

A lição de um colóquio

■ SUSANA OLIVEIRA JORGE* ■

À pergunta “Existe um Bronze Atlântico?” houve, de início, perplexidade entre alguns dos presentes: qual a utilidade de discutir o assunto? A pergunta não seria demasiado simples?

A resposta a esta dúvida parecia-me óbvia: a formulação era estratégica, pretendia suscitar o debate. Também desafiava a argumentação tradicional, mas, acima de tudo, procurava congregiar uma *audiência*.

Ao longo dos três dias do Colóquio não pude deixar de me questionar: se a maioria dos presentes aceitava a vulnerabilidade da entidade “Bronze Atlântico”, e se estava ali a renegociar a operacionalidade de uma construção histórico-cultural, ou seja, se a discussão em torno desta problemática parecia ser oportuna, porquê a resistência à maneira de colocar a questão?

Durante este encontro foram-se cristalizando algumas posições a favor da existência, na Idade do Bronze, de uma *unidade cultural atlântica*.

Por um lado, cedo Patrice Brun defendeu o que designou por “complexo atlântico”. Ou seja, uma entidade histórica, espacialmente delimitada, resultante de intercâmbios entre elites. Tais intercâmbios teriam desencadeado um fenómeno de “homogeneização cultural”, do topo para a base da hierarquia social. A posição de P. Brun acusa um forte enraizamento no pensamento histórico-cultural. A sua “área atlântica” emerge a partir da difusão de valores entre grupos interconectados. Neste sentido, esta “área cultural” parece aproximar-se de uma “totalidade homogénea agrupada por crenças partilhadas e socialmente determinadas” (Barrett, 1994, p. 157).

Mas não foi só P. Brun que assumiu, de forma enfática, a consistência de um “Bronze Atlântico”. Embora integrados noutras correntes teóricas, houve investigadores, como Kristian Kristiansen, que não deixaram de defender uma unidade atlântica. Contactos superestruturais entre elites teriam feito emergir um ritual partilhado como forma de poder intercomunitário. A articulação do papel da ideologia (como factor activo das relações sociais) e da interacção entre elites (no quadro de um sistema de “economia-mundo”) teria feito surgir uma “esfera ritual atlântica”.

De notar que qualquer das perspectivas referidas não é validada pelo “registo arqueológico”.

Mas se a atitude normativa de P. Brun prescinde “naturalmente” de contrastação empírica dos dados em ordem a provar um eventual processo de “homogeneização social”, já a posição que defende uma unidade ideológica atlântica, em boa verdade, deveria sujeitar-se ao “protocolo da prova”. As correntes neo-marxistas ou processuais não podem dispensar a procura de indicadores materiais de uma hipotética similaridade no comportamento ritual/ideológico dos grupos em causa. Ora, como se sabe, até hoje não foram descobertas quaisquer provas de “cenários rituais” que permitam inferir regularidades simbólicas transculturais na fachada atlântica durante a Idade do Bronze. E mesmo que tais cenários fossem detectados, é duvidoso que, a partir dos seus vestígios materiais, se pudessem recuperar os sentidos específicos das práticas ali realizadas. Se, por hipótese opti-

mista, viéssemos a encontrar cenários constituídos por arquitecturas e artefactos semelhantes, teríamos sempre de colocar a hipótese de, em cada espaço ritual, ter ocorrido uma total ou parcial reinterpretação dos sentidos. Em sociedades pré-estatais ou não estatais o poder reside na própria sociedade. A sociedade é o *locus* do poder (Clastres, 1977 [ed. port., 1979] cit. por Barrett, 1994, p. 164). O que implica uma grande liberdade na recontextualização dos significados.

Em última análise, num tão amplo espaço geográfico, ocupado na Idade do Bronze por uma constelação de grupos autónomos, dificilmente podemos encontrar sentidos idênticos. E mesmo que eles tivessem existido não há forma de o provar. O que de um ponto de vista explicativo é como se nunca tivessem existido.

Diversos arqueólogos expressaram também, durante o Colóquio, a sua descrença numa unidade cultural atlântica, tal como foi concebida pelo paradigma histórico-cultural. A. Bettencourt, S. Shennan, J. P. Pautreau, V. O. Jorge, ou R. Bradley, foram apenas alguns dos investigadores que mais veementemente intervieram neste sentido.

Mas, a certa altura, S. Shennan enunciou um conjunto de pressupostos para a discussão desta problemática. Era necessário conhecer a natureza política e social dos grupos responsáveis pelos intercâmbios, assim como a natureza dos mecanismos de troca desenvolvidos ao longo da fachada atlântica. Neste sentido, havia que reflectir sobre a operacionalidade do sistema de “economia-mundo” e insistir no aprofundamento do tema da construção da identidade.

Shennan aflorava assim um tópico central: para detectar uma qualquer unidade cultural num determinado espaço de tempo era necessário identificar previamente o perfil social e político dos agentes envolvidos no processo interactivo. O que implicava *dissecar exhaustivamente os contextos locais e regionais em toda a sua multiplicidade*.

Desta forma, a discussão encaminhava-se para uma confrontação com o modo de fazer hoje arqueologia: como avaliar a existência ou não de um identidade cultural se não estão feitos estudos comparativos exaustivos entre os vários contextos culturais atlânticos?

Um dos grandes desafios da década de oitenta, no que toca à reflexão da teoria arqueológica, foi a vontade de superar a visão esquemática do processualismo clássico: uma visão algo restritiva da complexidade dos sistemas sócio-culturais, em que se pretendia aceder a regularidades do comportamento humano através da análise de um número limitado e hiper-seleccionado de variáveis de natureza exclusivamente arqueológica.

Mercê da incorporação de muitas sugestões da corrente contextual, a arqueologia processual dos anos noventa pretende abarcar a diversidade e o aspecto contraditório do comportamento humano através de dois procedimentos básicos: a manipulação tendencialmente exaustiva de um número cada vez maior de “dados” (numa aproximação à mítica “amostra total”); o alargamento do âmbito dos “dados” a esferas não exclusivamente arqueológicas (fazendo apelo à etnoarqueologia, à arqueologia experimental, à arqueologia pós-deposicional, à história, à linguística, etc.). Nesta ampliação, em amplitude e natureza, do seu objecto de estudo, a arqueologia pretende dar resposta à assunção de uma certa resistência cognitiva do passado: neste sentido, abre-se à subtileza e à complexidade das correlações entre “cultura material” e “contexto cultural”, fundamentalmente a nível social e simbólico. A chamada “cultura material” não reflecte linearmente o comportamento humano, estando a relação entre ambos mediatizada por enquadramentos conceptuais dificilmente recuperáveis através da utilização exclusiva de “dados” arqueológicos. O uso de analogias culturalmente específicas torna-se, assim, indispensável para a compreensão da heteroge-

neidade e idiosincrasia dos sistemas sociais. Tal abordagem poderá conduzir, a prazo, à identificação de regularidades desconhecidas do comportamento humano.

É difícil de antever as consequências práticas de uma tal postura teórica. De salientar que, no quadro pós-processual (cuja influência na arqueologia corrente está longe de ser avaliada), também se almeja a construção de regularidades a partir de estudos específicos com base numa amostra total. Ou seja, mesmo segundo uma perspectiva anti-representacionista do passado, considera-se indispensável o manuseamento de um número infinito de “dados”.

Parecendo tal desiderato ser, hoje, um lugar-comum a todas as correntes do pensamento arqueológico, coloca-se a questão de se saber quais as condições institucionais em que os “dados” (heterogéneos e em número infinito) poderão ser obtidos e manipulados.

Uma *nova prática arqueológica* parece exigir um novo enquadramento político-institucional para a sua plena realização. Não estando já ao alcance do trabalho isolado do investigador, ou de um conjunto isolado de investigadores, ela só pode existir face à criação de centros de pesquisa com uma apreciável dimensão humana, científica, técnica e financeira.

Criar as condições sociais da renovação da prática arqueológica através da sua institucionalização plena, parece-me ser hoje, no final do milénio, o principal repto colocado à comunidade arqueológica internacional.

Face à consciência de uma certa inoperância da actual prática arqueológica, em geral, começa a fazer sentido a incomodidade da pergunta “Existe um Bronze Atlântico?”. De facto, poderia parecer uma provocação (mesmo para os que não seguem o paradigma normativo) incitar à demonstração da impotência da arqueologia para discutir este tema.

Quando, ao longo dos três dias de Colóquio, foram abordados os intercâmbios, a sociedade, e a paisagem construída, segundo diferentes eixos comparativos, pareceu que se tinha chegado a algum consenso: a impossibilidade de se harmonizar diferentes escalas de análise. A “unidade” resultante da cartografia de objectos metálicos em circulação não coincidia espacialmente com outras “unidades” construídas com base na cartografia de túmulos, povoados, depósitos, etc. Tal irredutibilidade poderia ser um excelente ponto de partida para uma discussão em torno da identidade da própria noção de passado em arqueologia.

E, contudo, há que voltar a insistir num ponto incómodo mas incontornável: só é lícito, neste contexto, comparar realidades exaustivamente estudadas em toda a fachada atlântica da Idade do Bronze. Se existem, pontualmente, estações, ou mesmo micro-regiões, que mereceram uma análise relativamente cuidada, existem também – e maioritariamente – áreas inteiras da fachada atlântica que correspondem a um enorme vazio de informação. Cartografar “o que se conhece”, comparar com base “no que se conhece”, e tentar retirar ilacções a partir de semelhanças formais entre realidades aleatoriamente truncadas, é, à luz da consciência que se adquiriu na última década, um exercício imprudente, desprovido de sentido.

E, no entanto, este encontro teve a qualidade de se ter constituído em *auditório*. Um lugar onde se desenvolveram diversos e contraditórios discursos argumentativos; onde o verdadeiro e o falso foram, no geral, substituídos pelo plausível, o razoável, o provável. Um lugar onde não se construíram artificialmente consensos. Um lugar onde se verbalizou o confronto na sua forma mais democrática: “a verdade é a retórica da verdade.” (Santos, 1989, p. 109).

Lisboa, 1995/Porto, 1996

REFERÊNCIAS

- BARRETT, J. (1994) - *Fragments from Antiquity. An Archaeology of Social Life in Britain. 2900-1200 BC*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- CLASTRES, P. (1979) - *A Sociedade Contra o Estado (Investigações de Antropologia Política)*. Porto: Afrontamento.
- JORGE, S. O. (1996) - Regional diversity in the Iberian Bronze Age. On the visibility and opacity of the archaeological record. *Trabalhos de Antropologia e Etnologia*. Porto. 36, p. 193-214.
- SANTOS, B. de S. (1989) - *Introdução a uma Ciência Pós-Moderna*. Porto: Afrontamento.
- TRIGGER, B. G. (1992) - *Historia del Pensamiento Arqueológico*. Barcelona: Crítica.
-

* Instituto de Arqueologia, Faculdade de Letras da Universidade do Porto, Portugal.

The Lesson from a Meeting¹

■ SUSANA OLIVEIRA JORGE* ■

The initial response of many participants to the question “Is there an Atlantic Bronze Age?” was one of perplexity. What was the point of the discussion? Was it not a simplistic question?

To me the answer seemed obvious: the question was a strategic one and its aim was to encourage debate. It was also a challenge to traditional discussion but, above all, the intention was to create an *audience*.

As the meeting progressed over three days, a question arose in my mind: if the majority of those present accepted the weakness of the concept of “An Atlantic Bronze Age”, if they had come to the meeting to renegotiate the viability of a cultural historical construction if, in other words, the time was ripe for a discussion of this issue, why was there so much resistance to the way in which the question was formulated?

During the meeting some opinions were expressed in favour of the existence of a cultural unity in the Atlantic area during the Bronze Age. On one hand, Patrice Brun was quick to defend the idea of what he called “the Atlantic complex”, by which he meant a historical, demarcated area which arose from exchange among the elite. This exchange would have led to cultural homogenisation, from the top to the bottom of the pyramid of social hierarchy. Brun’s position was clearly rooted in the cultural historical school of thought. For him the Atlantic area arose through the diffusion of ideas among inter-connected groups. Thus, his “cultural area” is very close to the notion of a “homogenous unit characterised by socially determined shared beliefs” (Barrett, 1994, p. 157).

But Patrice Brun was not alone in emphatically defending the idea of an “Atlantic Bronze Age”. Researchers such as Kristian Kristiansen, though belonging to other theoretical trends, also agreed with the idea of an Atlantic unity; in their opinion, superstructural contacts between the elite of different communities led to the emergence of shared ritual as a form of supra-regional power. “An Atlantic ritual sphere” would have arisen from the bringing together of ideology (as an active part of social relationships) and the interaction between community elite (within the framework of a “world-economy” system).

It should be noted, however, that the above-mentioned points of view are not validated by the archaeological record.

Even if the normative position of Patrice Brun “naturally” allows him to cast aside the need for empirical contrasting of data in order to prove a possible process of “social homogenisation”, the same is not true of the other group of defenders of a concept of a unity of ideologies within the Atlantic area, whose position should be scientifically validated. Neomaxist and processual archaeologists cannot dispense with the need to search for material evidence to justify this hypothetical similarity in ritual and ideological behaviour of the groups in question. As we know, to date, no evidence of ritual settings has been found from which we could infer the possibility of a pattern of transcultural symbols in the Atlantic area in the Bronze Age. And even if such settings were to be found, it is doubtful that the specific meanings of the activities which took place there could be recovered from those material records. If, by chance, we were to find settings consisting of similar architectural fea-

tures and artifacts, we would always have to consider the possibility that for each ritual setting, a total or partial reinterpretation of their meanings had taken place. In pre-state or non-state societies, power resides in the society itself. The society is the *locus* of power (Clastres, 1997 [Port. Ed., 1979] quot. by Barrett, 1994, p. 164). This implies great freedom in the rewriting of contextual meanings.

Finally, in such a vast geographical area, inhabited by countless autonomous groups during the Bronze Age, it would be very difficult to identify identical meanings. And even if such meaning existed, there is no way to prove this. It would be as though they had never existed.

During the meeting, several archaeologists also expressed their opposition to the idea of an Atlantic cultural unity, as conceived by the cultural historical paradigm; these included A. Bettencourt, S. Shennan, J. P. Pautreau, V. O. Jorge and R. Bradley, who all expressed their vehement opposition to this theory.

At one point, S. Shennan listed a number of issues central to this discussion. It would be necessary to know the social and political nature of the groups responsible for the exchange as well as the nature of the mechanisms for exchange developed throughout the Atlantic façade. Therefore a reflexion on the efficiency of the “world-economy” system was necessary, as well as an in-depth discussion of the theme of identity.

Shennan touched on the basic problem: to identify any cultural entity in any specific period of time previous identification of the political and social profile of the agents involved in this interactive process would be necessary. This would imply *exhaustive dissection of local and regional contexts in all their variety and number*.

As a result, the discussion was beginning to lead us to face the question of archaeological practice today: how should we go about determining the existence of a cultural entity if there are no exhaustive comparative studies on the different Atlantic contexts?

One of the great challenges of the 1980s, concerning reflection on archaeological theory, was the desire to transcend the schematic view of the classical processual theories: a rather restricted view of the complexity of social and cultural systems, which aimed to find regularities in human behaviour through the exclusively archaeological analysis of a limited and highly selected number of variables.

Processual archaeology of the 1990s, by embracing many aspects of the contextual school of thought, seeks to acknowledge the diversity and contradictory nature of human behaviour through two basic procedures: tendentiously exhaustive manipulation of a greater number of “data” (in an attempt to get as close as possible to the mythical “total sample”); widening the “data” sources to other than exclusively archaeological spheres (from ethnoarchaeology, to experimental archaeology, post-depositional archaeology, history, linguistics, etc.). With this widening of the object of study, archaeology tries to respond to the awareness of a certain cognitive resistance of the past: it opens itself to the complexity and subtlety of the relationships between “material culture” and “cultural context”, especially at symbolic and social levels. The so-called “material culture” is not a linear reflection of human behaviour, the relationship between them being affected by conceptual frameworks which are very hard to recover using only archaeological “data”. Thus, the use of culturally specific analogies is essential for the understanding of the heterogeneous and ideosyncratic nature of social systems. In the long term, this approach may lead to the identification of hitherto unknown regularities in human behaviour.

It is not easy to predict the practical consequences of this theoretical stance. It must be noted that one of the aims of post-processualism (whose influence on archaeology has yet to

be determined) is also to create a set of similarities from specific studies based on a total sample. In other words, even from an anti-representational standpoint it is considered crucial to study an infinite number of “data”.

All current archaeological trends seem to accept this idea, so the question arises concerning the institutional conditions necessary for obtaining and handling this infinite number of heterogeneous “data”.

It would seem that a *new archaeological practice* requires a new political and institutional framework if it is to reach its full potential. This new practice is no longer within the reach of the single researcher or isolated groups of researchers; it can only exist through the organisation of research centres of considerable human, scientific, technical, and financial dimensions.

It is my opinion that at the end of the millenium, the international archaeological community must focus primarily on the creation of social conditions for the renewal of the practice of archaeology through its full institutionalisation.

In light of a certain ineffectiveness of current archaeological practice, it becomes clear why some people feel that the question “Is there an Atlantic Bronze Age?” is an awkward one. In fact (even for those who do not follow a normative paradigm) to encourage the demonstration of our inability to deal with this issue could even appear provocative.

During the three days of the meeting, as the subjects of exchange, society and cultural landscape were being discussed, according to different comparative standpoints, it began to appear that we had reached a consensus: the impossibility of conciliating the different scales of analysis. For example, the “unity” resulting from the cartography of metal objects did not correspond to other “unities” based on the cartography of burial grounds, settlements, hoards, etc. This irreducibility could itself be an excellent starting point for a discussion about the meaning of the notion of “past” in Archaeology.

However, it is necessary to return to a controversial issue, which cannot be ignored here: the relevance of an exhaustive study of the materialities of the Bronze Age throughout the whole of the Atlantic Façade. Although there exist, here and there, sites and even micro-regions that have been the object of exhaustive study, there are also numerous whole areas in the Atlantic region about which we know very little. To make cartographic studies of “what is already known”, to try to establish comparisons based on “what we know” and to try to draw conclusions based on similarities between scattered areas is, in the light of new awareness gained over the last decade, a meaningless and unwise practice.

However, this meeting was held as a *forum*, a place where various, sometimes contradictory, points of view were aired; a place where, generally speaking, the words *true* and *untrue* were substituted by *probable*, *plausible* and *reasonable*. A forum which rejected artificial consensus, and where there was a free and truly democratic discussion of ideas: “truth is the rhetoric of truth.” (Santos, 1989, p. 109).

Lisbon, 1995 / Porto, 1996

REFERÊNCIAS

- BARRETT, J. (1994) - *Fragments from Antiquity. An Archaeology of Social Life in Britain. 2900-1200 BC*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- CLASTRES, P. (1979) - *A Sociedade Contra o Estado (Investigações de Antropologia Política)*. Porto: Afrontamento.
- JORGE, S. O. (1996) - Regional diversity in the Iberian Bronze Age. On the visibility and opacity of the archaeological record, *Trabalhos de Antropologia e Etnologia*. Porto. 36, p. 193-214.
- SANTOS, B. de S. (1989) - *Introdução a uma Ciência Pós-Moderna*. Porto: Afrontamento.
- TRIGGER, B. G. (1992) - *Historia del Pensamiento Arqueológico*. Barcelona: Crítica.
-

¹ This paper was translated by José Álvaro Monteiro da Costa and revised by Catherine Shaw Evangelista (Faculty of Arts, University of Porto, Portugal).

* Institute of Archaeology, Faculty of Arts, University of Porto, Portugal.

Concluding statement

■ KRISTIAN KRISTIANSEN* ■

In this conference, we have been challenged by the question: Is there an Atlantic Bronze Age? That is unusual: to challenge some of our basic notions and concepts.

The criteria of success, unlike other occasions when you are asked a question, would, in this case, not be of our ability to answer it. This is, as Susana told us, an academic dialogue about interpretation and about methods.

So what are the criteria of success of such a conference?

It is a success, in my opinion, if we have been able to diagnose the problem, if we will be able to delineate those areas where we need to do further research, where we are unclear in our concepts, where we need to develop theoretical concepts, methodological strategies or interpretative strategies.

What I shall try to do here, then, is not to summarise different positions, but rather to give you my personal perception of those areas of research that need to be elaborated.

I will do this by defining four areas in need of further discussion, and to do this I will take up four concepts which are vital for understanding Bronze Age society, and the Atlantic Bronze Age.

The first “area” is that of *openness and closure*.

Openness and closure, in my opinion, are two vital concepts for understanding and interpreting Bronze Age societies.

We have, on the one hand, a world-wide, or European-wide distribution of certain basic skills in metalurgy and technological know-how, we have distribution of metal from limited source-areas. These things had to be distributed, and were distributed widely. But on the other hand, what we see (that is what this symposium is about) is that, at the same time there are maintained some strong – or weak, that is the question – regional traditions, regional cultures, or whatever we choose to call them.

Some basic concepts, ranging from technology to certain social practices, certain basic value systems, in rituals, and some basic knowledges about warfare, can be transmitted globally in Europe, from the Mediterranean to Northern Europe, from Eastern to Western Europe. Despite that, what happens is that they are always “translated”, recontextualized into regional “dialects”, into a regional cultural uniform. It means that we have to do with a selective mechanism operating, but also with redefinitions. A lot of what we have been talking about has to do with these redefinitions and recontextualisations.

The visible things we are operating with as archaeologists are those of the material culture, metal, pottery, and so on, but especially metal in this instance. The invisible things are the knowledge, information and behavior linked to them. What is the relationship between form and meaning when translated into regional cultural “dialects”?

This leads on to a related point: How does the dialectic between openness and closure operate in relation to different *levels of interaction*?

I propose that we are dealing with three levels of interaction: a *community level* of day-to-day interaction between settlements, a *local level* of more selective contacts of political-economic nature, and a *regional level* (Nordic, tumulus, etc.) defined by a shared value system. The community level is typically 20-40 km, the local level 100-200 km in extension, while the regional level is more flexible in extension, but mostly more than 500 km, often 1000 km or more to its peripheries.

So, one could argue that at a certain level of interaction an Atlantic Bronze Age does indeed exist: but it is a matter of definition, of course. Here we need to compare different traditions. I would think that the Atlantic tradition, if we take that loose concept, is much less homogeneous, there are fewer shared elements than, for instance, in the Nordic tradition. But we have here a task of comparing the way we define these various regional traditions and what they share.

I think that interpretation becomes important in this instance, because interpretation is about what we mean by the warrior ideology, depicted on the stelae, seen in the hoards and so on. Of course that has a bearing on the way in which the Atlantic tradition may be different, in a social and ritual sense from other traditions (being they central-European Urnfield, or Nordic or northeastern European Lausitz), but, they are not only defined in their material culture, they are also defined in our interpretation of the meaning of those elements.

When we talk about interpretation we have to face a complexity, which has been a recurrent theme in this conference. I suggest there are *different spheres*, or kinds of communication and of dominance, that perhaps can be called influence: ways of influence and of creating power. What I want to stress is that we are faced with very complex situations when we are interpreting power and spheres of influence in pre-state societies, because there is no concurrence, there is no identity in the various aspects of power. In state societies it is much easier; there is a higher degree of identity between the different institutions: political, ritual and military overlap. They may operate outside their borders, of course, but they are much more easy to grasp from an archaeological point of view.

When we talk about pre-state societies things are more complex, and it puts higher demands upon our theoretical ability to define relevant concepts and to find relevant parameters and cases of comparison. I suggest that areas of political influence, where you can actually control your fellows, are quite small. But you can raid beyond your own base, you can exchange even further and you can have ritual power at an even larger scale.

We will come back to this; to rank and power as ritual and sanction institutionalized, rather than direct means of control.

Ritual influence areas can extend very, very far, and when you travel long distances you come back with new rituals. Ritual in this way becomes an exclusive thing.

When we interpret we have to be aware of this complexity, that there are different spheres of influence and dominance and they have different physical and spatial sizes.

Finally we come to the question of the *meaning of difference*, the *we* and the *others*. It began with that, you can say, with the openness and closure.

The Atlantic tradition seems to have an extremely conservative, archaic outlook. It reproduces archaic forms in metalwork to a much larger degree than does the central European or the Nordic Bronze Age. It seems to be a very conscious and distinctive feature of the Atlantic Bronze Age. What does that mean?

Practically, it means that communities of the Atlantic tradition were very selective in what they accepted from the outside. This should be analyzed in relation to gender and levels of interaction.

We have been talking about the symbolic nature of the landscape, the social impact of it and the impact of constructing that landscape.

This was meant to be at the local level: monuments, houses and so on. But if we look at the palaeobotanical evidence, as far as I know it, it would suggest that there is one thing in common in many areas of the Atlantic: they were extremely open landscapes, at least in the Late Bronze Age, compared with other areas in Europe. What would the impact and the

meaning of that be? and what would be the dicotomy between coastal landscapes and inland landscapes?

Landscapes as cultural identity is significant and should be considered: Is this part of the atlantic cosmology?

It has been said that we are dealing with a male dominated ideology. How different is that from other areas and regional traditions? Is it specific of the atlantic tradition? Some would say yes. But, if we want to come closer to the question of the distinctiveness or non-distinctiveness of an atlantic tradition, or perhaps of several atlantic traditions, we have to find meaning in relation to something else and not only internally.

Seen from the central european perspective, there is also the very peculiar conservative tradition, going back to the Neolithic: the round house. It links to the whole idea of domestic space and the conception of domestic space. Seen from northern Europe it would be a very peculiar trait of the Atlantic tradition. Why was this circular perception of house and space maintained?

Finally, the Atlantic communities shared a tradition of seajoueney and of seamanship, with an impact on social organization and cosmology. What does it mean in terms of comparison and contrast to neighbouring and other regions? We have to talk not only about meaning internally, but also about meaning as contrasting features, because meaning is defined in contrast to something else that is different.

In conclusion: What I have been trying to do to diagnose features we have to concentrate research and discussion.

Future research should look at the mechanisms at work: openness/closure, levels of interaction, the meaning of difference and identity, spheres and types of influence, defining spatial influence areas of various types. Finally: Why is it that the atlantic coastal areas maintain a number of rather archaic traditions. It must have an internal meaning but it must also be defined by contrast.

I would consider the success of this conference to be that we have raised the problem, that we have attempted to diagnose areas of further research.

This is my contribution, what I have done is to extract your contributions into a little more abstract form: maybe I have suggested some of the themes for our next meeting.

Before the final session, and while we are less formal in the academic session, I would like to conclude, on behalf of the Organizing Committee of the European Bronze Age Campaign and, I am sure, on behalf of all of the participants and the colleagues in this little academic community, to thank the person who got this idea.

This is the first time I have been to a conference raised with a theme as question mark. This is an original idea and it deserves to be recognised. But it is not enough to have the idea: it takes a lot of work, it takes passion to persuade people to come and make the conference happen: we were all persuaded by the fantasy, by the passion, by the energy and by the personality of Susana Oliveira Jorge. We should recognise that by thanking her for making this come through. Thank you Susana.

Behind Susana, we find the organizational and economic support of IPPAR, the Portuguese Archaeological Heritage, which has provided a good example, hopefully to be followed. For this we are grateful.

* Department of Archaeology, Göteborg University, Sweden.