Discussing archaeology and the nation in six European countries: a discourse analysis

Rimvydas Laužikas, Johanna Enqvist, Pedro Luengo, Rajna Šošić-Klindžić & Marina Toumpouri

Published online: 08 Feb 2022.

Submit your article to this journal ⬈

Article views: 248

View related articles ⬈

View Crossmark data ⬈

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

 OPEN ACCESS   Check for updates

Discussing archaeology and the nation in six European countries: a discourse analysis

Rimvydas Laužikas [a], Johanna Enqvist [b], Pedro Luengo [c], Rajna Šošić-Klindžić [d] and Marina Toumpouri [e]

aDigital Social Science and Humanities, Vilnius University, Vilnius, Lithuania; bDepartment of Digital Humanities, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland; cHistory of Art Department, University of Seville, Seville, Spain; dDepartment of Archaeology, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb, Zagreb, Croatia; eUniversity of Cyprus, Nicosia, Cyprus

ABSTRACT

We studied the use of archaeological scholarly knowledge for supporting and promoting national identity by global non-professional communities. The data collection consisted of asynchronous online text-based Facebook focus group discussions in Croatia, Cyprus, Finland, Greece, Lithuania, and Spain. After, we conducted a qualitative content analysis of posts and comments we collected.

Our research's main result is the identification of framing schemas that communicatively connect the personal perception and interpretation of scholarly archaeological knowledge with existing community knowledge on national identity. We identified, analysed, and discussed ten different framing schemas in this article: Uniqueness, Succession, Language, Christianity, Western civilization, Nature, Stranger civilizations, Double identities, National heroes, and Future expectations. The different framing schemas are interconnected, but application of the framing schemas varies in different countries.

Introduction

Archaeology, unlike many other disciplines, developed in the frameworks of specific cultures, countries, and nations. Its beginnings coincide with the Age of Enlightenment, and its growth corresponds with the Romantic era that saw national identity develop in many European countries. Arguments based on archaeological findings and knowledge have been used to support and promote national identity from the nineteenth century onwards this requires a reference. As a discipline that focuses on the past and often on prehistory, archaeology constitutes the foundation of a 'great nation' (earliest foundation evidence of a nation, myths of origin, or invented remote past), contributing important stories for national identity, arguments for the definition of the territory of the nation state (Fawcett and Kohl 1995; Diaz-Andreu and Sam 2005), and 'interpretations, where specific archaeological cultures were unproblematically seen as ancestral to contemporary ethnic or national groups' (Kohl 1998, 231). The intensification of these trends in archaeology and the growth of political nationalism before WWII engaged the first critics of 'national archaeologies'. Tallgren criticises 'nationality' in archaeology from the

methodological point of view. He denotes that 'a uniform [material] culture may exist quite independent of ethnographic frontiers', asserting 'the material culture of a given epoch cannot be identified with a nationality' and 'do[es] not enable us to determine national territories'. He argues that in the Rococo period of the eighteenth century, 'it might happen that a student studying the archaeology of the settlements would define a 'national' territory, of course with local variations, extending without a break from the coasts of France to the east of Berlin, perhaps as far as Warsaw'. Furthermore, Tallgren states that '[t]he economic system as a whole was of more significance than nationality' in archaeology (Tallgren 1937, 156–159).

The traumatic experiences of WWII and the discredit of the 'great nation' changed the public discourse on national identity in democratic Western and Southern European countries. The increasing importance of archaeology in developing other non-national identities (e.g. indigenous communities and new groups, such as New Age travellers, druids, and ecofeminists) has been underlined by different scholars (Shnirelman 2013; Díaz-Andreu and Champion 2016). The role of archaeological works as legitimisers of national identity after WWII remains crucial during the dictatorial regimes of Spain and Portugal. (Díaz-Andreu 1999). On the other side of the Iron Curtain, on the one hand, the officially sanctioned Soviet concepts of ethnos and ethnogenesis existed (Kohl 1998). On the other hand, Soviet internationalism pushed discussions about national identity to the margins of public discourse, between officially allowed and forbidden forms of nationality; in some contexts, 'national archaeology' engendered a kind of national resistance.

The issue of archaeology and national identity has been considered due to its connection with the dissolution of the Soviet Union and the fall of the Iron Curtain (Meskell 2002; Conrad et al. 2007; Díaz-Andreu and Champion 2016). Moreover, an increased sense of globalization has led local groups to feel disconnected from their contexts (Hamilakis 2007). Simultaneously, the proliferation of information and communication technologies has affected economic, political, and cultural processes on a global scale and contributed to the formation of the network society and the emergence of socio-cultural effects, including the increased significance of different kinds of identities (Castells 1997; Dijk 2005). National identity has experienced a renaissance in the network society, displayed by 'victories of nationalist parties, national sovereign governance as opposed to transnational collaborations', and 'the upsurge of nationalism masked under the term patriotism or conservativism' (Topić and Niamh 2019). However, the sense of a nation in the network society is different from that in the twentieth century. Schneider explains: 'We should view the nation as a networked community: a complex system in which power works according to the logic of networks, generating nationalism as an emergent property' (Schneider 2018). This process, as a contemporary phenomenon, is crucial for archaeology, which 'does not function independently of the societies in which it is practised' (Trigger 1984, 368). The rise of public (Merriman 2004) and community archaeology (Atalay 2012), the epistemic diversity of archaeological modes of knowledge production (Laužikas et al. 2018), and the rising impact of information communication technology and digital media in archaeological public communication engender new possibilities for the multi-interpretation of the meanings of archaeological objects (Dallas 2007) and multipurpose reuse of scholarly archaeological knowledge.

These 'new possibilities for the social construction of archaeological meaning' (Dallas 2007) can be considered part of the 'Communications Revolution' (Dijk 2005). However, they are insufficiently understood and investigated from the perspectives of knowledge work and communication. This forms a set of problems. The gap in the literature impedes the communication of scholarly results and hinders understanding between archaeology scholars and non-professional archaeology-related communities. Our research aims to better understand archaeological knowledge work – the communicative connection of personal perception and interpretation of scholarly archaeological knowledge with existing community knowledge (as framing schemas) – and its effect on national identity by examining these framing schemas in several European countries. To this end, we formulated two research questions:

RQ1: How is archaeological knowledge transformed into values of national identity?

RQ2: What kind of discourses (framing schemas) are used to construct archaeological knowledge-based national identity messages?

A better understanding of the construction, legitimization, and promotion of identities connecting archaeological knowledge and the concept of a nation in a network society is important in a wider sense. Bridging the gap of understanding fosters better collaboration between professional archaeologists and archaeology-related non-professional communities and engenders community empowerment and resilience in facing the challenges of the network society.

Knowledge work in archaeology and national identity

Our research's key terms are national identity and knowledge work – both terms with multiple meanings. For this research, the concept of national identity is rooted in Schneider's concept of a community as a group 'of people with whom we share a particular interest or purpose, as well as a culture and history'; the concept of patriotic and national communities is focused on different objects of affiliation: the territorial (country) and the ethnolinguistic (ethnic group; Schneider 2018). In our context, archaeological national identity-related communities include both – territorial and ethnic – dimensions with a particular interest in archaeology (such as places, artefacts, and knowledge). The ethnic dimension comprises 'named units of the population with common ancestry myths and historical memories, elements of shared culture, some link with a historical territory and some measure of solidarity, at least among their elites' (Smith 1995, 57). The linguistic element (common language) is one of the most significant markers of ethnic solidarity (Hobsbawm 1992). National identity communities are socially constructed 'imagined communities' (Anderson 1991). This construction process is permanent and continuous. Archaeological knowledge acts as a 'brick of identity' (Castells 1997), and social network sites work as mediating spaces.

The specific concept connected to national identity is nationalism, which comprises various forms of the political representation of national identity. Gellner describes nationalism as a political principle, which holds that the political and the national unit should be congruent (Gellner 1983). In this article, we perceive nationalism dualistically in the contradiction of territory and ethnicity, as (i) politically engaged 'patriotism' and a 'rational' version of nationalism that focuses on civic issues and love for one's community. In contrast, (ii) political ethnonationalism or neo-nationalism describes an ostensibly darker 'emotive' type of nationalism that aggressively promotes ethnic ideas' (Schneider 2018).

The concept of knowledge work developed in different contexts (Pyöriä 2005; Jacobs 2017). For this research, the definition of knowledge work is based on Huvila's considerations that reference 'the notion of activities, groups of people and societies involved in knowledge-intensive goal setting' and achievement. Moreover, the relationships between information and knowledge work are essential, as 'information work is defined as an integral part of everyone's professional and leisurely pursuits' and 'knowledge work as a parallel activity that supports and paves the way to knowing' (Huvila 2006; Huvila and Huggett 2018).

The current article is related to two research topics: (i) archaeology and national identity and (ii) archaeological knowledge work. In the early literature, the issue of archaeology and national identity is discussed by Bruce G. Trigger (1996), Sian Jones (1997), Philip L. Kohl (1998), and Stephen Shennan (1995); understanding of the field is furthered by Ulrike Sommer (2017), Margarita Díaz-Andreu (2004), Victor Shnirelman (2013), and Florin Curta (2014). More recently, archaeology has been used to support groups' identities, especially those of regional reach with political interests. Many scholars have addressed this issue in the last decades, focusing on local cases (Parkins 1997; Fewster 2000, 2006, 2008; Criado-Boado 2001; Kizilyürek 2003; Cabanes 2004; Ren 2006; Kulevičius 2012; Gracia and Luís 2013; Šermukšnytė et al. 2019); however, for a broader understanding of the phenomenon, a wider perspective that analyses the development of globalization and nationalism is necessary. The

development of new nations and regions during the late twentieth century involved creating archaeological icons (Ruiz Zapatero 2002, 2010; Díaz-Andreu and Champion 2016; Moshenska 2017). Furthermore, heritage – a permanent reminder of the past concretized in the present – is often defined by the dominant group in a society that, in many cases, is represented by the national government (Graham, Ashworth, and Tunbridge 2000; Davison 2008; McDowell 2008).

Archaeological knowledge work is a new interdisciplinary field of study, encompassing different disciplinary backgrounds. Investigations on information science are crucial for the contextualization of the research presented in this paper (Huvila 2006; Huvila and Huggett 2018; Huvila 2019).

Theoretical framework

To understand how archaeological knowledge and archaeological heritage affect the perception of national identities, we draw from semiosphere theory, initially developed by Yuri Lotman (2001, 2005). In Lotman's sense, archaeological objects (sites and artefacts) and knowledge are signs communicated in the textual format. In semiotic theory, (i) the signs we perceive as single, indivisible atomic data units, and (ii) the text is an orderly sign system arranged for communication, which we can clearly distinguish from other systems. The articulation of the signs into text is governed by semiotic rules (named codes).

The existence of archaeological objects and scholarly knowledge catalyse knowledge work – the emergence of new knowledge and new texts intended for members of non-professional communities (in our case, national identity-related communities). Technically, this process is the translation of knowledge from the scholarly to the non-professional semiosphere. Archaeological scholarly knowledge (the knowledge of archaeologists, who belong to a disciplinary archaeological semiosphere) is transformed through a process of knowledge translation into community knowledge (the practical knowledge of members of a non-professional community or semiosphere). For this process, the non-professional person becomes a translator and interpreter, reading the signs left by ancient societies (archaeological objects) and scholarly texts (knowledge and texts, such as sign systems). Simultaneously, the non-professional person interacts with existing community knowledge and catalyses the emergence of new community knowledge. This knowledge produces new non-professional texts that are created using language that is understandable for non-professional community members.

Here, the interpretation plays the role of semiotic code. However, these interpretations are 'individual', 'personal', and 'unique' in certain senses. They are driven by existing community knowledge – particular schemas that are typical and intelligible for non-professional archaeology and national identity-related communities. These schemas work as frames for this process, and the frames, as abstractions, organize and structure message meaning. The schemas as frames (i) filter and reject archaeological objects and scholarly knowledge that are unacceptable to the community and (ii) interpret filtered scholarly knowledge to create text understandable for other community members. Such features enable us to name these organizing structures 'framing schemas' or narratives.

The framing schemas are tools connecting individual interpretation with community knowledge. Thus, research on framing schemas is vital in understanding archaeological knowledge work – the translation of scholarly texts and the construction of non-professional knowledge and texts – and its reuse in non-professional community practices.

Conceptualizing the research as a case study

We studied the use of archaeological scholarly knowledge for supporting and promoting national identity as part of broader research on benchmarking the opportunities and problems related to the reuse of archaeological knowledge by global non-professional communities (Dallas et al. 2021). In one of the four case studies conducted using a common methodology and research

design, people used archaeology in the context of national identity. The common trait of these diverse case studies is the reliance on discussions between people belonging to a particular community or performing a specific function in which archaeology, archaeological knowledge, or archaeological heritage is vital. In each case, evidence consists of the speech of individual participants as they engaged in conversation with study investigators and other participants. To ensure that case studies were conducted coherently and methodologically, a qualitative data analysis approach was adopted. The research consists of three dimensions: the conceptual framework, data constitution and coding, and analysis and interpretation. The process includes 15 activities: literature review and desk research, scope definition, model conception, provisional code system formulation, participant identification, research on ethics policy, solicitation and informed consent, focus group preparation, focus group implementation, data preparation, memoing, descriptive coding, data analysis, theoretical coding, and synthesis and interpretation.

As the research aims to better understand how archaeological knowledge and archaeological heritage are reused for the construction of national identities, we chose a case study approach as a framework (Stake 2005; Yin 2014). The methodology followed was developed as an extension of the common methodology and research design of respondent selection stages, data collection, and conducting case data analysis.

We collected evidence in countries with different historical experiences, varying contemporary discourses on national identity, and diverse political situations: Croatia, Cyprus, Finland, Greece, Lithuania, and Spain. For respondent selection, at the first stage, we formed a list of potential respondents. From this list, we selected Facebook users who are interested in archaeology and national identity. We conducted a keyword-based search with the query 'archaeology and national' in the national languages using the Facebook search tools. At the next stage, we assessed the content-selected profiles using the following set of criteria: (i) the profile must be personal (not a page or group); (ii) the profile owner must be a real person, found on other sites by searching the internet; (iii) the profile owner must be active on Facebook (posts within the last week); and (iv) posts with comments on history, archaeology, and national identity exist in this profile. After this assessment, the users were invited to participate in Facebook group (FG) discussions led by the researchers following investigations of Facebook discussions on the research topic for each country. The Finnish focus group was established differently from all other countries – by posting an open invitation on the Facebook page of the Archaeological Field Services unit (AFS) of the Finnish National Heritage Agency (Museovirasto). Since the Finnish focus group was composed of followers of the AFS, all the participants were considered 'interested in the investigation of the past and history' or 'archaeology enthusiasts' in the background survey.

The data collection consisted of asynchronous online text-based FG discussions. The research was conducted from January to August 2019, as a series of online text-based conversations over one week in closed FGs for each country, performed in the national language. The acceptance level of invitations was about 25–30%. The number of participants in different countries varied from 10 to 63. The FG discussions were conducted following an established schema of common topics and similar questions connected to (i) archaeological heritage, archaeological artefacts, archaeological knowledge, archaeological science communication, and national identities; (ii) archaeology-based personal identities; and (iii) archaeology and national identity-connected actors and practices. The limitations of data collection derive from Facebook as a platform, such as (i) the popularity of the platform and each Facebook user's sociodemographic profile, (ii) elements of FG conversations in 'post-comments' sessions, (iii) the impact of a researcher's personal Facebook profile, and (iv) the impact of a researcher's personal Facebook image and reputation on the acceptance of an invitation to participate and participation in the FGs (the trust between the researcher and the participating individuals).

In developing our research design, we adopted the WG3 methodological framework, including the provisional coding scheme (Dallas et al. 2021). We conducted a qualitative content analysis of the Facebook posts and comments we collected. We used two different computer-assisted

qualitative data analysis software packages (Dedoose and ATLAS.ti) to create a provisional and then a final coding system to transcribe, pre-process, code, and analyse the Facebook data.

We identified the relationship between codes and framing schemas using the discourse analysis method (Gee 2014) in the following stages:

(1) We extracted the coded text fragments of the national (each country) Facebook posts and comments connected to the topic of 'archaeology and the national identity'.
(2) We classified the extracted fragments by content into semantically similar groups in each country.
(3) We compared and discussed the semantical groups of each country in the context of all six countries.
(4) We linked the 'national groups' to 'international groups' and identified the discourses (framing schemas) which contextualize them.

Results: from individual interpretation to community identity

Our research's main result is the identification of framing schemas that communicatively connect the personal perception and interpretation of scholarly archaeological knowledge with existing community knowledge on national identity. The identified framing schemas were discussed by FG participants in two or more countries. Following the research's objective, the identification of framing schemas aims to reference and interpret only what the respondents discussed but not develop a broader literature review on the thematic issue.

After analysing the collected data, we identified ten overarching framing schemas:

(1) Uniqueness. This concept asserts the uniqueness and significance of a nation in the distant past. This schema was observed in Croatia and Greece and partially observed in Cyprus and Lithuania. In Croatia, the 'proof of uniqueness' is important for archaeological finds in forming the national identity 'because they affirm that 'we' were unique and important, even if in the distant past', especially if they are symbolically connected to the war involving the former Yugoslavia in the 1990s. In Cyprus's case, the question of uniqueness arose when participants discussed the Greek element of the island; the controversial topic was whether Cyprus belongs to the 'Greek nation'. Only one discussant openly expressed their opinion on the issue; they considers themselves Cypriot and not Greek, apologizing to the rest of the group for this comment. He explained that he belongs to Cyprus's Maronite Christian community, recognized by the Cypriot Constitution as a national minority. The rest of the Greek Cypriot participants either did not express their opinions or described themselves as Cypriot citizens, living in a territory traditionally considered part of the Greek nation outside the motherland's territorial and political space. The issues of whether there is a Cypriot nation and whether the island's population considers belonging to it were not raised, probably because these issues are highly contested. Indicatively, Denktaş, the head of the Turkish Cypriot Delegation of the Constitutional Committee that drafted the Cypriot Constitution (1959–1960), president of the Turkish Communal Chamber in 1960, and founding president of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus – declared in 1983 and recognized only by Turkey – wrote: 'There is not, and there has never been a Cypriot nation'; Denktaş added that Archbishop Makarios, the leader of the Greek community who later became the president of Cyprus, was also aware that in 1960, they signed the creation of 'a state but not a nation' (Denktaş 1982). The two communities have experienced intense feelings of 'motherland neo-nationalism' towards Greece and Turkey, respectively (Loizides 2007; Katsourides 2018). However, various factors across time, space, and social classes have influenced the level of loyalty – or eventually its absence – of Cypriots towards their motherlands: labour and class strikes; bicommunal conflicts; terror

campaigns; the Greek military Junta Coup in 1974, which aimed to unify Cyprus with Greece; the Turkish invasion of 1974, all of which instigated dissatisfaction towards the two mother-lands; the democratization processes in Greece and Turkey; the nonviolent protests by Turkish Cypriots; as well as mobilisations for the reunification of the island, specifically the 2004 Annan plan referendum (Loizides 2007). Studies have generally acknowledged two opposing poles: 'motherland neo-nationalism' and 'Greek Cypriotism' (Stavrinides 1999; Loizides 2007), adherence to which is usually considered indicative of a person's political beliefs (Papadakis 1998). In truth, the fluctuating situation is more complicated, with various forms of appropriation and fusion discernible at the level of communities, smaller groups, and individuals (Papadakis 2005; Katsourides 2018).

(2) Succession. Native people and prehistoric cultures are evidence that 'our people have been here forever' and 'we are the descendants of those people'. This schema was observed in Croatia and Greece and partially observed in Cyprus and Lithuania. The countries in which framing schemes 1 and 2 are prevalent recently achieved independence, compared with those in which these comments are rare. For example, among Spanish comments, there is no antipathy towards Roman or Muslim expansion or connection between prehistoric cultures and the origins of the modern country. In contrast, for Croatian participants, the thesis that 'we are not Serbs and not Slavs' is prevalent; based on the argument for prehistoric cultures as evidence that 'our people have been here forever', this assertion focuses on medieval artefacts connected with Croats (inscribed by Croatian dukes and kings from the 9th–11th centuries). For Greek Cypriot respondents, Hellenism is admired and regarded positively, but the island is not unanimously considered part of the Hellenic nation. In Lithuania, the succession of intangible traditions is more important than geographical points. One participant from the FG in Lithuania noted, '… Karmazinai burial mounds [5th–8th centuries AD] are important because they show our ancestors' beliefs of the otherworldly. I think that our contemporary All Soul's Day [Nov. 1] tradition … [derives] from this … '.

(3) Language. The contribution of archaeological knowledge to national identity is filtered by the national language; only artefacts connected with one's (linguistic) nation carry significance. This schema was observed in Lithuania and Greece and partially in Cyprus. For Lithuania, language plays a crucial role in defining national identity, as our ancestors spoke the same language. Discussions on the Lithuanian language also connected with the schema of uniqueness. In discussing objects of archaeological heritage for national identity, an FG participant noted: '… why do we discuss the physical objects only? It seems to me that [the] Lithuanian language is also an object for this list … '. The evidence of the connections between the Lithuanian language and archaeology is based on Indo-European studies (in which Lithuanian is considered similar to Sanskrit) and studies on the linguistic inheritance between ancient Balts and contemporary Lithuanians. For Greece, all Greek-speaking areas are united by the (ancient and modern) Greek language, which is the most powerful connection of Hellenism. FG discussants from Cyprus and Greece agreed that Hellenism is an abstract concept of an enduring civilization communicating in the Greek language (Cypriots, Cretans, Pontic Greeks, Karagounides, etc.); its outreach and pre-eminence are not limited by national borders, since it conceived universal values and ideas that still influence humanity. Greek Cypriot discussants commented that they are connected to other Greek-speaking areas by their common language, although this attachment, as noted, fluctuates and depends heavily on many factors. Delineating the central issue of national identity in Croatia – dividing Serbs and Croatians – on these criteria is challenging. Therefore, to be Croatian is to be part of a historical tradition (e.g. Catholic). In conversations about language, however, Latin script is not essential to Croatian identity because there were other scripts, such as Glagolitic. However, the differences between the Croatian and Serbian languages are crucial aspects of national identity. After the war in the 1990s, differences between Croatian and Serbian were highlighted and artificially enhanced, and some words became inappropriate to use.

(4) Christianity. The connection to the Christian Church is an essential component of national identity. This schema was strongly observed only in Croatia but discussed in different contexts in other countries. For Croatia, this link is Catholicism because Orthodoxy is connected with Serbians. There was not unanimity between Cypriot and Greek respondents on whether Orthodoxy is an aspect of Hellenic identity. However, all the participants agreed that a Byzantine (Orthodox) monument, the cathedral of Saint Sophia (Constantinople/Istanbul), symbolizes Byzantium, which inherited and preserved Greek civilization throughout the Middle Ages. For Spain, the Catholic Church's historical prominence has made that tradition part of its culture, while Islam and Judaism have been connected with foreign governments.

(5) Western civilization. This schema emphasizes the recognition of the nation-state territory as a part of Western civilization. The definition of and relationship to 'the West' are complicated concepts, particularly for countries that consider themselves to be somewhat in 'the East' or in 'the South'. As such, this framing schema was observed in Lithuania, Croatia, Cyprus, and Greece. Croatia embodies the opposition between Western 'Croatian' Catholicism and Eastern 'Serbian' Orthodoxy. For Greece, a FG participant mentioned the ' … universality and superiority of the Greek spirit and ethos and its humanistic values on which Western civilization was founded'; they further commented that 'Hellenes never became part of what we call Western civilization today … '. In the case of Cyprus, the sentiments regarding Greek civilization were similar, although they were more neutrally expressed. In Lithuania, the view of Western civilization is divided. On the one hand, the Teutonic War is perceived as a war against 'aggressive Western civilization'. This draws a clear border between Lithuania and Western countries (and national and European identities). On the other hand, the boundary between the 'national space' and 'European space' works as a positive area for the diffusion of innovations.

(6) Nature. Archaeology-based evidence of connections with nature (e.g. hunters and gatherers) contributes to national identity. This schema was observed in Finland and Lithuania. One discussant in the Finnish FG described the connection between nature and Finnish identity: ' … For [a] long [time], some sort of 'bushiness' has united the Finns; the forest has provided a living, safety, [and a] place to hide; it has both divided and united [the Finns]. Maybe the finds associated with hunter culture represent the Finnish identity most … '. Some schemas or motifs, such as representations of wildlife (bear, deer, elk, and birds), in rock paintings and stone objects were considered age-old and specific connections to nature, especially to forests, which are regarded as characteristic of 'Finnishness'. The few preserved archaeological examples of transport or hunting equipment, such as wooden skies, boats, fishnets, and traps, thus represent a way of life that is still recognizable to many Finns, especially those living in the countryside. A Lithuanian FG participant highlighted the emotional relationships between locality, archaeology, and nature: ' … my grandfather was from [the] Latava region … I [came to] understand why this place is so important for my identity later when I heard the local fables [and] stories about the hillforts (maybe not so reasoned historically, but important for locals), histories of post-war resistance and tales about the beautiful nature, including the black storks … '.

(7) 'Stranger' civilizations. The role of 'stranger' (inherited from other nations) monuments is connected to archaeological knowledge. The importance of this framing schema was observed in Cyprus and Greece and partially in Croatia. For Greece and Cyprus, several monuments and artefacts on Greek soil were described as the remains of other civilizations, such as Frankish (Crusader), Ottoman, and Roman; these monuments were viewed sympathetically as reminders of specific historical periods.

(8) Double identities. These identities are based on the synergy between national and subnational (regional, local, and indigenous) identities. They were observed in Finland, Cyprus, and Greece and partially in Lithuania. On the one hand, this schema is connected to the relationship between contemporary identity and prehistoric and historical indigenous people (the ethnic dimension). On the other hand, this frame connects contemporary identity with prehistoric

and historical regions and subregions (the territorial dimension). When FG discussion partici-pants in Cyprus referred to important monuments, they not only cited those in Cyprus but also referred to monuments in Greece and elsewhere that connect with events and periods of Greek, rather than Cypriot, history. In Greece, people from Crete feel both Cretan and Greek; the same applies to Valachians (Vlachoi/Βλάχοι). In all these cases, the respondents described Hellenism as an umbrella under which all these local and native groups fit. One par-ticipant of the Lithuanian FG described his subnational identity: ' … for me, as Samogitian, the Lithuanian identity has a different structure … the Apuolė hillfort [8th–13th century AD, in Samogitia] is important for me, also the kūlgrindos [the medieval hidden underwater stony road] and also the [Samogitian] mythologies of [the] Šatrija, Tverai, [and] Rambynas sites … '. However, another discussant drew a clear line between the Balts and Lithuanians as one between native people and statehood: ' … A. Girininkas [Lithuanian archaeologist] tells us about the ancestors of [the] Balts, but our discussion is about Lithuanian identity. Lithuanian identity is connected with [the] later (medieval) period archaeology of [the] Pajauta valley and Kernavė (UNESCO) site … '.

In Finland, participants commented that material remains and locations, mainly places of historical significance or archaeological sites, can be significant to local or kin identity, family history, and community spirit, as a point of pride or facet of the landscape. In the Finnish FG, one participant stated: ' … As mentioned previously, archaeological finds first and foremost construct local identity, maybe because Finland is a vast country, and after the Ice Age, Finland was mainly settled near the water systems. That's why there are lots of older finds … inland. And the modes of living differed in different parts of Finland … '. The Cypriots self-identified as a Hellenic subnational group. Greek discussants mentioned notable archaeological sites as well as significant locations for smaller or local groups (e.g. the Monastery of Panagia Soumela in Trabzon for Pontic Greeks). The schema was also discussed in Lithuania, Croatia, and Spain. In Lithuania, one FG participant described the subnational identity as local: ' … the local archaeological findings, connected with peoples' family, ancestors [and] homeland are extremely important for [the] whole national identity … '. In Croatia, regional identities are based on the relationship between archaeology and geography. Being part of the Austro-Hungarian and Ottoman Empires and part of Yugoslavia, Dalmatia, once the centre of Croatian kings, is still regarded as the 'heart' of the Croatian nation. In Spain, this issue can be controversial and thus was obviated in FG discussions. Regional identity is underlined by several political discourses that span from heritage to museum displays. As such, the Celtic background is an identity element of Galician neo-nationalism (cf. Bahrami 2003). Furthermore, the History Museum of Catalonia (Barcelona) has proposed a display about the region's origins that contrast with the rest of Spain; a similar exhibit has been proposed in the Basque country.

(9) National heroes. There is a concentration on archaeology and national identity-connected great figures, such as kings. This schema was observed in Croatia, Lithuania, Greece, and Cyprus. For Croatia, this focus is on King Tomislav, and in Lithuania, the medieval duke Vytautas the Great and one of the leaders of the twentieth-century resistance, Adolfas Ramanauskas-Vanagas. The personality of Vytautas is connected to the romanticized 13th–15th-century Lithuanian state in relation to Lithuanian paganism, the Lithuanian war against the Teutonic Order, the leading of the Battle of Grunwald, and the narrative of ' … Lithuanian national features of combativity and power … '. The archaeological knowledge and heritage connected to national heroes include excavated medieval hillforts, castles, and battlefields. Research on Ramanauskas-Vanagas has been highlighted by the media in discussions on archaeology and national identity. Archaeol-ogists were credited for the discovery of Ramanauskas-Vanagas's grave in 2018. In Cyprus and Greece, Alexander the Great was mentioned by Greek and Cypriot discussants several times as a symbol of Hellenism's universality and magnitude. In Spain, this process was undermined by the dictatorship, and hero consideration is not evident in the contemporary national identity context.

(10) Future expectations. This concept focuses on ideas and dreams about the discovery of 'great future artefacts' (significant national identity artefacts that will likely be found in the future). This schema was observed in Croatia and Lithuania. Croatians cited the coronation crown of the medieval kings of Croatia, and Lithuanians, the medieval Grand Duke Vytautas's tomb.

According to our theoretical model, these framing schemas comprise the main issues of the scholarly knowledge translation process into national identity language. We found that archaeological objects and scholarly knowledge are accepted by members of archaeology- and national identity-related communities through the recognition of uniqueness, succession from the past (especially linguistic), connections to cultural patterns (such as Christianity and Western civilization) or natural features (such as forests), separation from 'stranger' civilizations, and the formation of 'pure' national or double levels (native and national or national and subnational) of identity, as well as expectations for future archaeological finds. The boundaries of these framing schemas are relative to one another and non-exclusive. They derive from community knowledge, are recognized by the members of the community, and connect the individual with a personal interpretation of the past in the larger structure of the community.

Conclusion and discussion

In the case study of FG discussions on archaeology and the nation in six European countries, we find that archaeological knowledge serves the specific needs of non-professional archaeology-related communities. In a broader sense, we perceive communication between professional scholars and members of non-professional communities as part of the field of science communication and a framework for avoiding cases of miscommunication and implementing more effective communication.

We define the transformation of scholarly archaeological knowledge into national identity values as the translation of knowledge in conjunction with the dominant ideas and discourses in particular communities. These discourses, which we refer to as framing schemas, play a crucial role in the translation process. They connect personal interpretation with community knowledge. Moreover, they work as (i) filters, by enabling or hindering community access to the particular knowledge, and as (ii) codes, by organizing the filtered knowledge into community-oriented messages. We identified ten different framing schemas: Uniqueness, Succession, Language, Christianity, Western civilization, Nature, Stranger civilizations, Double identities, National heroes, and Future expectations. The different framing schemas are interconnected; Western civilization is connected with Stranger civilizations, Double identities, and National heroes. National heroes links with Uniqueness, Succession, Language, and Future expectations, while Stranger civilizations connect with Christianity, and Christianity, with Nature.

The application of the framing schemas varies in different countries. For example, the National heroes schema was observed in Croatia, Lithuania, Greece, and Cyprus but not in Finland or Spain; the Nature schema was observed only in Finland and Lithuania. These differences reflect the different historical experiences of people living in different countries, based on the different political regimes in place during the 20th century. For example, Lithuania, as annexed USSR territory, Croatia, as part of Yugoslavia, Greece and Spain as right-wing dictatorships in the post-war period while Finland remained democratic.

Archaeological knowledge acts as a 'brick of identity' in constructing a nation as a kind of imagined community. Nevertheless, only a few discussion participants reflected it. One discussant in the Greek group mentioned that the concept of a Hellenic nation is more a construction than a historical reality. The 'immanence' of the nation, which remains the same through the centuries, is prevalent in the data analysed by us. Many discussants recognized the connection between archaeological knowledge and national identity as relatively weak, exercised caution in FG discussions on controversial topics, and acknowledged that archaeology and history can be or have been manipulated for specific purposes.

Social network sites work as mediating spaces. In a broader sense, they enable two ongoing opposite and related phenomena: 'new fragmentation' and 'global convergence'. During the process of new fragmentation, social network groups with specific local identities are created and strengthened at local and global levels. These groups are integrally interwoven and distinctly separate from other groups. However, on a global scale, fragmented local groups are connected to international networks of similar identities, engendering the convergence of fragmented ideas (such as the relationships between nationalist political groups from different countries in contemporary Europe).

The identified framing schemas form an applicable background for future research. They can be used to identify the relationships between identities and general cultural ideas, such as romanticized history, panhellenism, multiculturalism, and nationalism, or to classify different archaeology-based national identities. The framing schema-based model enables the determination of similarities in archaeological knowledge work and national identity construction in different countries and the identification of similar pairs, such as Greece-Cyprus, Greece-Croatia, and Finland-Spain. Moreover, the framing schema-based model enables us to better understand the processes of new fragmentation and global convergence.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

Notes on contributors

Dr. Rimvydas Laužikas is a Professor of Digital Social Science and Humanities in the Faculty of Communication of Vilnius University. His education is in the interdisciplinary SSH fields of educational sciences, archaeology and communication and information sciences. Rimvydas's research interests cover Information management and communication of cultural heritage; Medieval and Early Modern Times archaeology; History of food and gastronomic culture.

Dr. Johanna Enqvist is an archaeologist and heritage scholar, specialised in critical theory, concepts, terminologies and discourses of heritage. Her PhD research (2016) concerned the Finnish cultural heritage management's key concepts, discourses, and ideologies.

Dr. Pedro Luengo is presently professor of the History of Art Department in the Universidad de Sevilla. The received his PhD in History of Art from this institution, with his work "Intramuros: arquitectura en Manila, 1739–1788". He has been visiting academic at different international institutions, such as San Agustin Museum (Manila), Instituto de Investigaciones Estéticas (Mexico), European University Institute (Florence), the King's College London, the Oxford University or Sapienza Univeristà di Roma. He has taken part in several international research projects, being the principal investigator of one on Xiyanglou buildings in the Yuanming Yuan Garden in Beijing and one on the architecture of power during the eighteenth century. He has published several papers in journals both national and international. More remarkable is the edition of his books titled "Intramuros: Arquitectura en Manila, 1739–1762" (Madrid: Fundación Universitaria Española, 2012); "Manila, plaza fuerte. Ingenieros militares entre Europa, América y Asia" (Madrid, CSIC-Ministerio de Defensa, 2013) or "The Convents of Manila: Globalized architecture during the Iberian Union" (Quezon City, Ateneo University Press, 2017).

Dr. Rajna Sosic Klindzic is an Associate Professor at the Department of Archaeology, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb. She obtained a PhD at the same University in 2010. At the moment she is PI of the project "Modelling Prehistoric Networks of Slavonia" by Croatian Science Foundation. Here research interests and publications covers topics in History of Archaeology, Neolithic Archaeology and Landscape Archaeology.

Dr. Marina Toumpouri holds a PhD in Art history from the University Charles-de-Gaulle – Lille 3. She was involved in various research projects and digitisation initiatives in the field of Cultural Heritage in Cyprus, Greece and France, while she has also held a curatorial position at the Church of Cyprus (Holy Bishopric of Limassol). She is currently a Research associate of the Centre for Medieval Arts and Rituals (CeMAR) of the University of Cyprus. Her research focuses on Byzantine pictorial narratology, as well as on issues related to the materiality, production, collection and use(s) of Byzantine and Crusader manuscripts, with special emphasis on Cyprus.

ORCID

Rimvydas Laužikas 🔟 http://orcid.org/0000-0001-9853-8738
Johanna Enqvist 🔟 http://orcid.org/0000-0003-0901-7987
Pedro Luengo 🔟 http://orcid.org/0000-0003-0462-4921
Rajna Šošić-Klindžić 🔟 http://orcid.org/0000-0001-5065-7703
Marina Toumpouri 🔟 http://orcid.org/0000-0002-2201-9664

References

Anderson, Benedict. 1991. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London and New York: Verso.

Atalay, Sonia. 2012. *Community-Based Archaeology. Research with, by, and for Indigenous and Local Communities*. Berkeley: University of California press.

Bahrami, Beebe. 2003. "The Modern Celts of Northern Spain." *Expedition* 45 (1): 32–38. https://www.penn.museum/sites/expedition/the-modern-celts-of-northern-spain.

Cabanes, Pierre. 2004. "Archéologie et Identité Nationale en Albanie au XXe Siècle." *Dialogues D'Histoire Ancienne* 30 (1): 115–122. doi:10.3406/dha.2004.2707.

Castells, Manuel. 1997. *The Power of Identity*. Hoboken: Wiley-Blackwell.

Conrad, Sebastian, Eckert Andreas, Ulrike Freitag, Christopher A. Bayly, Charles Bright, Frederick Cooper, Arif Dirlik, et al. 2007. *Globalgeschichte: Theorien, Ansätze, Themen*. Frankfurt: Campus Verlag.

Criado-Boado, Felipe. 2001. "La Memoria y su Huella. Sobre Arqueología, Patrimonio e Identidad." *Claves de Razón Práctica* 115: 36–43.

Curta, Florin. 2014. "Ethnic Identity and Archaeology." In *Encyclopedia of Global Archaeology*, edited by Claire Smith, 2507–2514. New York: Springer.

Dallas, Costis. 2007. "Archaeological Knowledge, Virtual Exhibitions and the Social Construction of Meaning." *Archeologia e Calcolatori* 1: 31–63. http://www.archcalc.cnr.it/indice/Suppl_1/4_Dallas.pdf.

Dallas, Costis, Rimvydas Laužikas, Ingrida Kelpšienė, Irmelin Axelsen, Suzie Thomas, Vykintas Vaitkevičius, Elena Stylianou, et al. 2021. "A Framework for Qualitative Interviewing Research on Archaeological and Archaeology-Related Communities." *Journal of Community Archaeology and Heritage*. (Forthcoming).

Davison, Graeme. 2008. "Heritage: From Patrimony to Pastiche." In *The Heritage Reader*, edited by Graham Fairclough, Rodney Harrison, John H. Jameson Jnr., and John Schofield. Chapter 2, 31–41. London: Routledge.

Denktaş, Raouf. 1982. *The Cyprus Struggle*. London: Allen & Unwin.

Diaz-Andreu, Margarita, and Lucy Sam. 2005. *The Archaeology of Identity: Approaches to Gender, age, Ethnicity, Status and Religion*. London, New York: Routledge.

Dijk van, Jan. 2005. *The Network Society: Social Aspects of New Media*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE.

Díaz-Andreu, Margarita. 1999. "Nacionalismo y Arqueología. Del Viejo al Nuevo Mundo." *Revista do Museu de Arqueologia e Etnologia* 3: 161–180. doi:10.11606/issn.2594-5939.revmaesupl.1999.113466.

Díaz-Andreu, Margarita. 2004. "Nacionalismo y Arqueología: El Contexto Político de Nuestra Disciplina." *Eres. Arqueología/Bioantropología* 12: 143–168.

Díaz-Andreu, Margarita, and Timothy Champion. 2016. *Nationalism and Archaeology in Europe*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Fawcett, Clare, and Philip Kohl. 1995. *Nationalism, Politics, and the Practice of Archaeology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fewster, Derek. 2000. "Keskustelua: Lisiä Muinaisuuden Poliittisuuteen." *Muinaistutkija* 2000 (1): 49–53.

Fewster, Derek. 2006. *Visions of Past Glory: Nationalism and the Construction of Early Finnish History*. The Finnish Literature Society: Helsinki.

Fewster, Derek. 2008. "Arkeologisen Tutkimuksen Historia Suomessa." In *Johdatus Arkeologiaan*, edited by Petri Halinen, Visa Immonen, Mika Lavento, Terhi Mikkola, Ari Siiriäinen and Pirjo Uino. Chapter 4, 97–108. Helsinki: Gaudeamus.

Gee, James Paul. 2014. *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis Theory and Method*. London: Routledge.

Gellner, Ernest. 1983. *Nations and Nationalism*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Gracia, Alonso, and Francisco Luís. 2013. "Arqueología y Nacionalismo. El Desarrollo de la Arqueología en Cataluña a Principios del Siglo XX." *Complutum* 24 (2): 131–144.

Graham, Brian, Gregory John Ashworth, and J. E. Tunbridge. 2000. *A Geography of Heritage*. London: Arnold.

Hamilakis, Yannis. 2007. *The Nation and its Ruins: Antiquity, Archaeology, and National Imagination in Greece*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Hobsbawm, Eric. 1992. *Nations and Nationalism Since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Huvila, Isto. 2006. *The Ecology of Information Work: a Case Study of Bridging Archaeological Work and Virtual Reality Based Knowledge Organisation*. Åbo: Åbo Akademi Press.

Huvila, Isto. 2019. "Management of Archaeological Information and Knowledge in Digital Environment." In *Knowledge Management, Arts and Humanities*, edited by Meliha Handzic, and Daniela Carlucci, 147–169. Cham: Springer.

Huvila, Isto, and Jeremy Huggett. 2018. "Archaeological Practices, Knowledge Work and Digitalisation." *Journal of Computer Applications in Archaeology* 1 (1): 88–100. doi:10.5334/jcaa.6.

Jacobs, Ronald L. 2017. "Knowledge Work and Human Resource Development." *Human Resource Development Review* 16 (2): 176–202. doi:10.1177/1534484317704293.

Jones, Siân. 1997. *The Archaeology of Ethnicity. Constructing Identities in the Past and Present*. London: Routledge.

Katsourides, Yiannos. 2018. "The Rise of Greek Cypriot Nationalism to Hegemony: Agency, Particularities, and Popularization." In *Cypriot Nationalisms in Context History, Identity and Politics*, edited by Thekla Kyritsi, and Nikolaos Christofis, 25–46. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kizilyürek, Niyazi. 2003. "The Politics of Identity in the Turkish Cypriot Community: A Response to the Politics of Denial?" In *I. Méditerranée: Ruptures et Continuités. Actes du Colloque Tenu à Nicosie les 20-22 Octobre 2001*, edited by May Chehab, Yannis Ioannou, and Françoise Métral, 197–204. Lyon: Maison de l'Orient et de la Méditerranée Jean Pouilloux.

Kohl, Philip L. 1998. "Nationalism and Archaeology: On the Constructions of Nations and the Reconstructions of the Remote Past." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 27: 223–246.

Kulevičius, Salvijus. 2012. "Žemaičių Tapatumo Vingiai XXI a.: Savos Praeities ir Paveldo Paieškos." *Acta Humanitarica Universitatis Saulensis* 14: 224–245.

Laužikas, Rimvydas, Costis Dallas, Suzie Thomas, Ingrida Kelpšienė, Isto Huvila, Pedro Luengo, Helena Nobre, Marina Toumpouri, and Vykintas Vaitkevičius. 2018. "Archaeological Knowledge Production and Global Communities: Boundaries and Structure of the Field." *Open Archaeology* 4 (1): 350–364. doi:10.1515/opar-2018-0022.

Loizides, Neophytos. 2007. "Ethnic Nationalism and Adaptation in Cyprus." *International Studies Perspectives* 8: 172–189.

Lotman, Juri. 2001. *Universe of the Mind: A Semiotic Theory of Culture*. London: I.B.Tauris.

Lotman, Juri. 2005. "On the Semiosphere." *Sign Systems Studies* 33 (1/4): 205–229.

McDowell, Sara. 2008. "Heritage, Memory and Identity." In *The Ashgate Research Companion to Heritage and Identity*, edited by Brian Graham, and Peter Howard, 37–53. Surrey: Ashgate.

Merriman, Nick. 2004. *Public Archaeology*. London: Routledge.

Meskell, Lynn. 2002. "The Intersections of Identity and Politics in Archaeology." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 31: 279–301.

Moshenska, Gabriel. 2017. *Key Concepts in Public Archaeology*. London: UCL Press.

Papadakis, Yiannis. 1998. "Greek Cypriot Narratives of History and Collective Identity: Nationalism as a Contested Process." *American Ethnologist* 25 (2): 149–165. doi:10.1525/ae.1998.25.2.149.

Papadakis, Yiannis. 2005. *Echoes from the Dead Zone: Across the Cyprus Divide*. London: I.B. Tauris.

Parkins, Helen. 1997. "Archaeology and Nationalism: Excavating the Foundations of Identity." *Nations and Nationalism* 3 (3): 451–458. doi:10.1111/j.1354-5078.1997.00451.x.

Pyöriä, Pasi. 2005. "The Concept of Knowledge Work Revisited." *Journal of Knowledge Management* 9 (3): L116–L127. Doi:10.1108/13673270510602818.

Ren, Cotji A. 2006. "Maya Archaeology and the Political and Cultural Identity of Contemporary Maya in Guatemala." *Archaeologies* 2 (1): 8–19. doi:10.1007/s11759-006-0003-4.

Ruiz Zapatero, Gonzalo. 2002. "Arqueología e Identidad: la Construcción de *Referentes de Prestigio* en la Sociedad Contemporánea." *Arqueoweb: Revista Sobre Arqueología e Internet* 4 (1). https://webs.ucm.es/info/arqueoweb/pdf/4-1/ruizzapatero.pdf

Ruiz Zapatero, Gonzalo. 2010. "Arqueología e Identidad: La Proyección Social del Pasado." In *Actas XIII Jornadas de Estudios Sobre Fuerteventura y Lanzarote II*, edited by María José Alonso Gómez, Eva R. de León Arbelo y Félix Hormiga, 15–49. Puerto del Rosario: Cabildo de Fuerteventura.

Schneider, Florian A. 2018. *China's Digital Nationalism*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Shennan, Stephen J. 1995. *Archaeological Approaches to Cultural Identity*. London: Routledge.

Shnirelman, Victor A. 2013. "Nationalism and Archeology." *Anthropology & Archeology of Eurasia* 52 (2): 13–32.

Smith, Anthony D. 1995. "*The Formation of National Identity*." In *Identity*, edited by Henry, 129–153. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sommer, Ulrike. 2017. "Archaeology and Nationalism." In *Key Concepts in Public Archaeology*, edited by Gabriel Moshenska, 166–186. London: UCL Press.

Stake, Robert. 2005. *Qualitative Case Studies*. *Thousand* Oaks: SAGE.

Stavrinides, Zenon. 1999. "Greek Cypriot Perceptions." In *Cyprus: The Need for New Perspectives*, edited by Clement H. Dodd, 54–96. Huntington: The Eothen Press.

Šermukšnytė, Rūta, Vasil Banach, Ivan Choma, Irina Hnidik, Serhij Koniuchov, Salvijus Kulevičius, Julija Kurdina, et al. 2019. *Naratyvų Labirintuose: Lietuvos ir Ukrainos Muziejų Patirtys*. Vilnius: Vilniaus universiteto leidykla.

Tallgren, Aarne M. 1937. "The Method of Prehistoric Archaeology." *Antiquity* 11: 152–164.

Topić, Martina, and Kirk Niamh. 2019. "Media and Nationalism in the Network Society. Special Issue Information." *Social Sciences* 8 (60). https://www.mdpi.com/journal/socsci/special_issues/media_nationalism.

Trigger, Bruce G. 1984. "Alternative Archaeologies: Nationalist, Colonialist, Imperialist." *Man* 19: 355–370.

Trigger, Bruce G. 1996. "Romanticism, Nationalism and Archaeology." In *Nationalism, Politics and the Practice of Archaeology*, edited by Philip L. Kohl, and Clare Fawcett, 263–279. London: Routledge.

Yin, Robert K. 2014. *Case Study Research Design and Methods*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE.