

pca

european journal of
postclassicalarchaeologies

volume 9/2019

SAP Società Archeologica s.r.l.

Mantova 2019

EDITORS

Gian Pietro Brogiolo (chief editor)

Alexandra Chavarría (executive editor)

ADVISORY BOARD

Martin Carver (University of York)

Matthew H. Johnson (Northwestern University of Chicago)

Giuliano Volpe (Università degli Studi di Foggia)

Marco Valenti (Università degli Studi di Siena)

ASSISTANT EDITOR

Francesca Benetti

LANGUAGE EDITOR

Rebecca Devlin (University of Louisville)

EDITORIAL BOARD

Paul Arthur (Università del Salento)

Margarita Díaz-Andreu (ICREA - Universitat de Barcelona)

José M. Martín Civeros (Universidad de Granada)

Girolamo Fiorentino (Università del Salento)

Caterina Giostra (Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore di Milano)

Susanne Hakenbeck (University of Cambridge)

Vasco La Salvia (Università degli Studi G. D'Annunzio di Chieti e Pescara)

Bastien Lefebvre (Université Toulouse - Jean Jaurès)

Alberto León (Universidad de Córdoba)

Tamara Lawit (Trinity College - University of Melbourne)

Federico Marazzi (Università degli Studi Suor Orsola Benincasa di Napoli)

Dieter Quast (Römisch-Germanisches Zentralmuseum Mainz)

Andrew Reynolds (University College London)

Mauro Rottoli (Laboratorio di archeobiologia dei Musei Civici di Como)

Colin Rynne (University College Cork)

Post-Classical Archaeologies (PCA) is an independent, international, peer-reviewed journal devoted to the communication of post-classical research. PCA publishes a variety of manuscript types, including original research, discussions and review articles. Topics of interest include all subjects that relate to the science and practice of archaeology, particularly multidisciplinary research which use specialist methodologies, such as zooarchaeology, paleobotany, archaeometallurgy, archaeometry, spatial analysis, as well as other experimental methodologies applied to the archaeology of post-classical Europe.

Submission of a manuscript implies that the work has not been published before, that it is not under consideration for publication elsewhere and that it has been approved by all co-authors. Each author must clear reproduction rights for any photos or illustration, credited to a third party that he wishes to use (including content found on the Internet). For more information about **ethics** (including plagiarism), copyright practices and guidelines please visit the web site www.postclassical.it.

PCA is published once a year in May, starting in 2011. Manuscripts should be submitted to editor@postclassical.it in accordance to the guidelines for contributors in the webpage <http://www.postclassical.it>

Post-Classical Archaeologies's manuscript **review process** is rigorous and is intended to identify the strengths and weaknesses in each submitted manuscript, to determine which manuscripts are suitable for publication, and to work with the authors to improve their manuscript prior to publication.

This journal has the option to publish in **open access**. For information please visit the web site www.postclassical.it

How to **quote**: please use "PCA" as abbreviation and "European Journal of Post-Classical Archaeologies" as full title.

Cover image: statue of Mont'e Prama (from F. Pinna with modifications).

"Post-Classical Archaeologies" is indexed in Scopus. It was approved on 2015-05-13 according to ERIH PLUS criteria for inclusion and indexed in Carhus+2018. Classified A by ANVUR (Agenzia Nazionale di Valutazione del sistema Universitario e della Ricerca).

DESIGN

Paolo Vedovetto

PUBLISHER

SAP Società Archeologica s.r.l.
Strada Fienili 39/a, 46020 Quingentole, Mantova
www.archeologica.it

Authorised by Mantua court no. 4/2011 of April 8, 2011

For subscription and all other information visit the web site www.postclassical.it

CONTENTS PAGES

EDITORIAL		5
RESEARCH - PARTICIPATORY RESEARCH IN ARCHAEOLOGY. LEGAL ISSUES AND GOOD PRACTICES		
A. Olivier	Socialising heritage: polity and praxis	9
G. Tully	Skills, ethics and approaches: an introduction to 'the basics' of participatory archaeology	35
A. Castillo Mena	Participative processes in cultural heritage management. Methodology and critical results based on experiences within the Spanish World Heritage context	61
B. Wilkins	A theory of change and evaluative framework for measuring the social impact of public participation in archaeology	77
G.P. Brogiolo, A. Chavarría Arnau	Archaeology for local communities in Northern Italy: experiences of participatory research in an adverse legal framework	101
F. Pinna	Archeologia e costruzione partecipata dell'identità locale: percorsi di archeologia di comunità in Sardegna	123
S. Thomas	Doing public participatory archaeology with "difficult" conflict heritage: experiences from Finnish Lapland and the Scottish Highlands	147
F. Benetti, C.P. Santacroce	In the public interest? Archaeological research, permits and public participation in Italy	169
K. Möller	Will they or won't they? German heritage laws, public participation and the Faro Convention	199
R. Karl	Authorities and subjects? The legal framework for public participation in Austrian archaeology	219

M. Rizner Participatory research in archaeology in Croatia: between law and practice 257

L. Delgado Anés, J.M. Martín Civantos The legal framework of cultural landscapes in Andalusia (Spain): limits and possibilities of public participation from an archaeological perspective 269

K.A. Pyburn Archaeology by, for, and about the public 291

BEYOND THE THEME

E. Zanini Trama e ordito di un territorio: un esperimento tra (micro) *Big History* e archeologia pubblica a Vignale di Maremma (Toscana) 303

C. Citter From roads to mobility. A theoretical framework and a case study to investigate the medieval connections network 325

F. Sogliani, D. Roubis The discovery of the monastic settlement of Jure Vetere (S. Giovanni in Fiore, Calabria, Italy): a multidisciplinary project of landscape archaeology 343

RETROSPECT

T. O’Keeffe The archaeology of Ireland’s long middle ages: retrospective and prospective 365

PROJECT

L. Band CITIZAN 2015-2018 and 2019-2021, a community archaeology project past and future: successes, challenges, potential solutions 399

REVIEWS

S. Rippon, *Kingdom, Civitas, and County. The Evolution of Territorial Identity in the English Landscape* - by **G.P. Brogiolo**

W. Scheidel, *The Science of Roman History: Biology, Climate, and the Future of the Past* - by **M. Fecchio**

A. Izdebski, M. Mulryan, *Environment and Society in the Long Late Antiquity* - by **M. Rottoli**

M. Marinato, *Alimentazione, salute e mobilità della popolazione in Italia settentrionale tra IV e VIII secolo. Approcci bioarcheologici* - by **P.M. De Marchi**

V. Amorós Ruiz, *El Tolmo de Minateda en la Alta Edad Media. Cerámica y Contexto* - by **J. Sarabia**

B. Lefebvre, *La formation d’un tissu urbain à Tours. De l’amphithéâtre antique au quartier canonial* - by **M.-A. Causarano**

A. Chavarría Arnau, M.-A. Causarano (eds), *La memoria culturale dell’Oltresarca trentino. Paesaggi, persone e storie di pietre* - by **V. Higgins**

EDITORIAL

*In this ninth volume of the European Journal of Post-Classical Archaeologies we publish the contributions of the Spring School held in Tenno (Trentino, Italy) in April 2018, which was devoted to the methods of "Participatory Research in Archaeology. Archaeology for the future? Legal issues and good practices". The event was generously funded by the University of Padova (call Winter-Summerschool 2017) and brought together researchers and PhD students interested in discussing the legal framework and constraints that this kind of participatory approach involves and how good practice in community projects could represent a turning point for the immediate future of archaeology. Participatory Archaeology has a similar meaning to "Community Archaeology" and both are included in the wider label of "Public Archaeology", although the terms are not at all synonymous. Community and Participatory Archaeology should not be confused with communication or education strategies, although these are also of great importance, but it takes collaboration between "professionals" and "the public" or the "audience" to a very different level. Community or Participatory Archaeology follows the now popular formulation by Gabriel Moshenska of "archaeologists working with the public" (Moshenska 2017, p. 6; reflected in this volume by Suzie Thomas at p. 149), but we would add an extra dimension in the form of a final objective of "working also **for** the public".*

An important question emerges here: what public? Does this refer to "non-professional (in the sense of archaeology) groups and individuals" who intend to be involved in research "with the goal of finding out more about archaeological heritage through participatory practices" (as suggested by Thomas)? Or should we include under this label the indifferent and those who reject the past and its heritage? This inevitably leads us to reflect on the various meanings today of communities and on which "participatory practices" are appropriate for their involvement.

These problems, in turn, lead us to reflect on the cultural policy guidelines proposed, after Second World War, by institutions on the world (UNESCO, International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN), World Bank), European (Council of Europe, European Union) and national (between principles included in the Constitutions or issued with specific acts) level. Guidelines, summarized in the contributions of Adrian Olivier and Lara Delgado Anés with José María Martín Civantos, reveal contradictory or incomplete ideas. This is not only because they have different aims – “the management of landscapes and uses of land are represented by a combination of different demands and interests linked to agriculture, forestry, livestock, conservation of nature, conservation of cultural heritage, archaeology and local populations” (Delgado Anés, Martín Civantos) – but also because they fluctuate between proposed identities (local, national or European), legislation linked to professionalism and protection from above (see the Valletta Convention) and openness to public participation (Conventions of Florence and Faro). These contradictions are reflected in the great variability of national and/or regional norms regarding the possibility of public participation in Cultural Heritage in Europe (discussed in the contributions of Francesca Benetti, Clemente Pio Santacroce for Italy, Katharina Möller for Germany, Raimund Karl for Austria, Mia Rizner for Croatia, Lara Delgado Anés, José María Martín Civantos for Andalusia in Spain). This ranges from the harshest exclusion (in Italy and Austria) to various modes of involvement, more or less open, that confirm that Europe is today a sum of states, each of which is attentive to its particular interests, even though they superficially refer to the search for a common heritage identity. Research into historical identities, pursued in the past, does not fall within the objectives of community archaeology, which highlights the multiplicity of stories that can be drawn from the infinite information we can document in a region.

Most of the contributions focus on the variegated “participatory practices” adopted in concrete projects, noting limits, methods, successes and difficulties. Projects above all try to involve public participation in all stages of the project: starting from the planning stage, continuing with real research and concluding in publication and management of the results. Different positions are, however, taken by the authors on who has or should coordinate and lead the projects so as to achieve the difficult equilibrium between bottom up and top down approaches. The result often does not reflect the “ordinary perception and needs of the communities” (Alicia Castillo Mena), which can emerge only through reflection and comparison: people need the past ... but not “our concept” (academic) of the past and the value that we as academics attribute to it”. Most papers consider the possibility of assessing the impact or results of the

projects in the territories involved, a subject to which most discussions were devoted during our week in Tenno. The importance of the subject led us to contact Brendon Wilkins to delve more deeply into the problem of evaluation. Best practice and the actual degree of satisfaction and success of a project can be assessed in relation to the effects on “archaeology and heritage, individuals, community/society” (a gradation in three levels). However, this judgment cannot be reserved for experts, but must be extended to the various components of local communities. The social impact assessment is also linked to the collection of resources, through crowd-funding and crowd sourcing, discussed by Wilkins using the example of the Bronze Age site excavation at Flag Fen, near Peterborough (UK).

The actual role assigned to the communities finally leads us to reflect on the themes, strategies and aims of the projects. Lara Band, in the Project section, offers us a good example with the well-known project CITIZAN, which from 2015-2018 involved 1000 people in the recording of coastal and intertidal sites in England which were threatened by climate change. This project, which had a notable social and media impact, was re-proposed for 2019-2021, including, in addition to recording, multiple collateral initiatives (training sessions, public presentations, websites and media activation) as are typical of participatory archaeological projects.

A systemic approach that proposes a reunification of knowledge offers a scientific justification for the “holistic” protection of heritage, and suggests an archaeology of sustainability in the context of possible economic and social uses of results, has been tested in a dozen projects in northern Italy (Gian Pietro Brogiolo, Alexandra Chavarría Arnau). Concrete objectives are able to avoid the construction of political identities, such as that described by Fabio Pinna for Sardinia, where archaeology is well-funded by the region with the political objective of creating an identity linked to the Nuragic civilization of the Iron Age.

It is also undeniable that community projects very often drag archaeologists in complex social and political environments or ethical issues linked to the kind of conflictual heritage which is involved in the project (as in Thomas' paper). Participatory projects take specialists out of the ivory tower that academia represents into a wider, in some cases unknown world, and, in the same way as stratigraphic excavation or GIS managements require specific innate qualities of the archaeologist, participatory research also requires particular skills such as being “open, friendly and effective communicators, adaptable, good listeners, able to accept varied opinions, efficient record keepers and evaluators, team workers” (Gemma Tully).

The concluding paper by K. Anne Pyburn, and which is more than a conclusion, summarizes and discusses the topics addressed in the seminar, ordering them into eight key subjects or themes: Experts versus expertise, Agents versus agency, Discovery versus interpretation, Democracy versus sovereignty, Public versus community, Education versus collaboration, Legal versus ethical, Protection versus appropriation.

The three papers of the Beyond the Theme sections are linked, in a different way, to research perspectives on past local communities. Enrico Zanini, in relation to the research conducted in Vignale (Grosseto), hopes for a "form of dialogue with the landscape" that recomposes the "wear", produced by excavation, through diachronic routes able to connect activities that are repeated over time: the "warp", understood as anthropic activity (the road, the furnaces, the vineyards), compared to the "landscape weft", dictated by the earth and water. Carlo Citter compares road networks documented in the cadastral maps of 1823 and predictive analyses using GIS (in particular cost surfaces and attractors), emphasizing continuity, starting from the Bronze Age, of the network of local connections through which peasants, merchants and owners moved in relation to a central place (and also, it should be added, in relation to places and resources). Francesca Sogliani and Dimitris Roubis present a systemic and multidisciplinary research model applied to the settlement at San Giovanni in Fiore, Calabria, including written sources, ethnoarchaeological data, photo-interpretations, geological and geopedological research based on excavations, surveys, remote sensing, geophysical surveys, pollen and botanic analysis.

Finally, in the Retrospect section dedicated this time to Ireland, Tadhg O'Keeffe not only draws the history of medieval archaeology in that country, but also addresses some issues: "identity and cultural essentialism, the concept of continuity and change, the relationship of pattern to process, the meanings of words", that emerge above all in the relationship between the native, "Gaelic-Irish" population with respect to the "colonial" castle-owning Anglo-Norman class.