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Tracing networks: craft traditions in the ancient Mediterranean and beyond (by Lin Foxhall and Katharina Rebay-Salisbury)

A new research programme funded by The Leverhulme Trust and based at the University of Leicester brings together archaeologists from Leicester, Glasgow and Exeter, as well as academics from archaeology and ancient history, museum studies and computer science. This programme promises to open up an array of interesting research themes and to question the way in which we look at the past.

**Image:** Mediterranean connections on a black-figure kylix: Dionysos in a ship, sailing among dolphins, by Exekias (Photo: Staatliche Antikensammlung und Glyptothek, Munich)

‘Tracing networks’ investigates the network of contacts across and beyond the Mediterranean region, between the late Bronze Age and the late Classical Period (1500–200BCE). It focuses on networks of crafts-people and craft traditions, asking how and why traditions, techniques and technologies change and cross cultural boundaries, and exploring the impact of this phenomenon. The long time-span helps to set technological networks in their larger social, economic and political settings to expand our understanding how knowledge moves and develops in the context of wider cultural trajectories.

In seven closely linked archaeological projects, we investigate material culture as the primary evidence for cultural contact. Extensive contacts between different groups at all levels from the household to the state across the Mediterranean include the regular exchange of ideas, objects, materials and techniques. Studying a wide range of material objects at every stage of their production, distribution, use and consumption across a large geographical region, over a long time period, will allow us to capture the meanings and variety of the intricate socio-political, economic and cultural networks that people built and destroyed.

The concepts of the *chaîne opératoire* and Cross-Craft Interaction offer a systematic theoretical framework which allows comparisons across cultural contexts and diachronically. The *chaîne opératoire* considers all technological and social elements of the production, distribution and consumption of a specific object from the procurement of raw materials to the finished item. Cross Craft Interaction can best be understood as the ways in which multiple crafts studied together have a technological and social impact on each other. Both concepts link technologies with their social meanings in studying networks of crafts-people in the past.

An important component of the programme is the cooperation with computer science. It allows us to analyse and compare data on a larger scale and more systematically, and brings out relationships we could not otherwise find. We use IT to increase our understanding of history, but computer science can use that understanding of history as a metaphor, which helps to optimise computer software and to propose new methodologies for developing production-aware service networks in global computing. Outcomes from the programme will include at least one co-authored book, a session at a major international conference resulting in an edited volume, and monographs and specialist studies generated by and between sub-projects.

For more information on the ‘Tracing networks’ programme and the individual component projects, please visit [www.tracingnetworks.ac.uk](http://www.tracingnetworks.ac.uk) or contact Katharina Rebay-Salisbury at kcrs1@le.ac.uk
Archaeological discoveries in the caves of Seulo, Central Sardinia (by Robin Skeates)

During the summer of 2009, scientific research was carried out by an international team of archaeologists on a unique group of prehistoric caves in the Sardinian territory of Seulo (CA). Each cave contains rich prehistoric ritual deposits and one has rare paintings. The majority of this material dates to between the Neolithic and Bronze Age (between around 4000 and 2000 years BC), although the human use of these caves has continued to the present day. The utilized caves range from wide rock-shelters to small chambers, long corridors and large complex cave systems with elaborate stalagmite and stalactite formations. They are distributed along valleys formed by tributaries of the River Flumendosa.

The cave sites were discovered between 2004 and 2006 by Dott.ssa Giusi Gradoli (COMET – Valorizzazione Risorse Territoriali), and brought to the attention of archaeologists by Dott.ssa Gradoli and Dr Terry Meaden of the University of Oxford (UK).

The on-going research programme, funded by the British Academy and the Prehistoric Society (UK), and directed by Dr Robin Skeates of the Department of Archaeology of Durham University (UK), seeks to clarify the research potential of the Seulo caves, using a range of modern scientific techniques on this new and potentially high-quality archaeological dataset, with particular reference to questions surrounding the ritual transformation of persons, objects and caves in prehistoric times.

The work is being undertaken with the permission of the Direzione Generale per i Beni Archeologici (Roma), in collaboration with the Soprintendenza per i Beni Archeologici per le Province di Sassari e Nuoro, and with the assistance of the Comune di Seulo. A key part of this summer’s work was the archaeological excavation of four contrasting cave sites.

Image: Excavating Riparo sotto roccia Su Cannisoni

Riparo sotto roccia Su Cannisoni
‘Riparo sotto roccia Su Cannisoni’ is a wide rock-shelter situated in a highly visible area of cliffs just below ‘Su Grutta de is Bittuleris’. A key feature here was a pile of stones that had been constructed over a prehistoric burial deposit, which included a pair of adult human
skulls and an adjacent semi-circle of stones containing a large group of human long-bones, some animal bones and some fragments of pottery.

Su Grutta de is Bittuleris
‘Su Grutta de is Bittuleris’ is a small cave situated towards the top of a rocky outcrop on the edge of a plateau. It was used as a burial cave in prehistoric times. In addition to the recovery of substantial quantities of human bones from this cave, and smaller quantities of fragmented animal bones and pottery, a variety of special artefacts were found. These included an obsidian arrowhead, a bone pendant, two beads of shell and fired clay and a bronze button.

Grutta I de Longu Fresu
‘Grutta I de Longu Fresu’ is a 15m long cave that lies on the edge of a small stream in the Foresta di Addoli. A small group of Neolithic paintings has been identified in a niche just to the side of a now extinct spring, close to the innermost end of this cave. The paintings are difficult to decipher (indeed everyone who sees them has a different interpretation), but the general consensus is that at least two schematic linear representations of human (or combined human-animal) figures can be seen, with legs, arms and either an elongated head or horns. Nearby, a rare Neolithic axe-blade made of greenstone was found. Prehistoric human bones, including the remains of at least three skulls, were also found on the floor of this cave, in other niches and holes, and in a small semi-circular structure formed by a modified group of stalagmites.

Grutta de is Janas
‘Grutta de is Janas’ is a large cave complex with two interconnecting branches and two entrances, located on an upper hill slope in the Foresta di Addoli. Here, in a low but wide chamber, an intensively burnt layer was investigated. This contained a large quantity of pottery fragments, some animal bones and obsidian artefacts. Special finds included a perforated sea shell ornament, a small polished stone bead and three obsidian arrowheads.

All of the finds from the fieldwork are now being studied by specialists based in Italy, the UK and Australia. Some samples of material will be submitted for radiocarbon and Uranium-series dating. Other samples will be analysed for traces of DNA.

Further funding is now being sought to continue this cutting-edge scientific research, which promises to shed new light on the human uses of caves as places of natural wonder and as secret-sacred sites and on Sardinia’s prehistoric past.
Correlations between archaeology, ethno-linguistics and ethno-philology (Francesco Benozzo)

This research project consists in the application of Palaeolithic Continuity Theory (PCT) (see www.continuitas.com) to the field of European Archaeology and Ethno-philology. In the last Annual Meeting in Riva del Garda, I gave a paper providing a few examples of this new approach, studying in particular prehistoric incubatio (the practice of remaining for a long period inside a cave, in order to receive, through a dream, some sort of revelation/inspiration or healing). Starting from a reconsideration of the problem of folkloric, dialect and oral remains in the frame of an epistemologically renewed approach, incubatio has been treated from different points of view, pointing out that sources studied by Ethno-philology could be regarded as the only material evidence for many unresolved subjects approached by archaeology. This research operates on three main levels: 1) The linguistic one; 2) the folkloric one; and 3) the one documented by early written texts. The paper given in Riva del Garda (title: Sounds of the Silent Cave. An Ethno-philological Perspective on Prehistoric ‘incubatio’) represents a new starting point, after ten years of field-research on various subjects, such as the totemic motivation behind dialect names of animals and atmospheric phenomena and the prehistoric motivation of many dialect names of hand-tools and crafts.

Previous archaeological-ethno-philological data were presented in the last congress of WAC (‘World Archaeological Congress’), which took place in Dublin in July 2007, where I offered a representative exemplification of the evidence of a continuity from prehistory given by dialect names and legends related to European megaliths (title: Names and Legends of European Megaliths: Evidence of an Ethno-linguistic Continuity from Prehistory).
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In 2003 the ‘Gresham Ship’ was salvaged from the Thames estuary, together with some forty iron bars and other artefacts, including lead and tin ingots. The wreck has been identified as an armed merchant ship built from English oak that was felled around 1574 (Wessex Archaeology 2004, Auer and Frith 2007). At least four guns were also recovered, including one bearing a grasshopper motif and the initials ‘TG’, the mark of Sir Thomas Gresham, thought to have been produced at his Mayfield furnace in East Sussex sometime between 1567 and 1582. Gresham was a well established Tudor merchant with royal connections, and is most famous today for founding the Royal Exchange and Gresham College in London. It is thought that the ship was sailing fully-laden outbound from London or the River Medway. However, this is yet to be confirmed. With some doubt and concern over the future conservation and storage of the iron bars, the importance of their study cannot be underestimated.

The bars are long strips of iron that on initial inspection could be distinguished into two types. Two bars were distinctly flattish, with a rectangular cross-section (25x90mm), compared to the rest of the other bars, which were thinner and square in cross-section (40x40mm at their thickest, tapering down in cases to20x20mm). Their overall length as complete folded bars approximates to roughly 2m with an approximate weight of 60kg. When unfolded, the bars are consistently either 4m or 6m in length. The assemblage is unusual in that their origin is unknown and there are few parallels for comparison. Bar iron was produced in Britain by both the direct (solid state, ‘bloomery’) and indirect process (liquid state) during the late medieval period. It was also being imported into Britain (King 1996, 2003, 2005). The questions therein lie, by which process were the bars from the Gresham Ship made, and where were they made?

Seventeen of the bars were available for study. Following recent studies into entrapped slag inclusions (Blakelock et al 2009; Coustures et al 2003; Dillman and L’Hérithier 2007) the analysis of the iron bars proves them to be made of at least two types of iron, one probably
from a manganese rich ore. The iron was produced from the direct process and the slag inclusions indicate that the bars originate from more than a single source or smelting system.

The metallographic study revealed a great deal of similarity in the manufacture of the bars technologically. Macroscopically, the square section bars had consistent undulating ‘wavy’ surfaces characteristic of being shaped by a water-powered hammer, well attested historically and archaeologically in forges during the late medieval period in Europe (Awty 2006, 2008; Hayman 2005; Smith 1997; van Laun 1979).

The flat-shaped bars may have been rolled. The microstructure of the bars shows that they were largely formed from raw blooms as indicated by their volume and network of elongated slag stringers as well as the variable distribution of carbon.

So far, it has been possible to understand a great deal concerning the similarity and differences between the bars in terms of their technological manufacture and the process by which the iron was produced. Further work needs to be done to try and better establish the origins of these bars in relation to ore deposits in Europe.
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Recent conflicts in Europe and beyond have brought the deliberate destruction of heritage to the foreground. With this has come the realisation that the processes and long-term consequences of these actions are poorly understood. The CRIC project investigates the ways in which the destruction and selective reconstruction of cultural heritage shapes memories of this destruction and affects notions of belonging and identities at different scales, ranging from the individual to the pan-national. The project seeks to illuminate the empirical and theoretical relationship between cultural heritage, conflict and identity. Five regional case studies (Spain, France, Cyprus, Bosnia and Germany) provide historical depth, variation, and different trajectories, while the project’s shared methodologies and axes of investigation ensure comparative results. Collectively the project aims to answer the following questions:

1. What conditions and ideologies inspire the destruction of cultural heritage and what is selected for destruction?

2. What are the consequences at local, national and regional levels of such destruction and the subsequent reconstruction of parts of people’s heritage?

The first year the fieldwork and research has considered multiple sites and monuments throughout the case study areas. Early findings have helped to further the understanding of the specificities of each case study and also to concretise the shared themes that link them despite their spatial and temporal differences.

The research has tracked the sequences of events and identified changing meanings and connotations associated with particular sites – be they landscapes, town squares, churches, mosques or bridges. Initial analysis has brought to light several key themes:

- **Memorialization and commemoration** – these events influence constructions of meanings, including perceptions about rights and victimhood;
- **Monuments and symbols** – these play important social roles by cementing particular versions of history in the public sphere, making it important to understand
• **Complex and contested sites** – as sites where conflicts and discussions over meaning are constructed and renegotiated;

• **The role of the media** – literature, the visual arts, newspapers and television play central roles in how different historical events can become part of a collective set of references. Studying them can contribute to our understanding of issues of collectivity, authorship and authenticity and their role in the ever emergent processes of memory and identity formation;

• **The effect of time** – the importance of time, both as a distancing factor and as a transformative one. The passing of time, the evolution of memorial practices, and the transmission of historical narratives are all central to understanding the impact of destruction and its aftermath.

*The research leading to these results has received funding from the European Community’s Seventh Framework Programme [FP7/2007–2013] under grant agreement n° 217411. Further details can be found on the project website [http://www.cric.arch.cam.ac.uk/](http://www.cric.arch.cam.ac.uk/) and the project’s open access visual data repository at the University of Cambridge, D-Space [http://www.dspace.cam.ac.uk/handle/1810/214815](http://www.dspace.cam.ac.uk/handle/1810/214815)*
Between anthropology and archaeology: the ‘Landscape Mind Theory’ (by Matteo Meschiari)

Following the concept of ‘neuro-archaeology of the mind’ recently proposed by Colin Renfrew (Malafouris and Renfrew 2008), my research project seeks to establish a methodological basis from which to hypothesize a ‘landscape model’ of the human mind. Using archaeological, palaeo-ethnographic and ethnographic data and recent research in neuroscience, I am exploring the role of landscape and the ecosystem in the shaping of cognitive processes in Homo sapiens sapiens (Meschiari 2008, 2009). The analysis focuses in particular on hunter-gatherer societies, and shows how hunting phenomenology, on the one hand, and intellectual and symbolic activity related to the environment, on the other, are connected through evolutionary and cultural factors. My hypothesis is that the mind of Homo sapiens sapiens possesses a cognitive module specifically for landscape that spatially organizes perceptions, representations and individual and collective knowledge. In this project of wide scope in both time (geological, evolutionistic, palaeo-linguistic, palaeo-ethnological) and space (geographical, biological, ethno-linguistic, ethnographic), the possibilities for more detailed research are many: primatology, palaeo-anthropology and neuro-psychology; cynergetic phenomenology, i.e. hunting and predation as a cognitive model; prehistoric rock art, for cognitive models that underlie the spatial representation of the signs and animals depicted, as much as their connection with the natural landscape (Meschiari 1999, 2003, 2002–4); the landscape roots of religious behaviour, along with what Richard Bradley (2000) defines as the ‘archaeology of natural places’. At the last EAA Annual Meeting in Riva del Garda, for example, I gave a paper providing some guidelines for studying the upper Palaeolithic ‘soundscapes’: if we closely analyze the universal mechanisms of way-finding and cognitive mapping, we can argue that it is precisely upon these neuro-cognitive structures that the construction of cultural landscape is based, and, if we translate these space-spatial coordinates into space-sonic co-ordinates, we have at our disposal an analytical model for studying ‘soundscape’ in its structural articulation.
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The north-western archaeological expedition of the State Hermitage Museum (Saint-Petersburg) has been working in the region of Western Dvina for more than forty years. This region is situated at the watershed of three main rivers of Eastern Europe: the Volga, Dvina and Dnepr. This is the intersection of main water-ways and, consequently, of people and their cultures. A scientific approach developed in Saint-Petersburg in 1970s by A. Miklyaev named ‘archaeological geography’ determined the complex method of investigation of archaeological sites situated here. The aim of ‘archaeological geography’ was to investigate spatial expression of inter-relations between man and his physical and social environment using methods of archaeology and natural sciences. This territory was divided into ‘archaeological micro-regions’ – lacustrine basins including archaeological sites.

*Image: View of the site at Serteya II*

In our investigations, we have been collaborating with specialists in geology (P. Dolukhanov, University of Newcastle; project FP6–nest–028192), geo-magnetometry (J. Fassbinder, University of Munich), traceology (Y. Maigrot, UMR 7041 Proto-histoire européenne; project: ECO NET №16333YJ), GIS-technology, dendrochronology (A. Viellet, UMR 6249 Chrono-environnement; D. Hookk, The State Hermitage Museum; project: ECO NET №16333YJ). The development of the archaeological database ‘Monarch’ (Morozov, S., The Shate Hermitage museum), that included the entire description of archaeological sites, helped us to improve our analysis of the past, and to create different archaeological models.

Different types of sites attributed to the Iron Age were found here, but the main field of our researches concerns investigation of early Neolithic sites and pile-dwellings. Early Neolithic sites appeared in the beginning or middle of the seventh millennium BC and existed until the beginning of the sixth millennium BC. The amount of pottery from this period comes to around 240 pots, which represent four traditions of pottery making. They can be traced clearly in other archaeological cultures of Eastern Europe at the same time. They are believed to be connected with pottery diffusion from the earliest ‘pottery making centre’ that was situated in the region of Black Sea, where traces of productive economy were also found.

Pile-dwellings appeared in this territory at the boundary of AT–3/SB–1 (4600–4500BP), coeval with the regression of lakes. The changes in climatic conditions and degradation of broad-leaved forests, fall of the water-level of lakes, their bogging and reduction of their productivity in Sb could result in reduction of natural food resources on this territory and troubled the access to water resources. These circumstances resulted in changes of
economical strategy – settlements became installed on the boundary of different types of
landscape, became inhabited all year long. The building of pile-dwellings was the form of
adaptation to hard ecological conditions of Sb. At this particular time, on the boundary of
Atlantic and Subboreal we traced the appearance of high-capacity vessels, inhabitants
started to store up food and water. The population became more settled, and grew, resulting
in the strengthening of ‘horizontal’ social links, and the formation of a ‘big-man’ institution.

Image: Synchronization of pollen diagram (Dolukhanov et al. 2004) with C14 dates, water level, faunal
remains and archaeological cultures

These sites, now under water, have very-well preserved settlement structures as well as
unique artefacts made from wood, bone and amber. The investigations of these pile-
dwellings are made with the methods of underwater archaeology. Long sessions of
underwater excavations allowed us to gain huge experience in holding and organizing
underwater explorations, to develop the methodology of underwater excavations.

We would be glad to find different specialists who would be interested in developing mutual
projects to carry out multi-disciplinary investigations in this region.

Mazurkevich A. (a-mazurkevich@mail.ru: The State Hermitage Museum, The department of
archaeology), Polkovnikova M. (oaves@hermitage.ru: The State Hermitage Museum, The
department of archaeology), Dolbunova E. (katjer@mail.ru: The State Hermitage Museum,
The department of archaeology)
The prehistoric landscape of the middle Douro Valley: enclosures and social change (by Marcos García García)

Because of the lack of knowledge about the settlement patterns in the central area of Castilla y León (Spain), some authors have considered that it was uninhabited until the Early Iron Age, when the first remains of a permanent architecture appear clearly in the archaeological record. However, this situation has changed in the last twenty years, thanks to recent campaigns of field survey and, especially, with an aerial photography-based project that has led to the discovery of forty-five enclosures in this area. This kind of site, well-known in Western Europe, seems to have been occupied during the Copper and Bronze Ages, as shown by the archaeological survey of some of them and by the excavation of ‘El Casetón de la Era II’ enclosure (Villalba de los Alcores, province of Valladolid). This would mean that there were permanent structures earlier than has traditionally been thought.

Image: aerial photography of ‘El Casetón de la Era II’ (1997)

From 2007, a project directed by G. Delibes (University of Valladolid) and C. Parcero (C.S.I.C., Spanish National Research Council) has been trying to establish what these enclosures were built for, focusing on their spatial relationships with each other and with other contemporary sites. The main methodology is a GIS-based spatial analysis, which integrates spatial information with archaeological records from the excavation of ‘El Casetón’ and from a surface survey project developed between 2007 and 2009 in an area of about 25km radius of this site.

Image: ‘visually controlled’ water resources from ‘El Casetón’, i.e. density view-shed map (from a cloud of points) limited by an access isocrone of 15 minutes

In the first part of the research project, we tested the methodology in the nearby of ‘El Casetón’, in a 7x7km area between two geographic zones: the plain of Tierra de Campos and the moor of Torozos (provinces of Palencia and Valladolid). We contrasted and improved the information contained in the Archaeological Inventories with four months of field survey, managing data with GPS and GIS utilities. With the new data we were able to do the best with our GIS project using spatial terms in three groups of questions: orography, visibility and accessibility. The results of the analysis showed changes in the settlement preferences of societies that inhabited the middle Douro Valley during recent prehistory, as well as demonstrating that the placement of ‘El Casetón’
was an exception in the Copper Age landscape. These results are also remarkable since they are objective and analogous; unlike previous works with subjective and digital (yes/no) conclusions.

Nowadays, we face a bigger area with more prehistoric information: another seven enclosures and about 260 sites. We are working on addressing questions focused on historical problems such as the development of agriculture and stockbreeding or the conflicts for the resources, as well as determining how this can be reflected on the landscape and be contrasted thanks to spatial analyst tools (GIS software, pollen analysis, zoo-archaeology, remote sensing etc.). Our aim is to develop a better idea of the social evolution of the people that lived in the middle Douro Valley from the ‘time of the enclosures’ until the prelude of History.

Image: study area (red contour) defined from ‘El Casetón’ enclosure (blue circle) and including seven more enclosures (yellow circles) and the test area (black square).
3D modelling in archaeology: the case-study of St Martino’s Church, Lomaso, Trento, Italy (by Matteo Rapanà)

Modern 3D modelling techniques (e.g. laser-scanning and photo-grammetry) allow the creation of accurate, realistic and measurable digital 3D models of cities, buildings, terrains, artefacts and archaeological sites. Although these systems are broadly used within the wide sector of the Cultural Heritage for mapping, monitoring, visualization and documenting cultural and historical assets, these techniques are sporadically used in archaeology due to several factors. In this context, the SMALL 3D project was launched by the Soprintendenza Beni Librari e Archeologici of the Autonomous Province of Trento and The Bruno Kessler Foundation (FBK) of Trento. The model of St Martino’s Church was realized not only for visualization, but especially for the study of the 3D application in archaeology and to compare the information provided by this technique with data obtained by traditional techniques.

The twelfth-/thirteenth-century church was erected over the ruins of a fortified establishment of fifth- to sixth-century date. The site is on the summit of Blestone Mountain (980m above sea-level), isolated from other contemporary settlements which dominated the surrounding valley.

The digital model of the church was created using a ‘time of flight’ laser scanner (Leica Scanstation 2), working for one afternoon. Besides this, HDR pictures were acquired with a Kodak DCS ProSRL/n digital camera for the texturing of the 3D model and photo-realistic visualization. Finally, the 3D building has been geo-referenced using GPS data for a correct insertion into the surrounding Digital Elevation Model (DEM). In the lab, some operations were executed (range data alignment, editing, mesh generation, geometric simplification and texture mapping) to transform the 3D data into a complete 3D model (300 hours of work).

Exact measurements of distances, surfaces, thicknesses and volumes of the structures or of particular architectural elements were performed. Using a series of horizontal, vertical and inclined planes, horizontal and vertical sections as well as plans of the various building phases were derived.

Particular elements were also recognized and emphasized thanks to the creation of the 3D model. These elements have been inserted into a database according to their characteristics and this led to the generation of several 3D thematic maps (i.e. building phase maps or lithotopes).
Finally, the integration of the digital model of the church into the DEM could be used for the clarification and understanding of settlement trends and territorial organization in the past.

### Image: Plan of the church

3D modelling technologies (RBM, IBM) can be employed to:

- visualize an object in 3D and in its context (DEM);
- measure distances, surfaces and volumes;
- elaborate reliefs (plans, sections);
- study particular elements and create thematic or chronological maps;
- reconstruct the object or architectural fragment or building to its original aspect and in its different phases;
- analyze (stratigraphical patterning, restoration plans, virtual aid...);
- check situations in progress;
- create physical replicas

The presented experience demonstrates clearly how 3D modelling is an efficient tool in archaeology too, helping the research and the knowledge in the investigated area and it proves that is not anymore a mere optional accessory but it should become a standard for all the archaeological investigation on sites and objects.
In addition, old pictures showing parts of the ruins before the restoration were applied onto the generated geometric model, enabling the visualization of its original form.

**Image:** Different building phases (yellow elements belong to the Early Medieval structure; red elements to the church’s first phase; blue sections were added after the fifteenth century).
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Recent discoveries from the Late Neolithic to Middle Bronze Age settlement on the Kiechlberg/Thaur (North Tyrol, Austria) (by Ulrike Töchterle, Gert Goldenberg and Gerhard Tomedi)

The Kiechlberg is a small hill, 1028m above sea-level, on the south face of the Karwendel mountain range, a few kilometres northeast of Innsbruck (see map, below). The isolated position above the Inn valley, combined with the steep slopes of the hill might have been attractive for prehistoric settlers. Superficial finds of artefacts and metallurgical slags led to first archaeological excavations, which started in 2007 under the auspices of the Special Research Program HiMAT (History of Mining Activities in Tyrol and adjacent Areas – Impact on Environment and Human Societies: www.uibk.ac.at/himat). This interdisciplinary programme is based at the University of Innsbruck, with international partners and funding from the Austrian Science Fund, FWF, and local sponsors.

Image: Geographic location of the Kiechlberg

On the Kiechlberg, a large amount of ceramic and flint artefacts as well as objects of copper and bronze were collected during the investigation of a prehistoric layer of debris, indicating occupation of the site from the Late Neolithic up to the Middle Bronze Age. Together with the archaeological finds and (mostly in the upper layers of the studied stratigraphy), various slags and copper-rich semi-products (unrefined antimony-rich copper) occur and prove primary copper metallurgy at the site during the Copper and Bronze Age.

This feature gave reason to investigate and to discuss questions on the provenance of raw materials and prehistoric smelting techniques, on settlement structures and trans-alpine trade routes from the fifth to the second millennium BC. The first results of provenance studies for flint as well as copper show trans-alpine trade relations. Flint of southern alpine origin (Monti Lessini and elsewhere) played an important role for the lithic tools. In addition to local raw material, plate chert from Bavaria can also be found and this, together with ceramic from the ‘Polling-Group’, confirms cultural contacts with the area at the northern foothills of the Alps, in today’s Bavaria. This post-Rössen culture group is one of the many local phenomena that have emerged at the transition from the Middle Neolithic to the Late Neolithic in southern Germany. Some other ceramic fragments can be assigned to the south...
alpine culture group of ‘Vasi a Bocca Quadrata’. Based on the style of decoration as well as the typical square mouths, the pieces can be dated to the early fourth millennium BC. As ceramics from southern and northern alpine regions are always assembled with local material, the presence of cultural groups from the regions mentioned above is probable.

An important trade route running from north to south and vice versa passed near by the Kiechelberg, which made this settlement an outstanding site, as is demonstrated by the abundance and diversity of archaeological material. Further investigations will point out the importance of this route in the role of distribution of raw materials and also finished objects during the Late Neolithic to Middle Bronze Age. The analysis of the 2007 and 2008 excavations is taking place within a framework of broad interdisciplinary teamwork in the HiMAT research programme. By analyzing diverse finds, such as animal bones, charred cereals and metallurgical remains, the economy of the Late Neolithic to Middle Bronze Age population on the Kiechelberg site may be reconstructed, and this will help to shed light on the earliest settlements of the Tyrol.
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Report on the workshop ‘Bridging the Divide’, held at the McDonald Institute, Cambridge, 6–7 November 2009 (by James Whitley and Simon Stoddart)

How international is scholarship, in the fields of prehistory, classical archaeology and classics? Not as international as it should be, would be one answer. There are many divides in archaeology – in Britain, the divide between prehistory and classical archaeology remains deep, and few seem very keen to bridge it. And this divide relates, quite closely, to one that separates distinct traditions of scholarship, both in prehistory and in classical archaeology, between the German-speaking world of Central Europe (Germany, Austria and Switzerland) and the English-speaking world, particularly in Britain.

This particular divide has remained fairly impermeable for the past forty years or so. Despite the ‘fall of the wall’ in 1989, and the greater freedoms that many Europeans have enjoyed since then, it still persists. The workshop held at the McDonald Institute in Cambridge on 6 and 7 November, and supported by Cardiff University, the McDonald Institute and Magdalene College, Cambridge, was designed to address this issue. But it did not come about primarily as an initiative intended to improve our understanding of the history of archaeological thought and practice. Rather, it might be seen as a kind of ‘gift exchange’. In 2008, Professor Manfred Bietak of the University of Vienna, invited the two authors of this report to Vienna to help with his TiMe project. TiMe (Transformations in the Mediterranean World, 1200–500BC) is intended primarily as an Austrian German initiative (its German director being Professor Hartmut Matthäus of Erlangen). Its purpose is, first and foremost, to refine the chronology of the Mediterranean world in this period – to link up the relative chronologies that have been constructed for the Egypt, the Levant, the Aegean, the Central Mediterranean, Italy, North Africa and the Iberian Peninsula; and to develop further ‘absolute’ chronologies based on radiocarbon and dendrochronology. Our first response to this very kind invitation was to question what kind of transformations we are talking about, and what we would have a chronology of. Should we talk about collapse or connectivity, colonisation or Mediterraneanization? All of these terms are contested, as are the concepts that might help to explain how the Mediterranean world was transformed in this period (agency, trade, exchange, migration).

The workshop we held in Cambridge (which we developed with the help of Alexandra Villing of the British Museum) was intended to follow up the discussions we had in Vienna, with the dual intention of a) further developing the TiMe project and b) exploring the intellectual divide that has (it seems) turned British archaeologists into theorists and German-speaking archaeologists into empiricists (at least in the popular understanding of these terms). It could be argued that there is now a complementary ‘skills deficit’ in Britain and the German-speaking world. Britons may aspire to be accomplished theorists, but their knowledge of the material stuff upon which interpretation must be based often seems superficial (particularly nowadays when it comes to bronze objects). And Germans have (as yet) not much reputation as theorists. Whether, again, these stereotypical perceptions are in any way true is one of the things we set out to explore.

After an introduction by James Barrett, deputy director and acting director of the McDonald Institute, Anthony Snodgrass (Cambridge) set the tone of the workshop with some personal reminiscences, focusing on the strengths of German classical archaeology (chiefly the ability to test hypotheses in such a way as its truth or falsity can be determined with a certainty close to absolute). This was followed by Manfred Bietak’s description of the TiMe project, envisaged as a kind of umbrella meta-project within which a variety of sub-projects (with a particular regional or thematic focus) can be undertaken. Simon Stoddart followed this with a look at the ‘meta-narratives’ of theory in British archaeology/prehistory as contrasted with those in German or Italian publications. While German and Italian scholars noted (and referenced) the key theoretical works by American and British scholars, Matthew Johnston stated quite explicitly, in his primer on archaeological theory, that he was deliberately to make no reference at all to anything not written in English.
The introduction was followed by papers from senior scholars with a more specific focus. Diamantis Panagiotopoulos (Heidelberg) looked at the competing paradigms for the study of the ancient (and medieval) Mediterranean, from Braudel onwards. Hartmut Matthäus’s and James Whitley’s papers demonstrated the complementary strengths of German and British approaches, Matthäus’ demonstrating an exemplary degree of focus and Gründlichkeit, Whitley’s allowing more flights of literary fancy in its exploration of the Homeric ‘entangled object’. Alexandra Villing’s account of the twists and turns of the Naukratis project not only demonstrated the extensive Mediterranean entanglements of this Greek city-in-Egypt, but also surprised some of the British members in the audience by showing us how ‘theoretical’ major applications to funding bodies now have to be in Germany.

Saturday was devoted to the views of younger scholars, who had a variety of personal perspectives on how the divides between various archaeological traditions could be bridged. Esther Widman (Heidelberg/Cambridge) gave a personal account of trying to negotiate the moraine of theories in British prehistoric and German classical archaeology respectively. What have images of maenads on Attic red figure got to do with paths and networks in ancient Crete? Michael Krueger (Poznan and Barcelona) gave an account of the parallel developments in Spanish/Catalan and Polish archaeology in the study of the ancient Mediterranean, and the degree to which archaeological practice in either country was influenced by Anglophone or Germanophone theory/scholarship. Katherina Rebay (Leicester) pointed out that Germanophone scholarship is not uniform in its theories or guiding principles – there were marked differences between the North German and Austrian/S. German regions when it came to understanding culture history in the early years of the twentieth century. And Francesca Fulminante (Cambridge and NIAS Wassenaar) gave us a case study of the application of network theory to the distribution of sites in Early Iron Age Latium. The papers were rounded off by two reflections from some more established Italian scholars, both of whom have had to engage with Germanophone and Anglophone traditions. Letizia Abbondanza (Rome) looked in detail at the case of Lehmann-Hartleben, who had to move from Germany to the USA in the 1930s; and Gabriele Cifani (Rome) examined the distinct approaches to both urbanism and landscape employed by British and German scholars in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

To summarise the papers is not, however, to summarise the informal and wide-ranging discussions. What came through strongly was the number of German scholars who have recently found jobs in the UK, many (indeed most) of whom attended the workshop. Themes which surfaced in the papers were given a new twist in these discussions – theory itself may be an entangled object, moving from one country and then back again, being transformed in the process. The way traditions are maintained may be seen as a kind of ‘heirloom’, something passed down as a ‘possession for ever’ between one generation and the next (even if the Anglo-Saxon traditions like to celebrate rhetorical revolutions as against the underlying tradition)? Traditions in Germany may also be reinforced by the institutional separation of philology, Classical Archaeology, Ancient History and prehistory in many German universities – established professors see no reason to change their research focus; indeed, any change in a more ‘interdisciplinary’ direction is often seen as a direct threat to their ‘autocratic rule in their own little kingdoms’ (as one of our German colleagues put it). Certainly this is how some of the younger Germans view the academic structures in Austria and Germany, and it is one of the things they are glad to escape by coming to the UK.

Conversely, one of the reasons that these younger German scholars have found posts in the United Kingdom (and thus out-competed the supposedly more theory-savvy Brits) is precisely through the traditional German virtue of Gründlichkeit, of knowing their material with a thoroughness, immersion in the evidence and linguistic versatility that few younger British scholars in the fields of Classics, Classical Archaeology or prehistory can now match.

What also emerged was how German archaeology (and Classical Studies) holds up a mirror to the state of the affairs in the UK. Both in Britain and in the German-speaking world there remains a deep divide between prehistory and Classical archaeology. In Britain, the divide is
complicated by class. British prehistory is, in popular culture and television, celebrated for being *British* – no nasty Romans to mess us up and confuse us with complicated Mediterranean customs and ideas. Classical archaeology is seen as being irredeemably upper class, and so somehow less genuinely archaeological than prehistory. If it is less truly archaeological, so it must also be less genuinely theoretical. In Britain, archaeology (and so theory) is by default prehistoric. In Germany, these class complications are less clear, and *Archäologie* (the default setting) means Classical archaeology, not archaeology as a whole. Moreover, the divide between British and German archaeology is not so much that one is theoretical, and the other isn’t – it is not a matter of ‘applying’ theory from one place to another. Rather the difference lies in how theory is mobilised to bring about academic success. *Explicit* theorising, especially when novelty can reasonably be claimed, has been the essential feature of academic success in British archaeology since around 1990. One can be theoretical, demonstrate poor scholarship and be very, very wrong, as long as one is interesting. In Germany, the aim is primarily to be right – or, if not right, so thorough that no-one else can impugn one’s academic credentials. This may be one reason why those German classical archaeologists who *have* tried to be explicitly theoretical (notably Herbert Hoffman and Lambert Schneider in Hamburg) have managed to re-shape neither the academic structure nor the intellectual priorities of their discipline.

These themes were brought out sharply in the final discussion. John Davies (Liverpool), an ancient historian, was asked to act as discussant on the TiMe project. This project raises a number of issues which, if they could be clarified, would be of enormous interest to ancient historians. The difficulty again lies in what exactly it is we are seeking a chronology of, and how to describe the transformations that took place in the Mediterranean between 1200 and 500 BC (let alone ranking the possible causes, from climate change onwards). There followed a brief discussion of how there might be a British contribution to the TiMe project, though the prospects for funding from a British source (AHRC/British Academy) may be more difficult. The potential lies in the European dimension of funding where great success is currently being achieved by archaeologists. Barbara Borg (Exeter), our second discussant, brought out many of the issues discussed earlier (especially how the divides within British archaeology are structured by class, and an unacknowledged cultural nationalism). Though there is, at present, very little incentive for either the British or the German-speaking traditions to learn from one another, or engage in fruitful academic exchange, there is clearly now a desire to do so – and this must surely be encouraged.

Generally a good time was had by all, fuelled by some unusually good British food. We didn’t come up with a defining cross-cultural research agenda, but we did start a conversation, across a number of academic divides. This conversation needs to continue, through a variety of networks, fora and conferences. How it can be continued remains a question which the European Association of Archaeologists has been the most successful in answering.

*James Whitley (Cardiff) and Simon Stoddart (Cambridge)*

[www.arch.cam.ac.uk/TiMe/workshop.html](http://www.arch.cam.ac.uk/TiMe/workshop.html)
Professionalism in archaeology (by Kenneth Aitchison)

The EAA Committee on Professional Associations in Archaeology (CPAA) held a very successful round table and AGM at Riva del Garda, attracting a larger audience than any previous CPAA session at EAA Annual Meetings.

The session heard a presentation from Kenneth Aitchison reviewing the achievements of the Discovering the Archaeologists of Europe project, leading to discussion of future iterations of that project. Collecting data from 12 countries, that project mapped out the nature of archaeological employment across Europe and identified opportunities and barriers to movement between states for individual archaeologists. Representatives from several countries indicated that they would like to take part in the expansion of the network if the project was to be repeated, which will potentially take place from 2011 to 2013.

One of the participants in that project, Vesna Pintarič of the University of Primorska, presented a report on her research into student expectations regarding archaeological post-University in Slovenia and the mismatch between student and employer expectations with an identified knowledge deficit on the part of the university lecturers who were not best informing their students.

Corina Borș used the opportunity to set out the challenges facing Romanian archaeology, identifying the real need for a solid professional association that could maintain quality standards and represent the needs of archaeologists in that country. Following on from this identified need, the last two papers featured the Chairs of two existing professional associations, Finola O’Carroll of the Institute of Archaeologists of Ireland and Gerry Wait of the Institute for Archaeologists.

Finola’s paper, presented in Margaret Gowen’s absence, reviewed the serious changes that the end of major infrastructure projects, combined with the global economic downturn has wreaked upon Irish archaeology. Commercial archaeology in particular has been very hard hit, with many fewer people working in Ireland than had been at the time of the Discovering the Archaeologists of Europe project.

The final paper was the most dramatic, as Gerry Wait and Peter Hinton (the Chair and Chief Executive of the Institute for Archaeologists respectively) sought to open discussions on the possibility of the creation of a truly international body that could act as an umbrella organisation for all extant and future archaeological professional associations. This could be a way to ensure that high professional standards are shared and enforced across Europe and beyond, and delegates eagerly debated issues and agreed that this would be a very valuable topic to return to.

The meeting concluded with the election of Kenneth Aitchison to the position of Chair of the Committee, taking over from Gerhard Ermischer who was thanked for his enormous contribution over the past six years. The position of Secretary will be filled at the Committee’s inter-conference meeting which will take place in the spring of 2010.

Kenneth Aitchison, Institute for Archaeologists (kenneth.aitchison@archaeologists.net)
Report on the activities of the EAA Committee on the Teaching and Training of Archaeologists (by Mark Pearce)

A Committee meeting was held in Riva. The Chair is Arek Marciniak (Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznan, Poland), and the Secretary is Mark Pearce (University of Nottingham, UK). The main item of business was the Bologna agreement, and a wide-ranging discussion took place.

Mark Pearce reported on his questionnaire about progress on the Bologna agreement (see TEA 29, 19–21) which aims to align university curricula in Europe around a common (bachelors + masters + doctorate) pattern and to simplify university qualifications across Europe in order to favour mobility. This research, carried out by Dr Christoph Rummel, has been generously funded by the UK Higher Education Academy Subject Centre for History, Classics and Archaeology, whose support was acknowledged.

The first cycle (BA) qualification in archaeology
In the light of the replies received to date, a core question to be addressed is what the first cycle (i.e. BA) qualifies for in Archaeology. It appears that the only subject-specific employment available in most countries responding to the survey for an archaeologist with only a BA qualification would be as an excavator. In most countries, however, this position can be filled by a person with no formal qualifications in archaeology whatsoever. As such, it seems that even with a full adoption of the Bologna Protocol, it will be impossible to gain meaningful subject-specific employment without an MA qualification, making the BA somewhat superfluous – apart from the transferable skills it teaches. This development, in turn, may affect the style and emphasis of teaching for the BA, which may move away from subject-specific skills towards transferable ones. Such a development, however, would run the risk of ‘watering down’ subject-specific knowledge in BA graduates, with direct effects on the quality and content of MA qualifications and doctoral programmes.

Second cycle (MA)
Several countries do not offer taught MA courses, or MA by research programmes as part of their second cycle. The majority of responses highlighted a tendency towards a 2-year second cycle, rather than the 1-year model currently favoured in the UK. Indeed, a number of responses indicate that it would not be possible for a student with a 1-year MA qualification to be admitted to a doctoral programme (see also ECTS credits, below).

PhD programmes and credits required for admission
While a number of countries have not yet implemented fixed guidelines for doctoral programmes, ECTS credit levels for first and second cycle degrees appear to have generally been agreed on. BA courses appear generally homogenous, generating 180 ECTS credits. The second cycle, however, appears to be much more varied (in part depending on whether 1-year or 2-year MA courses are offered) and range from 60/90 to 120 ECTS credits. Where doctoral programmes are established and have fixed ECTS credit requirements, however, there is a clear tendency for this to be set at 300 ECTS credits. As such, there is direct evidence that a UK student with a 1-year MA, for example, would be hard pushed to an established doctoral programme in some Bologna countries. There are however variants such as in Sweden, where a direct progression from a 4-year first cycle programme to a doctoral programme appears to remain a possibility. At the same time, some German Universities appear to be implementing so-called ‘Leistungspunkte’, rather than ECTS credits, that follow a different progression from the generally accepted one.

PhD programmes
Where PhD programmes are established, it is clear that there is no common format. Some have significantly varying lengths, while others do not have a fixed timeframe.
Mobility
All responses show that a significant level of student mobility already exists in practically all countries involved in the Bologna Process, even without full implementation of the protocol. Worryingly, however, many respondents believe that rather than facilitating mobility, the way Bologna is being implemented is actually reducing student mobility as degree structures have not been homogenised and the admission of international students has been further complicated. This is a particularly common response from countries that have replaced a Humboldt system. In such countries, existing Erasmus agreements often meant that a functioning way of assessing qualifications has been abandoned in favour of ECTS structures that are not fully implemented or understood.

Use of diploma supplements
Despite the relatively advanced stage of implementation of the Bologna Protocol, five respondents stated that they issued neither Diploma Supplements nor a local equivalent, while eight institutions appear not to use a Supplement, but a local, compatible, variant. This inconsistency will have to be addressed in the course of the next year if it is not to directly affect the mobility of graduates and transfer, understanding and assessment of qualifications from different institutions and countries participating in the Bologna Process.

ECTS credits
As highlighted above with regard to doctoral programmes, issues remain regarding the number of ECTS Credits awarded for qualifications at different levels. While all but two responding institutions are already using ECTS, there is by no means agreement whether Credits are given for workload, learning outcomes or a combination. This may, to a large extent, be due to the personal interpretation of the respondents in question, but nonetheless appears to highlight the problem that the basis on which ECTS Credits should be awarded is not entirely clear at present.

A wide-ranging discussion of these findings tended to confirm the problems that the report highlighted. For example, Erzsébet Jerem reported that in Hungary first cycle (BA) degrees are offered by four Universities but only one offers an MA, and since an MA is necessary in order to develop an archaeological career, not all graduating students will be able to progress beyond the career of excavation technician. Arek Marciniak, Hrvoje Potrebica and Edouard Krekovič reported that in Poland, Croatia and Slovakia, PhD registration times are variable, depending on whether the candidate are internal to the university or work in the Academy of Sciences or elsewhere. In Slovakia, Edouard Krekovič reported that specific numbers of ECTS credits were not necessary to qualify for a PhD programme as admission was by exam, while Willem Willems reported that in the Netherlands there was flexibility when picking a prospective student for a research grant-funded PhD.

The Committee was delighted that Andrea Kurz and Johannes Trockels, student representatives from the Dachverband archäologischer Studierendenvertretungen in Austria and Germany attended its meeting, and agreed that their input was of great importance.

John Collis reported that new autonomy for Spanish Universities means that they will now be able to organise first cycle (BA) programmes, and that the Autonomous university of Barcelona is doing so. They will soon be followed by the Complutense University of Madrid and the University of Barcelona, and possibly the University of Granada.

Arek Marciniak reported that the Round Table on ‘E-Learning solutions in teaching and training of archaeologists in Europe’, which he organised at the Malta Annual Meeting, will be published in time for the ‘E-learning Archaeology’ conference in Amsterdam, 2–3 October 2009.

Mark Pearce, University of Nottingham, UK, mark.pearce@nottingham.ac.uk
Gender and archaeology in Europe (session report by Liv Helga Dommasnes, Doris Gutsmiedl and Sandra Montón Subías)

This session/round table, organised by Liv Helga Dommasnes and Sandra Montón Subías, was the first official action of the new EAA working party, Archaeology and Gender in Europe (AGE).

First, the organisers presented the background of the working party. The main motivation was the need for a common meeting place for discussing gender archaeology in a European context, where the variety of approaches within different academic traditions and languages are seen as valuable resources.

Seven scholars were invited to present the situation in their countries. The two first speakers, Nona Palincas from Romania and Natalia Berseneva from Russia, represent countries where gender archaeology is still a relatively new topic. They both reported from archaeological contexts where the overwhelming majority of archaeologists are male and few do research on gender in the past.

The speakers from Norway (Lisbeth Skogstrand) and Sweden (Cecilia Lindström Holmberg and Anna Gatti) represent countries where gender archaeology is well-established. They reported equal or almost equal representation of women and men among students and professors. Regarding the content of the research, Skogstrand characterised Norwegian gender archaeology as boring and predictable, while Holmberg and Gatti described gender archaeology in Sweden as part of the mainstream, but still politically ‘dangerous’.

Gender archaeology in Germany was presented by Julia Koch, who is also a member of the organisation FemArc-Netzwerk Archäologisch arbeitender Frauen, founded in 1991. In Germany, approximately 50% of the students and 5% of the professors are women. The national study/research group AG Geschlechterforschung is working on gender in the past. Some, but not all, universities offer courses in gender archaeology.

Spain, presented by Eva Alarcon, is a relative newcomer in the field of gender archaeology. The ‘maintenance archaeology’ approach was highlighted as an original contribution of some Spanish archaeologists to gender archaeology, focusing on the sphere of life where women are generally assumed to have contributed most. The number of gender-related studies is still low, but increasing.

The UK was represented by Rachel Pope and Ann Teather, members of the organisation British Women Archaeologists. British gender archaeology is mostly practised by women, and is definitely not part of the mainstream. Although women make up 50% of British students, they are still only 10% of the professors and one third of the profession in general. An important task for the future will be to document women archaeologists’ experience and communicate it to men – and younger women.

The papers were followed by a general discussion first on the situation for women in archaeology (maternity leave, male networks), then on gender archaeology and what it should be (‘women are not born, but made’, the role of feminist – and queer – theory). It was argued that we need to make a distinction between equity issues and gender archaeology. If not, gender archaeology can easily be misconstrued as a simple reflection of contemporary concerns.

Finally, there was a brief discussion on the working party itself, policy and suggestions for future EAA sessions.

The session papers will be published on the AGE website: www.upf.edu/materials/fhuma/age/
New research into upland landscapes: the contribution of European post-graduate students (session report by Francesco Carrer and Zsuzsanna Siklósi)

Organiser: Francesco Carrer, University of Trento, Italy
Co-organiser: Zsuzsanna Siklósi, Eötvös Loránd University, Institute of Archaeological Sciences, Hungary

European post-graduate students of archaeology do not have many opportunities to share the results of their research with colleagues from other countries, despite the importance of the circulation of data and new approaches as well as the discussion of methodological and theoretical issues. For this reason, for the first time in the history of EAA Conferences, we organised a student session, dedicated to the research of MA and PhD students.

The session was divided into two parts. The first one dealt with the exploitation of upland landscapes. The second part focused on settlement in the upland landscapes. In selecting the papers for the session, we tried to follow a ‘four-dimensional approach’, variable in time, space and function. The time-scale was from prehistory to the post-medieval period. The space-scale was from micro- (a church isolated in a mountain or inside a city), to medium (a city centre) and macro- (a valley, a district, a region). But the main variability was the functional one; in fact within the session, there were many different approaches: ethno-archaeological analysis (Carrer and Gonzalez Alvarez), GIS and 3D Modelling applications (García and Rapanà), isotope analysis (Salazar García), archive data analysis (Veldi), archaeology of buildings (Mato-Fresàn) and cognitive analysis (Matczak). That is the reason that some of the papers were not strictly landscape archaeology studies, but they are useful all the same to reconstruct ancient landscapes from a productive as much as from an ideological point of view.

With the success of this first student session, we hope to establish a tradition at EAA Annual Meetings, providing an excellent opportunity for post-graduate students to present their papers in front of an international audience.

Papers
Carrer, Francesco, University of Trento: ‘Sheeping’ the landscape! Prehistoric pastoralism and landscape changes in the Italian Eastern Alps
González, Álvarez David, Complutense University Madrid: Settlement patterns of Western Cantabrian mountains in the Iron Age: the Pigüeña valley (Asturias, NW Spain)
Salazar, García Domingo Carlos, Max-Plank Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology and University of Valencia: Isotope evidence for human diets in the Mesolithic and Neolithic periods of coastal Spain (Valencia)
García, Marcos, University of Valladolid: Analyzing prehistoric landscapes: a methodology of spatial analysis applied in the surroundings of ‘El Casetón de la Era II’ enclosure (Castilla y León region, Spain)
Veldi, Martti, Tartu University and Estonian National Heritage board: Centres and communication in South-Eastern Estonia during the Iron Age in the context of Early Modern era maps
Mato-Fresàn, Cristina, Heritage Laboratory Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas: Studying the city: reflection on the study of an historic centre
Matczak, Magdalena, Adam Mickiewicz University Poznań: Early Christian identity: the case of rotunda in Thessaloniki (Greece)
Rapanà, Matteo, University of Padova: The Medieval church of San Martino di Lomaso (Trento, Italy): a 3D modelling
The session on ‘Balkan flint in south-eastern European prehistory’ (organised by Maria Gurova, co-organisers, Clive Bonsall, Barbara Voytek and Dušan Borić) brought together scholars whose research on the early farming societies of south-eastern Europe has inevitably led them to confront the problem of the appearance of a new, high quality, raw material for the manufacture of chipped stone artefacts at the beginning of the Neolithic, widely known as ‘Balkan flint’ or yellow-spotted flint, and its continued use in some areas into later periods. How and where was it obtained, and why was it so popular? Did it hold symbolic as well as economic and technological significance for Neolithic peoples? The seven papers (and one poster) explored these and other issues.

The ‘Balkan flint’ problem emerged from Bulgarian prehistoric evidence and subsequently became deeply embedded in Balkan research concerning mainly the Karanovo I-Starčevo-Criş-Körös supra-regional cultural complex. The general introduction to the problem and its archaeological background regarding the nuclear area of the ‘Balkan flint’-Bulgarian territory was presented by Maria Gurova (Sofia). The substantial problem of the raw material outcrops – their identification and relation to archaeological artefacts – was the focus of Chavdar Nachev’s (Sofia) study. This topic was also central to the paper presented by Clive Bonsall (Edinburgh) on geochemical provenancing of ‘Balkan flint’ using LA-ICP-MS and EPMA. The promising results of this pilot study are a strong argument for further wide-scale sampling of archaeological artefacts and raw material outcrops to achieve more comprehensive results. Evidence of the availability and use of ‘Balkan flint’ artefacts among the Early Neolithic assemblages from neighbouring regions was presented by Vera Bogosavljević-Petrović (Belgrade) – for Serbia, Otis Crandell – for Romania, Georgia Kourtessi-Philippakis (Athens) – for northern Greece, and Clive Bonsall (Edinburgh) – for the Romanian side of the Iron Gates region.

Barbara Voytek (Berkeley), a pioneer in the study of Balkan Flint, then delivered a retrospective analysis of research into the use of this material during the Neolithic of south-eastern Europe, and explored the range of possible motives for its use. Her paper provided a substantial basis for the concluding discussion, from which emerged an agreement by those present to engage in close collaboration on future research, and to publish as rapidly as possible the papers from the session.

M. Gurova and C. Bonsall, 18 October 2009 gurovam@yahoo.fr; clive.bonsall@ed.ac.uk
PLAYTIME: the fundamental role of board games in ancient and medieval Europe (session report by Mark Hall and Ulrich Schädler)

Organisers: Mark A. Hall and Ulrich Schädler

In a session of eight papers, we successfully covered a broad range (in time, space and play) of board games from a material culture perspective and were able to communicate the richness and diversity of the evidence for gaming, its wider relevancies and also to give a flavour of on-going projects. The scope was wide, encompassing all kinds of gaming material including boards and other equipment (counters, dice etc.), specific games and sites as well as more general topics about games in the ancient world (social context, symbolic meanings, ritual functions etc.). The aim was also to demonstrate an interdisciplinary approach to material culture.

Proceedings commenced with David Caldwell (National Museums Scotland), distilling a recent research project by himself and Mark Hall, *What do we really know about the Lewis chessmen?* The walrus ivory gaming hoard from Lewis, split between the British Museum and the National Museums Scotland, contains some of the most iconic gaming pieces ever discovered, rightly regarded as works of art and ‘top of the range’ luxury items. This status, however, seems to have been responsible for a lack of critical examination since they were first published soon after their discovery in 1831. The paper took a fresh look at what is known about the circumstances of their manufacture in Trondheim, their use and loss in the Western Isles and their functionality for games other than chess.

Gaspar Pujol (Universitat Internacional de Catalunya) addressed the session on the theme of *Traditional cosmological symbolism in ancient board games*, reminding us that all board games can be said to be ‘representative’, not directly of a concrete human behaviour or activity but of the underlying order and pattern in nature. Human beings reproduce those patterns, which have fascinated them from the very beginning, through art, religion, music and many other cultural manifestations. The patterns can also be detected in board game designs but are rarely studied from this perspective. Gaspar’s paper analyzed some of the most ancient board games to find in them deep links to traditional cosmological symbolism through its primal geometrical patterns. The excursion on Sunday to view some of the rock art of Valcamonica gave some of us a chance to think about this aspect in front of some of the evidence, as the rock art includes some very clear examples of merels boards, a possible alquerque design, a labyrinth and several board-like gridded designs.

Genevra Kornbluth (an independent scholar) tackled the question of *Game pieces and amulets: how and when to tell the difference*, an aspect of her wider study of early medieval gemstones. She explored the question of early medieval amulets being frequently mistaken for Roman gaming pieces, and how varied abrasion patterns can help to indicate which of those uses is more likely to have been primary. The difference is easily demonstrated on gemstone objects, which retain most of their original surface polish and are abraded only where they most often came into contact with game boards or clothing. Game pieces could also, however, be reused as amulets in both Roman and Merovingian contexts, and some dice were made too small for actual use in games. Ludic and apotropaic objects can then be clearly demonstrated to be closely related in both conceptual and practical terms.

Mark A. Hall (Perth Museum and Art Gallery, Scotland), the session organizer, explored the theme, *Playtime for the holy, playtime for the dammed: a material culture approach to the fuzziness of Church authority*, developing on previous excursions into the social significance of medieval board games to look more closely at the somewhat paradoxical link between games play and church authority. It encompassed the incorporation of games play within the cult of saints and assessed the seeming-paradox of Church approval and Church condemnation of playing board games. The material culture evidence underpinning it included surviving boards and playing pieces, including examples from church treasuries and...
archaeological excavations, particularly a varied group from the Perth High Street excavations, and depictions of the same from medieval illuminations and texts, metal badges and sculptures.

The session co-organizer, Ulrich Schädler (Swiss Museum of Games) presented a fascinating case-study, *Games in Ancient Ephesus*, an account of the recent, first-time survey and consequent database of the board-games in and around the ancient Graeco-Roman metropolis of Ephesus. Apart from a number of gaming tables, some of which were professionally carved, most of the more than 300 patterns documented are found carved into the pavements of streets, colonnades and other public places. One of the key questions addressed which of these geometric patterns were really used to play games, notably in reference to the wheel patterns. Indeed, doubts about their function as game-boards have been raised especially concerning the so-called wheel patterns. An intriguing alternative interpretation of these is that they were topos markers, to indicate where certain people should stand during public ceremonies (as for example at Aphrodisias). It can also be observed that the game boards found on the site of the Roman town are different from those on the Ayasoluk hill, the site of the Byzantine-Turkish settlement. Therefore the games can provide useful information about the use of public space and the history of settlement especially in late antique and byzantine times. A notable implication is that the game of mill or merels, long-thought to be Roman, is suggested by the Ephesus evidence to be Arabic.

Moving further back in time, Helène Whittaker (Tromsø University, Norway) took the session on a *Journey to the Other World? Terracotta Models of Game Boards from Archaic Greek Funerary Contexts?* This paper discussed the function and meaning of two terracotta models of game boards which have been found in Attica, in the Kerameikos cemetery in Athens and in Vari. The game boards could not have been used for actual playing and must therefore have had some symbolic meaning associated with funerary ritual or beliefs about the afterlife. The playing of board games is a pastime which requires leisure and often skill; in the *Republic* (374c) Plato remarks that skill at board games can only be acquired by those who have plenty of leisure time. Literary evidence also indicates that there was a clear connection between military values and the playing of board games. It is therefore possible that the terracotta models were associated with the expression of status in a funerary context. Perhaps they indicate a belief in the continuation of an upper class lifestyle in the afterlife. However, their meaning may also have been more closely associated with specifically funerary beliefs. The possibility that the movements of gaming pieces across a board could have functioned as a metaphor for the transition from life to death was also explored.

Student Claudia-Maria Behling (Vienna University) gave a paper, *nuces (non) relinquere* – Light into the dark. Some remarks to secure gaming-rules, which focused on one particular game played in ancient Greece and Rome (and down to recent times), using walnuts or astragali. Claudia explored the variant interpretations of how this game may have been played through the surviving depictions on Roman sarcophagi (with comparison from later medieval imagery), where they were depicted as a symbol of childhood. Claudia presented the game as a case study of how difficult it can be to know the rules for particular games, one aspect of he PhD looking more broadly at the important role that toys and games played in ancient daily life.

The final speaker was Svetlana Avdusina (State Historical Museum, Moscow) who led us on an exploration of *What were the games which Vikings played in Ancient Russia?* In common with the other papers Svetlana stressed the important role that games had in daily life, in this case in medieval Russia, and the importance of archaeological evidence in helping us to assess that role. In such Russian cities as Novgorod and Old Ladoga for example boards for the game of mill or merels have been found. Many playing pieces, made of bone and glass have been found in excavations, some of which may have been for mill, but the majority of which were for the tafl group of games, particularly hnefatafl. Ranging from single piece to full sets, tafl pieces have been found in both settlement and burial contexts. The latter include the burial grounds in Gnezdovo (near Smolensk), Timerevo (near Yaroslavl), at
Rurikovo Gorodische (near Novgorod) and all linked to Scandinavian occupation in the tenth and eleventh centuries.

**Evaluation**
The session was planned on an inter-disciplinary and cross-period basis, as a holistic exploration of a fundamental area of human practice. However there was uncertainty about the level of interest that the session might draw. This proved groundless and both organisers and speakers were very pleased with the response. Including the speakers, the session attracted some 25–30 participants (despite the excessive heat of the room, even with cool air conditioning on) and there was fruitful discussion stimulated by all of the papers and in a brief concluding discussion, so much so that the possibilities of repeating the session at a forthcoming board games colloquium in Paris and of publishing the papers is actively being considered.

Mark A. Hall (History Officer, Perth Museum and Art Gallery, 78 George Street, Perth, PH1 5LB, Scotland; T: (00) 01738 783414; E: mahall@pkc.gov.uk) and Ulrich Schädler (Director, Musée Suisse du Jeu, Au Château, CH–1814 La Tour de Peilz, Switzerland, T: 0041-(0)21–977 23 01; E: u.schaedler@museedujeu.com)

---

**Reindeer and humans (session report by Svein Indrelid)**

**Organiser:** Svein Indrelid, University of Bergen, Norway  
**Co-organiser:** Knut Helskog, University of Tromsø, Norway

The objective of this session was to bring together archaeologists, anthropologists and biologists, working on different aspects concerning reindeer, reindeer hunting and reindeer husbandry, to discuss themes of common interest. The session focused on the exploitation of reindeer from the Palaeolithic to recent times. Eight of the ten registered papers were presented, by speakers from Norway, Denmark and the Netherlands.

One of the papers (Knut Røed) dealt with DNA variations in present-day reindeer populations through Eurasia and the importance of genetic studies to understand the transition from hunting to reindeer husbandry. Two papers focused on osteological analyses of archaeological samples, one on Pleistocene mammalian remains from Woerden, the Netherlands (Thijs van Kolfschoten), the other on a large medieval reindeer bone material from the South Norwegian mountains (Anne Karin Hufthammer). Knut Helskog discussed the meaning of certain hunting device motives in rock art panels of Alta, North Norway, and Svein Indrelid presented results from a study of medieval mass-hunting sites at the Hardangervidda mountain plateau, South Norway. Two papers were based on ethno-archaeological and historical data from studies of contemporary societies, one from caribou hunters in Western Greenland (Kerstin Pasda), and one from the Siberian Evenk reindeer herders (Ole Grøn), showing different kinds of territorial organisation, exploitation strategies and man-reindeer relation. The origin and dating of reindeer domestication in Norway, based on written sources and archaeological investigations, was discussed by Oddmund Andersen.

The topic of the session and the interdisciplinary focus attracted many listeners, and several members of the audience took part in the discussions. The organisers’ impression is that the aim of the session was achieved – to create a dialogue between researchers from different fields on a common subject of interest – the relationship between reindeer and humans.
**Zeitgeist (session report by Katharina Rebay-Salisbury and Susanne Hakenbeck)**

A session simply entitled ‘Zeitgeist’ was organised by Katharina Rebay-Salisbury and Susanne Hakenbeck. Our intent was to investigate large-scale, broadly contemporaneous phenomena in archaeology that are shared beyond cultural or regional boundaries. Typically, we observe such phenomena in two domains, as aspects of human practice and in the widespread occurrence of particular aesthetic styles. We chose the label Zeitgeist, the spirit of the age, as a shortcut to describe trends, worldviews and ideologies, in other words the dominant intellectual, cultural, ethical and political climate of an era. The intriguing and difficult point about Zeitgeist phenomena is that they do not appear to have an obvious point of origin and are not transmitted in a linear way. We therefore encouraged speakers to think beyond the conventional archaeological language of chronological or evolutionary change, the spread of peoples or culture groups, or the diffusion of ideas and instead to make an attempt at explaining underlying ideas, causes and possible forms of transmission.

António Carlos Valera started the sequence of papers with ‘Mind, cosmos and the circle: the ditched enclosure ambience in Iberian recent prehistory’. He placed the importance of cognitive structures as ways of transmitting properties between objects and people in the foreground, and proposed that architecture and landscapes can therefore map worldviews. Roderick Salisbury’s paper ‘The spirit of a Neolithic Age: social and material networks in the Carpathian Basin Late Neolithic’ was chronologically and thematically related, but focused on practice and materiality as part of the construction of Zeitgeist phenomena. In the paper ‘Ceramic traditions: a Zeitgeist of practice and aesthetics?’, Sheila Kohring reflected on Bell Beaker pottery using the concepts of communities of practice and shared aesthetics as expressions of ideological narratives.

Katharina Rebay-Salisbury’s case of the comeback of human images in the early Iron Age was interpreted in terms of a deep-running ideological shift, whereas Raimund Karl saw the ‘Celtic Zeitgeist’ as a result of mostly random processes in ‘small world’ networks, leading to clustered distributions of material (and immaterial) culture that merely appeared as if an underlying idea was causing them. Marika Święszkowska gave an account of Antoninian portrait sculptures, which contain elements of propaganda, identity and philosophy.

Susanne Hakenbeck opened the ‘barbarian pattern book’ and helped us to take a step back and see common themes in the entangled world of decorated fibulae of early medieval Europe. She explained styles in terms of the relationship between supply and demand and underlined the importance of the smith as the negotiator of these factors. Tore Artelius followed up with ‘The past is the future: the ‘spirit of the age’ in pre-Christian Viking Age’, discussing the use of a mythological historical past in the construction of a collective identity in Scandinavia. Paul Wallin and Helene Martinsson-Wallin ended the session with an ethnographic paper on ‘Monumental structures and the spirit of chiefly actions’ in Polynesia, explaining changes and variability in the architecture as resulting from the dynamics in social relations.

The session did not only bring together a range of chronologically and thematically diverse papers, but also offered an interesting range of interpretations of the underlying causes of Zeitgeist phenomena. One common theme that almost all papers touched upon was the idea of networks and their workings beyond the surface of the archaeological observable. We felt that investigating these workings in more detail will certainly be a rewarding avenue for future archaeological research.
The chaîne opératoire approach to ceramics studies (session report by Simona Scarcella)

The session ‘The chaîne opératoire approach to ceramics studies’, organised by Simona Scarcella (EHESS – Toulouse, France) was held on Friday 18 September and nine of the twelve papers accepted were presented. The session focused on the concept of the chaîne opératoire in ceramics studies and was interested in the experimental and archæo-metrical methods that allow a better understanding of the technological aspects of a culture. Some papers presented the opportunities offered by each of these two methods, while other papers considered an interdisciplinary procedure in order to obtain more reliable results in the study of the ceramic process.

A limited time for discussion was possible, but it was possible to focus on some first impressions. In the archaeological literature, a majority of papers are limited to showing the results of an experimental experience or of an archæo-metrical set of analyses. Instead, all papers within the session showed, in a practical way, the utility of the ‘chaîne opératoire approach’ in order to understand the social implication in a technical process. This aspect suggests that the more recent researches in the field of the ceramic studies have advanced remarkably in last years. Otherwise, the application of the ‘chaîne opératoire approach’ is relatively recent and it is a very large topic because it includes different methods of analysis that is possible to use and because there are numerous phases of the chaîne opératoire that could be dealt with. For all these reasons, it is very important to organize more opportunities for debate about this theme, in order to realise the potential of this approach.

Further to the success of the session, all the participants agreed to publish the proceedings.

Volcanism in Europe’s prehistory and history (session report by Felix Riede)

Organized by Felix Riede, Århus University, Denmark

Volcanoes and the natural and social catastrophes that they can cause are perennial topics in archaeology. Our session began with the observation that volcanic eruptions can be potentially powerful stimulants of cultural change, and that volcanoes – active, dormant or extinct – are significant features of human landscapes wherever they occur. Our aim was to go beyond simple chronological associations between a volcanic event and some cultural change observed in the archaeological record, but instead to arrive at a better, more holistic understanding of the role of volcanoes and their eruptions in Europe’s past. Holding such a session in Italy, where many (yet by no means all) of Europe’s volcanoes are located was very fitting, but case studies from other countries such as Iceland, Spain and Germany, were also included. The leading specialist on volcanoes and archaeology, John Grattan (University of Aberystwyth), set the scene with a passionate keynote address. He urged archaeologists towards a more nuanced, less sensationalist approach to volcanic eruptions, and to consider the positive as well as the negative effects of eruptions. The speakers that followed him, Maria Saña, Felix Riede, Joanna Krupa, Girolamo De Simone and Geoff Carver, heeded this advice and presented a series of very interesting papers drawing on archaeological as well as natural scientific, geographic, ethnographic and historical sources to interpret the relationship between past societies and volcanoes, right down to the influence of Vesuvius and Pompeii on the development of archaeological enterprise in Victorian England.

Did the session achieve its aim? A series of interesting papers was followed by a lively and very productive discussion. We agreed that those archaeologists seriously engaged in ‘archaeo-volcanology’ had in fact already moved well beyond simple models. We also agreed that it was difficult research, requiring international and interdisciplinary efforts as well as large amounts of data.
Archaeologists and civil engineers: challenges of large infrastructural projects (session report by Arkadiusz Marciniak and Gerry Wait)

Organised by Arkadiusz Marciniak (Poznan University) and Gerry Wait (Nexus Heritage).

This session continued a theme developed at the 2008 EAA Conference in Malta. The session was inspired by the work undertaken in the Archaeology and Construction Engineering Skills Project, which is supported by the EU through the Leonardo da Vinci (LdV) project No: 2007-UK/07/LLP-LdV/TOI. The European Association of Archaeologists is a partner in the project. The session was well attended – the room was packed full with standing room only for the entire session. The ensuing discussion was enthusiastic and spilled over into break-time. Anyone interested in the project should go to the website: www.aces-project.eu

The first speaker was Kenneth Aitchison of the UK’s Institute for Archaeologists, speaking about: ‘ACES: transferring innovation, developing skills’. This paper summarised the ACES project, which is providing information about engineering for archaeologists (and about archaeology for engineers) through the online learning system of the Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań, which will allow learners to access focused, vocationally relevant training in any of the four partner languages (English, Norwegian, Turkish and Polish). The project partners are now looking to find opportunities to expand the training material to allow its delivery in further languages with specific support materials for countries beyond the initial partnership.

The second paper from Ladislav Rytíř (Department of Archaeology FF ZČU Plzeň, Czech Republic) was entitled ‘Cooperation between archaeologists and archaeological heritage management with civil engineers and developers in the Czech Republic’. The paper introduced the present situation in the Czech Republic, illustrating how archaeological heritage management is structured and how archaeology is regulated. Ladislav also focused on Czech archaeologists themselves, how they understand the legal enactments and how they communicate with the competent authorities and developers illustrated by recent construction activity. This led to a discussion of the effective co-operation between archaeology and the civil sector and what facilities for system improvement are present.

Jostein Gundersen from the Norwegian Maritime Museum in Oslo presented a superb paper on ‘Archaeological challenges in co-operation with large-scale construction business: examples from the immersed tunnel project in Oslo, Norway’. This project involved the construction of a new road tunnel under the central harbour in Oslo. The immersed tunnel project has given archaeologists challenges beyond all expectations. The co-operation with the construction business included the surveillance of more than 1000m$^3$ of earth and underwater sediments every single day, shift work, working the whole year around, in temperatures ranging from -18 to +20 degrees centigrade, polluted and toxic masses that demanded the use of gas-masks, and (possibly) the world’s largest archaeological sieve. Despite this, the adaptation of the construction business’ methods, HSE regime, ever-changing plans, expectations and demands, and even the whole language, was the most challenging experience. In addition, the involvement of archaeologists in a project ‘normally’ completed by the construction business alone, meant teaching our values, methods and ways of thinking to a community mostly engaged in measuring time against money.

Jon Humble, Senior Policy Adviser (Minerals) and Inspector of Ancient Monuments, English Heritage, then spoke on ‘Relationship-building with the minerals industry’. This summarised three years of cross-sectoral (archaeology, minerals industry and planners) work to successfully develop an agreed basis for new practice guidance – this is now published as Mineral extraction and archaeology: a practice guide (www.helm.org.uk/upload/pdf/Mineral-Archaeology.pdf?1245105644) and it has been widely adopted in England by archaeologists, the minerals industry and planners. Jon examined the lessons learned and their relevance to our relationship with other sectors and other forms of development – particularly civil
engineering and large infrastructural projects, which are major consumers of the products of the minerals industry.

Richard Ciolek-Torrello and colleagues from Statistical Research, Inc. presented ‘Lessons from transportation project studies in the American southwest’. Highway system improvements are a fundamental aspect of population growth and the expansion of urbanisation. Although these improvements are tremendously important in terms of economic development and safety, they have placed at risk thousands of historic properties, requiring archaeological investigations for large-scale transportation projects for almost twenty years. These have been long, multi-year research projects, involving the excavation of single large sites and long, linear projects that have included dozens of prehistoric and historical-period sites extending over large, geographically diverse regions administered by numerous government agencies. Richard discussed the solutions that have been developed in response to this dynamic and multifaceted regulatory, financial and research environment.

---

Decoding rituals from visual representations (session report by Torill Christine Lindstrøm)

Session organizer: Torill Christine Lindstrøm, Department of Psychology, University of Bergen, Norway

Torill Christine Lindstrøm (Norway) explored indications of ritual clothing in the Great Fresco of the Villa dei Misteri, in Roman Pompeii. Findings of repetitive colour-use, old-fashioned, and foreign clothes were interpreted tentatively as codes indicating that religious rituals are being shown, or referred to. Riika Mustonen (Finland) showed that red ochre is not sufficient to indicate Stone-Age graves. Interpretations of burial rituals must not rely too heavily on ochre findings or on analogies from historical shamanistic cultures, but should be reconsidered in the light of newer data.

Anders Biwall (Sweden) suggested that white round stones, called grave orbs or funerary globes, found in Scandinavia, particularly in Sweden, from the Roman Iron Age to the end of the Migration Period, could have their antecedents in the Etruscan necropolis at Orvieto, Marzabotto and Montovolo. Hanna Menander (Sweden) illustrated how graves and aspects of their human remains give evidence regarding different burial rituals (with or without coffins), in a thirteenth-century Dominican convent.

Anna Rembisz (Poland) discussed changing interpretations of uncremated human remains from Lusatian Urnfield settlements (1300–750BC). These have been seen as indicating specific events: battles; ritual acts; or cannibalism. However, increasing evidence indicates that this sort of deposition was more common than we thought and new interpretations that take into account the whole social and cultural context are needed. Petér Csippán (Hungary) discussed animal deposits from the Copper Age Baden culture (3500–3000BC), which are generally interpreted as being ritual; he tested this using Mircea Eliade’s definitions of sacred and profane.

Finally, Ester Oras (Estonia) discussed the problems of identifying ritual in the Estonian Middle Iron Age (AD450–800) hoards. She argued that such interpretations not only depend on the artefacts found and the available literary sources, but also on the cultural-historical background of the researcher.

In sum, the presentations showed that rituals are decoded and interpreted from a variety of sources, visual and otherwise; and that such interpretations should be made with great caution.
Movements across and along water within landmasses (session report by Andrea Vianello)

Organisers: Andrea Vianello and Ingelise Stuijts

This session explored the importance of waterways in the cultural, social and economic development of societies. Ilze Loze opened the session with a cavalcade through hundreds of years at the Latvian lakes, the roots of the amber route, where people kept dry and wealthy in a challenging and changing environment. Andrzej Weber challenged our hosts by comparing Lake Baikal to Lake Garda, dwarfing the latter. After admitting that Garda is more picturesque, he then moved on to the Neolithic, to the delight of Marek Zvelebil, a ‘Neolithic man’ himself. Stephen Wickler brought the audience to the edge of northern Europe: until some water keeps running, life can prosper – cool! Heinrich Dosedla enchanted the audience with the beauty of Austrian rivers, before declaring, with some reason, that the Venetians copied some central European boats, including the prototype of the gondola. Attila Toth expressed his surprise at finding underwater old boats in the Danube right into the built-up area of Budapest. We’re in luck, because the finds reveal the importance of the river for the city better than anything else. Andrea Vianello assessed the role of water in the development of riverine cultures in the north-eastern Italian peninsula, demonstrating that rivers can be as important as the sea for culture and economy. Like the Latvians, the Veneti managed to stay dry and wealthy for long, forming cultures as refined as you could get in those days.

Image: Lithic scatters recently found by members of the Centre for Maritime Archaeology, on a ford (Sandelford) close to Ireland’s earliest known Mesolithic settlement (Mount Sandel) (Orthoimage, source NIEA)

Welmoed Out showed the audience how much Mesolithic and Neolithic Dutch people liked fish, and their impact on the environment. Peter Chowne focused on ancient Lincolnshire, where a complex system of land management, including drainage ditches, maximised the use of the land, until the Romans showed that they could do better, that is. Rory McNeary discussed the archaeology of fording places in Northern Ireland and outlined some current approaches to their study being employed at the Centre for Maritime Archaeology, University of Ulster. Amy Bunce presented the mystery of the disappearing Irish lakes (seasonal turloughs). She emphasised the perils and opportunities offered by such places, with some bias for the former. Even without the monster of Loch Ness making an appearance, the vivid picture of chaos at settlements being suddenly flooded by the rapidly changing levels of the lakes thrilled the audience. The thought of men showing their wives and guests their last purchase, a crannog in the middle of dry-land, was a highlight of the session. Ingelise Stuijts kept the audience ‘bogged down’ in wet Ireland, focusing on wood. However, ancient Irish people had gold too, and were a little better off than was suggested by the previous three speakers.

This enjoyable and productive session presented an array of case-studies showing how inland waters affected the culture of people; if you missed it you have only yourself to blame. To find out more, go to www.bronzeage.org.uk/eaa2009.htm

Andrea Vianello, Subject reviewer in archaeology, Oxford University; Phone/Fax: +44 (0)114 2347857; e-mail: a_vianello@hotmail.com; www.bronzeage.org.uk; www.intute.ac.uk
Down from the ivory tower: archaeology beyond the university (round table report by Thomas Kador and Don Henson)

This session, co-organised by Thomas Kador and Don Henson, set itself the challenge of starting a European-wide debate on the merits of professional (including academic) archaeologists being involved in community-based archaeology projects. Community (based) archaeology is different from public engagement in archaeology in that community participation stands at the centre of such projects rather being supplementary to a standard archaeological research project that involves volunteers or has another element of public engagement.

The session organisers set out their stall by identifying three key themes that the discussion should focus on, they were: a) hierarchy and elitism among archaeologists; b) ownership of the past; and c) process or product. The seven contributors to the session came from diverse backgrounds and reported on their varied experiences and different perspectives of community archaeology.

Image: members of the Great Ayton Archaeology Group, UK

Geoff Carver (University of New York, Buffalo, US; but working as archaeologist in Germany), bringing his perspective on both North American and central European archaeology to bear, pointed out the paradox of the session, as most archaeology takes place outside an academic context and is thus situated within the broader community already. However, he also cautioned that professional archaeologists tend to be highly qualified specialists and that it may not be advisable to have too much ‘non-specialist’ involvement in difficult projects, just as untrained people would and should not be allowed to fly a 747. Lolita Nikolova (The Art Institute of Salt Lake City, US) critiqued the hierarchies of current archaeological practice within and outside academia and also the fallacy of mistaking electronic communication for being equivalent to public engagement. Patrycja Filipowicz (Mickiewicz Adam University of Poznan, Poland) presented a case-study based on engagements with various groups and in particular goddess worshippers at the Neolithic site of Çatalhöyük, Turkey. She highlighted the desire for multi-vocality at the centre of the project’s methodology but also outlined potential pitfalls and ethical questions in ‘attracting’ people with a set agenda to participate in archaeological discourse. Suzie Thomas (Council for British Archaeology, UK) presented her experiences as the UK’s first Community Archaeology Support Officer and outlined the results of her recently completed research on the nature, scale and needs of community archaeology in Britain. As part of the survey, she identified some 2,000 groups involved with archaeology in a voluntary capacity and raised the important question to what extent these are representative of the wider (British) public. Sarah Dhanjal (University College London, UK) suggested that we should recognise community-based specialist archaeologists just as we recognise artefact, environmental or landscape specialists. She also made the important
point that archaeology can and should be fun and still produce significant outcomes. Kenneth Aitchison (Institute for Archaeologists, UK) discussed the interesting, and potentially worrying, trend of commercial archaeologists turning to the community sector for funding in the light of the current economic downturn and the ensuing decline in infrastructural funding for archaeology. He highlighted the need for establishing an independent advisory body for community groups interested in archaeology before they start embarking on raising funds and designing archaeological research projects. Finally, Ian Russell (University College Dublin, Ireland) presented a recent project based on artistically engaging the communities of Dublin’s inner city in questions relating to the past, present and future of their neighbourhoods. As part of this, he drew on the concept of relational art and suggested that we should also be talking about ‘relational heritage’.

Image: a project coordinated by Thomas Kador with De La Salle National School, Ballyfermot, Dublin, investigated the Early Medieval church site at Oughterard, Co. Kildare, Ireland

The session gave equal space to the position papers and discussion and although the papers presented an excellent launching platform for this discussion, it was the debate that made the session so effective. It would be difficult to do the discussion justice here, but some of the key talking points were: whether the hierarchy and elitism is most manifest in the products (e.g. publications) or the process of archaeological research; if too great an emphasis of public involvement in archaeology results in volunteers substituting as cheap labourers and thus undermines the employment prospects of archaeology graduates, and how the discipline can maintain its integrity in the light of untrained individuals and groups being involved.

While the views and opinions of those in attendance differed greatly on these matters, in the end most agreed that it is vital that these points should be debated and that there is a place for a broader, Europe-wide, network of archaeologists dealing with community ‘issues’. If you are interested in being part of such a network or would like further information on any of the matters discussed here please contact Thomas (thomas.kador@ucd.ie) or Don (donhenson@britarch.ac.uk).
The 16th Annual Meeting of the EAA will be held in the city of The Hague in the Netherlands from 1 to 5 September 2010. It is hosted by the Faculty of Archaeology of Leiden University (Prof. W. Willems), the Municipal Archaeology Service of The Hague (C. Bakker, MA) and the State Service for Cultural Heritage (Prof. J. Bazelmans). An excellent venue for the meeting has been found in Leiden University Campus, The Hague, in the building of the Royal Conservatoire, adjacent to the central railway station in the centre of town.

The 16th Annual Meeting promises to be the most easily reachable meeting ever in the history of the EAA. It is just a very short train ride away from Schiphol Airport that has direct flights to almost anywhere in Europe and many by budget airlines. Schiphol is also a stop on all major international intercity and high speed train connections from Germany and from Belgium/France.

A number of interesting excursions have been prepared both before and after the meeting, that will give members the opportunity to sample the archaeological delights of the Netherlands. An overview can be found on the conference website at www.eaa2010.nl.

Image: the residence of the Dutch government in The Hague

The meeting will differ from previous Annual Meetings in a number of ways, partly as a result of decisions by the Executive Board and partly at the initiative of the organizers. It will maintain its traditional division into three aspects: archaeological research, managing heritage resources and professional issues in archaeology. A fourth theme is Science and the Archaeological Record that will be dealt with in the pre-conference meeting in Delft on 31 August. In addition, it will be attempted to make a connection to the Biannual Meeting of the...
European Association of Social Anthropologists in Maynooth (near Dublin) that ends on 27 August, just before we begin.

**Early dates for session proposals**

Proposals for sessions and round tables can already be submitted online at the conference website, and all proposals must be submitted before 15 January 2010. Proposals for sessions and round tables must have an abstract, and session proposals must be accompanied by at least three abstracts for papers. Of course it is also possible to propose complete sessions.

From 16 January until 30 April, proposals for papers can be submitted for sessions that are still incomplete. During this period, posters can also be proposed. The new Executive Board hopes that by pushing the dates forward, a better quality control can be obtained.

**ArcheoRock**

Another innovation that is planned is the introduction of the first European ArcheoRock during the Annual Party. Members that are interested in participating as a musician or band are requested to contact archeorock@hazenbergarcheologie.nl. ArcheoRock has become a popular feature of the Annual Meeting of Dutch archaeologists in recent years, and the organisers would like to try this now at a European scale!

Rest assured, however, that the Annual Meeting will have at least two halls, so there is also a space for those that would like to chat without having to shout.

**Fees and grants**

Although it seems likely that some funds for grants will be available, there is no information as yet. Please check the conference website from January onwards. Participant fees are also indicated on the website and have remained at the same level as in 2009. The reduced participation fee will be available to members that register on or before 30 June.

**Annual dinner**

If you feel like having dinner at an Egyptian temple, you should not miss the Annual Dinner that will take place, not in The Hague, but in Leiden (just minutes on the train from The Hague), in the spectacular surroundings of the temple hall at the National Museum of Antiquities. And even the most ethical amongst us can rest assured: the temple was a recent gift of the Egyptian government, in recognition of Dutch assistance during the Aswan Dam project.

*Image: The Annual Dinner will be held here, in the National Museum of Antiquities in Leiden*
**European Journal of Archaeology: Post of General Editor**

The European Association of Archaeologists (EAA) seeks a General Editor for the *European Journal of Archaeology* (*EJA*), to take up office in September 2010, following the retirement of the current General Editor after completing six years in post.

The *EJA* is a refereed (peer reviewed) journal, currently published three times a year, and produced on the EAA’s behalf by Sage Publications from its London office. The editorial work is carried out by the General Editor, assisted by an Editorial Board and an Advisory Board (the latter purely titular in function). There is a separate position of Reviews Editor (and there may be an Assistant Reviews Editor). Sage pays a modest honorarium to the General Editor.

The General Editor is an *ex officio* member of the Executive Board (non-voting), and chairs the Editorial Board. The Executive Board meets twice a year, once in the early spring and once at the time of the EAA Annual Meeting in September. The Editorial Board normally meets once a year at the Annual Meeting and may occasionally meet at other times, depending on need and cost; most of its work is done by email, however.

All production and distribution work is undertaken by Sage Publications, after submission by the General Editor of fully edited copy.

The *EJA* is published mainly in English (though articles in French and German are also accepted), and the General Editor must be fully competent, preferably fluent – though not necessarily a native speaker – in English. Applicants who are not native speakers should indicate how they will deal with the issue of language checking and improvement, where necessary.

**Main duties**

- Soliciting and receiving articles for publication
- Reading the articles received and transmitting them for peer review (or rejecting them immediately / returning them for improvement of language or house style)
- On the basis of the advice received, accepting or rejecting articles, or requesting changes
- Corresponding with authors about illustrations, house style, language, etc once their articles have been accepted or changes requested
- Liaising with the Reviews Editor(s) and the Editorial Board
- Collating all copy for transmission to Sage
- Liaising with Sage over production issues
- Checking and collating page proofs for return to Sage
- Liaising with the Advisory Board
- Attending meetings of the Executive Board
- Advising the Executive Board on recruitment to the Editorial Board

**Person specification**

- Member of the EAA
- Interested in the aims and work of the EAA
- Fully competent in English
- Experienced in editorial work and used to dealing with authors and publishers
- Knowledgeable in a wide range of archaeological fields
- Having ready access to a major academic archaeological library
- Ideally having institutional support (e.g. secretarial/administrative assistance)
- Able to work accurately and quickly, and to keep to tight publication schedules
- Having good inter-personal skills

Applications are invited for the above post, and should be received by the Administrator, EAA Secretariat, Letenská 4, 118 01 Praha 1, Czech Republic; eaa@arup.cas.cz, by **15 December 2009**.
Please provide:
- A letter stating why you consider yourself a suitable candidate for the post
- A curriculum vitae
- Details of your experience relevant to the post
- Details of how you envisage managing the work
- Details of your language skills, in particular your ability to work in English if you are not a native speaker

You are welcome to email or phone the EAA President, Professor Friedrich Lüth, or the current EJA Editor, Alan Saville, for an informal talk about the position (lueth@rgk.dainst.de, +49 (0)174 324 1521; a.saville@nms.ac.uk, +44 (0)131 247 4054).

---

Calendar for EAA members November 2009–June 2010

Dear EAA member,

Those of you who are long-standing members of the EAA will have realized that the organization of the membership year and the format of the Annual Meetings have remained unchanged over many years. The EAA Executive Board has now undertaken to revitalize the EAA schedule; the main modifications affecting you as members (highlighted in red below) concern earlier deadlines for session and paper/poster proposals for the Annual Meeting. This step aims at offering you a better-structured and more attractive conference. We hope that you will observe the new dates and will enjoy an even better Annual Meeting.

November
- TEA 32 autumn issue circulated out to EAA members

December
- Reminder to renew EAA membership on-line e-mailed to members
31 December
- End of the 2009 EAA membership (log in the members’ only section valid until 31 January 2010)
1 January
- Beginning of the 2010 EAA membership (log in the members’ only section valid from 1 December 2009)
15 January
- Deadline for session proposals for the 2010 EAA conference in The Hague, Netherlands

Mid-March
- Call for nominations to the EAA election circulated to members
31 March
- Deadline for paper/poster submissions for the 2010 EAA conference in The Hague, Netherlands

9–11 April
- Executive Board meeting in Prague, Czech Republic
15 April
- Closure of nominations by members
30 April
- Deadline for articles and announcements for TEA 33 summer issue
1 May
- Deadline for proposals of candidates for the European Archaeological Heritage Prize
First half of May
- Nomination Committee Meeting
June
- TEA 33 summer issue circulated to members
From the Editor

Dear EAA members, after ten issues, 500 pages and 150,000 words, the time has come for me to step down as editor of The European Archaeologist. I have enjoyed my five years in this role, and the opportunities it has given me to read reports on recent research and events, as well as to be in contact (usually by email) with many different archaeologists all across Europe and further afield. I would like to thank all of those who contributed to TEA since the spring of 2005, as well as those who made suggestions and provided constructive criticism. Many people contribute voluntarily to the EAA in a wide variety of ways. My meagre contribution has been facilitated by my employers, The Discovery Programme (2005–2009), the National University of Ireland at Galway (2006–2007) and University College Dublin (2008–2009), and I am pleased to acknowledge the flexibility of these institutions and my colleagues there. I am also grateful for the unerring support of Sylvie Kvetinová, the EAA Administrator; Sylvie is a rock of sense and one the Associations greatest assets. In the production of the last eight issues, I have received much assistance from Michael Ann Bevivino, and I am especially grateful to her.

**********

The world of archaeology, like the world itself, is in a state of change at the moment. The EAA is also evolving: there is a new President and some new Board Members; there are changes to the way the Annual Meeting will be run; and there will soon be new editors of both TEA and the EJA. It is certainly an exciting time to be a part of the Association, and I look forward to its continued success and to reading about the members’ work and research in future issues of TEA – but this time without having to worry about deadlines, image copyrights and the spelling of colleagues’ names!

Michael Potterton, (Outgoing) Editor
Book discount offer for EAA members

The Oxford University Press has re-launched its website (www.oup.com/uk/sale/webeaoa), which now offers many new features and options for browsing and searching, which we hope you will find useful. The promotional offer previously made to EAA members is still valid. Anyone who follows the link provided here will be redirected automatically to the new OUP website, where they can go on to purchase products at the agreed discount. The discount will be applied automatically as long as you follow this link, or go to the promotion page by typing in this url. However, the discount may not be triggered if you navigate to the page in other ways, such as by following a bookmark or favourite. When you add eligible books to the shopping basket on our new site, you should be able to see that the discount has been applied. If the discount does not show in the shopping basket, you can claim it by entering the promotion code for this offer which is: WEBEAOA

A practical guide to in-situ dog remains for the field archaeologist (by Susan Crockford)

Ancient dogs all over the world were routinely buried in ritual fashion, on their own or with people, for at least 14,000 years, making the practice of burying dogs almost as old as dogs themselves. Dog burials and human/dog interments reveal a great deal about the complex relationship that ancient people had with their dogs but require that they be recognized in the field, carefully exposed, photographed and excavated.

This manual (2009) is meant to aid field archaeologists and physical anthropologists everywhere in the identification and excavation of in situ dog remains (complete and partial dog burials, including inclusions in human interments). It consists primarily of labelled photographs of modern and ancient dog skeletal elements, both adult and juvenile. Recommended procedures for excavating dog burials and mixed dog/human interments are provided, while some background on the evolution and history of dogs puts the practice of deliberate dog interments into cultural context. While this field guide is not intended as a reference for laboratory analysis, it would be useful for preliminary work.

The book is spiral-bound and printed on water-resistant ‘Rite in the Rain’ paper with a waterproof cover. A quick reference Pocket Guide insert, printed on water-resistant heavy tag stock, is provided with the book – see preview photos on the website (additional copies of the pocket guide can be purchased at point of sale or with proof of purchase afterward but are not sold separately, since it is not meant to stand alone).

A pdf of diagrams for recording dog burial elements can be downloaded without charge from the Pacific ID website, where you’ll also find a copy of the table of contents plus introduction, as well as a sample chapter to view. http://www.pacificid.com

ISBN 978–0–0913628–0–9; email inquiries to sjcrock@shaw.ca
Conference announcement (February 2010): *Wetland archaeology in Ireland and beyond*

Conference 6–7 February 2010, University College Dublin

Wetlands are an intrinsic part of the Irish landscape, they have also been at the heart of numerous archaeological investigations, particularly over the last twenty-five years. Although a relatively recently coined term, 'Wetlands' encapsulates a critical range of landscapes, locations and places – exploited, revered, feared, crossed or ignored in different measure by various groups of people across both time and space. Today, in Ireland, they are in many respects either marginal or exploited. However, both their environment and their archaeology represent very special and important places, an importance and uniqueness recognised by World Wetlands Day and the designation of forty-five Ramsar sites across Ireland.

This conference builds on a long tradition of archaeological examination of Irish wetlands.

Papers at the conference will be broadly grouped into sessions of archaeological and environmental studies at small and large scales. The first day will focus on site-level studies mainly relating to individual sites or excavations and environmental studies at local scale. The second day will feature inter-site papers, surveys, regional level environmental studies and multidisciplinary projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6 February</th>
<th>7 February</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Morning</td>
<td>Session 1: Archaeological 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>Posters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afternoon</td>
<td>Session 2: Environmental 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One of the major objectives of the conference is to highlight the diversity of archaeologies and environments in Irish wetland archaeology and the range of methodological and theoretical approaches adopted. Recent years have seen many notable projects undertaken in Ireland either as part of existing wetland strategies or as individual projects in the context of infrastructure developments etc. This conference will present forums for a wide range of people undertaking archaeological and environmental studies to (re-)engage in dialogue on the development of wetland archaeology in Ireland over the past twenty-five years and to consider themes, priorities and potentials for the future.

before 30 September 2009. Each speaker will be allotted 30 minutes for their presentation including five minutes for discussion. Speakers and attendees are also welcome to present posters which will be displayed throughout the conference.

For further information please contact the organisers at wetland.archaeology@ucd.ie, or visit our website at www.ucd.ie/archaeology/wetland2010