

ARCHIVES AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESEARCH: CASE STUDY OF ADAM ORŠIĆ

Abstract: *The paper discusses the importance of archival material in the light of archaeological research. During the last decade, the history of archaeology as a discipline became an important topic, and consequently, relying on material kept in various archives is simply inevitable. The usage of methodology which is not common to archaeologists and for which they do not have proper education, might lead to possible issues in interpretations. This paper deals with the specific case of Adam Oršić, an archaeologist whose actions had wider implications on archaeology in Serbia. Most of the information regarding his career comes from various private and public archives, so I hope that I will be able to demonstrate the value that such material has for the history of the discipline.*

Keywords: *Archaeology, archives, history of the discipline, Adam Oršić, research methodology.*



The most recognizable features of the discipline of archaeology are probably material culture and excavations through which archaeologists obtain it. However, nowadays, archaeology deals with a lot more than that. The material culture needs to be analyzed and then interpreted in a corresponding social, political, religious, or any other context, necessary for understanding events from the past. That usually means that archaeology often deals with methods and theoretical frameworks derived from different disciplines, such as anthropology, art history, or history.² Since the 1960s, archaeology has been in constant turmoil, trying to develop different methods and theoretical concepts to enhance its results and to make them more relevant for contemporary societies. With the beginning of the 1960s, many papers which insisted on "more scientific" approaches were published. Archaeologists like Lewis Binford and David Clark tried to introduce more measurable and strict methods to make archaeology closer to those scientific disciplines, whose results were verifiable. They were criticizing previous approaches in the field, labeled as cultural-historical archaeology, for being too descriptive, limited in interpretations and generally stuck in those theoretical frameworks that were introduced in late 19th and early 20th century. That generation of archaeologists, led mostly by colleagues from the USA, established a new

¹ This paper is a result of the research project Archaeological Culture and Identity at the Western Balkans, no. 177008, funded by the Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development of the Republic of Serbia.

² For general discussion on archaeology see S. Babić, „Čemu još istorija arheologije?“, Etnoantropološki problemi, 3, Beograd 2011, 565-577.

course of research which in the history of the discipline remained known as *New Archaeology* or *Processual archaeology*.³ Still, the main flaw of this extremely positivistic-oriented theoretical framework lies in the circumstance that it advocates the strict objectivity of scholars. In the 1980s and 1990s, a new generation of archaeologist began questioning their positions and interpretations. A significant number of them began to acknowledge that most of one's work depended on his/her views, attitudes, interests, daily political circumstances, or economic situation. The aura of objectivity was no more than an illusion.⁴ Scholars argued that we cannot be objective as we would like to be and that we must be aware of all our flaws and subjectivity to reduce biases as much as possible. Since there was not one single theory, but rather a spectrum of different theoretical concepts, proposals, and ideas within the newly formed perspective, they were all put under theoretical umbrella of *post-processual* or *post-modern* theory in archaeology.⁵ These ideas were changing and developing through the past few decades and still have the consequences in archaeology all over the world. Marginal groups, hybrid communities, single and collective identities were just some of the ideas derived from this theoretical framework, which still operates nowadays.⁶ In Serbia, and most of the neighboring countries, disciplinary changes ran much slower than in other academic communities. The majority of archaeological results are still interpreted within more traditional theoretical concepts, and some of it still stays on the basic level of description of archaeological material and simplified statistics. Accordingly, the interpretations constructed upon such results are often inadequate and inappropriate (e.g. Romanization).⁷

One of the outcomes of self-reflection of archaeology in Serbia is a large and ever-growing number of papers and discussions concerning the history of archaeology. Such projects do not merely serve to write down the memories of the participants or to address the focal points and characters that were important in the past. Most of them are trying to explore and understand the circumstances of the courses that archaeology took in different moments in the past. Exploring the social, political, and other contexts in which archaeological ideas originated is invaluablely helpful for understanding the consequences of our work and results today.⁸

³ А. Палавестра, *Културни контексти археологије*, Београд 2011, 165-214.

⁴ S. Babić, „Kakva nam arheologija treba“, *Етноантрополошки проблеми*, 3, Београд 2013, 622.

⁵ А. Палавестра, н. д., 229-262.

⁶ For a general review of different bibliography concerning "post-modern" concepts in archaeology, see: E. Conlin-Casella & C. Fowler, *The Archaeology of Plural and Changing Identities*, New York 2004; M. Diaz-Andreu & S. Lucy, *The Archaeology of Identity. Approaches to gender, age, status, ethnicity and religion*, New York, 2005; J. Sean, *The Archaeology of ethnicity. Constructing identities in the past and present*, London 1997.

⁷ V. D. Mihajlović, „Gordijev interpretativni čvor: rimski pisani izvori, ideja socio-kulturne evolucije i koncept romanizacije“, *Етноантрополошки проблеми*, 3, Београд 2011, 679-698; М. А. Janković, „Koncept romanizacije Teodora Momzena i njegova uloga u konstituisanju rimskih arheologija zapadnog Balkana“, *Етноантрополошки проблеми*, 3, Београд 2013, 747-762.

⁸ Н. Тасић (ур.), *Споменица српског археолошког друштва 1883-1983*, Београд 1983; S. Babić i М. Tomović (ур.), *Milutin Garašanin, razgovori o arheologiji*, Београд 1996; Ж. Петровић, *Народни музеј у Нишу 1933-2003*, Ниш 2005; Т. Цвјетићанин (ур.), *Музеј кнеза Павла*, Београд 2009; И. Љубомировић, *Никола Вулић - Историчар Антике*, Ниш 2013; А. Vandović, „Музејски курс и археологија током II svetskog rata“, *Етноантрополошки проблеми*, 3, Београд 2014, 625-646; P. Novaković, *Historija arheologije u novim zemljama Jugoistočne Evrope*, Sarajevo 2015; В. Бикић и Ј. Шарић (ур.), *Mnemosynon Firmitatis, седамдесет година археолошког института (1947-2017)*,

Excavating the archives

The official archival institutions mostly work systematically and predictably. A whole set of rules are employed, so that, different types of written sources are preserved for the future and available for research. Most of the sources are listed and thoroughly described, so that, any researcher could organize his or her exploration according to their research topics.⁹ On the other hand, the problem with complex state institutions could be the lack of experts, storage space or even time to organize all the archival material. As archaeologists are dealing with particular issues of our own discipline's history, most of the documents we need are sometimes unavailable, since such records are not among priorities of those institutions which are keeping them. Furthermore, we are often forced to explore those archives and written sources from the past which are not systematized, or even not placed in public institutions, but are a private property.¹⁰ Therefore, we are generally in a situation where we have to make many decisions concerning the methodology, the importance or the presentation of that material.¹¹ Usually, archival material has to be scrutinized before deciding on the importance of each paper. It is essential with this kind of sources and archival content to pay attention to the so-called "reality effect", a setting in which the scholar became self-identified with his subject, which in this case becomes much more enhanced by the circumstance that both author and his subject are archaeologists. This, together with the fact that archival material is transferring immediate message, could mislead the authors to poor, self-satisfied interpretation.¹² Thus, every piece of information, no matter, if it comes from formal or informal archives (public and private), had to be scrutinized and evaluated, and exposed to critics.¹³ Another level of the problem could be a lack of archivist training for an archaeologist. When approaching archival material, archaeologists have to introduce themselves to the basic archivist rules and types of usage of materials. Since archaeologists are mainly self-taught in dealing with archives, one must always be cautious and make sure that s/he addresses the content with proper methodology. That could be a potential source of numerous issues and insecurity when it comes to interpretations. With researches of this type, which includes at least basic knowledge on archives that specific knowledge is essential for archaeologists, as excavations are for some other disciplinary fields.

Biography of persons or a portrait of a discipline?

The genre of biography was generally underappreciated in historiographical studies. Extensive volumes on famous characters were perceived as illustrative but not

Београд 2017; М. А. Јанковић, Археолошке путање и странпутице Адама Оршића, Ниш 2018; А. Bandović, Nazi archaeology in Serbia: power and Ideology at the „Völkerstrasse“, National-Socialist Archaeology in Europe and its Legacies, New York, 2019 (in press); Ј. Митровић (ур.), Учењаци, старинари, археолози: Археологија у светлу сопствене историје, Београд 2019.

⁹ E.-A. Borchardt, Historical Archaeologists' utilization of archives: an exploratory study, San Jose 2009.

¹⁰ M. Diaz-Andreu, Archaeological Encounters: Building Networks of Spanish and British Archaeologists in the 20th century, Newcastle 2012.

¹¹ М. А. Јанковић, Археолошке путање..., Ниш 2018, 12.

¹² М. А. Kaeser, „Biography, science studies and the historiography of archaeological research: Managing personal archives“, Complutum, 2, Madrid 2013, 104.

¹³ Ibid, 104.

very helpful in general.¹⁴ Critics of using biographies in historical or archaeological studies argued that the specifics of contexts were not important, but only the results that we can further apply and scrutinize. However, the genre proved more than just helpful when scholars tried to explain specific ideas and thoughts which have consequences in our contemporary work and research. Social circumstances in which archaeologists worked seem to be crucial in that fashion. Networks of scholars, schools of thinking, different social relations between archaeologists and decision makers of the time, political agenda, and economic aspects heavily influenced their work and interpretation.¹⁵ Things that are usually perceived as unimportant or as irrelevant details could be essential for comprehending someone's ideas and interpretations. It is more than typical in Serbian archaeology (but also in some others) that once adopted, old ideas change hard, despite the fact that some of the underlying assumptions do not work anymore (e.g. objects = culture = nation), so it is crucial to explain and understand the context of origins in order to be able to deconstruct the ideas and take them in some new and different directions.

History of the discipline, or its biography, is often a history of great events and central characters of past periods. Every single paper written on that topic (including some of mine own) were following the straight line of the discipline's development since the very beginnings through the 20th century until the present time. In most of these papers one can find important information on great and valuable archaeological sites – like Vinča, Lepenski Vir, Gamzigrad, Viminacium, etc., but also information on researchers who were authors of those excavations – Miloje Vasić, Dragoslav Srejski, Aleksandar Jovanović, etc.¹⁶ The point is that we know nothing about their efforts before such "great discoveries" were published. Often, we do not have information about why they made the decisions that led them to that discovery or how they came to conduct the excavations in the first place.¹⁷ We need that information to understand the dynamics that led to the results we have today. Thus, what I suggest here is a concept of fully informed biographies observed through the broader context of the academic community, social and political circumstances and relations between the parties included in the processes and history of ideas. Only in that way, we would be able to complete most of the puzzle we call the history of archaeology. Single biographies of leading archaeologists of the past, often written as panegyrics, are just not enough for recreating the past events, but we need to put them in the appropriate context. Therefore, I will try to exercise such a concept in the case of the archaeologist who worked during the first half of the 20th century – Adam Oršić Slavetić.

¹⁴ E. Baudou, „The problem oriented scientific biography as a research method“, *Norwegian Archaeological Review*, 2, 1998, 79-96.

¹⁵ *Ibid*, 79-96.

¹⁶ For example, Н. Тасић (ур.), *Споменица Српског археолошког друштва 1883-1983*, Београд 1984; М. Јевтић, *Прочитавања прошлости*, Београд 2004; М. Лазич, „Археолошка збирка Филозофског факултета“, у: *Филозофски факултет 1838-1998*, Београд 1998, 440-445; М. Милинковић, „Одељење за археологију“, у: *Филозофски факултет 1838-1998*, Београд 1998, 425-440.

¹⁷ On the critics of such concept see N. Čosić, „Autoritet i proizvodnja arheološkog znanja“, *Etnoantropološki problemi*, 3, Београд 2016, 749-774.

Archival material on Adam Oršić Slavetić

Before I started my research on Adam Oršić, available information was very scarce and very random. He was mentioned in different papers when concerning some histories of research or within jubilee monographs. It took more than three years to find all the possible sources where archival material was kept during the past decades.¹⁸ It turned out that what initially appeared as the case of a local, half-anonymous archaeologist, was a more prominent figure, not only for archaeology in Niš but for the discipline as a whole. Since I have already written an extensive biography of Adam Oršić,¹⁹ I will only briefly underline the main courses of his career so that readers of this paper could have a complete picture before them.

Oršić was working with some of the most important archaeologists in Serbia, Yugoslavia, and even Europe. His research was important in many ways, including the initiation of excavations that are relevant research projects today – Bujanj, Mediana, Jagodin-Mala.²⁰ In short, Adam Oršić started his career as an archaeologist at the beginning of the 1930s in Niš, as one of the founders and first curators of the Museum of Niš in 1933.²¹ While working in the Museum and the Municipality of Niš, he created a voluminous archaeological map of Niš and its surroundings. For that purpose, he built a considerable network of associates, mostly consisting of local teachers, officers and priests, who were interested in history. Finally, he started a journal where these associates published their discoveries and results – *Moravski arheološki glasnik* (The Morava Archaeological Journal). While in Niš, Oršić was in contact with many colleagues – Jozo Petrović and Miodrag Grbić from the National Museum of Belgrade, Nikola Vulić from the Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts, but also with renowned European archaeologists such as Karl Bittel and Oswald Menghin.²² His involvement in the 5th excursion of Danubian archaeologist²³ was of great help in making the contacts

¹⁸ M. A. Janković, „U potrazi za Adamom Oršićem kroz arheologiju XX veka“, *Etnoantropološki problemi*, 3, Beograd 2016, 853-867; M. A. Јанковић, *Археолошке путање...*, Ниш 2018.

¹⁹ M. A. Јанковић, *Археолошке путање...*, Ниш 2018.

²⁰ A. Оршић Славетић, „Археолошка истраживања у околини и Нишу“, *Старинар VIII-IX*, Београд 1934, 303-310; A. Оршић Славетић, „Праисторијска налазишта у околини Ниша“, *Старинар X-XI*, Београд 1936, 174-181; A. Orsich de Slavetich, Bujanj, ein vorgeschichtliche ausiedlung bei Niš, *Mitteilungen der Prähistorischen Kommission der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, 4, Wien 1940.

²¹ Ж. Петровић, *Народни музеј...*, Ниш 2005; M. A. Јанковић, *Археолошке путање...*, Ниш 2018, 43-53.

²² Oswald Menghin was one of the most renowned prehistorians between the World Wars. He was working as a professor of the Institute of Prehistory at the University of Vienna and the University of Cairo. After the Anschluss in 1938, he was shortly appointed as the Minister of Education in a pro-Nazi government of Zeis-Inquart. After the war, he immigrated to Argentina where he worked at the Universities of La Plata and Buenos Aires until his death. See O. Urban, „Er war der Mann zwischen den Fronten“, *Oswald Menghin und das Urgeschichtliche Institut der Universität Wien während der Nazizeit*, *Archaeologia Austriaca*, 80, Wien 1996, 1-24.

²³ V. Studienfahrt der Deutschen und Donauländischer Bodenforscher was organized in cooperation with the Roman-German Commission in Berlin, the National Museum of Belgrade and the National Museum of Budapest. Experts, mostly from the German-speaking countries, were traveling down the Danube, visiting important sites and collections. For more details see P. Trebsche, „Zu den internationalen Beziehungen der Urgeschichtsforschung in Oberösterreich während der Zwischenkriegs – und Nazizeit“, in: *Archäologische Arbeitsgemeinschaft Ostbayern/West und Südböhmen, Rahden/Westfalen 2005*, 178-188; A. Bandović, „Naučne mreže Miodraga Grbića i njihov uticaj na srpsku arheologiju“,

with those colleagues. At the same time, he was studying Art History and Archaeology at the University of Belgrade and had Vladimir Petković as a mentor.²⁴ When the World War II broke out, Oršić was on the territory of Independent State of Croatia (ISC) at his family home, but he soon returned to Belgrade to work with some of the archaeologists who came with the occupational forces. He was in contact with Johann Albrecht von Reiszwitz, who was the chief of *Kunst und Denkmalschutz*,²⁵ the official institution for heritage protection worked closely with Kurt Willvonseder, who was the main representative of the *Ahnenerbe*²⁶ in Serbia, but he was also in contact with other important figures like Boris III, the Emperor of Bulgaria and his prime minister (who happened to be an archaeologist) Bogdan Filoff.²⁷ These international contacts bought him a great trust from German colleagues, so, he was expressly sent to Vienna to finish his studies and earn a Ph.D. with no less than Oswald Menghin as a mentor,²⁸ together with another archaeologist Vladimir Milojević. When the war was over, Oršić was already in Austria where he met his second wife Elfriede Stadler, also an archaeologist from Prague. They both lived in the displacement camps for the next five years during which they excavated a series of small sites in cooperation with Museum of Linz.²⁹ In 1951 they managed to acquire papers and left Europe for Brazil, where Oršić already had a family. Until his death in 1968 Oršić and his wife worked as archaeologists with a number of different institutions in Brazil³⁰. Adam Oršić and his work there is very important since there was no archaeology in Brazil before their arrival. He conducted some of the first excavation at the site of Araujo II³¹ and was in close contact with colleagues from the Smithsonian Institute – Betty Meggers and Clifford Evans.³²

Etnoantropološki problemi, 3, Beograd 2016, 831-852.

²⁴ Oršić studied at the University of Belgrade between 1933 and 1938. He never finished his studies there, but in Vienna, during the war. See M. A. Јанковић, Археолошке путање..., Ниш 2018.

²⁵ The *Kunst und Denkmalschutz* was an institution intended to protect the cultural heritage in occupied Europe. The institution worked in several countries and had its offices in Belgrade. Its director was Johann Reiszwitz, an anthropologist who already cooperated with Serbian and Yugoslavian archaeologist between WWI and WWII. He was included in an expedition at Ohrid in the 1930s. C. Kott, „Kunstschutz im zeichen des totalen Krieges“. Johann Albrecht von Reiszwitz und Wilhelm Unverzagt in Serbien, 1941-1944“, *Acta Praehistorica and Archaeologica*, 49, Berlin 2017, 245-269.

²⁶ The *Ahnenerbe* was organized according to orders of Heinrich Himmler in 1936. Before WWII started in Europe, the institution gathered mostly pseudo-scientists and organized expeditions throughout the world (probably the most famous one to Tibet) in searching for origins and contacts of German ancestors. During the war, organization massively expanded and at this moment put together almost all of the important scientific institutions, including Museums and Archaeological Institutes. *Ahnenerbe* conducted excavations in occupied territories? (like at Kalemegdan in 1941/42.) and Serbia was the only country that officially gave the *Ahnenerbe* the blank permission for archaeological research. For more on *Ahnenerbe* in general: M. H. Katter, *Das Ahnenerbe der SS 1935-1945. Ein Beitrag zur Kulturpolitik der Drittes Reiches*, Munchen 2006. For specifics in Serbia see A. Bandović, *Nazi Archaeology...*, New York 2019, (in press).

²⁷ M. A. Јанковић, Археолошке путање..., Ниш 2018, 72-77; M. H. Katter, *Das Ahnenerbe...*, Munchen 2006, 294.

²⁸ M. A. Јанковић, Археолошке путање..., Ниш 2018, 72-77.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 90-91.

³⁰ I. Chmyz, „Curriculum vitae“ de Adam Orssich de Slavetich“, *Cadernos de Arqueologia*, 2, Braga, 1977, 5-11.

³¹ A. Orssich & E. Stadler Orssich, „Stratigraphic Excavations in the Sambaqui of Araujo II, Parana, Brasil“, *American Antiquity*, 4, Cambridge 1956, 357-369.

³² NAA-SI, Orssich, Adam 1954-1968, Box 62, Betty J. Meggers and Clifford Evans Papers.

Searching for Oršić

His colorful biography shows us that Oršić lived and worked in many different places during his life. His results were published in Serbian, German, English and Portuguese, and most of the papers were dispersed in archives throughout European and American archives. Making contacts with colleagues from these archives and conducting research was a long and often painstaking process. However, as results I have obtained documents crucial for understanding his actions and their consequences. Instead of focusing on official papers and published works, I tried to collect as many records as possible, and in the end I had a large number of pages of his private letters, receipts and reports, mainly considering his work. Those documents consisted of much “non-archaeological” information, but they turned out to be crucial. For instance, the documentation showed that he was one of the first members of Croatian National Socialist Party led by Slavko Govedić³³ and that he had some family ties to the Bulgarian Emperor.³⁴ Both pieces of information are not connected to archaeology at first glance, but we now have a context in which some other Oršić’s activities are more understandable. Oršić had a full trust from German forces, he was provided with appropriate documents which gave him a freedom of movement all over the territory, but he was also free to make arrangements with Bulgarian politicians and archaeologists on his own. As a result, Oršić was conducting a series of archaeological researches during the World War II on the territories controlled by German forces, but also the Bulgarian ones. Fortunately, he and other persons involved in those activities left us dozens of documents on those events.³⁵

So, the research on Adam Oršić’s life and career expanded from Niš and the Museum’s archive to the archives in Vienna, Zagreb, Varaždin, Berlin, Madrid, Prague, Sao Paulo, Buenos Aires and Belgrade. Most of the archive material that I was searching for, was not systematized, so the collecting of needed information was slow and sometimes nearly impossible. Still, after some time, I was able to get a sizeable amount of documents that had to be sifted through and evaluated. A smaller amount of documents were just a „noise”, consisting of unimportant receipts, transcriptions of technical inquiries, etc., while most of it was precious material concerning the activities, not only of Adam Oršić himself but of his colleagues and institutions working in Serbia during the occupation. I tried, and hopefully, succeeded to reconstruct most of the career of Adam Oršić by basing my research almost solely on the archival material. Except for the short description in the previous chapter, I was able to understand most of his actions and to put them in, hopefully, proper context. It would be good to know that only a few years ago, we knew nothing about archaeology in Serbia during the WWII. Most of the information was anecdotal, coming from memories of participants, sometimes decades after the described events. After an extensive work on archives concerning only Adam Oršić, we are now able to shed more light on those events.

³³ BAB, NS 21-1995, Adam Oršić Slavetich, graf.

³⁴ HR-HDA, 233, Izvještaj gospodina Adama Grofa Orssicha-Slavetičkog o posjeti kod Nj. Veličanstva Cara Borisa III, dana 20. siječnja 1942. u 5 sati poslije podne, 20. 1. 1942.

³⁵ For planned expedition see BAB, NS 21-1995, Vorschlag zur Organisationsarbeit in Serbien und Macedonien in Sommer 1943, 21. 3. 1943. For excavation conducted in Pavlovac near Vranje during 1941. see V. Milojević, Chronologie der Jüngerer Steinzeit Mittel und Südosteuropas, Berlin 1949.

Thanks to other pieces of the puzzle, we know that archaeological research was more than extensive in those years.³⁶ A great number of German archaeologists and institutions were engaged, but also colleagues from Serbia, like Miodrag Grbić, Milutin Garšanin, Vladimir Miložić and of course Adam Oršić.³⁷ That chapter of our history is much brighter now than it was only some time ago.

Concluding remarks

Research on Adam Oršić would be much less interesting and irrelevant if not for those material gathered from different corners of the world. Of course, archival material in archaeology (or any other discipline) should not be perceived as mere fitting illustration. It is vital that every piece of information must be thoroughly inspected, put in an appropriate context, and related to other pieces of information. Naturally, it is more than desirable to have different sources when cross-checking the papers, but unfortunately, that is not always the case. Once again, writing a biography is not only a process of illuminating someone's life and career, but it is more of a reconstructing the pieces of the puzzle for creating a complete picture of our discipline. History of the discipline is crucial if it follows the ideas, concepts and networks, trying to relive the processes by which we ended up in our positions today. Considering results on the case of Adam Oršić, archival records were precious. As stated before, information about his activities was scarce. Most of the archaeologists' opinion was that he was an amateur, one of many, who was doing archaeological work as a hobby. The quotations of Oršić in other authors' work were just a few and very random. Archives provided much welcome material which was used to explain his social and political circumstances, necessary for decisions he made in his career and effects those decisions had on archaeology. His noble ancestry and family ties with European aristocracy made him somewhat privileged among the colleagues in Serbia during the 1930s and 1940s. That circumstance, together with his political activities, assured him a relatively comfortable position during the WWII and enabled him to go to Vienna, finish his studies and obtain a Ph.D. in archaeology. Still, the same reasons were crucial for his immigration to the other end of the world where, once again, his work was pioneering in the field of archaeology. Several monographs and Ph.D. thesis on Oršić's work and influence were written so far in Brazil, and one of the institutions where he worked is bearing his name today – Institute for Archaeology and Ethnology Adam Orsich in Vittoria, Brazil. Most of his work would be unknown today for Serbian academic community if we chose to neglect the archival material. We would not know that activities in archaeology were not suspended, but on the contrary were carried out by other people, previously not perceived as crucially important for the history of the discipline. Again, only scrutinized insight of all available sources, mostly from archives, made such results possible.

It is unnecessary to say that archives and archival material are essential in an archaeological research. For any research that concerns the history of the discipline, such methodology which includes insight into the written source material kept in

³⁶ Most of the work on the issue has been done by a colleague A. Bandović from National Museum of Belgrade: A. Bandović, „Muzejski kurs“, *Etnoantropološki problemi*, 3, Beograd 2014, 625-646; A. Bandović, „Nazi archaeology“, New York 2019 (in press); A. Bandović, „Naučne mreže“, *Etnoantropološki problemi*, 3, Beograd 2016, 831-852.

³⁷ M. A. Јанковић, *Археолошке путање...*, Ниш 2018.

different kinds of archives is even more crucial. As it is emphasized here more than once, that material allows us to get full insight in all social, political, economic, personal and other contexts in which some of the authors/archaeologists worked and made their decisions and interpretations. Such observations are often more valuable than published papers in which we have the results of the research but without an explanation of the process that led the author to them. Most of such information was never published within scientific journals or books and represented a piece of the puzzle that stays within the realm of oral traditions. We risk losing valuable insight into different dynamics of the past, simply because they were never published and shared within the academic community. Different institutional dynamics, relations between various scholars (both academic and private), construction of their authorities among peers and even their moral attitudes might, and many times did, influence the academic research, its results and interpretations. Archival material is an irreplaceable source for understanding these processes of construction of knowledge in the past. This is even more important in contexts of specific parts of the history of the discipline where some events are deliberately blurred or ignored as a part of unwanted legacy or infamous periods of disciplinary history.

Finally, the history of the discipline is only partially, and mostly selectively, published in academic publications, and most of it is still kept within various archives, public and private. Therefore, if we intend to illuminate different parts of the past of the discipline, we will have to rely on archival material. Only then, would we begin to understand the processes that led us to our positions today.

Abbreviations

AT-UAW – Universität Archiv Wien
BAB – Bundesarchiv Berlin
HDA – Hrvatski državni arhiv, Zagreb
NAA-SI – National Anthropological Archives, Smithsonian Institute, Washington D. C.

Bibliography

- Babić, Staša & Miodrag Tomović. ur., Milutin Garašanin, razgovori o arheologiji. Beograd 1996.
- Ista. „Čemu još istorija arheologije?“. Etnoantropološki problemi, 3, Beograd 2011.
- Ista. „Kakva nam arheologija treba“. Etnoantropološki problemi, 3, Beograd 2013.
- Bandović, Aleksandar. „Muzejski kurs i arheologija tokom II svetskog rata“. Etnoantropološki problemi, 3, Beograd 2014.
- Isti. „Naučne mreže Miodraga Grbića i njihov uticaj na srpsku arheologiju, Etnoantropološki problemi“. 3, Beograd 2016.
- Isti. „Nazi archaeology in Serbia: power and Ideology at the Völkerstrasse“. In National-Socialist Archaeology in Europe and its Legacies. Editor Martin Eickoff & Daniel Modl, New York 2019 (in press).
- Baudou, Eric. „The problem-oriented scientific biography as a research method“. Norwegian Archaeological Review, 2, 1998.
- Borchardt, Elisabeth-Ann, Historical Archaeologists' utilization of archives: an exploratory study, Master theses. San Jose 2009.
- Chmyz, Igor. „Curriculum vitae de Adam Orssich de Slavetich“. Cadernos de Arqueologia, 2, Braga 1977.
- Conlin-Casella Eleanor & Fowler, Chris. The Archaeology of Plural and Changing Identities, New York 2004.
- Ćosić, Natalija. „Autoritet i proizvodnja arheološkog znanja“. Etnoantropološki problemi, 3, Beograd 2016.
- Diaz-Andreu, Margarita & Lucy, Sem. The Archaeology of Identity. Approaches to gender, age, status, ethnicity and religion. New York 2005.
- Diaz-Andreu, Margarita. Archaeological Encounters: Building Networks of Spanish and British Archaeologists in the 20th century. Newcastle 2012.
- Janković, A. Marko. „Koncept romanizacije Teodora Momzena i njegova uloga u konstituisanju rimskih arheologija zapadnog Balkana“. Etnoantropološki problemi, 3, Beograd 2013.
- Isti. „U potrazi za Adamom Oršićem kroz arheologiju XX veka“. Etnoantropološki problemi, 3, Beograd 2016.
- Kaerer, Marc Antoine. „Biography, science studies and the historiography of archaeological research: Managing personal archives“. Complutum, 2, Madrid 2013.
- Katter, H. Michael. Das Ahnenerbe der SS 1935-1945. Ein Beitrag zur Kulturpolitik der Drittes Reiches, Munchen 2006.
- Kott, Christine. „Kunstschutz im zeichen des totalen Krieges“. Johann Albrecht von Reiszitz und Wilhelm Unverzagt in Serbien, 1941-1944“. Acta Praehistorica and Archaeologica, 49, Berlin 2017.

Mihajlović, D. Vladimir. „Gordijev interpretativni čvor: rimski pisani izvori, ideja socio-kulturne evolucije i koncept romanizacije“. Etnoantropološki problemi, 3, Beograd 2011.

Milojčić, Vladimir. Chronologie der Jüngerer Steinzeit Mittel und Südosteuropas. Berlin 1949.

Novaković, Predrag. „Historija arheologije u novim zemljama Jugoistočne Evrope“. Sarajevo 2015.

Orssich, Adam & Stadler Orssich, Elfriede. „Stratigraphic Excavations in the Sambaqui of Araujo II, Parana, Brasil“. American Antiquity, 4, Cambridge 1956.

Isti. Bubanj, ein vorgeschichtliche ausiedlung bei Niš. Mitteliungen der Prähistorischen Kommission der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften 4. Wien 1940.

Sean, Jean. The Archaeology of ethnicity. Constructing identities in the past and present. London 1997.

Trebsche, Paul. „Zu den internationalen Beziehungen der Urgeschichtsforschung in Oberösterreich während der Zwischenkriegs – und Nazizeit“. In: Archäologische Arbeitsgemeinschaft Ostbayern/West und Südböhmen. Rahden/Westfalen 2005.

Urban, Otto. „„Er war der Mann zwischen den Fronten“, Oswald Menghin und das Urgeschichtliche Institut der Universität Wien während der Nazizeit“. Archaeologia Austriaca, 80, Wien 1996.

*

Бикић, Весна, и Јосип Шарић, ур. Mnemosynon Firmitatis, седамдесет година археолошког института (1947-2017). Београд 2017.

Јанковић, А. Марко. Археолошке путање и странпутице Адама Оршића. Ниш, Београд 2018.

Јевтић, Милош. Прочитавања прошлости. Београд 2004.

Лазић, Мирослав. „Археолошка збирка Филозофског факултета“. У: Филозофски факултет 1838-1998. Београд 1998.

Љубомировић, Ирена. Никола Вулић – Историчар Антикe, Ниш 2013.

Милинковић, Михајло. „Одељење за археологију“. У: Филозофски факултет 1838-1998. Београд 1998.

Митровић, Јован (ур.). Учењаци, старинари, археолози: Археологија у светлу сопствене историје, Београд 2019.

Оршић Славетић, Адам. „Археолошка истраживања у околини и Нишу“. Старинар, VIII-IX, Београд 1934.

Оршић Славетић, Адам. „Праисторијска налазишта у околини Ниша“. Старинар, X-XI, Београд 1936.

Палавестра, Александар. Културни контексти археологије, Београд 2011.

Петровић, Живорад. Народни музеј у Нишу 1933-2003. Ниш 2005.

Тасић, Никола. (ур.), Споменица Српског археолошког друштва 1883-1983, Београд 1984.

Цвјетићанин, Тајјана. (ур.), Музеј кнеза Павла, Београд 2009.