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Our publishing colleagues at Maney, publisher of the European Journal of Archaeology, came up with such a nice slogan for the EAA Pilsen meeting, I simply had to replicate it: “Czech yourself before you wreck yourself: 19th EAA Annual Meeting in Pilsen. Looking at the programme, I feel a bit like a kid in a sweet shop.” The sweet shop is beautiful metaphor for a number of overwhelming figures: A total of 1397 participants registered for the Pilsen meeting, coming from 48 countries. From 4 to 8 September, 977 papers and 196 posters were presented within 91 sessions and 26 exhibitions. For the local conference organizers, it was a big challenge to deal with the huge number of proposals for sessions and papers and to create the academic programme, and at the end, they received many positive comments via Facebook or email.

From this "sweet shop-like" academic programme, I want to pick two particular “candies”: The EAA Executive Board sponsored a session on Isotopes and aDNA – Windows on the Past, organized by T. Douglas Price, University of Aarhus, Denmark, and Corina Knipper, University of Mainz, Germany, mainly discussing prehistoric mobility and haplogroups. John Bintliff, Leiden University, The Netherlands, and Kristian Kristiansen, University of Gothenburg, Sweden, chaired the session An Archaeologist at the Centre of Europe: A Symposium in Honour of Evžen Neustupný, celebrating one of the most prolific and influential Central European archaeologists. Evžen contributed to the discussion of archaeological methods and theories in Czech, German and English publications (cf. Neustupný 2009) and founded the Department of Archaeology at the University of West Bohemia in 1998, host of the Pilsen meeting (see also the interview with Evžen: Kuna 2012). He celebrates his 80th birthday this year – so congratulations again!

Of course, to frame all the hard academic work, there was also a nice social programme, with the EAA Annual Party in the Pilsner Urquell brewery, a special student party in the tavern Stará Sladovna (Old Malt House), and a number of pre- and post-conference excursions. Thankfully, Mark A. Hall, in his excursion report in this issue of The European Archaeologist, lets us take part in the “Glory of West Bohemia” excursion.

The EAA is happy to welcome two new Working Groups, which presented themselves during the meeting: the Working Group on Public Archaeology (WPAG), and the EU-funded project ArchaeoLandscapes; both groups introduce themselves in this TEA issue.

Another important part of the EAA, besides parties, Working Groups, excursions, and sessions, is the Annual Business Meeting, which takes place each year on the Friday during the conference. This yearly assembly is an important event, as it is here where members can vote on suggestions by the Executive Board, decide on EAA’s future development, raise their voice or make suggestions. One of the issues decided concerns membership fees: membership fees in 2014 will remain the same as in 2013 – they have not changed since 2009!

EAA also offers a perfect win-win situation in relation to membership fees: Members can take advantage of the early bird discount incentive by paying their fees for the following year in cash during the annual meetings at the EAA desk, and they will save on bank charges. The EAA, on the other hand, gains security for producing the EJA and its administration is facilitated. Have a close look at the EAA Annual Report below!

Having a close look, you will realize that TEA’s structure has changed a bit. We have rearranged the contents to make EAA information the top news of your newsletter – information from EAA committees or on EAA prizes, news from the editors of the European Journal of Archaeology and the like. And we are happy to include your information as well: The European Archaeologist is your newsletter!

Finally, let me alert you: sessions accepted for the 2014 EAA conference in Istanbul will be announced on 16 December and you can submit paper and poster proposals from 16 December 2013 to 27 January 2014.

Alexander Gramsch, TEA Editor

References


The EAA 2014 annual meeting will be held in Istanbul, the town where nature and history merge in harmony to create an enchanting cultural environment. Due to its central location among distinct cultural geographies, Istanbul has always been a world city of focal importance from early prehistory to the present, and is adorned with the fabulous relics of three great empires. Linking East and West, past and present, the city is a uniquely multicultural metropolis.

The meeting will be hosted by Istanbul Technical University and held at Taşkısla Campus of the Faculty of Architecture. The Taşkısla Campus is centrally situated in the European part of Istanbul, overlooking the Bosphorus and within walking distance to major hotels, budget accommodation facilities, and Istanbul’s world famous hub of entertainment.

The meeting will be organized under the auspices of the Ministry of Culture and Tourism and sponsored by Vehbi Koç Foundation.

Istanbul has two international airports on both sides of the city. There are many daily flights to both of the airports from all over the world. Turkish Airlines and Star Alliance will be the official carrier of the meeting.

There are shuttle bus services from the airports to Taksim area where the meeting venue and most of the hotels booked by the Meeting Secretariat are.
Sessions
Call for sessions and online session proposal submission is open until 11 November 2013. You can reach online submission form from https://www.eaa2014istanbul.org/form. Note that the session and round table organizers must be current EAA members. Sessions should normally have organizers from at least two countries – according to the location of the institution you are associated with – and speakers should normally be from at least three countries. For more information on how to propose sessions, poster sessions or round tables see https://www.eaa2014istanbul.org/sayfa/66.

The following six themes define the framework of the EAA Istanbul 2014 Meeting; the decision in selecting these themes was taken within the context of incorporating a wide range of subjects covering all time periods on a supra-regional level. So as to concert with the objectives of the EAA, the Scientific Committee considers the first theme, “Connecting seas – across the borders” as the prime theme of the Istanbul Meeting. The official language of the conference is English.

1) Connecting seas – across the borders
2) Managing archaeological heritage: past and present
3) Ancient technologies in social context
4) Environment and subsistence: the geosphere, ecosphere and human interaction
5) Times of change: collapse and transformative impulses
6) Retrieving and interpreting the archaeological record

Taşkısla Building, the Faculty of Architecture of ITU

Registration
Online Registration is open at https://www.eaa2014istanbul.org/paket. Before registering you are requested to sign up the web system at https://www.eaa2014istanbul.org/site/kayit.

Registration Fees:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Before 1 May 2014</th>
<th>After 1 May 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EAA Member</td>
<td>95 €</td>
<td>120 €</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>60 €</td>
<td>85 €</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
East European Member 60 € 85 €
East European Student 40 € 65 €
Non-Member 180 € 205 €
Student Non-Member 115 € 140 €
East-European Non-member 115 € 140 €
East European Student Non-Member 85 € 110 €
Retired Member 40 € 65 €
Retired Non-Member 100 € 125 €
Retired East European Non-Member 85 € 110 €
Accompanying Person 60 € 85 €

Important Dates
Meeting Dates 10-14 September 2014
Call for session & round table proposals September - 11 November 2013
Announcing accepted sessions 16 December 2013
Submission of paper & poster proposals 16 December 2013 - 27 January 2014
Announcing the final programme 17 March 2014

Programme at a glance
September 06-09
Pre-meeting tours

September 09
Registration
Special meetings and meetings of working groups

September 10
Registration
Opening Ceremony and Welcome Cocktail Party Venue TBA

September 11
Registration
Parallel Sessions
Annual Party, venue TBA

September 12
Registration
Parallel Sessions
EAA Annual Business Meeting

September 13
Registration
Parallel Sessions
Annual Dinner, venue TBA

September 14
Post-meeting tours
Accommodation
ITU Taşkışla Campus is conveniently located just in the middle of the business section of Istanbul, reachable from almost all categories of hotels on foot or by public transportation. Meeting Secretariat Oasis Travel is holding room allotments in different category hotels nearby Taksim Square and the old town close to the historical monuments. For viewing and booking the hotels online visit:
https://www.eaa2014istanbul.org/urunler/konaklama

Tours
As the organization committee we are offering numerous tour options to major archaeological and historic sites in Turkey to take place before and after the Congress. Considering the wide spectrum of interests of the expected participants, we have done our best to cover sites of all periods. Even if the excursions have been listed under thematic categories, sites and other monuments of interest en-route will also be visited.

All tours will be accompanied by expert guides and most of the archaeological sites that are currently under excavation will be presented by a member of the excavation team. In designing the tours, we have given priority to sites of utter importance that remain outside of the standard touristic itineraries, thus difficult to reach by oneself. Regretfully, these tours will have only a limited number of participants.

Tours around the Marmara Region will be conducted by comfortable coaches and/or vans and minivans, whereas long distance ones will cover air and train as well. Accommodation will be in tourist class hotels in the cities, or the best available accommodation facilities in the remote areas. As prices of flight tickets increase over time, in long-distance tours the prices of early and late booking will differ.

If a tour is under-subscribed it will be cancelled. If it is over-subscribed, you may be refused a place. As the organization committee, we are open to all inquiries for tailor-made itineraries according to special interests.
For viewing and booking the tours online you can visit
https://www.eaa2014istanbul.org/urunler/turlar

For general information about Turkey and Istanbul visit
https://www.eaa2014istanbul.org/sayfa/34

For more information please visit the EAA 2014 ISTANBUL website:
www.eaa2014istanbul.org

Relief from Alacahöyük

EAA 2014 Istanbul Meeting Secretariat:
Oasis
Travel Enterprises Ltd
P: +90 212 292 4714
F: +90 212 292 4797
www.oasis.com.tr/en
20th Anniversary EAA Annual Meeting

Nearly twenty years ago (22 – 25 September 1994), the EAA Inaugural Meeting took place in Ljubljana, Slovenia, and almost 250 delegates from 36 countries attended (Novaković 2013). Nineteen years later, 1237 delegates from 46 countries took part in the EAA Annual Meeting in Pilsen, Czech Republic, we could easily be over 1500 in Istanbul next year.

As the EAA Annual Meeting in Istanbul will be the 20th Anniversary conference, we are preparing a range of initiatives to celebrate this milestone in the development of our Association including a special issue of TEA, some celebratory round tables and an exhibition of EAA conference memorabilia. Unfortunately, the EAA archives do not hold a full collection of conference gadgets (such as bags, pens, notepads) and we would be particularly grateful to borrow the conference materials shown blank in the overview below. These materials will of course be returned to their owners after the exhibition unless you are prepared to donate them to our archive. We should also like to display photographs of e.g. excursions, the Annual Party, the Annual Dinner, etc. It is perhaps best if you could send scans of these (700 dpi, TIFF or BMP format).

If you can provide any materials relevant to past EAA conferences, we would be grateful if you could liaise with the EAA Administrator, Sylvie Květinová, administrator@e-a-a.org.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Venue</th>
<th>Poster</th>
<th>Leaflet</th>
<th>Abstract book</th>
<th>Badge</th>
<th>Bag</th>
<th>T-shirt</th>
<th>Pen / Pencil</th>
<th>Note pad</th>
<th>Registration form</th>
<th>Invitations</th>
<th>Announcements</th>
<th>Folder</th>
<th>Exhibition forms</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Ljubljana</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Santiago de C.</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Riga</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Ravenna</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Göteborg</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Bournemouth</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Lisbon</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Esslingen</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Thessaloniki</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Sankt Petersburg</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Lyon</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Cork</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Krakow</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Zadar</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Riva del Garda</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Haag</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>USB disk, flag</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Oslo</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Helsinki</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Pilsen</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Istanbul</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reference
The EAA Executive Board elected John Collis Honorary Member of the European Association of Archaeologists

John Collis was educated at Pembroke College, University of Cambridge, where he was awarded a PhD in 1975. He is Professor emeritus at the University of Sheffield, where he taught from 1972-2004. He has also taught at the Universities of Exeter, Leicester, Birmingham, Cambridge, Nottingham and Vienna. He is a Corresponding Member of the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Fellow of the Society of Antiquaries of London, Fellow of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland, Member of the Institute of Field Archaeologists and President d’honneur of the Association pour la Recherche sur l’Âge du Fer en Auvergne. He is also a member of a number of CNRS research groups and of the Conseil Scientifique du Centre Européen du Mont Beuvray since 1995.

He has directed excavation in the UK, France and Spain, and recently acted as a consultant for the EU-funded ‘Discovering the Archaeologists of Europe’ project. John Collis has authored seven books, co-authored nine books and edited three books; he has published 176 articles. His publishing house, J.R. Collis Publications, has published 45 archaeological books.

But above all John is a committed member of the EAA. He was Chair of the Committee for the Teaching and Training of Archaeologists from 2001 to 2008. As an accomplished linguist – he regularly lectures in French, German and Spanish, and has basic reading or speaking expertise in Norwegian, Italian and Czech – he well understands the problems non-native speakers have in speaking another language, and perhaps more importantly, the need for native speakers to make themselves more intelligible to non-native speakers. As a result, in 1998 he drafted the excellent ‘Notes for Speakers,’ which have long been part of our Annual Meeting Guidelines and have played an important part in the mission of the EAA to establish a truly European Archaeology.

The Executive Board of the EAA joyfully decided to elect John Honorary Member of our association! Thank you, John, for your long-standing commitment!
The European Archaeological Heritage Prize 2013

The EAA Committee for the European Archaeological Heritage Prize, consisting of 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 fifteenth Heritage Prize of the European Association of Archaeologists to

M. Daniel Thérond
Former Head of Department of the Culture, Heritage and Diversity Department, Council of Europe

and

Professor Vincent Gaffney
University of Birmingham

Daniel Thérond has been a crucial initiator and the central figure behind the set of cultural heritage conventions that over the years have been written under the auspices of the Council of Europe. The conventions have had a profound effect on all archaeologists working throughout Europe and beyond. Daniel Thérond was instrumental in identifying and promoting a political desire to expand Europe’s role in cultural heritage, recognizing the power and potential of forging links between cultural heritage and other social and political agendas. He was one of the key proponents of the need to re-situate people, rather than buildings or monuments at the centre of heritage. Daniel Thérond convened an international group of leading archaeologists to draft the Valetta Convention, and ensured that the finished convention remained true to the far-reaching principles espoused at the outset of the process, at the same time as remaining relentlessly practical and realistic. This ensured that the convention was capable of translation into and application under the very wide range of different legal, economic, and political systems current throughout the whole of Europe. Daniel Thérond was one of the originators of the application of landscape-wide considerations to cultural heritage. This ultimately led to the European Landscape Convention (Florence Convention), which encouraged public authorities to adopt policies and measures for protecting, managing and planning landcapes throughout Europe.

Carsten Paludan-Müller (left), chair of the EAA Committee for the European Archaeological Heritage Prize, presents Daniel Thérond (centre) and Vincent Gaffney (right) with the Prize during the Opening Ceremony in Pilsen.
Daniel Thérond has never lost sight of the critical importance of expressing different cultural identities in the context of establishing a European identity, which is the sum of co-existing traditions, as well as recognizing the common responsibility in Europe for the heritage of all communities. He recognized the importance of such issues for the Council of Europe, for which key concerns are ethics, policy and democracy. The most concrete outcome of this later phase of Daniel Thérond’s work with the Council of Europe was the Faro Convention of 2005. A visionary and challenging convention, which showed how cultural heritage could contribute to a broad range of priorities including democratic engagement, conflict reconciliation, education, and economic progress; always with great emphasis being placed on the role of “people” in heritage awareness and identification.

The importance of all these issues to current political agendas highlights Daniel Thérond’s foresight and prescience in ensuring that this approach was moved centre stage for cultural heritage, at the start of a long-term process, which prompts everyone to take a fresh view of heritage in order to make the most of its potential not only in terms of short-term commercial benefits, but also in terms of improved quality of life for communities in a more human and increasingly creative Europe.

For this truly momentous contribution to European archaeology and heritage management Daniel Thérond is awarded the European Heritage Prize.

The award recognizes the contribution of Vincent Gaffney through the North Sea Palaeolandscares Project to European and world heritage. Prior to this project the Late Pleistocene and Holocene landscapes of the majority of the coastal shelves of Europe were largely terra incognita. The results of research at Birmingham have demonstrated that the vast landscapes that lie hidden beneath the sea can be explored using available commercial data acquired for mineral prospection. However, at the moment of their rediscovery these unique landscapes are increasingly at risk from offshore development, including the rush for renewable energy sources. Despite this, this unique project demonstrates that the coastal shelves can now be appreciated as unique historic landscapes that are preserved at a supranational scale. For the first time they can now be explored and managed as cultural and heritage assets.

Professor Gaffney received his undergraduate and postgraduate archaeology degrees from the University of Reading (UK). His PhD studies, centred on the Island of Hvar in Croatia, provided him with a passion for landscape archaeology and Croatian heritage and this interest initially found expression in the international “Adriatic Islands Project” along with more recent research on the wetlands of the River Cetina. However, his early application of Geographic Information Systems to archaeological data also encouraged Professor Gaffney to pioneer technology within archaeology and his remote sensing study of the Roman City of Wroxeter in the UK was recognized through the award of the Queen’s Anniversary Prize for Higher Education. This was followed by research on landscapes elsewhere in Europe, Africa and the Americas. Recently he led the UK team in the “Stonehenge Hidden Landscapes” Project, a part of the Ludwig Boltzmann Institute project creating 3D and virtual imaging of the landscape from an extensive programme of geophysical survey of the largely unmapped landscape.

His work mapping the inundated landscapes of the Southern North Sea, the subject of this citation, began as a PhD project before receiving support from English Heritage. With further funding from the US National Atmospheric and Oceanographic Administration the Birmingham team has now mapped c. 45,000 km² of Holocene land surface within the North Sea representing nearly 60% of Holocene “Doggerland”. The project received the 2007 award for Heritage Presentation at the British Association for the Advancement of Science, whilst the project publication, “Europe's Lost World”, was awarded the “Best Archaeological Publication” prize at the British Archaeological Awards in 2010. The UK National Research Councils (UK) selected the study, from across the entire area of Sciences and the Arts, as one of the top 100 ground-breaking UK research projects that would have a profound effect on our future as part of its 2011 “Big Ideas for the Future” publication.

The implications of this research are significant at a global level. Appreciation of the scale and nature of the North Sea landscapes will undoubtedly result in significant changes in our understanding of the settlement archaeology of Northwest Europe. However, the results also demonstrate, dramatically, that European archaeology is able to add significantly to the international debate on climate change and sea level rise. The project is a timely reminder that modern man has endured catastrophic change in the past that implicated the permanent loss of immense areas of habitable land. Finally, the work in the North Sea supports the development of similar projects elsewhere in the world where comparable, unexplored,
landscapes also exist. Examples include the Bering and Sunda Straits, and mapping in these areas will add to the important debates on colonization of the Americas and early settlement in south East Asia and Australia. The contribution of the North Sea Palaeolandscape Project with its disseminations and with its related projects elsewhere is truly unique. No comparable project exists and the results of the project are of global importance. The contribution of Vincent Gaffney and the project to world archaeology is therefore recognized with the award of the European Archaeological Heritage Prize.

The 2013 Student Award of the EAA

The 2013 Student Award of the European Association of Archaeologists has been awarded to Oliver Dietrich for his paper “Learning from ‘scrap’ about Late Bronze Age hoarding practices: a biographical approach to individual acts of dedication in large metal hoards”.

Oliver Dietrich’s paper deals with a subject of European significance – Bronze Age hoards. It focuses on the large, so called ‘scrap hoards’ of the Late Bronze Age, which have generally been interpreted as raw material collected for re-melting. Dietrich reinterprets these as long-term accumulations of fragmented votive objects. More specifically, he interprets socketed axes filled with fragments of other objects as ‘miniature hoards’ within larger accumulations of fragmented metal. This outstanding paper successfully combines archaeological theory and practice. It is an original contribution to Bronze Age studies in general and to hoard research in particular. It is also well written, well informed and persuasively argued.

This annual award is generously sponsored by the publishers Cambridge University Press, UK, and Archaeolingua, Hungary.

Robin Skeates

Learning from ‘scrap’ about Late Bronze Age hoarding practices. A biographical approach to individual acts of dedication in large metal hoards

EAA Student Award Paper 2013

Oliver Dietrich (oliver.dietrich@dainst.de), German Archaeological Institute (DAI), Berlin

Hoard finds appear throughout the European Bronze Age with distinct chronological and chorological peaks. Especially the last twenty years have seen a paradigm change regarding their interpretation. It could be shown that hoards are constituted due to regionally and chronologically differing rules concerning the categories and conditions of objects that are included, their arrangement in the find context, the placement of hoards in the landscape and others (cf. Hansen 1994; Sommerfeld 1994; Hänsel and Hänsel 1997; Hansen et al. 2012 – all with further bibliography). Using the seminal essay of Marcel Mauss (1990) as a starting point, hoards can be understood as evidence for a gift exchange between men and gods in the sense of the religious principle “do ut des”, I give and you give in return.

1 This paper is a short summary of my presentation at the 19th EAA Annual Meeting 2013 in Pilsen. A longer version of the text will be submitted for possible publication in EJA. I once again want to thank the EAA for awarding my paper with the EAA Student Award.
On the other hand, especially the large ‘scrap metal’ or ‘founder’s’ hoards of the Late Bronze Age still provoke interpretations as raw material collected for re-melting (e.g. Bradley 1990; Fontijn 2002; Huth 2008). David Fontijn (2002: 25-26) has transferred this interpretation into the debate on hoards as evidence of gift exchange. In his eyes, ‘ritual hoards’ are constituted of complete and used objects that have accumulated meaning throughout their use-life and are part of gift exchange in the sense of Mauss. ‘Scrap hoards’ on the other hand would be formed of objects that are commodities and have lost their individuality and meaning by being reduced to scrap.

To introduce new arguments into this debate, the Carpathian Basin is chosen as a case study. Here, in the phase Hallstatt A (c. 1200-1050 BC) astonishingly big hoards consisting mainly of fragmented objects and raw material were deposited. It is not surprising that already with the earliest discoveries of this kind of deposits nearly all arguments for ‘founder’s hoards’ were in place. Thus, in his publication of the large hoard of Gușterița II in 1872, L. Reissenberger (1872: 35) named fragmented, ‘useless’ objects, a high proportion of raw material, and some objects that were deposited as cast in favour of this interpretation, but also made another interesting point. The socket of one axe from Gușterița was filled with fragmented metalwork (Fig. 1). For Reissenberger this was “a phenomenon, which is known also today, to save space, in the process of re-melting and casting”. In fact, this piece can be the starting point to explore exactly the other pole of interpretation.

Svend Hansen (1996-1998) collected 38 examples of similarly treated socketed and winged axes from all over Europe. The number of socketed axes alone can now be extended to 91 examples. All of these axes share a biography of longer use as a tool, and an end of the use-life marked by reworking into a container and finally deposition. To see the filling of the sockets as a prerequisite for re-smelting is highly arguable. To reach an advantage in the sense of economizing fuel, the founder would have had to...
produce as big a surface as possible for the heat to attack. Instead a larger and more compact object was produced, which would have been considerably more resistant to the heat of the furnace. Furthermore, in regions in which socketed axes were not very common or not used at all winged axes were treated in a very similar way. Fixing objects between the wings on one side of an axe can hardly be explained by technological advantages during re-smelting.

Hansen (1996-1998: 23) tentatively proposed that the combinations were intended to document the sacrifices of individuals, constituting ‘miniature hoards’ inside bigger finds, which would have accumulated through several acts of dedication. A way to test Hansen’s hypothesis is to try to integrate the object combinations into the larger framework of Bronze Age hoarding practices of the Carpathian Basin. It is important to note that there are earlier phenomena similar to the ‘miniature hoards’ in the form of combinations of complete objects. To name just two characteristic examples from Romania, the gold rings of the Late Bronze Age (Bz D) hoard of Bătărci belonged originally to a chain that was fixed in the loop of a socketed axe (Macrea and Kacsó 1972: 101). The hoard from Crăciunești also dates to Bz D and contains a bronze bar that is fixed to a bracelet (Nistor and Vulpe 1974: Figure 4, 29). If one tries to integrate both phenomena into the outlines of regional Bronze Age hoarding practices, a quite coherent picture emerges.

From the Early and Middle Bronze Age of the Carpathian Basin relatively few hoards are known (e.g. Mozsolics 1967; David 2002; Soroceanu 2012). The finds contain a very limited and canonical range of objects, mostly weapons and personal ornaments, while tools are largely missing. Axes and swords are individualized through complicated and distinct ornamentation. The hoards are small; most of them contain around ten objects. The small amount of objects included, their individuality and matching numbers of weapons and ornaments suggest personal endowments of warriors. In this period, object combinations are largely absent from hoards with the exception of golden rings, most often lock rings, which are often found arranged into bundles or chains. At the beginning of the Late Bronze Age, the hoarding customs change abruptly. The hoard finds not only are considerably larger, but also the rules regarding the selection of objects are somehow less selective (Mozsolics 1973; Petrescu-Dimboviţa, 1978; Hansen, 1994). With sickles and socketed axes, tools now form the backbone of the hoards, and raw material makes its appearance. Find combinations that could be interpreted as ‘personal’ are very scarce; the finds betray the impression of collective offerings of larger groups. It is exactly in this moment of de-individualization that combinations of complete objects other than rings appear and mark the togetherness of certain things inside the finds. In Hallstatt A the hoarding customs change again (Mozsolics 1985; Petrescu-Dimboviţa 1978; Hansen 1994). The finds become highly complex in their composition and very large. Most things are now deposited in a damaged or fragmented state. Within these seemingly unstructured hoards appear the fragment-filled socketed axes.

With the earlier object combinations in mind it becomes clear that this is no new development at all, but a cultural translation of an older hoarding scheme into period-specific forms of expression. Instead of complete objects, now fragments are combined. A development from complete, functional objects as a gift to the gods towards pars pro toto signs or symbols is discernible. Interestingly, in Hallstatt B (Petrescu-Dimboviţa 1978; Mozsolics 2000) find combinations that could be seen as personal hoards are attested again, and object combinations largely diminish.

To summarize, axes with filled sockets can be understood as a cultic phenomenon when re-integrated into the history of hoarding. They are part of a chain of similar occurrences attestable already from the Early Bronze Age on. Object combinations, whether in form of whole or fragmented things, seem to appear in phases when hoards get more collective in nature, while they diminish again or are restricted to certain object classes in phases when personalized hoards are attested. They are possibly evidence for single dedications in the accumulation-biography of large metal hoards. If fragments can be seen as signs for whole objects and combinations as symbols for complete hoards, an interpretation of depositions of whole objects and ‘scrap’ hoards in terms of a sacral / profane or gift / commodity dichotomy seems not adequate. Fragmentation does not strip objects of their meaning, but creates new meaning instead.

References
Why publish in the European Journal of Archaeology?

The EJA – the international, peer-reviewed journal of the European Association of Archaeologists – publishes some of the best new archaeological research undertaken in and around Europe. It is a mature, highly regarded journal. It has a broad international circulation, including over 1500 members of the EAA. Authors are able to work within a flexible word limit (4,000-12,000 words). The first editorial decision on newly submitted papers is made rapidly, within two weeks. Papers are then subject to expert, international peer reviewing, with final decisions usually made within two months of submission. We provide a detailed, developmental reviewing and editing process. We also provide rapid online publication, prior to the publication of the printed version of the journal.
Articles cover a wealth of topics, ranging from major reviews of the prehistoric and historic archaeology of Europe and neighbouring regions, to reports on key archaeological discoveries set within a European context, to cutting-edge research and debates on science-based archaeology, archaeological method and theory, public archaeology and the history of archaeology, to interviews reflecting upon the life and work of significant European archaeologists. All articles are published with short, accessible abstracts in English, French and German.

Thought-provoking reviews are also a key feature of the Journal, including: commissioned book reviews that summarize and assess new publications, evaluations of museum exhibitions and archaeological films, and critical commentaries accompanying articles published in the Journal.

If you are interested in submitting an article on any aspect of European archaeology, visit our website at http://www.maney.co.uk/index.php/journals/eja/, or directly submit a paper to us at http://www.editorialmanager.com/ejarch/.

If you have questions concerning your submission or a suggestion for a special issue of the EJA, do please get in touch with the General Editor Robin Skeates, Robin.Skeates@durham.ac.uk.

We try hard to ensure that a wide range of books are reviewed in the EJA, but by no means all publishers regularly send us their new archaeology books. If you have recently published a book that you would like us to review, please send – or ask your publisher to send – your new books to our Reviews Editor, Estella Weiss-Krejci, at the following address:

Austrian Academy of Sciences (ÖAW)
OREA Institute for Oriental and European Archaeology
Fleischmarkt 22
1010 Vienna, Austria

Finally, if you would be interested in reviewing new books for us, do please contact Reviews Editor Estella Weiss-Krejci, Estella.Weiss-Krejci@assoc.oeaw.ac.at or Assistant Reviews Editor Marta Díaz-Guardamino, mdgu@us.es.

Robin Skeates, EJA General Editor (Department of Archaeology, Durham University, UK), Estella Weiss-Krejci, EJA Reviews Editor (Austrian Academy of Sciences, OREA Institute for Oriental and European Archaeology, Vienna, Austria), and Marta Diaz-Guardamino, EJA Assistant Reviews Editor (Research Group Atlas, University of Seville, Spain)

Discovering the Archaeologists of Europe

The EAA Committee on Discovering the Archaeologists of Europe has been working to deliver the Discovering the Archaeologists of Europe 2014 project since it began on 1 October 2012.

This is a project supported by the Lifelong Learning Programme of the European Union that is bringing together participants from twenty European states to identify how archaeology is defined as a profession in those countries. It is seeking to find out what they do, how they are qualified and rewarded, and most importantly, how to maintain the skills of professional archaeology in the post-2008 economic situation we all find ourselves in. It is a successor to the previous Discovering the Archaeologists of Europe project which ran from 2006-2008.

The project partners have met three times: in York, Rome and then in Pilsen in 2013 immediately before the 19th Annual Meeting of the EAA. Partner organisations in twenty European states are gathering data on employment in all areas of archaeology – including commercial, academic, governmental, museums – in their own countries. The data will cover how many people work as archaeologists, what kind of work they do, what kind of organisations they work for, how much they are paid, what qualifications they hold and many other points of interest.

The data are now being processed, and during the next year they will be producing national reports on the state of archaeological employment in their countries. Once these are complete, a transnational report, comparing and contrasting the situation and approaches to professional archaeology across all of the countries will be prepared and launched at the 20th Annual Meeting in Istanbul.
The committee held a full, open session in Pilsen, which attracted a respectably sized audience on the Saturday morning of the conference to hear twelve papers that looked at the situation in ten of the participating countries and two – Switzerland and the USA – that are outside the project partnership. The conference presentations and further details on the project are available at http://www.discovering-archaeologists.eu/.

If anyone from a country not already represented in the project would like to participate – it is still possible for new partners to join – then please email Kenneth Aitchison, European Project Coordinator, at kaitchison@yorkat.co.uk.

Kenneth Aitchison (York Archaeological Trust), Gavin MacGregor (Northlight Heritage) and Heleen van Londen (University of Amsterdam).

Committee on Professional Associations in Archaeology (CPAA)

Each year the CPAA has met at the EAA Annual Meetings, and generated much discussion that has been well-received by those members in attendance (usually 50-60 members). In recent years the ‘landscape’ of archaeological associations in Europe has changed, and the recession has added pressure on individual members and corporate organizations. This has led to increased discussion in the CPAA.

At the EAA 2013 conference in Plzeň the members examined the roles of four different types of archaeological organizations (professional associations, learned or membership organizations [like EAA itself], trade associations and trade unions) along with a list of about 25 roles or services that such organizations can provide.

The CPAA decided that they would seek wider input from EAA members about the types of services or roles the members would value most, and report that back to members at the 2014 meeting CPAA session for consideration and action. The co-chairs and secretary will meet in January-February 2014 (in person or by Skype) to review the survey findings and plan the 2014 session. The CPAA also decided to ask the co-chairs to publish an article in the European Journal of Archaeology summarizing the 2013 session to serve as background for the survey and the 2014 session discussion.

After four years of exemplary service, the CPAA Secretary Vesna Pintaric-Kocuvan has stepped down. In her place the members present elected Jaime Almansa-Sanchez as Secretary.

Gerry Wait Co-Chair (Nexus Heritage: gerry.wait@neus-heritage.com)
Kenneth Aitchison Co-Chair (Landward Research: kenneth.aitchison@landward.eu)

ArchaeoLandscape Europe
An EU funded project and a new EAA Working Group

As of spring 2013 the EU project “ArchaeoLandscapes Europe” (or short ArcLand), funded by the EU Culture (2007-2013) programme, is a registered working party of the EAA. This reflects the highly international character of the ArcLand project and it also allows the project to include even more European and non-European archaeologists in its network.

Data derived from aerial archaeology, LiDAR scanning, geophysics, satellite imagery (including GoogleEarth) and so on, has been an essential part of archaeological surveying, preventive archaeology, site monitoring and landscape interpretation all over Europe and beyond for a number of years. However, the acceptance of these tools and their use are not evenly distributed all over Europe. Remote sensing needs – to a certain extent – expert knowledge that unfortunately also is not evenly distributed amongst archaeologists in Europe. There is a lack of education in this field in many parts of Europe and that is of course even more true for the use of these techniques for the wider public.

To overcome these problems the EU has decided to fund the ArchaeoLandscape Europe project with 2.5 million Euros for five years, adding to the 2.5 million Euros, which the project partners provide themselves.
Project leader (PL), co-organising partners (CO) and associated partners (AP) of the ArcLand project.

A large group of so far 71 institutions from all over Europe and beyond forms the project consortium, representing all kinds of archaeological engagement like museums, research institutes, universities, cultural heritage management authorities and private companies. This is by far the largest project consortium that has ever been funded by the EU Culture Programme and it reflects the idea of bringing together people and their knowledge, their experience and their enthusiasm from all over the continent to work together and to join forces.

The main project aim is to increase public appreciation, understanding, and conservation of the landscape and archaeological heritage of Europe through the application and international sharing of skills and experience in airborne and other forms of remote sensing. The focus of ArcLand is on landscape(s) and its archaeological heritage, but it is not restricted to the experts. The project wants the public to be involved as it is the tax payer who is interested in what archaeologists are doing with their money. So it is one of its main tasks to raise the appreciation of the public for the different landscapes of Europe and for the archaeological sites that are an important part of these landscapes and their development. ArcLand has established a great variety of activities to reach these aims – all of them organized by the various project partners but open to anyone who wants to know more about remote sensing and the good use of the tools for archaeological research, site monitoring and cultural heritage management purposes. Information on past, present and future project activities can be found on the project's website http://www.archaeolandscapes.eu.
One of the main current activities is the travelling exhibition “Traces Of The Past,” which started in Dublin in May 2013 and which will be hosted in various European cities and hopefully even further. As an EAA Working Group ArcLand is looking into ways of organizing one of its Working Package Meetings at next year’s EAA conference in Istanbul. Invitations to ArcLand activities (workshops, field schools, etc.) will be distributed via the EAA secretariat to be forwarded to the EAA membership. Potential fields of collaboration with the EAA Committee on the Teaching and Training for Archaeologists could be discussed at one of the next EAA conferences.

The ArchaeoLandscapes Europe project is looking forward to a fruitful collaboration with EAA and its members.

Axel Posluschny (axel.posluschny@dainst.de), Project Manager ArchaeoLandscapes Europe, Roman-Germanic Commission of the German Archaeological Institute, Frankfurt, Germany

Disclaimer
ArchaeoLandscapes Europe has been funded with support of the European Commission (Culture Programme 2007–2013 – CU7-MULT7 Agreement Number 2010-1486 / 001-001). This publication reflects the views of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

‘Public Archaeology from the ground up’ and the first meeting of the new EAA Working Group on Public Archaeology

Over the last year, the new Working Group on Public Archaeology (WGPA) tried to establish under the banner of the EAA², with the goal of building a network of interested professionals interested in making Public Archaeology more visible, and debate topics of interest. After building a first infrastructure for the working group, this year during the 19th EAA meeting in Pilsen we had the opportunity to begin formally, and start working for better practice of Public Archaeology in Europe. In addition, WGPA held its first session during the Pilsen meeting.

During the first WGPA meeting, which was attended by a dozen colleagues, we discussed the main topics of interest; amongst these, the definition of Public Archaeology itself seemed to be a priority. We agreed, both in the meeting and the following EAA session, that Tim Schadla-Hall's characterization published in the European Journal of Archaeology (Schadla-Hall 1999) was the starting point³, and that it was important to maintain a broad sense of the term, as the multiple relationships between archaeology and society, was the better option to keep moving forward.

The WGPA decided:
- to set a network (using the WGPA as basis);
- to raise the profile of Public Archaeology within the EAA (with annual sessions);
- to try political lobbying (taking advantage of the EAA board);
- to work as a platform to help people to start working in Public Archaeology (orientation);
- to leave the theoretical debate for the sessions (co-)organized by the WGPA⁴.

² Note by the editor: Following a successful session held at the Pilsen conference, and further to formal application, at its recent Meeting the EAA Executive Board decided to install a new Working Group on Public Archaeology.
³ Schadla-Hall lists a wide range of topics that would fit under the umbrella called “Public Archaeology”. In essence, we are talking about the multiple relations between archaeology and society and how they can affect the present.
⁴ You may want to join the mailing list and get more info at: http://centralpag.blogspot.com.
Our first session, held in Pilsen, ‘Public Archaeology from the ground up’, tried to debate the theoretical basis of the discipline in a moment when we need to move forward. There was a good response to the call for papers, with eleven papers and ten posters scheduled. Three papers and one poster were withdrawn, but we still had a great session with more than one hour and a half of debate. It is difficult to set a round table with the structure of traditional sessions, but we had the opportunity to adapt times to debate. This is not the place to repeat the contents of the session, as abstracts are available and we plan to publish it, but it is worth taking a look at the conclusions from the debate.

The main issue appears to be funding; coming from people wherever it comes. However, recent cuts and the economic environment of austerity in Europe make it difficult to find funds for Public Archaeology. This was one of the overarching links during the session, and a clear concern for professionals in all aspects of archaeology. What seemed clear was that re-pay options were not a viable solution and the involvement of communities and amateur archaeologists should not replace professionals. The ‘fashion' for Community Archaeology is a threat for the good practice of Public Archaeology, and that is why ethics were a major concern. In order to reach a sustainable future for archaeology, Public Archaeology seemed to be a good option to work in. It is all about knowing communities, connecting communities, creating communities, integrating communities, aggregating professionals, working on the image of archaeology, communication, policy... and practice.

This has been a first step for the Working Group. We are satisfied that our first steps have been a success, and we are willing to continue. Next year we will be dealing with ethics in Public Archaeology, and we want to maintain contact with members and hear of your concerns. This is why we will keep in touch and encourage you again to join the mailing list (see footnote).

Thank you for a great meeting in Pilsen and see you next year in Istanbul!

Jaime Almansa-Sánchez (almansasanchez@gmail.com), JAS Arqueología S.L.U., Spain, and Lorna Richardson, University College London, UK

Reference
The European Commission supports the “NEARCH” project: A major international archaeology programme

In the framework of the “Culture” programme, the European Commission has selected for funding the project “NEARCH – New scenarios for a community-involved archaeology”. Proposed by the French National Institute for Preventive Archaeological Research (Inrap, Paris) and 15 academic and research organizations from ten European countries, this five years international programme (2013-2018) aims to explore the different dimensions of public participation in archaeology today and to propose new ways of working and cooperating in a profession strongly concerned by the current economic crisis.

NEARCH programme is an EAA working party and also will be present at the EAA annual meeting in Istanbul 2014.

The project’s content is structured around six main themes and fields of action, as follows:

1. **Archaeology for the community: informing and involving people**
   Re-think and develop the ways to communicate and mediate archaeology towards the various audiences.

2. **Archaeology and the imaginary: crossroads between science and art**
   Explore and enhance the relationships between archaeology and artistic creation, by encouraging collaborations between archaeologists and contemporary artists.

3. **Archaeology and knowledge: teaching and sharing information**
   Promote new ways of teaching archaeological knowledge and practices to young professionals and sharing archaeological data to the various audiences by using the full potential of the web.

4. **Archaeology in a changing economy: towards sustainability**
   Shape, through the exchange of experiences and comparative studies, a new economic model for a sustainable practice of archaeology and heritage management.

5. **European archaeology and the world: dependencies and mutual development**
   Highlight the societal component of archaeology, considered as the expression of a wider community rather than a restricted academic domain.

6. **Coordination, mobility and project’s communication.**
   Coordinate the work programme and transversal activities such as mobility grants for archaeology professionals and communication and dissemination actions.

For this project, Inrap has brought together various European research centres, universities and cultural organizations:

- Aristotle University of Thessaloniki (Greece)
- Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas (Spain)
- Instituto per i beni artistici culturali e naturali dell’Emilia Romagna (Italy)
- Culture Lab (Belgium)
- Faculteit der Archeologie, Universiteit Leiden (Netherlands)
- Uniwersytet im. Adama Mickiewicza w Poznaniu (Poland)
- Archaeology Data Service (United-Kingdom)
- Deutsches Archäologisches Institut (Germany)
- Jan van Eyck Academie (Netherlands)
- Centquatre (France)
- University of Oxford (United-Kingdom)
- University of Gothenburg (Sweden)
At their inaugural meeting on 20 - 21 June 2013, at the Centquatre art centre in Paris, the partners discussed the project’s implementation details, fine-tuning the work program, roles and responsibilities and time schedule.

Coordination and contact
Kai Salas Rossenbach, Inrap - Head of International activities, kai.salas-roessenbach@inrap.fr

EAA Annual Report
Minutes of the Annual Business Meeting (ABM) in Pilsen
6 September 2013

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 delegates present at the ABM and thanking Martin Gojda for organizing the conference. With 1356 registered delegates the Annual Meeting in Pilsen is the largest ever in EAA history: altogether 954 papers and 195 posters presented in 91 sessions (at Helsinki (2012) there were 1156 participants, Oslo (2011) 835 and The Hague (2010) 1026). At the same time the number of members, which is always higher than the number of conference attendees, has risen to almost 1600 – the EAA would seem to be on very stable ground.

The schedule for the preparation of the scientific programme of future conferences has been moved forward and immediately after the end of the Pilsen conference the call for Session submissions for the Annual Meeting in Istanbul will be available until 11 November. After the evaluation period, the list of approved Sessions will be announced on 16 December, and submission of papers and posters will run until 27 January. The final programme of the 20th EAA Annual Meeting will be announced on 17 March 2014.

Negotiations with the former publisher concerning the production of the European Journal of Archaeology (EJA) concluded in 2013 and ended in a financially satisfactory separation. The Journal, produced by Maney since 2012, has this year become quarterly. A decision about the monograph series had to be postponed until the situation with the Journal had been cleared up, but negotiations with major publishers and other archaeological bodies (UISPP) have started and it is hoped to make an announcement to members in the course of the year.

As a consequence of the change in publisher of the EJA, the EAA has saved money, which should be returned to members. The EAA Board has therefore set up the Oscar Montelius Foundation in order to assist EAA members in financial difficulties to attend the EAA conferences. Unlike the Wenner-Gren Foundation support (which we did not obtain this year), this support will not be limited to members from countries of the former Eastern Bloc.

2. Honorary Membership
John Collis was awarded Honorary Membership for his continuous and outstanding commitment to the aims and goals of the EAA: he chaired the Committee for the Teaching and Training of Archaeologists from 2001 to 2008 and drafted the excellent ‘Notes for Speakers,’ which have long been part of the Annual Meeting Guidelines and have played an important part in the mission of the EAA to establish a truly European Archaeology.

3. Minutes of the ABM in Helsinki (circulated in TEA)
The minutes of the ABM in Helsinki 2012 were circulated in the Winter Issue of The European Archaeologist (TEA) No. 38. They were approved by the ABM.

4. Matters arising from the Minutes
The financial situation of the EAA is improved after settlement with the former publisher of the EJA and generous donations from previous conferences at The Hague and Helsinki. This surplus should be used to benefit members and it is proposed to make grants to members in financial difficulties to assist them
to attend future EAA conferences. The EAA Executive Board has therefore established the Oscar Montelius Foundation (OMF), registered in the Czech Republic. Its Statute (binding version in English) will be published in TEA and relevant information will appear on the EAA website. The first members of the OMF Board of Trustees are Eszter Bánffy, Carsten Paludan-Müller, and Willem Willems. Adrian Olivier agreed to be the first OMF Auditor.

The student questionnaire was widely disseminated, but after two years there have still been very few (8) replies. The EAA Executive Board therefore assumed that EAA student members are satisfied with the current student activities and decided to terminate the survey.

5. Annual Report by the Secretary and the Administrator

The EAA continually revises its Handbook to better reflect the reality of the Association, especially in view of changes as the EAA develops, and consequently the EAA Executive Board proposes Statutes amendments for approval by the membership. One of the issues the EAA must address immediately is a risk management plan.

Membership figures show a steady growth in the number of members – as of 26 August 2013 the EAA had 1425 individual members and 11 corporate members; the projection for the year end is well over 1600. The EAA corporate members in 2013 are:

- INRAP – Institut national de recherches archéologiques préventives
- OCENW - Rijksinspectie voor de Archeologie
- Historic Scotland
- English Heritage
- NIKU – The Norwegian Institute for Cultural Heritage Research
- ASHA – Agencia e sherbimit arkeologjik
- AÚ – Archeologický ústav AV ČR Praha, v. v. i.
- University of South Bohemia Jana Kryeziu
- Society of the Lithuanian Archaeology
- Association of Bulgarian Archaeologists
- Hungarian National Museum – National Heritage Protection Centre

It is EAA policy to classify members by their country of residence, work or study. According to this criterion, 69% of the EAA membership resides in Western European countries; the most represented countries being the UK, Germany and the Czech Republic. The EAA has 306 (21%) student members, 5% family members and 3% retired colleagues. Many members seem to have changed their behaviour and now pay membership dues on-line or by bank transfer earlier, but the number of members paying late through conference registration is still significant. This has a significant negative impact on
production and delivery of the EJA and the continuity of EAA administration. Members are urged to take advantage of the early bird discount incentive (payment before the end of March of the current year), and to save on bank charges by paying in cash at the EAA desk at the conference for the following year.

6. Statutes Amendment

The following Statute changes were proposed by the Executive Board, after consultation with the Statutes Committee and in the case of Art. I.7 on request by the Czech Ministry of the Interior, which registers the EAA Statutes:

Article I.7

Current reading:

“The Secretariat of the Association shall be located where the Executive Board decides.”

Amended text proposed by the EAA Board:

“The Secretariat of the Association shall be located where the Executive Board decides. Since January 2005 the Secretariat is located at Archeologický ústav AV ČR, Letenská 4, 118 01 Praha 1.”

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

Article VI.7

Current reading:

“Decisions shall be made by simple majority vote. The Board may delegate the conduct of the Association’s business to the President and other Officers and the Secretariat between meetings.”

Amended text proposed by the EAA Board:

“Meetings of the Executive Board shall normally be chaired by the President. In the President’s absence, the Incoming President (if applicable) shall take the chair. If President and Incoming President are both absent, the Secretary shall take the chair. If President, Incoming President and Secretary are all absent, the Treasurer shall take the chair. The quorum for a Meeting of the
Executive Board shall be half of its Members plus one, including at least one Officer. Decisions shall be made by simple majority vote. In the event of a tied vote, the chair of the meeting shall have the casting vote. The Board may delegate the conduct of the Association’s business to the President and other Officers and the Secretariat between meetings.”

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

7. Financial Report by the Treasurer and the Administrator

The 2012 accounts show a significant surplus, due to the change of EJA publisher. The accounts for 2012 have been audited. The EAA members present at the ABM approved the 2012 accounts (0 against, 0 abstained).

The negative result in 2013 is due to transfer of money to the Oscar Montelius Foundation endowment and is partially compensated by income on membership fees that will be – due to the increase in the number of members – higher than budgeted.

The Board plans to transfer any future surpluses to the Oscar Montelius Foundation, to be used for the benefit of members. The 2014 budget is based on 100,000 Euro income from membership fees. A major investment in a new business model will ensure an improved administration of the much increased EAA membership and a more efficient management of EAA conferences. Members present at the ABM gave a mandate to the Executive Board to investigate the best system and implement it. EAA members present at the ABM approved the 2014 budget (0 against, 0 abstained).

2012 Accounts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item - details</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Accounts</th>
<th>Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Membership fees</td>
<td></td>
<td>70000</td>
<td>101083</td>
<td>31083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>membership fees cc on-line (collected in 2012)</td>
<td></td>
<td>42031</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>membership fees cc off-line (collected in 2012)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1754</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>membership fees bank transfer (collected in 2012)</td>
<td></td>
<td>15948</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>membership fees cash (collected in 2012)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>membership fees collected in Helsinki</td>
<td></td>
<td>36225</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final compensation Sage</td>
<td>including &quot;royalty&quot;</td>
<td>12900</td>
<td>13142</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sage revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td>57529,54</td>
<td>57529,54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editorial support</td>
<td></td>
<td>6000</td>
<td>6000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maney royalty</td>
<td></td>
<td>12881,5</td>
<td>7246</td>
<td>-5635,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disco project</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1170</td>
<td>1170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wenner-Gren grant</td>
<td>received and paid out in Helsinki</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board meetings</td>
<td>April Prague, NC Prague, Helsinki, October Prague</td>
<td>-16000</td>
<td>-17880</td>
<td>-1880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>HP dinner, newcomers party, presidential lunch, gifts</td>
<td>-35000</td>
<td>-33362</td>
<td>1638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretariat (Prague)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-6000</td>
<td>-6046</td>
<td>-46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editorial support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-2097</td>
<td>-2097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EJA 15</td>
<td>including production and sale EJA 14</td>
<td>-9612</td>
<td>-18579</td>
<td>-8967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disco project</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-575</td>
<td>-575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal advice</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web page</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1500</td>
<td>-3351</td>
<td>-1851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion materials</td>
<td>HP medals, diplomas, folders</td>
<td>-2230</td>
<td>-2477</td>
<td>-247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting and audit 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td>-2000</td>
<td>-2030</td>
<td>-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax</td>
<td>tax from production of EJA 14</td>
<td>-8000</td>
<td>-7825</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>monthly payments web, cc acceptance, accessories</td>
<td>-1000</td>
<td>-828</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>19440</td>
<td>90310,54</td>
<td>70871,04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2013 Accounts (estimate as of August 2013)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item - details</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Accounts</th>
<th>Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Membership fees</td>
<td>membership fees cc on-line (collected in 2013)</td>
<td>70000</td>
<td>67431</td>
<td>17431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>membership fees cc off-line (collected in 2013)</td>
<td></td>
<td>37667</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>membership fees bank transfer (collected in 2013)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2305</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>membership fees cash (collected in 2013)</td>
<td></td>
<td>425</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>membership fees collected in Pilsen</td>
<td></td>
<td>30395</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editorial support 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>8000</td>
<td>-8000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maney royalty 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>14873</td>
<td>-14873</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maney royalty 2012 - outstanding due</td>
<td></td>
<td>5635,5</td>
<td>-5635,5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disco project</td>
<td></td>
<td>1170</td>
<td>-1170</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wenner-Gren grant</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board meetings</td>
<td>officers January, Exec. April, NC April</td>
<td>-16000</td>
<td>-6312</td>
<td>9688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraordinary meetings (OMF)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1500</td>
<td>-1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>Istanbul visit, SAA conference, HP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2643</td>
<td>-2643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretariat (Prague)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-35000</td>
<td>35000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editorial support</td>
<td></td>
<td>-8000</td>
<td>-2010</td>
<td>5990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EJA</td>
<td></td>
<td>-9612</td>
<td>9612</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMF - legal advice/Notary</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-5203</td>
<td>5203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMF - endowment</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-120000</td>
<td>120000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disco expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1000</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal advice</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1000</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web page</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1500</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion materials</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1957</td>
<td>-1957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting and audit 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1800</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax (advance)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1000</td>
<td>-3790</td>
<td>-2790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>monthly payments web, cc acceptance, accessories</td>
<td>-1000</td>
<td>-633</td>
<td>367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>23767</td>
<td>-56617</td>
<td>-80384</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2014 Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item - details</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Accounts</th>
<th>Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Membership fees</td>
<td>membership fees cc on-line (collected for 2014)</td>
<td>100000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>membership fees cc off-line (collected for 2014)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>membership fees bank transfer (collected for 2014)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>membership fees cash (collected for 2014)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>membership fees collected in Istanbul</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editorial support</td>
<td></td>
<td>8000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maney royalty</td>
<td></td>
<td>16193</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disco contribution</td>
<td></td>
<td>2340</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wenner-Gren grant</td>
<td>received and paid out in Istanbul</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board meetings - regular</td>
<td></td>
<td>-18000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation</td>
<td></td>
<td>-3000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretariat (Prague)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-35000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editorial support</td>
<td></td>
<td>-8000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EJA</td>
<td></td>
<td>-9211</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disco expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td>-4000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal advice</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web page</td>
<td></td>
<td>-5000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion materials</td>
<td></td>
<td>-3000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting and audit 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td></td>
<td>-2500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>35022</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Axel Posluschny pointed out that the CAA faces a similar problem and suggested pooling experience and information.
8. Membership fee level for the next year

The membership fees in 2014 will remain the same as in 2013 – they have not changed since 2009. There is a 5.00 Euro discount for early payments made before 31 March of the year of subscription. Members present at the ABM approved the membership fee level for 2014.

EAA corporate membership is open for institutions that undertake to make an annual financial contribution to the work of the Association. The corporate membership fee in category “A” is 1600 Euro, and 400 Euro in category “B”. Corporate membership entitles the organization to distribute up to 10 free individual EAA memberships to their employees, 3 copies of each EJA issue (worth 120 Euro paid to the EJA publisher for each corporate member), e-copy of the TEA and their logo and link on EAA home page. Category “B” corporate membership has historically been a low cost deal. The EAA Executive Board therefore proposed lowering the category “A” corporate membership fee to 1200 Euro, and increasing the “B” corporate membership fee to 700 Euro.

Adrian Olivier and Carsten Paludan-Müller proposed that the category “A” corporate membership fee be maintained at the current amount of 1600 Euro. EAA members present at the ABM voted for maintaining the “A” corporate membership fee at 1600 Euro and the motion was approved (1 against, 0 abstained).

John Chapman and Kristian Kristiansen pointed out that category “B” corporate members may not be able to afford the increased rate and suggested raising it gradually. The EAA President opposed the proposal, arguing that currently the EAA subsidises a “B” country institution, which is not the point of the scheme. Two proposals were voted on – that category “B” membership be left at 400 euro (17 in favour) or raised to 700 euro (45 in favour): the motion to increase the “B” corporate membership fee to 700 Euro was approved.

Margarita Díaz-Andreu proposed reinstating category “C” membership in the future. Given that some countries of the former Eastern Bloc are now more prosperous than some countries in the former West, it will be necessary to reconsider the membership categories, perhaps taking into account the results of the Discovering the Archaeologists of Europe (Disco) 2012 – 2014 project.

9. Announcement of the 2013 Election results

According to the Statutes the EAA Executive Board consists of 10 elected members: 3 Officers, an Incoming President elected one year before the term of office, and 6 Ordinary Members (one of whom is elected Vice-President). The period of service is 3 years. This year, the posts of Treasurer and two Ordinary members of the Executive Board became vacant. The EAA Nomination Committee consists of 3 elected members, one retiring each year; the period of service is 3 years. Personalized election materials were circulated via e-mail on 22 July. The 191 valid votes (125 received on-line, 65 at the conference ballot box, 1 by e-mail) were counted by the EAA Secretary Mark Pearce, Nomination Committee member Adrian Olivier, and EAA Administrator Sylvie Květinová. The candidates elected (shown in bold below) will serve from 2013 to 2016. 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>Name</th>
<th>Votes</th>
<th>Abstained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TREASURER</td>
<td>Karl Kallhovd</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXECUTIVE BOARD MEMBER 1</td>
<td>Elisabetta Borgna</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ericka Engelstadt</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maria Gurova</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXECUTIVE BOARD MEMBER 2</td>
<td>Pablo Arias</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ekaterina Devlet</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nurcan Yalman</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOMINATION COMMITTEE MEMBER</td>
<td>Timothy Darvill</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The EAA Executive Board confirmed the following in their positions:

TEA Editor: Alexander Gramsch
TEA Assistant Editor: Lidka Zuk
Heritage Prize Committee: Carsten Paludan-Müller, Margaret Gowen
EJA Editor: Robin Skeates
Editorial Board: Arek Marciniak

The Board appointed the following:
Editorial Board: Necmi Karul
EJA Reviews Editor: Estella Weiss-Krejci

10. Welcome to the new Board and Committee Members
The EAA President, Friedrich Lüth, welcomed the newly (re)elected Executive Board members, the new member of the Nomination Committee, thanked the outgoing Board members Halina Dobrzanska and Ericka Engelstad, and the outgoing member of the Nomination Committee Adrian Olivier, and expressed his appreciation for the engagement of the unsuccessful candidates.

12. Announcement of the EAA Student Award 2013
The Student Award Selection Committee, composed of the EJA Editor and two members of the Executive Board, received 15 papers for consideration for the Student Award. It decided to award the 2013 Student Award to Oliver Dietrich for his paper “Learning from ‘scrap’ about Late Bronze Age hoarding practices. A biographical approach to individual acts of dedication in large metal hoards”. The winner received a voucher sponsored by Cambridge University Press and books donated by Archaeolingua.

13. Progress Report for the European Journal of Archaeology (EJA) by the Editor
The EJA Editor Robin Skeates briefly expressed his satisfaction with the Journal and the current EJA publisher Maney. The EJA has this year become quarterly and has seen an increasing number of citations. Robin Skeates thanked the members of the Editorial Board for their work and appreciated the support received from Maney and the Officers of the EAA.

14. Report by the Editor of The European Archaeologist (TEA)
The TEA Editor Alexander Gramsch summed up the content of the latest issue, 39, and presented statistics about TEA contributions in regard of number of articles received and the country of residence of their authors. He requested that members submit session reports, announcements and short articles for the forthcoming issue 40 before the deadline on 13 October 2013. He thanked his assistant editor Lidka Zuk for her work.

15. Reports from the Working Parties, Committees and Round Tables
The EAA Vice-President, Monique van den Dries, and representatives of the various EAA Working Parties and Committees briefly introduced their work. Most Working Parties and Committees will submit a report to the TEA Winter Issue.

- Committee on Archaeological Legislation and Organization in Europe
- Committee on the Teaching and Training of Archaeologists
- Professional Associations Committee
- Committee on the Trade in Cultural Material
- EAA and EAC Working Group on farming, forestry and rural land management
- Working Group on Archaeology and Gender in Europe
- Working Party on Archaeological Archives and Collections in Europe
- The Discovering the Archaeologists of Europe project
- The Nearch (New scenarios for a community-involved archaeology) project
- The ArchaeoLandscapes project
16. Location of future Annual Meetings
The next conferences will be held in the following cities:
20th Annual Meeting 2014 İstanbul, Turkey
21st Annual Meeting 2015 Glasgow, Scotland
22nd Annual Meeting 2016 Vilnius, Lithuania
23rd Annual Meeting 2017 Maastricht, The Netherlands

17. Invitation to the 20th Annual Meeting in İstanbul, Turkey
The 20th anniversary EAA Meeting will be held on 8 - 13 September 2014 at the Taşkışla University Campus, Istanbul, and will be hosted by the Faculty of Architecture of the Istanbul Technical University. The conference web site www.eaa2014istanbul.org including registration, session proposal submission and accommodation booking will be launched on 8 September, and members are alerted to register and especially book a hotel early as September is a busy tourist season.
The following six themes have been identified for the İstanbul 2014 academic programme:
1) Connecting seas - across the borders
2) Managing archaeological heritage: past and present
3) Ancient technologies in social context
4) Environment and subsistence: the geosphere, ecosphere and human interaction
5) Times of change: collapse and transformative impulses
6) Retrieving and interpreting the archaeological record

Deadlines for the scientific programme have been moved forward in order to allow delegates enough time to find funding opportunities and enable early booking of accommodation.
08 September - 11 November 2013: Submission of Session and Round Table proposals
16 December 2013: Announcement of accepted Sessions on the conference web page and opening of the call for Paper and Poster proposals
17 March 2014: Announcement of the final programme

18. Any Other Business
Since no other business was raised, the EAA President, Friedrich Lüth, declared the Annual Business Meeting closed, and thanked everyone for their participation. He again thanked the local organizers, namely Martin Gojda and in particular the student volunteers who were granted free EAA membership in 2013 and 2014.

Committee on the Teaching and Training of Archaeologists.
The 2013 report
The Committee continued its works on investigating PhD programmes across Europe. As it has become clear that much variability exists across Europe in arrangements for doctoral study, it was decided to prepare and distribute a questionnaire aiming to identify this variation and provide a basis for a better understanding of doctoral study in archaeology across Europe. The questionnaire raised a number of issues pertaining the character of a PhD degree, the formal procedures, requirements, etc. Examples of questions being asked were as follows:
What is the qualification necessary to supervise (teach) PhD students?
Do students have to be registered at a University in order to study for a Doctorate?
How many years of full time study are required?
What kind of qualification is necessary for admission to a programme?
How is a PhD examined?

As the response to the questionnaire was very positive, the Committee decided to organize the session What should a PhD in Archaeology be all about? (http://proposal.eaa2013.cz/programme/session-abstract.php?id=78) at this year’s EAA meeting in Pilsen. It was chaired by Arkadiusz Marciniak and Ian Ralson. Altogether, seven papers were presented exploring the variability of PhD programmes across
the continent. They were prepared by PhD students, recent PhDs and those who supervise or examine PhDs. Among the speakers were Mark Pearce (University of Nottingham, UK), Marc Lodewijckx (Leuven University, Belgium), Monica Nicolaescu (“Vasile Parvan” Institute of Archaeology, Romania) and Roxana Morteana (University of Bucharest, Romania), Dănuț Prisecaru (Alexandru Ioan Cuza University of Iași, Romania), Wawrzyniec Miścicki (Jagiellonian University, Poland), Kenneth Aitchison (Landward Research Ltd, UK), and Michael Templer (University of Neuchâtel, Switzerland). The official part of the session was followed by a long and stimulating discussion.

As the term of current chairman and secretary came to an end this year, the Committee organized the election of new officers. Marc Lodewijckx of Leuven University was elected as new chairperson and Ian Ralston of University of Edinburgh as new secretary of the the Committee on the Teaching and Training of Archaeologists.

The new officers have already proposed a workshop for the forthcoming EAA meeting in Istanbul next year. It aims to explore the mutual relationship between the student and the supervisor in the PhD process. The organizers welcome presentations that illustrate best practice in making, supervising and examining a PhD.

Arkadiusz Marciniak (arekmar@amu.edu.pl), University of Poznań, Poland

For the future of the EAA – The Oscar Montelius Foundation

25 years ago Europe was divided mainly into two blocks of states with different approaches to their economy, social structure and democracy. When the European Association of Archaeologists was founded one of the main goals was to bridge the gap between East and West, in order to enable scientists from all over Europe to convene under one umbrella organization, to exchange and discuss knowledge, science, different approaches to the wide field of heritage management and to visit the archaeology of the different parts of Europe.

In order to make this economically possible the first elected Board took necessary measures by inventing an appropriate system of membership that mirrored the economic possibilities of EAA members throughout a Europe with very different economic foundations at that time. The EAA consequently created a membership-fee structure that mirrored the economic and social division within Europe of the early nineties. In order to further assist membership additional funding was raised through the Wenner-Gren Foundation, which generously funded participation from eastern countries under the “East meets West” idea.

23 years after the fall of the Iron Curtain the world economy has changed. The economic crisis has led to a different distribution and listing of countries by GDP within Europe. There is no more simple “East and West” partition and the changes in the economic sphere have led to a much differentiated situation not simply in terms of countries, but also within the different countries of Europe. EAA will have to respond to these economic and social changes for its membership within the next years.

EAA – moving the association forward

Since 2007 the Board of the EAA has been working on different plans to improve the financial situation of the Association, to improve the management of the Association with a more business-like model, but also, to increase membership numbers, to make the Annual Meetings more attractive by raising scientific standards, to raise the status of our European Journal of Archaeology and finally to serve the membership with fast and continuous information through our newsletter The European Archaeologist. After a worldwide tender the EJA was contracted out to a new publisher, Maney. Since then our Editor Robin Skeates, assisted by the Editorial Board and with the support of our publisher Maney has been able to raise the standard for the Journal, starting with a different format, better quality paper and regular colour pages. Recently we were able to move from three to four issues a year. This has made the Journal more attractive, which is also mirrored by the higher numbers of contributions submitted.

The Editor of The European Archaeologist Alexander Gramsch and his assistant Lidka Żuk have worked hard to develop the newsletter. It has become a rich instrument widely used by membership to exchange information.
The Annual Meetings have become more and more attractive; rising numbers of participants are reflecting the current development. With the Medieval Europe Research Congress (MERC) joining the EAA conferences in a true partnership we have been able to close a gap in the scientific programme. The EAA conferences at The Hague 2010, Oslo 2011 and Helsinki 2012 were great successes in terms of conference management. The constantly increasing number of attendees will have its next milestone at the up-coming Istanbul conference. More than 160 session proposals will truly make the EAA conference the greatest success so far.

During the last Annual Business Meeting (ABM) the Board has received a mandate for progressing towards a more integrated business model that integrates membership services and conference organization, especially the scientific service for session, paper and poster handling. We will be able to report on progress later next year.

A Foundation to serve members – the Oscar Montelius Foundation

Today we are able to report on another milestone to secure the future: since the Association’s economic basis has in the meanwhile been turned around and has become stable, we have managed through a tight handling of the finances to create a surplus that has mounted up over the years. On this economic base the Board expressed its concern to use the extra income generated to benefit the membership. Several options were discussed but finally the idea succeeded to create an EAA foundation with the aim of preparing for the future and becoming able to serve that part of the membership in need of support.

Why do we need to prepare for the future? The severe changes in the economic balance of Europe mentioned above have drawn our attention to the fact that the division in Europe is no longer the same as in 1992, when it was easy to divide Europe into “West” and “East”. More than twenty years later the situation is very different. The economy of many countries has changed, some for the better and some in the opposite way. Reflecting the economic crisis and the Euro-debate we see a more diffuse ranking of European states in relation to the GDP – the simple picture of East and West as we were used to see it in the early nineties has vanished. And this is an advantage and a disadvantage at the same time.

What does this mean for membership? Careful analysis of the attendance from different parts of Europe over the past conferences shows how the economic crisis had an effect on membership from Anglo-Saxon countries, and the Euro-crisis has a different effect on western and southern countries and their participation.

In this light it seems about time to prepare for the future of the association in a differential Europe. I wonder, whether in the not too distant future it will be important to change the membership rates to a more transparent and adequate system that takes more into account the present situation in Europe than the situation from 1990. It might be too early to restructure this part of the Association now, but we might take a step forward concerning contributions towards participation in the activities of the Association, namely the annual conference.

Funding exclusively for members from the former Eastern Bloc has generously been made available by the Wenner-Gren Foundation since the very beginning of the EAA. This has helped many colleagues to participate in the annual conferences.

Let’s remember for a second: it was the enthusiastic membership that built up the Association during the first decade, from the West with full membership rates, from the East with reduced membership rates (reduction also regarding the journal and participation in the Annual Meeting).

Funding was exclusively available again for members from the former Eastern Bloc countries. But how can we help members from the former Western Bloc when they were struggling during the economic crisis over the past ten years? And how are we going to help members from countries under heavy pressure through the Euro-crisis?

The Board of the Association has reacted accordingly. It was our concern to create a mechanism to support all membership in need, from whatever part of Europe they originate. In close correspondence with the past presidents Kristian Kristiansen, Willem Willems and Anthony Harding, I sought how to form such a body that in future could serve the needs of membership. Two years of discussion and preparation were necessary from the moment the Executive Board had given their support in principle to create such a body. It was mainly Mark Pearce, Hermann Hermansen and Roger Thomas who prepared the Statutes. With the help of a professional lawyer the Statutes were drafted according to Czech law. The foundation deed was agreed on by the Executive Board on its Board Meeting in Prague in April 2013 and signed in front of a notary.
The first Trustees of the Foundation are past President Willem Willems, past Secretary Eszter Banffy, and past Treasurer Carsten Paludan-Müller. Adrian Olivier, former President of the EAC and long-term member of the EAA, agreed to be the first Auditor. During a first meeting of the Board of Trustees on 30 April 2013 in Prague they signed the Statutes. The paperwork was sent on to the Court and the Ministry of Interior for approval. The Foundation Endowment has been placed in a separate bank account and a first contribution to the Foundation’s resources has been made with a lump sum of 100,000 € from the extra income, including profits generously returned by conference organizers prior to 2013. Following approval by the Ministry of Interior the new Foundation is now created. It took its name from the first true European Archaeologist, former researcher Oscar Montelius. You will be able to follow the activities of the Foundation online on the members-only section on our homepage after the page has been revised. We expect the Foundation to be in a position to start its support mechanism in the near future.

Friedrich Lüth, President of the EAA

**Calendar for EAA members November 2013 – June 2014**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>November</th>
<th>EJA 16/4 sent out to members (together with EJA 16/1 to 16/3 to those who renewed late for 2013)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>Reminder to renew EAA membership on-line e-mailed to members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 December</td>
<td>Announcement of accepted sessions for the 2014 EAA conference in Istanbul, Turkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Submission of paper &amp; poster proposals for the 2014 EAA conference in Istanbul, Turkey, opens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 December</td>
<td>End of the 2013 EAA membership (log in the members’ only section valid until 31 January 2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 January</td>
<td>Beginning of the 2014 EAA membership (log in the members’ only section valid since 1 December 2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 January</td>
<td>Deadline for submission of paper and poster proposals for the 2014 EAA conference in Istanbul, Turkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>early February</td>
<td>Call for nominations to the EAA election circulated to the members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 March</td>
<td>Closure of nominations to the EAA election by members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 March</td>
<td>Announcement of the final programme of the 2014 EAA conference in Istanbul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 March</td>
<td>Deadline for early-bird discount on EAA membership for 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 April</td>
<td>Deadline for articles and announcements for the TEA 41 summer issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>TEA 41 summer issue sent out to the members</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reports on Pilsen Meeting Sessions

EAA/EAC Working Group on Farming, Forestry and Rural Land Management Round Table

Mission accomplished – What may Archaeology expect from the new CAP after 2014?

Karl Cordemans (Karl.Cordemans@vlm.be), Flemish Land Agency, Department Project Realisation, Brussels, Belgium

This Round Table, organized by members of the joint EAA and EAC Working Group on Farming, Forestry and Rural Land Management (Michael Strobel, Thomas Westphalen, Noémi Pažinová and Ján Beljak), stood still with the current situation of the new Common Agricultural Policy (CAP), looking back at the past programme period with a short review on achievements in England and looking to the future with an analysis of the possibilities of the next programme period. On top of that a fascinating insight in the gigantic machinery behind European policy and decision making processes was presented.

The chairman of the Round Table, Michael Strobel, broke the ice by giving a short overview of recent events in the process of the new CAP. He stressed that most of the European work is done, but that it is now up to each individual member state ensure that archaeological heritage is present in the new Rural Development Plans.

Amanda Chadburn, Senior National Rural & Environmental Adviser at English Heritage, presented an overview of the past Rural Development programming period in England. Knowing that almost 20% of over 20,000 scheduled ancient monuments is directly threatened by agriculture, the huge potential benefit of the CAP is enormous. The archaeological heritage management works threefold. First of all, every farmer who receives money from the Single Payment Scheme (pillar 1) has to follow the Good Agricultural and Environmental Conditions. These GAEC state that they have to take care of stone field boundaries and help preserve scheduled monuments. Secondly, farmers entering the Entry Level Stewardship Scheme (6 years) receive a farm environmental record, which includes all known archaeological features. They can choose some options to actively manage the heritage present on their farm. Also all monuments within the farm holding are protected for the duration of the agreement. Finally, farmers who enter the High Level Scheme (10 years) receive a farm environment plan which includes several measures for the protection of archaeological sites, such as reversion to grassland and direct drilling. For the Stonehenge World Heritage Site, this resulted in the conversion of 20% of the arable into grassland and, importantly, for which the farmers lost plough consent since this fields have been grass for more than 6 years. Amanda also took a quick peak to the future with the New Environmental Land Management Scheme (NELMS), with a lot of questions that remain to be answered in the coming year, and presented a sneak preview of the online Advice Module for the Historic Environment which was developed.

Jon Humble, Senior National Minerals and Environmental Adviser at English Heritage, represented the Head of National Rural & Environmental Advice Vince Holyoak, who was absent. In his presentation he walked the audience through the process that led to the agreement for a new CAP by the Agricultural Council in June 2013. The European Parliament will have to approve this in the fall of 2013. Jon then explained some of the policy ‘hooks’ in the new CAP; notably the referring to the European Landscape Convention and the interpretation that ‘Landscape’ also includes Cultural Heritage. He also touched on the new Rural Development Programme that focuses on six objectives, of which objective 4 and 6 offer possibilities for archaeological heritage management. A lot of possibilities are also present in the Leader part of the RDP. He concluded by stating that the European framework and hooks are present, but that the real struggle is now up to the individual member states.

Emmet Byrnes, forestry inspector at the Department of Agriculture, Food and the Marine of Ireland, was closely involved in the Irish Presidency of the first six months of 2013, which gave him a good insight in the European decision making processes. He shared this insight with the audience in an overview of the bodies, preparatory bodies and committees (such as sector specific working parties), the European Commission and different Directorate-Generals. He explained the decision making processes and who is
involved in which state, thus revealing who is best placed to actively approach for a maximal result. Emmet also stressed that a message has more influence if it is a joined pan-European opinion. He finished with a speed-course in the do’s and don’ts for prospective interest representatives, based on the Burson-Marsteller Guide to Effective Lobbying in Europe (see: http://burson-marsteller.eu/2013/06/lobbying-guide-2013/).

Noëmi Pažinová, Department of Archaeology at Nitra University, presented the situation regarding archaeological heritage management in Slovakia. She started with an overview of the national legislation, followed by an overview of the land use in Slovakia. Almost 40% is covered in forest, which leaves less surface for agriculture. As a result of this the economic pressure on arable land is very high. This has great impact on agricultural practices such as drainage and deep ploughing. There is no political will to change this, and it must be concluded that archaeology will not be part of the Slovakian Rural Development Plan. The Working Group can only continue their efforts to raise awareness on this problem.

As final speaker, Michael Strobel, Regional Officer at the Archaeological Office in Dresden, presented an overview of the CAP in Germany. He explained that the programming of agri-environment policy is always the balance of national, federal and regional interests. The implementation of agri-environmental programmes is left to the federal institutions and done by the Länder ministries for agriculture. There are thus as many schemes as Länder. Until now the protection of archaeological sites has not been explicitly the object of programmes and is not part of the official guidelines. The German Länder heritage management agencies have made no attempts in lobbying the federal Ministries for Agriculture to include archaeological monuments. Furthermore it is feared that the most effective and biggest farming companies will reject the single payment scheme (first pillar). As the costs of bureaucracy exceed the economic benefit, these farmers will leave the complete system and cross-compliance will not apply to these farmers. They will try to compensate the loss of direct payments by intensifying the production at the expense of environment or landscape protection. In Saxony however, the Landesamt für Archäologie has made proposals focused on three essentials: Agri-environment-climate payments, including archaeology; the establishment of European Innovation Partnership to improve the application of precision farming solutions for archaeological issues, and thirdly knowledge transfer by practical on-farm advice on the integration of all aspects of farm conservation management: economics, nature preservation and archaeological heritage. For now six pilot farming companies are going to test management plans, which include the management of archaeological monuments by integrating archaeological remains in GPS-based management-systems.

All the presentations will be available at the webpage of the Working Group on the EAA-website http://www.e-a-a.org/wg2.htm.

After a long afternoon in a hot auditorium not much debate was initiated. Nevertheless, people were very impressed with the importance and possibilities of the new CAP and RDP. Everybody realized that a lot of good can come from this complex monster, but the efforts have to come from highly engaged individuals. We are certain that the existence of the Working Group as an advisory network of equally minded colleagues, dealing with similar issues is essential. At the Working Group meeting that followed the Round Table, all members present agreed that a new session at next year’s conference is necessary. It will be a special edition since it will be the 10th anniversary of the Working Group.

Gender in flux

Nancy L. Wicker (nwicker@olemiss.edu), Department of Art, University of Mississippi, USA

Elisabeth Arwill-Nordbladh (University of Gothenburg, Sweden), Kristin Armstrong Oma (Oslo University, Norway), and Nancy L. Wicker (University of Mississippi, USA) organized the session “Gender in Flux” sponsored by AGE (Archaeology and Gender in Europe), a working party of the EAA.

In the call for papers, the organizers noted that gender studies are currently in flux and asked for contributions that address the future of gender research and its role in the wider archaeological practice, research, and discourse. Both visionary position papers and case studies based on empirical analyses that challenge the fringes of the theme were welcomed. The aim was to provoke a discussion of where gender studies could and/or should go from here.
In one of the very last sessions on the programme of the EAA meeting in Pilsen, beginning on Saturday, at 16:30, six papers were presented as well as a response to all the papers. Paloma Gonzalez-Marcen (Universitat Autonoma de Barcelona, Spain) and Marina Picazo (Universitat Pompeu i Fabra, Spain) started off the session with a visionary position paper on contemporary practices in gender archaeology, “Feminist perspectives in action: looking for gender archaeology beyond academia.” In particular, they noted the minimal visibility of feminist activism and gender perspectives in public archaeology. The next paper, “Identity configurations with and without gender,” by Cecilia Lidström Holmberg (Uppsala University, Sweden) examined the contrasting understanding of gender and identity formation in the Mesolithic and Early Neolithic TRB.

The next three papers were illuminating case studies that expand the scope of prehistoric gender research. Julia Katharina Koch (German Archaeological Institute, Germany) reanalyzed gender determinations through comparison of physical anthropological and archaeological data in her paper on “Cross-gender in Bronze and Iron Age in Central Europe? A question of interpretation.” Corina Wetschei (Albert-Ludwigs-University Freiburg, Germany) examined the use of Bronze and Iron Age combs by women and men in her wide-ranging paper “The materiality of combs — multi-faceted personal items.” In her paper, Janis Mitchell (University of Iceland, Iceland) asked “Are Viking Age objects gendered? A case study from Iceland,” using statistical analysis of osteologically sexed burials to create a gender model.

Rounding out the formal portion of the session, Jo Zalea Matias (Durham University, UK) presented an eye-opening paper “A picture is worth a thousand words: Contemporary constructions of Iron Age gender,” about the norms and values of 19th and 20th-century images of Iron Age Britain as reproduced in both academic and popular texts that still guide established heritage presentations. At the close of the session, Anna Gatti (Uppsala University, Sweden) presented clear-sighted summarizing comments on the papers and noted the willingness of gender studies to try on new theoretical approaches while also coming to terms with earlier archaeological discourses.

**Biography and histories of archaeology: Present state and future scopes**

Ingrid Berg, Stockholm University, Sweden, Anna Gustavsson (annagust74@gmail.com), Swedish Institute in Rome, Italy, and Ulf Hansson, University of Texas at Austin, USA

The organizers as well as several of the speakers of the well-attended session on biography and histories of archaeology are members of HARN (Histories of Archaeology Research Network). Many scholars are interested in biography for a number of reasons and use it as one of the available tools for writing histories of archaeology and antiquarianism. Since the 1960s and early 1970s, when people started to seriously question whether the conventional brick-size womb-to-tomb stories of “great men” were really the only biographies that we should be writing, much has happened in this field of study in terms of subject and methodology.

Some scholars, referring to the many exciting and innovative new works and theoretical approaches, even speak of a “biographical turn”. The term "biography" has now been opened up to include not only prominent archaeologists and antiquarians, women as well as men, but also people from outside the academic community, groups of individuals, families, marriages, friendships, networks, collective movements etc., and it is increasingly also applied to non-humans: to institutions, landscapes, places, time periods, projects, publications, and objects. Much of what is happening is of course highly relevant to us and has implications for the study of our own and related disciplines. We therefore decided that the potential and limits of biography (in a very wide sense) as a tool for writing histories of archaeology should be the focus of our session.

Ten papers and four posters representing very diverse and highly interesting approaches and case studies were presented and discussed. Tove Hjørungdal (Sweden) gave a paper on the Danish-Swedish archaeologist Georg Sarauw (1862-1928) and his study of Maglemosian (early Mesolithic) culture. She discussed the nature of archaeological methods as interactions between scholars and materialities (On the nature of Maglemose). Roger White (UK) talked about the life-history of the Roman site of Virconium at Wroxeter and the archaeologists working there. He pointed to the multi-sensuous character of sites
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and the appropriation of Wroxeter in art and literature (Wroxeter and the development of archaeology in Britain). Torgrim Sneve Guttormsen’s (Norway) paper discussed how objects can constitute focal points for examining multivocality in biographies, using the Oseberg cart from the Oseberg ship burial as an example (Chronotypes in multivocal biographies).

Elin Engström (Sweden) presented an analysis of how gender and masculinity aspects of archaeological practice can be of vital importance for the history of archaeology through her work on the archaeological team that excavated the Iron Age fort at Eketorp, Sweden, 1964-74 (Visible and invisible masculinities in the Eketorp research project). Vladimir Mihajlovic (Serbia) gave a paper on the Italian military engineer/antiquarian Luigi Ferdinando Marsigli (1658-1730) and his pioneering work on, and journey along, the Danube. He pointed to the persistence of the antiquarian view of cultured landscapes in Serbian archaeology (Biographies of landscape through Marsigli’s biography). HARN member Margarita Díaz-Andreu (Spain) discussed social networks and international relations in archaeology as reflected in the Lluís Pericot Garcia (1899-1978) archive material. Her work is inspired by Latour’s Actor-Network Theory and demonstrates how archaeological knowledge was transmitted and shaped through the network (Actor-Network Theory and international relations in European archaeology in the post-World War II era).

Johan Hegaert (Sweden) presented his on-going work, which is conducted together with Anna Källén. He spoke about the Swedish archaeologist Olov Janse (1802-1985) and his wife Renée (1903-2000) and how an archaeological approach to the history of archaeology could look like (Objects, bodies and places: The Archaeology of an archaeologist’s life). HARN member Stephen L. Dyson (USA) spoke on the lives and works of Eugenie Sellers Strong (1860-1943) and William J. Stillman (1828-1901). He showed how biographies of people outside of the traditional academic circles can lead to new insights in the history of classical archaeology (Writing the life of outsiders in archaeological biography: A woman and an amateur as case studies). HARN member Frederick Whitling (Sweden) presented his on-going work on the archaeological interests of the former King of Sweden Gustaf VI Adolf (1882-1973) and the scholarly networks he was actively involved in. He raised questions about the tension between individual and structural levels of analysis when writing the history of archaeology and the quest to find a “middle ground” (King Gustaf VI Adolf of Sweden and biographical approaches to the history of archaeology).

The poster session included A biography of Argive Midea by Ann-Louise Schallin (Sweden); The Turkish story of the excavations in Larisa (Buruncuk) 1902-1932/34 by Turgut Saner (Turkey); Archaeological societies in the Russian Empire: The case study of the Odessa Society of History and Antiquities by Andrej Shamanaev (Russia); and Mendes Corrêa and the 1930s excavations at the Muge shellmiddens (Portugal) by Ana Abrunhosa (Portugal). Unfortunately, Patricia Rahemipour, Germany (In the footprints of… Theodor Wiegand) had to cancel her participation in the session.

Fig 1: The frontispiece of vol. 3 of Marsigli’s Danubius pannonico-mysicus (1726), dedicated to the minerals (De mineralibus circa Danubium effossis...), taken from Mihajlovic’s presentation.
This highly stimulating “cross-fertilization” gave rise to lively and very fruitful discussions. Where and how does a (scientific) question or debate rise? How have earlier archaeological practices shaped the discipline of today? Are we working with biographical fragments rather than with biographies? Questions raised concerned practical issues as well as theoretical approaches and problems when working on archive material and biographies. Many archaeologists have left more or less organized archives, but few have written their own biographies. The importance of oral sources as a compliment was discussed and underlined.

The discussion on networks rose questions on how networks are formed and on the strength of their impact. Does tracing a network always give information about the transferring of ideas or is the result sometimes the opposite? Can network analyses shed light on the non-transference of knowledge and ideas? And where should a network analysis start? Since agents are part of several different networks, defining a starting node can be problematic.

The relevance and significance of anecdotes and myths were also debated. We discussed how anecdotes might form a discourse of their own and how they have been used to maintain different hierarchies. Who can become a biographical subject? What criteria determine how big an impact a person has had on the discourse? Who can become a (successful) archaeologist?

The discussions (as we ran out of time, of course) continued over dinner. We would like to take this opportunity to thank our speakers, poster authors and discussants for an overall successful and very rewarding session. We think we all went home from Pilsen feeling very refreshed and full of ideas.

**Gender identities in the making – Prehistoric dress and network patterns in a supraregional perspective**

Sophie Bergerbrant, University of Gothenburg, Sweden, Karin Margarita Frei (Karin.M.Frei@natmus.dk)
National Museum of Denmark, Denmark, and Lene Melheim, University of Oslo, Norway

The session took place on a beautiful and warm Friday afternoon from 14:00-18:30 in one of the bigger rooms of building 2 (3rd floor, UU307) at the University of West Bohemia in Pilsen. The aim of the session was to discuss current perspectives on gender when viewed through the lens of the results of new scientific methods applied on dress and accessories. The session was very well visited, so more chairs needed to be taken into the room. The schedule was very tight and the audience was keen to discuss, so the temperature in the room was high also in literary terms. The presentations spanned both in time and geography, providing a broad discussion from changes of dress in the bushman tradition of South Africa, presented by Vibeke M. Viestad from the University of Oslo in Norway, to the Late Neolithic and Copper Age statue menhir evidence of Central and Southern Europe, discussed by Susanna Harris from the University College London in the UK.

This extensive frame provided a unique opportunity to view gender from case studies applying new cutting edge methods as, for example, isotopic tracing as well as a wide range of materials that one can use to better understand gender and how gender identities are played out in different regional and supraregional contexts. This broad setting made it obvious that there are still many ways in which gender can be understood and that the tracing of materials may complicate our understanding of the interplay of gender identity and regional identity rather than providing unequivocal answers. New options were for instance aroused by the paper about mobility in Early Bronze Age Slovakia by Samantha Reiter from Aarhus University and Karin Margarita Frei from the National Museum of Denmark, which showed that grave goods can sometimes be misleading, as strontium isotope analyses showed that one can still be local even though grave goods point to a non-local origin. Another interesting way in which to understand identity and ‘foreignism’ was presented by Mathilde Cervel from EPHE, France, and Stéphane Rottier from the University of Bordeaux, France, who discussed anthropological biology investigations vs. the role of ornaments.

Moreover, several papers presented the important role played by textile and textile tools in today’s archaeological research, especially when dealing with gender identities as well as the complex socio-economic networks behind textile production. Thus, the presentation of novel investigations of the important Northern European Bronze Age textile finds by Sølvi H. Fossøy from Norway and her co-author Sophie Bergerbrant from the University of Gothenburg in Sweden showed that old textile finds still
have lots of information to be unraveled. Furthermore, the evidence of textile production presented in several case studies provided keys to a more profound understanding of the many dimensions of the production of gender identities in past societies. The cases spanned from the travelling loom weights of the Bronze Age Aegean, presented by Joanne Cutler from the University College London, to textile tools as status symbols in Central Mediterranean female graves, presented by Christoph Kremer from the Bochum University in Germany, and finally the archaeological evidence of a Roman textile workshop in Pannonia, presented by Judit Pásztókai-Szeõke from Hungary. Apart from the already mentioned papers on bushman jewelry and the depiction of dress details on statue menhirs, another case study highlighting accessories as a crucial aspect of dress and appearance was the fibulas and pins of ancient Greek dress presented by Cecilie Brøens from the National Museum of Denmark and Center for Textile Research CTR in Denmark. The session included a poster discussing status, network and gender in connection with the earliest European golden textiles from Bronze Age Hungary presented by Judit Pásztókai-Szeõke, Péter Polgár from Sopron Múzeum in Hungary, and Sophie Bergerbrant.

All in all, the session was an eye-opener to the broadness of the subject as well as the many ways of how new interdisciplinary techniques can be applied to provide new dimensions to our understanding of the archaeological record.

**The bioarchaeology of the Neolithic Carpathian Basin**

Eszter Bánffy (banffy@archeo.mta.hu), Institute of Archaeology, Budapest, Hungary

Beginning in 2009, a German Research Foundation (DFG) project has been carried out, headed by Kurt W. Alt (Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz) and Eszter Bánffy (Institute of Archaeology, Budapest, RCH, HAS). At a fairly developed phase of the programme, the team decided to share the preliminary results with colleagues at the EAA conference.

The work has a twofold aim. Firstly, it hopes to achieve a full aDNA and isotope analysis of all available 6th to 5th millennium BC skeletons in the Carpathian Basin that it was possible to sample. Secondly, and no less importantly, it attempts to bridge the approaches of natural sciences and archaeology, for the sake of a better understanding of methods used and fields of possible inferences. Just like other fields of multidisciplinary research that involve the application of archaeometric methods to gain new data and develop archaeological interpretations, archaeogenetics, too, has occasionally come under heavy fire. Some researchers have perhaps been too quick in enthusiastically associating the genetic evidence with archaeological cultures, treating them like peoples, while others are simply ready to dismiss the entire method, contending that it is practically worthless owing to the often controversial results. This situation recalls the enormous scepticism, enthusiasm and heated debates generated by radiocarbon dating, which challenged and revolutionized traditional archaeological dating in the mid-20th century. The ongoing debates, studies and publications, as well as the new research paradigms and analytical procedures, have contributed much to the advances made in radiocarbon dating since then. The same appears to hold true for archaeogenetics: while it is quite obvious that we are still at the beginning of the road, it is also clear that we should not abandon this field of research, because bioarchaeological analyses are expected to play a crucial role in the study of ancient populations. As in the case of every new research method, we must raise the question of what archaeogenetics can tell us and what it cannot, what it can be used for and what it should not be used for.

After a short introduction touching upon these thoughts, Eszter Bánffy referred to previous research, which actually gave birth to the present project. On the basis of the aDNA and isotope analyses of prehistoric skeletons in the Middle Elbe and Saale region in Eastern Germany, the questions of origin were posed: where should their ancestors be sought? Thus, the idea of researching the Carpathian zone emerged. Bearing in mind the prelude, the first presentation by Guido Brandt summarized the results of this former project.

Coming to introduce the actual work in the Carpathian Basin, the talk by János Jakucs shed light upon the extremely complicated process of sampling that took place mainly in Hungary, but also in Croatia and Slovakia. János had the task of the coordination, getting all of the permissions, organizing visits to local museums and the search for and selecting of the skeletons. As a result, nearly seven hundred individuals were investigated from more than seventy prehistoric sites from the Carpathian Basin. The
sampled remains can be dated to the periods between the Mesolithic and the Middle Copper Age of the Bodrogkeresztúr and Lasinja cultures; nevertheless, the vast majority of our samples, more than six hundred individuals, can be dated to the 6th and first half of the 5th millennium BC. The presentation by Anna Szécsényi-Nagy, focused on the West Hungarian (Transdanubian) and Croatian results. Nearly 300 Neolithic DNA samples have been taken and analyzed, beginning with skeletons from the Starčevo culture, LBK, Sopot and Lengyel cultures, and up to the Chalcolithic Balaton-Lasinja culture. Mitochondrial analyses were completed by a pioneering analysis of Y-chromosome analyses. One of the most intriguing results was the comparison of the Transdanubian data to the published Mesolithic-Upper Palaeolithic hunter-gatherer mtDNA results from Central and North Europe; the mitochondrial (matrilinear) diversity appears with the earliest Neolithic Starčevo culture. Apart from the remarkably rich Early Neolithic mitochondrial haplogroup diversity, a range of the mitochondrial U haplogroups in the Vinca dataset contains presumably new elements, which supports a leapfrog colonization hypothesis. Vicki Keerl gave an account of a parallel investigation from Eastern Hungary with similar results, finding close genetical similarities between both the Körös and the Starčevo cultures and succeeding the Alföld and Transdanubian LBK. Vicki also stated that genetically, the Late Neolithic Tisza culture is a descendant of the Alföld LBK. These results are all in accordance with the archaeological data. This project included a thorough isotope analysis to look at migration and diet. One of the most intriguing charts was shown by Marc Fecher, who, among other important observations, showed that a significantly larger mobility could be detected with the Transdanubian LBK than in the Alföld variant. This observation affirms the thesis that the first farmers in Central Europe mainly consisted of the western groups, whereas those in eastern Hungary remained settled. After the first set of papers, the new bioarchaeological results were demonstrated with the help of one single site, taken as a case study. The excavator of the major and multi-period site Alsónyék-Bátaszék, Anett Osztás, gave a summary of the settlement and thousands of graves dated between 5800 and 4500 BC. Then Anna Szécsényi-Nagy and Marc Fecher, with the assistance of the zooarchaeologist Éva Ágnes Nyerges, gave an account of aDNA and isotope investigations, carried out specifically on the Neolithic (i.e. the Starčevo, Sopot and Lengyel segments) samples from Alsónyék. Over more than a millennium, a fairly high persistence of the genetic components in mtDNA could be observed, with some minor genetic flow traced in the Y-chromosome analysis. A further interesting result is connected to kinship relationships that could be detected among some Sopot and Lengyel burials and grave groups, respectively.

Fig. 1: The session on bioarchaeology in Pilsen was well-attended.
The last approach, still within the Alsónyék case study, was that of osteology and palaeopathology. Along with their reconstruction of the population’s demographic characteristics, Kitti Köhler and Balázs Mende also discussed the evidence of an infectious disease, osteo-articular tuberculosis, that was present in at least one individual of the Lengyel population. Following from this remarkable discovery, a series of further questions were posed, e.g. whether TB can be considered endemic within the Alsónyék Late Neolithic population at large, and if there is any connection between the chronological position of burial-groups and the appearance of the disease within burial-groups. Balázs mentioned that further research on the skeletons, including molecular analysis, will hopefully be undertaken. Summing up, Kurt Alt compared the preliminary results of the recent project with other DNA and isotope projects, which have been or are being carried out by the Mainz team. Since Kurt could not attend the Pilsen meeting, Eszter presented the summary alongside with her own inferences. The final discussion proved to be a highlight of the session: most of the questions and comments were reactions not only to the results and other details of the various presentations but – sometimes in an utterly passionate manner – also to the key problems of reconciling the genetic and the archaeological approach.

Identity and Heritage: Contemporary challenges in a globalizing world

Douglas Comer, Cultural Site Research and Management, USA / ICOMOS,
Christopher Prescott (christopher.prescott@iakh.uio.no), University of Oslo, Norway,
and Hilary Soderland, University of Washington School of Law, USA

This session was the second of a two-part biennial series and represents an initiative between the Society for American Archaeology (SAA) and the European Association of Archaeologists (EAA). The session was sponsored by the International Scientific Committee on Archaeological Heritage Management (ICAHM), a scientific committee of the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS). The 2011 sessions, held at the 77th SAA meeting in Sacramento and the 17th EAA meeting in Oslo, were published in 2013 by Springer in Heritage in the Context of Globalization: Europe and the Americas, edited by Peter Biehl and Christopher Prescott. The sessions at the 78th SAA meeting in Hawaii and this year’s EAA meeting in Pilsen also will be published by Springer in a follow-up volume in 2014, edited by Peter Biehl, Douglas Comer, Christopher Prescott, and Hilary Soderland, with a working title taken from the EAA session Identity and Heritage: Contemporary Challenges in a Globalizing World. Nine papers, with speakers from Europe, the Americas, Asia and Australia, were presented at the 2013 session of the EAA. These papers drew on cases from Latin America, North America, Europe, the Middle East and Australia, and explored various sides of identity and heritage. All the papers addressed broad and explicit issues facing archaeology and heritage management in a dramatically changing world, thus developing on the organizer’s objective for the EAA session to not only present variable experiences from the New and Old Worlds but also to discuss the need to look beyond national and regional contexts. The heritage sector and archaeology face a number of questions concerning the politics, practices, and narratives related to heritage and identity – questions that must be addressed if archaeology is to remain relevant in the not too distant future. These concerns do not necessarily pull in one direction. Questions of relevance in an affluent, cosmopolitan setting are at odds with those relevant for a region emerging from civil war or ethnic strife, or a national minority battling oppression or ethnic cleansing. A premise is that heritage not only represents a broad scope of empirically and theoretically sound interpretations but also that heritage is a response to contemporary contexts. It is therefore necessary to evaluate constantly what is scientifically accurate, and also what is valid and relevant and what can have a contemporary impact.

In Pilsen, the central themes of the theoretically informed and interpretative papers were tied to politics and socio-economic forces leading to

(1) the definition and management of heritage and identity in variable economic and political contexts (Pablo Alonso González, Veyssel Apaydin, Nicolas Zorzin, Richard Hingley);
(2) issues involved in doing archaeological research at World Heritage sites and the problems in converting sites and results into heritage accessible to the public (Peter Biehl and François Giligny);
(3) the management and definition of more modern urban heritage in which the perspectives of local communities as shareholders is taken into account (Caroline Sandes); and

(4) the increasingly pressing question of relationships among archaeology, heritage, and first to third generations of immigrants in Europe (Anders Högberg, Margarita Díaz–Andreu, Christopher Prescott).

The papers were to the point, engendering lively discussions relating to the individual papers as well as the overarching themes. Through these discussions various perspectives were uncovered and more questions were raised than answers provided, and thus in light of the organizers aims the session was a success.

**Digital heritage: Cross cultural conversations or nationally embedded soliloquies?**

Don Henson (dhwork@dsl.pipex.com), Institute of Archaeology, University College London, UK

The aim of this session was to examine how digital technologies are commonly used by archaeology and heritage organizations to impart knowledge and communicate with various audiences, such as fellow professionals and members of the public. We were interested in having papers from different national contexts, hoping that this might spark dialogue between different perspectives. Eleven papers were accepted for the session, only one of which failed to be delivered.

Valerie Higgins (The American University of Rome, Italy), *The real thing!!*

Val explored the tensions between experiencing heritage through reconstruction and visiting the real remains, focusing on the Colosseum. Students attending the American University of Rome have grown up with their image of Rome from television, feature films, the internet and in video-games. However, images in printed books were still the major source of their images. To visit the ruins of the Colosseum can be a disappointing experience. A survey of 119 students compared their experience of seeing a virtual reconstruction with visiting the real site. Encouragingly, 68% of the sample felt that the real site was more interesting than the reconstructions they had seen, and 81% felt that visiting the remains was better than seeing a visual reconstruction. We perhaps overestimate the impact of reconstruction, especially romanticized or inaccurate versions. People are well able to distinguish the real from the virtual and the real still has a power to intrigue, fascinate and affect that reconstructions find hard to match.

Sarah Colley (University of Sydney, Australia, now based at the University of Leicester, UK), *Digital technologies and ‘local’ and ‘global’ archaeology and heritage practice*

Sarah conducted interviews with thirty cultural heritage professionals and archaeologists working in and/or from Australia about their use of digital technologies. Digital technologies potentially make local projects accessible to wider global audiences and stakeholders, and can ease communication and information exchange between people regardless of physical location. Why do some projects remain of local interest while others expand their reach to wider non-local interest or participation? Survey results showed that most people used digital media for data sharing, networking, advocacy and PR, and for teaching. Only 6% used social media to transcend their immediate professional networks for reasons including workplace policies which block access; problems associated with social media, and digital literacy issues. Social media are better for some kinds of communication than others, and whether an archaeological project engages global or local audiences depends as much on context as on technology.

Diane Scherzler (German Society for Pre- and Protohistory (DGUF), Germany), *“The world must learn what happens here!” Web 2.0 and archaeological heritage during armed conflict*

Diane addressed the role of digital media – especially social media – in publicizing threats to heritage in the current civil war in Syria. Local activists have highlighted the destruction of several Roman buildings near Dara’a on Youtube, for example. Hundreds of videos showing the destruction of cultural heritage can be accessed worldwide. This contrasts with the situation in Iraq in 1993, where damage occurred in the absence of modern digital media. Images, videos, and tweets are often used by mass media, but
how can we be certain about the validity of eye-witness videos as authentic? Although media outlets take steps to verify what they publish, such problems perhaps lie behind the unwillingness of UNESCO to use this data and there has been little impact on public debate about heritage in the war zone. Local people care about their heritage and we have a duty to take notice of their efforts (often dangerously made at personal cost). Perhaps we need a hub of international experts to help verify what is published online and ensure they contribute to public debate outside of Syria.

Frank Siegmund (Heinrich-Heine-Universität Düsseldorf, Germany), *Digital publishing in open access helps crossing borders*
Frank made the case for open access publishing of archaeological papers, with his experience editing *Archäologische Informationen* (www.DGUF.de). This had been a print journal but is now also available through open access online, in response to a survey of its subscribers. Open access benefits authors who have their work made more widely accessible. They can also include a wider range of content, such as three-dimensional images, audio and video. The non-specialist public can sidestep paywalls and academic exclusion. Local people especially want information about their own heritage. Open access also allows an international readership, which is so important where ancient cultures cross modern political boundaries. However, there are disadvantages to open access publishing, such as the uncontrolled re-use of articles and the reading of articles outside of their academic context. Also, who pays the costs of publishing if open access is to be free to readers? Nevertheless, the open access model may increasingly be the future for a more inclusive and academically sound archaeological publishing.

Stephen Briggs (United Kingdom), *Better than metal detecting? The impact of early newsprint on the archaeological record in Britain, Ireland and beyond*
Stephen looked at the nature and accessibility of printed newspapers available online and found there is great potential for sourcing ‘new’ archaeological and historical information and that notices of otherwise unknown excavations, sites and finds appear in newspapers as far back as 1720. Canon William Greenwell, who excavated hundreds of barrows (c. 1864-1900) used the papers very effectively to publicize his findings. Newsprint can provide records of lost, altered or destroyed sites, as well as accounts of unknown excavations. Stephen's work has generated details of up to 500 Early Bronze Age burials from Scotland, most previously unknown. He has also listed over 1,300 ‘new’ medieval and later coin hoards. Additionally, early newsprint can expose the (sometimes controversial) activities of the dozens of archaeology and related organizations whose archives have not survived. Stephen hopes to hear of similar work taken up elsewhere in Europe.

Paloma Gonzalez-Marcen and Susana Vega (both Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Spain), *Communicate global, act local: possibilities and limits of digital heritage programmes*
Paloma and Susana outlined the work being done at the Palaeolithic site of Roca dels Bous in Catalonia, a Neanderthal seasonal camp with few features to see in an area with low tourism, but with attractive scenery and heritage. The project is opening up the tourism potential of the site without getting in the way of ongoing archaeological research, in a way which benefits local residents. The site has been extensively promoted using social media (Facebook and Twitter) and through a website in Spanish, French, Catalan and English, leading to an increase in visits to the area. Visitors to the site use iPads to connect to an interactive website while at the site. Content is tailored to a local audience since only 7% of website visitors have non-Spanish email addresses. More international audiences interact with the project through Facebook rather than the website. The project has been able to finance free wifi for the local village, as well as bringing more tourists to the area.

Faye Simpson (Manchester Metropolitan University, United Kingdom), *Community archaeology and human remains in the digital age*
Faye talked about a project at Oakington Anglo-Saxon Cemetery where 120 bodies have been uncovered. People are fascinated by excavated human remains. The excavators had legal permission to be open to public view and placed live feeds of the excavation on the internet, as well as publicizing the site through Facebook (with 500 friends), enabling a global community to become part of the discovery and interpretation. This has allowed people from different parts of the world to comment on the excavation and the finds. Comments have been positive and sometimes emotive. There have been
debates with the public about ethical issues and the archaeologists have had to be honest and self-reflective in their engagement with the public about these issues. The archaeologists have been taught to think beyond their own cultural attitudes and in confronting opposing attitudes attached to the discovery of human remains have strengthened their own future exploration of these remains.

Lorna Richardson (UCL, United Kingdom), Connecting with collections at the Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, Cambridge

Lorna reported on the ‘Connecting with collections’ digital project at the University of Cambridge Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology. The museum holds items from many parts of the world, collected since the 18th century. The project looked at how digital media could connect the museum with audiences whose collections they hold, and other external audiences. The museum will post on Facebook and Twitter, and has begun blogging. While having some success, this has been limited. As with most museums, staff have no training in how to use these media and a limited understanding of their audiences. There are guides that can be used, such as Let's get real produced by Culture24 on how to analyze online public engagement. It is clear that good engagement takes time and needs to be driven by a well-defined strategy. Digital media are not a short cut to public engagement.

Chiara Bonacchi (Newcastle University, United Kingdom), Areti Galani (Newcastle University, United Kingdom), Engaging with archaeological collections and sites in the north-east of England: the value of Facebook

Chiara spoke about a project in the north-east of England that had examined the value of Facebook as a way for the Tyne and Wear Archives and Museums to engage with the public, compared to other types of cultural institutions. The north-east has low levels of digital participation and high indices of economic deprivation. The majority of Facebook fans are local and regional. They tend to be people who already know the museums and mostly live within Tyne and Wear. They use the Internet at home rather than on site. What they want from the museums online is information about exhibitions and events, and to show their support for their local museum. It is clear that the use of Facebook is not reaching new audiences for the museum, and should not be a replacement for other forms of engaging with the public.

Leonor Amaro (Forvm MMX Project, Spain), Marcelo Castro (Regional Government of Culture and Sport, Junta de Andalucia, Spain), Francisco Arias (Archaeological Ensemble of Castulo, Spain), María Libertad Serrano (Forvm MMX Project, Spain), Crisis? What crisis? Forvm MMX project experience

Leonor talked about the Forum MMX project in Castulo, Spain; an important ancient city mentioned in various classical sources. The economic problems in Spain have reduced the state funding available for heritage projects, making it more important and relevant to involve the public in supporting archaeological excavation. The use of digital recording and three dimensional modeling, and immediate transfer to computer through bluetooth on site, allows high quality visual images to be made available to the public. A high quality of visitor experience is essential for gaining greater public support for the project. It also attracts members of the public who want to work on the site. Public engagement has to be based on the quality of archaeological work being done.

Archeology meets modern art: Artists’ approaches to prehistoric data

Estella Weiss-Krejci (Estella.Weiss-Krejci@assoc.oeaw.ac.at), Edeltraud Aspöck, both Austrian Academy of Sciences, OREA Institute for Oriental and European Archaeology, Vienna, Austria, and Mark Hall Perth Museum & Art Gallery, UK

The goal of this session, which took place on Friday 6 September, was to invite presentations to form a selection of modern art projects relating to and using archaeology. Modern artists’ interpretations of archaeological data are one way of how archaeology frequently presents itself to the public. Usually in such projects, what we call archaeological context and scientific method play a subordinate role and are secondary to a creative engagement with the past in the present. Seven presentations and two posters addressed these issues in various ways.
Dragoș Gheorghiu from the National University of Arts, Romania, presented what he has christened an art-chaeological experiment, consisting of the transformation of a whole site into a gigantic map. Archaeological Points of Interest (POI) were marked by works of art (like installations, i.e. allegories or metaphors) to evoke different features of each POI. The use of allegories created an augmentation of the reality of the POI-s and an analogous visual discourse, used to materialize invisible cultural features. The paper was accompanied by a poster presentation in the exhibition hall co-authored by Livia Stefan from the Institute for Computers ITC, Romania. The poster was a virtual exhibition and represented the map of the Vadastra site in Romania, which is part of the project “The Maps of Time”. A number of Points of Interest and Latitude Longitude Altitude markers were positioned on it, representing the locations to be discovered by the public in a virtual exploration in four dimensions. Each POI had attached layers of information to be explored in the manner of an archaeological stratigraphy (see http://timemaps.net/timemap/blog/).

The second presentation by Sebastian Walter from the Art Foundation Schöppingen in Northrhine-Westfalia illustrated the outcome of the Schöppingen Time-Machine Project, which was based on the collaboration between the Art Foundation and the regional branch of the state heritage board, LWL-Archaeology Münster (Fig. 1). Using archaeological data, artists developed visual scenes of the past for optical time machines, which were installed throughout the town of Schöppingen. In these time machines the current locations could be viewed at a certain time in the past. The images made use of archaeological data and reconstructions, but referred to the present as well, and included aspects that normally do not appear in the scientific context.

Marko Mele from the Universal Museum Joanneum, Graz, Austria, one of the largest museums of its kind in Europe, reported on a series of permanent and temporary exhibitions such as “Super Egg” by Simon Starling & Superflex (Fig. 2), “Mirrors” by Michelangelo Pistoletto and “The Beginning of Time,” in which Chinese artist Ai Weiwei and US video artist Sharon Lockhart presented their view on the stone artefacts from a Palaeolithic Austrian cave. Mele also talked about the international collaboration of the Austrian artists Rhizom & e.d gfrerer in the exhibition “Brought to Light” that was presented in the
European Capital of Culture 2012 Maribor (Slovenia). Artistic input wasn’t restricted to the exhibition rooms but also took place in the public space of Maribor’s inner city.

Kate Sloan of Peter Potter Gallery/University of Edinburgh, UK, and David Connolly of Connolly Heritage Consultancy, UK, explored the extraordinary outcomes of a partnership between these two organizations. Developing a unique engagement strategy for the rural region of East Lothian, Scotland, these two groups brought together community-focused archaeology with contemporary arts projects involving thousands of participants. Kate and David not only offered an overview of their programme but addressed issues such as new partner-funding possibilities in the UK, network building and sharing, the gallery as a hub for heritage engagement, contemporary art and the dissemination of heritage, and archaeology as a tool for community cohesion and engagement.

Anna Zalewska from Maria Curie-Skłodowska University, Poland, discussed the artistic consequences of being susceptible to a certain charm that emanates from archaeological finds and masses of material remains related to the tragic events of the 20th century. She sees assemblage, de-contextualization and re-contextualization of the “readymade” media material appropriated into the scope of artistic operations as a subversive technique conveying a very technical dimension to denote operations performed on objects. Subversion in this sense can be understood as a certain methodology or technique of constructing works of art. She expressed an anxiety that archaeology did not therefore always confront the brutal truth of war crimes.

Rebecca Younger and Kenny Brophy from the University of Glasgow, UK, considered Stonehenge-inspired contemporary artworks from an archaeological perspective. As interpretations of archaeological monuments created by non-archaeologists, replica monuments offer insight into the ways the public perceive prehistoric monuments, and how they receive archaeological interpretations of monuments. Rebecca and Kenny considered how the contested nature of Stonehenge has impacted on the ways alternative Stonehenges have been used as a focus for protest and subversive agendas.

The last presentation by the session organizers themselves discussed the results of qualitative interviews with six different artists from the UK (Brian Graham, Louise Tait, Jeremy Deller, and Paul Musgrove), France (Michaël Jasmin) and Austria (Markus Hofer). These artists have created artworks at archaeology museums or at archaeological sites, or have otherwise been inspired by archaeology. Interview questions focused on the motivations for the engagement with archaeological topics, the public feedback and how interactions with archaeology affected later artistic ideas and careers. All artists agreed that art perceives the past different from archaeology.

Finally, the second poster prepared by Ildikó Pintér (Centre for Preventive Archaeology, Institute for the Protection of Cultural Heritage of Slovenia, Slovenia), Lara Badurina (Academy of Applied Arts, University of Rijeka, Croatia) and Philip Mason (also Centre for Preventive Archaeology) presented the results of two artistic projects “Souvenirs Made In” and “Limited Series,” which applied archaeological methods such as surface collection and reconstruction of artefacts. The projects highlighted how different archaeologists and artists approach material culture.
The session brought to the fore a number of intriguing aspects to the discipline of archaeology. The recreation and reinterpretation of ancient objects and their social contexts by artists constitute subjective and sensual approaches to prehistoric and later people’s objects and mindscapes. Such approaches clearly engage public attention and have a strong relevance to archaeologists anxious to understand how interpretation can both be more collaborative (with a range of other practitioners, including the public) and demonstrate that the field of archaeology can only gain from such interactions.

Iron and change in Europe: The first 2000 years

Peter Halkon (A.P.Halkon@hull.ac.uk), University of Hull, UK

Ten European countries from Norway to Italy were represented in this session, organized by Claudio Giordino (Italy), Bernt Rundgeter (Norway), and Peter Halkon, which examined iron c. 1000 BC to 1000 AD. Mastery of iron was a crucial factor in the development of Europe in this critical period of the continent’s development, yet study of its production and use is often glossed over or misunderstood in general archaeologies of this period. Iron facilitated the production of more powerful weapons and efficient tools, agents of change for the transformation of both past societies and environments. The EAA session followed a successful European Science Foundation Workshop held in London in 2010 (Halkon and Serneels 2010), with the aim of further integrating the study of iron into the archaeological mainstream.

The session began with an overview of the past, present and future of the study of iron, 1000 BC to AD 1000 by Peter Halkon. The first iron appears in Late Bronze Age contexts either as small objects, such as pins or decoration on copper alloy objects for display, possibly enhancing the power of existing elites.

In many mid-northern European countries, rare iron artefacts appear and are usually regarded as imports. Diffusion of archaeological objects and ideas, often regarded as outdated, may be apparent in the case of iron, with a chronological shift South-East to the West and North across Europe:

- 13th - 12th century BC Cyprus, Greece and Southern Italy
- 11th - 10th century BC Mediterranean France and Southern Spain
- 10th - 9th century BC Central Spain, Central France, Switzerland, Germany, Austria, Poland
- 9th - 8th century BC Southern UK
- 7th - 6th century BC Ireland, Scotland, Denmark.

In Sweden, however, there are single iron artefacts in burials from as early as 1300 BC.

By the middle Iron Age there was increasing use of iron for larger prestige weapons, such as swords and a few specialized craft tools, probably related to production of prestige items, the chariot burials such as those in Belgium, northern France and the UK being good examples. In Greece and Italy, iron reached a high level of consumption for more mundane functions as early as the 7th century BC, whereas in the “Celtic” world, the significant increase seems to be later, c. 250 – 150 BC.

In the Roman Empire the use of iron becomes ubiquitous – one cannot imagine the Roman army without iron! Weapons, tools for crafts and agriculture are common and nails and fittings are frequently used in construction. In some areas this diversification occurred a few decades before the conquest. Outside the Roman Empire, production was at much lower levels, except in a few areas of concentrated production e.g. southern Poland.

Large scale production necessitated use of much wood for charcoal. Apart from some work in North Wales, little has been done to assess the environmental impact of large scale iron production. The impact of iron tools for woodland management and arable agriculture warrants further research. Throughout the period of study and across Europe, iron was associated with religion and ritual: the “Celtic” smith god Goibniu or Gofannan, the Roman Vulcan, the Anglo-Saxon Wayland and Viking legends associated with Sigurd. In Iron Age and post-Roman Europe, burials have been found containing smithing tools, often in association with weapons. The precise status of these people is unclear. Manufacture of swords remains important, the so-called “Ulfberht” swords of the Viking Age perhaps being the most sophisticated, to the extent that like Stradivari violins, bogus stamps appeared on the blades of inferior swords.
Claudio Giardino (University of Salento – Lecce, Italy) then presented recent research in Italy. One of the earliest iron objects yet found was an iron ring from the Castelluccio di Noto, Sicily, dating before 1500 BC, although a controversial iron awl from Selvacciola (Viterbo), Tomb 21, was provisionally dated to the 3rd millennium BC. This very early date was not accepted by all. A smithing hearth from Broglio di Trebisacce, Calabria, from the Late/Final Bronze Age is the earliest evidence of a forge yet discovered in the Central Mediterranean. The use of iron probably came to the Central Mediterranean from the Aegean and Cyprus, with Sardinia playing a crucial role. In Central Italy, the increased use of iron objects, generally weapons and brooches occurs in the 9th to 8th century BC, the large Villanovan necropolis of southern Etruria being of particular significance. In Rome, two smithing sites were found in the Campidoglio and under the Forum of Caesar in Rome dating from the mid-7th century BC. One of the most significant sites for the production of iron in Italy was at Populonia with activity there from 6th to 3rd century BC with Etruscan slag heaps covering large areas, in some places up to 10m deep.

Martina Renzi (COFUND Post-doc fellow, Topoi, Free University, Berlin, Germany) then summarised recent work on iron in the Iberian Peninsula. There is a small set of artefacts pre-dating the 9th century BC, but the earliest evidence of iron production comes from Phoenician settlements from the end of the 9th and the first half of the 6th centuries BC, on Phoenician sites particularly in Malaga province or local sites influenced by the Phoenician presence. Application of lead isotope analyses, together with the study of trace elements, is being carried out on those iron-related materials, shedding light on trading connections.

Attention then switched northwards to Sweden and Norway as Lena Grandin (Swedish National Heritage Board) examined the extent to which prehistoric trade routes and networks can be determined by chemically “fingerprinting” the place of production from major, minor and trace elements in bloomery slag, caused by variations in bedrock geology that produces various geochemical signatures in the major Scandinavian limonitic ores. Through a multivariate statistical approach applied to slag and ore databases, it was demonstrated that various iron production regions can potentially be distinguished by bloomery slag compositions.

Jan Claasens (ARCHEBO), a contract archaeologist working in the Hageland, Belgium, recounted recent research on Roman iron production. Large amounts of tap slag have been discovered in the last five years away from Roman settlements, but close to the larger Roman roads. Although good ore deposits occurred close to Roman settlements, e.g. the vicus of Tienen, they were not used. Perhaps accessibility to large amounts of timber for charcoal was more important than proximity to ore. Recent research also suggested that iron blooms were transported to specialized villae systems, and to Tienen. Forging slag was also discovered in great quantity, both in the vicus and the specialized villae. These new sites are most important as this region was previously believed to be only agricultural in the Roman era.

Michael Brauns (Curt-Engelhorn-Zentrum, Mannheim, Germany) considered Iron Age iron production and distribution in southern Germany. Recent research particularly in the Black Forest has revealed evidence including furnaces and iron objects, largely tools and weapons in burials and settlements and ritually deposited in rivers and lakes. Questions remain as to where and how far the iron was traded. A French-German research project comparing the osmium isotope ratios in slag inclusions of Early Iron Age objects with ores, blooms and objects, made it possible to match axes from a hoard with ores, isolating the probable place of manufacture. A sickle, also examined, had a different origin.

In the early Iron Age, manganese-rich limonite ores in the Northern Black Forest were utilized followed by hydrated hematite crusts from the Swabian Mountains, switching to bog ore by the later Iron Age. It was previously presumed that Swabian Mountain ores were used at the Early Iron Age Heuneburg hillfort above the river Danube. However isotopic analysis proved that the ore used both here and for the iron tyres from surrounding chariots burials was bog not mountain ore.

Ineke Joosten (Cultural Heritage Agency of the Netherlands) then explained what could be learned from iron nails from excavated Roman ships. Seven different types of nails were distinguished by dimensions and weight and their material properties and provenance studied by metallographic examination. The composition of the nails closely resembled those from the Roman fort at Inchtuthil, Scotland, and it appears that nails were standardized, using a particular type of iron for their production. Dendrochronology showed that the ships were built of timber felled in AD 163. The nails from the ships were compared to study whether the two vessels were built simultaneously in the same shipyard, but analysis of the slag inclusions in the nails showed no correlation.

The next two papers continued the theme of the provenance of iron. Marianne Senn (Empa, Switzerland) working on iron alloys in the north of the Swiss Alps, from the Iron Age till the Medieval period, used LA-
ICP-MS analysis of waste material on smelting sites and in smithies, tools, weapons and personal equipment. Early Medieval iron objects and ore sources from the Swiss Jura were matched. Analysis of slag inclusions indicated the ore family from which the metal originated. Other groups of unknown origin were identified as being used in specific settlements such as the oppidum of Rheinau in Zurich canton. Although manufacturing regions could be defined, the technique is not yet powerful enough to define the precise point of origin.

Arne Joutti-Järvi (Heimdal-archaeometry, Denmark) outlined research on hammerscale (produced as the smith strikes metal on an anvil) and slag inclusions. He argued that the physical characteristics and chemical composition of hammerscale from archaeological excavations could indicate the processes preformed in prehistoric workshops. By the careful recording of smithing residue from systematic sampling of soil from floors or postholes, it was possible to work out the layout of a workshop. The analysis of more than 3,000 pieces of hammerscale from a number of smithies in Scandinavia allowed the identification of differences in the type and number of processes undertaken in the workshops. The development of indigenous iron production and imports into Denmark can be outlined on the basis of slag inclusion analyses of more than 300 objects. By extending this methodology to slag from smelting sites within Northern Europe, different compositional groups can be mapped.

Sadly Gerry McDonnell (Archaeometals, UK), one of the leading UK archaeometallurgists, was unable to attend, but his presentation was delivered by Peter Halkon. The first appearance of iron in the UK as elsewhere in Europe, was in the form of smaller objects from Later Bronze Age contexts, such as the Llyn Fawr hoard from Wales. Structures associated with smelting have been dated to around 400 BC, although slag has been found in earlier contexts such as Aldeby, Norfolk, Hartshill Copse, Berkshire, and Shooter's Hill, London, where iron slag was found in association with Later Bronze Age pottery dating from c. 1000-700 BC. In the hillfort at Broxmouth, East Lothian, Scotland, iron production has been dated to 800-400 BC. The whole range of iron alloys has been identified including low and high carbon steel. In the Iron Age iron production was undertaken on a range of types of site. Of particular note are Bryn y Castell, and Crawcwellt in Snowdonia, North Wales, Old Scatness, Shetland, and Welhambridge in East Yorkshire. Other early iron production centres have recently been identified in the Thames Valley.

There was a massive increase in iron use in the Roman period, with major production centres developing in Northamptonshire, the Weald in Kent and the Forest of Dean, Gloucestershire. In comparison little is known of post-Roman iron production. Some fine iron objects survive, such as the Anglo-Saxon helmet from Coppergate. By comparison with the European continent provenance studies are in their infancy and much work needs to be done. Much has been learned by experimentation, particularly through the work of Peter Crew who has shown that the production of 1kg of iron billet using a low-shaft slag tapping furnace involves between 8 and 25 person days depending on a number of variables including ore quality.

The session closed with an excellent presentation delivered by Jan Bill (University of Oslo, Norway) entitled “Determining the origins of iron in prehistoric and medieval Norway – a chemical approach”. Jan who curates the famous Viking ships pointed out that the Gokstad ship used some 3000 nails in its construction. Nails were amongst the object analysed by electron microprobe techniques for chemical ‘signatures’ in order to trace the location of their production.

The archaeology and heritage of the Prisoner of War experience: researching and managing a fragile resource

Harold Mytum (H.Mytum@liverpool.ac.uk), University of Liverpool, United Kingdom, and Marek E. Jasinski, Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Norway

The aim of the session was to bring together active researchers who are exploring the relatively new field of Prisoner of War (PoW) archaeology. All the papers relate to World War 2, though the associated poster by Jenny Newell and Keith Winser explained survey on a PoW camp from World War 1. The papers revealed the range of evidence that can be recovered from combining archaeology with oral history and documentary study, and the ways in which the remnants and memories of the PoW past are still very active and powerful in the present. The session reinforced themes evident in the previous PoW archaeology EAA session organised by Gilly Carr and Harold Mytum at Riva del Garda in 2009: Prisoner
of War Archaeology (19th and 20th centuries), but also revealed the growing importance of memory and current efforts at confronting aspects of painful heritage across both Europe and North America. The papers covered the PoW experience from the level of the individual and family up to a national scale. A biographical approach was taken by Harold Mytum (Archaeology of and by Prisoners of War: Gerhard and Maria Bersu on the Isle of Man during World War 2) where the wartime internment experiences of the famous German archaeologist Gerhard Bersu were explored. Interned on the Isle of Man by the British for the whole war, he was able to carry out extensive archaeological excavations on Iron Age sites. Recent re-excavation has revealed much about his methods, and examination of the archives taking a relational approach demonstrates the ways in which academic networks functioned during wartime.

In complete contrast is the island of Alderney, one of the Channel Islands abandoned by the British during the war, with its local population evacuated to Britain. The Nazis populated it with military personnel and a large contingent of slave workers to construct many massive fortifications. Extensive survey by Caroline Sturdy Colls using many different techniques (Mapping Adolf Island: Archaeological approaches to the occupation landscape on Alderney) has revealed for the first time the scale of activity on the island, and the role of the slaves in creating the massive infrastructure. Many died in the process, but whilst their products survive, their graves and many elements of their flimsy accommodation do not. The importance of slave workers, yet their lack of direct presence in history or archaeology, was a recurrent theme of the session.

British PoWs held by the Nazis were held in camps, which largely conformed to the Geneva Convention, but that did not mean that the internees were passive. Iain Banks has been part of an interdisciplinary team exploring the ways in which escapes were attempted, including those brought to popular attention by the film “The Great Escape” (By George, it's Harry! Excavating escape tunnels at Stalag Luft III, Zagan, Poland). Despite looters, many elements of the tunnel structure survived, as did artefacts associated with the digging and servicing of the tunnels. The meshing of oral testimony and the archaeological evidence allowed a fuller picture of these actions of resistance than using one source alone.

The challenges of fragile resources, with problematic and uncertain national and cultural associations, were highlighted by Vesa-Pekka Herva and Oula Seitsonen (“War junk as cultural heritage: Perceptions of WWII material at German PoW camps and military sites in northern Finland). Finland resisted Soviet aggressive ambitions by allying with the Nazis for the first part of the Second World War, then changed to the Allied cause in 1944. This led to large-scale destruction of settlements as the Nazi forces retreated, but also many of these troops were killed and their equipment was abandoned. There is therefore a rich material heritage of structures and objects, but these are at risk from looting, and their ambivalent place in Finnish national history makes their management problematic.

Alleged another category of internment – that of civilian citizens of a country because of their ethnicity. This was the fate of the Japanese Americans after Pearl Harbour, and two papers provided insights into this experience. Laura Ng examined the ways in which Japanese cultural values were maintained by the interned families in an alien environment (Altered lives, altered environments: Creating home at Manzanar War Relocation Center), with particular emphasis on some of the Japanese gardens created between the domestic buildings. Although varying in design skill, they revealed both personal and communal desires to mould their environments into forms that provided psychological comfort in difficult circumstances. As with Bersu on the Isle of Man, so some Japanese Americans could be creative in their confinement. Laura also read the paper by Stacey Camp, who at short notice could not attend for family reasons. Her study (Making the unfamiliar familiar: The archaeology of Japanese internees at Idaho, USA’s WWII Kooskia Internment Camp) looked at an unusual camp in the Japanese American context, one that was all male. In this sense more similar to European civilian PoW camps, the resistance here took the form of a range of artwork and illegal activities such as drinking and gambling. The wrongs committed against PoWs have not always healed, and injustices have not even been officially recognised until decades after the events. Emma Login deconstructed the conflicting views surrounding the erection of the Japanese American Memorial to Patriotism in World War II in Washington DC (“America’s Concentration Camps’ and the Japanese American Memorial to Patriotism). Unveiled in 2000, this had undergone revisions but still caused – and causes – divisions within the present Japanese American population. For some it still hides the injustices inflicted on American citizens of Japanese descent during the war, even though they remained loyal to the United States, but to others it is a balanced reflection of history. To outsiders the monument appears unproblematic; understanding its context reveals a more complex reality.
Remembering and forgetting lie at the heart of Marek E. Jasinski’s research into the Norwegian PoW experience (Revenge of memories – Nazi construction plants and PoW camps in Norway). As on Alderney, the role of the slave workers is hidden behind the massive surviving concrete structures they lost their lives in building. The Nazi legacy stands firm, but the injustices behind it are forgotten and need to be re-told and the sites interpreted appropriately. The definition of ‘others’ based on race and religion allowed the Nazi exploitation of the slave workers, and similar definitions of ‘other’ fuel extremist views in Norway to this day. Archaeologists exposing the past can help to create tolerant environments in the present.

Creating closure in the present is the ambition of Andrzej Ossowski, Krzysztof Szwagryzk and Piotr Brzeziński in their work locating, exhuming and identifying victims of Communist imprisonment and execution (Contemporary totalitarian systems’ victims’ identification possibilities). Using innovative field methods and DNA testing, descendants can be linked to the remains of those found in illicit graves. This ongoing research has successfully made possible some identifications, but many more are anticipated, with the methods being applicable in other contexts.

Dealing with war crimes, not through science but through theoretically and ethically informed artefact analysis and displays, was the subject of the final paper in the session provided by Anna Zalewska ((Un)representable War crime. The presence and the roles of material relics of Katyn mass murder in public space). Here the artefacts recovered during the exhumation of the human remains confront and challenge the Soviet interpretation of the massacre, allowing the exhibition viewers the chance to link back to those executed, and the event itself. The objects allow an engagement with the victims that is both powerful yet potentially problematic, and requires careful contextualisation in public display.

The session, sponsored by the Society for Post-Medieval Archaeology, has revealed the vibrant research activity within PoW archaeology, and how only through the analysis of material culture can past actions and experiences of those oppressed be brought forcefully into the present. The PoW heritage is often fragile, yet rarely claimed or even acknowledged within national histories, and so has rarely been offered legal heritage protection. Only through fieldwork campaigns, the raising of local and national popular interest, and through the publicizing of this important strand of the recent past, can this heritage be safeguarded. Its research future is one of dynamic, socially engaged interaction with communities today as these difficult pasts are understood and, where possible, reconciliation achieved.

### Something out of the ordinary?

**Interpreting the diversity in the uniformity of the Early Neolithic Linearbandkeramik in Central and Western Europe**

Luc Amkreutz (l.amkreutz@rmo.nl), Rijksmuseum van Oudheden, Leiden, The Netherlands, Fabian Haack (fabian.haack@gdke.rlp.de), GDKE Rheinland-Pfalz, Direktion Landesarchäologie, Germany, and Ivo van Wijk (I.vanwijk@archol.nl), Universiteit Leiden, The Netherlands

While the Linearbandkeramik (LBK) culture is often described as very uniform, this well attended session at the EAA Pilsen meeting addressed the diversity that also characterizes this culture. Fourteen papers from eighteen colleagues covered many aspects of recorded LBK diversity, including settlement systems, pottery production, lithic exchange, ritual manifestations, and research into LBK lifeways.

### Introduction

Over the past two decades, research into the Early Neolithic LBK (5500-4900 cal BC) presented us with a lot of new information, from both traditional excavation archaeology and isotope and aDNA ‘lifeways’ studies, concerning the settlement dynamics and social structure of these early farming communities. This research, grounded in the well-known adagium ‘Diversity in Uniformity’ coined by Modderman (1988), increasingly demonstrated the spatio-temporal diversity of regional LBK cultural characteristics. The data increasingly supports the diversity of the LBK and thus our understanding would benefit from regular debate on the scope of such diversity for a number of LBK topics. Contributors were therefore asked to present their data and ideas in relation to a number of broader themes. These included:
The overall aim was to reflect on what diversity means and how this alters or gradually changes our picture of the LBK. Are we dealing with difference and variation in degree or in kind? Is the LBK governed by uniform principles or rather a mosaic of local and regional choices?

Settlement systems, settlements and houses
The different contributions can roughly be divided into a number of themes. The first of these included regional patterning, settlement systems and sites. In this group, Anne Hauzeur (National Centre of Archaeological Research, Luxemburg) presented a regional case study. In ‘In between LBK worlds: The Mosel area through the Luxemburg case study’, she illustrated how the Middle Mosel area today can be outlined as a link between two parts of the north-western LBK. This is demonstrated both by lithic assemblages and ceramic decorations. By comparing a number of characteristic elements, an affiliation with elements of the Rhine-Main area could be discerned. As such, the Middle Mosel area appears as a geographical limit of influence from the south-east, which also allowed exchanges of goods or ideas with the neighbouring regions, including the Rhine-Maas area.

In the next paper, Lech Czerniak (Institute of Archaeology and Ethnology, Gdansk University, Poland) was “zooming in”, discussed the house, household and village in Lesser Poland. He focussed on the remarkable trend of waxing and waning of settlements. Rather than interpreting the data according to the well-known Hofplatzmodell, which interprets settlements as a collection of loosely scattered farmsteads inhabited by small family groups, Czerniak argued that the average use period of a house may have been much longer, approaching 100 years. This, in combination with a larger number of occupants, would alter our ideas on settlements. According to Czerniak, the theoretical basis for this approach and for discussions on spatial and social organization can be found in the concept of household as it is applied in the archaeology of the Neolithic in the Near East.
Adriana Badtke (University of Gdansk, Poland) zoomed in even further. She presented research into previously unknown characteristics of LBK houses. Her paper focussed on the interior of LBK longhouses, underlining that these were not only the locations of posts. Research in Little Poland demonstrated the existence of pits with various functions (including for storing food as well as non-functional ‘cult’ use). These pits were not discovered in other regions and point to regional choices being made in this respect.

This was followed by a paper from Jaromír Beneš and Václav Vondrovs ký (Institute of Archaeology, University of South Bohemia, Czech Republic) on the meaning of the long house as an expressive phenomenon in the early agricultural period of Europe. They discussed the development of the “right angle” system of house construction and the symbolic role of the longhouse. It was interesting to note that following the LBK, a manifestation of more Mesolithic elements may appear in house construction.

The morning part of the session ended again on a regional level. Ivo van Wijk (Archaeological Research Leiden, the Netherlands) dealt with the degree of uniformity in the Dutch Bandkeramik settlement patterning. He discussed the relationships between settlement systems and the landscape for the Limburg regions. Strikingly, the clustered and non-linear settlement pattern of the Early Neolithic Bandkeramik on the Limburg terraces differs from well-known adjacent Bandkeramik settlement clusters, such as those on the Aldenhovener Platte in the Rhineland. Also, locations other than those originally chosen, and thus not expected by us, were selected, ‘tested’ and used for settlement. Van Wijk detected a trend where, upon arriving in the area, people distinctly focussed on those locations they were used to, but increasingly adapted to the characteristics of the landscape over time, eventually allowing for different choices.

Pottery and flint: issues of exchange and identity

The second part of the morning was aimed at detecting diversity in altogether different aspects of LBK society. The focus here lay on artefact studies. Marjorie de Grooth (Germany) analyzed flint assemblages of ten partly excavated Bandkeramik sites from the Dutch research project “An Odyssey along the River Meuse”. This investigation demonstrated that while the well-known ‘Rijckholt type’ flints extracted from locations in the residual loams at Banholt and Mheer predominated in the settlements of Elsloo-Koolweeg and Geleen-Janskamperveld, which had been studied previously, these newly studied sites displayed an unexpected diversity of both local and regional flint types. As sources obviously were
not exhausted, we are dealing with different choices being made. Apparently, when the number and the size of settlements grew, a diversification of raw material preferences occurred. This potentially relates to disruptions in social cohesion and the need to express social identity in new ways.

Jaroslaw Wilczyński's (Vertebrate Zoology, Institute of Systematics and Evolution of Animals, Polish Academy of Sciences, Poland) complementary paper focussed on several rich and diverse lithic assemblages from Little Poland. His data pointed to diversity in the structure of raw material use when comparing LBK and Malice cultures in the area. During the early LBK settlement, Kraków Jurassic flint was exploited; obsidian was added during the subsequent phase of LBK occupation. The study demonstrates that different sources and exchange networks moved into place over time.

Pottery was the topic of Hans Christoph Strien's (Institut für Vor- und Frühgeschichte, Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz, Germany) paper, dealing with the regional and social diversity of the earliest LBK in south-western Germany. He argues that the earliest LBK is far from homogenous. Differences may be detected in pottery, long-range exchange relationships and agricultural practices at different scales. A variety of archaeological proxies for this were presented in detail. According to Strien, these differences testify to local pre-LBK traditions as well as to the networks of immigrants from the north-western Carpathian basin. With respect to interpreting diversity, Strien here pointed at a distinct Mesolithic element that was introduced to LBK culture.

Continuing on the importance of non-LBK influence on diversity, Daniela Hofmann (Universität Hamburg, Germany) provided the final paper of this section as well as the most original title: ‘Your mother smelled of elderberries: the changing role of “hunter-gatherer” ceramics in an LBK context’. She offered a critique of the fact that models of the Mesolithic-Neolithic transition tend to be entrenched and invested with immutable characteristics. When the notion of uniformity of the LBK is abandoned, it is often attributed to the involvement of flexible and adaptable hunter-gatherers. These adaptable hunter-gatherers are the opposite of conservative farmers and hence no opening is created for approaches that view the latter or the interactions between both in a more hybrid fashion. She continued by taking both La Hoguette and Limburg pottery and their divergent trajectories as a case study. Hofmann stressed that we are not dealing with a simple distinction between two identities, but with a more diverse image of which ethnicity is but one element. If pots are not people, it is time we try and define what pots do signify and what their differences imply.

Life history dynamics and ritual aspects

The afternoon part of the session brought together five papers concerning differences and commonalities in lifeways, and burial and ritual expressions in different parts of the LBK community. Using high resolution analysis and focussing on the chaîne opératoire in the production of pottery vessels, Barbara van Doosselaere (LIATEC, University of Namur-FUNDP, UMR 8215), Louis Gormat (Institute of Archaeological Sciences, Loránd Eötvös University ELTE, UMR 8215) and Laurence Burnez-Lanotte (LIATEC, University of Namur-FUNDP, UMR 8215) brought the question of diversity down to the level of the single individual and the underlying cultural traditions. Their aim was to gain more data to solve the problem of the relative chronology between the late LBK in the Paris Basin and the complex of Villeneuve St. Germain/Bliquy (VSG/BQ). The examination of the assemblage from the key site of Vaux-et-Borset in Hesbaye resulted in the identification of three different fashioning traditions, which also included different forms and sizes of the vessels.

One important aspect in the discussion of diversity was introduced by Penny Bickle (University of Bristol, UK), who questioned the scale at which variation matters in the widespread area of the LBK. Were the regional groups the main player in allocating identity on different levels or do we have to address this issue by examining bigger entities? This was discussed by Bickle in terms of isotopic evidence, examining the different levels in which identities could be expressed: individual lifeways, community and region. Examples of some graves illustrated the potential of bioarchaeological research in combination with anthropological and archaeological data in reconstructing the specific content of these entities.

The architecture and the composition of graves formed the topic of the third afternoon paper by Corinne Thevenet (UMR 8215, France). In the Paris Basin, settlement burials are common, while cemeteries, as they are known for the rest of the LBK, are missing completely. These graves in the direct vicinity of houses are often characterized by a niche where the dead body was interred and a step below the opening. The installation of wooden walls, the deposition of pottery vessels and their deliberate fragmentation, and the evidence for secondary opening of the graves point to a much more complex burial rite. These elements are absent elsewhere, emphasizing regional diversity in burial rites.
Another example of the complexity of LBK burial rites was presented by Maciej Debiec (Pracownia Archeologiczna “Obsydian”, Poland). From the easternmost part of the LBK distribution, he introduced the site of Niezvisko in Ukraine, where, due to the sedimentation history of the Dniester River, the original Neolithic surface was preserved. This allows a reconstruction of the burial ritual in an extraordinarily detailed way. It consists of the burial itself and a related complex of different architectural features, such as a pit with burnt flint and a clay platform. The unique richness in grave goods provided an insight into the social stratification of the LBK communities.
The session was concluded by Andrea Zeeb-Lanz and Fabian Haack (both GDKE Rheinland-Pfalz, Direktion Landesarchäologie, Germany), with an overview of different ritual practices in the latest phase of the LBK. Their focus was on contextualizing the site of Herxheim in south-western Germany, where broken and scattered human bones were excavated, many of them with cut-marks and associated with fragmented pottery and tools. They discussed the question of recurring patterns in the manipulation of dead human bodies and the treatment of implements like pottery vessels, comparing Herxheim to LBK examples from wells, caves (like the Jungfernöhle), rock formations, settlement pits and mass graves, revealing a wide range of expressions and manipulations. They argued that the different character and motivation of treatments such as breakage and dismemberment can be linked more plausibly to differences on a regional level than to the on-going general discussion about a crisis at the end of the LBK.

Fig. 5: LBK pots from Herxheim, Germany (Photo: F. Haack, GDKE Rheinland-Pfalz, Germany)

Conclusion
The different themes and papers concerning LBK diversity covered a wide range of topics. This, on the one hand, could be interpreted as a heterogeneous collection of different aspects of LBK society, but it was more than that. All participants stressed that it is important to discern how and when certain elements diverge from what is accepted as an ‘LBK norm’. This seems something we can do at this moment in time, after having established what LBK is in general terms across large parts of Europe. In particular, the interplay between different elements of LBK existence, be they architecture, tool or pottery manufacture, resource procurement, symbolic acts, or lifeways in general, shed light on more and less conservative elements in these communities once thought of as very uniform. We hope that this convergence of topics may develop into a broader perspective on how to deal with and interpret LBK diversity. The aim is also to combine the papers in an edited volume.
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Thinking about health and diseases in archaeology

Darek Błaszczyk (darkus.blaszczyk@gmail.com), University of Warsaw, Poland, Magdalena Domicela Matczak (mmatczak@amu.edu.pl), Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań, Poland, and Hélène Réveillas (helene.reveillas@inrap.fr) INRAP Grand Est Sud, France

This session aimed to establish an interdisciplinary debate on the issue of health and diseases in the past communities based on archaeological and anthropological materials derived from graves and cemeteries. The main concern focused on answering a question of what was the attitude to the ill and impaired individuals in various past societies as well as if it is possible and with use of what kind of methods and data to investigate their social status and perception of them in a given period of time and within a particular society.

John Robb and Sheila Kohring (Experiencing health in prehistoric Europe: an anthropological view) in the opening paper explored the concept of health understood as a cultural interpretation of the medical states of people’s bodies. They underlined that there are three potential sources for studying how prehistoric people considered ‘health’ and how they experienced illnesses. These are: 1) skeletal evidence of diseases, 2) representations of human bodies in art, and 3) burial evidence providing information of how people with different health conditions were treated in death.

In the following paper Mark Guillón in place of Valérie Delattre who could not come (Deciphering differences: An archaeo-anthropological reading of physical handicap in past society) presented the ways how researchers using archaeological and anthropological materials can determine status and social roles as well as examine inclusion or exclusion of ‘handicapped’ within past communities.

Pavel Titz (The desire for health as a desire for prosperity) considered a specific group of findings in the form of terracotta votive objects from the central Italian regions of Tuscany, Latium and Campania dated to the period of 4th to 1st centuries BC. These objects were found in shrines and cult places being traces of religious practices of making votive offerings to local deities. Many of them represented particular body parts and depicted concrete problems with the hope of being cured with the help of a deity. Therefore, they can play a role in our attempt to understand human health related matters in everyday life of the period under study.

Tadeusz Baranowski (The man from medieval Kalisz (Poland) as an example of long life with multiple pathological changes) showed the case of an individual with multiple congenital defects identified as Ectromelia Brachialis. The skeleton of a 35-40 years old man was found in the burial ground surrounding the Romanesque collegiate church of St. Paul the Apostle in Kalisz-Zawodzie. The body with a strong right-sided scoliosis lacked right humerus, part of forearm and hand, making a man totally dependent on his relatives. Despite that, the person was in good general condition. The location of his grave close to the wall of the church could indicate his belonging to a higher social class. Taking this into consideration, presumably, it was his social status that prevented him of being marginalized in society and allowed him to live a more or less normal life within a community inhabiting early medieval Kalisz.

Magdalena Domicela Matczak (Emotions and illness in the Middle Ages) in an attempt to ‘find’ emotions such as fear of illness, empathy and compassion to the ill, sadness and sorrow after the bereavement, aggression to the outcasts and the like, examined anthropological and archaeological materials from an early medieval cemetery in Kaludus (in Latin texts mentioned as Culmn) dated to the 9th and 13th centuries. As she proposed, explicit and hidden attitudes and emotions of the living to the dead can be revealed by studying a treatment of bodies of the deceased combined with observing traces of pathologies left by diseases on the bones of the skeletons. As an example of this approach, she examined so-called ‘anti-vampire’ graves – individuals perceived by their contemporaries as dangerous to the living and because of that treated in a special way in a funeral.

Alison Atkin (Identifying the ‘lost’ plague victims in medieval England) dealt with the issue of identification of burials of plague victims. She noticed that during subsequent outbreaks of the Black Death in England in the 14th and 15th centuries thousands of individuals died. Despite this fact, very few mass graves, such as for example the Royal Mint site in London, which could be attributed to plague victims were identified in the archaeological record. Taking this into consideration and using demographic modeling (comparing normal and catastrophic mortality profiles) to detect the episodes of mass mortality, she suggested that in addition to the use of mass graves individuals who died because of plagues were buried in single graves with normative burials practices. To date these graves of plague victims located in regularly used cemeteries were un- or misidentified.
Hélène Réveillas (Contribution of archaeo-anthropology for the understanding of the health status of past populations: the example of medieval and modern hospital cemeteries in France) studied individual and multiple burials located in the cemeteries found around medieval (Troyes, Reims) and modern era (Verdun, Epinal) hospitals in northeast France. Analyses of skeletons revealed, among others, cases of osteoarthritis, infectious (tuberculosis, brucellosis), metabolic (rickets, scurvy) and dental (frequent examples of caries and tartar) pathologies as well as victims of plagues. Moreover, skeletal populations unearthed in these cemeteries were characterized by the presence of very few children under five years as well as elderly persons. Men and women were represented in roughly the same proportions, except Reims being known as specifically dedicated to men. As a concluding remark, she stressed that insight into the way the diseased were perceived and treated in the past can be made only by studying together funerary practices and lesions on human bones.

Pascal Sellier (Bioarchaeology and archives getting along: diseases, epidemics and demographic crises as seen from Sv. Benedikt in Prague (17th-18th c.) working with a group of researchers from CNRS in France and The Czech Republic examined the modern era mass graves found in the cemetery of the Premonstratensian St. Benedict church in Prague. According to previous interpretations they were viewed as burials of plague victims. New investigations based on examination of preserved skeletons (the demographic pattern – young adult males), written sources, radiocarbon dates, artefacts and stable isotopes analyses proofed that buried individuals were soldiers from France and Bavaria who died as victims of a famine during the 1742 siege of Prague.

Yvonne Willumsen (Post-medieval burials by Kristiansand cathedral) presented the results of osteoarchaeological investigation of skeletal remains uncovered in the crypt and burial ground of the Kristiansand cathedral (Norway). The examination of well-preserved skeletal remains provided knowledge regarding sex, age and health condition of the inhabitants living in the city during the 17th and 18th centuries.

Isabelle Souquet-Leroy (Health in the kingdom of France during modern period: anthropological studies of cemeteries in western France) studied urban populations in France in the time of the Ancient Régime with the aim of defining their sanitary level according to their geographical, social and religious origins as well as considering the proportion of the individuals with pathologies within them. Her study took into consideration biological (sex, age, dental and osseous pathologies), funeral (individual or multiple burials) and religious (belonging to Protestant or Catholic denominations) data obtained from excavated cemeteries in western France. The detailed analyses of these data allowed to assess the impact of diseases on the life of individuals in given populations as well as to identify individuals who were cared for in specialized institutions and those who were treated themselves without professional medical aid.
As Željka Bedić (Osteological evidence for rheumatoid arthritis in the Early Modern Age cemetery Drinovci – Greblje from Croatia) was unable to attend the session her contribution was read by Mario Novak. The paper presented the case of a person with a rheumatoid arthritis buried in the early modern era cemetery at Drinovci-Greblje. Besides exposing lesions of chronic disease that affected all of the joints, the body of the person was given an atypical funeral treatment for the time (the 16th century). The body of this 40-50 years old woman was buried in a contracted position lying on its back. So, it was evident that an unusual treatment after death was connected with her special health condition.

In the last paper presented during the session Dejana Nikitović (Diagnosing scurvy in the archaeological record) considered aetiology, current diagnostic procedure and the mechanism of lesions’ formation of scurvy. She also discussed and presented the examples of scurvy identified by her and her colleagues in the sample of 16 juvenile skeletons unearthed at a late medieval cemetery in Uzdolje-Grabje (Croatia).

In connection with the topic of the session also three posters were presented. Annamária Bartha (Health and illnesses of Charles I and Louis the Great, Angevin kings of Hungary) examined the diseases and injuries of Charles I (1301-1342) and his son Louis the Great (1326-1382). Jozo Perčić Peručić (Health and quality of life in the Early Modern Period St. Claire Monastery in Croatia) presented the results of the anthropological analysis of the ten graves containing the remains of 33 individuals (15 females, 7 males, and 11 subadults) excavated at the site of St. Claire’s convent near the church of St. Mary’s Annunciation located on the Croatian island of Krk. Irina Reshetova (Trephination of the skull among the population of the Khazar Kaganate) investigated the custom of skull trephination among the early medieval Saltovo-Mayaki culture (the Khazar Kaganate) in the middle Don area seeing it as a possible symbolic ethnic marker of a military elite of a population of Turkic origin, then transferred to the Great Plain of Hungary and practiced also by Ugric peoples.

The session brought together several contributions on health condition in prehistoric and historic societies combining various sources of evidence such as osteological materials, artefacts, art, written texts, and so on. Papers and posters presented in the session geographically spanned Europe from the British Isles and Scandinavia via France, Italy and the Balkans to Hungary, Poland and Russia. Most contributions concerned medieval times and/or the early modern era (16th to 18th centuries). Beside few more general and theory laden contributions, most papers concentrated on presenting source materials as well as on identifying and discussing cases of specific diseases in skeletal materials and funerary treatment of specific individuals. Some papers dealt also with the issues connected with investigating mass graves and crisis mortality. Anyway, the question remained open whether or not it is possible, using archaeological and anthropological materials, to conduct more in-depth social interpretations and ‘find’ feelings and emotions embodied in the data.

**Gendered violence in the past: Materialities and corporealities**

Uroš Matić ([urosmatic@uni-muenster.de](mailto:urosmatic@uni-muenster.de)), Institut für Ägyptologie und Koptologie, Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität Münster, Germany, and Bo Jensen, freelance archaeologist, Denmark

Archaeology experienced gender trouble more than three decades ago and has tackled the problem of gender in various ways, on various fields. However, so far, relations between gender and violence in past societies have not attracted much serious attention from archaeologists. With a few honourable exceptions, we have tended to focus on one or the other. This division of labour means that we have mostly failed to address statements such as “males have always been more aggressive” or “it is in their nature”. In many publications, an inherent biological destiny was assumed rather than investigated for all societies. Conversely, debate on gender and violence has raged outside archaeology, without reference to the archaeological record. Here, studies show a notable lack of time-depth, despite their remarkable theoretical sophistication.

We believe that we can do better. The present session was meant as first step towards exploring methods and facts in the archaeological analysis of past, gendered violence. Our goal was never to search for “Amazons”. Rather, we proposed that violence is political and perforfomative, a social activity on par with eating or having sex, a creative and innovative cultural practice (a point argued and developed further also by John Robb and Sheila Kohring in their paper in the session). We argue that human, gendered violence is never “natural” and given, but always a meaningful, cultural activity.
We invited speakers to explore both physical evidence for gender and violence on human remains, strategies and tools of violence (weapons), sites of violence (battlefields, back allies, arenas etc.), and representations of violence. Speakers presented studies ranging from the Mesolithic to the Middle Ages, from Europe, Egypt and Iran, and discussed skeletal evidence, pictorial and textual evidence.

The opening paper by Miroslav Kočić posed the question of purpose of violent interactions in Mesolithic and Early Neolithic Danube gorges. After reviewing the evidence of trauma, which seem more to affect men in these societies, Kočić made a note that as the evidence is not overwhelming “something was stopping these people from conflicts”. John Robb and Sheila Kohring continued discussion of early prehistoric gendered violence, based on an impressive synthesis of published evidence for violence and trauma in European archaeology, from the Palaeolithic to the Neolithic/Copper Age/Early Bronze age (depending on the region). Their basic argument was that the level of violence did not increase but that violence was organized differently and increasingly concentrated on adult men over time. They argued that new gender relations clearly affected the dangers and ways of living as a certain gender.

Stéphane Duboscq, Juan F. Gibaja and Raquel Piquè dealt with the division of labour in the Neolithic of the north-eastern Iberian Peninsula through mortuary data. As divisions of labour are one way of approaching gender structures and “symbolic violence” (cf. Pierre Bourdieu), they investigated various evidence for gendered occupations. They also paid particular attention to evidence of violence against women. André Spatzier investigated gendered patterns of evidence of trauma on the bodies buried on the Late Neolithic ditch enclosure site of Pömmelte-Zackmünde in Saxony, Germany. This is a recently excavated site with impressive preservation. The human remains included isolated skulls; whole, articulated, young male skeletons with goods; and partial skeletons (mostly sub-adult) and apparently bound individuals. Spatzier showed a relation between this pattern and inclusion and exclusion in and out of the supposed sanctuary’s enclosure. He invoked liminality, restricted access and cosmology to develop a hypothesis of “honoured and sacrificed” in this particular archaeological context. Uroš Matić offered a close reading of Egyptological interpretations of scenes depicting Queen Nefertiti in the so-called “smiting scenes”. He argued that recent scholars have developed an Orientalist discourse, which associated femininity, beauty and cruelty, and that this hindered them from contextualising these images of the queen in relation to the whole compositions and to study them through a gender perspective. Matić claimed that in Amarna iconography, despite the exceptionality of a female actor, Nefertiti, appearing in smiting scenes, such images still privilege the male and serve as a gender technology (cf. Teresa de Lauretis).

Ian Armit investigated gender in Iron Age head-hunting, giving no privilege to any gender but rather showing how there is an observable change from head-hunting as a communal action to head-hunting as an individual action related to individual identity. Through this development, head-hunting also became important in different elite, gendered identities, with male leaders shown as head-hunters. Christine Hue-Arcé investigated violence towards women in Graeco-Roman Egypt, based on Greek and Demotic documents with physical evidence of trauma. She found that there was no evidence of clear patterns. There is wide range of evidence for violence of women against women, men against women and women against men. Similarly, the palaeopathological evidence does not show significant difference between violence suffered by people of different gender. Maryam Dezhamkhoo and Ali Roustaeeyanfard analyzed the idealised image of Sassanid “king of kings” as a discursively formed ideal of the masculine body. Images of masculine violence of the “king of kings” were propagated as pure beauty and opened to the gaze of royal family members and nobles. They pointed out how this discourse continues today with modern visitors still considering these images to be beautiful.

Christian Meyer and Kurt W. Alt investigated patterns of traumatic injuries in Merovingian cemeteries at Bitburg and Mannheim in Germany. They stressed that on these sites, grave-goods do follow biological sex rigidly, and only men show evidence of asymmetrically placed injuries from sharp weapons. Women’s injuries are fewer, and can be explained away. Moreover, grave-goods suggest that young girls seem to have been gendered earlier in life than were young boys. They interpreted Bitburg as a military fort, Mannheim as a more civilian settlement. Bo Jensen investigated the concepts of revenge and “right” and “wrong” violence in Viking visual and written culture. He attempted to reconstruct social narratives which organized gender difference in regards to violence and revenge. Jensen concludes that in Viking society, men’s revenge was justified and socially productive, women’s revenge justified but socially destructive. The main difference he pointed at is the privileging of the lack of emotional commitment in masculine acts of violence. Laura Whitehouse introduced important new material and raised the old question of “gendering” graves solely through goods. She argues that predetermined ideas
of male and female largely influenced the interpretation of Anglo-Saxon burials at Kent and in East Anglia. Whitehouse reviewed the data with a critical awareness to unsecure sexing of the graves and presented a new view of violence patterns. Mario Novak presented pro-term results from an analysis of more than 1200 skeletons from the Late Medieval, eastern Adriatic coast. Based on bone evidence and historical records, he suggested that the majority of present traumas on female skeletons can be explained as traces of non-fatal domestic violence, but some also indicating fatal consequences. He also reminded us that today, less than 40% of attacks result in bone-injuries, and that as many as 1/3 of women suffer physical or sexual violence during their lives. The session showed that gender archaeology is not dead (as it is sometimes argued in archaeological circles), and that there are topics that can reveal innovative results and insights when analyzed through gender perspective. Violence, both physical and symbolic, is only one of these topics. Through our special commitment to materiality and time, archaeology can and should join the discussions of gender and violence already raging in other social disciplines. We therefore open a call for papers for an edited volume inspired by this session and invite all interested contributors to contact us on either uros_arheo@yahoo.com, urosmatic@uni-muenster.de or bojensen_dk@yahoo.dk.

Persistent economic ways of living. Production, distribution, and consumption in the Iron Age and Early Medieval period

Alžběta Danielisová, Institute of Archaeology CAS, Czech Republic, Manuel Fernández-Götz (M.Fernandez-Gotz@ed.ac.uk), University of Edinburgh, UK, and Kerstin Kowarik, Naturhistorisches Museum, Austria

Exploitation of natural resources, together with agricultural and craft production, are the most important aspects for the gradual growth of social complexity. Subsistence strategies, including not only food production but also redistribution, exchange, and specialization, are one of the most intriguing themes in archaeology. The real challenge, however, is to explore and understand the ways how resources were exploited and managed and what social, political and cultural institutions organized and structured them. Unfortunately, such questions are usually dealt with only within individual time periods or geographic regions. In order to overcome these constraints and to link different approaches, this session tried to focus on long-term economic structures which are closely related to the social structure and organization of past societies. The session sought to broaden the investigation of economic aspects of societies by bridging research topics from different places of origin. Although seemingly different, they in fact share many fundamental issues, showing strong underlying continuities despite their various cultural identities. The aim of the session was to find inspiration for further development of theories concerning past exploitation of the environment, natural resources and the production and distribution processes from the Iron Age to the Early Medieval period. In doing so, it was intended to discuss economic themes which transcend time and space and bring together different research experiences. Some of the topics discussed were:

- Production and consumption aspects of subsistence strategies related to the interactions of central places, common settlements and their environments (material collections, settlement structure, environmental data).
- Exploitation of natural resources and redistribution processes (mineral ores, salt, forests, charcoal, potter’s clay, etc.).
- Complex craft production processes, technology transfers, chaînes opératoires etc. in different social environments (centres, countryside, marginal areas…).
- Exchange and redistribution mechanisms.

The session was opened by a set of theoretical presentations: John Bintliff (Leiden University, the Netherlands) brought an overview of the social and political dimensions of economic archaeology in Later Prehistoric and Historic European societies. The paper investigated how new forms of society are both created by and stimulate new modes of economic life. Martin Bartelheim (Universität Tübingen, Germany) defined resources as the tangible and intangible means by which actors create, sustain or alter social relations, units or identities, thus abolishing the opposition between ‘natural’ and ‘cultural’
resources. In the last theoretical paper, Doreen Mölders (Staatliches Museum für Archäologie Chemnitz, Germany) talked about Late Iron Age workplaces (taking the oppidum of Bibracte as a case-study), bringing new concepts of agency theory into the focus.

In another paper dedicated to ancient Gaul, the rhythms of continuity and discontinuity in Iron Age soil occupation and rural landscapes were discussed by François Malrain (Inrap Nord-Picardie, France), Geertrui Blancquaert (DRAC-SRA Champagne-Ardenne, France), Thierry Lorho (DRAC-SRA Bretagne, France), Chantal Leroyer (Archéosciences, France), Patrice Méniel (CNRS, France) and Véronique Zech-Matterne (CNRS/MNHN, France). Their analysis was based on a database which includes around 700 settlements dated to the 6th to first centuries BC from all over the French territory.

Continuing with the Iron Age, Richard Thér and Tomáš Mangel (University of Hradec Králové, Czech Republic) dealt with the development of modes of pottery production in Eastern Bohemia during the La Tène period, a time when the complexity of pottery production process reached its climax.

Adopting a long-term approach that spanned from the Neolithic to the Middle Ages, Hans Geisler (Germany) showed how ‘wealth’ in Lower Bavaria must have been based on sustainable agricultural surplus production. Judit Pásztoikai-Széőke (Hungary), for her part, analyzed large-scale state investments for promoting food-producing capacities in Late Roman Transdanubia.

The set of papers specifically devoted to the Early Medieval period was opened by Petr Dresler (Masaryk University, Czech Republic), who dealt with the resource base of the fortified agglomeration of Pohansko, one of the largest centres of its age in Central Europe.

Finally, Andrei Măgureanu (Romanian Institute of Archaeology) and Bogdan Ciupercă as well as Anton Alin (Prahova County Museum of History and Archaeology) discussed the production capabilities, especially on moulds, in the Budureasca Valley, a micro-zone situated in the region of the Carpathian hills.

In addition to these papers, the session included a poster by Hilde Rigmor Amundsen and Kristin Os (Norwegian Institute of Cultural Heritage Research) about funnel shaped reindeer trapping systems in the mountains of Eastern Norway.

The papers presented in the session, as well as some additional contributions from leading scholars, will be published as an edited volume.

Archaeological sites in forests. Strategies for their protection

Walter Irlinger (walter.irlinger@blfd.bayern.de), Bavarian State Conservation Office, Germany, Grietje Suhr, independent scholar, Germany (grietje.suhr@t-online.de), Jan John, University of South Bohemia, Pilsen, Czech Republic, and Ondřej Chvojka, University of South Bohemia, Pilsen, Czech Republic

This session was focussed on the protection and management of cultural heritage sites in forests. To protect these sites, an intensified cooperation of heritage conservation and authorities of forest administration has been established in many European countries during the last decade. Therefore, the organizers asked for papers on concepts for the preservation and care of prehistoric and historic monuments in woodland, on the cooperation between heritage management and forest authorities, on the analysis of data collected by Airborne Laser Scanning (ALS) and on public relations concerning archaeological monuments in forested areas.

Four papers (two from Finland, one each from Norway and the Netherlands) introduced projects, which aim at the cooperation between heritage management and forest administration, four talks and one poster (from Finland, Poland, the Czech Republic, Lithuania, and Germany) dealt with methods of prospection, especially ALS and three papers and two posters presented case studies from the authors’ practical work in Sweden, Poland, the Czech Republic and Germany.

Vesa Laulumaa (The National Board of Antiquities, Finland) described positive experiences on the cooperation between archaeology and forestry in Finland. The EU-project SKAIK (Forests Cultural Heritage on the Kvarkenregion) comprises archaeological survey methods and documentation of data, professional cooperation with forestry, education of forestry professionals, teachers and students, information of private forest owners and community archaeology. The main goal of the project is to reduce damages on cultural heritage sites in forests and to enhance cooperation between cultural heritage management and forestry.
Riikka Mustonen (Metsähallitus, Finland) reported on the progress of Finland’s National Forest Program 2015 Cultural Heritage Project. Its goal is to survey all state-owned commercial forests by 2015. Recently the project focussed on the documentation process by testing a new tablet model on field conditions and on the functionality of GIS software. For the first time ALS-data were used on a large scale. The project was presented in the social media and to the public (information evening) and an education day for forest workers was organized.

Ole Risbøl (NIKU – The Norwegian Institute for Cultural Heritage Research) draws the attention to the neglected cultural heritage in Norwegian forests. In Norway these remains often don’t get the same attention as cultural heritage in other parts of the landscape. The paper focussed on challenges connected to the management of cultural heritage in forests from a Norwegian perspective and discussed LiDAR-scans as an approaching improvement of the situation.

Michel Vorenhout (Archeologische Monumentenwacht Nederland, The Netherlands) introduced concepts for the cooperation of archaeology and forestry from the Dutch perspective. The “Archeologische Monumentenwacht (AMW)” is a non-profit organization that helps owners to protect their archaeological monuments. The Dutch State Forestry Service (SBB) owns about 1400 archaeological sites in forests. SBB has signed an agreement with the Dutch Cultural heritage agency on the management of their cultural heritage. AMW provides feedback on cultural heritage in forests to the heritage agency, thus increasing the efficiency of protective measures.

Satu Koivisto (National Board of Antiquities, Finland) described the protection of archaeological sites by using LiDAR-scans in Finnish boreal forests. In 2012 the National Land Survey of Finland allocated its ALS-data available to all users and the open data products were warmly welcomed by Finnish archaeologists working in forests. The Finnish-Swedish SKAIK-project (Forests Cultural Heritage on the Kvarkenregion) has been systematically testing this set of data in archaeological prospection under thick forest canopy.

The paper by Rafał Zapłata (Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University in Warsaw, Poland) presented chosen aspects of the implementation of ALS in Polish archaeology and examples of the experience gathered during the use of ALS in forested areas. He concentrated on the development of strategies of implementing ALS in heritage conservation and forest administration, methods of gathering and storing ALS-data and providing access to them.

Jan John (University of South Bohemia, Pilsen, Czech Republic) discussed the opportunities of ALS in improving the protection of archaeological monuments in forests. According to John, ALS represents one of the most effective methods of landscape survey and documentation, resulting in the precise mapping of known as well as unknown monuments. These mappings may help to protect sites in forested areas, which are vulnerable to the use of heavy machinery in forestry. For the future, one of the main tasks will be to improve the communication between foresters and archaeologists, which in the Czech Republic do not yet share information effectively enough.

The paper by Hermann Kerscher (Bavarian State Conservation Office, Germany) described historical landscapes and archaeological sites in Bavarian forests, which were revealed in the last few years by ALS. Chosen sites were highlighted, reaching from prehistoric tumuli over ancient/Roman and medieval road and field systems up to relicts of World War II.

Moa Lorentzon (Jönköpings läns museum, Sweden) outlined examples from archaeological surveys in woodland areas in southern Sweden. In the last 10 to 15 years specialized surveys were conducted; besides the traditional prehistoric monuments, they also revealed many historic monuments. Their increase illustrates that in Sweden there are practically neither means nor methods to excavate and study them. As a consequence these historic monuments are in most cases not properly documented.

The presentation of Jakub Niebieszczański (Adam Mickiewicz University Poznań, Poland) summarized a regional case study concerning a cultural landscape of the Middle Bronze Age, which is preserved in a circa 150 years old oak forest. The application of various non-invasive methods, including ALS; helped to discover nearly 120 barrows of the tumulus culture.

Miloslav Chytráček (Institute of Archaeology of the Academy of Science of the Czech Republic, Prague) described the excavation of a rich burial mound from the Iron Age in the forest Sedlina. Currently in south Bohemia frequent disturbances of prehistoric tumulus graves in forests have been registered. It was decided to respond to this situation by a joint excavation of the Czech Academy of Sciences and the Römisch-Germanisches Zentralmuseum Mainz (Germany), which — together with numerous scientific analyses — demonstrates the potential of these methods for the rescue of information from disturbed archaeological sites in forests.
The poster by Anna Swieder (State Office for Heritage Management and Archaeology Saxony-Anhalt, Germany) presented a DTM of the Harz Mountains in Germany, which covers a region of 2,160 km². Until now more than 1000 archaeological sites were identified and digitalized. According to Swieder, particularly the emerging network of medieval settlements and economic structures seems to open a very promising field of research.

The poster by Jan Kolář (Masaryk University, Czech Republic) introduced an example of good cooperation between archaeologists and local forestry managers in a part of the Czech Republic. This cooperation led to an increase of archaeological evidence, better knowledge about the prehistoric population and vegetation dynamics and significant improvement in forestry techniques on archaeological sites.

The paper of Linas Tamulynas (Vilnius University, Lithuania) discussed the use of LiDAR to detect and map archaeological features in Lithuanian forests. The author concludes that although LiDAR proved to be a viable method for archaeological feature detection, its capabilities still depend on the scanning resolution and vegetation canopy.

During the discussion it became apparent, that the acceptance of archaeological sites in forests varies significantly in different regions of Europe. It seems that in some countries with a great importance of forestry there is little understanding for the protection of cultural heritage sites in forests, while in other countries the cooperation of heritage management and forest authorities works well.

In our opinion it is necessary to establish a European Network of archaeologists and forestry managers and discuss further on questions such as, e.g., the storage, administration and interpretation of data from Airborne Laser Scanning, the protection of archaeological sites and the adaptation of woodland to climatic changes.

Continuing the debate (see also Trow et al. 2010; Bayerische Landesanstalt 2012) the contributions of this session will be published by the Bavarian State Conservation Office in Munich (Germany). For any questions please contact the session co-organizers Walter Irlinger or Grietje Suhr.
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What is changing and when. Post-LBK life in Central Europe

Harald Stäuble (Harald.Staeuble@lfa.sachsen.de), Landesamt für Archäologie Sachsen, Germany, Jaroslav Řídký (ridky@arup.cas.cz) and Petr Květina (kvetina@arup.cas.cz), both Archeologický ústav AV ČR, Czech Republic

This session was organized to map the present state of knowledge and ideas about the development or "archaeological invention" of the Post-LBK (Linear Pottery culture) cultures that existed during the first half of the 5th millennium BC, within the large geographical area of previous LBK territory.

Although experts have long accepted the need to talk about the diversity of the LBK, most archaeologists still understand the LBK as a homogeneous archaeological culture, with mostly similar material and structural finds. Only under this perspective can one understand that we see an increasing heterogeneity of cultures, or cultural groups, when looking at the archaeological map reflecting the post-LBK situation (Fig. 1). It is possible to recognize a number of different cultural areas, particularly on the basis of pottery decoration and vessel forms. However, when we disregard such traditional cultural divisions, we find a large number of other common and unifying elements. Striking similarities are especially observable with regard to the ground plans of the houses, but also regarding the lithic raw material and pottery production. A little later, a completely new phenomenon – circular enclosures or so-called rondels – appears in the former LBK area (Fig. 1), covering a fairly wide territory once again.
The session was divided into three thematic blocks:

1) Theoretical aspects of culture change from LBK to post-LBK.
   The first block of papers and posters was more theoretically oriented. The aim of this introduction was to confront general trends with regionally different processes. All contributions dealt with issues of cultural change, population growth and theories of cultural groups that might be just a mirror of archaeological thinking based on different scientific traditions (Alexender Gramsch; Detlef Gronenborn, Christian Lohr, and Christoph Strien; Thomas Link; František Trampota; Stefan Suhrbier; Karin Riedhammer; Florian Eibl; Vladimír Peša; Isabel Hohle, Oliver Mecking, Sonja Behrendt, and Sabine Wolfram).

2) Intra-site patterns and social complexity within the post-LBK period.
   Preliminary results of large scale rescue excavations of post-LBK sites were presented, with a special focus on the funeral practices, longhouses and also spatial relationships between structures (Peter Demján; Markéta Končelová and Petr Květina; Christiane Frirdich, Maria Cladders, Isabel Hohle, Denise Girardelli, Thomas Tischendorf, and Harald Stäuble; Pavel Burgert; Václav Vondrovsksý, Jaromír Beneš, Michaela Divišová, Lenka Kovačíková, and Petr Šída; Tereza Blažková).

3) Long-distance contact and exchange during the post-LBK period.
   The last block of our session focused on systems of lithic distribution, including a specific research question concerning Bavarian and North Bohemian raw materials (Petr Šída; Silviane Scharl). Finally, eleven papers (unfortunately, one contribution had to be cancelled) and six posters from colleagues from different parts of Germany, the Czech Republic and Slovakia were presented. We were also addressed by Ivan Pavlů and Marie Zápotocká from the Institute of Archaeology of Prague, both co-directors of the legendary Bylany site excavations and publishers of its many and varied scientific results, to join our session. In the final part of the session, Ivan Pavlů made some dynamic, bright, and diagnostic concluding remarks regarding the selection of the contributions and the general outcome of the session (Fig. 2).
In the view of the session organizers, as well as of the contributors and last, but not least, the large audience (Fig. 3) – which we thank for the intensive discussions offered – the session was very successful. All contributors were fond of the idea of publishing the results, so it was unanimously decided to embark on the difficult task of publishing the contributions of this session in a special volume of the peer-reviewed journal Anthropologie.

Last, but not least, we would also like to thank the local organizers of the EAA in Plzeň for the excellent facility, in which our session took place.
Indigenous communities in conquered landscapes

Aleks Pluskowski (on behalf of the session organizers and participants; a.g.pluskowski@reading.ac.uk)  
Department of Archaeology, University of Reading

The “Ecology of Crusading” project sponsored a session at this year’s EAA meeting in Pilsen, which focused on the impact of military conquest and colonisation on indigenous populations in various parts of the world. This was co-organized by Aleks Pluskowski (University of Reading), Heiki Valk (University of Tartu) and Maciej Karczewski (University of Białystok). The session aimed to explore the material culture and practices of indigenous communities in different regions and time periods, with two goals in mind: firstly, to explore the value of different approaches to the same topic – which in this case included both specialist and integrated perspectives – and secondly, to gauge the commonality as well as specific nuances of indigenous experiences of militant colonisation in contrasting parts of the world. The session as a whole encompassed medieval colonising and post-medieval colonial societies.

The range of papers represented multiple perspectives and methodologies, several of which had a strong ecological and landscape component. The first five papers were dedicated to the eastern Baltic region, where crusading from the end of the 12th century AD resulted in the conquest of indigenous ‘tribal’ territories, the establishment of predominantly German-speaking colonies and the imposition of Christianity and other western European cultural elements. Alex Brown (University of Reading) began with a comparative survey of the pollen data for landuse and vegetation change associated with late Iron Age and medieval societies in Prussia, Livonia-Estonia. The two regions experienced very different trends in colonisation in the pre- and post-crusade periods, and the indigenous population in Livonia and Estonia remained comparatively intact. This in turn could be linked to the variable trends in deforestation and the intensification of agrarian activities; in the crusader state of Livonia the rural population actively engaged in landscape transformation was indigenous, with the incoming political elite largely confined to towns and castles. This segregation was underlined by Martin Malve and Heiki Valk’s (University of...
Tartu) paper on infectious diseases in urban and rural areas in medieval and post-medieval Livonia. Focusing on the analysis of human remains recovered from cemetery excavations in the medieval colony of Tartu (Dorpat) and villages within its hinterland (Fig. 1), it was clear that there was both a cultural and biological difference between town and country, with a significantly higher prevalence of infectious diseases evident in Tartu’s cemeteries. This was interpreted as a product of the nucleated urban environment, a cultural feature that was only established after the conquest. But the process of urbanisation resulted in a reconfiguration of the ethno-social landscape, which is also evident from material culture and the differential treatment of the dead in urban and rural cemeteries.

The relationship between colonists and indigenous population in the eastern Baltic was not always so polarised, and many towns in the eastern Baltic supported multi-ethnic communities. Tartu itself was home to a mixture of colonists and indigenous people, but even the character of the urbanised heartland of the Livonian crusader state was influenced by – and in turn influenced – the indigenous population. Pluskowski (University of Reading) and Seetah (Stanford University) presented one aspect of this relationship: a case study of animal exploitation and butchery technology in medieval Riga, where an indigenous ‘Liv quarter’ had been identified and excavated in the south-eastern corner of the town. When compared with the castle of the Livonian Order, there was little difference in the size and type of livestock present, whilst evidence for the use of cleavers in processing carcasses in the Liv quarter demonstrated how this imported technology had been adopted by the local population. Indeed, indigenous butchers may have supplied the castle community with meat and documentary sources indicate that other groups involved in provisioning, such as fishermen, were drawn from the local population. Indeed, the establishment of Riga itself was the result of collaboration with indigenous settlements already active on the right bank of the Lower Daugava from the 12th century.

The situation in the south-eastern Baltic, in Prussia, was somewhat different to Livonia. Here, the indigenous population suffered heavy losses as a result of the sustained military incursions of the crusading period. One of the last tribal territories to be incorporated into the Teutonic Order’s theocratic state was located in the south-east corner of Prussia – a landscape of lakes, marshes and woods which today is Masuria, in north-east Poland. One site in particular represented an important tribal centre where the community appears to have survived into the later medieval period, as presented by Maciej Karczewski (University of Białystok). This consisted of a lauks (a Prussian territorial unit) that extended from the settlement at Święta Góra located on the edge of Lake Wojnowo through to the village of Staświny. Excavations in the village indicated the later medieval colony had directly replaced the earlier Prussian settlement, whilst the settlement at Święta Góra, which has yielded vast quantities of artefacts and ecofacts, continued to function at least into the crusading period (Fig. 2). The exact nature of continuation and co-existence with the incoming colonists remains to be explored in further detail.

The final paper focussing on the medieval eastern Baltic was presented by Daniel Makowiecki (University of Toruń) and considered the impact of the crusades on indigenous animal subsistence strategies in medieval Prussia and its Slavic borderlands. Several changes were observed associated with the process of colonisation: the demand for large quantities of beef to feed the mushrooming urban colonies and eventually larger forms of livestock, particularly pig and sheep, began to appear – although cattle would not change their size until the post-medieval period suggesting an element of continuation in the indigenous stock at least in Pomerania, incorporated into the Teutonic Order’s crusader state in 1309. All of these had implications for changes in the organization of the landscape clearly evident in the changing composition of fauna as well as in the palaeobotanical record, whilst wildlife biodiversity remained high in the less densely populated conquered tribal territories in eastern Prussia.

The session then moved to case studies of indigenous societies in other regions affected by conquest and colonisation, although here the relationship can be more accurately described as colonial. Angus Mol (Leiden University), speaking on behalf of the Nexus 1492/Carrib Networks and Islands projects, focussed on the period of Spanish expansion in the Caribbean from the end of the 15th through to the 17th century. Cultural encounters were framed within the context of network theory. Presenting clear diachronic shifts in networks from the pre-conquest to post-conquest period at three case study sites – El Cabbo (Dominican Republic) (Fig. 3), Chorro de Maita (Cuba) and Argyle (St. Vincent) – it was clear that indigenous Caribbean societies were flexible in their responses to the variable presence of Europeans, resulting not so much in globalized peripheries as differential, local histories of renegotiation, transformation and resistance. The nuances of these cultural encounters will be explored in significantly more detail in the coming years of these projects.
The theme of colonialism in the New World was continued by Richard Ciolek-Torello (Statistical Research Inc.), who presented a case study of several decades of work on responses to European contact within a Native American Gabrielino village in southern California, which today lies within Los Angeles. Reviewing the archaeological evidence for the prehistoric and contact-period lifestyle of the Gabrielino indicated that the authors of the ethno-historical accounts documented a culture in transition rather than its earlier pre-colonial form. There were significant changes evident amongst the Gabrielino following interaction with incoming priests and ranchers, particularly in the types of burial rites used by the indigenous population, which indicated the emergence of complex social stratification linked to the accumulation of wealth. The mission period also prompted increased contacts between neighbouring indigenous groups and the Gabrielino began to visibly interact with the Chumash. In this respect, colonialism resulted not so much in the destruction of native culture as in ethnogenesis linked to indigenous agency – the creation of new identities expressing resistance and persistence.

The final paper in the session relocated from the New World to Sabodala, Senegal, in western Africa. Gerry Wait (Nexus Heritage) presented an intriguing relationship between oral history of a period of political reorganisation and ethnically divided rule in the 18th and 19th centuries. This revolved around the story of Tobri Sidebe, a slave who gained control over local water resources and ruled for a short period before being killed on the orders of the Cissokho chief of Tomara. His descendants, historically ethnic Peul, were subsequently barred from holding chieftainships and the region came under the control of the Cissokho lineages. Local tradition associated the remains of a small settlement at Masato with Tobri Sidibe's short-lived kingship, which has been the focus of the project’s archaeological investigations. Its link with a displaced and disenfranchised ethnic group has prompted questions of how to empower local communities by making their heritage more accessible. The tangled relationship between the modern socio-ethno-political situation in the region and the past is ultimately linked to divergent conceptualisations of slavery, a practice which in Africa pre- and post-dated the European slave trade.

Fig. 2: Excavations of the Prussian settlement on Święta Góra (Poland).

Fig. 3: Excavations at El Cabo (Eastern Dominican Republic)
In summary, the session focussed on medieval and post-medi eval processes of colonisation and colonialism, with papers seeking to compare the indigenous population with the incomers through the varied lenses of a suite of archaeological and environmental data. The indigenous communities of these colonised landscapes were visible to different degrees – and of course in virtually all cases the historical sources relating to these events were produced by the conquering societies – underlining the relevance of all forms of archaeological material in providing the conquered with a voice, whether in the form of their physical remains, artefacts, buildings or their essential relationships with the surrounding landscape, its animals and vegetation.

Integrated novel applications for dietary reconstructions in prehistory

Domingo C. Salazar-García (domingo_carlos@eva.mpg.de), Cynthianne Debono Spiteri (cynthianne_spiteri@eva.mpg.de), both Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology, Leipzig, Germany, and Beatrice Demarchi (beatrice@palaeo.eu), Departments of Archaeology & Chemistry, University of York, York, UK

A broad range of biogeochemical techniques encompassing a wide array of disciplines is successfully being used to address key questions in archaeological research, including chronology, migration, trade, palaeopathology and palaeoenvironmental reconstructions. The aim of the session was to focus particularly on the developments in palaeodietary studies, which inform about population dynamics and socio-cultural characteristics of different communities over space and time. Biogeochemical techniques in particular have shown a remarkable adeptness at acquiring data from a variety of archaeological substrates, such as ceramics, lithics, textiles, sediments, plant remains, and human and animal tissues, including dental calculus. These techniques allow an intensive exploitation of archaeological material, especially organics, which are often preserved in small quantities and would otherwise not have been considered viable for analysis. The success of this approach is attested by the wide range of publications detailing the development and application of novel techniques, targeted towards answering fundamental archaeological questions. This was also reflected in the broad range of analytical methodologies presented during the session, which comprised bulk light and heavy stable isotope analysis that allows a better understanding of the composition of ancient diets, characterization of foodstuffs absorbed within ceramic vessels using lipid residue analysis, identification of protein sequences informing on dietary deficiencies, studies on microbial communities associated with the production of specific food types, and microscopic techniques used on teeth and dental calculus to recover palaeodietary information.

Isotopic analyses are nowadays at the forefront of archaeological dietary research, and indeed, we had a considerable number of contributions showcasing both traditional and novel isotopic methodologies applied to archaeology. Palaeodietary data obtained using well-established stable isotope analysis on bone collagen was presented from different time periods and regions of Eurasia. At the Late Neolithic site of Gougenheim in northeastern France, carbon and nitrogen isotope ratios showed a higher diversity of food sources being consumed by women as opposed to men, and an unexpected overall similar diet between two distinct burial subgroups. Bulk carbon and nitrogen stable isotope analysis carried out on bone collagen from individuals buried at four different Italian sites located in three different regions, but all dating to the Bronze Age, showed that food choices varied according to the local environment. A small contribution from marine protein was evident at coastal sites, and it was possible to identify the gradual expansion of C₄ plants¹ from northern to southern Italy. In medieval Central Russia, the diet of pre-Mongolian urban and rural populations was compared using carbon and nitrogen stable isotope analysis, and results showed a greater meat consumption in urban locations than in villages, where vegetables were the main dietary staples. A higher diversity in diet between males and females in rural locations was also observed. Using the same technique, a diet based on fish, reindeer and seal was identified at the medieval site of Ii Hamina in northern Finland; however, the input from the different food resources was found to vary between the different individuals studied, and also over their lifetime. One

¹ Plants in which the CO₂ is first fixed into a compound containing four carbon atoms before entering the Calvin cycle of photosynthesis; these are mainly plants adapted to more arid conditions, like maize or millet.
paper looked at the potential of using nitrogen isotopes from bone and dentine samples to detect breastfeeding and weaning in a Great Moravian population, while another study utilized the same approach on both human and animal bones to track millet consumption across the Eurasian steppe. The limitations of using nitrogen stable isotope analysis on bulk collagen to predict the relative contribution of animal and plant protein to the diet was questioned and experimentally assessed in another study. Results showed that using nitrogen isotope values obtained from specific amino acids provides a higher resolution dataset than bulk collagen, which can be influenced by offsets in the nitrogen values of the plants consumed. New software was presented (FRUITS), which applies Bayesian statistics on isotopic data to construct mixing models that quantify the proportion of different components in the diet. A novel approach introduced the potential of carrying out isotope analysis on heavy metals, namely copper, iron and zinc, and provided promising experimental proxies that were tested on plants, herbivores and carnivores from South Africa to use these elements as new palaeodiagnostic indicators.

Dairying was also a key theme in the session, in which four papers and one poster presented were directly targeted at identifying pastoral activities and the consumption of dairy products in prehistory. The onset of pastoralism has more recently been shown to coincide with the start of the Neolithic, rather than being a later development. This, combined with ongoing research into the occurrence of lactose persistence and the spread of agriculture, has pushed studies on dairying to the forefront of current research. Consequently, it is necessary to continue to improve the analytical techniques available and develop new approaches, to securely and unequivocally identify the consumption of dairy products, and potentially increase our accuracy in determining identification down to species level. Five analytical methods were showcased, each focused on identifying prehistoric evidence for dairying. A novel approach, based on the use of stable calcium isotope ratios obtained from tooth enamel in sheep molars, shows that \(^{44}/^{42}\)Ca isotope measurements could securely identify different phases of tooth development (in utero, birth and weaning), and can therefore be used in the identification of pastoral husbandry practices. The potential of studying the co-evolution of human milk use and microbes involved in fermentation processes was also explored as a viable approach to identifying the consumption of milk products. Multidisciplinary approaches using pottery use-wear analysis, ethnohistoric analogies and lipid residues were used to identify milk residues from Late Vinca settlements in Central Siberia and the Early Neolithic site of La Draga in Catalonia. Evidence for cheese production was also shown through the application of lipid residue analysis on ceramic sieves dated to Early Neolithic settlements in Central Europe, confirming their original interpretation as ‘cheese strainers’. Analysis of food crusts from Neolithic ceramic vessels in northwestern Russia using lipid residue analysis further highlighted the versatility of this technique in identifying evidence for processing animal and plant products. Results obtained by carrying out immunological tests (ELISA) on protein residues were also reported from a wide range of food products present in ceramic vessels from the Czech Republic.

Teeth and dental calculus also provide an excellent dietary archive. A presentation combining both mesowear and microwear analysis on ungulate teeth from the Middle Palaeolithic levels of Teixoneres cave (Spain) provided valuable information on ungulate behaviour, which was useful in detecting seasonal procurement of such game by hominins. Analysis of dental calculus obtained from individuals in Neolithic Iraq, and Medieval and post-Medieval Lithuania, highlighted the potential of using trapped phytoliths, starches and pollen for understanding patterns of oral hygiene, diet, food processing and craft activities. The integration of microfossil and biomolecular analyses on calculus and food residues on pottery, combined with data from a range of elemental stable isotopes from skeletal remains, is beginning to paint a clearer picture of peoples’ diet in different parts of the world – however, what about dietary deficiencies, often with pathological consequences? This issue was addressed by one of the final talks of the session, where new research presented showed that the building blocks of bone collagen can act as an archive of diet-related diseases, such as scurvy, even in the absence of visible pathological lesions on the bones themselves.

It is clear that technological and methodological advances in the last two decades have brought on a “revolution” in palaeodiagnostic reconstructions. The field is flourishing, with applications now encompassing a wide range of periods and places. We have come a long way in integrating science in archaeological research, and both disciplines have been successfully combined in research agendas, but there is still a need to strive to improve on this communication, and not let our guard down. An awareness that different traditions of archaeological theory and discourse exist at both European and world-wide level is a crucial aspect for the future development of archaeological science. Different modes of practice, training and teaching, access to equipment and resources, and different topical archaeological questions will impact...
the way scientific techniques will be used to advance knowledge of the past. This is bound to create a rich and vibrant exchange and to lead to exciting discoveries; to ensure that this happens in the shortest timescales and with maximum profit, open dialogue, engagement and integration will need to be pursued. Our session was exemplary in this respect, a showcase of novel techniques and approaches to address relevant archaeological questions, which also have great impact on present society. This impact was highlighted in the discussion that followed the presentations: a community of people, not engaged directly with archaeology, is nonetheless following the outcomes of our research very closely, because they want to know what to eat today.

An example of such an attentive audience is the Ancestral Health Society, who strive for health reform and whose purpose is “fostering interdisciplinary collaboration and translational efforts between scientists, healthcare professionals, and laypersons that study and communicate about the human ecological niche and modern health from an evolutionary perspective to develop solutions to our current health challenges. […] Modern humans suffer from numerous diseases linked to the metabolic syndrome, such as diabetes, yet these health maladies were virtually nonexistent during most of our ancestry” (http://www.ancestralhealth.org/about). The Paleo Diet movement (http://thepaleodiet.com) also prescribes eating “everyday, modern foods that mimic the food groups of our pre-agricultural, hunter-gatherer ancestors", in order to “optimize your health, minimize your risk of chronic disease, and lose weight”. Such a direct transposition of “prehistoric diet” to “everyday diet” may be fraught with misunderstandings and therefore it is our duty to ensure clear and honest communication of our findings, their meaning and the limitations of our interpretations, to the wider public.

Children in prehistoric and historic societies

Paulina Romanowicz (paulina.romanowicz@wp.pl), University of Szczecin, Poland, and Aija Vilka, University of Latvia

There is no doubt that children were present in each past society even if their presence is so poorly visible in the archaeological record. While archaeologists increasingly seem to consider this phenomenon, still archaeological data are poor. Organizing a session on children in prehistoric and historic societies we wanted to give the youngest and quietest participants of the past their rightful place among the members of their cultures. The aim of this session was to bring together ideas and data to develop a European overview of childhood and the role of a child in past societies.

The session was held on 6 September, organized by Aija Vilka and Marta Chmiel, Katarzyna Orzyłowska and Paulina Romanowicz, all from University of Szczecin. All four are PhD students working on theses related to the archaeology of childhood and children. During the session 18 papers and seven posters were presented. Authors came from various places in Europe: the Russian Federation, Germany, Denmark, Greece, Latvia, Poland, France, Croatia, Lithuania, Czech Republic, United Kingdom, Hungary, Switzerland, Italy, Slovak Republic, Romania – as well as the Republic of Korea. The presentations covered a wide array of periods, cultures, and topics, based on up-to-date methods and theories in childhood research.

The session was opened by Paulina Romanowicz. Each part was moderated by her together with Marta Chmiel and Aija Vilka. The papers were scheduled in counterchronological order, from those on the early modern period back to 500 000 years ago. Not surprisingly, most authors based their speeches on the analysis of children burials, but we were happy that some of the papers referred to artefacts and their connection with children, showing that we can research childhood not only through burials, but also in a different household objects, such as toys or flint tools, that were used and made by them.

The first papers concerned children in early modern to early middle ages. We learned about the accumulation of newborn graves in medieval burial grounds (Martin Čechura), anthropological analyses of skeletal remains from children’s graves in comparison with grave goods (Doris Gutsmiedl-Schümann), the position of children in medieval and post medieval urban society (Lene Host-Madsen), and short grave pits as a child burials' indicator (Aija Vilka). The afternoon papers concerned prehistoric children. Beginning from the invisibility of children in the Wiebark culture (Marta Chmiel), through defining the social status and communal role of children in the Sarmatian tribes (Kornel Sóskutí) and describing the sociological consequences of child’s death visible in archaeological data in the Latène Period in Switzerland (Ursina Zweifel), finishing with the analysis of biface knapping and the hypothesis that the worst products belong to children from the Acheulean (Mathieu Leroyer).
The session was accompanied by seven posters. Interesting topics here were Bell Beaker child burials and their gender identity in the light of DNA analysis (Jan Turek), the reconstruction of the social status of children based on children’s footwear found in urban environment in Vilnius compared with anthropological data (Povilas Blaževičius, Šarūnas Jatautis and Rytis Jonaitis), and finds from early modern orphanage in Altenburg (Kathrin Schäfer). The session made clear that there are similar problems concerning the study of children in the past as, for example, the relative scarcity of child burials within cemeteries, especially within prehistoric cemeteries (although Duncan Sayer in the paper about Anglo-Saxon cemeteries argued that there are actually too many child burials). This problem is discussed within numerous publications, but still no unequivocal explanation is given. The papers also showed past scholars’ careless attitude towards children and problems that aroused from it, as a lack of information on archaeological and anthropological data and children exclusion from the archaeological reconstruction of the past societies. Therefore we are happy that the number of archaeologists studying children in the past is growing. Still we feel that a lot more needs to be done to research the material manifestation of children as well as their activities and their socioeconomic presence and existence in past societies.

Salt of the Earth: an invisible past in European archaeology

Robin Brigand (robinbrigand@yahoo.fr), Marius Alexianu, Roxana Gabriela Curca, all University of Iaşi, Romania, and Olivier Weller, CNRS, Paris, France

Common salt (sodium chloride) is an invisible object for archaeological research, but the ancient texts, the history, the ethnography and our everyday life confirm that man and animal cannot live without. Salt is a primordial reference of humanity. How can archaeology, related disciplines and other sciences approximate this soluble good, this “white gold”, this invisible past? Actually, approaches include social science perspectives (like archaeology, history, philology and anthropology), natural science (geo-archaeology, palynology, anthracology) and chemical analysis. For example, in our own actual project (cf. Alexianu, Weller and Brigand 2012, 17-22) we simultaneously propose:

1. Systematic archaeological survey and excavation around the salt springs;
2. paleo-environmental analysis of pollen, charcoal and remains of soil combustion in order to evaluate the relations and the impact of salt production on the environment;
3. spatial analysis to correlate archaeological and salt resource data bases;
4. ethnographic investigations to develop different ethnoarchaeological models and enlarge the points of reference of techniques and
5. geological and chemical analyses of the salt springs and the related ceramic sherds.
This is why the salt topics vary widely: from explorations (hunting for salt), exploitation techniques, tools for exploitation and use, transport and storage containers, to human and animal feeding, food conservation, manufacture related uses (cheese, glass, silver, skin...), barter, commerce, human and animal mobility, salt resources control, conflicts, strategic value, professions related to salt exploitation and uses, etc.

All these themes already constitute a study object for a wide array of interdisciplinary archaeological approaches. The number of interdisciplinary studies is continuously increasing, because to study an universal element only with indirect archaeological visibility needs a holistic approach.

Europe is the host to some important archaeological research projects on the role of salt in prehistory or history like in Romania, Bulgaria, Austria, Germany, Spain, Great Britain or France. In the same way, extremely important research is going on in China, Japan or Mexico, as well as ethnological research in South America, Western Africa and Oceania. All this demonstrates that research centred on this theme is gaining a more and more individualized place in the totality of humanities research in the world.

The EAA session held in Pilsen, with eleven papers and one poster, has been a valuable contribution to elucidate the role and the importance of salt in past societies not only for European prehistory and antiquity but also for protohistoric Japan.

Apart from Takamune Kawashima’s presentation concerning the forms of sea salt exploitation during the transition towards the first agricultural societies in Japan, most contributions dealt with European salt resources. The richest salt springs in Europe are gathered around the Carpathians of Romania. This is why almost a third of all presentations focused on this area. Most other works presented examples from Poland, Croatia, Germany, France and England. A more general overview of salt exploitation was only given by Olivier Weller (on a global scale, using examples from New-Guinea and Mexico) and Ulrich Stockinger (central Europe). Both these researchers offer a synoptic view on various forms of salt exploitation as well as on their many archaeological expressions.

Giving visibility to more or less ancient activities such as rock salt extraction or concentration and crystallization of natural brine is still a difficult task. It requires linked perspectives, on different levels:

- **Production.** The works of Valeriu Cavruc, focussing on the “industrial” protocols of rock salt extraction in the Bronze Age of north Transylvania, are to be mentioned here as well as those – just as original – conducted by the Spanish-Polish team led by Maria Ruiz del Arbol Moro. Not only do they study a field that is still poorly documented in salt archaeology – Poland’s lowlands – but they also display original processes of brine concentration for the first centuries of our era, which so far could not be detected anywhere else (graduation towers). Finally, the ethnoarchaeological works conducted for several years by Marius Alexianu and his Franco-Romanian team in Romania’s outer piedmont allow for a better understanding of the many traditional salt uses, either solid or liquid, as well as of the many production methods. These observations matter insofar as they broaden our fields of interpretation, and as they highlight
forms of exploitation, which are hardly noticeable by the archaeologist. Olivier Weller’s approach is similar, as he sums up the various known methods, former or still in use, which aim at separating salt from its natural supports.

- **Stakes.** All presentations highlighted the socio-economical stakes linked to salt production, and more precisely the capacity of this natural resource to enhance the development of human societies. Olivier Weller, Robin Brigand, Detlef Gronenborn and Gheorghe Lazarovici insisted on the capacity of resource holders during the Neolithic period in the West of France, in Moldavia, in Hessen and in Transylvania to attract first farmers-herders, or, later, socially-valued and prestigious goods, such as Alpine jade axes in west-central Europe or copper axes in Eastern Europe. These researchers also underlined how the availability of the salt resource could lead to a dense settlement pattern, structured by important and generally fortified settlements, which were directly involved in the control of both resource and exchange networks. From this time on, salt became a symbol for the richness of the societies that exploited it and it was probably the reason for some long-distance trade.

- **Networks.** Despite these first elements, the production of salt and its trade only seemed to intensify during the Bronze Age. This is what Valeriu Cavruc showed through the existence of sites that specialized in the extraction of rock salt and were directly connect to areas with no salt resource in the Hungarian plain. Salt is part and parcel of complex exchange networks. The issue of transportation, along with that of a “Salt Road” became paramount at that time, as Gheorghe Lazarovici’s work showed, as well as Isabella Tsigarida’s paper for more recent periods. She discussed how in Great-Britain’s Roman antiquity the trade of salt increased thanks to the improvement of road transport and trade infrastructures.

As a conclusion, the benefits of this session were as follows. Various approaches allowed to apprehend an object as complex and polymorphous as salt. Archaeology (typochronology of briquetages and salt moulds, production methods, socio-economical stakes), ethnoarchaeology (characterisation of the traditional uses of salt resources), history (exchange networks, organization of the salt trade) and geography (spatial analysis, settlement patterns and salt resources, landscape archaeology) are used for a better understanding of the relations between salt and human societies. Thanks to the specific input of all these disciplines, the study of salt for older societies can be thought all over again. Only one presentation really had an ethnoarchaeological perspective, which allowed a more accurate understanding of the exchange networks and of the forms and techniques of salt production in recent prehistoric Romania. This is a necessary step, though still insufficient. More studies, in Europe and elsewhere, are required to broaden the interpretation fields of archaeologists. This is about recording a fragile and insubstantial heritage, which will have disappeared within a few years, contrary to archaeological remains.

For all these reasons, it matters that a book be published to underline the step this session has made. It would highlight the newest contributions of the past few years. This seems all the more necessary as this session followed several other meetings, started by Olivier Weller in 2002 and continued by Marius
Alexianu at Iasi University (2008, 2012; cf. Alexianu, Weller and Curca 2011; s.a. Monah et al. 2007), which allowed to stay updated with the most recent interdisciplinary research surrounding salt. It is therefore important that the main results be published by an Anglo-Saxon publisher with a broad circulation. It will also be an occasion to include contributions by researchers who could not be in Pilsen, and to gather in just one volume the presentations given in 2013 during the 7th WAC (Dead Sea, Jordan) and the 19th EAA (Pilsen, Czech Republic). The emulation that both these sessions created seems favourable for publishing the main progresses and conclusions suggested in the field of salt research.
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Nobility versus artisans?
The multiple identities of elites and “commoners” viewed through the lens of materials and technologies during the European Bronze and the Iron Ages

Alexis Gorgues (alexis.gorgues@u-bordeaux3.fr), Université de Bordeaux III, Ausonius, Maison de l’Archéologie, Bordeaux-Pessac, France, Ann Brysbaert (a.n.brysbaert@arch.leidenuniv.nl), Faculteit Archeologie, Universiteit Leiden, The Netherlands, and Barbara Armbuster (barbara.armbruster@univ-tlse2.fr), CNRS archéométallurgie, Université de Toulouse, France

With this session, we intended to reconsider the nature of the relations between members of elites and artisans in the context of the so-called highly hierarchic societies of the European Bronze and Iron ages (Fig. 1). We wanted to discuss and to challenge the often-stated idea that one social class of society, i.e. the elites, had an overwhelming control of the whole productive system. We also questioned the less explicit but not less often present supposition that elite members stayed out of the technical sphere altogether.

This strong dichotomy often understood in the social relationships of production is underpinned by the idea that elites exploited their own social networks in order to monopolize the acquisition and control of raw materials and many other aspects of production, and thus used this monopolistic control to keep the artisans in a state of economic as well as social dependency. These artisans were supposed to provide the artefacts that elite members used to display and emphasize their dominating status. As Ann Brysbaert showed during her introduction of the session, this model relied in part on earlier interpretations of the archaeology and the written records from the Mediterranean and Near Eastern societies (e.g. Zaccagnini’s 1983 enchained and imprisoned artisans, female textile slave workers at Knossos, Olivier 1987). However, more recent re-examinations of, especially, the Linear B clay tablets (e.g. Shelmerdine 2008 among many others) have shown that the social relationships between elites and artisans, in the Aegean at least, was much more complex than we used to think. Examples of certain metal smiths as high status, even elite, members of certain Mycenaean societies go against strictly vertical hierarchic relationships. These more nuanced relationships may have also been characterized
by partnerships and defence of mutual interests. Moreover, not all bronze smiths held the same status either; so even within a class of specific workers, there seemed to have been more differentiation than a homogeneous dichotomous picture would allow.

Subsequently, our speakers showed that such a complexity was indeed present 2nd and 1st millennium BC Europe. Papers were presented in chronological order, and clear thematic issues from the papers and the ensuing debate emerged.

A first block of papers dealt with the context of elaboration of artefacts specifically designed to satisfy elites’ needs, as well as with the techniques used for their production. The paper presented by Verena Leusch (along with Raiko Krauß, Ernst Pernicka, Steve Zäuner and Barbara Armbruster) “Varna, the social and technological development of the earliest metalworkers” analyzed the fascinating problem of the start of gold and copper metallurgy during the 5th millennium BC in Chalcolithic Bulgaria. The presenter showed that a growing specialization, resulting in the inception and adoption of highly sophisticated techniques such as the use of lost wax casting, accompanied the development of an elite demand focussed on ostentatious goods. A topic closely related was treated by Barbara Armbruster’s paper (with Ernst Pernicka, Maryse Blet-Lamarquand, Emilie Dubreucq, Bernard Gratuze, Verena Leusch, Thomas Hoppe, Pierre-Yves Milcent, Birgit Schorer and Roland Schwab), “Aristocracy and craftsmanship – Preliminary results from a research project on economic, social and technological perspectives in the West Hallstatt culture”. This paper focused on the earlier Iron Age gold metallurgy and its close association with the princely elites emerging in the latter part of this period. It showed the wide variety of instrumental analyses that can be employed to reconstruct the complex chaîne opératoire, which allowed the production of mainly personal ornaments in gold, and the intricate technical influences at work in the Hallstatt goldsmith’s technical environment. Alexandre Bertaud investigated in his paper “Objects to carry the warlord’s voice: the making of military communication vectors in the Late Iron Age in Western Europe” how and by whom the different kinds of wind instruments were made. He explained, furthermore, how he came to interpret these instruments as media to transmit instructions into the battlefield, thus linking the maker and user of the instruments with those in charge of the troops.
The second theme that emerged during the session was about the relation(s) between power and production. In his paper “Flaked stone tools from the open-air settlement on Mínteri (Lleida, Spain, 2100-1650 cal BC) – first results” Dioscorides Marin (with Antoni Palomo, Juan F. Gibaja, David Ortega, Natalia Alonso and Andreu Moya), showed how the study of a complex material, often ignored by prehistorians, can aid in the understanding of ancient social structures. Sanjin Mihelíc changed his announced title to develop a theoretical paper named “Using Shakespeare in archaeology – Menenius Agrippa and his belly”. In contrast to most other papers he emphasized the reality of the bias aspect in our session title by illustrating the long-lasting prominent part played by the elites in the archaeological analysis, and subsequently deconstructed this notion in order to promote a more realistic approach of Bronze Age and Iron Age societies and production systems. Emilie Dubreucq returned to the West Hallstatt domain of the late Hallstatt Iron Age, with her paper “Metal craftsmen and aristocrats in the West Hallstatt culture (630-425 BC)”. Supporting her points by case studies (e.g. Bourges, France) of the last phase of the Hallstatt culture, she showed the rise of a category of free artisans who worked for their own profit and who escaped from the direct dependency from Celtic princes that seemed to have characterized the earlier periods. Alexis Gorgues’ paper “Working for power. Highly specialized production in the Iberian world (4th-1st century BC)”, insisted on the direct involvement of elite members in aspects of the production processes, which was a crucial point for them since these activities
provided the material support necessary to build and maintain social networks, sometimes far-ranging ones (Fig. 2).

All the papers led to the conclusion that craft activities were of central concern to Bronze and Iron Age elites and were not merely a set of technical operations delegated to low rank manual workers. This belief led some of us (particularly Verena Leusch and Alexis Gorgues) to state the possibility that elite members could have taken part in the technical processes themselves, and that such elite participation may have manifested itself in production lines for which advanced technical skills were necessary, at least in some contexts. The time schedule allowed for a rich debate, animated by a lively and reactive audience. A wide range of topics were explored, from the identification of productive structures to the nature of the relations between elite “demand” and artisan’s “production offer”. Moreover, it became clear that this session had been very useful to understand the rich nature of artisans’ social differentiations, depending on the context examined (from mere manual labourers or even slaves, to people of high social rank within their society). This also expanded into a more diverse understanding of who the elites were in these same societies. Clearly, a much more nuanced mosaic of social relationships emerged, based on contextualised studies of craft activities and, as such, this session fulfilled its purpose.

To conclude the summary of a very rich session, we would like to thank all the participants and the audience. It was precisely their interaction that brought up the importance of studying material and production chains in context, thus beyond theoretical models. While this session may have allowed for artisans to be more than passive receivers of elite orders, we also felt that it is not opportune either to unanimously move in the opposite direction, i.e. see all artisans as elites themselves. Each and every case needs to be seen and studied in its own context to come to a better understanding of the rich mosaic that craft interaction socially and technically afforded. We thus look forward to explore this topic in more detail next year at the EAA Istanbul meeting.

When the potters make the story…

Laure Salanova (laure.salanova@mae.u-paris10.fr), CNRS, France, and Alison Sheridan, National Museums Scotland, UK

Pottery is the main component of many archaeological assemblages and, for over a century, it has been one of the principal tools used to define cultural identity and to characterize culture change. But the simplistic equation of ‘pots = people’ has rightly been challenged, and in the meantime a huge ethno-historic literature has grown up around the question of what technical and stylistic traditions actually mean to the people who make and use pots. Such studies indicate that several different aspects of identity can indeed be conveyed through the design and manufacture of pottery – and that there is also much more that pottery can tell us about society (e.g. through examining its uses, the organization of its production, its symbolism, its movement, etc.). These studies also make it clear that choices in the chaîne opératoire of pottery manufacture are not all, or always, determined by the function of the end product – something that was illustrated during the 17th Annual Meeting of the EEA in Oslo, in a session that focused on the link between function and ceramic technology.

Pottery clearly does have a role to play in helping us to understand the nature of society. This session posed the question: are we, as archaeologists, making the most of what pottery can tell us about its makers and users? Are we asking the right questions and using the correct approaches when we study it? Can we enhance its heuristic value? What kind of history does the study of pottery reveal to us? Various answers were proposed during the 19 oral presentations that made up the session, covering a wide chronological and geographical framework from the oldest pottery production in Africa, Asia and Europe (around 7000-6000 BC) to the Early Middle Age pottery of Prussia (12th century AD).

Broadly speaking, the papers fell into two main groups: those that highlighted methodological aspects – the chaîne opératoire of manufacture and the application of scientific analytical techniques to assess how pots had been used – and others that presented interpretative models that sought to explain aspects of ceramic traditions, or distribution patterns, in terms of identity, contacts, innovation, emulation, and other aspects of social theory. Naturally, the two groups of papers were not mutually exclusive; results of analytical work were used to provide insights into the meaning of the pottery, while ‘social’ explanations and questions informed the application of scientific techniques.
The presentations that foregrounded methodological aspects covered raw material procurement (X. Clop, M. C. Gradoli), manufacturing processes (E. Dolbunova, H. Pioffet, V. Ard, M. Karczewska), surface treatments (C. Lepère), functional analysis (J. Vieugué, L. Cramp), firing techniques (N. Frérébeau et al.), stylistic studies (E. Nurcan Yalman, N. Karul, E. Andoni, C. Szabocs et al.) and lipid analysis (L. Cramp). To take just some examples of these: the question of temper choice and surface treatment, covered by X. Clop, M. G. Gradoli, C. Lepère and V. Ard, discussed the question of which choices are guided by functional requirements and which ones by tradition, while N. Frérébeau explored the implications for firing temperature and kiln structure when using particular types of clay (e.g. calcareous clays). Regarding pot use, the presentation by L. Cramp demonstrated that for Neolithic Britain, the earliest pottery shows a clear use of dairy fat as well as meat (from cattle, sheep and pigs) and effectively no use of marine resources; the earliest that any significant use of marine resources is attested is the Iron Age, with an upswing in the Viking/Norse period.

Many of the ‘interpretative’ presentations addressed questions surrounding the earliest use of pottery in different parts of Europe and Africa, and its variability. Impressed Wares and more sophisticated painted pottery appeared in the same sites in Albania around 6000 BC (E. Andoni), and stylistic regionalization is attested from the earliest appearance of pottery in Russia, around 6200-5500 BC (E. Dolbunova). The scenario presented by E. Garcea for the ceramic assemblages from Sudan brings new ideas to consider some of these situations. Between 7000 BC and 5000 BC, the Khartoum variant defines a set of pottery found in small amounts in hunter-gatherer sites; its production is interpreted in terms of the existence of a loose network of potters, a social group producing mainly storage vessels. Around 5000-4000 BC, a break in the production is observed with the appearance of the first cooking pots; this coincides with the emergence of the pastoral economy. Functional analysis has underlined the close link between pottery and economy – and above all, diet. The application of the aforementioned lipid analysis offers one way of testing and demonstrating this connection. Animal fat, well preserved in the first vessels from southeast Europe, shows that pottery was used since the beginning for utilitarian purposes. The same categories of pots are made in Bulgaria and Greece, but the position of the vessels during the meal cooking process is different, which could explain the typological variation between the two regions (J. Vieugué).

Pottery is indeed not only a utilitarian object. Many presentations underlined the social meaning of some specific productions. N. Karul discussed the bull symbolism, frequent in the earliest pottery assemblages from Anatolia, and N. Yalman identified ritual practices at Çatalhöyük, described as transmission of some pots in symbolic contexts for the next generation as a “memory item”. Similarly, J. Baldi discussed the ‘human-ceramic entanglement’ of the mass-produced protohistoric Coba bowls, mostly found in temple contexts in northern Mesopotamia. These papers posed the question of the identity of the potters and the consumers of these special items, as in the case, for instance, of the painted vessels from the Hungarian Late Neolithic (4500-4450 BC), which are always found in specific places within tell and probably used by a particular group (K. Sebök), or the wheel-made pottery that appeared during the Iron Age in the Carpathian Basin, probably made by specialized potters (C. Czifra). This issue was also discussed by H. Pioffet in her review of the forerunners for, and comparanda of, Early Neolithic pottery in Britain and Ireland. With a much later example, M. Karczewska discussed issues of identity in her study of ‘Prussian style’, ‘Germanic style’ and ‘Slavonic style’ pottery in the Middle Ages of Prussia.

Issues of identity were also touched upon by the papers that dealt with issues of innovation and adoption, and several of these adopted an implicit or explicit ‘social theory’ approach. The influence of neighbouring groups in the adoption process of new social norms through pottery was explored in several presentations on the Mediterranean: by P. Pavuk et al. on the Bronze Age, and by W. Balco, N. Frérébeau et al. on Antiquity. In particular, the concept of ‘hybridity’ was explored by W. Balco, who differentiated between ‘hybrid’ and ‘mixed style’ as concepts, and explained the significance of the difference.

Finally, this session could have been called Interpreting diversity in pottery production, since the different approaches adopted by the presenters have all been shown to be useful, irrespective of the widely-differing contexts and geographical areas where pottery was used. Whatever the focus of the analysis, pottery remains a precious tool to help us understand the people who made and used it.
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Archaeological research in central Europe during the 20th century focussed on cemeteries, large central sites, tells and fortified settlements. In the past decades, however, a fundamental change has occurred: settlements are now rarely investigated in isolation, and a new emphasis is placed on the micro-region. This micro-regional approach is especially promising for research on the Bronze Age in central Europe, where societies created increasingly complex networks of settlements. Central Europe provides ample evidence for emergent complex societies in the Bronze Age with significant wealth differences in cemeteries, two or three-tiered settlement hierarchies, and emergent craft specialization. Emphasizing theories with top-down dynamics, researchers have thought that the regional polities linked to micro-regions were characterized by hierarchical political economies whereby elites controlled key elements of subsistence, production, exchange and distribution of specialized goods, and/or ritual knowledge. Another strand, emphasizing bottom-up dynamics, has shifted to investigating the role of everyday life in political and identity formation processes, and the role of landscapes in creating socially meaningful lives.

Understanding the use of the landscape – through subsistence, dwellings, ritual practice and any other activity – is possible only with well-designed multi-scalar research projects. The aim of our day-long session was to provide an opportunity to present relevant research results as well as methodological improvements, with an emphasis on issues like the identification of political centres, differences in settlement types and activities, political processes, the ideational aspects of landscape, mortuary
landscapes, and ritual and society in the Bronze Age of central Europe. Furthermore, our goal was to provide a forum for various American and European archaeological schools working on problems in the Central European Bronze Age to discuss their results and methods. The result was a session with 21 lectures and three posters that provided a comparison of several different micro-regions and the development of a variety of approaches including remote sensing.

A group of archaeologists working with Tim Earle has been studying the Hungarian Benta Valley since 1998. The valley lies close to the most important Hungarian Danube Valley (a major route for bronze trade) and an Early to Middle Bronze Age tell settlement, Százhalombatta-Földvár, lies at its mouth. The group presented the results of two research phases covering the Benta Valley, which can be interpreted as the hinterland of the central Százhalombatta-Földvár settlement. The Wenner-Gren Foundation sponsored an American-Hungarian-Polish research group (Tim Earle and Gabriella Kulcsár, in cooperation with Viktória Kiss, Vajk Szeverényi (Hungary), Janusz Czebreszuk, Mateusz Jaeger, Łukasz Pospieszny (Poland) and Tamás Polányi (USA)) conducted geophysical surveys, shovel tests, and household excavations in the three most important settlements of the Benta Valley during 2012 and 2013. They presented the latest results in a joint lecture. Anna Priskin presented her study of trade, manufacture and use of stone tools in the Benta.

Similar to the Benta Valley study, a second micro-regional project was started in 2010 to investigate the Kakucs area, located to the east of the Middle Hungarian Danube Valley. The ultimate goal of this research is to reconstruct the Early and Middle Bronze Age settlement system, especially looking at the role of fortification. Gabriella Kulcsár and Mateusz Jaeger introduced the results of their latest geophysical surveys and excavations in the area, at the fortified site of Kakucs-Turján. László Reményi discussed the chronological boundaries of the researched era in the light of the latest chronological results related to the Carpathian Basin.

In a joint presentation Tobias Kienlin, Klára P. Fischl and Liviu Marta talked about a new interpretation of the Bronze Age settlement structures based on their geophysical survey and site surveys results in the northern Hungarian and north-western Romanian Middle Bronze Age settlements. The paper initiated a lively debate about the importance and existence of elites in the Bronze Age of central Europe.

János Dani and Gábor Márkus covered the results of their Berettyó and Ér Valley settlement research project, which followed a similar research methodology to identify fortified centres and investigate their internal structure. Zsolt Molnár and his colleagues analyzed the macro-regional systems between the north-western Romanian Plain and the Transylvanian Plateau. In their presentation, they identified numerous political units centred on tell settlements and investigated their changes through time.

The presentation of Colin Quinn and Horia Ciuguedan on their south-western Transylvanian results has taken us into the field of network analysis. According to their preliminary results, we should look at the
settlement of this small valley within the Transylvanian landscape from a quite different perspective, emphasizing the lack of micro-regional control over copper mining.

John O’Shea’s research in the valley of the river Maros, which forms a geographical corridor between Transylvania and the Great Hungarian Plain, offers excellent data to analyze the complicated cultural relationships found here between the mountain and plain regions.

In addition to settlements, burials are also important to reconstruct the Bronze Age landscape. Three of the lectures closely focused on cemeteries. Paul Duffy and Györgyi Parditka analyzed the cemeteries in the Körös area as related to the settlements, and Tamás Polányi illustrated ways to locate and analyze with remote sensing and excavations the cemetery in Kajászó in the Vál Valley in Middle Hungary. Péter Tóth and Jozef Bátora presented their work on south-western Slovakian settlements and burials.

Viktória Kiss analyzed the elements of the settlement hierarchy systems of Transdanubia and interpreted them from the perspective of political economy, showing the existence of a settlement hierarchy suggestive of micro-regional political institutions.

Janusz Czebreszuk and Mateusz Jaeger guided us to Bruszczewo, Poland and offered insights on their research in the area, showing its connections with other sites in the micro-region and the importance of – often devastating – human impact on the prehistoric landscape. Letizia Silvestri and her colleagues announced their plans for a still forming project in Central Italy, where little is known of settlement systems except for the prehistoric use of caves, mostly for burials.

New data on the settlement structure and remote connections of the Middle and Late Bronze Age of Northern Croatia were presented by Daria Loznjak Dizdar and Sanjin Mihelić. Matija Črešnar discussed the details of the Bronze Age of north-east Slovenia and Hrvoje Kalafatić presented the latest results of his research on Late Bronze Age settlements. Klára Šabatová analyzed the connections of a central site and its wider micro-region via the everyday life of a Moravian Late Bronze Age settlement.

Based on their southern Great Hungarian Plain research, Vajk Szeverényi and his colleagues presented their results on the history of 2nd-millennium Late Bronze Age large settlement centres defined by surrounding walls.

The session was closed by Tim Earle’s lecture on ways to study property as the basis for the variable political economy of the Bronze Age.

Our session was a great opportunity to get familiar with, analyze and at the same time compare not only the research of the Carpathian Basin, but also a wider region. Several micro-regional projects are now working on similar problems and with similar methodologies, thus offering the chance to rethink earlier visions of the Central European Bronze Age. Our results will be published in an edited volume, already under arrangement.

**Chains of citations. Re-contextualization in the Viking Age**

Nanouscha Myrberg Burström (nanouscha.burstrom@ark.su.se), Department of Archaeology and Classical Studies, Stockholm University, Sweden, and Howard Williams, University of Chester, UK

**Viking Age Citations**

For Scandinavia and regions subject to Norse contact and settlement across northern and western Europe, the Viking Age heralded new patterns and processes by which material culture circulated through plunder, trade and exchange, but also through imitation, influence and adaptation. The theme of citation draws upon research into the agency and the social and mnemonic affects of material culture and monuments in instigating social change. Citation provides a useful pivot around which to consider the active reconfiguring and evocation of previous landscapes, monuments and material culture in the creation of new social and religious worlds by Viking-period communities and individuals.

There are a number of reasons for adopting the original theme of citation for the session, as an alternative to considering the cultural biography of things, monuments and landscapes, which is otherwise often investigated when approaching the phenomenon of re-contextualization. Citation helps us to think of the active roles of enmeshed networks of people and things in the emergence of creolizing cultures of the Viking Age. This network-based approach has numerous advantages in understanding socio-economic, political and religious change. Through networks linking together the Viking world, citations provided a distinctive medium for social communication, identity-creation and commemoration.
including how things and places were imitated, adapted, reinvented, depicted, denoted, displayed, combined, fragmented, recycled and/or deposited alongside the biographical emphasis upon curation and reuse. Thus, exploring citational strategies equips archaeologists with the conceptual tools to adequately understand the shifting and not always linear linkages between different artefact types and assemblages in the construction of identities and memories in the Viking world. The session, attended by a great audience, included five high-quality papers, which were arranged and presented in order to underline the different scales that citations may work on: from artefacts to monuments to landscapes.

Citations through costume
Florent Audy, Stockholm University, opened the session by considering the uses of coins in graves from the Viking town of Birka, particularly their use as pendants. He used as his example the furnished female-gendered inhumation grave, Bj 963, dated to the mid-tenth century (Fig. 1). Together with a range of other female-gendered artefacts, there were three coins of different dates and origins, one Anglo-Saxon, one Scandinavian (Ribe or Hedeby), one Carolingian. They are examples of the estimated 10,000 coin pendants included in Viking-Age Scandinavian hoards and graves. Audy saw the concept of citation as useful to understand these graves in two different ways. First, as original objects, the coin being central to the ornament, they cited their origins and the contacts and exchanges required to reach the grave. Second, coin-pendants make reference to other practices and artefacts involved in material expression in the Viking Age, integrating the coin into contemporary modes of dress and identity-formation where different types of pendants and brooches were an important feature. In his presentation, Audy clearly showed how thinking about citations adds new understandings to the practice of producing and using coin-pendants during the Viking Age.

Runic and Gaming Citations
Mark Hall, Perth Museum and Art Gallery, presented two papers in one! He began by looking at several examples of runic citation in Viking Age Scotland. For example, he considered the eighth-century Hunterston brooch and the tenth-century runes and pseudo-runes by which it was afforded a new identity and ownership (Fig. 2). The second half of Hall's paper considered the role of material culture of making citations in Viking-Age mortuary practice. He focused on the widespread use of gaming, a Northern citation of Roman gaming practices, in the context of elite networks and performance in death. The particular role of board games and their symbolic values, Hall argued, link to cosmological understandings of the creation of the world and of the links between this world and the afterlife. Hall's contribution to the session showed the value of a citational approach in enhancing and expanding on studies of the cultural biographies of things, graves and monuments.

Coining citations
Nanouschka M. Burström, Stockholm University, explored how imitations work as citations, making indexical references to previous objects and contemporary phenomena. She argued that citations possess an inherent creative power; citations make things happen and orientate things towards the future. Burström's material point of departure was Scandinavian imitations of Anglo-Saxon coins c. AD 1000 (Fig. 3). This coinage was characterized by transfer of humans, knowledge and objects and by...
original-copy relations (imitation). She argued that the imitations were citations of the English coins, intended to create links between the Scandinavian issuer and the Anglo-Saxon king as well as promoting social and economic action through the invocation of concepts such as richness, regal rights, Christian discourse, etc. Burström considered how citation links objects together, links that need maintenance through recurrence. In this repetitive process, gradual changes take place, which in the case of coins is effectuated through the shifts of dies. Significantly she suggested that die chains are materialised webs of citation, where things change while staying the ‘same’ in the sense that the change was slight enough to allow a continued understanding of what the coin’s ‘ancestry’ was. Hence, the theme of citation is important in understanding the adoption and adaption of coinage in late Viking-age Scandinavia out from its creative capacity and its social significance in a political and ideological rhetoric.

Fig. 2: The eighth-century Hunterston brooch, with tenth-century runes and pseudo-runes on its back-side (after Allen and Anderson 1903 The Early Christian Monuments of Scotland fig 28).

Fig. 3: Die chains: citing and forming chains and webs. As coins are minted, worn obverse and reverse dies are substituted for new ones modelled on the old ones. The repeated practice makes coins ‘change while staying the same’ (cf. Jones 2007, Memory and Material Culture), their content subtly altered through performance. Coin citation creates new categories by linking objects together in new ways, and new expressions through integration and transformation of iconographical models. © N. M. Burström.
Citations in stone
Howard Williams, University of Chester, looked at stone sculpture as a citational medium. For pre-Viking sculpture, it has long been recognized that sculpture was made in monastic workshops using similar forms and motifs to those found in metalwork, manuscripts and other media. This theme is, however, seldom explored for the subsequent Viking Age. Williams argued that rather than evidence of ‘influence’, skeuomorphic elements in sculpture rendered them part of a citational network; the sculpture drew upon references to a range of contemporary and past material cultures and architectures in their commemorative programme.
Williams applied this approach to tenth-century hogback stones, suggesting their commemorative power derived from a ‘network’ of citations connecting the Insular and Norse worlds. This network incorporated not only halls, boat-houses, churches and shrines but also a range of artefacts including reliquaries, caskets, riding gear, weapons, brooches and combs. While very different in size, detail and function, these items shared a similar form and ornamentation: a hall-like form framed by biting beasts. He suggested these material citations made hogbacks an effective medium for promoting elite personhood as architectonic and the tomb as an inhabited space in which the dead resided (Fig. 4).

Landscape citations
Citations of places past and the creation of place were themes in the paper of Orri Vésteinsson, University of Iceland. The argument specifically evolved around the Viking-age landscape of Iceland and how Viking colonizers used citations to create an understanding of the new natural surroundings and a feeling of ‘home’. Vésteinsson argued that generic broad concepts of landscape were cited through the working and reworking of natural places and the transformation and ‘humanising’ of Iceland’s natural environment. For example, he talked about ‘natural burial mounds’ that afforded myths linked to the dead in the Icelandic sagas (Fig. 5). Also, specific place-names had mythological associations. Vésteinsson suggested that the dispersed topography of burial location may in itself have been a means of claiming the land: a contrasting strategy to the significance of ‘formal disposal places’ so often discussed as significant in territorial claims by prehistorians. Similarly, the building of cairns, earthwork boundaries and the booths at assembly places were considered as further ways of marking and making places in a landscape of colonization, evoking imagined homelands. Throughout, non-specificity tied places together, near and far, showing the potential of networks of citation as well as of specific citations in structuring and transforming Viking Age landscapes.
The concluding discussion was interesting, intelligent and hard-hitting. Some could not see the distinction between discussions of citation and discussions of biography. The issues of intentionality and the degree of specificity of citation were also raised, so that some thought citation had to be specific, while others though it could involve multiple citations to different sources. There were also issues regarding whether the citations were original, or culminated from multiple stages in an artefact/monument/landscape’s biography. Certainly the use of citation as ‘reference to’ as opposed to ‘influenced by’ suggests a more active adaptation and this needs to be clarified and refined in its usage. As organizers, we were delighted by the popularity of the session and the strong connecting theoretical perspectives between the five presentations. Even though they were addressing very different data and different contexts – landscapes, sculpture, runic inscriptions, mortuary practice and portable artefacts – the studies together showed the power of the citational approach both in Viking-period archaeology and beyond.

Archaeological perspectives on the Thirty Years’ War

James Symonds (james.symonds@york.ac.uk), Department of Archaeology, University of York, UK, Natascha Mehler (natascha.mehler@univie.ac.at) Department of Prehistory and Historical Archaeology, University of Vienna, Austria, and Pavel Vařeka (vareka@kar.zcu.cz) Department of Archaeology, University of West Bohemia, Czech Republic

The Thirty Years’ War (1618–48), which has also been referred to as ‘the European Civil War’, began and ended in Bohemia. It is therefore fitting that this session, which aimed to share knowledge and open up new lines of archaeological inquiry into the war, took place at the EAA meeting in Plzen, in west Bohemia. The terror of this prolonged 17th century conflict has been eclipsed by the traumas of 20th century European history, but the significance and legacy of the Thirty Years’ War should not be overlooked. It is no exaggeration to say that the map of modern Europe emerged at this time, over the course of more than forty major battles, which ranged across the continent, the balance of political power shifted and the structure of modern Europe as a community of sovereign states was established. In recent years archaeological work on battlefields, shipwrecks, and destroyed villages, has generated a renewed interest in the war.
Fig. 1. The excavation of the 1621 field fortification of the Imperial army on the battlefield near Rozvadov (West Bohemia).

This well-attended full day session succeeded in examining the Thirty Years’ War and its legacies from a variety of archaeological and historical perspectives. The call for papers for this session encouraged an interdisciplinary approach and was intentionally open-ended. As a consequence, the papers that were presented in this session drew upon a wide range of sources including documentary history, historical archaeology, paleopathology, the new genetics, bioarchaeology, and landscape archaeology. The range of sources was matched by a geographical range, which saw detailed case studies from a variety of settings in northern and central Europe.

The session began with an overview of archaeological investigations on sites from the Thirty Years’ War in the Czech Republic by Václav Matoušek. This wide-ranging paper demonstrated that investigations had taken place in the early 20th century, when work had been undertaken on the site of the 1620 battle of Rakovník, and the site of the Swedish army camp dating from 1639-40 at Stará Boleslav. In the 1960s and ‘70s work was undertaken on mass graves from the first major engagement of Thirty Years’ War, the Battle of the White Mountain, which took place in the outskirts of Prague in 1620. More recent fieldwork has concentrated on upstanding field fortifications dating from 1621 at Rozvadov (Fig. 1) and on-going work is taking place on the 1647 Swedish army camp at Třebel (Fig. 2).

Kateřina Blažková, Pavel Hrnčířík, Václav Matoušek and Zdeněk Šámar then presented the results of metal detector prospection at two battlefields from the Bohemian phase of the Thirty Years War: Rakovník (1620), and Rozvadov (1621). In both cases field prospection by non-destructive inspection and topographical survey was supplemented and greatly enriched by the use of metal detectors; surface or topsoil finds were accurately surveyed and located by means of GPS. The most frequent metallic finds recovered by the metal detector surveys were leaden and ferrous projectiles of different calibres (pistol, harquebus, musket, and even field cannons or mortars).
Petr Hejhal, Aleš Knápek and Jana Mazáčková continued on the theme of the conflict in Bohemia by discussing recent archaeological excavations on Thirty Years' War sites on the Bohemian-Moravian border. The paper presented evidence from recent excavations in the Royal Town of Jihlava, in the Bohemian-Moravian Highlands. At the beginning of the Thirty Years' War Jihlava sided with the Bohemian cause, but following the defeat of Bohemian forces at the Battle of the White Mountain in 1620 the town shifted its allegiance to support the Imperial allies. Jihlava was captured by the Swedish army in March 1645, but was re-captured by the Imperial army following a siege in the autumn and winter of 1647, leaving a complex history of defences and refortifications.

The hoarding of valuable items often occurs at times of great social and economic stress; Michal Preusz considered the evidence for the intentional deposition of coins and treasures over the course of the Thirty Years' War in Bohemia and suggested that buried deposits of coins may be re-assessed as cultural assemblages that reveal a great deal about the horrors of war, and the people who were forced to endure it.

The impact of the Thirty Years' War on rural settlement in Bohemia was further assessed by Pavel Vafeka, Lukáš Holata, Petr Kočár and Libor Petr. Their work has focussed on the disruption of the rural settlement pattern in Bohemia using a variety of spatial GIS analyses. The topographic survey of five deserted villages and their hinterlands situated in woodland in western and central Bohemia has produced complete village and farm plans by means of non-destructive methods, and generated evidence of sudden disaster as recorded in the burnt horizons of excavated sites. This ‘stopped life’ perspective provides a unique opportunity for archaeology to recover closely-dated evidence for living
standards at the time of the war, while environmental archaeology shows corresponding changes in the surrounding vegetation after depopulation and village abandonment.

Moving a short distance to the west, Eike Henning Michl outlined recent archaeological research on medieval and post-medieval settlement sites in northern Bavaria, where a series of small excavations have taken place at the village of Lindelach, a deserted settlement on the eastern outskirts of Lower Franconia. Continuing on the subject of Swedish aggression in Bavaria, Gerd Riedel, and Ruth Sandner presented evidence from the fortified city of Ingolstadt, in Bavaria, one of the most important strategic points along the German Danube, where it is possible to demonstrate from archaeological evidence that military confrontation occurred, but did not result in major destruction of the city, due to a focus on other strategic aims.

The value of LIDAR data for locating field fortifications from the Thirty Years' War in Bavaria was demonstrated by the next paper, presented by Pavel Hrnčířík, which revealed a selection of field fortifications in four localities in Bavaria: Fürholz (1619), Waidhaus (1621), Zirndorf (1632), and Nördlingen (1634). The theme of warfare in Bavaria was continued by Kathrin Misterek and Alexander Lutz with their paper on the mass grave from the Battle of Alerheim (1645), where human remains from the battle were only gathered up and buried by local villagers many months after the battle.

Further afield, the movement of pilgrims from Croatia on the Holy Roman Empire's western border during the Thirty Years' War was explored by Ana Azinovic Bebek, who found that pilgrim medals excavated from 17th century graves in north-western Croatia would seem to show that Croatian soldiers were actively involved in the Thirty Years' War and that the favourite pilgrimage sites visited by Croats in the 17th century Holy Roman Empire were Mariazell, Altötting, Cologne, Taferl and Einsiedeln.

Turning to Sweden, Georg Haggrén looked at the modernization of the war industry in relation to the iron industry, finding that large new ironworks were established incorporating blast ovens and forge hammers in the 1620s and 1630s and that the organization of Swedish iron production changed as ironmaster emerged, and began to play a central role in iron production, aided by foreign specialists.

Claes B. Pettersson stressed that early modern Sweden lacked the resources to fulfil its imperial ambitions. In support of this argument archaeological evidence was presented from the strategic town of Jönköping, which contained the royal chartered factories and the large artillery fortress, which were fundamentally under-resourced and poorly defended.

Jonas Nordin traced the biography of looted objects from the Thirty Years' War, and examined how they came to be used in Sweden, putting an emphasis not only on their display, but also on the re-modelling and re-working of things. This theme was continued in the final paper, from Vesa-Pekka Herva, who discussed the rise of Renaissance/Baroque culture in Sweden and the impact of classicism as can be seen on diverse material practice, arguing that this must be understood in terms of the relational Renaissance/Baroque understandings of the world.
Museums Sheffield: better news

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

In a previous issue of TEA (34, 2010) we reported on the disastrous impact on Museums Sheffield of the financial cuts imposed by central government, not only directly through the former Museums, Libraries and Archives Council (MLA), but also indirectly via local government, which traditionally provides the major funding for regional and local museums. In addition, in the case of Sheffield, funding from the Renaissance programme for renewal of museums has come to an end meaning the loss of a number of short-term posts, and Museums Sheffield was faced with the loss of about a third of its full-time and part-time positions. So when the archaeology curator left for another post in March 2009 despite the post being the Museums’ top priority for replacement, there was simply no money for it. The museum, faced with a lack of archaeological expertise, decided it had to close down the services normally provided, which included accepting finds and archives from excavations, and also to close access to the collections it already holds, even to the original excavators. In addition South Yorkshire Archaeology Service instructed the local council not to allow excavations on their land unless proper provision was made for the deposition of finds and archive, effectively preventing excavation taking place on major sites in the city. Thus a major collection of national importance became inaccessible to researchers, including the Bateman collection, one of the four most important antiquarian collections in Britain from the 19th century.

These decisions naturally produced an angry response from archaeologists, but we had to accept that there was no short-term solution, and that we had to think in the medium to long term how to deal with problems outside our control.

What we decided to do was to set up a network of organizations with an interest in the archaeological role of Museums Sheffield under the aegis of the Sheffield-based Hunter Archaeological Society, and which included national bodies such as English Heritage and the Council for British Archaeology, the two Sheffield Universities, and professional, amateur and commercial groups working in the area; when necessary we had a meeting with the Museum staff to discuss plans and strategy. We could thus act both as a pressure group on the funders and the Museum Trust, while at the same time offering support to the museum staff.

This policy is now paying off. The main museum representative in our discussions, Kim Streets, is now Chief Executive of Museums Sheffield, and though a Social Historian by training, she is well aware of the problems of the archaeologists. In autumn 2012, Museums Sheffield was awarded Strategic Support Funding from Arts Council England (which has taken over the functions of the former MLA), and this has allowed the appointment of an archaeological curator until 2015 (Helen Harman) and a curatorial assistant. Further funding from the Monument Fellowship has supported the short-term employment of
Pauline Beswick, who had been archaeological curator for many years and whose knowledge of the collections is unparalleled. The funding has allowed her to pass on her expertise to Helen Harman and introduce Helen and the collection to colleagues throughout the region. It means that the collections are now open again for study and new material can be accepted and accessed.

It does mean that now we can start thinking in the longer term. An immediate aim will be to secure funding for the archaeological posts after 2015, but we also need to find a way of ring-fencing posts within the museum to protect key areas, of which archaeology is one. We are also looking at future projects and exhibitions, for instance celebrating in 2016 the 150th anniversary of the first article on, and definition of, ‘Celtic Art’ by the Oxford academic John Obadiah Westwood, who was born and educated in Sheffield. The future is not secure, but it is brighter!
Excursion Report
The Glory of West Bohemia

Mark A. Hall (mahall@pkc.gov.uk), Perth Museum & Art Gallery, Scotland, UK

For me one of the highlights of the EAA meetings is always the post-conference tour. Increasingly it is also becoming one of the more intimate moments away from the massive crowd of the conference (this year 1397 participants from forty-eight countries) and where a more relaxed air pervades, facilitating renewed friendships and new contacts as well as often seeing conference themes in practice. That does not mean that the tours cannot be without their disappointments – in this case (and against all our expectations that we would) that we were not actually able to get to the Vladař hill-top site (for which our appetites had also been whetted by some of the conference sessions and the displays in the West Bohemia Museum in Pilsen), only to see it in the distance from several miles away. But I do not wish to dwell on that here, rather to sing the praises of the otherwise excellent tour of sharp contrasts. The other two elements were a visit to Bečov nad Teplou and the spa town of Karlovy Vary (full of splendid 19th and early 20th century architecture). Our lead guide was Lucie Čulíková, assisted by student helper Dominika Kožešníková (who was winningly enthusiastic and knowledgeable about Karlovy Vary).

Fig. 1: The main elements of Bečov castle.

The highlight of The Glory of West Bohemia tour, for me, was the morning and lunchtime spent in Bečov nad Teplou. Our objective was the National Cultural Monument of Bečov castle and chateau (including the shrine of St Maurus). The castle occupies a prominent, rocky knoll at the end of a spur, along which the small town is spread, above the river Teplá. In a nutshell, the castle was founded in the 14th century and extended by the construction of a Renaissance palace and, in the 17th century, a Baroque palace (Fig. 1). An extensive programme of conservation and restoration is making the castle accessible to the public, with a budget of several hundred thousand Czech crowns and several years to go before completion. Current work is focussed on the 15th century castle chapel (Visitation of the Holy Mary) and residential tower and we were led around these elements by the castle guide Kateřina Rozinková, who skillfully kept us informed, together and on-schedule (Fig. 2). Much of the medieval fabric of the building has been preserved because with the development of the palaces the tower was used as an ancillary building and largely undeveloped. It also has a fantastic assortment of graffiti spanning the 16th-20th centuries (Fig. 3).
The key highlight of the tour though was accessed, in the Baroque Palace, through a sequence of locked doors and interpretive displays giving the historical and conservation background, eventually leading into the dark room and the restored glory of the reliquary of St Maurus. Maurus or Maur was a 6th century figure associated with St Benedict of Nursia. His cult was particularly popular in France and the Low Countries. From the 9th century Paris was the key centre, until the relics there were dispersed or destroyed by the French Revolution. The house-shaped shrine or reliquary (Fig. 4) was made in the early 13th century for the Benedictine abbey at Florennes (medieval Burgundy, present day Wallonia, Belgium) and to contain their corporeal relics of St Maurus, St Timothy and St John the Baptist. The casket, profusely decorated with goldwork, cameos and precious gems, exhibits a series of gilt statuettes of Christ and the Apostles, St Maurus and life scenes relating to Maurus, Timothy and John. Florennes was a casualty of the French Revolution but the reliquary was rescued and transferred to the Collegiate Church of St Gengulf, Florennes, until 1838 when it was purchased by Duke Alfred de Beaufort-Spontin. Following display in Brussels, in 1888 the Beaufort-Spontins moved the reliquary to their Czech domain of Bečov, for private devotion and display in the castle chapel. Following the end of World War II the active pro-Nazi stance of the Beaufort-Spontins caught up with them and they were forced to leave for America with little in the way of possessions. Unknown to anyone they hid the reliquary below the floor of the castle chapel, assuming they would shortly be able to return to reclaim it, but the ‘Iron Curtain’ remained firmly drawn. In 1984 an American businessman made a dubious and cryptic offer to the Czech Government, involving $250,000 in return for a hidden treasure somewhere in the Czech Republic. A twelve-month investigation ensued and on the 5 November 1985 the Czech criminal police dug through the chapel floor and found the reliquary, in its glass display cabinet. There survives some fascinating archive film of the recovery (which was a treasure hunt rather than an excavation), which is shown as part of the exhibition. Several years of research, conservation (including the development of several new techniques to resolve difficult problems) and restoration work took place culminating in its redisplay in the castle since 2002.

Fig. 2: The tour party advancing on the donjon, Bečov castle.
The visit to Bečov fitted neatly into one of the conferences key themes – on which there were several diffuse sessions –, biographical approaches to material culture. At Bečov this was expressed through the changing social dynamics captured by both the shrine of St Maurus and the changing castle structures and their correlative habitation practices (notably the profuse graffiti already referred to). The conference sessions on cultural biography provided much stimulation.

The social dynamism of the conference papers that explored megalith re-use in early medieval Spain and the chains of citation theme that unpicked some of the subtleties of Viking Age cultural consumption and politics demonstrated that the biographical approach does still have a contribution to make (not least in escaping the tyranny of original purpose). The trip to Bečov castle did the same. But the conference sessions also suggested (especially the theme of fragmentation) that there are difficulties with the approach. It may well have become too fashionable and an over-used catch-all for everything through an easy-to-apply template of “chaptered lives”. Fashionable may be the wrong word as it has been gathering momentum essentially since the work of Kopytoff, Appadurai and co. published in 1986 (The Social Life of Things). A re-assessment, a taking stock, of the value of cultural biography and a sense of how it might develop further is clearly in order.

Thank you indeed to the tour organizers and guides for a very stimulating end to the conference.
Conference report
First TAG-Turkey meeting, Ege University, Izmir

Theoretical Archaeology Group meetings, which were initiated in the UK in 1979, have been carried out in many countries since then. In autumn 2012, Fahri Dikkaya (Bilkent University) and Çiler Çilingiroğlu (Ege University) initiated TAG-Turkey and assembled the Turkish Theoretical Archaeology Group. The major aim of TAG-Turkey was determining the position of Turkish archaeology within the sphere of worldwide archaeology theories and their implementation as well as bringing interested scholars and students together in order to create a forum for discussion. Thus, it was possible to make an assessment of current archaeological practice by discussing the various political, economic, cultural and scientific contexts experienced by the group members in their research.

Following the announcement for the TAG-Turkey meetings to archaeology departments of Turkish universities, a ‘Google group’ named tagturkey was formed in order to decide on the main themes for the first TAG meeting in Turkey. In total, 69 supporters joined the group, discussing the aims and procedures of TAG-Turkey, and deciding on the main themes of the first meeting, which were:

- Archaeology and State
- Issues in Archaeological Education
- Public Archaeology
- Theoretical Approaches to Archaeological Problems

The call for papers received more than 50 answers, coming mostly from Turkish universities. The first TAG-Turkey meeting lasted for two days, and a total 45 papers were presented. Scholars, students and administrative staff from the Ministry of Culture presented 15-minute papers in two parallel sessions. Discussions were held after each presentation. The participation of students in presentations and discussions was the most promising and encouraging aspect of the first TAG-Turkey meeting.

The sessions of the meeting were organized according to the main themes. The first session opened with the keynote speaker Güneş Duru (Istanbul University), who presented his paper entitled “Archaeology: a disciplined discipline”, which explained that the current issues in Turkish archaeology derived from ingrained power relationships, which themselves were explained by historical and political context. Güneş emphasized that archaeology should put aside the focus on archaeological material and cultural history and instead, reach towards multifocal and problem-targeted archaeological practice. He also stated that for the sake of archaeological discipline, a new archaeological understanding independent of power relations with the state should be reached.

For two days the presentations were mostly focused on the relationships between archaeology and the state, public archaeology, theoretical approaches, archaeological education and cultural heritage issues. Raising some of the general issues of the presentations Mehmet Kaya Yaylalı (Ministry of Culture and Tourism) explained how archaeology began to redefine itself in Turkey and that it should be self-critical. Nezih Aytaçlar (Ege University) suggested that archaeologists should experience epistemological rupture, while Çiler Çilingiroğlu (Ege University) focused on the problematic notions that emerge when the cultural historical approach is presented and taught as the only way of doing archaeology. Özlem Çevik (University of Thrace) completed her presentation on the monotony of themes of many PhD

Fig. 1: Poster of the meeting using people depicted on Neolithic Çatalhöyük and Latmos wall paintings to represent a coming together in a dynamic way in a Turkish context.

1 Also published in Theoretical Archaeology Group (TAG) Newsletter.
theses with a question, “Does TAG-Turkey have a future?” Elif Koparal (Hittit University) discussed some revolutionary solutions to problems caused by power relations in archaeology, such as the creation of novel ways to deal with mechanisms that reproduce power relations that constrain progress and improvement of archaeological work, for example immediate action against strict vertical hierarchies in the discipline without waiting for the ‘right time’. Heval Bozbay (Dokuz Eylül University) presented a comparative assessment of Turkish and Iranian state policies concerning archaeology. Pınar Özgüner (Boston University) made an assessment of archaeology-state relations in Turkey on the basis of proceedings of annual archaeological conferences held by the Turkish Ministry of Culture.

Fig. 2: The meeting attracted many scholars and participants from around Turkey.

Fig. 3: Also many students from Ege University and elsewhere attended the meeting.

The last session was on issues concerning excavation practices. Banu Aydinoğlugil (University College London) explained the pros and cons of the ‘self-reflexive’ method employed at Çatalhöyük. Sinan Ünlüsoy (Yaşar University) emphasized the significance of employment of contract archaeologists due to the shifting circumstances of archaeological practice and large scaled building activities where the academic scholars are not enough in number. Hüseyin Cevizoğlu (Ege University) gave a presentation on the problems caused by policies affecting archaeological excavation specifically for the case of Didyma. Aytekin Erdoğan’s (Ege University) presentation was also on a specific case, and mentioned the issues that arose from the collaboration of a museum and the university at the Milas salvage excavations.

A parallel session held in another room on the first day focused on “Theoretical Approaches to Archaeological Problems”. The presentations were mostly in English and covered a wide range of subjects including Gordon Childe and postmodernism (Emilio Rodrigues Alvarez, University of Arizona), transformation of imagery in the Neolithic period (Patrycja Filipowicz, Poznań Adam Mickiewicz University), gender-based research for Anatolian prehistory (Göksenin Abdal, Istanbul University), archaeology of districts evacuated for urban transformation projects (Elizabeth Angell, Columbia University), archaeological models and terminology problems for studies dealing with “complex societies” (Fulya Dedeoğlu, Ege University), and identity problems in ancient west Anatolian art (Tuna Şare, Çanakkale 18 Mart University). While the big issues in Turkish archaeology were being discussed next door, here, theoretical archaeology as applied to case studies was being presented.

On the second day of the meeting, only one session was held and the discussion themes were focused on issues in archaeological education and public archaeology. Most of the speakers were students and the presentations were quite original and inspiring. Bartu Dinç (Istanbul University), in his presentation on academic inbreeding, questioned the strict hierarchical, controlled and authoritarian environment in which archaeology students find themselves and how it prevents the development of a critical mind. Gökhan Murat Çoban (University of Thrace) examined the syllabi of archaeology departments in a comparative manner and criticized the ‘monotype’ education system based on rote learning. He particularly protested against the low number of lessons that included theoretical approaches. Ekin Dalbudak (Istanbul University) pointed out how archaeology isolates itself from sub-disciplines, which does a disservice to archaeology. Murat Karakoç (Ankara University) emphasized how the Paleolithic period is missing from the picture in Aegean archaeology resulting from a general lack of interest in Paleolithic research in Turkey.
The session on Public Archaeology focused on archaeological publication and archaeology in the media. Onur Bütün (İthaki Press) defined archaeological publications as complicated rather than complex and explained how this created a formidable situation for people out of archaeological sphere. She also recommended that all archaeologists should read more theoretical texts for stronger bonds with the current issues in the social sciences. Berkay Dinçer’s (Ardahan University) presentation put a smile on our faces after listening about serious issues for many hours. In a very witty and humorous way, he gave us a collection of newspaper articles on archaeology and pointed out that most news items on archaeology are speculative and far from expressing real information about the archaeological projects. The last session closed with Oğuz Erdur’s (University of North Carolina) presentation, which made a critical assessment of the two days and questioned how things changed in ten years since TAP (Public Archaeology Platform) was organized by Güneş Duru a decade ago. He was hopeful that today there is a new generation of archaeologists who believe in criticizing the issues in Turkish archaeology, which lost its distinguished position as a discipline in terms of its relationship with the state. The meeting ended with a panel discussion with the participation of Kenan Yurttagül, who is a retired bureaucrat from the Ministry of Culture. Even if he criticized the meeting as group therapy for archaeologists, he also admitted how he himself is worried about the current operation of the bureaucracy in Turkey. He ended his contribution by encouraging archaeologists to get into a dialogue with the ministry and discuss the problems.

Several exhibitions also took place. In the conference room, the “Faces of Archaeology” project by Jesse W. Stephen and Colleen Morgan, which comprised portraits of archaeologists who attended the 2013 World Archaeology Congress in Amman, was exhibited. Another exhibition, entitled “Born in Anatolia-Being An Anatolian”, by Aktüel Arkeoloji, also took place in the conference room. A video installation entitled “What We Can’t See, We Can Imagine”, by Annie Danis and Erin Schneider, was displayed on a screen during the breaks between the sessions on Friday. Caricatures involving archaeology were also exhibited in the conference room for two days. The sweetest surprise was the biscuits in the shape of a hand shovel and brush – the ultimate tools of an archaeologist – offered in the tea break.

Fig. 4: Group photo taken on the second day of the meeting in front of the Faculty of Letters, Ege University.
TAG-Turkey bloggers Elizabeth Angell and Canan Çakırlar kept people informed about the meeting online via http://tag2013.wordpress.com. The reports on the impressions of the participants are also online via the TAG-Turkey website: http://tagturkey.wordpress.com.

By the end of the first TAG-Turkey meeting, the members of the national committee were elected according to the regulations of the TAG Constitution. Six members were elected from fifteen candidates by vote. The members of the first National Commitee of TAG-Turkey are Özlem Çevik, Çiler Çilingiroğlu, Güneş Duru, Kenan Eren, Elif Koparal, Coşkun Sivil (undergraduate representative) and Ahmet Uhri. In the meantime, a committee is working on the election of an executive committee for the second meeting and is encouraging a wide base of participation for TAG-Turkey. Keep on watching us!
Conference Report

Frontiers of the Iron Age – with a regional focus on Italy.
University of Cambridge, 20 – 22 September 2013

Patricia Duff (pd339@cam.ac.uk), University of Cambridge, UK

The theme of the conference was established in Simon Stoddart’s introduction which, rejecting traditional definitions of fixed borders established by nation states, focussed on the fluidity and permeability of frontiers, noting that emic views were apt to conflict with the etic. This theme permeated the conference with notable papers given by delegates, of which I can only summarise a few of those I witnessed as I moved between the parallel sessions.

Elisabett Viggiani, an anthropologist, gave a clear summary of the political situation of the Northern Ireland “Troubles” and discussed how collective narratives and memories shape identities; that socio-political borders are clearly defined and that grey areas are ignored so that political identities are emphasised. She argued that material culture is really symbolic, informing and supporting present political ideological beliefs. Boundary markers such as flags, graffiti, painted kerbs also acted to challenge outsiders; whereas memorials in centres of residential areas reflected inward beliefs, which constitute identity, aiding memory as a material trace. She noted that rebuilding had re-sculptured landscape, thus memorials acted as an external proof of the past and, in certain cases, competing narratives were used to convert a story into positive historical facts. Christopher Smith agreed that material culture reflected boundaries in people’s heads; that they were cultural and did not necessarily accord with imposed political boundaries.

Turning to frontiers in Etruria, Andrea Zifferero argued for the role of sanctuaries as possible boundary makers; while Massimiliano di Fazio supported this premise in respect of sacred woods and marginal meeting places. In accepting that the sacred presupposes organisation, he argued that the role of the sanctuary changed from pre-urban to urban times: from that of being primarily a religious centre to that of being a political landmark, a boundary between territories. People perceived cultivated lands around settlements and towns with wild places beyond. The sanctuaries offered safe-havens for meetings between neighbouring communities, developing also trade and commerce as market places.

Christopher Chippindale focussed on Rome’s northern Italian frontier with the Alps, questioning why the conquest reported by Augustus at La Turbie was delayed some 200 years after the founding of Brescia, especially while the empire had been continuously expanding elsewhere to the north, even to the British Isles; and why, when it happened, was the conquest virtually instantaneous? Using the analogy of Central-European trucks flowing through the alpine valleys on today’s motorways in unending streams, he argued that the Roman legions simply flowed through the passes, unchallenged. No organized armies came down to fight them and, indeed, no rock-art has been found depicting any scenes of mass combat. He maintained that rock art is a view of the world as people understood it and that the single combat depicted thereon could have referred to initiations into manhood, or the combat of heroes.
representing their group: the idea of mass warfare and organized armies was foreign to the alpine tribes. Thus there was no conquest in the traditional Roman sense of subjugating peoples with their legions. While occasional skirmishes may have occurred, it was not until the areas to the north became important that passes needed to be secured. This, he argued, is supported by the fact that there was no network of forts established to secure territories; by archaeological evidence of the Romanizing of houses with frescos and mosaics, long before the alleged conquest; and by the monument of La Turbie, which, unusually, omits all mention of battles, but exists simply as a list of the tribes defeated: that indeed the “conquest” of this “frontier” was simply an exercise in propaganda.

The discrepancy between the description of the location of the frontier between the Ligurians and the Etruscans, as described by classical geographers, was the subject of Mark Pearce’s discussion. In Pseudo-Skylax’s Periplous of 338 BC, the Ligurians are noted as inhabiting the land from the Rhone valley to Cap d’Antibes and, thereafter, the Etruscans all the way to Rome. This, he informed, conflicts with Strabo’s account and indeed with the archaeology. According to Strabo, the border is at the Magra river, where Tuscany now meets Liguria. The Etruscan expansion northwards can be traced archaeologically with material at Pisa, Chiavari, Genoa and as far as Marseilles. Referring to his paper arguing that the expansion of Genoa was because it provided the shortest route to the Po Valley, he noted that archaeological material showed Genoa to be firmly under Etruscan control with Ligurian settlements all around. Thus, he argued that the Etruscans, who had taken control of the sea, as far as Antibes, from the Phokaian Greeks after the battle of Alalia in 540BC, established trading emporia at several locations in Ligurian territory: so the frontier, as Pseudo-Skylax reflects, actually ran along the coastline.

In ‘Frontiers of the Mind’, Giacomo Paglietti, in a presentation dedicated to the late Lawrence Barfield, a graduate of Magdalene College, explored the possible transcendental experiences associated with sweat-baths as identified, he argues, in Sardinian Iron Age Nuragic society. Repeated structural elements of circular spaces, seating, stone basins, hearths and rectangular baths, with the aid of ethnographic comparisons, suggest that steam was produced by the sprinkling of cold water on hot stones in these confined areas. Such semi-mystical locales, he argued, allowed for the transformation of the senses, taking the mind beyond corporal and temporal frontiers.
Many other papers of merit were given discussing the permeability and fluidity of frontiers and frontier zones; some others gave a summary of finds to date on frontiers, posing questions yet to be answered. With over 120 delegates, many giving papers or posters, the conference was the largest of the series, and yet maintained the friendly discursive atmosphere of its predecessors. This was facilitated by the strict maintenance of timing and the shaping of panel discussions at the end of each session, where key figures such as Mario Torelli, Alessandro Guidì and Francesco di Gennaro played a major role. The conference was, as with the previous two held in the same location, sustained by good food, sometimes by candlelight, and supportive organization, including on this occasion a small exhibition on Umbria in the Fitzwilliam Museum, and a viewing of maps on the theme of Italy in the Old Library.

The conference organizers would like to thank (in alphabetical order), the ACE Foundation, the Cambridge Italy Network, the Faculty of Classics, Historic Scotland, the McDonald Institute, Magdalene College and the Thriplow Trust, as well as the delegates themselves, for supporting the conference in various ways. It was particularly encouraging to see a substantial number of younger and emerging scholars, often supported by bursaries.

The conference organizers now take a rest of one year while they celebrate in November 2014 the achievements of an as yet unnamed, but living, ancestor in the same hall, and complete publication of the proceedings of the three conferences that have already taken place. The recent conference will be archived at this location:
http://www.arch.cam.ac.uk/iron_age/2013/index.html
Future developments in the conference series (including progress of publication) can be followed here:
http://www.arch.cam.ac.uk/iron_age/.

Magdalene College has already been booked for the last weekend of September 2015, when the theme is likely to relate to the infrastructure of the Iron Age.
Roşia Montană protest continues

In TEA 19, 2003, we reported on an international gold mining project at Roşia Montană, Romania, and the attempts to protect the remains of Alburnus Maior, the largest ancient gold mine in Europe. The archaeological heritage was in danger of being destroyed by the project conducted by the Rosia Montana Gold Corporation (RMGC), a daughter of the Canadian firm Gabriel Resources. By the end of 2002 scholars in Romania and from all over the world had protested by signing a petition against the project. The resolution of the 13th General Assembly of ICOMOS on Roşia Montană, made on 5 December 2002, also called to prevent the destruction of this important archaeological site. In 2003 Romanian Prime Minister Adrian Nastase declared that he will not approve the mining project.

Today, Canadian mining company RMGC still plans to do mining, provoking new debate in terms of its cultural heritage impact. RMGC commissioned Oxford Archaeology, an independent archaeology and heritage company, to provide an independent review of the work that has been done to date and to comment on the future proposals. “If nothing else”, Oxford Archaeology says, “ten years of intensive fieldwork, the results of 13 major excavations, extensive investigations of a network of Roman, medieval and modern gold mines, and a vast library of project documentation [...] reveals the huge importance of cultural heritage to communities” (http://oxfordarchaeology.com/7-top-level-pages/48).

In 2011 RMGC has reached an agreement with the Romanian culture ministry to continue the project. RMGC is to grant 70 million dollars for preserving and developing the local patrimony, the ministry explained (http://rogueclassicism.com/2011/07/21/rosia-montana-gold-mine-goes-ahead-roman-site-threatened/). Meanwhile, the Roşia Montană protest gains publicity. The a group of activists from Slovakia, which have been fighting for the last eight years to save Kremnica from cyanide leaching, support the Roşia Montană protest group. Both are going to make their activities international; for example, together with Greek, Turkish and Slovakian groups they protested against cyanide mining on 20 October 2013 in London (https://www.facebook.com/events/215215885308814/). In 2009 the Roşia Montană Cultural Foundation was established as a non-governmental organization by concerned citizens from Roşia Montană and some of the leading experts in Romanian history, archeology and geology. They organize guided tours, give radio interviews and establish contacts between locals and authorities (http://rosia-montana-cultural-foundation.com). International NGO’s and activities include We love Rosia (http://weloverosia.eu/en/) and the film Rosia Montana – Town on the brink (http://www.rosiamotoana-thefilm.com/).
Announcements

Society for American Archaeology launches new digital journal

For the first time in 12 years the Society for American Archaeology (SAA) has launched a new quarterly journal, *Advances in Archaeological Practice: A Journal of the Society for American Archaeology*, now available online through the SAA website. The journal is an all-digital, peer reviewed publication consisting of original articles focused on the challenges that archaeologists face. *Advances in Archaeological Practice* delves into the business models, technology, methodology, compliance, ethics, and public engagement required for proper maintenance of the archaeological record and provides creative solutions to everyday problems in archaeology.

The first two issues of *Advances in Archaeological Practice* – August 2013 and November 2013 – are available to all at saa.org. Starting in 2014, *Advances in Archaeological Practice* will be available for a fee to non-member individual subscribers or as a benefit option for SAA members.

The Society for American Archaeology is an international organization dedicated to the research, interpretation, and protection of the archaeological heritage of the Americas. With more than 7,000 members, the SAA represents professional, student, and avocational archaeologists working in a variety of settings including government agencies, colleges and universities, museums, and the private sector.

Theoretical Archaeology Group – 35th Annual Meeting: TAG on Sea
Bournemouth, 16-18 December 2013

The 35th Annual Meeting of the Theoretical Archaeology Group (TAG) will be hosted by the Archaeology and Anthropology Group in Bournemouth University, Bournemouth, UK, between mid-day on Monday 16 December and late afternoon on Wednesday 18 December 2013.

The conference website is available at https://microsites.bournemouth.ac.uk/tag2013/ where details of registration and accommodation can be found. You can also follow the run-up to the conference and the meeting itself on:

Facebook: http://www.facebook.com/TAGO/Sea2013
Twitter: https://twitter.com/TAGOnSea2013

79th SAA Annual Meeting is looking for volunteers

The 79th Society for American Archaeology (SAA) Annual Meeting will be held in Austin, Texas, on April 23 - 27 2014. SAA is looking for volunteers to assist with all on-site meeting services. There is only one requirement for volunteering: You must be able to work a total of 8 hours (two four hour shifts). In return for your time, you will receive a free meeting registration that gives you full access to the 79th Meeting. Training will be provided through detailed and targeted manuals sent to you electronically prior to the meeting along with on-the-job instruction. If you would like to volunteer, do so before 3 February 2014: http://www.saa.org/AbouttheSociety/AnnualMeeting/VolunteerApplication/tabid/190/Default.aspx.

If you have any questions or need more information, please contact Josh Caro at josh_caro@saa.org or by phone at +1(202)559-7382.

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

20% off the listed price on all titles purchased through the Routledge website until the 31 December 2013. To validate the discount, simply enter the code EAA13 when you make your purchase. The 2013 Routledge Archaeology online catalogue (http://www.routledge.com/catalogs/archaeology/) features all new and forthcoming titles for the year.
**ShortCuts**

Hermann Müller-Karpe (1925-2013)

One of the most prominent German prehistoric archaeologists, Prof. Dr. Dr. h.c. Hermann Müller-Karpe, died on 20 September 2013 in Marburg, Germany. Müller-Karpe received his PhD in 1948, supervised by Gero von Merhart, with his dissertation on the Urnfield Culture. As professor in the Prehistory Department at the University Frankfurt he initiated the publication series “Prähistorische Bronzefunde”, a huge corpus of bronze finds, published the „Handbuch der Vorgeschichte“ (1966–1980) and developed it into a universal history of mankind, „Grundzüge der frühen Menschheitsgeschichte“ (1998).

Müller-Karpe’s main interest and the target of his academic work was a worldwide archaeology of mankind as an epitome of human historicity. He became chair of a newly formed commission for world archaeology at the German Archaeological Institute, the Kommission für Allgemeine und Vergleichende Archäologie (KAVA), in 1979. He initiated research collaboration in Peru, in West Africa, in South and East Asia, and particularly in the Eurasian steppe region, crossing Cold War barriers. As a religious person he considered religion as the most articulated expression of human wholeness, visible in the wide array of diverse, historically formed religions. In his later years he thus published monographs on the archaeology of religion, e.g. *Religionsarchäologie. Archäologische Beiträge zur Religionsgeschichte* (Frankfurt: Lembeck 2009).

Source: [http://www.dainst.org/de/node/33240?ft=43](http://www.dainst.org/de/node/33240?ft=43)

---

**Hunter-gatherers lived side by side with farmers, new excavations say**

A new report published in Science on supposed ‘parallel worlds’ in the European Neolithic aroused the interest of both national and international media. Ruth Bolongino from the University Mainz and a team of archaeologists and anthropologists state that hunter-gatherers continued to live in Central Europe for 2,000 years after the introduction of farming. Human remains from the Blätterhöhle, a cave near the town of Hagen in Germany, have been excavated and interpreted as burials. Their mitochondrial DNA was analyzed to reconstruct biological lineages. Moreover, isotopic analysis reveals differences in diet: One part of the population buried in the cave had a specialized diet based upon freshwater fish and showed typical hunter-gatherer DNA. As the Washington Post puts it: “Two new scientific techniques, ingeniously paired together, suggest that for some 2,000 years, these distinct groups refused to mesh and would rarely cross their cultural boundaries to find a mate.” For the media, the case is clear – it is a culture clash between farmer and forager, between settler and hunter, between Abel and Cain.

Joachim Burger, head of the Institut für Anthropologie of the University Mainz, explains that marriage relations existed between both groups, with female hunter-gatherers moving into farmer societies, but not the other way round.

Sources:

- [http://www.washingtonpost.com/national/health-science/stone-age-farmers-hunters-kept-their-distance/2013/10/10/59f46f12-31ab-11e3-89ae-16e186e117d8_story.html](http://www.washingtonpost.com/national/health-science/stone-age-farmers-hunters-kept-their-distance/2013/10/10/59f46f12-31ab-11e3-89ae-16e186e117d8_story.html)
- [http://www.sciencemag.org/content/342/6157/479.abstract](http://www.sciencemag.org/content/342/6157/479.abstract)
Conference Announcements

TAG-On-Sea 2013

16 – 18 December 2013
Bournemouth University, United Kingdom
http://microsites.bournemouth.ac.uk/tag2013/

The 35th Annual Conference of the Theoretical Archaeology Group will be hosted by the Archaeology and Anthropology Group in the School of Applied Sciences at Bournemouth University.

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

Czech – TAG
“The meaning of things: artefacts and narratives”

3 – 4 March 2014
University of West Bohemia in Pilsen, Czech Republic
http://czechtag.wordpress.com/

The two-day conference constitutes as the 1st meeting of the Czech national chapter of the TAG. It aims to develop a broader interest in the discussion of theoretical issues in Central European archaeological research, establish the event as an annual meeting, and potentially, to extend the national chapter to include more Central European countries in the following years.

The overarching topic will be “The meaning of things: artefacts and narratives”. The following themes outline the general focus of the conference.

1. Developing theory
2. Joining the international debate
3. Theory in practice

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

Computer Applications and Quantitative Methods in Archaeology

22 - 25 April 2014
Paris, France
http://caa2014.sciencesconf.org/

The conference will be held at the “Université Paris 1 Panthéon-Sorbonne - Institut d’art et d’archéologie”. It usually brings together hundreds of participants and takes place according to the principle of parallel sessions and workshops or roundtables. The themes of the conference are likely to include the following:

1. Field and laboratory data recording
2. Historiography
3. Ontologies and standards
4. Internet and archaeology
5. 3D Archaeology
6. AIS (Archaeological Information Systems)
7. GIS & spatial analysis
8. Mathematics and Statistics in Archaeology
9. Open source
10. Computing in Epigraphy and History
11. Multi-agent systems and complex system modelling
12. Virtual Archaeology

Acts will be published under the shape of a volume containing the best communications.

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

SAA 79th Annual Meeting

23 - 27 April 2014
Austin, Texas, USA

The preliminary programme will be posted on the web in late December 2013.

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

DECOR
Decorazione e architettura nel mondo romano

21-24 May 2014
Rome
“Sapienza” Università di Roma (Centro Interuniversitario di Studi sull’Edilizia abitativa tardoantica nel Mediterraneo), in collaborazione con Simulacra Romae

Obiettivi del convegno sono la presentazione di un panorama degli studi più recenti sull’argomento, a Roma, in Italia e nelle province, e una riflessione e un confronto sul metodo: dalla tipologia e nomenclatura, alle possibilità e limiti dell’interpretazione stilistica, al rapporto con gli spazi delle architetture, ai problemi legati alla percezione del linguaggio architettonico. Prevediamo interventi diversificati nei tempi (tra i 20 e i 10 minuti ciascuno), distribuiti nei tre giorni del convegno, e un giorno finale con visita ad un sito archeologico significativo. È prevista inoltre la presentazione di poster. Gli interventi saranno suddivisi nei seguenti argomenti:

- Tradizione ufficiali e tradizioni locali, continuità e riprese e trasformazione dei modelli
- Tecniche, officine, materiali, costo dell’architettura
- Spazi, percorsi e percezione del linguaggio architettonico
- Reimpiego e ri-attualizzazione dell’antico
- Prospettive metodologiche di ricerca

Per consentire la copertura dei costi dell’organizzazione e della pubblicazione degli interventi e dei poster, a tutti i partecipanti sarà richiesta una quota di iscrizione, che darà diritto ad uno sconto sul costo di acquisto degli atti. Le proposte di intervento dovranno essere inviate all’indirizzo mail segreteria-cisem@uniroma1.it entro il 20 dicembre 2013, corredate da un abstract di lunghezza massima di 1500 caratteri spazi inclusi. Gli abstract saranno pubblicati sul sito del convegno.

Il calendario degli interventi e delle visite sarà elaborato in seguito, anche in base alle adesioni ricevute.

IL COMITATO ORGANIZZATORE
Patrizio Pensabene; Marina Milella; Javier Domingo; Francesca Caprioli

~~~~~~~~~~~~~~
MesoLife.
A Mesolithic perspective on Alpine and neighbouring territories

11 - 14 June 2014
Selva di Cadore (Belluno, Italy)

The conference is addressed to researchers working on the Mesolithic, especially in the area extending from the Atlantic Ocean to the Mediterranean Sea and the Danube Basin, with the Alps representing its core region. The aim is to highlight adaptation dynamics to different environments both from synchronic and diachronic viewpoints, and to investigate the role played by the Alpine chain in favourable and unfavourable contacts and cultural exchanges.
Conference sessions are going to focus on peculiar aspects of Mesolithic lifeways:

1. Holocene landscapes
2. Subsistence strategies
3. Lithic, bone and other technologies
4. I vs. II Mesolithic
5. Settlement dynamics
6. Mesolithic territories

We are glad to receive abstracts for oral and poster presentations.

The official conference language is English. You can find detailed information about registration, participation fees, abstract submission, conference program, venue and post-conference field trips at our website: www.mesolife.wordpress.com. For any other information please contact us at the following email address: info.mesolife@gmail.com.
The MesoLife organizing committee:
Federica Fontana - University of Ferrara
Davide Visentin - University of Ferrara
Ursula Wierer - University of Siena

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

Culture, Climate and Environment Interactions at Prehistoric Wetland Sites.

11 - 14 June 2014
University of Bern, Switzerland

The main themes will cover: Holocene climate and environmental changes in the cultural context; impacts of climate and environmental change on humans. Holocene ecology, economy and the use of resources at prehistoric wetland sites; anthropogenic impacts on wetland environments, ecosystems and regional climate. Prehistoric wetland sites in the regional context: migration, mobility, trade and exchange.

These themes will be addressed in invited keynotes, open oral sessions and formal poster presentations.

http://www.oeschger.unibe.ch/events/conferences/cultureclimate/index_en.html

~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~
12th Annual International Conference on History & Archaeology
From Ancient to Modern

28 - 31 July 2014
Athens, Greece
http://www.atiner.gr/history.htm

La Conferencia Intercontinental de la SAA
8 - 10 de agosto de 2014, Lima, Perú

8 - 10 August 2014
Lima, Perú

In addition to the 79th SAA Meeting in Austin, Texas, 23-27 April 2014, SAA organizes an intercontinental conference in Lima. Conference language is Spanish.
Para mayor información, escriba a Barbara Arroyo, Jefe del Comité Organizador de la Conferencia Intercontinental a arroyobarbara2012@gmail.com o a Tobi Brimsek, Directora Ejecutiva de la SAA a tobi_brimsek@saa.org.

XVII UISPP Conference

1 - 7 September 2014
Burgos, Spain
http://www.burgos2014uispp.es

Important dates:
December 2013: 3rd Congress Newsletter
30 April 2014: deadline to propose oral communication and/or posters
15 May 2014: deadline to propose sessions
31 May 2014: deadline to indicate in which session you want to take part
28 August 2014: deadline for registrations
2015-2016: publication of the Sessions Proceedings

Technical information: uispp2014@viajeseci.es
Scientific information: uispp2014@fundacionatapuerca.es

3rd International Landscape Archaeology Conference

17 – 20 September 2014
Royal Netherlands Institute, Rome, Italy
www.let.vu.nl/lac2014rome

Hosted by the Royal Netherlands Institute in Rome the LAC 2014 conference will cover the following five broad themes in Landscape Archaeology: Landscape Archaeology and Contemporary Society, Integrated Approaches in Landscape Archaeology, Mediterranean Landscape Archaeology, Social Dimensions in Landscape Archaeology and Digital Landscape Archaeology.
ShowRoom

Where archaeology is made

Office of Elin Dalen, Oslo.