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Dear EAA members, dear European Archaeologists, of course you would expect The European Archaeologist to be as European as possible. However, this issue of TEA is so European that it surprises even me. The Debate section in particular sees poignant statements that reveal a deep concern with Europe and its archaeology. Martin Rundkvist bluntly states: ‘The thinking habits of North-western and Eastern European archaeologists are very different’. Is this true, despite the fact that the EAA for almost twenty years provides a forum for exchanging new data and communicating existing paradigms, and that also a number of conferences have debated ‘Archaeologies East – Archaeologies West’? Rundkvist claims that much of archaeology in Eastern Europe is following the essentialist paradigm many ‘Westerners’ have abandoned due to the critical post-processual or generally theoretical debates. Is there a new East-West split in archaeological thought?

The Conference Report on a meeting in Russia that brought together young archaeologists from Eastern Europe may add fuel to the fire. It claims the unity of the former Soviet states, now loosely connected in the ‘Commonwealth of Independent States’ (CIS), and the author Vlasta E. Rodinkova expresses the wish that such a conference should ‘form a common scientific and partly ideological field’ for young CIS archaeologists. Obviously there is more than one European archaeology, and we should be aware of different traditions and trends, beyond the Western critical approaches.

Also Felipe Criado-Boado in his Debate paper emphasises this way of critical thinking. He reminds us that the critical debates that we, i.e. Western archaeology, intensified in the last two or three decades enable us to be more self-aware and reflexive than traditional archaeology was: archaeology ‘has never had the ability to be so transparent, or to be so un-naïve’ as it has today, he says. And he reminds us that archaeology has started to play new, non-nationalist roles: ‘from the 1990s onwards it became part of a project for a new Europe conceived as a hyper-nation. At the same time, it was part of a cultural critique to open the way for emancipatory demands, including the construction of a post-nationalist Europe’. However, Criado-Boado sees a pressing need to reconsider the construction of Europe and archaeology’s role due to the heavy crisis, which is not only a financial crisis.

Another conference, one dealing with two very particular types of monuments, is also able to reveal different attitudes towards ‘Europe’. While Sardinian Nuraghi and Scottish Brochs are juxtaposed in Brian Smith’s Conference Report, it becomes clear that we can compare different European regions and histories without writing a ‘Europeanist’ history that deems apparently similar phenomena such as Metal Age stone buildings as an example of ‘European’ ‘unity in diversity.’ Rather, the conference obviously is an example how to write histories of Europe (rather than European history) through diversity. However, even the concept of diversity is not an easy solution. Would we include the Ottoman Empire as a component of ‘Medieval Europe’, or would we consider the Balkans to be beyond ‘Europe’? These are questions posed and discussed during a session at this year’s EAA meeting in Helsinki – see the Session Report by Søren Sindbæk and Sam Nixon.

Other topics that re-emerge every now and then are metal-detecting and how to turn it into a somehow useful practice as well as the engagement with voluntary and hobbyist uses of heritage (Suzie Thomas’ conference report), publishing in archaeology (Report by Emese Sarkadi Nagy, Debate paper by C. Stephen Briggs, and Session Report by Robin Skeates and Estella Weiss-Krejci). And this issue contains a remarkable number of Session Reports and Announcements concerned with our heritage under water (s. Riikka Alvik and Elena Pranckenaite; Björn Nilsson; SPLASHCOS conference announcement).

Finally, let me remind you that the 2013 EAA Meeting will take place from 4 – 8 September in Pilsen. The deadline for session proposals is 15 November! The Deadline for articles and announcements for the TEA 39 summer issue is 15 April 2013. Looking forward to hearing from you!

Alexander Gramsch
Reports

The materiality of religious discourse in Late Bronze and Early Iron Age Central Europe: A study of birds on bronzes

Sebastian Niklas Becker, Department of Archaeology, University of Cambridge, UK
(snb27@cam.ac.uk)

As part of the HERA-funded project ‘Creativity and Craft Production in Middle and Late Bronze Age Europe’ (CinBA), my doctoral research focuses on the long-term continuity of bird iconography in Late Bronze and Early Iron Age Central Europe (ca. 1300-450 BC). During both periods, birds are one of the most common figurative motifs. Typically, they are represented as creatures that accompany or guide the sun, suggesting that they may have held an important cosmological status (Fig. 1-2). Scenes that indicate this are particularly common on metalwork, on which my research focuses. Given their widespread distribution and likely religious significance, bird representations have received much attention in the archaeological literature. Previous studies have taken two main directions. On the one hand, there has been the effort to trace their origins within Europe and beyond (e.g. Kossack 1954; Matthäus 1980; Matthäus 1981; Merhart 1952; Sprockhoff 1954). On the other hand, later textual sources have been consulted to gain more detailed insights into their ideological meaning (e.g. Bouzek 2000; Kristiansen 2004; Roes 1941; Sprockhoff 1954). However, little attention has been paid to the material format of bird representations, i.e. to their relationship with metalwork. In taking an object-centred approach, my research addresses the role of objects in mediating and maintaining the ideological significance of bird iconography from the Late Bronze to Early Iron Age. Objects facilitated access to ideological information, and hence need to be considered in conjunction with the iconography they bear.

Since the beginning of 2011, I have therefore worked on a database that comprises all known Late Bronze and Early Iron Age metal objects with bird motifs from Central Europe2. With more than 1000 objects recorded so far, the database has been a crucial resource for my research. In particular, it has allowed me to focus on two analytical scales. The first scale centres on the role of bird iconography within its material environment. How common were objects with bird representations within a particular object class? How did the geographical distribution of objects with bird representations compare to that of other objects? In pursuing these questions, one part of my research is thus concerned with the role that objects played in the construction of a social and material context within which bird iconography could operate. The second angle of my research focuses more closely on the relationship between motifs and the design of metal objects. How a motif relates to an object has implications for its capacity to mediate ideological information. The degree of its visibility and relationship to the function as well as the morphology of an object are variables that have been incorporated into the construction of the database.

Whilst work is still ongoing, this object-centred approach has already produced some interesting results concerning the long-term continuity of bird iconography from the Late Bronze to Early Iron Age, which are summarized here.

Contextual changes
During the Urnfield Period (Bz D - Ha B2/3, ca. 1300-750 BC), solid-hilted swords (Dreiwulst- and Schalenknaufscherwerter) constitute the main category of objects on which bird motifs occur (Fig. 1). A shift can be noted at the beginning of the Early Iron Age/Hallstatt Period (ca. 1300-450 BC). The aim is to make this database available online after the conclusion of the project. It comprises material from the following countries/regions: southern Germany, Austria, Switzerland, northern Italy, the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Hungary, and former Yugoslavia.

1 Humanities in the European Research Area.
2 The aim is to make this database available online after the conclusion of the project. It comprises material from the following countries/regions: southern Germany, Austria, Switzerland, northern Italy, the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Hungary, and former Yugoslavia.
750 BC), when bird motifs are mainly associated with vessels, whilst weapons appear to play a comparatively marginal role. This suggests a recontextualization of bird iconography through the choice of objects: from swords, objects associated with inter-personal violence, to vessels, objects that facilitated the formation and maintenance of communal identities through feasting.

**Fig. 1: Veľká, city of Poprad, Slovakia. Solid-hilted sword with three raised ridges on its handle (Dreiwulstschwert). The hilt of the sword, dating to Ha A1, features a bird-boat with associated solar motif (Prehistoric Department, Natural History Museum, Vienna, Inv. no. 18017). Scale: 1:2.**

**Object temporalities**
The first occurrence of bird iconography within an object class tends to be associated with the establishment of new object types; thus, the first widespread occurrence of bird motifs in the first half of the Urnfield Period (periods Ha A1 - Ha A2, ca. 1200-1050 BC) is associated with the appearance of a new type of sword (*Dreiwulstschwerter*). The initial establishment of bird iconography within metalwork appears to have capitalized on innovative objects within different object classes.

**Limited availability**
Within their wider metalwork environment, objects with bird motifs are generally limited. For instance, during the first half of the Urnfield Period (see above), bird motifs occur on only about one third of all swords. A similar scarcity of objects with bird motifs can be observed for other object categories during the Urnfield Period (e.g. personal ornaments and toiletries). This situation changed at the beginning of the Early Iron Age when more than half of all objects with bird motifs are accounted for by vessels. Amongst the latter, bird motifs were no longer limited, but widespread³.

**Mnemonic design**
During both periods, the relationship between bird representations and metal objects was designed so as to be mnemonically efficient. Objects, in other words, played an important role in recalling the ideological connection between birds and solar/cosmological movement. They achieved this in two ways: two-dimensional scenes depicting birds and solar motifs were usually ‘mapped onto’ the overall morphology of an object, such as the circular outline of a vessel (Fig. 2). Notions of cyclical movement (in relation to the solar cycle) were thus visually referenced in the relationship between object and motif. Additionally, there was a trend to ‘animate’ motifs by placing them onto parts of an object that needed to be touched and/or moved in order to be used. For instance, three-dimensional bird motifs may occur as different types of wagon fittings, objects to which physical movement was intrinsic (Fig 3). Thus, far from providing a mere canvas for bird iconography, objects played an important role in the articulation of its meaning.

³ They appear mainly in the form of bird-head terminations on handles of different types of sheet-bronze vessels.
Overall, the object-centred perspective adopted in this project not only highlights the important role of metalwork in the mediation of ideological information, it also provides new insights into the *modus operandi* of bird iconography within its wider material environment. A theme that stands out and will be explored in the future is the contextual shift from weapons to vessels at the beginning of the Early Iron Age and its impact on the role of bird iconography within its historical context. The results that have been sketched out in this report are the subject of two forthcoming publications (Becker in prep.; Becker in prep. [2013]), and the reader is referred to these for a more detailed discussion. Further information on this project can also be found on my blog, [http://bronzeage-and-ironage-birds.org](http://bronzeage-and-ironage-birds.org).
My research is supported by the CinBA project. Apart from providing financial support, CinBa has allowed me to place my research in a wider empirical and intellectual context. CinBa explores the creativity involved in the production, design and decoration of Middle and Late Bronze Age material culture in three different media: pottery, textiles and metal. It is the project’s reflective exploration of creativity across different materials that inspired the object-centred perspective of my own research, particularly my interest in object-motif relationships. More information on CinBa can be found on http://cinba.net/.

Over the following months, my research will focus on the structure and type of depositional contexts with which bird iconography is associated. One aim is to ascertain whether objects with bird motifs were preferentially deposited in a particular type of context. At the same time, I am going to compare the compositional structure of such contexts at both site-specific and regional scales, in order to identify possible conventions surrounding the deposition of objects with bird motifs. This type of contextual analysis should further our understanding of how objects played an active part in religious discourse.
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Trephination cases from the Early Bulgarian population (Saltovo-Mayaki culture)

Irina Reshetova, Institute of Archaeology of Russian Academy of Sciences
(resentovairina@yandex.ru)

Introduction
Practices of skull trephination are discoverable in different sources: archaeological, ethnographical, pictorial and others. In this paper, I will discuss the evidence of uses of craniotomy at the end of the Early Middle Ages, taking the data on burials of the Saltovo-Mayaki culture as an example. The widely-distributed phenomenon of trepanation can be considered as a cultural body treatment, as well as a surgical procedure. The tradition of trepanation was practiced by Early Bulgarian groups (8th to 9th century) in the middle Don-Donets region.

In the region of the Turkic community's formation – South Siberia, Central Mongolia – evidence for trephination has been found in human skeletal remains occurring in practically all ages of the lifecourse as well as posthumously, and is widely spread in medieval Europe. Evidence for all types of trephinations (surgery, symbolic, post-mortem destroys) is found in the region of the Saltovo-Mayaki culture, even up to the present time.

It is probable that the Turkic (“Bulgarian”) component of the Saltovo-Mayaki culture was one of the main “conductors” of trephination tradition from Asia to Europe during the early Middle Ages.

Therapeutic, symbolic and postmortem trephination
Researchers in different fields of science have found great interest in the traditional ritual aspects of life, especially ways of treatment of the human body. Today, it is difficult to understand the reasons for the modifications of the body practiced in ancient times. In spite of the fact that some of the methods are also practiced today (piercing, tattooing, branding, implantation, scarification), the modern attitude towards such modifications has changed and is now guided mainly by fashion and standards of beauty. Nevertheless, the human body was and remains the focus of modification practices in individual's attempts at self-identification and socialization.

One such bodily practice for which we have evidence is the rite of trephination of the skull. The the work of M. Mednikova, P. Boev, F. Lisowsky, St. Nemeskeri, and A. Marcşilk, among others, has been devoted to the study of this phenomenon. The term “trephination”, in the broadest and most general sense of the word, should be understood as the destruction of a fragment of one or more of the bones of the skull (Антропологический словарь 2003, 282).

A craniotomy may be performed for various purposes, and we may distinguish surgical (therapeutic), symbolic, and postmortem trephination. Therapeutic trephination usually penetrated the skull's inner table and may have been done to improve health status or as a surgical intervention in the aftermath of trauma. Placement on the skull is varied, which may be explained by way of treatment of different diseases. It is impossible to exclude a ritual nature to this type of operation in traditional societies, in which any interference with the integrity of the body had symbolic meanings.

Symbolic trephinations could possibly simulate actual penetration into the cavity of the skull. The term “symbolic trephination” was proposed by L. Bartucs, who described them as “non-penetrating damage”, affecting the upper compact layer (substantia compacta) (cited by Медникова 2001, 246; s.a. Nemeskery et al. 1960). This type of intervention did not necessarily involve a risk to life, as did a penetrating craniotomy. Symbolism was important when performing these surgical actions. This symbolism could result from the localization of damage as, in the most of cases, the location was linked to cranial sutures or important anatomical points of the skull, which are interpreted as having had a sacral meaning (Медникова 2001, 31-32).

There is evidence of repeated symbolic trephinations applied to one individual. Often traces are not random, but are clearly structured, again suggesting their symbolism.
Unlike trephinations of a medical nature, which had the aim of healing various diseases, symbolic trepanations are more varied in purpose, perhaps indicating the status of belonging to a particular social group, or being a part of the rite of initiation. Postmortem trephinations are often linked with mummification. They are usually located on the temporal bones or enlarge the foramen magnum of the occipital.

**Materials and method**

I would now like to present three cases of trephination from the Saltovo-Mayaki burial grounds – one from Lyisogorovka cemetery (excavated by K.I. Krasilnikov), and two from Zheltoe cemetery (excavated by K.I. Krasilnikov and M.L. Shvetsov).

In investigation of the human skeletal remains from these cemeteries, sex and age determination, as well as anthropometric data and palaeopathological data were collected following Ubelaker (1989), and Алексеев and Дебец (1964).

**Lyisogorovka cemetery**

Burial no. 9 (Fig. 1) is that of a male, aged between 29 and 34 years old, with an incomplete skull. On the skull, of which only the calvarium is preserved, two cases of trepanation (one symbolic and one post-traumatic) were recorded. The first trephination is round, measures 19 mm x 23.5 mm, and is located in the middle of the right parietal bone, 14 mm from the sagittal suture. The edge of the perforation is partially obliterated, practically through the skull save the lower layer of the inner table. The perforation is associated with a fracture. At the inferior edge of the hole is trace of cracking. At the endocranial surface of the perforation, the compact bone plate is separated by traumatic damage. This case is controversial, because it is not clear trephination, and the perforation could be the result of fracture. However, bone fragments are generally recovered where there is evidence of trephining as post-traumatic surgery. If in the Lyisogorovka case trephination has been completed, the fragment of the bone was removed.

The second perforation was localized on the lambdoidal suture, 26 mm left of the sagittal suture. The dimensions are 15 mm x 15 mm, in a circular shape. It is a symbolic trephination (Fig. 2).
To characterize the state of health of the individual from burial no. 9 would be difficult in view of the presence of only the isolated skull. No other pathological conditions were observed in this skull. The tomb did not contain burial goods (Красильников and Красильникова 2005, 191), and therefore we cannot use the trephinations as a marker of the social status of the individual.

**Zheltoe cemetery, burial no. 15**

This burial is that of a male, aged between 25 to 30 years. There is an oval-shaped trephination (measuring 23 to 24 mm in diameter) in the left parietal bone, 9 mm from the coronal suture and 40 mm from the sagittal suture (Fig. 3). Probably, the reason for the trepanation could be a skull fracture. The crack departing from the place of damage and the hole with irregular shape are located on the site of the subsequent trephination (Fig. 3).
The procedure of trephination was not finished, however. Trephination has been executed by cutting (not drilling or scraping) with the use of a template. The lines of cutting are intermittent. There is no evidence of healing or inflammation. The death of the individual mid-procedure could be the reason why the trepanation was not finished. According to Krasilnikov and Ruzhenko (1981, 287) this trauma was the reason of the surgical intervention, due to the lack of damage to the bones of postcranial skeleton.

During excavation, objects were discovered in grave no. 3 (the so-called “burial of the surgeon”), which have been interpreted by archaeologists as tools for conducting operations. These objects included a silver template, and two knives, different from domestic knives due to variation in the shape of the blade (Fig. 4). The discovery of the template gives an insight into the probable methods used in surgical trepanations and the possibility of fitting the instrument to the trephination in the male from burial no. 15 (Красильников and Руженко 1981, 287). The size and shape of the silver artifact and the trephination in burial no. 15 are completely congruent (Fig. 5). Therefore, it is likely that the silver template was used as the tool for the surgical procedure on the individual in burial no. 15. The skull from the “surgeon’s” grave has no traces of trephination.

Such surgical interventions not only provide evidence for possible surgical techniques, but also serve as a vivid example of the high level of development of medieval society and knowledge transmission at various levels, in view of the fact that the custom of trepanation was widely known, with evidence of the practice found around the world.

The example described here is interesting in that it is rare to be able to reconstruct the ancient surgical process. Such reconstruction becomes possible with the discovery of...
surgical instruments – the silver template, in this case. Nevertheless, the question of whether the template was made specifically as "medical equipment" or had a different original purpose but became a piece of surgical equipment by chance, remains open. This case provides evidence of conceptions of trephination for healing purposes for medieval society.

Zheltoe cemetery, burial no. 28
On the skull of a 25 to 30 year old female is an irregularly rounded 45 mm x 65 mm perforation, located on the right temporal bone (Fig. 6). According to the excavators, craniotomy was performed in the same way as in burial no. 15, i.e. by using the template. Traces of healing are not detected; it is possible that the individual’s death occurred a short time after surgery. On the other hand we might assume a ritual nature of this procedure. However, the first reason seems to be the most likely.

![Fig. 6: Zheltoe cemetery, burial no. 28. The skull of an adult female with a trephination hole on the right temporal bone. The straight, vertical edge of the hole indicates the possibility that a template was used, as in the case of burial no. 15.](image)

Discussion
There have been 13 reported cases of trepanation of the skull among the cemeteries of the Saltovo-Mayaki culture: nine cases in pit burials, three in catacomb graves, one in a kurgan (tumulus) with furrows. Thus, the practice can be found in skeletons in all types of burials with a significant occurrence in pit tombs.

The trepanation of the skull was widely practiced on the territory controlled by Khazar Khanate, and was not restricted to any particular ethnicity, as it was recorded in the monuments of different cultures and ethnicities, including the “Alans”, the “Early Bulgars”, the Volga Bulgars, and the Khazars.

Researchers suggest that symbolic trepanation was widespread in the Early Middle Ages, despite the fact that this custom was practiced also in other phases of the development of cultural and ethnic groups (Медникова 2001, 2003, 2004). In the literature, there is a view that craniotomy in the Migration Period and the Early Middle ages had a Turkic origin, and that this tradition was handed down and adopted due to the migration of Turks in a western direction.

Szathmáry and Marcsik, exploring trephinations in the territory of the Great Hungarian Plain, demonstrated that trephined skulls were found in the burials with richer grave goods. It was also noted that cranio logical diversity of individuals with trephinations was statistically wider than diversity of the group without trephinations. The authors suggest that this evidence provides support for the formation of the military elite at the expense of the Turkic ethnic component (Szathmáry and Marcsik 2006, 129-130).

A wide geographic range of the cultural, ritual, and practical applications of craniotomy may be associated with the Turkic component participating in the Great Migration of peoples. In Hungary, this tradition began to disappear with the strengthening of Christianity; indeed, many researchers have noted this phenomenon (Медникова 2001, 245).
There is a high frequency of occurrence of symbolic trephinations in pit burials, in particular, in the materials of the Don area. Many researchers of the Saltovo-Mayaki culture have associated the pit type of burial with individuals of Bulgarian ethnicity. Hence, this method of burial could have Turkic roots (Красильников 1981, 2005).

Summary
The widespread emergence of such phenomena testifies to the dissemination of general knowledge, the continuity of traditions and cross-cultural communication. The three individuals from the Zheltoe and Lyisogorovka cemeteries considered here showed different types of trephinations: surgical, symbolic and post-mortem modification. The symbolic trephination type was widespread in the Early Middle Ages.

There is an opinion that craniotomy in the Great Migration era and the Early Middle Ages had Turkic origins and that this tradition was handed down and adopted due to the stream of Turks migrating in a western direction. Trephination data from the pit burials of the Saltovo-Mayaki culture are consistent with this hypothesis. We can assume that the Turkic (“Bulgarian”) component of the Saltovo-Mayaki culture was one of the main “conductors” of the tradition of trephination from Asia to Europe during this epoch.

In terms of the social status of trephined people, it is possible to agree with Szathmáry and Marcşik about the formation of the military elite of Turkic tribes, which invaded Europe in the end of the 9th to 10th century. However, in most trephination cases from the Don region, interpretation of social status is problematic for various reasons: the absence of accompanying grave goods, fragmentation of the skeletal material, and looting. It is clear that these people were allocated a special group. But formulation of clear, concrete hypotheses on their position in medieval society would be premature at this moment.
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Notes from a Bronze Age tell: Százhalombatta-Földvár, Hungary

Joanna Sofaer, Dept. of Archaeology, University of Southampton, UK (J.R.Sofaer-Derevenski@soton.ac.uk), Marie Louise Stig Sørensen, Dept. of Archaeology, University of Cambridge, UK (mlss@cam.ac.uk) and Magdolna Vicze, Matrica Museum, Százhalombatta, Hungary (vicze@mail.battanet.hu)

Whereas in the early 20th century Bronze Age tell excavations were common and their results part of mainstream archaeological thinking, such excavations are now so rare that most don’t hear about them until they are finally published. As we sit here writing in the heat of the Hungarian summer, midway through our annual excavation season, we recognise the responsibility to share some thoughts about the importance of this kind of site.

We have been working now on the Százhalombatta-Földvár tell for twelve years, and every season we have surprises and learn new things that add to our ability to understand the nature of the site and the life which was going on within it. This year, after many years of a clear sequence of houses being built one-upon-the-other, our houses seem to have disappeared and in their place there are thick cultural layers with clusters of bones (including the articulated remains of nearly half a cow), pottery dumps, large heaps of ash, and pits. We are excited to see this change because it may mark a shift in the organization of the tell; this may merely be a shift in how quickly the single houses were built over or it may represent a substantial reorganization of the settlement layout. In addition to the approximately 2.5 metres already excavated we know from coring that there are another 3-4 metres of cultural deposits before we reach natural. The change in the layout could therefore mark a significant point in the tell’s history; it will be interesting to see how substantially the spatial layout was affected. At the same time, the first indicators of a shift in pottery types have been noted.
suggesting that we are now finally leaving the Koszider level (Hungarian Late Middle Bronze Age), which had a much deeper stratigraphy than we expected. As in previous years we continue the systematic sampling for archaeobotanical remains and small finds along with micromorphological samples, which are used to supplement the rich ceramic and fauna data in addition to a range of other finds, such as loom weights, spindle whorls, moulds, metal fragments, and worked bone tools. There is also an enormous amount of daub, unburned wood, and charcoal including charred grains, acorns, peas, apples, and various thatching and matting materials. The complexity of the use of clay, apart from for pottery and house-building, continues to surprise us. This year, for example, we found several partly burnt clay ‘legs’ from an unusually large grated oven re-deposited in a pit. In previous years we have found several examples of house ‘furniture’ made of clay, including storage vessels, boxes, and vessels built into the floor. Likewise, a surprising array of construction techniques has been used to build the walls, and porch structures using beams and clay have been found. In addition, evidence of room divisions, including a well-prepared step leading to a backroom, that presumably functioned as a storage area, were found in some of the houses excavated in earlier years – the last remnants of these were removed at the beginning of this season.

The richness and complexity of the site, even based on the limited excavation area of 20 x 20 m, means it can contribute in significant ways to current understanding of Bronze Age communities in temperate Europe. Although the excavation is ongoing, we shall therefore soon begin publication of the first levels of the site. But that is to come – this merely was a note from the field!

A number of site reports and preliminary publications is already available (s. references below). For more information visit our website: www.szazhalombattaexcavation.info.
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EthnosalRo:
An ethnoarchaeological project on Romanian salt

Marius Alexianu, Alexandru Ioan Cuza University of Iaşi, Romania, Arheoinvest Research Platform (alexianumarius@yahoo.com), Olivier Weller, CNRS-UMR 8215 ‘Trajectoires’, Maison de l’Archéologie et de l’Ethnologie, Nanterre (olivier.weller@mae.cnrs.fr), Robin Brigand, Alexandru Ioan Cuza University of Iaşi, Romania, Arheoinvest Research Platform

The sub-Carpathian area of eastern Romania, characterized by a high density of salt springs (over 200 that we know of so far), holds the record for the highest number of ancient traces of salt exploitation in Europe, beginning with the Starčevo-Criş culture (Weller and Dumitroaia 2005). The most distinctive aspect that clearly sets apart and distinguishes the entire extra-Carpathian areas of Romania from similar regions of Europe (and perhaps worldwide) where diachronic methods of salt water spring exploitation have been attested, is the continuity of these practices, at an astonishing intensity, and up to the present day (fig. 1), irrespective of any sort of mechanization, economic organization or legal regulation – hence in conditions that are similar to those of pre-industrial societies.

This situation, which is unique in Europe, constitutes the ideal framework for carrying out complex ethnoarchaeological research with direct-historical analogy (Ascher 1961). We contrast this with the situation most often encountered in current research, namely that of researchers resorting to ethnographic analogies using remote areas unrelated and far from the salt springs, in order to understand the archaeological phenomena related to salt springs, which drastically reduces the adequacy and credibility of the ethnographic analogy (Brown 1980; Ceja Acosta 2011). The salt spring or soil exploitation in Mexico, the Americas, and other places, even though they present very interesting comparative evidence, were not investigated geographically to an extent that allows complex modelling integrating all the data variability. In our case, with c. 250 salt springs distributed on 26,000 km² and more than 170 ethnographical inquiries performed for different aspects (exploitation, use, distribution networks, trade, hunting, halotherapy, social context, ethnoscience, symbolism, etc.) and corroborated with other kinds of data (such as the chemical composition of salt water, distribution and density of population, the road network, etc.), we can interpret and model this data in all of their dimensions, and propose a solid and unique referential data set for the understanding of traditional salt exploitation, which today is actually extinct in Europe.

In 1992, a first Romanian study (Alexianu et al. 1992) caught the attention of one of us, Olivier Weller. Olivier has extensive experience in New Guinea (Indonesia) (Pétrequin et al. 2001), and obtained several successive grants, since 2003, in order to carry out ethnoarchaeological investigations in the salt springs areas. The research gained momentum between 2007 and 2010, when intensive investigations were carried out under the Romanian CNCSIS Idei no. 167/2007 project entitled The salt springs of Moldavia: the ethnoarchaeology of a polyvalent natural resource (Alexianu and Weller 2009) (fig. 2).

Fig.1: Brine supplying at the Poiana Slatinei salt spring (Lunca, Neamţ County). Photo: O.W.
The ethnoarchaeological approach of the Romanian-French team used so far underlined the huge epistemic potential of this area on a global level. In order to inform a Neolithic situation (as well as later periods), despite the succession of different archaeological cultures around the salt springs, the present-day situation extends the archaeological working hypothesis around traditional brine supply methods and their intensity, uses of salt, trade and distribution of networks. This is also documented by medieval and early modern written sources that cover half of the last millennium (Vitcu 1987, 112; Townson 1797, 395). Thus, our approach consists of an application of current models to prehistoric archaeological contexts, testing the continuity in eastern Romania of economic patterns and social contexts generated by the existence of the salt springs.

A significant impediment in the ethnoarchaeological research was the lack of ethnographic studies related to the phenomenon of exploiting brine from salt springs. As we already know, ethnographers do not deal with the same issues as archaeologists; as a consequence, most of the situations that could be interesting for archaeology are never recorded. Because of this, an original ethnographic questionnaire related to the subject of salt springs exploitation from an archaeological perspective was developed. By successfully testing this tool on the whole eastern sub-Carpathian area of Romania, we developed a complex database that has already enabled the first modelling processes. The results of the spatial analyses provide solid arguments for accepting or rejecting several working hypotheses related to the role of salt springs in prehistory, especially in the Cucuteni-Tripolye cultural complex. Given the fact that almost each day of fieldwork revealed new and often unexpected aspects concerning the exploitation, uses, distribution networks, and social contexts related to salt springs and salt mountains/cliffs, we have extended the ethnoarchaeological research framework to the entire Romanian extra-Carpathian area (s.a. the project webpage: http://ethnosalro.uaic.ro), in order to build a saturated model (Sacks 2010).

![Fig. 2: Study areas in Romania (map: R.B.).](image-url)
We need to continue this type of research, also taking into account the imminent disappearance of the older generations that hold first-hand information regarding non-industrial salt exploitation during the last century. We underline the fact that for the first time in the field of ethnoarcheology, the correlations between the exploitation of salt springs and that of salt mountains/cliffs will be systematically analysed. We thus create the premises for fully substantiating interpretative models that are impossible to achieve anywhere else in Europe. It is obvious that the modelling based on such a consistent database maximizes the credibility of using the ethnographic analogy to understand the various contexts in archaeological time periods. We therefore assume that the different sub-models provided by this project can be used as reference for areas – anywhere in the world – with evidences of salt exploitation in archaeological, but not ethnographic, time periods. We also mention that while there is the tendency to build potentially universal models we have to keep in mind human agency and human decision-making in particular situations.

The ethnographical inquiries included specific archaeological issues. Three kinds of inquiries concerning salt springs, villages, and sheepfolds, were carried with the help of a spatial analyst, who scrutinized the ethnological information in the light of a Geographical Information System (GIS) in order to analyse uses, supply areas, and barter and trade. The creation of these working tools, which proved to be extremely efficient, ensured a systematic character to the ethnoarchaeological field work. This orientation in the ethnographical field survey will be extended to the whole extra-Carpathian region, and, in the future, to the intra-Carpathian area.

The actual project’s main objectives are:
1. to determine the sphere of non-industrial use of salt originating from salt springs and rock salt mountains/cliffs in the historical present (i.e. the last century);
2. to determine the distribution area of non-industrially exploited salt springs and salt mountains/cliffs;
3. to critically apply the ethnographic analogy in order to explain the archaeological situations and phenomena in the extra-Carpathian areas of Romania;
4. to model the distribution network of salt water (spatial information concerning the distribution of salt coming from salt springs and salt mountains);
5. to develop a synthesis on the implications of the project’s results for the ancient economic and social contexts, but also for cultural heritage policy.

Among the specific methods employed for this project, we are using ethnographic inquiries concerning the salt springs and rock salt mountains/cliffs, performed directly at the salt place, at the village or at the sheepfold. Each inquiry deals with: localization of the salt resources, identification of the exploiting localities, transport, uses, frequency, extracting methods, (re)distribution network, trade and barter transactions, gifts, hunting, symbolism, ethno-science, behaviours, toponymy and anthroponomy related to salt. This survey is completed by a geo-referential localization of each salt resource through GPS; a systematic description and chemical analysis of the natural salt; and an archaeological survey in the surrounding areas of the salt spring. In the same way, our databases of salt resources and prehistoric settlements (6000-3500 BC) are used to develop spatial analysis on GIS and statistical measures, notably kernel densities and viewsheds, in order to investigate the relationship between salt exploitation and settlement dynamics from the Neolithic to Chalcolithic (Weller et al. 2011). Generalizing the results for ancient times and today, taking natural and anthropogenic factors into account, different settlement patterns will be proposed.

This ethnoarchaeological project on salt is the first applying systematically ethnographical inquiries, GIS analysis and archaeological surveys. We hope that the resulting data, modelled and interpreted exhaustively, will constitute a solid reference (by capitalizing on a situation that is unique in Europe) for research in any area of the globe where there are archaeological traces of salt exploitation but where there are no more traditional practices of salt exploitation. This project thus will contribute to the field of ‘European ethnoarchaeology’. In this respect, to be a European ethnoarchaeologist refers to the area investigated rather than one’s citizenship.
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Fig. 4: The salt springs from Solca (1), Hangu (3), Poiana Slatinei-Lunca (5), and the rock-salt cliffs from Coza (2), Alghianu–Vrâncioaia (4), all located in the extra-Carpathian areas of Romania. Photo: R.B. (1, 2, 3) and O.W. (4, 5).
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New online publication on Hungarian archaeology

Emese Sarkadi Nagy, Deputy Editor (sarkadie@archaeolingua.hu)

‘Magyar Régészet – Hungarian Archaeology’, a new publication of the Archaeolingua Foundation, is a bilingual electronic journal, published four times a year with the aim of providing information on new advances and major new findings in Hungarian archaeology to the Hungarian and foreign archaeological community, as well as to the broader public interested in archaeology. We will also offer a review of major new research projects, exhibitions and publications around the world that have a bearing on archaeological studies in Hungary. Hungarian archaeology has undergone major transformations during the past decades, a process that is still underway. The development-led archaeological excavations conducted over extensive areas, such as motorways (cf. Bánffy and Gyucha in TEA No. 36), characterizing the past decades seem to be coming to a standstill, also bringing an end to the period of quantitative growth. This is not simply a natural process of change in an academic discipline, but more of a radical, and not necessarily voluntary transformation, which will fundamentally alter this discipline and every dimension of archaeological heritage protection. The general financial crisis, the changes in developers’ attitudes and the increasing pressure from various economic groups have led to a situation in which political decision-makers seem determined to curtail archaeological heritage protection and, parallel to this, to fundamentally reorganize the institutional framework of the museum system and of cultural heritage protection.

One of the main goals of ‘Magyar Régészet – Hungarian Archaeology’ is to build a bridge between Hungarian and world archaeology. The backbone of the electronic journal is made up of scholarly reports on recent research in Hungarian archaeology, of which a new selection will be published quarterly. The other main section of the journal features news on major discoveries made in Hungarian and world archaeology, with an additional focus on new books, exhibitions and other professional events, which will be continuously updated. Our online publication thus hopes to be – in contrast to printed papers – a medium for not only regular academic articles but also up-to-date information on events for both the academic community and the broader public, while conforming to the high academic standards of Hungarian and international archaeological publications. It is our hope that our
The journal will enrich the spectrum of archaeological journals and increase the number of the friends of Hungarian archaeology both in Hungary and around the world.

We decided to publish both a Hungarian and English version of the journal in order to reach as wide an audience as possible. However, there are some differences between the Hungarian and the English versions owing to our target readership. The longer studies will appear in both versions, although with slightly differing texts, with bibliographic references and recommended reading lists adapted to the background knowledge of our readers.

In this spirit, we would like to ask all colleagues to contribute to our publication; we welcome information on upcoming conferences or other interesting archaeological news from all over the world, as well as scientific articles on research projects related to Hungarian archaeology and culture.

The journal’s board feels a certain responsibility for the image that Hungarian archaeology projects in this swiftly changing world, how it exploits the many new potentials of communication and technology, and to what extent it can assert a presence and accomplish its goal of nourishing the curiosity of the broader public, while adhering to the strict principles of academic research and publishing. We will make every effort to ensure that our journal ‘Magyar Régészet – Hungarian Archaeology’ will fulfill its mission to keep readers informed of all relevant developments in this discipline, taking advantage of the digital possibilities.

Visit us at www.hungarianarchaeology.hu!
Cultural heritage works of the Gebze-İzmir Motorway Project in the west of Turkey

Gökhan Mustafaoğlu (gokhan.mustafaoğlu@regio.com.tr) and H. Uğur Dağ (ugur.dag@regio.com.tr), REGIO Cultural Heritage Management Consultancy Co., Sedat Simavi Sok. 17 A / 2 06550 Çankaya - Ankara / TURKEY

Introduction
This document is a report on the fieldwork carried out between Bursa and Balıkesir to identify the exact location of the cultural assets and their dimensions in the construction route and impact zone of the Gebze-Orhangazi-Izmir motorway and the Izmit Bay crossing (‘İzmir Motorway Project’) in the west of Turkey. The project comprises a 377 km 6-lane toll road, including the 3 km Izmit Bay Suspension Bridge, and, in addition, 46 km of approach roads, connecting Gebze in the province of Kocaeli in north-western Turkey with Izmir in the south-west.

Fieldwalking, intensive and extensive survey methods were used during the survey on the Gebze-Bursa section. During the fieldwork, the route incorporating the 200 m wide impact zone was surveyed step by step by the REGIO Archeo-Team and intensive archaeological survey was conducted whenever an archaeological site or artefact scatter was encountered. The intensive survey was also carried out on the areas identified as high potential in the ESIA Report. Photographs of the findings were taken during the field survey. The location of each identified archaeological site was recorded using a GPS device and these sites were marked on a 1:25.000 scale map.

Fig. 1: The Motorway route.

Purpose
Reporting the identification of archaeological assets on the planned route of the Bursa-Balıkesir Section of the project and its impact zone (including access roads, interchanges, service areas, stone quarries, etc.), setting up their dimensions, assessment of the potential
impact of the construction works on these assets and the suggestion of mitigation measures constitute the general aim of this work. National laws and regulations and international standards were followed during the work.

**Scope of work**
The field work on the area, which is a 161.5 km long and 200 m wide corridor of the Bursa-Balıkesir Section of the Motorway Project, started in Savaştepe District of Balıkesir Province on 21 July 2012, and ended in Bursa on 29 July 2012. The area spans Bursa and Balıkesir provinces and Nilüfer, Karacabey, Kemalpaşa, Susurluk, the Central District of Balıkesir and Savaştepe districts.

![Fig.2: Field Walking.](image)

The work was carried out to determine the potential archaeological and cultural assets on the motorway route and its 200 m corridor, including access roads, stone quarries and borrow areas, located outside of the 200 m corridor and localities of the motorway construction sites and all other related ones.

A total of 30 potential archaeological areas were identified as the result of the survey, which was conducted using a field walking method over the above-defined research area. All of these areas have been investigated using an intensive survey method. Areas with unfavourable geographical conditions, flood plains, private properties, agricultural lands, thick-set bushes and forested areas have been studied using an extensive survey method.

**Results of the archaeological work between Bursa and Balıkesir**
The archaeological portion of the work of the Gebze-Orhangazi-Izmir Motorway Project has started at the 104+500 km point of the motorway. This area lies between the borders of Gökçe and Büyükbalıklı villages in Nilüfer district, Bursa province. Bearing in mind the geography and natural resources, the region is highly favourable for settlement. Six archaeological sites (Büyükbalıklı slope settlement, Konaklı slope settlement, Çavuşyeri Sırtı slope settlement, Çavuşyeri finding area, Beşiktepe slope settlement, and Naltepe top mount settlement) have been identified, between 104+500-118+150 km points of the motorway. Four of these sites are slope settlements, one of them is a hilltop settlement and another one is a potential archaeological area. The identified areas are very close to each other, and presence of Roman potsherds and fragmentary roof tiles on the site surfaces have been observed.

The presence of big towns and the related settlement units, such as villas, farm or slope houses, in the southern region of Marmara during the Roman period has been indicated by archaeological research carried out previously. It is known from Roman and Byzantine
written documents that these types of dwellings belonged to some influential persons (high-ranking soldiers, rich citizens, etc.). These settlement units included their own lands on which farming activity was practiced, but the inhabitants paid taxes to the city kingdom to which they were affiliated or to their feudalities. As a result of the accomplished archaeological excavations, it has been found that most of the Roman villas were erected on the terraced slopes. The evidence identified from the above-mentioned six sites located on the route of the motorway and their geographical structure suggests that the sites represent remains of Roman farm houses or villas.

Considering the surface findings and the illegal excavation pits at the Çavuşyeri Sırtı settlement site, near the 111+000 km point of the motorway route, it is possible that the site bears archaeological importance. The Naltepe hilltop settlement, which is situated about 1.5 km north of Taşpınar Köyü, in Karacabey district, Bursa province, is another settlement site identified inside the impact zone of the motorway route, at 118+150 km point. This area is still under use as cultivated land. Plenty of fragmentary roof tiles and building stone blocks have been observed on the site.

The Seyitali slope-flat site is surrounded by Koca and Uluabat watercourses on the north and south, respectively. The site lies in a suitable location, as far as the presence of water sources are concerned. Numerous potsherds and brick fragments have been identified on the surface of the site, which lies on the slopes extending northwards from the plain. It is possible to identify one settlement within the site, dating to the Late Roman or Byzantine period, considering the provisional evaluations of the identified potsherds and other material evidence.

The area named Ceritbaşlı Tavlaları is located between 151+800-152+350 km points. The site, which lies on Karacabey plain, stands at an elevation of 0.5 m higher than its surroundings. Here extensive agricultural activities are in practice. Scattered potsherds have been encountered on the surface of the site. Potsherds of possible Early and Middle Bronze Ages date have been encountered, as well as others of possible Roman and Byzantine date. Previous archaeological surface surveys carried out in the area and the surroundings suggest that the höyük and tumulus settlement types, especially those of early period dates, have been destroyed by natural factors (such as alluvium cover) and, to some greater extent, by agricultural activities.

The site called İncibayırı Sırtı lies on the Susurluk exit of the motorway (near 177+000 km point). Potsherds of daily utility ware, dated to either the Byzantine or Late Roman periods, have been observed sporadically on the sunflower fields in the area. As a result of agricultural activity, it is possible that these potsherds were transferred to this area from another settlement site. On the contrary, it is also possible that these archaeological materials are the remaining traces of a totally disturbed archaeological site that was once standing in this area.
The motorway route starts at about the 170+000 km point in the region of Balıkesir. Together with İncibayırı Sırtı, a total of 20 archaeological areas or areas with cultural character have been identified on the route extending between Susurluk and Savaştepe and inside the construction impact zone. The archaeological history of Balıkesir and its surroundings constitute an important part of the cultural history of Anatolia. Although the region is rich in archaeological and cultural assets, the number of thus-far accomplished research activities is considered to be insufficient.

Çayırlık Mevkii lies at 177+000 km point of the motorway project. The area is used as agricultural fields. The survey has been intensified over a wide area, chosen by taking into consideration the surface materials distributed on the slopes from the mounds standing in higher locations, distributed by either natural factors or as a result of the agricultural activities. In spite of the surface finds, including fragmentary roof tiles and potsherds of utility ware, no architectural evidence has been identified in the area. Again, it is possible that the archaeological surface materials have been transferred to the area as a result of the agricultural activities from another settlement site.

Mountains cover the area after 181+500 km point of the motorway route. The Old Cemetery Field of Söğütçayıri is found at the 183+800 km point, while Karakol village cemetery is located at the 210+400 km point in uneven and forested land. It is possible that the Old Cemetery Field of Söğütçayıri, which stands at a distance of 1 km from the village, was used during the Ottoman period. Karakol cemetery is still in use. Both of the cemeteries stand inside the 200 m impact zone of the motorway route.

A site named Saman Tepe Flat settlement site has been identified at the southern foot of Saman Tepe on the 213+000 km point of the motorway route. In this area, extensive finds include fragmentary roof tile, broken bricks and potsherds of Ottoman date. The provisional evaluation made on the identified pottery and other surface evidence suggests the possibility that a settlement of Ottoman date could be found in this area and nearby surrounds.

The area named Gök Tepe slope settlement lies nearby 218+000 km point of the motorway route, inside the construction zone. Slight höyük formation has been observed in the area. Numerous artefacts, including potsherds, fragmentary roof tiles and bricks have been encountered on the surface. The findings suggest Late Roman-Ottoman features. Two water sources are found immediately near the field used as agricultural land.

As mentioned in the previous sections, not only the motorway route extending between Bursa-Balıkesir, but also stone quarry sites, borrow areas, interchange junctions and similar have been investigated. Of these sites, Küçük Kale Tepe quarry is situated near 233+000 km point of the route, about 1.5 km to the north of Kalaycılar village. Remains of an ancient castle or watch tower have been encountered on the most southerly edge of the rock masses during the survey in Küçük Kale Tepe stone quarry. Remains of architectural walls, roof tiles and stone blocks have been observed on the surface of the mound, which is at 434 m of elevation. The site stands at a very commanding position over the surrounding area, allowing the facility to watch a very wide area, including the Balıkesir-Edremit road.

Important evidence that needs to be considered from an archaeological perspective have been encountered in the area stretching between 203+500-234+200 km points nearby the western Motorway Project exit in Balıkesir. This area is characterized by its flatness when compared with its surroundings. In addition, the agricultural land and water resources necessary for settled life are available. Here, five archaeological sites have been identified along this 4.2 km stretch of the motorway route. These sites are Maltepe Mevkii, Çayar Tepe slope settlement, Karabiyik Çiftliği Mevkii, Karabiyik Çiftliği Drinking Fountain, and Pirinçlikbaşi. Potsherds and fragmentary roof tiles have been found widely scattered on the site named Maltepe Mevkii (230+000 km point), which is located on the western Balıkesir connection road of the motorway.

Numerous potsherds, bricks and building materials have been observed on the surface of Çayar Tepe slope settlement, which lies near the 230+500 km point of the motorway route. Pottery handles, rims, bases and glazed ceramics have been identified among the pottery observed on the surface. Based on the materials found among the surface findings, it is possible that the site was settled during the Late Roman or Ottoman period. It is
recommended that archaeological trial pit excavations be carried out on the site before the construction activities to facilitate the investigation of the site from an archaeological perspective.

Scattered surface materials composed of roof tiles and potsherds have been observed along a 1.3 km stretch of the motorway route, starting from the 237+700 km point. This area has been given the name of Karabıyık Çiftliği Mevkii. Although surface materials have been encountered on a 1.3 km long area, it has been difficult to identify any one core area forming the settlement site. It is possible that the surface materials have been distributed from one or more destroyed archaeological sites neighbouring the area or as a result of agricultural activities. Pirinçlikbaşı is another settlement site identified on the motorway route and its impact zone is inside the borders of Dallımandıra village, administratively connected to Balıkesir province centre. The site lies near the 234+200 km point of the motorway route. Extensive artifact scatters, including potsherds and fragmentary bricks of Byzantine or Ottoman date have been encountered on the surface. Handles, rims, bases and body fragments have been identified among the potsherds.

The surface scatter area named Ertuğrul Köyü Batısı is located near the 238+600 km point of the motorway. Medieval potsherds and fragmentary red brick have been observed on the surface. Although fragmentary red brick has been found on the site surface, no other architectural evidence has been found. It is possible that the materials encountered on the site surface have been brought in as a result of the agricultural activity or as a result of complete destruction of a settlement that was once standing on the site. Taking into account these possibilities, it is recommended that all construction activities intended to be done on the site to be under the supervision of expert archaeological teams.

A building of probable late 19th century date has been identified in Çakmak Mahallesi, Mecidiye village in Savaştepe district, Balıkesir, at the 250+300 km point of the motorway route. This building, which has been called “Çakmak Mahallesi Old Building”, is erected over a terraced platform. The corners and entrance door of the building are built of rectangular sandstone blocks, while the walls are built of irregular stones. The entrance door of Semerdamlı building is vaulted. The general building plan of the structure and ashlers used put the building in a unique position for the architecture of the region. The building is composed of a main room and another two adjoining it.

Fig.4: Ceramics on the surface at Çayır Tepe.
Hasırlı Tepe is located near the 258+500 km point of the motorway route inside the borders of Karacalar village, Savaştepe-Balıkesir. Potsherds and fragments of red brick have been encountered on the area surface. As a result of agricultural activities, it is possible that the scattered potsherds identified on the site surface have been transferred from another settlement site.

The area named Arkbaşı Öreni is found at 262+900 km point of the motorway route at a distance of 1.1 km from Arkbaş Mevkii, 1.5 km to the west of Savaştepe. Remains of one building composed of four rooms with their walls still partially preserved have been encountered in the site area. The roof of the building is not preserved. However, roof tiles are scattered around. The walls are built with irregular stones. Fieldwork has suggested that clay mortar was used between the stone lines. It is possible that the building is a 19th century farm house. It is possible to encounter similar buildings in the village settlements in the environs.

Eğitim Enstitüsü Çiftliği hilltop settlement is the last site identified during the archaeological survey carried out in the second section of the motorway project between Bursa and Balıkesir. The site area lies at about 264+250 km point of the motorway route. Remains of paved stone roads on the foot of the slope have been observed on the site together with foundation building materials, potsherds and roof tiles to the north. The building foundations are built of basalt stone. It has been indicated that a stone quarry from which basalt stones were mined is lying just 50 m to the north of the site. It is possible that this site represents the remains of a farm house or a similar building dating to the 18th or 19th century.

Web sites
http://tayproject.org
http://kve.ulakbim.gov.tr/kve/
Exhibition Report
‘A Journey through Time and the Landscape’. An exhibition. Kolín, Czech Republic

Radka Šumberová, Hana Brzobohatá, Markéta Končelová and Petr Květina (kvetina@arup.cas.cz), Institute of Archaeology CAS, Prague, Czech Republic

A long-term exhibition of finds from the rescue archaeological excavation along the route of the Kolín bypass road opened in Regional Museum of the central Bohemian city of Kolín in September 2012. The exhibition presents the most important finds from the excavation conducted in 2008-2010 by the Institute of Archaeology of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic in Prague. Although the processing of the finds is still in progress, the exhibition presents the preliminary results from this work. The exhibition is accompanied by a comprehensive publication, divided by subject matter and containing information from the main sphere of archaeological issues involved in the subject. The publication likewise includes a printed catalogue of all the artefacts on display (Šumberová et al. 2012).

The Kolín region is one of the busiest centres of archaeological activity in Bohemia and, thanks to the work of regional researchers, is well understood from an archaeological perspective. A detailed investigation of an eight-kilometre stretch of the landscape during the construction of the Kolín city bypass road became a unique opportunity to study, over a relatively large area of land, the history of a territory used by man for many millennia. The Kolín bypass road begins at the edge of the first Elbe River terrace, above a bend in the river to the north. The road then curves away from the river, climbs to a rise, composed of ridges of the Kutná Hora Crystalline Complex, and runs around the west and south edge of the city in a tight bend. The road crosses the bed of several watercourses, both existing and defunct, before returning after eight kilometres to the edge of the first Elbe River terrace (Fig. 1). The construction site, with a total area of 40 ha, was divided into ten excavation zones. All of the zones produced archaeological finds, and nearly 7,000 features were investigated.

Fig. 1: The route of the I/38 bypass road and the zones of the archaeological excavation.
The gathered information speaks of a period of almost eight thousand years that left its mark in the area through which the city bypass road runs. The earliest finds date to the 6th millennium BC, the latest to approximately the 18th century AD. The most significant discoveries were four Neolithic rondel enclosures (Kreisgrabenanlagen), while settlement components from the Early Neolithic, Chalcolithic (Eneolithic), Bronze Age, Iron Age (Hallstatt and La Tène period), Roman period, Migration Period and the Early Medieval period were also represented. The largest investigated cemetery belongs to the Early Bronze Age (Unětice culture, Aunjetitzer Kultur), and single graves from the Neolithic, Eneolithic, Iron Age and Migration Period were also uncovered. Two early medieval cemeteries were likewise investigated.

The excavation along the route of the Kolín bypass road attracted considerable interest, primarily due to the discovery of four Neolithic rondels dating to the first half of the 5th millennium BC, a period that corresponds to a later phase of Stroked Pottery culture (Stichbandkeramik; STK). Discovered at the edge of the Elbe River terrace, directly above the bend in the river to the north, the first Kolín rondel was surprising for its size and the number of ditches (Fig. 2). The outer construction was composed of four concentric ditches, the outermost of which was not completed. The inner rondel ditch reached a depth of 5 m beneath the level of today’s terrain, the other ditches reached approximately 3 m. The maximum outer diameter of the rondel is 213 m, whereas the diameter of the inner part of the rondel (the diameter of the area demarcated by the inner edge of the first ditch) is 147 m; it is reasonable to assume that one or more additional inner palisades existed within this space. Hence, the size of the enclosed area was about 1.6 ha, and the width of the entire system of ditches was more than 60 m. Gates were formed by out-turned projections in the ditches. The number of ditches makes this Kolín rondel a unique Bohemian monument, while its overall diameter ranks the earthwork among the largest rondels in Europe. Located in close proximity to the first rondel, the second enclosure was significantly smaller and had a simpler construction. The situation was the same with the second pair of rondels discovered 4 km away. Although the first radiocarbon dating suggests that the demise of the rondels began as early as 4900-4800 BC, the mutual relationship between the rondels and their ties to settlement features have not yet been clearly defined. In addition to extensive photographic documentation of the course of the rondel excavations and the finds from the fill of the ditches, the exhibition also includes a 3D reconstruction of the original appearance of these formations and their placement in the landscape.

Some of the investigated graves are on display in the exhibition hall, the most interesting of which features the skeleton of a young girl from the Neolithic, laid to rest in a position that was unusual for this location and period. Wearing ornaments made of sea and river shells,
the girl was buried in a stretched position with her arms folded in front of her face (Fig. 3). Traces of an injury without signs of healing were apparent on the parietal bone (Fig. 4). If it resulted in intracranial bleeding, this injury could have been the cause of her death. The girl was buried in close proximity to a ditch of the large rondel in the period corresponding to the dating of the earliest layers inside the ditch.

The exhibition also includes other anthropological finds, especially a large collection of bone fragments with traces of healed or unhealed wounds, degenerative productive changes and hematogenic osteopathies. Further selection was also made from the sizeable amount of archaeozoological material, which was well preserved thanks to the favourable soil conditions. Along with macrobotanical finds, the osteological material provided important information for a reconstruction of the agricultural system employed in the period at the given site.

The processing of the enormous assemblage of material from the Kolín bypass road is now only in its early stages. The first results of analyses presented at the exhibition and summarized in the accompanying publication document the extraordinary value of the acquired information and its importance for the study of the history of the entire region. The settlement and travel significance of the left bank area of the Elbe River above the bend to the north is indisputable. The investigated territory that rings the elevated land in the centre of Kolín today was, for several millennia, a peripheral part of an important settlement agglomeration, which apparently also had a central function in certain periods.
In order to bring the exhibition of the Kolín bypass archaeological excavation up to the level of the digital media era, a project entitled *Archaeological 3D Virtual Museum: New Technologies in the Documentation and Presentation of a Neolithic Settlement* has been conceived; the project has received support from the Czech Ministry of Culture. Utilizing a digital heritage management approach, the project aims to create a virtual museum to present Neolithic culture in central Europe. The results of the Neolithic rondel excavations in Kolín will be incorporated into the virtual exhibition. The goal of the project is to strengthen local community involvement and to highlight the global importance of archaeological heritage management.

**References**

Conference Report
Objects and Landscape: Understanding the Medieval period through finds recorded by the Portable Antiquities Scheme.
The Portable Antiquities Scheme and the Medieval Settlement Research Group
London, British Museum, Monday 22 October 2012

Suzie Thomas, University of Glasgow (Suzie.Thomas@glasgow.ac.uk)

In most years the Portable Antiquities Scheme (PAS – http://finds.org.uk) has organized a conference at London’s British Museum (where its central office is also based), which in previous years has covered various themes, including marking ten years of PAS in 2007, and a conference comparing management of portable antiquities in other European jurisdictions in 2009. PAS operates across England and Wales, and through its network of Finds Liaison Officers (FLOs) allows finders of archaeological material, primarily metal-detector users, to report and record their discoveries. It was established in 1997, initially as a pilot scheme, to complement the Treasure Act 1996, which also came into force that year in England and Wales (in Scotland the legislation is different).

This year was the first of what is planned to be a series of conferences organized by period, and, due to the focus on the Middle Ages this time, was organized in partnership with the Medieval Settlement Research Group (http://www.archaeologyuk.org/msrg), a multidisciplinary network of researchers. This partnership was explained in the brief introduction to the day by Roger Bland, the Keeper of Prehistory and Europe at the British Museum. The next PAS conference in 2013 will focus on post-medieval finds.
The themes of the day focussed primarily on the impact of the data collected through PAS (namely the Finds Database – http://finds.org.uk/database) on the understanding of the medieval period, both through artefact studies and landscape-level research. However, and perhaps reflecting the themes and nature of much of this current research (certainly that which was presented at the conference), the focus seemed almost entirely to be on archaeology in England with, as one person observed in the final discussions, only relatively rare mentions of Wales, despite PAS’ presence there as well.

The opening session, chaired by the Director of PAS, Michael Lewis, started with a presentation from Eleanor Standley from the Ashmolean Museum, University of Oxford, on ‘PAS and the Personal Possessions and Experiences of the Past’, particularly the reuse of metal artefacts, for example the reuse of coins as jewellery. Tim Pestell from Norwich Castle Museum then talked about medieval Papal bullae, and outlined his research which focussed primarily on the county of Norfolk.

Following a coffee break, Kevin Leahy of PAS and North Lincolnshire Museum chaired a session of five shorter papers described as a ‘PAS medley’. This showcased current research utilising the data of PAS, as carried out by both FLOs (the regional staff of PAS) and by PhD candidates (mostly current or past FLOs themselves) making use of PAS data. David Williams, the FLO for Surrey and East Berkshire, started the session with an overview of his research into Tudor purses, blending PAS data from England and Wales with data from Scotland and examples as illustrated in contemporary literature. Next Theresa Gilmore, FLO for Staffordshire and the West Midlands, talked about her research interests in late medieval decorative folding strap clasps, which vary in style from animal and human decoration to more abstract patterns. Much of this research to date has been supported by a Headley Trust internship. Third to speak in the session was Laura Burnett, the Somerset FLO, who presented her ongoing research into cloisonné brooches. With several types identified, she also noted that geographical biases in where certain types have been found may be to do with the amount of time that PAS has been active in certain areas, with the scheme not becoming nationwide in its coverage until several years after its inception. Rob Webley then outlined his planned PhD research at the University of York through a Collaborative Doctoral Award that will be supervised jointly with PAS through the Arts and Humanities Research Council. Webley is formerly a FLO himself, and will be focussing on PAS data and other sources to enhance our knowledge of medieval jettons. He also pointed out how important it is that metal-detector users record artefacts such as jettons, since the different types and their different distribution patterns shed important light. The fifth and final speaker of this multiple-paper session was Adam Daubney, the FLO for Lincolnshire, who explained his recently-commenced part time PhD research with the University of Leicester. This will involve looking at using PAS data in Lincolnshire from a landscape perspective, utilising also data from sources such as the Historic Landscape Characterisation information produced by English Heritage and local authority Historic Environment Records (see www.english-heritage.org.uk/characterisation).

A theme that emerged in this second session in particular, returned to and discussed in more detail later in this review, was the fact that much current published literature has not yet taken into account the additional data from recorded finds with PAS, and so the potential for this additional data to augment existing research was emphasized. This session, like all the others, worked especially well due to careful time-keeping by the Chair. This has the advantage of making speakers remain concise, and with only an hour for lunch and none provided (hence delegates had to find their own food within the museum or outside in central London), it was important that people had enough time for this.

Following lunch, John Naylor of the Medieval Settlement Research Group chaired a session of three papers. The first came from Letty ten Harkel of the University of Oxford, who talked about an England-wide research project utilising PAS data alongside other sources for European Research Council-funded project ‘Landscape and Identities: the case of the English landscape c. 1500 BC - 1986 AD’ (www.arch.ox.ac.uk/englishlandscapes-introduction.html), with particular focus on her own research within this project on Anglo-Scandinavian material. Next Kevin Leahy was in front of the audience again, this time presenting Middle Saxon finds in the landscape. Perhaps aware of the metal-detector users
in the audience, he made a point of praising the changing attitudes among the metal detecting community. This had led to the vast improvement in the quality of find spot information now disclosed to archaeologists as compared to earlier years, with some previously-recorded find spots even being revisited and updated with more detailed information. The third speaker was Anni Byard, FLO for West Berkshire and Oxfordshire, who described her intentions to use data from two metal detecting rallies in the same part of Oxfordshire as the basis for a dissertation as part of her part time MSc at the University of Oxford. As this work was yet to commence, she is likely to be able to present again in the coming years on her actual findings and conclusions.

After another well-planned coffee break, the final session of speakers began with Andrew Rogerson of Norfolk County Council. He spoke on the theme of ‘Buckles, Brooches, Fields and Farms: settlement and land-use in medieval Norfolk’, and was careful to reinforce the current positive trend of making use of PAS and other datasets, which he characterized as the movement from “data” to “information”. The final talk of the day presented research from Martin Locker (a PhD candidate at University College London) and Michael Lewis (of PAS and the British Museum), looking at pilgrim signs, including again utilizing the data collated through PAS. The paper was presented on behalf of both authors by Martin Locker. Among other things, the presentation focused on the nature of pilgrimage souvenirs, suggesting that the apparent paucity of surviving artefacts at certain sites known to have been foci for pilgrimage may be due to at least some pilgrimage souvenirs coming from nature (particular plants for example), which would not have survived in the archaeological record.

The overall structure of the day conference worked well. Allowing long coffee breaks (averaging at forty minutes for each break) was also a well thought out strategy, allowing delegates plenty of time to talk and network (a key function of conferences that is sometimes forgotten by organizers).

As well as scope at the end of each individual segment of the day for questions to speakers, a healthy amount of time was planned in at the end of the conference for more general discussion, which generated a number of questions and observations following an ad hoc summary of the day from Andrew Reynolds (University College London). One observer asked whether the study of metal-detected objects, by definition made of metal, was a sufficiently broad enough scope from which to make observations about any period, without, for example, collecting data through other methods such as fieldwalking. However, a number of the speakers were quick to point out that for some specific artefact studies this was appropriate if the artefact type under scrutiny was metallic, while other studies, such as of landscape, are more holistic anyway in the range of data that they consider. As mentioned earlier in this review, the issue of the apparent England-only focus of the day was also flagged as a potential issue. Responses to this observation pointed out that this was simply the nature of some of the research parameters, such as the prevalence of certain artefact types primarily in England, or the remit of such as ten Harkel’s project, which was intended to cover England only. A significant barrier to much research that was discussed was the nature of many counties’ Historic Environment Records (HERs), the system through which, at county or local authority level, historic and archaeological sites and monuments are recorded. Unfortunately, the software and databases are not always compatible across areas, which has evidently led to some difficulties in the first year of this project in terms of obtaining data.

The papers were all interesting and kept to time, with the PAS medley session before the lunch break working particularly well perhaps due to the variety of research seen through the collection of shorter papers. These briefer papers, lasting around fifteen minutes each, were particularly well suited to presenting the nature of the research projects being discussed in this section; all of which were either still in progress or in early stages of development.

The conference was fully booked, and perhaps its low cost (£10 per attendee) had much to do with this. It was nonetheless based in London again, which can logistically be limiting to those outside of the UK’s capital due to the cost of transport, especially of domestic trains from further afield. The British Museum location in many ways makes sense, especially with the Central Unit Team based on site. However, given the coverage of PAS across all of
England and Wales, it has to be asked perhaps whether there is scope for holding the main annual conference in other locations from time to time to increase opportunities for different people to attend.

One thing to note as an observation of the conference was the repeated mention by many of the speakers of the ways in which utilising PAS data was enhancing their research. It was clear that previous research and literature available had not always incorporated this ever-growing dataset. This raises an important issue in terms of whether archaeological research, in the UK or elsewhere, always takes advantage of all of the available information. Similar observations have in the past been made about the Archaeology Data Service (ADS – http://archaeologydataservice.ac.uk) and in particular the Grey Literature Library – a vast resource of unpublished fieldwork reports. There are so many sources of information in different places within the UK (with England, Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland often using different systems and resources), it is presumably difficult for archaeological researchers to know where to find relevant information, not to mention knowing necessarily where to deposit or disseminate their own results (especially if active in the voluntary sector). This is perhaps the case for other European countries as well, and is an issue to address.

Another thing that was striking about the research presented was the extent to which this was dominated by either current or former FLOs, even in the case of postgraduate research underway. This is perhaps understandable, since they are the ones most familiar with the PAS database as a resource, but it is also potentially worrying if use outside this group of individuals is still limited.

Within the context of Europe generally, PAS is interesting due to its uniqueness as a framework for engaging with voluntary and hobbyist uses of heritage, something that I have seen flagged as a point for discussion at a number of EAA conference sessions. Therefore, while the conference was specifically about archaeological research in the UK (and primarily England), in terms of the processes and research methods involved, conferences such as this are potentially significant for practitioners in other countries looking to consider whether a PAS-type framework would work in their own context. Many probably suspect that it would not work exactly as it does in England and Wales in other European jurisdictions, for cultural and legislative reasons, but it is perhaps still a useful exercise to envisage this model in other settings, even if only to rule it out or to consider modifications.

Finally, an observation that perhaps is unfair, given that the conference was period-specific and intended to present the research being developed through use of PAS data. Given that most of the data recorded and stored by PAS comes from the metal detecting hobby (regardless of how one feels about this group and their impact on archaeological heritage), it might have been appropriate to hear from one or more representatives of the British metal detecting community through more than just questions and discussion. Whether this could be achieved in the future through encouraging a paper or two from metal-detector users, or even inviting a representative to chair a session, it might have given more of an impression of cooperation and inclusivity, rather than ownership of the information residing with the archaeologists. However, this is a minor issue (if one at all, as far as the organizers were concerned), and it may be that the metal-detector users were content to listen to the archaeologists on this occasion.

Suzie Thomas is a Research Associate with Trafficking Culture (http://traffickingculture.org), a project funded by the European Research Council to gather evidence-based data on the global trafficking in looted cultural objects. This is an interdisciplinary research project based at The Scottish Centre for Crime and Justice Research, University of Glasgow, UK.
Conference Report
The ‘School of Young Archaeologists of the Commonwealth of Independent States’, Kirillov, Russia, 3 to 12 September 2011

Vlasta E. Rodinkova, Institute of Archaeology of the Russian Academy of Science, Moscow (vlasta2004@mail.ru)

The year 2011 – the 20th anniversary of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) foundation – was announced as the Year of Historical-Cultural Heritage in the CIS (see also http://www.cis.minsk.by/). The ambitious programme consisted of events that were aimed at the development of intercultural exchange, supporting the complex investigations and popularization of the historical-cultural heritage of the Commonwealth of Independent States’ nations alongside the elevation of interest among young people in the problems of its study and protection.

One such event was the School of Young Archaeologists of CIS organized under the title ‘Commonwealth in the Name of Heritage Preservation. Cross-Disciplinary Invention and New Methods of Investigations’, which was held in Kirillov-Belozersk Historical-Architectural and Art Museum (Kirillov, Vologda region, Russia), from 3 to 12 September 2011 (see also http://archaeolog-school.ru/ for more information, including programme, list of participants, titles of papers and lectures, organizers etc.). Organizers were the Institute of Archaeology of the Russian Academy of Science (IA RAS) with the assistance of the Multinational Fund of Humanitarian Co-Operation of the States-Participants of the CIS (MFHC).

There were three main directions in the School’s work:

1) protection of cultural heritage and opposition to the illegal destruction of archaeological monuments;
2) promotion of the use of modern methods and information technology in theory and practice of archaeological investigations;
3) examining the role of archaeological objects in the reconstruction of historical events.

Destruction of monuments of archaeological heritage in the course of intensive building, commercial exploitation of particular areas, illegal excavations and other such events is the common threat and one of the major problems the Commonwealth of Independent States are facing today. Destructive activity can lead to complete loss of a considerable portion of historical and cultural property not only in Russia, but also in other CIS countries. Under current conditions, it is necessary to unify the practice how heritage is protected and
preserved, to create a legal basis for the protection, and to elaborate methods of preserving heritage that would be common to all the post-Soviet territories. The efficiency of such activity is directly dependent on the consolidation of efforts of scientists, particularly the younger generation of researchers, with the states’ and legal structures at the international level.

Another common problem for all post-Soviet territories is the shortage of archaeological education. The level and quality of young scientists’ educational background frequently do not prepare them for the tasks that they must undertake at the beginning of their professional careers. In this case, it could be useful to create a transnational system of post-graduate education that would be aimed at providing entry-level scientists with the up-to-date information and methods required in order to develop their own professional qualifications and to create candidate pools for archaeology in general.

Finally, the last direction of the School’s work is an invitation to put an emphasis on the historical connections of the nations forming the Commonwealth of Independent States. The unification of the archaeologists from the all post-Soviet territories is called for not only by the similarity of today’s problems, but also by the similarities in the cultural-historical events that took place in the CIS territories in the past. Archaeological monuments are a common property and their comprehensive investigation is possible if efforts are made to consolidate the knowledge and expertise of scientists, particularly young ones, from different countries. Such consolidation will encourage cultural and scientific exchange, and help to restore and strengthen the relationships that were lost after the decay of the USSR. It could also make the people from the Commonwealth become closer.

During the preparation of the School’s program, which included about 70 hours of lectures, the emphasis was placed on a course of lectures giving coverage of modern methodological frameworks and the results of the latest research in selected archaeological fields. Therefore, in Kirillov, the first international theoretical School in the humanities was held, the audience of which was the representatives of the new generation of CIS researchers.

To take part in the work of the School, young scholars from ten countries – Azerbaijan, Belarus, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Moldova, Russia, Tajikistan, the Ukraine, Uzbekistan and Estonia – presented initiative projects for the contest, which were mostly concerned with finding the solution to problems in the sphere of preservation and examining archaeological heritage; these projects were then studied by independent experts.

The lectures in different archaeological fields were given by leading specialists, members of the main archaeological organizations of Russia and other CIS and Baltic countries.

The School began with a series of summarizing lectures, demonstrating the results and various perspectives of the archaeological studies of the different Eurasian epochs and regions. In this way, the main task of the School, to present the current situation of archaeological studies in CIS territory as widely as possible, was accomplished. The most important discoveries of the last years and major directions of archaeological development of their countries on the modern stage were characterized by the lecturers from Kazakhstan, Lithuania and Armenia. The results of research of ancient Kiev and new data collected by Russian scholars from the monuments of the ancient Russian period, the Migration period, the Neolithic and the Mesolithic were also presented. The latest results of architectural archaeology were also given coverage. Moreover, the students of the School were introduced to the results of the Jericho archaeological expedition of 2010; the exposition the Russian museum-park zone in Jericho is based on the materials from this expedition.

The central part of the study programme of the School, because of its importance and according to the interest shown by the participants of the project, was the module of lectures concerned with current problems of archaeological heritage preservation and preservation research. The most important was the panel discussion of illegal archaeological excavations of monuments, collaborations with the mass media and the use of scientific knowledge as a weapon of war against archaeological thieves. The result of the discussion was the conclusion that it is necessary to follow professional standards, which excludes any sort of collaboration between the scientists and the illegal excavators.

The topics of the third module were modern ways of collecting, processing and analysing data that are used both in the field and laboratory stages of archaeological research. A
significant part was devoted to the use of information technologies, such as electronic instruments, special software and non-destructive research methods. The importance of the cross-disciplinary approach to archaeological research was emphasized. The students were also introduced to the method of excavation of medieval monuments by the full floating of the cultural layer, the principles of the archaeological examination of historical necropolises and the problems arising with identifying the burials of historical figures, such as Dmitri Pozharskiy, Andrei Rubliov, and Ivan Susanin.

Another essential part of the programme was the three panel discussions concerning the students’ projects. It is significant that half of those projects were about solving the problems in the sphere of preservation archaeology. It demonstrates the strong concern of young scholars from the CIS and Baltic countries about the situation regarding the preservation of archaeological heritage and their willingness to take some drastic measures to change the situation. Further aspirations of the modern generation of scholars included the popularization of the achievements of archaeology, making them available and forming a positive public attitude towards archaeological research and findings. Other projects brought up topics important for the understanding of the historical processes that were taking place in CIS territory from the Neolithic to the medieval period. And finally, there were projects implementing the cross-disciplinary approach testifying that the use of the newest scientific and technological research instruments among young scholars in the humanities is becoming more popular.

The School participants have drafted and passed a final document, which states the necessity of consolidation of the research efforts of young scientists from different countries for the protection, preservation and examination of the common cultural-historical heritage of the CIS peoples. In this document, concrete measures are laid out, concerned with the improvement of professional qualifications, intensification of the collaboration of young archaeologists from the CIS, and further developing the multinational bonds in archaeology on the whole.

Besides the School of Young Archaeologists, another five similar projects were carried out in CIS countries with the support of the Multinational Fund of Humanitarian Co-Operation and within the Year of Cultural-Historical Heritage in the CIS. Field schools in Moldova and Azerbaijan were put on. The students of those Schools excavated Palaeolithic, Neolithic and Eneolithic monuments. The aim of Tajikistan’s School was getting young archaeologists familiar with the research methods of the raw architecture that is widely spread across Middle Asia. The Schools in Kyrgyzstan and Kazakhstan were also of a referential character. The former presented information on the monuments of the micro-zone of the Issyk-Kul basin and the methods of underwater research of Lake Issyk-Kul, while the latter presented information on the ancient and medieval monuments of Turkestan.

The Schools for young archaeologists provide not only an effective instrument to improve professional skills. Such Schools for the CIS area also provide an essential opportunity to form a common scientific and partly ideological field. Evidently, the future shape and development of archaeology as a science depends on today’s young scientists. The establishment of contacts between the representatives of the younger generation of archaeologists, and increasing interest in cooperative research could be the first steps to restoring that common sphere of scientific interests that existed in a not-distant past, originating not only in the common borders, but also similarities in the historical development of the societies of north-eastern Eurasia. To misunderstand this unity and to refuse the traditions of its investigation that were formed during the last centuries would not only result in a distorted picture of the past but also in the defection of the identity of many cultural societies in the future.

A volume has been published that contains articles of the School’s students, some lectures of the School programme, and reports of heads of similar schools in other countries of the CIS: Новые исследования по археологии стран СНГ и Балтии. Материалы Школы молодых археологов. Кириллов, 3-12 сентября 2011 г. (New research on the archaeology of the CIS and Baltic states. Materials of the School of Young Archaeologists, Kirillov, 3-12 September 2011) Moscow, 2011. A report on the School in Kirillov and other MFHS projects was published in the journal ‘Rossijskaja archeologija’ 2 2012, pp. 183-187.
Conference Report
Gardening Time. Reflections on Memory, Monuments and History in Sardinia and Scotland

Brian Smith, Shetland Museum and Archives, UK (brian@shetland-archives.org.uk)

A second annual conference on the Iron Age (conceived in the broadest terms) was held in Magdalene College, Cambridge between 21 and 23 September 2012, linking two regions – Sardinia and Scotland – and a theme – monuments and memory. A report on the first conference can be found in TEA no. 36. Here Brian Smith reports from the Northern Isles on this year’s event.

Simon Stoddart, organizer of the recent conference at Magdalene College about Scottish brochs and Sardinian nuraghi, met me at the door. He said: ‘There won’t be any hyperdiffusionism!’ I didn’t need the assurance, because Joseph Anderson showed in 1874 that there was no connection between the striking structures, respectively from the Iron and Bronze Ages of their homelands. Few have argued since that they were relatives. It is not strictly true, as Euan MacKie averred at one point during the weekend, that there is no resemblance between nuraghi and brochs; but the societies where they flourished (we learned) could not have been more different and separate.

Some speakers dealt with the key conference theme – memory (and its cryptic title, ‘Gardening Time’) more than others. Often it seemed irrelevant. Paola Filippucci, in an impressive paper, warned that scholars are getting fed up with the concept, just as some of us are getting bored with ‘identity’.

The conference comprised 37 papers. The Sardinian delegation, passionate about their monuments (there are 7,000 to 10,000 of them, an incidence which sounds impossible) was full of information about them. Nuraghi came on the scene in the 17th century before Christ,
and could be simple or (very) complex: ‘instruments of widespread territorial control’ in their original incarnation, and cult sites later. Nuraghi became icons. Their inhabitants, unlike the broch-builders, made models of them, and filled them with interesting artefacts; their modern successors commemorate them in masquerade, sometimes far from home.

A consensus emerged that brochs were duller. Tanja Romankiewicz, expounding recent work carried out with Ian Ralston, poured cold water on Alex Curle’s notion of 1920, popular at the present day, that they were full of timber. (That was satisfying to those of us who are tired of seeing Historic Scotland's reconstructions of brochs as medieval castles, with drapes and cushions.) She argued that brochs were the focus of small-scale, self-sufficient communities, and involved ‘construction by trial-and-error’.

Graeme Cavers described excavations in Caithness where broch foundations have been found to date from 400-200 BC, but where broch-development has turned out to be far more complex and ‘plastic’, indeed ‘malleable’, than expected. He hinted that the ‘political geography’ of Broch society should be rewritten. I have an impression that this Caithness work, so far largely unpublished (cf. History Scotland 12, 2012), will be very important.

The contents of the nuraghi were more impressive than those in brochs, too. Someone who championed the broch-artefacts received a cutting riposte that 'It doesn't matter how many words you throw at it [broch-pottery], it doesn't make it any richer!' The contrasts that emerged were fascinating, but (given the lack of prior contact between the participants) there were few attempts to discuss them. I got a clearer impression of Nuraghi society than I got of the corresponding broch one, not least from a luminous paper by Alessandro Usai, mainly because the Scots seem to have given up any attempt to explain what was going on in northern Scotland in the Iron Age, except in the most general terms. History with the politics left out …

Photograph of some of the participants at the ‘Gardening Time’ conference.

The conference ranged far and wide in space and time, from Malta to the Hebrides. I didn't mind that, because 37 treatments of the enigmatic structures might have become wearisome. Hannah Malone spoke fluently about the Bonaria graveyard at Cagliari and its history during the 19th century; Megan Meredith-Lobay drew on the late Raphael Samuel’s
Theatres of Memory (1996) to explore early Christian churches in Argyll. Niall Sharples built on his article in the Journal of Iberian Studies, 2006, to discuss alleged relationships between broch denizens and their (alleged) Neolithic ancestors. And there was a gurgling account of cauldrons found in lochs and pits in the south of Scotland and Wiltshire, by Jody Joy. I am pleased to say that there was an absence of critical theory. One speaker announced that ‘The Body’ couldn’t be omitted from a study of nuraghi, but mercifully didn’t elaborate. A contributor from the floor, flying to the opposite extreme, speculated that the buildings themselves might have been ‘agents’, a direction which even Althusser did not take. The rest of the weekend was refreshingly concrete.

We heard touching tributes to recently deceased scholars: Anna DePalmas on Giovanni Lilliu (1914-2012) and Mark Pearce on David Ridgway (1938-2012). The account of Lilliu’s career, in particular, gave rise to an interesting discussion about how Sardinians revere their ancient history, and how Scots are much more interested in their middle ages. I wonder, looking back, if the juxtaposition of nuraghi and brochs worked. We learned much about each kind of structure, but there was next-to-no speculation about how one might help us to understand the other. Such an attempt would not have had anything to do with hyperdiffusionism! I found myself wondering, if an invitation to experts on Spanish motillas, a structure far more like brochs than nuraghi (Concepción Martin, et al., ‘The Bronze Age of La Mancha’, Antiquity, 67, 1993), might have led to more probing questions about how the different societies differed from or resembled each other.

Simon Stoddart and Isabelle Vella Gregory deserve praise for organizing a conference that was quirky and exciting. The next in the series is about frontiers, at Magdalene next year, from 20 to 22 September 2013.

The organizers of the conference would like to thank the ACE Foundation, the Fondazione Banco di Sardegna and the McDonald Institute Cambridge for their support. Details of the conference will be archived at http://www.arch.cam.ac.uk/iron_age/2012/, and details of the next conference on Frontiers in the Iron Age can be found at http://www.arch.cam.ac.uk/iron_age/2013/.

References
Anderson, Joseph, 1874. Notice of the excavation of the brochs of Yarhouse, Brounaben, Bowermadden, Old Stirkoke, and Dunbeath, in Caithness, with remarks on the period of the brochs, and an appendix, containing a collected list of the brochs of Scotland, and early notices of many of them. Archaeologia Scotica 5, 1874.
**Conference Report**

**Commission on flint mining in pre- and protohistorical times**

Rengert Elburg, Landesamt für Archäologie Sachsen, Germany  
(rengert.elburg@lfa.sachsen.de)

The first conference entirely devoted to flint was probably the ‘Eerste symposium over Vuursteen/First symposium on flint’, which was organized in 1969 in Maastricht in the Netherlands. Since 1964, a small band of miners headed by Werner Felder had been excavating parts of a Neolithic flint mining complex between the villages of Rijckholt and St. Geertruid in the south of the Netherlands. As they were former miners who had only limited contact with ‘official’ archaeology, they decided to organize a symposium to present their results, create a platform for the exchange of experiences, to make the project better known and to conduct some fundraising. Although this conference was rather small and the proceedings were predominantly published in Dutch (Engelen 1969), it had an international audience and was rather a success. As the work continued in Rijckholt, excavations were undertaken too in the flint mines of Grimes Graves (Norfolk, UK), which gave an extra push to the study of flint mining in Europe. As a result, in 1975, a second flint symposium was organized in Maastricht, although the excavations in Rijckholt were concluded in 1972. With this event, the pace was set, and from there on the flint symposia were organized every four years, with the eighth conference taking place in 1999 in Bochum, Germany. The following session was to be organized in Israel, but due to the first Intifada, the situation was deemed too dangerous and the preparations abandoned.

Over thirty years, these meetings had become an institution and their disappearance was dearly felt by researchers working on flint. Several groups were thinking of reviving the symposia, but the decisive action was taken in 2006 by a group that proposed the institution of a permanent commission on ‘Flintmining in pre- and protohistoric times’ under the auspices of the UISPP. A proposition to this end was forwarded, and accepted, during the 15th UISPP congress in Lisbon in 2006.

The first, still unofficial meeting of the new committee was held just a few weeks later in Cracow during the 12th annual meeting of the EAA, where a number of flint specialists had gathered on the occasion of a session titled ‘Flint Mining in Prehistoric Europe: Interpreting the Archaeological Records’. Here it was decided to convene a first official meeting the following year in Paris and a call for papers was circulated among specialists on all aspects of flint, not just mining.

During the resulting small conference in September 2007 at the Institut d’Art et d’Archéologie, an executive board was elected and the activities for the next years planned. Since then, four further meetings have been held, in 2009 in Madrid, 2010 in Vienna, 2011 during the UISPP congress in Florianópolis (Brazil) and last September again in Paris, to hold elections for the board, whose five-year term was coming to an end.

Although the main focus of the commission is, as expressed in the name, flint mining, there is ample room for other aspects of flint to be dealt with during the meetings of the commission; for example, the focus during the last meeting in Paris was reference collections or lithotheques. Membership of the commission is open to all specialists working on flint, with a clear majority of the participants being archaeologists. Due to the changes in internal organization of the UISPP, members have now to apply for membership with the UISPP as well.

The next meeting of the commission will be held during the UISPP World Congress in Burgos (Spain), 1 - 7 September 2014, the week before the 20th EAA Annual Meeting in Istanbul.

At the moment, a website is under construction and can be found in its preliminary form under [http://www.uispp-flintmining.org](http://www.uispp-flintmining.org). Here you can find the contact details for the
secretary, Anne Hauzeur, who will be glad to supply further information or to receive your application as a member.
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Debate

A Post-European Association of Archaeologists?

Felipe Criado-Boado, Institute of Heritage Sciences (Incipit), Spanish National Research Council (CSIC), Santiago de Compostela, Spain (felipe.criado-boado@incipit.csic.es)

In this title I have chosen to use the prefix “post” in its two generally accepted meanings: as a criticism and as an alternative. Therefore, the intention of the title is twofold. On the one hand, it is a way of suggesting that if we do not react soon in Europe, we will have to start thinking about a new Europe that will no longer be the one we know. This is a Threat that affects us all, including the EAA. On the other hand, it is a way of suggesting that we should perhaps start to think in the future using ways of thinking and ideas that are different from those we have used up to now; I am not sure whether this is an Opportunity or a Weakness, but in any event, strengthening European integration against the backdrop of the current context is a challenge of interest to us all, including the EAA.

The creation of the EAA was an epiphenomenon that came about as a result of the wider process of constructing post-Cold War Europe. The generation that founded the EAA between 1993 and 1997, especially its former president, Kristian Kristiansen, saw very clearly that the European Union also required an integration of strategies in science and heritage, and therefore in archaeology; and vice versa. For this generation, the SAA or AAA were not only model organizations in terms of their quality and capacity, but also for channelling archaeological thought, practices and projects at a federal level. I remember that Kristian Kristiansen, at the end of the first meeting of the EAA, held in Santiago de Compostela (Spain) in September 1995, told me with a mixture of satisfaction, realism and responsibility: “We are making history”. He was right.

The problem is that this history has become warped. The project for greater integration at the European level has lost its way in the new Minotaur labyrinth that connects the Bundesbank with the City of London. The last ten years have shown right the hypercriticisms made by those denouncing that the common Euro would foster a mercantile Europe, instead of a social Europe, a Europe with the focus on its citizens or social aspects. It is true that over the last 30 years, the European project has been a scenario for an interplay of different interests. Without admitting a certain degree of cynicism (looking after your own interests within an European collaborative rhetoric), there was no way for play on the European environment: naivety fared badly on the European markets. But initially, the game had very different rules: regionalization, cooperation, solidarity, balance, and interaction. Today the focus is purely on selfish interests. Today Europeanism is at its lowest ebb; a vast majority believe that if their problems cannot be solved in Europe, then Europe is not the solution, but instead the problem. Dissatisfaction with European pragmatism and with the surrendering of governments in the face of the final transformation of capitalism (as today we are not only lacking social democracy, but even at least the difference between Renanian and Manchesterian capitalism) has reached the point where support for nationalist and local movements has appeared throughout the whole of Europe. The People’s Europe is turning its back on Europe.

All of this is occurring against the backdrop of the current economic crisis. But it is not the crisis; the crisis is this. Often it leaves you wanting to shout (rephrasing the unofficial slogan from Bill Clinton’s campaign): “it is not the economy, stupid!” We fix our eyes on the current crisis and forget about who has been responsible for it and who will benefit from it. The problem is not only the crisis, but the neo-conservative manner in which it is being handled. This means that we are suffering from the “Great R”, where the “R” can either stand for Recession or Robbery. The crisis is an excuse to operate a systematic transfer of income from the middle and working classes to the financial powers that be, and in the process to
rewrite our history at European, national and regional level of the last 30 or 40 years (something which has become very clear at this particular moment in time in Spain).

Operating as a tremendous disguise for all of this, the countries of southern Europe are being victimised. Once upon a time we were in fashion. At one time the young European democracies, together with the dynamism of our young demographics, were looked upon warmly and appreciated, a reference point and welcome partner for all of Europe. Today a veil of collective suspicion has fallen over us, which is resulting in a crisis of self-esteem and pessimism (and there is no harm in the rest of Europe being aware of this) which, together with the loss of opportunities, is further reducing our ability to respond to the crisis.

However, the population is not to blame for fact that our oligarchies have latched on to (or accepted, because really the Greek, Portuguese or Spanish oligarchies have not even been creators, but merely followers) the neoliberal strategies of all of the European oligarchies. We are accused of being wasteful; if we put to one side the fact that this is the fault of our bankers, this accusation is intended to serve as a narrative to legitimise a monumental process to sequester the savings of the middle and working classes of southern Europe, redirecting them to the financial systems of the north. The IMF used a similar policy for years with the debt of the emerging nations, ... with the result that it took them 25 years longer to emerge. When you talk to “normal” people from any European country (and not just the Spanish, Italians, Portuguese or Greeks), you realize that the process is general throughout all of Europe, and not just limited to a transfer of income from the south to the north (due to the high rates of country risk for southern Europe and other financial mechanisms), but that instead it is affecting the middle classes in all of our countries.

Here we find another rationale for the current crisis. It is true that this has partly been due to the globalisation and appearance of new players such as China, India and Brazil. However, there is a political and ideological crisis underlying all of this that has much to do with the rationality of Europe and historic debts we do not want to admit. The actual impoverishment of the Western World is partly a result of the impossibility to uphold the historical injustice (which served as the foundations for Europe’s development from the 15th century until the 1980s) of increasing the wealth of the West by expropriating the wealth of others.

However, this comment is not about international policy, and even less so about the crisis. This comment just asks about what the EAA is going to do (like any other player on the European stage) in order to critically and positively rethink Europe.

I can only put this challenge into words as a question, because I no longer know the answer. But I do know that for a time, the EAA was a Strength that served to construct a European archaeology, in Europe. Can it or should it continue to be one? Under what conditions, and in what way? The answer has to be collective. Either we reinvent Europe, or we will be left with a Post-Europe (in a critical sense), understood as a continent in which the promising “European” values of progress, welfare, liberty, tolerance, respect for cultures, promotion of the individual and development of the communities, will be merely a reminiscence of an episodic (not structural) moment of Europe history (ca. 1950-2005) that vanished in financial crisis. Faced with this dilemma, what role can archaeology and the EAA play?

This question calls for a reflection on the meaning of “crisis” as a questioning of Western hegemony, the struggle for the distribution of economic power in the coming years, the present transformation of capitalism in this transmodern context, and the historical role of the European welfare state: is Europe still a reference for the rest of the world, or is it an episodic itinerary of cultural evolution that was attempted at a given historical moment, and which will turn out not to be the main route, but instead an abandoned secondary route? There are a large number of powers interested in convincing us that the European welfare model is not an example, but instead an anachronism. The battle is now between liberal capitalism with its human, European face, and the capitalism without political and democratic liberties from outside of Europe that serves to heighten inequality and insecurity. A few months ago in Madrid, Lula da Silva, former president of Brazil, said: “You Europeans must protect your socio-economic model by any means possible. The European welfare state is part of the world’s heritage.” The dilemma is very clear: if this model fails, it will be bad news for most of humanity; but the model itself has problems in terms of its sustainability that call its viability...
into question. In any event, the declaration by Lula still has specific implications for all of us who are specialists in the field of heritage!

The battle looming on the horizon will not be easy. But our best ammunition is the high degree of self-awareness we have achieved as a result of the Cultural Turn of the 1980s and 1990s, and the real increase in reflexivity that is now available to us. Our civilization has never been as self-aware, nor as hypercritical, nor as reflexive as it is today; it never had the ability to discover all of the multiple facets of all of the different practices, to elucidate all of the different aspects of everything we do; it has never had the ability to be so transparent, or to be so un-naïve.

This self-awareness teaches us that in the European arena, archaeology has played and is still capable of playing three traditional roles, together with two new roles. Having comprised a fundamental cornerstone of modern national construction in Europe, from the 1990s onwards it became part of a project for a new Europe conceived as a hyper-nation. At the same time, it was part of a cultural critique to open the way for emancipatory demands, including the construction of a post-nationalist Europe. However, archaeology now also operates in a neo-nationalist scenario partially fed by a widely extended sense of failure of the European project. In the meantime, archaeology performs now an active function in public science, to engage archaeological knowledge with social and community claims. How will the EAA criticise or promote these different ways of perceiving archaeological practice?

Coda: In being situationists, by the moment we should set this comment apart from the critical consideration of whether this downfall of Europe was in fact already embedded in the very idea and historical practice of Europe. At the end of the day, the current European crisis is a result of applying to our societies the type of exploitation-based relationships we applied to others for long periods of time. Therefore we would have to invent a Post-Europe as a means of liberation, as an alternative.
Do archaeologists need guidelines for ethical Publishing?

C. Stephen Briggs, Independent Researcher, Aberystwyth (cstephenbriggs@yahoo.co.uk)

This must seem a strange question to be posing, and there are probably many EAA members who are puzzled to see it asked. The question concerns with many of the problems – or abuses – which arise when we take work to the press. Some were raised briefly during the useful session expounding ‘How to get Published in Archaeology’ at the EAA Helsinki conference 2012 (see session report by Skeates and Weiss-Krejci in this issue). It was chaired by EJA editor Robin Skeates, and usefully supported by contributions from Estella Weiss-Krejci (EJA Assistant Reviews Editor), Liz Rosindale of Maney (EJA Publisher), John Collis (Independent Publisher) and Kenneth Aitchison (Kindling Consultant). Although John Robb was unavoidably absent so we were denied his potentially challenging piece on ‘The View from the other Side of the Page – Publishing in Journals,’ Robin Skeates clearly underlined some of the mistakes we might make if we wanted to be really serious about knowing ‘How Not to Get Published in Archaeology’. The entire session was clearly intended to be helpful, particularly to the uninitiated, and that goal was achieved in a number of ways.

Although I found the session useful, upon reflection at the end, it seemed curious that nobody had been invited to lead a discussion on the pros and cons of refereeing and reviewing procedures. And we certainly need to be seriously concerned about this issue. At present, most journal and book publishers employ (though rarely pay) anonymous referees to adjudicate submitted research. Closed Refereeing – which this is termed – enables relatively fast scrutiny, though is arguably open to abuse by those who use it to maintain an intellectual status quo. But is that why we are here? Without openness and accountability, important, novel or even iconic research can be suppressed or held up without the need to show justification. On the other hand, operating more respectfully, Open Refereeing – where authors are given their referees’ names – can enable them to be given frank evaluations to help improve their scholarship and find the best place to have it printed.

In 1997, a Committee on Publishing Ethics (COPE) came into existence, mainly under initiatives from within the medical profession. COPE today provides a global forum for the airing of issues related to publication, by helping publishers, editors and authors. An international charity with over 7,600 subscribing members, it offers a mediation service to address ethical conflicts between interested parties. An important point to emerge from perusal of related websites, is that The British Medical Journal has revealed the names of reviewers to authors since 1999. Some researchers believe this ‘can reduce abuses, make referees more accountable and give them more credit for their work’. This practice offers a valuable example for archaeology to follow.

Although the existence of COPE as a disciplinary body has not resulted in the sudden widespread abandonment of old habits, some editorial processes have definitely begun to overhaul their behaviours over the past decade.

In fact, to help counter or reduce referees’ or reviewers’ self-interest, some British journals have begun requesting declarations of their relationship, friendship or any outstanding hostility to the authors or subjects under scrutiny. Let us not pretend that open refereeing is necessarily an easy option, for when the size of an interest group is small, referees willing to be identified are naturally likely to be more difficult to find than anonymous ones. Such difficulties should not, however, reduce our long-term efforts to attain more transparent practice.

Refereeing is by no means the only area of potential irregularity that researchers are likely to meet when going to the press. Some current publishing practices certainly represent irregular behaviours, and unfortunately some have become institutionalised. These include widespread infringements of copyright, plagiarism and biased citation practices. There are many more.
I do believe we need codes of practice in order to enable greater understanding. The EAA is at present probably the most important organization to set archaeological publishing standards globally and might itself seriously consider adopting one.

Here are some suggestions as to what such a code of practice might include. I intend most of them will be listed in a forthcoming IfA Good Practice Paper in Britain. Archaeologists should:

- promote best practice in the use and evaluation of evidence;
- encourage greater understanding of copyright law and sensitivity to the ownership of intellectual property;
- avoid plagiarism, fabrication, falsification and deception in proposing, carrying out and reporting the results of research;
- declare any interests, including financial ones that bear on publishing research findings;
- always give due and appropriate acknowledgement of assistance received, financial or otherwise, encouraging that particular care be taken when more than one author is involved;
- follow the most rigorous procedures for the citation of sources, including materials obtained from the internet, and
- report any conflict of interest, for example, by normally refusing to participate in the formal review of the work of anyone for whom they feel a sense of personal obligation or enmity.

Readers’ views are welcomed on the EAA’s development and adoption of such a code, or indeed on any of its potential components, particularly those related to refereeing practices and publication of the EJA.

Stephen Briggs is currently a member of the IfA’s (Institute for Archaeologists) Member Services Committee (formerly Editorial Board). He is preparing a Best Practice Paper on Ethical Publishing for the IfA’s Committee on Working Practices (see The Archaeologist, Autumn 2011, 26-7).
My dynamic friend and colleague Frans-Arne Stylegar has managed to liberate a respectable sum of Norwegian oil money to fund collaboration with Ukrainian archaeologists under the direction of Igor Khrapunov. The first results of this collaboration have been two international conferences on the theme ‘Between Two Seas. Northern Barbarians From Scandinavia To The Black Sea’. I was kindly invited to take part in the second one in October 2012, at the beach resort of Gaspra near Yalta on Crimea's Black Sea coast.

The reason that scholars from Ukraine and Norway might have something to talk about at all can be summarized in one word: Goths. Written sources allow us to follow this mobile and successful East Germanic-speaking ethnic group backward through time and across Europe from the ruins of the Western Roman Empire in the 6th century to the mouth of the River Vistula in the 1st century. Each step in this migration has a reasonable counterpart in an archaeological culture.

Prior to that, we don’t know if the Goths moved and, if so, whence. In the 6th century they believed that they had come from southern Sweden across the Baltic Sea. This idea of an early migration is not supported by the archaeology, and it should be noted that in the 6th century, all Germanic-speaking groups cultivated tribal mythology that placed their origins in Scandinavia. It is, however, uncontroversial that there always has been some level of contact between Sweden and the Vistula estuary throughout the millennia, particularly among the elite.

The thinking habits of North-western and Eastern European archaeologists are very different. It is probably fair to say that most Westerners see the Easterners as theoretically backward, and most Easterners see the Westerners as quite extraterrestrial. At the conference, I was, to tell the truth, quite dismayed at how the Easterners dealt with ethnicity. This is nothing new: I have enjoyed contact with Eastern colleagues for almost twenty years, and I feel I am at a stage where I am able to summarize some critical impressions.

Before I do so, I must emphasize the great strength of the Easterners, in my opinion. They very wisely place great value on an intimate knowledge of the source material. Few Scandinavian academics can compete with them on that arena. It was no surprise that the Scandinavians at the Gaspra conference were mainly museum and excavation unit employees, with a few retired academics. Myself, I’m seen as a conservative and naïvely empirical scholar in some Scandinavian academic circles. Yet in this company I was a radical theoretician.

I will list a few ideas that I believe many Eastern archaeologists have about the First Millennium AD (and BC) and how its archaeological record should be dealt with by scholars. I am not claiming that many colleagues hold all of these opinions at once, and I am well aware that there are Eastern colleagues who share none of them at all. But I feel justified in saying that each of these ideas is common in Eastern European archaeology yet almost entirely extinct in Western Europe.

1. Ethnic labelling is one of archaeology’s main responsibilities. First you date your site, and then you must immediately determine its ethnic affiliation.
2. The ethnic labels you can operate with should be taken from written sources. Preferably, but not necessarily, sources coeval with your site.
3. Whether the ancient authors you use are ascribing ethnic labels to themselves or to foreign and distant groups of people is not very important.
4. Language = ethnicity = material culture. Linguistic categories are useful as ethnic and archaeological labels. If you know what language a group spoke then you can recognize its material culture, and vice versa. There is such a thing as an Eastern Germanic brooch.
5. An ethnic label does not really change. It is born somewhere, lives, moves around, expands, contracts and finally goes extinct – all as an essentially unchanged thing.
6. If the written sources name three ethnic groups in an area, then you must look for three archaeological groups there – not two, not four.

7. It is sound methodology to mingle arguments from the archaeological record and from the written sources, because after all, there is no chance that they might contradict each other.

8. When the archaeology becomes confusing or the written sources fail you, you can classify a site as a mixture of two or three well established ethnic labels.

9. Ethnic craniometry is a fairly unproblematic scientific data source.

Looking in awe at the vast archaeological and historical record of Eastern Europe, I myself can claim no specific knowledge of it worth mentioning. And I am not suggesting that we should ignore the written evidence. But I do believe that regardless of where we work in the world, we should keep archaeology separate from history until late in the classificatory and interpretive process. Then we may juxtapose them, each on its own strengths, and allow them to illuminate – and potentially contradict – each other.

* Martin Rundkvist teaches at the Linnaeus University and blogs at scienceblogs.com/aardvarchaeology.*
Session Reports

Malga, Buron, Alm, Shieling, Seter, Salaš, Orry and Cayolar.

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

These are just some of the words which are used across Europe for the sites that are occupied by farmers in the summer to exploit the resources in mountain areas. The movement of part or the whole population of farms and villages seasonally to exploit summer grazing is virtually a pan-European phenomenon, but ours has been the first attempt to look at it at a continent wide scale and to look at it through time, though our survey has been far from comprehensive (s. TEA No. 36, Winter 2011/2012). Continuing on from our first session in Oslo in 2011, in Helsinki we again reviewed several cases. As ever the Alps where this activity is well known dominated the session, but it is highly variable, and it leaves very different sorts of remains in different areas, so the study of Alpwirtschaft in its various guises is far from exhausted, especially archaeologically, and surveys such as that by Brigitte Andres in the Bernese Alps in Switzerland has produced a wide range of new structures in the areas above the tree line.

Mark Pearce looked at the economic basis of the use of summer farms in the Bronze and Iron Ages in Italy in both the Apennines and the Alps, and the production of hard cheeses must be a key element in making such activity worthwhile in providing foods that can be stored long term for use over winter. Kevin Walsh and Florence Mocci showed that climatic conditions are also important along with ancillary activities such as mining, and how long-term changes can potentially be studied as they are doing in the southern French Alps. In northern Spain a team represented by David González-Álvarez has been looking at the brañas of the Asturian Mountains and their history. Even on a small island such as the Isle of Man there are summer shielings to be found on the higher ground, and which excavation
Evidence from the 1960s showed began in the medieval period. Recent survey by Andrew Johnson has shown there is still more survey to be done to understand how these sites functioned and related to permanent settlements on lower ground. However, not everywhere do such summer farms exist, and Dagmar Dreslerová and Máriá Hajnalová discussed reasons why the highland areas of Bohemia and the Carpathians in Slovakia may not have been exploited in earlier periods. In Bohemia, mountain cabin farming was introduced by Alpine woodcutters in the 17th to 19th centuries in the Krkonoše Mountains, and in Slovakia summer farming by Wallachians in the 15th to 16th centuries. Most of our studies have centred on the visible remains of the settlements, but another approach is to look at the skeletal evidence, especially isotopes, which can show the differences in diet, and so the seasonal movements of individuals, as Natalia Shishlina has been doing with Bronze Age burials in the North Caucasus and the Eurasian Steppes.

These papers and others will be published by J.R. Collis Publications in conjunction with Equinox, we hope next year.

New perspectives on lithic scatters and landscapes: Evaluation and selection in and outside the context of archaeological resource management

E. Rensink, Cultural Heritage Agency, the Netherlands (E.Rensink@cultureelerfgoed.nl) and C. J. Bond, Department of Archaeology, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, The University of Winchester, United Kingdom (clivejbond@aol.com)

Session organizers: Eelco Rensink (the Netherlands), Clive Bond (United Kingdom) and Erwin Meylemans (Belgium)

On Saturday, 1 September 2012, the session E16 on lithic scatters was held during the Annual Meeting of the EAA in Helsinki (Fig. 1). A year earlier, during the EAA meeting in Oslo, a number of topics relevant to the study of lithic scatters had been addressed in the session ‘Lithic scatters, a European perspective’ (see Bond et al. 2011; for a brief summary, see Smit 2011). The session in Helsinki was a logical follow-up to the lithic scatter session held in Oslo.

Although lithic scatters occur in more than 99% of the occupation history of most European countries, relatively few professional archaeologists are dealing with lithic scatters in the context of archaeological heritage management. And the ones that are have a hard job: in daily practice, lithic scatters are often considered as a problematic, non-attractive and expensive source of information. In terms of lithic scatters as derived from ploughed or disturbed surface contexts, they are also often perceived as only able to provide poor data, derived from palimpsests, inferior to single period excavated sites. But, both this surface and below surface archaeology has value and can be assessed by deploying a range of field techniques and methods (Bond 2011; Scott-Jackson and Scott-Jackson 2011).

In the Netherlands, an increasing number of people working for municipalities or in consultancies are very skeptical about the archaeological value of Stone Age sites, asking questions such as:

- What information exactly can be derived from lithic scatters?
- Why should we pay a considerable amount of money for excavation when the site is disturbed by bioturbation and modern land use?
- Why excavate another hunting camp?

Of course, these questions are both useful and legitimate, and policy makers and even colleague archaeologists may have good reasons to bring up such questions. It underlines the notion that we are facing a new reality. Developments in national policies and legislations are such that Stone Age archaeologists cannot sit back and continue to do what they did in...
the past decades. Obviously, we have to create new, evidence-based, well-founded frameworks for recording and analysing lithic scatters that are reliable and transparent. We also have to communicate these frameworks in very clear and convincing ways to other stakeholders in the archaeological field and heritage management, otherwise such unique evidence at site and landscape scale will be ignored, under-valued and lost.

Fig. 1: Participants enjoying the opening lectures in the session in Helsinki. Many old and new faces joined the organizers, demonstrating a growing Europe-wide network of archaeologists keen to meet at EAA and discuss ‘lithic scatters’ as an important subject for archaeological research and practice, in its own right.

The main focus of the Helsinki session was the evaluation and selection of lithic scatters and landscapes. How do we evaluate lithic scatters? What are the important questions before we start fieldwork and how (with what methods, techniques and strategies) can we do this in an efficient and reliable way?

Experiences from fieldwork in the Netherlands and Belgium demonstrate that surveys carried out in the context of development-led archaeology are often oriented towards trial trenching and the detection of features, explaining the absence or low number of stone artefacts that are detected. When flint artefacts are found, it is often not clear whether or not to proceed with fieldwork and how to do that. Indeed, what are adequate methods and techniques in order to evaluate a prehistoric hunter-gatherer site? How do we deal with large scale Stone Age landscapes and palimpsests? Sampling should be done to such an extent that:

- we collect sufficient archaeological materials (including retouched tools) for answering the research questions and for making a reliable assessment about the total site, and
- we have enough information to determine the effects of post-depositional processes on a site.

So, how much of a site do we need to excavate, and is it possible to make this explicit before fieldwork starts?

The lithic scatter session in Helsinki comprised one general introduction and nine presentations of 15 minutes, each followed by a short discussion. Before the coffee break, there were five presentations dealing with prospection and evaluation of lithic scatters from the United Kingdom, Denmark, Poland and the Czech Republic. These five presentations mainly dealt with ploughed surface sites. It is worth noting, in the United Kingdom and elsewhere, this is often the only context for lithic scatters. Unfortunately, despite much research on plough-zone archaeology, this type of lithic scatter site still represents one of the most neglected categories of sites in archaeological heritage management (see for instance, Rensink and Peeters 2006).
Clive Bond presented some examples of shovel test pit surveys focusing on locating and assessing the extent and character of lithic scatters in Somerset (Somerset Levels and the Mendip Hills) and Norfolk (the fen-edge and Goodsands region), United Kingdom. His conclusion is that shovel test pit surveys are a cheap, fast and effective method to apply to the evaluation of Mesolithic and early Neolithic landscapes. They can offer a volumetric sample of lithics from the plough soil, able to be compared to other assemblages recovered by the traditional systematic field survey techniques, such as line-walking or timed grid walking.

Peter Chowne discussed current research in the upper reaches of the valley of the River Lymn in Lincolnshire, United Kingdom. The paper focused on the methodology used to assess the research potential of a large collection of lithic material collected from the ploughed fields by a local prolific and skilled amateur (William ‘Bill’ Bee). The surface derived assemblages comprised of over 20,000 lithics, mostly debitage and at least 6000 diagnostic retouched pieces. He demonstrated that the ‘information value’ of such collections for understanding early prehistoric landscapes is very high. For instance, plotting diagnostic pieces using Geographical Information Systems (GIS) has allowed the mapping of repeated patterns in human activity in relation to different soils and the subtle topography of this Lincolnshire landscape.

The paper of Lone Ritchie Andersen and Søren Timm Melvold Christensen dealt with the inland Mesolithic settlement of Jutland in Denmark. Thanks to the application of well-considered strategies of fieldwork combined with a growing understanding of the location of sites in the landscape, several small Mesolithic sites have been detected and excavated in Central Jutland over recent years. This allowed mapping of a landscape that had been ignored in recent published syntheses and viewed as devoid of Mesolithic settlements. The conclusion was that it is not only possible to locate new Mesolithic sites, but also that lithic scatters contain meaningful and new information relevant to understanding land use, key for the current heritage management.

Iwona Sobkowiak-Tabaka spoke about the possibilities of registration of Stone Age sites in Poland and of minimizing the risk of underestimating the value of such under-researched sites. In the last 15 years, effective methods of detection, evaluation and selection have been developed in relation to the construction of national highways. Combining GIS and aerial
photographs with the results of archaeological research enabled the prediction of the potential locations of Late Palaeolithic and Mesolithic sites and ensured their effective recording, often under pressure through commercial timescales, but still enabling local communities to be involved in recording their archaeology.

In the last paper before the coffee break, Katarína Čuláková presented a case study from a region in Eastern Bohemia (Czech Republic). In the study area, ploughed fields had been surveyed in an area of about 100 km$^2$. The survey provided a collection of more than 15,000 lithics, particularly dating from the Mesolithic period. In isolating different types of lithic scatters, based on composition and landscape setting (open landscape, near rivers or lakes, rock shelters, etc.), this survey had started to explore the different ‘story’ of each scatter. Lithic scatters are not just a collection of stone tools or waste; they have stories to tell about the people who made the artefacts, the people who visited (often re-visited) very specific places in our regional European landscapes. They are, above all, very human places often settled by generations of people colonizing and exploiting our landscapes.

After the coffee break, the session continued with four presentations from the Low Countries. Yanik Raczynski, Henk and Marcel Niekus addressed two recently discovered Middle Palaeolithic sites in the Netherlands (Fig. 2). At both sites, sub-surface artefact concentrations have been found in relation to surface scatters of artefacts. Trenches were dug to provide a geological framework, but at both sites, much to the surprise and delight of the researchers, artefacts were unearthed well below the disturbed (ploughed) topsoil. Based on these results, Henk and Niekus concluded that the traditionally-ascribed low value of ‘surface sites’ is very much in need of reassessment. In fact, this category of sites may signify exciting new research possibilities, moving from topsoil to sub-surface and very ancient lithic scatters.

Fig. 3: Erwin Meylemans chairing questions and discussion after Marijn van Gills, Bart Vanmontfort and Ferdi Geerts’ thoughtful presentation on survey strategies and techniques for locating Final Palaeolithic lithic scatters.

Marijn van Gils presented a paper for colleagues Bart Vanmontfort and Ferdi Geerts, and focused on the importance of practical survey strategies and techniques for the detection of buried Final Palaeolithic sites associated with palaeosols (like the Usselo soil) in the coversand area of Belgium. In this area, buried sites (despite good preservation conditions) are barely included in current heritage management practices. In fact, standard surveys are not adapted to the nature of these sites. Drawing on experience obtained from three intensively surveyed and partially excavated sites (Arendonk Korhaan, Lommel Maatheide...
and Lommel Molse Nete), Van Gils proposed new survey and evaluation techniques and strategies. One of the key challenges appears to be the identification of the palaeosols, which requires specialized skills and methods (Fig. 3).

In his presentation, Bjørn Smit pointed out that in the Pleistocene parts of the Netherlands, the vast majority of lithic scatters dating from the Late Palaeolithic, Mesolithic and Neolithic are disturbed to a high degree (as a result of biotic, chemical processes and modern land use) and consist only of inorganic archaeological remains (mostly lithics). Due to these characteristics, these sites have received little attention within the realm of archaeological heritage management. Taking examples of fieldwork conducted in the Netherlands, Smit made a plea in favour of integration of palaeo-ecological information from nearby organic deposits when assessing lithic scatters. In his opinion, this information should be a decisive factor in deciding whether a scatter is worth preserving in situ or not.

The final paper was that of Jeroen Flamman, which focused on the rich Mesolithic and Neolithic record associated with point bars at Well Aijen, along the River Meuse in the Netherlands. Over an area of 6 ha, several Neolithic settlements were mapped, and over another area of 1 ha, numerous lithic scatters from the Mesolithic were encountered. These Mesolithic scatters were spatially separated both horizontally and vertically in a matrix of sandy loam on levels between 1 to 2.5 metres below ground level. Flamman presented a new research strategy applied at a landscape scale, providing miraculously good information on the stratigraphy and the distribution of the sites. The research strategy was reiterative, enabling the team to reflect and re-focus on selected locations after the first fieldwork evaluation, honing the in-field methodology for future fieldwork along this tract of the River Meuse.

The session was concluded by Clive Bond providing thanks to fellow organizers, the speakers and participants. A few comments as an overview were provided by Bond.

- **Lithic Scatters, Heritage and Research Context:** It is interesting that at Oslo and now, Helsinki, work on lithic scatters was clearly taking place in research, commercial and even community archaeology project contexts. It may be that field recording of lithic scatters may lend themselves to less technical, complex, community based projects (skills learnt easily; short episodes of fieldwork; limited equipment required), rather than excavation. This may certainly be the case with surface lithic scatters, shovel tests and test pitting. However, there were also, particularly in the Netherlands and Belgium, examples of very structured approaches, including analytical science, sampling and full scale excavation by professional archaeologists alone. Approaches are as diverse as landscapes and prehistoric material culture are across Europe.

- **Lithic Scatters and a Positive Discourse:** Overwhelmingly, the language of the speakers and participants with questions and discussion was positive. There was no reference to lithic scatters as ‘poor data’, just different data, compared to other types of sites. Lithic scatters can provide important information through different survey, evaluation, excavation and sampling regimes.

- **Lithic Scatters, Collectors and Museums:** Many papers used existing museum collections, some amateur collections, and still others were drawn from professional fieldwork. From such studies, is there a value for museum collections to re-analyse, or relate to more recent assemblages drawn from survey, evaluation and/or excavation? Many parts of Europe have a tradition of amateur collection. Can we access this, build on this knowledge and deploy it for engaging communities in their past, but also informing our research strategies and frameworks?

- **Lithic Scatters and Assemblage Data:** Data not just from the site or landscape (spatial level), but also the assemblage are of statistical significance. Few researchers have explored the properties of lithic scatter palimpsests. This is a unique and important property of this class of site. It offers a tangible means of accessing different tempos of human settlement; perhaps even different ways of attaching meaning and perceiving place over generations (see Bond 2009). Can we understand why some lithic scatters are single period/activity based, whilst others are multiple period, complex palimpsests?
A number of themes were also noted through their absence in the EAA session at Helsinki and the year before in Oslo. Importantly, no papers were submitted by colleagues working in Mediterranean Europe. This is disturbing and surprising. Many of us have grown up learning about the last 30 years or so of systematic field surveys across these countries that recorded pottery sherds from the Classical and medieval periods, lithics and more rarely, prehistoric pottery. Perhaps there is a different tradition of fieldwork in these regions, different ways of funding and prioritizing sites, with undervaluing of lithic scatters in the ploughzone. Site-centred studies may dominate, rather than landscape orientated research. Who is researching lithic scatters in these regions? We’d like to hear from you!

At Oslo and Helsinki, the levels of artefact and assemblage analysis, and the type and number of attributes were also absent in papers and discussions. Perhaps this is another theme worthy of rethinking; should there be a standard for recording the lithic scatter assemblage; and is there a limit to the utility of recording attributes from lithics derived from lithic scatters? Given the numbers involved, there may well be a time limit, given constraints on research or commercial project budgets. There may also be an important match with the type of statistical software and GIS one uses that either limits, or provides opportunities, for multiple variables to be queried.

Interestingly, there was also a lack of explicit archaeological/social theory in contributions. Coming from a United Kingdom perspective, prehistoric landscape archaeology is very much focused on ‘taskscapes’ and ‘locales’, all a hangover from the Tilley phenomenological approach (McFadyen 2008). Sadly, all the detail from the lithic, spatial and environmental analyses are mostly ignored in such discussions, rendering a ‘taskscape’ for any landscape, but not the one that is evidenced in tabular lithics data from an actual surveyed or excavated site. Fieldwork, practice and social theory are separated. So, we also need to analyse the lithics and the place, and engage in social theory when we write our reports! Lithic scatters were places that were populated; this needs emphasizing. Lithic scatters are too important to be ignored, too spatially diffuse across Europe to be only a footnote in prehistoric syntheses. This session served to start re-addressing this status quo, situating the proper study of lithic scatters in European Archaeological Resource Management. It was very pleasing to see contributors coming from across Northern and Eastern Europe, giving insights to original and new case studies.

At the close of the session, the organizers looked to the future: a session on lithic scatters, again, to be planned and held at EAA 2013 in Pilsen. Indeed, if you read this, and you are interested in contributing to a future session, we’d very much like to hear from you!

Every year we meet new colleagues from across Europe, who all share our deep interest in lithic scatters. You would be very welcome to join us.
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Guidelines for in situ preserved archaeological sites and areas

Vibeke Vandrup Martens, NIKU – Norwegian Institute for Cultural Heritage Research, Norway (vibeke.martens@niku.no) and Michel Vorenhout, Archeologische Monumentenwacht Nederland; University of Amsterdam, the Netherlands (m.vorenhout@mvhconsult.nl)

Many countries have adopted the practice of in situ preservation: a system where the original site is preserved in its surroundings, in combination with essential archaeological research. This practice is challenged by many types of developments at these sites, like building activities, road construction and changes in water management. These developments require a good assessment and response. What is allowed, and what is not? Can a developer simply build roads or edifices, and use piling? Or do we need to regulate in a standardized way?

Several countries have developed generalized answers to these questions, and set guidelines for in situ preservation. The session at the EAA 2012 meeting in Helsinki, organized by the Norwegian Institute for Cultural Heritage Research (NIKU) and the Archeologische Monumentenwacht Nederland, brought together speakers from six countries (plus archaeologists from a couple more countries in the audience) to discuss the value of guidelines and share experiences in their use.

Norway was represented by Vibeke Vandrup Martens (from NIKU). She showed that Norway has a nice set of written guidelines, a Norwegian standard, detailing how things should be done. This amount of detail was really impressive, but the pitfall is that not many people are using the guidelines, as they seem rather difficult and laborious and are simply not known by enough people. Only a small group of people seem specialized enough to actively follow the guidelines.

Sweden was represented by Gertie Ericsson and Ivan Balic, from Kulturen, Kulturhistoriska föreningen för Södra Sverige. They showed that the current focus is on the important organizational aspects of in situ preservation. Some projects can fail without a good integration into building applications, or with untimely information gathering. They use a set of guidelines to include the archaeology much earlier in the development process, preferably before a permit is requested. They also documented the importance of following up building permits, with regular progress checks at the site.

The question of piling and general building activities was addressed by two Dutch presentations. Maarten Groenendijk (from the Municipality of Gouda) explained the guidelines set out in Gouda. He initiated the creation of a photo catalogue of observations of pilings in Gouda. It shows damage caused by piling, but also many situations where piling did not hinder archaeological research. Archaeologists were asked to answer a few questions on the difficulties they encountered while working at sites with recent piling. From this, a set of general rules was derived, which allow a developer to get automatic permission when he complies with these rules. The possible loss of some archaeology due to the piling itself was considered a small sacrifice for a lot of goodwill in return, and it was stressed that automatic building permits were not given in the most archaeologically valuable parts of the town.

The other example, presented by Michel Vorenhout (from AMW), came from the city of Vlaardingen. There, a risk assessment was performed for the inner city area. This revealed that a combination of adequate water infiltration and retention together with a solid soil creates very good preservation conditions. Guidelines focus on these aspects, ensuring wet soil conditions. In Vlaardingen, the piling situation is similar to the experiences in Gouda, with the exception that some basic monitoring must be included with piling.

Two Polish presentations (by Robert Zukowski and Tadeusz Baranowski, Institute of Archaeology and Ethnology of Polish Academy of Sciences), and one from Lithuania (by Audrone Kasperaviciene, Directorate of the State Cultural Reserve of Vilnius Castles) focussed on public awareness and political surroundings. No guidelines can be used without good cooperation from stakeholders.
A poster, "Archeological in situ Park in Urban Context: The Case from Ljubljana, Slovenia" was presented by Bernarda Županek (from MGML, Slovenia) on Thursday, but it was also presented during the session and fit in very nicely with the whole session theme. The session ended with a general agreement that guidelines are useful and necessary, but they need to be kept short and simple, so that they can be easily communicated to heritage management, field archaeologists, developers, contractors and all other stakeholders.

Vocational training of archaeological heritage

Marjolijn Kok, Bureau Archeologie en Toekomst, the Netherlands (marjolijnkok@ilahs.com) and Rosa Martínez, Aranzadi Society of Sciences, Spain (rosamr.07@gmail.com)

The session on vocational training of archaeological heritage was organized as a result of the EU Leonardo da Vinci project, “Vocational training system in archaeological heritage based upon e-learning resources”. The main aim was to look at the different possibilities of vocational training within a heritage context, and the subject was approached from a number of different positions.

Raimund Karl, Marc Lodewijckx, Arek Marciniak, and Amanda Forster in their respective papers emphasized the need for education that connects to the present-day reality of commercial archaeology. Karl talked about the Archaeology Training Forum in the UK and how this could help individual people develop practical competence. Lodewijckx explained that the difficult political system in Belgium is reflected in the educational system, and that Flanders has adapted its higher education to the needs of commercial archaeology. Marciniak and Forster explained about post graduate courses that were more group-based; Marciniak relied on e-learning that could be done from different places, while Forster relied on open conferences, which required people to gather together. To conclude, they suggested that vocational training can prepare people for archaeological work in the present-day context through changes to the educational content and through the ability to certify certain skills outside academia.

Rosa Martínez and Teresita Majewski emphasized that the role of heritage training outside the normal educational institutions can give people skills they can use in their lives. People participating in projects can develop a more active citizenship. Majewski explained how veterans with learning difficulties can be taught certain skills, such as documentation and working in a regular job, that they can use in other jobs inside or outside the heritage sector. Martinez showed how knowledge of heritage in the local environment makes people more active in their community.

Ben Thomas and Meredith Anderson Langlitz showed how a day of celebrating archaeology can make people aware of heritage in their area (cf. their report in TEA no. 37). The discussion focused on how incidental events can be turned into a more enduring learning relationship.

The session ended with the personal story of Lindsey, who had been part of the Institute for Archaeologists (IfA, Reading, UK) vocational training and had furthered her career, through learning new skills that were certified. It could be concluded that vocational training more focused on the present-day working environment could also help professionals further their careers and the general public could, through the use of heritage, learn new skills that would help them become more active participants in society.
Material chains and networks in space: Production sequences, processes, chaînes opératoires and object biographies in Bronze and Iron Ages workshops

Barbara Armbruster, CNRS – Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, France (barbara.armbruster@univ-tlse2.fr), Alexis Gorgues, Université de Bordeaux, France, and Katharina Rebay-Salisbury, University of Leicester, United Kingdom (kcrs1@le.ac.uk)

This session was the product of a lucky coincidence and emerged out of two sessions with similar focus, but slightly different aims, which we combined at the suggestion of the scientific committee in Helsinki. One initiator was the programme ‘Tracing Networks: Craft Traditions in the Ancient Mediterranean and Beyond’ funded by The Leverhulme Trust and based at the universities of Leicester, Glasgow and Exeter (http://tracingnetworks.ac.uk/content/web/introduction.jsp); the other was a programme funded by the Région Aquitaine, called ‘Un artisanat en réseau. Innovation et transferts de technologie dans le sud-ouest de l’Europe (Aquitaine, Languedoc, péninsule Ibérique), de l’âge du Bronze final à la conquête romaine’ (Craftsmen in Networks: innovation and technology transfers in south-west Europe from the Late Bronze Age to the Roman conquest), based at the university of Bordeaux 3-Michel de Montaigne.

Our common interest lay in craft production in the ancient Mediterranean and adjacent regions in the Bronze and Iron Ages. We were interested in two aspects in particular: first, to examine the theoretical underpinnings of studies of craft production, and second, to investigate their spatial unfolding. Concepts such as production sequences, processes, chaînes opératoires and artefact biographies consider the technological elements of production, distribution and consumption of objects step by step from the procurement of raw materials to the finished item, extending into artefact distribution and transfer of technologies. Increasingly, social and embodied aspects of craft, and the importance of human agency on process have been taken into consideration. Examples include the social roles of the craftpersons and the embeddedness of their skills, learning, transmission and modification of styles and technologies, and gauging material properties with the human senses. We have developed new and diverse vocabularies to talk about craft production – but are the approaches different, or just the words we use to describe them? What are the commonalities and differences between the concepts in use today? In this session, papers by Katharina Rebay-Salisbury and Roderick Salisbury, Sara Strack and Maria Giuseppina Gradoli were particularly helpful to explore these questions. Ann Brysbaert and Melissa Vettters contributed with a discussion on the concept of exotica, which likewise is an under-theorized concept.

Production sequences and chaînes opératoires were at the heart of several papers on pottery products (Alessandro Quercia and Lin Foxhall, Alexandra Ghenghea, Juan Jesús Padilla Fernández, as well as a paper by a research group from Bordeaux including Nicolas Frèrebeau, Alexis Gorgues, Ayed Ben Amara, Nadia Cantin, Michel Pernot and Charlotte Sacilotto), several of which used scientific methods to reconstruct individual steps of the production processes. The discussion was continued by shifting our focus to metal production, with papers by Maikel Kuipers, Tina Hansen Adam, Ziad El Morr, Eleftheria Theodoroudi, Alexandre Bertaud and Jody Joy. Production sequences, processes, chaînes opératoires and artefact biographies, however, do not exist in a vacuum; craftsmanship is carried out in physical space, in work areas and workshops.

The second theme of this session thus addressed the spatial dimension of craft production, which includes permanent structures such as workshops as well as ephemeral traces. In some cases, the place where craftspeople worked can be well studied through moulds, furnaces and slags in situ. Regular and intense activities have a major impact on the archaeological record, whilst one-off activities may be more difficult to reconstruct and finding these places might prove to be a challenge. Comparing the archaeological record linked to craft, work areas and their spatial organization was explored through specific questions: was...
the work area permanent, temporary, or a one-off? Was the work area located in an area within a palace, mansion, farm or house? Was it part of a room or located in an open space? Was the work area exclusively dedicated to a specific production process, or was it embedded in a wider range of activities, such as domestic tasks? How are workshops situated in relation to each other, to settlements and within the landscape? We saw concrete examples of workshop findings from recent excavations in papers by Paola Bianchi from Italy and Alexis Gorgues from Spain. Barbara Armbruster contributed with a paper that brought ethno-archaeological context to the study of craft production. Halina Dobrzanska and Nanouschka Myrberg brought us back into more recent times with papers on medieval pottery and coin production.

As a whole, the ‘Material Chains and Networks’ session brought together a range of papers with tight theoretical focus, and great chronological and geographical diversity. Various kinds of craft production were discussed in the context of their spatial unfolding. The session provided the opportunity to compare the sequence of production in different crafts and the associated workshops, and thus to learn from each other’s research. We are aiming to publish the session in the Ausonius Editions (Bordeaux) within the next two years.

‘Princely sites’, oppida and open settlements – New approaches to urbanization processes in the Iron Age of central and western Europe

Manuel Fernández-Götz, Regierungspräsidium Stuttgart, Landesamt für Denkmalpflege (manuel.fernandez-goetz@rps.bwl.de), Holger Wendling, Römisch-Germanische Kommission Frankfurt, Katja Winger, Römisch-Germanische Kommission Frankfurt and Jesús Álvarez-Sanchís, Universidad Complutense de Madrid

The European Iron Age has for quite a long time been perceived as a pan-continental phenomenon, not only with regard to a presumed ethnic unity of the ‘Celts’. However, traditional notions of a ‘Celtic’ ethnicity and culture have been severely challenged in recent years (e.g. Collis 2006). From the beginnings of Iron Age archaeology in the 19th century, another seemingly comprehensive development has been focused on: the emergence and characteristics of ‘Europe’s first towns north of the Alps’ (Collis 1984; Fichtl 2012), which were perceived as a common trait of Late Iron Age communities following Joseph Déchelette’s fundamental paradigm of the civilisation des oppida. Since then, processes of urbanization and centralization have been intensely discussed in conferences and sessions. Two congresses at Glux-en-Glenne in 1998 (Guichard/Sievers/Urban 2000) and at Aschaffenburg in 2010 (Sievers/Schönfelder 2012) presented the status of present-day studies on urbanization, and laid down basic principles for future research. Additionally, the latest investigations on ‘central sites’ (‘Zentralorte’) of the Early Iron Age in Central Europe have significantly altered the perception of the characteristics, social dynamics and development of Late Hallstatt/Early LaTène ‘princely sites’ (Krausse 2008, 2010).

In order to link different approaches on particular temporal phenomena all over Europe, the EAA session on ‘Princely Sites, Oppida and Open Settlements’ tried to incorporate a variety of regional and supra-regional analyses on urbanization and on the emergence of complex settlement structures throughout the European Iron Age. A stated intention was to facilitate a comparative view on developments within continental and British Iron Age communities, promoting a sustained discussion on similar underlying trends or unique aspects of urbanization.

John Collis (University of Sheffield) opened the session with a comparison of processes of urbanization in the Mediterranean and temperate Europe. He contrasted ‘city states’ and ‘tribal states’, and discussed the implications each of them had on the emergence and quality of towns within different social and political systems.
Olivier Buchenschutz (Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, Paris) and Ian B. M. Ralston (University of Edinburgh) pointed out the importance of power, wealth and society for urbanization in Central France. Incorporating both archaeological and written sources (e.g. Caesar’s account of his campaign in Gaul), they analysed the impact of different social groups (e.g. members of the elite, traders, craftsmen) on the emergence of highly differentiated settlements.

Raphaël Golosetti (Centre Archéologique Européen, Bibracte) discussed the role that places of memory, heroic cults and ritual continuity in Southern Gaul played for urbanization processes. The importance of Bronze Age sanctuaries for the development of Iron Ages settlements was underlined.

Excavations at the La Tène settlement at Roseldorf in Lower Austria have revealed a variety of artefacts and features that provide an insight into ritual and economic aspects of an Iron Age agglomeration. Veronika Holzer (Naturhistorisches Museum Wien) portrayed structural and functional characteristics of the eponymous unfortified site of the type ‘Němčice-Roseldorf’.

Alžběta Danielisová (Akademie věd České republiky, Archeologický ústav AV ČR, Praha) and Mária Hajnalová (Univerzita Konštantína Filozofa v Nitre, Nitra) introduced the first results of an ambitious project on Late La Tène subsistence strategies. Their multidisciplinary approach incorporates archaeological and ecological data to assess the demand and environmental interdependencies of urban and rural communities.

Dominik Lukas (Excellence Cluster Topoi, Berlin) pursued a historical semantic approach to the term ‘oppidum’, i.e. massively fortified sites of considerable size. Following the history of research on Bibracte/Mont Beuvray in Burgundy, he exemplified the changing meaning and appropriation of archaeological terms within the discussion on Late Iron Age urbanization.

Tom Moore (Durham University) presented recent research on an unenclosed settlement at the source of the Yonne River, only 4 kilometres from the oppidum of Bibracte/Mont Beuvray. Environmental settlement analysis is intended to reveal aspects of site interdependencies and functional characteristics of an open settlement in the hinterland of the rather well-known oppidum.

Ian Armit, Chris Gaffney and Ashley Hayes (University of Bradford) showed the impact of integrated geophysical and topographic prospection on understanding organization of space and urbanization in the southern French Iron Age. Francisco Burillo-Mozota (Universidad de Zaragoza) presented results from the excavations at the Celtiberian oppidum of Segeda. The
synoikismos, which is attested in ancient written sources, seems to be reflected in the archaeological record.

Developed hillforts in southern England as a particular settlement type are generally not considered to be urban. Niall Sharples (University of Cardiff) presented fresh data and recent approaches that lead to a re-evaluation of these large and often densely settled sites.

In addition to the papers presented, Hannele Rissanen (Archäologische Bodenforschung Basel-Stadt), Muriel Roth-Zehner (Antea-Archéologie), Corina Knipper (Johannes Gutenberg University Mainz), David Brönnimann and Sandra Pichler (University of Basel) presented a poster about interdisciplinary investigations of the Late La Tène settlement Basel-Gasfabrik and its hinterland (cf. the report in TEA no. 37).

The variety of temporal and regional phenomena that were discussed in the session reveal the need for a reconsideration of the seemingly comprehensive phenomena that are subsumed under the broad term ‘urbanization’. With reference to singular processes and concepts, peculiarities and similarities within emerging complex settlements of different regions and times might be revealed. This in turn enables the characterization of common basic imperatives and analogous processes, which might lead to the development and subsequent testing of models of prehistoric urbanization. As seen in the different session contributions, the emergence of early towns is a phenomenon that is highly dependent on the interaction of an urban core with its economic and social surroundings. The papers presented in the session will be published as a volume under the title *Paths to Complexity – Centralisation and Urbanisation in Iron Age Europe* (Oxbow Books).
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**From bone to bead: Developments in European research on worked osseous materials**

Aline Averbouh, Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique - CNRS, TRACES, Toulouse, France (averbouh@univ-tlse2.fr), and Alice M. Choyke, Central European University, Budapest, Hungary

Worked osseous materials are among the earliest tools and ornaments manufactured and used by human beings. They are found across the world in find assemblages from every period where conditions of preservation exist. Despite this fact, bone tools have remained an understudied class of artefacts. Their study has only begun to take form in the past forty years and has only really begun to take off in the past twenty years.

The 1960s and 70s saw fundamental work carried out by schools of research founded by Henriette Camps-Fabrer in France and by the lithics expert A.S.A. Semenov in Russia. However, elsewhere in the world, individual work was carried out by researchers working in isolation with little opportunity to coordinate and learn from each other.

Until the early 2000s, technological and functional approaches to osseous materials (already applied to lithic industries from the middle of the 70s) were seldom employed in studies of osseous materials (except for pioneers such as Semenov 1964, Billamboz 1977, Stordeur 1979). Over the past decade, methodological and practical advances have enabled the development of this type of approach in the analysis of osseous materials through the acquisition of more efficient methods and procedures especially adapted to the particular requirements demanded by the raw material (particularly in France, Averbouh 2000, 2001 with osseous technology, and Maigrot 2003, 2005 with osseous functional traceology).

These advances also complemented and integrated previously collected information on certain technical and functional aspects, thus opening new research avenues to many students and young researchers in France and Russia in particular. Conducted within a common framework of analysis (systematization of procedures, ranking and definition of the parameters of observation, proposition of a standardized vocabulary), these analyses, through their multiplication, have not only enabled the identification and characterization of debitage methods, transformation schemes, and certain functions and ways objects were used, but permits comparison of these results. In addition, by following the same methodological systematization as that in studies of other types of industries (lithic, ceramic or metal), these new studies allow comparisons to be made between the practical and conceptual means employed to exploit and use other types of materials. In this way, osseous technology and functional traceology have now become one of the major tools for clarifying the nature of a site, reconstructing technical, economic and social spheres, and more broadly, the lifeways and functioning of those past societies where osseous materials were exploited.

Starting in the 1980s, archaeozoologists also started to become involved in bone tool studies (for example Jörg Schibler in Switzerland (Schibler 1980), Alice Choyke in Hungary (Choyke 1984) and Sandra Olsen in the USA) creating schools with more of an emphasis on raw material choice.

Today, there is an official working group for bone tools (Worked Bone Research Group – WBRG) and on-going initiatives by CNRS-based projects in France bringing together archaeologists from different scholarly backgrounds across Europe to exchange experiences and resolve targeted research problems.

The 2012 EAA congress offered an opportunity to introduce the European archaeological community to some of the achievements of the past twenty years in terms of developing theoretical and methodological approaches to the study of this important but still understudied and misunderstood artefact class.

The half-day devoted to the 'bone to bead' session allowed us to select nine papers focused on the work and results of the last GDRE (CNRS-financed research network, see below) and of the WBRG; on future research directions and potentials (methodology and theory)
including raw material studies, memory and various kinds of social identity, attitudes to animals, trace wear studies with a few cases concretely showing what kind of research is taking place today in Europe. Two posters were also selected. Researchers that participated in the session come from research and educational institutions from France, Spain, Italy, The Netherlands, Switzerland, Hungary, Yugoslavia and Romania. A few of the speakers are GDRE Members; all of them are registered on the bone-tool list of the WBRG. The first presentation by A. Averbouh (CNRS Toulouse, France) and A. Choyke (CEU Budapest, Hungary) was set up as a reminder that until the 1990s, worked bone researchers were isolated within their own archaeological communities. The study of bone tools is still rarely taught formally outside France and the Netherlands but two organizations, European Research Group ‘GDRE PREHISTOS’ and the Worked Bone Research Group have worked hard to bridge these gaps. The WBRG (Worked Bone Research Group) working group of the ICAZ (International Council for Archaeozoology) promotes a move away from simple-minded typological approaches. One concern has been the selection of raw materials. Bones, teeth and antler from animals exploited by people provide a huge number of choices for manufacturing. While the particular shape and properties of these materials places limits on the forms which can be produced it is argued here that manufacturing traditions play a determinant role in the final form rather than modern notions of efficiency on the part of the craftspeople who made them. Thus, there is a complex inter-play between the physical characteristics of the raw material, which make them more appropriate for certain kinds of use, and the strong, social reinforcing and/or separating power of tradition. This research field as practiced across Europe today was introduced in the presentation by A. Choyke. Created in 2007, the CNRS European Research Group on the ‘Exploitation of osseous materials in Europe’, GDRE PREHISTOS, currently comprises 46 members affiliated with research laboratories in nine Western, Central and Eastern European countries. Together, the aim is to trace the history (potentially linked) of two key innovations in prehistoric use and transformation of osseous materials: ‘debitage’ by extraction and bevelling in hafting systems. Their social impact over a vast geographic and chronological scale is being assessed. The results and tools of analysis (data sheets, multilingual lexicon on bone industries) created by the GDRE were briefly presented by A. Averbouh. Following that introduction, two presentations were devoted to technological approaches applied to osseous industries. The first one, by José-Miguel Tejero (SERP Barcelona, Spain and ArScAn Nanterre, France) and Nejma Goutas (CNRS, ArScAN Nanterre, France) focused on the potential contributions of the study of osseous technologies. The authors showed once again the way that technological analysis may be part of a systemic approach to this class of artefacts and that any technological observation must then be reconsidered in a social and paleohistorical perspective in order to understand not only the activities that took place during the occupation of a site, but more broadly, to translate these data into ‘a realistic story of human behaviours’. This topic was illustrated with examples from key French and Spanish Aurignacian sites. The second paper dealt with the role of experimentation in technological analysis and the theoretical basis needed to construct such a project. Marianne Christensen (University Paris I Panthéon-Sorbonne, France), José-Miguel Tejero and Pierre Bodu (CNRS, ArScAn Nanterre, France) reminded us that the study of an osseous industry necessarily goes together with an understanding of the technical operation sequence (acquisition - production - use and abandonment). Within this framework, experimentation has great informative potential, particularly in the field of production and use of tools. The authors drew attention to the importance of back-reference to ancient materials prior to any experimental programme in order to establish a protocol that is as close as possible to the archaeological context. Data from a technological analysis of Spanish Aurignacian osseous industry, in particular the production of antler blanks by percussion, illustrated this presentation. The next two presentations addressed use-wear traces or issues of identification of technical striations. Annelou van Gijn and Sara Graziano (Leiden University, the Netherlands) expanded the topic of the archaeology of absence by revealing ‘Invisible Crafts’ from bone and antler tools coming from Mesolithic and Neolithic sites in the wetlands of the...
Rhine/Meuse delta in present-day Netherlands. These tools displayed traces from a range of contact materials indicating that several craft activities, otherwise invisible in an archaeological context were carried out at these sites. These crafts included hide-cleaning and processing, pottery-making, and the processing of plant fibres into basketry products and textiles. The analysis also shows the interdependence of different categories of tools in a technological system, enabling the reconstruction of toolkits. On the other hand, the absence of tools we know were produced on some sites because of waste product presence leads to the issue of absence of evidence. Thus, the speakers argued that reconstructing craft activities relies on the formation of ‘reasonable’ evidence (sensu Putnam) in combination with functional analysis, experimental archaeology, contextual data and ethnographic models.

Zsuzsanna Tóth (Eötvös Loránd Science University, Hungary) for her part chose to present some new finds from the bone industry of the Late Neolithic Period in Hungary. Large cultural complexes emerged in this period in Hungary that expanded far beyond the boundaries of the present-day country. This clearly shows important links between prehistoric communities in this time period. The two main cultural complexes situated on the Western (Lengyel Culture) and Eastern (Tisza-Herpály-Csőszhalom Cultural Complex) part of Hungary had connections of varying intensity to different regions in Europe. On-going studies on material from some important sites with different cultural backgrounds, such as Aszód, Polgár, Öcsöd, Góró and Alsónyék, were used as examples to reflect different attitudes towards rule of production with special regards to raw material selection and typological composition of the assemblages.

Two other presentations emphasized new tools of analysis. First, Noëlle Provenzano (CNRS Lattes, France) tested the utilization of modelling and 3D reconstruction on a special artefact. This kind of work was supposed to permit a backup to be made of the virtual archaeological object, reducing handling and, depending on the degree of fineness of micro-scanning, to allow real usewear analyses to be carried out remotely by reconstitution of micro-surfaces. She illustrated her test with a small bone anthropomorphic statuette found on a Giumelniţa culture site, from the Romanian Chalcolithic. Second, Jörg Schibler, Stefanie Jacomet (University of Basel; Switzerland) and Jorge E. Spangenberg (University of Lausanne; Switzerland) outlined their insights from chemical and isotopic analyses of lipids found on bone and antler tools from Swiss Neolithic Lake Dwelling Sites. Those tools are known to be very well preserved. All kinds of traces, such as grinding marks, hammer marks or polish striations, are readily recognizable on the surface of the artefacts. These traces are often used for functional interpretation of several artefact types. But are all these traces the result of their use, asked the authors? To help answer this question chemical and isotopic analysis were performed on the surface of freshly excavated and not conserved bone and antler artefacts from the site ‘Zurich Opera’ dating to about 3000 BC. The results indicate that Neolithic craftsmen may have maintained their bone and antler artefacts regularly with plant oils.

The presentation given by Monica Mărgărit (Valahia University of Targoviste, Romania), Cătălin Lazăr, Valentin Radu and Mădălina Voicu (National History Museum of Romania) raised the question of the presence of ornaments in funeral contexts in the Eneolithic societies and their meaning. Adornments in such contexts are an inexhaustible source of reflection on the symbolic behaviour of prehistoric groups as well on certain socio-economic aspects of these communities. Benefiting from an ideal archaeological situation at the Eneolithic site from Sultana-Malu Rosu (Romania), consisting of a contemporary tell settlement and a necropolis, and extrapolating to other south-east European discoveries, authors aimed to find out if the ornaments present in the graves were created exclusively as part of the grave goods. Microscopic study and comparison with the ornaments coming from the settlement helped the authors to conclude that funeral ornaments were also worn during the lifetime of the deceased. However, out of the large array of existing forms, only certain types of adornments were deposited as grave goods, especially those made from exotic materials (shells such as Spondylus and Dentalium), while there are fundamentally different forms present in the settlement assemblage made from local raw materials.

To finish off the session, two posters were presented. The first one was devoted to bone industry studies in Western and Central Balkans, especially in former-Yugoslavia (Selena
Vitezović, Archaeological Institute, Belgrade, Yugoslavia). The second one, dealt with two
symbolic objects made from dog mandibles first from the Sultana-Malu Rosu tell settlement
in Romania and second from Europe, presented by Cătălin Lazăr, Adrian Bălășescu, Vasile
Opriș (National History Museum of Romania) and Monica Mărgărit (Valahia University of
Targoviste, Romania).

There is a plan to publish the proceedings of the ‘Developments in European research on
worked osseous materials: from bone to bead’ session in addition to this short report. Further
information will be available on the GDRE PREHISTOS website (gdre-prehistos.cnrs.fr) or on
the WBRG website (www.wbrg.net).
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Landscape of our ancestors:
Current state and future vision

Emmet Byrnes, Department of Agriculture, Food and the Marine, Ireland
(emmet.byrnes@agriculture.gov.ie), Cees Van Rooijen and Karl Cordemans, Vlaamse
Landmaatschappij, Brussels (Karl.Cordemans@vlm.be)

Session organizers: Riikka Mustonen, Noémi Pažinová, Ján Beljak

This session, organized by members of the joint EAA and EAC Working Group on Farming,
Forestry and Rural Land Management, continued the discussion that began at last year’s
Round Table at the EAA Meeting in Oslo, 2011, about the state of cultural landscapes and
the priorities of their management.
In Oslo, the focus was on the role of cultural heritage managers, with perspectives from
England, Norway, Scotland and Sweden (see report by Stephen Trow in TEA no. 36). In
Finland, the organizers asked for papers focusing on three topics:
  a) the role of cultural heritage managers/archaeologists in the landscape-scale
conservation and the use of land,
b) archaeological challenges and opportunities offered by rural and forested land management in Central/Eastern Europe, and
c) the border between appropriate landscape changes and landscape conservation to secure the protection and survival of the archaeological record.

Colleagues from Finland, Germany and Slovakia presented engaging and highly informative papers on a range of related issues and activities.

Piritta Häkälä and Riikka Mustonen gave an account of their work with the Finnish National Forest and Park Service (Metsähallitus), in particular the on-going survey aimed at locating and documenting cultural heritage sites in the forests. Forest workers have been educated about the value of protecting these sites and monuments and given new procedures and rules to accomplish the task. Practical constraints such as the frequency of transferring spatial datasets to and from the Finnish National Board of Antiquities were noted, as were new opportunities and ways of positively engaging landowners and local communities through the documentation of more recent early modern and 20th century structures and features that have a more tangible social importance. Two contrasting case studies on the efficacy of legislative protection and management responses were presented: The first was a prehistoric site that was disturbed by forestry works, despite its prior notification to the national authorities; the other showed that, with the support of the National Board of Antiquities, scheduled forestry works on a rare 17th century settlement were cancelled and the site scheduled as a National Monument.

Grietje Suhr outlined the history and nature of the county-based archaeological and historical monument survey volumes, or “Denkmaltopographie Bundesrepublik Deutschland”, published by State Conservation Offices and common to most of the federal states of Germany. Suhr especially praised the volumes produced in Bavaria, where archaeological monuments have been routinely included since 1989 and where there is a greater integration of the archaeological and historical elements. This foresight has resulted in the production of a more comprehensive resource for archaeologists, planners, the public, and administrators alike. Whilst academic rigour is maintained, the information is presented in a way that is appealing and allows local people to explore the history and development of their particular village, town or city.

Satu Koivisto gave an account on work by the Finnish National Board of Antiquities to counter the more negative effects of forestry activities on cultural heritage. Although problems were evident from the 1970s, it was only in the 1990s that the Ministry responsible for cultural heritage slowly began to react to the issue, and it was nearly another decade before negotiations and agreement were secured with the forestry sector. Recognizing the benefits of co-operative and educational actions in addition to purely legislative protections, a joint three year Swedish-Finnish EU-funded project was recently initiated in the Kvarken region, a block of land that spans the formal boundaries of the two countries and where there is a known high density of archaeological sites and monuments and an equally high incidence of damage from forestry activities. The role of the four partner agencies, i.e. the Finnish National Forest and Park Service, the Finnish National Board of Antiquities, Wästerbotlens Museum, and the Swedish Forestry Agency (Skogsstyrelsen), was detailed, as were the experiences and problems encountered to date. Various means of public outreach were discussed as were the benefits of cross-border exchanges and cooperation, especially between forestry professionals and educators and archaeologists. Engagement with private landowners was identified as an equally pivotal activity.

Noémi Pažinová and Ján Beljak described a landscape management project they and other Slovakian colleagues are working on. The project involves an assessment of historical land use, and changes in, around and associated with the Zvolen Castle (known today as Pustý hrad or “Deserted castle”), a medieval castle located on a hill near the city of Zvolen in central Slovakia. The picturesque castle is situated on a steep cliff above the confluence of the Slatina and Hron rivers. It was an important regional administrative centre from the 12th to 15th centuries, after which it was semi-abandoned. The work of Pažinová and Beljak is a cooperative effort between the Archaeological Institute of the Slovak Academy of Sciences and the Technical Institute, responsible for Forest Management, undertaken in the context of
Slovakia’s ratification of the European Landscape Convention and the spatial planning requirements of the city of Zvolen. It involves the examination of historical sources for land management around the castle, as well as field work to document surviving land management features and historic routes in the surrounding forest park. Excavations have also been undertaken to better understand the development of the castle itself and the complex defensive arrangements.

Cees van Rooijen drew the session to a close with summary remarks, noting some striking common points. All the projects benefitted from a good cooperation with the forestry/land managers, thus creating support for the interests of heritage management. Cooperation means exchange of information, working together in the field, and most important: accepting and appreciating the interests of all partners involved. Such appreciation allowed for choices to be made in the interest of the heritage, but also, quite often, practical solutions beneficial to all partners were found. The availability of good information in relation to the management of the sites is crucial. This also helps to gain the indispensable support that is, in many cases, built up from the start by the incorporation of an educational framework.

The session was reflective of the terms of reference of the Working Group, in terms of collation and presentation of information on the activities of colleagues, national agencies and authorities involved in the management of the historic environment in farmed and forested landscapes. It encouraged the dissemination of the results of special projects, all of which have provided new means of assessment, insight, and responses to the problems encountered by archaeologists and other land managers in their efforts to protect the historic environment.

Even more positively, the discussion amongst speakers and delegates arising out of this session and the prior Working Group meeting in Finland has encouraged a number of its members to propose another session for next year’s conference in Pilsen, in the Czech Republic. A focus on the proposals for the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) for the years 2014-2020 has been suggested, in particular, the risks and opportunities at both national and federal levels for cultural heritage arising out of the current discussions between the European Commission, European Parliament and European Council on the CAP. The need for information on the national situation in the Baltic States, Poland, the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Slovenia, Hungary, Romania and Bulgaria has also been identified.

Other German colleagues have kindly proposed a session focussing specifically on the protection and management of cultural heritage sites in forests, and it is hoped that both sessions will come to fruition and can either be run consecutively or with a sufficient time gap so as to allow attendance at both.

**Examining diseases and impairments in social archaeology:**
**Current issues and future options**

Darek Błaszczyk, Museum of the First Piast at Lednica, Poland (derek-blaszczyk@wp.pl), Magdalena Domicela Matczak, Adam Minckiewicz University, Poland (mmatczak@amu.edu.pl) and Leszek Gardela, University of Aberdeen, United Kingdom (leszekgardela@yahoo.pl)

The session was devoted to archaeological and anthropological investigation of burials containing individuals with diseases and impairments, as well as to the (re)interpretation of so-called atypical or deviant burials. On the one hand, the session aimed to present examples of burials of people with various physical anomalies. On the other hand, it was supposed to go a step further and place burials of such individuals in the broader social context of the life of past societies – of how the ill and disabled were perceived and treated by their communities.
The session included five papers:

- William Southwell-Wright (w.a.southwell-wright@durham.ac.uk): **Deviancy and disability in Romano-British burials**
- Leszek Gardela (leszekgardela@yahoo.pl): **Rethinking West Slavic deviant burials**
- Magdalena Domicela Matczak (mmatczak@amu.edu.pl): **Peopled Culmine – Perception of illness and health in Middles Ages**
- Dominique Castex (d.castex@pacea.u-bordeaux1.fr) and Sacha Kacki (sacha.kacki@inrap.fr): **Impact of plague epidemics on medieval social structures in the light of funeral customs**
- Hélène Réveillas (helene.reveillas@inrap.fr) and Isabelle Souquet-Leroy (isabelle.souquet-leroy@inrap.fr): **Support of a disadvantaged population in the eighteenth century: the Protestant Hospital of La Rochelle (1765-1792)**

William Southwell-Wright investigated 1100 burials dating to the Late Roman period in Britain (3rd and 4th centuries). He noticed that alongside regular burials, Romano-British cemeteries also included so-called ‘deviant burials’, represented most notably by prone and decapitated burials. Taking into consideration such elements of burial custom as positioning of the body, grave good provision and evidence of medical treatment, Southwell-Wright concluded that deviant burials of impaired individuals represent specific and local responses and may possibly indicate attitudes of care or notable investment, rather than negative superstitions.

Magdalena Domicela Matczak examined 132 burials from the medieval cemetery (10th to 13th centuries) at Kaldus, site 1 (called Culmine in written medieval texts), in north-east Poland. She tried to (re)construct cultural classification of diseases in medieval society by using both an emic and etic approach to the culture. Moreover, Matczak considered such categories as location of pain, weakness, visibility and mobility. Taking into consideration the location of a grave within a cemetery, orientation of a burial pit and the body, construction of the grave, positioning of the body, as well as the grave goods provided, the analyses have shown that people with diseases and impairments buried at Culmine were not separated in any way from the community. Presumably, they were treated in the same way as others, following the same burial customs, since there are no archaeological indicators of social exclusion. The only burial within the cemetery that can be interpreted as atypical was of a man with a decapitated head, set in prone position, with no grave goods (grave no. 24/57). The buried person may have been a victim of ‘anti-vampire’ practices or a convict punished by decapitation. However, even this burial was not separated from other graves.

The same period (10th to 13th centuries) was also discussed by Leszek Gardela, who examined a wide range of atypical burials from inhumation cemeteries in Poland and compared them to similar practices from Viking Age Scandinavia and Anglo-Saxon England. He focused mainly on three categories of deviant burials – prone burials, decapitations and graves with stones lying directly on the deceased. In Polish archaeology, such graves were often interpreted as a form of protection against ‘vampires’ or ‘living-dead’. According to Gardela, for studying deviant burials, scholars should avoid simplistic and ‘sensationalist’ interpretations and take into consideration other explanations for different treatment of the bodies and for practicing atypical funerary behaviour, for example, law, punishment, slavery, local customs, etc. Moreover, Gardela stressed that early medieval ‘deviant burials’ should be studied in a cross-cultural and cross-disciplinary context.

Sacha Kacki and Dominique Castex explored the potential of anthropological and archaeological studies of epidemic cemeteries. They proposed a three step strategy for investigating such sites, comprising:

1) making a distinction between collective (deposition of dead bodies in the same place gradually over time) and multiple burials (simultaneous accumulation of several individuals in a short period),
2) recognizing the type of mortality crisis, and
3) determining the cause of the increased mortality, for example, war, massacre, epidemic, natural disaster, etc.

They stressed that to recognize burial grounds of plague victims, mortality profiles (compared with ordinary mortality life tables), sex ratios and molecular palaeobiochemistry (DNA,
immunological analyses) can be useful. Kacki and Castex observed that burial grounds of victims of epidemics are characterized by:

1) deposition of dead bodies in simple pits, immediately filled with earth,
2) burying the dead in multiple graves with a possibility of burying them in individual graves,
3) absence or rarity of grave goods,
4) use of prophylactic materials, e.g. lime, and
5) sometimes use of coffins and shrouds.

Moreover, Kacki and Castex discovered that epidemic-related graves were not always excluded from the regular graveyards and that exclusion practices depended on the historical period.

In the last paper, Hélène Réveillas and Isabelle Souquet-Leroy presented the results of analyses of 500 interments unearthed on the cemetery adjacent to the hospital of La Rochelle. The investigations brought to light funerary customs, as well as medical and surgical techniques, practiced by the Protestant community in 18th century France. The excavated burials contained individuals with numerous pathological conditions, for example, degenerative lesions, traumatic injuries, osteoarthritis and others. Noticeable was the significant number of graves of women who died in labour, as well as foetuses and new-born infants. The examination of burial practices and skeletal remains of buried people has shown that patients of the hospital were receiving the same level of care, regardless of sex, age or social status.

As a result, the session brought together archaeologists and physical anthropologists, who presented and discussed examples of burials of people with osteological manifestations of diseases and impairments, as well as non-normative burial practices. The case studies crossed various periods and cultures, spanning from Romano-British England, through medieval Poland, to medieval and early modern France. The lively discussion that followed the presentations ended with an idea to organize a session concerning burials with disarticulated bodily remains.

The speakers of the session (photo M. Matczak).
The aim of this session was to bring together archaeologists interested in the creation and elaboration of special places in Iron Age Europe. These may be natural features, such as hills, marshes and lakes, as well as settlements, ritual enclosures and of course the archetypical site in many areas, the hillfort. Many such sites had lengthy biographies, or use-lives, extending over many centuries or (in some cases) millennia. For the purposes of the session we broadly defined the Iron Age as incorporating the 1st millennium BC across much of continental Europe, as well as the ‘long Iron Age’ of Scandinavia, Ireland and Scotland, running as late as AD 400-800.

Hillfort studies have often tended to focus on single periods of monumentalization, when ramparts, walls and ditches were created and actively used. They are also frequently interpreted as the apex of the settlement hierarchy, their abandonment being linked to social change. In the past, such transformations have sometimes been seen in terms of historic events, referenced in the written sources for the period. Recent research has shown that hillforts can be much more complex. They may represent the enclosure or fortification of a prominent natural feature, an existing settlement, or entirely a place with no particular earlier significance. However, once created within the landscape, the hillfort was ever-present and had the potential to acquire new symbolic meanings even during periods of apparent abandonment. Thus, a hillfort might represent a defended settlement permanently inhabited by a large or small group, a pre-existing special place co-opted by a dominant interest group, a sacred space, a place of periodic assembly by large or small groups, or all of the above, perhaps at different times.

Our speakers sought to explore the nature of special places in the Iron Age landscape from a wide range of perspectives and across a range of geographical areas. The first group of papers focussed on south-east Europe. Phil Mason spoke first on the subject of ‘Hillfort Tales: Towards Biographies of Place in the Iron Age of South-Eastern Slovenia,’ in which he examined the ways in which hillfort centres in this region came into being, developed, changed and were reinterpreted in the landscape in different periods, through the medium of two hillfort centres, Kučar and Vinji vrh.

Matija Črešnar then presented on ‘Archaeological Data and Remote Sensing, Hand in Hand Towards a More Realistic Interpretation of the Early Iron Age Landscape: A Case Study of North-Eastern Slovenia,’ sharing the huge advances made through recent programmes of Lidar survey and other forms of remote sensing. Maša Sakara Sučevič completed the suite of Slovenian papers with a presentation of her work on ‘Hillfort Settlements in Istria and their Dynamics through Prehistory,’ giving new insights into the distinctive hillfort settlements, known as castellieri, characteristic of that region.

Moving into Romania, we then had a paper by Monica Constantin and Cătălin Constantin on ‘Defensive Strategies at Late Iron Age Geto–Dacian Settlements in South Romania’ which discussed the remarkable Muntenia Dava type settlements and their landscape setting in the 2nd century BC to 1st century AD.

The second set of papers shifted the geographical focus northwards with a paper by Manuel Fernández-Gótz bringing the audience up to date with the extraordinary recent work at the Heuneburg, in his paper ‘Reconsidering Heuneburg: New Data, Old Questions’; leading to a lengthy debate about the nature and complexity of such centres in the Early Iron Age. Loup Bernard’s paper on ‘Iron Age Places and Space around the Upper Rhine Valley: A Geographical and Archaeological Survey’ then presented the early results of an exciting new project examining settlement patterns across national borders on both sides of the Rhine.

Niels Algreen Møller extended the geographical focus northwards with his presentation ‘Nothing Special? Formation of Social Space in Early Iron Age Villages,’ extracting new insights into Iron Age settlement in western Jutland from the results of three decades of salvage excavations. Dragos Mandescu then presented his paper ‘Leveraging the
Landscape and the Intercultural Contacts to Establish and Develop a Settlement in Late Iron Age Dacia’ examining specifically the extraordinary rocky hilltop at Cetateni. The session ended with Susanne Sievers’ fascinating account of the afterlife of a major Iron Age centre entitled ‘Manching – A Powerful Place in the Plain’, which reinforced the sheer scale and monumentality of the Iron Age enclosure system.

After lunch we had a series of papers focusing on Britain and Ireland, beginning with Ben Gearey and colleagues’ contribution ‘Head of the River, Source of the Sea… Iron Age Timber Alignments in the Waveney Valley, East England,’ which considered an extraordinary series of apparently ritual wetland sites. Tina Thurston and colleagues then discussed their recent fieldwork results in ‘Placing Irish Hillforts in their Contemporary Landscapes: The Role of Geoarchaeology and Palaeoecology,’ applying novel geochemical techniques to the identification of Iron Age settlement landscapes in Ireland. Ian Armit then discussed ‘Place and Memory in the Iron Age of SE Scotland,’ examining the role of both large and small hillforts in the creation and maintenance of Iron Age identities.

The final series of papers began with a talk by Rebecca Peake and colleagues on ‘Defining Place and Space in the Seine Valley during the Bronze Age/Iron Age Transition Period: The Case of Villiers-sur-Seine,’ which highlighted the remarkable evidence from this very important recent excavation. Lorenzo Castellano and colleagues followed this with a discussion of their work on ‘Forcello di Bagnolo San Vito (MN): Archaeology and Paleoenvironment of an Etruscan Harbour in Northern Italy,’ drawing particularly on the evidence for landscape change in prehistory. Finally, Alexis Gorgues drew the session to a close with a lively and provocative talk entitled ‘Memory of the Origins: How Does the Morphogenesis of Northwestern Mediterranean Iron Age Hillforts Influence their Long Term Structure?’, in which he examined the ways in which Iberian hillfort layouts might embed traces of deep-rooted social structures.

As organizers we were delighted by the broad range of approaches presented, which tackled the issues we had set out from a range of perspectives. We hope to publish papers from the session along with papers from our session on Iron Age landscapes held at the 2011 EAA in Oslo.

Beyond the frontiers of Medieval Europe

Søren M. Sindbæk, Aarhus University, Denmark (soren.sindbaek@york.ac.uk) and Sam Nixon, University of East Anglia, United Kingdom (sam.nixon@uea.ac.uk)

The session had a double purpose: on the one hand, it was to explore the archaeology of the medieval period in regions beyond the geographical boundaries of Europe; on the other, it was to question the limitations of the concept of “medieval” and the notion of a “Medieval Europe” as a clearly defined cultural and historical entity. To some, “medieval” refers specifically to a clearly defined period in European history, while to others it can be used more widely to refer to a broader period of world history in regions from West Africa to Japan. The organizers of the session wanted to draw archaeologists together to focus on the extent to which it is relevant to distinguish a wider “Global Medieval Period”, or whether the concept of “medieval” is a construction with relevance only for some parts of the European “subcontinent”.

One theme that came out of the session was the erosion of conventional ideas of the geographical space of medieval Europe, and a challenge to the validity of the concept of a clearly defined “Europe” in the medieval era. This was most apparent in papers focusing on case studies in regions at the boundary of the space commonly considered to constitute medieval Europe. Amalia Pérez-Juez (Boston University, USA), for instance, pointed to the conspicuous neglect of the Moorish period in the Balearic Island of Menorca. Not only did this talk allow us to recover what could be considered a “non-European” episode in a geographical area conventionally understood as “European”, it also called for the recognition of an Islamic “medieval” archaeology. In another paper, particularly relevant to this theme,
Fahri Dikkaya (Bilkent University, Turkey) posed the question of how we should consider the archaeology of the Ottoman period in the Balkans – would we include the Ottoman Empire as a component of “Medieval Europe”, or would we consider the Balkans to be beyond “Europe”? Likewise, do we fit the newly emerging field of Ottoman archaeology into European or Islamic medieval archaeology?

Another distinct theme of the session was a desire to move beyond the border areas of Europe to look more widely at global flows and networks in the medieval era. Søren M. Sindbæk (United Kingdom and Aarhus University, Denmark), for instance, argued that discussions of early urbanization in Europe were biased by the Eurocentric particularism of influential theorists such as Pirenne and Weber, and that the proper study of medieval urbanism would benefit from a global framework, rather than a European one. Mateusz Bogucki (Polish Academy of Sciences, Poland) and Błażej Stanisławski (independent scholar, Poland) reminded us that the famous Dirham hoards in north-east Europe were likely to reflect counter-flows, almost certainly including the slave-trade, into the minting areas of Central Asia. Susanne Hakenbeck (University of Cambridge, United Kingdom), together with Stefania Merlo (University of Botswana, Botswana), presented a case study of settlement in the Fazzan, Libya, as an example of a region beyond whatever might be considered the frontier of medieval European, yet tightly interwoven with its historical trajectory. Stephanie Wynne-Jones (University of York, United Kingdom) discussed the organization of trade on the Swahili Coast, a region in many ways distant from medieval Europe, but at the same time part of the same global maritime network.

The final clear theme to note from the session was the consideration of the question to what extent regions beyond Europe’s immediate horizons could be considered “medieval societies”. Jason D. Hawkes (Aarhus University, Denmark) reviewed the genealogy of historical periodization in India, explaining why a concept of “Medieval India” had come into use, and why its implications might be considered unfortunate as a frame of historical development in South Asia. Sam Nixon (University of East Anglia, United Kingdom) considered “global medieval archaeology” in North and West Africa, not only highlighting the intense cultural continuities between Africa, Spain, and the Islands of the western Mediterranean, but also the ways in which West African societies developed a dynamic that can be reasonably argued to have strong parallels to medieval Islamic and European developments. Finally, Simon Kaner (Sainsbury Institute for the Study of Japanese Arts and Cultures, United Kingdom) explained how the concept of a “Middle Period”, largely coinciding with the Medieval Period in Europe, is in use in the Japanese Archipelago, and how Japanese urbanism in that period might be approached as a pertinent aspect of “medieval” urbanism.

The lively end debate picked up from the points made by the speakers and voiced strong views on the general questions that had been raised. There were calls from the floor to abandon the concept of “medieval”, certainly for use beyond Europe, but also voices pointing to homologies across the world, which might sustain the idea of a specifically “medieval” society. Others still asked the inevitable question of what alternative conceptual frameworks might be offered. The audience left with the certainty that neither “Europe” nor “medieval” are innocent or self-evident concepts, but also that collaboration between archaeologists from different parts of the wider medieval world has much to offer.
In this lively and well-attended full day session the organizers, accompanied by 16 researchers from nine countries, set out to explore what happens to archaeological narratives or objects when they leave the hands of archaeologists. How are they appropriated by different publics? Who is involved in these transformations, and how come archaeologists often find journalists stories or local heritage displays wanting, even if they themselves have simplified their stories before parting with them? Furthermore, how do we relate to publics creating heritage and archaeological narratives more or less without our help, in order to save threatened communities or to exclude certain groups in society? All these questions and many more were dealt with throughout the day, both in papers and in the vivid discussions with the other participants, at times filling the room to the brim. This report will mention the contributions in each session block and the main points of discussion sparked by them, although many of the topics will be developed upon further in a planned publication.

After a brief introduction by Elisabeth Niklasson, Margaux De Pauw started off the first session block by discussing the tension between public and science in visual representations of the past. She was followed by Diane Scherzler, dealing with appropriation in mass media, and Michael Cremo, giving a personal account of his experiences in appropriating archaeologists’ narratives in ways many archaeologists find objectionable. These contributions gave rise to three lines of discussion. The first circled around the question of how we should portray the past for the public. If people want realistic images, leaving little or no room for interpretation, should we provide such images? Along the second line, regarding the relationship between journalists and archaeologists, it was concluded that while media representatives are primarily creating interesting stories for publics and not reporting results for scientists, we as archaeologists also have to participate more if we want to be heard and not leave media interactions to only a handful of people. The last line revolved around the notion of tolerance of different archaeologies and where the border to what can be called archaeological research is really set.

The second block featured four presentations. Joanna Sofaer (and Marie Louise Stig Sørensen, who was unfortunately not able to attend) talked about crafts, creativity and Bronze Age Narratives, and Mark A. Hall looked into how museum visitors weave their own interpretations around archaeological objects. Luisé Rellensmann and John Schofield activated the issue of what heritage is and how it can be used as a tool or an argument by communities such as the Berlin techno scene in fighting gentrification processes. Lastly, Maria Persson and Anita Synnestvedt asked the disturbing question of whether an archaeological narrative really adds something to an ancient site that is currently used for other purposes, like a stage for an open air art exhibition. Should we in such cases actively engage and raise these narratives? While all four presentations differed a great deal, they also complimented each other as all of them made clear that engagement with the past needs stories. One question raised to all the contributors was whether we at all need archaeologists to be involved in these activities and stories, in which crafts people, exhibition visitors and communities are encouraged to make up their own interpretations and heritage? All presenters agreed that archaeologist were important both as instigators and guides and that people wanted them to be involved, demanded it even. They were the glue keeping these projects together. It was also asked if we as archaeologist should take a step back in these situations or actively try to change society for the better, whereupon opinions differed, although most were in favour of taking an active stance and contributing directly to society.

The third session block focussed on appropriations in sensitive political situations. First out was Mirette Modarress, taking a stand for a more interactive and sharing approach in Iranian archaeology, incorporating the wills of local publics. After her, John Bintliff discussed how local communities in Greece have mobilized and created their own narratives around
archaeological objects, and what part archaeologists could play under such circumstances. Relating to the former, Hamish Forbes shared a fascinating case study, showing how minority groups in Greece have used the authorized classical heritage in order to fit into Greek society while performing small acts of defiance, thereby triggering the larger question on minorities’ rights in Greece. Even more acute and pressing, was the last paper by Eszter Bánffy, dealing with new hedonism and the unscientific archaeologies of right-wing and nationalist movements in Hungary. How should we battle the distorted image of archaeologists these groups produce and argue against the exclusionary narratives they create? The presentations in this block left the audience simultaneously shocked and intrigued, and the debate that followed concerned some of the most fundamental questions to our discipline. Why do we often see the local as better than larger entities, and how do we choose sides? How do we act and take a stance when arguing with facts does not work? When our arguments have to rely on ethics and moral, on what we see as right and wrong, how do we convince people to listen harder to what we have to say, rather than to others? The responses differed, but ultimately it was stated that narratives can work in excluding and inclusive ways, and we always need to consider the consequences of our choices. And when facts no longer bite, we need to use our main strength, which is to incisively and relentlessly ask the hard questions.

Thomas Meier started off the last session block by using an interesting case study of a Bavarian village to illustrate how academic and local histories sometimes run in parallel, and how they can be preoccupied with different features in history and in the landscape. Jutta Leskovar discussed in depth how neo-pagan literature uses archaeological narratives to legitimize their own belief in ‘the Celts’, finding that the only way we can avoid these appropriations is to either abandon the concept ‘Celts’, or by being explicit with what we mean by it. Last speaker of the day was Per Nilsson, who by illustrating and reflecting upon the many different appropriations of rock carving motifs, was able to address both intentions and consequences of these usages. The discussion that followed involved issues of time and place. Of how long narratives carry meaning, and if the physical remains are really necessary for a figure or a narrative to persist. The issue of archaeologists’ accountability in relation for their own interpretations was also lifted in relation to the neo-pagan appropriations.

In the final discussion, which continued even after the official end of the session at 6 pm, Thomas Meier neatly summed up the most characteristic and pressing issues of the day. Right after, Alexander Gramsch posed the question that came to dominate the final half hour, namely: So what comes out of all of this in the end, what will change due to our discussions here today? And, have we really done what the session abstract promised, to see the appropriations in ‘in their own right’? The tone of conversation had admittedly, and especially after the discussion about Hungary, turned increasingly negative and questioning towards the appropriations considered. However, in the end most of the presenters and many in the audience agreed that, while being here and raising these issues may not have any direct impact on anyone but ourselves, it definitely cannot stop here. It must continue on the next conference and the next again, as well as outside in our workplaces. A constant self-examination in concert with outward engagement and constant questioning is the only way to change things.

Interpreting maritime archaeological record in
and around water

Riikka Alvik (riikka.alvik@helsinki.fi) and Elena Pranckenaite

Session organizers: Johan Rönnby (Södertörn University, Sweden), Riikka Alvik (the National Board of Antiquities, Finland) and Elena Pranckenaite (Klaipeda University, Lithuania)

The idea of this session arose when the PhD students of MARIS had a weekend seminar in Helsinki in November 2011. MARIS is a research institute at Södertörn University in Stockholm, Sweden, which carries out and develops maritime archaeological research, with a special emphasis on the Baltic Sea and the surrounding area. Another of MARIS’ aims is to bring students and researchers of maritime topics together for exchanging ideas and information. In the seminar in November, we discussed the approach we would take in presenting maritime research in the session and what we thought important to present at the upcoming EAA conference. We were thinking of two options: the first option was participating and presenting in many sessions so that maritime archaeology would not be a special issue, just another type of archaeological research, like land archaeology, with the same kinds of theories and research questions; the second option was to have a special session for interpretation of the maritime archaeological record. Maritime archaeology has been criticized as lacking theory and for being some kind of subsidiary science for maritime history. Our goal was to prove that maritime archaeology has similar approaches to land archaeology and that maritime archaeological research can produce information that is not possible to find from historical sources. Maritime archaeological research is multidisciplinary and also often has an international aspect – for example, research of trade and colonial issues are worldwide phenomena. People have always been connected to water in some way, which is why we did not want to specify a time period or type of source material – it could be anything from a Stone Age settlement to a shipwreck.

When we received the proposals for papers and posters we noticed the wide range of topics and approaches. We had a half day session and so many interesting and important issues to discuss. In the end, we decided to have all eight presentation proposals, and the time was limited to 15 minutes for each presentation. The contents of the presentations included theoretical issues and different kinds of methodological questions, which affect the interpretation. One question is how to collect the data so that there is enough valid source material for making interpretation or synthesizing the data. Different kinds of methodological solutions were of importance – researching the submerged archaeological source material can be very demanding, time consuming and costly. An example of this was the presentation ‘Blind Underwater Archaeology’ by Ekaterina Dolbunova and Andrey Mazurkevich from State Hermitage Museum in Russia. The Stone Age sites of the research project, including pile dwellings and fish traps, are very complex, with different kinds of wooden structures, and the underwater conditions are difficult because of extremely low visibility. New technical equipment, like autonomous underwater vehicles (AUV), remote sensing survey equipment and involvement of other marine sciences, such as geological survey in sea and lake bottoms and researching environmental conditions, can provide additional information and good solutions for maritime archaeology. Examples of the use of new technology and collaborations with other marine sciences were provided by the presentation of the Thesaurus Project by Gloriana Pace (et al.), where AUVs are now used for maritime archaeological inventory and survey, and an Austrian project presented by Michel Pregesbauer (et al.), which involves connecting topography to maritime archaeology, where Airborne Laser Bathymetry is used for maritime archaeological survey. The green, water-penetrating laser was tested in shallow waters of the Adriatic Sea, Croatia.

Actor-network theory as a stimulating theoretical approach was the topic of the presentation ‘Interpreting the Post Medieval Pottery from Underwater Survey and City Excavation in Gdansk Area’ by Joanna Dabal (Gdansk University, Poland). A model was applied to
interpret pottery as a source material from different perspectives, including the sources and the acquisition of materials. The range of information spans data on the owners, users and manufacturers of the pottery. Niklas Ericsson's presentation, ‘Sculptural Proclamation of 17th century Fluitships’, provided new ideas on interpreting the originally Dutch fluitship, particularly its decorative parts, as symbols of urban society and their effect on society. Maili Roio from the Estonian National Heritage Board provided an interpretation of archaeological and historical source material concerning shipwreck finds from Estonian waters in the project ‘Shipwher’. This project provides many ideas on interpreting shipwreck finds, comparing and connecting them to written sources, and also how careful we should be with interpretation when we identify shipwrecks. The possibility of misinterpretation is quite remarkable, if there is not enough valid data.

And last, but not the least, we had two presentations, which had similarities in approach and source material. The presentation by Minna Leino (National Board of Antiquities and Helsinki University, Finland) presented the vast variety of underwater finds from the UNESCO World Heritage site Suomenlinna Fortress, off Helsinki. People have recycled and thrown objects, including artefacts and raw materials, into the sea up until very recent times, treating the sea as a huge bin. This research gives new perspective to the inhabitant's lives and behaviour in this fortress island during the community’s existence. Mirja Arnshav from the National Maritime Museum of Sweden gave a presentation called ‘Underworld’, which examined a source material that we usually neglect: all kinds of contemporary junk and waste, including household material. This source material could be very informative in understanding the relationship between man and the sea.

To make a brief synthesis of the maritime archaeological topics presented, we learned that there are a multiplicity of source materials, from waste to huge structures and historical shipwrecks in underwater and water-bound contexts. Most importantly, all of this research provides information about the relationship between people and water: water, lakes, rivers, and seas have been used as waterways, waste bins and as sources for livelihoods. We should and will continue dealing with these issues open mindedly, adding archaeological theory to our research and testing our source material in the theoretical framework chosen.

Living and being in wetlands and lakes

Benjamin Jennings, University of Basel, Switzerland (benjamin.jennings@unibas.ch)

Session organizers: Benjamin Jennings, Philipp Wiemann, Stephanie Jacomet, Raquel Piqué, Tony Brown, Christine Fredengren

The session ‘Living and being in wetlands and lakes’ was originally proposed as three separate sessions addressing methodological issues in archaeobotanical sampling at wetland sites and current research, the application of theoretical models to wetland settlements, and dynamics in wetland environments. Due to the similarity in scope and subject of these three proposals it was decided to combine them into a single, full day session. The response to the call for papers was very strong and covered the range of subjects addressed in the session outline. Abstracts were submitted by researchers working in various parts of Europe, in the United States of America and Australia. In 2011 a selection of the prehistoric pile-dwellings in the Circum-Alpine region were awarded UNESCO World Heritage Site status, and it is not surprising that a number of the papers were centred on current research projects in Switzerland.

The morning programme began with a joint paper by two of the session organizers, Philipp Wiemann and Benjamin Jennings, discussing their PhD research (Swiss National Fund project ‘The End of The Lake Dwelling Phenomenon’), which focused on archaeological soil micromorphology and the potential that it has for understanding the development, and biographies, of lake-settlements. The application of micromorphology to sediments from lake-dwellings can illuminate individual, sequential, on-sight events such as flooding, house
construction, use, and destruction. Although there is an abundance of information available from these wetland settlements, new theoretical models need to be developed and applied to better understand events in those settlements and the motivations for settling and abandoning these wetland locations — the biographical model (sensu Gerritsen 2003) may provide an excellent departure point.

Continuing in Switzerland, Niels Bleicher (City of Zurich Office for Urbanism, Switzerland) began with a brief overview of the recent excavation of a pile-dwelling in Zurich city centre. The excavation began as a result of construction works for an underground car park to serve Zurich Opera House, and is adjacent to the well-known pile-dwelling Zurich Mozartstrasse. Niels used his departure point to re-open many of the old questions in lake-dwelling research, and particularly "what do we mean by in situ". A well-reasoned argument eloquently made the point that in situ does not necessarily relate to an original position, and that it is essential to consider all of the available evidence before identifying features.

Two presentations then followed which detailed the recent excavation of a lake-settlement (La Draga, Spain) and its surrounding environment, by Raquel Piqué, and the results of plant macro remain analysis, by Ferran Antolin.

Tony Brown stood in for the unfortunately absent Thierry Fonville, to present the last paper of the first block, addressing current research approaches to Crannogs in Scotland and Ireland. Research focuses on off-site sampling strategies, and can provide information regarding the duration, intensity, and timing of settlement occupation in the absence of extensive excavation.

In the second part of the morning Stefanie Jacomet brought the discussion back to Switzerland with a paper addressing methodological issues in wetland excavation and sampling strategies for organic remains. Drawing upon extensive experience Steffi divulged her knowledge of how to sample and sieve sediment remains to ensure that the greatest possible amount of information can be recovered.

Javier Fernández-López de Pablo returned the discussion to the Iberian Peninsula, through his report of a Mesolithic lake-shore settlement, in what is now an arid environment. This provided a clear reminder, and illustration, of the fact that wetlands and lakes are not a static environment, and just because some wetland settlements — for example those of the northern Circum-Alpine region — have excellent preservation levels, we should not take these for granted. What is left when former wetlands dry out and how would we identify former pile-dwellings if all of the timbers are lost?

This is a topic of discussion that was continued by Richard Corello-Tiolek in his presentation of the human occupation and palaeoenvironmental reconstruction of the Ballona Wetlands (California, USA). The changing nature of this environment, from river estuary to silty lagoon, significantly impacted upon the settlement and occupation of the area of several millennia.

Returning to Europe, this time south of the Alps, M. Baioni and C. Mangani detailed the creation of an integrative GIS system to compile data from the excavation of the Lucone di Polpenazze pile-dwelling with data generated through other practices in the surrounding environment. The system is used to guide research and also to provide a method of disseminating information to the public.

Tony Brown began the afternoon session with a discussion of current research in the United Kingdom addressing the changing nature of wetlands — particularly mires and bogs — and anthropogenic influence in their creation. This topic had not been addressed in the session so far, and the generally accepted situation is that lakes and rivers are imposed upon the environment and human inhabitants, rather than created by them, though deforestation and agricultural practices may influence lakeshores and riverbanks. Yet, in many ways the lake environment was created by the communities occupying the area, not in the sense of filling the landscape with water, but in that they created the social environment of the lake, and filled the landscape with social places. In the same way that maritime archaeologists have come to use the concept of the ‘seascape’, maybe we should consider a ‘lakescape’.

Niko Latvakoski presented his post graduate research on the reconstruction of terrestrialized lakes through the utilisation of LiDAR data. Such a method would enable the projection of former environments onto the landscape without the need for extensive environmental sampling and coring. The presentation prompted a high level of discussion, and although
there is some further work required on the methodology, it was agreed that such an approach would be highly beneficial for research projects.

Sally Brockwell took discussion to the other side of the world, with a discussion of wetland archaeology in northern Australia, and the periodical utilisation of these environments in prehistory. As there are relatively few wetland sites in Australia, wetland archaeology has traditionally been incorporated into models of terrestrial settlement, and the seasonal utilization of wetlands fits this pattern.

Luc Amkreutz returned discussion to Europe, and the Lower Rhine area, with a presentation of the Neolithization processes and transition to agriculture by communities inhabiting the various wetland environments incorporated in this region. Some communities persisted in their traditional manner for a longer duration than others, adopting practices that correlated with their wetland resources.

Renate Ebersbach began a group of three presentations on research based in Switzerland, with a discussion of theoretical aspects of settlement dynamics. Beginning with an overview of the number of wetland (c. 1000) and terrestrial (c.100) settlements of Neolithic period in the region, she rapidly whittled down the number of sites that have accurate dendrochronological dating and site plans (c.100). Based upon the dendro dates a rotational system of settlement occupation was proposed, under which households from one settlement could/did periodically relocate to others. Construction in settlements often left open spaces for absent households to fill at a later date. Renate then proceeded to propose that Neolithic communities inhabiting the pile-dwellings may have a ‘non-correspondence’ form in which households were not necessarily identified with the community/village in which they dwelt, but with supra-community identities spread across several villages.

Daniela Hofmann provided a theoretical discussion of the Neolithic and Bronze Age pile-dwelling communities of the Alpine forelands, asking why they chose to live in such close confinement, where are the socially differentiating structures that would be expected hierarchical societies, and should we be considering ‘sound-scapes’ in such densely constructed settlements?

The final presentation returned the session to where it began – with another group of research conducted under the Swiss National Fund (SNF) project ‘The End of The Lake Dwelling Phenomenon’ on Late Bronze Age lake-dwellings in the northern Circum-Alpine region. This time results of micromorphological, botanical, pollen, and archaeozoological analysis from Zurich-Alpenquai were presented by Marlu Kühn. The discussion and results provided a clear indication that climatically deterministic models for the abandonment of pile-dwellings and lake-shore settlements should be expanded to include cultural influence.

The session included a poster by Renata Perego that was presented during a separate poster session. The poster presented results from a comparative analysis from the pile-dwelling of Lavagnone (Northern Italy). The study is concerned with the pollen and macrofossil content of goat and sheep coprolites in particular, which is compared with the cultural layer sample. This gave interesting insight in the contribution of dung to pollen influx. The session was concluded with a general discussion, during which it was stressed by Tony Brown that methodologies and techniques including LiDAR data and aDNA should be incorporated into wetland research projects, and will become highly significant for the field in the future.

It is hoped that a proceedings volume of the session will be published in the near future. For further information regarding the session, please contact Benjamin Jennings (University of Basel).
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Flooded Stone Age – Towards an overview of submerged settlements and landscapes on the continental shelf

Björn Nilsson (bjorn.nilsson@sh.se)

Session organizers: Anders Fischer (Danish Agency for Culture, Denmark), Björn Nilsson (Södertörn University, Sweden) and Fraser Sturt (University of Southampton, United Kingdom)

Underwater archaeology consists of more than shipwrecks. Over the last decades, submerged settlements of the Holocene (and older!) have emerged as a potential research interest within the archaeological community. It is our opinion that the increasing interest and knowledge of submerged Stone Age sites around the world, not least in Europe, will rejuvenate some old archaeological problems. The Flooded Stone Age session had some specific goals. It was a way of bringing together researchers from different stages, disciplines and backgrounds. With this session, we wanted to create the opportunity to widen the field, and present a background for a pan-European perspective for the general audience. A central objective of the session was to contribute to the preparation of an atlas project on submerged Stone Age sites and landscapes of Europe and adjacent Mediterranean regions. The atlas is spin-off of the EU-COST-financed SPLASHCOS network (www.splashcos.org), which comprises scholars from both archaeology and the geosciences, all dedicated to the fascinating history and remains of the today-submerged Pleistocene and Holocene landscapes.

The call received an unpredicted interest; the initial half-day session plan grew to a full day. We were extra pleased to see that several papers were submitted by young scholars. Likewise, the session spanned over several spatial and temporal regions. The session was roughly divided into three informal and overlapping themes: “New regions and methods”; “Industry linked research”, and “New advances in Baltic research”. Despite a “competing” wetland session in the room next door, we were pleased to find our session well visited, and at times the room was completely full. The discussion was open, and since we had some unfortunate late cancellations, we had time for longer conversations and questions. Before we continue for a short résumé of the papers and questions that arose, we would like to take the opportunity to thank our student assistant, our presenters and the auditorium.

The morning started with some new perspectives on a classical topic. Håkon Glörstad and colleagues (“Things to do in Doggerland when you are wet”) presented a multi-disciplinary project that re-evaluates the significance of the Doggerland area in relation to the pioneering settlement of southern Norway. After examinations of new and old geological data, core samples and possible archaeological findings in the Norwegian sector of the North Sea, they conclude that this route might not have been of any great significance for colonization during the Younger Dryas/Preboreal. Instead, the “Swedish” west coast was claimed as a more likely colonization route. This, of course, awoke a discussion.

Victoria Pia Spry-Marques presented results from recent research in Croatia (“The Adriatic Plain: A human refugium”). From a zooarchaeological perspective, we got to learn of an enticing land archaeology, and a not-yet-evolved but potent (sub)marine archaeology of the Adriatic Sea.

The following four papers, Louise Tizzard and colleagues – presented by co-author Jonathan Benjamin – (“Area 240: A submerged Palaeolithic site off East Anglia, England”); Luc Amkreutz and colleagues (“Context for contextless finds: Recent offshore investigations of Palaeolithic and Mesolithic sites along the Dutch coast”); Fraser Sturt and colleagues (“Industry linked research: Submerged landscapes in English waters”); and Garry Momber (“The story of the Solent, changing landscapes and human adaptation”), unmistakably showed both the potential and the difficulty of Palaeolithic underwater research. We followed several different research efforts, and got to know the amount of both time and pebble heaps...
that have to pass before the archaeology becomes visible. The cooperation with the industry – fisheries, dredging and surveying companies, and aggregation business – were presented as something very important and positive. Submarine Palaeolithic research was discussed, both as something intellectually interesting, but also from a more critical stance: what can the wet sites teach us that we cannot achieve on terra firma? However, for many of us, the idea of finding the middle Palaeolithic in northwest Europe is a goal as good as any. The papers clearly showed how methods and theories are evolving in current British, Dutch and French research.

Undoubtedly, when it comes to Mesolithic underwater research, it is hard to compete with the Danish and German situation. Claus Skriver presented another astonishing Danish site, with his paper “Hjarnø: An eroding Mesolithic site with decorated wood”. In 2009, erosion of a submerged late Mesolithic settlement in Horsens Fjord was detected. In connection with rescue investigations and documentation, several extremely well preserved artefacts of wood and antler have been found. More than few ahhs! and ohhs! were heard among the listeners during Skriver’s talk. However, the presentation was not only aesthetically attractive: the socio-archaeological conclusion regarding Late Mesolithic territoriality and the strict use of symbols was liberating.

Moreover, behind the “successful archaeological story” lies a harsh reality: the erosion and vanishing of submerged cultural heritage. This topic was already touched upon in Fischer’s introduction of the session, and was something that we returned to several times. The Hjarnø site shows the true dilemma of submerged settlement archaeology: processes of erosion, dredging, or any other seabed exploitation, will eventually destroy many of our preserved sites, but at the same time our archaeology often depends on these processes, in order to find, explore and survey this fragmented natural and cultural heritage.

Jørgen Dencker showed yet another interesting site (“‘STAALDYB’ – Co-operation between industry and archaeology and field method for the location and excavation of submerged Stone Age settlements and landscapes”), and demonstrated the accumulated Danish experience, when it comes to methodology and contracting underwater archaeology.

Anders Fischer concentrated on multidisciplinary benefits and environmental data gathering (“Recording the Stone Age flooding of sites and landscapes”). Through archaeological knowledge of the western Baltic Stone Age sites (both land and under water), a methodology of using archaeological findings for producing and/or fine-tuning local sea level curves was presented. The paper rendered some interdisciplinary debate, and one conclusion was that archaeologists can gain a lot from being more “geological”, and geologists from being more archaeologically sensitive. This is nothing new; however, the sea-level discussion is one of the important interfaces these “groups” share, which contains an array of relevant present-day questions.

The “Danish” section was concluded with Ole Grøn’s paper (“A challenge: How to map submerged Stone Age sites”) that went methodologically further, especially when it came to the critique of predictive modeling. Grøn’s technical and anthropological experience gave many of us exciting ideas. The idea developed of seismically found flint tools was one of these.

Carina Brühl and colleagues’ paper, “Breetzer Ort – A submerged Ertebølle site in the northern coastal waters of Rügen island, north-eastern Germany”, presented by co-author Harald Lübke, gave us an updated picture of one of the most well-examined areas of the south-western Baltic. The number of sites and well-preserved late Mesolithic finds are vast. The zooarchaeological examination of terrestrial and marine resources shows several cultural traits, not least regional ones. The stratified multi-phase sites at Breetzer Ort – situated in shallow water – give an important accessibility to regional development over several hundreds of years (5200-4200 cal. BC), which is not available on land sites.

Arne Sjöström (“Fishing grounds and forests. A new turn in the Scandinavian archaeology of the lost landscapes of the southern Baltic Sea”) presented a Swedish project that aims to investigate and survey some areas in the southwestern Baltic. A main goal is to elucidate the Early Mesolithic (i.e., the Yoldia and Ancylus Baltic stages), while another is to study the possible human settlements on the shallow banks in the middle of the southern Baltic (Southern Middlebank). Archaeological surveys have begun this year and, so far, important
indications have been detected. At the earlier known “natural” site of Haväng in eastern Scania, archaeological findings have been made. The Haväng site extends from the present river mouth and 0.5 km out in the sea, to a depth of 15 m. At the bottom of the valley, 10,500-year-old pine stumps and trunks were found. These were preserved due to flooding and mud accumulation in the valley. The relict river valley exposed a well-preserved large scale Early Mesolithic fishing ground, with large stationary fish traps, as well as discarded artefacts of bone and flint. Some of the fish traps are dated to 7000 cal BC, which make them the oldest hitherto found in the world!

Vladas Zulkus and colleagues presented a similar situation (“New data on the Yoldia Sea shoreline landscape in the East Baltic region”). Preboreal pine stumps that are 9,000-10,000 years old have been found some 5 km outside the Lithuanian coast. This is a very interesting find, and the researchers and audience are looking forward to more dating and dendrological examinations of the trees. So far, no evidence of human settlement has been found.

Finally, Fraser Sturt concluded the session and synthesized some of the points made. The organizers suggested that the session ought to be published, which was agreed upon. After the Helsinki meeting, contact was made with the editors of the Journal of Maritime Archaeology, who are letting us arrange a thematic issue on the topic. We welcome such a rapid publicizing strategy.

Over the edge: Heritage management and coastal erosion

Tom Dawson, School of History, University of St Andrews, Scotland (tcd@st-andrews.ac.uk)

Session organizers: Marie-Yvane Daire and Tom Dawson

Over recent years, archaeologists have become increasingly successful in integrating heritage management into the planning process. There is a growing acceptance in many countries that ‘the polluter pays’, and in those cases where the doctrine of ‘preservation in situ’ cannot or will not be applied, there is a responsibility for the developer to financially contribute towards archaeological recording work.

In general, this hard-won situation has not been applied to heritage sites that are threatened with destruction by natural processes. There are a range of natural threats to the archaeological heritage, and coastal sites are amongst the most vulnerable, facing challenges that increase in severity depending upon geographic location and local geology. Coastal erosion, tidal surges and the scouring of sediments are already damaging thousands of sites on the coast and intertidal zone. Many climate change scientists assert that there will be an increased threat in the future, with the melting of polar ice causing a rise in sea levels and changes to ocean temperatures leading to more frequent and intense storms.

Against this background, the conference session ‘Over the Edge: Heritage Management and Coastal Erosion’ brought together a number of leading practitioners working in the management and rescue of archaeological sites threatened by coastal processes. Coastal managers have several options when developing Shoreline Management Plans, but they usually advocate either holding the line (building coastal defences) or managed retreat (alternatively referred to as Do Nothing). Defences will be built where there is something that is perceived to be of value and therefore needs protecting, but archaeological sites do not often qualify for the construction of sea walls (which are expensive to both build and maintain).

Robert van de Noort (Exeter University, England) set the scene, demonstrating that there is a diverse wealth of archaeological heritage at the coast; including sites related to maritime industries and past coastal management. He has studied areas where defences have been constructed in the past, and he showed that coastal populations have been adapting and reacting to threats from the sea for centuries. As the scale of the threat has increased, so has the size and durability of coastal defences. Although people have a long history of
planning for adverse climates, recent mitigation strategies have involved building 'harder' defences over larger areas. The construction of seawalls and barrages and the managed realignment of existing embankments has interfered with sediment movement and has disrupted the equilibrium that had been established over centuries. Changes in the sediment budget are especially noticeable in coastal wetlands, and areas that once responded naturally to sea-level rise are now unable to do so. This is resulting in more coastal and intertidal sites becoming damaged, with problems being observed further upstream on tidal rivers.

Long-term changes to coastlines is being investigate by the Arche Manche Project, which is attempting to use the evidence locked in archaeological sites to understand how both landscapes and people have evolved in the face of changing climates. Garry Momber and Lauren Tidbury (Hampshire and Wight Trust for Maritime Archaeology, England) presented details of this EU-funded initiative that is showing how maritime heritage sites and artistic representations can be used to indicate long-term patterns of coastal change and the way in which climate has impacted upon human settlement. The project is studying areas on either side of the English Channel and has posed three questions: do sites contain evidence of changes in sea level?; do sites provide evidence of environmental change?; and do sites demonstrate temporal continuity? The project team are investigating the interplay between archaeological features and data from artistic representations to establish a methodology that will show the value of archaeology, art and maritime heritage.

Although coastal archaeological sites may be rich depositories of evidence about past environments, the threat to many of them is so grave that action is needed to help preserve or extract the evidence before they are lost. There are numerous threats to coastal sites, and the management of an area's cultural heritage becomes even more acute in places where the majority of past activity was coastal. One such area is the Faroe Islands, situated between the north of Scotland and Iceland. Due to a number of factors, including topography and access to maritime resources, much of the archaeology of the Faroe Islands is coastal and a number of sites are threatened with destruction. Simun Arge (Foroya Forminnissavn) indicated that it wasn't only erosion that was threatening cultural landscapes, but also other processes associated with climate change, including rising temperatures, greater humidity and increased precipitation, all of which may cause landslides. He presented examples of a number of threatened sites; showing how the work of Faroese archaeologists and foreign teams has been helping to record some of the sites before it is too late, but noting that there is still much to do.

Another area where past activity has been predominantly coastal is Svalbard, an archipelago in the Artic Circle. Anne-Cathrine Flyen (NIKU, Norway) explained that although the islands have no indigenous population, people from many European countries have used the land in a variety of ways over many centuries. Most past activity was centred on hunting and extractive industries. Due to increasing threats to the cultural heritage, the Governor of Svalbard requested that a methodology be devised that would identify sites in an area which is affected by extreme weather, long, dark winters, and has few roads and other infrastructure. The researchers found that existing maps were poor and that there was little aerial photography that was of use to archaeologists. They realised that they had to undertake new field surveys in the harsh and dangerous environment (which includes the threat of polar bears). The ongoing work has resulted in the identification of over 2000 historic sites. Surveys have also led to the identification of numerous threats to the coastal heritage, including the melting of permafrost and damage caused by pack ice. The team are recommending action at different sites, and they have noted that in the formulation of management plans, an attempt must be made to ascribe value to sites. This is essential when trying to prioritize action at threatened sites.

Tom Dawson (University of St Andrews, Scotland) noted that of the many threats facing coastal sites facing the Atlantic, erosion was one of the gravest. Coastlines can change very rapidly, especially when high tides combine with low pressure and high winds. He gave examples of how single climatic events can destroy entire archaeological sites; in the Western Isles, a storm in 2005 caused up to fifty metres of the coast edge to recede in a single night. Surveys have been completed of 40% of the Scottish coast, revealing over
12,000 sites, many of which were previously unrecorded. Information was also collected about the local geology, geomorphology and whether the stretch of coast was eroding, accreting or stable on the day of the survey. Due to the details of the surveys, the research noted that erosion was often localised and more of the Scottish coast was threatened than previous studies had suggested. Dawson advocated that local communities had a crucial role in monitoring and recording vulnerable sites, and gave examples where archaeologists and local groups had worked together to take action in a variety of ways. This included survey and excavation projects; recording threatened remains through art projects and video; and even moving an entire site from the coast edge to the local heritage centre.

Marie-Yvane Daire (Université Rennes, France) noted that irreversible damage can be caused to archaeological sites on the coast by both long-term processes (such as sea level rise) and sudden extreme events (such as storms). These events can cause widespread and irreversible damage to heritage sites situated on the coast. Bringing together colleagues involved in Integrated Coastal Zone Management with archaeologists and geologists, she has formed a team that has developed a collaborative project which combines geology, geomorphology and archaeology. Much of the work of the AleRT project has focussed on Brittany, an area whose long and vulnerable coastline and numerous islands contain a wealth of archaeological sites. The AleRT project has developed the Vulnerability Evaluation Form (VEF), an objective method of recording threats to sites that is also simple to use. The project has enlisted the help of the Conservatoire du Littoral, an organisation that employs officers who act as custodians for much of the French coastline. Although more used to working with the natural heritage, the project has trained officers to use the VEF to monitor sites and to raise awareness with the visiting public.

In addition to using professional rangers, the use of the general public to help record threatened sites was also seen as an important way of helping to manage the problem of erosion. Joanna Hambly (The SCAPE Trust, Scotland) explained that thousands of Scottish sites carried recommendations for further work in advance of destruction, far outstripping available resources. This meant that priorities had to be set, and a project by SCAPE developed a GIS-based system for assessing the value of sites, together with the level of threat. The project resulted in a ‘top 1,000’ priority sites being drawn up in collaboration with regional and national heritage managers. The project noted that the dynamic nature of the coast meant that all priority sites needed to be revisited. This was to verify which sites had been destroyed, which had stabilised, and which were in a more critical condition than when first surveyed. In order to help raise awareness of the problem and to bring communities into the heart of decision making, SCAPE has launched a new project, Scotland’s Coastal Heritage at Risk, that encourages the public to participate in the management of sites. The project has developed an interactive website and mobile phone app to allow a crowdsourcing approach to be adopted. An army of ‘citizen archaeologists’ is being recruited all around the country to monitor and record threatened sites. A form allows the submission of results directly from site via a mobile phone or back at home through the website. Once verified, text and images are added to the project database, which is also accessible online. The public are also being asked to make recommendations for follow up work at sites that they feel are important locally. These recommendations will result in community projects involving local people and professionals at a number of sites which are both a priority for archaeologists and are valued by the general public.

The Thames Discovery Project is another long-running and successful example of how to involve the public in recording sites threatened by erosion. Eliot Wragg (Museum of London) explained how the tidal River Thames is the longest archaeological site in London, a place containing evidence of centuries of intensive occupation along its banks. A large number of sites are revealed at low tide, when structures and artefacts can be found along the Thames foreshore. Many of the sites are under severe threat from erosion caused by changing scour patterns and tidal flows resulting from newly constructed structures in the river. The project works with teams of volunteers to record sites and groups have been set up order to monitor site stability. The Thames Discovery Project team provide training and collect records from volunteers, which are placed on their website, together with videos of activities. The team have found that the best way to monitor sites is through photography, as this is a rapid and
accessibility of recording which allows observation of changes to sites over time (which can be both exposed and covered by sediment). The project provides people with a sense of “ownership” for sites whilst helping to ensure that archaeology remains a relevant subject for the public.

Following the presentations, a lively discussion showed that although there is a growing awareness of the threat that natural processes pose to coastal sites, much still needs to be done. The lack of baseline knowledge concerning coastal sites and the severity of the threat that many face was noted. In addition, threats are largely unpredictable as erosion is not a steady process, but is dependent upon a number of variables that can combine to cause widespread damage and destruction. In order to manage coastal heritage, there is a need to locate and record vulnerable heritage assets as well as the severity of the threat and the value of the site. Recording value can be especially difficult, as many systems exist, but the application of public value as a means of prioritising action at heritage sites was noted as being important.

There are many thousands of archaeological sites threatened with damage and destruction. In order to plan for the future, there is a need to engage heritage managers, archaeologists and the public in the problem. Greater cooperation is needed, with people sharing experiences and ideas on how best to manage the threatened resource before it is destroyed. Organizations such as the EAA could play a pivotal role in coordinating the sharing of experience and collaborative action.

Rather than necessarily seeing the threat posed by coastal processes in a negative way, the potential destruction of a site could act as a catalyst that stimulates action. For example, research projects that at present target unthreatened sites could be focussed on coastal sites, allowing important questions to be answered while saving valuable information that would otherwise be lost.

### Not just meat:
The role of plants in paleonutritional reassessment

Karen Hardy, ICREA at the Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona ([khardy@icrea.cat](mailto:khardy@icrea.cat))

Understanding the role of plant foods in human diet before plant and animal domestication is a challenge. Bones invariably survive more readily than plants and this has led to a traditional emphasis on meat. New evidence, however, in part generated by the adoption of a range of microscopic and biomolecular techniques, is revealing that plants were also consumed and processed deep into the Palaeolithic.

In this session we heard of research from a wide range of time periods and different methods used to detect evidence of plants in pre-agricultural context. The extraction of biographical information from dental calculus is an emerging field which is revealing potential to detect detailed information, at an individual level, on material ingested. The session began with Amanda Henry, who reported on the use of starch granules extracted from stone tool residues and dental calculus to explore the use of specific plants among Neanderthals and modern humans. She suggested that both groups drew on a broad range of plants, including low ranked foods such as grass seeds, with an intensification of the use of plants around 50,000 BP.

Dental calculus was also used by Celia Boyadjin, who reported on a study of material from the Brazilian Sambaqui site of Jabuticabeira II. By studying the plant microfossils trapped in the dental calculus, she and her co-authors were able to identify the use of a wide range of plants and a variation in the amount of different plant types eaten, which suggested that some individuals ate a more diversified diet than others.

Karen Hardy focused on the recently published evidence for medicinal plants found trapped in the dental calculus of a Neanderthal individual from the north Spanish site of El Sidrón (Fig. 1) ([Hardy *et al*. 2012, *Naturwissenschaften* DOI: 10.1007/s00114-012-0942-0]). The selection and use of bitter tasting plants requires an extensive knowledge as in many cases
bitter taste can be an indicator of poison. The knowledge demonstrated by these Neanderthals is not surprising when viewed from the perspective of the very widespread use of medicinal plants among most animals including higher primates, to treat a broad range of ailments. The identification of these medicinal plants (yarrow and camomile) also highlights the need to be aware of non-dietary materials that may be trapped in dental calculus.

Two presentations focused on the identification of parenchymatous tissue. Alex Pryor and his co-authors presented a study of charred vegetative organs from the Gravettian site of Dolní Věstonice II and highlighted an important use of underground storage organs such as roots, rhizomes, tubers, bulbs and swollen stems at this Upper Palaeolithic site. Lucy Kubiak-Martens offered a presentation highlighting the usefulness of parenchyma identification and stressed that starchy foods so far identified from hunter-gatherer sites add much to our knowledge of the dietary diversity of pre-agrarian Europe (Fig. 2). She also offered exciting results from a study of a new Mesolithic site, Rotterdam Yangtzehaven on the Netherlands coastline. These presentations highlighted the importance of detecting vegetative tissue to and the probable widespread exploitation of roots and tubers as an important source of starch.

Fig. 1: Left Py-GC-MS - TD-GC-MS inset, Neanderthal dental calculus. (From Hardy et al. 2012. Naturwissenschaften DOI: 10.1007/s00114-012-0942-0). Right SEM image of starch granules in Ranunculus ficaria (lesser celandine) stem; a plant found on many Mesolithic sites.

Fig. 2: Scanning electron micrograph of starch granules entrapped in early Mesolithic charred parenchyma from Całowanie, Poland (left); charred tuber of a species from sedge family (Cyperaceae) from late Mesolithic Rotterdam-Yangtzehaven in the Netherlands (right). Photos: L. Kubiak-Martens.
Food processing can be very important in releasing nutritional qualities of food, to remove toxins and assist in digestion. Robert Power and co-authors presented the results of a study of phytoliths extracted from stone mortars, some of which were carved into bedrock, from the Natufian site of Raqefet Cave in Israel. Their results indicate consumption of wild grasses and cereals. Biancamaria Aranguren offered a last minute presentation on the work of the Italian group which also comprises Anna Revedin and Laura Longo, who are working on Upper Palaeolithic grinding stones from a wide range of sites across Europe (cf. the report in TEA no. 36, Winter Issue 2011/12). Here also, one of the primary items identified is USO’s, underground storage organs such as the Typha rhizome, a sedge that grows along rivers and in marshy areas. This rhizome, which is very nutritious, can be ground to make flour. The grinding technology behind the processing of this kind of USO’s dates back to at least 30,000 cal BP, and is widespread in Late Pleistocene Europe.

Robert Tykot offered an interesting perspective on stable isotope analysis to explore plant use. This method is used predominantly to explore dietary protein and has focused largely on the meat and marine components of the diet. Using linear and multivariate statistical methods he examined the role of plant foods in the diet from some Lower Palaeolithic sites in Africa and Europe, where the lack of collagen survival normally restricts this type of study. He also emphasized the value of integrating isotope data with barium and strontium elemental analyses, especially in places where collagen is not preserved.

Finally Raquel Pique presented a paper for Marian Berihuete on an archaeobotanical assemblage of plant remains from a number of recent hunter gatherer sites in Tierra del Fuego. This ethnoarchaeological study provides an important insight into the broad use of plant resources by hunter-gatherer groups in a high latitude environment. Plants were an integral part of life here and were likely to have been in the past also.

It is exciting to see the range of techniques in use to investigate pre-agrarian plant use. This is a subject that has been little studied up to now, largely due to the lack of direct evidence. Starchy food is important in the diet, underground storage organs in particular, and could provide much needed carbohydrates in winter and spring months. In order, however, to assess the amount of plant food consumed by hunter-gatherers and to balance the complex relationship between animal protein and the starchy plant component in hunter-gatherer diet, we need to broaden our studies and extract information using the range of techniques discussed in this session. Additionally, we need to present evidence even where specific identification is difficult or impossible, which can often be the case with regards to charred parenchyma or starch granules. A broader approach to identifying the presence of plants as illustrated by the work of Biancamaria Aranguren et al., in which networks of hunter-gatherer sites are targeted, will provide a wider perspective on the use of plants in pre-agrarian contexts.

Boundary crossings and gendered bodies: The limits of the body – Gender trouble at the margins and in the centre

Silvia Tomášková (University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, USA) and Bo Jensen (Denmark)

A Saturday, 1 September 2012, a morning session was organized under the auspices of AGE (the ‘Archaeology and Gender in Europe’ Working Party, see www.e-a-a.org/AGE.pdf) by Silvia Tomášková, UNC Chapel Hill and Bo Jensen, Copenhagen. The eight papers and a brief summary of the discussion are summarized below.

The idea for the session emerged in an AGE discussion at the EAA Oslo meeting in 2011. We agreed to invite papers that would question the natural and cultural boundaries of a body while also examine how gender may cross the biological/cultural divide to form the situated experience of personhood. How does bodily mobility across boundaries affect gendered experience? How do we recognize such a processes in the archaeological record? We
intended to look at various material expressions of ‘biographies of the body’ through the lens of gender. The organizers invited papers that would address normative and non-normative gender formations in past societies as reflected on the physical body, contributing to the nature/culture hybrid, and/or as reflected in physical space. Members of AGE were particularly interested in contributions that would discuss cases in which generally accepted ‘boundaries’, either bodily or spatial, are obscured, altered, or transgressed. Topics that we were hoping to attract included bioarchaeology, skeletal studies, decorated bodies – adornments, tattoos, physical modifications – disabled or differently abled bodies, representations of bodies, materializations of bodies as idealized or as normative, and technologies of the body. Diet, labour, and health were also on our radar as interesting ‘traditional’ topics that could be viewed through this prism. Finally the organizers also welcomed papers dealing with the gendered ordering of movement, space and place, in ritual, architecture, and economy. The goal of the session was to encourage archaeologists who work on gender to focus on boundaries and boundary-crossings, and those who work on boundaries to focus on gender.

As the deadline approached, we were pleased with all submissions and included eight papers in our final program. The first speaker was Silvia Tomášková from UNC Chapel Hill with her paper ‘Embodied difference: Limits of the Neanderthal body’. She asked a set of fairly simple question: Who were the Neanderthals? Our closest kin or very distant ancestors? Did ancient humans connect with them through ‘interbreeding’, rape, or romantic trysts in front of a cave, as recent scientific claims suggested? The paper looked closely at the scientific evidence beneath the speculative debates, and examined the very small number of individuals we actually identify as Neanderthals. The presenter suggested that in the absence of complete Neanderthal skeletons, we are dealing with a hybrid, a composite body, assembled in laboratories from pieces frequently separated by thousands of years. It is out of this body with questionable limits, or boundaries, in a physical and metaphorical sense that scientific and popular narratives about Neanderthals are made. Moreover this ‘man-made’ physical evidence serves a range of ideologies far beyond questions of human origins. The paper paid particular attention to the variation of the physical body as a gendered vessel of particular claims, pointing out an almost complete absence of female reconstructions in both popular displays and in scientific discussions. Drawing on feminist science studies, Tomášková suggested that the Neanderthal body reflects meanings and metaphors that illuminate archaeology’s shifting position as the science of the past, while reflecting social and historical changes of European societies. Race and gender, not surprisingly, have
shaped and reshaped Neanderthals into both familiar relatives and foreign rivals. From ‘Boule’s error’ to denials of any acquaintance with our forebears, the Neanderthals have been haunting prehistory for well over 100 years, accompanying us on our journey into the past and embodying our sense of difference. In conclusion the presenter drew on the concept of ‘the body multiple’, used in medical anthropology, to suggest that the absence of a ‘Neanderthal body’ generates a multiplicity of bodies that do work for archaeologists and for the popular imagination.

The second presenter was Susan Stratton from Cardiff University with a paper titled ‘Binary gender categories in south-east Europe Late Neolithic and Early Copper Age cemeteries - real or modern bias? A case study from Durankulak’. Her starting premise was that within burial studies in the Late Neolithic and Copper Age (5400 - 3500 BC) of south-east Europe a number of studies of large extramural cemetery sites have focused on the gender association of different types of material culture deposited in the grave. Yet these interpretations had a binary view of gender, in which biological sex was used as a proxy for identifying objects in male and female gender categories. Associated funerary artefacts are considered to act as symbols of various life roles or statuses. Stratton argued in her paper that such artefacts were not merely symbols of gender, but that their use or wear was a part of the embodiment of gendered identities. Using the Bulgarian Late Neolithic/Early Copper Age cemetery of Durankulak as an example she considered how gender might have been constructed through an individual’s lifetime by such objects. Stratton concluded that modern Western understandings of binary gender categories resulted in the association of objects with biological sex, and subsequently these associations were considered as much less ambiguous as they actually might have been in the past.

Margarita Sánchez Romero from the University of Granada followed with a presentation titled ‘Shared spaces and invisible boundaries: gendered places in the archaeological record’. The paper addressed the recent emergence of the ‘archaeology of the body’ and its relevance to the study of the body as a site of lived experiences. Sánchez Romero pointed out that this approach aligned two distinct theoretical approaches: phenomenology and feminist theory. Phenomenology addresses human experience of the world and the relationship between people and objects. Feminist theory, on the other hand, has used the material existence of this relationship so as to examine the position of women in society and to examine (pre)history from a different point of view. While these approaches have been successfully employed in analyses of funerary records, Sánchez Romero argued that we must try to examine also living spaces, activities areas, spaces, objects and bodies used by both men and women. Her theoretical presentation was followed later in the session by a paper with a specific archaeological case study that illustrated her central points.

Jo Zalea Matias from Durham University focused on materials from several Iron Age sites in England. In a paper titled ‘Bodies in a ditch: anatomy of burials on Iron Age Sites’, Zalea Matias attempted to discern the motivations behind specific burial choices by looking beyond associated artefacts and burial practices. She examined several Iron Age sites and offered an analysis of their burial contexts, burial practices, treatment of remains, skeletal pathologies, and associated artefacts to determine if differential treatment in regards to gender and age would reveal Iron Age attitudes to these aspects of prehistoric lives. Zalea Matias suggested that the spatial location of burials at a particular site could have a significant impact on the analysis of such burials. Landscape studies in Iron Age archaeology have emphasized the significance of the relationship between people and the surrounding area. The author of the paper argued that the positioning of burials within the Iron Age sites was imbued with as much meaning as the placement of the sites and the outlying field systems themselves. Zalea Matias illustrated her paper with images, suggesting that a burial of an individual in the enclosure of a settlement could have a different meaning than a burial in a pit within the settlement, and the prevalence of aged or sexed individuals within certain places could be indicative of gender and age ideologies.

Margarita Sánchez Romero next returned to the podium with a paper co-authored with Eva Alarcón García, also from the University of Granada. In a presentation titled ‘Body, dead and identity social in the culture of Agrar, South-Eastern Spain’, the authors argued that the human body is a document, in which identities can be both constructed and expressed in
different ways. According to the authors, the body materializes the biography of a person, while simultaneously it is also the means used to interact with the environment. Sánchez Romero and Alarcón García introduced the concept of ‘embodiment’ as a way of approaching the bodies of the past, pointing out that it has been recently productively used in the so-called ‘archaeology of the body’. Through the analysis of skeletal remains, material culture and their contexts, archaeologists have explored aspects of nutrition, health, life expectancy, physical efforts and activities. At the same time they also noted material manifestations of gender identities, age or social status. The aim of the conference paper was to offer an interpretation of the experiences of the world by various members of social groups and the range of ways to build identities during the live-span in the Bronze Age. The authors presented an analysis of three interconnected elements: the subject (bodies), objects (material culture) and their contexts in the funerary record of two archaeological sites from the Bronze Age of Southeast of the Iberian Peninsula (Spain): El Cerro de la Encina (Monachil, Granada) and Peñalosa (Baños de la Encina, Jaén).

Elisabeth Arwill-Nordbladh from the Department of Historical Studies, University of Gothenburg presented next a fascinating discussion of disability in her paper Sight and vision – variations in visual abilities in Scandinavian Iron Age. The author started by presenting a thorough discussion of current disability studies theory, mainly drawing on phenomenology and feminist theories of the body. Based on a discussion of bodily variations in relation to an ability-disability order of power, the paper highlighted several Scandinavian Iron Age artefacts, indicating that vision and sight was a theme for negotiation of social practices during the time. She illustrated her argument with a range of images of engraved and carved metal objects, focusing on the representation of eyes and the sense, or absence, of ‘seeing’. Employing a phenomenology, Arwill-Nordbladh cautioned that this theoretical approach should also be understood as a contextually shaped social and cultural construction.

Bo Jensen from Copenhagen, one of the organizers, tackled the topic of human animal connections and boundaries in his paper ‘Unheimliche bodies: between man and unman, human and animal, home and away in the Viking Age’. Jensen offered the case of the warrior’s grave form Repton, England, which contained a Viking leader who may have been castrated. The body was buried on the military border between Anglo-Saxon Christians and pagan Vikings. Furthermore, the grave had two other unusual features, inclusion of silver and inclusion of a Thor’s hammer amulet in a man’s grave. The author suggested that all these variables were connected, and reflected an attempt to restore the Repton man to full manliness through juridical symbolism and magic. Jensen found a mythological parallel to this in the maiming and restoration of Wayland the smith, and suggested that Wayland’s mythic origins in Finland, on the eastern limit of the Viking world, reflected a similar borderland situation. He further argued that the legend of Wayland was mainly about conflict and justice and that it was part of what we may call ‘borderland stories’. Like the fictional Wild West, the Early Medieval borderlands may have been a suitable habitation for extreme, boundary-crossing phenomena, banished there to reinforce the boundaries respected at the centre. Jensen concluded that for this reason Viking Age elites saw no lack of logic in celebrating the legend of Wayland, a killer who preyed on the elite: as a borderland figure, Wayland illustrated how not to behave in civilised society.

Ria Berg from the Insitute Romanum Finlandiae concluded the session with her presentation ‘Man with a Mirror? Gender Trouble in Pompeian Domestic Artefact Assemblages’. Her central claim was that inventory lists of finds from Pompeian AD 79 houses, compiled at the time of their excavation, are the closest we can get to the material contents of Roman households, the activities and (gender) identities of their inhabitants. Yet, up to date, surprisingly little research has been done on Pompeian artefacts in context. The paper had a seemingly simple methodological aim: to scrutinize different possible readings of engendered identities, normative or non-normative, of the inhabitants of the Pompeian houses, on the basis of the extant excavation records. As a case study, Berg analysed an artefact assemblage from the House of L. Aurunculeius Secundio, excavated in 1904. This assemblage contained an exceptional collection of gender specific toiletries, such as mirrors and perfume containers normally associated with females, and strigilis – scrapers associated with males. All these were instruments for creating and expressing cultural gender, while...
potentially marking its transgressions. To get beyond the simple female/cosmetic – male/athletic association, or the total rejection of the question because of the multiple elements missing in the record, Ria Berg proposed a mapping of alternative readings of the artefact assembly. She suggested setting it in the context of the whole house through the lens of gender, thereby inviting new interpretations of the artefacts and simultaneously engendering the past in a radically new way.

The discussion following the paper presentations was lively and wide-ranging. Some questions and comments clarified factual and technical matters, while others raised more theoretical issues relevant to the entire session. A recurrent theme was that of revisiting old data and re-examining it using a new, gender-aware theoretical approach. Several papers demonstrated that we can make new observations (e.g. Arwill-Nordbladh, Stratton), new interpretations of well-known associations (e.g. Jensen, Berg), and that an informed interest can reveal how too-quick suppositions are taken for a fact in established research (Tomášková). All this highlighted the importance and urgency of the need to revisit old materials and data, and to reconsider ‘facts’ that we think we know. It was equally impressive to see how old catalogues can be combined in new, sweeping overviews (Zaleas Matias) and how much analysis can be brought to bear on newly excavated materials to provide a truly ‘thick’, descriptive analysis (Alacon Garcia and Sanchez Romero).

In the past, the AGE and gender research in general has shown a tendency to focus mainly on representation in artwork or in formal burials, and to pay less attention to economy, settlement and everyday life. We were pleased to observe that our focus has broadened: papers by Zaleas Matias and by Alacon Garcia and Sanchez Romero clearly showed how burials were integrated in settlement landscapes, and Berg, in particular, showed how much potential a well-preserved settlement context can hold (including art in a settlement context no less). Likewise, several papers successfully, reflexively engaged with modern society and modern debates, notably Tomášková and Arwill-Nordbladh. Overall the papers demonstrated that gender research is an on-going, rather than a finished project, one that continues to develop through engagements with present society as well as through new archaeological finds and interpretations. Some of the subsequent discussion addressed the question whether we should analyse power, gender and the body in more complex ways, rather than start with gender as a baseline. While we did not come to any concluding thoughts, the conversation was certainly lively and thoughtful.

We were also impressed how shared theoretical concerns unified papers that spread geographically and temporally across the width of European archaeology, and how common themes emerged, from Scandinavia to the Balkans to Spain, from the Palaeolithic to the Early Medieval period. The session was very well attended, filling the room past capacity, drawing in
 submit proposals next time. Finally, we must thank our Finnish hosts, and the student volunteer who helped make everything run smoothly even when we used different software platforms. It is in no small way their contribution that made this session so successful.

**Round Table: How to get published in archaeology**

Robin Skeates, Durham University, United Kingdom (robin.skeates@durham.ac.uk), and Estella Weiss-Krejci, University of Vienna, Austria (estellawk@hotmail.com)

This round table, sponsored by the EAA’s *European Journal of Archaeology* and by Maney, successfully achieved its two aims: to offer practical advice to less experienced archaeologists interested in getting the results of their research published; and to discuss some current issues relating to publishing archaeological research. Papers presented by Robin Skeates (Durham University, UK), Estella Weiss-Krejci (University of Vienna, Austria) and Liz Rosindale (Maney, UK) offered some practical advice to prospective authors on how to minimize problems when preparing and submitting an academic paper or book review for publication in an international peer-reviewed journal. Issues covered included: approaching editors, choosing the right title, originality, scope, impact, audience, structure, writing style and conventions, using pre-submission language polishing services, word limits, abstracts and keywords, bibliographic referencing, tables and illustrations, publication ethics and plagiarism, copyright assignment and permissions, libel, responding to peer reviewers’ comments, coping with rejection, online submissions, publication processes and schedules, print vs. online, impact, and open access publishing, abstracting and indexing services, maximising citation and impact, dissemination through social media networks, PR and list-servs, guidelines on depositing in institutional repositories, and making use of follow-up facilities such as author questionnaires. The audience, consisting of professional academics and students engaged in a lively debate. Discussion focussed especially on whether or not peer reviews should be anonymous, and on how to interpret copyright legislation.

Papers presented by John Collis (University of Sheffield, UK) and Kenneth Aitchison (Landward Research Ltd, UK) then detailed the problems and potential of self-publication and ‘gorilla publishing’. Both showed that, although self-publishing can be laborious, involves a steep learning curve, and is only sometimes commercially viable, it is nevertheless possible to publish monographs and edited volumes successfully without using the standard publishers. Since one major advantage of publishing with a standard publisher relates to their marketing and distribution capability, debate here centred on how to best advertise such publications. An edited video of this Round Table is available on the *EJA*’s website: http://maneypublishing.com/index.php/journals/eja/
Isn’t archaeology inspiring?

A metro tunnel covered with rock art paintings at Kaisaniemi station in Helsinki was located just a few meters away from the Porthania Building, one of the venues for EAA 2012 conference. According to a Finish rock art specialist, sources of inspirations can be found in Northern Sweden and Norway. Some archaeologists may disapprove of the use of original motifs in a completely different context, more suitable for great Lascaux paintings, other may find it a proof of vitality of archaeology in a modern society. I wonder how many conference delegates had a chance to appreciate them but apparently these figures were well aware of what was happening just behind the wall.

Find out more about the artists at: www.vivagranlund.fi/sitespecificart/rockpaintings/
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The conference venue is the main University Campus, which is located near the main accommodation facility Parkhotel and is easy to access by public transport from the city centre. The campus is conveniently located about 80 km from the German border, near Exit 80 of the D5 motorway. Parking is available free of charge at the main campus car park area. For further information, visit www.eaa2013.cz.

Pilsen is easy to reach from the Václav Havel Airport Prague, which operates a wide range of international flights, including the low cost airlines. There will be a shuttle service organized between Prague and Pilsen (approximately 50 minutes). For further information, visit www.prg.aero.

The conference venue is the main University Campus, which is located near the main accommodation facility Parkhotel.
Sessions
The meeting will focus on the following main themes:

- Interpreting the Archaeological Record
- Archaeological Heritage Resource Management
- Theory and Paradigms in Archaeology
- Public Archaeology
- Archaeology of Food and Drink

Note that the session and round table organizers must be current EAA members.

The official language of the conference is English. 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. For more information, visit www.eaa2013.cz.

Programme

**Monday 2 September – Wednesday 4 September**
- Pre-conference excursion

**Tuesday 3 September**
- Special meetings and meetings of working groups
- Registration

**Wednesday 4 September**
- Registration
- Official opening of the 19th Annual Meeting
- Opening reception

**Thursday 5 September**
- Registration
- Parallel sessions
- Annual Party – Na Spilce – Pilsner Urquell brewery pub

**Friday 6 September**
- Registration
- Parallel sessions
- EAA Annual Business Meeting

**Saturday 7 September**
- Registration
- Parallel sessions
- Annual Dinner - Parkhotel Pilsen

**Sunday 8 September**
- Post-conference excursions

Registration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fees before 1st June 2013 for EAA members</th>
<th>Fees before 1st June 2013 for EAA 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 1st June 2013 for EAA members</th>
<th>Fees after 1st June 2013 for EAA 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>
**Accommodation**
Hotels of various categories at reduced rates will be available for participants of the 19th Annual Meeting of the European Association of Archaeologists 2013 in Pilsen.

**Grants**
The organizers hope to provide opportunities for participants from Eastern Europe to apply for grants. The application for the Wenner-Gren Grant is currently under preparation.

**Visa**
Participants requiring a visa should apply immediately to the consular office or embassy of the Czech Republic in their country in order to avoid inconvenience. Please note that the visa application procedure can take up to two months.


Should you need an invitation letter to obtain a visa, please contact the Conference secretariat at [www.eaa2013.cz](http://www.eaa2013.cz).

**Conference Secretariat**
GUARANT International spol. s r.o.
Opletalova 22
110 00 Praha 1
Česká republika

Tel: +420 284 001 444
Fax: +420 284 001 448
E-mail: guarant@guarant.cz
Web: [www.guarant.cz](http://www.guarant.cz)

PILSEN – the MUST GO place for all European archaeologists in 2013!
Committee on Professional Associations in Archaeology

The Committee on Professional Associations in Archaeology held a formal session at the Helsinki Annual Meeting, where in addition to a set of papers there was extensive discussion of the nature of both professional associations and applied archaeological practice across Europe.

The Institute for Archaeologists in the UK continues to be the largest and most active professional association in European archaeology, expanding in membership even at a time when the number of people working in UK archaeology is still falling. By contrast, other national professional associations — such as in Ireland and the Netherlands — are shrinking. In general, the need for the mediating role of professional associations is most visible and valued in the countries where archaeological practice is at least partly commercialised; where the state has a controlling influence, professional associations have struggled to make an impact.

These issues relate to a major project that was discussed in Helsinki and which many members of the Committee are going to be involved in — Discovering the Archaeologists of Europe 2012-14. This will be the successor project to Discovering the Archaeologists of Europe (www.discovering-archaeologists.eu) which assessed the scale and nature of archaeological employment in ten European states just before the onset of the global economic crisis. Six years on, the European Commission has agreed to fund an expanded repetition of that project, which this time will involve 21 partner organisations collecting and disseminating data on archaeological employment, education and training in 19 European states.

The other project that was discussed and which Committee members are involved in is Studying Archaeology in Europe (www.studyingarchaeology.eu), an ambitious project which is involving students in sharing information about higher education opportunities across the continent.

The meeting closed with an election for the position of Committee Chair, a position which will now be shared for the next three years by Gerry Wait of Nexus Heritage and Kenneth Aitchison of Landward Research. The Co-Chairs now intend to involve the Committee in playing a more active advisory role within the Association.

Kenneth Aitchison (kenneth.aitchison@landward.eu) and Gerry Wait (gerry.wait@nexus-heritage.com)

Archaeology in Contemporary Europe
Project’s advancement
EC Culture programme 2007-2013

The EC-funded project ACE — Archaeology in Contemporary Europe: Professional practices and public outreach, constituted as an EEA Working Party, was already mentioned twice in TEA (no. 31 and no. 36) and came now to its end after five years full of activities.

The 13 partners of the ACE network undertook research, documentation and related activities along four thematic axes.

The theme I, “Researching the significance of the past”, was aimed to highlight, on both scientific and cultural grounds, the relevance of the past for contemporary Europe. Archaeology provides a unique contribution to our knowledge of the history of ancient societies, their evolutions and interactions, their material culture and their interactions with the environment. By the organisation of international conferences, articles and books publications, the members of the ACE network contributed to demonstrate the importance of the study of the past in contemporary Europe. Such issues as social and identity construction, including phenomena of migration, settlement, as well as the formation of cultural and political identities were addressed.
The diversity of administrations, practices and historical contexts of European archaeology justified a comparative assessment at the European level. In the framework of the theme II, “Comparative practices in archaeology”, conferences and meetings have been held on data management, the impact of the global crises on archaeology and the international development of European archaeology. It made possible to share skills and expertise, and provide guidance and recommendations; several publications and scientific papers were produced by the network.

Under the theme III “The archaeological profession”, surveys had been carried out at the European level to identify the archaeologists in qualitative and quantitative aspects. The rise in archaeological activities across Europe has changed the status and responsibilities of professionals within the archaeological community. Such transformations have important implications in social, economic, educational and scientific terms. Round table and sessions were organised to compare and present the results of these surveys; a synthetic publication was published. Professional training was also addressed by the creation of an e-learning module and mobility bursaries allocation.

Given the importance of communication and valorisation for a better awareness of the past, the ACE project planned from the beginning to undertake several outreach activities, destined to the various publics of archaeology, at different levels of diffusion. In the framework of the theme IV “Public outreach: invitations to archaeology”, the ACE network implemented multiple activities within this theme: scientific publications, book for children, film festivals, international exhibitions, publications, conferences...

After five years, more than 80 papers and books have been published, 2 archaeological film festivals have been set up, one exhibition about the profession of archaeologist has been shown in 10 countries, 24 trainees were financed, 15 conferences have been organised by the partnership who participated to more than 60 conferences and colloquiums, ... This project is now a strong network that will survive beyond the life of ACE.

From 1 December 2012, all the outcomes of the project will be available at the following address: http://archaeologydataservice.ac.uk/archives/view/ace_2011/

The ACE exhibition about the archaeological profession in Europe: www.profession-archaeologist.eu

More information on ACE website: www.ace-archaeology.eu

Contact: kai.salas-rossenbach@inrap.fr

Report from the Working Party on Archaeology and Gender in Europe.
Activity in 2011

Every year since the working party was established, some of its members have proposed either a session or a round table at the EAA annual meeting. The subject of the Oslo (2011) session, arranged by Kristin Armstrong Oma, University of Oslo, Norway, and Nona Palincas, Romanian Academy, Bucharest, Romania, was “Humans and animals in the making of gender”, drawing contributions from all over Europe and beyond, as well as a large audience. Judging from the ensuing discussion, there seems to be a growing understanding of the roles of animals in human lives through the ages, and that human-animal interactions are also engendered.

The Helsinki (2012) AGE session was organized by Bo Jensen, Denmark and Silvia Tomášková, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, USA and titled "Boundary crossings and gendered bodies: the limits of the body – gender trouble at the margins and in the center". Again, papers were presented from a variety of geographical and theoretical standpoints and discussed by an enthusiastic audience.

AGE activity between these two successful sessions has been more limited. The AGE webpage, which was earlier financed from one of Sandra Montón-Subías’ projects, is still
available, with a lot of information and many papers for downloading. It is no longer being updated however, due to lack of funding. For the same reason, no AGE-initiated events other than the AGE sessions have taken place. On the other hand, AGE members have organized and participated in meetings and conferences all over the world. Many bi- and multilateral contacts have been established, possibly helped by the AGE membership. Likewise our members have published widely (some older publications can be downloaded from our website). Two papers by AGE members which deal with gender archaeology in general and relate it to AGE will be mentioned here: Silvia Tomásková: Landscape for a good feminist. An archaeological review (2011, Archaeological Dialogues 18 (1)) and Liv Helga Dommasnes and Sandra Montón-Subías: European Gender Archaeologies in Historical Perspective (forthcoming, European Journal of Archaeology, vol. 15 (3)).

Membership has increased to 60. We have recently started a discussion on the future of the Working Party on Archaeology and Gender in Europe - AGE - and its organization, and plan to present our conclusions at the next EAA annual meeting.

Liv Helga Dommasnes (Liv.Dommasnes@um.uib.no)
Sandra Montón-Subías

**EAA Committee on the Teaching and Training of Archaeologists**

The Committee (Chair: Arek Marciniak, Secretary: Mark Pearce) held a meeting at the Helsinki Conference to discuss its current initiative, which is to study how PhDs vary across Europe. Questions discussed varied from ‘How far can you go from Archaeology and it still be a PhD in Archaeology?’ (Willem Willems) to ‘Whether PhDs should be graded’ (Ian Ralston). The Committee decided to propose a session for the Pilsen Annual Meeting in 2013 on the topic ‘What should a PhD be all about?’ Hrvoje Potrebica reported on how reforms in Croatia are impacting on PhD regulations.

The Committee is open to all EAA members interested in the teaching and training of archaeologists, and those interested in becoming involved are invited to contact the Secretary, Mark Pearce (mark.pearce@nottingham.ac.uk) who will add them to the email circulation list.

Mark Pearce (Mark.Pearce@nottingham.ac.uk)

**EJA to be published quarterly**

The EAA’s journal, the *European Journal of Archaeology*, is currently going from strength to strength. In response to the significantly increased number of new, high quality articles now being submitted to the journal, the EAA’s Executive Board and our publisher, Maney, have agreed to increase the quantity of *EJA* issues from three to four per annum. The *EJA* will consequently now be published in February, May, August and November. This development will not only provide members with a greater number and range of scholarly articles to read (at no extra cost), but will also increase revenue for the EAA under the terms of the publishing agreement signed with Maney.

Commenting on this development, Liz Rosindale, Maney’s Publishing Manager for Humanities, writes: ‘The increase in papers and move to quarterly publication is a very positive step and shows a growing journal with a solid reputation able to attract high-quality papers. The increase in frequency also gives more scope for publishing themed issues without compromising the number of general papers that can be published each year.’

Robin Skeates (robin.skeates@durham.ac.uk)
General Editor, *EJA*
The European Archaeological Heritage Prize 2012

The EAA Committee for the European Archaeological Heritage Prize, consisting of Anastasia Tourta from Greece, Margaret Gowen from Ireland, Luboš Jiráň from the Czech Republic, Mircea Angelescu from Romania, and Carsten Paludan-Müller from Norway (chair), has decided to award the fourteenth Heritage Prize of the European Association of Archaeologists to

Professor Willem J.H. Willems, Dean of the Faculty of Archaeology, University of Leiden.

Professor Willem J.H. Willems is a distinguished and internationally respected scholar in the field of Roman archaeology and archaeological heritage. His contribution to Dutch, European and world heritage has been of major importance. Willem Willems played a central role in the internationalization, integration, consolidation, and modernization of archaeological heritage policies and practices in Europe during the last 30 years. He has held numerous major positions in his own country.

These included, among others: the position as director of the Dutch State Archaeological Service, State Archaeologist of the Netherlands, and Inspector General for Archaeology at the Netherlands Ministry of Culture. He was one of the initiators and authors of the Convention on the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage of Europe. He was one of the founders and the President of the European Association of Archaeologists as well as the founding President of the Europae Archaeologiae Consilium. He is currently a co-President of the ICOMOS Committee for Archaeological Heritage Management. He also serves as an expert in the nominations of World Heritage Sites.
Professor Willems has been awarded numerous prestigious distinctions in recognition of the uniqueness of his contribution. The reason for adding the European Heritage Prize to an already ample collection of distinctions is that with his work Willem Willems has significantly contributed to widening of the perspective of European archaeology and heritage management. It is a widened perspective that not only helps us transgress the internal European borders, but also positions European archaeology and heritage in a wider global context.

2012 Student Award of the European Association of Archaeologists

The 2012 Student Award of the European Association of Archaeologists has been awarded to Maria Lahtinen for her paper on ‘Early Farmers in Finland – Was There Pre-Iron Age Cultivation (500 BC)?’ This annual award is generously sponsored by the publishers Cambridge University Press and Archaeolingua. The award panel, comprising Robin Skeates (Chair), Peter Biehl and Monique van den Dries, were very impressed by overall standard and number of submissions this year, but felt that Maria’s paper was the most outstanding. Maria’s interesting paper addresses the long-debated question of whether or not cereals were cultivated in Finland before 500 BC. It bravely presents a rigorously systematic and detailed critique of the existing palaeobotanical evidence, and it rejects those arguments that favour early farming. Instead, it concludes that – on the basis of the currently available evidence – cereals were not cultivated in Finland before the Iron Age.

Maria’s paper is well written and professionally illustrated. When published, it is easy to imagine how controversial this paper will be in Finland, but it is also of international importance, and is likely to have a significant impact on wider studies of early farming.

Maria is a Finnish archaeologist, who is currently undertaking doctoral research at Durham University in the UK. The subject of her research is ‘Diet, Migration and the Beginning of Cultivation at the Medieval site of Iin Hamina in Northern Finland’. Her aim is to use isotope analysis to investigate paleodiet and migration in Northern Finland by analyzing prehistoric skeletal remains. The Site Iin Hamina is a cemetery site with 70 in-situ burials and 160 skulls. It was used between the 14th and 17th centuries AD. Historical documents suggest that the beginning of cultivation occurred during 15th to 16th century AD in the Northern Ostrobotnia region. In previous research, the progression from hunting and gathering to farming was examined by comparing different sites. The value of Iin Hamina lies in the possibility of seeing this evolution in a single site. In general, after the Neolithic Revolution, people settled and thus their diet became more terrestrial. The idea that farmers no longer hunted and gathered food is widely accepted. However near the northern border of cultivation this might not be the case.

Robin Skeates
Early farming in Finland – Was there any before 500 BC?
EAA Student Award Paper 2012

Maria Lahtinen, Dept. of Archaeology, University of Durham (m.lahtinen@durham.ac.uk)

The issue of early farming in Finland has not often been discussed in international arenas. This might be due to the remote northerly location of the country or the fact that Finns are not Indo-Europeans (considering the idea that the Neolithic revolution was related to the spread of Indo-Europeans into Europe). The context is also different, as pottery and long-houses were introduced much earlier than the suggested dates for early farming. Furthermore, the archaeological community in Finland is very small and the lack of a culture of debate has provided an atmosphere where opposing opinions are not often published or publicly discussed. I therefore see my paper as the opening of a public discussion in a broader forum. This article is only a short version of the original one, based on my presentation at the EAA meeting in Helsinki this year. The full paper is going to be submitted to an international journal in the near future.

The question of when people started farming in Finland has been under discussion since the 20th century. It has been suggested that farming began during the Corded Ware period (3200-2300 cal BC) (Vuorela and Hicks 1996; Alenius, Lavento and Saarnisto 2009; Mökkönen 2010) or the Bronze Age (1500-500 cal BC) (Donner 1984; Zvelebil and Rowley-Conwy 1984; Simola 1999). It is not certain whether farming began simultaneously throughout the country, since most studies cover only southern Finland. While there is no consensus as yet, there has not been any discussion about the reliability of the evidence or its interpretation after the 1990s either.

The only evidence dating before the beginning of the Iron Age (500 BC) has been a macrofossil site (Vuorela and Lempääläinen 1988) and pollen grains from various places around Finland. The macrofossil, a barley grain, has been dated to 3400 ± 430 cal BP (3200 ± 170 BP) and used as evidence for cultivation. However, it comes from a multiperiod site and with a modern field. As there are no other supporting dates from the site, and it is very broad range, it is reasonable to question whether it is accurate in the first place.

The idea behind the pollen evidence has been that self-pollinating (autogamous) barley releases only a very small number of pollen into the immediate surroundings (Vuorela 1973). This is most likely true; however, the recognition of barley is more difficult and not always accurate. In pollen analysis, it is almost always impossible to recognize species. In most of the criteria used in studies in Finland (for example, Beug 1961; Andersen 1978), the limits for barley pollen are statistical. In reality, this means that ‘the barley type’ also includes several other species, some of which are wild. Therefore, it is unreliable to use only single pollen evidence as a proof of cereal cultivation. Finally, it is highly important that the identification criteria are published and discussed.

Recognition is not the only problem. In most cases, the dating of the pollen core has been done from a bulk sediment sample. This means that the entire organic carbon component from the sample has been used for dating. Thus, the old carbon from lake environments (sediment/water) will be part of the sample. In 1970, it was already known that samples from Finnish lake environments can produce dating errors on a scale of 500 - 700 years (Tolonen, Siiriäinen and Hirviluoto 1976). Such samples have been used more as an advisory date in paleoecological studies, but regarding early farming, these dates has been used literally.

For my paper, I went through the pollen studies that have been used to suggest an early date for farming in Finland. The conclusion was that only a few sites have more than one pollen grain of the hordeum or triticum types. Only one site that shows a continuous pollen curve during the Bronze Age has published the criteria that were used for type recognition, and has produced a reliable date before the Iron Age in Finland. However, the data consist of only one or two pollen grains, and the same core includes a single grain of barley type pollen in a late Stone Age layer. This suggests that the wild species that are included in barley type pollen are present in the area, and it is very difficult to support an early beginning of farming from pollen analysis alone.
Economic and economical

John Collis

Those of us who have English as their mother language are blessed that so many of our international colleagues communicate in English. As I have suggested in the recommendations for presentation at EAA conferences, in return we native speakers should offer our help to improve our colleagues’ English presentations, though we also get lost at times with the complications of spelling and grammar! But one common mistake I have noticed at EAA conferences is to confuse the two words ‘economic’ and ‘economical’.

‘Economic’ is the adjective which refers to the financial economy or how we gain our living. So my old Professor’s (Grahame Clark) seminal book was called *Prehistoric Europe; the economic basis*.

‘Economical’ derives from another meaning of economy, ‘thrift’, ‘being careful with money or expenditure’. So ‘economical’ means ‘sparing’, ‘careful with expenditure’ or ‘being careful in other respects’. One of the most famous uses was by a leading bureaucrat in our civil service, speaking at a public enquiry in Australia about what the British government had done. He said that he had been ‘economical with the truth’, that is not actually lying, but avoiding saying anything that might allow the real truth to be known!

Confusingly ‘politic’ and ‘political’ is the other way round, with ‘political’ referring to politics, and ‘politic’ meaning ‘discreet’ or ‘prudent’. On behalf of all English speakers, I apologise for our language!
EAA ANNUAL REPORT (Minutes of the ABM in Helsinki)

31 August 2012

1. Opening and welcome by the President of the EAA
The EAA President, Prof. Friedrich Lüth, opened the EAA Annual Business Meeting by welcoming the members who were in attendance. He thanked all the delegates for participating in this year’s conference which has been very well organised even though the number of delegates reached 1156 (the highest ever in EAA history). Altogether 700 papers were delivered at 78 sessions, and 80 posters were displayed. A considerable part of the attendance is thanks to the involvement of MERC who have become and it is hoped will remain EAA members. On behalf of MERC, Martin Carver clarified that special MERC meetings will be held at every fourth EAA conference, but in the years between medieval-themed sessions will be integrated in the programme of the EAA conference. Negotiations between MERC and the EAA will be considered by the EAA Executive Board and the result will be reported to membership.

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 high quality academic content at the conference. The central theme of the next conference in Pilsen will be “Archaeology as Science” and this aspect will be prepared by Eszter Bánffy, Friedrich Lüth and Robin Skeates. Proposals for future conference themes are welcome. The deadlines for the next EAA conference in Pilsen will shift to even earlier dates, with the deadline for session proposals on 15 November; paper and poster submission will open on 15 January. 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, and the dates and frequency of Executive Board meetings have also been changed. Another noticeable change concerns the EAA election: this year it has been possible to vote on-line for the first time, which has resulted in increased participation.

Negotiations concerning the production of the European Journal of Archaeology (EJA) with the former publisher have resulted (with legal advice) in a financially satisfactory breakup. The Journal is now fully owned by the EAA and is being produced by a new publisher, Maney. The lengthy negotiations about the EJA hindered preparation of the EAA monograph series, which has been requested by the membership. Major publishers have however been approached, as well as other archaeological bodies (SAA, WAC, UISPP) and a series may be published as a joint project.

As will be clear from the financial report, the EAA is now on stable ground and has been able to produce a surplus which must be given back to the membership. In view of the difficult economic situation, the EAA will institute the Oscar Montelius Foundation, which will distribute grants to members in need. This support will serve as a back-up for and extension of the Wenner Gren grants generously available to EAA members from Central and Eastern Europe in the past. The Board will report back to members about progress in establishing the Foundation.

2. Minutes of the ABM in Oslo (circulated in TEA)
The minutes of the ABM in Oslo 2011 were circulated in the Winter Issue of TEA, no. 36. The ABM approved them as a correct record of the previous meeting. The Minutes of the ABM in Helsinki are circulated in the current TEA Winter Issue, no. 38, after the Executive Board has confirmed their accuracy.

3. Matters arising from the Minutes
The representation of students in the EAA has long been a recurrent topic, and it has been systematically addressed since 2009. Different solutions were proposed at the 2010 and 2011 ABMs and Peter Biehl and Monique van den Dries undertook to prepare a questionnaire to better understand who the students actually are and what their needs are within the EAA. The questionnaire was launched on-line in May 2012, but by the ABM on the
31 August 2012 only five students had responded. It was therefore decided that the questionnaire should be once again advertised to EAA student members and that the results should be analysed when a large enough response has been obtained.

4. Annual Report by the Secretary and the Administrator
Communication with the local organisers has been excellent this year and therefore up-to-date figures are available. As of the 28 August 2012, the EAA has 1008 paid up individual members, and the following corporate members (institutions that make a financial contribution to the EAA):

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

It is EAA policy to classify members by their country of residence. Most of the EAA membership resides in Western European countries; the most represented countries being the UK, Norway and Finland. EAA members seem to have become accustomed to paying their membership fees earlier and direct to the Prague Secretariat rather than with their conference fees; this is important as it ensures regular and timely delivery of the EJA. The EAA Handbook has been revised and offers e.g. simpler instructions for conference organisation. It will be further modified and members will be kept informed about the new guidelines.

The new EAA website has been running for more than a year; it is flexible and can be quickly modified or updated if needed. The web page is maintained and designed by Andrew Leszczewicz, to whom we extend our thanks – he is doing an excellent job.

5. Statutes Amendment
Following revision of the Statutes over the past year by the members of the Statutes Committee (Roger M Thomas [Chair], Harald K. Hermansen, Kristian Kristiansen and Willem Willems), the following amendment was put forward to members for approval:
Article V, § 5 of the Statutes will now read “Subscription rates for *The European Journal of Archaeology* may be included in certain membership categories *EAA membership*.”

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

6. Financial Report by the Treasurer and the Administrator

The EAA is at present financially strong which is good especially in view of the global economic crisis. There are three main reasons for the larger surplus: good attendance at recent conferences, a donation of 15,000,- euro received from Leiden and resulting from the 2010 conference, and change of EJA publisher. The accounts for 2011 have been audited and were approved; budgets for 2012 and 2013 are balanced and were approved by the members present.

**Accounting 2011**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>EUR</th>
<th>EUR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance 2010</td>
<td>5 370</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td>87197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>membership fees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wenner Gren grant donation from Leiden</td>
<td>15000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EJA 14</td>
<td>25059</td>
<td>487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>legal advice EJA</td>
<td>29904</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editorial support and settlement from Sage</td>
<td>1586</td>
<td>7032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sage revenue</td>
<td>57529</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maney welcome bonus</td>
<td>12000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>printing of diplomas, HP medal engraving</td>
<td>229</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reimbursements boards (NC, SAA, Exec, Edit, preparatory Disco)</td>
<td>16 555</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dinners, refreshments, gifts</td>
<td>3570</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prague secretariat</td>
<td>28528</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>web page costs</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Payments Europe (cc acceptance monthly fee)</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accessories</td>
<td>5348</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accounting 2010</td>
<td>1229</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>3144</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>116739</td>
<td>179 245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>balance 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td>62 506</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Accounting 2012 (estimate as of August 2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Expenses EUR</th>
<th>Income EUR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance 2011</td>
<td>62,506</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2012</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership fees</td>
<td></td>
<td>59,899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wenner Gren grant EJA 14</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tax from production of EJA 14</td>
<td>7,825</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EJA 15</td>
<td>9,612</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maney editorial support</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maney royalty</td>
<td></td>
<td>12,077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sage royalty</td>
<td></td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>legal advice EJA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>final payment Sage</td>
<td></td>
<td>12,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>printing of diplomas, HP medal engraving</td>
<td>229</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reimbursements boards (NC, Exec)</td>
<td>4,785</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dinners, refreshments, gifts</td>
<td>3,919</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prague secretariat</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>web page costs</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Payments Europe (cc acceptance monthly fee)</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>promotion materials (folders)</td>
<td>2,230</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accounting and audit 2011</td>
<td>2,030</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>total</strong></td>
<td>69,217</td>
<td>93,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>balance 2012</strong></td>
<td>24,043</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Budget 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Expenses EUR</th>
<th>Income EUR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Membership fees</td>
<td></td>
<td>70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wenner-Gren grant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disbursement boards and committees</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretariat (Prague)</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editorial support</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maney royalty</td>
<td></td>
<td>14,874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EJA</td>
<td>9,612</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal advice</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web page</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting and audit 2012</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>total</strong></td>
<td>73,112</td>
<td>90,874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>14,762</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fritz Lüth informed the members of the financial results of the shift to a new EJA publisher – the difference between the loss in 2010 and profit in 2012 was about 40,000,- euro. The editorial support received from the new publisher partially covers the expenditure of the Editor and members of the Editorial Board and the other collaborators (language editing etc.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income on membership fees</th>
<th>83422</th>
<th>86521 (ongoing)</th>
<th>76646</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of copies</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>948</td>
<td>836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure for the Journal (total)</td>
<td>18751</td>
<td>25059 (ongoing)</td>
<td>9612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Advice</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>29904</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welcome Bonus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editorial Support</td>
<td>1276</td>
<td>1586</td>
<td>6000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royalty</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>12077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>70430</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>-18057</td>
<td>17295</td>
<td>20465</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Membership fee level for the next year
The membership fees in 2013 will remain the same as in 2012 – they have not changed since 2009. There will be a 5,- euro discount for early payments made before 31 March of the year of subscription. Membership category “C” (members from Central and Eastern Europe without Journal) has disappeared with the approved Statutes change. The higher fee in category “B” poses problems to some EAA members and together with conference attendance costs may prevent some from renewing. While the price of membership for members from Central and Eastern Europe has risen, it is still discounted in comparison with the “A” rate for members from the West. The EJA for all members forms part of the new EAA business model with the publisher and helps create surplus which will in turn be reinvested in grants for members to take part at the conference, no matter their country of origin. Together with the Wenner Gren support these grants should ensure that despite the global financial crisis any EAA member in need can be aided. Criteria for grant aid will be adjusted after the Oscar Montelius Foundation is launched, making them transparent and available to all in need. Members present at the ABM approved the membership fee level for 2013.

8. Announcement of the 2012 Elections
According to the Statutes the EAA Executive Board consists of 10 elected members: 3 Officers, an Incoming President elected one year before their term of office, and 6 Ordinary Members (one of them appointed as a Vice-President). The period of service is 3 years. This year, the posts of two Ordinary members of the Executive Board will become vacant; the candidates elected will serve from 2012 to 2015. The Annual Business Meeting in Riva del Garda (2009) decided that Editorial Board members should be appointed rather than elected, as had been the case in the past. Following the Statutes amendment adopted at the Annual Business Meetings in Riva del Garda (2009) and The Hague (2010), a new Nomination Committee member is elected by ballot in the normal election process, and will serve on the Nomination Committee from 2012 to 2015.

A call for nominations by members was sent out on 24 February; the deadline for nominations was 2 April. Two nominations for the post of Ordinary member of the Executive Board, supported by ten full members, were received: Agnė Čivilytė and Kenneth Aitchison.
Monique van den Dries, a serving Board member whose position has been available for election and who had only served one term, agreed to run for a second term. While the Nomination committee identified Svetlana Sharapova as a suitable candidate for the post of Ordinary member of the Executive Board, it failed to find a second candidate to run for the post on the Nomination committee. Personalised election materials were circulated via e-mail on 16 July. The 195 votes received (159 on-line and 36 at the conference ballot box) were counted by the by EAA Secretary Mark Pearce, Nomination Committee member Adrian Olivier, and EAA Assistant Administrator Hana Brzobohatá. The number of votes has increased considerably thanks to the on-line personalised ballot system. The elected candidates (shown in bold in the chart below) will serve from 2012 to 2015. The EAA congratulates the successful candidates, and thanks those who were not elected for standing and their continuing interest in the work of the Association.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Candidates</th>
<th>Votes received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive board member 1</td>
<td>Monique van den Dries</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 - 2015</td>
<td>Kenneth Aitchison</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive board member 2</td>
<td>Agnė Čivilytė</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 – 2015</td>
<td>Svetlana Sharapova</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nomination committee</td>
<td>Anna Maria Bietti Sestieri</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 - 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Welcome to the new Board Members
Friedrich Lüth welcomed – unfortunately in her absence - the newly elected Executive Board member Agnė Čivilytė, the new member of the Nomination Committee Anna Maria Bietti Sestieri, congratulated the re-elected Board member Monique van den Dries, thanked the outgoing Board member Nathan Schlanger and the outgoing member of the Nomination Committee Predrag Novakovic, and expressed his appreciation of the engagement of the unsuccessful candidates.

10. Announcement of new Heritage Prize Committee member
Anastasia Tourta and Mircea Angelescu have been re-appointed to the Heritage Prize Committee for the 2012 – 2015 term.

11. Announcement of the EAA Student Award 2012
The Student Award Selection Committee composed of the EJA Editor and two members of the Executive Board received nine papers for consideration for the Student Award. It decided to award the 2012 Student Award to Maria Leena Lahtinen for her paper “Early Farmers in Finland – Was There Pre-Iron Age Cultivation (500 BC)?”. The winner unfortunately missed the Business Meeting for serious family reasons, but will be presented a voucher sponsored by Cambridge University Press and books donated by Archaeolingua. The award citation was read out: Maria Lahtinen's interesting paper addresses the long-debated question of whether or not cereals were cultivated in Finland before 500 BC. It bravely presents a rigorously systematic and detailed critique of the existing palaeobotanical evidence, and it rejects those arguments that favour early farming. Instead, it concludes that - on the basis of the currently available evidence - cereals were not cultivated in Finland before the Iron Age. Maria’s paper is well written and professionally illustrated. When published, it is easy to imagine how controversial this paper will be in Finland, but it is also of international importance, and is likely to have a significant impact on wider studies of early farming.
12. EJA Progress Report by the Editor

Having formally ended EAA’s relationship with the previous EJA publisher, Maney was selected among eight other publishers to publish the EJA. Maney has been very efficient in making all EJA and JEA issues available on-line, establishing a new EJA web site, launching an on-line editorial system, and marketing the Journal. This resulted in an increased profile of the Journal and higher number of article submissions, which in turn enables transition to four issues per year at no extra cost to members. The EJA Editorial board has contributed to the development of the Journal, and Robin Skeates thanked Ladislav Šmejda, the outgoing Editorial Board member, for his work. He also welcomed two newly appointed members of the Editorial team: Laurence Manolakakis and Gitte Hansen. He also thanked Hana Brzobohatá, Jennifer Sharman and others who have worked for the Journal. Members are encouraged to check that they have accurately given their postal address to the Prague Secretariat in order to avoid re-sending undelivered EJA copies. All members can also view the EJA on-line after activation of their access. EJA is Maney’s Journal of the Month for September 2012 and the www.maney.co.uk/jotm/eja website offers many on-line features. The Editorial Board welcomes recommendations of books for review and of course paper submissions to the EJA.

13. Report by the Editor of TEA

The summer issue, TEA 37, was sent to members on 24 May 2012 and comprised 73 pages. The deadline for submissions for the TEA 38 winter issue is 15 October and session organisers are especially welcome to submit their reports. Alexander Gramsch thanked his Assistant TEA Editor, Lidka Zuk, for her work on TEA issues, and Jennifer Sharman for language editing. Willem Willems pointed out that despite being a newsletter, the TEA is published in just two issues per year, while the Journal will feature four issues yearly. Peter Biehl reminded members of the blog which as on-line counterpart of the TEA can publish news instantly. It may be useful to include an introduction how to blog on the EAA website.

14. Reports from the Working Parties, Committees and Round Tables

The EAA Vice-President, Monique van den Dries, notified members of the sessions and round tables held at the Helsinki conference by the various Committees and Working Parties. Most of them agreed to report in the winter TEA issue. The Committee on the Teaching and Training of Archaeologists has focused on PhD study across Europe through a questionnaire published in TEA and will hold an academic session at the Pilsen conference. The Professional Associations in Archaeology Committee has currently two active projects concerned with studying archaeology in Europe and employment in archaeology (“Disco 2012 – 2014”). It organised a round table at the Helsinki conference. The Archaeological Legislation and Organisation Committee held a round table at the Helsinki conference and proposed a number of decisions, including revision of terms of reference, for ratification by the Board. It will focus on specific issues in European archaeology and will invite interested individuals and bodies to cooperate. The EAA and EAC Working Group on farming, forestry and rural land management has 30 participants from 16 countries. It will hold its meeting at the last day of the Helsinki conference. The Archaeology and Gender in Europe (AGE) Working Party did not present its work at the ABM but is otherwise a very active group. The “Archaeology in contemporary Europe - professional practices and public outreach” project is about to conclude a five-year project of 13 partners, the objective of which was to promote archaeology in Europe. It has a good web page and a number of publications.

15. Location of future Annual Meetings

The future conferences will be held in the following cities:
19th Annual Meeting 2013 Pilsen, Czech Republic
20th Annual Meeting 2014 Istanbul, Turkey
21st Annual Meeting 2015  Glasgow, Scotland
22nd Annual Meeting 2016  Vilnius, Lithuania

Friedrich Lüth and Sylvie Květinová will make a preparatory visit to Vilnius to ensure that there is enough space, since the 22nd EAA conference will coincide with the next MERC meeting.
There is a preliminary bid for the 2017 venue.

16. Invitation for the 19th Annual Meeting in Pilsen, Czech Republic
The 19th EAA conference will be held on 4 – 8 September 2013 in Pilsen, Czech Republic. The conference will be held at the University of West Bohemia campus Bory, on the southern edge of Pilsen. The campus is about 50 minutes by road from Prague airport, and approx. 40 minutes by road from the Czech/German border. There are buses and trains between Prague and Pilsen, but there will also be a special shuttle service from Prague airport. Several hotels in Pilsen have been block-booked, including student residences. The Opening Ceremony and Welcome Reception will be held at the campus; the Annual Party will take place in the Spilka Pilsner Brewery Pub, and the Annual Dinner will be in the Parkhotel Plzeň. There will be a pre-conference three day trip to South Moravia, and various post-conference one day excursions; medieval Pilsen itself is worth visiting. The conference website is up and running at www.eaa2013.cz.

17. Any Other Business
Jean-Olivier Gransard-Desmond inquired about the EAA Code of Practice and the Principles of Conduct and was asked to enter in e-mail contact with the EAA Secretary, Mark Pearce, for further information.
Since no other matters arose, Friedrich Lüth declared the Annual Business Meeting closed, and thanked everyone for their participation. He specially thanked the local organisers, namely Esa Mikkola, Mika Lavento, Eeva-Maria Viitanen and Ville-Martti Rohiola, the sixty student volunteers who were granted free EAA membership in 2012 and 2013, the EAA Executive Board, the EAA Secretariat and the Institute of Archaeology that hosts it in Prague, and above all EAA members for their involvement.

Calendar for EAA members November 2012 – June 2013

15 November  Deadline for session and round table proposals for the 2013 EAA conference in Pilsen, Czech Republic
December   Reminder to renew EAA membership on-line e-mailed to members
31 December End of the 2012 EAA membership (log in the members’ only section valid till the 31st January 2013)
1 January Beginning of the 2013 EAA membership (log in the members’ only section valid since the 1st December 2012)
15 January Paper and poster proposal submission for the 2013 EAA conference in Pilsen, Czech Republic opens
15 March Closure of nominations by members
15 March Deadline for paper and poster proposal submission for the 2013 EAA conference in Pilsen, Czech Republic
15 April Deadline for articles and announcements for the TEA 39 summer issue
June TEA 39 summer issue sent out to the members
Announcements

Archaeological Institute of America (AIA) invites EAA members to the Institute’s Annual Meeting in Seattle

The 114th Joint Annual Meeting (AM) of the Archaeological Institute of America (AIA) and American Philological Association (APA) will be held from January 3 to 6 2013 in Seattle, Washington, U.S.A. The AIA is pleased to offer EAA members the discounted AIA member conference registration rate. For details on attending and participating in the AM, please visit www.archaeological.org/annualmeeting.

Approximately 3,000 people from over 35 countries will attend the three-day conference that features over 500 presenters and more than 70 academic sessions. There is still time to participate in the Academic Program through the inaugural Lightning Session. This fast-paced, informal session that emphasizes interaction and networking gives participants an opportunity to deliver a 5-minute talk on their current research, a specific case-study, or methodological problem to an interdisciplinary audience and get feedback from colleagues. The full academic program and submission forms for the Lightning Session are available online at www.archaeological.org/annualmeeting. The submission deadline for the Lightning Session is 15 November 2012.
Attendees who register for the AM before 16 November 2012 will receive even deeper discounts on their conference registration during our Early Bird registration period. The conference hotel rate of $139USD per night (plus taxes) for a single or double room is now available for booking at the official AM hotel, the Sheraton Seattle, located in the heart of downtown Seattle. The conference rate is lower than any other full service hotel in the area and includes complimentary internet.

We hope that you will join us in Seattle. Visit the website for complete meeting details and travel, airport, and ground transportation information.

A new open access online archaeology journal:  
*Forum Kritische Archaeologie*

In 2010 a group of archaeologists came together in Berlin with the idea to start a new journal. The motivation stemmed from the wish to provide a platform for researchers with an interest in the connections between archaeological work and its political and social dimensions. After a series of internal discussions, the journal *Forum Kritische Archäologie* published its first issue in the spring of 2012 with a general forum on “What is a Critical Archaeology?”, containing papers in English and German. A total of 21 authors from a variety of scholarly, national and cultural backgrounds discuss the subject in manifold ways, addressing the scope and limits of a critical archaeology or presenting specific examples of one. The editing collective in turn responds with its own position. *Forum Kritische Archäologie* has as its goal to further discussions of these and related issues especially within the framework of the German-speaking archaeological community. Interest in the political dimensions of archaeology has grown dramatically around the world. One of the outcomes has been a questioning of archaeological truth claims, which in turn has led to demands for the return of cultural property, questioning who may research, speak and write about the past of Others, and considerations of what kinds of relations we can and should develop to past Others. Today it is scarcely possible to speak about an ethically based, socially responsible archaeology without engaging with these themes.

The journal aims to further discussions, ranging from colonial and neo-colonial pitfalls of archaeological practice to the problems of an increasingly digitized archaeology, to theoretical reflections about the nature of archaeological discourse. We do not set any
chronological or regional limitations for case studies. The journal invites single contributions from anyone interested in a politically engaged archaeology; it also publishes special issues that focus on a specific topic to which authors are invited to contribute. Many of the submissions in English will also appear in German, and German articles will have a detailed English abstract. All individual submissions pass through a peer review system. The journal is published digitally and is indebted to open access modalities to make it available to all internet users. Articles are published in accordance with the Creative Commons License that specifies non-commercial sharing, and that the articles remain unmodified (CC BY-NC-ND 3.0). All interested persons are invited to submit contributions to Forum Kritische Archäologie by forwarding articles or enquiries to post@kritischearchaeologie.de. For further information please see www.kritischearchaeologie.de

We look forward to hearing from you.

**AIA, EAA, SAA, and WAC organize session on archaeological collaboration for WAC 7 in Jordan**

At the EAA Annual Meeting in Helsinki, representatives of the Archaeological Institute of America (AIA), European Association of Archaeologists (EAA), Society for American Archaeology (SAA), and World Archaeological Congress (WAC) discussed the possibility of organizing a session on collaboration among archaeological organizations to be presented at the Seventh World Archaeological Congress (WAC 7) that will be held in Jordan from January 14 to 18 2013. We are happy to announce that the proposed session entitled ‘How does collaboration among archaeological organizations benefit archaeologists and the discipline?’ was accepted into the academic program for WAC 7.

The session will explore the idea of collaboration among archaeological organizations in an effort to determine how cooperative endeavours can benefit archaeologists and the discipline. Currently, the numerous archaeological organizations around the world act more or less independently of each other. Collaborations could unify disparate voices, increase efficiencies, eliminate redundancies, and build capacity. But what do archaeologists want from these archaeological organizations? How can the efforts of these institutions benefit archaeologists?

During the session, representatives from several of the world’s major archaeological organizations will comprise a panel that will interact directly with attendees in an effort to identify archaeologists’ concerns and needs. This information will provide the opportunity for the various organizations to design and implement effective programs that adequately address the issues. Some of the topics to be considered include activities and actions that are common to all groups, such as public outreach and engagement, raising awareness and the profile of the discipline, promoting ethical and professional behavior, and responding to crises in the field.

We invite all of you to attend both WAC 7 and this important session. If you represent an archaeological organization and would like to be part of the panel, please contact Ben Thomas at bthomas@aia.bu.edu.

**Rock art in a global perspective**

Margarita Díaz-Andreu is organising at the Museu d’Arqueologia de Catalunya a series of lectures on rock art from 14 to 16 November, 7 to 9 pm, under the title ‘Message and Spirituality. Rock art in a global perspective’. Talks will be given by Daniel Arsenault (CÉLAT-Université du Québec à Montréal (UQAM)), Antti Lahelma (University of Helsinki), Paul
Taçon (Griffith University, Australia), Ben Smith (Rock Art Research Institute, South Africa), Margarita Díaz-Andreu (ICREA-Universitat de Barcelona) and David Whitley (ASM Affiliates, California, USA).

**Academic conference documented in innovative formats**

*Places, People, Stories* was the title of an interdisciplinary and international conference arranged at Linnaeus University in Kalmar, 28-30 September 2011. One important aim of the gathering, which attracted nearly 200 participants from around the world, was to create a platform for unpredictable dialogues between professional scientists and artists exploring the relations between places, people, and stories. The conference homepage with the full programme and other information is still available at [http://lnu.se/about-lnu/conferences/places-people-stories-2011?l=en](http://lnu.se/about-lnu/conferences/places-people-stories-2011?l=en). Now two conference documentations have been published and are available freely to all:

**Places, People, Stories - The Comic**, by Mats Brate and Petter Hanberger

**Places, People, Stories - The Film**, by Staffan Lindqvist och Johanna Karlin
- [http://youtu.be/Y2xkwwPEUQ8](http://youtu.be/Y2xkwwPEUQ8)

Both the comic and the film are not only documenting the conference but, as you will notice, they also make their own original contribution to the topic of the conference by using artistic means to explore the relations between places, people and stories.

Cornelius Holtorf
With my warmest greetings, I am pleased to inform you now of the details regarding this year’s J. J. Winckelmann celebration:
The event will take place at the German Archaeological Institute in Calle Serrano 159 at 7 p.m. on 12 December 2012.
Klaus Stefan Freyberger, the Deputy Director of the German Archaeological Institute in Rome, will speak on the subject of ‘La Basilica Aemilia sul Foro Romano a Roma: un lussuoso edificio publico per il commercio e la giustizia’.

Dirce Marzoli, German Archaeological Institute Madrid, First Director

Global Exploration Fund for Northern Europe

In 2011 National Geographic established a regional Global Exploration Fund for Northern Europe. Building on National Geographic's legacy of supporting exploration worldwide for more than a century, the Global Exploration Fund establishes local support for Research, Conservation and Exploration projects tied to regional networks. The grantees and outcomes supported by the fund will benefit from National Geographic media and outreach with support from a scientific advisory committee, executive committee and regional partnerships. The Global Exploration Fund supports research in a range of field sciences including geology, anthropology, palaeontology, biology and archaeology. Since its foundation in 2011 the North European fund, with an Advisory Board drawn from across the relevant disciplines, has funded eight archaeological projects among a total of 54 projects overall. The mission of
the Global Exploration Fund is to encourage top-quality research and it is seeking to develop its support for projects in archaeology and other fields.

The Global Exploration Fund for Northern Europe is open to residents of Belgium, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Norway, Sweden, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom and Ireland to work anywhere in the world. Applications can be submitted in three categories: Research, Conservation, and Exploration. Research grants must have hypothesis-based scientific research as a primary focus and are awarded based on potential for new advances in field sciences. Conservation grants will be awarded for innovative and applied approaches to conservation issues with potential for global application. Exploration grants support exploration and adventure around the world and are approved by media experts looking for engaging stories and topics suitable for National Geographic media.

For further details and online application form please see nationalgeographic.com/gef/northerneurope/ or email Camilla Hansen, Programme Officer: chansen@ngs.org.

**New Sheffield University Zooarchaeology Short Courses for 2013**

Animal bones and teeth are among the most common remains found on archaeological sites. Studying archaeological animal bones can give us valuable insight into diet, farming, industry, society and environment in the past.

Over the past two years we have had the privilege of introducing over 120 people from commercial archaeological units and museums as well as students and archaeology volunteers from across the world to zooarchaeological analysis through our three day Zooarchaeology Short Course here in Sheffield.

We as a team have loved every minute of it, so in 2013 we are rolling out two new additions to our original Zooarchaeology Short Course. Through short lectures, discussions and hands on practical workshops, these courses will provide practical experience of zooarchaeological methods.

We will be running ‘Understanding zooarchaeology I: A short course for archaeology and heritage professionals, students and enthusiasts’ from 18 to 20 March 2013. This will be the 6th presentation of this course, which is specifically designed for people with little or no previous experience in zooarchaeology. It is an ideal introduction to our zooarchaeology for archaeologists, museum curators and other heritage professionals who come across animal bones and/or zooarchaeological reports in their professional capacity, and want to understand more about this line of evidence. Students are also welcomed and our short course aims to provide a firm basis for further training.

From 21 to 22 March 2013 we will be running an advanced two day short course: ‘Understanding zooarchaeology II’, which will build on the content of our basic course. This course will cover the identification of a wider range of species than our introductory course, and will provide participants with experience in recording and analysing a real archaeological assemblage. Understanding Zooarchaeology II is suitable for anyone who has already attended our Understanding Zooarchaeology I course, or who already has a basic knowledge of zooarchaeological methods.

But that's not all! In the summer of 2013 we are also planning to run Understanding Zooarchaeology I in conjunction with a new two day short course on marine resources. Keep an eye on our website for more details in due course!

More information about the content of our courses and teaching team, can be found on our website: [http://www.shef.ac.uk/archaeology/research/zooarchaeology-lab/short-course](http://www.shef.ac.uk/archaeology/research/zooarchaeology-lab/short-course).

You can e-mail us at: zooarch-shortcourse@sheffield.ac.uk, and you can find us on Facebook for regular updates [https://www.facebook.com/home.php#!/pages/Sheffield-Zooarchaeology-Short-Course/100619023380021](https://www.facebook.com/home.php#!/pages/Sheffield-Zooarchaeology-Short-Course/100619023380021).

Kim Vickers
Under the sea: 
Archaeology and palaeolandscapes of the continental shelf

COST Action TD0902 SPLASHCOS Final Conference

University of Szczecin, Poland, 23 – 27 September 2013

1st Announcement and call for abstracts

Conference rationale
For most of human existence, sea levels have been substantially lower than the present, exposing extensive areas of the continental shelf with productive conditions for human settlement.

Some of the most important developments in human social evolution over the past 100,000 years took place on these now-submerged landscapes against a backdrop of fluctuating sea levels and dramatic changes in physical landscape – early colonisation of new territory; the origins of seafaring and fishing; the dispersal of early agriculture; and the roots or our earliest civilizations. Most of the relevant evidence is now under water.

Thousands of archaeological sites and find spots are known to have survived the sea level rise at the end of the Last Glaciation, often with unusual conditions of preservation and valuable data on past environmental conditions, along with extensive traces of the ancient landscape, including palaeoshorelines and sediments that are providing new data on changes of sea level and palaeoclimate.

Nevertheless, recovering data from the seabed poses significant technical challenges, and demands collaboration between many different disciplines including archaeology, marine geosciences, palaeoclimatology, geophysics, cultural heritage management, government organizations and offshore industries. Many new investigations involving such collaborations are now underway or being planned, and new technologies are being developed to meet these challenges.

Since 2009, COST Action TD0902 SPLASHCOS, Submerged Prehistoric Archaeology and Landscapes of the Continental Shelf, has brought together over 100 specialists across a range of disciplines from 24 European States to coordinate existing knowledge, promote the wider field of submerged landscape archaeology, and plan new research. This final Conference is open to participation by all those with an interest in this field.

Conference themes
Reconstruction of submerged landscapes and their archaeological significance
- Integration of palaeoclimatic, palaeooceanographic and geophysical data and models;
- Sea-level change, including GIA modelling, and its human impact and response;
- Integration of multi-proxy data – archaeological, geological, environmental;
- Submerged palaeosols, vegetation, peat, drowned forests and other organic indicators;
- Human colonisation, dispersal and sea crossings, seafaring, island colonization and exploitation of ice margins;
- Social and economic implications of submerged landscapes for past societies.

Preservation and discovery of underwater sites and landscapes
- Preservation, degradation and disturbance of artefacts and palaeontological material;
- Case studies of known sites and potential targets such as submerged caves and shorelines;
- Taphonomy of underwater sites and artefacts;
- Use of DNA analysis in seabed prehistoric environments;
- Techniques of exploration and excavation, seismics, seafloor mapping, photogrammetry, underwater vehicles;
• Development of new technologies, future challenges of deep and shallow water investigation.

Management of underwater sites and landscapes
• Legislation and the submerged cultural heritage;
• Collaboration with offshore industries;
• Public outreach and education;
• Producing, accessing and managing archives of archaeological and marine geoscience data;
• Engagement of volunteers, sports divers, and the general public in reporting finds;
• Recruitment, training and technology transfer.

Scientific committee
Pablo Arias, Spain
Geoff Bailey, UK
Ulrich Bathmann, Germany
Ryszard Borowka, Poland
Miquel Canals, Spain
Francesco Latino Chiocci, Italy
Katerina Dellaporta, Greece
Helen Farr, UK
Anders Fischer, Denmark
Nicholas Flemming, UK
Jan Harff, Germany
Friedrich Lueth, Germany
Tine Missiaen, Belgium
Marian Rębkowksi, Poland
Dimitris Sakellariou, Greece
Julie Satchell, UK
Hans von Storch, Germany
Andrzej Witkowski, Poland

Further details
The Conference is sponsored by the European COST programme (Cooperation in Science and Technology) through COST Action TD0902, the University of Szczecin, the Polish Academy of Sciences, the Helmholtz Zentrum Geesthacht, and other partners.

Abstracts should comprise: title, lead author, institution, email address and abstract of 300 words maximum.
Submission to: splash.cost@gmail.com.
Abstract deadline: 31 March 2013
Conference Announcements

New technologies for archaeology, architecture, design and cultural resources

22 – 23 October 2012
Surgeons’ Hall, Edinburgh, United Kingdom
www.digitaldocumentation.co.uk

Digidoc is the leading international conference on new technologies in relation to archaeology, architecture, design, and heritage. This year’s conference will include speakers from the United States, Germany, Spain, France, UK and Kenya - from Pixar Studios to the Smithsonian. The event promises to bring together some of the world’s leading visionaries on the application of state of the art technologies and digital innovation.

The conference will help foster global collaboration in the use of digital imaging technology. These techniques are increasingly being used to investigate, record and protect global cultural heritage.

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

High resolution satellite imagery – The magnifying glass for science

8 – 10 November 2012
University of Bern, Switzerland
http://www.hi-res.unibe.ch

The workshop encourages presentations on current work that take advantage of the increase in spatial, spectral, radiometric and temporal resolution of high resolution satellites for earth observation. Contributions from earth sciences and archeology are particularly welcome.

It will serve as a platform to exchange experience and discuss best practice rules for utilization of earth observation satellites like GeoEye, WorldView I + II, but also TerraSAR-X and TanDEM-X to name the most prominent ones. It presents current work or work in progress that take advantage of the increase in spatial, spectral, radiometric and temporal resolution of high resolution satellites for earth observation.

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

VAST2012
The 12th International Symposium on Virtual Reality, Archaeology and Cultural Heritage

19 – 21 November 2012
Brighton, United Kingdom
http://www.vast2012.org/

Use inspired scientific advances in heritage Digital technology has the potential to influence every aspect of the cultural heritage environment. Archaeologists and cultural heritage scientists as well as Information and Communication Technology (ICT) experts have in the past collaborated to find solutions to optimize all aspects of capturing, managing, analysing and delivering cultural information, but many unsolved problems remain. The goal of VAST
2012 will be to build on the open dialogue between these different areas of expertise, and in particular allow ICT experts to have a better understanding of the critical requirements that cultural heritage professionals have for managing and delivering cultural information and for the ICT systems that support these activities. To achieve this, VAST 2012 will explore the entire pipeline of ICT in cultural heritage from background research to exploitation. The conference not only focuses on the development of innovative solutions, but it will investigate the issues of the exploitation of computer science research by the cultural heritage community. The transition from research to practical reality can be fraught with difficulty. The digital environment provides new opportunities and new business processes for sustainability, but with these opportunities there are also challenges. VAST 2012 will provide an opportunity for the heritage and ICT communities to understand these challenges and shape the future of ICT and heritage research.

7th experimental archaeology conference

11 – 12 January 2013
Cardiff University and St Fagans National History Museum, United Kingdom
http://experimentalarchaeology.org.uk/category/7th-conference-cardiff/

The Experimental Archaeology Conference is an annual event first held at University College London in 2006. It provides a forum for experimental archaeologists and related researchers to present the results of ongoing and completed projects. The range of topics covered at previous conferences has been diverse, ranging from work on taphonomic processes, artefact replication, the theoretical basis for experimental work, and living experiments.

The 2013 conference will be held in two contrasting settings. The first day at Cardiff University will focus on papers and discussion. The second will be held at St Fagans National History Museum and will offer the opportunity for further papers, and the chance to explore one of Britain’s oldest open-air museums as it begins a series of archaeological developments.

The conference is an opportunity for new and established researchers to present their work and benefit from dialogue with a wider network of experimenters.

WAC-7

13 – 18 January 2013
Dead Sea, Jordan
http://wac7.worldarchaeologicalcongress.org/

On behalf of the Organizing Committee of the Seventh World Archaeological Congress it is a great pleasure to invite colleagues from across the globe to come to the Dead Sea.

Jordan is currently celebrating 200 years since the rediscovery of the World Heritage site of Petra. WAC-7’s brilliant scientific program will be complemented by an opportunity to experience the Kingdom of Jordan’s rich cultural life as well as its outstanding archaeological heritage. This cultural heritage includes four sites on the World Heritage list, and another fifteen nominations.

Theme titles are organized to complete the phrase: “Archaeology as...”
• Public: Education, Communication and Various Understandings of the Past
• Science and Technology: Methods, Analysis, and Tools
• Discussion and Debate: Ethics, Politics, and Engagement
• Understanding and Interpretation
• Heritage Conservation and Protection
• The Future: New Perspectives on the Past
• Business: Profitability and Sustainability of Cultural Heritage
• Economic Development: Community Engagement and Grassroots Movements
• Entertainment
• Open Access: Freedom of Information, Peer Review
• Identity Politics: Ethnicity, Nationalism, Globalization
• A Target: Preservation and Heritage Identities in Times of Conflict
• Indigenous
• Useful: Reintroduction of Ancient Techniques and Recovered Knowledge
• Sustenance: Foodways, Subsistence
• Discovery: Field Reports
• Answering the Big Questions
• Subjective

... and other themes.

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

Neolithic Transformations I
The Puzzle of Time: Problems of Absolute Chronology of Neolithic Societies

4 – 7 December 2012
University of Wroclaw, Poland
http://www.archeo.uni.wroc.pl/2012-2/NeoTrans1/NeoTrans-1-invitation.pdf

The main aim of the conference is to initiate a series of international conferences called “Neolithic Transformations”. It is a response to the needs of the research community to discuss the variety of aspects of culturally indicated changes occurring in the Neolithic: the economic, social and cultural transformations and the theoretical and methodological aspects of research on these issues.

Organizers also wish to provide a regular forum on Neolithic transformations for professionals dealing with the issues from different perspectives. It is a forum for presentations and discussion about research results and for the exchange of information, views, ideas and experiences.

The first conference will be devoted particularly to the chronological issues. It will focus not only on methods and tools but also on results of research in the field of the Neolithic absolute chronology. Major topics will include:

• A presentation of the current state of research on the Neolithic chronology and a debate of the opportunities and prospects in the discussed field
• A presentation of research on the progression in the development of absolute dating methods and the potentials and limitations of innovative methods of direct dating of pottery (different samples: adhesive substances, pigments, organic residues and organic matter in the pottery paste)
• A comparison of contemporary methods of absolute dating results interpretation (including the applications of Bayesian statistics).
Radio-Past Colloquium
Non-destructive approaches to complex archaeological sites in Europe: a round up

15 – 17 January 2013
Ghent, Belgium
www.radiopast.eu

This colloquium is organized within the framework of the European Marie Curie project “Radiography of the Past”. The meeting will have sequential sessions about such topics as: Geo-archaeological Survey, Remote Sensing and Aerial Photography, Geophysical Survey, Digital Technologies and Visualisation and Site Management and Valorization. It will conclude with a round table discussion, rounding up possibilities and future directions of non-invasive survey on large and complex archaeological sites in Europe.

During the last 20 years a set of methods of surface survey and non-invasive sub-surface prospections have been developed to investigate complex buried archaeological sites, aiming to limit destructive intervention such as excavation. These methods include different kinds of remote sensing, ground based geophysics, systematic recording of surface materials, GIS-based analysis and visualisation tools, geomatic and geomorphological survey.

The colloquium is intended to bring a European round up of these developments in order to join resources and very different skills to tackle each possible aspect connected with “non-destructive” approaches, not only to have a “radiography” of what is still buried in the ground but also to work out new instruments for interpretation and visualisation of results, where a 3D vision of sub-surface evidence can provide a formidable medium to vehicle scientific information and to enhance cultural resource management on an international and interdisciplinary scale.

The main target of the colloquium is to bring together a series of European academic research leaders in the fields summed up above, to exchange opinions, discuss and develop some common goals and approaches for future research. At the same time promising young researchers will be able to participate actively in this process, as well as present some of their own research and innovative methods. Finally, also commercial archaeological teams and stakeholders in the wide domains of archaeological landscape survey, visualisation and archaeological resource management will be able to participate actively and profit from this international meeting.

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

Individualization, Urbanization and Social Differentiation: Intellectual and Cultural Streams in Eurasia (800-400 BC)

11 – 13 February 2013
Stuttgart, Germany
Haus der Wirtschaft, Willi-Bleicher-Straße 19, 70174 Stuttgart
Contact: manuel.fernandez-goetz@rps.bwl.de

The study of cultural and intellectual phenomena is one of the most fascinating, but at the same time most demanding challenges in historical and archaeological scholarship. In many parts of Eurasia the centuries between c. 800 and 400 BC mark a fundamental turning point that was accompanied by the appearance of a whole range of phenomena that were to play an important part in shaping our world. Some of the key elements we might mention are writing, urbanization, individualization or intercontinental trade networks.
Following on from the Priority Programme ‘Early Celtic Princely Seats’ (2004-2010) funded by the German Research Foundation, and coming at the end of the major exhibition ‘The World of the Celts’, these phenomena are to be discussed and analysed from a broad perspective. The focus will be on the processes of urbanization that took place at this time. However, this will be done not only from the conventional perspective of settlement archaeology, but first and foremost by putting the emphasis on the preconditions and consequences for thought, mentality, philosophy, art or religion. A meeting of eminent scholars from the fields of archaeology, ancient history, ethnology, sociology, philosophy and religious studies can contribute to a deeper understanding of the processes that led to the evolution of the first towns and to the integration of local and sub-regional groups into larger federations. Key speakers include, amongst others, Lord Colin Renfrew, Kristian Kristiansen, Jean Guilaine, Jan Assmann, Hans-Joachim Gehrke, Mario Liverani, Gary Feinman, John Bintliff or John Collis.

A wide range of themes will be discussed and compared during the course of the following sections:

- The Beginnings of Social Differentiation;
- Typologies of Social Complexity;
- Between Myth and Logos;
- 800-400 BC: A time of changes;
- The first cities: Concepts, Models and Definitions;
- The first cities: Visible and Invisible;
- The first cities: Looking far away;
- The first cities: Between Mediterranean and Keltiké;
- The La Tène Art as expression of changing identities.

Key concepts of the conference are the longue durée and grand narrativ; the geographical limits are China and the Atlantic coast, although with greater emphasis on Europe. The central question must be that of how these changes in thinking that find their expression in ancient written sources are reflected in the archaeological material, and how this material can, in turn, best be interpreted from a social-historical perspective. Furthermore, archaeological and ancient historical research should be made accessible for the broader discussion of cultural science in the humanities and social sciences.

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

CAA2013 Perth
Across Space and Time

25 – 28 March 2013
Perth, Western Australia
http://caa2013.org

CAA (Computer Applications and Quantitative Methods in Archaeology) is the premier international conference for all aspects of computing, quantitative methods and digital applications in Archaeology. With a history going back to 1972, CAA encourages participation from scholars, specialists and experts in the fields of archaeology, history, cultural heritage, digital scholarship, GIS, mathematics, semantic web, informatics and members of other disciplines that complement and extend the interests of CAA.

The main themes of the conference are likely to include the following:

- Field and laboratory data recording
- Data modelling, management and integration
- Linked data and the semantic web
- Data analysis and visualisation
• 3D modelling, visualisation and simulations
• Spatio-temporal modelling, GIS and remote sensing
• Users and interfaces: education, museums and multimedia
• Theoretical issues
• Digital Cities, cultural heritage interpretation and modelling the past.

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

First International Conference on Remote Sensing and Geo-information of Environment

8 – 10 April 2013
University of Technology, Pafos, Cyprus
http://www.cyprusremotesensing.com/rscy2013/

The conference invites scientists, researchers, students, and other professionals in order to address and discuss emerging issues in remote sensing and geo-information of environment. The Keynote Speakers and thought-provoking technical programme will encourage the exchange of ideas and provide the foundation for future collaboration and innovation. The programme is open to all topics in Remote Sensing and Geo-information of Environment and related techniques and applications. The RSCY2013 scientific programme will accommodate sessions and workshops on a wide range of themes, which include:
• Cultural heritage
• Remote sensing for archaeology
• 3D remote sensing, Radar, Lidar, Thermal Remote Sensing
• New instruments and methods
• Laser Scanning
• GIS

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

Creativity: An Exploration Through the Bronze Age and Contemporary Responses to the Bronze Age

10 – 11 April 2013
University of Cambridge, United Kingdom
http://cinba.net/conference/

At the same time as we assume creativity as embedded in human history, it is unclear how we locate, explore and analyse creativity. The explicit aim of this conference is to engage with this challenge. We will discuss creativity through a focus on its outcomes - in this case material culture - and through an exploration of creative practice.

The European Bronze Age provides an interesting focus for discussions of the outcomes of creativity because in this period we see the development of new and pre-existing materials that we take for granted today. We also see new ways of working with them, accompanied by the growth of technical skill, to produce complex forms and elaborate decorated surfaces.

This conference will explore how viewing these through the lens of creativity has the potential to offer fresh insights into the interaction between people and the world. An understanding of creativity further demands that we examine the processes that lie behind creative expression. To consider this, the conference will explore how the distant Bronze Age may be able to act as a stimulus and inspiration for creative practice in the present. This is therefore
a call for papers about creativity in the Bronze Age or creativity that has been stimulated by encounters with prehistory.

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

XIII Nordic TAG
Borders – Margins – Fringes: Archaeologies on / from the Edge

21 – 25 April 2013
University of Iceland, Reykjavik
www.nordictag2013.hi.is

In April 2013 the Nordic TAG (Nordic Theoretical Archaeology Group) conference will give the western outskirts of the Nordic world its first visit after having previously resided in the Nordic heartlands. The hosting institutions of the conference are the Department of Archaeology and The Center for Research in the Humanities at the University of Iceland in a partnership with the National Museums of Iceland, the Faroe Islands and Greenland. Under the title “Borders – Margins – Fringes: Archaeologies on/from the Edge”, a multicolored group of scholars and professionals will participate in a critical debate about these issues from various perspectives; how they are applied to geography, culture, society or the academic discourse, within archaeology, cultural heritage management, material culture studies and beyond.

The West-Nordic area is marginally located in multifarious aspects. A reorientation of perspective makes Iceland, however, an interestingly central node for an academic meeting of scholars from Scandinavia, continental Europe, Britain and North-America, where they can join in and/or contribute to the Nordic debate engaging in cutting edge discussions about the controversies and the ambiguities of Borders, Margins and Fringes.

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

Landscape and memory in ancient Latium

4 – 13 May 2013
Rome, Italy

The main theme of the workshop is “Landscape and Memory”. By discussing various approaches and methods pertinent to this theme, the final aim of the workshop is to come to an improved understanding of Latium Vetus and Adiectum. The chronological frame reaches from the Archaic period to the Imperial Age.

One important approach focuses on archaeological remains as a starting point for landscape archaeological research. Issues to be investigated here include the development of settlement patterns in a diachronic perspective, demography, land use and sustainability of human landscape transformation processes, as well as a discussion of methodological and theoretical approaches for a holistic understanding of ancient landscapes.

A second approach considers the cultural and semantic creation of landscapes and its meaning for local and regional identities. Sanctuaries, mythical narratives and historical memories are of crucial importance in this regard. Archaeological remains and written sources may inform us about these, but how can we use them?
The workshop is aimed at 10-12 early stage researchers and graduate students of classics, archaeology and related fields, whose research concerns ancient Latium and issues relevant to the overall thematic framework.

An important scope of the workshop is to improve international and interdisciplinary exchange among junior researchers with diverse scientific backgrounds. In addition, it offers the opportunity to get in touch with local and international experts.

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

**Columna Traiani — Trajan’s Column: A Victory Monument and War Report in Pictures. International Conference Marking the 1900th Anniversary of its Dedication**

9 – 12 May 2013  
University of Vienna, Austria

The dedication of Trajan’s Column took place on May 12, AD 113, a date that is attested by the Fasti Ostienses. It was the crowning adornment of Trajan’s Forum, which had been completed just over a year prior to this. Nearly seven years had passed since the victory over the Dacians and their king Decebalus, which the column commemorates. The 1900th anniversary of the dedication presents itself as an outstanding opportunity to organize an international conference thematically encompassing both this exceptional triumphal monument and Trajan’s two campaigns against the Dacians, which are depicted on the spiral frieze winding around the column.

The objective of the conference is threefold: Firstly, existing scholarship is to be summarized and older lines of research reviewed. Secondly, new perspectives are to be developed. Finally, attention shall be devoted to reception history in light of the fact that one of the most prominent imitations of Trajan’s Column is located in Vienna, where it is part of early 18th century Karlskirche.

In addition to this, the event is intended to give insights into a Vienna-based research project dealing with the rediscovery in the years 1803-1805 of Sarmizegetusa Regia, the political and religious centre of the Dacian empire destroyed by Trajan in A.D. 106 (FWF: P23975-G21).

The excavation history will be retraced and recent results from fieldwork being conducted at this eminently important site by archaeologists from Cluj-Napoca will be presented.

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

**10th International Conference on Archaeological Prospection**

29 May – 2 June 2013  
Austrian Academy of Sciences, Vienna  
[http://ap2013.univie.ac.at/](http://ap2013.univie.ac.at/)

The conference aims to provide a forum for the presentation and discussion of latest developments and cutting-edge research in the field of archaeological prospection. It shall cover the entire spectrum of methodology and technology applied to the detection, localization and investigation of buried cultural heritage (aerial photography, airborne laser scanning, hyperspectral imaging, near-surface geophysics, data processing, visualization and archaeological interpretation).
The focus shall be on integrative approaches exploiting the diversity of all data and information necessary for the visualization and interpretation of archaeological and historical monuments, structures and entire archaeological landscapes. This scientific and social venue will provide a meeting place for young researchers and experienced professionals in the field of archaeological prospection. We welcome high-level contributions from all over the globe - and beyond. Young researchers are invited to join the conference on a reduced conference fee.

ARAM Conference
The Decapolis: History and Archaeology

01 – 04 July 2013
University of Oxford, United Kingdom
http://www.aramsociety.org/conferences.htm

ARAM Society for Syro-Mesopotamian Studies is organizing its Thirty Ninth International Conference on the theme of The Decapolis: History and Archaeology, to be held at the Oriental Institute, the University of Oxford.

The conference aims to study the movement of nomads and their settlements in the Syrian Orient; and it will pay a special attention to the migration of Arab nomads from the Arabian Peninsula to the Fertile Crescent in the pre-Islamic period.

Sensing the Sacred: Religion and the Senses, 1300-1800

21 – 22 June 2013
University of York, United Kingdom
http://www.york.ac.uk/crems/events/sensingthesacred/

Religion has always been characterized as much by embodied experience as by abstract theological dispute. From the sounds of the adhān (the Islamic call to prayer), to the smell of incense in the Hindu Pūjā (a ritual offering to the deities), the visual emblem of the cross in the Christian tradition, and the ascetic practices of Theravāda Buddhism, sensation is integral to a range of devotional practices. At the same time, the history of many faiths is characterized by an intense suspicion of the senses and the pleasures they offer. This international, interdisciplinary conference will bring together scholars working on the role played by the senses in the experience and expression of religion and faith in the pre-modern world. The burgeoning field of sensory history offers a fertile ground for reconsideration of religious studies across disciplinary boundaries. We welcome papers from anthropologists, archaeologists, art historians, historians, literary scholars, musicologists, philosophers, theologians, and any other interested parties. Possible topics might include, but are by no means limited to:

- Synaesthesia: how do religious rituals blur sensory boundaries, and challenge sensory hierarchies?
- Iconography and iconoclasm: how might we conceive the ‘rites of violence’ in sensory terms? How does iconography engage the non-visual senses?
- The senses and conversion: how are the senses used to elicit conversion?
- Material cultures of religion: what role do the senses play in mediating between bodies and sacred objects?
• The senses and gender: are sensing practices gender specific?
• The inner (spiritual) senses: how do they relate to the external (bodily) senses?
• Sensory environments: to what extent do environments shape devotional practices and beliefs, and vice versa? How do we use our senses to orient ourselves in space?
• Affect: what role do the senses play in the inculcation of religious affect?

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

International Open Workshop: Socio-Environmental Dynamics over the Last 12 000 Years: The Creation of Landscapes III

15 – 18 April 2013
Kiel University, Germany
http://www.workshop-gshdl.uni-kiel.de/

This workshop aims to bring together researchers from different disciplines to discuss the interaction between physical and social landscapes as the most profound process that catalyses human activities in space and time; and the interplay of environments, social relationships, material culture, population dynamics, and human perceptions of socio-environmental change.

In its third edition, the single sessions will cover aspects of Palaeolithic, Mesolithic, Neolithic, Bronze and Iron Age studies as well as aspects of Greek and Roman history. Further sessions will deal with diachronic approaches or methodological questions concerning, for example, data management.

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

Wikipedia meets archaeology. Freies Wissen, Neue Medien, populäre Wissensvermittlung und Enzyklopäden in den Archäologien

22 – 23 February 2013
German Archaeological Institute, Berlin, Germany
http://www.dainst.org/en/event/symposion-wikipedia-trifft-arch%C3%A4ologie-freies-wissen-neue-medien-popul%C3%A4re-wissensvermittlung-u?ft=all

This is a follow up of the 2011 symposium “Wikipedia trifft Altertum” held at the University of Göttingen. The Berlin symposium is organised by the “Wikipedia in Residence” at the German Archaeological Institute.

Paper proposals for a 30 minute presentation can be submitted until 15 December 2012. Registration ends 15 February 2013 – no fee.
Contact: Marcus Cyron, Wikipedian in Residence, marcus.cyron@wikimedia.de

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

Sculpture in Roman Asia

1 – 3 October 2013
Selçuk (Turkey), Town Hall

The Austrian Archaeological Institute kindly calls your attention to a conference on “Sculpture in Roman Asia”, which will be organized by the Austrian Archaeological Institute, in cooperation with the German Archaeological Institute, Istanbul, Oxford University and New
York University. Papers must be not more than 20 minutes. There will be ample time for discussion. English is preferred as the official language of the conference. The Organising Committee of the conference decides on the acceptance of the proposed titles and on the form of the presentation (paper or poster). Committee members are F. D’Andria (University of Lecce), M. Aurenhammer (Austrian Archaeological Institute, Vienna), St. Faust (University of Hamburg), R.R.R. Smith (Oxford University) and K. Töpfer (University of Heidelberg). Travel and accommodation expenses have to be met by the participants. Breakfast and lunch will be offered in the Austrian excavation house. Please send your applications with the preliminary title of your contribution and an abstract of not more than 100-200 words by 15 December 2012 to maria.aurenhammer@oeai.at.

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

Archaeology and Palaeogenetics
DGUF Annual Meeting

9 – 12 May 2013
Friedrich-Alexander University Erlangen (Germany)
www.dguf.de

From an archaeological point of view, questions about human evolution, population dynamics as well as about domestication research are burning issues. For that purpose, palaeogenetics has provided numerous new methods, facts and interpretation models within a few years. The DGUF-conference 2013 “Archaeology and Palaeogenetics” aims to comprehend and penetrate the current state of research and to present valid methods, results and their historical consequences. Furthermore, we want to be able to relate better to internal discussions and divergencies as well as to agreements and disputes between archaeology and palaeogenetics.

In terms of key lectures on anthropology and palaeogenetics we are looking forward to welcome Dr. Ruth Bollongino (Mainz), Prof. Dr. Joachim Burger (Mainz) and Prof. Dr. Katerina Harvati (Tübingen). Prof. Dr. Jens Lüning (Cologne) will present a first classification of the current state of knowledge regarding new population dynamics and domestication research from the perspective of archeology. In another introductory lecture, PD Dr. Frank Siegmund (Basel) gives an overview of the archaeological discussion on cultures, peoples and identity groups.

In addition to specific new research results and case studies in this field, we kindly ask for other lectures with the following contents:

- May we expect concurrent results from both genetics and archaeology?
- Can we correlate similarities, differences and changes of archaeological cultures and ethnicities and respectively of human behavior with genetic characteristics?
- How reliable are historical interpretations on the basis of scientific data?
- At which spatio-temporal level do palaeogenetic data allow hypotheses that can be verified by means of archaeological methods and data?
- What degree of generalisation do the scientific analysis permit which were usually obtained from small samples?

We kindly invite researchers such as palaeoanthropologists, palaeogeneticists, archaeobiologists, bioinformaticians as well as archaeologists cooperating in research projects to present their results, models and historical interpretations. Moreover, we encourage you to explain the theoretical and methodological aspects of your own work. Please submit proposals for lectures and poster presentations with a short abstract (up to 2,000 characters) until 31 December 2012 to tagung2013@dguf.de. A focus on human evolution, population dynamics and domestication research would be appreciated but is not obligatory for accepting a lecture.
Cosmopolitan Heritage: Archaeology beyond Nationality

22 – 23 November 2012
Blindern campus, University of Oslo
The Department of Archaeology, Conservation and History (IAKH), University of Oslo and the Norwegian Institute for Cultural Heritage Research (NIKU)

The principal aim of the seminar is to positively challenge the participants to think “cosmopolitan” about their own work and to engage in discussion of past, present and future archaeological research and heritage management. We ask participants to reflect on the following key question, on the basis of their own work: How do we study and manage heritage beyond nationality? It is our intention that papers presented at the seminar subsequently will be published in an anthology.

In current heritage research, the concept of cosmopolitanism is employed in studies of material culture from the past, storytelling and memory work. Perhaps in particular there is a focus on understanding in a world citizen perspective. Memory studies have contributed significantly through their explicitly cosmopolitan view of heritage. An example is Holocaust research; being a “traumatic heritage” that concerns humanity, it therefore has global influence on local experience of places of memory.

A question of increasing importance is how archaeological heritage and its objects of study – things, places and landscapes – from distant as well as not-so-distant pasts invite cosmopolitan thinking.

The departure point for a cosmopolitan view of historical storytelling is emphasis on the interfaces or connections between cultures or societies over time, as well as understanding of globalism and world connections in different historical periods. A cosmopolitan approach acknowledges a migrant history space (that history is shaped by migration and diaspora), which invites a rethinking of national heritage through hybridity. Cosmopolitan heritage studies seek understanding of the unfolding of events when increasing numbers of people seem to shape their identity from global categories of understanding, no longer looking exclusively to ethnicity or nationality. Cosmopolitan heritage research rests on an extensive body of theory, engaging in questions concerning subjects such as world citizenship, common humanity, plurality and the values of difference. Relating to globally shared commitments, cosmopolitanism is therefore also about ethical and political attitude and development of future policies.

Contact: Ditlef Fredriksen, p.d.fredriksen@iakh.uio.no; Torgrim S. Guttormsen, torgrim.guttormsen@niku.no
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