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TIMETABLE AND USEFUL INFORMATION
Day 1: Monday 18\textsuperscript{th} December

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROOM</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>The Archaeology of Forgetting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>Archaeology in Poetry, Poetry and Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>Wibbly, Wobbly, Timey, Wimey... Stuff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>Writing and Re-Writing the Transitional Body: The Changing Narratives of the Ancient Dead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>Histories for Prehistory: Narrative, Scale and the Particular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>Representation and Conflict: Reconciling the Philosophy and Practice of Heritage Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>Time and Transition: The hybridization threshold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>Materiality of Time: Phenomenology and its place in archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>Animal Timekeeping: From March Hares to Donkey’s Years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Workshop:** Making Archaeological Comics (Led by Hannah Sackett and John Swogger):
13:30-15:30. Room 1.31: Note: Advanced Sign-up Required

17:00: The Antiquity Lecture, Reardon Smith Lecture Theatre, National Museum of Wales

18:30 Wine Reception, National Museum of Wales
### Day 2: Tuesday 19th December

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROOM</th>
<th>AM</th>
<th>PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>Unstuck in Time – Science Fiction, Speculative Futures and Archaeological Imaginings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>How to See Time: A Visual Culture Perspective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>Failure is Not Fatal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>Saving Time: Conservation as a Means of Preserving and Advancing Archaeological Context</td>
<td>Passage of Time and Dynamics of Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>(S-ite)rations: Memory, Forgetting and the Temporal Architecture of Space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>Parallel Worlds: Studies in Comparative European Archaeologies</td>
<td>Why do Undergraduate Students Hate Archaeological Theory? Improving Student Experiences of Learning Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>Shamans Through Time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>Stuff and Nonsense? Theory and Medieval Material Culture</td>
<td>Dykes Through Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>Archaeology, Heritage and Well-Being</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13:45: Cardiff Alumni Photograph, Main Entrance to John Percival Building

19:30: The Antiquity Quiz, Students Union

20:30: TAG Annual Party, Students Union
## Day 3: Wednesday 20th December

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROOM</th>
<th>AM</th>
<th>PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>Time and Temporality: Twenty Years on From Time, Material Culture and Being – Ways of Thinking About Narrative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>My Chemical Romance: Keeping Our Theoretical Heads in the Face of Seductive Methodological ‘Certainties’</td>
<td>Historical Foodscapes: Reconstructing Social, Political and Historical Dynamics Through Diet and Consumption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>Futures of the Past: Everyday Landscapes and the Archaeology of Anticipation</td>
<td>A Look Forward at the Study of the Mind in the Past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.69 (and Visualisation Lab)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Theorising Visualisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.01</td>
<td></td>
<td>Parsing Posthumanism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>The Past in the Past: Investigating the Significance of the Deposition of Earlier Objects in Later Contexts</td>
<td>Walking the Archaeological Walk: Walking and Thinking in Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>Periodization, Time and Fault Lines: The Fifth Century AD</td>
<td>A More Central Place: Theorising Early Medieval Wales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>Time and the Maritime: The Temporality of Coastal Zones</td>
<td>Global Perspectives on British Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>The Wind in the Willows: Employing Narrative in Environmental Archaeology</td>
<td>Temporalities Otherwise: Archaeology, Relational Ontologies and the Time of the Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13:00: National Committee Meeting, Room 5.26.
**Practical Information**

**Lunch**

Lunch is not provided. There are a number of possibilities in the immediate vicinity of the University, including:

- Hoffi Coffi (corner of Colum Road and Corbett Road)
- Kappucinos (Cathays Terrace)
- Embassy Café (Cathays Terrace)
- The Woodville (Cathays Terrace)
- Baguettes and Bagels (Senghennydd Road)
- Burrito Brothers (Senghennydd Road)
- Subway (Park Place)
- Costa Coffee (Park Place)
- Cardiff University Student’s Union (Park Place)
- 29 Park Place (Park Place)
- The Pen and Wig (Park Lane/Park Grove)
- Coffe a GoGo (St Andrews Place)
- The National Museum of Wales Café

Most University buildings have a café or sandwich shop. Hot meals are available at the Cardiff Business School and in University Main Building.

Cardiff City Centre has a wide range of shops, cafes and restaurants and is approximately a 20 minute walk from the conference venue.

**Toilets and Baby Change Facilities**

Toilets can be found on each floor of the building. Disabled toilets are available on the ground floor at the back of the café.

Baby changing facilities are available in the disabled toilet on the ground floor.

**Disabled Access**

All floors can be accessed via lift. There are two sets of lifts, both of which can be found towards the rear of the building.

**Bookstalls and Exhibitors**

Bookstalls and exhibitors can be found on the ground floor in rooms 0.01, 0.02 and 0.06.
WiFi

Details of temporary access to the Cardiff University Guest WiFi network are provided in the conference pack.

Break out Rooms

Two rooms on the 5th floor, 5.24 and 5.26, are available to delegates.

Money/Cash

Cash machines are available outside the Students Union and at the corner of Colum Road and Corbett Road.

Events

Antiquity Lecture: Gavin Lucas (University of Iceland): The Future of the Past: On archaeological eschatologies and the end of time

The lecture will begin at 17:00 in the Reardon Smith Lecture Theatre, National Museum of Wales.

Wine Reception

The reception will begin at 18:30 and will take place at the National Museum of Wales. Please note that delegates are required to register for the reception in advance. Please bring your conference badge to gain entry.

TAG Party and Antiquity Quiz

The Annual Party will begin at 20:00 on Tuesday 19th December. It will take place at Y Plas in the Cardiff University Student Union Building. The bar will be open from 19.00 and includes a special Brains Ale bar with special edition TAG ale. Please bring your conference badge to gain entry and a free first drink. Music will be provided by DJ Hippocampus (AKA Prof. John Schofield) and DJ Potboiler (AKA Duncan Brown). There will also be a performance by a Welsh Male Voice choir.

The Antiquity Quiz will take place in the same venue, beginning at 19:30.
Tea and Coffee

During coffee breaks complimentary refreshments will be available in the John Percival café (ground floor), Room 1.29 (1st Floor) and Room 4.45 (4th floor).

TAG National Committee Meeting

The TAG National Committee meeting will take place at 13:00 on Wednesday 20th December in Room 5.26.

Cardiff Alumni Photograph

We will be taking a photograph of Cardiff alumni attending TAG on Tuesday 19th December at 13:45. Meet at the main entrance to the John Percival Building (by the revolving door).

Workshops

Making Archaeological Comics (Led by Hannah Sackett and John Swogger): Monday 18th December, 13:30-15:30. Room 1.31: Note: Advanced Sign-up Required

This two-hour workshop is for anyone interested in making comics about archaeology. Starting with a short presentation, this workshop will consider ways in which archaeology can be presented and explored through comics.

The practical aspect of this workshop will focus on a single archaeological site (to be revealed on the day). All participants will work on their own plan/thumbnails/script for a comic about this site and share their different approaches with one another.

If you have already made your own archaeological comics, or are working on/planning a comic please bring along some of your work to share at the end of the session.

No drawing experience necessary

Exhibitions

Making Time: Rooms 4.43 and 4.45. Organised by Ben Hunt.
This exhibition features contemporary artists and designers who explore space, place and landscape. There is a varied array of visual mediums used in the show. It has opened up an opportunity to reflect on the temporal relationships between image specificity – making process – finite outcome – object/subject tensions.
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Session Timetable

Monday 18th December (PM)

Histories for Prehistory: Narrative, Scale and the Particular
Room 2.01

Session Organisers: Bisserka Gaydarska and Alasdair Whittle

Formal chronological modelling of radiocarbon dates in a Bayesian statistical framework has produced a series of much more precise chronologies for prehistory, as seen for instance in Gathering Time, the ERC-funded The Times of Their Lives (2012–17), and other projects. We think that the implications of this new-found ability to measure time much more precisely are profound, and should encourage ‘prehistorians’ to think in much more specific terms about the sequences of the past, and to realign their practices more closely with history. Absolute distinctions between ‘prehistory’ and history, formerly rooted in the deciding card of written records, can be challenged. Both ‘prehistory’ and history share an interest in the creation of narratives, at multiple scales, and concerns with the nature and quality of sources. Following the American historian John Lewis Gaddis in The Landscape of History, historians can be seen to work with particular generalisations embedded within narratives, rather than embed narratives within generalisations like social scientists. Contrast that with the recurrent practice in prehistory of starting with some form of general model, often generated in the first place in other disciplines such as social theory and anthropology, which is then applied in a soft or fuzzy chronological framework. There is the opportunity now, however, with better control of time, to shift to much more particularising approaches.

All this raises much to debate. There are many questions about narrative, sources, choices and combinations of scale, and what a particularising approach to ‘prehistory’ could look like after another generation of research. There are the rival claims of ‘the ontological turn’ for a more dispersed agency. Papers are invited across all these and related themes.

13:00: Alasdair Whittle: Introduction
13:20: Stella Souvatzi: Prehistory as History: Problematizing historical units and scales of analysis
13:40: Oliver Harris: Intensive Scales and Virtual Archaeology
14:00: Discussion
14:10: Coffee

14:40 Alex Bayliss: On Intensity
15:00: Kevin Kay: A Path Toward Reconciliation? Biographies, between scales, assemble history
15:40: Discussion
Values associated with heritage are multiple at any given moment. This challenge for heritage professions is made a moving target as values also change over time. Critical heritage discourse has long debated the values-based agenda, and acknowledged the impact of many factors including age, ethnicity, experience and environment. Its’ inevitable conclusions – questioning the principle of universal values, and the potentiality for conflicting perspectives – are well known, but still far from resolved in practice. These studies go hand in hand with those on diverse society. Meanwhile the language to describe society has moved from multiculturalism towards integration. Alongside the theory and politics sits practical heritage management and conservation practice, requiring real decisions based on interpretation at every level.

Four factors relevant to the debate are: (1) the presence of multiple values and its complexity in a post-modern society is indisputable; responding to values as they shift in four dimensions is a major challenge. (2) As all heritage is someone’s heritage, it potentially excludes someone else, leading to contested values. (3) Government advocates the transformative qualities of culture, heritage, and the arts, particularly in addressing inequalities (especially social and health related). (4) There is a risk of disinheritance from heritage creation and given its relationship to belonging and identity (and associated perceived links to social cohesion) addressing this remains a priority.

This session will explore how these four factors relate in an attempt to have an inclusive debate on the relationship between theory and practice. Under-pinned by the current agenda (cultural and political) of the accessibility of heritage in all its forms, it will use a combination of case studies and theoretical work to explore the issues, consider the potential of heritage to address social inequalities, and speculate on what this means for organisations that ‘decide’ (or advise on) heritage.

12:30: Linda Monckton: Heritage Values, Where are we Now? An institutional perspective
12:50: Neil Redfern: EVERYTHING IS AWESOME: How the LEGO movie helps me reconcile heritage practice, philosophy and theory
13:10: Chris Gosden and Chris Green: Using Archaeology to Understand Inequality in England Over the Last Millennium
13:30: Rebecca Lowe: Negotiating Working-Class Values in the UK Heritage Sector
13:50: Discussion

14:10: Coffee

14:40: Emma Login: From Grateful Memories to Eloquent Witnesses: War memorials in the heritage process
15:00: Natalija Ćosić and Monika Milosavljević: Contested Heritage of Srebrenica
15:20: Jonathan Last: From Place to Landscape in Heritage Discourse
15:40: John Carman: Theorising Value: Not for the faint-hearted!
16:00: Discussion
The Archaeology of Forgetting

Room 0.31

Session Organisers: Sophie Moore and Miriam Rothenberg

As time passes, we forget. In the ongoing conversation about memory and archaeology, this session frames forgetting as a productive and selective process. The act of forgetting, deliberate or otherwise, shapes which ideas persist in communities of practice. Archaeology is a discipline built around absences; we piece together our truths from a highly fragmentary material record. The concept of forgetting, analogous to that of destruction of the material record, can be constructed as both inadvertent decay and deliberate omission. Pulling apart those two types of forgetting in past and contemporary societies is a key aim of this session.

Archaeology tends to be concerned with what remains: we are afraid of losing things or allowing traces of the past to slip through the cracks. However, this is a perspective not necessarily shared with our subjects of study. Following recent ontological approaches to the past which emphasise the potential radical differences between different ways of living, we seek papers which address material absences that might be interpreted as omissions. We are interested in critically appraising whether we can identify moments of forgetting as deliberate or otherwise, and whether such omissions are archaeologically visible in prehistoric, historic, and contemporary societies. Paper submissions are encouraged to deal with topics as broad as the role of the state in forgetting, transgenerational memory and different scales of memory/forgetting, the difference between memory and knowledge of the past, and the knotty problem of how to discuss material culture which is absent from the archaeological record.

13:00: Sophie Moore and Miriam Rothenberg: Tracing Forgetful Practices: An introduction to the archaeology of forgetting
13:20: Katharina Zinn: Narratives Against Forgetting: The archaeology of unloved objects
13:40: Martyn Barber: A Few Things We’ve Forgotten about Stonehenge
14:00: Rob Hedge: Once, Twice, Three Times Forgotten: Material, myth, and memory in a Midlands city
14:20: Discussion
14:30: Coffee
15:00: Vesna Lukic and Thomas Kador: The Waster Memories of (Tsar) Nikolai II
15:20: Agni Prijatelj: Cave Burials and the Politics of Social Remembering and Forgetting
15:40: Nicolas Zorzin: Alternating Cycles of the Politics of Forgetting and Remembering the Past in Taiwan
16:00: Discussion

Archaeology in Poetry, Poetry in Archaeology

Room 0.36

Session Organisers: James Whitley and Josh Robinson

Time, and particularly the problem of the recoverability of the past in the present, has been a major theme in poetry, at least since the emergence of romanticism. In Four Quartets, T.S Eliot explores the possibility of seeing ‘time past’ through the experience of particular places. George Seferis’s The King of Asine focuses more concretely on the present-day remains of the least famous of Homer’s cities, Asine in the Argolid. Anne Carson’s work is replete with fragments from different times which are brought together and reordered, without fusing into a timeless whole.
Often it is poetry, whether that of Hölderlin or of Pindar, that provides the lens through which the remains of the past (in Heidegger’s case the sanctuary of Olympia) can be re-experienced. In some cases, the gap between time past and time present is emphasised – the past is irrecoverable and can only be experienced poetically. A radically different approach has been taken by J.H. Prynne, perhaps the most ‘difficult’ of contemporary poets writing in English, who has explored the concepts that archaeologists (ranging from Gordon Childe, to James B. Griffin and Richard Bradley) use in their interpretations of the past.

This session seeks to explore the potential of these links. What are the resources and limitations of the attempt to re-experience the past ‘poetically’? What does it mean for archaeological practices and concepts to be explored in poetry and criticism? How might archaeology best learn from and draw on the resources of poetry? What can be learned from comparative reflection on the processes and procedures of the poet, the archaeologist, and the literary critic? How do poetry and archaeology represent conflicting or complementary responses to the phenomenon of the fragment?

This session will explore the ways in which poetry and archaeology can, perhaps together, explore the relationship between time present and time past.

12:30: James Whitley and Josh Robinson: Introduction
12:40: Anastasia Stelse: The Poet as Archaeologist, The Archaeologist as Poet
13:00: James Whitley: In Cimmerian Darkness: An archaeological reading of J.H. Prynne

14:00: Coffee

14:30: Steven Hitchins: Canalchemy: A collaborative walking performance series along the Glamorganshire Canal
14:50: Erin Kavanagh: Mind the Gap: Poetry as a chronometer
15:10: Martin Locock: Scribe and Scripture: Poets’ experience of a sacred Medieval landscape
15:30: Areti Katsigianni: Iconography, Hybrid Art and Self-Portrait in H.D.’s Helen in Egypt
15:50: Josh Robinson: Excavating Poetry’s Truth-Content
16:10: Discussion

**Wibbly, Wobbly, Timey, Wimey... Stuff**

*Room 0.45*

Session Organisers: Caitlin Kitchener and Alistair Galt

Computer games, computer science, TV and films, and virtual reality have an interesting and complex relationship with archaeology and conservation. Questions on ethics, capitalism, consumption, interactions with artefacts and heritage, and presentation of the past all arise from this intersection. In what ways can games, TV, and film be used not only as a form of education, but studied in relation to their materiality and merchandise in archaeological contexts? What are the ethical and epistemological ramifications of using computer science for conservation, heritage, and archaeological practice? Is virtual reality fundamentally affecting archaeology? This session is purposefully broad to invite a range of discussion on several issues and opportunities challenging archaeology’s relationship with consumerism and the digital economy today and for the future. Papers are
welcome to explore the intersections from both theoretical and practical perspectives, with innovative methodologies being particularly appreciated.

13:00: Caitlin Kitchener and Alistair Galt: Introduction
13:10: Andrew Reinhard: eBay Phone Home: Auctioning Alamogordo’s Atari assemblage
13:30: Meghan Dennis: Looting (Digitally) for Fun and Profit
13:50: Fred Craig: Worlds.net – The Digital Ruins of an Online Chatroom
14:10: Owen Lazzari: The Gold-plated Dinosaur: What can we do to improve the public’s idea of archaeology?
14:30: Discussion

14:40 Coffee

15:10: Jake Streatfield-James: An Infernal Machine? Anticipating the future of Building Information Modelling and Archaeological Practice
15:30: Ben Price: Can 3D Reconstruction Provide Commercial Opportunities for Archaeology? An Atlantic Iron Age case study
16:10: Discussion

Animal Timekeeping: From March Hares to Donkey’s Years
Room 4.44

Session Organisers: Julia Best, Richard Madgwick and Jacqui Mulville

Animal time infiltrates many areas of modern life, from being awoken by a dawn chorus of birds, to mourning the shorter lifespans of many of our most loved animals (e.g. we often hear phrases such as “he was 84 in dog years”). It is therefore important that concepts of animal time keeping are recognised in the past, and the many forms that these can take.

Themes may include (but are not limited to) the farming year, animal biographies, hunting time, feasting and the calendar, pet lives, micro-time analyses (e.g. incremental analyses), migrations, and seasonality. The session will explore the time-related aspects of human-animal interactions and the role animals have in dictating the temporal rhythms of life. It will also discuss the different scales at which human-animal relations are permeated by issues of time.

13:00: Julia Best, Richard Madgwick and Jacqui Mulville: Introduction
13:10: Matty Holmes: Sign of the Times – 1500 years of cultural change reflected in the human-animal relationship
13:30: Julia Best: Winging Away Time: The seasonality of birds in Scottish and North Atlantic islands
13:50: Richard Madgwick: Time for a Feast? Considering approaches to the temporality of feasting in later prehistoric Britain
14:10: Thor McVeigh: Timing is Everything: The structure of Neolithic-Bronze Age calendars in the British Isles, a theoretical framework
14:30: Discussion

14:45: Coffee
Periods of transition are recognizable archaeologically for their jarring nature. These periods offer unique insights into conceptions of culture and community as individual and group identities respond and adapt. Particularly interesting are those transitions that occur through contact between different cultures. These connections result in new practices as identities are renegotiated in response to new cultural influences. Limited or isolated changes within a culture due to a small migrations, trade, raiding, or other forms of cultural transmission are visible as well. Archaeologically, the study of transitional periods has been examined within culturally specific contexts. Our studies look beyond the appearance of foreign imports to the production of new materials by drawing from both contexts, resulting in those changes that we identify as markers of cultural transition. This session will explore when transitions appear with a particular interest in the hybridity threshold and the cultural intimacies necessary for hybrid materials to be persistent in the archaeological record. Transitional materials are easily identified when they change dramatically and quickly. However, when there is subtle change resulting from persistent culture contact, how do archaeologists parse out the motivations and negotiations behind the hybridized forms? Differentiating between the causes of change is vital to understanding the nature of transitional phases. This session aims to deal with both the process of transition and the nature of culture contact and exchange that precipitates these liminal periods of hybridization.
Materiality of Time: Phenomenology and its Place in Archaeology

Room 3.62

Session Organisers: Donald Crystal and Stefan Schmidt

In the past two decades, phenomenology has enjoyed its use within archaeological theory. This vein of inquiry saw its most fruitful deployment within the archaeology of Neolithic Britain during the mid to late 90s. Yet, since its translation into archaeological practice, the question of time has seldom been addressed within the wider archaeological-phenomenological debate. The concept of time is, however, widely discussed within philosophical phenomenology. Philosophically, it provides a framework for understanding the merits of corporeally ‘being-there’ and the creation of place through human praxis. The marginalisation of time (both modern and ancient perception of it) in archaeological theory is arguably a misinterpretation and distortion of philosophical phenomenology by archaeologists. Time is the axiom which all actions obey, yet the experience of time is subject to our consciousness as well as to our corporeal experience. In a sense, a reassessment of the relevancy of phenomenology and time in archaeology seeks to place human existential experience back into the human past. There shall be two main focuses within the session: The first will be on the link between time and “geographical experience,” which describes the reciprocal process of human-environment interactions; the second will seek to demonstrate the interconnectedness between, what Ricoeur (1985) termed cosmological and phenomenological aspects of time, using archaeology.

Overall, the session invites papers which cover at least two of its three aims:
1) To reconcile the concept of time in archaeology with its continental philosophical roots;
2) To re-evaluate and renew dated arguments surrounding phenomenology in archaeology;
3) And to demonstrate the merits of phenomenology in supporting archaeological narratives which consider a broader range of past lived experiences.

12:45: Donald Crystal and Steffan Schmidt: Introduction
12:55: Stefan Schmidt: Materiality of Time and Temporality of Place
13:15: Donald Crystal: Postphenomenology and Time
13:35: Jack Robert Coopey: Hourglass Dawns
14:15: Discussion

14:30: Coffee

15:00: Andrew Watson: Phenomenology in the Present Day: Can it really enhance the archaeological record?
15:20: Ana G. San-Martin: Times the Living Make the Dead Live
15:40: David Fine: Against Instance: Proposing a radical epistemology of times
16:00: Discussion
Writing and Rewriting the Transitional Body: The Changing Narratives of the Ancient Dead

Room: 1.69

Organisers: Michelle Scott and Emma Tolleffsen

The physical remains of the human body have long been a source of curiosity, particularly the ‘transitional’ body; mummies, bog bodies, and even shrunken heads occupy a space somewhere between the living and the dead, and narratives that surround these bodies, be they ancient or modern, historical or mythical, academic or fictional, have become layered and entangled over time and space.

As early as the fifth century BCE, Herodotus already portrayed the Egyptian mummy as both sexualised and commodified. Likewise, as a mainstay of the Early Modern Cabinet of Curiosities, the mummy’s exotic ‘Otherness’ was to have a lasting impact on its interpretation. Academic interest in Egyptology at the end of the nineteenth century saw the mummy become a sociable body with a recoverable history, which in turn provided the potential for fictionalisation. The animated corpse of the gothic novel became at once decontextualized and eroticised, and now the scientific gaze of the twenty-first century virtually unwraps the mummy, narrating experience through pathology.

In this way, the human body is an archive of its experiences (in life and death): its deposition and its discovery, interpretation, storage and display. Each process has become abstracted into both written and visual language, which means that the body of the ancient dead is already transformed within the imagination at the point of each of our individual encounters.

With a focus on the changing narratives over time, and using the idea of writing in its broadest sense, this session invites papers that take a new and creative approach to the epistemologies surrounding the transitional body; weaving discourses, including those of personhood, gender, power and identity, together with the writings about, upon, and by the human body.

13:00: Michelle Scott and Emma Tolleffsen: Introduction
13:10: Sarah M. Schwarz: Middle Palaeolithic Mourners: Development of Neanderthal mortuary practices and structured responses to death
13:30: Katarzyna Harabasz: A Powerful Dead: Decapitation and plastering of human skulls at the Ancient Near East
13:50: Savanah Ebony Fahmy-Fryer: Tattooed Women of Ancient Egypt: Inscribing power and protection upon the body
14:10: Discussion
14:20: Coffee
14:50: Karina Croucher, Lindsey Büster, Jennifer Dayes, Laura Green and Christina Faull: Continuing Bonds and the Ancient Dead
15:10: Howard Williams: Writing and Rewriting with the Cathedral Dead
15:30: Rebecca Horne and Jennifer Cockitt: Conversations with a Mummy
15:50: Eleanor Dobson: Sleeping Beauties: Mummies and the fairy tale genre at the Fin de Siècle
16:10: Discussion
The Antiquity Lecture

Reardon Smith Lecture Theatre, National Museum of Wales, 17:00

Gavin Lucas (University of Iceland): The Future of the Past: On archaeological eschatologies and the end of time

In this talk, I want to explore the idea of endings and their relation to conceptions of the future. Archaeological narratives have often been characterized in terms of origin stories, quests for the beginnings of things, like agriculture or inequality. Such narratives accentuate the role of archaeology as a discipline which looks back – indeed, it is most commonly defined as a discipline concerned with the past. Although we are all well-versed in the need to see how the past and present cannot be separated, less acknowledged is the status of the future and its connection to the past – although in recent years, several archaeologists have begun to draw our attention to this issue. I would like to add to this emerging discussion and reflect on how past futures might be incorporated into our archaeology and how the idea of the future relates to concepts of endings and more broadly, the temporal horizons within which archaeology operates.
Tuesday 19th December (All Day Sessions)

(S-ite)rations: Memory, Forgetting and the Temporal Architecture of Place
Room 2.01

Session Organisers: Emily Banfield and Philip Hughes

Sponsored by Archaeopress

Place is constructed through located practice; through ongoing engagement, it is in a constant state of becoming. Place presents and draws together multiple temporalities, allowing the emergence of conceptions, articulations and subversions of temporal rhythms.

The significance of place as a locus for creating temporal consciousness and multiple temporalities has informed the development of diverse conceptual frameworks such as ‘the past in the past’ (Bradley and Williams 1998), social memory (Jones 2007), and residues (Lucas 2012). Recent discourse situated within a broadly new materialist agenda argues for the entanglement of phenomena in an unfolding web of becoming (Hodder 2012; Fowler 2013; Olsen 2012). These perspectives enable the development of different, more nuanced understandings of the relationships between place and time. Place and material remains are memory-making works that simultaneously reference the past, make sense of the present, and permit projections into the future. But the emergence of place is not limited to (re)active construction; the significance of pause (McFadyen 2006), anthropogenic hiatus, and active forgetting are also significant. Indeed, the affective qualities of ruination, absence, and forgetting are emerging as important areas of research (Olsen and Pétursdóttir 2014).

In this session, we will explore these themes further. We invite papers that consider and problematize the ways in which place and situated memory produce, and are products of, different temporalities, and encourage contributions from practitioners working across all time periods. We are interested in examining ideas including but not limited to:

• The role of place in the emergence and maintenance of a sense of past
• The co-constitutional nature of time and place, building on notions of architecture as performance
• Place as a convergence of multi-temporal practices
• The intersections of remembering and forgetting through situated practice
• Memory, place, and the creation and maintenance of identities
• Ideological appropriation of place
09:30: Emily Banfield and Philip Hughes: (S-ite)rations: Memory, forgetting and the temporal architecture of place
10:10: Zena Kamash: The Palmyra Arch: Places, memories and ideologies
10:30: John Ertl: Reconstructions in Ruins: The practice of building and dismantling contemporary prehistoric dwellings in Japan
10:50: Discussion

11:00: Coffee

11:30: Stine Urke Brunstad: Rune Stones, Graves and Places: Viking Age commemorative practice through text and context
11:50: Isobel Wisher: Beyond the Functional: Palimpsests of memory and the significance of place in Middle Palaeolithic occupations
12:10: Darrell J. Rohl: Archaeology, Place Theory, and Process Philosophy
12:30: Steve Dickinson: Cathedrals of the Neolithic?
12:50: Discussion

13:00: Lunch

14:15: Laurence Ferland: On the Edges: Boundaries as places
14:35: Erin Kavanagh: Scaling Ideological Time
14:55: Liisa Kunnas-Pusa: Giants’ churches: Stone Age megastructures as multi-temporal architecture
15:15: Discussion
15:25: Coffee

15:55: Monica Bouso: Setting the Place for Ancestors
16:15: Mari Arentz Østmo: Sitations of the Near and Distant Past as Maintenance of Regional Identities
16:35: Richard Bradley: Commemoration and change: Remembering what may not have happened
16:55: Discussant: Lesley McFadyen

Unstuck in Time – Science Fiction, Speculative Futures and Archaeological Imaginings
Room: 0.31

Organisers: Penelope Foreman and Florence Smith Nicholls

Science fiction and archaeology are a classic combination in popular culture – long before Indiana Jones’ Nazi foes unleashed the forces within the Ark of the Covenant there were dire consequences for investigating the Mountains of Madness, perils of unleashing demonic forces at the Devil’s Hump, and cautions on the limitations of anthro-centric interpretations in the classic novel Rogue Moon.

Archaeology and science fiction make such comfortable bedfellows because of their common interest on constructing interpretations of human worlds – past, present, future, sideways – that are consciously and unconsciously mirrors of the present cultural and social mores, mired in the existing political and sociological constructs governing society. Both are mirrors for society’s ills and achievements, its hopes and dreams. Archaeologists construct pasts of human achievement, drive, ingenuity, warfare, cataclysm, and change; writers and artists create science fiction worlds out the same building blocks.
Both the writer and the archaeologist, then, are unstuck in time. They take cues from the past, present, and speculative future to create something that belongs in none of those places and all of them at once – something that invokes a sense of belonging in the intended audience. They both weave models of the human condition, create snapshots of a human way of life that never did or will never exist, but that can be recognised, empathised and related to by the audience.

This session is open to any interpretation on the theme of archaeology and science fiction. What is the future of the past? Whether that’s looking at depictions of archaeologists in popular culture, or how interpretations of the past are inspired by the way we hope the future will unfold, or how speculative advances in machine learning and automation move towards a science-fiction future where humans no longer need to act as archaeologists, we welcome creative approaches.

09:30: Penelope Foreman and Florence Smith Nicholls: Introduction
09:40: L. Meghan Dennis: Exploring Archaeological Ethics Beyond the Prime Directive
10:00: Sarah Howard: The End of Eternity: The future of the past as a resource
10:40: Discussion
10:55: Coffee

11:25: Penelope Foreman: Do Humans Dream of Analogue Sheep? The construction of memories in SF and archaeology
11:45: Katy Soar: No Digging’ ere!’: The haunted spaces of archaeology in 19th century horror writing
12:25: Glyn Morgan: Speculative Pasts: Archaeology, alternate history, and excavating trauma
12:45: Discussion
13:00: Lunch

14:15: Andrew Gardner: On Most Ancient Earth: The narrative role of stratigraphy and deep time in terrestrial science fiction
14:35: Jaime Almansa Sánchez: Archaeologies of a Future That Never Happened
14:55: Jonathan Last: Ballard in the Bronze Age? Writing otherness in past and future narratives
15:15: John Carman: Inverted Worlds: Where archaeology and science fiction meet
15:35: Discussion
15:45: Coffee

16:35: Matthew G. Knight and Emily Johnson: ArteFicts: The good, the bad, and the ugly portrayals of archaeologists in fiction
16:55: Tony Keen: The Figure of the Archaeologist in Alastair Reynolds’ Revelation Space
17:15: Paul Graves-Brown: Chap with the wings...: Aldbourne, science fiction and archaeology
17:35: Discussion
How to See Time: A Visual Culture Perspective

Room: 0.36

Organisers: Felicity McDowall, Lisa-Elen Meyering and Katie Haworth

Time exerts a powerful influence on visual culture. Whether a whole landscape shaped by human agency, architecture, portable objects, or artwork, all visual media have a temporal context to which they belong, and all are affected by the subsequent passage of time. This session proposes to explore the ways that time can be made visual, captured, or reflected in archaeological materials, and how we as archaeologists interrogate visual materials.

The visual appearance of archaeological material – shape, size, colour, texture – are used to place objects in their temporal context, through typological dating. Yet the relationship between archaeological visual culture and time can be much more nuanced and complex. The passage of time can affect the physical form of visual materials, their meaning, significance or value, or their reception by contemporary audiences.

A visual culture perspective provides a critical approach which complements archaeological practice by deconstructing the politics of viewing, facilitating a less subjective interpretation of archaeological materials. The papers here explore the relationship between visual material and archaeology and how we can use time as a tool for understanding visual materials.

Possible areas for inquiry include, but are not limited to:

- References in visual material to the past, such as replication or repetition of ideas from the past, or the incorporation of antique materials into new media.
- Changing attitudes to visual culture by later generations, including reinterpretation and/or misinterpretation.
- Evidence of extended interaction with and/or modification of visual media, across multiple timescales.
- Ways of depicting, measuring, or understanding the passage of time (both linear and non-linear) through visual means.
- How we present the breadth of time to the public at heritage sites and museums, especially in relation to prehistory.
- Visible indications of the passage of time.

09:30: Felicity McDowall, Lisa-Elen Meyering and Katie Haworth: Introduction
09:40: Eloise Govier: Doing Time: Ontogenesis, causality, and the life-matter predicament
10:00: Monika Stobiecka: Discarded Matter: How do museums dematerialize objects?
10:20: Donald Henson: Presenting Stone Age Time in Museum Displays
10:40: Discussion
10:50: Coffee

11:20: Li Sou: Scanning Over Time: Digital documentation of Shetland’s Iron Age brochs
11:40: Barnaby Chesterton: Visualising New Pasts: Representing Greco-Roman visual culture in video games
12:00: Gwendoline Pepper: Let’s do the Timed-warp Again: Visualising Medieval cloth production time
12:20: Liliana Janik: From Prehistoric Rock Art to Cubism: Social and cultural aspects of seeing time in space
12:40: Discussion
13:00: Lunch

14:15: Pippa Browne: A Feast for the Eyes: Sustaining the dead through images in ancient Egypt
“Success is not final, failure is not fatal: it is the courage to continue that counts.” – Winston Churchill

Human success, rather than human failure, has been valorized in our understanding of what it is to be human in past societies and the contemporary world. What it has been to fail to successfully experience, adapt and survive the human condition has often been ignored or understated both within and beyond the academy, save for ‘exceptional’ examples. Within Western society, discussion of any kind of failure is difficult, often at great cost to our mental and physical health, and it is seldom discussed in relation to our own practices as archaeologists. Failure within archaeology is potentially disastrous – consequences may involve the withdrawal of funding, academic shame, the loss of data, and career insecurity. Yet failure also has an irreplaceable role in learning, progression, and resilience, individually and societally.

At a time when so many are feeling, and being, failed economically, socially, and politically on a national and global scale, this timely session aims to explore and discuss the many contexts for failure within both historical and contemporary settings.

The session covers a range of failure in archaeology and related areas:

- The failures of past cultures – failure to change, inability to adapt to climate change/food scarcity, religious change, cultural adaption, etc.
- Archaeological evidence of failure – what are we missing?
- The failures of the archaeological community itself, past and present – academic, interventions/excavations, projects, communications.
- (Perceived) personal/professional failure, and lessons to be learned and shared – how can we ‘fail better’ in the discipline?
- Failing to share information on what does not work, issues of data hoarding, and Open Access.
- Celebrating failures (negative results, repaired artefacts, etc.) and encouraging ‘beta’ mind-sets towards archaeological projects.
09:30: Lorna Richardson and Alison Atkin: Introduction
09:40:00: Katy Whitaker: Failure is not Fatal: It’s the silicosis that will kill you
10:00: Rune Nyrup: Navigating the Interpretative Dilemma: Making progress through failed analogies
10:20: Kathy Baneva: Failure in the Middle/Neolithic Forward Thinking?

10:40: Discussion
10:50: Coffee

11:20: Darcey Gille: Failure. You’re doing it wrong
11:40: Theresa O’Mahony: What Price is Failure?
12:00: David Connolly: You’ll Never Make Anything of Yourself
12:20: Heba Abd el Gawad: Disciplinary Failures: It’s not me, it’s the discipline
12:40: Discussion

13:00: Lunch

14:15: Kevin Woolridge: The Failure of Commercial Archaeology in the UK: Can it be fixed?
14:35: Hannah Fluck and Meredith Wiggins: Failure in the Face of Climate Change
15:15: Discussion

15:30: Coffee

16:00: Neil Redfern: Let it Go: Loss is good for us
16:20: Thomas Kador and Vesna Lukic: Exhibiting Failure
16:40: Discussion

Archaeology, Heritage and Well-Being

Room: 4.44

Organisers: Timothy Darvill and Laura Drysdale

The concept of therapeutic landscapes was developed by Wil Gesler in the early 1990s, building on contemporary theory in the field of cultural ecology. It has since expanded to become a key concept in health geography applicable at a range of scales. But whether natural, designed, or symbolic, places connected with healing the body and soul have been recognized and studied for much longer. Routes of pilgrimage, destinations for health-giving visits, facilities for ‘taking the waters’, hospitals, and gardens surrounding asylums and institutions, have all been instrumental in formalizing relationships between place, space, and well-being that have been promoted and applied in many different ways and with varying degrees of real or perceived success. This session will consider archaeological and heritage dimensions of therapeutic landscapes, asking what can be learnt from the study of existing sites and whether there is a role for developing new ones appropriate for the needs of the 21st century. Contributions are invited in relation to three main themes. First, studies of recognized therapeutic landscapes through historical or archaeological investigations that enrich understandings of their construction and use. Second, case-studies of recent or ongoing projects that make use of archaeological sites or heritage resources to promote physical or mental well-being amongst defined participant communities. And third, analyses of the philosophical and theoretical frameworks appropriate to the study of archaeology and heritage in relation to health and well-being.
Shamans Through Time

Room: 3.58

Organisers: Ffion Reynolds and Henry Dosedla

Shamans are religious practitioners who occur across the globe. The word ‘shaman’ comes from the Tungus tribe in Siberia and it means spiritual healer or one who sees in the dark. Many schools of thought object to the application of shamanism to cultures outside its Tungus origin, while others suggest the term might be used universally. A common feature within shamanism is the use of altered states of consciousness. A shaman can be viewed as a highly skilled individual who ‘acts out’ or performs particular tasks within the community. The shaman, from this perspective, may be viewed as an important mediator between worlds. Shamans are actors of particular roles, skills, and arts that require the participation of others. Shamans perform, they alter their consciousness using various techniques, including hallucinogenic substances, hypnotism, trickery, chanting, dance, and healing; they are ambiguous individuals.

This session will look at the evidence for shamans through time, discussing the archaeological, historical, and contemporary ethnographic evidence for shamanism across the world. Shamanism has been suggested to exist in the ancient past, from prehistory to present times. What validity is there to the claim that shamanism existed in prehistory? Where in the world today do shamans still exist?

Presenters are encouraged to explore the topic from the perspective of their area of expertise, past and present. Topics might include paradigms of shamanic interpretation, misconceptions associated with the term shamanism, the social functions of shamanism; shamanic altered states of consciousness, music and ecstatic
journey, shamanic power objects and materials; storytelling, performance and healing, the use of plants and food as medicines; and shamanism and cognitive evolution.

09:30: Ffion Reynolds: Ways of Seeing, Being, Doing: Evidence for shamanism in the archaeological record
09:50: Rick Knecht and Anna Mossolova: Excavating Shamanic Objects at the Nunalleq Site Near the Village of Quinhagak, Alaska
10:10: Aaron Watson: Visions of Transformation: Optics and ritual within the Neolithic chambered cairns of Britain and Ireland
10:30: Discussion

10:45: Coffee

11:15: Henry Dosedla: Healers, Seers, Mediators: Multitasking aspects of shamanic practice among recent Neolithic societies in Melanesia
11:35: Robert J. Wallis: Art and Shamanism: From cave painting to the White Cube
11:55: Mike Williams: Tasting the Sweetness of Death: A timeless morality in dark shamanism?
12:15: Paul Devereux: Landscape Relics of Pre-Columbian Shamanisms in the Americas
12:35: Discussion

13:00: Lunch

14:15: Mike Crowley: Stealing Women’s Clothes: Patriarchal appropriation of women’s mysteries
14:35: Andy Reyman: Words Come Easy: About the problematic usability of a non-operational term for describing deviant prehistoric burials
14:55: Robert Dickins: Domestic Shamanism in the Victorian Middle-Classes
15:15: Discussion
Tuesday 19\textsuperscript{th} December (AM)

Parallel Worlds: Studies in Comparative European Archaeologies

\textit{Room: 2.03}

Organisers: Oliver Davis and James Whitley

All too often we as archaeologists are solely engaged with the study of particular periods of the past or particular places. Our work is, perhaps necessarily, rooted within specific intellectual frameworks – a product of the diverse social and political contexts of the countries or institutions at which we are based and the contrasting histories and traditions of study of different periods and regions (‘Celtic’ prehistory vs Classical archaeology, for example). One unfortunate by-product of this gulf between intellectual traditions is the creation of intellectual silos, which in turn has led to significant divergence across Europe and the wider world in both method and theory. There is now considerable unfamiliarity between the approaches to the archaeologies of Europe for instance even in adjacent geographical areas or amongst those studying broadly the same period. Notable divergences can now be seen in the study of later prehistory (last millennium BC) in Europe between scholars focused solely on Britain, those who study transalpine Europe, and those study the ‘Corrupting Sea’ and its interconnections. As a result, similar problems of interpretation encountered in different places or periods are treated as if they require entirely separate debates. Notions of personhood, materiality, embodiment and the role of ritualized feasting have all cropped up in the study of both the Aegean and British Iron Ages, but this fact has occasioned no discussion across area specialists. The aim of this session is to open up a dialogue between scholars who may be working in widely different areas or periods. By highlighting curious parallels, connections and trajectories that are synchronised across large geographic areas the session will begin to explore the entanglement of both endogenous and external practices which caused similar patterns of behaviour. We welcome papers that attempt to interpret archaeologies that cut across national boundaries and focus on highlighting the peculiar parallels between past societies.

09:30: Oliver Davis and James Whitley: \textit{Introduction}
09:35: Maximilian Buston: \textit{Diversity, Similarity and Time Mislead: 10,000 fibulae from the Aegean and Anatolia, a new typology and their stylistic variation}
09:55: Donald Crystal: \textit{Unpacking the Term ‘Dolmen’ Around the Black Sea Coast}
10:15: Alex Davies: \textit{Feasting, Deposition and the Dead: Social change and social integration in Britain and the Aegean during the 8\textsuperscript{th} century BC}
10:35: Discussion

10:45: Coffee

11:15: Oliver Davis: \textit{Hillfort Communities in Early Iron Age Europe}
11:35: Manuel Fernández-Götze: \textit{Cut off by the Pyrenees? Some thoughts on Iron Age research in the Iberian Peninsula}
11:55: Matthew Hitchcock: \textit{Celtic Art in Britain and the Continent: An archival approach to understanding knowledge production}
12:15: James Whitley: \textit{Society and Personhood: Homer in (several) Iron Ages}
12:35: Discussion
**Stuff and Nonsense? Theory and Medieval Material Culture**

*Room: 3.62*

Organisers: Alice Forward and Ben Jervis

Ten years ago, the Society for Medieval Archaeology sought to tackle the difficult relationship between Medieval archaeology and archaeological theory with a series of sessions at TAG in York and Southampton. This session will reflect upon the impact of this initiative, to question whether we are any closer to developing theoretically informed, innovative and challenging approaches to the archaeology of the Medieval World. In this time some of the most revolutionary work has been undertaken in the field of material culture studies, from the study of brooches (Martin 2013) to the analysis of pottery and Hanseatic identities (Gaimster 2014; Naum 2013; 2014). Despite this, with notable exceptions (Jervis and Kyle 2012; Cumberpatch and Blinkhorn 2014) Medieval material culture studies have been poorly represented at TAG. This session seeks to reflect upon how far we have come and explore the directions that future work might take, to move Medieval material culture studies from a discipline largely concerned with description and characterisation to one which helps us to understand what it was to be Medieval. Contributions are welcome which address the material culture of any region or time period within the Medieval period (broadly conceived), and contributions which explore material culture in an international perspective are particularly welcome. Themes may include, but need not be limited to:

- The application of new theoretical or ontological approaches to material culture.
- The relationship between archaeological objects and text.
- The contribution that material culture analysis can make to broader questions in Medieval studies.
- The contribution that Medieval material culture studies can make to archaeological theory more generally.

09:30: Alice Forward and Ben Jervis: *Introduction*

09:35: Chris Cumberpatch: *Down and out in Durham and Cardiff: People, pots and structure in Medieval ceramic studies*

09:55: Alice Forward: *Creating Communities and a Sense of Place in Medieval South Wales? Four ram aquamaniles from South Glamorgan*

10:15: Justine Biddle: *Close to Home or Far Away? Exploring identity in early Medieval Suffolk*

10:35: Ryan Lash: *Taskscapes of Pebbles and Pilgrims: A sensory approach to ‘natural’ stuff in Irish pilgrimage traditions*

10:55: Coffee

11:25: Gemma Watson: *Love Sex Magic in Medieval Europe: The archaeological evidence*

11:45: Charlotte Howsam: *Late Medieval Books and their Fittings: A material culture study*

12:05: Ben Jervis and Sarah Semple: *Textual Worlds, Material Worlds*


12:45: Discussion
Saving Time: Conservation as a Means for Preserving and Advancing Archaeological Context

Room: 1.69

Organisers: Ashley Lingle and Jerrod Seifert

Modern conservation practices and analytical techniques offer an array of information for building archaeological understanding and interpretation. Conservation can be an integral part of archaeological practice, creating informed strategies for proactive research, and to this end can be used as a tool for preserving and furthering archaeological context with appreciable outcomes. Employing experimental methods that advance both real world and theoretical frameworks, archaeological conservators are increasingly being utilised as on-site material scientists, instrumentation authorities, and micro- and macro-excavation specialists. A continuing dialogue between conservators and archaeologists serves to further advance contextual theory while balancing the pragmatic needs of archaeology. This session looks to explore the ways in which conservation can benefit archaeological practice and provide insight before, during, and after excavations.

We welcome proposals that include, but are not limited to, the following topics:

- Reflective practice within archaeological conservation
- Digital preservation and documentation
- Innovations in analytical equipment and their use in the field
- Collaborative projects between conservators and archaeologists

09:30: Ashley Lingle and Jerrod Seifert: Introduction
09:40: Neil Mahrer, Georgia Kelly and Viki Le Quelenec: Torque of the Town: Conserving the World’s largest Iron Age coin hoard
10:00: Karla Graham: Using Investigative Conservation to Understand Roman Burial Practice on the Northern Frontier
10:20: Gesualdo Busacca: The paintings from Neolithic Çatalhöyük and the Delicate Balance Between Archaeological Research and Conservation
10:40: J. Cowey, L. Gutierrez, A. Monreal, M.D. Murillo, Y. Al Ali and A. Mahmoud: Conservation of Saruq Al Hadid (UAE): Objects as a key for archaeological interpretation
11:00: Discussion

11:10: Coffee

11:40: Natalija Ćosić: Articulating Discovery: Experience from the Neolithic site of Drenovac
12:00: William Tregaskes: Losing Context: Does context change impact our phenomenological experience and ability to create agency?
12:20: Eric Nordgren and Ashley Lingle: 3D Digital Documentation in Archaeological Conservation: Revolution or evolution?
12:40: Discussion
Why do Undergraduates Hate Archaeological Theory? Improving Student Experiences of Learning Theory

Room: 2.03

Organisers: Penny Bickle, Benjamin Gearey and Emilie Sibbesson

The QAA Benchmarking Statement for Archaeology states that ‘the vitality of theoretical debate within the subject is one of its intellectual attractions as an HE subject’. Yet, anecdotally, the ‘theory module’ tends to receive poor student feedback, and among academic staff it is widely thought of as a challenging module to teach. This session invites speakers who consider the challenges of teaching and learning archaeological theory in a university setting. Topics may include, but are not limited to:

- Why is there a disconnect between staff appreciation that ‘theory’ is an intrinsic part of our subject and students’ exasperation with the theory module?
- Does student engagement differ between the theory module and other modules? Why? How can we enhance engagement?
- Examples of successful (or not) pedagogic approaches
- What do students ‘get’ from the module? Do they apply the knowledge/skills later on (in other modules, as postgraduates, in life)? If not, what’s the point?
- Experiences of ‘learning theory’ from recent graduates (and current undergraduates!); what works and what doesn’t?
- Should archaeological theory be compulsory for undergraduates? If theory permeates everything we do as archaeologists, is it not embedded within other modules anyway? Is it time to abolish the dedicated theory module?

The session is intended to help gauge whether there is appetite for a network and/or collection of shared resources for lecturers who teach archaeological theory.

14:15: Penny Bickle, Benjamin Gearey and Emilie Sibbesson: Introduction
14:20: Catherine J. Frieman: Building a Community in the Theory Classroom in Australia
14:40: Hannah Cobb and Karina Croucher: Assembling Theory: Teaching, learning and embedding archaeological theory
15:00: Benjamin Jennings: Why do Undergraduates Hate Archaeological Theory? Is it only the students...?
15:20: Marge Konsa: Application of Student-centred Teaching in Learning Theory

15:40: Coffee

16:50: Penny Bickle: Embedding Debate From the Beginning: Teaching theory in Year 1
17:10: Julian Thomas: Undergraduates Don’t Hate Theory: Reflections on three decades of teaching archaeological theory
17:30: Discussion
In stark contrast to Roman archaeology and despite their magnitude, linear earthworks have been marginalised in investigations of the Early Middle Ages (c. AD 400–1100). For example, among the 52 chapters in The Oxford Handbook of Anglo-Saxon Archaeology (Hamerow, Hinton and Crawford (eds), OUP, 2011), Offa’s Dyke is mentioned only twice, Wat’s Dyke once, while other significant linear earthworks such as East Wansdyke receive no mention. Not only have early Medieval settlement, burial and material culture studies side-lined linear earthworks in recent decades, dykes are even peripheral among most recent investigations of early Medieval territorial organisation, warfare and landscape.

With only a few notable exceptions, this constitutes a collective ‘forgetting’ of early historic linear earthworks as foci for archaeological and interdisciplinary early Medieval research. This situation is paradoxical given the long-term ambitions to conserve and manage linear earthworks and the heritage success which constitutes the incorporation of one into a high-profile National Trail since the 1970s: the Offa’s Dyke Path. This is also an eerie academic silence given the recent high-profile political debates on migrations, ethnicity, frontiers and nationhood (from Devolution to Indyref and Brexit) into which early Medieval dykes have been repeatedly mobilised.

This session aims to foster new approaches and investigations of early Medieval linear earthworks, theorising their significance in the past and the present. The focus in particular is upon the temporalities and materialities of early Medieval linear earthworks as monuments operating to perform a series of complex space-time landscape dynamics. Incorporating new perspectives on historical, archaeological, literary and place-name evidence, the session invites contributions to address one or more of the following themes relating to linear earthworks as boundaries, components of frontier zones, and elements of broader political and cultural geographies in the Early Middle Ages:

- dating dykes;
- theorising beyond defence and display;
- reinterpreting construction and materiality;
- rethinking landscape contexts and dynamics;
- evaluating life-histories from Prehistory to the present;
- critiquing heritage conservation, management and interpretation;
- uses and abuses in contemporary culture and politics.

14:15: Howard Williams: Introduction
14:25: Mark Bell: Bringing the Dykes into the 21st Century: How did we get there?
14:45: Richard Mortimer: The Early Iron Age Origins of the Cambridgeshire Dykes
15:05: Andrew Seaman: Llywarch Hen’s Dyke and the Royal Estate at Llan-gors: Defining space and power in Early Medieval Wales
15:25: Dries Tys: Dykes as Ideological Markers: Embankment and state formation in the salt marshes of Flanders
15:45: Discussion
15:55: Coffee
Passage of Time and Dynamics of Practice
Room: 1.69

Organiser: Peter S. Wells

In contexts with exceptionally good chronological controls, we can examine changes in the ways that practices and behaviours were performed, enabling us to examine processes of cultural change at much finer scales than is usually possible. Changes in the ways that funerary rituals were performed, in the ways that objects were deposited, and in the ways that buildings were constructed, for example, can in some cases be examined decade by decade or generation by generation. Such analysis with tight chronological controls allows us to get much closer to details in the processes of change from one performance to the next, providing unusually precise opportunities to examine details of change in practice and behaviour. Possible examples include distinguishing changes in the ways that burial mounds were situated with respect to settlements, in the ways that pottery and personal ornaments were arranged in graves in a cemetery, in the ways that metal objects were deposited in pits, and in the ways that weapons were laid out on sanctuary sites.

14:15: Peter S. Wells: Introduction
14:45: Helen Chittock: Celtic Art and Iron Age ‘Histories’
15:05: Jody Joy: Marking Time: Re-examining the Iron Age hoards from Snettisham, Norfolk
15:25: Discussion
15:35: Coffee

16:05: Katherine M. Erdman: Continuity or Coincidence? Interpreting 2,500 years of deposits at the source of the Douix
16:25: Christopher Evans: Robust Sequences: Filling time (and tracking absurdity)
16:45: Peter S. Wells: Memory, Continuity, and Variability in Three Generations of Funerary Ritual
17:05: Discussion
Wednesday 20th December (All Day Sessions)

Parsing Posthumanism
Room: 2.01

Organisers: Oliver Harris and Craig Cipolla

Posthumanism encompasses a variegated array of theories and critiques from the humanities and social sciences. From new materialisms to object oriented ontology and from symmetrical archaeologies to the new animist approaches, posthumanism’s influences in archaeological theory continue to grow and diversify. Each of these approaches orients around a general commitment to challenging the limitations of modernist, western perspectives on the world. This can entail moving beyond the limitations of assumed human exceptionalism through recognition of the vibrancies of matter and the complex human-nonhuman relationships through which agency emanates. Or it can involve embracing how objects always withdraw from our knowledge of them, and indeed from all relations. Sometimes it involves examining how things open us up to the alterity and otherness of the past. In the end, these arguments ask us to give things ‘their due’.

Archaeologists tend to orient themselves to these ideas in a dualistic fashion: enthusiastic adoption versus outright rejection. The former group is quick to applaud the intellectual binaries that these new approaches reportedly undercut; they celebrate the ways in which various strands of posthumanist thought lead them to new and interesting questions/problems in archaeological theory. The latter group offers sharp critiques of posthumanism, often for its purported lack of engagement with politics, power, identity, representation, and humans in general. Papers in this session reject both of these caricatured propositions, parsing posthumanism in archaeological theory. Presenters probe their own archaeological research specialties and interests to address what aspects of posthumanism work for them, what aspects they feel they must disregard, and what aspects are in need of further archaeological modification.

10:00: Craig Cipolla and Oliver Harris: Introduction: Parsing posthumanism
10:20: Brian Boyd: Posthumanism and Ecologies of Human Responsibility: An archaeological contribution
11:00: Discussion
11:15: Coffee
11:45: Rachel Crellin: Power in a World Without Subjects and Objects
12:05: Steve Kosiba: When Things Move People
12:25: Sophie Moore: A Posthumanist Archaeology of Byzantine Song
12:45 Discussion
13:00: Lunch
14:15: Zoe Crossland: Corpse Life: Semiotic processes of forensic investigation
14:35: Oliver Harris: Rethinking Relations: Characterising connections in the light of posthumanism
14:55: Discussion
15:10: Coffee
Time and Temporality: Twenty Years on From Time, Material Culture and Being – Ways of Thinking About Narrative

Room: 0.31

Organisers: Julian Thomas and Seren Griffiths

A number of key publications in the 1990s addressed the theme of time in archaeology, including works by Tim Murray, Julian Thomas, and Tim Ingold. Specifically, the publication 20 years ago in 1996 of *Time, Culture and Identity: An interpretive archaeology* by Julian Thomas provides a watershed in thinking about material culture, time and narrative in recent archaeological theory. This and another key 1990s publication — Tim Ingold’s ‘The Temporality of Landscape’ published in World Archaeology in 1993 — set the scene for specific types of thinking about archaeology and about approaches to archaeological theory in the 1990s. The fundamental impact of temporality as a concept can be seen in the rapid post-1993 boom in publications citing the term. In part this emphasis on temporality was a kicking back against the abstracting approaches found, for example in the work of Clarke and Binford, which was concerned with a more interpretively-informed way of writing and thinking about materials. The emphasis in the 1990s on temporality holds a number of interesting parallels with contemporary archaeological practice, where a wealth of new evidence — especially from the more precise chronologies afforded by Bayesian statistical modelling — means that it is now timely to return in detail to the importance of both ‘time’ and ‘temporality’ as constructs informing the production of archaeological narratives.

This session calls for papers focusing on the interplay of time and temporality in archaeological ways of telling, including the production of archaeological textual narratives, the use of spatial and landscape analogues for temporality, the relationships between our understandings of data and interpretation, totalising and specific narratives, material culture as way of telling, and the relationships between materials and framing intellectual structures.
Visual representations have been seminal to the generation of archaeological knowledge since the birth of archaeology. Nowadays archaeologists of all branches and theoretical orientations deploy, on a regular basis a wide array of visual methods to represent empirical (i.e. sense) data; from drawings and photographs to images produced by advanced digital technologies (e.g. within the framework of microscopy, geospatial technologies, etc.). Influential works have highlighted the role of images in framing questions and interpretations (Moser, Perry), in re-creating the Cartesian divide between body and mind (Thomas), and image-making, particularly illustration, as a creative process in the crafting of archaeological narratives, while calling for reflexivity and multi-vocality in image production (Perry). Yet, given the relevant role that images of all kinds play in our daily practice as professionals, researchers, and teachers, it is surprising to find that there are many processes of image-production that are still taken for granted (i.e. ‘black-boxed’), while the use and potential of numerous visual methods (particularly those considered more ‘scientific’) have not yet been critically scrutinized and remain within the realm of restrictive normative practices.

The session’s contributors will expand on existing theoretical debates and/or interrogate visual methods from new perspectives, including:

- Image and image-making from the perspective of recent theoretical trends, such as New Materialism (i.e. assemblage theory, agental realism).
- Image-making, multi-vocality, participatory practice, and communities of practice
- Archaeological visual culture
- Visual representation as a learning tool
- The circulation of images
- Image and temporality, multi-temporal representations
- Visual representations and the senses
- Merging methods and the creation of hybrids
10:00: Marta Díaz-Guardamino, Jacqui Mulville, Ian Dennis, and Rhiannon Philp: Introduction
10:10: Yasuyuki Yoshida: Visualizing Prehistoric People in Japan: From the perspective of sociology of archaeological knowledge
10:50: Rachel Opitz: Visualization, Depiction and Interpretation: An ongoing conversation about engaging with landscape topography
11:10: Discussion
11:20 Coffee
11:50: Joana Valdez-Tullett: To See or Not to See: Computing and sensing Atlantic art’s (in)visibility
12:10: Francesca Dolcetti: Digital Interactive Visualisation of Archaeological Sites: A case study from Middle Bronze Age Cyprus
12:30: Mateusz Sosnowski, Jerzy Czerniec and Krystian Kozioł: To Find Un-Findable: How analysis of DTM (Digital Terrain Model) of forest areas can boost archaeological surface survey to the new level
12:50: Discussion
13:00: Lunch
14:15: Practical Demonstrations (Visualisation Lab)
14:15:
Rhiannon Philp and Jacqui Mulville: Micro to Macro: Visualisation of environmental archaeology for diverse audiences
Ian Dennis & Marta Díaz-Guardamino: Multi-vocal Visualization: Exploring the cross-fertilization of illustration and digital imaging
Catriona Cooper: Auralization Making in Practice
15:15:
Scott Williams: The Digital Landscape Representation: An epistemological research tool
Benjamin Hunt: A Dirty Dialectic
Rebecca Davies: The Interface Between Experiential and Experimental Archaeology: A case study in horn work
The Past in the Past: Investigating the Significance of the Deposition of Earlier Objects in Later Contexts

Room: 2.03

Organisers: Matthew G. Knight, Dot Boughton and Rachel Wilkinson

Prehistoric and later societies’ perception of the past has received increasing attention over recent years. One practice that has received relatively little attention, however, is the association of already ‘old’ objects with later contexts, despite being noted across multiple eras (e.g. Bronze Age metalwork in Iron Age hoards or Roman artefacts in Anglo-Saxon graves). Interpretations for these items range from the discard of scrap to objects of veneration, though they may have been important tools for memorialising or, conversely, forgetting the past. Whilst some of these objects may have been heirlooms, others may have been uncovered during building or agricultural work perhaps impacting on their biography for those who redeposited them. Often the contexts in which they are deposited form significant locations in the landscape, which may in turn have their own histories and significance to past communities. Such objects thus hold interesting insights into conceptions of time and memory in the past. This session aims to bring together a range of case studies and theoretical approaches to better understand this practice across a longer temporal span.

09:40: Matthew G. Knight, Dot Boughton and Rachel Wilkinson: Introduction
09:50: Sarah Bockmeyer: Moving Memories: Remembering ancestors in the Single Grave Culture (2800–2200 BC) in Neolithic northern Germany
10:10: Catriona Gibson and Adrian Chadwick: Days of Future Pasts: Material memories in past societies
10:30: Alex Davies: ‘Multi-period’ Hoards From the Late Bronze Age and Iron Age in Southern Britain: Interpreting patterns and contextualising deposition
10:50: Helen Chittock: Fragmentation and Reassembly in the Iron Age: Tracing the biographies of heirloom objects
11:10: Discussion

11:20: Coffee

11:50: Mark Lewis: The Antique Antique?
12:10: Stephen Sherlock: The Reuse of ‘Antiques’ in Anglo-Saxon Graves
12:30: Murray Andrews: Treasured Possessions? Heirlooms and antiquities in Medieval coin hoards, AD c.1000–1550
12:50: Discussion
Over the past twenty years, archaeology has benefited from a raft of new and improved scientific dating methods, allowing us to be more precise than ever before about the dates of significant events and practices in the past. Through the increased use of sophisticated techniques including radiocarbon, archaeomagnetic, dendrochronological and luminescence dating, and with the application of statistical methods such as Bayesian approaches or quantum theory, we have ever more data available to inform us.

While all these methods and approaches have been taken up by the discipline, they are not without theoretical ramifications. This session aims to assess the impact of this numerical revolution on archaeological interpretations, asking whether our wider theoretical approaches have caught up with these new forms of data, questioning the implications of the blind acceptance of statistics, and examining the effects on our narratives of the past.

How can we compare sites and areas with significant differences in the levels of chronological information available? Is there a danger that proposed statistical models become the unchallenged status quo? What kinds of data are these scientific methodologies producing, what are they not telling us, and how does this affect our research outputs? When do these techniques and approaches become problematic for historical interpretations? Do we have adequate training in archaeology to ensure a robust understanding of these complex mathematical models? Further, how do we address the construction of new categories of interpretive data from dating summaries e.g. ‘outliers’ and ‘residuality’? As well as scientific dating, there will be relevant implications for other new scientific analyses (such as DNA and genetics research).

Papers explore this broad theme, providing case studies or commentaries on archaeological research where chronologies have provided theoretical challenges or opportunities.

10:00: Susan Greaney, Anne Teather and Emily Wright: Introduction
10:10: Maria Emanuela Oddo: How Many Hands Has a Clock? Integrating chronological records: A semiotic approach
10:30: Susan Greaney: The Spiral of Interpretation: Thoughts on constructing narratives using precise chronologies
10:50: Discussion
11:00: Coffee

11:30: Anne Teather: Revealing a Prehistoric Past: Evidence for the deliberate construction of a historic narrative in the British Neolithic
11:50: Kathy Baneva: Good, Bad or Absolute? Is Culture History Evil?
12:10: Emily Wright: Bad Timing: Problems with chronologies and narratives by numbers in Mediterranean prehistory
12:30: Discussion
Futures of the Past: Everyday Landscapes and the Archaeology of Anticipation

Room: 0.45

Organisers: Andrew Gardner, Lacey Wallace and Ben Jervis

The aim of this session is to explore how people in past societies manipulated temporality in the landscapes that they created by asking how we can understand anticipatory actions. Studies that explicitly unite spatial and temporal concepts as meaningful constructs have tended to emphasise memory and past-ness in the past; in this session, we wish to re-orient this focus towards the past futures that people sought to shape.

As archaeologists, our natural inclination is to work backwards from what we know, from which perspective the future is a fait accompli. Reality is, of course, very different, and is rather oriented to more or less open futures. We wish to ask, ‘how and why did people in the past define how a landscape would be experienced, how their descendants would use it, and how they would be remembered?’ In achieving this shift in time-perspective, we also seek to break down three sets of boundaries: those between the phenomenological traditions that have influenced archaeology thus far and other theoretical perspectives dealing with time; those between later prehistoric scholarship, where experiential studies are common, and that of more recent societies; and the boundaries between the monumental and the everyday, expanding investigation of the latter to place the former in proper context, and emphasising the dialectical nature of power relations in the landscape.

Papers are invited which tackle any or all of these issues, using multi-temporal archaeologies at site or landscape scales to consider how experience was constructed to shape future actions and memories, and how different cultural understandings of ‘the future’ might enable or constrain past agency. Papers that explore the choices and changes made by people in the past in relation to group identities, hierarchies, ideologies and other structures linked to forces like colonialism or globalization will be particularly welcome.

10:00: Andrew Gardner, Lacey Wallace and Ben Jervis: Introduction
10:10: Kevin Kay: Pits and Places: Using anticipation to characterize deposits at Neolithic Çatalhöyük
10:30: Laura Ghisleni: Futures That Could Have Been Otherwise: Time and the past in an Imperial landscape
10:50: Lacey Wallace and Andrew Gardner: Making Sense of Past Futures: Rural landscape temporalities in Roman Britain
11:10: Discussion

11:20: Coffee

11:50: Ben Jervis: Anticipatory Action: Archaeology, power and clairvoyance in a Medieval town
12:10: Marcus Brittain: Archaeology of Utopia: The future and legacy of a 19th century socialist community at Manea Fen
12:30: Discussant: Barbara Adam
The Wind in the Willows: Employing the Narrative in Environmental Archaeology

Room: 4.44

Organisers: Lee G. Broderick and Suzi Richer

Scientific communication is often presented as logical and empirical (context-free). The facts, however, do not speak for themselves and context serves a very necessary function in providing meaning for data. Honestly, who cares that there were 14 ducks a-dabbling, or that the Wild Wood was bigger at some point? Secretly, even most specialists do not. Yet as specialists, we continue to complain that our reports are consigned to the graveyard of the appendices where they can be safely ignored by non-specialists.

Storytelling might appear to be anathema to rigorous scientific approaches to data. Literary theory and psychology research both suggest though that readers better understand narrative writing in comparison with expository writing. It has also recently been demonstrated that climate change science papers which adopt a narrative style are both more likely to be cited by peers and more likely to have a wider impact beyond the specialist audience.

Environmental archaeology is in a unique position – able to contribute equally to archaeological debates and to the discourse surrounding climate change. As such, it is especially important that our voice is heard – not just that our data is published but that our interpretations are understood and remembered. We believe that adopting a narrative approach in our writing may be one way in which to achieve these aims.

09:45: Lee G. Broderick and Suzi Richer: Introduction
09:55: Terry O’Connor: ‘It’s Muddy and it Smells’: Telling the past human environment
10:15: Matt Law: ‘My Shadow Sunning Itself on This Stone Remembers the Lava’: Public perceptions of past environments
10:35: Jess Collins: Archaeology, Museums and Climate Change

10:55: Coffee

11:25: Phil Statsney: ‘Narrativizing Science’: Ecocriticism and peatland archaeology
11:45: Hywel Lewis: Using Narrative to Understand Messy Management and Opportunistic Woodland Use
12:05: Alex Fitzpatrick and Valerie San Filippo: Things Worth Telling: Considering narrative storytelling in environmental archaeology
12:25: Don Henson: Climate Changes as Human Experience
12:45: Discussion
Periodization, Time and Fault Lines: The Fifth Century AD

Room: 3.58

Organsiers: James Gerrard and Elliot Chaplin

Most archaeologists and historians would agree that the fifth century AD is a fundamental time in the history of Britain and Western Europe. It marks the break between Classical Antiquity and the Middle Ages. As such it is a fundamental fault-line, a rupture that divides both material culture and people.

Collingwood (1927, 324) argued that ‘a “period” of history is an arbitrary fabrication, a mere part torn from its context, given a fictitious unity, and set into fictitious isolation, yet by being so treated, it acquires a beginning, and a middle and an end’. The fifth century stands both as an end (of the Roman period) and a beginning (of the early Middle Ages). It lacks an identity and coherence, falling between its academic parents in a lacklustre divorce, condemned as a difficult and uninteresting child.

Much of the research on this period is focussed on empirical concerns: if only we had more sites, radiocarbon dates, objects or texts this time would somehow resolve itself and the scales would fall from our collective eyes. In this session we hope to explore how linear time and nineteenth-century periodizations have constrained our understanding of the ‘long fifth century’. For instance, Lucas (2005, 100) has dismissed the fifth century and its sometimes acrimonious debates as ‘a largely fictitious problem’, the result of our failure to reconcile an ordinal system of chronology with an interval system. We hope to build on this perspective and develop theoretical discussions that allow us to look anew at the fifth century as a time worthy of analysis in its own right.

10:00: James Gerrard and Elliot Chaplin: Time and the Fifth Century
10:20: James Harland and Katherine Fliegel: Britain and the Transformation of the Roman World: Rethinking rupture, ideology, and time
10:40: Susan Oosthuisen: Is the Fifth-century Fault-line a Hallucination?
11:00: Discussion

11:10: Coffee

11:40: Paul Gorton: Romans, Britons or Anglo-Saxons in Fifth century Britain: How do we know, why should we care?
12:00: Vince Van Thienen: Human Nature Plus Bias Persistence Equals an Obscure 5th century
12:20: Peter Guest: Hopes, Fears and Eating Cake: Brexit in the Fifth-Century?
12:40: Discussion

Time and the Maritime: The Temporality of Coastal Zones

Room: 3.62

Organsiers: Christopher Nuttall and Henriette Rødland

Coastal regions are dynamic spaces and people’s interactions with these areas have played a large role in shaping societies, cultures, and technologies (Cordell 1989; Fitzpatrick et al 2015; Rainbird 2007), as well as how we frame our research. We have now moved beyond subsistence-based interpretations to account for why people inhabited coastal locations in the past, and the desire to inhabit these marginal areas can in part be viewed from the standpoint of social determinism. Maritime ways of life may seem like an obvious option, but they are not an inevitable choice (Vavouranakis 2011), and we should attempt to assess the wide range of economic,
religious, and social factors that inspired these choices. People’s relationships with coastal areas can be complicated and fluid, despite the seemingly obvious benefits of coastal living. What influenced people to pursue a maritime way of life in the first place, and how were these spaces used, perceived, and renegotiated over time and space? To what extent did coastal environments impact and shape social spaces and relationships between people?

This session will seek to invite papers dealing with these issues from a temporal perspective. The session will explore the temporality of coastal zones through theoretical debate particularly focusing upon identity, the body, cognition, innovation, culture change and movement within a maritime context.

10:00: Christopher Nuttall and Henriette Rødland: Introduction
10:10: Tom Lawrence: We Do Not Sow: Hunter-gatherer coastal communities on the eve of the Mesolithic-Neolithic transition
10:30: Chris Nuttall: Maritime Entanglement in the Aegean Islands in the Bronze Age Long Term Perspective
10:50: Helene Martinsson-Wallin: Bronze Age Monuments and Coastal Landscape Changes in a Long Term Perspective on Gotland Island in the Baltic Sea
11:10: Discussion

11:20: Coffee

11:50: Caradoc Peters: Cornwall’s Romano-British ‘Cottage Industry’: Networking communities, seasonality and historic chronology
12:10: Tom Fitton: Time and Relative Divisions in (Swahili maritime) Space
12:30: Andy Sherman and Lara Band: Gifts from the Wrath of God: The re-animation of submerged prehistoric forests by coastal communities in the post Medieval period
12:50: Discussion
Walking the Archaeological Walk: Walking and Thinking in Archaeology

Room: 2.03

Organiser: Kirsty Millican

The movement of walking is itself a way of knowing’ – Ingold and Vergunst 2016: 5

Much of archaeological practice takes place on the move. We fieldwalk and survey on the move, and phenomenological and experiential archaeologies have specifically embraced walking as part of the bodily engagement of these approaches. Yet while walking and movement is implicitly acknowledged as an integral part of what we do, it is less common to reflect on walking itself. Or to consider the impact it has on the way in which we, and the general public, come to understand and interpret archaeology. This is relevant as walking is not just a mechanical action; it is part of our engagement with place and one way in which the world is revealed to us. It can be political, is grounded in culture and affected by physical abilities and background. Where and how we walk is influenced by the present layout of the landscape, in turn affecting the way the landscape and archaeology is revealed to us. So how does the way we walk and think contribute to archaeological understandings of sites and landscapes? What about more static practices – does this diminish our understandings? How does directed walking around heritage sites affect the way the public engage with these sites?

Contributors are asked to reflect on walking as part of archaeological practice, to consider less what walking around sites or across a landscape can tell us about past places and landscapes and more the impact it has (or has not) on archaeological interpretations, ways of knowing and the production of archaeological knowledge. Contributors may wish to reflect on walking as part of their own archaeological practice, or reflect on the walking of others, whether that be other archaeological practitioners or the general public.

14:15: Kirsty Millican: Introduction
14:25: Benjamin Gearey and Suzi Richer: Walk on the Wild Side: Moving through past and present environments
14:45: Kirsty Millican: Walking Lochbrow: Experiencing a landscape through the feet
15:05: Faidon Moudopoulos: Of Time and Money: Walking around the archaeological landscape of Zagori
15:25: Coffee

15:55: Paul Tubb: Praxis and Perambulation: The benefits to mind & body of a good archaeological walk
16:15: Coralie Acheson: Walking Around or Walking Over? Wandering tourists and storytelling in the Ironbridge Gorge
16:35: Sonia Overall: Don’t Walk That Way! Why heritage sites need psychogeography
16:55: Discussion
**Historical Foodscapes: Reconstructing Social, Political and Historical Dynamics Through Diet and Food Consumption**

*Room: 0.36*

Organisers: Alice Toso, Veronica Aniceti and Holly Hunt-Watts

Food is a crucial aspect of living, biologically it provides the energy and nutrients which enable the vital physical processes necessary for life, but there is much more to food than the needs of the body. Food is a complex social aspect of most people’s lives, it is feasted on during celebration, it is given for comfort, it provides a moment to talk or reflect with colleagues, friends, and family. More than this, the diet of a person can indicate many details about their life, for example their socioeconomic standing, their health, or their cultural background.

The significance of food in human culture makes it a valuable source of information for researchers considering aspects of life in past societies and evidence for historical diet takes many forms. The physical remains of food can be found in anaerobic environments. Skeletal remains of slaughtered animals or pollen and phytolith remains of plants in the soil can also reveal the types of food procured by people in the past. Dietary health can be ascertained from the skeletal remains of individuals, using techniques such as isotope analysis and by recording indicators of pathology, and for the more recent past records of consumption can be found within the pages of historical documents. In sum, there is a broad range of evidence for food and diet in the past, with methods and projects constantly evolving.

This session aims to cover a broad range of research across time and region, exploring the concept of food and diet as a means to shed light on past social and political dynamics, and as such we invite papers that explore food consumption and what it can reveal about society in the past. The session is the result of a White Rose Doctoral Network, exploring the relationship between food, faith and social status through a variety of methodologies and approaches; therefore, we particularly encourage proposals of an interdisciplinary nature.

14:15: Alice Toso, Veronica Aniceti and Holly Hunt-Watts: *Historical Foodscapes: Combining zooarchaeology, stable isotope analysis, osteology, and nutritional science to explore economy, diet and nutrition from the Middle Ages to the present day. Challenges and reflections*

14:35: Jennifer Bates: *Creating ‘Indusness’: Food as an integrative material culture in the Indus Civilisation of South Asia*

14:55: Akshyeta Suryanarayan: ‘Cooking the World’: *Culinary choices in the Indus Civilisation*

15:15: Discussion

15:25: Coffee

15:55: Mauro Rizzetto: *Food Production and Consumption in Late Roman and Early Anglo-Saxon Britain: The zooarchaeological evidence from Pakenham, Icklingham, and West Stow (Suffolk)*

16:15: Samantha Leggett: *Anglo-Saxon Foodways and Faith*

16:35: Discussion
A Look Forward at the Study of the Mind in the Past
Room: 0.45

Organiser: Marc A. Abramiuk

The views and approaches for conducting mind-related research in archaeology have gone through a number of transformations over the past few decades – enough to give us pause to see that the field of cognitive archaeology in particular has come full circle. Cognitive archaeology emerged in part as a response to the logical positivist claim that the mind could not be studied by scientific-inclined archaeologists. Underlying the positivist claim was behaviourism which explained away a role for the mind; at most, the mind was envisaged as a simple, rational response system that was universally employed. With the most recent trend in cognitive archaeology, which advocates radical enactivism and envisions human engagement with the material world as affordances and cognitive scaffolding, we seem to have returned to a position that is effectively similar to behaviourism in certain key respects. Having the benefit of hindsight and utilizing what we have learned over the past few decades, this session seeks to rediscover the mind’s role in the past by revisiting tried-and-true approaches, as well as exploring new approaches by which the mind can be revealed to archaeologists.

14:15: Marc A. Abramiuk: A Mind Entangled or Strangled?
14:35: Ariane Burke: Space: The final frontier?

15:15: Coffee

15:45: Esther Fagelson: In the Mind of the Maker: Using lithic reduction sites to trace the development of planning and forethought in the human evolutionary past
16:05: Taryn Bell: Mind over Matter, and Matter over Mind: An archaeology of object attachment
16:25: Charlotte Burnell: MSA Problem Solving: Examining the evidence for working memory in the development of projectile weaponry
16:45: Discussion

Temporalities Otherwise: Archaeology, Relational Ontologies and the Time of the Other
Room: 4.44

Organisers: Francesco Orlandi Barbano and Silvia Truini

Archaeology as ‘undisciplined’ practice (Haber 2012; Hamilakis 2013) emerged from the acknowledgement of its disciplinary entanglements with the philosophical and epistemological tenets of Western modernity and necessarily also with its ‘darker side’ that, as Mignolo (2011) writes, is the irreducible colonial character of the knowledge it produces. With the recent ‘ontological turn’ in theory, archaeological materials came forth as vibrant components of material-sensorial assemblages: but is that enough to counteract the coloniality of (archaeological) knowledge?

In this session, we wish to expand the conversation on decoloniality, modernity, and archaeology from the realm of materiality to that of time, focussing on the discipline’s many ‘others’: non-professional local communities – beyond the boundaries of the political category of ‘indigeneity’ – but also the materials themselves. If ‘the self-determination of the Other is the other-determination of the Self’ (Holbraad et al. 2014), we seek to explore the ways in which archaeologists translate these self-determined temporalities into archaeological knowledge, and how their practice is reshaped in the doing. We hope to promote a dialogue between case-studies from different
regional contexts, where alternative voices emerge in the face of dominant archival productions, exceeding their limits and shaping creative ways of being in relation.

Contributions will explore:

• The place and the role of archaeology – as praxis in fieldwork, but also as discipline that retains archival power over the past and is part and parcel of the work of statutory and intra-governmental agencies for heritage conservation – in the production of time and temporalities;
• The practices of negotiation with the past of the Others and their translation into academic knowledge;
• The legacies of colonialism/imperialism in the production of archaeological knowledge and new avenues for the creation of emancipatory, counter-modern and alter/native archives;
• Memory, materiality and multi-temporal encounters in and around archaeological sites.

14:15: Francesco Orlandi Barbano and Silvia Truini: Introduction
14:25: Janine Ochoa: ‘Indigeneity’ and ‘Endemicity’ in an Environmental Archaeology Narrative: A Philippine case
14:45: Haythem Bastawi: Tracing the Mirage of the Near East: Saracens, Barbarians, Turks, Moors and Arabs
15:05: Viki Le Quelenec: Bridging the Gap: Social media in the open lab

15:25: Coffee

15:45: Francesco Orlandi Barbano: The ruins of the Sacred City: Alternative indigeneity in the other-history of Quilmes (North West Argentina).
16:05: Silvia Truini: TBC
16:25: Discussion

A More Central Place: Theorising Early Medieval Wales
Room: 3.58

Organisers: Andrew Seaman and Marion Shiner

Wales is not only the most poorly understood region of early Medieval Britain, but the period between c. 400 and 1100 AD in Wales also stands out as one of the most opaque of any era of British archaeology since the Mesolithic. A dearth of historical sources and an ephemeral archaeological record that exhibits great regional variation have made the application of recent theoretical frameworks more difficult than for elsewhere, and Wales has largely been left on the periphery of a ‘theoretical awakening’ that has been a major feature of research in other parts of early Medieval Britain over the last two decades. Moreover, despite being identified as having the potential to contribute to wider European debates and to readdress the Anglocentric focus of current research priorities within the field (e.g. Wickham 2010), Wales is often seen as part of a peripheral ‘Celtic fringe’. In this session we invite speakers to consider two sets of questions; firstly, what is the place of theory in the study of early Medieval Wales? What theoretical frameworks have been used by scholars, and are these appropriate given the complexities of the period and region? Indeed, is there room for theorization, or should we simply concentrate on the collection of data? Secondly, what is the place of Wales within the early Medieval world? How can research on Wales contribute to wider debates, and what needs to be done to bring Wales in from the periphery?
With the exception of a small number of world-renowned examples (Stonehenge, Hadrian’s Wall), the majority of British archaeological sites receive very little attention on the global stage. Occasionally some achieve momentary celebrity status as ‘globally important’, the result of significant fieldwork discoveries, but then sink back below the topsoil, real or metaphorical. Is there a way to escape this temporality – the archaeological ‘five minutes of global importance’ – and to transcend the miasma of localism to create a more sustained global engagement with British archaeology? Would it be desirable to do so?

This session examines wider relationships between local, national and global archaeologies, approached through the lens of British Archaeology. Within an increasingly globalised world of education and research, there appears a pressing need to engage the British archaeological agenda as fully as possible with developing global currents. World Archaeology is a hugely active field of research for British archaeological institutions. In contrast, research on British archaeology sees little involvement of non-British research institutions. Surely a necessary component of the pursuit of World Archaeology is a World/Global Perspective on British archaeology. Key questions investigated by this session are as follows: What role does British archaeological heritage have beyond our borders?; How is it perceived and presented, and what is its impact within global educational and economic arenas?; How is the perception of the past amongst British communities informed by or reconceived through engagement with international perspectives on the past?

The session relates to an ongoing AHRC-funded research project investigating innovative new ways to connect British archaeological heritage and associated timelines to a broader history of humanity. The session will include case studies from this project and present the findings of a survey of attitudes towards internationalising British archaeological heritage. We also welcome other contributions relevant to the session theme.

Global Perspectives on British Archaeology

Organisers: Simon Kaner and Sam Nixon
15:45: Jennifer Wexler: *Digital Experimentation and Developing Innovative Digital Tools for Global Engagement in Archaeology*
16:05: John Ertl: *Site Development and Utilization in Japan and the UK*
16:25: Discussion
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