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Editorial

Dear EAA Members, dear European Archaeologists!

Back from a very stimulating Annual Meeting in Oslo, I am still amazed by how smoothly this year’s conference went and how calmly and efficiently the organizers took care of all concerns – they even provided sunny weather! Well, at least until the start of Saturday’s Annual Dinner in the Ekeberg Restaurant over the roofs of Oslo, where we were served a brilliant three course menu accompanied by excellent wine. Those attending the Sunday excursions experienced somewhat more humid conditions (see the Excursion Report).

As you will have expected, this Winter Issue of your newsletter again features a number of Session Reports from the Oslo meeting. Fifty-nine sessions and round tables ensured that a wealth of topics, archaeological and beyond, were covered, bringing together colleagues from all parts of Europe, the US, and Japan. The overall quality of the papers presented was motivating, stirring many discussions that were continued during the coffee breaks in Radisson’s lobby, in the Frokostkjelleren and in Oslo’s pubs and restaurants. Many thanks to the Oslo Scientific Committee – and I am sure that the Scientific Committee for next year’s Annual Meeting in Helsinki will be eager to at least match, if not outdo their predecessors.

That said, it comes as no surprise to you that in this TEA issue, the Helsinki organizers provide you with the first information on the 2012 Annual Meeting and invite you warmly to visit the Finnish capital. Please note that the 18th Annual Meeting in Helsinki in 2012 will take place unusually early, due to the early start of the academic year in Finland. It will be opened on Wednesday 29 August and last until Saturday, 1 September 2012, preceded and followed by excursions, as usual. Therefore, the dates for registration are also quite early: please note that session proposals have to be submitted by 1 December! Please have a close look at the EAA Calendar below.

This issue also informs you about this year’s winner of the Student Award that was given in Oslo, as well as the Heritage Prize. Among the many EAA Matters that are submitted to you and give you an impression of the vivacity of Europe’s major archaeological organization, there is one I am very happy to call attention to: Robin Skeates, the editor of the European Journal of Archaeology, provides you with some details of the new EJA. After successful negotiations with Sage, who published previous EJA issues, we now have agreed to terminate the contract, and Sage agreed that the EAA retains the journal’s name. So now we are in full control again and have our journal back! And it returns better and stronger than ever: larger in size, better paper quality, high-quality images, and even colour – imagine that! EJA’s issue 14/1-2, a double volume, has been presented to the participants of the Oslo meeting and been posted to all EAA members – you should have received your copy, too. Currently EAA is negotiating with new publishers and will bring out issue 14/3 later this year.

Bad news, however, come from Hungary’s and Britain’s governments – the former plans to reduce all rescue excavations to 30 days of trial digging and another 30 days for rescue operations on the entire project area. Resistance is forming in the archaeological community that welcomes support\(^1\). The latter has cut the budget for English Heritage so that 200 posts will be lost. But there is more in this new legislation, and English Heritage is trying to deal with in an innovative way. Please check the details in the Reports.

Finally, please note that there is a new e-mail address for your submissions of reports, announcements etc. for TEA: TEA.gramsch@yahoo.com. The deadline for the Summer Issue of TEA, No. 37, is 30 April 2012. Looking forward to hearing from you!

Alexander Gramsch

\(^1\) See, for example, ‘600-an a Régészetért’ – ‘600 for Archaeology’ on Facebook.
Eszter Bánffy and Attila Gyucha, Budapest

In 2010, responsibility for contract archaeological projects in Hungary was taken away from the national organization that oversaw a unified process for the whole country. Since then, all excavations and processes, and, above all, finances, have again been made the responsibility of county museums, even though they often suffer from a shortage of capacity in terms of both space and expertise. According to a recent modification to the heritage protection law, the situation, already hard enough, is planned to be further aggravated by limiting the costs of archaeological work (previously normally 1-5 % of the overall project budget) to 1% of the total, or even capped at 200 million Hungarian Forints (approx. 65 000 Euro). This includes projects such as motorways or cross-country pipelines that cross dozens of sites. Additionally, after 30 days of trial excavations, a maximum of 30 days will be given to carry out rescue operations on the entire project area.

Here is just one example of a site that would have suffered under such a regulation. The Alsónyék-Bátaszék Neolithic site was excavated prior to the construction of the M6 motorway between 2006 and 2009. It consists of a mostly continuous sequence from the early Neolithic to the Middle Chalcolithic, with the largest Starčevo sites and number of graves ever found in Hungary, LBK and Sopot settlements and a Late Neolithic site with about 80 buildings and almost 2500 burials. Most of these Late Neolithic graves have extremely rich grave goods,
including *Spondylus* and copper jewellery, obsidian knives, polished tools, hundreds of whole vessels and even grave constructions standing on large wooden posts. The excavation of this unique site is followed by a scientific evaluation, funded by research programmes, and several PhD dissertations will be based on data from the site. A site like this, not unusual in the rich (pre)-history of the Hungarian lowlands, would be almost entirely destroyed without proper and detailed excavation and documentation, if, or when, the planned modification comes into force.

Fig. 2: Early neolithic burial from inside a subterranean oven, Alsónyék-Bátaszék.

A large and still growing group of Hungarian archaeologists are protesting against the changes planned. Friedrich Lüth, the EAA president, sent a letter to the Minister of Culture on behalf of the European Association of Archaeologists, in which the EAA expresses its strongest concerns regarding the recently proposed modifications to archaeological heritage protection regulations in Hungary. This has been mentioned in the media, so it seems that reactions from outside of Hungary can be helpful. However, time is running out. Therefore we ask you to register your protest, if you care about our European heritage. Please write to:

Prof. Dr. Miklós Réthelyi  
Minister, NEFMI  
info@nefmi.gov.hu  
sajto@nefmi.gov.hu  
Budapest V. Szalay u. 10-14  
1055 Hungary
In April 2008, the UK Government published the Heritage Protection Bill. This innovative document proposed legislation to enable a wholesale revision of the existing law that protects the historic environment in England and Wales out to the 12-mile limit of the Territorial Sea.

However, Parliamentary time was not found to take the Bill forward in the current session and so introduction of new legislation has been delayed.

English Heritage has therefore implemented a series of initiatives through a Heritage Protection Reform Programme to improve the designation system without the need for primary legislation. This paper will summarise the ways in which reforms to Heritage Protection in the English marine zone are being carried forward.

Background
Commitment by the UK Government to reform heritage protection in the UK marine zone commenced in March 2004 with the jointly-published consultation paper Protecting the Marine Historic Environment: Making the System Work Better (DCMS 2004). The paper set out key issues and questions in relation to marine historic environment (MHE) designation and proposed a legislative framework that enabled positive, transparent, inclusive, sustainable and, above all, effective management.

Following consultation, Government published the Heritage Protection Review White Paper in March 2007 which set out a vision of a unified and simpler heritage protection system (DCMS 2007a). Specific provision was made for proposed legislative change affecting the MHE across territorial waters of the United Kingdom (consistent with the current extent of the UK Protection of Wrecks Act 1973) to include:

- Broadening the range of marine historic assets that can be protected;
- Making designation decisions on the basis of ‘special interest’;
- Publishing new selection criteria;
- Introducing interim protection, and;
- Introduction of a new statutory duty with regard to salvaged material.

The White Paper was accompanied by a Regulatory Impact Assessment which stated that costs arising from reform of the marine heritage protection system ‘are expected to be negligible’ (DCMS 2007b: para. 58).

However, disappointment was expressed by the sector that the issue of Salvage Law had not been addressed within the White Paper. The Government’s stated policy position was that they ‘do not intend … to make substantive changes to salvage law in relation to marine historic assets, as … this would be a disproportionate response’ (DCMS 2007c: para 3.8.3).

At the same time, Scottish Ministers withdrew from the specific UK-wide (marine) applications of the proposed Bill in November 2007, preferring to legislate on the devolved issue in the Scottish Parliament.

Similarly, Northern Ireland withdrew from the proposed Bill in early 2008 having decided that it had adequate provision under Article 38 of the Historic Monuments and Archaeological Objects (NI) Order 1995 for the protection of wreck sites by scheduling. Northern Ireland also has provision for the reporting of finds from the seabed under Article 42 of the same Order, though a review of this legislation was to commence in 2009.
Heritage Protection Bill
The draft Heritage Protection Bill, published in April 2008, proposed a wholesale revision of the existing law that protects the historic environment in England and Wales. The Bill also intended to repeal several Acts, including the Protection of Wrecks Act 1973.

Marine Heritage Sites
Provisions in the draft Bill allowed for the establishment of a unified list of all Heritage Assets, the creation of Marine Heritage Sites and the protection of non-vessel marine heritage assets, such as vehicles, aircraft and, for the first time, archaeological structures and sites that are partly or wholly below the high water mark in English waters. All existing wrecks protected under Section 1 of the Protection of Wrecks Act 1973 were to be immediately added to the list as Marine Heritage Sites.

Access to marine heritage sites was to be controlled through the issue of marine heritage licences. These Licenses were likely to define permitted activities and contain specific conditions. As with the Protection of Wrecks Act 1973, it would remain an offence to carry out certain activities without a licence and was anticipated that Licences would generally be obtained from English Heritage upon application. Some robust sites, however, may have been designated as being suitable for unintrusive diving activities (i.e. access is permitted but unauthorised interference is not).

It was intended that English Heritage would be responsible for maintaining a publicly available list which would include all Marine Heritage Sites. The list was likely to become the most publicly visible element of the proposed reforms.

Intertidal Structures
Dealing with structures and sites in the intertidal zone would require consideration of the most appropriate management regime. The SoS would consider first whether they should be registered as Marine Heritage Asset. The SoS may reject such an application, leaving it open to English Heritage to consider whether registration as a (land) Heritage Asset should follow.

Historic Environment Records
Another innovation was that it would be the duty of local planning authorities to create and maintain an historic environment record (HER) for their area, or delegate that role to another authority.

An historic environment record would contain a record of all marine heritage sites in the local planning authority’s area.

Delay to legislative reform
Unfortunately, it was announced on the 3 December 2008 that Parliamentary time had not been found to take forward the Heritage Protection Bill in the current session. Introduction of the Bill has therefore been delayed.

Despite this perceived set-back, we know that Government remains committed to the historic environment as the protection of the nation’s cultural heritage is an acknowledged priority of the Coalition.

Heritage protection implementation strategy
Despite Parliamentary delay of the Heritage Protection Bill, English Heritage believes that forthcoming initiatives will act as a new focus for reform, and that we can still achieve many of our goals to improve the designation system, widen public involvement, and simplify protection processes.

1 The definition of English waters used within the context of the draft Bill extended to the seaward limit of UK territorial waters adjacent to England. Reference to ‘intertidal’ was also made; this being between the high and low water marks of ordinary spring tides. Archaeological sites or objects were classed as ‘marine heritage assets’ if they wholly or partly fell in the intertidal zone or were fully submerged.
English Heritage has therefore set up a dedicated Heritage Protection Reform Team within the Heritage Protection Department to both lead and co-ordinate the many aspects of delivering the new system. This will ensure that the sector as a whole is adequately equipped to take the reforms forward in partnership. The marine strand of the implementation strategy is to be undertaken by a Maritime Designation Advisor, appointed to initiate and lead project planning and management to both support and take forward key maritime projects.

The policy background to English Heritage’s approach to the marine historic environment is framed by the UK Government’s adoption of the Annex to the 2001 UNESCO Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage as best practice for archaeology in 2005. Where a marine heritage site containing marine heritage asset(s) qualifies for statutory protection, it is intended that future designation decisions will be based on special architectural, historic, archaeological or artistic interest. Selection Guides will define what is ‘special’ in the marine environment with particular reference to ‘vessels’ and will be informed by detailed guidance on the known archaeological resource allowing new sites to be contextualised. Our Conservation Principles (2008) will provide the framework for making consistent, well-informed and objective conservation decisions while the innovative methodology for the Risk Management of Protected Wreck Sites (2008) will assist with strategic prioritisation.

In addition, English Heritage has produced clearer designation records for marine sites, bringing them into line with buildings and archaeological monuments. These records are available online on the National Heritage List for England: http://list.english-heritage.org.uk/.

Organisational efficiencies

English Heritage currently receives €154 million grant from the Department for Culture, Media and Sport (and about one quarter income is generated from commercial activities). However, the deteriorating global economy has had an effect through the Government announcement of a 32% cut to the grant of English Heritage forcing protection of some services, the need to make significant cuts in other areas of business and to make savings through other efficiencies. In the national interest, designation (i.e. identifying our heritage and protecting it by listing, scheduling and so on) has been protected but grants have been reduced by around one third and 200 posts will be lost which will affect a wide range of services. As such, the context for English Heritage’s work over the four year period 2011-15 will be a real terms reduction in resources of €58 million.

Wider public expenditure cuts are also resulting in changes to the balance of expertise in local planning departments and heritage services. As part of its ambition to strengthen and empower the Big Society, Government is looking to reform the planning system including introducing marine planning for the first time (see below). This will involve the re-balancing of the roles played by national, local and voluntary bodies and the private citizen.

Central government bodies have a role to play too in that expenditure reductions have caused those who have responsibility for heritage to look closely at how they work together to eliminate overlap, clarify responsibilities and ensure that resources are carefully targeted. English Heritage’s Corporate Plan 2011/2015 describes the context for future activities, organisational priorities and the budgets available to safeguard the most significant remains of England’s national story.

Public Bodies Reform

The Government’s Public Bodies Reform – Proposals for Change document (October 2010) noted that the UK-wide Advisory Committee on Historic Wreck Sites (ACHWS) was abolished and its functions, in relation to England, were transferred to English Heritage. (Similarly, the Government’s Advisory Committee for National Historic Ships was declassified under the reforms).

---

2 HC Deb 24 January 2005 c210917.
Since then, English Heritage worked with the Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) and the Devolved Administrations of Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland, to both develop and resource a continued transparent approach to the delivery of maritime heritage designation.

The ACHWS, which met for the last time on the 24 March 2011, was set up to advise Government on the designation and licensing of historic wrecks under the UK-wide Protection of Wrecks Act 1973. To fulfill these functions as they relate to England, English Heritage has established a new ‘Historic Wrecks Panel’ – an internally managed panel made up of independent marine experts drawn from the sector.

English Heritage already maintains a number of advisory panels to ensure access to expert advice in specialist fields. The establishment of the new Historic Wrecks Panel is consistent with our established approach in ensuring transparency and accountability of English Heritage’s advice. English Heritage envisages that only complex, contentious and high profile designation cases and license applications will be subject to review by the Panel and this will ensure that processes are aligned with ongoing Heritage Protection Reform.

The new Panel will provide advice to English Heritage staff on policy and practice with respect to historic wreck designation in UK Territorial Waters surrounding England. The Panel will also be able to advise on the protection and management of marine historic assets in UK Controlled Waters around our shores.

In the longer term, English Heritage believes that this approach will lead to reduced costs and increased transparency, accountability and efficiency of marine designation.

Fig. 1: Strategic Designation arising from core assessments of significance may include assessment of all East India Company (EIC) vessels. Assessment of all EIC wreck sites in the English Territorial Sea, such as the Amsterdam pictured here, will produce a set of potential proposals for future designation activity (Image: English Heritage).

National Heritage Protection Plan
As designation has been identified as being a protected service in the face of efficiency measures, English Heritage has set out in the National Heritage Protection Plan (NHPP) how, with help from partners in the sector, heritage protection will be prioritised and delivered over the next four years (2011-2015).
The NHPP will make best use of resources so that England’s vulnerable historic environment is safeguarded in the most cost-effective way at a time of massive social, environmental, economic and technological change. At the heart of delivery of the NHPP is the Action Plan, which is divided into eight themes. These are further sub-divided into a series of Activities comprising over 400 projects. The Activities address specific areas of work (e.g. places of worship, historic ports, strategic designation) that have been identified as priorities for the Plan. Maritime priorities across the Plan period comprise practical reporting protocols for discoveries at sea, reducing the impacts of offshore renewable energy schemes, reducing risk and the establishment of voluntary management agreements for vulnerable wreck sites. It is envisaged that a programme of strategic designation will follow assessments of significant assets to address the protection of features such as submarines, pre-Industrial vessels and East India Company ships.

Marine and coastal access act 2009
Receiving Royal Assent in 2009, this Act is helping to deliver more efficient and sustainable protection of all marine resources, including an improvement in the way in which the marine environment is protected and managed. There are three broad areas of the Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009 which are most relevant to the historic environment here: Planning and Licensing, Marine Conservation Zones and Inshore Fisheries and Conservation Authorities.

Planning and Licensing
Marine planning is a devolved responsibility, outside the terrestrial planning system, and new systems of marine planning are being introduced through primary legislation, with the Marine Policy Statement as the framework for these marine planning systems. It provides the high level policy context, within which national and sub-national Marine Plans will be developed, implemented, monitored, amended and will ensure appropriate consistency in marine planning across the UK marine area.

The Marine Policy Statement will enable an appropriate and consistent approach to marine planning across UK waters, and ensure the sustainable use of marine resources and strategic management of marine activities from renewable energy to nature conservation, fishing, recreation and tourism. The Marine Management Organisation (MMO) will deliver marine planning for the English area of the UK Territorial Sea and the adjacent area of UK Controlled Waters (not subject to the responsibilities of any Devolved Administration). The first two marine plan areas are now being worked on by the MMO: East Inshore (the English area of the UK Territorial Sea between Felixstowe and Flamborough Head) and East Offshore (the adjacent area of UK Controlled Waters). The issue of co-ordination with terrestrial planning authorities is on-going, particularly with regard to the proposed National Planning Policy Framework which is a key part of Government reforms to make the planning system less complex and more accessible, and to promote sustainable growth.

Marine Conservation Zones
Marine Conservation Zones (MCZs) are objective-based statutory Marine Protected Areas; a term used to describe any area of intertidal or sub-tidal terrain, together with its overlying water and associated flora or fauna, historical or cultural features, which is protected by legal or other effective means (Parliamentary Office of Science and Technology, 2008). Proposed Marine Conservation Zones (MCZs) will allow for the protection of nationally important habitats and species, not presently subject to European protection (such as Special Areas of Conservation), and will take into account socio-economic factors in site selection. English Heritage is currently seeking to identify how the Conservation Objectives of a MCZ might be used to secure co-ordinated management of cultural marine heritage both in the English Territorial Sea and UK Controlled Waters.
Inshore Fisheries and Conservation Authorities

Fisheries and environmental management arrangements were strengthened by the Act so that more effective action can be taken to conserve marine ecosystems and help achieve a sustainable and profitable inshore fisheries sector. As part of modernising inshore fisheries management in England, Inshore Fisheries and Conservation Authorities (IFCAs) were established with provision to enable wide consideration of the marine environment to be realised, inclusive of historic and archaeological interests, as directed by Part 6 (Management of inshore fisheries) of the Act.

English Heritage is actively working with IFCAs to bring together Local Authority archaeologists, fisheries officers and communities to achieve delivery of local management and protection of the inshore marine historic environment through enhanced historic environment records.

Conclusion

While it is disappointing that Parliamentary time was not found to take forward the Heritage Protection Bill at this time, English Heritage welcomes the Government’s firm commitment to the historic environment.

Although legislation is still required to create a unified list of all heritage assets and identify marine heritage sites on the basis of ‘special interest’, the Heritage Protection Reform programme is already underway and it is estimated that more than two-thirds of the changes set out in the Heritage White Paper can go ahead without primary legislation.

Whatever happens, changes to the way in which our marine heritage is enjoyed, understood, valued and cared for is in progress, and public engagement will be at the heart of this process.

Finally, it should not be overlooked that in 2012, Britain will host the Olympic and Paralympic Games. This is a huge opportunity to present and celebrate England’s unique heritage and history.
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The Excavation of a Small Church Adjacent to the Entrance of the National Park of Butrint, Albania

Skënder Bushi
Archaeological Service Agency, Conservation and Archaeometry Unit
Tirana, Albania

During an excavation in December 2010, the remains of a small church near the entrance of the National Park of Butrint (a UNESCO World Heritage site in Albania) were partially uncovered. This report presents the initial data provided by the excavation. We attempt to give a preliminary plan of the church, its construction and the cultural material, which is of particular importance for the dating of the church. This consists of fragmentary bird-beak shaped tiles, Keay LXII amphoras, Late Roman (LR) Amphorae 3 and a fresco fragment, which indicates that the walls of the church were decorated with fresco paintings.

Fig. 1: Preliminary plan of the church near Butrint.

The road section Kanali i Çukës - Butrint is a project planned by the General Roads Directorate of Albania. The planning of this project has become necessary because of the large number of vehicles moving in this section of road, especially during the tourist season. Since the road passes through a rich archaeological area, and in accordance with law no. 9048, the Archaeological Service Agency in cooperation with the Regional Directorate of National Culture\(^1\), Saranda, and the Office of Administration and Coordination, Butrint,  

\(^1\) Archaeological Service Agency (ASA) is a central institution created in 2008 by the Law on Cultural Heritage in Albania. Its primary goal is to ensure the detection, the rescue excavation (when it is needed) and study of the archaeological heritage affected by development and infrastructural works (as in the case of Butrint). Also, we ensure the archaeological monitoring of infrastructural works conducted adjacent to the well-defined archaeological areas in order to prevent any damages. ASA’s specialists undertake the study of these fines and disseminates the research results within the scientific community. We expand our competence over the whole territory of Albania. The institute has two units: Rescue Archaeology Unit and Conservation and Archaeometry Unit. ASA includes specialists such as ceramic experts, restorers etc. and our research activities rely on other
accomplished an intensive archaeological survey of this road section. This agency noticed that several areas of this road had great archaeological potential, because of its proximity to the National Park of Butrint. The archaeological survey of the Kanali i Çukës - Butrint section of road identified the ruins of a structure, which was situated on the right side close to the entrance of the ancient city of Butrint, an area known to be the cemetery of the city².

Adjacent to these ruins, past excavations had revealed a monumental burial (Hodges 2006: 108-109) of the Roman period³. Also, during the archaeological survey undertaken before the beginning of the work for the reconstruction of the road other monumental burials and slight traces of walls, probably from dwellings, were identified⁴. In December 2010, excavation at the structure was conducted for the first time. The principal objective was to reveal the structure and define its function and to map some features of its plan. Thus, the humus stratum of 0.4 m thickness was removed, uncovering building remains aligned in a longitudinal axis east-west (Fig. 1). The building was constructed with local pumice stones bounded with abundant lime mortar and evened out by tile splints. The bird-beak shaped tiles represent a very important element, which provide a date for the building of the 6th century AD. The walls have a width ranging from 0.7 m to 0.9 m and they are homologous institutions in Europe such as the Institut National de Recherches Archeologiques Preventives (INRAP), France, as well as other local institutions as Albanian Heritage Foundation (AHF), etc.

² The General Roads Directorate, in accordance with the law no. 9048, informed our Agency about the Butrint road project. Because a segment of ca. 3 km of this road is situated near the territory of National Park of Butrint and the cemetery of the ancient city in particular, an intensive survey of the area was necessary. This area is included in the A3 zone (subdivision of cultural inheritance area; defined by the Albania Law on Cultural Heritage according to their archaeological potential) and protected as a National Park. As a result we identified the ruins of some other burials and slight traces of walls and the church and noticed that these structures will not be affected by the road construction.

³ The monumental burial was first noticed and excavated by Luigi Maria Ugolini in 1924. He gave a date in the 3d century AD. In 2004 Richard Hodges noticed that the tomb was reused, repainted and modified as a chapel, probably the chapel of Saint Demetrios on Le Chevalier’s 1802 map of Butrint.

⁴ ASA didn’t excavate these ruins because they weren’t affected by the road construction.
preserved to a height of up to 1.5 m. No anomaly exists in the masonry of the walls, which means that they are constructed in one single period, although the nave wall is 0.2 m narrower than the apse wall (Fig. 2).

The structure measures approx. 12 m from east to west overall, and has a width of around 6.1 m (Meksi 2004: 140 – 141), measured from its inner facades; this is in line with the proportions of the naves of many churches of this kind in the Albanian territory\(^5\); the suggested proportion of length and width is 1:2. This year’s excavation could only trace along the nave’s walls for a length of 2 m.

On the eastern side the complete church apse was recovered, with a small window at its centre and traces of the semi-circular vault, which was well preserved at its northern side. The apse has a semi-circular shape at the inside and outside. The actual archaeological data, also supported by other excavations in the Late Antique and Early Medieval churches of Albania, suggests that the apse is aligned in the same axis with the west door of the nave.

![Fig. 3: Transport amphorae of the 6th century.](image)

The archaeological data from the site consist of fragmentary tiles from the Late Antique period, two amphorae slats from the same period (Fig. 3) and a fresco fragment. The first slat belongs to a group of amphorae of African origin, used for transport, probably of the Keay LXII type (Fig. 3.a) whereas the second slat belongs to the LR Amphora 3 type, produced in the Aegean Islands (Fig. 3.b). The group of LR Amphorae 3 is represented in many other sites and Late Antique horizons in the Albanian territory such as Durrës\(^6\), at the Basilica of Saranda\(^7\), at Butrint (Saranda), at the Monastery of Forty Saints (Saranda), Lezha, Bylis (Balish)\(^8\), at the castle of Shkodra (Hoxha 2003, Tab. II, 8-11) and at the site of Finiqi (Saranda). Likewise, fragments of Keay LXII group of amphoras were discovered in almost all the sites mentioned above. This type is the most usual in the 6th century horizons at Durrës. The excavations undertaken in the 6th century contexts at the castle of Shkodra are

---

\(^5\) The features of the plan of our church show similarities to the plan of the church of Shurdhahu (or medieval Sarda, located in northern Albania), which is situated outside of the surrounding wall of the city and dates to the early medieval period.

\(^6\) Shkodra 2003: 73, Tab. 16, no. 6; Tab. 18 no. 4; Tab. 19, no. 9, with a fragment from a rim and three fragments of base.

\(^7\) Lako 1984: 198; Tab. IV, no. 1-3; no. 5-7; Lako 1977-78: 299; Tab. III, no. 1; Lako 1981: 137-39; Tab. II, no. 3; Tab. IV, no. 1; Lako 1993: 253; Tab. I, no. 20.

\(^8\) The cultural material of Byllis is unpublished. The excavations are conducted by Skënder Muçaj (Centre for Albanian Studies and the Research Institute for Archaeology, Tirana) in collaboration with Ecole Française d’Athènes (EFA).
dominated by the presence of Keay LXII amphora and allowed the researchers to distinguish all the type variations (Hoxha 2003: 56, Tab. VI, 14; Tab. VI, 3, 4, 7-9). Also, this type is found in the 4th century horizons at the site of Onhezêm (Saranda) and at the 6th century horizons of the Great Basilica at Butrint (Saranda), excavated by K. Lako, who inventoried only a handle of this type (Lako 1984, Tab. III, 4; Reynolds 2004: 229; Fig. 13, 158). The excavations undertaken at the Monastery of Forty Saints (Saranda) yielded a large quantity of LR Amphora 3 and Keay LXII, but the cultural material of this site is still unpublished.

On the northern side of the nave wall, the existence of a fresco fragment, painted with dark red colour and white colour was discovered (Fig. 4). It was not possible to define whether this is a fragment of an ornament or part of a garment, but it provides evidence for the church being decorated with fresco paintings. Nevertheless, we hope that further archaeological excavations will clarify the plan of the church and will provide more evidence to reinforce its actual dating.
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The Harbour of Proconnesus in Greco-Roman and Early Byzantine Times: The Marble Trade, a Source of Financial and Cultural Development

Alexandra Karagianni
Department of Byzantine Archaeology, Faculty of Philosophy
Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Greece

The island of Proconnesus, today known as Marmara island, is situated in the eastern part of the Propontis Sea or Sea of Marmara, between the cities of Priapus (today Karabiga) and Cyzicus (today Aydincik) in Turkey. It is the biggest of a group of islands in the Propontis Sea covering an area of about 18 km east to west and 10 km north to south. It is located at a distance of some 70 nautical miles away from Constantinople.

Fig. 1: Map of the Propontis Sea and the island of Proconnesus (Freely and Çakmak 2010: 4).

Historical evidence
Proconnesus was colonized by the Greek inhabitants of the Ionian city of Miletus in the middle of the eighth century B.C. According to historical evidence, Proconnesus was burned by a Phoenician fleet which was in the service of the Persian King Darius in 493 B.C. In 410 B.C. Proconnesus was subjected to the domination of Athens. In the early third century B.C. Proconnesus was conquered by the Romans and became part of the Roman Empire. Afterwards it joined the Byzantine and the Ottoman Empires, following Constantinople and its neighbouring cities (Asgari 1978: 467-469).

Marble export trade
Since ancient times the traditional occupation of the island’s population was fishing, fruit and olive growing, vegetable gardening and lumber exportation. But the island’s prosperity was mainly due to the marble quarries and the export marble trade which was possible thanks to the harbour. The principal Proconnesian products that were exported abroad were marble columns, bases, basket-capitals, ambos, rectangular chancel reliefs and blocks for pavement and revetment for Early Christian churches. Proconnesian quarries also produced a large number of sarcophagi and rarely statues. Those products were exported by ships mainly to Constantinople, to the Eastern and Western Europe, North Africa, Crimea and the Middle East (Betsch 1977: 14-17).
The Proconnesian marble trade was an organized system of production and exportation that was primarily based on the planning of quarrying methods with proper tools and the creation of storage areas at the quarries and in the marble-yards of the importing cities. The tools used by the craftsmen were mainly the quarry-picks, with which the artisans cut out narrow trenches around the blocks so as to remove them from the parent rock. Besides this method, the Proconnesian craftsmen also used the method of splitting by wedges (Asgari 1988: 115-121).

After the extraction of the marble blocks from the parent-rock, the blocks were carried with wooden or metal rollers to an area right in front of the quarry, where they were dressed into a regular rectangular shape. The rectangular blocks were afterwards loaded on wooden carriages pulled by oxen, arrived at the harbour and were shipped to the Aegean and Mediterranean markets. The sea transport was done by big cargo boats upon which were loaded the smaller marble blocks, whilst the bigger ones – in order to be lighter – were hung in the water with wooden beams, which were supported by two other cargo boats (Ward-Perkins 1992: 16-17).

**Proconnesian quarries**

The quarry area was located in the northern part of the island of Proconnesus in and around the harbour town of Saraylar, today’s Palaces. Proconnesus had six harbours, but mostly the harbour of Saraylar was used for the marble trade. The ancient town of Saraylar was located underneath the modern settlement. This may be inferred both from the emplacement of the Roman necropolis surrounding the modern settlement and from the ancient aqueduct which has been traced from its source as far as the modern harbour.

---

1 Spectrographic analysis has proved that indeed this marble came from Proconnesus.
In the first century AD Roman emperor Tiberius had the quarries organized and made into state property. As a result of this, quarrying began on a large scale and the island became a great centre of production. During the second and third century AD Proconnesus marble trade dominated the eastern Mediterranean and Adriatic markets as well as the Black Sea. By the reign of Titus, Proconnesus was already exporting large quantities of marble capitals and other forms of architectural sculpture to the Lebanese cities of Tyre, Byblos and Beirut. A big quantity of architectural elements was also exported to the province of Pamphylia in southern Asia Minor as well as Leptis Magna in Libya (Pensabene 1998: 328).

The quarries and the marble trade derived fresh importance after the foundation of Constantinople. From the 4th to the 6th century, a large number of marble capitals were imported from Proconnesus and employed in civil and religious buildings, such as porticoed squares, Episcopal buildings and colonnaded streets. Proconnesian marble also figured among the precious marbles of Hagia Sophia and was used for the marble elements of the monastery of Livos in Constantinople (Ward-Perkins 1951: 102-104).

Until the mid-sixth century, during the reign of Justinian I, church construction and export marble trade remained at a high level. But around 600-625 AD the quarries of Proconnesus were gradually abandoned. The reason of the abandonment was the fact that building in the public sector of Constantinople, except for churches, virtually ended after the first half of the sixth century. Most of Byzantine emperors preferred renovating local churches and not constructing new ones. So the needs in marble were less and consequently the orders and the exportation decreased (Betsch 1977: 325-328).

Financial and cultural development of Proconnesus
The highly profitable export trade led to the financial and cultural development of Proconnesus especially during the Roman and early Byzantine times. The financial development is attested by the prosperous living of the inhabitants and mostly by the
The decision of the Byzantine Emperor Justinian I (483-565) to build his palace there. Justinian brought with him a large entourage of nobility, palace guards, tradesmen and servants. Afterwards other notable Byzantine aristocrats from Constantinople settled on the island and built residencies there. The servants and guards that worked in the palace were also cultivators of the land and were engaged in viticulture, oil production and fishery. Many of those products were also exported to the Mediterranean markets.

The cultural development of Proconnesus is attested by the erection of a large convent on the island during the reign of Justinian I. The choice of the island is justified by the fact that Proconnesus served as the siege of the archdiocese of the islands of Marmara during the early Byzantine period. The convent had educated monks, who worked as scribes of religious books, psalms and greco-roman philosophical texts. The libraries, which were created thanks to the presence of the monks and the financial support of the Orthodox Church, represented a cultural heritage for future generations. The convent also brought a big number of pilgrims that traveled from various places of the Byzantine Empire in order to stay at the convent and to satisfy their religious needs.

Excavation results
Concerning the archaeological investigation of the quarries and the harbour of Proconnesus, we note that the excavations carried out on the island in 1971 by Nusin Asgari revealed mainly a Roman necropolis that dated from the second and third century AD. The Roman necropolis, which lied in a valley just behind the harbour of Saraylar, consisted of about fifty sarcophagi and sarcophagi fragments (Asgari 1978: 470). Not much archaeological evidence of the ancient Greek period was found during the rescue excavations.

Other archaeological finds around the harbour and the quarries were certainly the plethora of capitals, columns and bases that had been left on the harbour unfinished because of their flaws and also the mass of inscriptions, crosses and Christograms that were incised on the quarry-rocks. The majority of the inscriptions had religious meaning and manifested the desire of the craftsmen and the people that worked there to set the quarries under the protection of God. Today the unfinished marble elements form an open-air museum around the harbour.
Two shipwrecks as archaeological evidence

Important evidence for the archaeological investigation constitute two shipwrecks that were found, one on the Black Sea coast of Turkey near Sile and the other one on the east coast of Sicily near Marzamemi. The first one was a Roman trade ship that parted from Proconnesus with a load of marble columns, capitals and sarcophagi; after passing through the Bosphorus it must have been overtaken by a storm on entering the Black Sea and sunk (Beykan 1988: 127-137). The second trade ship was a Byzantine one dating from the early 6th century. It also departed from the island of Proconnesus, passed from a harbour of the Aegean Sea and headed to Italy or North Africa. Then it probably lost its way in a storm and hit the reef at Marzamemi. This ship carried a load with prefabricated building materials, such as marble slabs, columns, pillars, shafts, bases and capitals intended for the interior decoration of a Christian basilica (Kapitan 1969: 122-130). Those two shipwrecks, studied by M. Beykan and G. Kapitan respectively, are important for the investigation because they enrich our knowledge concerning the trade relations between Proconnesus and the other importing cities.

**Fig. 6:** Proconnesian marble column shafts, capitals and bases from the Marzamemi shipwreck (the photo dates from the 1962 discovery of the wreck; Kapitan 1969: 124).

Conclusions

In conclusion we can say that the island of Proconnesus, famous for its quarries and its continuous mass production of white marble, played an influential role in the marble workmanship and the marble export trade. Thanks to its vicinity with Constantinople, Proconnesus attracted many Byzantine aristocrats from the capital who chose to build their residencies there, as well as the emperor Justinian I who constructed a palace and a convent.

We conclude that the export marble trade, which was facilitated thanks to the harbour, helped enormously the financial and cultural development of Proconnesus. This activity brought wealth to the island, contributed to the prosperous living of the inhabitants and consequently raised their social and cultural level.
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During the early Upper Paleolithic, *Homo sapiens* was living in nomadic hunter-gatherer groups. In terms of diet, there is a lot of evidence for meat consumption provided by prehistorians and archeozoologists, but little is known about plant food during Paleolithic times. The research project ‘Vegetable Resources during the Paleolithic’, financed by the Istituto Italiano di Preistoria and Protostoria, and coordinated by Anna Revedin, is devoted just to this issue.

The aim of the project is the application of new non-destructive techniques for the recovery and the identification of vegetable remains in Paleolithic sites; in particular, the project focuses on tools made from unknapped stone likely to be used in the treatment of plant-substances, such as pestles, grinders, grindstone, hearth-stones, etc. to acquire new evidence on the importance of the use of plants in the Paleolithic and gain a better understanding of the economy and the diet of these most ancient humans.

The project started in 2007 and, at the beginning, was focused on the Gravettian site of Bilancino (near Florence, central Italy), a seasonal camp-site devoted to wetland plant harvesting and processing (Aranguren, Revedin 2001), dated (by AMS) to 28,298+/-301 cal BC (Aranguren, Revedin 2008). The Bilancino research team coordinators are Biancamaria Aranguren and Anna Revedin. A pestle and a grindstone were found here, with starch grains on their surfaces, recovered by Marta Mariotti Lippi. Along with the starch analysis, trace-wear analysis was carried out by Laura Longo (by means of a new digital microscopy analytical procedure, HIROX).
A wide range of starch grains have been found on both the pestle and grindstone, attesting to the processing of different plants (e.g. *Typha* and *Sparganium*). The plants processed to obtain flour were identified according to the morphology and size of the starch grains. This was in turn related to the starch grain morphology of the edible plants found, as attested by the pollen spectra of the site and discussed in ethno botanical literature.

The ethnographical comparisons show that the use of *Typha* rhizomes to make flour is well known all over the world, particularly in the non-European countries, including China, Australia, and North America, where this plant is still used.

Furthermore, experiments were carried out by Biancamaria Aranguren and Anna Revedin, in order to verify the technique for using the grindstone and pestle. The experiments suggest that it is possible to mix cattail flour (obtained from the dried rhizomes) with water to obtain a sort of flat bread or cake to be cooked on hot stones.

The use of different plant processing techniques is also demonstrated by the insights gained by analyzing the grinding tools at Kostienki 16 – Uglyanka, Russia, and Pavlov VI, Czech Republic (Revedin et al 2010). The recovery of starch grains on the surfaces of grinding tools from the UP sites in Italy, the Czech Republic and Russia testifies to the fact that vegetal food processing and preparation was common practice in Europe at least from around 30 kyr cal BP.

Chemical and nutritional analysis carried out by Emanuele Marconi make it clear that flour was an important source of carbohydrates in the Paleolithic diet. Flour enhanced humans’ mobility capacity, since it ensured a good source of high-energy food while on the move and when they were facing a lack of prey. Moreover, the flour has to be cooked in order to be metabolized during digestion, therefore our research supports hypotheses regarding the systematic practices of cooking elaborate and complex food.

The data gathered by the research project "Vegetable Resources during the Paleolithic" demonstrate that with an appropriate methodology, it is possible to investigate the varied knowledge of the environment supplies available to nomadic people in Europe and, most importantly, demonstrates the systematic application in everyday life of plant processing by anatomically modern humans, at least at 30.000 years ago.
The future steps of this research will try to find wider and older evidence. At the moment, the data supports this ability, not only to collect but also to process plant food, only in relation to *Homo sapiens*; this might be one of the species’ advantages in terms of competition with Neanderthals.

**References**


Travertinization and Holocene Morphogenesis in Armenia: A Reading Grid of Rapid Climatic Changes Impact on the Landscape and Societies Between 9500-4000 cal. BP in the Circumcaspian Regions?

Vincent Ollivier\textsuperscript{1,2}, Sébastien Joannin\textsuperscript{3,4}, Paul Roiron\textsuperscript{5}, Samuel Nahapetyan\textsuperscript{6} and Christine Chataigner\textsuperscript{7}

Context and problematic

Travertine deposits are very rich paleoenvironmental and geomorphological archives. Thanks to their biosedimentary formations property with physico-chemical and biochemical origin, they are sensitive to biotope changes linked to climatic oscillations and/or anthropogenic activities (Ollivier et al. 2006). Frequently localized downstream karstic resurgence, they need temperate and humid climate with relatively forested watershed to be significantly developed. Coupled with morphosedimentary analysis, they are very useful to reconstruct landscape mutations patterns concerning long to short time period. Integrated into the ‘Caucasus Mission’ Program (CNRS, MAE) and the International Associated Laboratory HEMHA (‘Humans and Environment in Mountainous Habitats: The Case of Armenia’), one of the objectives of our research is to define and identify the rapid climate changes and their impact on the landscape mutations (including expressions, terms, rhythms and amplitudes) and societies in the Circumcaspian regions. To answer this question we use the Quaternary travertine system development analysis in feedback with the morphogenical trend variations in a pluridisciplinary approach integrating geomorphology, paleoecology and archaeology.

The Holocene travertine systems studied are located in the Vorotan valley (Syunik region, southern Armenia, Fig. 1). This major river in Armenia rises in the Syunik mountains and is confluent with the Arax near the Iranian border. The area is dominated by lower Pleistocene diatomitic fluvio-lacustral deposits with rich palaeoecological content already analyzed (Fig. 2 and 3, Joannin et al. 2010; Ollivier et al. 2010).

A total of five major travertine formations were studied in Uyts, Shamb and Tatev localities. The most detailed analysis was performed in the Shamb 2 travertine sequence.
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Morphosedimentary analysis, absolute dating and palynology
The morphosedimentary approach was used to correlate in a spatiotemporal dynamic scale the different facies and morphologies of the travertine formations from low to high energy sedimentary pole (sharp travertine to chalky units). The samplings for dating were performed on each facies’ variations which are the expression of hydrodynamic and/or climatic changes (from dry to humid conditions) in a short time range. We used Uranium/Thorium and Radiocarbon dating methodology to better fit the morphosedimentary evolution (Poznan Radiocarbon Laboratory (Poland), IFM GEOMAR (Kiel, Germany)). Some of the travertine formation allows palynological analysis. The first samplings were collected on the silty and chalky facies of the most representative and continuous formation in Shamb 2.

Fig. 2: Uyts-Aghitu geomorphological transect with travertine formation localization.

Fig. 3: Shamb-Darbas geomorphological transect with travertine formation localization

Preliminary results
The main part of the valley connected to the Vorota River in the Sisian-Tatev localities area were quickly filled by alluvial formations (around 6 to 10 meters thickness) during the Lateglacial and the Holocene. Fire signatures can be read inside the Lateglacial silt deposits and are represented by burned levels with charcoals. This kind of record probably underline a short period of drier climate around 12,900 cal. BP corresponding to the Younger Dryas event. The first travertine formations, which often express the production of biogenic carbonate and high aquifer levels, appear from the very beginning of the Holocene in the context of the postglacial warming.

A record of Rapid Climate Change and major landscape mutation around the 8th millennium BC identified through the Shamb 2 travertine
The Shamb 2 travertine formation (Fig. 4) is the most representative of the rapid climate change affecting the first part of the Holocene. In terms of sedimentary facies, our results clearly show the progression of temperate and humid conditions since the Last Glacial Maximum with an optimum ranked around 9000-9500 cal. BP. These conditions are expressed through the progressive development of various travertine facies, from chalky units to sharp carbonated deposits that underline the growth of hydrodynamic conditions in the valley. The major phase of carbonated accumulation highlighted at this time indicates an
important environment changing with the appearance of attractive humid zone for the Neolithic populations in this area. The pollen analysis gives more paleoenvironmental detail on these results. Thirteen samples provided enough pollen grains for pollen analysis (Fig. 5). On this short-time record (1000 years), herbs and steppe mainly composed an open-vegetation landscape where only few temperate trees (*Quercus* and *Carpinus* mainly) probably developed in the valleys. Thanks to a high temporal sampling resolution (80 yrs/sample on average), a more woody phase, and therefore a more humid phase is recorded from around 10,000 to 9500 cal. BP in accordance with the sedimentological analysis.

This travertinization optimum around 9500-9000 cal. BP corresponds to a period of humidity identified in Anatolia, in the north-western Iran and more generally in the Caucasus (Kvadadze and Connor 2005; Morteza et al. 2008; Turner et al. 2008; Wasylikowa et al. 2008; Wick et al. 2003). After this episode, the travertine growth records an abrupt interruption. Around 4000 cal. BP, the permanent antagonism between the sedimentation budgets (erosion/sedimentation), main parameter controlling the travertine formations development, is again positively balanced in favor of carbonate accumulation as we can be observe with the Tatev travertine formation in the downstream part of the Vorotan valley. The Tatev travertine (4140 cal. BP) contains numerous leaf imprints that allow us to reconstruct the local vegetation (Figs 6 and 7). This travertine is the last testimony of the Holocene carbonatogenesis in the Vorotan Canyon. Its lower position in the valley show the major impact of cutting phases related to climate but also to the local tectonic evolution.

Between 9000-4000 cal BP, an important cutting of the valleys occurs (ca. 40 m depth). According to the dating and the geometry of the Shamb (9500-9000 cal BP.) and Tatev (4140 cal. BP) travertine formations, this incision can be connected to the
cumulative effect of the river sedimentary budget variation balance and to the uplifting of the Lesser Caucasus range. The interpolation of our results allows us to calculate the tectonic impact on the landscape mutation in this area and to propose an uplift rate situated ca. 8 mm/year.

Fig. 6: Tatev holocenic travertine formation.

**Rapid Climate Change and tectonic data, the travertine as a reading grid of Neolithic/Chalcolithic landscape mutations in Circumcaspian regions?**

The analysis of the morphosedimentary travertine system development in Lesser Caucasus, allow to identify and characterize the rapid Postglacial climate changes and their potential impact on the landscape mutations and societies of this bioclimatic and cultural crossroad area between Africa, Asia and Europe. The sensitivity and responsiveness of the travertine formations are an efficient recording of the rapid and short term (inferior to 1 Ky) climate changes. The generalized and synchronized travertine system development in the valleys illustrates a major landscape mutation with the apparition of alluvial/marshy environment in a prior context dominated by dry and steppic valleys. The cumulative effects of alluvial incision and tectonic elevation on the valleys physiography between the beginning and the end of the Holocene underline the importance and the rhythmicity of the landscape mutations (Fig. 8). Such Holocene landscape changes variability must have influenced the human group mobility and/or occupation modes.

Few Neolithic sites are known in Armenia (Tsaghkunk, Aratashen, Verin Khatunarkh / Aknashen, Teghut, Ada-Blur, Masisi-Blur, Artashat) and the fragmentary character of the information available has not allowed the establishment of a precise chronological sequence for the material culture within the 7th/6th to the middle of the 4th millennium BC (Badalyan et al. 2010). The widespread use of the landscape reading grid provided by the geomorphological study of the travertine systems could be useful to have a better knowledge about the relationship between environmental fluctuations and the evolution of the Neolithic societies but also to lead differently the prospecting for new archaeological sites or to understand their absence in some areas.

In the zone of the studied travertine formations the correlation between environmental and archaeological data is under progress and will be also available for the Chalcolithic period with the site of Godedzor (4th millennium BC) excavated in the framework of the Caucasus Mission. At last, the wide dissemination of travertine formations context allow to work on local and extra-regional scale but also diachronically on the whole Quaternary period.
Fire is a key ecological factor at different scales of space and times. In addition with palynological analysis, studies about fire frequencies using microcharcoal distribution in Armenian chalky travertine or detrital sequences (were fire signatures are frequently

Fig. 7: Leave imprints of the Tatev travertine formation.
recorded) will also be provided in the context of the International Associated Laboratory HEHMA to reconstruct Holocenic bioclimatic oscillations as well as anthropogenic landscape impact of the Neolithic occupation modes. Many multidisciplinary (geomorphology, archaeology and paleoecology) research opportunities focused on circumcaspian travertine system environment are open.

![Panoramic view of the downstream Postglacial Shamb Travertine](image)

**Fig. 8: Holocene alluvial cutting and tectonic readjustment around Shamb travertines.**
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The Contribution of 3D Scanning and Virtual Modeling to the Reconstruction of the East Pediment of the Temple of Zeus at Olympia
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Introduction

The temple and its sculptural decoration in general
The temple of Zeus at Olympia was built in the first half of the 5th century B.C. (ca. 475–455). Its sculptural decoration consists of two pediments and twelve metopes. Given the large size of the building itself, the sculptures were all well over lifesize and were made of white marble. Most of them are quite well preserved and are depicted in practically every handbook on Greek art or on ancient art in general. The sculptures of the temple in general and the fragments of the east pediment (Fig. 1) in particular have been thoroughly studied since their discovery in the 1880’s, but they still pose some important questions, as indicated by the growing number of monographs and scholarly articles related to them (e.g. Ashmole and Yalouris 1967; Säflund 1970). The most recent debate has started with a series of publications by the author and concerns the interpretation of the east pediment, which involves the problematic issue of the correct reconstruction of this group as well. (cf. Patay 2008).

Fig. 1: Fragments of the east pediment, as displayed in the Archaeological Museum of Olympia today.

The problem of the reconstruction
The arrangement of the five central figures of the east pediment has been the subject of scholarly debates since the discovery of the fragments more than a century ago (in general see Herrmann 1972). The basic problem is that the fragments themselves can be arranged in four substantially different ways and there are no obvious clues for choosing the most probable one. There is a fairly detailed description of the group by Pausanias, who saw it in the 2nd cent. AD, but his text (Description of Greece, book V, ch. 10, 6-7) is not conclusive regarding the precise arrangement of the figures. The findplaces are not unequivocal either, since the pieces were scattered around the temple by an earthquake in the 6th cent. AD and the fragments were subsequently reused in medieval buildings.

In sum, there are four different arrangements, all of which have already been advocated by certain scholars for various aesthetic, technical and other considerations. Most often the reconstructions are presented in simple drawings, ignoring the three-dimensional form of the statues (Fig. 2).

A brief history of research
Since the original fragments are insufficient to answer the question and their enormous size and weight make experimentation practically impossible, scholars had to approach the problem in a different way. At the end of the 19th century, plaster models of the statues were produced first on a reduced scale (1:10), then on the actual scale (1:1) and lost body parts, arms, etc. were reconstructed as well. Experimenting with the plaster models for several years, G. Treu the archaeologist, who published the sculptures of Olympia, claimed in 1897...
that one of the four conceivable arrangements (Open "A": K – G – H – I – F) is physically impossible, because the left hand of figure K and the spear in the right hand of G do not fit but run across each other in the limited space. To support this rather strong argument, Treu added that with the help of the plaster models, anyone can verify his statement (Treu 1897, 120). Indeed, during the following decades, several archaeologists exploited the possibility and experimented with the life-size models: they concluded that the reconstruction proposed by Treu had to be modified at some major points, yet none of them advocated the option excluded by him.

![Fig. 2: The central part of the pediment enlarged. Schematic reconstruction drawings showing every conceivable arrangement of the five central figures. Different colours highlight the differences of the four versions. After Herrmann 1972.](image)

The large plaster models (kept in Dresden) were not used for experimentation after the World War II; in fact their sheer existence fell into oblivion. (It is something of a miracle that they survived the notorious demolition caused by the bombings of the city.) Most scholars used either the reduced models or just simple drawings to propose new reconstructions. Besides a great number of studies, a complete monograph was also published on the east Pediment in 1970, but no-one was able to present a fully satisfactory and convincing reconstruction. It is characteristic of the situation that a pair of reknown authors presented two completely different reconstructions side by side in the same volume (Ashmole and Yalouris 1967) on the sculpture of the temple.

There was a major methodological problem as well. In general (see Säflund 1970), scholars were accustomed to discuss the reconstruction and the interpretation together and the reconstruction was normally adapted to the interpretation, which is logically the wrong way, of course; evidence, which could be used to establish the correct reconstruction independently from the interpretation, was usually neglected.

After a while it seemed that all conceivable arguments have been formulated and no approach proved to be entirely viable, thus archaeologists grew tired of a seemingly unproductive debate and gradually agreed (during the 1970s and 1980s) on a reconstruction, which was proposed by a few authoritative scholars supporting their notion by some theoretical considerations of supposed universal validity (cf. Patay 2008).
Thus an absurd situation emerged: today the most widely accepted reconstruction (Fig. 3) is precisely the one, which was deemed technically impossible by Treu. Obviously, this would not present a problem, if his results had been thoroughly tested and clearly refuted, i.e. if anyone had showed that Treu had experimented with ill-restored models or had come to wrong conclusions for some other reason. Instead, everyone (with honourable exceptions) has ignored his arguments and his results. Apparently nobody realized that the best evidence for the benefit of experimenting with life-size models is provided by G. Treu himself, who had advocated the arrangement widely accepted today, while he only had the miniature models at his disposal, but later his experiences with the life-size models made him change his mind.

Fig. 3. The most commonly accepted reconstruction of the pediment (after Herrmann 1972 fig. 95).

The application of 3D technologies

General overview
Since experimentation with the precious and monumental original fragments is out of question, plaster casts and models are expensive to produce and not easy to handle, it seemed to be reasonable to apply the latest 3D scanning technology to the problem. The aim of the project was to test the practical feasibility issues raised by the early experiments and to assess the aesthetic effects of the possible arrangements with 3D models of the reconstructed statues. The digital models were produced by scanning the original fragments and by reconstructing them (i.e. completing their missing limbs and armour) virtually. The complete virtual 3D model including the architectural frame of the group (Fig. 4) was realized by January 2011.

Fig. 4. The new virtual reconstruction (closed arrangement “A”) of the complete pediment. The original fragments in grey, reconstructed parts in blue.

The 3D models offer a large variety of possibilities and can be used very easily. Due to the 3D PDF format, no special hardware or software is needed for the average user to view them. The textured, lightweight 3D models of the individual figures and those of the entire group can be freely manipulated (rotated, zoomed and measured) and thus can be studied
more effectively than the originals or any replicas: e.g. one can easily adopt the viewpoint of a visitor standing in front of the temple and have a look at the group from below (Fig. 5). They are all included in a CD-ROM (ISBN 978-963-284-196-0), which can be obtained from the author. Details of the reconstruction (the relative position and the poses of the figures, the geometry of the reconstructed parts, etc.) can be adjusted with appropriate softwares (e.g. 3ds max studio) and the original high-definition models can be used for further research and visualization.

Fig. 5. The central figures of the pediment from the viewpoint of a visitor standing in front of the temple.

Data capture
The difficult task of scanning all the available monumental marble fragments belonging to the pediment (13 human figures and two four-horse chariot teams) was carried out in the Museum of Olympia from 23.08 to 03.09. 2009 by two experienced technicians of Tondo Ltd. (Budapest, Hungary) under the supervision of the author. A Breuckmann smartSCAN Duo structured light scanner has been used and 1150 scans were taken, amounting to ca. 57 GB. The difficulties encountered during the data capture are detailed in the preliminary report (Patay 2010) and can be summarized as follows:

- monumental scale (1.5-2 times lifesize) of the fragments, upper parts are accessible only with a special crane (Jimmy Jib)
- absolutely unmovable pieces: fastened to the wall with several massive iron bars, alignment close to the wall, rear sides difficult to reach with the scanner
- world-famous pieces, highlights of the museum: restricted working hours from 8–12 p.m.

Virtual modelling and reconstruction
The high-resolution models of the fragments were simplified by a radical decimating of their polygons in order to create models (each measuring approximately 150 000 polygons), which are easily manipulated, but in order to preserve their high artistic quality, normal maps were applied to their surfaces. For the completion of the missing parts (limbs, heads, armour, chariots) different software products have been tested (Bentley Microstation, Poser by SmithMicro, Leonard3Do by 3DforAll, Autodesk 3ds Max Studio) The most problematic issue was the completion of the missing arms, because their exact rendering and position is far from being certain. Modeling was done by a sculptor (M. Hitter) and by an architect-designer (G. Gedei) independently from each other. Both were instructed and supervised by the author (a classical archaeologist) coordinating the project, in order to create models which are conform with the style of the original fragments (the so-called severe style, characteristic for the first half of the 5th century B.C.), but both of them used different softwares (Leonard3Do, Autodesk 3ds Max) and adopted different methods for the reconstruction of the missing parts. The resulting models were, however not substantially different regarding their poses and their proportions. For details see the final report (Patay 2011).
Results and discussion
The experimentation with the reconstructed models revealed that contrary to the expectations based on the results of the early experiments with plaster casts, every arrangement could be realized. (Fig. 6).
The virtual model shows, however, that the arrangement, which was considered to be physically impossible in the 19th century (open “A”) and which is most commonly accepted today (Fig. 3), is indeed the most difficult to realize: the limbs of figure K and G do not necessarily run across each other, but the distance between them is so small (max. 10 cm) that we can hardly believe that this arrangement could follow the original intentions of the designers or the sculptors.
Furthermore, the model clearly shows that in the case of both open arrangements, another problem arises: the spears in the hands of the male figures fit the available space only if both of them grip the shaft directly under the spear-head (Fig. 7), which is otherwise not attested in Greek art. In the case of closed arrangements, we have no such problem with the spears, these arrangements can therefore be regarded more probable than the open ones.

Fig. 6. Virtual 3D reconstructions of the central figures arranged as in Figure 2. The fragments are displayed in grey, the reconstructed parts in pale blue.

Fig. 7. The spear-heads of the male figures in the open and closed arrangements.
Conclusions
The complete virtual 3D reconstruction of the composition leads to the conclusion that the reconstruction, which is most widely accepted today (Open “A”), is technically the most difficult to realize and that both open arrangements would be feasible only if we ignored a general pictorial convention of ancient Greek art. Still, it is important to emphasize that the virtual reconstruction does not enable us to establish the right arrangement, i.e. the one actually realized in antiquity, but only to exclude (with a high degree of probability) two of the four options. However, considering the uncertainties experienced so far, this result can be regarded as a great progress. Though the remaining two closed arrangements are possible both technically and iconographically, one can observe, that every piece of evidence, which is independent from the interpretation actually point to type “A”, which can be considered therefore as the most probable reconstruction.

The project presented here clearly demonstrates, that 3D scanning can be used not merely for documentation (as it is most frequently employed), but for effective research purposes as well.
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Excursion Report
Excursion to the Viking County of Vestfold: A Postscript

Estella Weiss-Krejci
University of Vienna, Austria

One of the destinations of the 17th EAA Annual Meeting post-conference excursions was Vestfold County, which lies about an hour’s drive south of Oslo. The trip took place on Sunday 18 September 2011 and was guided by Terje Gansum and his colleagues from the Department of Cultural Heritage at Vestfold County Council. The area is archaeologically famous for its Viking ship burial mounds, especially those of Gokstad and Oseberg, both excavated over a century ago. In the course of our trip we visited the following locations:

1) the Midgard Historical Centre at Borre and its associated mound cemetery, located approx. 3 km south of Horte;
2) Oseberg mound, 5 km northeast of Tønsberg;
3) the city centre of Tønsberg, where a replica of the Oseberg ship is currently being built, and
4) Gokstad mound, 2 km northeast of Sandefjord and the southernmost point of our excursion

Midgard Historical Centre and Borre cemetery
Because of the rainy weather we spent the morning at the Midgard Historical Centre looking at the archaeological exhibits and listening to a lecture by our guide. After lunch we walked 200 m east to the entrance of the Borre Park, which once contained nine mounds and two cairns – the largest grouping of burial mounds in Scandinavia (Myhre 1992:310). Today only seven mounds and one cairn are left. One of the former mounds was Skipshaugen (the ship mound) whose 15–20 m long ship was destroyed during road construction in 1852. Based on the few remaining artifacts, the mound has been dated between the late ninth and early tenth century AD (Shenk 2002:45-46).

Fig. 1: Excursion participants walking towards the Oseberg mound (all photos: Estella Weiss-Krejci).

See Google Earth: entrance to the Borre Park: 59°23’03.00"N, 10°28’08.00”E; Oseberg mound: 59°18’27.64"N, 10°26’48.53”E; the Oseberg ship reconstruction site at Tønsberg: 59°15’51.62”N, 10°24’24.70”E; Gokstad mound: 59°08’26.70”N, 10°15’ 11.30”E.
Borre is not just a Viking site but already gained importance during the Merovingian period between the sixth and eighth centuries AD (Myhre 1992:307-308). While the large Borre mounds were probably built between AD 650 and 900, some of the smaller barrows are older. In 2007, the underground remains of two great hall buildings were discovered west of the major burial mounds during magnetometer and geo-radar survey (Trinks et al. 2007). One of the halls is believed to have been up to 40 m long and 12 to 13 m high. It probably dates around AD 700-800. This means that Borre was not only a burial place but a centre of royal power².

Oseberg mound

Our next stop was at the famous Oseberg ship mound, a landmark in Norway's archaeological history (Fig. 1). Beneath a layer of grass turf and a cairn-like structure of big stones, one of the world’s most spectacular Viking graves was discovered in 1904. The excavations brought to light a carved clinker-built boat with twelve strakes (Fig. 2). Like the Gokstad ship mentioned below (both on display in Oslo’s Viking Ship Museum), the ship had been in use for some years before it was pulled ashore and buried. The Oseberg ship was constructed around AD 820 whereas the burial was only made in AD 834 (Bonde 1997). The buried ship and the wooden chamber, which was built behind the mast, were lavishly furnished and contained the remains of two women – variably interpreted as a queen and her thrall or a queen and her daughter – together with fifteen horses, four dogs, an ox, a wagon, several beds, four sledges, a chair, a large amount of wooden objects, iron buckets, ropes, textiles, etc. (Arwill-Nordbladh 2003:21). The fragmentary condition of many of the objects and the presence of a hole in the roof of the grave chamber led to the idea that the barrow had been looted after the burial (Arwill-Nordbladh 2002:205; 2003:21).


Fig. 2: The Oseberg ship replica. The strakes are built up from either side of a single-piece oak keel in clinker form of construction. Five strakes are almost completed, but there are seven more to go.
In 1948 the human remains were reburied into the mound (Arwill-Nordbladh 2002:310), but exhumed again in 2007 because of concerns regarding their preservation. The bones have been investigated and some preliminary results are available³.

**Oseberg ship replica at Tønsberg**
The third stop took place at Tønsberg, 5 km southwest of Oseberg. Currently Tønsberg is witnessing the building of a full scale replica of the Oseberg Viking ship (Figs 2 and 3). The project is directed by the New Oseberg Ship Foundation and carried out on the pier area right outside one of Tønsberg’s main hotels. It is a cooperation project with the Viking Ship Museum in Roskilde, Denmark⁴. The project’s goal is to achieve a functioning sailing reconstruction of the ship which is being built by professional boat builders from Denmark and cooperating volunteers. The building process will be the topic of an upcoming National Geographic documentary. The boat builders (chief boat builder Geir Røvik and tool expert Thomas Finderup) are applying the most recent knowledge by using replicas of Viking-age tools and authentic materials. For example, as in the original ship, the strakes are lashed to the ribs with ropes made of baleens from the Greenland whale (Figs 4 and 5)⁵.

Not only is this project an exciting exercise in experimental archaeology but also a prime example for how archaeology and history can be communicated to the public. The ship construction has attracted local school classes and the general public from Norway and abroad, and inspired a range of further cultural activities such as the composition of an Oseberg concert. It is therefore hardly surprising that in the spring of 2011 the project received a generous award of 100,000 Norwegian kroner (a little less than 13,000 €) from the newspaper *Tønsbergs Blad* for spreading engagement and happiness within the local community⁶.

---


⁶ The brochure can be downloaded at [http://www.osebergvikingskip.no/eng/](http://www.osebergvikingskip.no/eng/).
Although our visit took place on a Sunday, project employees and volunteers showed up in large numbers and dressed up in period costumes to give us a perfect impression of the project in full-swing. We were received by the chairman of the board of the New Oseberg Ship Foundation, Einar Chr. Erlingsen and instructed by the builders. Some of us also tried out Viking tools. I drilled a hole into a thick plank, which – to my surprise – went almost as fast and easy as using an electric drill.

**Gokstad mound**

After two exciting hours we moved on to our last Viking site: the Gokstad mound. Excavated between April and June 1880, this was the first Norwegian mound ever to reveal a fully-preserved Viking ship. The person buried in the mound was a man of about 40 years of age, very tall (about 1.83m) and unusually hefty. As in the case of the Oseberg women, animals had been included with the deceased: 12 horses, seven dogs, two goshawks and two male peacocks. Like in the Oseberg mound, the ship predated the construction of the grave. It was built around AD 901; the mound was constructed a little less than a decade later, in AD 910 and also reentered after the burial.

In 1928 the skeletal remains of the Gokstad man were reburied into the mound thereby preceding the Oseberg reburial by 20 years and serving as a precedent for it. Interestingly, this was done by a small, chosen circle of people whereas in the following year (in 1929) the restored mound was inaugurated in the presence of the Norwegian king Haakon VII and a crowd of an estimated 10,000 to 20,000 (Arwill-Nordbladh 2002:209). The reburied bones were exhumed once again in 2007 and are currently being investigated as part of the project ‘Gokstad Revitalized’.

---


8 This information is available at the Gokstad site. See also Nicolaysen 1882.

9 [http://www.khm.uio.no/prosjekter/gokstad/project_overview.html](http://www.khm.uio.no/prosjekter/gokstad/project_overview.html)
The trip to Vestfold raised some of the theoretical issues of this year’s EAA meeting, such as the problem of ‘past disturbances of graves’ (s. session report by Aspöck and Klevnäs). Like the Oseberg and Gokstad mounds, many of the Viking mounds in Vestfold County have been opened soon after burial. Initially these grave openings (haugbrott) were considered as an act of robbers who broke into the chambers in order to take away the fancy grave goods. However, based on reviews of the old reports in combinations with more recent exploration (e.g. the Viking burial site at Gulli Farm in Vestfold investigated by Gjerpe), these disturbances are now seen in a different light (Price 2010; Soma 2007). Reviewing the excavation diaries and photographs several years ago, Gansum suggested that the Oseberg ship had initially been covered by a mound to only half its length and that the grave was left open and accessible for a while (see also Arwill-Nordbladh 2003:21; Price 2010:Fig.2). The covering of the mound and full burial of the ship as well as the ‘robbery’, which happened afterwards, may have been part of a multi-stage and lengthy funeral. The possibility that some of these graves were left open and accessible for a time has also been raised for ship burials outside Norway (see Price 2010:140).

One of the ideas associated with boats is that of voyage, an aspect mentioned by Gansum during his morning presentation at Midgard Historical Centre. Two of the three horses in the Borre Skipshaugen had been reportedly found standing, somehow stiffened by clay while the rest of the mound consisted of sand. Schenk (2002:46; based on personal communication by Gansum) writes: ‘One of the two horses was found standing outside of the ship and was probably originally hitched up to a cart or sledge. This strongly suggests that the horses were meant to be in motion – in other words, traveling somewhere. […] Wherever they were headed, they clearly served a different purpose in the grave than the horses at Oseberg.’ On the other hand, Williams et al. (2010:5) suggest that boat burial was not only a distinctive practice because it may have articulated a particular type of afterlife journey, but because it installed the dead into the landscape in a distinctive manner. Boats are means of transport,
and their presence may have evoked one element of the funerary procession to the cemetery. The dead were believed to reside at the cemetery and the ships were for homecoming, not for departure.

The Vestfold mounds are also a reminder that dead bodies can be tremendously powerful objects in building national identity and legitimizing political power (Verdery 1999). Until accurate dating became available, the mounds had been considered as burial places of the members of legendary House of Yngling and its descending kings, who were responsible for the unification and Christianization of the Norwegian kingdom. The key person in these stories is Harald Fairhair (died c. AD 933) who is credited by later tradition as having unified Norway into one kingdom in AD 872. Originally the Gokstad mound was identified as the grave of King Olav Geirstadalv (died c. AD 840), older half-brother of Halvdan the Black (died c. AD 862) and uncle of King Harald Fairhair. One of the two women in the Oseberg mound — although it was never quite decided who — was believed to be Åsa, mother of Halvdan the Black, and grandmother of Harald Fairhair (Arwill-Nordbladh 2002:207-201). Other Vestfold mounds (at Borre and Tønsberg) were considered as the burial places of King Harald’s sons (Gansum and Oestigaard 2004:75). Although the connection between different people mentioned in the sagas and specific Vestfold mounds reaches back into the late middle ages (Gansum and Oestigaard 2004:75), the material reference to King Harald’s grandmother, uncle and sons also supported the young Norwegian nation. When Norway became an independent monarchy in 1905, after a period of 500 years in unions, first with Denmark and then with Sweden, the desire to back up the old stories with material evidence about the times when King Harald had founded Norway as an independent kingdom was especially strong.

The idea that the Vestfold mounds hold ancestors and descendants of King Harald was challenged in the early 1990s (Gansum and Ueland Kobro 2005:18). Archaeologists, who played a crucial role creating these myths, also volunteered to destroy them. Today it is known that Åsa was still alive when the two women were buried in the chamber of the Oseberg ship in AD 834, whereas Olav Geirstadalv was dead 60 years before the Gokstad ship even came into existence. King Harald’s sons were probably not buried in the Borre mounds because King Harald’s stronghold was on the southwestern coast of Norway, not in the southeast, as recent analysis of the sagas has shown. The association of Harald with Viking Age Vestfold can now be considered as propaganda, which over time became more and more anti-Danish, focusing upon how King Harald liberated Norway from the Danes (Gansum and Oestigaard 2004:74-75).

According to Gansum and Ueland Kobro (2005:18-19) Viking Age Vestfold was probably a part of Denmark in the 9th century and therefore was directly connected to the Continental European world. The international cooperation with Denmark in building the replica of the Oseberg ship is probably a first step in re-establishing this connection. It will be tremendously interesting to observe what role archaeological research will play in this process. Although the principle reason for exhuming the bones from both the Oseberg and Gokstad mounds in 2007 was the concern over their preservation, the investigation results will have an influence on how the people of Vestfold will perceive the Viking mounds in the future.
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It may safely be argued that the introduction of the constructivist concept of identity over the last couple of decades has induced profound changes in the archaeological investigation of the past. However, this strain of inference has not been pursued equally vigorously in all local archaeological communities. Thus, the proliferation of literature written in English is in stark contrast to the sporadic application of the concept of identity in other settings. South-Eastern Europe, one such region reluctant to embrace quickly shifts in archaeological theory, has once more remained more or less withdrawn from the current vivid debate on applicability of the concept of identity in archaeological research.

Therefore the recent conference *Fingerprinting the Iron Age. Approaches to identity in the European Iron Age. Integrating South-Eastern Europe into the debate*, held at the Magdalene College from 23 to 25 September 2011, and organized with the support of the McDonald Institute of the University of Cambridge, was aimed at addressing this quickly widening gap in communication between the specialists dealing with the late prehistory of different parts of Europe. Archaeologists from eight principal countries of Europe (Austria, Bulgaria, Croatia, Germany, Hungary, Romania, Serbia, and Slovenia) as well as participants from more than fifteen countries including the United States and Australia, engaged in vivid three-day debate, organized in eleven sessions, ranging in topics from regional surveys and recent discoveries, issues of technology, settlement, burial, art, to politics and theory in the study of identities in the European Iron Age. The main focus of the majority of the contributions was on the matters of ethnic attributions of the communities in the past, whereas gender, social and other aspects of identity emerged sporadically in the proceedings. This need not come as a surprise, since the concept of cultural group – a construct encompassing a territory and material manifestations of human actions therein, and implying the unity of other cultural elements and ultimately ethnic unity over the region in question, bestowed to us by Vere Gordon Childe, but by Gustaf Kossinna as well – remains the staple element of archaeological investigation. In spite of its amply demonstrated inherent problems, it is still deeply embedded in our basic toolkit and this surely is one of the hardest burdens on the discipline. Moving forward in the direction of acknowledging constant negotiation of group identities in the past, instead of fixing them into sharply delineated stable units, requires continuous theoretical as well as practical reconsideration. The discussions at the Conference echoed this concern and problematized a series of theoretical and methodological aspects of the study into the period particularly laden with the issue of ethnicity, with its echoes in the modern world. The fact that the communities inhabiting temperate Europe during the first millennium BC attracted attention of the literate southern neighbours – the Greek and Roman authors,
brings forward the key matter of the role of written sources in archaeological research. This point was addressed by a number of contributions to the Conference, reconsidering the attitudes of the Classical world towards ethnic identity and the implications of these texts for our modern understanding of the political maps of the Iron Age Europe. The modern political maps and their consequences for our endeavour of understanding the past were also treated in a number of presentations. This line of inquiry illustrates the appeal of the late prehistory for the current identity-building processes in many parts of Europe, from the ideas of the Celtic realm, to the disputes over the lawful heir to the name of Macedonia and the ancestors of the Albanians.

Fig. 1: Some of the participants of the conference.

In summary, the archaeologists gathered at the Conference differed in their starting points, but the discussions proved that communication between the specialists in different regions, methods, and adhering to different theoretical approaches is possible and indeed fruitful. Therefore, the most important result of the Cambridge gathering lies in setting solid foundation for the future dialogue of the archaeologists from various parts of the world dealing with the Iron Age.

Further details of the conference (including the programme, abstracts, plans for publication and plans for future thematic conferences focused on the Iron Age) can be found here: http://www.arch.cam.ac.uk/iron_age_conference_2011. The conference is grateful for support from the McDonald Institute, Brewin Dolphin investment management, the ACE foundation, the Ironmongers livery company and Magdalene College Cambridge.
Debate

The Importance of Palaeolithic Surface-Scatters to our Understanding of Hominin Dispersal and Neanderthal Variability.

Key Methods for Unlocking Hidden Data

Julie Scott-Jackson, Institute of Archaeology, University of Oxford, UK
Email: julie.scott-jackson@arch.ox.ac.uk
William Scott-Jackson, Institute of Archaeology, University of Oxford, UK

Data derived from excavated sites (in any particular area) are unlikely to provide information on the Palaeolithic peoples’ use of the landscape as a whole. To investigate this hominin spatial organization, a study of Palaeolithic surface-scatters of stone-tools and waste-flakes is required.

The term ‘surface-scatter’ is used here, in preference to ‘lithic-scatter’ to clarify a confusing problem of terminology that exists in lithic research. Often the phrase ‘lithic-scatter’ is used to describe lithic artefacts that are found both on the land-surface and below the land-surface (i.e. embedded/excavated/site). But in other instances, the term ‘lithic-scatter’ is only applied to lithic artefacts that are found on the surface of the land – so the term lithic-scatter and surface-scatter mean the same. The lithic artefacts found below the land-surface are then described variously as embedded/excavated/site. As the methods and techniques for investigating surface-scatters and embedded/excavated lithic artefacts are in many ways different, there is much opportunity for misunderstandings in short reports and abstracts if these distinctions are not clearly stated.

The methodologies and techniques described here for locating, recording and analysing Palaeolithic surface-scatters (see also www.users.ox.ac.uk/~padmac/) produce repeatable, testable datasets which can provide scientifically credible answers to questions relating to hominin dispersal patterns, Palaeolithic habitat preferences (including the provision of resources) and the use of the landscape as a whole.

Fig. 1: Desk-based methodologies for locating surface-scatters.
Desk-based methodologies for locating Palaeolithic surface-scatters (Fig. 1)
The first stage in any surface-scatter investigation is the creation of a Project Database using a Geographic Information System (GIS) consisting of:

- A basic geo-referenced digital mapping of the specific area (Fig. 1.1).
- Previously recorded Palaeolithic scatters/sites (Fig. 1.1).
- Historical mapping data (Fig. 1.1).
- Geological and soils/sediment data (Fig. 1.1).
- Satellite mapping data (Fig. 1.2).
- Digital Elevation Models (DEM) based on spot heights (Fig. 1.3).
- Aerial photography data (Fig. 1.4).

This information is analysed to explore both the landscape features and surface geology, to identify areas of Palaeolithic potential, and to study relationships between known Palaeolithic surface-scatters and sites in a variety of topographical contexts (e.g. plateaux edges with views into valleys (overlooking possible animal migration routes), interfluves and drainage systems. Also, to calculate slope profiles, cross-sections and relative distances to knappable stone and/or water.

Field investigations: aims and techniques for recording Palaeolithic surface-scatters
The desk-based geo-archaeological assessment data previously entered into the GIS Project Database is now incorporated into a high-resolution GIS Palaeolithic Survey Grid (PSG) where each specific grid square in the PSG has a unique identifier.

- Global Positioning System (GPS) is used to record the presence/absence of Palaeolithic evidence during field investigations (Fig. 2.1).
- Differential GPS is used within the area of the surface-scatter/site to record the extent of the Palaeolithic archaeology and provide detailed Digital Terrain Mapping (Fig. 2.2).
- Close range aerial photography can provide an overview of a site (Fig. 2.3).
- Photogrammetry, GPS/ laser /or total station survey are used to provide a 3D model of the artefact positions (Fig. 2.4).
- Deep resistivity survey (or ground penetrating radar) identifies sub-surface geological profiles indicative of retained Palaeolithic sites (Fig. 3.1).
- Magnetometry can show sub-surface features affecting Palaeolithic evidence, and Magnetic Susceptibility can indicate land use over time (Fig. 3.2).
- Soils/ sediments are sampled to understand site formation processes.
- Lithic artefacts are collected (if appropriate), or photographed/drawn for later analyses.
Off-site analysis of data from field investigations of Palaeolithic surface-scatters

The desk-based assessment and field investigations are the basis for the off-site analyses of the: inter surface-scatter relationships; intra surface-scatter relationships and technotypological analysis of the Palaeolithic artefacts.

**Inter surface-scatter relationships:**
- Analyse the geographic relationships between recorded surface-scatters and/or sites and other locations with Palaeolithic potential (Fig. 3.3).
- Analyse geomorphological processes of erosion and deposition and the results of soil/sediment samples to establish the integrity of the surface-scatter/site (Fig. 3.4).
- Identify post-depositional anthropomorphic modification using historical mapping (Fig. 1.1).

**Intra surface-scatter relationships:**
- A 3D model of the artefacts, their orientations and distribution patterns is produced using: Photogrammetry or Laser scan/ Total station survey data (Fig. 4).
- Circular statistical analysis (using Oriana for example) indicates geomorphological processes (Fig. 4).
- Geophysical results are analysed to identify sub-surface features and local geomorphological processes (Fig. 3.1 and Fig. 3.2).
Techno-typological analyses of artefacts from Palaeolithic surface-scatters
The off-site techno-typological analysis of the Palaeolithic artefacts is in two parts: The intra surface-scatter and then inter surface-scatter. Results of these investigations are entered into the Project Database.

The intra surface-scatter techno-typological analysis aims to identify the industry types, particular manufacturing techniques and to determine the integrity of the artefact assemblage. Using the intra surface-scatter information, the inter surface-scatter artefact techno-typological comparison is then made.

The inter surface-scatter techno-typological artefact comparisons between the surface-scatter/s and other related sites can provide valuable information on Palaeolithic hunter-gatherers’ use of the landscape as whole.

What techniques or methods are you using? Have you experienced any problems with those listed above? We very much welcome your ideas and comments. E-mail: julie.scott-jackson@arch.ox.ac.uk University of Oxford (Director, PADMAC Unit).

The Web as a Publication Medium for Archaeological Projects
Andrea Vianello and Harrison Eiteljorg, II (nicke@csanet.org)

The growing use of the web to disseminate scholarly information cries out for good, explicit, carefully defined practices for placing archaeological material on the web for access by others. In a series of articles in the CSA Newsletter, the authors presented many questions relevant to this process (http://csanet.org/newsletter/fall11/nlf1103.html). In those articles the authors generally tried not to make judgments about the best and most appropriate approaches, preferring instead to try to ask the right questions so as to encourage analysis of the issues. A short presentation was also given at the EAA meeting in Oslo, and the authors thank the audience for the stimulating discussion that followed.

Here we wish to make clear some very specific recommendations about publication on the web of the results of archaeological projects.
1. National and international organizations need to provide their views on a variety of matters so that both processes and content can be well and carefully proscribed, at least in those areas where agreement can be reached today.

2. Archaeologists – both those who conduct fieldwork and those who consume the results – also need to be involved in the formulation and adoption of appropriate standards. Those standards need to be developed with careful attention to different data types as well as the needs of both field work and secondary use of the data. All should be committed to the prompt and full sharing of digital data.

3. Archival preservation of data files (no matter the format, from text to GIS to CAD to images) is a separate issue. It is the absolute and unequivocal responsibility of any scholar to assure the archival preservation of the records, whether digital or not.

4. It may be necessary to put unfinished work on the web, but that impetus should generally be resisted. So long as movement toward completion is reasonably steady, it is better to wait than to put onto the web materials that will likely be changed.

5. Digital publications need not be copies of printed publications. Nor must digital publications displace printed publications.

6. Where national repositories exist for data, the final publication process should fully integrate the data in repositories with all other portions of the record of a project.

7. Where data repositories are not required, care of the data files will necessarily become the responsibility of the project, whether that means simply finding an archival repository or attempting the archival preservation at the project level. In either case, the integration of data and other portions of the record remains central to the process.

We invite everyone to read our discussions, and comment on the many issues by using the online forum [http://webpub.bronzeage.org.uk/] that we have set up. Publishing may be the last act of a project, but it needs careful planning well in advance. Everyone benefits from rigorous and accessible publications, and we hope to raise awareness about the many issues still uncertain or unresolved that impede successful web publishing of archaeological reports.

The Beginnings of Lithuanian Statehood According to the Exploration of the Dubingiai Microregion

Rimvydas Laužikas Rimvydas.Lauzikas@kf.vu.lt

In April 2011, a group of scientists from Vilnius University, supervised by Albinas Kuncevičius, started implementing a research project under the title *The beginnings of Lithuanian statehood according to the exploration of Dubingiai microregion*. The project is funded by the European Union Operational Programme for Human Resources Development for 2007–13, Priority 3, Strengthening Capacities of Researchers.

The aim of the project is to analyse the formation process of the state of Lithuania, as a political and territorial unit, invoking the example of the Dubingiai micro-region and the data from natural sciences, history and archaeology from the 1\textsuperscript{st} to 15\textsuperscript{th} centuries AD. The process of the establishment of the state of Lithuania and feudal society formation was a unique case in medieval Europe, as it became a crossroad to the eastern and western Christian cultures; the Islamic influence is also felt; however, the Lithuanian society was pagan until the very end of the 14\textsuperscript{th} century. The research of the micro-region, which is close to Vilnius (the historic capital), exhibits how the Baltic society, which was pagan and tribal, transformed into a territorial and administrational unit. It is obvious that during centuries the society had to outlive many changes, which are recognisable while researching old living and burial places. Thus, the established scientific goals are as follows:
1) To validate theoretically definitions of geographical space in the micro-regional concept, to adjust methodology of micro-regional research.

2) To collect, analyse and systemize the scientific information about the situation of the period and to determine chronologically its development.

3) To perform research and comparative analysis of the social structure and organization of archaeological sites in the micro-region.

4) To elaborate models on social organization of a particular micro-region, including cultural multilayered evolutional models.

The project is being carried out by six researchers: Albinas Kuncevičius (the supervisor), Rimantas Jankauskas, Rimvydas Laužikas, Renaldas Augustinavičius, Ramūnas Šmigelskas and Indrė Rutkauskaitė.

The scientific project will be carried out within four years. In summer of 2011, the surroundings of the old Dubingiai churches were excavated. Yet, the researchers continue working with historical documents and old maps. Their goal is to reconstruct the history of Dubingiai living-places as well as their evolution; it is important to know how the Dubingiai parish and the duchy of Radvila developed. The specific feature of the scientific project is the application of innovative technologies. The archive data is being connected to the geographical coordinates, after that it is processed with special GIS computer programmes. Furthermore, the non-interventional computer technologies are applied to the research of burial monuments and mounds.

The methodology chosen is superior to the traditional one, as the older excavation methods cause destruction of heritage, they are not efficient, expensive and the knowledge extracted is never sufficient. The project The beginnings of Lithuanian statehood according to the exploration of Dubingiai microregion aims to apply new, modern methods, which would not destroy archaeological heritage, would allow collecting more scientific data saving money and time.

This scientific research is a fundamental one and the expected results is knowledge, which will be shared with the academic and common public as well as with the international audience. The results of research will be delivered in a monograph, scientific articles, and presentations in national and international conferences. Moreover, the methodology of the interdisciplinary micro-regional research in the domain of the last prehistoric period through Early Middle Ages, and the three-dimensional analytic model will be established, and will be appropriate for the application to other micro-regional research.
Ole Crumlin-Pedersen (1935-2011)

It is with great sorrow that we announce the death of Dr. phil. h.c. Ole Crumlin-Pedersen. He passed peacefully away on Friday, 14 October 2011, after a long period of illness, aged 76 years. Ole Crumlin-Pedersen remained committed to his life’s work in the field of maritime archaeology until his very last days. He has dedicated his work to the development of the Viking Ship Museum in Roskilde, and he also contributed considerably to the founding of the Viking Museum in Schleswig/Haithabu. The Viking Ship Museum has dedicated an Internet page to the memory of Ole Crumlin-Pedersen: http://www.vikingeskibsmuseet.dk. The funeral took place on Saturday, 29 October at Himmelev Church in Roskilde, followed by a memorial reception at the Viking Ship Museum.

Skirt from Areni Cave

The excavators of the Areni 1 Cave (s. TEA issues 34 and 35) successfully provide us with yet another update on interesting finds from the cave. This year Pavel Avetisyan, Director at the Armenian Archaeology and Ethnography Institute, reported to Armenian News (News.am) that a piece of cloth was found made of woven straw, interpreted as a woman’s skirt. The artefact with rhythmic color hues, discovered already in 2010, dates back to 39th century BC.


New date for new australopithecus

*Australopithecus sediba* is a new hominid that was discovered last year at the Malapa site in South Africa, and was reported with a bracketed date between 1.78 and 1.95 million years ago. Now a series of papers in *Science* dates *Au. sediba* back. Uranium-lead dating of the flowstone, combined with paleomagnetic and stratigraphic analysis of the flowstone and underlying sediments, provides a tightly constrained date of $1.977 \pm 0.002$ million years ago (Ma) for these fossils. This new date may lead to controversies, since it suggests that *Au. sediba* predates the earliest uncontested evidence for *Homo* in Africa. The fossils may be less of an australopithecus and more of an erectus. *Au. sediba* has several important skeletal features that are more similar to our human ancestors, including hand, cranium and pelvic changes that are more commonly associated with *Homo erectus*. The earliest firmly dated *H. erectus* remains are from Koobi Fora in Kenya, at 1.88-1.9 mya. Thus, the five articles in *Science* argue that our categorization of hominids evolution may need some serious retooling.

Sources: http://www.sciencemag.org/site/extra/sediba/index.xhtml
The struggle against looting

On 9 September 2011 Egyptian Tourism and Antiquities Police succeeded in arresting twelve antiquities traffickers at the Upper Egyptian city of Meniya while they were engaged in selling 27 stolen artefacts. The suspects had large sums of money and a car with Libyan plates. They said that they purchased the antiquities from tomb raiders in Meniya.

On 14 September 2011 Bulgarian media announced that the Bulgarian Customs Agency has bestowed upon the Regional History Museum in Burgas a Roman statue. The statue, made of Mediterranean marble, is said to represent a goddess or a female aristocrat, dating to the 2nd century AD. It was seized during a customs check at the Lesovo border crossing point from a truck with Turkish license plates transporting clothes from Turkey to Belgium via Bulgaria. Under the Bulgarian legislation, the Roman statue will be kept in the Black Sea city of Burgas until the respective authorities figure out its origin and whether it has been stolen and searched for by Interpol. Since the statue bears no marks from any museum, it will probably be kept permanently by the Burgas museum. Thanks to the Burgas Customs, the local history museum is the only one in Bulgaria outside of Sofia, which has an entire collection of ancient artifacts and finds captured from traffickers of antiques.

US news announced that the Minneapolis Institute of Arts has agreed to surrender a classical Greek vase that has been a museum showpiece for nearly 30 years. The institute intends to return the object to Italy, which says it was looted from an ancient grave. In recent years, under pressure from Italy, American museums have been repatriating questionable objects and have stopped buying antiquities that lack verifiable histories of ownership. Italian authorities produced three Polaroid photos with details unique to the vase. The images came from a cache of 10,000 Polaroids of illegally excavated goods seized by Italian police in a 1995 raid on a Swiss warehouse operated by Giacomo Medici, an antiquities dealer who eventually was sentenced to 10 years in prison for trafficking in illegal art. The Minneapolis museum bought its vase in 1983. It came from Robin Symes, a prominent British antiquities dealer and sometimes associate of Medici who also brokered to the Getty many items that were later challenged. Getty officials evidently suspected Symes even while buying from him. The vase most likely came from Rutigliano in the Puglia region of southern Italy where Greek settlements were established in ancient times, according to La Sapienza University in Rome. Since Minneapolis’ collection of antiquities is comparatively small, the vase was a star of the museum, and museum scholars had identified its artist, now known as the Methyse Painter.

As a discipline, archaeologists have traditionally been highly focussed on the material fabric of the past. It is therefore unsurprising that - in the face of many serious threats to this resource - they have expended considerable effort on securing its long-term conservation, both through the development of technical approaches to archaeological site management and through advocacy aimed at influencing the development of public policy. Following the development of landscape archaeologies by academics and stimulated by the rapid growth of their own archaeological inventories, curatorial archaeologists have more recently been drawn into the arena of landscape-scale conservation and the increasingly urgent and complex debate on the future of landscape and the use of land.

Fig. 1: Hornelen, a Norwegian mountain with changing connotations, from an awful landscape in the 18th century to an appreciated part of the Fjord landscapes today (photograph by Axel Lindahl; Riksantikvaren archive, Norway).

At the 17th Annual Meeting of the EAA in Oslo, the joint EAA and EAC Working Group on Farming, Forestry and Rural Land Use organised a well-attended and lively round table that...
considered the opportunities and challenges archaeologists face as they stake a claim in the landscape debate. The round table was very deliberately focused on the role of cultural heritage managers, rather than academics. Given their role in increasing understanding and providing interpretations, there can be little debate that archaeological researchers have a great deal to offer the development of thinking on landscapes. In contrast, the role of cultural heritage managers and curatorial archaeologists is, perhaps, less obvious.

Fig. 2: Village Bay, St Kilda – a landscape recognised as a World Heritage Site for both its cultural and natural heritage values (© National Trust for Scotland).

Ratification of the Florence (European Landscape) Convention (which defines landscapes as “an area as perceived by people, whose character is the result of the action and interaction of natural and/or human factors”) requires states party to protect, manage and plan for their landscapes. Implicit in these three undertakings is the need to strike an often difficult-to-define balance between conserving the archaeological record and allowing or enabling landscape change. Can an approach to land management that recognises change as an inherent characteristic of landscapes ever be effectively reconciled with current approaches to archaeological site management, which are generally directed to securing continuity and stability?

The Oslo round table was chaired by Emmet Byrnes and was structured around four brief presentations by its organisers: Ingunn Holm, Stephen Trow, Leif Gren and Jonathan Wordsworth. Each presentation was designed to stimulate discussion and debate amongst those attending. Holm discussed the contrasting philosophies which underpin Norwegian evaluation criteria for landscapes and archaeological sites and posed questions about how these relate to the issue of national and personal identity. Trow illustrated several tools and approaches developed in England that attempt to bridge the gap between the management of site and landscape, but also considered the challenges in utilizing these tools effectively in
terms of strategic thinking. Wordsworth explored contrasts between nature conservation and heritage conservation in Scotland and more widely in Europe and explored the conflicts between archaeological site preservation and the main drivers of landscape change. Gren examined similar issues from a Swedish perspective, including the major pressures arising from renewable energy policies, and pointed to the need to increase inter-disciplinary working between the natural and cultural environment sectors.

Discussion in the Round Table was wide-ranging, but brought out a number of key themes, all of which would bear further, and more detailed, examination. They included:

- The discrepancy between the thousands of “dots on the map” which comprise a typical archaeological inventory and the holistic concepts of landscape, which necessarily encompass a wide range of interests and which - in terms of the cultural heritage alone - can also embrace the built environment, folklore, art, memory, and sense-of-place.
- The difficulties faced by curators when working at the landscape scale in terms of identifying robust priorities for action and investment
- The often radically different approaches to decision-making exercised by archaeologists and other landscape interest groups in terms of identity values and evidential values in the landscape.
- The importance of new approaches based on landscape character and the integration of different expert interests within a common landscape character framework but also the largely untapped potential of such approaches at the strategic level.
- The apparently greater empowerment of the natural heritage sector, compared to the cultural heritage sector and the possibility that this balance may shift in the face of current economic pressures.
- The effective appropriation of “landscape” by the nature protection sector and the challenges posed by confused concepts of “naturalness” and “wildness”.

Fig. 3: The Swedish database of ancient monument contains information on more than 1.7 million remains in nearly 600,000 places. In some areas the heritage is maintained through clearance and pasture, at the same time the surrounding nature reserve is left for spontaneous regeneration with forested land. Ismantorp hillfort, Iron Age, Island of Öland, Sweden. Photo Jan Norrman 1997-08-17 (© Swedish National Heritage Board).
• Similarities and differences between the natural environment and cultural heritage sectors’ objectives and ways of working, together with the undoubted advantages of forging closer links across disciplines.
• The importance of the views of farmers, land managers and local communities in terms of the defining possible landscape futures and the need to find ways of further encouraging and empowering their participation.
• The significant gap between the philosophical approaches embraced by the Florence and Faro conventions and the need for practical action on the ground by cultural heritage managers.
• The role of politics, land ownership, legal traditions and different approaches to cultural heritage management in dictating the possibilities for engagement and influence.
• The need for a more social-sciences oriented research agenda for those engaged in landscape and cultural heritage management.
• The need for archaeologists to develop new tools, new concepts and even new mind-sets in order to become more effective participants in the future landscapes debate.

Fig. 4: Can we balance the dynamic nature of landscapes and the need to adapt to and mitigate climate change with the desire to conserve the historic environment? Wind turbines and prehistoric standing stone on St.Breock Down, Cornwall, England © English Heritage 2006 K050101

Underlying all of these themes, however, remains the challenge of reconciling what might be considered “preservationist” approaches to archaeological site management with apparently inescapable processes of landscape change. Equally, there is a need to consider how high-level theorising about landscape can begin to offer tangible assistance to those archaeologists engaged in urgent action to protect our most threatened and important sites. Inevitably, given the complexity of these issues, the Round Table was more focussed on problems than solutions. But it is clear that archaeologists must begin to make inroads into these challenges in the not-too-distant future and that international exchanges of this type will have an increasingly important role to play in developing our thinking.

A more detailed account of the Round Table discussion, kindly compiled by Hugh Cary, is available on the Working Group’s web pages at: http://e-a-a.org/wg2.htm.
Europe’s Early Medieval Sculpture: Meanings, Values, Significance

Mark Hall (Perth Museum & Art Gallery, Perth, United Kingdom) and Sally M. Foster (Dept. of Archaeology, University of Aberdeen)

The aim of the session (Fig. 1) was to explore the diverse national and local responses to the research, preservation, interpretation, presentation and dissemination of early medieval sculpture (c AD 300-1200). Its particular concern was how giving new meaning to this material makes – or can make - a practical difference ‘on the ground’ in terms of how different people can appreciate its significance and attach value to it. In some areas these carved stones comprise one of the key resources in charting and celebrating a nation’s development, in others they form a small part of an embarrassment of monumental riches, while in some places their significance is overlooked. Different ways of perceiving this resource affect the potential significance it can realise, and therefore the value local communities, national heritage bodies and others attach to it. This influences the ways societies seek to preserve, interpret and present this cultural resource, which in iterative fashion transforms understandings of it, and thereby perceptions of its significance and value.

Mark Hall (*Significant reuse: material biography and early medieval sculpture in Scotland*) explored material or cultural biography as an approach to the study of early medieval sculpture, illustrated with case studies from the Pictish inheritance of Scotland (including St Madoes, Inchyra and Meigle). Such an approach reveals human complexity and is people focused, it does not fetishise objects but seeks to tell us about how they were used and reused and changed by people. Objects have use lives and multiple users. There is still a need for archaeology to more fully recognise that objects, including sculpture, are more complex than their fixed site context or where they came to rest. Objects have wider social contexts. The biographical approach is sympathetic with a landscape approach: there is a close affinity in studying landscape palimpsest and the life histories of objects, indeed the two should be linked. A biographical approach seeks to make complexity accessible and emphasizes human investment in monuments.

Sally Foster (*The impact of Victorian and later casts of early medieval sculpture on understanding and appreciation of early medieval sculpture*) opened up the subject of plaster casts of early medieval sculpture (Fig. 2). The story of the casts, whether examined on the...
long biographical axis of individual monuments or assemblages, or on a horizontal axis – the phenomenon of casting from the 1830s to the present, peaking at the end of the 19th century/beginning of the 20th century – casts light on the intrinsic, contextual and associative significance of what is now a fragile and vulnerable international resource. Sally’s contribution was illustrated by a review of the National Museum of Ireland’s temporary exhibition of their stunning casts of Irish high crosses and a series of case studies from Britain, with the intention of promoting a discussion that reflected wider European practices and potential.

At short notice Betsy McCormick was unable to attend so Mark read her contribution (‘The Highly Interesting series of Irish High Crosses’: reproduction of early medieval Irish sculpture in Dublin and London). This extended the discussion of casts with a particular focus on Irish examples. In particular, Betsy revealed how plaster casts of early medieval sculpture played an important role considerably earlier than previously realised, and how in this they actively contributed to the developing sense of Irish identity through their inclusion in the Great Exhibition of 1851 in Hyde Park, London, the Irish Industrial Exhibition of 1853 in Dublin and the exhibition at Crystal Palace, Sydenham, London from 1853 onwards.

Roger Stalley (Irish sculpture and its audiences) discussed how Irish monumental crosses might be better and more widely understood. In recent years academic writing has focussed of the iconography of the carvings and their context in medieval life. But in a post-Christian world, these issues rarely capture the imagination of visitors, who tend to ask quite different (though equally valid) questions. These human tales, Roger argued, are the ones which we should focus on explaining. These include the practical demands of quarrying, transporting stone, the technical difficulties involved in carving, the overall conception and design of the crosses, and the status of those who actually cut the stone. There are major questions
concerning the autonomy of the sculptors, for example the extent to which they themselves were concerned with the selection of subjects and the identification of potential models. Cecilia Ljung (*Eleventh century stone sculpture and the transformative Scandinavian Christianity*) focused on how the design, inscriptions and use of stone sculpture reflected altering perceptions of death, gender and memory in a time of religious transition (Fig. 3). She began with what has long been seen as the earliest examples of churchyard monuments in Sweden, the early Christian grave monuments often called Eskilstuna cists, which in their most elaborate form consist of a stone cist standing visibly on the ground. Simpler constructions such as recumbent slabs with or without head- and foot-stones seem however to have been more common. These monuments have several characteristics in common with rune stones, in particular the phrasing of the runic inscriptions and the ornamental design. Cecilia argued that both these kinds of stone sculpture belong to the same memorial tradition, which changes during the course of the 11\textsuperscript{th} century due to influence from Christian beliefs and mentality.

Andrew Johnson (*The Manx Crosses – A Case of Mistaken National Identity?*) considered the question of whether, as the Isle of Man forges an increasingly independent persona, it will become important to establish the significance and symbolism of the Manx crosses, at both academic/public, and historical/modern levels. The Isle of Man boasts some 200 early medieval stone crosses, the art-historical, religious and linguistic influences of which owe much to the surrounding islands and further afield, and demonstrate the far-flung historical and archaeological associations that have contributed to the modern Manx identity. Illustrations of the Manx crosses, either in the form of complete depictions or as motifs and patterns extracted from them, find their way into many official government publications, company logos and club badges as a means of implying or demonstrating Manx-ness, both historically and in the modern era. By any measure the quantity of Manx crosses is remarkable for such a small geographical entity, but their number and variety seems to contribute to an ongoing uncertainty – at least at a public level – regarding their significance and meaning. While not limited to the Isle of Man, Andrew explored the reasons for this in a Manx context, which appear to be bound up in the accessibility or otherwise of academic research, and public perceptions of issues such as national and cultural identity.

In the Netherlands, stone has to be imported and there is therefore little in the way of early monument carved stones. Elizabeth Den Hartog (*Sarcophagi in the Netherlands*) revealed that instead of great stone crosses investment was made in a range of sarcophagi. In the
Frankish period limestone sarcophagi from northern France were imported; from the 11th until the 13th centuries sarcophagi of a red sandstone were brought via the Rhine. Exceptionally great numbers of such monuments are to be found in some churches in West-Friesland. In Friesland and Groningen sarcophagus lids or tombstones can bear the image of the deceased. Elizabeth made it engagingly clear that these funerary monuments have a story to tell, which transcends their material value and which goes beyond what we know from the written sources. On the whole, this material has not attracted the public attention it deserves, whether in museums or churches.

In sharing new approaches and best practices through a balance of case studies and explorations of broader issues, the aim of the session was to promote a Europe-wide debate that can help broaden and strengthen the potential of this material. We wanted to commence a fuller understanding of the surviving character and nature of the resource in different parts of Europe and to understand what is driving the different ways people look at it and use it. In what ways (biographical, inter-disciplinary, scientific, landscape, etc approaches) does it help us generate new stories about our past and what impact are these having on the ground (principally publication, online and museum/site displays)? The session made a successful start in promoting discussion among the diverse range of attendees. Notably, we were able to promote links with the Runes, Monuments and Memorial Carvings International Research Network, organised by Cecilia Ljung and Marjolein Stein, which had its inaugural meeting in Uppsala just before the EAA (http://monuments.runology.net/). Cecilia introduced the EAA attendees to this in our discussion and there was widespread support for opening this up in some way to other sculptural forms and to anyone researching and interpreting this material. We are publishing our session jointly with a University of Edinburgh conference, Scotland and Beyond: Early Medieval Carved Stones.

The session organisers gratefully acknowledge travel grants from the Hunter Archaeological and Historical Trust, The Lambarde Fund of the Society of Antiquaries of London and the Society for Medieval Archaeology.

**Integrated Landscape Research: The Dynamics of Policy, Practice and Philosophy Across Europe**

K. Brophy, C. Dalglsh, A. Leslie and G. MacGregor

This round table discussion session facilitated conversations about archaeological landscape practice across Europe and explored the issues of and opportunities for integrated landscape research. The session was organised as part of the Royal Society of Edinburgh funded Transforming Practice research workshop series, developed by researchers from the University of Glasgow (Brophy and Dalglsh) and Glasgow-based practice Northlight Heritage (Leslie and MacGregor). For details see: http://www.gla.ac.uk/departments/archaeology/research/groups/heritagephilosophypractice/.

The session was in two parts. In the first, delegates from Norway, Finland, the Netherlands, Germany, the Czech Republic, Spain and the United Kingdom reflected on aspects of their respective national contexts for archaeological/landscape practice, to provide a baseline for further discussion.

The second part focused on the potential for, and implications of, integrated approaches to landscape, including consideration of policy contexts, discussion of the opportunities afforded by integrated landscape thinking and working, and exploration of the implications for our current philosophies and practices. The following summary provides a flavour of the discussion.
Traditions in European archaeology:
- Across Europe there are a range of different intellectual traditions and perspectives regarding how archaeology should situate itself in relation to other disciplines.
- At present, those with a developed interest in landscape archaeology appear more inclined to developing integrated disciplinary approaches.

On disciplinarity:
- Structures of research and practice have forced disciplines apart. In certain contexts, inter-disciplinarity was more common in the 1960s than it is now, but changing circumstances and imperatives have pushed individual subjects into disciplinary silos, with occasional exceptions (e.g. the Netherlands).
- Archaeology is inherently inter-disciplinary in its outlook and could be bold and lead the development of integrated approaches to landscape.
- Do we need a new discipline to develop an integrated approach to landscape? Is landscape potentially a post-disciplinary field? Might the best results come from a situation where strong disciplines continue to exist, each bringing a depth of knowledge and understanding of the value of their fields, but with a predisposition to thinking and practising in an integrated way?
- Certain ways of thinking and working will lead to integration between disciplines, so the future involves integrative as well as integrated landscape research and practice.

Towards an integrated approach: attitudinal and conceptual issues
- A process of translation and connection-building between disciplines is required. Existing boundaries between disciplines (e.g. through the use of different concepts and terms) can act against collaborative working. The structures of research and of practice often divorce related interests (e.g. cultural and natural heritage concerns).
- Given the vested interests and power relations which characterise the current situation, integrated practice will be difficult to achieve.
- There is much less public compartmentalisation of issues; it may therefore be easier to achieve an integrated approach to landscape through public involvement in collaborations.
- A certain stance towards landscape may help to overcome entrenched divisions and barriers – not requiring everybody to give up their current concerns and interests but seeking collective exploration of landscapes, the formation and normalisation of meaningful relationships between disciplines and the articulation of different interests.
- To achieve a positive and creative integration of interests, all disciplines, and the public, must be willing to take an open intellectual stance to their landscape work, receptive to and inquisitive about other points of view and open to being surprised.
- Integration of landscape interests will require those who are interested in the past of a landscape to come together with those whose primary concern is the present and those who focus on the future. This too will require intellectual changes on all sides.
- Landscapes are fluid and changing. One intellectual change required of archaeologists is for them to be less defensive in relation to change and to consider how to play a creative (as opposed to a solely conservative) role in landscape planning i.e. moving beyond a concern only for the preservation/conervation of archaeological material (ultra-conservativism) to a concern for using the past creatively in working towards the future of a landscape.
- Long-term narratives of landscape change may be something archaeologists, more than others, can contribute to a consideration of the future of the landscape.
- Landscape is a multi-scalar concept, with no universal scale – this is determined in each case, as appropriate to the situation, and can shift and change.
- Integrated landscape thinking and practice will require a willingness to be uncertain and an acceptance of ambiguity.
Towards an integrated approach: issues of practice

- Effective collaboration between academics and professional practitioners, and the public, will require new ways of working. Story-telling is an example of an alternative means of generating public dialogues about landscape.
- There is a need to situate research and practice in relation to the particular landscape with which it is concerned, by involving anthropologists, sociologists and others in the research process. Situated research or practice would adapt its approach to the context by using language appropriate to the community/ies with a relationship to a given landscape and by seeking to know which questions and problems are of particular concern to those communities.
- Approaches which give members of the public a significant role in the investigation of landscapes, in the creation of visions and plans for, and in the taking of decisions about landscapes are potentially powerful in transforming the way in which we think and act.
- Archaeologists might seek to capitalise on the large non-professional archaeological community, to provide a bridge to the wider world.
- Landscape’s complexity of spatial scale means that there is no pre-defined relevant ‘public’ in every case. For example, the interests of ‘local communities’ are often considered to be particularly important but those living in a locality are not the only people to have a relationship with a landscape and local interests are not necessarily more significant than others.
- The Charette process is a possible model for future practice. As a collaborative design process the Charette seeks solutions to problems by integrating the aptitudes and interests of a diverse group of people.
- Similar processes can be found more generally in spatial planning contexts where professionals from diverse backgrounds regularly come together to work on particular issues and problems. Such collaboration requires a degree of openness in attitude and an ability to see things from the perspectives of others. Research into the processes, practices and dynamics of such situations could provide insights for developing new ways of working.
- To contribute in an effective way to discussions and decisions about the future of a landscape, archaeologists need to contribute to the design process and involve themselves in the design stage of landscape planning. This will allow archaeologists to move beyond a reactive position, responding in limited ways to directions set by others but there is a need to understand how archaeology will have to change to achieve that goal.

Promoting integrated ways of thinking and practising:

- New types of education and training will be required to embed new approaches to landscape. It will be important to introduce the attitudes and practices which allow integration to education and training programmes. In this, the archaeologist need not be trained to be an expert ecologist, but could develop an open stance towards other disciplines and the public and to learn about practices which promote collaborative working.
- Other means of promoting integrated working should also be sought (e.g. journals which promote this approach provide a means circulating and accessing current and emerging ideas and methods).
- A recent ESF-COST paper¹ aspires to a pan-European, all-disciplinary forum for integrated landscape research. This laudable ambition is unlikely to be effective unless under-pinned by other networks focused on specific issues and concerns. As archaeologists, we should consider creating a network focused on the question of archaeology’s stance towards integrated landscape research and how archaeologists might seek to think and practice in future, in relation to integrated landscape research.
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concerns. Such a network might also consider the broader question of the role of the landscape’s past in considerations of its present and future.

The session proved very positive and aspirational, demonstrating a shared commitment to thinking creatively about landscape futures and how we can use our understanding of the past of landscapes to facilitate positive development and change. Especially significant was a shared aspiration to re-learn the ways that we engage with and see the landscape, to learn from the experience of others and to do this through integrated landscape research i.e. to transform our own practice and look to the future, not just the past, by engaging with contemporary communities. There was general agreement that it would be worth creating a network to facilitate further discussion and promote tangible developments in research, philosophy, practice and policy along the lines described above. In collaboration with others, the session organisers have committed to the development of such a network and to the proposal of a related session for the 2012 EAA meeting in Helsinki.

Humans and Animals in the Making of Gender

Nona Palincăş, Institute of Archaeology/Romanian Academy, Bucharest
Kristin Armstrong Oma, University of Oslo

Because gender archaeology previously focused on gender and material culture, this session, organized by the EAA working party ‘Archaeology and Gender in Europe (AGE)’ intended to explore another relation: that between gender and animals. Two approaches were suggested to the participants in the session abstract, without excluding other possibilities. One was that of the theory of practice, and in particular the process of naturalization of the social and of socialization of the natural by means of which gender characteristics and relations are dehistoricized and made to look as given. The other was that of feminist and post-humanist studies with the explicit intention of investigating animal agency in relation to gender.

The session started with the latter perspective, so that the participants were able to assess recent developments in the field with the other, more well known theoretical stances. Thus, Kristin Armstrong Oma’s theoretical paper raised the problem of animal agency within the frame of ‘living with animals’, while Emma Nordlander asked whether we should confine gender to humans or we should extend it to animals as well.

A group of papers focused on the possible meaning of gender-animals correlations in the archaeological record. Natalia Berseneva showed that in the Sintashta burials clear-cut gender-animal associations exist. Lourdes Prados Torres and Juan Antonio Santos Velasco followed by Consuelo Mata et al. investigated the same relations by means of depictions on Iberian Pre-Roman painted pottery, and Pre-Roman fibulae, respectively. Evgenia Zouzoula searched for a structure in the great variety of hybrid human-animal-objects representation from the Aegean Bronze Age, and showed that the feminine gender is represented more fluidly than the masculine one.

Another group of papers looked into the making of gender, both on the level of the analyst and in prehistory. Thus, Silvia Tomaškova, working on human-animal hybrid representation in South-African rock art, asked: Do we always know that something is a human? Can we gender a head? Why focus on genitalia? Do we think of legs, arms, hands as gendered parts of the body? Nona Palincăş presented a case from the Late Bronze Age in the Carpathian Arc where animal symbolism was used in the process of redefinition of gender symbolism and renegotiation of gender relations; she showed that among those animals there was one species (snails) to which archaeologists generally pay little attention, and that that species was, rather surprisingly, associated with femininity and with the dominant. Lisbeth Skogstrand, studying the occurrence of bear remains in Roman Iron Age graves argued that not all that is associated with men is about masculinity: these bears appeared in shamans’
graves, but the latter, even if they are men, hardly represent ideal masculinity. Doris Gutsmiedl-Schümann showed that despite equal presence of bear claws (skins) in men’s and women’s graves from the Migration period in Western Norway, many German archaeologists present these bears as associated with masculinity, thus contributing to the reinforcement of contemporary ideas about masculinity.

Other papers looked at how animal agency contributed to the creation of various images of reality. Kristopher Poole argued that interaction of women with cows in the process of dairying in the Anglo-Saxon period contributed (in particular by suggesting analogies with birth- and milk giving) to the formation of a certain view of feminine gender. William Meyer drew attention upon the connection between gender, animals and landscape. Analyzing hybrid and shape-shifting characters from the French folklore, he argued that while in particular they can be either men or women, taken as a group they were perceived as queer; being located at ancient burial mounds, they conveyed those mounds an air of danger, which in turn contributed to the protection of ancient monuments and landscape against destruction.

Cristina Fredengren, interpreting women bog bodies from two sites (in Sweden and in Ireland) where these were associated with body parts of different animal species, and drawing on Irish folklore, looked into how humans and animals may have been working to set up a different plan of reality, a magical realism.

As expected in a direction of investigation still at its beginning, the contributions had diverse points of departure and many of the ideas raised at this occasion need to be addressed in the future. Some periods when human-animal relations, judging by representation on various objects and by grave goods, were particularly important (e.g. classical Greece, Scythian and Celtic Cultures) were regrettably not represented in the session. Otherwise, the session was well attended and the discussions showed a wider interest in the theme than initially expected by the organizers.

Past Disturbances of Graves
The Reopening of Graves for Grave-Robbery and Other Practices

Edeltraud Aspöck, Austrian Academy of Sciences
Alison Klevnäs, University of Cambridge

This session invited papers discussing archaeological evidence of reopened graves. The response to the call for papers was strong and encompassed a broad range of phenomena, regions and archaeological periods, as well as theoretical and methodological approaches. Reopened graves are too often a neglected and underestimated source of evidence. The traditional focus of burial archaeology is on the analysis of graves as closed contexts, and disturbed burials are not seen as a desirable source for reconstructing mortuary practices or social structures. Currently however, there is new interest in the topic of grave disturbance, as seen in the several recently finished or ongoing Master’s and doctoral dissertations which were presented in the session.
This was probably the first time an entire conference session has focused on the archaeological evidence for reopened graves. The 1977 symposium on ‘Grabfrevel in vor- und frühgeschichtlicher Zeit’ (‘The sacrilege of graves in pre- and protohistory’ (Jankuhn et al 1978)) held in Göttingen, Germany, was crucial in establishing grave disturbance as a research topic. However, both the 1977 and two subsequent symposia held in Germany (Kümmel 2009, 52) had the main weight on written sources. The focus at this year’s EAA was firmly on the physical evidence, with useful critical discussion of historical sources for the early medieval period of continental Europe and the Scandinavian Viking Age.

In the morning the first four papers spanned two continents and several millennia, to give a sense of the breadth and diversity of practices covered by the term reopening. The first two papers discussed the reuse of graves in later periods, while the second two explored near-contemporary reopening in two very different cultural contexts.

Mara Vejby (University of Reading, UK) discussed patterns of reuse of megalithic tombs across Atlantic Europe in the Iron Age and the Roman periods, including reuse for habitation or for funerary activities. She argued that the basis for the reuse was a shared interpretation of the sites, which was formed and perpetuated through social memory.

Camilla Cecilie Wenn (University of Oslo, Norway) talked about ongoing excavations run by the University of Oslo at a Roman period house tomb in Hierapolis, Turkey which was reused over several centuries. The re-use in the late 13th century AD, when the remains of 27 individuals in different stages of decomposition were placed in the tomb, poses challenging questions such as the origin of the bones, and the motives behind the intentional placement and sorting of some bones and finds.

Lazar Catalin, Theodor Ignat and Radian Andreescu (National History Museum of Romania, Bucharest, Romania) described the Eneolithic cemetery from Sultana-Malu Roşu (fifth millennium BC). In seven graves skeletons without skulls were found, in some graves pits could be seen which were dug into the grave, whilst in other graves no disturbances were discovered. In some grave pits, only parts of skeletons were discovered, but again without evidence for reopening. The discussion was whether these types of evidence represent exceptional body treatment outside funerary practices or different stages of a multi-stage burial rite.

Estella Weiss-Krejci (University of Vienna, Austria) introduced different types of grave reopening among the Ancient Maya. Hieroglyphic texts on ancient monuments provide information about the background to the practices visible in the archaeological evidence. Estella described different types of activities which involved grave reopening in relation to the funerary circle: activities which are part of funerals, those that happen after funerals or practices outside the funeral.

The following four papers all discussed aspects of the phenomenon known as early Medieval ‘grave robbery’: graves reopened shortly after or at least within a few decades after the original burial where in most cases grave goods were removed – on average close to 40% of Merovingian period graves were disturbed after burial. The presentations clearly showed that the concept of early Medieval grave robbery has changed – or is about to change (some presenters were talking about results from their ongoing or recently finished PhD and Master theses: Aspöck, van Haperen, Klevnäs, Zintl).

The papers showed that: early Medieval grave-robbery is not seen as the activity of gangs of strangers and criminals, and solely driven by materialistic motifs any more but more complex cultural explanations are found; secondly, ‘grave-robbery’ is not used as a synonym for
reopened graves any more, but researchers are more aware of the inherent interpretative properties of the term: it is frequently questioned whether grave robbery is the right category to describe the phenomenon and alternative interpretations are sought; different types of ‘grave-robbery’ may be defined; reopening of graves is not seen as a sacrilege from the outset anymore; studies were characterized by close attention to the archaeological evidence (way of reopening graves, types of objects removed, manipulation of body).

Stephanie Zintl (Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg i. Br., Germany) talked about variability in the evidence of grave-reopening in Merovingian period cemeteries in Regensburg, Bavaria. The cemeteries showed differences regarding the number of reopened graves, the selection of graves and of grave goods. Stephanie discussed whether there may in fact have been different motives for reopening in these cemeteries.

Alison Klevnäs (University of Cambridge, United Kingdom) presented the results of her research on Anglo-Saxon grave-reopenings in Kent. She argued that the reopening is a targeted search for specific types of grave goods, meaning grave goods were removed for their symbolic value rather than for their material one. She suggested that grave-robbery may have been part of a conflicts and feuds between groups, and that the aim may have been to harm the living by violating the graves of their relatives.

Martine van Harperen (University of Amsterdam, Netherlands) discussed evidence of Merovingian period reopened graves in the Netherlands and took a wider view, drawing on historic and ethnographic sources for interpretation. She distinguished between different types of interventions and suggested that some of the reopenings may have to do with the collection of relics of the deceased.

Edeltraud Aspöck (Austrian Academy of Sciences) discussed attitudes towards grave reopening in the early Medieval period and how the appearance of the body may have influenced the practices which were carried out. Different stages of decay of the corpse may have led to different types of interactions with the body and the grave. Written sources show that the reopening of graves in the early Medieval period was officially condemned, but this may have been the ‘ideal’, whilst archaeological evidence (and written sources too) show that it still happened quite frequently.

The next two papers took us to Viking Age Scandinavia. Julie Lund (University of Oslo, Norway) looked at the social biography of objects which were removed from Scandinavian Viking Age mounds. She suggested that the breaking of mounds and the removal of objects from mounds related to other practices of deposition of objects in the Viking age.

Lars Erik Gjerpe (University of Oslo, Norway) presented the results of his fieldwork at the Viking age cemetery Gulli (eastern Norway). At Gulli not only special graves (ship graves and mounds) were reopened and robbed, but also half of the remaining ‘normal’ graves. Erik suggested that the percentage of robbed graves in Viking Age Norway may generally be underestimated. Robbing may distort the social analysis of Viking Age burials, and differences in grave goods may be down to robbed and non-robbed graves, rather than indicating social differences.

In the afternoon we saw a series of papers focusing on methodology. Alexandru Morintz (Institute of Archaeology, Romania) demonstrated how to investigate whether a burial mound was reopened before the actual excavation through surveying the surface of mounds and 3D models. Christine Keller (University of Vienna/Natural History Museum Vienna, Vienna, Austria) told us about her osteological (macroscopic and reflected-light microscopic investigations) of human bone of the early Bronze Age cemetery Franzhausen I (Austria). In her analysis she compared the patterning of peri-mortem and post-mortem fractures (types and frequencies) with the degrees of disturbances of the graves. Andrey Epimakhov (Institute of History and Archaeology, Russia) talked about evidence of reopened graves of the Ural Bronze Age Alakul’ kurgan cemeteries. More than half of the graves were reopened, often before the decomposition of the corpse was finished. Because many valuable items were left in the graves, he suggested that the ‘disturbance ritual’ may have been part of post-funeral activity and ancestor cults.

The final two papers dealt with a much neglected topic: reopened cremation graves. Eberhard Bönisch (Brandenburgisches Landesamt für Denkmalpflege, Wünsdorf, Germany)
introduced evidence of reopening of cremation graves from the Late Bronze Age of Lower Lusatia/Brandenburg. The archaeological evidence showed that the graves were reopened about a few years to decades after the original deposition of the burnt bone: the urns were taken out when the roofs of the grave chambers were already collapsed. The bone was deposited on the ground and bronze grave goods were taken out too.

Karol Dzięgielewski (Jagiellonian University, Poland) presented evidence of reopened stone-cist graves of the Pomeranian culture (early Iron Age, Poland), where graves were reopened, possibly to add new urns. The reopening of the graves showed regularities, which suggest that the reopening was part of ritual practices. Dzięgielewski suggested that the largest of these graves containing ten and more urns represent collective graves.

Despite the advanced hour and it being the last day of the conference the final discussion was still lively. One point concerned dating: unless reopening happens shortly after burial it is difficult to date, which creates difficulties with interpretation and a danger of mixing up different phenomena. Activities which look similar in the archaeological record may have quite different motivations. There was a lively discussion about to what degree it is possible to discover intentions behind grave reopening at all. This was against the background of use of ethnographic sources and some recent attempts to search for general models and rules (Kümmel 2009; Zintl 2011). For graves which were reopened soon after the original deposition it was pointed out that a precondition for interpreting the reopening is understanding of the original burial practices. Hence there is a need to discuss reopened graves in the context of the respective cemetery and historical/archaeological context. There was also a discussion whether grave-reopenings may have ritualistic character – e.g. regarding opening of Viking Age mounds. Generally it was agreed that there may have been many different versions of ‘grave-robbery’ (reopening graves to remove objects), e.g. in the early Medieval period.

Other points which were frequently made during the session were: Grave disturbances are probably more frequent than assumed and there are probably still many unknown cases. Frequently it is not recognized if graves were reopened because archaeologists don’t associate reopening with graves of a certain period. Once some disturbed graves are found and the phenomenon becomes a recognized part of the archaeology of a locality or period, there may be an increase in reporting of reopened graves (Aspöck, Bönisch, Klevnäs, Gjerpe). Many speakers agreed that reopened graves are much undervalued in their potential as archaeological sources about past societies.
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‘Lithic Scatters’: A Variety of Approaches, Methods and Ideas.

B.I. Smit, Cultural Heritage Agency of the Netherlands

At the last EAA congress in Oslo, the first of hopefully a series of sessions on lithic scatters was organized. After an initial session on this topic, hosted by C. Bond during the Mesolithic in Europe 2010 conference in Santander, Spain, the session in Oslo had a wider scope and was organized by a group of researchers. The session ‘Lithic scatters, a European perspective’ was formulated by C. Bond (United Kingdom), E. Meylemans (Belgium), B.I. Smit and E. Rensink (the Netherlands).

Fig. 1: Participants at the ‘Lithic scatters’ session in the ‘Lofoten Room’.

The main objective of the session was to gather an international group of enthusiastic researchers to discuss different topics regarding lithic scatters. While lithic scatters might not be the most prolific part of cultural heritage, they are the result of thousands of years of land use by early prehistoric communities throughout Europe (and in fact the world). These lithic scatters are in many instances the only remains left of those communities and for that they deserve our interest. Lithic scatters have to be regarded as a valuable part of our cultural heritage and should have a firm base within Heritage Resource Management.

During this session the aim was to emphasize the positive qualities and potential of these scatters, without refraining from the limitations and difficulties that the study of lithic scatters pose. At the conference itself the popularity of the topic of lithic scatters was shown by the fact that the ‘Lofoten Room’ was packed, all seats taken and more people standing at the sides (Fig. 1).

The contributions showed a wide variety, both in terms of the origin of the speakers (including speakers from Sweden, Denmark, United Kingdom, the Netherlands and Belgium).
and the areas from which lithic scatters were studied (Sweden, Denmark, United Kingdom, the Netherlands, Belgium and Qatar). All aspects were covered, from heritage management to university research projects, including many different research approaches and methods, from site level to regional levels, and from classic field walking to full scale excavations.

An important point which was addressed at the start of the session was the question of scale. An important point that was addressed at the start of the session was the question of scale of analysis. The quality of the available data may dictate our research questions on the one hand, but on the other, we could ask what questions can our material answer. Rensink presented four studies recently conducted within the scope of commercial archaeology in the Netherlands. He showed that selection of areas to be studied is crucial; however, the way these choices were made and on which arguments these decisions were based are sometimes flawed. In his opinion, the question of valuation (or ‘evaluation’) is critical; how are lithic scatters evaluated so that good choices can be made to protect these scatters in situ or ex situ, and which scatters are neglected? This question of valuation (or ‘evaluation’) is crucial both for small individual scatters but also for complete landscapes that are dotted with scatters.

Meylemans addressed similar dilemmas in the study of lithic scatters in Flanders (Belgium). He showed that lithic scatters basically can be divided into three categories: those situated in plough soils; scatters on Pleistocene soils that are variably intact; scatters that are covered by Holocene deposits and therefore difficult to detect. He focused on the way these lithic scatters can be detected, from the use of field walking surveys to intense borehole surveys combined with geoarchaeological studies. Furthermore, he emphasized the problem of the standard practice of trial trenching in commercial archaeology. This method is suitable for detecting later prehistoric remains characterized by features. But, in the course of digging these trenches, lithic scatters are easily missed, a situation which is also known in the Netherlands.

Bond focused on the tradition of the collection of lithic artefacts. He showed bar graphs comparing the number of pages dedicated to lithic scatters over 29 years in two publications: *Lithics* and the *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society*. Based on this data, it is safe to conclude that most articles were based on excavated assemblages. Lithic scatters as ploughzone features were marginal to this publication output. By using lithic scatters to phase activity across the landscape, the spatial patterning of lithic scatters in the landscape provides an insight into prehistoric land use of a particular region over millennia. Furthermore, Bond advocated the need for participation by the general public in the study of lithic scatters, for two reasons: surveys can be easily initiated, and by mixed survey teams (professional and amateur), local people become more aware of the Stone Age heritage in their backyards.

The presentation by Scott-Jackson showed the benefits of using GIS techniques in the study of lithic scatters from the arid areas in Qatar. Scott-Jackson showed the potential of the combination of her lithic data from a large region with information on topography, geology, erosion, etc., in a GIS environment. The combination of these data provides the possibility to gain insight into both synchronic and diachronic developments in ‘chaîne d’opératoires’ of lithic reduction and raw material sources. This approach also can provide a glimpse into the potential of tracing post depositional processes relevant for the preservation and discovery of lithic scatters.

Compared to the nation-wide scale of Scott-Jackson, Riede focussed on a very small lithic scatter, with a diameter of 2 meters, consisting of only 20 artefacts. This scatter was discovered during a large scale excavation of later prehistoric remains, so it is a surprise that these lithics were even discovered. Riede’s analysis showed the potential of these types of small scatters in terms of different interpretations. Although only a few lithics were discovered, both primary and secondary reduction sequences were present and even three refits were isolated. This means that this scatter is the product of one specific activity at a specific moment in prehistory. According to Riede, these types of scatters might be the clue to bridge the gap between ‘site’ and ‘off site’ approaches.
The lecture by Knutsson showed the scientific potential of studying private collections from a region that has only received marginal attention in terms of full scale excavations (Central Sweden). Furthermore, within her research area, the opportunities for doing survey were limited due to extreme weather conditions. The focus therefore was aimed at settlement locations near watercourses, mostly consisting of palimpsest sites. Fortunately, Knutsson showed the potential of these collections, previously viewed as low value. Through the use of detailed studies of the ‘chaîne d’opéraiores’ and refit studies, full patterns on a landscape scale have been discovered. Knowledge of lithic technology and patterns of exchange of raw materials between Central Sweden, Finland, and even Russia were isolated, from data previously assumed to be poor.

Gurova focused the attention on a more crucial aspect of the research of flint scatters – namely the generally-accepted idea that lithic scatters are synonymous with settlement locations. However, sometimes it is essential to critically review our basic premises. Generally, only the scatters of lithics are investigated or excavated. Hardly ever does one look outside the area with lithics, so this might be the reason why we rarely recover structural elements (house floors/plans). It may be that our view on the arrangement of social space is incorrect: lithic scatters might be no more than dump areas, whereas the locations where people have lived are the more ‘empty’ areas or are characterized by other archaeological remains. The paper suggested use-wear studies might be one way to research this topic in the future.

Finally, Harding started his contribution to the lithic scatter session by showing a different type of archaeological material, namely, henge monuments. These monuments are, of course, often visible, and have attracted much attention for many years. However, the landscape around these henge monuments is dotted with lithic scatters, which generally have had little attention. Research of these lithic scatters showed that these scatters are the remains of large scale differentiated and possibly domestic use of the landscape. These remains may relate to the intermittent visiting of pilgrimage communities to different parts of this regional landscape over millennia.

The session in Oslo showed that lithic scatters have a lot of potential, that many different research lines can be used, and, more importantly, that these analyses result in relevant interpretations of our prehistoric past. Lithic scatters as a type of material culture and site should not be overlooked and can contribute to a deeper understanding of our prehistoric landscapes. Several contributions also mentioned the importance of getting the public and amateur archaeologists involved. This type of partnership between professional and amateur archaeologists has resulted both in an increasing public awareness of the cultural legacy of the Stone Age, but also is a source for help in studying, collecting and protecting these undervalued sites and assemblages. Finally, within the archaeological ‘in-crowd’, there remain numerous questions – for example, on the assessment of individual lithic scatters and how to protect or research them within the context of Archaeological Resource Management. The contributions to the session and the observations above show that there is a lot to be discussed and it is hoped that further sessions on lithic scatters will be organized in the future, at the EAA and at other platforms.

‘What do I Care?’ About Priorities and Ethics in the Management of the Archaeological Heritage

Katalin Wollák and Terje B. Hovland

The aim of this session was to discuss priorities and ethics in the management of the archaeological heritage in a time of economic crises and how we can ensure the preservation of the archaeological values in a less supporting surrounding. We wanted to focus upon our societal responsibility as archaeologists, and discuss whether we’re putting enough emphasis on our prioritisations and the knowledge that we produce. What should be
our strategic priorities for the next 20 years to ensure that people do care and acknowledge
the need for managing the archaeological heritage also in the future?
In the introduction, Katalin Wollák emphasized that in most European countries there are
vast quantities of archaeological material and documentation that does not correspond with
the societal expectation that archaeology should produce cultural benefit from the results of
the excavations and bring it back to society. It was stated that there seem to be a tendency
of a weakening reputation of archaeology in many countries across Europe. If so, how can
we mitigate this tendency?
In the first paper at the session Carsten Paludan-Müller gave an overview of the original and
current motivators for doing archaeology, stating that archaeology today is overwhelmingly
regulation driven and that rescue excavations appear to have become a ritual performed as
an end itself. He then pointed out some of the important aspects that makes archaeology
matter, like when we bring the past back to life, when we bridge the time gap and confront
people with their fellow humans from a distant past etc. Paludan-Müller stated that for the
time being we are allowed to continue excavating without giving back much of importance to
the general public and rhetorically asked should we “act ourselves to set a new agenda for
rescue archaeology before one is forced upon us?”.
The other seven papers at the session perfectly illustrated different aspects of the challenges
we face across Europe, with case studies from Sweden (Carolina Andersson), Spain (Jaime
Almansa Sánchez), Hungary (Attila Gyucha et al.), Germany (Joachim Haberstroh), Finland
(Riikka Mustonen), Slovakia (Noemi Pazinova et al.) and the United Kingdom (Gerald Wait,
who stepped in on short notice as Roger M. Thomas was not able to participate at the
conference).
Adrian Olivier tried to sum up the session, and started by asking why we have such big
problems in defending what we are doing. He continued by presenting some observations
based on the different presentations and the following discussion:

- Everything we do, we do for the public – for the public benefit
- The archaeological heritage and research on the archaeological heritage is indefinite.
  Whatever we do, we will never get the entire picture anyway
- We need to focus on what we know, rather than being afraid of what we may lose.
- It is about time that we raise the difficult questions

Olivier also underlined, that the basic effort should be turned to transfer the archaeological
knowledge to understanding, while this could help in enhancing the societal acceptance

**Archaeological Sites and the Politics of Identity**

Athena Hadji (Athena.hadji@ouc.ac.cy) and
Stella Souvatzi (stella.souvatzi@ouc.ac.cy), Open University of Cyprus

The session formed part of the thematic group *Cultural heritage and the formation and articulation of identities*. It aimed to investigate the formation and reshaping of place identities
with regard to archaeological sites. In this framework, archaeological sites are examined as
objects of deliberate re-construction of identities in the realm of cultural heritage. In addition,
tourist consumption of the archaeological site as well as the popular and populist strategies
of representing sites to the public on behalf of the state and advertising, to name but a few
factors, are explored and analyzed. These issues revolve around a central axis: the idea of
archaeological sites and the metamorphosis of their identity in relation to (cultural) tourism
and because of its consequences.
The archaeological site is perceived not only as a three-dimensional space entity, but
primarily as a notional and ideational construct, (c.f. “the island”, “the historical site”, “the
resort”) with a shifting and malleable identity. The manipulation of the past for the
construction of present identities with reference to a number of visitable archaeological sites or to places, landscapes, monuments and communities, through what is variously called ‘culture or heritage industry’, ‘public culture’, ‘tourist consumption’ and ‘mass communication’ involve issues of control of knowledge as well as multiple/various meanings of identity and power. It has led, among other things, to the objectification of spaces, to the promotion of certain sites and landscapes over others and to specific strategies of site preservation and representation in popular imagery. Similarly, questions about the relation between archaeological spaces and cultural difference are vitally important for archaeology’s growing concern with issues of ethics and social justice, including an appreciation of the importance of ‘multilocality’ and ‘multivocality’ and of indigenous concepts of identity. Heterotopian, utopian and imagined communities, the creation of ‘authentic’ landscapes for tourism, local social movements against spatial changes effected to promote to tourism, and ‘cultural sites’ as loci of conflicting identities are further themes of inquiry.

The following topics were illustrated through the session’s individual presentations, preceded by a comprehensive introduction by the organizers:

- archaeological sites as theme parks;
- the identity that archaeological sites acquire through modern advertising and promotional campaigns;
- the identity of archaeology as a leisure activity;
- theory of place and landscape identity formation;
- theory of tourism in relation to issues of cultural heritage and the imposition of identities through tourism.

As a whole, the session was successful in bringing together scholars from different research contexts and theoretical backgrounds, from archaeology, architecture and anthropology, and case studies ranging from Knossos in Crete to Nubian Africa, and it attracted many attendees. Between the blocks of papers, and particularly at the end of the session, we found sufficient time for lively debate and intriguing dialogue.

Summer Farms

John Collis, University of Sheffield, j.r.collis@sheffield.ac.uk

The use of marginal land is a major indicator of important processes of economic and social pressures or of environmental change both at a local and regional scale. The largest category of such land is the hilly or mountainous zones which can only be exploited for a few months of the year. The ‘summer farming’ session at the Oslo conference was a first attempt to look at this on a European scale, and included examples for Scandinavia, Britain and especially the Alpine areas, but we would dearly love to hear from people working in other regions such as Spain, central Europe, the Balkans, the Black Sea area or the Urals.

Though there have been, and still are, a number of excellent projects, highland regions have not generally enjoyed the attention lavished on more lowland areas, partly because many are still remote, and, except for mining and quarrying, they are less affected by the modern pressures such as road building and industrial development. They also often require a different sort of archaeology from that traditionally taught in universities (e.g. studies of artefacts, excavation and dating techniques) as many features are still visible on the surface, the ‘humps and bumps’ studied by landscape archaeologists; it also requires a multi-period approach from the Palaeolithic to the modern period. Two of the contributions by Francesco Carrer and Yolanda Alther in fact dealt with present-day transhumance in Italy, and demonstrated the need for archaeologists to be involved in ethnographic work to record modern structures and how they may relate to earlier temporary structures; archaeologists can also take the long-term view. Such work is essential and urgent as the people who used summer farms in the traditional way or remember how they functioned are fast disappearing.
One surprise was the amount of variability in the nature of summer farming. One obvious variable is the distance travelled. In Norway in Westfold the home farm may only be a couple of hours walk away so there could be continuous to-ing and fro-ing, while on the Hardanger plateau it might take a couple of days to reach the summer pastures. The Spanish Mesta traversed virtually the whole of Spain, and such was its importance the routes, the Canadas, were under royal control. In the Massif Central in France it was the men who went up to the burons (Fig. 1) as moving the milk churns was considered too heavy work for the women, whereas in Scandinavia it was mainly the women who were milking and making the hay on the seter (Fig. 2). But in one case in Scotland described by Steve Boyle the whole population was forced by the landowners in the summer months to take their livestock and families above the ‘head dyke’ which defined the upper limit of the arable land where there were seasonal shielings or bothies. In some cases there are families who specialise in transhumance; it may be merely an optional adjunct to normal farming activities, or it can be an integral part of the economy. As Kristoffer Dahl demonstrated, when Norse colonisers moved to Iceland they set up summer farms from the start as part of the initial landnam in the 9th-10th century. However there are no obvious cycles of highland economies; in Cornwall as described by Peter Herring, the traces of transhumance are only preserved in the hendre and hafos place names from the early medieval period, but it had virtually disappeared by the later medieval period when it was just taking off in other parts of Europe.

When transhumance started is also controversial. The rich summer pastures provided good resources for wild animals so hunting remained an important resource, but the ‘Secondary Products Revolution’ of cheese and butter allowed the development of a major resource which could be kept over winter, and pigs could be fattened up on the waste product, the whey. The herbs of the upland pastures can give cheeses a special taste, and the summer Salers cheese still commands a much higher price than the winter Cantal cheeses from the Massif Central, and it was already big business in the medieval period as court cases over
who owned the cheeses show. But elsewhere as in Norway, the products were more for home consumption rather than trading.

Fig. 2: Netta Karlsen Gravdal who was a settlerjente on the Bjørge summer farm in Norway for 32 years in the early 20th century.

As Klaus Oeggl’s discussion about what the Ice Man ‘Ötzi’ was doing when he was killed shows it is not easy to answer – was he a hunter or a pastoralist, and had transhumance started already in the third millennium? It is a question which shows the importance of scientific studies such as pollen analysis and isotope studies; highland projects are not cheap and only rarely produce spectacular results like the Ice Man or the Pazyryrk burials. Large scale survey can now be done, at a price, by Lidar, but this does not replace detailed fieldwork on the ground. Dating must usually be done using C14, and it is unusual for sites to produce good artefactual evidence as in the Bronze Age case described by Franco Nicolis in the Trentino. Francesco Carrer’s study shows that shepherds with flocks mainly used of wool and meat production can leave negligible signs of their presence, sleeping under trees or in rock shelters, whereas milk production for cattle can leave substantial traces of buildings for production and storage.

Despite some outstanding cutting edge projects, there are many areas where survey has hardly started, let alone large-scale excavations to explore the origins and history of these sites. As Thomas Reitmaier’s fieldwork in the Silvretta Range on the Swiss-Austrian border, even the origins of Alpwirtschaft are little known and require much basic fieldwork. There is also a question about their future; many lie in spectacular locations and standing buildings can be used as overnight shelter for walkers. Elsewhere as in Norway seter have evolved into family summer houses. But many sites are simply falling into disrepair. I went up to one of the Norwegian sites just before the conference, and though I think of myself as reasonably experienced with landscape archaeology, it was depressing how little I managed to see of what had been there!

We hope to hold another session at Helsinki in 2012, and then publish the papers from the two sessions. Anyone interested should contact me at j.r.collis@sheffield.ac.uk.
Repatriation and Reburial of Human Remains: Debating Current Sensibilities and Future Actions in Europe

Estella Weiss-Krejci, University of Vienna, Austria

Throughout the western world, one can observe a growing concern with the handling and display of human remains. This not only applies to (predominantly non-European) skeletons stored in ethnographic museums and anatomical collections, but increasingly to the exhumation, study and retention of European bones deriving from archaeological excavations. While repatriation of non-European remains to indigenous people is already taking place in many European countries, requests for reburial by Neo-Pagan groups as well as legal decisions concerning the handling of human remains deriving from archaeological excavations have been largely confined to the British Isles.

The discourse about proper treatment of human remains is of a global scale. However, decisions to repatriate are usually made at the national or institutional level. For this reason, I wanted to bring together anthropologists and archaeologists to present their viewpoints on repatriation and discuss future actions from a European perspective. Norway seemed the ideal location to hold such a session because this country has a long history in reburying skeletal remains from both archaeological and anatomical collections. For example, the Viking bones from the Gokstad and Oseberg mounds (southeastern Norway, county Vestfold) were reburied in the first half of the twentieth century (in 1928 and 1948), and in 1997, the heads of two Sámi men, formerly owned by the anatomical collection of the University of Oslo, were reburied in Kåfjord, Alta.

The session included seven presentations by scholars from four different countries: three from Austria, two from Norway, one from the United Kingdom and one from the United States of America. The first speaker was Liv Nilsson Stutz (Emory University, US), who contrasted the repatriation process in the US with examples from Sweden, asking to what degree the experiences in North America may be relevant to Europe. Nilsson Stutz stressed the importance of formulating a debate in the repatriation discourse that is more suited for the specific issues raised by the European context. European archaeology has a colonial past – but it also has a very significant nationalistic past, which radically affects the ways in which critical and contemporary archaeology understands claims to the past by specific stakeholders and specific ethnic groups. What may be viewed as a progressive movement toward emancipation in a post-colonial context could be seen as a reactionary claim in a post-nationalist context.

Duncan Sayer (University of Central Lancashire, UK) described the legal complications that developed in England after the responsibility for the Coroner's Office passed from the Department of Constitutional Affairs to the Ministry of Justice. In England, exhumation of human remains is licensed by the government through a process of application to the Ministry of Justice. In 2008, the Ministry of Justice decided that all human remains excavated with this license would need to be reburied. This decision not only caused considerable concern amongst the archaeological community, but also created variable reactions. Some English archaeologists consulted with the ministry behind closed doors, while others chose to campaign in the popular press for change. Sayer discussed the situation and analyzed the consequences of the legal decisions.

Ethical issues concerning excavation, research and museum storage of skeletal remains in Norwegian museums were the topic of the paper by Berit J. Sellevold (NIKU - The Norwegian Institute of Cultural Heritage Research, Norway). The collections were made over a period of 150 years and pertain to all periods of Norwegian prehistory. Ethical dilemmas arise because scientists and the general public have different subjective interpretations and different ethical concerns. The formulation of codes of ethics and ethical guidelines and the implementation of practical measures, such as repatriation, have been outcomes of efforts to deal with these ethical dilemmas. However, using a graphic model, Sellevold showed that not all types of bones are perceived in the same way and that the ethics are somehow biased.
For example, inhumations are rated higher than cremated bones; remains that can be associated with a name are more likely to be selected for reburial than anonymous bones.

The fourth paper, presented by Edeltraud Aspöck (Austrian Academy of Sciences ÖAW, Austria) and coauthored by me, addressed the sanctity of human remains from a historic and cross-cultural perspective. The very general questions around which this paper revolved were: is there a right way of dealing with human remains? What is a proper burial? Whose laws, whose ethics and whose political agenda should one follow when considering repatriation? We approached these questions by looking at a series of misconceptions, which can be found as part of the arguments in today’s repatriation and reburial discussion. For each misconception (e.g. ‘exhumation is unethical’, ‘display is unethical’, etc.), we presented archaeological, historical and ethnographic counter-examples.

After the coffee break, we listened to a presentation by Maria Teschler (Natural History Museum Vienna, Austria). As head of the anthropology department in a museum that houses 40 000 human skeletons and skulls, she has been involved in several repatriation events. In particular, collections made between 1907 and 1909 by Rudolf Pöch, an anthropologist, travelling explorer and media pioneer have become subject to scrutiny. Teschler critically reflected on past collection practices and discussed the future handling of these human remains. She also presented her current research project, which is funded by the Austrian Federal Ministry of Science and Research and deals with ethical and scientific aspects of anthropological museum collections.

Stine Camilla Bergum (Norwegian Sami Parliament, Norway) presented a summary of the situation of the Norwegian Sámi, whose skeletal remains have been collected since the 1850s. She showed how the attitude of the Sámi changed over time. Some Sámi originally assisted in retrieving skeletons for research. However, the more the focus shifted to the description of racial traits and to the display of the Sámi as an inferior people, the more they started to protest against the acquiring of their remains. The Sámi Parliament was founded in 1989 and the status of the Sámi as indigenous people was ratified by the Norwegian government in 1990. Since then the Sámi parliament has gained full control over the Sámi human remains, which has resulted in restitution and reburial.

The last paper was my own contribution on attitudes towards dead bodies in present-day Europe. The paper’s core argument was that a European discussion about repatriation and reburial needed to take into account present-day country- and group-specific cultural attitudes towards our own dead. I outlined some major differences in Europe (highlighting Austria, England and the Netherlands) and tried to identify some of the reasons why the establishment of pan-European ethical codes and legislations regarding human remains may be hard to achieve.

The session wrapped up with a 40 minute-long discussion involving some of the speakers and the multi-national audience. We touched upon a series of issues such as the question what ‘care for the dead’ actually implied. I was also criticized by some English archaeologists for overrating the political influence of the British Neo-Pagans. Several people warned against striving for legal decisions because reburial and repatriation laws would only complicate matters. Instead it was suggested that we should engage in a continuous scientific discourse about how to deal with human remains in a multi-cultural world.

---

**Development of Agrarian Societies**

**Agrarian Settlement as Parts of Social Networks**

Mads Ravn (mads.ravn@uis.no), Søren Diinhoff, Hauke Jöns

The session started with an introduction to the Norwegian Research Council research initiative in archaeology and especially the initiative on agrarian settlement by M. Ravn. Here the framework for the initiative was presented and ideas for relevant topics were asked for. Key in this presentation was that this is an ongoing project running to 2014 that needs...
constant input from outside. Themes of relevance for the session seemed to be diachronic discussions of settlement continuity and discontinuity, and discussions as to why those patterns are present. Also other topics of relevance were forwarded, such as settlement hierarchy, specialized settlements and craft specialization at certain settlements.

Ravn’s paper from an early Neolithic site in Denmark concentrated on aspects of spatial organization, investigated continuity or discontinuity between the Ertebølle and subsequent Funnelbeaker culture, and demonstrated little or no continuity to the earlier culture. Diinhoff et al. presented the data from the subgroup Agrarian land-use and settlement, with a focus on Norwegian material spanning a period of 4000 years. Here it became evident that there is an abundance of material from various climatic and micro-climatic regions and periods along the long Norwegian coast spanning over several climatic zones. Diinhoff emphasised that despite variation, there were also a number of similarities to the agrarian concept developed in Norway and on the continent. This probably reflects a tight social and possibly an ideological network of contacts; this had been discussed in the session’s last papers in particular. Marius-Tiberiu Alexianu discussed continuity and discontinuity in the Chalcolithic in the Balkan region, suggesting that there existed a double economy of both pastoral and agricultural practices, the former developed from the ‘Indo-Europeans’. This, he suggests, explains the non-Indo-European cereals names in the Proto-Indo-European vocabulary.

George Bodi et al. also revealed various aspects of agrarian economy in the Chalcolithic in NE Romania. They suggested that a hierarchy of settlements had developed with specialized pottery production; settlements were placed even at high risk localities in order to meet demands for production. Sophie Bergerbrant developed this approach, and suggested that in the Scandinavian Bronze Age there existed specialized textile production sites, which, through a network of contacts, supplied and collected wool from other raw material sites where sheep were present. Hauke Jöns’ paper explored the relationship between coast and inland through changing river and coastal systems of the NW German marsh coast, and the networks present to fulfill demands for power, safety, communication, and exchange of raw material. He demonstrated the potential of a contextual approach where natural scientific data about changing landscapes and coastal developments are set into a larger cultural context, including archaeological finds and change in settlements through time.

The discussion afterwards focused on issues related to the above mentioned approaches, but also included a treatment of the necessity of integrating several data sets into a holistic understanding of settlement patterns over time, as in Bodi’s presentation. It was also noted that concepts of territoriality and mobility should be further developed. Territoriality seems to be too strong a word that overshadows aspects of mobility in pre-state and pre-national societies. Possibly mobility can be better monitored though particular material, such as, for example, salt exchange, as seen in Jöns’ example.
Marek Zvelebil 1952 - 2011

It is with profound sadness that we announce the death (late on the 7th July) of our good friend and colleague Marek Zvelebil. Marek was at the heart of our community, and we will miss him dearly. Marek was a world-class prehistorian and a great archaeological thinker – world archaeology is diminished by his absence. We extend our deepest sympathies to all those who were close to him both personally and professionally. Marek’s funeral took place in the chapel at Abbey Lane cemetary Friday 22nd July.

Marek Zvelebil left his native Prague in his teens. He gained his BA at Sheffield, and his PhD at Cambridge where he was one of the last students of Professor Sir Grahame Clark. He then taught at the University of South Carolina before returning to Sheffield in 1981 as a Research Fellow, then Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, Reader and Professor. His mastery of many languages gave him access to academic writings beyond the reach of most anglophone researchers. This helped him to research the eastern European origins of the farmers whose descendants encountered the hunter-gatherers of the Baltic over a millennium later. It also allowed him to research another of his interests, shamanism and related phenomena in Siberian hunter-gatherers. Marek was a world-class prehistorian whose interests and impact transcended modern political boundaries. Marek was only 59 when he died, and our understanding of some of our earliest European ancestors will inevitably be diminished by the fact that his ambitious plans for future research and teaching projects will not now be brought to fruition.

Source: http://www.shef.ac.uk/archaeology/staff/zvelebil.html

Another Early Neolithic well discovered

In July this year, archaeologists from the State Archaeology Service in the Rhineland sent out a press release, reporting that an Early Neolithic water supply well was excavated in Merzenich-Morschenich. It was made with oak timbers and had a size of 1.6 to 1.6 m at the bottom. The well is unusually deep, reaching 15 m below the topsoil, and was located in the centre of a Linearbandkeramik (LBK) settlement. Its excavation became necessary due to daylight mining for brown coal in the Rhineland. In recent years, several wells dating back to the LBK have been discovered and excavated in Germany, both in the Rhineland and in Saxony (s. TEA No. 33, Summer 2010). They are a rich source of finds, especially the lower part that is preserved under waterlogged conditions, and also the bottom two meters of the Merzenich-Morschenich well will be examined in the laboratory, after the complete well has been excavated en bloc with the technical help of the utility company responsible for the coal mining.

Source: http://www.bodenpflege.lvr.de/presse/pm+morschenich.htm
Cave with Palaeolithic Depictions in Bavaria?

In 1991 speleologists discovered a cave in Bavaria near Bamberg, the so-called Mäanderhöhle. Due to a yet unpublished preliminary report by G. Bosinski the cave gained huge attention in the German media. The cave is ca. 80m long and displays an impressive range of geological formations that developed over 150 million years. A small ‘chapel’ can be reached after passing a very narrow entrance area and surmounting a chamber full of broken stone. Behind the ‘chapel’, which extends only a few meters, the cave meanders on for another 30m – giving rise to its name.

The walls are covered with mineral sinter that deposited over millions of years. In the Upper Palaeolithic, around 10,000 BC, modern humans discovered and explored the cave. The geological formations coated with sinter may have reminded them – as they remind us – of human body parts, e.g. female breasts, inspiring them to place petroglyphs at these formations. Some of these scratches are difficult to understand, they show lines, parallels or certain patterns, others may remind of highly stylized female figures. The Mäanderhöhle is the first cave in Germany and in Central Europe that may display human images from the Palaeolithic. The scientific collecting and evaluation of data concerning the cave is still underway. Isotopic analysis of the dripstones is currently carried out.

Source: Bayerisches Landesamt für Denkmalpflege, Hofgraben 4, D-80539 München
The 18th Annual Meeting of the European Association of Archaeologists will be held in Helsinki, Finland, 29 August – 1 September 2012. The Conference venues are the Main Building of the University of Helsinki (Fabianinkatu 33) and the Porthania Building (Yliopistonkatu 3). The buildings are conveniently located near each other in the city centre. For further information, visit www.eaa2012.fi.

The meeting is being organized by the University of Helsinki, the National Board of Antiquities, the Finnish Antiquarian Society and the Archaeological Society of Finland. The Main sponsor of the meeting is the Ministry of Education and Culture.

Helsinki is served by Helsinki-Vantaa International Airport with frequent flight connections to most cities in Europe and beyond. There is a bus connection from the airport to Helsinki city centre (approx. 25 minutes). For further information www.helsinki-vantaa.fi.

Online registration
Since 17 September, online registration is available at www.eaa2012.fi. Also, proposals for sessions and round tables can be submitted. If you have questions, please contact eaa2012@confendenet.fi for technical or practical questions or eaa2012helsinki@gmail.com regarding programme-related questions. The early registration deadline is 1 June 2012.
Dates to remember
17 September 2011 Online registration and hotel booking opens
September – December 2011 Proposals for sessions and round tables can be submitted
1 December 2011 Deadline for session proposals
1 June 2012 Deadline for early fee registration
29 August – 1 September EAA Annual Meeting 2012

Sessions
The meeting will focus on three major themes: Archaeological Heritage Resource Management, Interpreting the Archaeological Record and Perspectives on Archaeology in the Modern World. The organizers would like to invite sessions that explore the roles and realities of the Heritage Management Agencies in the modern world. In addition, we would like to welcome sessions that focus on methodologies and case studies of Maritime Archaeology.
Note that the session and round tables organizers must be current EAA members.
Language: Papers in English, German, and French will be accepted. Abstracts must be in English. The opening ceremony and the annual business meeting will be in English only.

Programme
Monday 27 August – Wednesday 29th
Pre-conference excursions

Tuesday 28 August
10:00–17:00 Special Meetings and working groups
10:00-17:00 Registration

Wednesday 29 August
12:00-17:00 Registration
17:00-19:00 Official opening of the 18th Annual Meeting, the Main Building
19:15-22:00 Opening reception

Thursday 30 August
9:00-18:00 Parallel Sessions
20:00-01:00 Annual Party at the Old Student House

Friday 31 August
9:00-14:00 Parallel sessions
16:00-18:00 EAA Annual Business Meeting
19:00-22:00 Original Finnish Sauna Experience

Saturday 1 September
9:00-16:00 Parallel sessions
19:00-01:00 Annual Dinner at the House of Nobility

Sunday 2 September
Post-conference excursions

The Annual Dinner will be at the Ritarihuone
Excursions

Pre-conference excursions (2 days)

Western Coast – Western Gates
The first day focuses on late Iron Age and Medieval sites and monuments in Finland Proper. After spending the night in Turku, the excursion heads to Satakunta, where one of the attractions is the World Heritage site Sammallahdenmäki, a Bronze Age cemetery.

Landscape of conflict: history of war in Southeast Finland
Visit the 18th century fortresses and see the remains of defence systems from the 1st and 2nd World Wars in Southeast Finland.

Pre-conference excursions (½ day)

Suomenlinna Sea Fortress is a UNESCO World Heritage site located in a group of islands off Helsinki – see www.suomenlinna.fi.

Post-conference excursions (1 day)

Porvoo
Visit the old wooden town of Porvoo and two motte-and-bailey castle sites on this one day trip.

Terra Tavestorum
Visit one of our late medieval castles and the most famous Iron Age hill fort in Finland.

Archaeological Landscapes of Uusimaa
Visit archaeological sites in Uusimaa province

The World Heritage site of Sammallahdenmäki, Bronze Age cemetery. The excursion Western Coast - Western Gates visits this site.

Fees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fees before 1 June 2012 for members</th>
<th>Fees before 1 June 2012 for non-members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>€ 95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student member</td>
<td>€ 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Europe member</td>
<td>€ 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE student</td>
<td>€ 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>€ 40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fees after 1 June 2012 for members</th>
<th>Fees after 1 June 2012 for non-members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>€ 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student member</td>
<td>€ 90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Europe member</td>
<td>€ 90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE student</td>
<td>€ 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>€ 70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Grants
The organizers hope to provide opportunities for participants from Eastern Europe to apply for grants.

Visa
Should you need an invitation letter to obtain a visa, please check the conference website www.eaa2012.fi for more information.

Accommodation
Several hotels in a range of price categories have been pre-booked for the conference. More information and the online booking form are available on http://www.eaa2012.fi.

Conference Secretariat
Confedent International
Porkkalankatu 3
00180 Helsinki, Finland
Tel:+358-9-5840 9350
Fax: +358-9-5840 9555
E-mail: eaa2012@confendenet.fi
www.confedent.fi

Report on the joint SAA-EAA round tables, April and September 2011

Peter F. Biehl, Christopher Prescott, Douglas Comer, Eszter Bánffy

The Executive Board of the European Association of Archaeologists started a discussion to develop a closer cooperation between the Society for American Archaeology (SAA) and the EAA at their board meeting at the EAA Annual Meeting in The Hague in 2010. As a result, two consecutive round tables were organized, the first at the SAA annual conference in Sacramento, 1 April 2011, and the second at the EAA annual conference in Oslo, 15 September 2011. The next series of roundtables is planned for the SAA in Hawaii and the EAA in Plzen in 2013.

One of the objectives of the roundtables was to review and discuss similarities as well as differences in methods and theories used in research and teaching of archaeology and cultural heritage in North America and Europe. Archaeology is a mature academic discipline in the Americas and in Europe, but in several aspects it has matured differently on each side of the Atlantic. The Sacramento forum “Cultural heritage management and archaeological research in the Americas and Europe: A Forum on SAA and European Association Of Archaeologists (EAA) collaboration and was sponsored by the SAA Heritage Values Interest Group and ICAHM and organized by Peter F. Biehl and Douglas Comer around three main issues:

1. Traditions and legal regulations of heritage and its management;
2. Major problems in heritage protection and contract archaeology;
3. The teaching of cultural heritage.

Discussants were Arkadiusz Marciniak, Christopher Prescott, Maurizio Forte, Francois Giligny, Petr Kvetina, Eszter Bánffy, Hilary Soderland and Willem Willems.

The EAA Oslo round table “Teaching and Researching Heritage - Outreach and Identity” (organized by Eszter Bánffy, Peter F. Biehl, Douglas Comer and Christopher Prescott) focused in particular on heritage and identity both on a national and international level; e.g. it was discussed whether indigenous minorities can be related to a national and/or different identity and whether the construction of national identities consists of mixing and enmeshing between prehistoric and early historic cultures, landscape and present day population groups.
In this context the concept of identity seems to be problematic for scientific, empirical and political reasons. The issue comes even more to the forefront in light of globalization. One of its central characteristics is large-scale global migrations. A very large minority in present day Europe comes from Asia and Africa. One question that was discussed was how could these groups be better included in the central tenets of heritage politics and practices? The problem is even more complex in regard to minorities who have resided in the USA and in Europe long before the global migrations of recent decades. The Roma people in Europe are a case in point, and became a core part of this discussion as presented by Eszter Bánffy. With many variants of their original Indo-Iranian language, the Roma are still a people that, according to the most of their many centuries’ mobile history, can be called ‘European’. Central and Southeast Europe have been a scene of their recent migrations. Still, the Roma never could form any part of any nation states. The presentation on their exclusion from any European heritage - especially regarding problems since the fall of the Berlin wall - was illustrated by examples taken from present Hungary and Romania. Also, it has been reported that a Roma Museum is planned to be established in Budapest - even though any definition of its possible collection is lacking: nobody knows what exactly it should contain – so far there has not been any archaeological research about the Roma, so these finds will certainly be missing from the future Roma Museum.

Concurrent with the processes that perhaps render traditional concepts of national or regional identity irrelevant, there is the risk of a counterforce of political populism and chauvinism. The situation in the Americas, e.g. the US and Canada immigrant nations with other references to identity building, is different. It became clear that the US and Canada were a step ahead as evidenced by their experiences with native populations and related legislation (e.g. NAGPRA).

A further issue was raised setting out from the problems with immigrant minorities in Northern Europe. Christopher Prescott reported in his presentation that the ‘average student’ in the schools of Oslo, as contrasted to a few decades ago, is more and more a student of non-western descent, and it is a question how archaeology can attain relevance for this large body of students, and how migrant intellectuals may refer to North European Heritage in the future.

Hilary Soderland discussed issues of ownership, title, standing, burdens of proof, evidentiary standards, and jurisdiction, all important elements through which law affects heritage. From local to global, law has become interwoven in current cultural debates and practices as well as in the contemporary fabric of archaeological discourse. Although it is not immune from historical and modern political backgrounds, the role of law holds increasing importance in heritage teaching, research, and management.

Douglas Comer tackled the tricky issue of presenting the past of and to minorities. Examples like the archaeology of slavery attract both African Americans and the general public. Some further cases were mentioned, e.g. the search for the Sand Creek Massacre Site, where peaceful Cheyenne and Arapahoe civilians were killed, as well as the archaeology and interpretation at the Little Bighorn Battlefield National Monument.

In sum, the discussion of migrations and cultural diversity in an increasingly globalised world poses important political, ethical and practical as well as theoretical issues to the teaching, dissemination/public outreach and practice of archaeology, and further, to the formulation and practice of heritage management and the conceptual basis for these practices. The question is, whether we have understood the challenges and responsibilities of today, and if through this, we are prepared for the near future.

This double-roundtable has been an exploration of the various experiences in Europe and North America to better understand where we are today, and where we hope to be in the near future. We believe that a comparison between various parts of Europe and the Americas is beneficial. This concept is, in our opinion, so valuable that we hope it becomes a regular event at future EAA and SAA meetings.
Report on the Student Award 2011

The Student Award, founded for rewarding the best paper given by both MA and PhD students, was founded in 2002. Each year, so also before the 2011 annual meeting, the possibility to apply for the Student Award was widely announced and advertised by both the local organizers and the EAA board. Session organizers were also asked to encourage students with accepted papers in their sessions. In spite of all these efforts, not more than six applications were received. This leads the board to consider to introduce some changes for the future, in order to receive more student papers submitted for the Student Award. The possible changes will be discussed on the upcoming board meetings.

The 2011 applications were evaluated by Robin Skeates (EJA editor), Monique van den Dries and Peter F. Biehl (executive board members) and by Eszter Bánffy (secretary). According to their unanimous view, The European Association of Archaeologists awards the 2011 Student Award of the European Association of Archaeologists to Heide Wrobel Nørgaard for her paper titled: “‘It’s All the Same’. From Prestige Goods and Itinerant Craftsmen: A Case Study of Individual Markers”.

This highly interesting paper focuses on showing individuals’ hand traces on bronzes, with nice didactic illustrations. Although it is admitted that barter exchanges or personal belonging transferred with marriage cannot be excluded, there are many hints that craftsmen may have moved from one settlement to the other, to supply locals with bronze artefacts. The paper is thus identifying people’s work instead of just “transfer of ideas”, or fashion.

According to the words of the laudito, by Robin Skeates: Heide Nørregaard’s research aims to identify traces of individual metalworkers on decorated bronze neck collars found at Bronze Age sites in Germany and Scandinavia. Her paper discusses the results of this detailed analytical work with reference to the long-running debate about the organization of metalworking in Bronze Age Northern Europe. The paper is interesting, original and well illustrated. It also has the potential to be published.

Student Award 2011: Heide W. Nørgaard on the Quest for the Bronze Age Craftsman

Heide W. Nørgaard is a PhD student at Aarhus University in Denmark, where she is employed in the Section for Prehistoric Archaeology through the Marie Curie training network ITN Forging Identities Project. By virtue of this grant, she is working on craftsmen’s traces on bronze objects during the early and middle Bronze Age in Northwest Europe and Scandinavia. The research for her PhD began in September 2009 under the supervision of Helle Vandkilde (Aarhus) and Svend Hansen (Berlin). Heide studied Prehistoric Archaeology at the Freie Universität in Berlin and was awarded the Rudolf-Virchow prize in 2009 for her M.A. (Magister Artium) thesis on the typology of neck collars in Bronze Age Europe. During her studies, she was intensively involved in fieldwork as well as in other archaeology-related projects such as the editing of the Eurasia Antiqua at the German Archaeological Institute. Because of her former education as a goldsmith, she had long been interested in the traces of ancient craftsmen. Emeritus Professor Bernhard Hänsel (Berlin) introduced Heide to the Bronze Age in Northern Europe during her study. This region includes the cultural and regional group of the Nordic Bronze Age and has been associated with magnificent
decorated ornament assemblages dating between 1800-1100 BC. Despite this, very little research has been done on the techniques used to craft these objects. Heide’s PhD project aims to rectify this discrepancy by finding the craftsman in Bronze Age Europe through the traces left behind on magnificent decorated bronze ornaments. In wider terms, she is aiming to clarify the organization of metalwork and metalworking in prehistoric times, as is demonstrated by her award-winning paper, “It’s all the same. From Prestige goods and itinerant craftsman”.

Workshops and their sphere of influence are an important factor in the identification of social groups that are related to them. Specialization within the workshop based on certain practices can be linked to the knowledge of social groups. The identification of workshops or the “hand that crafted” is possible through traces of the actual crafting process on bronze objects. Internalized behaviour, repeated actions and the adoption of social habits create individual markers in a craftsman’s work. Additionally, other features that are based on the personal working behaviour of the smith himself will be added to the investigation of Bronze Age workshops in northwest Germany and south Scandinavia. Statements about the origin of foreign objects are an important tool to clarify social interaction in Bronze Age Europe. Here especially, the presence of itinerant craftsmen, which has been shown in ethnographic research to be a widely accepted form of metalworking organization, is of interest. As the award-winning paper shows, this kind of organization might also be possible in the Nordic Bronze Age. It is Heide’s goal not only to find the centres of production and their distribution areas, but also to examine their role in the creation of social identities. The project will furthermore examine the techniques used by the Bronze Age smith in Northern Europe. The research completed thus far has been a great success and shows the quality of and educational level required for the techniques used. The presence of crafting similarities on the bronze objects is the main argument for their production in a specific workshop. Due to the fact that on a bronze object it is possible to recognize these distinctive features and traits of crafting, it is therefore possible to compare these traits between different bronze objects. Using a group of bronze objects that are already critically analyzed with regard to their formal characteristics provides a unique opportunity for recognizing workshops and their distribution areas, and will form the base of her PhD project.

**European Journal of Archaeology:**

*New developments and call for papers*

Robin Skeates, EJA General Editor, Department of Archaeology, Durham University, UK

2011 saw the publication of the new-look *European Journal of Archaeology*. The modernized print-version of the *EJA* has a new design, high quality paper, printing and illustrations (including colour images), a larger page size, and more articles and reviews per issue. The electronic version of this should be online by the end of 2011.

Thomson Reuters also began to index the *EJA* in 2011. This means that the *EJA* is now listed in the exclusive ISA Web of Knowledge (i.e. the Web of Science/Social Sciences Citation Index, including Journal Citation Reports), which will further enhance the global impact of our international peer reviewed journal. (The *EJA* was already ranked A in the European Reference Index for the Humanities as a ‘high-ranking international publication with a very strong reputation among researchers of the field in different countries, regularly cited all over the world’.)

We are currently looking for new scholarly articles for the *EJA*, having expanded its size, at the same time as getting fully up to date with our publication schedule. Our aim, then, is to publish more articles, and to publish them rapidly.

Any enquiries regarding prospective articles for the *EJA* should be send via email to Dr. Robin Skeates, General Editor of The European Journal of Archaeology, at the following address: Robin.Skeates@durham.ac.uk
The European Archaeological Heritage Prize 2011

Decision

The EAA Committee for the European Archaeological Heritage Prize, consisting of Anastasia Tourta from Greece, Margaret Gowen from Ireland, Luboš Jirán from the Czech Republic, Mircea Angelescu from Romania, and Carsten Paludan-Müller from Norway (chair), has decided to award the thirteenth Heritage Prize of the European Association of Archaeologists to Dr Girolamo Ferdinando de Simone of St Johns College, University of Oxford, and the Mayor of Pollena Trochia, Avvocato Francesco Pinto, in recognition of their combined efforts that have set an important example for the integration of scholarly and civic achievements with good heritage management under particularly demanding circumstances.

Justification for the Prize

The cooperation between Dr. Girolamo Ferdinando De Simone and Avvocato Francesco Pinto has brought back to light an important Roman monumental complex which after its first uncovering in 1988, had been forgotten, buried under tons of refuse in an illegal dump. From a scientific point of view, the systematic investigation of the monument revealed that the Northern slopes of Vesuvius did in fact have important habitation also during antiquity, and also that it had been re-inhabited again soon after the eruption of Vesuvius responsible for the destruction of Pompeii and Herculaneum. By focusing on the Northern slopes of Vesuvius, the project has considerably expanded and nuanced the insight into Roman settlement in Campania, hitherto overshadowed by the splendour of Baiae, Pompeii and Herculaneum. The investigation has also added to our insights into life in Campania during the later and late empire between the eruption of 79 AD and that of 472 AD which particularly affected the Northern slopes of Vesuvius. Most important of all, the excavation, presentation and return of the monument to the public, all of which happened under very difficult conditions, mobilized and encouraged the local community, which participated in the archaeological work with enthusiasm. It is ground-breaking and in line with the spirit of the European Faro Convention. Dr Girolamo Ferdinando De Simone’s work bespeaks the spirit of responsibility and dedication of the active field archaeologists in Europe. The firm stance of the Mayor of Pollena Trochia, Avvocato Francesco Pinto, who bravely defended the archaeological work against illegal but mighty interests, is laudable as it reconnected the Pollena Trochia inhabitants with their historical past and reinstated their lost pride. The awarding of the European Heritage Prize to Dr Girolamo Ferdinando De Simone and Avvocato Francesco Pinto sends a message of optimism to other European regions whose cultural heritage is endangered by questionable interests. The synergetic results of their cooperation constitutes a luminous example of what can be achieved when heritage management and archaeological research enjoys local society’s support and when archaeologists are fully aware of their potential to contribute to society.

Report on AGE 2010-2011

Sandra Montón-Subías and Liv Helga Dommasnes

AGE – Archaeology and Gender in Europe – is an EAA working party with 56 members from 17 different European countries. It is aimed at discussing gender archaeology across the variety of approaches more or less isolated within different academic traditions and languages of Europe, treating these as valuable resources rather than obstacles. It fosters an awareness of gender archaeology in places where it has gained little or no impact and promotes deeper insights and continuous reflection in those other places where it has been already established as a solid field of research.
Since its foundation in 2009, AGE has been very active in organizing gender encounters in the several different countries where they members belong to. As a way of example, we can mention the ICREA workshop on Europe’s Gender Present. New Reflections on Cultural Memories of the Past, that took place in Barcelona in 2010. Of special significance are the annual AGE sessions at the EAA Annual Meetings. After the session/round table Gender and Archaeology in Europe (organized by Liv Helga Dommasnes and Sandra Montón Subías) in Riva di Garda 2009 (see TEA No. 32, Winter 2009/10), Feminist, Masculinist and Queer Visions of the Past (organized by Will Meyer, Ericka Engelstad and Margarita Díaz-Andreu) followed in The Hague 2010 (see TEA No. 34, Winter 2010/11) and Humans and Animals in the Making of Gender (organised by Kristin Armstrong Oma and Nona Palincas) has been recently celebrated in Oslo 2011 (see this issue of TEA). In addition, in 2010 Situating Gender in European Archaeologies, co-edited by five AGE members, was published by Archaeolingua. More information about these and future activities can be gathered from our web page http://www.upf.edu/materials/fhuma/age/.

EAA Annual Report (Minutes of the ABM in Oslo)

16 September 2011

1. Opening and welcome by the President of the EAA
The EAA President, Prof. Friedrich Lüth, opened the EAA Annual Business Meeting by welcoming its 120 attendees from among the members of the Association. He thanked all the delegates for participating in this year’s conference – the number of delegates approached 900 from more than 47 countries. Altogether 490 papers were delivered at 59 sessions, and 90 posters were displayed in the venue foyer. Ten presentations had to be cancelled at the last minute, but all the sessions that had been proposed took place. The schedule for the preparation of the scientific programme has been moved forward to allow for proper evaluation of proposals and ensure high scholarly standards for the conference. This change seems to have been accepted by the membership and has yielded quality academic content at the conference. Suggestions for themes for future conference plenary sessions are welcome and should be e-mailed to Sylvie Kvetinova at eaa@arup.cas.cz. The ABM itself has been shifted to the second day of the conference in order to allow more time for discussion and exchange among members and to encourage greater attendance.

The dates and frequency of Executive Board meetings have also been changed: The officers’ meeting on the Tuesday prior to the conference to prepare the ABM is followed by a short (2 hours) meeting of the whole Board on the Saturday afternoon to meet the newly elected Board members. There will be an Autumn Board meeting (shifted to an earlier date) to discuss matters arising, the election and publications (reflecting also the papers given at the conference), and a Spring meeting to deal with finance, appointments at the ABM, future meetings, networks, the EAA secretariat, working parties and round tables, etc. The costs incurred by holding two Board meetings over the year must be included in the budget.

One of the highlights of the past EAA year is the changes concerning the Journal, long requested by the membership. Following The Hague conference, the EAA began negotiations with the publisher, Sage, aimed at making structural changes to the Journal (size, paper quality, flexibility in the number of pages). Although these changes were eventually agreed, the EAA formed the clear view in the negotiations that Sage’s part-ownership of, and business model for, the Journal were not serving members’ needs and interests. With the benefit of specialist legal advice, the EAA successfully concluded an agreement under which it recovered ownership of the Journal, and the parties agreed to the following joint statement: “The Board of the Association has reached agreement with Sage Publications to bring to an end the current agreements for the publication of the European Journal of Archaeology in view of the parties’ differing views about the appropriate business model for the Journal and how best to serve the needs of the membership. Volume 14 of the Journal will therefore now be published by the EAA itself and the Board anticipates
concluding new arrangements with another publisher for future volumes.” Before the agreement was signed it was ensured that the expenditure including the lawyers and extra travelling costs is fully covered by the income from SAGE. As the process began on 1 August the full figures are not available yet. Tender for a new international, experienced publisher to produce the EJA from vol.15 has just begun.

Detailed planning of the long desired monograph series to publish successful sessions from EAA conferences had to be postponed due to the EJA business, but the Editorial Board – with approval voted by the members present at the ABM - will prepare guidelines for such publications.

Members are welcome to raise any relevant matters or queries either during the ABM or by e-mail to the EAA Secretariat.

2. Minutes of the ABM in The Hague (circulated in TEA)

The minutes of the ABM in The Hague 2010 were circulated in the Spring Issue, TEA No. 35. The ABM approved them as a correct record of the previous meeting. The Minutes of the ABM in Oslo will be circulated in TEA No. 36 in Autumn 2011 after the Executive Board has confirmed that they are accurate.

3. Matters arising from the Minutes

The answer to the recurring question of languages within EAA and its conferences is that English is the official language of both the Association and its conferences. Individual papers in English, German and French are accepted, but abstracts and PowerPoint Presentations must be in English. Full sessions in languages other than English are possible when simultaneous translation is provided and paid for from external sources.

Notes for speakers at the EAA conference, currently on the EAA web page, have a direct hyperlink from the conference web page so that all speakers may read them. John Collis committed himself to update the guidelines and asked that they be circulated by e-mail to all speakers every year, as well as included on the conference web page.

A table for EAA members to place their publications or information was available adjacent to the exhibition area, and not used during this conference. It should also be provided at future conferences, but better advertised.

At the ABM in Riva del Garda (2009) it was proposed to add a student representative to the Board. The Board suggested at the ABM in The Hague (2010) to attribute responsibility for student affairs to a Board member. It was suggested at the ABM however, to create a post on the Board for a student. A temporary working group was created at the ABM in The Hague consisting of Monique van den Dries, Sylvia Marshall, and Mark Pearce who proposed three solutions:

1. to change the Statutes
2. to leave the Statutes as they are
3. to create a committee that will stimulate student involvement

Since there was no agreement within the Student working group, the Board discussed all three options.1) Statutes change was discarded, as this would be unfair to other interest groups within the EAA. 2) At present any member of the EAA can be elected and this also applies to students, following the proposal system in the statutes: students can be elected to the Board or any other EAA position, but not as a specific representative of students. 3) One elected Board member could be appointed to take care of student affairs (Student Award, Students4students, grants, student session at conference etc.). A Student committee can be created to handle student matters, but as an initiative from below – if it happens, a Board member would be the liaison with the Board. At present, no special duties will be assigned to a newly elected Board member prior to election. Peter Biehl will draft a questionnaire for students to find out what they prefer and who they actually are, as the definition is rather loose and includes everyone who is involved in a formal university education process.
4. Annual Report by the Secretary and the Administrator

Due to problems in the transfer of information between the registration (and membership payment) through the conference and the EAA Secretariat, only figures valid for August 2011 were available: according to these, the EAA had 902 paid up members, and the total membership this year is therefore likely to surpass one thousand after the final list of conference delegates is incorporated. About half of the members pay their fees together with conference registration; this fact brings about administrative problems, and members are urged to renew in advance, ideally by cash payments at the conference for the next year. The Association has the following corporate members (institutions that undertake to make financial contribution to the EAA):

- INRAP – Institut national de recherches archéologiques préventives
- OCENW - Rijksinspectie voor de Archeologie
- Historic Scotland
- English Heritage
- NIKU – The Norwegian Institute for Cultural Heritage Research
- ASHA – Agencja e sherbimit arkeologjik
- AU – Archeologický ústav AV ČR Praha, v. v. i.
- Archaeological Institute of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences
- Society of the Lithuanian Archaeology
- Institute of Archaeology of the Jagiellonian University
- Stowarzyszenie Naukowe Archeologów Polskich

The new EAA website was launched on September 14. The new website structure is highly flexible and can be quickly modified or updated if needed; the new website layout is up to date with the current web design trends. The website is being updated systematically. The TEA website was launched on 31 August; the EAA Blog is meant as its enhancement. Facebook and Twitter EAA accounts have been created. A new EJA website will be launched shortly. Thanks for the web page are due to Andrew Leszczewicz who has done an excellent job.

5. Statutes Amendment

Following revision of the Statutes over the past two years by the members of the Statutes Committee (Roger M Thomas (Chair), Harald K Hermansen, Kristian Kristiansen and Willem Willems), the below amendment is now put forward to members for approval. Article V of EAA Statutes has so far read:

Article V: Membership

1 Full Membership is open to professional archaeologists in the following categories:
   - Regular (annual)
   - Family (annual)
   - Student (annual)
   - Retired (annual)
   - Long-term (period to be determined by Executive Board)
   - Life

2 Associate Membership is open to non-professionals.

3 Family Membership is open to professional archaeologists who are partners of Full Regular, Long term or Life Members.

4 Only Full Members shall have voting rights in the affairs of the Association.

5 Decisions regarding eligibility for Membership or class of Membership to which candidates are assigned shall be made at the discretion of the Executive Board.

The new wording proposed for approval reads:

Article V: Membership

1 There shall be the following categories of Full Membership:
   a) Regular (annual)
   b) Family (annual)
   c) Student (annual)
   d) Retired (annual)
   e) Life
2 Family Membership is available to partners of Full Members.
3 Only Full Members shall have voting rights in the affairs of the Association.
4 By signing up for membership, a member agrees to adhere to EAA’s Codes of Practice and Code of Conduct.

The Statutes change was approved by show of hands (0 against, 1 abstained).

6. Financial Report by the Treasurer and the Administrator
Karl Kallhovd is at the same time EAA Treasurer and local conference organiser; he therefore has the appropriate insight into EAA’s income and expenditure this year. The accounts for 2010 have been audited and approved by the ABM; they provided a surplus. Budgets for 2011 and 2012 are balanced and have been approved by the members present.

Accounting 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>difference assets - liabilities 2009</th>
<th>12.585</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>membership fees cc on-line (collected in 2010)</td>
<td>30491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>membership fees cc off-line (collected in 2010)</td>
<td>3444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>membership fees bank transfer (collected in 2010)</td>
<td>15312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>membership fees cash (collected in 2010)</td>
<td>1660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>membership fees collected in The Hague</td>
<td>32515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wenner Gren grant received and paid out in Hague</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACES</td>
<td>777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editorial support from Sage 2009 and 2010</td>
<td>2536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>print of diplomas, HP medal engraving</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reimbursements boards</td>
<td>7853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prague secretariat 1/1 - 31/12 2010</td>
<td>32423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sage EJA volume 12</td>
<td>12555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sage EJA volume 13</td>
<td>18751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>postage reviews editor</td>
<td>417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cc payment administration maintenance</td>
<td>1712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>web page costs Andrew</td>
<td>1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Payments Europe (cc acceptance monthly fee)</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>audit 2009</td>
<td>479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accounting 2009</td>
<td>1208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INGO subscription</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>80588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>difference assets - liabilities 2010</td>
<td>5.370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZK + Euro account 31/12/2010</td>
<td>28.656</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Budget 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Expenses EUR</th>
<th>Income EUR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Difference assets - liabilities 2010</td>
<td>5 370</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership fees</td>
<td>75000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wenner-Gren grant received and paid out in Oslo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board meetings</td>
<td>8000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretariat (Prague)</td>
<td>35000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal</td>
<td>18000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal advice</td>
<td>12000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web page</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting and audit 2010</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79300</td>
<td>80 370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance income - expenditure</td>
<td>1 070</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. Membership fee level for the next year
The membership fees in 2012 will remain the same as in 2011.

8. Announcement of the 2011 Elections
According to the Statutes the EAA Executive Board consists of 10 elected members: 3 Officers, an Incoming President elected one year before the serving period, and 6 Ordinary Members (one of them appointed as a Vice-President). The period of service is 3 years. This year, the posts of Incoming President, Secretary, and two Ordinary members of the Executive Board became vacant; the elected candidates will serve from 2011 to 2014. A system of appointment rather than election, as was the case in the past, was approved at the Annual Business Meeting in Riva del Garda, 2009, for members of the Editorial Board. Following the Statutes amendment adopted at ABMs in Riva del Garda, 2009, and The Hague, 2010, new Nomination Committee members are elected by ballot following the normal election process.

A call for nominations by members was sent out on 28 January; the deadline for nominations was 3 March. A self-nomination by Mark Pearce, supported by ten full members, was received for the post of Secretary. Serving Board members whose position was available for election and who had only served one term (Friedrich Lüth, Peter Biehl, Franco Nicolis) have all agreed to run for a second term. It has been impossible to find a second candidate to run for the post of Incoming President. Election materials were circulated via e-mail on 17 August. 155 received votes (2 received by regular mail, 47 received by e-mail and 106 at the conference ballot box) were counted by the Secretary (Eszter Bánffy), Executive Board member Nathan Schlanger, Willem Willems, and EAA Assistant Administrator Hana Brzobohatá. Although the number of votes was higher than in the past, before announcing the results of the election to the ABM the EAA President encouraged even more involvement of the members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incoming President</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friedrich Lüth</td>
<td>139 (90%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blank</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total votes</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Budget 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Expenses EUR</th>
<th>Income EUR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Difference assets - liabilities 2011</td>
<td>1 070</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership fees</td>
<td>70 000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wenner-Gren grant</td>
<td>received and paid out in Helsinki</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board meetings</td>
<td>10 000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretariat (Prague)</td>
<td>35 000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal</td>
<td>15 000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal advice</td>
<td>5 000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web page</td>
<td>1 500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting and audit 2011</td>
<td>1 800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>1 000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>69 300</strong></td>
<td><strong>71 070</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Balance income - expenditure**

|               | 1 770 |

---
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9. Welcome to the new Board Members
Friedrich Lüth welcomed – unfortunately in his absence - the new Secretary, congratulated the re-elected Board members and thanked the unsuccessful candidates for their engagement. He also announced a new member of Editorial Board to be appointed by the Executive Board at its next meeting: Laurence Manolakakis. The officers thanked Eszter Bánffy for her term as Secretary and introduced her into her new position on the Nomination Committee; the EAA President also thanked the outgoing member the Nomination Committee Jean-Paul Demoule.

10. Announcement of new Heritage Prize committee member
Luboš Jiráň has been re-appointed to the Heritage Prize committee for the 2011 – 2014 term.

11. Announcement of the EAA Student Award 2010
The Student Award Selection Committee composed of the EJA Editor and three members of the Executive Board received ten papers for consideration for the Student Award. It decided to award the 2011 Student Award to Heide Wrobel Nørgaard for her paper “‘It’s All the Same’. From Prestige Goods and Itinerant Craftsmen: A Case Study of Individual Markers”. Heide Nørgaard’s research aims to identify traces of individual metalworkers on decorated bronze neck collars found at Bronze Age sites in Germany and Scandinavia. Her paper discusses the results of this detailed analytical work with reference to the long-running
debate about the organization of metalworking in Bronze Age Northern Europe. The paper is interesting, original and well illustrated. It also has the potential to be published.

12. Progress Report of the EJA by the Editor
Robin Skeates detailed some of the information already presented by the EAA President. He thanked his predecessor Alan Saville, former Reviews Editors Cornelius Holtorf and Troels Myrup Kristensen, and past Editorial Board members for their work. Volume 14 of the Journal is produced by the EAA – thanks are due to Sonja Magnavita who ensured the technical side, but also to the Editorial Board who supported Robin. Double issue 14.1-2 appeared shortly before the conference and was distributed to members in person; those who could not get hold of it there will receive it by post. The Journal now features a new design, size, an increased number of pages, better and colour illustrations, and high quality paper; it is accompanied by a new EJA web page. Issue 14.3 will be published in December. The EJA is therefore up to date, without a backlog of articles to be published, and is owned by the EAA. For volume 15 onwards a new publisher will be found through a tender. Editorial Board members have been scouting in the conference sessions for good papers, and members are welcome to submit their texts to the EJA as has been the intention from the very beginning of the EAA. Both opening lectures of the Oslo conference should be published in the Journal.

13. Report by the Editor of TEA
The Summer Issue, TEA No. 35, was sent to members on 16 May 2011 and comprised 69 pages. The deadline for submissions for the TEA Winter Issue, No. 36, is 30 October and session organizers are especially welcome to submit their reports. Alexander Gramsch together with his Assistant TEA Editor, Lidka Zuk, and the EAA web master Andrew Leszczewicz have launched a new TEA web page which is open to public, not only to EAA members, and contains back TEA issues. Alexander Gramsch thanked his co-editor Lidka Zuk, and the language editor Jennifer Sharman for their work.

14. Reports from the Working Parties, Committees and Round Tables
The EAA Vice-President, Monique van den Dries, briefly summarized the general guidelines for the work of EAA Committees and Working Parties. An EAA Working Party is created for a limited period in order to achieve a particular result (formulate policy, develop a standard, create an inventory etc.) while a Committee is established only if the issue is considered to be of permanent concern to the EAA. Committees and working parties meet at conferences, publish reports in TEA and at the web. The usual terms of Committee members are three years, starting and ending at annual meetings. Members can express their interest in membership in a committee or working party, or can propose creation of a new one. Chairs of the committees and working parties have been asked to contribute to the TEA Winter Issue, No. 36.

15. Location of future Annual Meetings
The future conferences will be held in the following cities:
18th Annual Meeting 2012 Helsinki, Finland
19th Annual Meeting 2013 Plzen, Czech Republic
20th Annual Meeting 2014 Istanbul, Turkey
21st Annual Meeting 2015 Glasgow, Scotland
22nd Annual Meeting 2016 Vilnius, Lithuania (to be decided)

16. Invitation for the 18th Annual Meeting in Helsinki, Finland
The 18th EAA conference will be held on 29 August – 1 September 2012 in Helsinki, Finland. The meeting will be organised by the University of Helsinki, the National Board of Antiquities, the Finnish Antiquarian Society, and the Archaeological Society of Finland. The main sponsor of the meeting is the Ministry of Education and Culture. The conference venues are the Main Building of the University of Helsinki and the Porthania Building; the buildings are conveniently located near each other in the city centre. The meeting will focus on special
themes: maritime archaeology and heritage management. Registration opens on 17 September 2011; the deadline for session proposals is 1 December 2011, and the deadline for early registration fee is 1 June 2012. The Opening Ceremony will be held on 29 August 2012 at 17:00 at the University of Helsinki, followed by an opening reception in the City Hall. The Annual Party will be held on 30 August 2012 from 20:00 at the Old Student House. The Annual Dinner is scheduled for 1 September 2012 at 19:00 at the House of Nobility. There will be two two-day pre-conference excursions and one half-day one. Three post-conference excursions have been planned for the Sunday 2 September. Members are urged to use the designated hotels. The web site has been launched already at www.eaa2012.fi.

17. Any Other Business
Since no other matters arose, Friedrich Lüth declared the Annual Business Meeting closed, and thanked everyone for their participation. Special thanks are due to Gyro and their staff, the student volunteers, and Egil Mikkelsen, Karl Kallhovd and Elin Dalen, for a perfect conference.

“Archaeology in Contemporary Europe” Project’s Advancement.
EC Culture Programme 2007-2013
Kai Salas Rossenbach

Since its last evocation in TEA Summer Issue No. 31, 2009, the EC-funded network ACE – Archaeology in Contemporary Europe: professional practices and public outreach was very active. As you maybe remember, the 13 partners of the ACE network undertake the research, documentation and related activities along four thematic axes.
In the framework of theme I, “Researching the significance of the past”, three colloquia have been held:

- In Poznan at the Adam Mickiewicz University in October 2009. Two days were dedicated to the “Contemporary faces of the past” where past interpretation, interaction between society and museum or the relationship between archaeology and media were discussed. Papers presented during this conference were published in an edited volume¹.
- In Paris at the Musée d’art et d’histoire du Judaïsme in January 2011. The symposium “Archaeology of Judaism in France and Europe” has led to the publication of the proceedings in February 2011. Specialists confront archaeological and historical research and present a synthesis of the contribution of archaeology through international examples. These new data contribute to our knowledge of European Judaism since Antiquity and enable us to better apprehend its very early existence in medieval society.
- In Brussels in May 2011, VIOE organised an international colloquium ‘The very beginning of Europe? Cultural and Social Dimensions of Early-Medieval Migration and

Colonisation (5th–8th century). The focus was put on two of the most important aspects and subjects for debate of the investigation into this quite unknown period: migration and colonization.

Under theme II, “Comparative practices in archaeology”, a workshop on the good practice in the use of digital data in archaeology in November 2009 was organised in Brussels by the VIOE. Subjects such as digital data recording in the field or their preservation were discussed.

The ACE partnership also proposed at the 16th EAA conference a session on “European Archaeology abroad: historical antecedents and future collaborations”. The focus was on the ways values and motivations change and influence the relations with the host countries and their different official and un-official representatives. Several themes have been addressed, among them: Archaeology, diplomacy and foreign policy, Heritage management issues, International agencies.

Theme III, “The archaeological profession”, was the opportunity for the partners to identify various archaeologists. A large survey of the profession in Europe has been conducted. From the definition of an archaeologist to a typology of fieldworks, the complete chaîne d’opératoire of the activity was explored. At the 17th EAA conference, a session was organized to present the results of this action.

The ACE network is also setting up a mobility bursaries programme. Four institutions, INRAP, ADS, Unité d’archéologie de Saint-Denis, and RGK will receive trainees during 3 or 4 weeks. Several subjects are proposed depending of the institution: preventive archaeology, heritage management, urban archaeology, mediation, field summer school, archaeological digital data archiving and documentation.

In the framework of theme IV, “Public outreach: invitations to archaeology”, the ACE network through one of its partners took part in two archaeological film festivals. The first one took place in Brussels in November 2009. A symposium on “Archaeology and Media” was organised at the beginning of this festival. The second one was held in Bordeaux in October 2010 with an opening symposium about “Archaeology and Politics”.

Within the ACE project, VIOE tried to answer simple questions, such as what’s an archaeologist and how to explain it to young children? The result is a funny children’s book called De archeoloog (The Archaeologist).

Finally, an international exhibition on archaeology in Europe is in the process of achievement. A photographer was sent in seven partners’ countries to illustrate in a tangible way to the general public, through aesthetically photographs, what is an archaeologist and what is the context of the archaeological practice today.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28 - 29 October</td>
<td>Executive Board meeting in Frankfurt am Main, Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 November</td>
<td>TEA 36 fall issue sent out to the members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 December</td>
<td>Deadline for session and round table proposals for the 2012 EAA Annual Meeting in Helsinki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>Reminder to renew EAA membership on-line e-mailed to members; EJA 14/3 sent out to members (together with EJA 14/1-2 to those who could not receive it in Oslo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 December</td>
<td>End of the 2011 EAA membership (log-in to the members’ only section valid until 31 January 2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 January</td>
<td>Beginning of the 2012 EAA membership (log-in to the members’ only section valid since 1 December 2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 February</td>
<td>Paper and poster proposal submission for the 2012 EAA Annual Meeting in Helsinki opens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>early February</td>
<td>Call for nominations to the EAA election circulated to the members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 March</td>
<td>Closure of nominations by members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 March</td>
<td>Deadline for paper and poster proposal submission for the 2012 EAA Annual Meeting in Helsinki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March / April</td>
<td>Nomination Committee Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 - 14 April</td>
<td>Executive Board meeting in Prague, Czech Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 April</td>
<td>Deadline for submissions for TEA No. 37, Summer Issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 May</td>
<td>Deadline for proposals of candidates for the European Archaeological Heritage Prize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>early May</td>
<td>TEA No. 37, Summer Issue, sent out to the members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 June</td>
<td>Deadline for early conference fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Aug. - 1 Sept.</td>
<td>18th EAA Annual Meeting, Helsinki</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Announcements

Online-Survey on Aerial Photography

Dear colleagues,

Aerial photographs are an invaluable source for archaeologists and allied disciplines, especially those working in a landscape or historical framework. However, archives of aerial photographs are often under-utilised, in part because their very existence is not widely known. Within the framework of the EU funded ArchaeoLandscapes network (http://www.facebook.com/pages/ArchaeoLandscapes-Europe/268492236514621; http://www.archaeolandscapes.eu/) a working party is seeking to encourage fuller exploitation of these unique sources for European archaeology. An online-survey has been prepared which seeks to gather information on archives of aerial photos with potential for archaeological and landscape research in Europe. This information will be eventually published by the ArchaeoLandscapes Project, subject to agreement of survey participants, to facilitate fuller use of aerial photo archives. This survey will run until 15 December 2011.

It would be highly appreciated if you or one of your colleagues could find 5 minutes of your precious time to fill in the survey, available at www.surveymonkey.com/s/arcland_archive1.

Feel free to forward this to anyone who is involved in aerial photography and photo archives. Thank you very much in advance for taking this into consideration,

with best regards,

Axel Posluschny

Summer School in Çatalhöyük, Turkey
July - August 2012

University of California Merced and Stanford University
3-D ARCHAEOLOGY AT ÇATALHÖYÜK

UC Merced’s School of Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts (Prof. Maurizio Forte), in collaboration with Stanford University, will continue the archaeological fieldwork and digital recording in the archaeological site of Çatalhöyük (http://www.catalhoyuk.com/), Turkey, in 2012, after the successful seasons 2010-2011. The scope is the three-dimensional reconstruction of all the archaeological phases of excavations during the fieldwork and the 3D data recording of the most important artifacts using Teleimmersive systems, computer vision and 3D laser scanners.

Nowadays fieldwork archaeology is able to produce a major amount of information in comparison with the past thanks to an integrated use of digital technologies. This fact opens new perspectives in the interpretation process but requires also more advanced skills in different domains.

Contact: Prof. Maurizio Forte: mforte@ucmerced.edu
Summer School in Athens
6 - 19 September 2012
„Tod und Ewigkeit, Bestattung und Erinnerung vom 1. Jahrtausend v.Chr. bis zur Gegenwart”
Deadline for applications: 15 February 2012
contact: Marion.Meyer@univie.ac.at

Heritage Portal

Heritage Portal (www.heritageportal.eu) is an online resource developed by the EU Net-Heritage Project providing news and information on European cultural heritage research, conservation science, education and training. It was officially launched in Rome on 28 September 2011 by partners of the Net-Heritage Project (http://www.netheritage.eu) and features news, events, opportunities, a database of documents and a social networking area.

Heritage Portal aims to provide a platform for sharing news and information on European cultural heritage research, conservation, education, and training. Moreover, it disseminates the outcomes of European Union-supported projects, including the Joint Programming Initiative on Cultural Heritage and Global Change, and provides a platform for users to disseminate their own content.

We would like to invite EAA members to see our latest news and discover cultural heritage resources and opportunities available across Europe, including training courses, events, documents and databases, and to contribute to the Portal. EAA members are also welcome to sign up for our newsletter: http://eepurl.com/eJHNU.

To sign up, just follow these simple steps:
1) Go to Social Tools tab and click on “Sign me up!” or on the Home page, go to the log in box (right-hand-side of page) and click on “Create a new account”.
2) Fill in your name, username (you can make this up), email address and password. Add a short biography and upload a photo of yourself if you wish.
3) An activation link will be sent to your email address – click on (or copy and paste into your browser) the „activation link” in the email to activate your account.
4) Sign-up complete! Now you can navigate around the site and also upload your own content. Just go to the Contribute tab and follow the instructions!

Julie Clayton
Editor, Heritage Portal
julie.clayton@heritageportal.eu

Bulletin de la Société préhistorique française

Founded in 1904, the Société préhistorique française (SPF) is one of the oldest archaeological societies and now has almost 1,300 members throughout the world. The SPF has published the quarterly Bulletin de la Société préhistorique française without interruption since 1904, and current issues are each about 200 pages long. Articles are peer-reviewed and deal with a broad range of topics, covering prehistory from the Palaeolithic up to the early Iron Age. The approach can be technological, cultural, environmental, or
archaeometric. Most articles are published in French with a long summary in English, although overview articles are now accepted in English, Spanish or German.
The SPF also publishes the proceedings of the Congrès préhistorique de France, as well as a series of Mémoires and Travaux presenting the results of major research projects or excavations.
The SPF organises conferences throughout France and occasionally in neighbouring countries too. From 2012, these conferences will be published in a new online collection.
The new SPF website provides information about the Society and its activities and will soon include a newsletter. E-commerce facilities will shortly be available for paying membership fees and buying publications.
Find out more and join up on www.prehistoire.org.

ERC in a nutshell

The European Research Council (ERC) is the first pan-European funding body, set up to support the best frontier research in Europe.
The ERC was created by the European Commission in February 2007, and it is the newest, pioneering component of the EU's Seventh Research Framework Programme, named the "Ideas" specific programme. It has a total budget of € 7.5 billion (2007-2013).
The ERC aims to stimulate scientific excellence in Europe by supporting the very best scientists, scholars and engineers in any field of research. Through Europe-wide peer-reviewed competition -with scientific excellence as sole selection criterion- the brightest ideas at the frontiers of knowledge are funded. There are neither thematic priorities, nor geographical quotas.
The competitions are open to top researchers from anywhere in the world, provided they are based in or are moving to Europe.

Being 'investigator-driven', or 'bottom-up', in nature, the ERC approach allows researchers to identify new opportunities and directions in any field of research, rather than being led by pre-set priorities. By challenging Europe's brightest minds, the ERC expects that its grants will help to bring about new and unpredictable scientific and technological discoveries -the kind that can form the basis of new industries, markets, and broader social innovations of the future.
The ERC has two main grant schemes: the "ERC Starting Grants" are targeted at early-career, emerging research leaders, while the "ERC Advanced Grants" support established, senior top researchers. Since its launch, the ERC has funded over 2200 frontier research projects throughout Europe.

In addition to being a funding organisation, the ERC aims to strengthen and shape the European research system and it already has an impact on the European Research Area. The ERC is helping to create international benchmarks and to trigger new thinking about research management and science policy at a national level. Ultimately, the ERC aims to make the European research base more prepared to respond to the needs of a knowledge-based society and provide Europe with the capabilities in frontier research to meet global challenges.
Panel SH6 (Social Sciences and Humanities), under the title "The study of the human past: archaeology, history and memory", has so far funded 75 research projects, 24 of which in the area of Prehistory, Protohistory, Landscape Archaeology or Classical Archaeology all around the world.
For more information see: http://erc.europa.eu
Contact: Pilar Lopez, pilar.lopez@ec.europa.eu

1 In the EU or the FP7 associated countries (Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Iceland, Israel, Faroe Islands, Liechtenstein, FYR of Macedonia, Norway, Republic of Montenegro, Serbia, Switzerland and Turkey).
Conference Announcements

16th International Conference on Cultural Heritage and New Technologies (CHNT)

14 – 16 November 2011
Vienna (City Hall), Austria
http://www.stadtarchaeologie.at/?page_id=3109

The main Topic of the Conference is "Urban Archaeology and Prospection":
Section 1: Prospection, Survey and Data Integration
* Prospection and Remote Sensing - Advanced Methods For Archaeology
* Data integration, data handling and data processing/analysis
* 3D Reconstructions from Urban Surveys
* Newbies
* Lost Cities - Prospections and hypothetical Urbanistic Reconstructions

Section 2: Urban Archaeology - Streets, Roads and Squares
* Streets, Roads and Squares - Development, Function and Conversion
* Streets, Roads and Squares - Continuity versus Discontinuity
* Streets, Roads and Squares - The Urban Square - a public space free of buildings?
* Pre-Excavation Strategies '
* Kulturportale' - Historical Maps and Views

Workshops:
* Geographical referencing of historical maps
* Streets and Squares in Central European Towns - Work in Progress (English/German)

"I Know Where I'm Going"
Remote Access to World Heritage Sites from St Kilda to Uluru

23 - 24 November 2011
Edinburgh, Scotland ,UK
http://inspace.mediascot.org/beholder/iknowwhereimgoing

This two-day international conference will focus on the potential for new technologies to create high-quality, remote-access visitor experiences for World Heritage Sites and other sites of cultural, historical and natural significance where remote access is either desirable or necessary.

The Conference has three main aims:
- to showcase some of the new technologies available (3D/4D scanning, mobile technologies, GPS/GIS, satellite technologies, apps and social media) & discuss their applications;
- to debate policy issues linked to the benefits and challenges these new technologies present for sites preservation, conservation, and interpretation worldwide;
- and to encourage site managers worldwide - particularly within the UNESCO World Heritage Sites Network - to consider the benefits & impact the new technologies could have for their own sites and allow them to investigate those further.
The conference will maximise opportunities for collaboration and knowledge-sharing between sites, where a balance needs to be found between enabling remote-access and encouraging visitation, between attaining sustainability, fostering communities involvement & opportunities, whilst preserving and conserving sites' unique value. Building on the experience gained at World Heritage properties, the Conference aims to create a network (both physical and remote) of interpretation specialists, curators, conservators and custodians facing the challenge of creating remote access to sensitive, hard-to-access or other trans-national sites. It will bring together Sites directors and heritage practitioners- both tangible and intangible- in the UK and abroad, but also policy makers and technological innovators, and will seek to break down conventional sectoral divides between heritage practitioners and technological innovators, in order to debate remote access.

Contact: Isabelle UNY, rawhsc11@gmail.com

~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~

**Bodies and identities**

**Gendering Sculpture in the Greek and Roman World**

8 - 9 December, 2011
Leiden University, The Netherlands

Although gender is by now a well-established field of study within Classical Archaeology, the relationship of gender and the means of its visualizations remains underexplored. There has not yet been a differentiation of the various media and their specific functions, idiosyncrasies and communicative potential in terms of gender differences. Taking its point of departure from several recent publications, which we will discuss together, this workshop aims to reassess questions of gender identity and representation with a particular focus on the role of the medium. In addition we want to explore whether and how the modern and theoretical approaches of Gender Studies can be combined with the large strand of traditional scholarship that treats sculpture as a prime medium of representation (for mortal and immortal beings) - and as the prime example of artistic production. Thinking of both together shall challenge and strengthen our methodological toolset.

The seminar is open to Ph.D. researchers and graduate students either interested in or already working on projects that are related to the workshop’s theme. In addition, participants will be required to give a presentation and to discuss it in the seminar. Possible research questions can deal with gender issues (men, women, children, families, animals etc.) in portrait or figurative representation, or with the role of gender in producing or in commissioning sculpture, but they might also include other topics such as historiography of scholarship (Forschungsgeschichte).

For information on organization matters: please contact Gerrie van Rooijen by-email g.k.van.rooijen@umail.leidenuniv.nl

~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~

**TAG 2011**

14-16 December 2011
CentralTAG, Birmingham, UK
Organiser: Institute of archaeology and Antiquity, University of Birmingham

All information about CentralTAG are available at [http://centraltag.wordpress.com](http://centraltag.wordpress.com)
GlobalPottery
1st International Congress on Historical Archaeology and Archaeometry for Societies in Contact

25 - 27 January 2012
Universitat de Barcelona, Catalonia, Spain
http://globalpottery.ub.edu/

The aim of GlobalPottery is to provide scholars with a specialized international forum that deals with Historical Archaeology ceramic studies, primarily including the so-called topics of Post-Medieval Archaeology and Later Historical Archaeology or Industrial Archaeology. It is also the aim of GlobalPottery to promote the studies on societies in contact, bearing in mind that the colonization of America and the first World circumnavigation must be considered the beginning of the present Global World.

~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~


9-13 April 2012
Menorca, Balearic Islands, Spain
Organiser: Complutense University of Madrid
http://www.congresopatrimoniomundialmenorca.cime.es

The conference aims to generate a meeting point on archaeology management and treatment of World Heritage sites. It will focus on archaeology, keeping in mind that it needs to consider not only the sites, which have been inscribed as World Heritage due to its archaeological nature, but also any site, property or group of material properties, inscribed as World Heritage, which can be studied using an archaeological methodology.

Research works from a global perspective on these sites, beside the ones commissioned by UNESCO, are still scarce but necessary. In the Department of Prehistory at the Complutense University of Madrid, a research project is being developed on Archaeology and World Heritage (http://www.parquecipamu.es), which involves people from several research institutes, universities and administrations. This project has raised the need to put in common and share different initiatives and experiences that have been carried out in this Heritage context, to improve the treatment given to these exceptional cultural properties.

The celebration of this Conference and the impact that it will have in the scientific world will certainly benefit the nomination initiated by Menorca, as a candidate to become World Heritage, with the importance of its exceptional archaeological sites.

We encourage all those interested in the world of the archaeological management to participate, as there will be space not only for Archaeology as a science, but also for insights from other disciplines.
Approaching Monumentality in the Archaeological Record

12 - 13 May 2012  
State University of New York at Buffalo, USA  
www.iema.buffalo.edu/conference/

Institute for European and Mediterranean Archaeology (IEMA) at The University at Buffalo, State University of New York, will be hosting its fourth annual international visiting scholar conference on contemporary theoretical issues in European and Mediterranean archaeology.

The building of sculpted monuments and monumental architecture seems to be a universal human trait at all levels of social complexity and in all parts of the world, from the grand pyramids of ancient Egypt to the modest inuksuit cairns of the Inuit. Unfortunately, the words “monumental” and “monumentality” as used by scholars have different meaning and intent in nearly every work in which they appear.

This symposium seeks to clarify what we mean by “monumentality," but more than that, to understand the social and political significance of monumentality as it was manifested in various ways around the world. Approaching Monumentality brings together archaeologists, art historians, architects, and sociologists, whose areas of expertise span from the Neolithic to the Early Modern periods, and from Europe and the Mediterranean basin to the New World. In this way we will be able to explore monumentality both as a general human phenomenon as well as in its rich and varied particular social contexts.

~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~

Early Farmers: The view from Archaeology and Science

14 - 16 May 2012  
Cardiff University, Wales, UK  
Organiser: Department of Archaeology and Conservation, Cardiff University  
http://www.cardiff.ac.uk/share/newsandevents/events/archaeology/early-farmers-the-view-from-arch-and-science.html

Scientific and interpretative archaeology often speak to very different audiences despite shared interests in themes such as landscape, climate, subsistence, social structure and cultural identity. This conference challenges different disciplinary paths to find ways of talking to each other, taking the European Neolithic as its focal point. Contributors will cover a broad range of innovative approaches across different subjects, from archaeological theory to ancient DNA, bringing together vital new research that has forced the reconsideration of long held assumptions about the Mesolithic-Neolithic transition, the social organisation of the earliest farmers and individual biographies of past persons.

Please contact Dr. Penny Bickle (bicklepf@cf.ac.uk) if you have any questions or would like to present a poster at the conference.

~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~

Buffalo TAG 2012: Bridges to New Worlds

17 - 20 May 2012  
State University of New York at Buffalo, USA  
http://www.cas.buffalo.edu/tag2012/
Buffalo TAG 2012 is the fifth meeting of TAG-USA, an organization dedicated to the exploration and debating the implications of theoretical issues for archaeological practice and interpretation, worldwide. We welcome the submission of papers from faculty and students alike and aim to foster a lively environment for the discussion of theory within the field of archaeology, classical archaeology, visual studies/art history, and cultural heritage. Our theme “Bridges to New Worlds” emphasizes both the multidisciplinary and international focus of this conference. The conference will feature an opening panel on the “Past and Future of Theory” on Thursday, May 17 and an invited interdisciplinary symposium on “The Future of Heritage: Laws, Ethics and Sustainability” on Friday, May 18. Details of both the panel and symposium will be posted shortly on the website.

If you have any further questions, please contact our Buffalo TAG 2012 secretary Eugen Ruzi (eugenruz@buffalo.edu).

~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~

Association of Critical Heritage Studies Inaugural Conference

5-8 June 2012
Organiser: University of Gothenburg, Sweden

The theme of the conference is ‘The Re/theorisation of Heritage Studies’. This conference will develop current theoretical debates to make sense of the nature and meaning of heritage. As such, we invite submissions from people working within the ‘broad church’ of the current flowering of contemporary heritage studies. Papers should encourage cross-cutting thinking and should not be afraid to try to theorise what critical heritage studies is and where it should go. They should be underpinned by an active move away from site- and artefact-based definitions of heritage in a traditional sense and should pursue instead a range of methodologies and questions aiming at interdisciplinarity stemming from social science scholarly traditions, the natural sciences, and also creative sciences such as art and the performing arts.

The Association of Critical Heritage Studies, to be launched at this conference, will establish (in association with the International Journal of Heritage Studies) an extensive network of heritage scholars across the globe in order to debate and discuss cutting-edge research in the field of heritage studies.

Submissions are encouraged for sessions, workshops, panel discussions and performances, as well as individual papers (20 minute duration):
- the deadline for abstracts on sessions, workshops and panel discussions is 30 November 2011.
- the deadline for individual papers or performances is 31 December 2011.
- selected papers and/or sessions will be published in IJHS.
Abstracts should be addressed to Bosse Lagerqvist (Conference Organisation Committee) and either emailed, faxed or posted to: bosse.lagerqvist@conservation.gu.se
Cultural Mobility in Bronze Age Europe

5-9 June 2012
Department of Archaeology, Aarhus University, Denmark

During the Bronze Age societies became linked in new ways while at the same time regional traditions were formed. Intense and dynamic relations between local and large-scale processes of change coincided with increased mobility in different domains and forms. An influential factor in these processes was the exploration of spatial restricted metallurgical sources of copper, tin and gold, and the connected trade mechanisms that enabled bronze objects and associated technologies and ideas to become widespread across Europe.

The aim of the conference is to nuance these propositions by debating new results in the broader field of Bronze Age mobility and to identify the agenda for future scholarly inquiries.

The conference is marking the end of the FP7 Marie Curie Initial Training Network Forging Identities http://www.forging-identities.com – and is organized in co-operation with the 12th Nordic Bronze Age Symposium.

Please contact farkbr@hum.au.dk to obtain more details.

~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~

Landscape Archaeology Conference (LAC) 2012

6 - 9 June 2012
Science & Conference Center, Freie Universität, Berlin
http://www.geo.fu-berlin.de/geog/fachrichtungen/physgeog/lac2012/

Standing in the tradition of the 1st Landscape Archaeology Conference held in Amsterdam in 2010, LAC2012 will provide a platform for archaeologists, geographers and researchers from neighbouring disciplines to present and discuss results in the broad field of geo- and landscape archaeology.

~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~

Edomites-Nabataeans' Conference

25-27 July 2012
University of Oxford, UK
http://www.aramsociety.org/conferences.htm

ARAM Society for Syro-Mesopotamian Studies is organizing its Thirty Three International Conference on the theme of the Edomites (Idumeans) and the Nabataeans. The conference aims to study Edom and the Edomites and Idumea and Idumeans and their relationship to the Nabataeans

Each speaker’s paper is limited to 30 minutes, with an additional 10 minutes for discussion. All papers given at the conference will be considered for publication in a future edition of the ARAM Periodical, subject to editorial review.

If you wish to participate in the conference, please contact aram@orinst.ox.ac.uk
14th International Conference of the European Association of Southeast Asian Archaeologists (EurASEAA)

18 - 21 September 2012
Dublin Castle, Chester Beatty Library, Dublin, Ireland
Organiser: University College Dublin School of Archaeology

The conference brings together archaeologists, art historians and philologists who share a common interest in Southeast Asia’s past from prehistoric to historic periods. Its aim is to facilitate communication between different disciplines, to present current work in the field, and to stimulate future research.

Papers and sessions are invited on any topic or theme related to Southeast Asian archaeology. Papers on South Asia and Southern East Asia which are important for issues of long-distance contact and regional modelling will be considered if they relate closely to Southeast Asian themes. As 2012 is also the year that Dublin is European City of Science, the organisers have proposed one special theme on 'Science, Archaeology and Heritage in Southeast Asia', for which we also welcome proposals.

There is no over-arching theme for EurASEAA 14, and proposals are welcome on any theme of interest to Southeast Asian archaeology. However, in light of 2012 also being the year that Dublin is the European City of Science, one special theme has been proposed by the organisers to guide some of the sessions: Science, Archaeology and Heritage in Southeast Asia.

For all queries and further information please contact euraseaa14@ucd.ie

For updates to conference information, please check back soon, join the mailing list at euraseaa14@ucd.ie, or join the Facebook Group Page or the Facebook Event Page.

Gardening Time

21 - 23 September 2012
McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research and Magdalene College, Cambridge, UK
http://www.arch.cam.ac.uk/iron_age/2012/index.html

Gardening Time is a conference that aims to bring together researchers from Scotland and Sardinia, Northern and Mediterranean Europe and beyond, in a first step towards a continent wide archaeology of Later European prehistory (and more specifically the Iron Age), focusing on the issue of memory. Gardening may seem worlds away from nuraghi and brochs, but tending a garden is a long process involving patience, accretion and memory. Scholars argue that memories are also cultured, developed and regained. The monuments in Scotland and Sardinia are both testament to the importance of memory and its role in maintaining social relations.

The conference builds on the concept of the successful conference, Fingerprinting the Iron Age, in the same venue held in September 2011, which focused on another region, the Balkans, and another theme, Identity. In the same spirit, this conference aims to take a theme, memory, and two unconnected regions, where the material form of monuments in the broadest sense is prominent. Both conferences also share the purpose of establishing a
dialogue between scholars of different backgrounds, by exploring theoretical dimensions beyond mere material (including architectural) forms.

Titles and Abstracts should be sent to the following address: Dr. Isabelle Vella Gregory iv219@cam.ac.uk

~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~

Fokus Fortifikation
Conference on the Research of Fortifications in Antiquity

6 - 9 December 2012
Danish Institute at Athens, Greece
www.fokusfortifikation.de

The International Research Network Fokus Fortifikation (Deutches Archäologisches Institut/Freie Universität Berlin, TOPOI/funded by Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft) has in a three years period of innovative work discussed several research-topics on and around fortifications in Antiquity. The Network now aims to present and debate its preliminary results in the context of a major international conference. Rather than merely focus on the role fortifications played as utilitarian military architecture, a major objective of the conference is to highlight fortifications as consciously structured elements within the built space of ancient societies. Fortifications served functions on various levels which are reflected in their individual configuration and form, and which are connected directly to their actual historical and political contexts. In addition, fortifications are embedded in regional contexts of various extension and are thus always to be understood as products of specific practical conditions such as the available resources in the local natural environment, financing, as well as the technical knowhow of the allocated workforce.

The Network happily invites archaeologists, architectural historians, historians and other specialists working on ancient fortifications to send proposals for talks that present new research in the topical framework set out above, be it based on archaeological, written, or other types of source material. Although the Network has its main focus on ancient Greek fortifications in the eastern Mediterranean, researchers working on fortifications of all ancient cultures of the ancient Mediterranean and Asia Minor are encouraged to send proposals.

The following sessions are planned:
1. Origins of Fortifications in the Eastern Mediterranean
2. Physical Surroundings and Technique: The Building Experience
3. Function and Semantics
4. Historical Context
5. The Fortification of Regions
6. Regionally Confined Phenomena

Abstracts must be submitted to Sine Riisager (riisager@diathens.com) in the Danish Institute no later than 31 December 2011.
ShowRoom

Where archaeology is made

Office of Kristian Kristiansen, Göteborg