

THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL INSTITUTE OF THE HUNGARIAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCES: THE FIRST FORTY-ONE YEARS, 1958–1999¹

1. The foundation of the Archaeological Research Group

The first attempts at the foundation of an archaeological research institute were made in the mid-1950s. It may well seem that the idea was part of the Soviet-style reorganization of academic life in Hungary and the planned institute was intended to promote a politically determined process of centralization in the field of archaeology. In reality, however, professional arguments for the necessity of such an institute had already been presented before the *Gleichschaltung* of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences. While the idea of the institute indeed received political support because it was regarded as a means of centralization, when finally established, the institute lacked all instruments of centralization. It could not exert control over other institutions and its research programs had little in common with the official scientific policy of the 1950s.²

Archaeological research was resumed after World War II in the pre-war institutional framework in the Department of Archaeology at the Pázmány Péter (later Eötvös Loránd) University in Budapest, in the Hungarian National Museum, and in county and city museums. The pre-war framework was, however, far from being regarded generally satisfactory. As a radical alteration of the existing structure, Professor András Alföldi argued for the foundation of an archaeological institute within the Faculty of Arts in Budapest, devoted entirely to research work and he also made the first step towards the establishment of this institute by merging the archaeological library of the Aquincum Museum with the library of the Department for Numismatics and Archaeology³ at the Pázmány Péter University.⁴ Alföldi's suggestion had, however, no further consequences and by the time the idea of the institute was revived he was already in exile.

The reparation of war damages entailed renovation work at the overwhelming majority of art monuments in Hungary. The renovations also necessitated — and rendered possible

¹ Revised version of a paper written originally in Hungarian for a volume published on the occasion of the 175th anniversary of the foundation of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences. Thanks are due to my colleagues at the Archaeological Institute who have read and commented on the first draft of the Hungarian version. I am especially indebted to Mrs Beatrix Darázsy who assisted my work in the archives of the Institute. I am also indebted to Professor László Bartosiewicz, Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, for the careful stylistic revision of my English text. The Hungarian version which is available in the form of a separate brochure (*L. Török: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Régészeti Intézet* [Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Archaeological Institute], Budapest 2000) was published without footnotes.

² For bibliographical abbreviations see the end of this paper. Literature published after 1999 by the fellows of the Institute is not referred to in this study.

³ The later Department for Archaeology.

⁴ Later Eötvös Loránd University. Cf. *A. Alföldi: Budapest Székesfőváros Aquincumi Múzeuma és a Pázmány Péter Tudományegyetem Érem- és Régiség-tani Intézete könyvtára együttes föllállítása a budapesti Bölcsészeti Kar központi épületében* [The combined establishment of the libraries of the Aquincum Museum of the City of Budapest and the Department for Numismatics and Archaeology of the Pázmány Péter University, Budapest in the central building of the Faculty of Arts, Budapest]. *ArchÉrt Ser. III.* 7–9 (1946–1948) 442–444.

— archaeological survey and rescue activities of a, to that date, unknown volume, intensity, and complexity. From the early 1950s, the amount of archaeological rescue work was further increased by oversized industrial investments, regulation of waterways, and major changes in land use. The full capacity of archaeology was shortly engaged in rescue excavations and associated museological duties. As a consequence, problem-oriented research work became almost entirely impossible. Archaeologists realized with increasing concern the growing gap between the historical research maintained in Hungary and their own daily activities. The perspectives of Hungarian archaeology appeared especially dull in light of what was known about the large-scale excavation programs of the archaeological research institutes founded in other countries of the Soviet bloc and about the technical background to their work.

In shadow of complete disintegration of archaeological research,⁵ the solution was sought by urging, as the jargon of the day had it, the „coordination of theory with practice” in archaeology too.⁶ „Coordination of theory with practice” meant, in fact, what we would term to-day problem-oriented archaeological research and it was obvious that problem-oriented research could be optimally carried out in a research institute and not in an educational institution or museum. In this sense, the professional interests of archaeology coincided with the official policy of concentrating research in all branches of natural and social sciences in institutes attached to the Hungarian Academy of Sciences (in the following HAS). The institute network of the reorganized Academy was destined to establish centralized political control of scholarship. Under „theory”, scientific policy of the period understood, of course, dialectical and historical materialism. As we shall see, when speaking of theory, the greater part of the archaeological community, while pretending to be in full agreement, practiced a kind of positivism.

In January 1955, the Section for Social Sciences of the HAS presented to the President the first draft of the foundation document for an archaeological research institute.⁷ After lengthy discussions, the tasks of the institute were defined in an improved draft which was submitted for governmental endorsement to the Council of Ministers as follows: „1. The elevation of Hungarian archaeological research to a modern level with the help of a complex archaeological (i.e., scientific) laboratory; 2. Excavations conducted in order to promote solutions to the most important problems in [Hungarian] archaeology. The analysis of the evidence from these excavations and the preparation of comprehensive archaeological monographs is to be achieved in collaboration with experts from other institutions; 3. Centralized recording of excavations and archaeological finds in Hungary.”⁸

The improved foundation proposal was drafted in cooperation with the Department of Museums at the Ministry of Popular Culture and the Budapest Historical Museum. It also relied upon suggestions made by leading archaeologists and historians who had been asked to review the first draft. The majority of the reviewers suggested instead, however, that the Ministry of Popular Culture create an archaeological institute attached to the Hun-

⁵ In his unpublished review of archaeological research between 1945–1961, prepared in 1962 for discussion by the Theoretical and Methodological Working Group at the Archaeological Research Group of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, András Mócsy identifies the reasons for the negative developments, on the one hand, in official scientific policy which demanded general social-historical conclusions from every archaeological communication while branding the „pure” study of sources ideologically incorrect and, on the other, in the rigid regulation of publication rights which hindered archaeologists from acquiring sufficient information. In Mócsy’s view the ideological expectations led to forced combinations of material publications with shallow historical generalisations.

⁶ Cf. *L. Gerevich*. A régészettudomány helyzetéről [On the situation of archaeology]. MTAK II 11 (1961) 207–211 207.

⁷ Imre Szabó, Secretary of the IInd Class, under no. (II)SI/55 to István Ruzsnyák, President of the Academy.

⁸ Proposition of the HAS to the Council of Ministers on September 3, 1956.

garian National Museum as an already established institution with respectable traditions in archaeological work.⁹ Yet, other reviewers, being obviously in the possession of first-hand information about the potentials of the archaeological institutes attached to the academies of other Soviet bloc countries and also fully realizing the impact of museological duties and salvage activities on research work, supported the establishment of an archaeological research institute within the framework of the HAS. These latter reviewers even suggested the transfer of certain tasks (recording of all excavations in the country) and structural elements (Archaeological Find Archives and Archaeological Library) from the Hungarian National Museum to the planned institute. These suggestions, as well as the third paragraph of the improved draft submitted by the HAS to the Council of Ministers, corresponded not only with the centralizing ambitions of the Academy but also with the current views concerning the optimal structure of a research institute. Considering all these reviews, the Section for Social Sciences of the HAS decided finally on the establishment of an institute with a purely research profile and attached to the Hungarian Academy of Sciences. The decision was submitted to the highest academic forum, the Archaeological Committee of the HAS, which passed it with a majority of one single vote.¹⁰ Though the accepted plan no longer conflicted with the interests of the Hungarian National Museum, the memory of the abandoned ideas — which were suggested primarily by external reviewers — proved nevertheless stronger and for long decades overshadowed the relationship between the Museum and the Archaeological Institute.

During the course of the next three years, however, the HAS was unable to raise the necessary funds. In the late months of 1956 and in the first half of 1957, i.e., during the 1956 revolution and in the period immediately following it, consideration of the proposal submitted to the Council of Ministers in September 1956 could not be expected. It was repeated thus in August 1957,¹¹ and, with necessary governmental authorization, on July 1, 1958 the President of the HAS announced the establishment of the Archaeological Research Group of the HAS.¹² Only a few permanent jobs could be funded, however, and the director himself as well as the majority of the nine founding research fellows of the Research Group continued to occupy part-time positions in the Research Group until the early 1960s. The founding order of the President of the HAS determined the tasks of the Research Group to be the following: „a/ Methodologically exemplary field research with the gradual introduction of modern techniques; analysis of the finds on the basis of historical materialism; b/ Progressive establishment of the conditions for coordinating and directing archaeological research nation-wide; c/ Preparations for the establishment of the Archaeological Institute”.¹³

2. *The founders and the works of the first years*

The foundation document was rather vague and rhetorical as to the tasks of the Research Group but its vagueness also secured some freedom of movement. Fortunately, the tasks of nation-wide coordination and direction of archaeological research — the instruments of which remained unspecified in the document — were transferred shortly to a higher level when the Scientific and Higher Education Council, i.e., the directing body of research policy

⁹ Minutes of the meeting of the IInd Class of the HAS on January 18, 1955.

¹⁰ Oral communication of Professor János György Szilágyi, 22. 10. 1999.

¹¹ Memorandum drafted by László Castiglione and signed by Imre Szabó, Secretary of the IInd Class of the HAS, no. MTA II. Osztály (II) Dm/1957.

¹² Presidential order no. 13/1958. MTA (A.K. 15.-16.).

¹³ *Ibid.*

at that moment, conferred them on a committee composed of representatives from all archaeological (museological) institutions, of the Archaeological Committee of the HAS, and the Archaeological Research Group. There remained two areas, however, where the Research Group was compelled to accept the role of the coordinator, viz., the works of the Archaeological Topography of Hungary, and archaeological research outside Hungary. Before turning to these, however, let us briefly discuss the place of the founders of the Research Group in contemporary archaeology and the significance of the Group's initial activities.

The founders were among the most acknowledged Hungarian archaeologists of the post-war period. Some of them had completed their studies and started their career before World War II. The medievalist László Gerevich (1911–1997), the first Director of the Research Group, later Archaeological Institute, László Barkóczi (Roman and Late Antique Pannonia), Ida B. Kutzián (Copper Age), Erzsébet Patek (Bronze Age and Iron Age), and Mihály Párducz (Iron Age, Scythians, Huns) represented the most significant traditions of Hungarian pre-war archaeology, namely, the trends developed by the prehistorians Ferenc Tompa and János Banner, the ancient historian András Alföldi, and the medieval art historian Tibor Gerevich. László Gerevich graduated under the aegis of his uncle, Tibor Gerevich, and was deeply influenced by his researches concerning the European, primarily Italian, context for Hungarian Romanesque art. He started his study of Hungarian Medieval art under the circumstances created by the Versailles Treaty, i.e., under circumstances where access to the majority of Hungarian medieval archaeological sites, monuments, and collections was severely restricted because they were located in the new successor states. He had thus to realize at an early point in his career the necessity for a change in methodological orientation. Doubtless also due to the influence of the art historical lessons learned at the spectacular excavations in the 1930s at medieval centres such as Esztergom and Székesfehérvár, he argued for an opening towards the knowledge and methods of the history of architecture on the one hand and, on the other, for systematic archaeological work at the sites of the destroyed royal/cultural centres of medieval Hungary lying within the actual frontiers of the country.¹⁴ With the excavation of the medieval royal palace under the badly damaged Royal Castle in Buda between 1946–1962, and with his subsequent researches at the Abbey of Pilisszentkereszt and the Priory of Dömös between 1967–1981, Gerevich initiated a monumental working program which aimed at the investigation of the evidence from the medieval political and cultural centres as part of a wider European context. His working team also included his own pupils, among them Imre Holl who participated in the excavations at Buda castle. Holl also joined the Archaeological Research Group and conducted a series of important excavations at medieval town and village sites¹⁵ during the course of the subsequent decades.

The work of Ferenc Tompa and János Banner rooted in the traditions of the German typological school¹⁶ and unfolded under the impact of Culture History.¹⁷ Culture-historical research in Hungary concerning the typological description of archaeological cultures, the

¹⁴ For the career of Gerevich see his obituary by *Ernő Marosi* in: *MTud* 1997: 1377–1380.

¹⁵ One of the first pre-war excavations at a medieval village site was conducted by L. Gerevich at Nyék. It was this excavation that resulted in the first complete map of a village in medieval Europe.

¹⁶ Cf. *F. Tompa*: *Régészet* [Archaeology]. In: B. Hóman (ed.): *A magyar történetírás új útjai* [New avenues in Hungarian historiography]. Budapest 1932; *F. v. Tompa*: *24 Jahre Urgeschichtsforschung in Ungarn 1912–1936*. BRGK 24–25 (1934–35) 27–127; *J. Banner*: *A budapesti egyetem és a kolozsvári régészeti iskola* [The Budapest university and the archaeological school of Kolozsvár]. *DissArch* 3. Budapest 1961: 44–47.

¹⁷ For the place of Culture History see *Trigger* 1989: 148–206; *B. G. Trigger*: *Sociocultural Evolution. New Perspectives on the Past*. Oxford 1998: 95–108.—For a survey of the trends in Hungarian Prehistory see also *Chapman* 2000: 9–25.

analysis of their interrelationships and chronology, and the interpretation of cultural changes as consequences of migrations and cultural diffusion was indebted to the works of V. Gordon Childe and to his visits to Hungary.¹⁸ Research continued to be determined by a typo-chronological and culture-historical orientation in the 1950s, not only because Hungarian pre-historians continued (and still continue) to be preoccupied by the description and chronology of the archaeological cultures of the Carpathian Basin but also because in this way they felt excused from committing themselves directly to any kind of social-historical theory.

Similarly to the contemporary art historians André Grabar and Ernst Kantorowicz,¹⁹ András Alföldi argued for the investigation of his subject in its broadest possible context and his work was characterized by an emphatic interest in the history of ideas and institutions. It was this latter interest that has primarily resolved the hostile attitude towards Alföldi and his views in the period dominated by the Stalinist version of Marxism. While Alföldi's outlook as a historian²⁰ was declared irrelevant, his pupils profited much from their education in the fields of material culture and archaeological typology and, albeit indirectly, they contributed to the eventual maintenance of Alföldi's views concerning the relationship of provincial archaeology with the archaeology of the Empire.

The undeclared demand of fitting provincial archaeology within the universal context of ancient history was also vindicated in the Research Group by the employment of one of the most eminent of the Hungarian classical archaeologists who had already participated in the formulation of its tasks. László Castiglione²¹ (1927–1984) belonged to the younger generation of the founding members. Formerly he had worked as Assistant Curator in the Department of Classical Antiquities in the Museum of Fine Arts. János György Szilágyi, the Head of the Department, and through him his teacher Károly Kerényi,²² profoundly

¹⁸ See especially V. G. Childe: *The Dawn of European Civilization*. London 1925; *Idem*: *The Danube in Prehistory*. Oxford 1929; *Idem*: *The Bronze Age*. Cambridge 1930; *Idem*: *Races, Peoples and Cultures in Prehistoric Europe*. History 18 (1933) 193–203; *Idem*: *New Light on the Most Ancient East: The Oriental prelude to European Prehistory*. London 1934; *Idem*: *Man Makes Himself*. London 1936; *Idem*: *Prehistoric Migrations in Europe*. Oslo 1950; *Idem*: *Notes on the Chronology of the Hungarian Bronze Age*. ActaArchHung 7 (1956) 291–300. In Hungarian: in 1959: *A civilizáció bölcsője* (What Happened in History, original edition Harmondsworth 1946), in 1962: *Az európai társadalom őstörténete* (The Prehistory of European Society, original edition Harmondsworth 1958) and in 1968: *Az ember önmaga alkotója* (Man Makes Himself) was published. On the influence of Childe in Hungary see J. Makkay: V. G. Childe on chronological correlations between the Orient and Europe. in: S. Bökönyi (ed.): *Neolithic of Southeastern Europe and Its Near Eastern Connections*. International Conference 1987 Szolnok – Szeged. VAH 2. Budapest 1989: 177–181.

¹⁹ For the common features in Alföldi's, Grabar's, and Kantorowicz's outlook cf. the interesting, though at several points contestable, comments of T. F. Mathews: *The Clash of Gods. A reinterpretation of Early Christian art*. Princeton 1993: 18–22.

²⁰ For the work and impact of Alföldi see G. Alföldy: *Andreas Alföldi*. Gnomon 53 (1981) 410–414; H. Woolf (ed.): *Andrew Alföldi, 1895–1981*. Princeton 1982; J. Gy. Szilágyi: „Mi, filológusok” [„We, philologists”]. AT 31 (1984) 167–197 184ff.; *Id.*: *Alföldi András hagyatéka* [The legacy of András Alföldi]. BMHB 74 (1991) 115–118.

²¹ For his work see J. Gy. Szilágyi: *László Castiglione (1927–1984)*. ActaArchHung 36 (1984) 3–8 (bibliography in pp. 9–20, compiled by I. Bellus); L. Török: *László Castiglione 1927–1984*. MittArchInst 14 (1985) 13–17.

²² For Kerényi's work and impact cf., e.g., T. Mann–K. Kerényi: *Gespräch in Briefen*. Zürich 1960; A. Magris: *Carlo Kerényi e la ricerca fenomenologica della religione*. Milano 1975; J. Gy. Szilágyi: *Károly Kerényi and His Greek Mythology*. The New Hungarian Quarterly 19 (1978) 160–168; N. Cusumano: *Károly Kerényi e l'Italia*. Il veltro 37 (1993) 161–170; V. Losemann: *Die „Krise der Alten Welt” und der Gegenwart*. Franz Altheim und Karl Kerényi im Dialog. in: P. Kneissl–V. Losemann (eds): *Imperium Romanum. Studien zu Geschichte und Rezeption* (Festschrift Karl Christ). Stuttgart 1998: 492–518;

influenced Castiglione's complex approach. His imposing command of the archaeological, art historical, and textual evidence as well as his interest in the history of religion owed much to the academic traditions of the Museum. To the younger generation of the founding members also belonged András Mócsy who left, however, before long for the Archaeological Institute at the Eötvös Loránd University. Through his pupils he continued to exert an influence on the projects of the Research Group and its successor the Archaeological Institute. As Professor of (Provincial) Roman Archaeology, Mócsy educated generations of archaeologists with a special interest in material culture and in epigraphic and prosopographic research. The group of founders also included Ferenc Fülöp, Director of the Hungarian National Museum, whose work facilitated the working contacts between the two institutions. Fülöp also initiated research into Late Roman Pannonia in the Research Group. Migration Age archaeology and work in the field of the archaeology of the conquering Magyars was initiated by István Erdélyi who acquired as a post-doctoral student in Leningrad a knowledge of sites and museum collections in the Soviet Union relevant to the research into the proto-history of the Hungarians. Last, but not least, Nándor Fettich²³ (1900–1971), one of the most influential experts on Migration Age and Conquest Period archaeology, a scholar of great international reputation, participated in the Danube Bend project of the Research Group (see below) between 1958–1965.

From 1958, continued efforts were made to effect the transition from the research group structure into the structure of a research institute, by extending the Group's research field on newer and newer areas and by employing new research fellows on the one hand, and, on the other, by improvement in the technical equipment and infrastructure. In the early 1960s the founding team was joined by Nándor Kalicz (prehistory), Ágnes Salamon (provincial Roman archaeology and Migration Age), Kornél Bakay (Conquest Period, Árpáadian Age), László Nagy (prehistory), László Papp (Middle Ages), and, in 1964, by István Torma (prehistory, archaeological topography) and László Török (at that time, medieval architecture). The research fellows were assigned, on the basis of their special fields, to individual Sections of the Research Group. By the second half of the 1960s there existed Sections for Prehistory, Classical Archaeology, Roman Archaeology, Migration Age, Medieval Archaeology, and Topography. The work of the Sections was supervised and coordinated by the Director, the Deputy Director (L. Castiglione), and the section heads. Some of the research fellows were also responsible for the direction of the infrastructural sections and technical laboratories supporting research work.

The first steps undertaken in order to fulfil the task of gradually introducing modern technologies as recommended in the foundation document involved the establishment of a department for graphic documentation under the direction of Kornél Seitl²⁴ and the employment of the archaeochemist György Duma. Duma was the first collaborator in the newly established Science Section, the activity of which was restricted initially to the analysis of ceramic finds.²⁵ From the mid-1960s, the profile of the Section also included physical

and see recently the essays in *J. Gy. Szilágyi (ed.): Mitológia és humanitás. Kerényi Károly 100. születésnapjára* [Mythology and humanity. Studies published on the occasion of the 100th anniversary of Károly Kerényi's birth]. Budapest 1999.

²³ From 1939, a member of the HAS. With the reorganization of the HAS in 1949 he lost his membership which was restored posthumously in 1990.

²⁴ For his career see *L. Török: Seitl Kornél 1910–1967. Műemlékvédelem* 12 (1968) 52.

²⁵ Cf. *Gy. Duma: Régi fazekasok természetes fekete festéke a „Borostyán”* [The natural black pigment, the „Borostyán”, of ancient potters]. *Építőanyag* 11 (1959) 463–464; *Idem: Újabb vizsgálatok a kerámiaanyagokban történő szénkiválással kapcsolatban* [New researches on the precipitation of carbon in ceramic

as well as chemical anthropology. Besides the physical anthropologist, István Kiszely, who was responsible for the metric analysis of skeletal material from the excavations of the Research Group, the Section was joined also by the physician and medical biologist Imre Lengyel who developed his methods of palaeoserological and serogenetical analysis on human remains originating both from inhumation and cremation burials excavated by the Research Group.²⁶ As a result of his analyses, not only the age, sex, blood group, and diseases of the deceased could be determined with increasing precision, but also the genealogical relationships within the individual cemetery communities could be investigated.²⁷ Archaeological field work, research, and the preparation of publications were supported after the Research Group took up permanent residence at 49 Úri Street, Budapest I, in 1960 by special photographic and restoration labs, a library, and a joiner's shop as well as the archaeological storage rooms where find materials are kept for the period of documentation and publication before being transferred to the district museum in charge of the territory they actually come from.

The Research Group's modest finances did not allow more than a limited amount of field activity in the first years. The selection of sites was carefully considered, however, from the viewpoint of the complex chronological, typological, and historical investigation of individual archaeological horizons and periods, as, e.g., the Pre-Scythian cemetery at Mezőcsát-Hörcsögös from the 2nd half of the 8th century BC,²⁸ the Late Bronze Age-Early Iron Age and Early Iron Age settlements at Bükkszentlászló-Nagysánc²⁹ and Neszmély,³⁰ respectively, or the Hunnic period (AD 5th century) cemetery at Csongrád.³¹ In 1960, Ágnes Salamon initiated a systematic series of excavations at AD 4th-6th century sites in order to assess the archaeological evidence for the political and settlement history and material culture of Pannonia and the neighbouring *barbaricum* in the Late Roman period. Concurrently with Salamon's researches at Arka,³² Garadna,³³ Mözs,³⁴ Gibárt,³⁵ and Szilvásvár,³⁶ Imre

materials]. *Építőanyag* 13 (1961) 442-452; *Idem*: Mázas kerámiák felületi elváltozásának vizsgálata [Surface changes on glazed ceramics]. *ArchÉrt* 92 (1965) 221-228.

²⁶ See first of all *I. Lengyel*: Contribution à l'analyse histologique et chimique combinée des os et des dents en archéologie. *Bull. Groupe Int. Rech. Sc. Stomat.* 7 (1964) 182-206; *Idem*: Über die Blutgruppenbestimmung an Knochen mit der Fluoreszenz-Antikörpermethode. *Homo* 15 (1964) 65-72; *Idem*: A sárbogárdi honfoglaláskori temető állatsontjainak kémiai analízise [Chemical analysis of the animal bones from the Conquest Age cemetery at Sárobgárd]. *MMMK* 1 (1964) 243-246; *I. Lengyel - J. Nemeskéri*: Investigation of the chemical composition of aged human bones, belonging to recent and subfossil periods. *International Conference on Gerontology*. Budapest 1965: 141-146; *I. Lengyel*: Biochemical aspects of early skeletons. in: D. R. Brothwell (ed.): *The Skeletal Biology of Earlier Human Populations*. Oxford 1968: 271-288.

²⁷ For a summary of the methods and its perspectives see *I. Lengyel*: Sozialarchäologische Deutung der Ergebnisse von Laboruntersuchungen unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der spätneolithischen Gräbergruppe von Mórág-Tűzkődomb. In: *International Prehistoric Conference Szekszárd 1985 (BÁMÉ 13)*. Szekszárd 1986: 155-169.

²⁸ Excavation directed by *E. Patek*, *MittArch Inst* 1 (1970) 118-120.

²⁹ Excavation directed by *M. Párducz*, *MittArch Inst* 1 (1970) 99-100.

³⁰ Excavation directed by *E. Patek*, *MittArchInst* 1 (1970) 121.

³¹ Excavation directed by *M. Párducz*, *MittArchInst* 1 (1970) 145-146.

³² *MittArchInst* 1 (1970) 140; *Á. Salamon*: Funde von N-O Ungarn aus der Römerzeit I. *FolArch* 12 (1960) 145-159.

³³ *MittArchInst* 1 (1970) 141.

³⁴ *MittArchInst* 1 (1970) 148-149.

³⁵ *MittArchInst* 1 (1970) 141-142.

³⁶ *MittArchInst* 1 (1970) 142-143.

Holl began the investigation of the medieval city walls of Sopron³⁷ and the excavation of the medieval castle of Kőszeg.³⁸

Before presenting the first results from these researches, however, the Research Group found its place in the division of labour in Hungarian archaeology by launching two large-scale team projects which also involved other institutions with an archaeological profile. The first was, rather ironically, the organization, coordination, and execution of a rescue campaign, the second the work of the Archaeological Topography of Hungary which involved the organization of a wide-ranging cooperation over the long run. The scene of the rescue campaign was the Danube Bend, i.e., the Danube valley from Komárom to Visegrád and the delta of the Ipoly river to Letkés. This rescue work was necessitated by the planned hydroelectric station at Visegrád. In the course of the project, excavations of various sizes were conducted at sites of periods ranging from the Neolithic to the Middle Ages.³⁹ While some sites were completely excavated, the publication of the archaeological finds and the final evaluation of the settlement historical and historical results from the campaign never took place, especially because the special Danube Bend Section, which was established in the Research Group and included the employment of several outside collaborators, had to be dissolved in 1965.

The second large-scale undertaking began in 1961 and has remained one of the most demanding tasks of the Research Group and then the Archaeological Institute until today. The aim of the Archaeological Topography of Hungary (*Magyarország Régészeti Topográfiája*, in the following MRT) was to present a topographical repertory of the archaeological sites and finds of Hungary from the Neolithic to the end of the Ottoman occupation, according to counties, districts, and settlements, on the basis of the textual-literary evidence and the archaeological-artifactual evidence including all archaeological phenomena identified in the course of field surveys (i.e., settlements and parts of settlements, settlement traces, roads, cemeteries, burials), and complemented with the description of the natural environment of the sites.⁴⁰ The archaeological community expected a well-structured repertory of Hungarian archaeological evidence, providing a useful basis for complex settlement history investigations and which would facilitate the selection of sites for problem-oriented research in all archaeological periods.⁴¹ For each subsequent volume of MRT a team was, and is, organized from collaborators in the Research Group (later the Archaeological Institute) and interested professionals at educational institutions and/or (locally responsible) museums. The aim of the field surveys is the identification of sites known from the literature and/or museum registers, their location on maps at appropriate scales and according to a unified keying system as well as the identification of previously unknown archaeological sites and phenomena. For the collection and storing of literary data and museum inventory records a Topographical

³⁷ MittArchInst 1 (1970) 162; *I. Holl*: Sopron középkori városfalai [The medieval city walls of Sopron] I–IV. ArchÉrt 94 (1967) 155–183; ArchÉrt 95 (1968) 188–204; ArchÉrt 98 (1971) 24–44; ArchÉrt 100 (1973) 180–207.

³⁸ MittArchInst 1 (1970) 155–156; *I. Holl*: Kőszeg vára a középkorban. Az 1960–62. évi ásatások eredménye [The castle of Kőszeg in the Middle Ages. The results of the 1960–62 excavations]. FontArchHung. Budapest 1992.

³⁹ A comprehensive review of the sites is presented in *Castiglione 1966*: 98–100.

⁴⁰ For the principles cf. *E. Patek*: A készülő Magyar Régészeti Topográfia [The work of the Hungarian Archaeological Topography]. MTud 1962 432–433; *I. Holl*: A magyar régészeti topográfia középkori részének feldolgozási szempontjai [The principles of the medieval sections of the Hungarian Archaeological Topography]. ArchÉrt 92 (1965) 71–72; *Castiglione 1966*: 89–91.

⁴¹ Cf. *Gerevich 1961*: 209; *Castiglione 1966*: 91.

Archive was established in the Research Group. By 1965, this archive possessed 64,000 object cards with photographs and 124,000 literary cards. Prior to the establishment of the Archaeological Institute in 1966, data collection and field surveys for the volumes on the archaeological topography of Veszprém County were completed while the archaeological topography of the districts of Keszthely and Tapolca was published in 1966.⁴² The volume was discussed at a national conference in early 1967.⁴³ While the uses and significance of the archaeological topography could not be fully assessed on the basis of a single volume, it was convincing indeed that the increase in the data base through field surveys resulted in the separation of the earlier and later phases of the Transdanubian Linear Culture, the discovery of the Boleráz Group (by István Torma⁴⁴), and the identification of the Copper Age Balaton Group (Nándor Kalicz⁴⁵).

By the time the first volume was printed, it was clear to the Research Group that the goal of completing the archaeological topography of the whole country within one or two decades was far too optimistic. Nevertheless, it seemed that the financial and personal circumstances would allow the publication of a new volume every two or three years. The works were supported by the HAS as well as by the university departments and museums. Politically motivated intervention occurred at one point only, but it was far from being insignificant. Namely, the editors were forbidden to publish maps with correct contour lines and altitudes. As basic cartographic work was completed in advance of the volumes, all subsequent volumes were published with maps of this kind. We shall return below to the later volumes of MRT, here I note only that the publication of Volumes 1 and 2 were separated by three, Volumes 2 and 3 by one, Volumes 3 and 4 by two, Volumes 4 and 5 by seven, Volumes 5 and 6 by three years. The volumes appeared at intervals of 4, 3, 4, and 5 years between Volumes 6 and 10 (the latter published in 1998).

The foundation of the Research Group was doubtless influenced by the politically motivated centralization of research but it took place in a period of rapidly loosening ties between archaeology and Marxism.⁴⁶ The impact of Marxist theory on archaeology, if judged on the basis of published works, was formal and frequently vulgarizing. It did not inspire any archaeological investigation in which historical and dialectical materialism subsequently provided the theoretical basis for the socioeconomic and ideological investigation of an archaeological horizon or a historical period or the analysis of an artefact complex. Although the foundation document expressly demanded the application of historical materialism in archaeological analysis, the Research Group responded in a demonstrative manner to the expectations of the Marxist research policy only at one particular point, namely, when it

⁴² K. Bakay – N. Kalicz – K. Sági: Veszprém megye régészeti topográfiája. A keszthelyi és tapolcai járás [Archaeological topography of County Veszprém. The districts of Keszthely and Tapolca]. MRT 1. Budapest 1966.

⁴³ Cf. Anon.: A „Veszprém megye régészeti topográfiája, keszthelyi és tapolcai járás” c. munka vitája [Discussion of the „Archaeological topography of County Veszprém. The districts of Keszthely and Tapolca”]. VMMK 5 (1966) [1967] 381–391.

⁴⁴ I. Torma: Adatok a Badeni (péceli) Kultúra bolerázi csoportjának magyarországi elterjedéséhez [Data to the Hungarian distribution of the Boleráz Group of the Baden (Pécel) Culture]. VMMK 8 (1969) 91–108.

⁴⁵ Cf. MittArchInst 1 (1970) 23; N. Kalicz: Über die chronologische Stellung der Balaton-Gruppe in Ungarn. Symposium über die Entstehung und Chronologie der Badener Kultur. Nitra – Malé Vozokany 1969.

⁴⁶ Similarities and differences in the developments in Hungary, Poland, and Czechoslovakia can be easily traced with the help of the excellent studies of J. Lech: Between captivity and freedom: Polish archaeology in the 20th century. APolona 35–36 (1997–1998) 25–222, and E. Neustupny: Recent theoretical achievements in prehistoric archaeology in Czechoslovakia. in: I. Hodder (ed.): Archaeological Theory in Europe. The last three decades. London – New York 1991: 248–271, 261–262.

insisted on the investigation of what was defined as the archaeological evidence for the Slavs⁴⁷ and when it undertook organization of the 1963 Slavic Archaeological Seminar. Several fellows of the Research Group completed their university studies after the war and regarded themselves as Marxists. There was no real correspondence, however, between the ideological attitude of the archaeologist and the political conviction of the private person in their cases, either. The occasional Marxist phraseology of the non-Marxist research fellows is less surprising than the half-hearted effort at Marxist interpretation of the archaeological contexts of finds, displayed by their Marxist colleagues. Besides the ambivalent or lukewarm political expectations toward archaeology considered by official research policy to be politically far less „dangerous” than history or art history, the reason for the lack of Marxist rhetoric may be found in the outlook of the university teachers of archaeology and the methodological traditions of Hungarian archaeology. The archaeological curriculum did not provide a place for the discussion of theory, and the methodology taught and traditionally applied did not postulate ideological points of view. In prehistory, the views of Culture History and the methods of typochronology were maintained. Research into the Migration Age and the Age of the Hungarian Conquest was dominated by the highly influential views of Professor Gyula László who, as a forerunner of the ethnoarchaeology approach emerging in the late 1970s,⁴⁸ developed a complex sociohistorical cemetery analysis, investigating artifacts and archaeological contexts with the help of the ethnographic evidence.⁴⁹ In classical and Roman provincial archaeology, similarly to the archaeology of the medieval periods, the epistemological and methodological closeness of history and art history exerted a normative influence, justifying a generally positivist attitude. In this sense the work of László Castiglione is especially interesting. As a Marxist, he looked at Roman art generally and Egyptian Hellenistic art in particular from a socioeconomic angle but concentrated his research, nevertheless, on the same style critical, iconographic, and cult problems which were in the focus of attention of contemporary western classical archaeology. It may be added that the demand of the development of modern natural scientific methods for the purposes of archaeological analysis, as it was articulated in the foundation document, also indicates an awareness of developments in western archaeology in spite of the physical isolation of Hungarian archaeology. These developments attracted, however, Hungarian archaeologists only insofar as they enhanced their traditional methods.

3. Transformation into the Institute. Research between 1960–1980

Interest in modern analytical methods is manifested in the lecture series organized in 1962–63 by the short-living Theoretical and Methodological Working Group existing within the Research Group, especially in an essay presented there by János Makkay.⁵⁰ The introduction of the new methods discussed by Makkay was readily considered by the Research Group. Yet the scientific analysis of the environment — soil, hydrography, flora, fauna, climate —

⁴⁷ Gerevich 1961: 209.

⁴⁸ Cf. L. R. Binford: *Nuniamut Ethnoarchaeology*. New York 1978; *Idem*: *In Pursuit of the Past*. London-New York 1983; A. Leroi-Gourhan: *Le fils du temps: ethnologie et préhistoire (1935–1970)*. Paris 1985; Trigger 1989: 360–363; Renfrew–Bahn 1991: 166–169.

⁴⁹ See Gy. László: *A honfoglaló magyar nép élete [The life of the conquering Hungarians]*. Budapest 1944. For the impact of László cf. J. Laszlovszky – Cs. Siklódi: *Archaeological theory in Hungary since 1960: theories without theoretical archaeology*. in: I. Hodder (ed.): *Archaeological Theory in Europe. The last three decades*. London–New York 1991: 272–298, 276–277.

⁵⁰ For the contents of the unpublished text cf. Castiglione 1963: 383–386.

of the archaeological site, its exploration with the help of aerial photography and the measurement of soil resistance and the magnetic field; the collection of pollens and materials for ^{14}C testing, spectrum analysis, neutron activation, and thermoluminescence all encountered serious difficulties. The financial potentials of the Research Group did not allow the acquisition of the appropriate apparatus and the employment of specialists. For the majority of the above-listed methods there was anyhow no capacity in laboratories in Hungary at all. Aerial photography for archaeological purposes remained prohibited until 1990. The Science Section could be furnished, however, with the basic technical equipment, needed for ceramic and physical anthropological analyses and a close collaboration was established with Imre Lengyel whose seminal palaeodemographical researches unfolded in the late 1960s and early 1970s. Lengyel succeeded in convincing the archaeological community of the importance of collecting samples for scientific analysis. The standards for sample collection were also laid down.⁵¹ Despite all efforts, circumstances remained unsuitable for the assessment, introduction, and consequent application of other methods of scientific analysis. The radical epistemological changes brought about in American and Western European archaeology by the scientific methods⁵² which led there by the late 1960s to the unfolding of processual archaeology („New Archaeology”), did not reach Hungarian archaeology. The actual perspectives and limitations of processual archaeology, which aimed at investigating archaeological phenomena primarily with the help of quantitative scientific analyses the results of which were generalized in hypotheses and models as evidence of sociohistorical and cultural *processes*,⁵³ remained to be discovered.

Processual archaeology developed methods for the testing of the results based on quantitative analyses and, instead of restricting archaeological investigations to object typologies and chronology and positing cultural diffusion through migration of peoples, preferred the independent analysis of each of the subsystems forming an individual culture, viz., subsistence, technology, society, demography, ideology, trade, etc.⁵⁴ In Hungarian archaeology a

⁵¹ Cf. *I. Lengyel*: Chemico-analytical aspects of human bone finds from the 6th century „Pannonian” cemeteries. *ActaArchHung* 23 (1971) 155–156; *Idem*: Palaeoserology. Blood typing with the fluorescent antibody method. Budapest 1975; *Idem*: Determination of biological age in case of ancient dead. *MittArchInst* 5 (1976) 151–161; *Idem*: Osteon-oszteon-populáció–a szervezet biológiai kora [Osteon. Osteon population. The biological age of the organism]. *AnthrK* 20 (1976) 69–79; *Idem*: New methods and results in palaeoserology in Pannonian research. In: A. Lengyel–T. G. Radan (eds): *The Archaeology of Roman Pannonia*. Kentucky – Budapest 1980: 429–454; *Idem*: ABO blood typing of human skeletal remains in Hungary. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology* 63 (1984) 283–290; *Idem*: Ergebnisse der Laboruntersuchungen menschlicher Knochenüberreste aus dem frühpadenzeitlichen Gräberfeld von Szabolcs. In: L. Kovács: *Das frühpadenzeitliche Gräberfeld von Szabolcs*. VAH 6. Budapest 1994: 183–213; *I. Lengyel – Gy. Farkas*: A mokrini kora-bronzkori temető embertani csontmaradványain végzett laboratóriumi vizsgálatok eredményeinek kritikai elemzése a régészeti és antropológiai adatok tükrében [A critical analysis of the results of the laboratory analysis of the bone remains from the Bronze Age cemetery of Mokrin in the light of the archaeological and anthropological evidence]. *AnthrK* 16 (1972) 51–71; *I. Lengyel – J. Nemeskéri*: Application of biochemical methods to biological reconstruction. *Zeitschrift für Morphologie und Anthropologie* 54 (1963) 1–56; *Idem*: A csontváz-leletek dekompozíciójáról [On the decomposition of skeletal remains]. *AnthrK* 8 (1964) 69–82.

⁵² Cf. *D. R. Brothwell – E. S. Higgs (eds)*: *Science in Archaeology*. London – New York 1963.

⁵³ For the emergence of processual archaeology and an important case study see *J. A. Sabloff*: *The New Archaeology and the Ancient Maya*. New York 1990.

⁵⁴ *S. R. Binford – L. R. Binford (eds)*: *New Perspectives in Archaeology*. Chicago 1968; *D. L. Clarke*: *Analytical Archaeology*. London 1968; *D. L. Clarke (ed.)*: *Models in Archaeology*. London 1972; *Idem*: *Archaeology: the loss of innocence*. *Antiquity* 47 (1973) 6–18; *C. Renfrew (ed.)*: *The Explanation of Culture Change*. London 1973; *C. Renfrew – K. Cooke (eds)*: *Transformations: Mathematical Approaches to Culture Change*. London 1979.

traditional interpretation of historical processes, with a more or less pronounced descriptive accent, remained standard⁵⁵ in prehistory where research focused on the chronological, cultural, and ethnic interrelationships between archaeological cultures, horizons, and groups. This was also true for the research on later periods where the viewpoints of „historical archaeology” continued to appear fully adequate.

By 1966, the Research Group had the academic staff and infrastructure required for the change of its status. It was given the status of an Institute in 1967,⁵⁶ but its structure remained temporarily unchanged. The sections (Prehistory, Classical Archaeology, Roman [Provincial] Archaeology, Migration Age, Age of the Hungarian Conquest, Middle Ages, Topography) acquired the status of Departments, without more essential changes, only in 1973. The Science Section, now the Department for Interdisciplinary Research, of the reconstituted Archaeological Institute of the HAS changed its orientation considerably when it was joined by two palaeozoologists, the internationally acknowledged scholar, Sándor Bökönyi and the young István Vörös (whose place would be taken in 1978 by László Bartosiewicz) and when its working connections with scientific institutes and laboratories were placed on a somewhat broader financial basis. Bökönyi published his fundamental works on the history of domestic animals in Europe⁵⁷ and on the last wild horse species⁵⁸ shortly after joining the Institute. In the second half of the 1970s, besides his wide-ranging international activities, Bökönyi investigated the animal bone material from the excavations of the Institute and participated in the interdisciplinary team of a number of excavations in Hungary⁵⁹ and continued his researches in the early history of agriculture in the Carpathian Basin.⁶⁰

Excavations and surveys were conducted in the 1960s and 1970s at sites such as Aszód,⁶¹ Ószentiván (Tiszasziget I, II, VII),⁶² Hévízgyörök,⁶³ Pári-Altacker,⁶⁴ Dévaványa

⁵⁵ This adherence to traditional views was not explained in terms of theoretical considerations. For such considerations see the influential work of *I. Hodder: Theoretical archaeology: A reactionary view*. In: I. Hodder (ed.): *Symbolic and Structural Archaeology*. Cambridge 1982: 1–16.

⁵⁶ Order of the President of the HAS under no. 4/1967.(A. K. 4.).

⁵⁷ *S. Bökönyi: History of Domestic Animals in Central and Eastern Europe*. Budapest 1974.

⁵⁸ *S. Bökönyi: The Przewalsky Horse*. London 1974.

⁵⁹ See, e.g., *S. Bökönyi: Animal remains of Sarmatian sites from Bács-Kiskun County*. *Cumania* 4 (1976) 41–72; *Idem: Árpád-kori magyar szokás analógiája: kiaggatott lókoponyák közel-keleti falvakban* [The analogy of a Hungarian custom from the Arpadian Age: horse skulls hung out in Near Eastern villages]. *ArchÉrt* 105 (1978) 91–94; *Idem: Copper Age Vertebrate fauna from Kétegyháza*. In: *I. Ecsedy: The People of the Pit-Grave Kurgans in Eastern Hungary*. *FontArchHung*. Budapest 1979: 101–118; *Idem: A Közép-Alföld bronzkori állatvilága* [The Bronze Age fauna of the central Alföld]. *SzMMÉ* 1979–1980: 109–116.

⁶⁰ *S. Bökönyi: Délkelet-Európa korai állattartásának kialakulása és közelkeleti kapcsolatai* [The beginnings of animal keeping in Southeast Europe and its Near Eastern connections]. *AgrSz* 1977: 1–23; *Idem: Vlasac und die Frage der neolithischen Domestikation*. *MittArchInst* 7 (1977) 85–92; *Idem: The earliest waves of domestic horses in East Europe*. *JIES* 6 (1978) 17–76.

⁶¹ Excavation directed by N. Kalicz, cf. *N. Kalicz: Einige Probleme der Lengyel-Kultur in Ungarn*. Symposium über den Lengyel-Komplex und die benachbarten Kulturen. Nitra – Malé Vozokany 1967: 5–19; *Idem: Kőkori telep Aszódon* [A Neolithic settlement at Aszód]. *Aszódi múzeumi füzetek* 3 (1967) 33–47; *Idem: Siedlung und Gräber der Lengyel-Kultur in Aszód*. *MittArchInst* 2 (1971) 15–25; *MittArchInst* 3 (1972) 65–71; *MittArchInst* 5 (1974–1975) 33–39; *Idem: Kőkori falu Aszódon* [The Neolithic village at Aszód]. Aszód 1985.

⁶² Excavation directed by Ida B. Kutzián, *MittArchInst* 1 (1970) 135–137.

⁶³ Excavation directed by Nándor Kalicz, *MittArchInst* 1 (1970) 103–104.

⁶⁴ Excavation directed by István Torma, *I. Torma: Neolithische Siedlung und Gräberfeld, kupferzeitliche Siedlung, bronzzeitliche Siedlung in Pári-Altacker*. *MittArchInst* 2 (1971) 27–34.

(Katonaföldek and Réhelyi gát),⁶⁵ Bicske-Galagonyás,⁶⁶ Méhtelek,⁶⁷ and Medina.⁶⁸ This research was intended to increase evidence needed for the clarification of the chronology and connections of the Neolithic in Hungary. Accordingly, the publications in this special field described Neolithic cultures and discussed their chronology. Hungarian specialists in the Neolithic also became involved in the international debate flaring up anew⁶⁹ in the sixties on the rise of farming and animal husbandry.⁷⁰ Their main concerns were the southern relations of Neolithic in the Carpathian Basin, i.e., the questions of the spread of the knowledge of farming, its local preconditions, and its socio-cultural impact.⁷¹ The investigation of cultural interconnections was overshadowed, however, by the limited reliability of 14C dating. Although the methods of calibration were increasingly refined in this period, a number of archaeologists reacted to their initial weaknesses with growing scepticism and even with a disproportionate mistrust towards processual archaeology as a whole.⁷² The assessment of the Neolithic Körös-Starčevo Culture⁷³ and the Linear Pottery Culture (AVK)⁷⁴ seemed to confirm the traditional view according to which migrations and culture diffusion played a decisive role in historical processes. The archaeological evidence for Neolithic cults also received attention.⁷⁵ Sándor Bökönyi's research concerning one of the key problems of the emergence of farming, viz., the centres, ways, and chronology of animal domestication, represented a significant contribution to Neolithic researches in general⁷⁶ and to the works

⁶⁵ Excavation directed by István Ecsedy, *I. Ecsedy: Neolithische Siedlung in Dévaványa, Katonaföldek*. MittArchInst 3 (1972) 59–63; *Idem: Neolithische Siedlung in Dévaványa, Réhelyi gát*. MittArchInst 3 (1972) 153–154.

⁶⁶ Excavation directed by János Makkay, MittArchInst. 6 (1976) 147; *J. Makkay – E. Starnini – M. Tulok (eds): Excavations at Bicske-Galagonyás (Part III). The Notenkopf and Sopot-Bicske Cultural Phases*. Società per la Preistoria e Protostoria delle Regione Friuli-Venezia Giulia, Quaderno 6. Trieste 1996.

⁶⁷ Excavation directed by Nándor Kalicz and János Makkay, *N. Kalicz – J. Makkay: A méhteleki agyagistenek* [The clay gods from Méhtelek]. Nyíregyháza 1974.

⁶⁸ Excavation directed by Nándor Kalicz and János Makkay, *N. Kalicz – J. Makkay: A medinaí koraneolithikus leletek* [The early Neolithic finds from Medina] A Szekszárdi Balogh Ádám Múzeum füzetei 10. Szekszárd 1972.

⁶⁹ For the original thesis according to which farming originated in the Near East see *V. G. Childe: Social Evolution*. London 1951; *New Light on the Most Ancient East*. London 1952.

⁷⁰ Cf. *Renfrew – Bahn 1991: 242 f.*

⁷¹ Cf. *N. Kalicz: Über die chronologische Stellung der Balaton-Gruppe in Ungarn*. Symposium über die Entstehung und Chronologie der Badener Kultur. Nitra–Malé Vozokany 1969; *Idem: Südliche Beziehungen im Neolithikum des südlichen Donaubeckens*. In: *Evolution und Revolution im Alten Orient und in Europa*. Berlin 1971: 145–157; and see next note.

⁷² Cf. *N. Kalicz – P. Raczky: Új-e az „újrégészet”? Megjegyzések a diffúzió, adaptáció és innováció kérdéseihez* [Is „New Archaeology” really new? Remarks on the problems of diffusion, adaptation, and innovation]. *Valóság* 77/6 (1977) 76–94. For the issue of dating see especially *J. Makkay: The crisis of prehistoric chronology*. MittArchInst 14 (1985) 53–70.

⁷³ *J. Makkay: „Das frühe Neolithikum auf der Oztaki Magula” und die Körös-Starčevo-Kultur*. ActaArchHung 26 (1974) 131–154.

⁷⁴ *N. Kalicz – J. Makkay: Die Linienbandkeramik in der Grossen Ungarischen Tiefebene*. StudArch 7. Budapest 1977.

⁷⁵ *J. Makkay: Über neolithische Opferformen*. In: *Valcamonica Symposium '72*. Capo di Ponte 1975: 161–173; *Idem: A Szegvár-tűzkövesi újkőkori férfiszobor és a „föld és ég elválasztásának” ősi mítosza*. ArchÉrt 105 (1978) 164–183 = *The Late Neolithic male statuette of Szegvár and the ancient myth of the „Separation of Heaven and Earth”*. ActaArchHung 27 (1979) 1–38.

⁷⁶ *S. Bökönyi: Archaeological problems and methods of recognizing animal domestication*. In: *P. J. Ucko – G. W. Dimbleby (eds): The Domestication and Exploitation of Plants and Animals*. London 1969: 219–229; *S. Bökönyi* in: *F. Hole – K. Flannery – J. A. Neely: Prehistory and Human Ecology of the Deh Lurun Plain*. Ann Arbor 1969.

concerning Eastern and Central Europe in particular.⁷⁷ Similar methodological perspectives characterized the Institute's excavations at the sites of Dévaványa,⁷⁸ Nagykanizsa⁷⁹ (Copper Age), and Mezőcsát-Höröcsögös,⁸⁰ Szilvássvár-Töröksánc,⁸¹ Bakonyszűcs,⁸² Tokod-Leshegy,⁸³ Szakály,⁸⁴ Berettyóújfalú-Herpály⁸⁵ (Bronze Age). Erzsébet Patek began her excavations at the promising late Bronze Age-early Iron Age fortified settlement site of Sopron-Burgstall and at the adjacent cemeteries.⁸⁶ Trial excavations were conducted at Neolithic, Copper Age, and Bronze Age sites identified during the course of the field surveys connected with the works of the Békés county volumes of MRT.⁸⁷ Besides investigating problems of Copper and Bronze Age chronology and cultural interconnections, studies by Ida B. Kutzián⁸⁸ and others⁸⁹ also addressed socioeconomic issues.

⁷⁷ S. Bökönyi: *History of Domestic Mammals in Central and Eastern Europe*. Budapest 1974.

⁷⁸ Excavation directed by István Ecsedy, *I. Ecsedy: Eine neue Hügelbestattung der „Grubengrab-Kultur“ (Kupferzeit-Frühbronzezeit) in Dévaványa*. *MittArchInst* 2 (1971) 45–50.

⁷⁹ Excavation directed by Nándor Kalicz, *N. Kalicz: Siedlungsfunde der Balaton-Gruppe in Nagykanizsa*. *MittArchInst* 4 (1973) 19–24; *Idem: Die Funde der Phase III der kupferzeitlichen Balaton-Gruppe in Nagykanizsa-Sánc*. *MittArchInst* 5 (1974–1975) 41–44; *MittArchInst* 6 (1976) 149–150.

⁸⁰ Excavation directed by *Erzsébet Patek*, *MittArchInst* 1 (1970) 118–120.

⁸¹ Excavation directed by Erzsébet Patek, *E. Patek: Bericht über die Ausgrabung des spätbronzezeitlichen Burgwalles von Töröksánc bei Szilvássvár im Jahre 1963*. *MittArchInst* 4 (1973) 25–30.

⁸² Excavation directed by Erzsébet Patek, *E. Patek: Ein spätbronzezeitliches Grab von Bakonyszűcs-Százhalom*. *ActaArchHung* 22 (1970) 41–49.

⁸³ Excavation directed by István Torma, *I. Torma: Frühbronzezeitliche befestigte Siedlung in Tokod-Leshegy (Bericht)*. *MittArchInst* 3 (1972) 73–77.

⁸⁴ Excavation directed by István Torma, *I. Torma: Das Gräberfeld von Szakály aus der mittleren Bronzezeit*. *MittArchInst* 2 (1971) 35–44.

⁸⁵ Excavation directed by Nándor Kalicz, *N. Kalicz: Ausgrabungen in Berettyóújfalú-Herpály und in Szentpéterszeg-Körtvélyes*. *MittArchInst* 8–9 (1978–1979) 157–159; *MittArchInst* 10–11 (1980–1981) 211–213.

⁸⁶ *E. Patek: Über die neueren Ausgrabungen in Sopron-Várhely (Burgstall) und die Probleme der östlichen Beziehungen*. *MittArchInst* 6 (1976) 39–46; *Eadem: Sopron-Burgstall*. *FUFUG* 10 (1978) 59–61; *Eadem: MittArchInst* 10–11 (1980–1981) 265–267; *Eadem: Die Anfänge der Siedlung und des Gräberfeldes von Sopron-Burgstall*. In: *Die Hallstattkultur. Bericht über das Symposium in Steyr*. Linz 1981: 93–104; *Eadem: Recent excavations at the Hallstatt and La Tène hillfort of Sopron-Várhely (Burgstall) and the predecessors of the Hallstatt culture in Hungary*. In: D. Gabler (ed.): *Studies in the Iron Age of Hungary*. BAR Intern. ser. 144. Oxford 1982: 1–56.

⁸⁷ János Makkay and his collaborators, *MittArchInst* 6 (1976) 151–152; *MittArchInst* 7 (1977) 121–122; *MittArchInst* 8–9 (1978–1979) 204, 206–213; *MittArchInst* 10–11 (1980–1981) 259–261.

⁸⁸ *I. Bognár-Kutzián: Über südliche Beziehungen der ungarischen Hochkupferzeit*. *ActaArchHung* 9 (1958) 155–190; *Eadem: Angaben zur kupferzeitlichen Chronologie des Kapatenbeckens*. *Swiatowit* 23 (1960) 341–361; *Eadem: Beiträge zur Chronologie der Kupferzeit des Karpatenbeckens*. *ActaArchHung* 13 (1961) 1–32; *Eadem: The Copper Age Cemetery of Tiszapolgár-Basatanya*. *ArchHung*. Budapest 1963; *Eadem: The Relationship between the Bodrogeresztúr and the Baden Cultures*. Symposium über die Entstehung und Chronologie der Badener Kultur. Nitra – Malé Vozokany 1969; *Eadem: The Early Copper Age Tiszapolgár Culture in the Carpathian Basin*. Budapest 1972; *Eadem: The beginning and position of the Copper Age in the Carpathian-Pannonian Region*. In: *Actes du 8^e Congrès International des Sciences Préhistoriques et Protohistoriques 2*. Beograd 1973: 300–316.—For Kutzián's work cf. also *Chapman 2000*: 13 ff.

⁸⁹ *N. Kalicz: Einige Probleme der mittleren und späten Kupferzeit in Ungarn*. *Istrazivanja* 5 (1976) 65–71; *Idem: Újabb adatok a rézkori hunyadihalmi csoport időrendjéhez* [New evidence for the chronology of the Copper Age Hunyadihalom group]. *SzMMÉ* 1979–1980: 43–62; *Idem: Die Frühbronzezeit in Nordostungarn*. Abriss der Geschichte des 19–16. Jahrhunderts. Budapest 1968; *I. Torma: Ein Grab der transdanubischen inkrustierten Keramik aus Esztergom*. *MittArchInst* 6 (1976) 25–37; *Idem: Bronzezeitliche Gräber aus Nyergesújfalú (Komitat Komárom)*. Angaben zur Frühphase der inkrustierten Keramik in Nordosttransdanubien. *MittArchInst* 10–11 (1980–1981) 59–69.

Ida B. Kutzián's seminal monograph on the Copper Age cemetery of Tiszapolgár presented a sociohistorical analysis of burials and burial customs which was far ahead of contemporary perspectives and opened a new period in this field. István Ecsedy discussed the culture of the pit-graves in Eastern Hungary,⁹⁰ and Nándor Kalicz presented his view that the emergence of the Pécel-Baden Culture was a result of immigrations from Anatolia and the southern Balkan Peninsula.⁹¹ Excavations were also conducted at the late Bronze Age-early Iron Age earthworks of Bükkszentlászló-Nagysánc,⁹² at the early Iron Age settlement site of Neszmély,⁹³ and at another important settlement site in the neighbourhood of Sopron at Sopron-Krautacker.⁹⁴ The excavations at the Celtic settlement of Szakály contributed valuable information on the Romanization of the late Iron Age population.⁹⁵ In the forefront of the research concerning the Iron Age was the classification of the Hungarian find material,⁹⁶ as well as the investigation of the chronology of the Scythian culture associated with early Iron Age cultures, its emergence in the Carpathian Basin, and the analysis of its ethnicity and social stratification.⁹⁷

Research on Roman Pannonia and the neighbouring barbarian territories displayed a wide, yet coordinated, range of interests. The collaborators in the Department of Roman Archaeology, László Barkóczi and Ágnes Salamon and, from the 1970s, Dénes Gabler, Dorottya Gáspár, and Andrea H. Vaday, while conducting excavations at several sites in spite of the modest funds at their disposal, published studies on the political, social, and economic history of Roman Pannonia as well as on its connections with other parts of the Empire and the neighbouring barbarian polities. Further work was carried out on its frontiers, military defense, religion, and material culture.⁹⁸ László Barkóczi began his investigation of

⁹⁰ *I. Ecsedy*: The People of the Pit-Grave Kurgans in Eastern Hungary. *FontArchHung*. Budapest 1979.

⁹¹ *N. Kalicz*: Die Pécel (Badener) Kultur und Anatolien. *StudArch*. Budapest 1963.

⁹² Excavation directed by *Mihály Párducz*, *MittArchInst* 1 (1970) 99–100.

⁹³ Excavation directed by Erzsébet Patek, *E. Patek*: Die Siedlung und das Gräberfeld von Neszmély. *ActaArchHung* 13 (1961) 33–82.

⁹⁴ Excavation directed by *Erzsébet Jerem*, *MittArchInst* 5 (1974) 203–204; *MittArchInst* 6 (1976) 150–151; *MittArchInst* 7 (1977) 123–124; *MittArchInst* 8–9 (1978–1979) 217–218; *MittArchInst* 10–11 (1980–1981) 263–265; *E. Jerem*: Siedlung und Gräberfeld in Sopron aus der Früh- und Späteisenzeit. *FUFG* 10 (1978) 63–65; *FUFG* 11 (1980) 34–37

⁹⁵ Excavation directed by Dénes Gabler, *D. Gabler*: Forschungen in der späteisenzeitlich-römerzeitlichen Siedlung von Szakály. *MittArch Inst* 10–11 (1980–1981) 71–99; *I. Vörös*: Vorbericht über die späteltischen und römerzeitlichen Tierknochenreste von Szakály. *ibid.* 101–103.

⁹⁶ *E. Patek*: Die Urnenfelderkultur in Transdanubien. Budapest 1969; *Eadem*: A Hallstatt-kultúra Sopron környéki csoportja [The Sopron group of the Hallstatt Culture]. *ArchÉrt* 103 (1976) 3–28; *E. Jerem*: Zur Geschichte der späten Eisenzeit in Transdanubien. Späteisenzeitliche Grabfunde von Beremend. *ActaArchHung* 25 (1973) 65–86; *Eadem*: Stempelverziertes frühlatènezeitliches Gefäß aus Écs. *MittArchInst* 5 (1974–1975) 45–57.

⁹⁷ *M. Párducz*: Graves from the Scythian Age at Ártánd. *ActaArchHung* 17 (1965) 137–232; *Idem*: Western relations of the Scythian Age Culture at the Great Hungarian Plain. *ActaAntHung* 13 (1965) 273–301; *Idem*: Magyarország szkíta kora, manuscript of Academic doctoral dissertation; *Idem*: The Scythian Age cemetery at Tápíószele. *ActaArchHung* 18 (1966) 35–91; *Idem*: Szkítakorunk etnikumának és kronológiai helyzetének kérdéséhez. *AT* 15 (1968) 135–148; *Idem*: Die Fragen der ethnischen Verhältnisse der Skythenzeit und der skythisch-keltischen Bevölkerungen in Ungarn. *AR* 23 (1971) 585–596; *Idem*: Probleme der Skythenzeit im Karpatenbecken. *ActaArchHung* 25 (1973) 27–73; *K. Bakay*: Scythian Rattles in the Carpathian Basin and Their Eastern Connections. Budapest – Amsterdam 1971.

⁹⁸ *L. Barkóczi – I. Bóna – A. Mócsy*: Pannónia története [History of Roman Pannonia]. Budapest 1964; *L. Barkóczi*: The Population of Pannonia from Marcus Aurelius to Diocletian. *ActaArchHung* 16 (1964) 257–356; *D. Gabler*: Győr a rómaiak korában [Győr in the Roman period]. In: L. Dávid – A. Lengyel (eds): Győr. Várostörténeti tanulmányok [Győr. Studies on its urban history]. Győr 1971: 21–47; *Idem*:

imported glass finds as a result of which glass artefacts became an especially useful „type fossil” in the dating of archaeological contexts. Barkóczi also assessed trade connections⁹⁹ and contributed to the edition of the Roman inscriptions from Pannonia.¹⁰⁰ Dénes Gabler begun to systematically investigate the similarly significant imported Samian Ware finds.¹⁰¹ From the excavations of the 1970s, I mention here Gabler’s work at Győr, Roman Arrabona,¹⁰² at the Roman fort of Ács-Vaspuszta¹⁰³ and at the late Iron Age-Roman settlement and cemetery of Szakály (Réti földek)¹⁰⁴ and Vaday’s research at the Sarmatian settlement and cemetery of Tiszaföldvár (Téglagyár).¹⁰⁵ The political and ethnic history of the last century of Roman Pannonia’s existence, the archaeological identification of the barbarian *foederati* settled in the province, and the political, ethnic and social changes occurring after the abandonment of the Roman province were considered in a series of pioneering studies by László Barkóczi and Ágnes Salamon.¹⁰⁶ Significant

Zu Fragen der Handelsbeziehungen zwischen den Römern und den „Barbaren” im Gebiet östlich von Pannonien. In: H. Grünert (ed.): Römer und Germanen in Mitteleuropa. Berlin 1975: 87–121; *D. Gáspár*: Spätromische Kästchenbeschläge in Pannonien. Szeged 1971; *Eadem*: Római ládikák felhasználása [The use of Roman caskets]. *FolArch* 22 (1971) 53–69.—See also *L. Castiglione*: L’influence orientale dans la plastique de terre cuite de Pannonie. In: Le rayonnement des civilisations grecque et romaine sur les cultures périphériques. VIII^{ème} Congrès International d’Archéologie Classique. Paris 1965: 361–364.

- ⁹⁹ *L. Barkóczi*: Plastisch verzierte spätromische Glasfunde aus Pannonien. *FolArch* 22 (1971) 71–83; *Idem*: Mit Blumen und Vögeln verzierte Gläser aus Pannonien. *MittArchInst* 3 (1972) 95–101; *Idem*: Spätromische Glasbecher mit aufgelegten Nuppen aus Pannonien. *FolArch* 23 (1972) 69–74.
- ¹⁰⁰ *L. Barkóczi – A. Mócsy*: Die römischen Inschriften Ungarns RIU 1. Savaria, Scarbantia und die Limes-Strecke Ad Flexum-Arrabona. Budapest 1972; *L. Barkóczi – A. Mócsy*: Die römischen Inschriften Ungarns RIU 2. Salla, Mogentiana, Mursella, Brigetio. Budapest 1976.
- ¹⁰¹ *D. Gabler*: Die Eroberung Pannoniens im Spiegel der Sigillaten. *FolArch* 23 (1971) 83–91; *Idem*: Sigillaten auf dem Gebiet des Palatiums von Gorsium. *Alba Regia* 13 (1972) 9–68; *Idem*: Italische Sigillaten in Nordwestpannonien. *Wiss. Arb. Burgenl.* 51. Eisenstadt 1973: 3–44; *Idem*: Zu Fragen der Handelsbeziehungen zwischen den Römern und den „Barbaren” im Gebiet östlich von Pannonien. In: H. Grünert (ed.): Römer und Germanen in Mitteleuropa. Berlin 1975: 87–121.
- ¹⁰² *D. Gabler*: Ásatások Arrabona canabaejában [Excavations in the *canabae* of Arrabona]. *Arrabona* 3 (1971) 5–54.
- ¹⁰³ *D. Gabler*: Későrómai éremlelet Ács-Vaspusztáról [A Late Roman coin find from Ács-Vaspuszta]. *ArchÉrt* 99 (1972) 232–238; *D. Gabler et al.*: The Roman Fort at Ács-Vaspuszta (Hungary) on the Danubian Limes. *BAR Intern. ser.* 531. Oxford 1989.
- ¹⁰⁴ *D. Gabler*: Forschungen in der späteisenzeitlich-römerzeitlichen Siedlung von Szakály. *MittArchInst* 10–11 (1980–1981) 71–99; *Idem*: Late Roman Settlement at Szakály-Rétiföldek in Hungary. In: *Din istoria Europei Romane*. Oradea 1995 211–225; *D. Gabler – F. Horváth*: A szakályi terra sigillaták és helyük a bennszülött telep kerámiáspektrumában [The *terra sigillata* finds from Szakály and their place in the ceramic complex of the native settlement]. *WMMÉ* 19 (1996) 115–190.
- ¹⁰⁵ *MittArchInst* 8–9 (1978–1979) 231–233; *MittArchInst* 10–11 (1980–1981) 276.
- ¹⁰⁶ *Á. Salamon*: Északmagyarország császárkori kutatása [The research of Northern Hungary in the late Imperial period]. *AT* 13 (1966) 84–87; *Eadem*: Über die ethnischen und historischen Beziehungen des Gräberfeldes von Környe (VI. Jh.). *ActaArchHung* 21 (1969) 273–297; *Eadem*: Archäologische Angaben zur spätromischen Geschichte des pannonischen Limes-Geweißmanufaktur in Intercisa. *MittArchInst* 6 (1976) 47–54 (with an archaeozoological appendix by István Vörös, pp. 54–55); *L. Barkóczi*: Das Gräberfeld von Keszthely-Fenekpuszta aus dem 6. Jahrhundert und die frühmittelalterlichen Bevölkerungsverhältnisse am Plattensee. *JRGZM* 18 (1971) 179–199 (with a palaeodemographical appendix by Imre Lengyel); *Á. Salamon – L. Barkóczi*: Bestattungen von Csákvár vom Ende des 4. und vom Anfang des 5. Jahrhunderts. *Alba Regia* 11 (1970) 35–76; *Á. Salamon – L. Barkóczi*: Archäologische Angaben zur spätromischen Geschichte des pannonischen Limes-Gräberfelder von Intercisa I. *MittArchInst* 4 (1973) 73–95; *Á. Salamon – L. Barkóczi*: Archäologische Angaben zur spätromischen Periodisation Pannoniens (376–476). *MittArchInst* 8–9 (1978–1979) 75–84; *L. Barkóczi – Á. Salamon*: Das Gräberfeld von Szabadbattyán aus dem 5. Jahrhundert. *MittArchInst* 5 (1974–1975) 89–111.

contributions to the research of the culture of the Sarmatians and Huns were published by Mihály Párducz and Andrea H. Vaday.¹⁰⁷

In the 1960s, the work of the Department of Migration Age Archaeology embraced excavations at settlement sites of the Avar period (Tépe, Karos, Oros,¹⁰⁸ and Gergelyugorony¹⁰⁹), attempts at the classification of the Avar find material,¹¹⁰ and the publication of Avar cemeteries.¹¹¹ The research into Hungarian proto-history was represented by studies on Magna Hungaria, while the 10th-11th century Hungarian archaeological find material was investigated primarily from the political-historical aspect of the foundation of the Hungarian state.¹¹² A shift of accent in the study of the Avar period, the archaeological evidence from the 9th century, Hungarian proto-history and the Age of the Conquest, and the Árpáadian Age took place in the 1970s when five young archaeologists, Csanád Bálint, Dénes Jankovich-Bésán, László Kovács, Zsuzsa Miklós, and Béla Miklós Szőke joined the Institute. All of them participated for various lengths in the preparation of MRT volumes. The excavations conducted in the 1970s at Avar settlements (Jánoshida-Tótképuszta,¹¹³ Eperjes¹¹⁴) and cemeteries (Pilismarót, Öregek-dűlő,¹¹⁵ Dömös,¹¹⁶ Kaposvár-Fészerlakpuszta¹¹⁷), and 8th-9th century settlement sites (Miklósfá-Mórichely,¹¹⁸ Hunya¹¹⁹), as well as settlements (Zalacomár,¹²⁰ Örménykút,¹²¹ Szabolcs¹²²), ce-

¹⁰⁷ *M. Párducz*: Einige Probleme der Sarmatenforschung des Karpatenbeckens. Actes du VII^e Congrès International des Sciences Préhistoriques et Protohistoriques 1. Belgrad 1971: 267–274; *A. H. Vaday*: Rasparagus rex Roxolanorum. MittArchInst 7 (1977) 27–31; *A. H. Vaday*: Sarmatisches Gräberfeld in Törökszentmiklós, Surján. MittArchInst 8–9 (1978–1979) 75–84; *M. Párducz*: Archäologische Beiträge zur Hunnenzeit in Ungarn. ActaArchHung 11 (1959) 309–398; *Idem*: Die ethnischen Probleme der Hunnenzeit in Ungarn. Budapest 1963; *Idem*: Neue Angaben zur Geschichte der Grossen Ungarischen Tiefebene des Mitteldonaugbietes im 4. Jh. u. Z. MittArchInst 4 (1973) 61–68.

¹⁰⁸ Excavations directed by *István Erdélyi*, MittArchInst 1 (1970) 152, 154, 158.

¹⁰⁹ Excavation directed by *István Erdélyi*, MittArchInst 1 (1970) 153; and cf. *I. Erdélyi*: Forschungen auf awarenzeitlichen Siedlungen. Międzynarodowy Kongres archeologii slowiawkiej Warszawa 14–18. IX. 1965. Wrocław – Warszawa – Kraków 1969 163–175.

¹¹⁰ *I. Erdélyi*: Avar művészet [Art of the Avars]. Budapest 1966; *N. Fettich*: Symbolischer Gürtel aus der Awarenzeit (Fund von Bilisics). MFMÉ 1963: 61–89.

¹¹¹ *N. Fettich*: A jutasi avarkori temető revíziója [The Avar cemetery of Jutas revised]. VMMK 2 (1964) 79–107; *Idem*: Das awarenzeitliche Gräberfeld von Pilismarót-Basaharc. StudArch 2. Budapest 1965.

¹¹² *K. Bakay*: Gräberfelder aus dem 10–11. Jahrhundert in der Umgebung von Székesfehérvár und die Frage der fürstlichen Residenz. Alba Regia 6–7 (1965–1966) 43–88; *Idem*: Régészeti tanulmányok a magyar államalapítás kérdéséhez [Archaeological studies on the problem of the foundation of the Hungarian state]. Pécs 1965.

¹¹³ Excavation directed by *István Erdélyi*, MittArchInst 5 (1975) 216.

¹¹⁴ Excavation directed by Csanád Bálint, *Cs. Bálint*: Die spätawarenzeitliche Siedlung von Eperjes, Kom. Csongrád. VAH 4. Budapest 1991.

¹¹⁵ Excavation directed by István Erdélyi and Ágnes Salamon, *I. Erdélyi – Á. Salamon*: Bericht über die Ausgrabungen in Pilismarót Öregek-dűlő (1973–1974). MittArchInst 10–11 (1980–1981) 147–161.

¹¹⁶ Excavation directed by *István Erdélyi*, MittArchInst 5 (1975) 214–215.

¹¹⁷ Excavation directed by Eugénia Szimonova, *E. Szimonova*: Ausgrabungen in Kaposvár-Fészerlak. MittArchInst 8–9 (1978–1979) 93–95; MittArchInst 10–11 (1980–1981) 278–279; MittArchInst 12–13 (1982–1983) 268.

¹¹⁸ Excavation directed by Béla Miklós Szőke, MittArchInst 10–11 (1980–1981) 279; *B. M. Szőke*: 7. és 8. századi településmaradványok Nagykanizsán [7th and 8th century settlement remains at Nagykanizsa]. ZalaiMúz 4 (1992) 129–167.

¹¹⁹ Excavation directed by Béla Miklós Szőke, MittArchInst 10–11 (1980–1981) 277–278, MittArchInst 12–13 (1982–1983) 267.

¹²⁰ Excavation directed by László Kovács, MittArchInst 4 (1973) 189.

¹²¹ Excavations directed by Csanád Bálint, Dénes Jankovich-Bésán, Béla Miklós Szőke, MittArchInst 8–9 (1978–1979) 236; MittArchInst 12–13 (1982–1983) 269.

¹²² Excavation directed by László Kovács and Péter Németh, *L. Kovács – P. Németh*: A szabolcsi ispáni központ régészeti kutatásának első három évéről [The first three years of research at the ispán's seat at Szabolcs]. Szabolcs-Szatmári Szemle 6 (1971) 49–59.

meteries (Szabolcs,¹²³ Dabas,¹²⁴ Pusztaszentlászló¹²⁵) and earthworks (Váchartyán,¹²⁶ Mende-Leányvár,¹²⁷ Szada-Várdomb¹²⁸) of the Árpadian Age aimed at resolving settlement historical problems. Artifact complexes, especially from the early¹²⁹ and the terminal Migration Age, were reassessed in order to revise current views on population and settlement continuity, the connections of the conquering Hungarians,¹³⁰ and the political and cultural structure of 9th century Pannonia.¹³¹ The studies initiated in the 1970s by Csanád Bálint on the Eurasian context of the culture of the Avars and Magyars¹³² and by László Kovács on the weapons of the conquering Magyars and the Árpadian Age, and on Árpadian Age coinage¹³³ would unfold further in the 1980s and in the 1990s. Bálint turned to the stylistic analysis of Avar and Magyar find complexes, while Kovács complemented traditional numismatic studies with the study of coinage as evidence for political and intellectual history and published an interesting series of papers on a Hungarian royal insignia also represented on coins.

László Gerevich directed excavations at two 11th-13th century building complexes of great historical and art historical significance. The excavation of Dömös Priory presented new evidence for the understanding of the beginnings of Romanesque art and architecture in Hungary and the relationship between the royal seat and the ecclesiastic institution at early Árpadian Age Dömös.¹³⁴

¹²³ Excavation directed by László Kovács, *L. Kovács: Ausgrabungen der Gräberfelder des ungarischen gemeinen Volkes in Szabolcs und Timár*. ActaArchHung 28 (1976) 383–389.

¹²⁴ Excavation directed by *László Kovács*, MittArchInst 5 (1974) 218.

¹²⁵ Excavation directed by Béla Miklós Szőke and László Vándor, *B. M. Szőke – L. Vándor: Das Gräberfeld von Pusztaszentlászló aus dem 11. Jahrhundert*. MittArchInst 6 (1976) 99–106; *B. M. Szőke – L. Vándor: Pusztaszentlászló Árpád-kor temetője* [The Arpadian Age cemetery at Pusztaszentlászló]. FontArchHung, Budapest 1987.

¹²⁶ Excavation directed by Zsuzsa Miklós, *Zs. Miklós: Árpádenzeitliche Burgwälle in der Hügellandschaft von Gödöllő*. MittArchInst 8–9 (1978–1979) 125–136.

¹²⁷ Excavation directed by *Zsuzsa Miklós*, MittArchInst 10–11 (1980–1981) 286–288.

¹²⁸ Excavation directed by *Zsuzsa Miklós*, MittArchInst 10–11 (1980–1981) 290–291.

¹²⁹ *Á. Salamon – I. Erdélyi: Das völkerwanderungszeitliche Gräberfeld von Környe*. StudArch 5. Budapest 1971.

¹³⁰ *Cs. Bálint: A honfoglaláskori lovastemetkezések* [Equestrian burials of the Age of Conquest]. MFMÉ 1971–1972: 85–107; *Idem: A gádorosi honfoglaláskori nyereg* [The Conquest Age saddle from Gádoros]. ArchÉrt 101 (1974) 17–44; *Idem: A szaltovo-majaki kultúra avar és magyar kapcsolatairól* [Avar and Magyar connections of the Saltovo-Majack Culture]. ArchÉrt 102 (1975) 52–62; *Idem: A magyarság és az ú.n. bjelobrdói kultúra* [The Magyars and the so-called Bjelo-Brdo Culture]. Cumania 4 (1976) 225–254; *Idem: Vestiges archéologiques de l'époque tardive des sassanides et leurs relations avec des peuples des steppes*. ActaArchHung 30 (1978) 173–212; *Idem: Les selles hongroises du X^{ème} siècle et leurs rapports orientaux*. Permanent International Altaistic Conference 1973. Ankara 1979: 1–49; *Idem: Der landnahmezeitliche Grabfund von Pestlőrinc*. ActaArchHung 32 (1980) 241–250.

¹³¹ *B. M. Szőke: Zalavár*. ZalaiGyűjt 6 (1976) 69–103; *Idem: Zur Problematik des Bestattungsritus mit verstümmeltem Rinderschädel des Typs von Sopronkőhida*. ActaArchHung 31 (1979) 51–103.

¹³² *Cs. Bálint: Vestiges archéologiques de l'époque tardive des Sassanides et leurs relations avec les peuples des steppes*. ActaArchHung 30 (1978) 173–212; *Idem: Südungarn im 10. Jahrhundert*. StudArch 11. Budapest 1991.

¹³³ *L. Kovács: A honfoglaló magyarok lándzsái és lándzsás temetkezésük* [The spears of the conquering Magyars and their burials with spears]. Alba Regia 11 (1970) 81–108; *Idem: A magyar honfoglaláskori fegyvertörténeti kutatások állásáról* [On the status of the research on the weaponry of the conquering Hungarians]. HK 22 (1975) 519–529; *Idem: Über die ungarischen Lanzen aus dem 10–11. Jahrhundert*. MittArchInst 7 (1977) 61–73; *Idem: Adatok a LANCEA REGIS köriratú pénz értékeléséhez*. Alba Regia 14 (1975) 257–274 (=Zur Deutung der Münze mit der Umschrift LANCEA REGIS. ActaArchHung 28 [1976] 123–135); *Idem: Bemerkungen zur Bewertung der fränkischen Flügellanzen im Karpatenbecken*. MittArchInst 8–9 (1978–1979) 97–119.

¹³⁴ For the unpublished excavations see MittArchInst 4 (1973) 8–9; MittArchInst 5 (1974–1975) 218, MittArchInst 6 (1976) 159; MittArchInst 7 (1977) 133; MittArchInst 8–9 (1978–1979) 239; MittArchInst 10–11 (1980–1981) 282; MittArchInst 12–13 (1982–1983) 268.

In turn, the excavation of the Cistercian abbey at Pilisszentkereszt and the discovery of the remains of its sculptural decoration marked a turning point in the research into Gothic art in Hungary. The sculptural finds inspired highly impressive suggestions concerning Villard de Honnecourt's connections with Hungary in general and with Pilisszentkereszt in particular.¹³⁵ While in a series of fascinating studies Gerevich promptly fitted the principal lessons drawn from his finds into the context of Hungarian medieval art,¹³⁶ the analysis and publication of the buildings and the finds in their entirety remained a task to be achieved by a team of experts formed after the death of the excavator.

Through the person of Gyula Siklósi, the Institute joined the group of archaeologists engaged in the study of the urban history of medieval Székesfehérvár.¹³⁷ In the field of medieval urban history, the studies of Imre Holl¹³⁸ and his excavations at a late medieval village site (Sümege-Sarvaly¹³⁹) are especially noteworthy.¹⁴⁰ Last, but not least, by 1972 the

¹³⁵ *L. Gerevich*: Villard de Honnecourt és Magyarország [Villard de Honnecourt and Hungary]. *MűÉ* 20 (1970) 81–104; *Idem*: A pilisi cisztercita apátság [The Cistercian abbey of Pilisszentkereszt]. Szentendre 1984.—For the influence of Gerevich's work at Pilisszentkereszt cf., e.g., *I. Takács*: A pilisi ciszterci apátság [The Cistercian Abbey of Pilis] and *Idem*: Gertrudis királyné síremléke [The sepulchral monument of Queen Gertrudis]. In: Á. Mikó–I. Takács (eds): *Pannonia Regia. Művészet a Dunántúlon 1000–1541. Kunst und Architektur in Pannonien 1000–1541*. [Catalogue of the exhibition held in the National Gallery, Budapest]. Budapest 1994: 236–247, 247–255.—For arguments against the identification of the master of Queen Gertrudis' monument with Villard de Honnecourt see *I. Takács op. cit.* 250 f.; *Idem*: Villard de Honnecourt utazása a művészettörténetben [Villard de Honnecourt's journey in art history]. *ArsHung* 22 (1994) 15–19.

¹³⁶ *L. Gerevich*: A gótika korának művészete [Gothic art in Hungary]. In D. Dercsényi – A. Zádor (eds): *A magyarországi művészet története [History of Hungarian art]* I. Budapest 1970: 101–188; *Idem*: A gótikus klasszicizmus és Magyarország [Gothic classicism and Hungary]. *MTAK* II 20 (1971) 55–72; *Idem*: The Art of Buda and Pest in the Middle Ages. Budapest 1971; *Idem*: Budapest művészete az Árpád-korban [The art of Budapest in the Arpadian Age]. In: *Budapest története [History of Budapest]* I. Budapest 1973: 351–401; *Idem*: Budapest művészete a későbbi középkorban [The art of Budapest in the later Middle Ages]. In: *Budapest története [History of Budapest]* II. Budapest 1973: 241–334; *Idem*: Die mittelalterlichen Städte im Zentrum Ungarns. In: *Vor- und Frühformen der europäischen Stadt im Mittelalter II*. Göttingen 1974: 258–276; *Idem*: Die Anfänge des Bauornaments in Ungarn. In: *Kolloquium über frühmittelalterliche Skulptur* 1972. Heidelberg 1973: 149–158; *Idem*: Tendenze artistiche nell'Ungheria Angioina. *Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei* 1974: 121–156; *Idem*: A koragótika kezdetei Magyarországon [The beginnings of early Gothic art in Hungary]. *MTAK* II 23 (1974) 164–169; *Idem*: Pilis Abbey. A cultural center. *ActaArchHung* 29 (1977) 155–198.

¹³⁷ *MittArchInst* 12–13 (1982–1983) 269–270; *Gy. Siklósi*: Emberfejes szenteltvíztartó töredéke a székesfehérvári Szigetről [Fragment of a holy water basin with the representation of a human head from Székesfehérvár-Sziget]. *Alba Regia* 17 (1979) 297–299; *Idem*: A középkori Sziget [The Sziget in the Middle Ages]. In: *Palotavárosi írások. IKM B sor. 34* (1982) 6–11; *Idem*: Török konyha Isztolni Belgrad városából [Turkish kitchen from the city of Istolni Belgrad]. Székesfehérvár 1982; *Idem*: Adattár Székesfehérvár középkori és törökkori építészetéről [A repertory of the architecture of Székesfehérvár in the Middle Ages and the Ottoman period]. Székesfehérvár 1990.

¹³⁸ *I. Holl*: Mittelalterarchäologie in Ungarn 1946–1964. *ActaArchHung* 22 (1970) 365–411; *Idem*: A városkutatás kérdései a középkori régészetben [Problems of urban history in the archaeology of the Middle Ages]. *RégFüz.* II:14. Budapest 1971: 53–57.

¹³⁹ Excavations directed by Imre Holl and Nándor Parádi, I. Holl – N. Parádi: Die Ausgrabung des spätmittelalterlichen Dorfes Sarvaly. *MittArchInst* 8–9 (1978–1979) 143–148; *I. Holl*: Sarvaly középkori lakóházai [The medieval dwelling houses at Sarvaly]. *ArchÉrt* 106 (1979) 33–51; *I. Holl – N. Parádi*: Das mittelalterliche Dorf Sarvaly. *FontArchHung*. Budapest 1982.

¹⁴⁰ See also *I. Holl*: Középkori kályhacsempék Magyarországon [Medieval glazed tiles from Hungary]. *BudRég* 22 (1971) 161–207; *Idem*: Zur Verbreitung romanischer Tonfliesen in Ungarn. *MittArchInst* 4 (1973) 105–112; *Idem*: Angaben zur mittelalterlichen Schwarzhafnerkeramik mit Werkstattmarken. *MittArchInst* 5 (1974–1975) 129–150; *Idem*: Regensburgi későközépkori kályhacsempék Magyarországon [Late medieval glazed tiles from Regensburg found in Hungary]. *ArchÉrt* 107 (1980) 30–45; *Idem*: Zinn im spätmittel-

archaeological topography of the whole territory of Veszprém County was completed and published.¹⁴¹ In 1979, the MRT volume covering the territories of the town of Esztergom and the Dorog district was also published.¹⁴²

4. *Research beyond the frontiers of Hungary, international cooperation, 1958–1980*

The classical archaeologist László Castiglione was one of the most energetic promoters of the foundation of the Research Group. Before 1958, as already mentioned above, he occupied the post of Assistant Curator at the Department of Classical Antiquities at the Museum of Fine Arts and was also active as the official in charge of archaeology at the IInd Section of the HAS. From the very outset, he insisted on the importance of the participation of Hungarian archaeologists in projects outside Hungary. Behind his untiring efforts at the integration of the Archaeological Research Group into international research we may well suspect the impact of András Alföldi's and Károly Kerényi's work. However faintly, the phraseology of the foundation document drafted by him echoes Alföldi's and Kerényi's warnings formulated in the critical years of the 1940s:¹⁴³ for it could be feared that, based though on different premises, the ideological and practical limitations imposed by the Marxist ideology would inevitably result in the same isolation and decline in academic standards as the Hungarocentrism found in the archaeology and history (including ancient history) of the pre-war period. While as a convinced Marxist Castiglione refused to recognize the real political dimensions behind the official reluctance to support classical archaeological research that would also involve field work abroad, he continued to fight the separation of „national” and „international” research themes and disciplines as a manifestation of professional conservatism.

Being unable to start archaeological field work in the Mediterranean, Castiglione continued the research in the Research Group he had started in the Museum of Fine Arts. In the 1960s, and again in the second half of the 1970s, he focused on the interaction of the Hellenistic and the traditional pharaonic cultures in Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt. His papers, the argumentation of which usually set out from the discussion of a single art object or an iconographical problem, represented significant contributions to international research into the religion and arts of Hellenistic Egypt. They still continue to be referred to in the literature after several decades.¹⁴⁴

alterlichen Ungarn. *ActaArchHung* 39 (1987) 313–335; *Idem*: A budai várpalota egy középkori rétegsorának elemzése [Analysis of a medieval stratigraphical series from Buda castle]. *ArchÉrt* 112–113 (1987–1988) 183–198.

¹⁴¹ *K. Bakay – N. Kalicz – K. Sági*: Veszprém megye régészeti topográfiája. A devecseri és sümegi járás [Archaeological topography of Veszprém County. The districts of Devecser and Sümeg]. MRT 3. Budapest 1969; *M. Dax – I. Éri – S. Mithay – S. Palágyi – I. Torma*: Veszprém megye régészeti topográfiája. A pápai és zirci járás [Archaeological topography of Veszprém County. The districts of Pápa and Zirc]. MRT 4. Budapest 1972.

¹⁴² *I. Horváth – M. H. Kelemen – I. Torma*: Komárom megye régészeti topográfiája. 1. Esztergom és a dorogi járás [Archaeological topography of Komárom County. Esztergom and the district of Dorog]. MRT 5. Budapest 1979.

¹⁴³ On Kerényi's view of classical studies and the changes in Alföldi's views from a Hungarocentric Ancient History to the acceptance of Kerényi's attitude see *J. Gy. Szilágyi*: „Mi, filológusok” [„We, philologists”]. *AT* 31 (1984) 167–197; *J. Gy. Szilágyi*: Alföldi András hagyatéka [The legacy of András Alföldi]. *BMHB* 74 (1991) 115–118; *J. Gy. Szilágyi*: Kerényi Year 1997. *Budapest Review of Books* 8 (1998) 107–113.

¹⁴⁴ *L. Castiglione*: Die Rolle des Kyathos im ägyptischen Kult. *ActaAntHung* 8 (1960) 387–404; *Idem*: Dualité du style dans l'art sépulchral égyptien à l'époque romaine. *ActaAntHung* 9 (1961) 209–231; *Idem*: Un taureau Apis gréco-égyptien du VI^e siècle avant n. è. *BMHB* 18 (1961) 21–29; *Idem*: Quelques têtes de terre cuite hellénistiques. *BMHB* 22 (1963) 9–23; *Idem*: Hérodote II 91. In: *Mélanges offerts à Kazimierz Michałowski*. Warszawa 1966: 41–49; *Idem*: Tables votives à empreinte de pied dans les temples d'Égypte. *ActaOrHung* 20 (1967) 239–252; *Idem*: Inverted Footprints. *ActaAntHung* 16 (1968) 187–189; *Idem*:

This is especially true for his studies on the iconography of Sarapis¹⁴⁵ and his work on Egyptian art in the Roman period and its societal context.¹⁴⁶ Besides studies on the history of art in Roman Pannonia,¹⁴⁷ he also became increasingly interested in processes in Roman art in a broader, imperial, context¹⁴⁸ while continuing to insist on the maintenance of contacts between international classical archaeology and the research into Roman Pannonia at home. This latter aim was also supported by the surveys written at his instigation in the periodical *Acta Archaeologica*¹⁴⁹ whose editor he became in 1969. In subsequent decades, he changed the structure and direction of the *Acta* to a considerable degree and the articles and reviews published in it testify to the enlargement of Hungarian archaeological perspectives at this time.

In 1964, the HAS finally sent an archaeological expedition under the direction of Castiglione and with the participation of László Barkóczy, Ágnes Salamon (Archaeological Institute of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences), Gyula Hajnóczy (Technical University, Budapest), László Kákosy (Eötvös Loránd University), and Edith Varga (Museum of Fine

Inverted Footprints. A contribution to the ancient popular religion. *ActaEthnHung* 17 (1968) 121–137; *Idem*: Stele eines Kupferschmiedes. *MDAIK* 24 (1969) 78–86; *Idem*: Vestigia. *ActaArchHung* 22 (1970) 95–132; *Idem*: Diocletianus und die Blemmyes. *ZÄS* 96 (1970) 90–103; *Idem*: Isis Pharia. Remarque sur la statue de Budapest. *BMHB* 34–35 (1970) 37–55; *Idem*: Az alexandriai Paneion (A görög-egyiptomi vallásos szinkretizmus társadalmi-gazdasági alapjainak kérdéséhez) [The Alexandrian Paneion (On the socioeconomic bases of Graeco-Egyptian religious syncretism)]. *AT* 23 (1976) 1–13; *Idem*: Eine neuere Darstellung des Pharos und die Kult-Statue des alexandrinischen Paneions. *ActaArchHung* 29 (1977) 351–362.

¹⁴⁵ *L. Castiglione*: La statue de culte hellénistique du Sarapieion d'Alexandrie. *BMHB* 12 (1958) 17–39; *Idem*: Zur Frage der Sarapis-Kline. *ActaAntHung* 9 (1961) 287–303; *Idem*: Fragment einer thronenden Sarapis-Statue in dem Sarapieion von Gortyn. *ActaArchHung* 23 (1971) 229–230; *Idem*: Zur Frage der Sarapis-Füsse. *ZÄS* 97 (1971) 30–43; *Idem*: Das wichtigste Denkmal der Sarapis-Füsse im British Museum wiedergefunden. *StudAeg* 1 (1974) 75–81; *Idem*: Újabb adatok a Sarapis-kultusz kialakulásához [New evidence for the genesis of the Sarapis cult]. *ArchÉrt* 104 (1977) 176–188; *Idem*: Nouvelles données archéologiques concernant la genèse du culte de Sarapis. In: *Hommages à Marteen J. Vermaseren II*. *EPRO* 68. Leiden 1978: 208–232; *Idem*: Sarapis-arcok. Kísérlet az isten ábrázolásainak gyarapítására [Sarapis faces. An attempt at the increase of the god's representations]. *AT* 26 (1979) 202–218.

¹⁴⁶ *L. Castiglione*: Kunst und Gesellschaft im römischen Ägypten. *ActaAntHung* 15 (1967) 107–152.

¹⁴⁷ *L. Castiglione*: A soproni Silvanus-oltár hátoldalának ábrázolásához [On the representation on the back of the Silvanus altar from Sopron]. *AT* 9 (1962) 134–135; *Idem*: L'influence orientale dans la plastique de terre cuite de Pannonie. In: *Le rayonnement des civilisations grecque et romaine sur les cultures périphériques*. *Actes du VIII^e Congrès International d'Archéologie Classique*. Paris 1965: 361–364.

¹⁴⁸ *L. Castiglione*: Polybios és a római művészet [Polybios and Roman art]. *AT* 20 (1973) 111–127; *Idem*: Die Bedeutung des 2. Jahrhunderts v.u.Z. in der Geschichte der römischen Kunst. *MittArchInst* 4 (1973) 37–59; *Idem*: Pompeji szobrászatához a colonia alapításának idejében [On Pompeian sculpture in the period of the colony's foundation]. *AT* 21 (1974) 204–223 (in German in: *Neue Forschungen in Pompeji*. Recklinghausen 1975: 211–217); *Idem*: Zur Deutung des Grabmals von M. Vergilius Eurysaces. *ActaArchHung* 27 (1975) 157–161; *Idem*: Dolmen képe egy pompejii falfestményen [The representation of a dolmen on a wall painting from Pompeji]. *AT* 24 (1977) 7–17; *Idem*: Die gesellschaftlichen und ideologischen Bewegungskräfte in der Gestaltung der römischen Kunst. *MittArchInst* 7 (1977) 111–116; see also his popular books which were based primarily on his own researches: *Az ókor nagyjai* [The great personalities of the ancient world]. Budapest 1971, ²1972, ³1978, ⁴1982; *Római művészet* [Roman art]. Budapest 1971, ²1978; *A római művészet világa* [The world of Roman art]. Budapest 1974; *Pompeji, Herculaneum*. Budapest 1979; *Hellénisztikus művészet* [Hellenistic art]. Budapest 1980.

¹⁴⁹ *I. Holl*: Mittelalterarchäologie in Ungarn 1946–1964. *ActaArchHung* 22 (1970) 365–411; *I. Bóna*: Ein Vierteljahrhundert Völkerwanderungszeitforschung in Ungarn (1945–1969). *ActaArchHung* 23 (1971) 265–336; *L. Török*: On the State of Nubiology. *ActaArchHung* 24 (1972), 303–317; and see also *I. Erdélyi*: Resultats des recherches archéologiques relatives aux trouvailles des cavaliers nomades orientaux en Hongrie (1953–1964). *ActaOrHung* 18 (1965) 373–378.

Arts) to Egyptian Nubia, the scene of the greatest rescue campaign in the history of archaeology, necessitated by the building of the High Dam at Aswan and conducted under the auspices of UNESCO. The Hungarian mission unearthed a small AD 5th-12th century urban settlement and a section of its cemetery at Abdallah Nirqi near Abu Simbel.¹⁵⁰ After the return of the expedition to Hungary, László Török joined in the work of the publication of the finds from Abdallah Nirqi and he also received an invitation to participate in the publication of the excavations conducted by the Egyptological Institute of the Humboldt University, Berlin, in the Sudan.¹⁵¹ The 1960s and 1970s witnessed the unfolding of Nubian Studies as an increasingly independent discipline dealing with the history and archaeology of the Middle Nile Region. Török joined in the research begun in the wake of the UNESCO campaign with the study of the administrative structure and socioeconomic conditions of the ancient Nubian state, the kingdom of Kush (Napata-Meroe),¹⁵² and the archaeological and textual evidence of the connections between Nubia and the Greek and Roman world.¹⁵³

- ¹⁵⁰ L. Török: Fragment eines spätantiken roten Tongefäßes mit Stempelverzierung und sein Problemkreis. *MittArchInst* 2 (1971) 87–97; I. Lengyel: Bestimmung des einstigen Inhalts des Gefäßes aus Abdallah Nirqi (Nubien). *ibid.* 99–101; L. Castiglione – L. Török: Abdallah Nirqi 1964. Introduction. *ActaArchHung* 26 (1974) 277–287; L. Barkóczy – Á. Salamon: Archaeological investigation of the settlement „Town A”. *ibid.* 26 (1974) 289–338; Gy. Hajnóczy: Abdallah Nirqi 1964. Architectural characteristics of the settlement and buildings. *ibid.* 339–368; L. Kákósy: Abdallah Nirqi 1964. Burials. *ibid.* 27 (1975) 103–117; L. Török: Abdallah Nirqi 1964. Finds with inscriptions. *ibid.* 26 (1974) 369–393; *Idem*: Abdallah Nirqi 1964. Fragments of wall-paintings. *ibid.* 395–403; *Idem*: Abdallah Nirqi 1964. The finds from the excavation of the Hungarian Mission 1, 2. *ibid.* 27 (1975) 119–153; *Idem*: Abdallah Nirqi 1964. The pottery finds of the settlement. *ibid.* 353–494; V. Pósa: Abdallah Nirqi 1964. The chemical analysis of the leather finds. *ibid.* 155–156; I. Kiszely: Anthropological examination of Nubian premature infant. *AAE* 99 (1969) 79–84; I. Skoflek – V. Árendás: Abdallah Nirqi 1964. Plant remains from the Nubian excavation. *MittArchInst* 10–11 (1980–1981) 215–219; I. Vörös: Abdallah Nirqi 1964. Animal bone remains of the Christian times from the Nubian excavation. *ibid.* 221–234.
- ¹⁵¹ L. Török: Ein christianisiertes Tempelgebäude in Musawwarat es Sufra (Sudan). *ActaArchHung* 26 (1974) 71–103.
- ¹⁵² L. Török: A special group of Meroitic property marks. *Meroitic Newsletter* 10 (1972) 35–48; *Idem*: Archäologisches zur nubischen Taufliturgie. *MittArchInst* 4 (1973) 97–103; *Idem*: Some comments on the social position and hierarchy of the priests on Karanog inscriptions. *Ägypten und Kusch* [Festschrift Fritz Hintze]. Berlin 1977: 364–376; *Idem*: Inquiries into the administration of Meroitic Nubia: I–II. *Orientalia* 46 (1977) 34–50; *Idem*: Tanulmányok a későmeroitikus és korai középkori Nubia gazdaságáról és kormányzásáról [Studies on the economy and administration of late Meroitic and early medieval Nubia]. *MTAK* II 25 (1976) 297–323; *Idem*: Money, economy, and administration in Christian Nubia. *Études nubiennes*. IFAO *Bibl. d'Étude* 77 (1978) 287–311; *Idem*: Two Meroitic studies: The Meroitic chamber in Philae and the administration of Nubia. *Oikuméné* 2 Budapest 1978: 217–237; *Idem*: A meroitikus Nubia gazdasági hivatalai és hivatalnokai [Economic offices and officials in Meroitic Nubia]. *MTAK* I 31 (1979) 55–95; *Idem*: Die meroitischen Nomoi. *MittArchInst* 8/9 (1978–1979) 47–56; *Idem*: Economic Offices and Officials in Meroitic Nubia. A study in territorial administration of the Late Meroitic Kingdom. *StudAeg* 5. Budapest 1979; *Idem*: To the history of the Dodekaschoinos between ca. 250 BC and 298 AD. *ZÄS* 107 (1980) 76–86.
- ¹⁵³ L. Török: On the state of Nubiology. *ActaArchHung* 24 (1972) 303–317; *Idem*: An archaeological note on the connections between the Meroitic and Ballana cultures. *StudAeg* 1. Budapest 1974: 361–378; *Idem*: A görög-római világ és a meroitikus Dél [The Graeco-Roman world and the Meroitic south]. *AT* 21 (1974) 125–129; *Idem*: Man in the vessel. To the interpretation of a Nubian fresco representation. In: K. Michałowski (ed.): *Nubia Récentes Recherches*. Varsovie 1975: 121–125; *Idem*: Traces of Alexandrian architecture in Meroe: A Late Hellenistic motif in its history. *StudAeg* 2. Budapest 1976: 115–138; *Idem*: Meroe és Nubia a 2.-7. században [Meroe and Nubia in the 2nd-7th centuries]. Budapest 1977; *Idem*: Bemerkungen zum Problem der „römischen” Gräberfelder von Sayala (Nubien). *ActaArchHung* 30 (1978) 431–435; *Idem*: The Art of the Ballana culture and its relation to Late Antique art. *Meroitica* 5 (1979) 85–100.

He was also interested in research on the Egyptian end of the Nubian-Egyptian connections, and especially on the sculpture of the Late Antique period.¹⁵⁴

In spite of repeated efforts made at launching excavations at sites in Turkey and North Africa, Abdallah Nirqi remained for a long while the first and last expedition of the Institute at a site on the fringes of the Graeco-Roman world. By contrast, the eleven archaeological expeditions sent between 1961 and 1990 to Mongolia under the direction of István Erdélyi encountered no difficulties. The Mongolian expedition of 1961 investigated pit mounds of the Hiung-nu period (1st century BC) at Noin-Ula while that in 1962 studied burials dating from the 10th-5th centuries BC between the rivers of Orchon and Selenga. Work in 1963 was conducted at an AD 7th century pit-grave with a stone superstructure in the valley of the river Huniy, where graves of the Hiung-nu period were also unearthed. Works continued at the latter cemetery in the 1964 season.¹⁵⁵ The excavations, undertaken jointly by the Institute and the Archaeological Institute of the Academy of Sciences of the Soviet Union, continued to enjoy similar support at Majatzkoye (District of Voronezh, 1975, 1977) in the Soviet Union and at Bajót, Csolnok (1975), Keszthely-Fenekpuszta (1976–1977, 1978, 1979), Berettyóujfalu-Herpály, and Szentpéterszeg-Körtvélyes (1977, 1978) in Hungary. Majaki, the eponymic Chazar fortress of the Saltovo-Majaki Culture, received attention because finds made there were relevant to research into Avar culture. The site was also relevant to the history of the Magyars in the 9th century. The most important scenes for this cooperation in Hungary were the late Roman (4th-5th century) fort at Fenékpuzsza and the late Neolithic-middle Bronze Age tell at Herpály.¹⁵⁶ The sites were selected with the greatest care. A comprehensive assessment and publication of these excavations was never finished, however, which is especially regrettable in the case of Fenékpuzsza.

¹⁵⁴ L. Török: Late Meroitic elements in the Coptic art of Upper Egypt. *ActaArchHung* 23 (1971) 167–180; *Idem*: Adatok a VI–VII. századi kopt kőfaragóművészet ikonográfiájához. *AT* 16 (1969) 167–194; *Zur Ikonographie der koptischen Kunst im 6. bis 7. Jh.* *WZHUB* 20 (1971), 295–306; *Idem*: On the chronology of the Ahnas sculpture. *ActaArchHung* 22 (1970) 163–182; *Idem*: Notes on Prae-Coptic and Coptic art. *ActaArchHung* 29 (1977) 125–153; *Idem*: Art égyptien de la basse antiquité et art copte. *BMBH* 51 (1978) 3–39, 169–183.

¹⁵⁵ I. Erdélyi: Jelentés a magyar-mongol régészeti expedíció 1961. évi munkálatairól [Report on the work of the Hungarian-Mongolian archaeological expedition in 1961]. *ArchÉrt* 89 (1962) 93–100; *Idem*: Raszkopi v Noin-Ule. *ActaArchHung* 14 (1962) 231–247; I. Erdélyi – L. Ferenczy: Jelentés a magyar-mongol expedíció 1962. évi eredményeiről [Report on the results of the Hungarian-Mongolian expedition in 1962]. *ArchÉrt* 90 (1963) 120–126; I. Erdélyi: A mongol-magyar régészeti expedíció 1961–1963. évi eredményei [Results of the Mongolian-Hungarian archaeological expedition in 1961–1963]. *MTud* 60 (1963) 647–651; I. Erdélyi – D. Navaan: Az 1963. évi mongol-magyar régészeti expedíció eredményei [Results of the Mongolian-Hungarian archaeological expedition in 1963]. *ArchÉrt* 92 (1965) 73–85; I. Erdélyi: Az 1964. évi mongol-magyar régészeti expedíció eredményei [The results of the Mongolian-Hungarian archaeological expedition in 1964]. *MTAK* II 15 (1966) 123–128; *Idem*: A tomb of the Turcic Period in Northern Mongolia. *Bulleten* (Ankara) 30 (1966) 197–203; I. Erdélyi – C. Dorsjüren – D. Navaan: Results of the Mongolian-Hungarian archaeological expeditions 1961–1964 (A comprehensive report). *ActaArchHung* 19 (1967) 335–370.

¹⁵⁶ Cf. S. A. Pletneva: Ausgrabungen in der Festung Majaki. *MittArchInst* 6 (1976) 119–123; S. A. Pletneva *et al.*: Ausgrabungen in der Festung Majaki. *MittArchInst* 8–9 (1978–1979) 149–150; T. Makarowa *et al.*: Ausgrabungen in Bajót und Csolnok. *MittArchInst* 6 (1976) 123–124; N. Kalicz: Ausgrabungen in Berettyóujfalu-Herpály und in Szentpéterszeg-Körtvélyes. *MittArchInst* 8–9 (1978–1979) 157–159; *ibid.* 10–11 (1980–1981) 211–214; I. Erdélyi – K. Sági: Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen von Keszthely-Fenekpuszta (1976–1977). *MittArchInst* 8–9 (1978–1979) 151–156; I. Erdélyi: Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen von Keszthely-Fenekpuszta (1978 und 1979). *ibid.* 10–11 (1980–1981) 207–209.

In the 1970s, Sándor Bökönyi's palaeozoological work at sites in the Near East and the Balkan Peninsula¹⁵⁷ contributed significantly to a new orientation in international research into the history of animal husbandry and thence to the development of the methods of processual archaeology.¹⁵⁸

5. Research between 1981–1993

The results of the excavations carried out in cooperation with the Archaeological Institute of the Academy of Sciences of the Soviet Union were never published. The reasons for the failure of the undertaking lay partly in the equivocal relationship between the adherence to the principle of free research and a consistent and systematic execution of the Institute's projects.

The number of research themes and projects pursued in the Institute increased in a rather alarming manner. While it may be tempting to regard it as a consequence of the academic staff's growth and its increasing specialization, the frittering away of the projects was resulted, in fact, by a constant decrease in the financial support for field work. While for a period in the 1970s the number of excavations increased, especially at Migration Period sites and those of the Árpadian Age, no field project could set as a target the complete excavation of a settlement or a cemetery. Field work also included a great number of small trial excavations executed in the framework of the archaeological topography. By the end of the 1970s the necessity for better concentrating the intellectual and financial potentials of the Institute became quite obvious. Reorganisation was based thematically as well as methodologically on the research methods of processual archaeology. Thus, it seemed self-evident that this reorganization must be carried out by a scholar who was familiar with the manner in which team projects were organized in the so-called „New Archaeology” and in particular with the scientific methods which played such a key role in them. This scholar was found in the person of Sándor Bökönyi (1926–1994) who succeeded László Gerevich

¹⁵⁷ S. Bökönyi: Vlasac: An early site of dog domestication. In: A. T. Clason (ed.): *Archaeozoological Studies. Papers of the Archaeozoological Conference 1974. Groningen – Amsterdam – Oxford – New York 1975*: 167–178; *Idem*: The Vertebrate fauna of the Neolithic settlements at Obre, Bosnia. *WMBH A.4. Sarajevo 1976*: 55–154; *Idem*: La fauna domestique néolithique en Europe Sud-Est et ses connections avec le Proche-Orient. *Ethnozootechnie 14 (1976)* 5–6; The development of early stock rearing in the Near East. *Nature 264 (1976)* 19–25; *Idem*: Effects of environmental and cultural changes on Prehistoric faunal assemblages. In: M. Arnott (ed.): *Gastronomy. The Anthropology of Food Habits. The Hague – Paris 1975*: 3–12; *Idem*: The Vertebrate fauna of Anza. In: M. Gimbutas: *Neolithic Macedonia. Los Angeles 1976*: 313–363; *Idem*: Animal Remains from the Kermanshah Valley, Iran. *BAR Suppl. series 34. Oxford 1977*; *Idem*: Délkelet-Európa korai állattartásának kialakulása és közelkeleti kapcsolatai [The emergence of animal husbandry in Southeast Europe and its Near Eastern connections]. *AgrSz 1977* 1–23; *Idem*: Environmental and cultural differences as reflected in the animal bone samples from five Early Neolithic sites in Southwest Asia. In: L. H. Meadow–N. A. Zeder (eds): *Approaches to Faunal Analyses in the Middle East. Peabody Museum Bulletin 2 (1978)* 57–62; *Idem*: The animal remains of the 1970–1972 excavation seasons at Tell ed-Der: A preliminary report. In: L. De Meyer (ed.): *Tell ed-Der II. Progress Reports. Leuven 1978*: 185–189; *Idem*: The animal remains of Nush-i Jan, A preliminary report. 1973 and 1974. *Iran 14 (1978)* 24–28; *Idem*: The introduction of sheep-breeding to Europe. *Ethnozootechnie 21 (1978)* 65–70; *Idem*: The Vertebrate fauna of Vlasac. In: D. Srejovic – Z. Latica (eds): *Vlasac II. Beograd 1978*: 35–65; *Idem*: Die Pferdeskelette von Linz-Zizlau. In: A. Kloiber: *Die Menschen von Linz-Zizlau. Linz 1978* 71–85; *Idem*: The importance of horse domestication in economy and transport. In: P. Sörbom (ed.): *Transport Technology and Social Change. Stockholm 1979*: 15–21; *Idem*: Animal remains from Abu Habbah. In: L. De Meyer (ed.): *Tell ed-Der III. Sounding at Abu Habbah (Sipper). Leuven 1980*: 87–90.

¹⁵⁸ For Bökönyi's role see *Renfrew – Bahn 1991*: 242.

as Director of the Institute at the retirement of the latter in early 1981. Bökönyi dissolved the Departments in the Institute and established instead research teams where the composition was based on individual research projects. His declared aim was to place man, i.e., past behaviours, and not material culture, at the centre of archaeological research. It is clearly possible to identify in this aim the impact of processual archaeology's principal concern, namely, the processes of the life of human communities. The negative attitude of „New Archaeology” towards positivist typochronology is similarly evident. During the period of Bökönyi's directorship, efforts were made to close the gap between the Institute's situation and the international standards of the 1980s in the field of the application of computers. The digitalization of the records collected in the Archives established in conjunction with the works of the Archaeological Topography of Hungary was initiated in the late 1980s when the use of PCs also became general in the Institute. For a period, a team worked on methods of computer applications and the introduction of the Geographic Information System (GIS) in some of the Institute's projects. The unfolding of computer applications was, however, seriously inhibited by the Institute's limited financial basis.

Besides continuing the works of MRT — in the framework of which between 1982–1993 two of the planned four volumes of the archaeological topography of County Békés and two of the planned four volumes of the topography of County Pest have been published¹⁵⁹ — the Institute concentrated on a microregion research project in the neighbourhood of Endrőd in County Békés. As in the case of the microregional projects carried out in Central America and Mesopotamia on which the project was modelled, the excavations were preceded by intensive field survey which constituted part of the topographical survey of County Békés. The survey for preparing the microregion project was intended to create the basis for complex settlement history investigations, i.e., to recover evidence for archaeological and scientific analyses on the basis of which the interaction between the palaeoenvironment and the communities living in them may be assessed. This survey influenced considerably the works of MRT theoretically as well as methodologically.¹⁶⁰ Excavations were conducted at several sites for the reconstruction of the settlement history of the Endrőd region between the Neolithic and the Middle Ages. Here mention must be made of the Neolithic site at Endrőd-Öregszőlők (János Makkay) and the Sarmatian settlement at Gyoma Site 133 (Andrea H. Vaday). The finds from these excavations were published, together with the results of the geophysical and archaeometric investigations and cores,¹⁶¹ in the first

¹⁵⁹ *I. Ecsedy – L. Kovács – B. Maráz*: Békés megye régészeti topográfiája. IV/1. A szeghalmi járás [Archaeological topography of County Békés. The district of Szeghalom]. MRT 6. Budapest 1982; *D. B. Jankovich – J. Makkay – B. M. Szőke*: Békés megye régészeti topográfiája. IV/2. A szarvasi járás [Archaeological topography of County Békés. The district of Szarvas]. MRT 8. Budapest 1989; *I. Dinnyés – K. Kövári – Zs. Lovag – S. Tettamanti – J. Topál – I. Torma*: Pest megye régészeti topográfiája. XIII/1. A budai és szentendrei járás [Archaeological topography of County Pest. The districts of Buda and Szentendre]. MRT 7. Budapest 1986; *Zs. Miklós – I. Torma*: Pest megye régészeti topográfiája. XIII/2. A szobi és váci járás [Archaeological topography of County Pest. The districts of Szob and Vác]. MRT 9. Budapest 1993.

¹⁶⁰ Cf. *D. Jankovich-Bésán*: Archaeological Topography. Theoretical and Practical Lessons. MittArchInst 14 (1985) 283–288; *Idem*: A felszíni leletanyag szerepe a településrégészetben [The significance of surface finds in settlement archaeology]. Unpubl. thesis for a candidate's degree, Budapest 1992; *D. Jankovich-Bésán – M. Pattantyús-Á.*: Archaeological and geophysical survey of a multi-aged site Endrőd-170, SE Hungary. Preliminary report. ProsAr 1990: 123–132; *D. Jankovich-Bésán – J. Kvassay – M. Pattantyús-Á.*: Interdisciplinary survey and trial excavation of a multicomponent site, Endrőd 170. In: S. Bökönyi (ed.): Cultural and Landscape Changes in South-East Hungary I. Reports on the Gyomaendrőd Project. Archaeolingua 1. Budapest 1992: 99–120.

¹⁶¹ *M. Cucarzi*: The integrated geoarchaeological approach within the territory: The case of the Microregion; *B. Székely – O. Magyar – P. Steinbach – T. Tóth*: Results of geophysical surveying in the investigation of

two volumes of the Békés Microregion series.¹⁶² The settlement historical analysis of the data is in progress.

As this microregional research was not designed only to serve merely its own ends, it was obvious from the very outset that the Békés project in the southeastern part of the Great Hungarian Plain should be carried out in parallel with similarly structured research in a West Hungarian region in which different environmental, socioeconomic, ethnic, political, and cultural contexts had existed in the same chronological horizons. Although only after a delay of several years, such a parallel project was started under the direction of Ferenc Redő. The direction of the project was taken over subsequently by Béla Miklós Szőke, who had been the first to argue for its necessity. This project was carried out in cooperation with the Directorate of the Museums of County Zala in the Hahót Basin west of Lake Balaton. The work in the Hahót Basin emerged from a rescue campaign in the Kis-Balaton (Little Balaton) area conducted by Eszter Bánffy, Mária Bondár, Judit Kvassay, and Béla Miklós Szőke as well as archaeologists from Zala County museums.¹⁶³ The methods and accents of the research in the Hahót Basin were determined by the special potentials inherent in the region, especially as regards the Roman and Carolingian presence and the richness of the medieval textual evidence. The excavations conducted between 1986–1993 at Neolithic,¹⁶⁴ early Copper Age,¹⁶⁵ early Bronze Age,¹⁶⁶ Roman,¹⁶⁷ Carolingian,¹⁶⁸ and medieval¹⁶⁹ settlements and cemeteries resulted in a detailed picture of the ethnic, socioeconomic,

archaeological sites in the Gyomaendrőd Region, Hungary; *E. Jerem – Zs. Kiss – A. G. Pattantyús – A. Varga*: The combined use of archaeometric methods preceding the excavation of archaeological sites. In: S. Bökönyi (ed.): *Cultural and Landscape Changes in South-East Hungary I. Reports on the Gyomaendrőd Project. Archaeolingua 1. Budapest 1992: 61–98.*

¹⁶² S. Bökönyi (ed.): *Cultural and Landscape Changes in South-East Hungary I. Reports on the Gyomaendrőd Project. Archaeolingua 1. Budapest 1992; A. H. Vaday – K. Berecz – T. Vida – M. Vicze et al.*: Cultural and Landscape Changes in South-East Hungary II. Prehistoric, Roman Period, Barbarian and Late Avar settlement at Gyoma 133. *Archaeolingua 5. Budapest 1996.*

¹⁶³ L. Vándor (ed.): *Régészeti kutatások a Kis-Balaton térségében [Archaeological researches in the Little Balaton region]. Zalaegerszeg 1986; B. M. Szőke – L. Vándor*: Kísérlet egy táji egység településtörténeti rekonstrukciójára. A Kis-Balaton programot kísérő leletmentő ásatások (1980–1985) tapasztalatai [Settlement historical reconstruction of a geographical unit. The lessons of the rescue excavations of the Kis-Balaton project (1980–1985)]. *Zalai Gyűjt 26. Zalaegerszeg 1987: 83–100; R. Müller (ed.)*: *Sieben Jahrtausende am Balaton von Ur- und Frühgeschichte bis zum Ende der Türkenkriege. Mannheim 1989.*

¹⁶⁴ Excavations directed by Eszter Bánffy, cf. *E. Bánffy*: Neolithic and Copper Age settlements at Hahót and Zalaszentbalázs; Early Calcolithic settlement at Zalaszentbalázs-Szőlőhegyi mező. In: *Antaeus 22: 35–50; 71–102.*

¹⁶⁵ Excavations directed by Mária Bondár, cf. *M. Bondár*: The settlement of the Lengyel culture at Zalaszentbalázs. In: *Antaeus 22: 51–70.* See also previous note.

¹⁶⁶ Excavations directed by Mária Bondár, see previous note.

¹⁶⁷ Roman villa excavated by Ferenc Redő, see *F. Redő*: Roman Villa at Alsórajk-Kastélydomb 1987–1993. in: *Antaeus 22: 269–306.*

¹⁶⁸ Excavations directed by Róbert Müller, Béla Miklós Szőke, and László Vándor, cf. *B. M. Szőke*: Karolingerzeitliche Gräberfelder I–II von Garabonc-Ófalu. In: *Antaeus 21: 41–204; B. M. Szőke – L. Vándor*: Katalog der Gräber von Garabonc-Ófalu I–II. *ibid.* 205–262; *B. M. Szőke*: Siedlungsobjekte von Garabonc-Ófalu I und III. *ibid.* 263–270; *B. M. Szőke*: Das birituelle Gräberfeld aus der Karolingerzeit von Alsórajk-Határi tábla. in: *Antaeus 23: 61–146; R. Müller*: Gräberfeld und Siedlungsreste aus der Karolingerzeit von Zalasabar-Dezsősziget. In: *Antaeus 21: 271–336.*

¹⁶⁹ Excavations directed by Judit Kvassay, Béla Miklós Szőke, and László Vándor, cf. *B. M. Szőke*: Das völkerwanderungszeitliche Gräberfeld von Kilimán-Felső major. In: *Antaeus 23: 29–60; Idem*: Siedlungsreste und Gräber aus dem frühen Mittelalter von Gelsesziget, Börzönce und Hahót-Cseresznyés. *ibid.* 167–182 and see *K. Éry*: Anthropologische Untersuchungen an zwei frühgeschichtlichen Populationen des Hahóter Beckens (SW-Ungarn). *ibid.* 147–166; *L. Vándor*: Archäologische Forschungen in den mittelalterlichen weltlichen

and cultural processes in a border region west of Lake Balaton. The publication of the team's work contains a comprehensive settlement historical assessment of the region between the Neolithic and the Middle Ages,¹⁷⁰ a detailed study of the settlement history of the entire Southwest-Transdanubian region in the early and middle Copper Age¹⁷¹ and in the early Bronze Age,¹⁷² and further an analysis of the prehistoric stone tool finds,¹⁷³ of the plant remains,¹⁷⁴ a palaeozoological study of the region,¹⁷⁵ a discussion of 14C date from the Zalaszentbalázs-Szőlőhegyi mező site,¹⁷⁶ and finally the comprehensive physical anthropological investigation of the Carolingian burials.¹⁷⁷

The activity of the former Department for Interdisciplinary Research was reshaped administratively in a team project entitled „Archaeological-interdisciplinary investigation of ecological and anthropogenic interactions”. The team worked, in collaboration with other institutions, on the scientific dating of archaeological finds,¹⁷⁸ on physical-anthropological analyses,¹⁷⁹ the analysis of plant remains and soil probes.¹⁸⁰ As in earlier years, the palaeozoological work of Sándor Bökönyi¹⁸¹

und kirchlichen Zentren des Hahót-Buzád-Geschlechts. *ibid.* 183–218; *J. Kvassay*: Das mittelalterliche Dorf Buzád (Sárkány-) sziget von Hahót-Telekszeg. *ibid.* 219–242, and cf. *I. Holl*: Spätmittelalterliche Zinngegenstände von Buzád/Sárkénysziget (Hahót-Telekszeg). *ibid.* 243–250; *B. M. Szőke*: Die Prämonstraterpropstei von Alsórajk-Kastélydomb. *ibid.* 251–306; cf. *B. G. Mende*: Paleodemographische Untersuchungen an der mittelalterlichen Population von Alsórajk-Kastélydomb. *ibid.* 307–319.

¹⁷⁰ *B. M. Szőke*: Borderland of cultures. Settlement patterns in the Hahót Basin (Aims, methods, results). In: *Antaeus* 22: 13–34.

¹⁷¹ *E. Bánffy*: South-West Transdanubia as a mediating area. On the cultural history of the Early and Middle Chalcolithic. In: *Antaeus* 22: 157–196.

¹⁷² *M. Bondár*: Early Bronze Age Settlement patterns in South-West Transdanubia. In: *Antaeus* 22: 197–268.

¹⁷³ *L. Bondor*: Raw materials of grinding stones and polished stone material; *K. T. Bíró*: Raw material analysis of the lithic materials of the Microregional Survey Project; *E. Bácskay*: Chipped stone implements found at the sites of Hahót-Szartóri I–II, Zalaszentbalázs-Pusztatető and Zalaszentbalázs-Szőlőhegyi mező. In: *Antaeus* 22: 103–104; 105–108; 109–118.

¹⁷⁴ *F. Gyulai*: The plant and food remains from the Copper Age settlement at Zalaszentbalázs-Szőlőhegyi mező. In: *Antaeus* 22: 145–156.

¹⁷⁵ *L. Bartosiewicz*: Archaeozoological studies from the Hahót Basin, SW Hungary. In: *Antaeus* 22: 307–366.

¹⁷⁶ *E. Hertelendy*: 14Carbon dating of Zalaszentbalázs-Szőlőhegyi mező 1992–93. In: *Antaeus* 22: 105–108.

¹⁷⁷ *K. Éry*: Anthropologische Untersuchungen an drei Populationen aus dem 9. Jahrhundert in Westungarn (Gräberfelder Garabonc I und II, Zalasabar-Dezsősziget). In: *Antaeus* 21: 337–481.

¹⁷⁸ *I. Bognár-Kutzián*: Contributions to the Prehistoric chronology of Hungary. *MittArchInst* 14 (1985) 293–298; *Eadem*: A comparative study of independent dating results obtained from Prehistoric samples. INQUA HNC Congress Ottawa. Ottawa 1987: 141–150; *Eadem*: Investigation of two Copper Age cultures by means of TL dating. *Nuclear Tracks* 14 (1988) 287–291; *É. Csongor*: Archaeological 14C dating. Absolute chronology. *MittArchInst* 14 (1985) 299–306; *L. Benkő*: Thermoluminescence dating: Recent developments and applications in Hungary. *ibid.* 307–312; *Idem*: Progress of TL dating in Hungary. *AIInA* 4 (1986) 161–169.

¹⁷⁹ *I. Kiszely*: Az aquincumi későrómai erőd közeléből származó csontvázak antropológiai összeglése [Anthropological summary on the skeletal material from the neighbourhood of the late Roman fortress of Aquincum]. *Comm-ArchHung* 1988: 71–75; anthropological study In: *B. M. Szőke-L. Vándor*: Pusztaszentlászló Árpád-kori temetője [The Arpadian Age cemetery at Pusztaszentlászló]. *FontArchHung*. Budapest 1987: 157–186.

¹⁸⁰ *F. Gyulai*: Environment and Agriculture in Bronze Age Hungary. *Archaeolingua* Ser.Min. 4. Budapest 1993.

¹⁸¹ *S. Bökönyi*: Die frühneolithische Wirbeltierfauna von Nosa. *ActaArchHung* 36 (1984) 29–41; *Idem*: A comparison of the Early Neolithic domestic and wild faunas of the Balkans, Italy and South France. *Cahiers Ligures de Préhistoire et de Protohistoire* 2 (1985) 181–192; *Idem*: The Late Neolithic Vertebrate fauna of Öcsöd-Kováshalom: A preliminary report. *MittArchInst* 14 (1985) 270–274; *Idem*: Szarvas 1. lelőhely, egy késő újkőkori teleprészlet állatmaradványainak archaeozoológiai vizsgálata [Szarvas Site 1, the archaeozoological investigation of a late Neolithic settlement section]. *MMMK* 1986–1987: 89–103; *Idem*: Horses and sheep in East Europe in the Copper and Bronze Ages. In: *S. N. Skomal – E. C. Polomé* (eds): *The Archaeology of a Linguistic Problem. Studies in Honor of M. Gimbutas*. Washington 1987: 136–144;

and László Bartosiewicz¹⁸² presented a significant contribution to international palaeozoological research as well as to the investigation of archaeological sites in Hungary.

Prehistoric research was carried out primarily in conjunction with archaeological topography. Several projects started before 1980 were completed in the period under review as, e.g., János Makkay's survey of Neolithic research in Hungary in which he also presented a settlement-historical evaluation of the archaeological topography of Békés County,¹⁸³ or Erzsébet Patek's work at Iron Age settlement sites and cemeteries in Western Hungary.¹⁸⁴ The latter project was complemented by studies on the survival of Iron Age populations in the Roman period.¹⁸⁵ Research on the Neolithic and the Copper Age increased from the

Idem: Animal domestication and early animal husbandry in Central, East and South Europe. In: L. Manzanilla (ed.): *The V. G. Childe Colloquium, Mexico 1986*. BAR Intern. Ser. 349. Oxford 1987: 163–168; *Idem*: Animal breeding on the Danube. In: C. R. Whittaker (ed.): *Pastoral Economies in Classical Antiquity*. Cambridge 1988: 171–176; *Idem*: Animal remains from Bronze Age Tells in the Berettyó valley. In: T. Kovács – I. Stanczik: *Bronze Age Tell Settlements of the Hungarian Plain I*. IPH [1]. Budapest 1988: 123–135; *Idem*: Animal Husbandry and Hunting in TÁC-Gorsium. *StudArch* 8. Budapest 1984; *Idem*: Környezeti és kulturális hatások későneolitikus Kárpát-medencei és balkáni lelőhelyek csontanyagán [The impact of environment and culture on bone materials from sites in the Carpathian Basin and the Balkans]. *Értekezések, emlékezések*. Budapest 1988; *Idem*: Camel sacrifice in Roman Intercisa. *ActaArchHung* 41 (1989) 399–404; *Idem*: Kamid el-Loz 12. Tierhaltung und Jagd. Tierknochenfunde der Ausgrabungen 1964 bis 1981. *Saarbrücker Beiträge zur Altertumskunde* 12. Bonn 1990; *Idem*: Tierknochenfunde der ersten Ausgrabungen in Vinca. In: D. Srejović–N. Tasić (eds): *Vinca and Its World*. Beograd 1990: 49–54; *Idem*: Animal remains of Mihajlovac-Knjepiste, an Early Neolithic settlement of the Iron Gate Gorge. *Balkanica* 23 (1992) 77–87; *Idem*: The possibilities of cooperation between archaeology and zoology. *Bollettino di paleontologia italiana* 83 (1992) 391–401; *Idem*: Domestication models: the Anatolian-Mesopotamian and the others in Southwest Asia. In: C. Buitenhuis – A. T. Clason (eds): *Archaeozoology in the Near East*. Leiden 1993: 4–9; *Idem*: Pferdedomestication, Haustierhaltung und Ernährung. *Archaeolingua Ser.Min.* 3. Budapest 1993; *Idem*: Interaction between hunting and economic, social and cultural relations in two large Prehistoric sites of Southwest Asia. In: J. Desse – J. Audouin-Rouzeau (eds): *Exploitation des animaux sauvages à travers le temps*. Juan-les-Pins 1993: 125–135; *Idem*: The beginnings of conscious animal breeding in Hungary: the biological, written and artistic evidences. In: R. Durand (ed.): *L'homme, l'animal domestique et l'environnement du Moyen Age au XVIII^e siècle*. Nantes 1993: 97–108.

- ¹⁸² L. Bartosiewicz: Most na Soci: A preliminary faunal analysis of the Hallstatt Period settlement. *AV* 36 (1985) 107–130; *Idem*: Roman Period animal remains Most na Soci. *AV* 37 (1986) 287–296; *Idem*: Multivariate methods in archaeozoology. *ActaArchHung* 38 (1986) 279–294; *Idem*: Animal exploitation and its relationship to bone deposition at Lovasberény-Mihályvár. *Alba Regia* 23 (1987) 7–18; *Idem*: Bone morphometry and function: A comparison between cattle and European elk. *Acta Veterinaria Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 35 (1987) 435–446; *Idem*: Water sieving experiment at Örménykút, Site 54. In: M. Járó – L. Költő (eds): *Archaeometrical research in Hungary*. Budapest 1988: 267–273; *Idem*: Animal remains from the 1970–1972 excavations of Iatrus (Krivina), Bulgaria. *ActaArchHung* 43 (1991) 181–209; *Idem*: Középkori állatmaradványok Vác belvárosából [Medieval faunal remains from the centre of Vác]. *Váci könyvek* 5. Vác 1991: 129–152; *Idem*: Lócsontváz leletek Vörs-Papkert avar kori lelőhelyéről [Remains of horse skeletons from the Avar period site at Vörs-papkert]. *HOMÉ* 31 (1993) 597–604; *Idem*: Early medieval archaeozoology in Eastern Europe. In: H. Friesinger – F. Daim et al. (eds): *Bioarchäologie und Frühgeschichtsforschung*. Wien 1993: 123–131; *Idem*: Late medieval lynx skeleton from Hungary. In: A. Clason et al. (eds): *Skeletons in Her Cupboard*. Oxford 1993: 5–17; *Idem*: Metapodial asymmetry in draft cattle. *International Journal of Osteoarchaeology* 3 (1993) 69–75; *Idem*: The anatomical position and metric traits of Phalanges in cattle (*Bos taurus* L. 1758). *Revue de Paléobiologie* 12 (1993) 325–335.
- ¹⁸³ J. Makkay: A magyarországi neolitikum kutatásának új eredményei [New results of Neolithic research in Hungary]. Budapest 1982.
- ¹⁸⁴ E. Patek: Neue Untersuchungen auf dem Burgstall bei Sopron. Mit einem Beitrag von G. Szádeczky-Kardos. *BRGK* 63 (1982) 105–177; *Eadem*: Westungarn in der Hallstatt-Zeit. Weinheim 1993.
- ¹⁸⁵ D. Gabler – E. Patek – I. Vörös: Studies in the Iron Age of Hungary. BAR Intern. Ser. 144. Oxford 1982.—For further research concerning the Neolithic, the Copper Age, and the Bronze Age see N. Kalicz: On the chronological problems of the Neolithic and Copper Age in Hungary. *MittArchInst* 14 (1985)

mid-1980s with the work of István Zalai-Gaál whose studies display a socio-archaeological orientation.¹⁸⁶ Several studies were published on various chronological, cultural, settlement historical, and socioeconomic problems of the Hungarian Neolithic and Copper Age by Nándor Kalicz¹⁸⁷ and János Makkay.¹⁸⁸ Erzsébet Jerem published the first results of a so far unfinished comprehensive study of the Hallstatt and La Tène Periods in Hungary.¹⁸⁹

A team project, under the old-fashioned title „Material culture and ideology in the Roman Empire and its peripheries”, united colleagues from the former Department for

21–51; *Idem*: Kőkori falu Aszódon [The Neolithic village at Aszód]. Aszód 1985; *Idem*: Kultúráváltozások a korai és középső rézkorban a Kárpát-medencében [Cultural changes in the early and middle Copper Age in the Carpathian Basin]. ArchÉrt 114–115 (1987–1988) 3–15; *Idem*: The new results of the investigations on the Hungarian Copper Age. Summary. Rassegna di Archaologia 7 (1988) 75–103; *N. Kalicz – P. Raczky*: Preliminary report on the 1977–1982 excavations at the Neolithic and Bronze Age Tell settlement of Berettyóújfalu-Herpály. ActaArchHung 36 (1984) 85–136; *J. Makkay*: Early Stamp Seals in South-East Europe. Budapest 1984; *Idem*: Angaben zur Archäologie der Indogermanenfrage I–IV. ActaArchHung 38 (1986) 13–29; ActaArchHung 40 (1988) 3–25; *Idem*: A tartariai leletek [The Finds from Tartaria]. Budapest 1990.—For researches concerning the Iron Age see *E. Jerem*: Zur Späthallstatt- und Frühlatènezeit in Transdanubien. In: Die Hallstattkultur. Bericht über das Symposium in Steyr 1980. Linz 1981: 105–136; *Eadem*: Gal'statskaya kul'tura v Zadunav'e; Skifskij period v Vostochnoj Vengrii; Latenskij period, kel'ty. In: Arheologia Vengrii. Moskva 1986: 153–168; 169–187; 187–236; *E. Jerem et al.*: A Sopron-Krautackeren feltárt vaskori telep régészeti és környezetrekonstrukciós vizsgálata [Archaeological and palaeoenvironmental analysis of the Iron Age settlement at Sopron-Krautacker] I–II. ArchÉrt 111 (1984) 141–169; ArchÉrt 112 (1985) 3–24.

- ¹⁸⁶ *I. Zalai-Gaál*: Közép-európai neolitikus temetők szociálarchaeológiai elemzése [Socioarchaeological analysis of Central European Neolithic cemeteries]. Szekszárd 1988; *Idem*: A neolitikus körárokrendszerek kutatása a Dél-Dunántúlon [Neolithic circular earthworks in Southern Transdanubia]. ArchÉrt 117 (1990) 3–24; *Idem*: Die chronologische und soziale Bedeutung der Mitgabe von Steinaxten in den spätneolithischen Gräbern Südtransdanubiens. In: J. Lichardus (ed.): Die Kupferzeit als historische Epoche. Bonn 1991: 389–399; *Idem*: Neue Angaben zum Kult und sakralen Leben des Neolithikums in Transdanubien. WMMÉ 17 (1992) 3–28; *Idem*: A lengyeli kultúra kronológiai problémái a Dél-Dunántúlon [Chronological problems of the Lengyel Culture in Southern Transdanubia]. JPMÉ 37 (1992) 79–91; *Idem*: Betrachtungen über die kultische Bedeutung des Hundes im mitteleuropäischen Neolithikum. ActaArchHung 46 (1994) 33–57; *Idem*: Die Kupferfunde der Lengyel-Kultur im südlichen Transdanubien. ActaArchHung 48 (1996) 1–34; *Idem*: Die applizierte Tierplastik der Lengyel-Kultur. ActaArchHung 50 (1998) 43–90.
- ¹⁸⁷ *N. Kalicz*: Die terminologischen und chronologischen Probleme der Kupfer- und Bronzezeit in Ungarn. Atti del X Simposio Internazionale sulla fine del Neolitico e gli inizi dell'età del Bronzo in Europa. Verona 1982: 117–137; *Idem*: Übersicht über den Forschungsstand der Entwicklung der Lengyel-Kultur und die ältesten „Werkanlagen”. MUAG 33–34 (1983–1984) 271–293; *N. Kalicz – R. Schreiber*: Aszód, Siedlungswesen und Wirtschaft einer Siedlung aus der Frühphase der Lengyel-Kultur in Nordungarn. MUAG 33–34 (1983–1984) 309–325; *N. Kalicz – P. Raczky*: Preliminary report on the 1977–1982 excavations at the Neolithic and Bronze Age tell settlement of Berettyóújfalu-Herpály I. Neolithic. ActaArchHung 36 (1984) 85–136.
- ¹⁸⁸ *J. Makkay*: Some comments on the settlement patterns of the Alföld Linear Pottery. In: Siedlungen der Kultur mit Bandkeramik. Internationales Kolloquium Nové Vozokany 17–20. November 1981. Nitra 1982: 157–166; *Idem*: The origins of the „temple economy” as seen in the light of prehistoric evidence. Iraq 45 (1983) 1–6; *Idem*: Chronological links between the Neolithic cultures of Thessaly and the Middle Danube Region. Diethnés Sünderiou Thessalonikon Spoudon. Athen 1984: 47–58.
- ¹⁸⁹ *E. Jerem*: Südliche Beziehungen einiger hallstattzeitlichen Fundtypen Transdanubiens. Archaeologia Iugoslavica, Materiali 19. Beograd 1981: 201–220; *Eadem*: An Early Celtic pottery workshop in North-Western Hungary. Some archaeological and technological evidence. OJA 3 (1984) 54–80; *Eadem*: A review of recent work on the Late Bronze Age and Early Iron Age of Hungary. BIAL 21–22 (1984–1985) 85–109; *E. Jerem et al.*: Scientific investigation of the Sopron-Krautacker Iron Age pottery workshop. Archaeometry 27 (1985) 83–89; *E. Jerem – G. Facsar*: Zum urgeschichtlichen Weinbau in Mitteleuropa. Reb kernfunde von Vitis vinifera L. aus der urnenfelder-, hallstatt- und latènezeitlichen Siedlung Sopron-Krautacker. Wissenschaftliche Arbeiten aus dem Burgenland 71. Eisenstadt 1985: 121–144.

Roman Archaeology who continued their research on the archaeology of Roman Pannonia and the neighbouring *barbaricum* and in the history and archaeology of the Middle Nile Region (Nubia) as a special periphery of the ancient Mediterranean world. Field work was, however, complemented from 1983 with the still ongoing excavation of a monumental Italian villa at San Potito di Ovindoli near Rome.¹⁹⁰ The principal scene of field activities was, besides Zalalövő, a Transdanubian settlement site,¹⁹¹ the territory of the micoregion project in County Békés where Andrea H. Vaday excavated a large Sarmatian settlement (see note 162). A series of monographs contributed to the systematic assessment of important classes of archaeological and textual evidence relating to Roman history.¹⁹² László Barkóczi¹⁹³ and Ferenc Redő¹⁹⁴ (co-)edited epigraphic collections, Dénes Gabler continued the publication of the Pannonian terra sigillata finds¹⁹⁵ and participated, together with Ferenc Redő, in the publication of the sculptural finds from Roman Pannonia;¹⁹⁶ Dorottya Gáspár presented a comprehensive study on mounted Roman caskets from Pannonia, a special object type which ultimately provided extremely useful evidence for late Roman social history, religion, and art.¹⁹⁷ The first comprehensive typological study of the archaeological evidence from the Sarmatian *barbaricum* was presented by Andrea H. Vaday,¹⁹⁸ while László

¹⁹⁰ D. Gabler et al.: Gli scavi nella villa romana a San Potito. ActaArchHung 38 (1986) 41–87; D. Gabler – F. Redő: Gli scavi a San Potito di Ovindoli 1985–1986. Seconda relazione. SpecN 1988: 64–94; D. Gabler – F. Redő: Eine kaiserliche Villa in Mittelitalien bei San Potito di Ovindoli. In: Stuttgarter Kolloquium zur historischen Geographie des Altertums. Stuttgart 1993: 245–262; D. Gabler – F. Redő: Scavi nella villa romana di San Potito di Ovindoli. Rapporto 1989–1990. ActaArchHung 46 (1994) 127–193.

¹⁹¹ D. Gabler – F. Redő: Römische Forschungen in Zalalövő. ActaArchHung 33 (1981) 273–295; ActaArchHung 34 (1982) 323–341; ActaArchHung 41 (1989) 405–433; T. Bezececzky: Roman amphorae from Zalalövő. MittArchInst 12–13 (1982–1983) 153–166; D. Gabler: Die Sigillaten von Salla. ActaArchHung 41 (1989) 435–475.

¹⁹² Cf. L. Barkóczi: History of Roman Pannonia. In: A. Lengyel – T. G. Radan (eds): Archaeology of Roman Pannonia. Budapest – Lexington 1980: 85–124; Á. Salamon – I. Lengyel: Kinship interrelations in a fifth-century „Pannonian” cemetery: An archaeological and palaeobiological sketch of the population fragment buried in the Mőzs cemetery, Hungary. WA 12 (1980) 93–104; L. Bartosiewicz: Animal bones as indications of continuity at Roman provincial sites. MittArchInst 19–20 (1990–1991) 103–124; D. Gáspár: Eskü a rómaiaknál és a sacramentum militiae [The oath of the Romans and the sacramentum militiae]. Budapest 1992.

¹⁹³ L. Barkóczi – S. Soproni: Die römischen Inschriften Ungarns RIU 3. Brigetio (Fortsetzung) und die Limesstrecke am Donauknie. Budapest – Bonn 1981 (for this series see also A. Sz. Burger – F. Fülep: Die römischen Inschriften Ungarns [RIU] 4. Das Gebiet zwischen der Drau und der Limesstrecke Lussonium-Altinum. Budapest – Bonn 1984).

¹⁹⁴ F. Redő et al.: Die römischen Inschriften Ungarns RIU. Registerband zu Lieferungen 1–4. Bonn – Budapest 1991.

¹⁹⁵ D. Gabler: The dating of terra sigillata: A survey of results, perspectives and limits. MittArchInst 14 (1985) 81–92; Idem: Einige Besonderheiten der Verbreitung der Rheinzaberner Sigillaten in Pannonien. BVbl 52 (1987) 75–132; Idem: Spätantike Sigillaten in Pannonien. CarnuntumJb 1988: 9–40; D. Gabler – A. H. Vaday: Terra Sigillata im Barbaricum zwischen Pannonien und Dazien. FontArchHung. Budapest 1986.

¹⁹⁶ Z. Farkas – D. Gabler: Die Skulpturen des Stadtgebietes von Scarbantia und der Limesstrecke Ad Flexum – Arrabona. CSIR Ungarn 2. Budapest 1994; C. Ertel – S. Palágyi – F. Redő: Die Skulpturen des Stadtgebietes von Salla und Mogentiana sowie des Balaton (-Plattensee-)oberlandes in den Komitaten Zala und Veszprém. CSIR Ungarn 8. Budapest 1999.

¹⁹⁷ D. Gáspár: Römische Kästchen aus Pannonien I–II. Antaeus 15. Budapest 1985, 1986.

¹⁹⁸ A. H. Vaday: Die sarmatischen Denkmäler des Komitats Szolnok. Ein Beitrag zur Archäologie und Geschichte des sarmatischen Barbaricums. Antaeus 17–18. Budapest 1989; and see also: A. H. Vaday: Sarmatisches Gräberfeld in Törökszentmiklós-Surján Újtelep. ActaArchHung 37 (1985) 345–390; A. H. Vaday: The Dacian question in the Sarmatian Barbaricum. Antaeus 19–20 (1990–1991) 75–83; A. H. Vaday: Sarmatia and the Roman Empire. In: Probleme der Relativen und Absoluten Chronologie ab Latènezeit bis zum

Barkóczi summarized his extensive study of the glass finds from Pannonia.¹⁹⁹ Work concerning the ancient Middle Nile Region (László Török) concentrated in the period under review on the task of preparing a complete critical edition of the textual and iconographic evidence of the political and social history of the region between the 8th century BC and the 6th century AD.²⁰⁰ Török also published studies on the connections between Nubia and the external world and the chronology of imported and locally manufactured artifacts from the Nubian region,²⁰¹ essays on the history of ancient Nubian mentality,²⁰² and presented a comprehensive history of the Middle Nile Region in the Meroitic (3rd century BC–5th century AD) and post-Meroitic (5th–6th century AD) periods.²⁰³

A research project entitled „Modes of life in the early Middle Ages–socioeconomic reconstructions” investigated the Migration Age evidence from the microregional research on the Great Hungarian Plain and in Transdanubia. The energies of a team engaged in the project „Avars, Magyars, and their neighbours” were greatly taken up in the publication of the „Encyclopaedia of the early history of the territory of Hungary and its peoples” the work of which dragged on hopelessly. The Institute, which began cooperation in this latter project against its better judgement, finally ended its participation in 1992.²⁰⁴ The failure of the encyclopaedia highlighted the crisis of Hungarian proto-history and the research on the Conquest Age. The crisis manifested itself in a decrease in the numbers of Hungarian scholars engaged in this research and in the impossibility of their cooperation in complex academic ventures. The experience reinforced, however, the commitment of the Institute to coordinate its research in these particular fields with priority given to research into Hun-

Frühmittelalter. Kraków 1992: 81–87; *A. Vaday – P. Medgyesi*: Rectangular vessels in the Sarmatian Barbaricum in the Carpathian Basin. *CommArchHung* 1993: 63–89.

¹⁹⁹ *L. Barkóczi*: Pannonische Glasfunde in Ungarn. *StudArch* 9. Budapest 1988.

²⁰⁰ *L. Török*: Der meroitische Staat I. Untersuchungen und Urkunden zur Geschichte des Sudan im Altertum. Berlin 1986; see also *Idem*: Economy in the Empire of Kush: A review of the written evidence. *ZÄS* 111 (1984) 45–69. For the iconographical evidence: The Royal Crowns of Kush. A study in Middle Nile valley regalia and iconography in the 1st Millennium BC and AD. *Cambridge Monographs in African Archaeology* 18. Oxford 1987; *Idem*: The costume of the ruler in Meroe. Remarks on its origins and significance. *Archéologie du Nil Moyen* 4 (1990) 151–202. For the history of the state see also *Idem*: Ambulatory kingship and settlement history. A study on the contribution of archaeology to Meroitic history. In: Ch. Bonnet (ed.): *Études nubiennes*. Genève 1992: 111–126; *Idem*: Amasis and Ergamenes. in: U. Luft (ed.): *The Intellectual Heritage of Egypt*. Studies presented to László Kákósy. *StudAeg* 14. Budapest 1992: 555–561.

²⁰¹ *L. Török*: Meroitic religion: Three contributions in a positivistic manner. *Meroitica* 7 (1984) 156–182; *Idem*: Zur Datierung des sog. römischen Kiosks in Naqa/Sudan. *AA* 1984: 145–159; *Idem*: Meroitic architecture: Contributions to problems of chronology and style. *Meroitica* 7 (1984) 351–366; *Idem*: The historical background. Meroe North and South. In: T. Hägg (ed.): *Nubia Past and Present*. Stockholm 1987: 139–229; *Idem*: Meroitic painted pottery: Problems of chronology and style. *Beiträge zur Sudanforschung* 2 (1987) 75–106; *Idem*: Kush and the external world. *Meroitica* 10 (1989) 49–215, 365–379; *Idem*: Augustus and Meroe. *Orientalia Suecana* 38–39 (1989–1990) 171–190.

²⁰² *L. Török*: Kush and the external world. *Meroitica* 10 (1989) 49–215, 365–379; *Idem*: Iconography and mentality: Three remarks on the Kushite way of thinking. In: W. V. Davies (ed.): *Egypt and Africa*. Nubia from Prehistory to Islam. London 1991: 195–204.

²⁰³ *L. Török*: Geschichte Meroes. Ein Beitrag über die Quellenlage und den Forschungsstand. In: W. Haase – H. Temporini (eds): *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt* II.10.1. Berlin – New York 1988: 107–341; *Idem*: Late Antique Nubia. History and archaeology of the southern neighbour of Egypt in the 4th–6th century A.D. With a Preface by Sir Laurence Kirwan. *Antaeus* 16. Budapest 1988.

²⁰⁴ The articles submitted for the unfinished encyclopaedia were published in *I. Bóna – J. Cseh – M. Nagy – P. Tomka – Á. Tóth*: *Hunok-gepidák-langobardok: történeti-régészeti tézisek és címszavak* [Huns, Gepids, Langobards. Historical and archaeological theses and articles]. Szeged 1993; and *Gy. Kristó* (ed.): *Korai magyar történeti lexikon* (9–14. század) [Lexicon of early Hungarian history]. Budapest 1994.

garian proto-history and the Conquest Age as a whole. Csanád Bálint expanded the framework of his research in order to investigate the culture of the Avars in its historical context, i.e., in its connections with the peoples of the Eurasian steppe, contemporary Iran, Byzantium, China, and Europe.²⁰⁵ His comprehensive survey of the 6th-10th century archaeological evidence of the peoples of the Eurasian steppe²⁰⁶ was followed by the publication of the excavation material from an Avar settlement in Hungary²⁰⁷ and then by the study of a find complex of key importance, viz., the grave find from Üc Tepe in Azerbaidzhan.²⁰⁸ Bálint also conducted excavations in 1981–1984 at Örménykút Site 54 in order to clarify the typology and chronology of late Avar and 9th-10th century Magyar ceramics. The publication work is in progress. In the framework of another promising field project *ca.* 1600 burials from the Avar cemetery at Budakalász were excavated by Adrienne Pásztor and Tivadar Vida.

The research into Transdanubia's history in the Carolingian period received a new impetus from Béla Miklós Szőke's studies published in the 1980s. Szőke provided new points of departure by revising the chronology and provenance of various object types and he also reassessed their connections with the material culture of the regions around Carolingian Pannonia.²⁰⁹ As a result of the microregion research directed by Szőke, a new picture of the ethnic and cultural plurality of 9th century Transdanubia took shape.²¹⁰

The accent on research as concerns the period of the Hungarian Conquest and the Árpáadian Age shifted from excavation²¹¹ to the reassessment of the archaeological evidence in comparison with the historical evidence. Besides initiating a systematic treatment of the find material from the 9th-10th century commoners' cemeteries within the framework of a

²⁰⁵ Cs. Bálint: Einige Fragen des Dirhemverkehrs in Europa. *ActaArchHung* 35 (1981) 105–131; *Idem*: Über die Datierung der osteuropäischen Steppenfunde des frühen Mittelalters (Schwierigkeiten und Möglichkeiten). *MittArchInst* 14 (1985) 137–147; *Idem*: Zur Frage der byzantinischen Beziehungen im Fundmaterial Ungarns. *Archäologische Forschungen zwischen 1970 und 1984*. *MittArchInst* 14 (1985) 209–223; *Idem*: Some ethnospecific features in Central and Eastern European archaeology during the Early Middle Ages. In: S. Shennan (ed.): *Archaeological Approaches to Cultural Identity*. London 1989: 185–194.

²⁰⁶ Cs. Bálint: *Die Archäologie der Steppe. Völkerschaften zwischen Volga und Donau im 6.-10. Jahrhundert*. Wien – Köln 1989.

²⁰⁷ Cs. Bálint: *Die spätwarenzeitliche Siedlung von Eperjes, Kom. Csongrád*. VAH 4. Budapest 1991.

²⁰⁸ Cs. Bálint: Kontakte zwischen Iran, Byzanz und der Steppe. Das Grab von Üc Tepe (Sowj. Azerbajdzan) und der beschlagverzierte Gürtel im 6. und 7. Jahrhundert. In: F. Daim (ed.): *Awarenforschungen I*. Wien 1992: 309–496.

²⁰⁹ B. M. Szőke: Ein charakteristischer Gebrauchsgegenstand des ostfränkischen Grenzgebietes: das Eisenmesser mit Knochengriff. *ActaArchHung* 34 (1982) 23–39; *Idem*: Chronologischer Grundriss der Denkmäler des 9. Jahrhunderts im Karpatenbecken. *MittArchInst* 14 (1985) 161–167; *Idem*: Koraközépkori tanulmányok [Early medieval studies] I–II. *ZalaiGyűjt* 25. *Zalaezerszeg* 1986–1987: 21–36; *ZalaiGyűjt* 26. *Zalaezerszeg* 1987: 46–64; *Idem*: The question of continuity in the Carpathian Basin of the 9th century. *Antaeus* 19–20 (1990–1991) 145–157; *Idem*: Die Beziehungen zwischen dem oberen Donautal und Westungarn in der ersten Hälfte des 9. Jahrhunderts (Frauentrachtzubehör und Schmuck). In: F. Daim (ed.): *Awarenforschungen I*. Wien 1992: 841–968; B. M. Szőke – L. Vándor: 8–9. századi birituális temető Zalakomár határában [A biritual cemetery from the 8th-9th century in the fields of Zalakomár]. *ZalaiGyűjt* 18 (1983) 69–86.

²¹⁰ B. M. Szőke – K. Éry – R. Müller – L. Vándor: *Die Karolingerzeit im unteren Zalatal. Gräberfelder und Siedlungsreste von Garabonc I–II und Zalaszabar-Dezsősziget*. *Antaeus* 21. Budapest 1992. Cf. also B. M. Szőke – L. Vándor: Kísérlet egy táji egység településtörténeti rekonstrukciójára. A Kis-Balaton programot kísérő leletmentő ásatások (1980–1985) tapasztalatai [Settlement historical reconstruction of a geographical unit. The lessons of the rescue excavations of the Kis-Balaton project (1980–1985)]. *ZalaiGyűjt* 26. *Zalaezerszeg* 1987: 83–100.

²¹¹ For field work in the period cf. L. Kovács: Magyarhomorog-Kónyadomb. *RégFüz* I:39 (1986) 70–71; *RégFüz* I:40 (1987) 81–82; *RégFüz* I:41 (1988) 63; *RégFüz* I:42 (1991) 62.

„Repertory of the finds from the Age of the Conquest and the Árpadian Age”,²¹² László Kovács continued his efforts to bring researches on the history of Árpadian Age coinage nearer to the archaeological research of the period.²¹³ Miklós Takács presented a comprehensive study of a much discussed and little understood 10th-14th century ceramic cauldron type, providing a new chronology for these finds and suggesting that they reflect a semi-nomadic socioeconomic context. Further, he put forward the idea that their disappearance was brought about by changes in lifeways.²¹⁴ Elek Benkő's archaeological topography of the Keresztúr region in Transylvania²¹⁵ as well as Zsuzsa Miklós's excavations at earthworks and her investigation of small forts²¹⁶ provided important evidence in research into medieval political, social, and settlement history. László Gerevich,²¹⁷ Imre Holl,²¹⁸ and Gyula Siklósi²¹⁹ continued their research in settlement history while various find types and contexts

- ²¹² L. Kovács: Honfoglalás kori sírok Nagytarcsán I: Temető utca 5. Adatok a gombos nyakú kengyelek értékeléséhez [Burials from the Age of the Conquest at Nagytarcsa I: Temető street 5. Data to the evaluation of the stirrups with spherical neck boss]. *CommArchHung* 1985: 125–138; II: A homokbányai temető-részlet. Adatok a nyéltámaszos balták, valamint a trapéz alakú kengyelek értékeléséhez [II. The cemetery section at the sand-pit. Data to the evaluation of the axes with braced handle and the stirrups with trapezoid tread]. *CommArchHung* 1986: 93–120; *Idem*: A tímári (Szabolcs-Szatmár m.) honfoglalás kori temető-maradványok [The cemetery remains from the Age of the Conquest at Tímár (County Szabolcs)]. *CommArchHung* 1988: 125–158; *Idem*: A nagyhalász-zomborhegyi 10. századi magyar temetőrészlet [The 10th century Hungarian cemetery section at Nagyhalász-Zomborhegy]. *CommArchHung* 1989: 165–176; *Idem*: Ergänzungen zu einer wertvollen Monographie: B. M. Szőke – L. Vándor: Pusztaszentlászló Árpád-kori temetője [The Arpadian Age cemetery at Pusztaszentlászló]. *ActaArchHung* 42 (1990) 313–330; *Idem*: Bemerkungen zur Arbeit von Nebojša Stanojev: Nekropolen aus dem 10–15. Jahrhundert in Vojvodina. *ActaArchHung* 43 (1991) 399–424; *Idem*: A Móra Ferenc Múzeum néhány régi, 10–11. századi leletanyagáról [On some 10th-11th century finds in the Móra Ferenc Museum]. *MFME* 1991–1992: 37–74.
- ²¹³ L. Kovács: Über den Datierungswert der landnahmezeitlichen Münzen. *MittArchInst* 14 (1985) 177–194; *Idem*: Megjegyzések Gedai István: A magyar pénzverés kezdetei c. könyvéhez [Remarks on István Gedai's book *The beginnings of Hungarian coinage*]. *Századok* 122 (1988) 674–693; *Idem*: Münzen aus der ungarischen Landnahmezeit. Archäologische Untersuchung der arabischen, byzantinischen, westeuropäischen und römischen Münzen aus dem Karpatenbecken des 10. Jahrhunderts. *FontArchHung*. Budapest 1989; *Idem*: Régészeti jegyzetek I. László király érméinek sorrendjéhez [Archaeological notes on the sequence of the coins of László I]. *NK* 88–89 (1989–1990) 63–76; *Idem*: Salamon pénzveréséről [On Salamon's coinage]. *Századok* 125 (1992) 79–106.
- ²¹⁴ M. Takács: Die Arpadenzeitlichen Tonkessel im Karpatenbecken. *VAH* (1). Budapest 1986; and see also: *Idem*: Formschatz und exaktere Chronologie der Tongefäße des 10–14. Jahrhunderts der Kleinen Tiefebene. *ActaArchHung* 48 (1996) 137–197.
- ²¹⁵ E. Benkő: A középkori Keresztúr-szék régészeti topográfiája [Archaeological topography of the Keresztúr region in the Middle Ages]. *VAH* 5. Budapest 1992.
- ²¹⁶ Zs. Miklós: A gödöllői dombvidék kisvárai [The small forts of the Gödöllő hills]. *Aszód* 1982; *Eadem*: Einige Fragen der mittelalterlichen Siedlungsgeschichte im Spiegel der archäologischen Topographie. *MittArchInst* 14 (1985) 235–242; *Eadem*: Árpád-kori (XII–XIV századi) kisvárok Magyarországon [The small forts of the Arpadian Age (12th-14th century) in Hungary]. In: I. Fodor – L. Selmeczi: *Középkori régészetünk újabb eredményei és időszerű feladatai*. [New results and tasks of our medieval archaeology] Budapest 1986: 143–156; *Eadem*: Árpád-kori földvár, középkori templom és temető Kerepes (Kerepestarcsa)-Kálvária [Arpadian Age earthworks, and the medieval church and cemetery at Kerepes (Kerepestarcsa)-Kálvária]. *StudComit* 22 (1991) 347–370.
- ²¹⁷ Cf. L. Gerevich (ed.): *Towns in Medieval Hungary*. Budapest 1990.
- ²¹⁸ I. Holl: Négy saroktoronyos szabályos várak a középkorban [Medieval castles with four corner towers]. *ArchÉrt* 111 (1984) 194–217; *Idem*: Mittelalterliche Dorfgrundrisse in Ungarn. *MittArchInst* 14 (1985) 243–249; *Idem*: A középkori Szentmihály falu ásátása [Excavations at the medieval village of Szentmihály] I, II. *ZalaiMúz* 1 (1987) 161–177; *ZalaiMúz* 2 (1990) 189–207; *Idem*: Stadtarchäologie in Budapest und in Ungarn. In: G. Biegel (ed.): *Budapest im Mittelalter*. Braunschweig 1991: 71–94.
- ²¹⁹ Gy. Siklósi: A török kori Székesfehérvár [Székesfehérvár in the Turkish period]. In: P. Kovács (ed.): *Alba Regia liberata. Székesfehérvár* 1988: 5–20; *Idem*: Angaben zur mittelalterlichen Topographie von Székes-

were discussed by Elek Benkő²²⁰ and Imre Holl.²²¹ Settlement historical research was also started in the framework of nascent road archaeology (Miklós Takács²²²). With the work of Gyöngyi Kovács, the Institute has participated since the mid-1980s in research into the Turkish occupation.²²³ Mention must be made here of László Kovács's participation in the so-called Petőfi debate, during the course of which he contributed to the general public's understanding of the archaeologist's work by explaining the uses and current abuses of archaeological evidence.²²⁴

6. Research between 1993–1999

In the years following the change of the political system in 1989, we were repeatedly confronted with the possibility that consolidation of the HAS may result in the closing down of the Institute or its merging with some other institution.²²⁵ The repeated examinations of the Institute conducted by the Academy in the 1990s did not take into consideration any theoretical aspects of the Institute's achievements. An impartial survey of the projects and publications of the decades following the foundation of the Archaeological Research Group may, however, serve to convince the impartial observer that throughout its history the Institute silently refused to conform to political expectations and tried to define its activities in terms of the norms of international archaeology — even if the efforts to achieve ideological neutrality brought about an indifference towards all developments in archaeological thought and a technically determined, selective acceptance of certain aspects of „New Archaeology” instead of its consequent adaptation to the potentials and problems of archaeology in Hungary.²²⁶ Yet, the ambivalent or negative attitudes towards processual archaeology were not necessarily politically motivated in other countries, either.²²⁷ The Academy examiners of the Institute agreed with the thematic structure of the projects begun in the early 1980s,²²⁸

fehérvár aufgrund der Grundrisse und Karten über die Stadt. *ActaArchHung* 40 (1988) 211–250; *Idem*: A székesfehérvári korai és későbbi királyi vár és palota [The earlier and later royal castle and palace of Székesfehérvár]. In: *Castrum Bene. Várak a 13. században* [Castrum Bene. Castles in the 18th century]. Gyöngyös 1990: 104–120.

²²⁰ E. Benkő: Székelykeresztúri kályhacsempék [Glazed tiles from Székelykeresztúr]. Bucharest 1984.

²²¹ For a bibliography see notes 38, 140, 169 above.

²²² M. Takács: Falusi lakóházak és egyéb építmények a Kisalföldön a 10–16. században [Rural architecture in the Kisalföld in the 10th–16th centuries]. In: Gy. Perger – M. Cseri M. (eds): *A Kisalföld népi építészete* [Folk architecture of the Kisalföld]. Szentendre – Győr 1993: 7–53.

²²³ Cf. Gy. Kovács: Törökszentmiklós-Rózsa tér. *RégFüz* I:36 (1983) 125–126; *RégFüz* I:37 (1984) 130; *Eadem*: Török kerámia Szolnokon [Turkish pottery from Törökszentmiklós]. Szolnok 1984; *Eadem*: 16th–18th century Hungarian pottery types. *Antaeus* 19–20 (1990–1991) 169–180.

²²⁴ Cf. L. Kovács (ed.): *Nem Petőfi! Tanulmányok az MTA Természettudományi szakértő bizottsága tagjai és felkért szakértők tollából* [Not Petőfi! Studies by the members of the scientific committee of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences and invited experts]. Budapest 1992.

²²⁵ For the situation of archaeology in the early 1990s see *Bökönyi 1993*.

²²⁶ See, e.g., N. Kalicz – P. Raczky: Új-e az „újrégészet”? Megjegyzések a diffúzió, adaptáció és innováció kérdéseihöz [Is „New Archaeology” really new? Remarks on the problems of diffusion, adaptation, and innovation]. *Valóság* 77/6 (1977) 76–94; J. Makkay: The crisis of prehistoric chronology. *MittArchInst* 14 (1985) 53–70 (where the author argues from the perspective of historical and dialectical materialism); further *Idem*: Diffusionism, antidiffusionism and chronology: Some general remarks. *ActaArchHung* 37 (1985) 3–12.

²²⁷ For the complexity of the attitudes towards processual and post-processual archaeology on the one hand and neo-Marxist archaeological theories, on the other, see the papers in: I. Hodder (ed.): *Archaeological Theory in Europe. The last three decades*. London – New York 1991.

²²⁸ In 1993, the main assignments of the Institute were formulated as follows: „1. The continuation of the work on the archaeological topography of Hungary, an enterprise that it has been carrying out jointly with

primarily emphasizing, however, the importance of the projects which would prove the most problematic in the next years as a consequence of constant decreases in funding. While it was acknowledged that with its special tasks and potentials it fits organically into the context of Hungarian archaeology, the Institute was nevertheless still forced in 1997 to defend itself against the resurrecting of an ill-considered idea abandoned first in 1957, namely, that it should leave the HAS and be integrated as an „independent research unit” into the Hungarian National Museum.

In reality, the repeated acknowledgement of the Institute’s significance remained a rhetorical phrase since the examination of archaeological research remained limited to the Institute instead of being extended to all institutions where archaeological work is done. The whole of archaeological research in Hungary has remained unsurveyed and when the Institute fought for its survival, it was not in terms of a competition of quality. While the generally useful potentials of its interdisciplinary staff and equipment were readily acknowledged, little, if any, attention at all was paid by the successive examining committees to the fact that the Institute had succeeded in maintaining problem-oriented archaeological research projects in spite of suffocating financial restrictions. They wanted to see the Institute only as a sort of record office and information service based on the work carried out in archaeological topography.

In retrospect, it seems clear that while Institute policy avoided theoretical standpoints, did not develop a theoretical/practical dichotomy in its projects, and did not encourage any research into archaeological theory within its walls, its work was nevertheless not „independent” from theory. Besides an adherence to the traditional perspectives of typochronology, prehistoric research was characterized to a considerable extent by the interdisciplinarity of processual archaeology. In turn, research on the archaeology of historical periods were, and remain under the influence of the positivism of „historical archaeology” — as is the case in most European countries.²²⁹ As to interdisciplinarity, new developments within and outside the Institute, especially concerning archaeometry and environmental archaeology, are clearly reflected in Erzsébet Jerem’s candidate’s thesis defended in 1995,²³⁰ while the impact of cognitive archaeology,²³¹ a new direction aiming at developing approaches to the reconstruction of the cognitive relationship of ancient communities with their environment, is prevalent in some recent works presented by prehistorians at the Institute who are also interested in the history of religion.

Following the retirement of Sándor Bökönyi, Csanád Bálint was appointed Director of the Institute on January 1, 1994. The team structure and the current research projects were maintained, while the structure of the Institute was altered insofar as three departments were formed, viz., the Research Department, the Topographical Department and Archives, and the Department for Research Service. The former two departments united the majority of the academic staff (up to senior research fellows), while the third includes the library and the laboratories for graphic recording, photography, and conservation and restoration. By

archaeologists from the relevant county museums; 2. Carrying out and organizing interdisciplinary research; 3. Working on large-scale regional settlement projects in a strong interdisciplinary cooperative effort, with the object of reconstructing historical and environmental development in specific areas.” *Bökönyi 1993*: 143 f.

²²⁹ Cf. *I. Hodder*: *Theory and Practice in Archaeology*. London – New York 1995: 1 ff., 117.

²³⁰ *E. Jerem*: *Környezetregészeti és archaeometriai módszerek alkalmazása a településtörténeti kutatásban* [The application of the methods of environmental archaeology and archaeometry in settlement historical research]. Unpubl. manuscript, Budapest 1995.

²³¹ Cf. *C. Renfrew et al.*: *What is cognitive archaeology?* *Cambridge Archaeological Journal* 3 (1993) 247–270; *C. Renfrew – E. B. W. Zubrow (eds)*: *The Ancient Mind. Elements of Cognitive Archaeology*. Cambridge 1994 (with the earlier literature).

the mid-1990s, even securing basic funding became problematic. While the financial situation of the Institute improved subsequently as a consequence of the consolidation of the HAS, a situation seems to have evolved in which it is not possible to fund any research project from the Institute's own budget. Projects can exclusively be funded by competition. The flexibility of teams formed for projects funded in this way proved effective in the case of work that may be concluded within shorter periods of time (1–4 years). The ending of budgetary funding has had disastrous consequences for long-term work planned over several decades such as especially the archaeological topography. Over the course of the last six years, one single MRT volume could be completed and published,²³² and the preparation of further volumes²³³ slowed down considerably, the more so that the museums participating in the work of the topography are themselves in a critical financial situation. The manner in which the work of the topography will be continued after 38 years will depend first of all on the revision of the principles followed so far, especially as to the postponement of settlement historical syntheses. Further changes in the working methods and the structure of the volumes may be necessitated by the planned cooperation with the Institute of National Heritage founded in 1998. The digitalization of the data material of the MRT volumes and the records kept in the Archives of the Institute is continued as it is of central importance for the working connections between the Institute and other archaeological institutions.

Interdisciplinary work in the Institute, the development of the laboratory equipment, and working connections with specialists in scientific institutions and laboratories are similarly impeded by the limitations of funding. At present, the permanent interdisciplinary staff consists of one single scientist, physical anthropologist Balázs Gusztáv Mende.

Apart from the work of the MRT, research is in course in four major thematic groups, viz., the prehistory of the Carpathian Basin, the interrelationships between the Roman Empire and its peripheries, Avars, Magyars, and their neighbours, archaeology of medieval Hungary.²³⁴ The individual projects within the individual thematic groups do not rely to the same extent on actual archaeological fieldwork. Yet, the decision made by the Institute, to participate in road archaeology, has brought about remarkable methodological developments in all of them. With the impossibility of large-scale problem-oriented excavations, which would constitute under more optimal circumstances the central element of the research strategy of an archaeological research institute, the archaeologists at the Institute — like many of their colleagues in other countries²³⁵ — try to pose the same questions in the course of rescue excavations which they would ask at deliberately selected excavation spots. The possibilities inherent in the combined traditional and numerical²³⁶ analysis of sites excavated after intense preliminary field surveys within the framework of the rescue campaign necessitated by the construction of the M3 highway are demonstrated by a volume published

²³² *D. Jankovich-Bésán – P. Medgyesi – E. Nikolin – I. Szatmári – I. Torma: Békés megye régészeti topográfiája. IV/3. Békés és Békéscsaba környéke* [Archaeological topography of County Békés. Békés and the environs of Békéscsaba]. MRT 10. Budapest 1998.

²³³ *County Békés: Gyula and its environs; County Fejér: Székesfehérvár and its environs; The district of Bicske; County Pest: The districts of Aszód and Gödöllő; The district of Nagykáta; County Szolnok: The district of Künszentmárton; County Tolna: The district of Szekszárd; County Zala: The district of Nagykanizsa; The environs of Zalaegerszeg.*

²³⁴ The latter theme also includes the archaeology of Hungary under Turkish rule.

²³⁵ Cf., e.g., *E. Neustupny: Czechoslovakia: The last three years. Antiquity* 67 (1993) 129–134 132.

²³⁶ Cf. *A. Vaday: Metrikai, statisztikai és proxemikai analízis a telepkutatásban* [Metrical, statistical, and proximity analyses in settlement studies]. in: *Múltunk jövője. Future of Our Past. Budapest 1997: 40–49.*

by Andrea Vaday, Eszter Bánffy, et al. in 1999.²³⁷ Their analysis of the Neolithic, Bronze Age, Sarmatian, and Avar sites excavated at Kompolt summarizes the results from the first of the Institute's road archaeological undertakings.²³⁸

In cooperation with the Museum of the city of Graz and within the framework of micro-regional research in the Transdanubian Kerka Valley, excavations were conducted by Eszter Bánffy at Szentgyörgyvölgy-Pityerdomb — the first site where Transdanubian Linear Pottery and the Starcevo Culture were shown to be contemporaneous —, and by Mária Bondár at Zalabaksa at a building of the Copper Age Balaton-Lasinja Culture. In County Pest, the excavation of a Bronze Age tell settlement was recently begun by Gabriella Kulcsár. The changes in the orientation of prehistoric archaeology in the Institute are marked by the prominence of methodological questions (Sándor Bökönyi, Erzsébet Jerem)²³⁹ and settlement historical studies (Mária Bondár, Gabriella Kulcsár)²⁴⁰ as well as by an increasing interest towards the evidence for prehistoric cults (Eszter Bánffy, Mária Bondár, Erzsébet Jerem, Nándor Kalicz, István Zalai-Gaál).²⁴¹

²³⁷ *A. Vaday – E. Bánffy – L. Bartosiewicz – K. T. Biró – F. Gogáltan – F. Horváth – A. Nagy*: Kompolt-Kisté. Újkőkori, bronzkori és szarmata és avar lelőhely. Leletmentő ásatás az M3-as autópálya nyomvonalán [Kompolt-Kisté. Neolithic, Bronze Age, Sarmatian, and Avar sites. Rescue excavations along the track of highway M3]. Eger 1999.—For the whole undertaking see *P. Raczky – T. Kovács – A. Anders* (eds): Utak a múltba. Az M3-as autópálya régészeti leletmentései. Katalógus [Roads into the past. The archaeological rescue works at highway M3. A catalogue]. Budapest 1997.

²³⁸ Highway M1: excavations directed at Ménfőcsanak by Erzsébet Jerem, Gabriella Némethy, Eszter Szőnyi, Miklós Takács, Andrea Vaday, cf. *A. Vaday – T. Grynaeus*: Dendrochronological study of Roman wells found during the rescue excavations of Ménfőcsanak 83 Road. In: International Conference on Informatics. Budapest 1996: 115–123; *M. Takács*: Honfoglalás- és kora Árpád-kori telepeltárások az M1 autópálya nyugat-magyarországi szakaszán [The excavation of settlements from the Age of Conquest and the Arpadian Age along the West Hungarian section of highway M1. In: M. Wolf – L. Révész (eds): A magyar honfoglalás korának régészeti emlékei [Archaeological monuments of the Age of the Magyar Conquest]. Miskolc 1996: 197–217.—Highway M3, excavations directed by Dénes Jankovich-Bésán and Andrea Vaday at sites Kompolt; Nyáregyháza Road 405.

²³⁹ *S. Bökönyi*: The possibilities of a cooperation between archaeology and zoology. *Bolletino di paleontologia italiana* 83 (1992) 391–401; *E. Jerem – M. Pattantyús-Á. – A. Varga*: Application of multiple archaeometrical methods in prospecting archaeological sites. In: *Archaeometry '90*. Basel 1990: 729–738; *E. Jerem – P. Somogyi*: Zur statistischen Auswertung von Keramik aus Siedlungsobjekten. *ActaArchHung* 44 (1992) 161–192; *E. Jerem – Zs. Kiss – A. G. Pattantyús – A. Varga*: The combined use of archaeometric methods preceding the excavation of archaeological sites. In: *S. Bökönyi* (ed.): Cultural and Landscape Changes in South-East Hungary I. Reports on the Gyomaendrőd Project. *Archaeolingua* 1. Budapest 1992: 61–98; *E. Jerem – Gy. Csáki – F. Redő*: Data Recording and GIS application in landscape and Intra-Site Analysis: Case-studies in progress in the Archaeological Institute of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences. In: *G. Lock – Z. Stančić* (eds): *Archaeology and Geographical Information Systems: A European perspective*. London 1995: 85–99.

²⁴⁰ *M. Bondár – E. D. Matúz – J. J. Szabó*: Rézkori és bronzkori településnyomok Battonya határában [Traces of Copper Age and Bronze Age settlements in the fields of Battonya]. *MFMÉ StudArch* 4 (1998) 7–31; *G. Kulcsár*: The distribution of the Makó culture in South-East Hungary. In: *H. Cingudean – F. Gogáltan* (eds): The Early and Middle Bronze Age in the Carpathian Basin. *Bibliotheca Musei Apulensis* 8 Alba Iulia 1998: 31–53; *Eadem*: Adatok a Dél-Alföld korabronzkori történetéhez [Data to the history of the South Hungarian Plain in the Bronze Age]. In: *P. Havassy* (ed.): *Látták Trója kapuit. Bronzkori leletek a Közép-Tisza vidékéről* [They saw the doors of Troy. Bronze Age finds from the Middle Tisza region]. Gyula 1997: 13–56.

²⁴¹ *E. Bánffy*: Anthropomorphic Figurines in Cult Corners of Neolithic and Chalcolithic Houses. In: *La statuaría antropomorfa en Europa dal neolitico alla romanizzazione*. La Sezia 1994: 73–84; *Eadem*: Cult Objects of the Neolithic Lengyel Culture. Connections and interpretation. *Archaeolingua* Ser.Min. 7. Budapest 1997; *Eadem*: The origin of an imaginery animal figure type in the Lengyel culture. In: *Anreiter – Bartosiewicz et al.* 1998: 55–64; *M. Bondár*: Kora bronzkori kocsimodell Börzöncéről [An early Bronze Age cart model from Börzönce]. *ZalaiMúz* 4 (1992) 113–127; *E. Jerem*: Iron Age horse burial at Sopron-Krautacker.

Efforts were also made at the publication of so far unpublished sites and assemblages (Nándor Kalicz, István Zalai-Gaál).²⁴² Palaeobotanical analyses were carried out mainly in connection with prehistoric sites (Ferenc Gyulai).²⁴³

Excavations at Roman period sites were directed by Dénes Gabler at the site Sárvár-Végh malom in Western Hungary²⁴⁴ and by Dénes Gabler and Ferenc Redő at San Potito di Ovindoli in Italy.²⁴⁵ The scope of research concerning Roman frontiers, the Romanization of the native population in the Pannonian area, and material culture — especially *terra sigillata* —, further Roman numismatics²⁴⁶ and onomastics,²⁴⁷ the settlement history of the Sarmatian *barbaricum*²⁴⁸ and the archaeological evidence of early Christianity in Pannonia²⁴⁹ was determined by projects started before 1993.²⁵⁰ The seemingly independent projects all contribute, however, to the investigation of the connections between provinces in the Roman Empire and at the peripheries of the Empire.

The analytic catalogues of the collections of Roman glass (László Barkóczi),²⁵¹ Hellenistic Egyptian terracotta, and Egyptian Late Antique art (László Török)²⁵² in the Budapest

In: *Anreiter – Bartosiewicz et al. 1998*: 319–334; *N. Kalicz*: Figürliche Kunst und bemalte Keramik aus dem Neolithikum Westungarns. Budapest 1998; *I. Zalai-Gaál*: Neufunde der neolithischen anthropomorphen Idolplastik im südlichen Transdanubien. *WMMÉ* 19 (1996) 115–190.

²⁴² *N. Kalicz – R. Schreiber*: Bronzkori urnatemető Szigetszentmiklós határában [Bronze Age urn cemetery in the fields of Szigetszentmiklós]. Ráckeve 1995; *I. Zalai-Gaál*: Die Kupferfunde im südlichen Transdanubien. *ActaArchHung* 48 (1996) 1–34.

²⁴³ *F. Gyulai*: Későbronzkori magleletek Budaújlakról [Late Copper Age seed finds from Budaújlak]. *BudRég* 32 (1998) 105–123; *Idem*: The study of organic remains from the Celtic Period site of Keszthely-Fenekpuszta. In: *Anreiter – Bartosiewicz et al. 1998*: 275–285.

²⁴⁴ *D. Gabler*: Die römische Strassenstation von Sárvár-Végh malom und ihre Vorgängerbauten aus dem 1. Jh. n. Chr. *CarnuntumJb* 1997: 23–82.

²⁴⁵ For the earlier seasons cf. note 190 above and see *D. Gabler – F. Redő*: Animal representations on the mosaic pavements of a Roman villa at San Potito di Ovindoli. In: *Anreiter – Bartosiewicz et al. 1998*: 275–285.

²⁴⁶ *F. Redő* (ed.): Die Fundmünzen der römischen Zeit in Ungarn III. Komitat Komárom-Esztergom. Zsgt. von V. Lányi, F. Redő und M. Torbágyi. Berlin – Budapest 1999.

²⁴⁷ Based on András Mócsy's unfinished work, *F. Redő – B. Lőrincz*: *Onomasticon Provinciarum Europae Latinarum I. Aba-Bysanus*. Budapest 1994.

²⁴⁸ Cf. *A. Vaday*: Atipikus szarmata telepjelenség Kompolt-Kistéri tanya 15. leldhelyén [An atypical Sarmatian settlement at Site 15, Kompolt-Kistéri tanya]. *Agria* 33 (1997) 77–107; *Eadem*: Kereskedelem és gazdasági kapcsolatok a szarmaták és a rómaiak között [Trade and economic connections between the Sarmatians and the Romans]. In: *Jazigok, roxolánok, alánok. Szarmaták az Alföldön* [Jazygs, Roxolans, Alans. Sarmatians in the Great (Hungarian) Plain]. Gyula 1998: 118–143.

²⁴⁹ Cf. *D. Gáspár*: Gondolatok a pannóniai ókereszténységről [On early Christianity in Pannonia]. *Egyháztörténeti Vázlatok* 1993: 5–21.

²⁵⁰ *D. Gabler*: Die Siedlungen der Urbevölkerung Unterpannoniens in der frühromischen Zeit. In: J. Tejral et al. (eds): *Kelten, Germanen, Römer im Mitteldonauebiet vom Ausklang der La Tène-Zivilisation bis zum 2. Jahrhundert*. Brno – Nitra 1995: 63–81; *Idem*: Contributi per la valutazione dell'importanza della colonizzazione norditalica nella romanizzazione della Pannonia. In: S. G. Chiesa – E. Arslan (eds): *Optima Via*. Cremona 1998: 293–300; *Idem*: Die Bildstempel von Westendorf. Helenius und Onniorix. *BVbl* 58 (1994) 185–270; *Idem*: The Flavian *limes* in the Danube-Bend (Eastern Pannonia). *CommArchHung* 1999: 75–86; *D. Gabler – F. Horváth*: A szakályi terra sigillaták és helyük a bennszülött telep kerámiaspektrumában [The *terra sigillata* finds from Szakály and their place in the ceramic complex of the native settlement]. *WMMÉ* 19 (1996) 115–190.

²⁵¹ *L. Barkóczi*: *Antike Gläser*. *Monumenta antiquitatis extra fines Hungariae reperta* 5. Roma 1996.

²⁵² *L. Török*: *Coptic Antiquities I*. *Monumenta antiquitatis extra fines Hungariae reperta* 2. Roma 1993; *Idem*: *Coptic Antiquities II*. *Monumenta antiquitatis extra fines Hungariae reperta* 3. Roma 1993; *Idem*: *Egyptian Terracottas of the Hellenistic and Roman Periods*. *Monumenta antiquitatis extra fines Hungariae reperta* 4. Roma 1995; *Idem*: *The Hunting Centaur*. A monument of Egyptian Hellenism from the fourth century AD in the Museum of Fine Arts, Budapest. Budapest 1998.

Museum of Fine Arts were published by fellows of the Institute within the framework of cooperation with the Museum. The Institute also continued to participate in the unfolding Nubian studies of the 1990s. In its formative period, Nubian studies badly lacked critical editions of the hieroglyphic and Demotic Egyptian, Greek, Latin, Meroitic, and Coptic texts relating to the history of the ancient Middle Nile Region, without which no „national” historiography of the Sudan can be developed, either. The three volumes of *Fontes Historiae Nubiorum*, published by an international team under the initiative and with the participation of László Török between 1994 and 1998, present the text and English translation of all published source texts with philological and historical commentaries.²⁵³ In the period under review Török summarized his previous research on the governmental structure of the ancient state formations in the Middle Nile Valley in a series of monographs,²⁵⁴ published the British excavations carried out before World War I at Meroe City, one of the capitals of ancient Nubia,²⁵⁵ and published a handbook of the history and archaeology of the Middle Nile Region between the 11th century BC and the AD 5th century.²⁵⁶

Besides rescue excavations in conjunction with the construction of highways, field work was carried out at Migration Age (late Avar cemetery at Kehida, Béla Miklós Szőke and László Vándor), Árpáadian Age (settlement at Lébény-Billedomb, Miklós Takács), and later medieval sites (Vác, Decs-Ete, Zsuzsa Miklós; Bajcsa, Gyöngyi Kovács-László Vándor, Csókakő, Gyöngyi Kovács-Gábor Hatházi). Csanád Bálint's work in this period includes the investigation of the Iranian, Byzantine, and European connections of Avar history and culture,²⁵⁷ the reassessment of the Nagyszentmiklós treasure,²⁵⁸ and the cultural context of the archaeological evidence for the 9th-10th century Magyars.²⁵⁹ The collection of his essays

²⁵³ T. Eide – T. Hägg – R. H. Pierce – L. Török: *Fontes Historiae Nubiorum*. Textual sources for the history of the Middle Nile Region between the eighth century BC and the sixth century AD I. From the eighth to the mid-fifth century BC. Bergen 1994; II. From the mid-fifth to the first century BC. Bergen 1996; III. From the first to the sixth century AD. Bergen 1998.

²⁵⁴ L. Török: *The Birth of an Ancient African Kingdom*. Kush and her myth of the state in the first Millennium BC (CRIPEL Suppl. 4). Lille 1995; *Idem*: *Kush: An African state in the first Millennium BC*. PBA 87 (1995) 1–38; *Idem*: *The end of Meroe*. In: D. A. Welsby (ed.): *Recent Research in Kushite History and Archaeology*. Proceedings of the 8th International Conference for Meroitic Studies. London 1999: 133–156; *Idem*: *The origin of the Napatan State: The long chronology of the El Kurru cemetery*. *Meroitica* 15 (1999) 149–159; *Idem*: *On the foundations of kingship ideology in the Empire of Kush*. *ibid.* 273–287.

²⁵⁵ L. Török: *Meroe City An ancient African capital*. John Garstang's excavations in the Sudan I–II. With contributions by I. Hofmann and I. Nagy. *Egypt Exploration Society Occasional Publications* 12. London 1997.

²⁵⁶ L. Török: *The Kingdom of Kush*. Handbook of the Napatan-Meroitic civilization. *Handbuch der Orientalistik* 31. Leiden – New York – Köln 1997.

²⁵⁷ Cs. Bálint: *Probleme der archäologischen Forschung zur awarischen Landnahme*. *Vorträge und Forschungen* 41 (1993) 195–273; *Vvedenie v arheologiyu avar*. In: R. D. Goldina (ed.): *Tipologiya i datirovka arheologicheskikh materialov Vostochnoj Evropi*. Izevsk 1995: 38–87; *Idem*: *Methodologische Probleme der archäologischen Untersuchung der frühmittelalterlichen Gesellschaftsstrukturen bei den Steppenvölkern*. In: *The Prehistory of Asia and Oceania, Colloquium XXXI*. Forli 1996: 115–120; *Idem*: *Zur Geschichte und Archäologie der osteuropäischen Reiterhirten im Frühmittelalter*. In: *Reitervölker aus dem Osten. Hunnen & Awaren*. Burgenländische Landausstellung Schloss Halbturn. Eisenstadt 1996: 202–204; *Idem*: *Die Awaren und der Osten aus historischer Sicht*. *ibid.* 229–230.

²⁵⁸ Cf. Cs. Bálint: *Nagyszentmiklósi kincs* [The Nagyszentmiklós treasure]. In: Gy. Kristó (ed.): *Korai magyar történeti lexikon (9–14. század)* [Lexicon of early Hungarian history (9th-14th century)]. Budapest 1994: 478–479; *Idem*: *Il tesoro di Nagyszentmiklós*. In: G. C. Menis (ed.): *Gli Avari*. Friuli 1995: 201–207; *Idem*: *Új könyv a nagyszentmiklósi kincsről* [A new book on the Nagyszentmiklós treasure]. *Századok* 32 (1998) 231–256.

²⁵⁹ Cs. Bálint: *A 9. századi magyarság régészeti hagyatéka* [The archaeological legacy of the 9th century Magyars]. In: L. Kovács (ed.): *Honfoglalás és régészet* [(Hungarian) Conquest and archaeology]. Budapest 1994:

on the Avar period²⁶⁰ made significant contributions to Avar period archaeology. Tivadar Vida's 1999 typology of Avar pottery²⁶¹ — to date the most comprehensive assessment of the ceramic production of the Avars — has proven to be an important research tool. Vida also studies the cultural context of other Avar period assemblages and artefact types.²⁶² In collaboration with the Hungarian National Museum, the Institute is engaged in the edition of the corpus of Avar period finds from Hungary (Tivadar Vida) and in the publication of earlier, unpublished, fieldwork at Avar period cemetery sites (Gábor Fancsalszky).²⁶³

The field work directed by Béla Miklós Szőke at Zalavár (in cooperation with the Hungarian National Museum) set as an aim the complete excavation of the most important Carolingian centre in Transdanubia, the seat of Pribina and Kocel. The investigation of the settlement fits into the series of complex investigations of political-cultural centres initiated by László Gerevich. The finds from the first seasons have considerably modified current views on ecclesiastic institutions, settlement structure, and monumental buildings in 9th century Zalavár. Zalavár is a key site for early Árpadian Age settlement history as well and there are good reasons to believe that its excavation will change our picture of the ethnic and cultural history of 9th-11th century Transdanubia as well as the current assessment of its connections with neighbouring regions.²⁶⁴

The important large-scale project of the „Repertory of the finds from the Age of the Conquest and the Árpadian Age” (László Kovács, István Paszternák, Miklós Takács) evolved in the mid-1990s. The work on ongoing projects „Avars, Magyars, and their neighbours” and the „Hungarian Middle

-
- 41–44; *Idem*: Die landnehmenden Ungarn und Europa. In: *Congressus Octavus Internationalis Fenno-Ugristarum I.* Jyväskylä 1995: 9–16; *Idem*: A kora-középkori kelet-európai steppe régészete és a 9–10. századi magyarok [The archaeology of the early medieval East European steppelands and the 9th-10th century Magyars]. *MTud* 1996: 937–947; *Idem*: Két könyv Magna Moravia délre való lokalizálása érdekében [Two books on the southern localization of Magna Moravia]. *Századok* 130 (1996) 992–999; *Idem*: Hungarian contribution to the archaeology of Central and Southeastern Europe. *Hungarian Studies* 12 (1997) 17–26; *Idem*: A honfoglaló magyarok és Európa [The conquering Hungarians and Europe]. In: J. Makkay – J. Kobály (eds): *Honfoglalás és Árpád-kor* [The Age of the Conquest and the Árpáds]. Ungvár 1997: 5–38.
- ²⁶⁰ *Cs. Bálint*: Kelet, a korai avarok és Bizánc kapcsolatai (Régészeti tanulmányok) [Connections between the Orient, the early Avars, and Byzantium (archaeological studies)]. Szeged 1995.
- ²⁶¹ *T. Vida*: Die awarenzeitliche Keramik I. VAH 8. Berlin – Budapest 1999.
- ²⁶² *T. Vida*: Frühmittelalterliche scheiben- und kugelförmige Amulettkapseln zwischen Kaukasus, Kastilien und Picardie. *BRGK* 76 (1995) 219–290.
- ²⁶³ *G. Fancsalszky*: Három avar kori temető Tiszavasváriban [Three Avar period cemeteries at Tiszavasvári]. *CommArchHung* 1999: 107–141.
- ²⁶⁴ *Cf. B. M. Szőke*: Karoling-kori szolgálónépi temetkezések Mosaburg/Zalavár vonzáskörzetében. Garabonc-Újfalu I–II [Burials of Carolingian auxiliaries in the region of Mosaburg/Zalavár. Garabonc-Újfalu I–II]. *ZalaiMúz* 5 (1994) 251–317; *Idem*: Avarokor, az avarokor vége, karoling-kor [The Avar period, the end of the Avar period, the Carolingian age]. In: L. Költő – L. Vándor (eds): *Évezredek üzenete a láp világból* (Régészeti kutatások a Kis-Balaton területén 1979–1992) [Millennia's message from the marshlands (archaeological researches in the Kis-Balaton region 1979–1992)]. Kaposvár – Zalaegerszeg 1996: 104–113, 123–135; *Idem*: Plaga orientalis. A Kárpát-medence a honfoglalás előtti évszázadban [Plaga orientalis. The Carpathian Basin in the century before the (Hungarian) Conquest]. In: L. Veszprémy (ed.): *Honfoglaló ősaink* [Our conquering ancestors]. Budapest 1996: 11–44; *Idem*: A Kerka völgye a Krisztus utáni első évezredben. Csesztreg és környékének településtörténeti kérdései a római megszállástól a magyar államalapításig [The Kerka Valley in the first millennium AD. Settlement historical questions of Csesztreg and its environs from the Roman occupation to the foundation of the Hungarian state]. In: L. Vándor (ed.): *Fejezetek Csesztreg történetéből* [Chapters from the History of Csesztreg]. Zalaegerszeg 1996: 21–32; *Idem*: A korai középkor hagyatéka a Dunántúlon [The (archaeological) legacy of the early Middle Ages in Transdanubia]. *ArsHung* 26 (1998) 257–319.—*Cf. also Á. Cs. Sós – Á. Salamon*: Cemeteries of the Early Middle Ages (6th-9th c.) at Pókaszeptk. Ed. by B. M. Szőke. Budapest 1995.

Ages" included a complex archaeological-demographic study of cemeteries from the Age of the Conquest (László Kovács and Imre Lengyel²⁶⁵), a comprehensive interpretation of Árpadian Age coinage (László Kovács²⁶⁶), studies on Árpadian Age and later medieval settlement history, material culture, and arts (Elek Benkő,²⁶⁷ Imre Holl,²⁶⁸ Dénes Jankovich-Bésán,²⁶⁹ Gyöngyi Kovács,²⁷⁰ László Kovács,²⁷¹ Zsuzsa Miklós,²⁷² Gyula Siklósi,²⁷³ Miklós Takács,²⁷⁴ Tivadar

- ²⁶⁵ L. Kovács: Das früharpadenzeitliche Gräberfeld von Szabolcs. Mit einem Beitrag von Imre Lengyel. VAH 6. Budapest 1994; and see also *Idem*: Waffenwechsel vom Säbel zum Schwert. Zur Datierung der ungarischen Gräber des 10–11. Jahrhunderts mit zweischneidigem Schwert. Fasc. Arch. Hist. (Łódź) 7 (1993) 45–60; *Idem*: István Dienes' grösste Ausgrabung in Magyarhomorog-Könyadomb. ActaArchHung 49 (1997) 363–384.
- ²⁶⁶ L. Kovács: A LANCEA REGIS a király kezében [The LANCEA REGIS in the king's hand]. CommArchHung 1996: 165–180; *Idem*: A kora Árpád-kori pénzüjtásról [On the coinage reform in the early Arpadian Age]. In: I. Krankovics (ed.): A numizmatika és a társtudományok [Numismatics and the related sciences]. Debrecen 1996; *Idem*: Die Variante des Denars vom Typ LANCEA REGIS in einem mährischen Schatzfund. ActaArchHung 48 (1996) 197–208; *Idem*: 12. századi anoním dénárak [Anonymous denars from the 12th century]. Századok 131 (1997) 75–104; *Idem*: A kora Árpád-kori magyar pénzverésről. Érmetani és régészeti tanulmányok a Kárpát-medence I. (Szent István és II. (Vak) Béla közötti időszakának (1000–1141) érméiről [On early Arpadian Age coinage. Numismatical and archaeological studies on the coins from the Carpathian Basin of the period between István I (the Saint) and Béla II (the Blind) (1000–1141)]. VAH 7. Budapest 1997.
- ²⁶⁷ E. Benkő: A székelyek betelepülése Erdélybe [The settlement of the Székelys in Transylvania]. In: Gy. Dávid (ed.) Történelmünk a Duna-Medencében [Our History in the Danube Basin]. Kolozsvár – Temesvár 1998: 50–65; E. Benkő – I. Demeter – A. Székely: Középkori mezőváros a Székelyföldön [A medieval market-town in the Székelyföld (Eastern Transylvania)]. Kolozsvár 1997; E. Benkő – T. Csikány et al.: Az aradi vár története [History of the Fortress of Arad]. Budapest 1998.
- ²⁶⁸ I. Holl: Die mittelalterliche Stadt Kőszeg. ActaArchHung 49 (1997) 95–101.
- ²⁶⁹ D. Jankovich-Bésán: Adatok a Körös-vidék középkori vízrajzához és a vizek hasznosításához [Data to the medieval hydrography and water uses of the Körös region]. BMMK 16 (1996) 305–349.
- ²⁷⁰ G. Hatházi – Gy. Kovács: A post-medieval assemblage from Vál. ActaArchHung 49 (1997) 195–225.
- ²⁷¹ L. Kovács: Árpád-kori templom és temető a karcagi Kápolnás-halmon [Arpadian Age church and churchyard on the Kápolnás Hill at Karcag]. Szolnok 1998.
- ²⁷² Zs. Miklós: Vác középkori pincéi [The medieval cellars of Vác]. Váci könyvek 9. Vác 1996; *Eadem*: Falvak, várak, kolostorok a Dél-Börzsönyben [Villages, castles, and monasteries in the Southern Börzsöny]. Váci könyvek 8. Vác 1997; *Eadem*: Die Holzfunde aus dem Brunnen des spätmittelalterlichen Paulinerklosters von Márianosztra-Toronyalja. ActaArchHung 49 (1997) 103–138; *Eadem*: A Galga-völgyi földvárkutatás újabb eredményei [Newer results of the research of earthworks in the Galga Valley]. In: Egy múzeum szolgálatában. Negyven éves az aszódi Petőfi Múzeum. Tanulmányok Asztalos István tiszteletére [In the service of a museum. Forty years of the Petőfi Museum at Aszód. Studies in honor of István Asztalos]. Aszód 1998: 93–111.
- ²⁷³ Gy. Siklósi: Székesfehérvár. In: Medium Regni. Középkori magyar királyi székhelyek [Medium Regni. Hungarian royal seats of the Middle Ages]. Budapest 1996: 43–64; *Idem*: Die Siedlungsgeschichte der Stadt Székesfehérvár (Stuhlweissenburg) von der Regierungszeit der Arpadenkönige bis zum Ende der Türkenherrschaft. ActaArchHung 48 (1996) 428–435.
- ²⁷⁴ M. Takács: Honfoglalás- és kora Árpád-kori telepfeltárások az M1 autópálya nyugat-magyarországi szakaszán [Excavation of Conquest Age and early Arpadian Age settlements along the West Hungarian section of highway M1]. In: M. Wolf – L. Révész (eds): A magyar honfoglalás korának régészeti emlékei [Archaeological monuments of the Age of the Magyar conquest]. Miskolc 1996: 197–217; *Idem*: Formschatz und exaktere Chronologie der Tongefässe des 10–14. Jahrhunderts der Kleinen Tiefebene. ActaArchHung 48 (1996) 137–197; *Idem*: A 10. századi magyar-szláv viszonyról és a honfoglaló magyarok életmódjáról (Néhány megjegyzés Kristó Gyula: A magyar állam megszületése. Szeged 1995 c. könyvéről) [On the Hungarian-Slavic relationship in the 10th century and on the way of life of the conquering Magyars (Some remarks on Gyula Kristó: The genesis of the Hungarian state. Szeged 1995)]. Századok 131 (1997) 168–215; *Idem*: Ornamentale Beziehungen zwischen der Steinmetzkunst von Ungarn und Dalmatien im XI.

Vida,²⁷⁵ and Csilla Zatykó²⁷⁶). László Kovács edited the material of the conferences organized by the HAS in conjunction with the 1100th anniversary of the Magyar Conquest.²⁷⁷

7. *The collections*

The excavations of the Institute as well as the works of the archaeological topography necessitated the establishment of data archives, the use of which quickly outgrew the limits of the Institute's projects and acquired a nation-wide character. The Archives store, besides the documentation of the Institute's excavations and the graphic and photographic documents prepared in connection with the research carried out by the Institute's fellows, a constantly expanded archaeological and historical bibliography concerning archaeological sites and finds from Hungary (at present over 30,000 titles), and inventory cards for archaeological sites and finds from Hungary (at present over 230,000 cards). The latter inventory is indexed according to sites (at present over 82,000 site index cards). The digitalization of all these collections is in progress. Besides the above-mentioned collections, the Archives furthermore keep over 300,000 inventory records based on the inventory books from eighteen museums in seven counties. The Archives provide an information service for the national database of archaeological sites which is under preparation in the Ministry of National Cultural Heritage. The data material contained in the MRT volumes published to date, including the cartographic data, is being digitalized.

In the years following its foundation, the library of the Archaeological Research Group could collect little more than the archaeological periodicals published in Hungary. The HAS acknowledged, however, the vital importance of a reference library and supported its development. The composition of the library collections in terms of books and monographs was primarily determined by the interests of subsequent research projects, while the development of a more comprehensive collection of periodicals and series was rendered possible by publication exchanges using the periodical of the Institute and publications edited in the Institute. These exchanges were maintained with over 200 institutions in Hungary and abroad. In 1984, the Institute was able to buy a considerable part of László Castiglione's library and in the 1990s, with financial aid from the HAS, it acquired the libraries of Sándor Bökönyi and János Makkay. The library of László Gerevich was donated by his heirs to the Institute and Gerevich's rich collection of manuscripts and documents entered the Archives. At present, the library possesses over 61,000 books, periodicals, and small pamphlets.

Jahrhundert. *Hortus Artium Medievalium*. Journal of the International Research Centre for Late Antiquity and Middle Ages 3 (1997) 165–178.

²⁷⁵ T. Vida: Külsővat és környékének régészeti emlékei a római kortól az Árpád-korig [Archaeological monuments of Külsővat and its environs between the Roman period and the Arpadian Age]. In: G. Ilon (ed.): *Tanulmányok Külsővat történetéből* [Studies on the history of Külsővat]. Külsővat 1996: 57–103.

²⁷⁶ Cs. Zatykó: Traditions in Hungarian Settlement Studies. *Bulletin of the Institute of Medieval Research* 2–3 (1996–1997) 36–44; *Eadem*: Morphological Study on a 15th Century Village, Csepely. *ActaArchHung* 49 (1997) 167–193.

²⁷⁷ A honfoglalásról sok szemmel [The Hungarian Conquest from various aspects]. Gen. ed. Gy. Györffy: Vol. 1. L. Kovács (ed.): *Honfoglalás és régészet* [The Conquest and archaeology]. Budapest 1994; 2. L. Kovács – L. Veszprémy (eds): *A honfoglaláskor írott forrásai* [The written evidence of the Age of the Conquest]. Budapest 1996; Vol. 3. L. Kovács – L. Veszprémy (eds): *Honfoglalás és nyelvészet* [The Conquest and linguistics]. Budapest 1997; Vol. 4. L. Kovács – A. Paládi-Kovács (eds): *Honfoglalás és néprajz* [The Conquest and ethnography]. Budapest 1997.

8. *The place of the Archaeological Institute in Hungarian and international archaeological research and its perspectives*

It may seem that the profile of the Archaeological Institute as an institution established exclusively for archaeological research work differs significantly from that of a university institute or a museum. In reality, the fellows of the Archaeological Research Group/Institute were engaged from the very outset in education and their participation in the teaching of archaeology only increased over the course of the times. The mutually useful connections with museums in Hungary were not only motivated by self-evident professional interests. Cooperation between a great number of museums and their staff and the Institute was established during the archaeological topography and access to the materials kept by the Archives of the Institute is unlimited for professionals. As to museological work, the cleaning, conservation, restoration, and inventory registration of the finds from the excavations of the Institute are carried out in the Institute where the finds are also stored before they are delivered to the museum which has responsibility for the area where the actual excavation site belongs. Furthermore, fellows of the Institute participated and participate regularly in the organization and mounting of archaeological exhibitions in Hungary and abroad. Through preparing and publishing museum and exhibition catalogues, research fellows of the Institute participate actively in the work of Hungarian museums.

In the foregoing, I have tried to indicate briefly the Hungarian and international research context of the individual research projects. Besides various cooperations, the basic form of participation in Hungarian and foreign archaeological research is, of course, the publication of the results of our own fieldwork and research. Besides the publication of individual research projects at various levels of synthesis, the Institute laid emphasis on the publication of various series. Their thematic structure not only reflect the changes in the orientation and outlook of Hungarian archaeology but also indicate deliberate research policy. Between 1962 and 1964, the three volumes of the *Régészeti Tanulmányok* [*Studies in Archaeology*] (editor László Gerevich) published monographs in Hungarian on archaeological evidence from the Age of the Conquest, the early Árpáadian Age, and the late Paleolithic²⁷⁸ while the eleven volumes of *Studia Archaeologica*, published between 1963–1991 in foreign languages (editor László Gerevich), presented larger find complexes or analysed artefact types. Monographs on prehistorical periods, the Huns, the Avars, and the conquering Magyars were also part of this series.²⁷⁹ The volumes of MRT were listed earlier in this paper. The nineteen volumes of *Fontes Archaeologicae Hungaricae* published in Hungarian or in foreign languages between 1973 and 1992 (editor Imre Holl) present individual sites. The majority

²⁷⁸ *B. Szőke*: A honfoglaló és a koraárpádkori magyarság régészeti emlékei [The archaeological monuments of the conquering Magyars and the early Arpadian Age]. Budapest 1962; *G. Febér – K. Éry – A. Kralovánszky*: A Középduna-medence magyar honfoglalás- és koraárpádkori sírleletei. Leletkataszter [The burial finds of the Middle Danube Basin from the Age of the Hungarian Conquest and the early Arpadian Age. A repertory]. Budapest 1962; *M. Gábori*: A késői paleolitikum Magyarországon [The late Palaeolithic in Hungary]. Budapest 1964.

²⁷⁹ *M. Párducz*: Die ethnischen Probleme der Hunnenzeit in Ungarn. Budapest 1963; *N. Kalicz*: Die Pécelser (Badener) Kultur und Anatolien. Budapest 1963; *N. Fettich*: Das awarenzeitliche Gräberfeld von Pilismarót-Basaharc. Budapest 1965; *I. Holl*: Mittelalterliche Funde aus einem Brunnen von Buda. Budapest 1966; *Á. Salamon – I. Erdélyi*: Das völkerwanderungszeitliche Gräberfeld von Környe. Mit Beiträgen von I. Lengyel und T. Tóth. Budapest 1971; *I. Erdélyi (ed.)*: Les anciens hongrois et les ethnies voisines à l'Est. Budapest 1977; *N. Kalicz – J. Makkay*: Die Linienbandkeramik in der Grossen Ungarischen Tiefebene. Budapest 1977; *S. Bökönyi*: Animal Husbandry and Hunting in Tác-Gorsium. Budapest 1984; *L. Barkóczy*: Pannonische Glasfunde in Ungarn. Budapest 1988; *J. Makkay*: The Tiszaszőlős Treasure. Budapest 1989; *Cs. Bálint*: Südungarn im 10. Jahrhundert. Budapest 1991.

of these was excavated by other institutions. Accordingly, among the authors we find sixteen experts from outside the Institute.²⁸⁰ In turn, the series *Varia Archaeologica Hungarica* (eight volumes published in Hungarian or foreign languages between 1986 and 1999, editor Csanád Bálint) publishes studies on individual sites, find complexes, object types as well as monographs and essay collections on individual periods written exclusively by the fellows²⁸¹ of the Institute.²⁸² From 1970 onwards, the Institute publishes a periodical in foreign languages under the title *Mitteilungen des Archäologischen Instituts*, from volume 15 under the title *Antaeus. Communicationes ex Instituto Archaeologico Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* (so far twenty-four numbers and three *Beihefte*,²⁸³ editors: vol. 1 László Castiglione-Ágnes Salamon, vols 2–8/9 Ágnes Salamon-László Török, vol. 10/11 László Barkóczi, vols 12/13–23 László Török, vol. 24 Andrea Vaday; vol. 25²⁸⁴ Eszter Bánffy). Most of the volumes are collections of essays by fellows of the Institute and experts from outside concerning archaeological research in Hungary as well as abroad or publication of the proceedings from conferences organized by the Institute. Several numbers of the *Antaeus* published, however, individual monographs by fellows. While a number of series has slowed down or even ceased

²⁸⁰ Gy. Török: Sopronkőhida IX. századi temetője [The 9th century cemetery at Sopronkőhida]. Budapest 1973; Á. Kiss: Roman Mosaics in Hungary. Budapest 1973; I. Bóna: VII. századi avar települések és Árpád-kori magyar falu Dunaújvárosban [Avar settlements and an Arpadian Age Hungarian village at Dunaújváros]. Budapest 1973; I. Banner – I. Bóna: Mittelbronzezeitliche Tell-Siedlung bei Békés. Budapest 1974; O. Trogmayer: Das bronzezeitliche Gräberfeld bei Tápé. Budapest 1975; P. Patay: Das kupferzeitliche Gräberfeld von Tiszavalk-Kenderföld. Budapest 1978; Gy. Nováki – Gy. Sándorfi – Zs. Miklós: A Börzsöny hegység őskori és középkori várai [The prehistoric and medieval earthworks and castles of the Börzsöny mountains]. Budapest 1979; A. Sz. Burger: Das spätrömische Gräberfeld von Somogyuszil. Budapest 1979; I. Ecsedy: The People of the Pit-Grave Kurgans in Eastern Hungary. Budapest 1979; É. Garam: Das awarenzeitliche Gräberfeld von Kisköre. Budapest 1979; J. Kovalovszki: Településásatások Tiszaeszlár-Bashalom (bronzkor, III–IV. és XI–XIII. század) [Settlement excavations (Bronze Age, 3rd–4th and 11th–13th centuries) at Tiszaeszlár-Bashalom]. Budapest 1980; K. Sági: Das römische Gräberfeld von Keszthely-Dobogó. Budapest 1981; K. H. Gyürky: Das mittelalterliche Dominikanerkloster in Buda. Budapest 1981; J. Topál: The Southern Cemetery of Matrica (Százhalombatta-Dunafüred). Budapest 1981; I. Holl – N. Parádi: Das mittelalterliche Dorf Sarvaly. Budapest 1982; D. Gabler – A. H. Vaday: Terra Sigillata im Barbaricum zwischen Pannonien und Dazien. Budapest 1986; B. M. Szőke – L. Vándor: Pusztaszentlászló Árpád-kori temetője [The Arpadian Age cemetery at Pusztaszentlászló]. Budapest 1987; L. Kovács: Münzen aus der ungarischen Landnahmezeit. Archäologische Untersuchung der arabischen, byzantinischen, westeuropäischen und römischen Münzen aus dem Karpatenbecken des 10. Jahrhunderts. Budapest 1989; I. Holl: Kőszeg vára a középkorban [The castle of Kőszeg in the Middle Ages. The results of the 1960–62 excavations]. Budapest 1992.

²⁸¹ Except for the conference volumes edited by Sándor Bökönyi and Csanád Bálint (see next note).

²⁸² M. Takács: Die arpadenzeitlichen Tonkessel im Karpatenbecken. Budapest 1986; S. Bökönyi (ed.): Neolithic of Southeastern Europe and Its Near Eastern Connections. International Conference 1987 Szolnok – Szeged. Budapest 1989; Cs. Bálint (ed.): Die Keramik der Saltovo-Majaki Kultur und ihrer Varianten. Budapest 1990; Cs. Bálint: Die spätawarenzeitliche Siedlung von Eperjes (Kom. Csongrád). Budapest 1991; E. Benkő: A középkori Keresztúr-szék régészeti topográfiája [Archaeological topography of the Keresztúr region in the Middle Ages]. Budapest 1992; L. Kovács: Das früharpadenzeitliche Gräberfeld von Szabolcs. Budapest 1994; L. Kovács: A kora Árpád-kori magyar pénzverésről. Érméleti és régészeti tanulmányok a Kárpát-medence I. (Szent) István és II. (Vak) Béla közötti időszakának (1000–1141) érméiről [On early Arpadian Age coinage. Numismatical and archaeological studies on the coins from the Carpathian Basin of the period between István I (the Saint) and Béla II (the Blind) (1000–1141)]. Budapest 1997; T. Vida: Die awarenzeitliche Keramik I. Berlin – Budapest 1999.

²⁸³ I. Erdélyi – Á. Salamon (eds): Les questions fondamentales du peuplement du bassin des Carpathes du VIII^e aux X^e siècle. Conférence internationale 1971 à Szeged. Budapest 1972; N. Kalicz – R. Kalicz-Schreiber (eds): Die Frühbronzezeit im Karpatenbecken und in den Nachbargebieten. Internationales Symposium 1977 Budapest – Velem. Budapest 1981; E. Jerem (ed.): Hallstatt Colloquium Veszprém 1984. Budapest 1986.

²⁸⁴ From vol. 26: B. M. Szőke.

publication, *Acta Archaeologica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*, the archaeological periodical of the HAS, continues to be edited ever since 1969 by fellows of the Institute (László Castiglione 1969–1984, Dénes Gabler 1984-).

The Institute organized, or participated in the organization of, nineteen international conferences between 1963 and 1998.²⁸⁵ The fellows regularly attend, and participate actively in the work of, national and international conferences and the majority of the Institute's research projects are connected topically as well as methodologically to the international research of the history and archaeology of Central and Eastern Europe, the Mediterranean world, the Balkan Peninsula, the Near East, and Eurasia. Projects carried out in international cooperation in the course of the Institute's first forty years were repeatedly mentioned in the foregoing and new ones are currently being developed.

The preeminent role played by the Institute in Hungarian academic life is also indicated by the election of its directors, to be members of the HAS as well as by their membership, and the membership of several fellows of the Institute, in various HAS committees and boards. The participation of the Institute in education is also acknowledged by the honorary professorship of several senior fellows. The Institute's presence in the international world of

²⁸⁵ 1963: Szláv Régészeti Szeminárium [Seminar on the archaeology of the Slavs]; 1968: archaeological conference on the occasion of the 10th anniversary of the Institute's foundation, cf. *MittArchInst* 1 (1970); 1971: A Kárpát-medence népei a 8–9. században, Szegedi Nemzetközi Konferencia [The peoples of the Carpathian Basin in the 8th-9th centuries. International conference at Szeged], cf. *I. Erdélyi – Á. Salamon (eds): Les questions fondamentales du peuplement du bassin des Carpathes du VIII^e aux X^e siècle. Conférence internationale 1971 à Szeged.* Budapest 1972; 1973: A középkori mesterségek keletkezése és fejlődése (5–14. század) Nemzetközi Kollokvium Budapest [The emergence and development of medieval crafts (5th-14th century). International symposium Budapest], cf. *L. Gerevich – Á. Salamon (eds): La formation et le développement des métiers au moyen âge (V^e-XIV^e siècles). Colloque international organisé par le Comité des Recherches sur les Origines des Villes,* Budapest 1973. Budapest 1977; 1974: Archaeological conference on the occasion of the 15th anniversary of the Institute's foundation, cf. *J. Makkay: A Régészeti Intézet jubileumi ünnepe és 1974. évi tudományos ülésszaka* [The anniversary of the Archaeological Institute and the 1974 archaeological session]. *MTAK* II 23 (1974) 233–248; 1974: Russian-Hungarian working conference on the prehistory of the Magyars, Moscow; 1977: A Kárpát-medence és a szomszédos területek koraközépkora [The early Bronze Age in the Carpathian Basin and the surrounding areas], Budapest – Velem, cf. *N. Kalicz – R. Kalicz-Schreiber (eds): Die Frühbronzezeit im Karpatenbecken und in den Nachbargebieten.* Internationales Symposium 1977 Budapest – Velem. Budapest 1981; 1982: British-Hungarian round table conference on the archaeology of the Middle Ages, Budapest; 1983: conference on the occasion of the 25th anniversary of the Institute's foundation, cf. *MittArchInst* 14 (1985); 1984: Hallstatt Kollokvium, Veszprém, cf. *E. Jerem (ed.): Hallstatt Colloquium Veszprém 1984.* *MittArchInst* Beiheft 3. Budapest 1986; 1987: Délkelet-Európa újkőkora és közelkeleti kapcsolatai [The Neolithic in Southeast Europe and its Near Eastern connections], Szolnok – Szeged, cf. *S. Bökönyi (ed.): Neolithic of Southeastern Europe and Its Near Eastern Connections.* International Conference 1987 Szolnok-Szeged. Budapest 1989; 1989: Kontinuitás és diszkontinuitás, jubileumi konferencia a Régészeti Intézet fennállásának 30. évfordulóján [Continuity and discontinuity, conference held on the occasion of the 30th anniversary of the Institute's foundation], cf. *Antaeus* 19–20 (1990–1991); 1989: Kulturális és kereskedelmi kapcsolatok a koraközépkori Közép- és Kelet-Európában [Cultural and trade connections in early medieval Central and Eastern Europe], Szekszárd-Tengelic, cf. International Conference on Early Middle Ages. Internationale Konferenz über das Frühmittelalter. *WMMÉ* 15. Szekszárd 1989; 1991: A középkori városok fejlődéséről [The development of medieval towns], cf. *ActaArchHung* 48 (1996) [Holl Imre Festschrift] 373–491; 1994: Kelta konferencia [Celtic conference], Keszthely; 1994: Hallstatt konferencia [Hallstatt conference], Sopron, cf. *E. Jerem – A. Lippert (eds): Die Osthallstattkultur. Akten des Internationalen Symposiums Sopron 10–14 Mai 1994.* *Archaeolingua* 7. Budapest 1996; 1995: Nemzetközi ősrégészeti konferencia [International conference of prehistorians], Szekszárd; 1998: Ósi kutak a Kárpát-medencében, jubileumi konferencia a Régészeti Intézet fennállásának 40. évfordulója alkalmából [Ancient wells in the Carpathian Basin, conference on the occasion of the 40th anniversary of the Institute's foundation].

archaeological research may be chiefly characterized by simple statistical facts, viz., 60% of the books and papers published by the fellows of the Institute are in foreign languages, and 40% were published in foreign languages and abroad. Besides the membership of one of the fellows (László Török) in a foreign academy (the Norwegian Academy of Science and Letters), several fellows were elected president or board member of international learned societies. The majority of the fellows are members of learned societies in Hungary and/or of international societies. The Institute's status and presence in international academic life is also indicated by the visiting professorships and other teaching commitments held abroad by its fellows.

While the Hungarian archaeological community continues to regard the archaeological topography and the maintenance of interdisciplinary researches — i.e., the application of scientific analyses in the interpretation of archaeological finds and phenomena — as its principal tasks, the Institute is confronted with increasing difficulties in reconciling the requirements of long-term research projects with their funding from grants that have to be applied for annually, or every two or three years. One of the principal lessons to be drawn from the survey of the Institute's history is that a marked deterioration of funding inevitably brings about the fragmentation and multiplication of the research projects and themes. Processes of this kind can be halted most effectively by large-scale, problem-oriented projects, although it is actually the large-scale field work and problem-oriented team work which proved the most problematic to fund over the course of the last fifteen or so years. Nevertheless, it seems that, albeit with a shift from problem-oriented field work towards armchair archaeology, the Institute is able to maintain its status and its role in archaeological work in Hungary and abroad. The changing proportion of research based primarily on our own fieldwork and research based on archaeological evidence from earlier excavations, has brought about, it seems, a growing interest in theoretical archaeology. While the Institute's traditionally limited interest in the developments of archaeological thought prevented confusion of historical research with political ideology in the first three decades of its history, we realize today that a reluctance to follow changes in archaeological theory and methods deprives the archaeologist of essentially important means of interpreting archaeological materials. The unfavourable financial environments does not discourage the Institute from maintaining its traditions and to renew, at the same time, the thematic and methodological structure of its research, from maintaining its role in education, and participating in the recovery and preservation of mankind's archaeological legacy or its interpretation for common knowledge.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL ABBREVIATIONS

*Anreiter – Bartosiewicz
et al. 1998*

P. Anreiter – L. Bartosiewicz et al. (eds): Man and the Animal World. Studies in archaeozoology, archaeology, anthropology and palaeolinguistics in memoriam Sándor Bökönyi. Archaeolingua 8. Budapest 1998.

Antaeus 21

B. M. Szőke – K. Éry – R. Müller – L. Vándor: Die Karolingerzeit im unteren Zalat. Gräberfelder und Siedlungsreste von Garabonc I–II und Zalasabar-Dezsősziget. Antaeus 21. Budapest 1992.

Antaeus 22

B. M. Szőke (ed.): Archaeology and Settlement History in the Hahót Basin, South-West Hungary. From the Neolithic to the Roman Age. Antaeus 22. Budapest 1995.

- Antaeus 23* *B. M. Szóke (ed.):* Archäologie und Siedlungsgeschichte im Hahóter Becken, Südwest-Ungarn. Von der Völkerwanderungszeit bis zum Mittelalter. Antaeus 23. Budapest 1996.
- Bökönyi 1993* *S. Bökönyi:* Recent developments in Hungarian archaeology. *Antiquity* 67 (1993) 142–145.
- Castiglione 1963* *L. Castiglione:* A magyar régészettudomány időszerű elméleti és módszertani problémái. A MTA Régészeti Kutató Csoportjának Elméleti és Módszertani Munkaközössége, 1962–1963 [Theoretical and methodological problems in Hungarian archaeology. The work of the Theoretical and Methodological Working Group at the Archaeological Research Group of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, 1962–1963]. *MTAK II* 13 (1963) 375–387.
- Castiglione 1966* *L. Castiglione:* A Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Régészeti Kutató Csoportjának munkájáról (1958–1965) [On the activity of the Archaeological Research Group of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences (1958–1965)]. *MTAK II* 15 (1966) 87–109 (with a bibliography by I. Torma).
- Chapman 2000* *J. Chapman:* Tensions at Funerals. Micro-Tradition analysis in Later Hungarian Prehistory. *Archaeolingua Ser. Min.* 14. Budapest 2000.
- Gerevich 1961* *L. Gerevich:* A régészettudomány helyzetéről [On the situation of archaeology (in Hungary)]. *MTAK II* 11 (1961) 207–211.
- Renfrew – Bahn 1991* *C. Renfrew – P. Bahn:* Archaeology. Theories, Methods, and Practice. London 1991.
- Trigger 1989* *B. G. Trigger:* A History of Archaeological Thought. Cambridge 1989.