

# Introduction: clusters of knowledge

*Julia Roberts and Kathleen Sheppard*

This edited volume is the first to apply scientific network theories to the history of archaeology. As an innovative approach to historiography it takes its place amongst recent studies that have transformed the discipline. Using theories including those of Ludwik Fleck, David Livingstone, Michel Callon and Bruno Latour, the authors of the following chapters have taken an unprecedented approach to their subjects: rather than looking at individuals and groups biographically or institutionally, or accepting that this is simply how archaeology *was*, these studies look at how networks are formed and how this in turn impacts on how archaeological knowledge is generated and disseminated. This original perspective has yielded novel and surprising insights into the history of archaeology which, we believe, will become the foundation of a new appreciation of the complexity of archaeology's history.

Studies of the histories of archaeology have dramatically increased in recent decades. Prior to Bruce Trigger's ground-breaking *A History of Archaeological Thought* in 1989, students had few texts to consult and, of those, many were repetitive, focussing on a few key names, generally 'great men' of archaeology credited with being the 'father' of whatever archaeology they espoused. The studies had little to offer more rigorous and theoretical archaeologists, particularly those interested in gender, race or class and how those with more marginal status access archaeology. In this climate, *A History of Archaeological Thought* quickly became a seminal work, *the* go-to textbook for students, lecturers and researchers. While it is undoubtedly flawed, as any pioneer text inevitably is, *A History of Archaeological Thought* provided archaeologists with a social, economic and politically grounded intellectual history of

their origins and, perhaps more importantly, it gave succeeding generations of researchers the justification to investigate archaeological history (e.g. Patterson, 1993; Díaz-Andreu and Sørensen, 1998; Schlanger and Nordbladh, 2008; Abadía, 2009; Klejn, 2012).

Trigger's work sparked a revolution in writing archaeological histories. Those of us who felt there was still more to say – different people, different methods and different ideas to be investigated – now had an authoritative foundation from which to begin our work. The 1980s and 1990s saw an explosion of interest: workshops, seminars and conference sessions were organised; while many of these – most notably the Cambridge Critical History Sessions – remain unpublished, they did give rise to several important volumes (e.g. Christenson, 1989; Kohl and Fawcett, 1995; Díaz-Andreu and Champion, 1996; Díaz-Andreu and Sørensen, 1998; Härke, 2000; Schlanger and Nordbladh, 2008) and countless journal articles (e.g. Bar-Yosef and Mazar, 1982; Arnold, 1990; Evans, 1989, 1990, 1998). These works that more specifically analyse the history of the practice of archaeology in various contexts in turn have inspired ever more sophisticated and complex readings of history. Micro-histories of Cambridge University's archaeology department (Smith, 2009) and finely drawn contextual biographies (Sheppard, 2013) investigate how interpersonal relationships impact who practises archaeology as well as their methods and theories. Examinations of fieldwork practice (Lucas, 2001), including fringe archaeology in Britain before the Second World War (Stout, 2008), broaden the picture of how archaeology was performed in the field. Moreover, there has been a move away from the assumption that 'archaeology' means solely European prehistory (Hall, 2000; Mizoguchi, 2011). Histories of historical archaeology are appearing and the history of Classical archaeology has been gathering steady momentum (Schnapp, 1996, 2002; Gran-Aymerich, 1998, 2001, 2007; Orser, 2004; Dyson, 2004, 2006; Hicks and Beaudry, 2006), ensuring that historians and practitioners of archaeology get a more well-rounded view of the whole field, as opposed to a snapshot at a distinct period. Egyptology has, unsurprisingly, proved to be a productive area of enquiry with a very particular history, one which has enormous public appeal in the form of both broader histories (e.g. Thompson, 2015) and more specific explorations into particular episodes of colonialism, education, field practice, biography and mummy studies (MacDonald and Rice, 2003; Ucko and Champion, 2003; Day, 2006; Murray and Evans, 2008; Carruthers, 2014; Murray, 2014). However, this heroic thread of disciplinary history has been contested by imperialists and nationalists alike (Mitchell, 1991; Reid, 2002, 2015; Jeffreys, 2003) and has the additional complexity of having largely been the work of foreign investigators relying on a native workforce (Drower,

1985; James, 1992; Thompson, 2008; Quirke, 2010; Abt, 2011; Adams, 2013). From the start, authors of these histories have been, largely but not exclusively, archaeologists who wished to explore the history of their own discipline as performed in the field. In doing so, they laid the historiographical groundwork.

Inevitably, as more nuanced and informed histories of archaeology have been written, there has been increased interest in the subject both from within and outside the discipline. External historiographers have brought different methods and theories to the writing of these stories. There is a wider range of critical approaches and analytical frameworks available to bring about new angles of inspection, such as feminist history, queer theory, science and technology studies, and political history. In turn, these new approaches have been adopted and utilised by archaeologists who now define themselves as historians of archaeology rather than simply archaeologists interested in the discipline's history. These alternative perspectives utilise new research agendas, theoretical foundations and critical approaches that incorporate archaeological practice into the narratives of political, economic, social and cultural history (Patterson, 1995; Schmidt and Patterson, 1995; Meskell, 1998; Roberts, 2005), histories of education (Janssen, 1992), histories of the professionalisation of science (Levine, 1986), *conversaciones* (Alberti, 2003), feminist and gender theory (Gero and Conkey, 1991; Cohen and Joukowsky, 2004) and more. In doing so, it becomes clear that archaeology's history is not a simple, teleological tale of heroic excavators digging up remnants of a past civilisation, but instead contains an exciting, multi-disciplinary and multi-faceted complexity of stories, which have opened up the history of archaeology and revealed so much more about our past.

In recent years archives have become a focus of critical histories with archaeologists debating both what constitutes an archive and how it should be utilised (Schlanger and Nordbladh, 2008; Lucas, 2012; see also Derrida and Prenowitz, 1995; Ketelaar, 2001; Manoff, 2004). There are practical and chronological histories of institutions, societies, museums, fieldwork, archaeological theories and archaeological sites. In recent years, more theoretical histories have been written, drawing on processualism, post-processualism, personhood theory, historiography, and the philosophy and sociology of science, all of which help historians analyse the formation of these fields in new and innovative ways. Many of these works inspect the acquisition of artefact collections and how those collections shaped knowledge of particular cultures or the practice of other sciences (Shepherd, 2002, 2003; Moser, 2006; Alberti, 2009; Challis, 2013; Stevenson, 2019). In fact, the angles from which to view the history of the discipline of archaeology have become so numerous

that, as Hamilakis has said, ‘there is not one but many histories of archaeology’ (2010: 893).

This volume takes its place amongst these studies introducing alternative readings of archaeological historiography, but it does so in an entirely innovative way. We present individual case studies that collectively analyse the process of *how* archaeological knowledge is generated based on where and by whom it is created. Each of the chapters, and therefore the entire volume, uses as its theoretical foundation the history and philosophy of science, in which there is a rich tradition of investigating the role of communication among practitioners using Ludwik Fleck’s theory of ‘thought collectives’, Bruno Latour’s actor-network theory, and the geography of knowledge (Fleck, 1979 [1935]; Livingstone, 2003; Latour, 2005; Shapin, 2010). Fleck (1979 [1935]) argued that the production of scientific knowledge is largely a social process which depends upon not only the actors themselves, but the cultural and historical contexts of their work. Related to this, Latour’s actor-network theory argues that these interactions between and among scientific practitioners shifts and changes depending on which actors are present in a given context, thus making up the network of people at a given place or time. Actor-network theory is careful not to explain the *how* or the *why* of network formation or behaviour, but it allows scholars to interrogate the relationships within networks simply by providing the *who* and the *where*. If we may define these fields of study by what questions they answer, new knowledge would clearly answer the question where knowledge is created, as well as the questions who gets to participate in which investigations, and why and how they are able to take part.

Thought collectives, actor networks, and studies of place are crucial to the foundation of the social studies of scientific networks – a complex theoretical framework used to analyse sociological phenomena in a historical context. Although historians have been studying the history of archaeology using some of these ideas for almost a decade, this volume of collected works is the first of its kind in the field to use these theories as a unified web to tell the stories of some familiar practitioners, sites and institutions. However, it makes no claim to be comprehensive. We understand that there are limits to the chapters here, especially geographically speaking, and we understand that we have not incorporated all of the network and practice theories presented in this introductory essay into the chapters that follow. Instead, all the authors of this volume aim to use the examples in the chapters presented here to continue on a larger, more collective, scale an important conversation about practice that needs to take place in archaeology. In order to answer the historical questions of participation, of knowledge formation, of the importance

of place in the development of the discipline and of the centrality of historical context in the story of archaeology in the past, we must use different theoretical tools.

Each of the chapters included in this publication presents a vignette of a network in which knowledge is exchanged and the effects these networks have on other groups and single actors. Networks create, share, consider and work through knowledge systems. Martin J. Rudwick's *The Great Devonian Controversy* (1985) details the 'shaping of scientific knowledge among gentlemanly specialists' in and around Devonshire between the early and the middle nineteenth century. Using these groups of gentleman scientists, Rudwick analyses how networks operate and behave when creating knowledge. He argues that these short-lived networks have a long-lasting impact on scientific thought because of their presence in time and space.

David Livingstone's and Charles Withers' work on the geography of knowledge (2011) expands on the idea of knowledge creation in particular places, and how people operating in those spaces are affected by locality. Where science is done depends on who is able to or allowed to participate in the creation and communication of knowledge; the reverse is also true, that is, who is allowed to create knowledge depends on where science is done (see also Livingstone, 2007). The chapters in this volume collectively use geography of knowledge to determine how relationships within scientific networks operate depending on where they were built, where they operate, and where and how their knowledge is spread. To do this, it is crucial to understand who is interacting at different types of site, such as universities, excavation sites, museum offices, private homes, hotels or formal scholarly meetings. But what happens once those ideas leave specific spaces?

Throughout the history of science, practitioners – both amateurs and professionals – have shared knowledge with their scholarly communities through various forms of interaction such as publications, conferences, seminars, lectures and exhibitions. Bernard Lightman's seminal *Victorian Science in Context* (1997) focuses on public lectures and public exhibits during the late-nineteenth century as key spaces in which scientists engaged with particular audiences. These popular public events are particular points of analysis for other historians as well (e.g. Levine, 1986; Sweet, 2004). Other, smaller networks were clearly established by a variety of means. Rudwick (1985) clearly studies the power of in-person conversations for spreading knowledge and building professional connections. Mary Terrall examines the power of private and semi-public spaces for doing science in eighteenth-century France (2014). And Samuel J.M.M. Alberti's work focuses on various institutions – museums, semi-private *conversaciones*, academic societies

– and their roles in the spreading of new knowledge about the natural world (2007, 2009, 2017). Each of these key texts investigates not only the spreading of knowledge but also the responses it provokes, which, arguably, constitutes an open dialogue indispensable for the community's accumulation and revision of collective knowledge. However, preceding such public events information is gained and exchanged by informal clusters or networks of scholars, individuals and groups, who generate and communicate knowledge and ideas both within the system and with external actors and communities.

The creation of and activities involved in these networks and communities are central to the chapters in this volume. Studying the groups of colleagues, assistants, students and staff is not new to the history of science, but in the case of archaeology it bears some explicit discussion here. Scholars who study present-day scientific networks argue that the best way to visualise their connections is through tracing joint publication and reviews of those publications (Newman, 2001; Glänzel and Schubert, 2005). However, it is often difficult to trace more personal contact. Many further argue that correspondence is a key piece of evidence in understanding how networks interacted with each other outside publications, that is, out of the public eye. Jim Secord's *Victorian Sensation* (2000) traces the acceptance of Charles Darwin's *On the Origin of Species* after its publication in 1859. To do this, he relies heavily on Darwin's correspondence with scientists and lay-people throughout his life. Darwin was a prolific correspondent and there are thousands of letters authors have used and continue to use as important sources for studying the behaviour of networks. Another of Darwin's biographers, Janet Browne, has recently argued that studying correspondence among scientific networks allows 'the prospect of reconstructing patterns of sociability with due appreciation to the structure of the society in which they emerged' (2014: 169). More generally, in Ruth Finnegan's edited volume *Participating in the Knowledge Society* (2005), the individual chapters taken as a whole study how the knowledge society is 'engaged in active knowledge building outside the university walls' (1). The authors are concerned with how researchers interact with one another and with scientific information away from their professional offices and laboratories. That volume, much like this one, is a general one by design, dealing with studies of communities of amateurs and professionals within (or outside) universities and industry. In general, the volume studies both written and spoken conversation among these groups, and the picture it presents of these widely varied communities is one of a unified endeavour to create knowledge.

But these works do not deal with archaeology, which is a particular kind of practice. In archaeology, the main groups of scholars who

influence each other tend to gather in the field, in ephemeral groups in which some members are permanent fixtures every dig season, others come and go, and still others only appear once, briefly, and then vanish into the dust of the site and archive. Their connections do not necessarily appear in joint publications, and are therefore hard to trace. But by doing archival work and reading diaries and letters, site reports and more, we gain insight into schools of thought, in order to better understand who is sharing ideas, how these are being shared and who is participating. Every chapter in this publication illustrates this expansion and diversity in the inclusion of new methods in the history of archaeology; each of them in turn concentrates on a particular aspect of archaeological history: the critical examination of modes of knowledge exchange between individuals and groups and how this affects the trajectories of their public ideas about material culture and past civilisations.

### **Outline of chapters**

The individual chapters in this volume focus on the networks archaeologists create and how communication among them affects the work archaeologists produce. Much of the evidence used in this volume comes from archival sources rather than published ones since these exchanges take place in person or through correspondence. As a unit, the chapters argue that the informal character of these gatherings inspired the generation of ideas and thus markedly affected the process of knowledge production in other, equally significant, ways than scholarship produced within more formal contexts. Each author, nevertheless, takes a unique approach to the topic. The chapters can be roughly grouped into those that discuss institutions – by Milosavljević, Snead, de Tomasi – and those that discuss individuals – by De Armond, Gustavsson, Hansson, Arwill-Nordbladh, Sheppard, Mihajlović, Trigg. Connecting the two groups is Weststeijn and de Gelder's chapter, in which they discuss the work of two individuals, Carl Claudius van Essen and Maarten Vermaseren, via the Royal Netherlands Institute in Rome and the wider, post-Second World War political, archaeological and economic networks. The emphasis on individuals does not imply that they were more important than institutions, and it has to be admitted that the division is not always clear-cut. So, while Gustavsson, Hansson, Arwill-Nordbladh and Sheppard discuss individual scholars they do so partially within the context of institutions. Snead, Milosavljević and de Tomasi focus on institutions but refer to specific people working within those organisations. Additionally, given the nuanced and critical nature of modern histories of archaeology, these chapters vary in their focus, discussing state formation, politics, law or economics, applying gender theory,

or the philosophy of science, or Fleck's theory of thought collectives to illustrate their arguments. The varying viewpoints allow for a more holistic exploration of the instrumentality of informal clusters of actors in the production and mediation of data.

Taking a more explicitly theoretical stance, Milosavljević also considers Fleck's thought collectives, this time in association with a Gephi study, to discuss the development of the culture historical school of archaeology in Serbia during the twentieth century. By examining Fleck's theory in detail, Milosavljević appraises the advantages and disadvantages of using this philosophy in the history of archaeology. As a consequence of its history as part of the socially conservative Yugoslavia and its isolation from Western Europe during the latter half of the twentieth century Serbian archaeology, Milosavljević argues, has a history dissimilar to that of the discipline in the rest of Europe. While these factors led to dogmatism within local archaeological communities Milosavljević looks at how Serbian archaeologists overcame epistemological limitations through informal communication and how this has shaped modern Serbian archaeological thought and practice.

The following two chapters look at the connections and communications between collectors and institutions. Once again informal and fluid networks are the focus of Snead's chapter as he discusses antiquarian communities in the United States during the nineteenth century, looking in particular at the cooperation and competition between antiquarian societies, individuals and the nascent national institutions. Drawing on unpublished documents Snead demonstrates the contrast between local 'amateurs' and their empirical, material-based approach, on one hand, and the more abstract perspective in favour amongst intellectuals, on the other. The Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, Joseph Henry, attempted to capitalise on the interest in indigenous artefacts by announcing a major report on American archaeology. Lacking sufficient staff to attempt an internally generated report the Smithsonian archaeologists sent out a circular to interested groups and societies. The antiquarian community responded wholeheartedly and hundreds of documents were sent to the Smithsonian, and it is this archive Snead uses to discuss the cultural and social context of nineteenth-century North American archaeology.

De Tomasi also touches on North American collections, but from a very different perspective. In 1889 the Professor of Ancient Topography at the University La Sapienza, Rodolfo Lanciani, was accused of having played an active role in the sale of archaeological objects to North American museums and forced out of his professional positions. While the museums and art galleries of North America and Europe used salaried agents in Rome to acquire materials, many leading scholars,



archaeologists and state officials were often called upon to give an opinion on the authenticity and value of these purchases. Lanciani made no secret of his connections with the directors of several North American institutions or his pride at being invited to give a series of lectures at North American universities. Using Lanciani's archived correspondence with General Charles G. Loring, director of the Boston Museum of Fine Arts, de Tomasi discusses the motivation of those who became intermediaries in the Roman antiquities market.

Rome is also the setting for Weststeijn and de Gelder's chapter: they discuss the Dutch excavations that took place in Italy between 1952 and 1958 at the *Mithraeum* under Santa Prisca Church on the Aventine Hill. A combination of favourable political, economic and academic circumstances converged to allow the inexperienced Carl Claudius van Essen, Vice-Director of the Royal Netherlands Institute in Rome, and Maarten Vermaseren, a student working at the Netherlands Institute, the opportunity to direct these excavations. Using a variety of archive sources, Weststeijn and de Gelder emphasise that these successful excavations were as much the result of Italy's reintegration into Europe and the Dutch desire for international cultural status as they were attributable to the work of Van Essen and Vermaseren. Behind the scenes a complex web of negotiations and networks ensured that the Dutch excavation team had the political weight, archaeological expertise, funding and media attention required to successfully undertake the work.

The chapters dealing with individuals are equally wide-ranging while following the central theme of informal communication between antiquarians and archaeologists. De Armond's chapter discusses twentieth-century developments in Czechoslovakian Classical archaeology, the link with European politics and the role played by Antonín Salač. There are few *in situ* Classical remains within the Czech Republic and for most of the twentieth century Prague was far outside the geopolitical centre of Europe, yet Salač managed to create an international reputation as an epigrapher and archaeologist working in Greece and Turkey. It was his connections with French scholars, De Armond argues, that enabled him to be the first Czechoslovakian archaeologist to excavate in these areas. She demonstrates that the encouragement of Salač's work was at least in part a result of French political manoeuvring to promote Czechoslovakia as a bulwark against possible German expansionism. The 1948 communist coup d'état in Czechoslovakia saw an end to Czech–French political relationships and an end to Salač's Francophile leanings.

Gustavsson's chapter similarly examines international relationships between scholars, in this case between the Swedish savant Oscar Montelius and his Italian counterparts. Montelius is best known for his work on seriation and although he is now seen primarily as a 'Nordic'

scholar he travelled extensively in Europe and wrote the first work on prehistoric Italy. Gustavsson's chapter reveals how much more there is to Montelius' legacy than typologies of material culture and places his work within a wider, international, scholarly framework of late-nineteenth-century debates about the Italian Iron Age. She places Montelius back within his contemporary and cultural landscape, tracing the connections he made while in Italy and how these networks continued to influence his later work. Using Fleck's theories of thought collectives, allied to actor-network theory, Gustavsson discusses the possibilities and limitations of methodological and theoretical perspectives related to network analysis.

Hansson's chapter continues the theme of northern European scholars involved in Mediterranean archaeology. His examination of the German classical scholar Adolf Furtwängler again focuses on the interaction between scholars, but whereas other chapters demonstrate the constructive results of these collaborations, Hansson discusses how Furtwängler deliberately set himself apart from his colleagues, choosing instead to cultivate contacts within the international art market. During his lifetime Furtwängler was never marginalised as a scholar, but his publication of aggressive criticisms and personal attacks on colleagues resulted in a problematic relationship which then affected the career decisions he made. While the immense quantity of work Furtwängler produced over his lifetime cannot be ignored, Hansson argues that his impact on artefact studies has been overlooked by conventional histories of archaeology as a direct result of his fractious character. Drawing on unpublished archival material Hansson reconstructs Furtwängler's professional networks and work methods.

Arwill-Nordbladh's subject, Hanna Rydh, also encountered problems with her university colleagues, although in this instance it appears that rather than her personality it was her gender, location and theoretical stance that provoked departmental critique. Although based in Sweden, Rydh spent time in France studying Palaeolithic archaeology at the Musée des Antiquités Nationales in St-Germain-en-Laye, near Paris. She published the popular *Millennia of the Cave people* [*Grottmänniskornas årtusenden*] (1926a) to great critical acclaim, but her more scholarly articles were dismissed by her colleagues. These articles, discussing social order, social structure and social organization (Rydh, 1929a, 1931) show how strongly Rydh was influenced by Emile Durkheim's philosophies. Arwill-Nordbladh suggests that Rydh disrupted ideas of gender norms by her presence in Swedish archaeology and then further disrupted academic complacency by adopting alien theories, and as a result was virtually ostracised by her Swedish colleagues.

Demonstrating that geography is crucial not only to the treatment

of scholars within institutions, but also to how scholars build their networks to begin with, Sheppard's investigation of James Henry Breasted's early scientific network shows that *where* networks are built is just as important as who is in them. By contrasting the very different relationships Breasted instituted and maintained with Flinders Petrie and Gaston Maspero, Sheppard demonstrates that scientific associations that begin in a space far from a formal institution, such as the field, will maintain that familiarity; whereas connections made in a formal university office will always bear the mark of that decorum. Additionally, these relationships affect the networks produced between scholars and the manner in which information is communicated and utilised. Like others in this volume, this chapter relies more on unpublished correspondence and biographical accounts than on published volumes of scholarship.

Many of the people discussed in this volume worked away from their native countries; in contrast Felix Philipp Kanitz was born in Budapest and became one of the founders and most influential investigators of Serbian archaeology. Mihajlović's discussion of Kanitz and his impact on Serbian archaeology focuses on the latter's role as the central node of a complicated archaeological network. Despite having little, if any, formal training, Kanitz has been called the 'Columbus of the Balkans' and his archaeological work continues to exert considerable authority over modern studies of Roman Serbia. Mihajlović argues that, having been subjected to the frontier colonialism of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, Kanitz deliberately set out to create a network of people from various political, academic, ethnic and socio-economic backgrounds to reflect this environment. It was through these connections that his version of a particularly Serbian archaeology – as opposed to the colonial Yugoslav archaeology – was spread.

Trigg demonstrates the difficulty of finding networks in archives and published works, while discussing the life of Dr Robert Toope. He argues that it is because of Toope's network that we know about him at all. Although he was intensely productive at certain times in his life, and this work was clearly influential on his contemporaries, Toope did not publish his own work, instead relying on the communication and conversational networks that were so common in the seventeenth century. He was a figure who loomed large in antiquarian circles in south-west England, and he appears in the works of those who did publish their ideas, but he failed to make his own ideas public, thereby relegating himself to the dust of the archive. In spite of this, his ideas were and continue to be influential in antiquarian studies.

The diversity of these chapters reflects the current worldwide interest in histories of archaeology; subjects and presenters cover a wide spectrum of periods and places; but all adhere to the contention that the

investigation of place, networks and communication in science is indispensable to the study of archaeological history. We said above that these papers had the power to transform the way in which we understand and write histories of archaeology; that may seem like an ambitious claim but we think it is a truthful one. The early histories written by men such as Daniel presented archaeologists in isolation, unaffected by their cultural and social milieu; later histories have addressed this *lacuna* but this is the first volume to argue that place and space affect interpretation, that personality has to be taken into account when discussing the formation of networks and the dissemination of information, and that, while archaeology has always been a communal effort, there is a pattern to that community, a pattern that can be mapped and nodes that can be identified.

The chapters in this volume demonstrate how much more can be said about the history of archaeology, why certain practitioners such as Furtwängler, Rydh and Toope are overlooked by conventional histories, how in order to fit a particular narrative arc archaeologists such as Montelius – and the amateurs involved with the Smithsonian census – have been defined by only a fraction of their work, as has the role played within archaeology by collectors and collecting, an aspect of our history which archaeologists either ignore or view as shameful yet, as de Tomasi demonstrates, is an important strand within our history and one that clearly demonstrates the importance of sites of knowledge and the networks they generate. We cannot possibly understand the significance of archaeologists such as Breasted, Salač and Kanitz unless we are aware of their involvement in international and personal politics: without his French network Salač would not have been able to establish Czechoslovakia's involvement with Classical archaeology. Similarly, in a different international political situation Van Essen and Vermaseren would not have been allowed to excavate the Santa Prisca *Mithraeum*, nor would Kanitz have been able to exploit his experience of imperialism and deliberately create a diverse network that disrupted these colonial boundaries and allowed him to circulate his version of archaeology. All of these examples demonstrate the importance of networks within international political situations, but the personal is also political and, as Sheppard clearly demonstrates, the Breasted who wrote to Petrie was a very different man to the one who interacted with Maspero; physical and social location affect the networks created, just as much as personality and expectations.

This collection is by no means exhaustive in such a broad and deep field as the history of archaeology, and one particular absence is immediately noticeable: with the exception of Hanna Rydh, all the individuals discussed are men. This is especially conspicuous given how many of

the chapters are *by* women. This is not a deliberate exclusion, however; as has been extensively discussed within histories of archaeology (Díaz-Andreu and Sørensen, 1998; Smith, 1997, 2000; Roberts, 2005; Sheppard, 2013) and demonstrated here by Hanna Rydh's work, women have been subjected to different social constraints and expectations than men and this is equally true for female archaeologists. Women have often struggled to be involved in archaeology and when they have succeeded their contribution has not always been given the significance it deserves. As Sheppard states in this volume (chapter 9): '[m]any times women were actively involved in scientific networks, running the administrative side of institutional life while the men were in the field. These women are necessary and important parts of these networks, but they are part of the group that tends to be left out of the story.' Nor do any of the chapters discuss the problems faced by other marginalised groups, those whose race or class impeded their involvement with archaeology. Again, this was not a deliberate choice and again, their importance is undeniable, although little studied (Shepherd, 2002, 2003; Lucas, 2001; Roberts, 2005; Quirke, 2010), but their traces are difficult to discern within networks. We know, largely from biographies and anecdotes, that excavation directors employed, re-employed, blacklisted and recommended particular foremen and labourers. Unfortunately, we do not yet know how these workers experienced archaeology, how they felt about their role and how they interacted with their employers.

There are still many questions to be asked and answered, many archives to be explored and it is our hope that this volume provides a foundation that will stimulate other scholars to investigate this valuable field. Without claiming too grandiose a position and purpose for this book, it is hoped that, like Trigger's formative history, it will stimulate debate, investigation and alternative theories.