, F., editors, 2004, *Maulnes: Archéologie d'un château de la Renaissance*. Picard, Paris.
- Christie, N., Beavitt, P., Gisbert Santonja, J.A., Segui, J., and Gil Senis, M.V., 2004, *Ethnography and Archaeology in Upland Mediterranean Spain. Manolo's World: Peopling the Recent Past in the Serra de l'Almirant*. Leicester Archaeology Monographs 12. School of Archaeology and Ancient History, Leicester.
- Claval, P., 2003, *Géographie culturelle. Une nouvelle approche des sociétés et des milieux*. 2nd ed. Armand Collin, Paris.
- Clevis, H., editor, 1995, *Assembled Articles 2. Symposium on Medieval and Post-Medieval Ceramics*. Stichting Promotie Archeologie, Zwolle.
- Coblentz, W., 2002, Archaeology under Communist Control: The German Democratic Republic, 1945–1990. In *Archaeology, Ideology, and Society: The German Experience*, edited by H. Härke, pp. 308–341. Peter Lang, Bern.
- Coudart, A., 1999, Is Post-Processualism Bound to Happen Everywhere? The French Case. *Antiquity* 73:161–167.
- Council for British Archaeology (CBA), 2006, Council for British Archaeology, Valletta Convention. <http://www.britarch.ac.uk/valletta/>.
- Courtney, P., 1994, Urbanism and Marketing in Medieval and Early-Modern Gwent. In *Medieval and Later Usk:*

- Report on the Excavations at Usk*, vol. 6, edited by P. Courtney, pp. 111–141. University of Wales Press, Cardiff.
- Courtney, P., 1996, In Small Things Forgotten: The Georgian World View, Material Culture and the Consumer Revolution. *Rural History* 7:87–95.
- Courtney, P., 1999, Different Strokes: The Trans-Atlantic Development of Historical and Post-Medieval Archaeology. In *Old and New Worlds: Historical/Post-Medieval Archaeology Papers from the Societies' Joint Conferences at Williamsburg and London 1997 to Mark Thirty Years of Work and Achievement*, edited by G. Egan and R.L. Michael, pp. 1–9. Oxbow, Oxford.
- Courtney, P., 2005, Urbanism and 'Feudalism' on the Periphery: Some Thoughts from Marcher Wales. In *Town and Country in the Middle Ages: Contrasts, Contacts and Interconnections, 1100–1500*, edited by K. Giles and C. Dyer, pp. 65–84. Society for Medieval Archaeology Monograph 22. Maney, Leeds.
- Courtney, P., 2006, The Post-Medieval Period 1500–1750. In *The Archaeology of the East Midlands: An Archaeological Resource Assessment and Research Agenda*, edited by N. Cooper, pp. 217–235. University of Leicester Archaeological Services, Leicester.
- Courtney, P., 2007, Archaeologists and Historians: An English Perspective. *Historical Archaeology* 41(2):34–43.
- Deligne, C., 2003, *Bruxelles et sa rivière: Genèse d'un territoire urbain (12e–18e siècle)*. Brepols, Turnhout.
- Demoule, J-P., Giligny, F., Lehoëoff, A., and Schnapp, A., 2005, *Guide des méthodes de l'archéologie*. La Découverte, Paris.
- Demoule, J-P., editor, 2004, *La France archéologique: Vingt ans d'aménagements et de découvertes*. Hazan, Vanves.
- Dibbitts, H., 2001, *Vertrouwd Bezit. Materiële Cultuur in Doesburg en Maassluis, 1650–1800*. SUN, Nijmegen.
- Dibbitts, H., and Noordzij, A., 2000, Keramiek in Boedelinventarissen uit Doesburg en Lichtenvoorde, 1650–1850. In *Töpfer, Kramer, Pottenbakkers. Keramiek zwischen – Keramiek tussen IJssel & Berkel*, edited by A. Böing, W. Elling, G. Inhester and A. Menke, pp. 97–115. District Kreis Borken, Borken.
- Dickinson, R.E., 1969, *The Makers of Modern Geography*. Routledge and Kegan Paul, London.
- Di Méo, G., and Buléon, P., editors, 2005, *L'espace social: Lecture géographique des sociétés*. Armand Colin, Paris.
- Dow, J.R., and Lixfield, H., editors, 1986, *German Volkskunde: A Decade of Theoretical Confrontation, Debate and Reorientation (1967–1977)*. Indiana University Press, Bloomington.
- École Pratique, 1970, *Archéologie du village déserte*. 2 vols. Cahiers des Annales 27. École Pratique des Hautes Études Vie section and Institut d'Histoire de la Culture Matérielle de l'Académie Polonaise des Sciences. Armand Colin, Paris.
- Eggert, M.K.H., and Veit, U., editors, 1998, *Theorie in der Archäologie: Zur Englischsprachigen Diskussion*. Waxmann, Münster.
- Eley, G., 1989, Labour History, Social History, *Alltagsgeschichte*: Experiencing Culture and the Politics of the Everyday – A New Direction for German Social History. *Journal of Modern History* 69:297–343.
- Elias, N., 2000, *The Civilizing Process*. Blackwell, Oxford. Originally published in German in 1939.
- Ericsson, I., 1995, Archäologie der Neuzeit. Ziele und Abgrenzung einer Jungen Disziplin der Archäologischen Wissenschaft. *Ausgrabungen und Funde* 40:7–13.
- Ericsson, I., 1999, Archäologie des Mittelalters und der Neuzeit als Universitätsdisziplin – Erfahrungen aus der Otto-Friedrich-Universität Bamberg, Deutschland. In *ESTMA III. Actes du IIIe Colloque Européen des Professeurs d'Archéologie Médiévale*, edited by J. Decaëns and A-M. Flambard Héricher, pp. 27–31. Publications du CRAHM, Caen.
- Ericsson, I., 2002, Neue Forschungen zu Mittelalter und Neuzeit. Der Aufstieg einer Forschungsdisziplin. In *Menschen – Zeiten – Räume*, edited by W. Menghin and D. Planck, pp. 362–364. Archäologie in Deutschland monograph, Berlin.
- Ersgård, L., Holmstrom, M., and Lamm, K., editors, 1992, *Rescue and Research: Reflections of Society in Sweden 700–1700*. Riksantikvarieämbetet, Stockholm.
- Faucherre, N., and Pellerin, A., 2003, *Crazannes, logis alchimique*. Le Cröit Vif, Paris.
- Faure-Boucharlat, E., Vicard, T., Maccari-Poison, B., and Savay-Guerraz, S., editors, 1996, *Pots et potiers en Rhône-Alpes époque médiévale, époque moderne. Documents d'Archéologie en Rhône-Alpes (DARA), No. 12*. Lyon.
- Ferguson, L.G., 1977, An Archaeological–Historical Analysis of Fort Watson: December 1780–April 1781. In *Research Strategies in Historical Archeology*, edited by S. South, pp. 41–71. Academic Press, New York.
- Ferguson, W.K., 1948, *The Renaissance in Historical Thought: Five Centuries of Interpretation*. Mifflin, Boston.
- Fetten, F., 2002, Archaeology and Anthropology in Germany before 1945. In *Archaeology, Ideology, and Society: The German Experience*, edited by H. Härke, pp. 143–182. Peter Lang, Bern.
- Flambard Héricher, A-M., 2002, *Potiers et poteries du Bessin. Histoire et archéologie d'un artisanat rural du XIe au XXe siècle en Normandie*. Publications du CRAHM, Caen.
- Fozzati, L., editor, 2005, *Ca' Vendramin Calergi. Archeologia urbana lungo il Canal Grande di Venezia*. Marsilio, Venice.
- Friedman, S.W., 1996, *Marc Bloch, Sociology and Geography: Encountering Changing Disciplines*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Gaimster, D.R.M., 1997, *German Stoneware 1200–1900: Archaeology and Cultural History*. British Museum Press, London.
- Gaimster, D.R.M., 2005, A Parallel History: The Archaeology of Hanseatic Urban Culture in the Baltic c. 1200–1600. *World Archaeology* 37:408–423.
- Gardini, A., and Milanese, M., 1979, L'archeologia urbana a Genova negli anni 1964–1978. *Archeologia Medievale* 6:129–170.
- Gamay, P., 1999, France. In *Council of Europe, Report on the Situation of Urban Archaeology in Europe*, pp. 191–102. Council of Europe Publishing, Strasbourg.
- Geertz, C., 1973, *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays*. Basic, New York.
- Gelichi, S., and Librenti, M., 1998, *Senza immensa dote. Le clarisse a finale emilia tra archeologia a storia*. All'Insegna del Giglio, Florence.
- Giddens, A., 1973, *Capitalism and Modern Social Theory: An Analysis of the Writings of Marx, Durkheim and Max Weber*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

- Gilbert, A., 1988, The New Regional Geography in English and French-Speaking Countries. *Progress in Human Geography* 12:208–228.
- Gingrich, A., 2005, The German Speaking Countries. In *One Discipline, Four Ways: British, German, French and American Anthropology. The Halle Lectures*, coauthored by F. Barth, A. Gingrich, R. Parkin, and S. Silverman, pp. 61–156. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois.
- Ginzburg, C., 1980, *The Cheese and the Worms: The Cosmos of a Sixteenth-Century Miller*. John Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, Maryland.
- Given, M., 2004, *The Archaeology of the Colonized*. Routledge, London.
- Goldthwaite, R.A., 1989, The Economic and Social World of Italian Renaissance Maiolica. *Renaissance Quarterly* 42(1):1–32.
- Goldthwaite, R.A., 1995, *Wealth and the Demand for Art in Italy, 1300–1600*. John Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, Maryland.
- Gosden, C., 2004, *Archaeology and Colonialism: Cultural Contact from 5000 BC to the Present*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Götsch, S., and Lehmann, A., editors, 2001, *Methoden der Volkskunde. Positionen, Quellen, Arbeitsweisen der Europäischen Ethnologie*. Reimer, Berlin.
- Green, R.W., editor, 1959, *Protestantism and Capitalism: The Weber Thesis and Its Critics*. D.C. Heath and Company, Boston.
- Gringmuth-Dallmer, E., 1994, Archaeology in the Former German Democratic Republic since 1989. *Antiquity* 67:135–142.
- Guidi, A., 2002, An Italian Perspective. In *Archäologien Europas: Archaeologies of Europe*, edited by P.F.A. Biehl, A. Gramsch, and A. Marciniak, pp. 353–360. Tübinger Archäologische Taschenbücher 3. Waxmann, Münster.
- Hagen, W.F., 2002, *Ordinary Prussians. Brandenburg Junkers and Villagers, 1500–1840*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Härke, H., editor, 2002, *Archaeology, Ideology, and Society: The German Experience*. 2nd ed. Peter Lang, Bern.
- Hartshorne, R., 1976 [1939], *The Nature of Geography: A Critical Survey of Current Thought in the Light of the Past Perspective on the Nature of Geography*. Association of American Geographers, Lancaster, Pennsylvania.
- Hassmann, H., 2002, Archaeology in the ‘Third Reich.’ In *Archaeology, Ideology, and Society: The German Experience*, edited by H. Härke, pp. 67–142. Peter Lang, Bern.
- Hayden, D., 1997, *The Power of Place: Urban Landscapes as Public History*. MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Hechter, M., 1975, *Internal Colonialism: The Celtic Fringe in British National Development 1536–1966*. Routledge and Kegan Paul, London.
- Hervieu, J-P., Désiré-dit-Gosset, G., and Barré, É., editors, 2003, *Les paysages ruraux en Normandie*. Congrès des Sociétés Historiques et Archéologiques de Normandie 8. Caen.
- Hicks, D., 2000, Ethnicity, Race and the Archaeology of the Atlantic Slave Trade. *Assemblage* 5 (online journal, Sheffield University). <http://ads.ahds.ac.uk/catalogue/adssdata/assemblage/html/5/hicks.html>.
- Hodder, I., 2003, Archaeology as a Discontinuous Domain. In *Essential Tensions in Archaeological Method and Theory*, edited by T.L. VanPool and C.S. VanPool, pp. 5–10. University of Utah Press, Salt Lake City.
- Hodder, I., editor, 1991, *Archaeological Theory in Europe*. Routledge, London.
- Hodder, I., editor, 2001, *Archaeological Theory Today*. Blackwell, Oxford.
- Holl, I., 2005, *Fundkomplexe des 15. bis 17. Jahrhunderts aus dem Burgpalast von Buda*. Varia Archaeologica Hungarica 17. Budapest.
- Hudson, P., editor, 1989, *Regions and Industries: A Perspective on the Industrial Revolution in Britain*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Hudson, P., 1999, Regional and Local History: Globalism, Postmodernism and the Future. *Journal of Regional and Local Studies* 20(1):5–24.
- Jacobs, J., 2002, German Unification and East German Archaeology. In *Archaeology, Ideology, and Society: The German Experience*, edited by H. Härke, pp. 342–355. Peter Lang, Bern.
- Jardine, L., 1998, *Wordly Goods: A New History of the Renaissance*. W.W. Norton, New York.
- Jeffries, N., 2001, Historically Visible but Archaeologically Invisible? The Hueguenots of Spitalfields. *Medieval Ceramics* 25:54–64.
- Johnson, M., 1995, *An Archaeology of Capitalism*. Blackwell, Oxford.
- Kamermans, J.A., 1999, *Materiële Cultuur in de Krimpenerwaard in de Seventiende en Achttiende Eeuw. Ontwikkeling en Diversiteit*. Afdeling Agrarische Geschiedenis Bijdragen 39. Landbouwwuniversiteit, Wageningen.
- Karlenby, L., 2003, *Mittens Rike*. Riksantikvarieämbetet, Sweden.
- Kater, M.H., 1974, *Das Ahnenerbe der SS 1935–1945. Ein Beitrag zur Kulturpolitik des Dritten Reiches*. Deutsche Verlags-Ansalt, Stuttgart.
- Kriedte, P., Medick, H., and Schlumbohm, J., editors, 1981, *Industrialization before Industrialization*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Kuntz, A., 1996, Nicht nur “grau-blau.” Westerwälder Steinzeug als “Seismograph“ einer historisch-regionalen Volkskunde. *Volkskunde Online*, University of Basel. <http://pages.unibas.ch/volkskunde/volo/berichte/kuntz.html>.
- Kuper, A., 1999, *Culture: The Anthropologist’s Account*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Laan, C., 2003, *Drank en Drinkgerei: Een Archeologisch en Cultuur-Historisch Onderzoek naar de Alledaagse Drinkcultuur van de 18de-Eeuwse Hollanders*. De Bataafsche Leeuw, Amsterdam.
- Laszlovszky, J., 2003, The Middle Ages and the Post-Medieval Period. In *Hungarian Archaeology at the Turn of the Millennium*, edited by Z. Visy, pp. 317–412. Ministry of National Cultural Heritage and Teleki László Foundation, Budapest.
- Levi, G., 1991, On Microhistory. In *New Perspectives on Historical Writing*, edited by P. Burke, pp. 93–113. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Lindman, G., 2004, *Garda Fran Forr*. Riksantikvarieämbetet, Stockholm.
- Löfgren, O., 1997, Scenes from a Troubled Marriage. Swedish Ethnology and Material Culture Studies. *Journal of Material Culture* 2(1):95–113.
- Löw, M., 2001, *Raumsoziologie*. Suhrkamp, Frankfurt.

- Lozny, L., 2002, Far Outside, Looking In. Polish Archaeologists and Looking-Glass Self. *Archaeologia Polona* 40:137–148.
- Lucas, G., 2004, *An Archaeology of Colonial Identity: Power and Material Culture in the Dwars Valley, South Africa*. Kluwer/Plenum, New York.
- Lucia, G., 2005, *La storia nel paesaggio. Economia nell'Appennino lucchese dal medioevo all'età moderna*. Maria Pacini Fazzi Editore, Lucca.
- Lüdtke, A., 1993, *Eigen-Sinn: Fabrikalltag, Arbeitererfahrungen und Politik vom Kaiserreich bis in den Faschismus*. Ergebnisse-Verlag, Hamburg.
- Lüdtke, A., editor, 1995, *The History of Everyday Life: Reconstructing Historical Experiences and Ways of Life*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey.
- Malvoti, A., and Pinto, G., editors, 2003, *Incolti, fiumi, paludi: Utilizzazione delle risorse naturali nella toscana medievale e moderna*. Leo S. Olschki, Florence.
- Mannoni, T., and Giannichedda, E., 1996, *Archeologia della produzione*. Einaudi, Turin.
- Mannoni, L., and Mannoni, T., 1975, La ceramica dal medioevo all'età moderna nell'archeologia di superficie della Liguria centrale e orientale. *Abisola* 8:121–136.
- Mannoni, L., and Mannoni, T., 1985, *Marble: The History of a Culture*. Facts on File, New York.
- Mariage, T., 1998, *The World of Le Nôtre*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey.
- Matoušek, V., Hájek, J., Kubu, F., and Meduna, P., 1990, A Complex Investigation of a Field Fortification of the Seven Years War (1756–1763) at the Site of Nebesa by Aš. In *Studies in Postmediaeval Archaeology* 1, edited by Z. Smetánka and J. Žegklitz, pp. 29–61. Institute of Archaeology, Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic, Prague. Reissued in CD-ROM format 2008.
- Mawick, A., 1970, *The Nature of History*. Macmillan Press, London, England.
- Mazzino, F., and Ghersi, A., editors, 2003, *Per un atlante dei paesaggi italiani*. Alinea, Florence.
- MDGAMN, 2003, *Mitteilungen der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Archäologie des Mittelalters und der Neuzeit* 14. Also available online: <http://www.dgamn.de/mbl/mbl14/mib14.htm>.
- MDGAMN, 2005, *Mitteilungen der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Archäologie des Mittelalters und der Neuzeit* 16. Also available online: <http://www.dgamn.de/mbl/mbl16/mib16.htm>.
- Melli, P., 1999, Italy. In *Council of Europe, Report on the Situation of Urban Archaeology in Europe*, pp. 163–142. Council of Europe Publishing, Strasbourg.
- Mendels, F., 1972, Proto-Industrialization: The First Stage of the Industrialization Process. *Journal of Economic History* 32:241–261.
- Mennell, S.J., 1985, *All Manners of Food: Eating and Taste in England and France from the Middle Ages to the Present*. Basil Blackwell, Oxford.
- Mennell, S.J., 1999, *Norbert Elias: An Introduction*. University College Dublin Press, Dublin.
- Mentges, G., Mohrmann, R-E., and Foerster, C., editors, 2000, *Geschlecht und Materielle Kultur. Frauen-Sachen, Männer-Sachen, Sach-Kulturen*. Münsteraner Schriften zur Volkskunde/Europäischen Ethnologie 6. Waxmann, Münster.
- Mientjes, A., Pluciennek, M., and Giannitrapani, E., 2002, Archaeologies of Recent Rural Sicily and Sardinia: A Comparative Approach. *Journal of Mediterranean Archaeology* 15:139–166.
- Milanese, M., 1993, Italian Pottery Exported During the 15th and 16th Centuries. *Medieval Ceramics* 17:25–33.
- Milanese, M., 2004, Dell castello all'uliveto. Archeologia e storia delle trasformazioni del paesaggio in Valdinevole tra XVIII e XIX secolo. In *Il castello e l'uliveto: Indediamiento e trasformazioni del paesaggio dalle indagini archeologiche a Massa in Valdinievole*, edited by M. Milanese and M. Baldassarri, pp. 53–74. Commune of Massa and Cozzile.
- Milanese, M., editor, 1997, *Archeologia postmedievale 1: Società - ambiente - produzione. L'esperienza Europa e l'Italia*. All'Insegna del Giglio, Florence.
- Milanese, M., editor, 2000, *Archeologia postmedievale 4: Società - ambiente - produzione. Contiene gli atti del "Primo Convegno Nazionale di Etnoarcheologia"* (Roma, maggio, 1998). All'Insegna del Giglio, Florence.
- Mohrmann, R-E., 1990, *Alltagswelt im Land Braunschweig. Städtische und Ländliche Wohnkultur vom 16. bis zum 20. Jahrhundert*. Waxmann, Münster.
- Moore, J.D., 1996, *Visions of Culture: An Introduction to Anthropological Theories and Theorists*. AltaMira Press, Walnut Creek, California.
- Muir, E., and Ruggiero, G., editors, 1991, *Microhistory and the Lost Peoples of Europe: Selections from Quaderni Storici*. John Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, Maryland.
- Mukerji, C., 1983, *From Graven Images: Patterns of Modern Materialism*. Columbia University Press, New York.
- Mukerji, C., 1997, *Territorial Ambitions and the Gardens of Versailles*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Musée Val-d'Oise, 1998, *Aspects méconnus de la Renaissance en Ile-de-France. Musée Archéologique Départemental du Val-d'Oise*. Somogy, Paris.
- Musgrave, E., 1997, Memento Mori: The Function and Meaning of Breton Ossuaries 1450–1750. In *The Changing Face of Death*, edited by P. Jupp and G. Howarth, pp. 62–75. Macmillan, London.
- Mytum, H., 2002, A Comparison of Nineteenth and Twentieth Century Anglican and Nonconformist Memorials in North Pembrokeshire. *The Archaeological Journal* 159:194–241.
- Mytum, H., 2004, Artefact Biography as an Approach to Material Culture: Irish Gravestones as a Material Form of Genealogy. *Journal of Irish Archaeology* 12/13:111–127.
- Nawrołski, T., 1983, Archaeology in the Investigations of the Renaissance City and Fortress of Zamość. *Archaeologia Polona* 21–22:125–172.
- Newman, R., 2006, Farmers and Fields: Developing a Research Agenda for Post-Medieval Agrarian Society and Landscape. *Post-Medieval Archaeology* 39:205–214.
- Ogilvie, S.C., and Cerman, M., editors, 1997, *European Proto-Industrialisation*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Olsen, B.J., 1991, Metropolises and Satellites in Archaeology: On Power and Asymmetry in Global Archaeological Discourse. In *Processual and Postprocessual Archaeologies: Multiple Ways of Knowing the Past*, edited by R.W. Preucel, pp. 211–224. Southern Illinois University, Carbondale.

- Olsen, B.J., 2002, Divided We Stand? Some Opinions about Trends and Developments in Scandinavian Archaeology 1970–2000. In *Archäologien Europas: Archaeologies of Europe*, edited by P.F. Biehl, A. Gramsch, and A. Marciniak, pp. 213–224. Waxmann, Münster.
- Olsen, B., 2003, Material Culture after Text: Re-Membering Things. *Norwegian Archaeological Review* 36(2):87–104.
- Orser, C.E., Jr., 1996, *A Historical Archaeology of the Modern World*. Springer/Plenum, New York.
- Orser, C.E., Jr., 1997, Expanding Historical Archaeology. In *Method and Theory in Historical Archaeology*. Papers of the 'Medieval Europe Brugge 1997' Conference, vol. 10, edited by G. De Boe and F. Verhaeghe, pp. 9–13. Instituut voor het Archeologisch Patrimonium, Zellik.
- Orser, C.E., Jr., 1999, Negotiating Our 'Familiar' Pasts. In *The Familiar Past?: Archaeologies of Later Historical Britain*, edited by S. Tarlow and S. West, pp. 273–285. Routledge, London.
- Paillet, A., 1999, *Archéologie de l'agriculture en Bourbonnais: Paysages, outillages et travaux agricoles de la fin du Moyen Âge à l'Époque Industrielle*. Creer, Nonette.
- Paillet, A., 2005, *Archéologie de l'agriculture moderne*. Errance, Paris.
- Penna, M-T., 1999, *L'archéologie historique aux États-Unis*. Le Comité des Tavaux Historiques et Scientifiques (CTHS), Paris.
- Pinto, G., Poni, C., and Tucci, U., editors, 2002, *Il medioevo e l'età moderna*. Storia dell'agricoltura italiana, vol. 2. Accademia dei Geografi and Edizioni Polistampa, Florence.
- Piponnier, F., 1986, Après le Moyen Âge, survie et désertion d'un village castral dans les Monts du Forez (XVIe–XVIIIe siècle). *Ramage* 4:33–60.
- Pluciennik, M., Mientjes, A., and Giannitrapani, E., 2004, Archaeologies of Aspiration: Historical Archaeology in Rural Central Sicily. *International Journal of Historical Archaeology* 8:27–65.
- Puau, O., and Philippe, M., 1997, *Archéologie et histoire du Sannamary du XVIIe au XXe siècle (Guyane)*. Documents d'Archeologie Francaise 60. Editions de la Maison des Sciences de l'Homme, Paris.
- Pomata, G., 2000, Telling the Truth about Micro-History: A Memoir (and a few Reflections), *Netværk for Historieteorier og Historiografi*. *Arbejdsrapporter* 3:28–40. Online version used: <http://www.hum.ku.dk/histnet/publikationer/arbejdsrapporter3/pomata.html>.
- Preucel, R., and Hodder, I. (editors), 1996, *Contemporary Archaeology in Theory: A Reader (Social Archaeology)*. Blackwell, Oxford.
- Quirós Castillo, J.A., 1997, L'archeologia dell'insediamento abbandonato postmedievale. *Archeologia Postmedievale, Società, Ambiente, Produzione* 1:101–116.
- Reisenleiter, M., 2002, Central European Culture in Search of a Theory, or: The Lure of "Post/Colonial Studies." *Spaces of Identity* (Online Journal) 2(2): http://www.univie.ac.at/spacesofidentity/_Vol_2_2/_HTML/Reisenleitner.html.
- Represa, F., 1996, Post-Medieval Archaeology in Spain: An Overview. *World Archaeology Bulletin* 7:137–148.
- Reynolds, S., 1994, *Fiefs and Vassals: The Medieval Evidence Reinterpreted*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Rogan, B., 1996, Material Culture, Meaning and Interpretation in Nordic Ethnological Research: From Functionalist to Phenomenological Approaches. *Pro Ethnologia* 4:57–70. Also available online: <http://www.erm.ee/?node=135>.
- Rosen, J., 1995, *La faïence en France du XIVe au XIXe Siècle. Histoire et technique*. Errance, Paris.
- Rosén, C., 2004, *Stadsbor och Bönder: Materiell Kultur och Social Status i Halland från Medeltid till 1700-tal*. Riksantikvarieämbetet Arkeologiska Undersökningar Skrifter 53 and Lund Studies in Medieval Archaeology 35. Almqvist and Wiksell International, Stockholm.
- Ruggerio, G., editor, 2002, *A Companion to the Worlds of the Renaissance*. Blackwell, Oxford.
- Said, E., 1978, *Orientalism*. Pantheon Books, New York.
- Sarfati, H., 1999, Netherlands. In *Council of Europe, Report on the Situation of Urban Archaeology in Europe*, pp. 151–162. Council of Europe Publishing, Strasbourg.
- Sarfati, H., editor, 1990, *Verborgten Steden. Stadsarcheologie in Nederland*. Meulenhoff, Amsterdam.
- Sarti, R., 2002, *Europe at Home. Family and Material Culture, 1500–1800*. Yale University Press, New York.
- Scarre, C., 1999, Archaeological Theory in England and France. *Antiquity* 73:155–161.
- Schild, R., 1993, Polish Archaeology in Transition. *Antiquity* 67:146–150.
- Schuurman, A., and Spierenburg, P., editors, 1996, *Private Domain, Public Inquiry. Families and Life-Styles in the Netherlands and Europe, 1550 to the Present*. Verloren, Hilversum.
- Schuurman, A., de Vries, J., and van der Woude, A.M., editors, 1997, *Aards Geluk. De Nederlanders en hun Spullen van 1550 tot 1850*. Balans, Amsterdam.
- Seidenspinner, W., 1986/1987, Mittelalterarchäologie und Volkskunde. Ein Beitrag zur Öffnung und zur Theoriebildung Archäologischer Mittelalterforschung. *Zeitschriften für Archäologie des Mittelalters* 14/15:9–47.
- Sereni, E., 1997, *History of the Italian Agricultural Landscape*. Princeton University Press, Princeton. Originally published in Italian in 1961.
- Smetánka, Z., and Žegklitz, J., editors, 1990, *Studies in Post-medieval Archaeology 1*. Institute of Archaeology, Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic, Prague. Reissued in CD-ROM format 2008.
- Smith, W.D., 1980, Friedrich Ratzel and the Origins of *Lebensraum*. *German Studies Review* 3(1):51–58.
- Stoklund, B., 1983, *Folklife Research: Between History and Anthropology: A 75th Anniversary Lecture*. National Museum of Wales, St. Fagans, Cardiff.
- Tarlow, S., 1999, *Bereavement and Commemoration: An Archaeology of Mortality*. Blackwell, Oxford.
- Tarlow, S., and West, S., editors, 1999, *The Familiar Past?: Archaeologies of Later Historical Britain*. Routledge, London.
- Tilly, C., 1993, *Coercion, Capital and European States, A.D. 990–1990 (Studies in Social Discontinuity)*. Blackwell, Oxford.
- Trigger, B.G., 1989, *A History of Archaeological Thought*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Trochet, J-R., 1987, Sur les techniques et les instruments agricoles en Bretagne vers 1840. *Ramage* 5:27–46.
- Trochet, J-R., 1997, *Aux origines de la France rurale: Outils, pays et paysages*. CNRS Editions, Paris.
- Trochet, J-R., 2006, *Les maisons paysannes en France et leur environnement: XVe–XXe siècles*. Editions Créaphis, Grâne.

- Urbanczyk, P., 1996, Urban Archaeology in Poland. *World Archaeological Bulletin* 8:255–259.
- Valk, H., 2001, *The Cemeteries of Southern Estonia 1225–1800 AD*. 2nd ed. Tartu University, Tartu.
- van Dam, P.J.E.M., 2002, Ecological Challenges, Technological Innovations: The Modernization of Sluice Building in Holland, 1300–1600. *Technology and Culture* 43:500–520.
- Van Ossel, P., editor, 1998, *Les Jardins du Carrousel (Paris): De la Campagne à la Ville: La Formation d'un Espace Urbain*. Documents d'Archéologie Française 73. Editions de la Maison des Sciences de l'Homme, Paris.
- Vaysettes, J.-L., 1987, *Les Potiers de Terre de Saint-Jean-de-Fos*. Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, Paris.
- Veit, U., 1998, Zwischen Tradition und Revolution: Studien zur Britischen Archäologie. In *Theorie in der Archäologie: Zum Stand der Englischsprachigen Diskussion*, edited by M.K.H. Eggert and U. Veit, pp.15–65. Tübinger Archäologische Taschenbücher 1. Waxmann, Münster.
- Veit, U., 2002, Gustaf Kossina and his Concept of a National Archaeology. In *Archaeology, Ideology, and Society: The German Experience*, edited by H. Härke, pp. 41–66. Peter Lang, Bern.
- Verhaeghe, F., 1991, An Aquamanile and Some Thoughts about Ceramic Competition with Quality Metal Goods in the Middle Ages. In *Custom and Ceramics: Essays Presented to Kenneth Barton*, edited by E. Lewis, pp. 25–61. APE, Wickham.
- Verhaeghe, F., 1997, The Archaeology of Transition: A Continental View. In *The Age of Transition: The Archaeology of English Culture 1400–1600*, edited by D.R.M. Gaimster and P. Stamper, pp. 25–44. Oxbow, Oxford.
- Verhaeghe, F., 1999, Postface. Culture Matérielle: Quelques Défis pour l'Archéologie du Moyen Âge et des Temps Modernes. In *La Vie Quotidienne dans une Forteresse Royale. La Grosse Tour de Bourges (fin XIIe - milieu XVIIe siècle)*, edited by C. Monnet, pp. 381–399. Editions de la Ville de Bourges, Bourges.
- Vieille Charité, 1995, *Le Vert et le Brun, de Kairouan à Avignon, Xe–XVe siècle*. Exhibition catalog, Centre de la Vieille Charité, Marseille. Réunion des Musées Nationaux, Marseille.
- Vionis, A.K., 2005, Domestic Material Culture and Post-Medieval Archaeology in Greece: A Case-Study from the Cyclades Islands. *Post-Medieval Archaeology* 39:172–185.
- Vroom, J., 2003, *After Antiquity. Ceramics and Society in the Aegean from the 7th to 20th Century A.C: A Case Study from Boeotia, Central Greece*. Faculty of Archaeology, Leiden University, Leiden.
- Weber, M., 1958 [1905], *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. Scribner's Sons, New York.
- Wiley, G.R., and Phillips, P., 1958, *Method and Theory in American Archaeology*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Williams, G.A., 1985, *When Was Wales?: A History of the Welsh*. Penguin, Harmondsworth.
- Wolfram, S., 2002, Vorsprung durch Technik or 'Kossina Syndrome'? Archaeological Theory and Social Context in Post-War Germany. In *Archaeology, Ideology, and Society: The German Experience*, edited by H. Härke, pp. 183–204. Peter Lang, Bern.
- Zemon Davis, N., 2001, *The Gift in Sixteenth-Century France*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.