

- 2000. 'Igino Cocchi e la nascita della paleontologia in Toscana'. *Rassegna di Archeologia* 17: 325–356.
- 2000–01. 'La storia dell'archeologia e la storia degli storici', *Rivista di Scienze Preistoriche* LI: 7–65.
- 2002a. 'Archeologia e scienze naturali in Italia. Il caso dell'organizzazione degli studi etruschi (1925–1932)', *Rassegna di Archeologia* 19 (2002), pp. 321–351.
- 2002b. 'Appunti sui rapporti tra archeologia preistorica e fascismo'. *Origini* XXIV: 3–20.
- 2004. 'Dal Fascismo alla Repubblica. La fondazione dell'Istituto Italiano di Preistoria e Protostoria nel quadro delle vicende istituzionali della ricerca (1927–1960)'. *Rivista di Scienze Preistoriche* LIV: 5–82.
- 2005. 'Georges Laplace in Italia tra tipologismo e antropologismo. Appunti per una riflessione storica. In *Askategi. Miscellanea in onore di Georges Laplace. Rivista di Scienze Preistoriche, suppl.* 1: 31–40.
- Tosi, M. 1985–86. 'Ancora in tema di *New Archaeology in Italia*', (risposta a N. Cuomo di Caprio). *Sibrium* 18: 7–11.
- Undset, I. 1882. 'Di alcune relazioni paleontologiche fra l'Italia e l'Europa centrale e settentrionale'. *Bullettino di Paleontologia Italiana* 8: 36–44.
- Vaufrey, R. 1928. *Le Paleolithique Italien*. Paris: Archives de l'Institut de Paleontologie Humaine.

doi:10.5334/bha.20204

Iberian Crossroads: Archaeology and Dictatorships

Ana Cristina Martins*

(Ana.c.martins@nectabo.pt) / (anna.martins@iict.pt)

'Mucho pudo hacerse con la cooperación de prehistoriadores de ambos países. [...].
Lo que se acuerde de prehistoria y sobre todo las reuniones científicas,
una vez en un país y otra en otro donde nos conozcamos
y tratemos mas íntimamente los geólogos de las dos naciones
y en general los naturalistas y especialistas en las demás ciencias,
redundará seguramente, en beneficio de ambos países.'¹

Beginning(s)

The Iberian political regimes of Portugal and Spain were unable to completely ignore each others' political or cultural agendas. In reality, there was a convergence of interests and intellectual efforts, especially when these concerned science and technology, and involved the exchange of ideas,

* Ana Cristina Martins has a Ph.D in History, Master of Art in Heritage and Conservation, and a graduate degree in History, Archaeology variant, from the University of Lisbon, where she is currently undertaking a Post-Doctorate project at the Centre for Archaeology – Uniarq – on Portuguese Archaeology between the 1920s and the 1960s, and is the main researcher on the 'History of Archaeology in Portugal: Theoretical Issues'. She is the author of several publications on the history of the evolution of archaeological, museum and heritage issues, mainly as the result of lectures presented at national and international conferences. Assistant Researcher at the Instituto de Investigação Científica Tropical (Tropical Research Institute) within the programme *Compromisso com a Ciência* (Compromise with Science), where she promotes projects in the areas of the History of Science, in general, and History of Archaeology, in particular. She also lectures at the Universidade Lusófona de Humanidades e Tecnologias as a Guest Assistant Lecturer, where she also co-ordinates the Secção de História do Património e da Ciência.

¹ Letter from E. Hernández-Pacheco to Joaquim M. Fontes, reproduced in Cardoso *et al.*: 195–321).

experiences and knowledge. As with other European nations, and for a long time, there was the gradual and official development of a *République des Lettres*, although it lacked the splendour of certain other contemporary European examples.

The longer history of intellectual communion between these two Iberian nations is lost in time. In fact, it was André de Resende (ca. AD 1500–1573), a Portuguese scholar of the Renaissance, and the Illuminist, Frei Manuel do Cenáculo Vilas Boas (AD 1724–1814), who maintained connections with their Spanish colleagues, within the context of a Classical revival. Although they lived two centuries apart, both of these scholars collected archaeological material, mostly dating from the Roman period, and from the vast Alentejo region of Portugal, which they used to create their well-known cabinets of curiosities. They also described the Roman ruins they discovered, such as the site of Tróia (Setúbal, Portugal)². From very early on, the discovery of such a site attracted the attention of both local and foreign dilettanti and scholars. One of these was the Spanish traveller³ Modesto Fernandez y González (1840–1897)⁴, a recognised promoter of the *Congreso Pedagógico* and president of the *El Fomento de las Artes*. In 1871, he celebrated the efforts of the *Sociedade Archeologica Luzitana*, which had been created in the late 1840s for the exclusive study, valorisation and promotion of artefacts discovered at Tróia, which were presented in articles published in the journal *La Ilustración Española y Americana*.

The *Real Associação dos Architectos Civis e Archeologos Portugueses* (RAACAP) was established in Lisbon in 1863. RAACAP initiated contacts with specialists from other countries to implement and strengthen its objectives, thereby stimulating archaeological practice in Portugal. Contacts were established, primarily after the Universal Exhibition of Paris of 1867, where human history was presented in an evolutionary manner, in the *Galérie du Travail*⁵. In fact, connections with Spanish researchers were established at this event and maintained from then on. Iberian collaboration included the public presentation of the prehistoric artefacts from *San Isidro, Manzanares*⁶, whose recent discovery was announced by Juan Villanova y Piera (1821–1893)⁷ during the second session of the ‘*Congrès International d’Antropologie et d’Archéologie Préhistoriques*’ (CIAAP), which took place at the same time as the Paris Universal Exhibition.

Nevertheless, it should be noted that the first Iberian exchanges occurring within this context had taken place when the *Comissão Geológica de Portugal* (1848) was established in Lisbon⁸. In fact, the question has recently been raised⁹ as to what extent the *Comisión del Mapa Geológico de España*, along with one of its most famous members, Casiano de Prado y Vallo (1797–1866)¹⁰, may have inspired the creation of the *Comissão Geológica* in Portugal.

In the meantime, the large amount of correspondence exchanged by the RAACAP reveals a gradual closeness in Iberian archaeological relations. This is attested by the exchange of publications, news

² Martins, 2005: 65–74.

³ Fernandez y González, 1874.

⁴ Modesto Fernandez y González belonged to a large academic family whose members included Francisco Fernández González (1833–1917), a famous Orientalist, Professor and ‘progressive’ anthropologist, founding member of the *Sociedad Antropológica Española* and son-in-law of José Amador de los Ríos, a personal friend of Possidónio da Silva, mentor and president of the *Real Associação dos Architectos e Archeologos Portugueses*.

⁵ Mortillet, 1867.

⁶ Preysler, 2002: 81–107.

⁷ Ayarzagüena, 2004: 139–147.

⁸ This commission was led by the mining engineer and pre-historian Carlos Ribeiro (1813–1882) and F. A. Pereira da Costa, teacher of mineralogy and geology at the Lisbon Polytechnic.

⁹ Puche Riart, 2004: 79–87.

¹⁰ *Idem, Ibidem*: 83.

and articles published in its official journal, *Boletim de Architectura e Archeologia*, as well as, by the archaeological and artistic objects, presented by the Spanish Embassy in Lisbon, and displayed to the public at the *Museu Arqueológico do Carmo* (MAC), the museum of the RAACAP.

This exchange grew primarily because of the friendship established between José Amador de los Rios y Serrano (1818–1878) and the President of the RAACAP, J. Possidónio N. da Silva (1806–1896). However, it is also equally true, that this was due to experiences acquired during the Universal Exhibition of 1867, where the MAC exhibited prehistoric artefacts and C. Ribeiro presented a collection of objects belonging to the *Comissão Geológica*. Exchanges between Spanish researchers and the most important Portuguese members of the RAACAP intensified from this date onwards. This relationship developed until it resulted, during the CIAAP of 1880 held in Lisbon, when the only Spanish participant was committed to his objective that the international community should recognise the authenticity of Altamira's rock art paintings. For the first time, and with this purpose in mind, he also suggested a visit to this site that sadly, never materialised.

(Re)launching

The experiences shared since the 1860s seemed auspicious for further ongoing archaeological cooperation between the two Iberian nations. Nonetheless, the death of Possidónio da Silva in 1896 seems to have halted it, at least temporarily, based on evidence from the contents of the archives of the RAACAP. This apparent break may also reflect the political situations experienced in both countries, with the Bourbon restoration in Spain, and the decline of the monarchy in Portugal, which ended with the Proclamation of the Portuguese Republic in 1910. Collaboration later recommenced during the First World War, although on a more personal level, as with the case of Altamira.

This relationship should now be defined as 'collaborative' since it moved beyond the simple sharing of vocations, information, bibliographic notes and artefacts. This sort of collaboration developed from the opening years of the twentieth century onwards, even though it was still somewhat unilateral, favouring the interests of Portugal, at least during the first twenty-five years of the century. During this time, for example, Portuguese scholars were invited to participate in Spanish archaeological field expeditions. Although sometimes unable to achieve this goal, two eminent contemporary Portuguese scholars, Eugénio Augusto dos Anjos Jalhay (1891–1950) and Joaquim Moreira Fontes (1892–1960), struggled to change this imbalance, and insisted on a bilateral approach.

Contrary to more scientifically advanced countries at the time, Portugal did not yet possess the means essential to affirm, or officially recognise, the practice of archaeology. There were no research institutes, seminars and university courses in this subject, and there was, above all, a lack of researchers holding degrees in this academic field, even though there were certain individuals who were interested in archaeology and devoted their time and resources to studying it.

Portugal's peculiar situation, within Europe's chessboard of nations, seems understandable if one recalls that Portugal, unlike other nations, did not need to use archaeological evidence to legitimise its political, geographic and cultural existence. It also lacked regionalist arguments, like those experienced in Spain, for interpreting the past. In contrast, Portuguese political agendas were interested, primarily, in its Medieval past, that witnessed the formation of the kingdom, and that relegated both Prehistory and Proto-History into the background. This trend became less obvious over time, but it was insufficient enough to guarantee public funding.

(Some) of the Earliest Protagonists

Eugénio Jalhay began his long career in prehistoric research, when he was transferred from the Portuguese Jesuit college of Lisbon, to that of *La Guardia* in Galicia, in Spain, beginning his friendship with the great names in Spanish archaeology, especially with those in Asturias.

Making use of religious and social resources gathered over the years, at the start of a new century,

Jalhay accompanied ‘... the priest of Vidiago (Asturias) D. José Menéndez¹¹, and other enthusiasts of the Prehistory of the Asturias, on visits to collections and museums in Porto, Lisbon, etc.’¹², introducing them to the charismatic director of the Portuguese Ethnological Museum (Museu Etnológico Português, MEP), José Leite de Vasconcellos (1858–1941). Jalhay’s donations of prehistoric artefacts from Asturias to Leite de Vasconcellos, a renowned Portuguese archaeologist and pre-historian, were possible because of his friendship with Ricardo, the Duke of Estrada y Bustamante, Seventh Earl of la Vega del Sella (1870–1941)¹³.

While in Spain, Jalhay also extended his archaeological interests to Galicia. He surveyed the surroundings of the La Guardia College and the site of Monte de Santa Tecla, whose protection he promoted¹⁴. Along with Jesuit priest Alphonse Luisier¹⁵, Jalhay also discovered the prehistoric site of Castro da Forca (La Guardia, Pontevedra)¹⁶. He also searched for similarities amongst pre- and protohistoric materials found in the Northwest of the Iberian Peninsula, so as to determine any common grounds with which to justify an eventual communion of contemporary political interests on both sides of the border. This was one of the reasons for his increased interest in the lithic industries of Asturian and Pre-Asturian types from Minho-Galicia.

Nevertheless, Jalhay gained greater renown among his Portuguese colleagues because of his experiences at Altamira, where he was friends with the Count of la Vega del Sella (whose guest he was), and archaeologists Hugo Obermaier (1877–1946) and Henri Breüil (1877–1961). At Altamira he participated in efforts to stop the collapse of the roof of the first chamber of the cave, describing the events as, ‘Que belo exemplo não nos dão os nossos vizinhos!’ (What a wonderful example our neighbours have given us!)¹⁷. While arguing for the need for progress in the field of archaeology and monument conservation and restoration in Portugal, Jalhay collected artefacts for his private collection and for the modest museum he created at the college in La Guardia¹⁸. However, a Real Orden (Royal Decree) forbidding excavations and the removal of objects from archaeological sites in that region of Spain, made it impossible for him to continue sending objects to Portugal¹⁹.

Although the new legislation forced him to put a stop to his fieldwork, Jalhay continued to communicate the results of his work. For example, in 1929 he gave a conference, illustrated with projected images²⁰

¹¹ The Priest José Fernández Menéndez, archaeologist and member of the *Real Academia de la Historia*.

¹² Eugénio Jalhay. – [Letter] 21 de Outubro a José Leite de Vasconcellos. In the Library of the Museu Nacional de Arqueologia, Lisboa, Portugal. Epistolário de J. L. V. 10558.

¹³ *Ibidem*.

¹⁴ Eugénio Jalhay. – [Letter] 23 de Dezembro a José Leite de Vasconcellos. 19[?]. In the Library of the Museu Nacional de Arqueologia, Lisboa, Portugal. Epistolário de J. L. V. 10570.

¹⁵ The Galician ethnographer and archaeologist Casto Sampedro y Folgar (1848–1937), founder, in 1894, of the *Sociedad Arqueológica de Pontevedra*, founding member of the *Real Academia Galega*, responsible for the creation of the *Comisión de Monumentos* and first Director of the *Museo de Pontevedra*.

¹⁶ Eugénio Jalhay. – [Letter] 6 de Maio a José Leite de Vasconcellos. 1917. In the Library of the Museu Nacional de Arqueologia, Lisboa, Portugal. Epistolário de J. L. V. 10576.

¹⁷ Eugénio Jalhay. – [Letter] a José Leite de Vasconcellos. 19[?]. In the Library of the Museu Nacional de Arqueologia, Lisboa, Portugal. Epistolário de J. L. V. 10573. Our highlight.

¹⁸ *Ibidem*.

¹⁹ Eugénio Jalhay. – [Letter] 18 de Janeiro a José Leite de Vasconcellos. 1921. In the Library of the Museu Nacional de Arqueologia, Lisboa, Portugal. Epistolário de J. L. V. 10579. E. Jalhay considered, at least partially, that these obstacles resulted from a certain rivalry – although undeclared – between Galician and Portuguese researchers: ‘the fact that a foreigner comes here, especially Portuguese, and to discover what they have not seen before and probably would never see [Camposancos], was for them like an electric shock that still persists! Therefore, Casto Sampedro, de Pontevedra, has already moved strings to stop my researches, telling me, indirectly, that I may suffer some disappointment if I continue to send stones to Portugal etc.’ (Cardoso 2006: 230–231).

²⁰ Historical Archive of the Associação dos Arqueólogos Portugueses (A. H. /A. A. P.), *Livro das Actas da Real*

and entitled 'As ultimas descobertas arqueologicas do Sul da Galiza e a sua relação com a pré-historia portuguesa' (The latest archaeological discoveries in the South of Galicia and their relationship with Portuguese Prehistory)²¹, at the Association of Portuguese Archaeologists (Associação dos Arqueólogos Portugueses, AAP) in Lisbon. Jalhay was familiar with recent developments in the archaeology of Galicia due to the efforts of Angel del Castillo (1886–1961), Florentino López Cuevillas (1886–1958) and Fermín Bouza-Brey Trillo de Figueroa (1901–1973), whose work had been inspired by Obermaier.

In 1922, the latter was invited by the University of Santiago de Compostela²² to talk on the Palaeolithic occupation of the region, which in those days was still a little studied subject. Moreover, this invitation coincided with the inclusion of prehistoric research in the Spanish archaeological curriculum, so that Obermaier was awarded a professorship²³, in recognition of foreign supremacy on this subject²⁴. This enthusiasm had its rewards. Jalhay collaborated closely with Spanish archaeologists, such as the Count de la Vega del Sella, and Eduardo Hernández-Pacheco y Estévan (1872–1965)²⁵. In his opinion, this collaboration allowed him to corroborate the continuity of human occupation in the south and southwest of Galicia since the Quaternary, both in the field and through artefactual analysis. This was discerned, based on materials from sites of Palaeolithic, Pre-Neolithic (i.e. Epipalaeolithic and/or Mesolithic), Neolithic and Chalcolithic dates, as well as from the Period of Metals.

The scope of the paper presented by Jalhay to the AAP was not confined to the archaeology of Galicia. It also sought to raise awareness among both Portuguese institutions and scholars so that they might embrace such an example. The idea was to encourage a survey of the Minho region of Portugal to search for similar archaeological sites in order to fill the academic gap that existed at the time. Such work took place when, in 1924, Joaquim Moreira Fontes discovered the first Palaeolithic site in the northwest of the Peninsula, although it was located on the Spanish side of the border²⁶. In this context, it seems interesting that Obermaier and Fontes remained in the capital of Galicia for a year, before and after, respectively, of the creation of the *Seminario de Estudos Galegos* promoted by the (ultra) regionalist journal *Nós* and *Rexionalismo* (or *Rexurdimento*). These were both true intellectual epicentres opposed to the rigid political restrictions of Miguel Primo de Rivera y Orbaneja, Marquis of Estella and Ajdir (1870–1930)²⁷.

In this context, the invitations that were often extended to Portuguese researchers such as Jalhay and Fontes, to visit and participate in, Galician studies, especially from 1923 onwards, were not mere coincidence. Given its distance from the southern Peninsula, which was closer to the Roman and Pre-Roman cultural spheres, and beyond a Celtic uniformity envisioned by the intelligentsia of Galicia, and more akin to British shores, the northern Peninsula experienced their own peculiar and specific pan-Celticism. In fact, Galicia was adjacent to, and identified historically and linguistically with, Portugal, from where it derived inspiration for a new model. This model was national(ist) more than regional(ist), in its relationship with Madrid, which banned the use of its language and culture. It is therefore hardly surprising that one of the members of the *Seminario*, Ramón Otero Pedrayo (1888–1976), envisaged a Galicia that was both *Luguense* (from Lugo, in Galician Spain) and *Bracarense* (from

Associação dos Architectos Civis e Archeologos Portuguezes (01-05-1928 a 07-11-1930). Acta n.º 53, 25/04/1929.

²¹ Id., *Idem*. Acta n.º 54, 16/05/1929.

²² Fernández Ibáñez; Fábregas Valcarce, 1996: 99–126.

²³ Díaz-Andreu, *Idem*: 410.

²⁴ A. H./A. A. P., *Idem*. Acta n.º 54, 16/05/1929.

²⁵ Id., *Livro das Actas da Real Associação dos Architectos Civis e Archeologos Portuguezes (31-07-1935 a 17-02-1941)*. Acta n.º 161, 17/01/1936.

²⁶ Id., *Livro das Actas da Real Associação dos Architectos Civis e Archeologos Portuguezes (01-05-1928 a 07-11-1930)*. Acta n.º 54, 16/05/1929.

²⁷ Prado Fernández, 1997: 457–458.

Braga, in Portugal), stressing the absolute need to narrow and deepen collaboration with Portugal²⁸, at times even hinting at the coherence of a hypothetical reintegration of Galicia into Portugal.

Eventually, Jalhay collaborated with one of the greatest contributors to the development of Portuguese archaeology, Joaquim Moreira Fontes, who led the AAP after having been the president of the Prehistoric Section of the same association.

One of the leitmotifs of these researchers involved making both those in positions of responsibility, and scholars, aware of the pressing need for Portugal to seek inspiration in the Galician experience. This would involve surveying the border of Minho in search of similar patterns of human occupation from remotest times. They believed that the uncomfortable scientific deficit extant in Portugal, could only be overcome through such work. Although this was their common project, Fontes' major interest included the creation of an organisation similar to the Spanish *Comisión de investigaciones paleontológicas y prehistóricas* in order to better institutionalise archaeology in Portugal. To that end, he appealed for the personal involvement of J. Leite de Vasconcellos's, particularly because of the latter's prestige. Fontes was well acquainted with this modal organisation due to his contacts with Spanish institutions and individuals, some of which were introduced to him by Jalhay²⁹.

1917 was an important year in the history of the AAP, as this institution took the path that would, from then on, define archaeology in Portugal. It became *the* home for archaeologists, promoting related activities, including excavations³⁰. This new phase in the history of the association began in the best possible way with individuals, such as Fontes, being invited to excavate in Spain³¹, and financed by scientific institutions based in Madrid. The AAP gained prestige through this (re)introduction back into the Iberian scientific network. Participation in this network had waned since the death of Possidónio da Silva. However, there were asymmetries.

The early twentieth century witnessed the launch of the basis for a solid, albeit intermittent, collaboration with Spanish scholars, especially with those from Asturias and Galicia, a sign of the undoubted vitality of the *République des Lettres*. The role played by the president of the AAP was, in a way, transferred to Fontes. The latter represented the AAP at major international archaeological conferences, even when the focus was mainly towards Spain, giving rise to a long and profitable official relationship between Iberian researchers, as seen in their participation at the Congreso de Sevilla de la Asociación Española para el Progreso de las Ciencias (1917)³².

While these events unfolded, Fontes worked towards his goal, exchanging correspondence with Spanish individuals directly associated with the study and safeguard of archaeological remains. Fontes wrote frequently to Juan Cabré de Aguiló (1882–1947) and E. Hernández-Pacheco, and often visited Spain to participate in excavations with Hernández-Pacheco, while struggling to achieve the institutionalisation of archaeology and the protection of archaeological remains in Portugal³³.

Ancient Practices, Renewed Horizons

In a similar way as Spain, the Portuguese awaited developments abroad in order to promote archaeology as an integral part of a larger project that celebrated Portugal from remotest times. The delay in the institutionalisation of the discipline may be explained by the fact that in Portugal there

²⁸ *Idem, Ibidem*: 460.

²⁹ Joaquim Moreira Fontes. – [Letter] 17 de Outubro a José Leite de Vasconcellos. 1917. In the Library of the Museu Nacional de Arqueologia, Lisboa, Portugal. Epistolário de J. L. V. 8579.

³⁰ Mendes Correia, 1938: 247.

³¹ “Vida intelectual da Associação”, 1917: 268.

³² *Idem, Ibidem*: 309.

³³ Joaquim Moreira Fontes. – [Letter] 29 de Augusto a José Leite de Vasconcellos. 1916. In the library of the Museu Nacional de Arqueologia, Lisboa, Portugal. Epistolário de J. L. V. 8574.

were no regional movements similar to those experienced by other European countries, such as in Spain, and there was a lack of interest in Portugal's past by foreign scholars. It was the involvement of Portuguese scholars in the intellectual circles of Barcelona and, somewhat later, of Madrid, that gradually introduced archaeology into the Portuguese academic system. Although archaeology was always associated with key figures of national society and politics, who used the past to advance their own agendas. Thus, important archaeological institutions were created, inspired by France, influenced by Germany's ascendancy and reinforced by national(ist) goals. These included the *Escuela de Estudios Superiores Hispánicos*, created in 1909, and the *Junta para Ampliación de Estudios e Investigaciones Científicas* (JAEIC) created in 1907, as a mirror image of the *École des Hautes Études*, and the *Institución Libre de Enseñanza*³⁴.

It was amongst the latter, and under the influence of the first Spanish legislation on archaeology, that the *Comisión de Investigaciones Paleontológicas y Prehistóricas* (CIPP)³⁵ was created in 1912. It was led by Enrique de Aguilera y Gamboa, Marquis of Cerralbo (1845–1922), and a friend of Fontes. Successor to the *Comisión de Exploraciones Espeleológicas*³⁶, the CIPP emphasised interdisciplinary work, as characteristic of the study of the remotest past, in order to (re)construct ancient human life in periods when no written documents existed. It was declared the first Spanish public institution dedicated to archaeological research, complemented by the areas of geology, anthropology and palaeontology, and it received the support of conservative sectors of Spanish society, such as the Catholics who conducted research within its agendas³⁷.

Belonging to the JAEIC and complementing a vast educational and cultural programme, the CIPP was at the forefront of institutionalisation of prehistoric archaeology in Spain. It resisted increasing foreign influences (especially French) and stimulated Quaternary studies within the context of a broader scientific and cultural Spanish scheme known as the 'Age of Silver'. Although the initial impetus that led to the rebirth of prehistoric research had actually come from abroad (often as the result of personal contacts between individuals), after a period of endogenous disinterest³⁸, the Iberian Peninsula became, for a long time, the focus for research from Paris' Institute of Palaeontology. Some authors have described this as a kind of pacific conquest of Prehistoric Spain by French science³⁹.

Renowned scholars associated with the CIPP included J. Cabré and E. Hernández-Pacheco, the latter being responsible for the organic structure of the institution. Hernández-Pacheco was professor of geology at the University of Madrid and a pioneer of the study of ecology in Spain, developing this subject in the context of the *Ley dos Parques Nacionales* (1916) and the *Junta Central de Parques Nacionales* (1917). This led to the establishment of two new entities: *sítio natural de interés nacional* (natural sites of public interest) and the *monumento natural de interés nacional* (natural monuments of National interest)⁴⁰. Other famous individuals associated with the CIPP were the Marquis de Cerralbo, head of the Traditionalist Party, and the Count of la Vega del Sella.

In the meantime, Fontes was invited to excavate in Spain, after it became public knowledge that at the time, such work was carried out in poor conditions in Portugal. He was also invited to visit caves with prehistoric paintings in order to become 'familiar with them and then be able to search for similar sites in Portugal'. This situation called for a reassessment of the reasons why similar work was not being carried out in Portugal, when the 9th Session of the CIAAP finally opened the way for

³⁴ Maier, 2004: 77.

³⁵ Rasilla Vives, 1997: 431–437.

³⁶ Moure Romanillo, 1996: 22.

³⁷ *Idem, Ibidem*: 27.

³⁸ Díaz-Andreu, *Ibidem*: 403.

³⁹ Hernández Pacheco citado por *Idem, Ibidem*: 432. Our highlight.

⁴⁰ Mar Merino, 2002: 72.

the institutionalisation of archaeology in Portugal through the creation, for example, of university courses⁴¹.

The actual reality of the situation, however, was very different from what was desired by many archaeologists. Universities were not the only institutions that ignored this fledgling human science, some even associating prehistory with the discipline of zoology in a philosophy degree. Successive Portuguese governments did not recognise archaeology's autonomy as a separate discipline, and always attempted to associate it with the Fine Arts or ethnographic studies. This forced archaeology to assert itself within more or less dilettante private circles and societies. Even so, these governments were aware of the importance of archaeological practice for the development of national characteristics and images at local, regional and national levels.

In contrast, innumerable associations, societies, museums, institutes and universities in Spain were financed by its central government and by private individuals, especially aristocrats, in a society that was gradually becoming more Republican, as had once occurred in Portugal. This was a period in which regional interests received support, and which saw the establishment of a wide system of scholarships for specialisation abroad, particularly in Paris and Berlin. These were granted mostly by the JAEIC⁴², who was also responsible for legislation on the protection of archaeological remains and the cultivation of bilateral contacts, overcoming foreign scientific supremacy.

On the opposite side of the Iberian border, Portugal had an almost nonexistent Academy of History; an Academy of Fine Arts, which simply taught the subject implied by its name; a Portuguese Museum of Ethnology, controlled by individuals who were too involved in validating their theories on ethno-genesis, rather than addressing archaeological discoveries with greater care and interest, which occurred in Spain; an archaeological associative movement that could not establish itself; an Academia adverse to the absolute acceptance of Prehistoric Archaeology; and a government that did not encourage archaeological research⁴³. This scenario was further aggravated by the almost total inaction of the Geological Services of Portugal, and, consequently, the opportunities afforded by the 9th Session of the CIAAP were not realised.

Portugal thus lacked a specific policy for this field of study, probably due to the nonexistence of regionalist and nationalist movements capable of strengthening archaeology, as in other European countries. Western scholarly traditions were also discouraged because of Portugal's peripheral geographic and political position. The Republican regime did not know how to, or could not, overcome these particularities completely, due to political disinterest. In fact, Portugal did not arouse enough curiosity from foreign individuals, who possessed the means to create journals and institutes dedicated to the study of the country, whether in their countries of origin, or in Portugal. This was what was happening in Spain with the activities sponsored by Prince Albert I of Monaco (1848–1922), and the journals *Révue Hispanique* (1894) and *Bulletin Hispanique* (1899)⁴⁴.

One of the Portuguese researchers involved in scientific exchanges with their Spanish contemporaries, was army officer Manuel Afonso do Paço (1895–1968). He was central to Portuguese archaeology conducted during the regime known as the Estado Novo, of António de Oliveira Salazar (1889–1970). Afonso do Paço maintained close contacts with Júlio Martínez Santa-Olalla (1905–1972), with whom he collaborated at Manzanares, and he also visited museums and archaeological collections. It was, in fact, Afonso do Paço who launched the new phase of relations between archaeologists on both sides of the border, during the first quarter of the twentieth century.

⁴¹ Correia, 1916: 116.

⁴² García y Bellido, 2004: 59.

⁴³ Fitas, Rodrigues and Nunes, 2002: 450.

⁴⁴ Díaz-Andreu, *Ibidem*: 105.

The first practical results of these relations were designed to provide a closer knowledge of the Spanish field archaeology, contacts with well-known individuals in the field, and with those in positions of responsibility, and closer collaboration with research centres. After these, a more ambitious plan followed, beyond the sphere of purely personal acquaintances. Jalhay, Fontes and Afonso do Paço, had worked towards this goal, although they had not achieved the desired results, even though resources and conditions seemed favourable for such an outcome. After all, their connections and positions in Portugal, at the time, should have helped them to achieve such a goal. They were all men of the system, all men of the state. Fontes was professor at the University of Lisbon and president of one of the municipalities carrying immense historical significance in the country, Sintra; while Afonso do Paço represented the Army; and Jalhay the Catholic Church.

With the creation of the *Direcção-Geral dos Edifícios e Monumentos Nacionais* in 1929 and the *Junta Nacional de Escavações, Antiguidades e Numismática* (JNEAN) in the 1930s, it was hoped that fundamental decisions concerning the knowledge and preservation of Portugal's heritage would finally occur. All factors seemed to indicate a move in that direction, and the field's vitality was attested by the following: the teaching of subjects related to archaeology had been introduced into university curricula; the National Museum of Ethnology (Museu Nacional de Etnologia), in Lisbon, was functioning; the Association of Portuguese Archaeologists (Associação dos Arqueólogos Portugueses) continued to inspire educated elites throughout Portugal; journals specialising in the subject were published; legislation covering the field of archaeology was promulgated; Portuguese Youth (Mocidade Portuguesa) groups, a Fascist inspired movement, participated in archaeological summer camps, etc.

Even so, all of the above occurred on a modest scale in comparison with the aspirations of the major promoters of archaeology. When compared with Spain, Portuguese archaeology did not possess institutes and its own units of research, not even a national archaeological museum. Archaeological studies continued to be subordinate to artistic and architectural studies. Not even the two most influential figures in Portuguese archaeology in the middle of the twentieth century, physician, anthropologist, prehistorian and university professor, António Augusto Esteves Mendes Corrêa (1888–1960), and the director of the Museum of Ethnology, and university professor, Manuel Domingos Heleno Júnior (1894–1970), were able to raise archaeology from its secondary place. The reason was that, at the time, Portugal's official political discourse celebrated the nation's Medieval past and its maritime prowess, as the key archetypes or symbols of what it was to be, and feel proud about being, Portuguese. This agenda was on display and celebrated in 1940 at the Exhibition of the Portuguese World (Exposição do Mundo Português) at a time when Europe was immersed in one of its greatest nightmares, the Second World War.

This state of affairs did not, however, prevent the exchange of ideas, experiences, knowledge, and projects etc., between Iberian archaeologists. On the contrary, from then on there was an almost continuous exchange that was clearly beneficial for Portugal, at least throughout the first half of the twentieth century. Spanish scholars were invited to lecture in Portugal at associations and universities, and their articles were published in Portuguese journals mainly concerned with archaeology. They visited archaeological sites in Portugal, and were encouraged to join archaeological societies and participate in scientific conferences such as the 1st National Archaeology Congress of 1958, organised to celebrate the first centenary of the birth of J. Leite de Vasconcelos. Some Portuguese archaeologists crossed the border to visit archaeological sites, museums and collections, and to present lectures at specialised conferences. These were important actions on the part of scholars from both countries, especially since the Portuguese government continued to create funding difficulties, in terms of scholarships for travelling and for academic training abroad, even though it created an institution to that effect: JNEAN.

In conclusion, we are at the beginning of a process that will lead to the full reconstruction of the network of communications and influences, developed by Spanish and Portuguese scholars. To this

effect it seems important to understand the origins and objectives, and the causes of its past weakening and break down. Although the unfolding events were explicable, in the light of the two nation's differing political contexts it was all the more intriguing, considering that, in 1916, Hernández-Pacheco had enthusiastically welcomed the possibility of regular scientific meetings on and about the archaeology of the Iberian Peninsula, and collaborative excavations in both countries.

His said:

I am glad to ... agree ... with the essential and urgent need for the creation of a Union of Iberian Archaeologists. It seems hard to accept that those who study Iberian Archaeology should not maintain close scientific contacts and friendship. The Portuguese and Spanish are the sons of a common motherland: Iberia; therefore, it is good that one who studies the common past of our two Nations also knows the scientific movement subscribing to a point of view of two brotherly nations.⁴⁵

References

- Arquivo Histórico da Associação dos Arqueólogos Portugueses (A.H./A.A.P)
Museu Nacional de Arqueologia
- Ayarzagüena, M. 2002. Juan Vilanova y Piera. *Pioneros de la Arqueología en España*. Madrid: Museo Arqueológico Regional, pp. 139–147.
- Cardoso, J. L. 2006. Arqueólogos portugueses nas Astúrias nos inícios do século XX. *Astúrias e Portugal. Relações históricas e culturais*. Lisboa: Academia Portuguesa de História, pp. 191–233.
- Cardoso, J. L. and A. A. Melo, 2006. Correspondência de Joaquim Fontes. Contributos para a História da Arqueologia Peninsular (1910–1930). *Estudos Arqueológicos de Oeiras* 13, CMO: 195–321.
- Correia, A. A. 1938. Arqueologia e Biologia. *Trabalhos da Associação dos Arqueólogos Portugueses* 4: 211.
- Correia, V. 1916. Arte Pré-histórica. Pinturas rupestres descobertas em Portugal no século XVIII. *Terra Portuguesa* 1(4): 116.
- Díaz-Andreu, M. 1997. Nación e internacionalización. La Arqueología en España en las tres primeras décadas del siglo XX. In G. Mora and M. Díaz-Andreu (eds) *La Cristalización del Pasado: Génesis y Desarrollo del Marco Institucional de la Arqueología en España*. Málaga: Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad de Málaga, pp. 403, 410.
- Fernández Ibáñez, C. and R. Fábregas Valcarce, 1996. Obermaier y la Prehistoria en el Noroeste de la Península Ibérica. *‘El Hombre Fósil’ 80 años después*. Santander: Universidad de Cantabria, pp. 99–126.
- Fernandez y González, Modesto, 1874. *De Madrid a Oporto pasando por Lisboa: Diario de un caminante*. Madrid: Imp. y Fundición de M. Tello.
- Fitas, A. J. S., Rodrigues, M. A. E. and M. de F. Nunes, 2002. A filosofia da ciência no Portugal do século XX. In P. Calafate (ed) *História do Pensamento Filosófico Português* 5(2). O Século XX. Lisboa: Círculo de Leitores, p. 450.
- García Y Bellido, A. 2004. Impresiones a la llegada de un viaje en tren a Berlin, en 1931. In J. B. Pérez and M. P. Ruiz (eds) *Antonio García y Bellido*. Madrid: Comunidad de Madrid/Ayuntamiento de Madrid/Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, p. 59.
- Maier, J. 2004. Juan Cabré y su entorno científico e intelectual. *El arqueólogo Juan Cabré (1882–1947). La fotografía como técnica documental*. Madrid: Instituto de Patrimonio Histórico Español/Universidad Autónoma de Madrid/Museo de San Isidro, p. 77.
- Mar Merino, M. del, 2002. Eduardo Hernández Pacheco (1872–1965). *Ambienta* 72: 157.
- Martins, A. C. 2005. *A Associação dos Arqueólogos Portugueses na senda da salvaguarda patrimonial. 100 anos de (trans) formação (1883–1963)*. Texto policopiado. Tese de Doutoramento apresentada à Universidade de Lisboa.
- 2008. Palavras cruzadas. Arqueologia portuguesa e espanhola no primeiro quartel de noventa. In G. Mora et al. (eds) *Documentos inéditos para la Historia de la Arqueología*. Madrid: SEHA, pp. 101–116.

⁴⁵ *Ibidem*.

- 2003. *Possidónio da Silva (1806–1896) e o elogio da memória. Um percurso na Arqueologia de oitocentos*. Lisboa: AAP.
- Mortillet, G. de. 1867. *Promenades préhistoriques à l'Exposition universelle*. Paris: C. Reinwald.
- Moure Romanillo, A. 1996. Hugo Obermaier, la institucionalización de las investigaciones y la integración de los estudios de prehistoria en la Universidad española. In J. B. Perez and M. P. Ruiz (eds) *'El Hombre Fósil' 80 años después*. Santander: Universidad de Cantabria, p. 22.
- Paço, A. do. 1961. Joaquim Moreira Fontes. *Arqueologia e História* 10: 19.
- Prado Fernández, O. 1997. El Seminario de Estudios Galegos: génesis, aportación y desaparición. In G. Mora and M. Díaz-Andreu (eds) *La Cristalización del Pasado: Génesis y Desarrollo del Marco Institucional de la Arqueología en España*. Málaga: Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad de Málaga, pp. 457–458.
- Preysler, J. B. 2002. El paleolítico en Madrid durante el período 1916–1936. *Bifacez y Elefantes. La investigación del Paleolítico Inferior en Madrid*, pp. 81–107.
- Puche Riart, O. 2004. Casiano de Prado y Valle. *Pioneros de la Arqueología en España. Del Siglo XVI a 1912*. Alcalá de Henares: Museo Arqueológico Regional, pp. 79–87.
- Rasilla Vives, M. de la. 1997. La Comisión de Investigaciones Paleontológicas y Prehistóricas y la Arqueología Prehistórica en España (1913–1935). In G. Mora and M. Díaz-Andreu (eds) *La Cristalización del Pasado: Génesis y Desarrollo del Marco Institucional de la Arqueología en España*. Málaga: Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad de Málaga, pp. 431–437.

III. Book reviews

Richard Lewis Burger (ed) 2009. *The Life and Writings of Julio C. Tello: America's First Indigenous Archaeologist*. Iowa City, IA: University of Iowa Press. ISBN-13:978-1-58729-783-0.

Reviewed by **David L. Browman**

One might quibble with the title's hyperbole of identifying Julio Cesar Tello Rojas (1881–1947) as America's 'first' indigenous archaeologist. Certainly Iroquois specialists might nominate Arthur C. Parker (first president of the Society for American Archaeology) or even Cornelius Cusick, both of whom were conducting archaeological researches earlier than Tello; and similar candidates could be suggested from Mexico. Beyond this, however, one would not contest the claim that Tello made seminal contributions to Andean prehistory, nor that he seems to have been 'South America's' first indigenous archaeologist.

The volume was conceived as a commemoration of the 50th anniversary of Tello's help in founding the Institute of Andean Research in the United States in 1936, although its actual publication is just two years shy of the 75th anniversary. Burger, as a member of the Institute, agreed to undertake the task of assembling this tribute. The volume starts with three biographical essay chapters by Richard Earl Daggett, John Victor Murra, and Burger. These three chapters comprise about one quarter of the volume, and are followed by eleven 'chapters', each consisting of a short article or an excerpt from a longer piece that Tello wrote. Because some of the selections are from difficult to find newspaper articles in *El Comercio*, *La Prensa*, and *El Peru*, or from discourses in short-lived journals like *Inka*, *Wira-Kocha*, and *Chaski*, they are rarely to be found in library collections and thus it will be the first time they will have been seen by many Andeanists. For this volume, Burger had these articles of Tello translated by the Peruvianist Freda Yancy Wolf de Romero. Dr. Wolf has translated many Andean anthropological pieces over the last three decades and edited several archaeological tracts, although in his position as editor of this volume, Burger says he tweaked some of the specialized archaeological terminology in her translations. After the set of eleven selected essays, there is a final chapter