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Introduction

Anna-Kaisa Salmi, Tiina Äikäs & Sanna Lipkin

In recent years, theoretical discussion has gained ground in Finnish archaeology. Theory is embedded in teaching via new course books and theory courses, and researchers have used multifaceted theoretical frameworks in their studies (e.g., Halinen et al. 2008, Puputti 2010, Wessman 2010). Old typology-oriented views of research have been acknowledged and recent theoretical discussions have been broadly followed. Nevertheless, due to the relatively recent increase in theoretical interest, researchers are still seeking their course in the use of theory. Archaeologists are actively getting to know different theoretical starting points and finding their weakest and strongest aspects. We hope that, in the future, Finnish archaeologists will be taking an even more substantial part in international theoretical discussions and thus in the development of archaeological theories.

The number of doctoral students has also increased in recent years. Since the early 21st century, also the number of PhD degrees taken has risen (Table). The financing for the graduate school in archaeology has also provided many archaeologists with the opportunity to begin to write their doctoral dissertations. The Academy of Finland and private foundations have supported multi-year archaeological projects and individual doctorates. This has enabled academics in three different Finnish universities to find their own branches of studies: The University of Helsinki has carried out research in Syria, on Jabal Harun in Jordan, in Pompei in Italy, and in Karelia (both Russian and Finnish), as well as research focusing on prehistoric and historic times in southern Finland and Lapland, the University of Turku has specialized in the Middle Ages in Finland, and the University of Oulu has developed research projects concentrating on human and animal osteology and specialized in the research of Sámi archaeology and historical times in northern Finland, as well as carried out a research project of the ancient settlement site at Crustumerium near Rome. Furthermore, all universities have a project researching ancient human or animal DNA.

Table. The number of PhD degrees in archaeology in Finnish universities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>1990-1999</th>
<th>2000-2005</th>
<th>2006-2010</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Helsinki</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oulu</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turku</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For young researchers in different universities, it is important to find a forum for discussion and the exchange of ideas. Hence was born the idea of a workshop that is open for PhD students in archaeology from all Finnish universities. The workshop was organized on the 5th and 6th of November 2009 at the University of Oulu. Professor Tim Insoll from the University of Manchester and Dr Jan Storå from the Osteological Research Laboratory of the University of Stockholm were invited as guest lecturers.

The theme of the workshop was “The use and critique of social archaeology”. Ideas of social archaeology have been used in recent articles and dissertations, but usually the archaeologists using the theory have not clearly defined what they mean by it (e.g., Vaneeckhout 2009, Salmi et al. 2011). Since post-processual ideas have gained a solid foothold, archaeologists have more or less abandoned the quest for an overarching archaeological theory and have focused their attention on a number of different theoretical frameworks complementing, not excluding each other. Archaeologists have been interested in a wide variety of theoretical themes, such as gender and queer archaeology, the archaeology of age and religion, object biographies, and so forth. What is common to all these approaches is that archaeological artefacts are understood in their social context, and thus the term “social archaeology” has been used to describe these different archaeological approaches. Today, the term “social archaeology” is widely used and also debated (e.g., Webmoor & Witmore 2008). It has been argued that, in fact, all archaeology can be called social archaeology and thus the concept is meaningless, and that the emphasis on the social diverts our attention away from the actual materiality of the archaeological artefacts.

The aim of our workshop was to raise the questions “What is social archaeology?”, “How is it used?”, and “Does it give something new to the archaeological research?”. This volume gathers together the papers presented during the workshop. In this volume, we have also invited researchers who didn’t attend the workshop but who are interested in social archaeology and apply its themes in their research to contribute their papers. The themes of the articles cover a wide range of issues, such as the archaeology of religion (Paula Kouki, Sanna Lipkin, and Juha Tuppi), identity (Pirjo Hamari, Minna Lehtola, and Jari-Matti Kuusela), human-environmental and human-animal relationships (Samuel Vaneeckhout and Anna-Kaisa Salmi), and ways of doing and writing archaeology (Visa Immonen and Mirette Modarress). The extent of time and space discussed in the papers is considerable, as they range from the Neolithic to the Early Modern period and cover a geographical area reaching from Siberia to Fennoscandia and from the Mediterranean to Northern Finland.
The presentations during the workshop and the papers in this volume show that social archaeological approaches can be used for solving a wide range of archaeological research questions, and that new insights into the past can be gained by taking into account the complex relationships between people, other people, and things. The unifying theme of the papers is that people are understood as actively engaged with each other, their material culture, and the environment. It is shown that material culture is used in making and displaying identities and that material culture also shapes the way people see the world and interact with each other. People also engage with their natural environment and animals, and thus, the inclusion of “natural” things into social networks is called into consideration. It is also shown that archaeologists work in a social milieu with and for other people, and that political currents, ideologies, and research paradigms always affect the way archaeologists perform, publish, and use their research. The workshop also considered the differences between the concepts of cultural and social. Some archaeologists have claimed for using these terms as equals. In fact, these terms have many touching points, since both social and cultural issues exist among a group of people at the same time and affect one another. They may be examined in the social relations between different cultural groups, such as two neighboring families of different ethnicities having similar kinds of houses and furniture. These two groups may still be distinguished, for example, according to their cooking customs or religious habits.

The organization of this volume follows a temporal and spatial framework. The volume starts with studies concerning medieval and more recent times. With the topic of identities, we move from Siberia to the Mediterranean area. The next four articles deal with classical archaeology. The topic of religion binds articles dealing with Italy and Ostrobothnia. From the Bothnian Bay we return once more to the south to consider ethical questions in archaeology. Professor Milton Núñez kindly accepted our proposal to write the afterword of this volume and provide his long-term perspective on the use and development of theory and the inclusion of social approaches in Finnish archaeology. The editors wish to thank him for that. We are also grateful to all the workshop participants and paper authors who devoted their time to presenting and writing their papers and who made it possible to publish this volume.
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1. Mapping the ontology of the Middle Ages

It is seemingly easy to say what a medieval artefact is – in Scandinavia this means that the object was produced after the Viking Age, c. AD 1050, and before the modern period, c. AD 1550, or in Finland, that it dates to the years between AD 1150/1200 and AD 1523. Similarly, in the routines of archaeological work, the Middle Ages appear as a highly practical term establishing a certain chronological frame distinguishing Antiquity or, in the Nordic countries, the prehistoric period, the Middle Ages, and the modern era from each other and assigning the material to different specialized professionals (cf. Taavitsainen 2001). Despite the ease of applying the Middle as a concept, the difficulty of determining its content becomes apparent when justifying certain years as its limits and separating objects dated to such a period from artefacts of earlier or later periods. The different chronologies used in Scandinavia and Finland, and the enigmatic formulation ‘AD 1150/1200’ alone betray something of this complexity.

The Middle Ages are in fact an elusive concept suggesting a temporal difference between the premodern and the modern, and only certain material configurations, a certain ontology, allow us to speak of these differences. This particular nature of the period is crucial for medieval archaeology as it orientates research and implies which aspects of historical change it should describe and interpret (Cinthio 1984). In the following, I analyse the effects of periodization, its modern conditions, and subsequent relevance for medieval archaeology and approaching the Middle Ages as something nonmodern or premodern. The analysis draws from the theoretical physicist and feminist theorist Karen Barad’s ideas on the philosophy of sciences. Her thoughts and concepts help reveal the intricacies of conceptualizing the Middle Ages, and ask whether the medieval period is merely a heuristic disciplinary construction, perhaps affected by the discipline’s ties to contemporary social realities, or does it have some genuine connection with the past. After introducing the main points of Barad’s agential realism, I proceed to various periodizations
of the medieval in Finland, both across disciplines and in archaeology where the meaning of the Middle Ages has undergone significant revisions. Despite these developments, I argue that medieval archaeology should be even more concerned with the issue of modernity, and the entanglements between the Middle Ages and the modern. I present two examples of archaeological topics, which do not explicitly engage with relations between the modern and nonmodern, but are nonetheless affected by them. Lastly, to embrace this complexity and articulate its consequences, I introduce the concept of medievality.

Karen Barad’s analysis of realism and constructionism in academic disciplines gets to the heart of the relationship between periodization and the past. With the physicist Nils Bohr’s (1885–1962) theories on quantum physics and feminist science studies as her springboard, Barad (2007: 18) tries to find a way out of the swamps of the absoluteness of scientific realism, and the relativism of social constructionism. Instead of placing herself in some middle ground between the two extremes, she argues that both are representationalist accounts. They sternly believe in scientific knowledge as a mediator between us and the material world. The only difference between the two positions is in the referent of this knowledge, which for realists lies in the world “as it really is”, while the referent in the constructionist view is the social sphere (Barad 2007: 48). In contrast to this shared ground, Barad’s agential realism is based on performative approaches. It forms “an epistemological-ontological-ethical framework that provides an understanding of the role of human and nonhuman, material and discursive, and natural and cultural factors in scientific and other social-material practices, thereby moving such considerations beyond the well-worn debates that pit constructivism against realism, agency against structure, and idealism against materialism” (Barad 2007: 26).

As Barad (2007: 55) rejects the notion of a representational relation between interpretations and things, her focus shifts to developing a diffractive methodology which reads the insights of different disciplines through one another and contributes to the relational ontology that is the core of agential realism. She calls this attitude transdisciplinarity, since it does not mine useful fragments of information from a range of disciplines, but analyses the histories of organization of knowledge and their role in the formation of subjectivities and disciplines. Diffractive methodology is attentive to the finer details of various disciplinary approaches and tries to avoid cooking up a holistic soup. In medieval archaeology, diffractive methodology can help in analysing periodization and its constitutive elements, modernity and its counterforce, premodernity. Diffractive methodology criss-crosses disciplinary discourses and material realms, enabling the ontologically distinct nonmodern to be approached.
Writing science and the social together is writing against reflexivity which, according to Barad, has its ground in representationalism, and thus leads to treating social variables such as class, colonialism, gender, or nationalism as already formed categories merely affecting science (Barad 2007: 87–91). As variables, they could be played out from the relationship formed between medieval archaeologists and the medieval past. In place of reflexivity, Barad offers the concept of *diffractivity*, which should be understood as an *intra-action* between the science and the social. Intra-action, in turn, signifies the mutual constitution of entangled agencies of entities, the researcher and the researched, which are distinct only in relation to their entanglement. As such, they do not exist as individual elements, but are mutually individuated, coextensive, and cannot be reduced to smaller units, or extracted from the final conclusions.

The intra-activity of elements can be conceived in its full force only by introducing Barad’s other central concept, *phenomenon*. Phenomena are the primary units in her account of ontology. They are not entities or cognitive schemata with independently determinate limits, but instead the entangled material agencies where these limits are negotiated. Emerging always as in a phenomenon, agentially intra-acting components are ontologically inseparable; they are relations without pre-existing preforms.

The Middle Ages are a phenomenon of a kind, and thus a site of scholarly intra-action, a material arrangement that comes to being along the emerging outlines of subjects and objects. As a contemporary phenomenon, the study of the Middle Ages set up “an agential cut between ‘subject’ and ‘object’ “, between the scholar and the material trace of the medieval. Intra-actions are enactments of agential separability, which, in turn, is the condition for the emergence of “exteriority-within-phenomena”, its matter and meaning (Barad 2007: 139–140). Hence, following Barad’s agential realism, the Middle Ages are a disciplinary construction, which nevertheless is necessary for the actual past and its material traces to become visible. Such a conclusion appears to conform to many current attempts to reinstate materiality, realism, and various forms of objectivity into archaeological theory after post-structuralism and the linguistic turn, and their claims of fully constructed and textual nature of reality (e.g. Olsen 2003). The extent to which the social and science are entangled in Barad’s agential realism suggests, however, that the Middle Ages as a concept and the foundation of medieval archaeology should be reinvestigated in the light of that entanglement. I begin this endeavour by analysing various definitions of the Middle Ages across Finnish disciplines studying the medieval past.
2. Varieties of the Middle Ages

A well-known way to give a content and structure to the medieval period is to refer to political events as in the historian Jalmari Jaakkola’s (1885–1964) influential division of the Finnish Middle Ages. The basis of his periodization lies in the Central European tripartite model distinguishing the Early, High and Late Middle Ages, which he adapts to local political events (Jaakkola 1935, 1938, 1944, 1950, 1959).

In Jaakkola’s scheme, the early Middle Ages begins with Christianization and integration into the Kingdom of Sweden. Nineteenth-century historiography established that this happened around the 1150s, when St Henry of Uppsala and King Eric of Sweden undertook the First Crusade to Finland. The early Middle Ages ended with the signing of the Treaty of Schlüsselburg (Sw. Nöteborg), the first document regulating the border between Sweden and the Novgorod Republic, in 1323. The succeeding period, the high Middle Ages, lasted until 1397, when Queen Margaret (1353–1412) formed the Kalmar Union, uniting the three kingdoms of Denmark, Norway and Sweden. In Jaakkola’s periodization, the late Middle Ages ended in 1523, when Gustavus Vasa (1496–1560) was elected as the king of Sweden and the Kalmar Union was dissolved. A nether token year could be 1527, when the Church of Sweden was officially separated from the Catholic Church and the Reformation began.

Many historians have criticized such periodizations based solely on political events. For instance, the historian Jukka Korpela (1999, 2004, 2006) has pointed to differing historical and cultural circumstances in Finland. Jaakkola’s periodization is based on events that affected South-West Finland, while in east Finland and Karelia the political and cultural situation was different. The eastern Orthodox Church, the Novgorod Republic and other eastern powers were much more significant in east Finland, making the western periodization inappropriate.

In addition to its limited geographical applicability, Jaakkola’s periodization seems more or less superfluous for other fields of historiography as it does not provide easily identifiable criteria for organizing other kinds of developments. The historian Mika Kallioinen (2001: 42), for example, argues that even in south-west Finland transformations in fundamental social structures were much slower than changes in the political sphere, and thus the society characterizing the Middle Ages ended with the emergence of the modern nation-state with its centralized administration and deepening polarization between social classes or estates. This process, however, was not complete until the turn of the 16th and 17th centuries.
In addition to historians, disciplines such as art history and ethnology have presented their conceptualizations of the Middle Ages. Before the 1990s, the study of medieval material culture was a firmly established part of the repertoire of ethnology (Vuorela 1977; Räsänen 1992). Since then, focus has gradually shifted to modern and contemporary cultures while archaeology has expanded its scope into the historical era. Despite this, the ethnologist Ilmar Talve (1997) sketches the historical outlines of folk culture in his general survey Finnish Folk Culture, first published in Finnish in 1990. He detects two major ruptures in the past – the transition from prehistory to history during the 13th century and the onset of industrialization in the 1860s and 1870s.

Besides the two ruptures, Talve (1997: 296–304) distinguishes historical periods of which the first extends from the 13th century to around 1500. In Talve’s scheme, the Middle Ages are characterized by the centrality of the church and the crown, but the foundation of first towns, and the adoption of north European urban culture are also listed among the important features. The medieval period was succeeded by a transition period from 1500 to 1730, which saw the birth of the nation-state and its centralized administration. Moreover, the 16th century was the era of the Reformation, and from the late 16th century onwards the period was distinguished by wars in which Sweden took part. However, according to Talve, the most significant event was the expansion of permanent settlement from the coastal areas of south and west Finland into central, east and north Finland.

In art history, the definition of the Middle Ages has traditionally rested on a stylistic chronology in which the Romanesque and Gothic styles belong to the confines of the period. They were preceded by Viking art and the artworks of the Crusade Period. While Viking art (800–1025) is a stylistic designation common to all the Nordic countries, the Crusade Period (1025–1150/1200) has no equivalent in the Scandinavian chronology of style. In fact, the period has not been attributed with special epoch-defining characteristics of style (Sarvas 1987, Edgren 1998: 253–259). Hence, from the stylistic point of view, it seems best to consider it as a transitional period between Viking and Romanesque art (Holmqvist 1963).

In Finland, the Romanesque period remains rather brief, lasting from around 1150 to 1250, while Gothic style is dated to 1250–1550/1560, and its succeeding Renaissance style to 1550/1560–1660 (Gardberg 1987, Riska 1987a, 1987b). Although the periodization seems to suggest a rather easy succession of styles, Viking art and Romanesque features are often both present in the artefacts of the Crusade Period, making the distinction solely on stylistic grounds problematic. The same difficulty is present in categorizing some artefacts as Romanesque or Gothic,
or Gothic or Renaissance, especially in the 16th century, when features of both styles often appear simultaneously.

Further predicaments in bringing together style and chronology are exemplified by the wooden font of Vesilahti Church, which is decorated with a Romanesque braid motif. This object was long considered to be from the early Middle Ages (Valonen 1971), but a dendrochronological analysis of the wood eventually showed that the font dates to 1425–45 (Hiekkanen 2007b: 271–273). The ornamentation might be a symptom of Romanesque fashion or revival during the late Middle Ages. Be that as it may, such stylistic and chronological concerns remain pivotal in art history, although in more recent scholarship the social background as well as the production and use of works of art and architecture have gained more currency in defining the Middle Ages (e.g. Edgren 2000, Pirinen 2000, Hiekkanen 2007a, 2007b, Räsänen 2009).

Due to the character of their object of research and sources, folklore studies are quite distinct compared with the above-mentioned disciplines. Accordingly, the periodization used by folklorists might appear quite peculiar. In their survey of Finnish folklore, Leea Virtanen and Thomas DuBois (2000) draw a broad distinction between agrarian and the 20th-century industrial societies. In agrarian society, the village constituted the most basic folkloric community, whereas in industrial society, the family becomes the core unit. Virtanen and DuBois do present more subtle chronological distinctions than this, but instead of historical development, geographical variations are much more prominent in their survey.

The preceding glance at a variety of disciplines and their ways of defining the Middle Ages remains abridged and without the full historical complexity of the medieval in respective disciplinary histories. Moreover, since the 19th century many Finnish medievalists, especially those focusing on material culture, have worked in an interdisciplinary atmosphere combining archaeological, art-historical, ethnological and historical methodologies (see e.g. Immonen 2010a). In spite of its brevity and shortcomings, the scope of definitions nevertheless manages to demonstrate how the concerns of disciplines result in differing, though not altogether detached, criteria for the medieval. In Finland, medieval archaeology has also adopted elements from the range of definitions of the Middle Ages, while developing its own distinct ways of construing the medieval past.

3. Written sources, material processes and medieval archaeology

In the earlier part of the 20th century, Finnish medieval archaeology largely conformed to the periodization presented by historians (cf. Immonen 2010b),
but gradually the Middle Ages have been increasingly approached in terms of material culture and distinctly archaeological concerns. Since the medieval period means a transition from prehistory to history in Finland, written sources often have a major role in drawing the line between the prehistoric and historical eras (Andrén 1998, Taavitsainen 1999). The availability of the new source material is indeed an important feature, but upon closer examination, the situation is not so straightforward.

Between 1910 and 1935, the antiquarian Reinhold Hausen (1850–1942) compiled all the then-known written sources related to the Finnish Middle Ages, and published them as *Finlands medeltidsurkunder* (FMU), or ‘the Medieval Documents of Finland’. The oldest entries are passages from Russian chronicles and Scandinavian rune-stones describing events from the 9th century onwards. In contrast, the oldest authenticated written source directly related to Finland is Pope Alexander III’s (in office 1159–1181) letter from the early 1170s to the Archbishop of Uppsala and other bishops (FMU 24). Written documents remained very scant well into the 13th century. Even if the earliest sporadic entries of the corpus can be excluded from the definition of the Finnish Middle Ages on the premise that they are not local or reliable, there survives a small number of Late Iron Age artefacts with written texts. In addition to a disc brooch of silver with a runic phrase, and a ring brooch with a Latin inscription (Figure 1), the Finnish material includes Iron Age swords ornamented with Latin inscriptions (Jarva

*Figure 1. This ring brooch of silver found in the Late Iron Age and early medieval burial ground of Tuukkala in Mikkeli was probably made in the 14th century. The inscription set in Gothic majuscles reads as ABCDEFGH–AKLMNOA (National Museum inv. no. 2481:94, Immonen 2009b: Cat. 19:63). Photo: Visa Immonen / National Museum of Finland.*
2002: 12–13). In sum, the appearance of written sources does not provide an absolute definition of the Middle Ages.

According to both David Austin (1990: 9, 13, 24) and John Moreland (2010: 1–2), the predicament of medieval archaeology has indeed been its insistence on the availability of texts. This has trapped the discipline into an agenda generated within history, and left the periodization archaeologically unchallenged. Moreover, if the beginning of the Finnish Middle Ages could in some way be defined by the occurrence of written sources, this would not solve the problem of finding a suitable end for the period. There are nevertheless more archaeologically justifiable phenomena for anchoring the periodization.

The transition from the Crusade Period to the early Middle Ages took place with the First Crusade c. 1150, if the 19th-century view is held. The conversion can be archaeologically detected as the change of burial customs from pre-Christian to Christian, or in more practical terms, as the decrease and eventual absence of grave goods in burials. Since the pre-Christian burials with artefacts can be dated on the basis of their finds, it has been argued that the youngest of them reveal the earliest possible date for Christianization. Before the 1970s, archaeologists maintained that such a transformation in graves happened indeed in south-west Finland around 1150 (cf. Kivikoski 1961), but in an important article published in 1971, the numismatist and archaeologist Pekka Sarvas was able to present several excavated graves with artefacts, including coins, which date the burials to the latter part of the 12th century. Pre-Christian burials were thus at least half a century younger than the traditional date of the conversion. Sarvas did not explicitly propose that his discovery would amount to a change of chronology. After Sarvas’ article, however, it has become customary to place the beginning of the early Middle Ages to c. 1200, although the older dating to 1150 has still its proponents, resulting in the rendition “AD 1150/1200”.

Archaeology has been able show on the basis of burials that the pace of Christianization was slower and more uneven across the country than previously assumed (Sarvas 1971, Taavitsainen 1999, Hiekkanen 2005: 23). In contrast to south-west Finland, Christianization was further prolonged in the northern and eastern regions of the country, implying a later date for the early Middle Ages. In Karelia, grave goods still appear as late as the 14th century, and in North Finland even later. Christianization was thus not a matter of any clear-cut conversion, but a process that lasted centuries.

Since specific monuments, such as Christian burials, churches, castles, and artefact types such as ring brooches enable archaeologists to date certain sites as medieval, the
archaeologist Knut Drake argued in 1992 that the scope of medieval archaeology in Finland should be defined on the basis of the monuments and finds that characterize the period. Drake’s and others’ contributions founded on the identification of particular types of artefacts or structures serve their purpose on a practical level (e.g. Mäkivuoti 1992), but they have limits for developing an archaeological understanding of the Middle Ages. In fact, in order to work, they require the assumption that we already know what the Middle Ages were, the only remaining problem being the finding of proper chronological frames for the phenomenon.

The Swedish medieval archaeologist Erik Cinthio noted in 1984 that the Middle Ages are not only a chronological term, but fundamentally based on recognizing and distinguishing various social and material processes in the past and its archaeological record. In his view, the Middle Ages are an intermediate period, a radical rupture between the prehistoric and the modern (Table). In Scandinavia, the medieval period witnessed the agrarian revolution, the establishment of peasant society, the rise of bourgeois urban culture, and religious restructuring with Christianization. While these or similar lists of characteristics are implicit in a range of studies produced in Nordic medieval archaeology, Cinthio’s way of articulating them as the ontological premises of inquiry has remained rather unusual in the Finnish context (cf. Mogren 2005).

Archaeological scholarship on Christianization emphasizing its processual nature can be seen as an archaeological way of tracing the meaning of the medieval. Another more recent contribution to understanding archaeologically the medieval era is the discussion on the transition from the Middle Ages to the modern period. Georg Haggrén (2009) introduces the concept of ‘the age of transition’ into Finnish archaeology (see Gaimster & Stamper 1997). With this term, Haggrén refers to the shift from premodern to modern systems of production and consumption, reflected

Table. Erik Cinthio’s (1984) conception of the Nordic Middle Ages as an intermediate period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Prehistoric period</th>
<th>Middle Ages</th>
<th>Modern period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Written sources</strong></td>
<td>No written records</td>
<td></td>
<td>Quantitative and structural change in written sources (cameral sources)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Christianity</strong></td>
<td>No or weak Christian influences</td>
<td></td>
<td>Decreasing political power of the church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State organization</strong></td>
<td>No or weak supra-regional organization</td>
<td></td>
<td>Emerging central administration and state bureaucracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economy</strong></td>
<td>Barter</td>
<td></td>
<td>Market economy and increasing financial competition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Archaeological analyses consider Christianization and the age of transition as processes which cannot be contained easily into a strict chronology. J ohn M oreland (2010: 9), in fact, urges medieval archaeologists to let go of the historiographical obsession with finding clear limits, ends and beginnings, and focus instead on writing coherent studies in their own terms. A s if following Moreland’s encouragement, the new archaeological work on the Finnish Middle Ages has brought into light the social and material processes that contribute to the archaeological definition of the period, and reveal the need to engage in an even more thorough analysis of its material cultures. M aterial and social processes are not, however, only the subject matter of medieval archaeology, the discipline is also subjected to them, and this could pose a threat to the project of mapping the ontology of the Middle Ages.

4. The Middle Ages as a mirror of modernity

Cinthio emphasizes the social and material processes that unfolded during the Middle Ages, but his apprehension of the period is strangely void like the column in his table shows. Cinthio’s conceptualization of the Middle Ages is not unprecedented, and as a matter of fact, it appears to follow the early modern humanisms which saw a rupture or gap, medium aevum, between Antiquity and the Renaissance (Workman 1999a: 12). This brings forth the modern background in which the period is embedded. If the Middle Ages veritably are a modern construction, this has problematic consequences as summarized by the folklore scholar Pertti J. Anttonen (2005: 14):

“M odernity cannot represent non-modernity without modern mediation, which therefore makes the representation of non-modernity also modern. […] Since non-modernity can only be discussed as modernity’s otherness, modern discourses on non-modernity are at the same time modern discourses on modernity.”
Immonen: The mess before the modern

The concept of medievalism is repeatedly invoked when the modern interest in its revival or reconstruction is discussed (Petersen 2009: 36). Leslie Workman’s (1999a: 12) influential definition considers medievalism as the continued construction of the Middle Ages:

“medieval historiography, the study of successive recreation of the Middle Ages by different generations, is the Middle Ages. And this of course is medievalism.”

According to Umberto Eco (1987), in modernity, for something to be rooted in the medieval is to have unquestionable authority and tradition over contemporaneity. The Middle Ages allow issues of modernity to be justified: modern languages, nation-states, the capitalist economy as well as individuality emerged in the medieval period, and thus “looking at the Middle Ages means looking at our infancy” (Eco 1987: 64–65). Kathleen Davis (2010: 59) identifies, moreover, a double structure in the periodization: the Middle Ages are both the origin of a nation or culture, and the despised space of barbarism, the Other. Gwendolyn A. Morgan (2009) stresses that also academic cultures create and reproduce such post-medieval conceptions of the Middle Ages.

If medievalism is produced by modernity (e.g. Workman 1999b), then the Middle Ages are a representation without proper access to the past as such. Indeed, Richard Glejzer (2000) points out that there lies a danger in considering the Middle Ages as a single period, as “an object of knowledge”, which can somehow be approached through careful study and contextualization (cf. Moreland 2010: 48; see also the problem of worlding the world in Cole & Smith 2010: 9).

Medievalism has also aroused the interest of scholars in Finland during the last decade, as shown by several studies on antiquarian and archaeological medievalism (Valkeapää 2000, 2002, Fewster 2006, Immonen & Taavitsainen 2008, Ahl-Waris 2010, Immonen 2010a, 2010b). A common theme for them is the pre-eminence and use of the medieval period in nationalism, the construction of local identities and the forging of religious sympathies. These are ultimately elements of modernization. In this vein, Derek Fewster (2006) has critically examined the boom of medieval archaeology since the 1990s and suggests that Finland’s membership in the European Union and deepening integration in the late 20th century have affected the notion of the national past. This has elevated the attention given to European universalism, and its past precedent, the Hanseatic League, and consequently increased resources
If Cinthio was perhaps too hasty in concluding what the Middle Ages were, the problem with medievalism lies, conversely, in its inability to envision alternatives to the totality ascribed to modernity. Are there not ways to address the nonmodern otherness of the Middle Ages without contamination by modernity? How is medieval archaeology as a discipline, saturated with modernity, equipped to face the possibility of alternative material cultures and, ultimately, alternative ways of being and existence? Answering these questions without falling into medievalism calls for acknowledging an intra-action, to apply Barad’s concept, of modern and premodern, or of contemporary context and traces of the medieval, in medieval archaeology. Their intra-active relation connotes an ontological difference separating the two. In the current disciplinary situation, however, an analysis of premodernity and its relation to the medieval is still largely underdeveloped, or at least it has not become a point of departure for organizing research and its issues such as the concept of modern for the archaeology of modernity.

5. From the archaeology of modern capitalism to the receding premodern

An impetus for turning to the analysis of the Middle Ages as an ontological concept comes from the archaeology of modern capitalism. This endeavour emerged in the archaeology of the New World in the 1980s and culminated in Charles E. Orser’s (1996) and Matthew Johnson’s (1996) seminal works. They demonstrate the need to examine archaeologically the impact of colonialism, capitalism, and modernity on a global scale. Here, capitalism is not conceived of simply as an exploitative economic system, but crucially a more powerful and dynamic historical process affecting all aspects of everyday life. As part of the archaeological study of capitalism, Johnson (1999), in particular, has raised the question how far into the distant past the historical antecedents of and preconditions for the emergence of modern capitalism should be traced. Usually, 15th-century mercantile capitalism with its long-distance trade monopolies is considered to be the first instance of modern capitalism (Groover 2002).

In medieval archaeology, perhaps inspired by the archaeology of modern capitalism, analyses of the Middle Ages tend to focus on tracing modernity at the expense of the premodern and medieval. This is especially discernible in a certain reductive strategy exemplified here by two cases dealing with medieval economics.
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and trade but expanding into broader cultural visions. The first one is from Peter Carelli’s work on early-medieval South Scandinavia, which has no parallels in the Finnish archaeological tradition, while the second concerns the archaeology of the Hanseatic League, a topic that has also fascinated Finnish scholars.

In 2001, Carelli sketched a broad account of the social and material processes of 12th-century South Scandinavia in his monograph En kapitalistisk anda: Kulturella förändringar i 1100-talets Danmark (A capitalist spirit: Cultural changes in twelfth-century Denmark). Carelli analyses, for instance, the division of plots in Lund, where their number increased tenfold within a century, while at the same time the layout of the town transformed. A common feature of the new settlement was the orientation of the long, narrow plots towards the street, which Carelli associates with increasing commercial interest. Also, urban commodity production changed fundamentally during the early Middle Ages as production increased and diversified, and the social status of craftsmen became freer and more articulated. Moreover, the consumption of pottery, shoes and beads shifted from limited to mass consumption, indicating the expansion of the consumer population. In sum, Carelli argues that the early medieval towns saw the birth of urban identity reflected in the archaeological record. All these changes in society and material culture occurred in a period which he calls “the long 12th century” whose social dynamics were characterized by a general economization of social life and incipient capitalization.

Carelli bases his analysis of 12th-century Scandinavia on Max Weber’s and Werner Sombart’s sociological theories of the birth of modern society and its forms of interaction. By doing this, by bringing the model of modern capitalism into the early Middle Ages, he traces the roots of the capitalist market system and other modern features further and further back to the Middle Ages. Carelli thus extends the notion of modernity gradually into the realm of the premodern, erasing the latter. The premodern and modern ultimately rest on an ontologically unified basis which Carelli sets out to unravel. They form a line of progressive development from one to the other, or rather, modernity serves as the preform for premodernity.

A similar line of argument is present in the conceptions of the impact of German Hanseatic material culture in the Nordic countries. In recent decades, the presence of the Hansa has been discussed in terms of (proto-)colonialism. In Turku, the oldest and largest medieval town in Finland, local archaeological evidence has revealed several indications of northern German influence on its material culture, and these are interpreted in terms of Hanseatic culture (Figure 2) (e.g. Haggrén 2003: 235, Immonen 2003: 251, Ahola et al. 2004, Majantie 2010: 36–37, 271–272, 286). Consequently, the economic hegemony of the Hanseatic League is
paralleled with that of a proto-colonial power, which has marked repercussions for archaeological interpretations of economic, cultural and social phenomena alike. Some artefacts or certain characteristics of Hanseatic origin in artefacts found in Turku are quite often interpreted as a sign that Hanseatic culture and its practices had been successfully adopted in the town. Imports formed a progressive medium for cultural, ethnic, genealogical and social ties contributing to the creation of a Hanseatic culture and identity.

The cultural aspect of the Hansa and the concept of identity production have indeed vitalized medieval archaeology and permitted new avenues for research. However, problems arise from the very loose and vague manner in which the concept of Hanseatic culture has been applied to material culture in Finnish studies that do not analyse the differences between modern colonialism and the premodern dynamics of economics and social interaction (Gosden 2004, Immonen 2007, Mehler 2009). For instance, the distinction between Hansa and non-Hansa may have been drawn differently in political and trade contexts than in consumption. How
do economic networks actually translate into proto-colonial forms of interaction? One might ask even more pertinently whether the use of a colonial or even proto-colonial model is appropriate for a medieval context of no nation-states and their administration, which were so important for modern colonialism.

It is easy to relate Hanseatic culture to a more advanced civilization that was imposed from the outside and remained a superficial layer on indigenous cultures as in Turku or other medieval towns in the Baltic Sea region. Likewise, when studies follow the historical narrative of spreading capitalism, the new economic form is conceived as an advance and a self-evident end of historical progress. As in Carelli’s narrative, modernity has become the only ontological logic relevant in approaching the premodern. The premodern is uprooted from the Middle Ages, and the Other of the modern is pushed further and further away. In the case of Hanseatic culture, the premodern also has a spatial dimension since it comes to imply indigenous or local material culture in contrast with progressive international trends.

6. Modern/nonmodern/premodern

The archaeology of modernity has made contemporaneity and modernization conceptual motors energizing theoretical debate in archaeology (for Finnish examples, see Herva et al. 2007, Ylimaunu 2007, Herva 2010). It has formed into a creative attempt to dislodge or detach contemporaneity from its givenness, and to expand disciplinary awareness of the unique role of material culture in constituting the modern era. The question of modernity is an ontological one drawing the very foundation of knowing and being into the limelight. In other words, the archaeology of modernity envisions how archaeology could be dislodged from its traditional ontologies.

The archaeology of modernity has an ambiguous relationship with the phenomena that it analyses. On the one hand, it dwells in contemporaneity which establishes the conditions of the inquiry in the first place, while on the other, it questions the foundations of modernity and attempts to reveal its aporia and criticize its consequences (Lucas 2004). For instance, the new insistence on materiality in archaeological theory is grounded, e.g., on the attacks of such contemporary thinkers as Gilles Deleuze, Martin Heidegger, or Bruno Latour on modernity’s anthropocentrism. They assert man as the foundation of all knowledge and order of the world, dismissing the materiality of the world as secondary in importance (see e.g. Normark 2008, Webmoor & Witmore 2008, Lihammer & Nordin 2010).
Another criticism of modernity, also embraced in archaeology, is grounded on the post-colonial insight of the interconnectedness of modernity and colonialism (Cohen 2001, Ingham & Warren 2003, Liebmann & Rizvi 2008). Here, colonialism is constitutive of modernity, of the making of the capitalist world system, the public sphere and the self-government of people. It entails not only the geographical and economic expansion of Europe in the form of establishing colonies and the ensuing unequal and exploitative power relations, but also the more general imposition of modern ideology into the life-world of the subjects. Hence, the world and its history are reduced to a manifestation of the history of the modern. Yet, as Arturo Escobar (2008: 165–168) states, modernity should be refracted through the lens of colonialism. This uneasy entanglement of colonialism and modernity questions the appropriateness of using proto-colonial models for approaching premodern phenomena, such as Hanseatic culture.

Although the discussion of the modern often draws on the concept of nonmodern, the notion of premodernity is much less explored. Modernity nevertheless implies or constitutes a certain understanding of premodernity, or as Cole and Smith (2010: 2) point out, “the intellectual and political history of the Middle Ages gives coherence to various theories of the modern”. Central ideas of premodern thought have been read in contemporary or postmodern philosophy as an opposite force to modernity. Examples include gift as a model for the emergence of social and exchange structures and commentary or citation of the Scriptures as a model for the constitution of subjectivity as well as interpretation in general (Holsinger 2005, Labbie 2006, Cole & Smith 2010).

It is crucial to link discussion on premodernity with the concept of modernity, because, as Julian Thomas (2004) argues, archaeology as a discipline and a way of organizing the world is thoroughly saturated with the modern, or rather, archaeology and modernity have emerged in intra-action. Instead of stunting understanding, the modern disciplinary discourse makes it possible to talk of the Middle Ages. Medieval archaeology could be described as a mode of engagement with the medieval, a process of involvement with things of that era (cf. Emery 2009: 78).

7. Materiality and performativity in medieval archaeology

The Middle Ages act as modernity’s strange Other. Although the concept of otherness has typically belonged to the arsenal of postmodernist approaches, the frictions it implies are crucially not merely epistemological or social, but also material. Put in Barad’s terms, the Middle Ages are a material-discursive phenomenon iteratively
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produced in the entanglements of the past and the boundary-drawing practices of medieval archaeology. As determinate entities emerge in intra-action in their ontological inseparability, similarly the objects of observation and their measuring agencies emerge from the intra-action that produces them: “[A] phenomenon is a specific intra-action of an ‘object’ and the ‘measuring agencies’” (Barad 2007: 128). For Barad, arrangements of measuring and observation, or apparatuses, are not mere instruments of recording, but practices of drawing boundaries. They are specific material and meaningful engagements in the configurations of the world (Barad 2007: 56). In other words, in addition to being a discursive formation, the Middle Ages are also a social, epistemological and material phenomenon.

If matter and meaning can be grasped only in their becoming along with a phenomenon, matter is not fixed to the world’s structure, given, or even a final outcome of the world’s spectrum of various processes. The matter of the Middle Ages is agentive without any stable essence. Echoing many contemporary ontologies, for instance Deleuze’s (1994), grounded on the primacy of radical difference, Barad considers mattering in terms of differentiation. “Which differences come to matter, matter in the iterative production of different differences.” The constantly transforming patterns of difference, like between the modern and premodern, bring along the causal structure, and its sets of causes and effects (Barad 2007: 137). The Middle Ages are a positive enactment of difference, or interplay between familiar and strange.

The differentiation from which mattering emerges has consequences on how the position of concepts in relation to phenomena are conceived. Such descriptive concepts as ‘medieval’ used by scholars acquire their determinate content, in Barad’s view, only by reference to a particular physical apparatus, to a certain material-discursive constellation. Concepts are inferential and normative in chains of interpretative performances, and through such performances of concepts, phenomena acquire intelligibility (Rouse 2004: 151–153; cf. the discussion on concepts in Deleuze & Guattari 1994). For instance, a medieval artefact has the property of position through its inferential performativity, as part of material processes, in the hands of the finder, the measurer, and through its inferential uses in excavation reports, distribution maps and periodization.

Reality, or rather the appearance of its stability, is sedimented in an infinite series of phenomena, including the phenomenon of the Middle Ages, which, through their constitutive practices, provide intelligibility to the world. Our position in these practices and phenomena makes us responsible for what exists, Barad (1998: 102, 105) argues. The responsibility or responsiveness to the world’s becoming is the
condition of scholarly objectivity. For Barad, this means that we are accountable to the specific materializations of which we as subjects and bodies are a part. The anchor of scholarly knowledge is thus in a phenomenon, not any object independent of the apparatuses of observation. This crucially implies our becoming as part of the world (Barad 2007: 56, 120), or in the context of the Middle Ages, the necessary presence of modernity in approaching the premodern.

Although Barad also has strong opinions on the ontological structure of reality, her continuous emphasis on the situatedness of knowledge and objectivity as responsiveness and responsibility to the world nevertheless opens a space for other ways of being to emerge. What seemed artificial, i.e. the Middle Ages, might, in fact, in its estranged and uncomfortable form, create a critical and ethical space towards naturalized practices of the modern and premodern, questioning its own premises and reaching towards but not colonizing alternative ontologies. In this sense, also the Middle Ages can be redefined, not as reinforcing some notion of social or cultural significance, but as a modern approach to the becoming of the world as human and non-human, modern and premodern. Periodization is thus a critical intervention in the present defined by present-day schemes of intelligibility (Davis 2010: 42). If, as Cole and Smith (2010: 24) argue, “modernity and post-modernity have defined themselves toward the Middle Ages and they will never let it go”, the Middle Ages, reciprocally, should be defined towards modernity but not as its mirror image.

Instead of the concept of medievalism or even medievalisms, I would like to use the term medievality in the explorations of the Middle Ages. Medievality approaches the Middle Ages not as a representation but as a set of presences and absences with the possibility of alternative ontologies. Medievality is a relation established intra-actively in the phenomena of modern and premodern. The project which this concept evokes is not so much after a ‘better’ definition of the Middle Ages as such, but focuses on tracing the effects which the analysis of the period generates and diffracts.

8. Towards the past

The Middle Ages, its material remains, are real and concrete, argue Andrew Cole and D. Vance Smith (2010: 19, 21), and as such they provide a possibility and intelligibility for being human. Hence, the period should not be considered impossible or false due to its connections and attachments with the modern, but something that carries alterity and hope to change precisely because of these
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The question of medievality has become topical in recent decades in Finland. Firstly, medieval archaeology as a discipline has seen significant development and subsequent explosion of available source material since the 1990s. This has created unparalleled possibilities for approaching various social and material processes that took place in the Middle Ages (Figure 3), while raising the question of how the mass of new finds can deepen understanding of the period. Many recent studies in medieval archaeology routinely state that they aim at expanding and nuancing the picture of the Middle Ages, but still periodization and premodernity as archaeological concepts are rarely addressed explicitly. Secondly, along with the study of the medieval material past, the history of the discipline and its connections with contemporary society have attracted scholarly scrutiny. These studies have acutely shown that the Middle Ages and its uses have fluctuated throughout the
As important as these new analyses of medieval material culture and disciplinary history are, the two lines of investigation have remained rather distant from each other, or in other words, scholars usually focus only on one or the other. However, it is precisely in this strange intersection of the two approaches that the concept of medievality lays. It draws upon material traces of the past and the modern uses of the period in order to bring out the otherness of the Middle Ages. Consequently, from the point of view of medievality, arguments concerning the general economization and capitalization of early-medieval social life or the colonial character of Hanseatic culture remain inadequate if they are formulated either as explaining the medieval past or seen merely as modern ideological constructions. The concept of Hanseatic culture may be a helpful analytical tool and historical context for approaching social strategies of colonization, appropriation, acceptance, adaptation and resistance, but only if the modern background is at the same time explicated in the analysis, and it is acknowledged that the alterity of the medieval traces may resist modern interpretations. What are the assumptions of and conditions for such a combination of modern and premodern? What are the holes and discrepancies that the colonial interpretation leaves behind?

Diffractive methodology proceeds by analysing the background of the scholarly apparatus, its concepts and links with the modern condition. It focuses particularly on the differences brought forth by the encounter of modern and premodern. Differences in the phenomenon, and the partial inapplicability of the concepts to describe them, become validations for the heterogeneous approach. This leads to placing less weight on the question what the theory of capitalism can tell about the Middle Ages and emphasize more the question of how the ruins of the Middle Ages make capitalism inappropriate as an explanation. The phenomenon of the Middle Ages, through the disciplinary constitutive practices, provide intelligibility to the world, and thus the unintelligible and unstable are crucial for approaching the otherness of the Middle Ages.

Haggrén’s idea of the age of the transition as well as other in-depth studies of medieval material culture in Finland emphasize the processual nature of change. An archaeological conceptualization of the Middle Age is developing. However, there are several processes of political, social and material kind in action in any given time, processes of differentiation and integration, and medievality denotes the assemblage of these processes, one of them being modernization. Moreover, since periodization is defined by present-day schemes of intelligibility, it acquires
Immonen: The mess before the modern

its determinate content through reference to a particular disciplinary apparatus. The heterogeneity of medievality thus has a necessary disciplinary dimension. The archaeological conception of premodern and medieval differs somewhat from the views of art history, ethnology, folklore studies and history, as the cross-disciplinary analysis of the Middle Ages provisionally showed. Further thought should be put on these differences, taking up various understandings of the period, while discovering commonalities, threads that allow these different Middle Ages designated with the same name. What, on the one hand, is unique for medieval in archaeology, and on the other hand, what does it share or have that resonates with other disciplines? Diffractive methodology reads the insights of different disciplines through one another and contributes to the relational ontology of medievality.

Responsiveness to the world’s becoming is the condition of proper knowledge. In regard to medievality, this establishes a challenge to create not only terminologies, but also disciplinary practices that allow a discussion of the medieval without making it a diminutive of modernity, or, on the other hand, presenting it as an epoch of stagnation before the dawn of dynamic modernity. If social archaeology seeks to understand the archaeological past by addressing past societies and social practices in their totality, medievality adds yet another layer by showing how the social embeddedness of archaeologists in modernity is the necessary condition for the premodern past to emerge. The complexity of this meeting of social and scientific can be approached with the help of the post-colonial critique which bears clearly decisive relevance as a reminder of scholarly accountability. Medievality is not merely a matter of distinguishing certain chronological limits or processes. It also refers to the contemporaneous effects of these processes in encountering the traces of the past, and as such, it opens up the possibility for alternative ways of being.
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Man’s best friends? The treatment of the remains of dogs, cats and horses in early modern northern Finland

Anna-Kaisa Salmi

Pets are tame animals that are treated differently from other animals, often as favorites or family members. Pet keeping increased in Europe during the post-medieval period and was connected to various changes in human-animal and human-environmental relationships. This paper is an archaeological perspective to pet culture, and it focuses on the bones of pet animals in archaeological deposits dating from the historical period in northern Finland. The archaeological animal bone finds from northern Finland indicate that the concept of pet cannot be unequivocally applied to the relationship between people and their cats, dogs and horses. The interaction between people and animals depended on the context and the same animals may have had different roles in life and death.

1. Introduction

This paper focuses on bones of the dog (Canis familiaris), the cat (Felis catus), and the horse (Equus caballus) in archaeological deposits dating from the historical period in northern Finland. These species are nowadays considered as pets and they have had a special relationship with people in the past as well. Pets are tame animals that are treated differently from other animals, often as favorites or family members. In archaeological investigations, it is often tricky to define which animals were considered as pets (Thomas 2005). We have to be careful not to impose our own cultural values on past cultures. Archaeologists may use various criteria, such as relative abundances of taxa, the occurrence of exotic species and differential treatment of bones to distinguish which animals may have been pets. Deliberate animal burials are often used as a sign of the animals’ status as pets. Indications of economic usage, such as skinning or processing for food are usually taken as indications that the animal in question was not a pet. The nutritional and health status of animals may also be used in defining pet keeping in past cultures. (Thomas 2005.)

In Europe, pet status has been reserved to especially dogs, cats and horses, although a range of other animals such as rabbits and different birds have also been
treated as pets. In Finland, though, it has usually been cats, dogs and horses that have had a special status in comparison with other animals. Archaeologically, it is problematic to assess the status of these species and evaluate the development of pet culture. Small amounts of cat, dog and horse bones are regularly found in archaeological deposits dating from the historical period. Some of these finds may represent buried pets, while others are found from refuse deposits with apparent marks of economic utilization, such as skinning, found from the bones (Tourunen 2008: 109–110). There is historical and ethnographic evidence of the differential status of these animals in comparison with other domestic animals in later periods in Finland. Although they had economic functions (hunting, catching mice, traction), they were generally not eaten (Vuorela 1975: 195). Their bones are also poorly represented in archaeological deposits consisting mainly of ordinary household refuse (Puputti 2010a), but historical records clearly indicate that they have been present in early modern northern Finnish towns (e.g. Halla 1954: 441, Mäntylä 1971: 52).

In this paper, I will investigate the relationships between people and dogs, cats and horses and consider their possible special status as pets and companions in three early modern towns in northern Finland, Pietarsaari, Oulu, and Tornio, respectively. The archaeological material dates from the period between the early 17th century and the early 19th century. I will investigate how people disposed of the remains of dogs, cats and horses in early modern northern Finland, and what it indicates about the ways people related to these animals in life and death. I will consider whether these animals were deliberately buried or treated as household waste. I will also consider whether the remains of these animals were used for economic purposes. The results will be mirrored against what we know of the development of pet culture in general during the early modern period, and the use of the concept of pet in northern Finland context is problematized. The differences in human-pet relationships between northern Finland and northern Europe shed light to the development of human-pet relationships on a local level. The investigation of humans’ relations to these animals gives new information on the nature and modernization of human-animal and human-environmental relationships in the north. It will also illuminate the context-dependency of human-animal relationships.

2. The development of pet culture and humanizing attitudes towards animals in post-medieval Europe

Pets and companion animals are tame animals that are kept as favorites and treated with fondness not reserved for other animals. They are usually kept primarily for
social or emotional reasons, as opposed to functional or economic reasons. Pets fulfill social and emotional roles that are comparable, although not necessarily identical, with those fulfilled by other people. Pets are often treated as family members. (Serpell & Paul 1994.)

Although there is evidence of pet keeping from a range of cultural contexts, pet keeping is most often discussed in relation to post-medieval Western culture (Serpell & Paul 1994). In Europe, urbanization and modernization led to the emergence of middle and upper classes that no longer interacted with domestic animals on a daily basis and did not raise their own food (Thomas 1984, Franklin 1999). Domestic production animals and farming activities were still elementary in the towns of early modern northern Finland, but people started to alienate from wild nature and animals (Puputti 2008). At the same time, discussion on animal rights and animal protection began and pet keeping gained popularity among the upper and middle classes (Thomas 1984, Ritvo 1987: 82–121, Serpell & Paul 1994, Lahtinen & Vuorisalo 2005, Thomas 2005).

The emergence of pet culture was also connected to a range of changes that happened in human-animal and human-environmental relationships during the post-medieval period. People began to take a new kind of interest in nature in the early modern period: curiosity cabinets, for instance, with collections of different natural phenomena as well as objects from exotic primitive cultures, were popular among the upper classes (Thomas 1984, Kaartinen 2006: 240–248). Also the interest in scientific classification of plants and animals began in the early modern period (Thomas 1984). At the same time, pet keeping became more popular among the upper classes and the humane treatment of cats, dogs and horses began (Thomas 1984: 102). Pets were given human names, they were often fed better than the servants, they were adorned with different accessories and they were commonly depicted in family portraits (Thomas 1984: 117). From the 18th century onwards, pets of the upper classes did not necessarily have functions as such and they were not kept for catching mice or hunting. Instead, they were kept solely for pleasure and company and people started to treat their pets as child-like lesser members of the family (Thomas 1984, Ritvo 1987: 82–121, Thomas 2005). During the 19th century, pet keeping became popular also among the growing middle class (Ritvo 1987).

The emerging pet culture also contributed to the development of positive attitudes towards animals and the subsequent animal protection movement (Serpell & Paul 1994). The ideas of the humane treatment of animals and animal protection emerged as topics in public discussion in the early modern period (Maehle 1994).
Theological viewpoints, the alleged brutalizing effect of violence towards animals, Cartesian ‘beast-machine’ theory and considerations on animal souls affected the early modern and Victorian animal rights discourse (Maehle 1994, Ritvo 1994). The arguments were often based on an anthropocentric viewpoint, such as the profit people were gaining by protecting animals, or the brutalizing effect that the violence inflicted to animals had on people (Ritvo 1994, Lahtinen & Vuorisalo 2005).

There were no specific laws regulating animal protection in Europe prior to the 19th century, although occasional condemnations were handed down because of cruelty to animals (Maehle 1994: 95). The first animal protection societies were established and first anti-cruelty legislation was enacted in the early 19th century in Britain and Germany, fighting against cruelty to cattle, cock and dog fighting and the vivisection of animals (Maehle 1994: 100, Ritvo 1994: 108). In the USA, the Massachusetts Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (MSPCA) and the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (ASPCA) were founded in 1867. Both societies successfully lobbied for anti-cruelty laws, especially focusing on the abuse of horses. Other interests of these societies involved the prevention of dog and cock fighting, rat baiting, feeding cows swill and garbage, keeping cows in filthy condition and cruelty to cattle, dogs, cats and poultry. (Arluke 2007: 419.) In Finland, animal protection emerged as a topic in the early 19th century and the first society for protection of animals, Åbo Djurskyddsförening, was founded in Turku in 1871. The prevention of the mistreatment of horses was an especial interest of the society. (Lahtinen & Vuorisalo 2005.)

Eventually, the humanizing attitudes towards pet animals were also applied to pet burials. The establishment of separate pet cemeteries was connected to urbanization and the spreading out of pet culture among the urban middle class. Landless people in urban milieus did not have a place where to bury their beloved pet, and still it was unbearable and unsanitary to throw the animals in the trash or in rivers (Hyttinen 1996, Hartsdale Pet Cemetery & Crematory 2011). Burying pet animals in pet cemeteries began in the 19th century; the first pet cemeteries were founded in Britain and France in the late 19th century (Thurston 2007). Pet cemeteries were established to meet the growing need of human-like burials for beloved pet animals, which could be buried with all the formality of human burials. Some people even photographed the deceased pets in their coffins, a habit that was also practiced in human funerals (Hartsdale Pet Cemetery & Crematory 2011). In Finland, the first pet cemeteries were founded in the first half of the 20th century. In Helsinki, for example, the first pet cemetery was founded in 1927 (Hyttinen 1996).
3. Archaeological evidence of the treatment of the remains of cats, dogs and horses in post-medieval northern Finland

3.1 Tornio Keskikatu

In the Tornio Keskikatu excavations, two modern-day plots which roughly correspond to seven early modern plots were investigated. The archaeological remains consisted of building remains, yard deposits, different pit and ditch structures and cultural layers of unknown function. Most of the deposits date from the 17th and 18th centuries (Herva 2003, Nurmi 2005). The bones of horses, cats and dogs were found in small quantities from the Keskikatu excavation in Tornio in 2002 (Figure 1, Table). Two horse bones were found in a yard deposit in area 5 (SU4023) and six in an underfloor deposit from the residential building in area 5. All horse bones were parts of lower limbs and they were subjected to more surface erosion than other bones in those contexts. The erosion is probably not caused by weathering of the bones, because weathering would have affected the other bones in the same context as well. Instead, the erosion of the horse bones may point to their use as raw material in cooking soap or glue. Inferior parts of animal carcasses could be used in cooking soap or glue although only reindeer antlers are...
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mentioned in that connection in Northern Finland (Talve 1990: 101). One of the horse metatarsals was pathological (Figure 1). It had osteophytes, bony outgrowths that are related to heavy load or stress on the joint (Roberts & Manchester 1995: 101–102) on its proximal end. In addition, the first and fourth tarsal bone and the cuboid bone were fused to the metatarsal. It may be a case of degenerative joint disease, such as spavin, which may have been caused by a sprain or a constant concussion against a hard surface (Baker & Brothwell 1980, Daugnora & Thomas 2005). The horse may also have been used as a traction (Bartosiewicz et al. 1997).

The dog bone finds were limb bones (Figure 2). A yard deposit under the timber-covered yard in excavation area 2 (SU 1029) contained a right radius and ulna and a left scapula and humerus, which may derive from one individual. The estimated withers height, estimated with the aid of the coefficients of Koudelka (von den Driesch & Boessneck 1974), was 47–54 cm. Although modern dog breeds have been selectively bred and their size may not be comparable with that of the early modern dogs (Clutton-Brock 1987: 26–33), it is perhaps useful to note that the withers height of the modern Finnish Spitz is 42–47 cm and that of the Finnish Lapphund is 44–49 cm (Suomen Kenneliitto 2011). Thus, the dog individual from SU 1029 was not a small lapdog, but rather in the size range of traditional Finnish

Figure 2. Dog bone finds from Tornio Keskikatu excavations. Photo: Anna-Kaisa Salmi.
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hound breeds. The age of the individual, based on epiphyseal fusion (Silver 1969), was approximately 15 months or more. Other dog bone finds were two extremity fragments from yard deposit in area 5 (SU 4023), a phalanx from an underfloor deposit in area 5 (SU 4037), and an unfused distal humerus from a layer associated with the ditch (SU 2034). The latter belonged to an animal less than nine months old (Silver 1969). The cat bone finds were mostly singular elements. An unfused femur was found in an underfloor deposit under the residential building in area 1 (SU 53). A fused distal humerus was found in a layer associated with the ditch (SU 2034), and an axis was discovered in the yard deposit in area 5 (SU 4023). In addition, a humerus, a right and a left femur and one cervical vertebra of a young cat were found in a clay layer next to a building in area 1 (SU 37). These may derive from one individual.

It is possible that cat and dog remains were intentionally buried in association with buildings, or that for example, a cat had died under a building. Another possibility is that their remains were discarded among other refuse. The disarticulated state of the skeletons found in Tornio Keskikatu excavations would thus be due to secondary disturbance of the archaeological deposits (cf. Stallibrass 2000). There were no marks of skinning or deliberate disarticulation in the carcasses. There remains, however, a possibility that these animals were skinned for their furs. At least, we know that dog fur mittens were still used in traditional agrarian Finland (Vuorela 1975: 195), and it seems that cats and maybe also dogs were skinned for their furs in Medieval Turku (Tourunen 2008: 109–110).

3.2 Pietarsaari Lassfolk 2008

In the Pietarsaari Lassfolk excavations, several large excavation areas were opened. The archaeological deposits date mostly from the 18th and 19th centuries (Oikarinen 2009). There were 12 horse bone fragments in the animal bone assemblage from the 2008 Lassfolk excavations. Two incisors were found in the floor layer of a late 19th century building (DSU 46) and one in the floor of leveling layer of the same building (DSU 42). Also, a cervical vertebra VII was found in the floor layer of the building (DSU 53). One medial phalanx, one distal phalanx and one *sesamoideum phalangis distalis* were found in the earthen floor of an early 19th century building (CSU 33). One proximal phalanx was found in the leveling layer of the same building (CSU 32). One cervical vertebra VII was found in the activity layer dating from the 18th century (DSU 66) (Figure 3). It had chop marks which may relate to the decapitation of the horse for one reason or the other. The horse may have been...
butchered for meat, or its carcass may have been used for cooking soap or glue. One distal phalanx of a horse was found in a deposit of unknown function, dating from the 18th century (FSU 166). One fused proximal femur of a cat was found from an 18th century fire layer (FSU 133).

3.3 Oulu Pikisaari and Byström house

In the Oulu Pikisaari excavations, the subject of investigation was a late 18th or early 19th century waste midden, situated next to the stone foundation of a building of an unknown function (Herva 2006). An anterior part of a mandible of a stallion was discovered from the waste midden excavations in Pikisaari in 2006. It dates from the late 18th or early 19th century. The teeth were considerably worn, indicating a relatively high age at death. Two medial phalanges, a distal phalanx and a distal metapodial were found. All the epiphyses were fused. A right mandible of a cat was also found in the Pikisaari excavations.

The bones analyzed from the small-scale rescue excavations at Oulu Byström house were found in layers associated with a building dating from the late 17th or early 18th century (Kallio 2004). There were 12 dog bone finds from the Byström house excavations in 2004. They date from the late 17th or early 18th century. 11 of these bones derived from limb extremities with the minimum number of two individuals. There was also one fragment of a tibia. There were no cut marks on...
the bones. The fact that most of the bones originate from dog paws may indicate that the dogs were skinned. In that case the bone finds would originate from a dog fur where the phalanges and metapodials were still left attached to the skin. On the other hand, animal paws were also used as amulets and foundation or border deposits (Hukantaival 2007, Falk 2008). The paw bones may also suggest such ritual uses of dog paws.

4. The multiple roles of dogs, cats and horses

The scarceness of the dog, cat and horse bone finds among the urban animal bone assemblages from the towns of northern Finland seems peculiar, as we know that based on historical records these animals were present in the towns. Notes of dogs and cats are scarce and sporadic in the historical records, because these animals were not taxed. Horses, however, were taxed. For instance, in Tornio, there seem to have been even more horses than cattle. The bones of dogs, cats and horses are just not found among the regular household waste, of which the urban archaeological deposits often consist of. This clearly indicates that there were differential disposal practices for dogs, cats and horses as opposed to other animals the urban people kept (see also Puputti 2010a). This reflects the differential status of dogs, cats and horses. The lack of bones of these animals in the urban archaeological assemblages suggests that they were buried to some other location rather than that they were not present in the towns at all. Still, there is little archaeological evidence of deliberate pet burials in northern Finland. As of yet, no certain pet burials with complete skeletons are known from archaeological contexts in early modern northern Finland. The fact that archaeological excavations are often concentrated on areas of household chores has therefore most probably hindered the possibility of finding buried pet and companion animals.

The archaeological finds of cat, dog and horse bones from urban excavations testifies of the varied attitudes to the remains of these animals in the early modern northern Finland. Clearly, some of them were used economically, e.g. for soap, glue, furs or hides, hunting, or fieldwork, and subsequently their remains were thrown among household waste. Some of the animals, however, may have been buried under residential or other buildings, and there remains a possibility that some of the companion animals were buried somewhere outside the household area. Furthermore, parts of these animals, such as paws, may have been used for amulets or buried in ritual deposits. The varied indications of attitudes towards cats, dogs and horses in the early modern northern Finland may seem puzzling.
at a first glance. Nevertheless, there are several possible explanations for the seemingly contradictory ways of treating the remains of these animals. First possibility is that there is a temporal difference in the treatment of the dog, cat and horse remains. In general, the attitudes towards animals grew more friendly and humanizing in the course of the post-medieval period. In research literature, the new humanizing attitudes towards animals are usually contrasted with medieval cruelty and indifference towards animal welfare. The old attitudes are described as functional, unsentimental and utilitarian. They enabled people to mistreat animals and use their carcasses for economic purposes (c.f. Thomas 1984). Accounts of this kind very often focus on the fact that cats, dogs and horses were used for furs, glue, grease and so on when claiming that the attitudes were utilitarian and unsentimental. Moreover, the lack of bones of pet animals in archaeological deposits can be interpreted as a sign that these animals were not kept and their amount did not increase until the Victorian age (Thomas 2005). Other possibility is that different people related differently to their cats, dogs and horses. The emerging animal rights discourse was restricted to the uppermost classes of society, and the historical records are often silent about the attitudes ordinary people had towards animals (Maehle 1994, Lahtinen & Vuorisalo 2005). Pet keeping and humanizing attitudes towards animals are often contrasted with barbarian cruelty towards animals among the uneducated classes.

The archaeological material, however, does not agree with the ideas of the cruel past and the brutality of the lower classes. Although the amount of the archaeological material is quite small and thus any comparisons are likely to suffer from the lack of statistical significance, it seems that there were no temporal changes in the treatment of the remains of dogs, cats and horses. Signs of the economic usage of especially horses were still found from deposits dating from the 18th and 19th centuries. The class aspect is even more difficult to evaluate archaeologically, as we do not know the identity of the people who inhabited the excavated locations during the early modern period. In Tornio, the plot locations on Keskikatu Street seem to have been mediocre, at least judged by the prices of the plots during the late 17th and 18th centuries, and we do not know whether there were status differences among the plots (Mäntylä 1971: 125–126, 244, Puputti 2010b). In Oulu, Pikisaari was probably inhabited by craftsmen, and the area around Byström house was mainly inhabited by craftsmen and sailors as well (Halila 1953). Thus, there is no evident class structure in the archaeological material that would serve to explain the contradictory ways of treating the remains of dogs, cats and horses in early modern northern Finland.
Moreover, the views of the Medieval period as cruel and the lower classes as uneducated are probably oversimplified, as there may be several contrasting attitudes towards animals within a society (Ritvo 1994), and the earlier attitudes towards animals were also variable according to cultural context. As a contrast to the philosophical nature of the animal discourse in the upper class, there were various folk beliefs about animals in different parts of Europe that affected the way people treated animals. People were living in close proximity and familiarity with animals in pre-modern Europe, even in urban settlements (Thomas 1984, Cohen 1994, Puputti 2008). There existed folk beliefs about animal personality, animal agency and the possibility of human-animal communication in various medieval and early modern cultures, and the treatment of animals was tightly interwoven with these beliefs about human-animal relationships in each cultural context (Thomas 1984, Dinzelbacher 2002, Keskisarja 2006). The folk attitudes towards animals were not sentimental and humanizing, but they were not cruel and indifferent either. These attitudes acknowledged the personality and agency of animals, while they also enabled their economic use after their death.

In my opinion, the seemingly contradictory ways of treating the remains of dogs, cats and horses in early modern northern Finland call for a re-evaluation of the borderlines between the different roles animals had as companions, pets and economic resources. I suggest that the concept of pet as opposed to other animals should be opened to question, at least in the cultural context of early modern northern Finland, because the concept is complicated and cannot always be unequivocally applied to past societies. The borderlines between pets and other animals are unclear, as emotional bonds and economic usages of animals are not mutually exclusive. Dogs may have been used for hunting and at the same time considered as family members. Along the same line, cats may have been useful in catching mice and still emotionally and socially close to people. Horses certainly have been used for many economic purposes, such as fieldwork or pulling carriages, and still there have undoubtedly been emotional bonds between people and horses. The lines become even more unclear when we consider production animals, such as cattle. Cattle have undoubtedly been economically important in many cultures. They may also have been socially and culturally important, and there may have been emotional bonds between people and cattle (e.g. Keskisarja 2006). The definition of pet is culturally specific and such categories as pets and production animals are often permeable. Thus, the relationship between a man and his pet may be dependent on the context and vary according to different situations. The indications of economic utilization of the animal carcasses do not exclude the possibility that the same animals were
considered pets and companions in life. Rather, the attitudes towards pets may have been contextual, where the animals and their bodies have had different roles in different situations (cf. Willerslev 2001, 2007: 116–118, Herva & Salmi 2010). They may have had special roles as companions in life, but after their death, they may have become just skin, bones and flesh to be disposed of.

5. Conclusions

The concept of pet, in its post-enlightenment sense, cannot be applied to cats, dogs and horses in early modern northern Finland, because they served many economical functions and the treatment of their remains was not fully anthropocentrized. Still, the low number of their bones in ordinary household waste deposits suggests that most of them received a burial and thus they had some special social or emotional bond with people, which was not like the bonds between people and other animals. The relationship between people and dogs, cats and horses in early modern northern Finland is further clarified by the idea of the contextual nature of human-animal relationships and the idea that the companion animal’s role in life was perhaps different from their role in death.
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Table. Bones of cats, dogs and horses found from Tornio, Oulu and Pietarsaari.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Excavation</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Skeletal element</th>
<th>Other information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tornio</td>
<td>Keskikatu</td>
<td>yard deposit (SU 4023)</td>
<td>17th century</td>
<td>Equus caballus</td>
<td>mc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tornio</td>
<td>Keskikatu</td>
<td>yard deposit (SU 4023)</td>
<td>17th century</td>
<td>Equus caballus</td>
<td>phalanx proximalis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tornio</td>
<td>Keskikatu</td>
<td>underfloor deposit (SU 4043)</td>
<td>1621–1650</td>
<td>Equus caballus</td>
<td>mt III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tornio</td>
<td>Keskikatu</td>
<td>underfloor deposit (SU 4043)</td>
<td>1621–1650</td>
<td>Equus caballus</td>
<td>calcaneus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tornio</td>
<td>Keskikatu</td>
<td>underfloor deposit (SU 4043)</td>
<td>1621–1650</td>
<td>Equus caballus</td>
<td>talus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tornio</td>
<td>Keskikatu</td>
<td>underfloor deposit (SU 4043)</td>
<td>1621–1650</td>
<td>Equus caballus</td>
<td>mt IV/IV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tornio</td>
<td>Keskikatu</td>
<td>underfloor deposit (SU 4043)</td>
<td>1621–1650</td>
<td>Equus caballus</td>
<td>mt IV/IV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tornio</td>
<td>Keskikatu</td>
<td>underfloor deposit (SU 4043)</td>
<td>1621–1650</td>
<td>Equus caballus</td>
<td>CIV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tornio</td>
<td>Keskikatu</td>
<td>clay layer beside a building (SU 37)</td>
<td>1621–1650</td>
<td>Felis catus</td>
<td>humerus</td>
<td>both epiphyses unfused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tornio</td>
<td>Keskikatu</td>
<td>clay layer beside a building (SU 37)</td>
<td>1621–1650</td>
<td>Felis catus</td>
<td>femur</td>
<td>both epiphyses unfused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tornio</td>
<td>Keskikatu</td>
<td>clay layer beside a building (SU 37)</td>
<td>1621–1650</td>
<td>Felis catus</td>
<td>femur</td>
<td>both epiphyses unfused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tornio</td>
<td>Keskikatu</td>
<td>clay layer beside a building (SU 37)</td>
<td>1621–1650</td>
<td>Felis catus</td>
<td>vertebrae cervicales</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tornio</td>
<td>Keskikatu</td>
<td>underfloor deposit (SU 53)</td>
<td>1650–1721</td>
<td>Felis catus</td>
<td>femur</td>
<td>both epiphyses unfused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tornio</td>
<td>Keskikatu</td>
<td>yard deposit (SU 4023)</td>
<td>17th century</td>
<td>Felis catus</td>
<td>axis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tornio</td>
<td>Keskikatu</td>
<td>ditch (2034)</td>
<td>1690–17170</td>
<td>Felis catus</td>
<td>humerus</td>
<td>distal epiphysis fused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Excavation</td>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Species</td>
<td>Skeletal element</td>
<td>Other information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tornio</td>
<td>Keskikatu</td>
<td>yard deposit (SU 4023)</td>
<td>17th century</td>
<td>Canis familiaris</td>
<td>mc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tornio</td>
<td>Keskikatu</td>
<td>yard deposit (SU 4023)</td>
<td>17th century</td>
<td>Canis familiaris</td>
<td>phalanx anterior</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tornio</td>
<td>Keskikatu</td>
<td>yard deposit (SU 1029)</td>
<td>1621–1650</td>
<td>Canis familiaris</td>
<td>scapula</td>
<td>fused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tornio</td>
<td>Keskikatu</td>
<td>yard deposit (SU 1029)</td>
<td>1621–1650</td>
<td>Canis familiaris</td>
<td>radius</td>
<td>fused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tornio</td>
<td>Keskikatu</td>
<td>yard deposit (SU 1029)</td>
<td>1621–1650</td>
<td>Canis familiaris</td>
<td>ulna</td>
<td>fused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tornio</td>
<td>Keskikatu</td>
<td>yard deposit (SU 1029)</td>
<td>1621–1650</td>
<td>Canis familiaris</td>
<td>humerus</td>
<td>distal epiphysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tornio</td>
<td>Keskikatu</td>
<td>underfloor deposit</td>
<td>1621–1650</td>
<td>Canis familiaris</td>
<td>phalanx anterior</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oulu</td>
<td>Pikisaari</td>
<td>waste midden</td>
<td>late 18th to early 19th century</td>
<td>Equus caballus</td>
<td>mandibula</td>
<td>with incisors and canines, male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oulu</td>
<td>Pikisaari</td>
<td>waste midden</td>
<td>late 18th to early 19th century</td>
<td>Equus caballus</td>
<td>phalanx media</td>
<td>fused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oulu</td>
<td>Pikisaari</td>
<td>waste midden</td>
<td>late 18th to early 19th century</td>
<td>Equus caballus</td>
<td>mp</td>
<td>fused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oulu</td>
<td>Pikisaari</td>
<td>waste midden</td>
<td>late 18th to early 19th century</td>
<td>Equus caballus</td>
<td>phalanx media</td>
<td>fused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oulu</td>
<td>Pikisaari</td>
<td>waste midden</td>
<td>late 18th to early 19th century</td>
<td>Equus caballus</td>
<td>phalanx distalis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oulu</td>
<td>Bysströmin talo</td>
<td>clay layer (SU 2)</td>
<td>18th century</td>
<td>Canis familiaris</td>
<td>mc II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oulu</td>
<td>Bysströmin talo</td>
<td>clay layer (SU 2)</td>
<td>18th century</td>
<td>Canis familiaris</td>
<td>mc III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oulu</td>
<td>Bysströmin talo</td>
<td>clay layer (SU 2)</td>
<td>18th century</td>
<td>Canis familiaris</td>
<td>mc IV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oulu</td>
<td>Bysströmin talo</td>
<td>clay layer (SU 2)</td>
<td>18th century</td>
<td>Canis familiaris</td>
<td>mc V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oulu</td>
<td>Bysströmin talo</td>
<td>clay layer (SU 2)</td>
<td>18th century</td>
<td>Canis familiaris</td>
<td>1 phalanx</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Excavation</td>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Species</td>
<td>Skeletal element</td>
<td>Other information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oulu</td>
<td>Byströmin talo</td>
<td>clay layer (SU 2)</td>
<td>18th century</td>
<td>Canis familiaris</td>
<td>1. phalanx</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oulu</td>
<td>Byströmin talo</td>
<td>clay layer (SU 2)</td>
<td>18th century</td>
<td>Canis familiaris</td>
<td>calcaneus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oulu</td>
<td>Byströmin talo</td>
<td>sand layer (SU 8)</td>
<td>late 17th century</td>
<td>Canis familiaris</td>
<td>mc II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oulu</td>
<td>Byströmin talo</td>
<td>sand layer (SU 8)</td>
<td>late 17th century</td>
<td>Canis familiaris</td>
<td>mc IV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oulu</td>
<td>Byströmin talo</td>
<td>sand layer (SU 8)</td>
<td>late 17th century</td>
<td>Canis familiaris</td>
<td>mc V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oulu</td>
<td>Byströmin talo</td>
<td>sand layer (SU 8)</td>
<td>late 17th century</td>
<td>Canis familiaris</td>
<td>tibia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pietarsaari</td>
<td>Lassfolk</td>
<td>activity layer</td>
<td>18th century</td>
<td>Equus caballus</td>
<td>vertebrae cervicales VII</td>
<td>chop marks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pietarsaari</td>
<td>Lassfolk</td>
<td>levelling layer (DSY66)</td>
<td>early 19th century</td>
<td>Equus caballus</td>
<td>phalanx proximalis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pietarsaari</td>
<td>Lassfolk</td>
<td>earth floor (CSY32)</td>
<td>early 19th century</td>
<td>Equus caballus</td>
<td>phalanx media</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pietarsaari</td>
<td>Lassfolk</td>
<td>earth floor (CSY33)</td>
<td>early 19th century</td>
<td>Equus caballus</td>
<td>phalanx distalis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pietarsaari</td>
<td>Lassfolk</td>
<td>levelling layer (CSY33)</td>
<td>early 19th century</td>
<td>Equus caballus</td>
<td>sesamoideum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pietarsaari</td>
<td>Lassfolk</td>
<td>floor/levelling layer (DSY42)</td>
<td>late 19th century</td>
<td>Equus caballus</td>
<td>phalanx distalis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pietarsaari</td>
<td>Lassfolk</td>
<td>floor (DSY46)</td>
<td>late 19th century</td>
<td>Equus caballus</td>
<td>incisor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pietarsaari</td>
<td>Lassfolk</td>
<td>floor (DSY46)</td>
<td>late 19th century</td>
<td>Equus caballus</td>
<td>incisor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pietarsaari</td>
<td>Lassfolk</td>
<td>floor? (DSY53)</td>
<td>late 19th century</td>
<td>Equus caballus</td>
<td>vertebrae cervicales VII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pietarsaari</td>
<td>Lassfolk</td>
<td>? (FSY166)</td>
<td>early 18th century</td>
<td>Equus caballus</td>
<td>phalanx distalis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pietarsaari</td>
<td>Lassfolk</td>
<td>levelling layer (FSY177)</td>
<td>early 18th century</td>
<td>Equus caballus</td>
<td>atlas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pietarsaari</td>
<td>Lassfolk</td>
<td>fire layer (FSY133)</td>
<td>18th century</td>
<td>Felis catus</td>
<td>femur</td>
<td>proximal epiphysis fused</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Why theory and the cultural transition in the Sakha Republic

Minna Lehtola

1. Introduction

How can people live and survive in a -50°C temperature? Why have people chosen to live in such fierce conditions? This article focuses on a region located in Siberia, the region is called Yakutia by Russians and the Sakha Republic by Sakha people and indigenous minorities. In this article I use both Yakutia and the Sakha Republic because both of them are used in official context in the region. The area is inhabited by indigenous minorities (Evenks, Evens, Yukaghir, Chukchi, Dolgan), the Sakha, Belorussians, Ukrainians and Russians; the overall population is over one million people. The area is large, 3.1 million square kilometers, with sparse habitation and the republic’s economy is based on industry. In the region there are also communities which livelihood is based on herding.

In summer 2010 I was given an opportunity to travel, to the Sakha Republic to get to know the culture and people. I spent most of my time in Yakutsk, the capital of the region which, is situated on the Lena River. In the city there are both old built heritage and new buildings which also represents the area’s culture: a mixture of the past and the present. The city has a lot to offer: opera, theaters, movies, art, institutes, schools and shops. Also In the centre there is a Lenin square.

Nature’s impact on the Yakutsk cityscape can be seen in the pipelines going over the streets and in the cracks on the pavement. These derive from permafrost, which reaches a depth of 1.5 meters and causes a shift in the earth as it thaws unevenly. It’s been there from the last ice age (Crat 2006: 5). I wonder has the environment also affected the territory’s culture as it has affected the scenery.

I also made trips to smaller villages that are different to Yakutsk. On my travels in the Sakha Republic I could see the taiga and tundra around me. In the villages, there are wooden buildings and people are walking on the sandy streets among cattle and horses. The animals are branded and trained to recognize their master. Overall, people in Yakutia appear more as Asian than European, with their black hair, brown or black eyes and round face shape.
In my research, I concentrate on the ethnic groups of the Sakha people and the indigenous minorities. The Sakha are not considered as an indigenous people by law due to their late arrival into the region in historical time. The northern indigenous people are the Evenkis, Evens, Chukchis, Yukagirs and Dolgans. During the Soviet regime they were called “the small peoples of the north” and for example Sakha were mixed to indigenous minorities to improve the indigenous peoples’ culture. Throughout the Soviet era the aim was to wipe out differences and alternatives such as the culture of indigenous minorities. After the fall of the Soviet power and during the existence of the Sakha Republic, laws to protect the rights of indigenous minorities have been passed.

Throughout times the Sakha people have been more horse and cattle herders and the northern indigenous people have been more hunters, fishers and reindeer herders. The Sakha people use the Yakut horse, which is known for its ability to feed itself during the harsh wintertime as well as the reindeer can. The largest groups of the indigenous minorities are the Tungus-Manchurian languages speaking Evenkis and the Evens. The other indigenous minorities have less than 1,000 people. Out of the area’s indigenous minorities the first arrivals to the area were the Yukagirs. The indigenous minorities populate the eastern and northern regions of the Sakha Republic.

In this article I write about my hoWhy theory, the Sakha people, their culture and traditions, and the differences of the Yakutian ethnic groups. Furthermore, I name elements that affect how the cultures and traditions are passed down to next generation in the region. I combined the words how and why, the main two interrogatives in social archaeology, to hoWhy and used it as the name of my theory, which provides answers to these questions about Yakutia. First I provide general information and history about the Sakha Republic and then focus on the Sakha people. I also want to highlight the use of mammoth bones in the Sakha Republic. How and why are they used and to what extent can they be used, considering that they are not a renewable resource.

I visited in the Sakha Republic, and to me, it was a great experience to see how people are living there, to explore their rituals and customs, and to notice that there are similarities in the way they and Finnish people think.

2. Research questions

This article is an introduction to the Sakha Republic. First I go through the questions that I present to the research, and then I write about the territory’s history and
continue to the hoWhy research theory and the elements that affect the culture transition from one generation to another. I present some archeological findings and write about the material culture, rituals, identity and family structure of the present ethnic groups in the Sakha Republic – especially of the Sakha people. Finally, I refer to some problems the ethnic groups’ currently face in Yakutia.

The questions that I present to the research are as follows: What ethnic groups have populated and populate the Sakha Republic? What is the history of the territory’s ethnic groups? What kind of material and built heritage they have had and has it changed over time? What are the elements that affect the traditions and culture passed down from one generation to another? Does the environment have any influence on the culture and people? What kind of rituals do the present Sakha people have? What are the problems the people are facing in the Sakha Republic?

I also want to raise attention to the use of mammoth bones in the Sakha Republic. In Siberia many mammoth bones can be found, and they are often used for creating art. The selling of mammoth bones has become a form of side income in some places. For good bones people can get over 500 EUR per kilogram (Tiede 2010: 58). Is the selling of the bones acceptable or should it be more controlled?

3. History of the Sakha Republic

In the Tertiary period 50 million years Before Present, the climate was warmer than now in the Sakha Republic. Beech, hornbeam, alder, birch, elm, maple, oak, and walnut fossilized remains, have been found from northern Yakutia and dated to the Tertiary period. Between the late Tertiary and early Quaternary, the climate turned colder which destroyed the rich flora and fauna. Siberia was a refuge for many plants and animals because Eurasia was partly covered with ice. In archeological excavations in the region, mammoth, woolly rhinoceros, saber tiger and bison remains and an ancient horse skeleton have been found which have also been dated to the period concerned. (Litmanen 2010: 32, Crater 2006: 5.) Today it is easy to find mammoth remains in the Sakha Republic from places such as riverbanks. The bones are used as material for create souvenirs. Thirty-seven complete mammoth skeletons have been found in the entire world, 19 of which are from the Sakha Republic (Figure 1).

Although the climate in the Sakha Republic changed colder and conditions became extreme, the area was populated in the Paleolithic era by dispersed groups of hunters. The origin of the first settlers is unknown but they may have belonged to the Paleoasiatic peoples. (Ventsel 2005: 49.) In the Sakha Republic,
there is evidence suggesting that people hunted mammoths 40–35.000 years ago (Litmanen 2010: 32). Susan A. Crater presents (2006: 2) in her book *Cows, Kin, and Globalization* that invention of thread and ability to clothe, made it possible for people to populated the north and survive there around twenty thousand years ago.

The population in the region began to increase in the Neolithic era. The ancestors of the indigenous minorities of the Yakagirs and Evenkis were living as hunters in the region during the Iron Age. The use of reindeer appeared at the end of the first millennium or beginning of the second millennium A.D. The ancestors of the Evenki, also commonly called Tungus, were already using reindeer as transport animals. (Ventsel 2005: 49.) The Sakhas’ Turkic ancestors migrated to the region circa 900 A.D (Crater 2006: 2–3).

The Russians came to the territory in search of fish, furs, pearls, salt, and walrus tusks by the ninth century. After the 16th century the expansion intensified, and in 1632 Russian Cossacks, Peter Beketov and a detachment of thirty people, established a fort close to Yakutsk. The fort was called Lensky. The territory was populated by different ethnic groups, including the Turkic-speaking Sakha People. In 1643 a new site was chosen, due to flooding, and the new fort was called Yakutsk, the present capital city in the region. (Ventsel 2005: 49.)

By 1917 the population in Yakutia was 275 000 and only 4 % of the population was living in the urban settlements. In the region lived mostly cattle, horse and reindeer herders, hunters and fishers, but also agriculture appeared. Few years later on 27.4.1922 the Yakutian Autonomous Socialist Soviet Republic was established. (Ventsel 2005: 63–64.) In the 1920s onwards the Soviet power started to influence the practices of the traditional cultures: the aim of the Soviet regime was to wipe out all alternatives and all diversity. In practice this meant going as far as physically eliminating the

---

*Figure 1. A whole mammoth skeleton, Museum of Archaeology and Ethnography in Yakutsk. Photo: Minna Lehtola 2010.*
The use of natural resources increased in the 20th century. In 1924, gold mining began in the Sakha Republic (Nikolaev 1997: 7), and the first diamond was found in 1949. The diamond industry was established in 1956, when the Mirnyi diamond fields were discovered. This was followed with an increase in the number of Russian, Ukrainian and Belorussian immigrants. By the year 1955, the share of the native population (the Sakhas and the indigenous people) had fallen from 60% to 50% and by 1989 it was 35%. (Ventsel 2005: 2, 75.)

The 1960s was generally time of resettlement in Siberia: for example villages were liquidated and people were transported by the military to new habitation to create larger villages and impact the so-called weaker cultures like Evenki by mixing them to Yakut-speaking newcomers (Anderson 2000b: 134). During this time and after it, the political structures remained in the hands of the native people. What is interesting is the way people were thinking. The most important issue for the people was loyalty to the system and being Soviet patriots rather than remembering their own ethnic background. The industrialization and appropriation campaign in the 1960s increased the importance of the Sakhas to Russia. (Ventsel 2005: 2, 75.)

The time under the Soviet regime is also thought to be the time of progress and development in the Sakha Republic – especially for the economy. There were developments in industry but also in education, and the University was established on August 6, 1956. In 1993 the university was appointed as the main educational institute in the region and it was named the Sakha State University. In autumn 2010, the Yakut State University became the North-Eastern Federal University. The main subjects in the research institutes are geography, ecology, agriculture, industry and economics of the Sakha Republic and the language, history and traditions of the Sakha people and other peoples of the North. At present there are 525 institutions of culture, 538 libraries, 43 museums and seven professional theaters in the Sakha Republic (Anderson 2000c: 18, Litmanen 2010: 35).

Today the Sakha Republic consists of 35 administrative units, of which 33 are districts referred to as ulus in Sakha. There are 11 cities and towns and 65 settlements and villages. The largest cities are Yakutsk, Mirny and Nerungri. Over 250,000 people live in Yakutsk. After the fall of the Soviet power, Yakutia was recognized as the Sakha Republic under the jurisdiction of the Russian federation. On September 27, 1990, a Declaration of Sovereignty was signed, and in 1991 the
Constitution. Yakutia became the Sakha Republic and it gained a symbolic status of statehood but not a genuine one. (Argounova-Low 2004: 257.)

The Sakha Republic has its own constitution and self-government and the president is the highest official. There have been three presidents until now. The first president was Mikhail Yefimovich Nikolayev in 1991–2001, the second Vyacheslav Shtyrov (2001–2010), and the third Egor Borisov, who was appointed in 2010. The Republic’s economy is based on both industry and agriculture. Sakha is well known for its diamonds, especially for a company called ALROSA (Almazy Rossii-Sakha – Diamonds of Russia and Sakha). Other natural resources used in industry are coal, tin, silver, gold, oil and gas.

People have inhabited Yakutia for thousands of years. They have fed themselves on the nature and natural resources, developed as industrial territory. They have moved to the territory to find better hunting grounds because of the rich natural resources and work or because of other ethnic group movement. The people have arrived to the region bringing along with them their own traditions, which have mixed with traditions of other cultures. However some traditions and built heritages
have remained. For example the Sakha winter house called balaghan\(^1\), cow barn called *khoton* (Figure 2) and *Buluus*, an underground ice chamber, have been part of the Sakha culture ever since the time they populated the region.

4. Research theory

In the research, I use the social theory. I try to find answers to the questions how and why with regard to human behavior and societies in the Sakha Republic. I use my own hoW hy concept as the core of my research. As Schiffer (2000: 1) has stated: “virtually all theories that archaeologists use to explain behavioral and/or social variability and change [...] qualify as social theory.” Although the statement on what qualifies as social theory sounds simple and straightforward from a research viewpoint, a theory always needs directional framework to exist. I will provide a frame for the social theory I use and call it hoWhy theory.

Jeanne E. Arnold (2000: 14) suggests two anthropological domains in her research of the archaeological theory on societal change: the use of ethnographic and historical data and attention on the processes of agency, motivations and decision-making. In her research, Arnold focuses on the role of changing rights to labor and what changing rights may be monitored archeologically. Labor includes the forms of people participation in events such as rituals, feasts and ceremonies. These form the basis of my research also but I do not focus on the role of changing rights to labor. Instead I discuss the family structure over time and the problems it is confronted with the present Sakha Republic. At present the process of passing down traditions in the Sakha Republic focuses my attention on factors that influence that process. Furthermore I discuss the differences and similarities the ethnic groups have as well as describe some of the ceremonies such as articles associated to shamans and used in the Sakha Republic.

Susan A. Crate has conducted research in Siberia on cultural and political ecology, environmental policy, sustainable community development, and global climate change. She has written a book called *Cows, Kin, and Globalization, An Ethnography of Sustainability* published in 2006. The book tells about the Sakha

\(^1\) *Balaghan* was built small to keep heat in and from a variety of timber sizes. Its structure was sealed with a mixture of cow dung and clay, and when the first snow fell, it was used for insulation by piling it around the *balaghan*. During winters, the windows were covered with thick ice, cow stomachs or afterbirth, and during summers with woven horsehair to keep the insects out. The door faced east, from where the sun rises and could warm up the house. The floor was either earthen or wooden according to the family’s wealth. In summers, many Sakha people lived in an *uraha*, or a birch park teepee, *saylyyk*, a summer home. (Crate 2006: 19, 21.)
people and culture especially in Viliui Sakha. The book is close to my research theory.

My research does not only rely on the literature, but also observation. I visited the Sakha region in summer 2010 and took part in some ceremonies and rituals as part of my studies in the Yakutsk State University. I studied the history, ethnography, politics, and applied arts of the Sakha region as well as the Russian language. I attended classes and visited different museums, institutes and villages, as well as private homes, spending a total of two months in the region. I can relate to some things through studying Finnish Sami people and through the Finnish culture, but I can also see the differences and the challenges the people face in Yakutia. For example the Sami people divide in their cosmological view the world in three like the Sakha do, and in midsummer celebration birch has symbolic value both Finns as well as the Sakha people.

An existing difference can be seen for example in the family structure. In Finland it is common that the nuclear family consists of a mother, a father and children. The meaning of the word is wider in the Sakha culture. For young people in Finland, it is common first educate themselves and afterwards start a family. In Sakha people start a family earlier in life. Usually in Finland, young people move from home to study and have their own place, but in the Sakha Republic, young people move to stay with their relatives, it is partly an economical solution. I think that in regards to family structure, the people in the Sakha Republic are closer to what was the reality in the past in Finland than the present day Finns are.

Robert L. Kelly (2000: 63) has asked “what we can realistically know about the past”. Can we see the past through looking at the present or does it influence our interpretation? Later in this text, I will introduce elements that affect the transition of tradition. The question arises that if those elements are recognizable why would not those that have been influenced in the past also be recognizable? Can we see the past and its complexity through an artifact found today?

Kelly (2000: 62, 72) points out that in research and making theories, it should be taken into consideration that behavioral decisions made by individuals have behind them the decisions and actions of many individuals. He also emphasizes that culture changes over time; thus some information is not passed down and some is added. Children and the process whereby they learn their culture, as well as changes in adult activities, are very important influences in the cultural change.

I will now introduce the elements I believe have the strongest influence on the transmission of tradition. They are 1. economy, 2. society, 3. interaction with
other societies, 4. family structure 5. the government, and 6. geographical location/environment. Changes in economy for example the industrialization of herding can cause people to have their own incomes and thus they are no longer financially dependent on other family members. Over a long time period, this can lead to diminished interaction between family members and less information is passed down from one generation to another.

Linked to industrialization are changes in the society such as education that are more focused on individuals. Sometimes this means sending a child away from the family even abroad, to keep up with the development. This means interaction with other societies. Contacts to other cultures bring changes to the culture: for example when children are educated away from home, the family structure changes. In this example the grandparent’s role in passing down the traditions loses its importance when the children are far away and the grandparents cannot carry out their role in the society.

Who has the possibility to influence the direction to which the society is going? The government makes the decisions that affect the people. The decisions may or may not support the family members who have to travel far for education or to herd and be separated from their family. The people whose lives are most affected by the decisions live in rural districts or far away from the large centers which is why the geographical location is also considered to be one element. All these elements influence the process how children learn their culture in the Sakha Republic.

Crate (2006: 289–290, 292–293) has carried out research in Sakha. She writes that indigenous cultures have a high capacity for adaptation. For culture, traditions and transmission this means that they are more vulnerable to change the aforementioned elements. Interaction with other societies takes different forms. For example in the Sakha Republic, the relationship with Japan is different from the relationship with Russia. As regards Russia the relationship is more about the competition for the control of recourses. The relationship can be also viewed between Soviet Union and Yakutia or the Sakha Republic and Russia and compare those two to each other. It can be also asked whether possessing modern technology impacts the power balance for example if the resources are diamonds. What are the benefits of diamonds to the people or are there any? Diamonds mean money for the people but on the other hand they also threaten people’s health. In my article I scratch the surface on the same issues Crate has covered in her book, but I put my focus on viewing the culture through the elements I have mentioned earlier.
5. The Sakha people and the indigenous minorities in the Sakha Republic

Next I will discuss the Sakha people and the indigenous minorities in the region. The indigenous minorities are the Evenkis, Evens, Chukchis, Yukagirs and Dolgans. I discuss the similarities and differences in their cultures as well as the mixture of cultures which, can be seen in shamanic and herding practices. I continue my speculation about the connection between Kelly’s question and archeological findings.

The two largest indigenous minority groups in the Sakha Republic are the Evenkis and the Evens, and the Evenkis are one of the largest indigenous people groups in Siberia with its approximately 30,000 people. Out of the area’s indigenous minorities, the first ethnic group in the region was the Yukagirs. The Evenkis and the Evens belong to the Tungus–Manchurian language family of the Ural–Altai language families and the Sakha people to the Turkic family. The Evenkis inhabit a large area in Asia that covers parts of Siberia, China and Mongolia. They have at least three distinct dialects. They call themselves by the name such as bail, khamaniganil and orochenil. (Anderson 2000a: 59–60, Bloch 2004: 30–31, Vitebsky 2005: 415, Crate 2006: 16.) The Evenkis and the Evens are related, but the relation to the Sakha people is not as clear. There are many people who have ancestors in two ethnic groups, although they claim to belong to only one. (Vitebsky 2005: 415.) The cultures in the territory have interacted and therefore many similarities have developed between the cultures.

The Chukchi people belong to the Chukotka–Kamchatkan language family (Schweiter and Gray 2000: 17), and the Dolgans are the youngest Siberian nationalities and an ethnic group with mixed origins. In fact according to Aimar Ventsel (2005: 231, 233), the Dolgan have never defined themselves as one ethnic group and they were partly created by the Tsarist and Soviet authorities. The Dolgans are composed of Russians, Sakha, Nentsy and Evenki people and according to Ventsel, Uurung Khaia is a Dolgan village in the Republic of Sakha. Dolgans have sub-groups; one with a dialect that reminds the Sakha language and another that reminds more the Evenki one. The Russian name Dolgan was determined by state ethnographers and administrators and it became a term referring to a nationality as of 1960. Earlier the Dolgans were also referred to by Russians as the Yakut, and the term they used themselves was haka/hakalar. (Anderson 2000c: 9, 89, 101, 109.)

Different cultures have been combined into one society in Russia through governmental decisions, which has impacted the indigenous people’s identities.
Russia and the Soviet government carried out an ethnic designation and the Soviet state renamed the native groups, it was part of administrative prerogative. For example by 1928 the Soviet authorities began to refer Tungus people specifically as the Evenk and Eveny. (Bloch 2004: 32.)

One thing common to all these ethnic groups are shamans, the ritual specialists, but there are also differences in the shaman rituals. The words shamán or hamán are derived from the Eveny and Evenki language (Vitebsky 2005: 12). Vitebsky (2005: 260) determines the word as follows: “The Eveny word shamán, like corresponding terms in various Siberian languages, refers to a figure who draws together many animal powers, represented by the skins, furs, feathers, and beaks that make up the costume, in addition to metal representations of mammals, fish, and birds.”

The Evenkis have ritual specialists who they call samanil. An artifact with an important role in shamanism among the Evenkis was the drum. The samanils had a round or polygonal shape skin drum. The drum was used to contact the spirit helpers during kamalan. The spirits were asked for help to find out the whereabouts of a certain animal or for healing patients. The helpers could take a form of an animal and they were connected to lower, middle and upper worlds. Each samanil was chosen by the spirits to his calling. In the 1930s, a samanil were arrested and executed as they were seen as a threat to the Soviet regime (Anderson 2000a: 63).

The Chukchis had male and female shamans who connected with the spirit world. This connection helped them to cure the sick, prevent misfortune and predict weather. Their cosmological view is that the non-human environment is alive. It has the ability to act and speak: not only humans have a soul but animals have one also. Animals can transform to humans and vice versa. Wild animals, trees, lakes and rivers contain spiritual entities and humans respect them to use the resources appropriately. (Schweitzer & Gray 2000: 21.)

The Sakha people call their shamans oiuun, and they are either white or black. Many shamans are men, but there are also many female shamans called udagan. The white shamans, urung represent the upper world and the black shamans, khara the lower world. The Sakhas believe in the khallaan (upper), orto (middle) and allaraa (lower) worlds. The khallaan is home to the gods, the orto is home to people and earthly beings and the allaraa is home to evil spirits. Sakhas’ believe that all things have spirits also plants. (Crate 2006: 34.) The black shamans connect with spirits through blood sacrifice and the white shamans by singing. In the shamans’ clothes, there were metallic articles that represented animals, and the articles’ sound protected from bad spirits.
Imagine a future archeological excavation in Uurung Khaia. You would find there a round shaped drum and shaman clothes with metallic articles in the same layer. Thousands of years have passed and there is not so much knowledge about the layers' time period, it mostly relies on the artifacts. Would you understand the society behind the artifacts as it was? Could the artifacts be tracked back to the different cultures that lived in the area at the same time, or could the different gender roles be recognized based on the artifacts? You might come to the conclusion that they belonged to one shaman, and at first you might not even consider that a mixed-culture society once lived in this city. Then when you compare the finding to other archeological sites, you are more likely to go towards a more accurate direction with your assumption. But how could you know that the shaman connected to gods by singing? There would be no remains of this shaman act; his tool to connect with the spirits is not a material tool. What we can realistically know about the past? Can we provide an answer to how why?

Other similarities exist among the ethnic groups for example in herding, hunting and fishing. The difference between the groups is that throughout time, the Sakha people have been more horse and cattle herders and the northern indigenous people reindeer herders. Based on this some separation could be made between the Sakhas and the indigenous minorities and the material culture connected to herding. At present the long history of herding can be seen in the legends and also in the languages which have rich vocabularies connected to reindeer.

There is a legend among the Eveny people that reveals how reindeers became domesticated. The legend goes as follows:

"An old hunter was walking through the forest when he came across the head of a reindeer calf protruding from a vulva-shaped crack in the trunk of a larch tree. The old man stroked the calf and talked to it gently, helping it to emerge painfully, one limb at a time until it was fully born. This was the first male reindeer. When this reindeer was 3 years old it met a female (presumably born from another larch tree) and they had a family of two calves. One day the family was attacked by wolves. The parents cried helplessly to the god Hövki in the sky, while their calves fought back and impaled the wolves on their antler. Afterwards, the parents felt ashamed of their cowardice. When Hövki asked them why they had not fought to protect their children, they answered that they did not have the strength or the sharp antlers of the younger reindeer. Hövki asked them how they proposed to survive in the future, and the father replied, 'When I was being born from a tree, a human was kind to me. Let us
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go and live with humans. They will protect us from wolves and out of gratitude
we will serve them. Hövki then asked the younger reindeer how they wanted
to live. They replied that however hard the life, they preferred to remain free.
Then each pair ran their separate ways to their separate destinies. (Vitebsky
2005: 26–27.)"

In the Eveny language there are different words for wild reindeer and domestic
reindeer. Wild reindeer are called buyun and domestic reindeer oron (Vitebsky
2005: 26–27). The Sakha call wild reindeer taba, privately owned reindeer ketekh
and reindeer used for riding uutsak. Reindeer have been and are important in the
area, and it is important for the new generations to know how to take care of them
to survive – especially in the rural districts.

In the Sakha Republic there are three reindeer breeds: Evenki, Khargin (Chukchi)
and Even. The Evenki breed is suitable for work, Khargin is a meat animal and
the Even is both. (Ventsel 2005: 194.) In the Sakha Republic, reindeer have been
hunted at least since the Neolithic era which is when the Yakagir culture formed.
Even thought reindeer herding is a common feature among indigenous people,
there are also differences among the different indigenous minorities especially in
reindeer use. For example the Evenkis drink reindeer blood but the Dolgans do not,
and the Dolgans do not eat reindeer sexual organs as some indigenous peoples do.
Even though there are some small differences, most of the reindeer parts are well
used. In the Sakha Republic reindeer are used for meat and to obtain products such
as furs and bones, they have a religious significance, and they have been used for
transport throughout time. (Ventsel 2005: 193, Litmanen 2010: 32.)

Reindeer are perfect for transport in the region because they are strong and
reliable and they feed themselves when they are released on open pasture even in
harsh conditions. According to the Evenkis to master a reindeer, the reindeer must
recognize its own herd and the people who master it. Since the sixth century the
Evenkis have ridden reindeer with a saddle or they have used a wooden sledge.
(Anderson 2000a: 59–60.) Saddled reindeer have been used in Siberia even in 1960
(Anderson 2000c: 7).

The Sakha people’s arrival to the territory is not known. Some say it occurred
in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, others say it happened a century earlier.
Susan Crate suggest 900 A.D. They were semi-nomads, who lived in permanent
villages and moved away if the resources were exhausted. Some say that in this
time the Sakhas had clear social stratification and the indigenous minorities did
not, but the ancestors of the Sakhas and the Yukagirs still assimilated. The Sakhas
keep horses and cattle in alaas, an open place in the forest. (Ventzel 2005: 50, Crate 2006: 3.) Every house had a sergei, a horse-hitching post, on top of which was carved horse head or other totem. It was sacred and it was not moved from its post because it would have brought bad luck. (Crate 2006: 19, 24.)

In the Sakha culture horses are highly valued and more important than reindeer. Sakha believe that the horse was the first creation of Urung Ayii Toion, their highest god. It is said that “In the beginning, god made the horse and from it came the half-man half horse and from there humans were born (Crate 2006: 23).” In the Sakhas’ epic poem Olankho, the horse is humans’ counselor, friend and supporter. For Sakhas horses are more important than cows. Horses were used for transportation, food and clothing. Sakhas use horsehair for example to make hats or fishing nets. The horse came to the district either with Sakhas’ ancestors or they were in the area before Sakhas (in the area, there have been wild horses in the time of mammoths). Sakhas have many rituals and traditions that honor horses. They have horse-related ornamentation in their furniture such as horse legs, hooves and heads (e.g. table legs can be shaped in the form of a horse leg). According to Sakha traditions, horses are the spirits of the upper world and cows are the spirits of the middle world. (Crate 2006: 22–24, 29.)

A herding-related archaeological finding would easily lead to the conclusion that reindeer are of more importance to indigenous minorities than to Sakha and that horses are more important to Sakha people. Compared to the example on the differences in shamanism, herding provides a clearer division between the ethnic groups. Along industrialization and development in transportation vehicles, the distances have become shorter and different ethnic groups interact with each other more. This means that cultural mixing occurs at a faster rate than 50 years ago. What will be said in the future about the time we live in? How accurate the interpretation of our time period will be?

6. The Sakha and their traditions

In this chapter I want to present the Sakha culture and its traditions. Compared to the area’s indigenous minorities the Sakhas are newcomers in the region. Their religion is not officially registered, but it has been influenced by the Orthodox religion even as early as the seventeenth century (Bloch 2004: 35). The Sakhas were converted to the Russian Orthodox religion, but even today they might call themselves pagans. Some of the Sakha people said to me on my visit that they do not believe in anything, but I noticed that for example when they went to the forrest;
they did not dare to scream because it could disturb the spirits. Spirits are part of the traditional beliefs and even though people do not connect to the traditions, it is part of their life even though they do not always recognize it.

According to my observations in the cities among the young people, the old traditions are vanishing but there are some things that appear under the surface that show the ethnic heritage. In addition there is a movement to store the heritage and increase its value. Many young people are interested in traveling and different cultures. There is more and more interaction with other cultures, which has its influence. For example at present some young people idealize the Japanese culture as regards the way Japanese young people dress, what they eat, read and create. On the other hand, it can be a fad, but I think that some things will remain in the culture after the fad has passed. Although there exists idealization of other cultures, the young people are also mixing old ornamentation to modern clothing. For example I saw they wore jeans decorated with traditional ornaments.

The Sakha culture uses lunar and solar calendars. One lunar cycle equals one month. The Sakhas have named their months according to events related to the months. For example March is Kulun Tutar, the month to catch horses, April is Muus Ustar, the month to take down the ice windows, and May is Yam Yia, the cow-milking month (Ivanov 2011). There are differences in the explanations of the names. Crate (2006: 31) writes that March is holding-the-colt month and May the month to mark the fish spawn. Maybe it is connected to the family’s livelihood. Because of the cold winter, there are not that many activities in the winter period, so the months in that time are named after numbers from 6 to 10.

In midsummer, the Sakha people celebrate the second “new year”, Yhyakh. It is a ceremony with rituals. Yhyakh is conducted every year in a place marked by god, referred to as tjsjulge. The name means a present fallen from gods. Yhyakh is an event to meet the sun, welcome the summer and awakening of summer and it takes place at sun rise. There are also other events and rituals related to it: singing, dancing, and competitions in the daytime. People of all ages take part in the event.

When a person comes to a tjsjulge area, he or she must step in through an entrance; men enter to the area from the right side and women from the left side. There are people along the way welcoming attendants and wishing them good health. They give a strand of horsehair and a piece of pancake that can be thrown in the fire. The strands of hair used in rituals are either from horse mane or tail (Crate 2006: 24). After this the person has to walk around the fire three times and make a wish. Number 3 is an important number in Sakha rituals. It symbolizes the three existing worlds and it connects the worlds together. In Sakha culture fire is used to
transfer gifts to the upper world, and Sakha feed the fire spirit wot ichchite regularly with food and drink to protect their home (Crate 2006: 34).

After the opening ceremony of Yhyakh follows the circle dance osuokhai, in which every able person takes part. The dance has three parts: slow walk, fast small steps and jumping. The Sakha people have different kind of folkdances. It is their cultural property, and the dances are associated to the ethnic group or cultural style (King 2004: 51). Articles such as choron (Чорон) (Figure 3), can also be part of the dance. Choron is a wooden cup which stands on three horse legs or one pedestal. It is used daily and in rituals. Usually it is used for drinking kymys, fermented mare milk. Drinking kymys is also part of the ceremonies and it is also offered to quests. (Crate 2006: 22, 34.)

When the sun rises, all the people gather together and a white shaman begins the ritual (Figure 4). The white shaman is seen as the servant of gods. The ceremony area is decorated with young birches which symbolize life. It is the ritual of meeting the sun and the gods coming to the middle world. The fenced area where the ceremony is conducted symbolizes the middle world. The ceremony progresses and people raise their hands towards the sun for energy. The Yhyakh ritual is still part of the Sakha people lives, but it is mixed with the modern day technology and trends, for example as regards music.
The Sakha music has elements of traditional music and other styles of music. In the 1980s, new rock-influenced groups were formed such as Cholbon, Aital and Serge. These groups had strong ethnic elements in their music. They used traditional Sakha instruments such as the mouth harp and traditional singing techniques, töiük. In Russian TV Aital was presented as “Yakutian shamanic-rock group”. In addition there is Sakha folk music. One folk group Iekhei-Chuokhai mixed folk music with country and western and performed in Sakha folk costumes. Well-known traditional music in the area is also throat singing, and Stepanida Borissova is one of the most famous throat singers. (Ventsel 2004: 69–72.) Throat singing can also be heard during the Yhyakh.

Another tradition element, in addition to Yhyakh where the influence of the modern world is seen clearly is in the bridal clothing. Figure 5 is a picture of a traditional bridal dress, but nowadays women also use white dresses like in Finland. In the traditional dress, the bride’s face was hidden behind a veil, so that only her eyes could be seen. The veil was used years after the wedding, or even for the bride’s lifetime to prevent other men from seeing the bride’s face, but the interaction with Russians changed this tradition. The traditional dress was decorated with silver jewelry, and the belief was that the sounds from the jewelry would banish bad spirits.
The total weight of women’s jewelry on their hair, ears and clothes could amount up to 60 kilograms. The jewelry around the neck, wrists, and temples and on the stomach and back protected the person’s organs and veins in ceremonies and weddings. Jewelry was not used at home. When the bride stepped to the husbands’ home for the first time, it was a sign of good wife if the jewelry made a high and light sound. I was told that there is a known event where the sound from the jeweler was low and the bride killed herself because of it.

In the Sakha traditions, it was considered that at least nine generation as blood kin could not marry. Interesting is that in the late 17th century men had more than one wife and the reasons for it were that they grew out of love when they got older or the marriage did not produce children. Furthermore they could increase their herds if there were more women taking care of the herd or they wanted to replace a poor herd keeper or to maximize the chance having many children. (Crate 2006: 32.) This tradition is not usual in today’s Sakha Republic.

Today in the cities can be seen people in white wedding gowns posing for pictures, just like in Finland. The weight of the jewelry and veil has been lifted off and the influence of other societies can clearly be seen.
7. The indigenous minorities and the Sakha and the problems they are facing today

The changes of culture over time, the processes of modernization and the transformation into an industrial society have created, and will continue to create, challenges for the Sakha and the indigenous minorities. One problem that has appeared in South Yakut is the effects of the coal industry on people’s health and on the climate. Another problem is the industries that pollute the rivers. Among the Evenkis, the following problems have emerged: the loss of the family structure, declining birthrate, accelerating death rate, the loss of domestic reindeer herds and chronic alcoholism. (Anderson 2000a: 64.) These problems are not limited to only the Evenkis, but apply as well to the other peoples in the region.

One thing causing the tension for the family structure is education. People have to leave their family to study. For example the Dolgans had a kin-based network to help each member, and the grandparents were passing down the traditions and knowledge. (Ventsel 2005: 152, 153.) How can grandparents pass down tradition to the young people who are studying away from their family? How can the young know how to survive in demanding conditions when they do not live there? Some of the young Dolgans do not even know their native language anymore. Can they communicate with their grandparents after the study period?

The State has tried to improve the situation of indigenous children and the State educational policy has written principles to support it. They are: “1. securing the rights of educating and training children in their native language; 2. instilling a civil identity, solidarity with their nation and with the nations of joint residence; 3. training of vital skills with regards to the traditional lifestyle, working traditions of the nation, and up-to-date requirements in the conditions of new economic relations; 4. special approach to defining the content, the structure and the forms of education; 5. applying new informational technologies and distant training in children’s education and teacher’s professional training.” (Gabysheva 2007: 9–10.) By writing down these goals, the government tries to achieve improvement and direct the culture to a certain direction. But are they carried over to peoples’ lives or do they work only in theory? The implementation faces problems, but for example I visited a school in a small village and it applied new information technologies, even though still on a small scale.

Another fact that affects families is that in the 1970s and 1980s, each household started to have its own source of income. The importance of the extended family as an economic unit became less important. The rich terminology to describe the
kin shows its importance among the Sakha people. However it is interesting that many of the terms are no longer in use. For example Sakha traditions refer to the young sister with balys and to the old sister with ed’ii, i.e. there is more than one word for a sister. It should be noticed that the Sakha can also use the word ‘brother’ or ‘sister’ to refer to a person without any biological relationship, only because of close emotional ties. (Ventsel 2005: 154–155, 159.)

Although the family structure is facing difficulties, the people are connected despite the long distances. There is exchange of the goods between the north and Yakutsk relatives: for example groceries like fish and meat. (Ventsel 2005: 179.) In addition many people live with their relatives when they go to study in the city.

Changes in the economy have an effect on people’s health, the family’s economic reliance and the use of natural resources. The health problems from pollution and the problem of getting good health care in the rural districts affect the society. Industrialization and modernization come along with the interaction with other cultures, and the technological development makes interaction with these other societies more regular.

In the past, the government (the Soviet Union) had a strong effect on the territory, and the people of Sakha are still today experiencing the problems that came with it. During the Soviet era indigenous people were saying: “our traditions are being lost” and “the young people do not remember our rituals”. There was the ethnic cleansing and in 1969 the resettlements. Individuals had more than one identity, like the Dolgans. The collapse of the Soviet ideology created a spiritual vacuum and many indigenous people turned towards new traditions and religions rather than towards their ancestors. For example in Chukotka in the 1990s, younger people chose not to return to their traditions and not to value the Soviet ideology, but to turn to a new religion, the Pentecostal congregation. (Anderson 2000b: 136, Vakhtin 2005: 29, 34, Fondahl 2005, 89.)

Another problem affected by government has been the land ownership. The northern indigenous people have never regarded land as private property like the Russian domination has. Land ownership has been based on the principles of long-term and uninterrupted land use, inheritance and oral agreement with neighbors. Many people had rights to claim the same land so the administration suggested creating communities and joint rights to own land. (Sirina 2005: 205.) In 1992–1994 the process of land ownership advanced in the Sakha Republic, creating communities and self-determination by the northern people. By 1997 there were 207 clan communities and Yakutia was the first area in Siberia where the clan-based communities were established. Between 1992–1999 legal rights for the northern
indigenous people were established. Seven laws were passed; one law for example defined area, its economy and its function and development. (Sirina 2005: 197–199.) The view change on land ownership was effected by Russian government and it created communities, affecting the social structure.

Deputy Minister Anna N. Shishigina of the Republic of Sakha’s Ministry of Foreign Relations answered few questions about the Sakha Republic the international relations, protection of mammoth bones and the effects on the environment (Figure 6). First Yakutia is geographically located, in the Far Eastern Federal District, close to countries such as Japan, China, and the Republic of Korea and thus, the majority of the international relations are tied with these countries. The forms of cooperation include export of mineral resources, foreign investment in the assimilation of the mineral resource field of Yakutia, and import of various foreign goods and services to Yakutia related to, for example science, culture and educational exchange and tourism. This cultural interaction influences the present culture in Yakutia, and the results of this interaction can be seen in the future. There is also cooperation with European countries and the USA, but in lesser volume and values. Large-scale international relations are coordinated with Russian MID (Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation), which also coordinates the way these relations are conducted. Yakutia can propose cooperation projects to MID. (A. N. Shishigina 1.9.2010.)

The government also influences whether the non-renewable natural resources are protected or not. For a long time there has been mammoth tusk trade in the Republic of Sakha. In the archeological
excavations, bone objects intended for different purposes have been found from different ages. (Arguho et al. 1997: 65.) For how long do the mammoth remains last and why they are not protected? According to A. N. Shishigina, “right now their volume are still large and can be found in masses. They are a good export product used in souvenir production.” But she also thinks they should be protected in the future because they are of non-renewable nature.

I also asked Shishigina another question presented at the beginning of this article: does permafrost/nature in Shishigina’s opinion have an effect on Yakutia’s economy, culture and peoples? She answered with the following: “Permafrost is what we live on, so it does not affect life of Yakut. Permafrost can restrict construction, it affects roads, together with harsh climatic conditions it limits vegetation period in the summer.” One of the benefits of permafrost is that it makes a good natural underground fridge for storing food products. (Shishigina, 1.9.2010.)

Today there is more and more cultural interaction with other societies and cultures in the Sakha Republic. The cultural change that has taken place in the past hundred years is clear: the effects on the economy, society, family structure, government and geographical location are noticeable. It is interesting to see the past through the present and its values. However it is difficult to measure how close to the truth the view on the historical people is. It will also be interesting to see what the future will be like.

6. Conclusions

Culture is formed of various elements: people, their actions and functions, time and place decisions taken in the past and the present, artifacts, interaction with the environment and religion to name just few. For people it is important to ask questions: how something happened and why. How the Sakha Republic was inhabited and why did the people come there? How did the people live there and why? How they redeem themselves and why they want to pass the information down to the next generation?

Why is it important to think the answers to these two words how and why, how? As human beings we want to know about our past and through that to understand human behavior and societies. We want to know our function what made us the way we are today and what might be our future. For our existence it is important to know our heritage, our cultural properties and to pass them to the next generation. This process is not always a conscious one, but it is important to the Finnish people as well as Sakha and indigenous minorities.
Throughout time in Sakha Republic, there have been different ethnic groups. People have come to the territory due to different reasons: some to find better hunting grounds, other to find work and some not by their own choice. Some inhabitants came from the east or south, while others came and continued to elsewhere on the continent. They lived from hunting, fishing and herding horses, reindeers and cattle: using animals that can manage the cold wintertime period. They express themselves by using natural materials such as wood, bone and metal and making beautiful embroidery, fur clothes and complex native dresses. They use these in events such as *Yhyakh*, a ceremony with rituals. In the ritual, people have different functions and the ritual leader is the shaman. All of these traditions and knowledge regarding how to survive and what to believe in was passed down from generation to generation.

But even thought people carry out their duty to continue the traditions, there are elements that influence the cultural transition: the economy, society, interaction with other societies, family structure, the government and geographical location/ the environment. Over time the traditions, rituals and culture changes and we can see what culture is in a territory at present; we can see what artifacts are being used and what the economy is based on. But even though we know the present, we cannot suggest that the culture was the same in the past, even if the material culture has its resemblance. The present might tell how an object can be used and why, or what can be found out about the material culture, but it does not tell how something was used before and why. How the mentioned element has affected in-between? What we can realistically know about the past?

I think that in some parts, we can see the past through present, but for researchers the most important thing is to remain critical towards the research, information, artifacts, cultural traditions and properties and most importantly ourselves. An excavation in one village may not reveal the cultural difference but comparison to other excavations might show that the area was inhabited by different cultures and not just by one. This research discusses what the present society in the Sakha Republic is and in what ways it is a result of past processes.

At present, the Sakha Republic is a combination of old traditions and modern streams. People face challenges that create tension to the family structure as the old and the new merges. In villages can be seen *balaghan* and *khoton*, in cities block houses. Traditional wedding dresses have changed to white dresses and people take pictures, with the white dress on, in front of the traditional three houses that symbolize the three existing words. Sakha people have their traditional celebration *Yhyakh*, during which just by listening can be noticed the
merge of music, rock and pop mixed with traditional music, instruments and singing techniques.

Today in Sakha young people want to educate themselves, travel and follow the trends of the world. "In the wider context, popular culture could, in times of a 'new ethnic of pleasure and consumption' reformulate cultural and ethnic identities" (Ventsel 2004: 81). The family structure is changing. Young people head to larger centers to educate themselves and grandparents, who have had a significant role in passing down traditions, live far away from them and they might not speak the same language anymore. Household have started to have their own incomes and the importance of family as an economical unit is smaller than before. The rich vocabulary for family is not used so much anymore.

The other problems the people face today in the Sakha republic are industrialization, its effect on the family structure and people's health. One impact of the fall of the Soviet Union was the loss of traditions. It meant that the young did not want to return to the Soviet ideology or the old traditions but they rather wanted to find something new. During the Soviet time, the Russian culture and language was dominant in Yakut whereas today it is the Sakha culture - but what will be the future (Sirina 2005: 198)? Land ownership has created communities and affected the society's functions and structure. What will the values be in the future? Will old remains be protected or will the non-renewable resources like mammoth bones be used? It is my hope that these resources will receive protection in the future.
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Signifying Roman in the east – Identity and material culture in Roman archaeology

Pirjo Hamari

1. Introduction

Identity has in recent years been a constant topic of discussion for archaeologists, whose research matter consists of tangible remains of past individuals and cultures. For archaeologists, the fundamental question is how identities are reflected in the material culture, or how the material world and societies interact.

In this paper, I will take a short look at how such questions are approached in the sphere of Roman archaeology. I will map out some possible ways in which a specific material group can tell us more about the cultural changes in the Roman world. Such an approach is connected to a wider theoretical framework of looking at identities through phenomena in material culture, which also finds parallels in many other disciplines, each with their own approach to studying identities. For archaeologists, the connection between material culture and the social reality is the key to understanding past cultures. This emphasizes context as the framework providing the necessary information and creating meanings as well as underlining the material world as an inseparable part of the fabric of society.

In the current archaeological research of antiquity, a lively discussion is going on about cultural changes that were brought about with the expansion of the Roman Empire. Much of this discussion is centered on Romanization as a phenomenon, and the different “Roman” identities of a multiethnic and multicultural empire. There are two important factors that support this kind of approach. First, the very nature of the Roman Empire as a global, colonial construct provides a fruitful discussion base for research connected to these questions. On the other hand, Roman archaeology has long focused on monumental remains and architecture, and has only in the last decades broken out of the old conventions and broadened its view to other kinds of questions, such as aspects of social archaeology (Hingley 2005, see articles in Lavan & Bowden 2003). These approaches have been able provide new answers to old questions and open up the discipline to a new kind of debate.

This paper should be considered as a preliminary testing of a theoretical framework, with the help of which it may be possible to explain phenomena that
can be seen in the material. As the particular material framework I will use the subject of my research, Roman-period roof tiles from the Eastern Mediterranean in general. My particular areas of interest are mainland Greece and Jordan (Hamari 2008, Hamari forthcoming), which offer an interesting pair to be used in comparative analyses. I will take a look at the concept of Romanization in general and outline some possible implications for a specific group of archaeological finds in particular. I aim to demonstrate how the cultural change that was the result of the expansion of the Roman Empire is reflected in material culture and, more importantly, how to look for local adaptations to this expansion. This paper is an exercise in showing how Roman roof tiles fit into the current discussion. My interest in the matter was aroused when I considered why, in research literature, certain material remains, of which tile and brick fragments seem to be a specifically strong example, are described as generically “Roman”, when in practice when one goes through the material, it is evident that its specific features differ from area to area to a considerable degree. My goal is not only to draw attention to tiles as meaningful research material in this sense but to emphasize the multiple forms they take as “Roman” material and the cultural implications of this multiformity/hybridity.

2. The tiled roofs of antiquity

Tiles and bricks are one of the most common material finds from the Roman period in the Mediterranean area, specifically of post-Republican times. Fragments of these objects come up in huge amounts during surveys and excavations and are frequently used almost categorically in classifying a site as “Roman” in many areas of the Mediterranean. In this context “Roman” is often used to mean as material originating in Rome/Italy or clearly of a form derived from there and thus belonging to the same cultural complex. Ceramic building materials were, along with stone and wood, the primary building materials of the Roman period, and became hugely popular in mainland Italy, as well as in many parts of the Empire (Brodribb 1987, Dodge 1987, Adam 1999).

Even though roof tiles had been in use in the Mediterranean area already in the Archaic period, covering the roof with tiles made of burned clay became only really common in the Roman period. The commonest form of a Roman roof tile (tegula) was rectangular, approximately 0.5 m long and flat, with raised square flanges on both long sides and cut-outs in corners to accommodate fitting into the next row of tiles. In many cases, the tiles are stamped with stamps containing different types of
manufacturing information and/or with a figure drawn with fingers (signature) on the upper or lower surface. These pan tiles were placed on wooden support rafters on the roof overlapping the tiles in a lower row. The joints between the pan tiles were covered with narrow convex covering tiles (imbræx) and mortared in place to produce the sloping and watertight Roman tile roof of alternating vertical pan- and cover tile rows (Figure 1, Brodribb 1987: 5–18, Wikander 1988).

Tiles cannot be produced without a certain degree of skills, nor can they be classified as really cheap, although unfortunately we do not know their exact value in antiquity (Brodribb 1987: 23). However, in both senses the requirements are not extensive. Tiles can easily be produced in bulk and can be manufactured in the same premises as pottery, which reduces the production costs. Suitable clays for tiles can be found almost anywhere, and much of the production is assumed to be local although we have some evidence of long-distance transportation (Rautman 2003: 213–215, Bardill 2004: 4–5 and n. 6). Roof tiles are a durable, replaceable, and recyclable building material, as their very common reuse indicates.

Without going into a more detailed description of different types of tile and brick material, which is beyond the scope of this paper, it is worth pointing out that this picture of a “typical” Roman roof tile is defined first by the ancient sources describing tiles, like Vitruvius (De architectura II.3, V.10) and Pliny (Naturalis
historiae 33.3), but also by the bias of the archaeological research, which has been executed and thus produced information on tiles from Italy and the western provinces, notably Britain (see e.g. McWhirr 1979, Warry 2006). In these areas, the tile forms and details seem to be more uniform (to simplify), possibly due to the influence of the army and the legions as tile producers and mobile carriers of tradition, defining the “standard” Roman tiles. This definition slightly obscures the fact that even when tile rooting as a method appears in many areas of the Empire as the result of the spread of Roman influence, the form the tiles themselves take varies considerably from area to area. I will return to the meaning of this variation later in the paper.

In their heyday during the imperial times, roof tiles have clearly been employed in settings that can be best described as humble, but also in virtually all public building, at least in the heartlands of the Empire. They are one of the quintessential “Roman” comforts, something that used to be seen as signifying the spread of the amenities of the Roman civilization to privileged barbarians, along with baths, luxury pottery and Roman governance models (Ward-Perkins 2005: 94–96). Despite this, or perhaps because of this, there has been only sporadic research into the material and its closer study is usually not included in excavation or survey reports even when such material was encountered during fieldwork. Tiles have had little significance for research focusing on questions concerning society, with the important exception of the study of brick stamps and, through them, questions of production patterns (see, e.g., Bruun 2005, Graham 2006).

The general assumption seems to be that tiles are too standard and too uniform over time and space to give meaningful information to research. A starting point in my research is the belief that despite their (supposed) uniformity, meaningful differences exist, and tiles are worth studying as a part of the material assemblage of a Roman period site. Thus, tiles can give us information about the societies that produced them and this information will add to our conceptions about the Roman Empire.

3. Romans and roof tiles in the eastern Mediterranean

The Roman Empire was the most extensive governing unity of its time. In the centuries before and after our era, it expanded to cover most of Europe and the Near East, annexing, conquering, subjugating, and ultimately encompassing a great variety of peoples and cultures over vast areas. Several scholars have pointed out similarities in the situation with modern colonial powers and the global nature of
the empire, and the fertile ground this provides for studies on transformations in colonial situations (van Dommelen 1997, Hingley 2005). As stated in the beginning, my discussion centers on two areas of the Empire with their own characteristics, mainland Greece and Jordan.

Roman rule reached the eastern part of the Mediterranean in the centuries before and after our era. The Roman conquest (by diplomacy and force) started in Greece in the 2nd century BC, and the first decisive annexation of a province, that of the provinces of Macedonia and Achaea, took place in 146 BC (Astin et al. 1990, Alcock 1993). By the time of Augustus, the whole of the Greek area and the Eastern Mediterranean was under Roman rule, and coloniae were being established in the coastal areas of Syria and Lebanon. In Jordan, the Nabataean kingdom and the city of Petra were annexed to the Empire in AD 106 (Millar 1993). The expansion brought with it soldiers but also tradesmen, settlers, and craftsmen from the heartlands of the Empire.

It is important to remember that the cultural changes traced here took place in a broader context of incorporation of the subject peoples into the Roman Empire. This covered techniques of subjugation, accommodation and settlement, the development of systematic economic exploitation, and the imposition of Roman law. Cultural change took place within this framework and was part of it, involving the spread of Latin and the development of urbanism, personal identities, dress, eating habits, religious practices, and artistic representation (Keay 2001: 122–123).

Of these areas, Greece, as the homeland of Hellenistic culture and civilization, was an integral part of the Greco-Roman cultural sphere. Countless features in the Roman cultural sphere originated in Greece, and it has been argued that the Roman conquest of Greece brought little change in terms of culture (Woolf 1994: 116–117, MacMullen 2000: 27–29, see however Alcock 1993). At the eastern end of the Mediterranean sea, even if in character Oriental before and after the annexation, the area that was later to become Roman Near East had been closely connected to the Greco-Roman world as part of the Hellenistic kingdoms in the East. This area had been the recipient of western cultural influences already before the Roman rule, reflected, for example, in the Hellenistic influences seen in Nabataean architecture and material culture (Butcher 2003, Rababeh 2005: 15–26).

It is without doubt that the spread of Roman building traditions and the monumentalization of urban centers to the East is connected to the expansion of the Empire, and that we can trace these changes taking place (Price 1984: 133–167, Macready & Thompson 1987). However, it should be immediately pointed out that these traditions were not adopted wholesale or comprehensively, or simply
by replacing existing local habits – a picture that is sometimes transmitted in this connection. Instead, changes are gradual and happen both before and after any political changes. Likewise, and in a similar manner as other aspects of material culture, the changes reveal an architectural landscape of endless local variations and adaptations instead of simpler emulation or replacement in changing political settings.

Those aspects of Roman building traditions most frequently cited are monumental public building and baths, as well as the use of materials seen as “Roman” or in contexts particular to Rome. Expansion of the Empire brought with it in many places the realignment of public space. We see a preference for building techniques from Rome and, connected to this, the use of tile as one element in the material portfolio. This is a picture that also emerges for my areas of interest. Even when taking into account previous use of ceramic building materials in both of these areas, tile and brick in these areas is essentially a Roman-period building material: if not introduced, it is made abundant (Greece) or more common (Jordan) in these provinces during the Empire (Dodge 1987).

However, when tile material from the provinces that can be dated to the early decades of the Roman rule is observed in more detail, the picture that emerges is one of small but significant variations in form and style. What in general passes for a typical Roman roof tile in Italy, in Gaul, and particularly in Britain is no longer present. In Greece, the tradition of using roof tiles of burned clay already existed in the Archaic period and particularly in the Hellenistic period, most commonly using specific tile orders called Laconian and Corinthian (Orlandos 1966: 83–86). This picture changes with the Roman annexation of the area. There are indications that the flat legionary tile typically perceived as Roman is present in the beginning of the era but is gradually sidelined in favor of a Hellenistic form, the curved Laconian tile. However, what is introduced in this transformation is the phenomenon of signatures. On their surface the tiles carry the same curving finger-drawn lines as the legionary tiles in Britain, a phenomenon occurring only from the 1st century AD onwards in Greece (Figure 2, Theocharidou 1988, Hamari forthcoming). It is intriguing to follow the life of this phenomenon through the Roman Empire, and in fact, its meaning is not known for certain, though it is very likely primarily connected to the tileries and work processes (Brodribb 1979: 215–216, Brodribb 1987: 99, Theocharidou 1988: 108). Stamping tiles was never common in Greece, and stamps are present in Roman-period tiles in the area only sporadically and in abbreviated forms. In mainland Greece, such roof tiles or their fragments are very common finds in the Roman period, very often present in surveys even in rural contexts (see, e.g. Wells 1996, Forsén & Forsén 2003, Hjolman et al. 2005).
In the area of modern Jordan, ancient Arabia, tile roofing was certainly introduced already before the annexation by Rome of the Nabataean kingdom in AD 106. Tiled roofs are present – even if not dominant – in many of the most prestigious new monumental buildings of the late Nabatean period in downtown Petra. It is, however, clear that the use of ceramic building materials intensifies during the Roman period (Rababeh 2005, Hamari 2008, Mikkola et al. 2008: 104, 113). Preliminary results of the material in Petra show that there is no apparent distinction between pre- and post-annexation tile roof material; already the late Nabataean roof tiles are produced in a way that is clearly related to the Hellenistic-Roman roof tile tradition in the sense outlined in the beginning of this paper. But again, the common genealogy does not manifest as direct copying; instead the tiles show a variety of features that are not derived from their Roman counterparts. Here again, the roof tiles are in general flat, but they do not have the standard corner cut-outs for fitting. Neither are they very regular in form, but include highly versatile flange shapes and varying thicknesses and finishing touches. There are some signatures on this material, but no proper stamps.

However, even when there are differences, the distinctions in form are not very big. What is worth noting is that this roofing style is used instead of the more
common flat beam and plaster roof native in the area and well suited to local conditions (Schmid & Kolb 2000, Rababeh 2005: 174–187). This is an architectural choice that stands out from the situation in general, since it is evident that tile and brick as building or roofing materials never become very common in the area. Roofing tiles have been present in Petra in some quantities, since fragments are found in excavations and surveys in the city and are frequently reused in later building. However, they are limited to specific instances and parts of buildings even in Petra. In the area in general, they are very seldom encountered in surveys in rural areas, and most of the reported finds are connected to public building in large urban centers. In fact, every instance of using roof tiles suggests both the willingness to take the extra trouble of using a material that is not so easily obtained (including the wooden beams for the necessary trussing) or manufactured in the area and not dominant in building practices, as well as the choice of an imported building technique.

As a product, tiles in general can be, as other products are, either imported or locally produced. We know of both ways of producing tiles from Antiquity, especially in areas where burned clay was not a traditional building material. Tile production is connected to pottery production, since it shares a large number of common features with it (raw material, treatment of raw material, firing facilities). In Petra, pottery has been produced already in the Nabataean period. There are usable clay deposits in the area, and Roman pottery kilns have been discovered in Petra and nearby, like the one excavated in Zurrabah (‘Amr 1991). In fact, one of the tile roof finds from Petra from the domestic area around the Temple of the Winged Lions, found in a pre-AD 363 stratum, is reported as having a Nabataean letter on the surface (Hammond & Johnson 1994: 336), almost certainly indicating local production. In Greece, both pottery and tile have been produced already in the Archaic period in large quantities, and there are several known Roman and Byzantine tile works in the area surrounding Thessaloniki (Theocharidou 1988). It seems most likely that in both areas, Roman period tiles were of local manufacture and not an imported material. This local production may have been the result of travelling manufacturers or local craftsmen or a mixture of both, although a completely imported workforce seems unlikely. In any case, the transition over time from a novelty to a standard to tradition seems a likely outcome in tile production.

Many of the problems related to the question revolves around the choices in tile use and production. We do not have enough evidence to know in any detail how commissioning roof tiles to building sites or to specific architectural projects worked. It is perhaps more likely that they were not commissioned directly for
particular roofs but obtained from premanufactured batches, since caches of these are sometimes found, and this hypothesis would also better fit the models of tile and brick manufacture that are known from the Roman world (Helen 1975, Graham 2006). The frequent reuse of the material complicates the picture, since it makes it hard to distinguish between primary and secondary uses and the internal relative chronology of the material. The apparent longevity of the items also presents a challenge for interpretation, as well as the relatively slow morphological changes. None of this is facilitated by the limited publication of this type of material, making any kinds of comparisons very difficult.

Therefore it is not obvious who makes the style choices in the event of manufacturing a roof tile. For the producer, what can be envisaged is not an intentional choice between “Roman” or other tile models, but a tradition learned and adopted in the area, something that is defined both by demand and by the traditions and influences the producers have grown up with. These situations have certainly been affected after the initial period of Roman conquest by the movement of tradesmen and craftsmen as well as the influence of the settlers and perhaps more notably the army, which in itself was a great importer of Roman building traditions. Another possible source of choice could be the contractor or the architect of the building project itself. In this case, the choice is connected more to display than to production, and in the light of what has been said previously, it is difficult to believe that there would be a very direct link between the contractor and the specific form the tiles commissioned for the building take. In this aspect, tiles differ from pottery, which is meant for immediate and highly visible use and where the commissioner needs and wants to make a direct statement, affecting also the demands on production. I think that with respect to tiles, the latter kind of choice described is more directly connected to the question of projecting identity or status, but the former provides us with the more intriguing possibility of analyzing the impact of the Roman rule in the cultural changes happening in local communities, as it remains at a more subconscious level. Research indicates that pottery producers tend to be very traditional and pottery models change slowly (Rotroff 1997: 98); this makes any changes detected significant.

In both Arabia and Greece, tiles share simultaneously both Roman features and features that belong to the local cultural sphere. For the Greek material, this means combining a traditional Hellenistic form and medium (Laconian roof tile) with a signifier from the Roman sphere (finger line signatures on tiles). What we see is a fusion of practices and influences both already present locally and those introduced from the outside. For the Jordanian material, it is the use of a non-native building
material in Roman-influenced format. Both these sets of materials are defined by their colonial context. Add the variations in the materials and we have a case for studying not only what the changes are that take place with the coming of Rome and when they happen, but much more importantly, how and why these changes take place.

The spread of Roman rule to these areas is reflected in the material world, in architecture in general and in tile rooting as a particular phenomenon. It is also reflected in the way tiles were turned out, not as the straightforward and generic emulation of an existing model, but as a local response to changed political and social circumstances. They are, in short, a part of the process of what has been termed Romanization, in which the material world is changing to reflect the changing ideologies and identities of the users and producers connected to the spread of Roman rule. Although the material world stays recognizable to its users, it is also altered to fit the new context.

4. The debate about Romanization

As stated earlier, the Roman Empire provides a valuable model of cultural interaction over a wide area and the consolidation over time of a sense of subjectivity and cultural interaction. Rome’s interaction with other cultures provides material for studies of imperialism and its effects on a variety of cultural aspects (Hingley 2005: 4–5).

Romanization as a term refers to all those changes that were brought about when the Roman Empire extended its domination to areas it conquered. Romanization is convenient shorthand for the series of cultural changes that created an imperial civilization, within which both differences and similarities came to form a coherent pattern. It is a process by which the inhabitants of these areas came to be, and to think of themselves as, Romans (Hingley 2005: 30–48, Swift 2006, Woolf 1998: 7). The concept and the following discussion have their roots in the undeniable and highly visible changes in the material culture brought on by the Roman conquest.

The scientific debate concerning Romanization has been long, starting already in the 19th century, and vigorous over time with a veritable explosion of research in recent years.¹ It is a term that carries a heavy ideological burden, connected to the context of 19th- and 20th-century western imperialism and the resulting colonial undertones of the early contributions in the debate (see, e.g. Haverfield 1912,

¹ It is impossible to make adequate references here to all key works in this debate; excellent summaries of the complexities of the debate with comprehensive references can be found for example in Mattingly 1997a and 2010, Keay & Terrenato 2001, and Hingley 2005.
In recent research, many inherent difficulties in the use of the concept and the conventional paradigm have been pointed out (Keay & Terrenato 2001). Still, shadows of this colonialism hover over us each time the term is used and make it necessary to justify the content and the choice to use the term in order to avoid association with the old paradigm (Alcock 2001). However, as a term it is firmly entrenched in the scientific debate and nevertheless holds a great deal of explanatory power, if past biases can be put behind and new justifications used.

Romanization has been studied through epigraphy and literature, documenting the spread of Roman institutions, names, the use of Latin, and citizenship, when researchers in archaeology have identified styles in architecture, luxury items, and pottery. This has traditionally been done to distinguish between what is “Roman” and what is “local”, in order to trace the spread and the depth of Romanization in the provinces.

The Roman Empire was regarded as global already in antiquity. It covered most of the area that was known to Romans in Antiquity and successfully governed culturally very diverse areas. Roman rule in the provinces in general consisted of garrisons, maybe auxiliary (or local) troops, and some Roman officials as well as settlers - but was mainly maintained by the local ruling class, in general with surprisingly little resistance given the size of the Empire. The role of these provincial elites in the Romanization process has been stressed. Throughout the Empire, this class shows an easy tendency to “become Roman”, adopting the Roman way of life, with beliefs, customs of dress, food, and material culture, including architecture and building methods (Millett 1990a, Woolf 1998: 67–76).

Reasons for this apparently easy transformation have been sought. A strong trend in the previous approaches to Romanization sees Roman material culture as an improvement for the conquered areas; it is a process that refines the western barbarians and arrests the decadence of the eastern Greeks (see Terrenato 2001: 58). Latest in this tradition is Ramsay MacMullen’s important study (2000) on the crucial period of the reign of Augustus, formative of the “Roman” culture, where he explains why “Roman” material culture spread: because it was desirable - a material improvement and thus intrinsically attractive to the new provincial elites. This paradigm of the spread of materially superior culture has long been an explaining factor in studies connected to changes in the material culture. However, its power to fully explain changes has been contested in later research (Mattingly 2004, Roth 2007).

In recent contributions, the Romanization debate has moved from “bringing the light of culture to barbarians”, a centralizing and civilizing unidirectional process,
to an approach recognizing local variations, the internal dynamics of societies, and multiculturalism, challenging the coherence of the unified imperial picture. This approach, born within the postcolonial theoretical framework, emphasizes the diversity of identities and the local responses that arose within the Empire (e.g. Freeman 1993, 1997, Keay 2001, Terrenato 2001, Mattingly 2004, Hingley 2005, see also Sivonen 2006). Rather than tracing a one-way flow of influence or monitoring the selection of elements drawn from the dominant culture, a far wider range of potential transformations evolved through a complex dialogue between ruler and ruled, and this must be accepted as a fit subject to study (Alcock 1997a, Mattingly 1997b).

New approaches do not focus on cultural superiority but on the negotiation of status and access to power. Greg Woolf’s studies in the cultural change and identities in Roman Gaul emphasize a new view of the motives of the changes – that the adaptation of the Roman culture meant incorporation into the dominant power structure. Influential people are seen to have been keen to adopt Roman culture because this helped them to negotiate their own power simultaneously in local and in imperial contexts. Authority was granted to those who succeeded in dominating cultural production (Woolf 1998, Woolf 2001: 182).

This turns Romanization into a question of an ideological identity instead of one tied to a place or to origin. Identity in this case was partly negotiated through the consumption of goods, a strong identity-defining feature in the Roman society already in the Republican period (Woolf 1998: 170–171). Such an approach allows for a subtle and complex interpretation of social change at a regional level and the role of Roman culture within provincial societies. It also serves well to explain the ways in which material culture related to ‘Roman’ identity (Hingley 2005: 47). If ideas and artifacts were a form of cultural capital for the Roman elites, as research suggests, then the use of similar symbols by the provincial elites can be interpreted as an effort to align themselves with the Roman elite. They signal a negotiation in which new goods and ideas are used according to a local set of rules and values (Woolf 1994, Laurence 1998: 2, James 2001: 199, Terrenato 2001, de Jong 2007: 23.

The views emphasizing the role of the (urban male) elites in the process of Romanization vary in strength from veritable self-Romanization to a more enforced cultural (and political) adaptation. A real threat lies in overemphasizing elite agency and underestimating violence against negotiation (Alcock 2001: 228, James 2001: 198). Whatever the true level of elite engagement was, it is clear that this approach does not provide explanations for the effect of Romanization on non-
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elite groups. Usually, a passive “trickledown” effect carrying the symbols further down the social hierarchy is assumed for the silent masses (see Millett 1990b, Alcock 1997b: 3, James 2001: 202). It has also been debated whether the expansion of the Empire was accompanied by a conscious imperial policy of Romanization. The consensus is that there is little evidence to support the view of the existence of a particular policy although occasional regional and temporal efforts of a more concerted nature of turning specific areas “Roman” were made (Williams 2001: 94–95, Woolf 2001).

Another point to emphasize is that Romanization as a process need not and was not connected to the act of conquering itself. It is a more subtle realignment, a cultural transformation or a “Roman cultural revolution”, a term that has been offered as a replacement to Romanization, which takes place around the act but is not connected to any specific historical event. In Athens, e.g., such a phenomenon can be followed in Athenian pottery, which is slowly transformed, not simultaneously with or starting from any specific event or direct imperial intervention but as a more intrusive “side effect” over time to the conquering of Greece by Rome. This change is more connected to the transformation of the Roman state from Republic to Empire, with its new imperial grammar all over the Empire, including Augustan Rome, than to the annexation itself (Walker 1997: 75, MacMullen 2000, Woolf 2001).

Research assessing the impact of Roman imperialism has been concentrated on the western parts of the Empire. Research in the eastern part is much rarer, and in general the West is seen as a much more fertile ground for this kind of debate due to its more straightforward dichotomy between Romans and Barbarians, people originally outside the Greco-Roman cultural sphere (see discussion in Woolf 1998: 19, Hingley 2005: 17). In the East, what is generally stated is that cultural change was much less marked. It is usually assumed that Greece never became very Roman but “resisted” the spread of Roman culture - a view championed also by the ancient authors (Goldhill 2001, Whitmarsh 2001). A historical emphasis on Greek cultural continuity and superiority at the level of “high culture” has masked any appreciation of the very real impact of Rome upon the east. This view has started to become more nuanced and has gained depth from recent research both in history, epigraphy and archaeology (Millar 1990, Alcock 1993, Woolf 1994, Alcock 1997a, 1997b, 1997c Madsen 2009). Still, Greece remains in a particular position and in its own trajectory in the Empire in its relation to Roman conquest and the responses it generated (Woolf 1994, Alcock 1997b). A reas east of Greece have been similarly mostly sidelined in the Romanization debate (Cloke 2007: 19-20). In general, these
areas of the Empire are seen as retaining most of their previous cultural features also during the Roman domination. Widening this picture in the future is essential for understanding the nature of the Roman Empire in the area.

Despite varying approaches and differing levels of research in different parts of the Empire, in total cultural change under Roman rule is still seen as a meaningful framework for research. Changes in the material culture can have an explanation against the backdrop provided by Romanization. The question of how and why changes take place will be approached below.

5. Material culture and identity in Roman archaeology

The debate around social identity in Roman archaeology has for a long time been focused on the projection of identity in material culture. Recent studies have highlighted the diversity, complexity, and plurality of identities in the ancient world. At the same time, scholars have acknowledged the dynamic role of material culture, not simply in reflecting those identities but also in creating and transforming them (see e.g. Webster & Cooper 1996, Laurence & Berry 1998, DeMarrais et al. 2004, Schörner 2005, Roth & Keller 2007, Hales & Hodos 2009).

Identity has become a very powerful organizing principle; it presents a connecting line between persons and the society they live in. In recent archaeological research, it is recognized that material culture itself remains a fundamental element in the creation of identity, as it can be actively used to constitute that identity in a tangible, visible sense, even though the simplistic equation between assemblages of archaeological material and people must be rejected. Instead, material culture must be taken on its own terms, as a vocabulary which may express a range of meanings, that is, not simply a “Roman” identity (Swift 2006: 98–99).

It is clear all over the Empire that the expansion of the Empire brought with it the transformation of the material culture. A broad range of pottery types and styles as well as architectural styles spread to many, perhaps most, communities within the boundaries of the Empire. There is certain uniformity in material culture, and the volumes of production of certain object types, for example transport amphorae, are huge. This, in itself, is not enough evidence that Roman culture spread uniformly across the Empire, down through the social hierarchy, from the elite to the non-elite. It has been pointed out that we need to consider whether it is appropriate to argue a Roman identity for many of these material items. Their use may represent

---

2 For an overall view, see articles in Hodder 2001; only such works that have key relevance in Roman archaeology have been referred to in this article.
Hamari: Signifying Roman in the East

convenience rather than the adoption of some form of standardized Roman identity. Something that is “Roman” to us may not have been obvious to the people who owned and used these objects (Woolf 1998, Gosden 2005: 207, Hingley 2005: 105). Nor are all manifestations of high art indicators of power balance. There is a need to anticipate a complex series of choices taking place when it comes to the appearance of Roman material culture connected to perception, acquiescence, wealth, and status, and these need to be analyzed primarily in their own contexts, not as part of any uniform imperial framework (Keay 2001: 135, Terrenato 2001: 59).

Recent studies indicate that in many cases, the Empire brought a recognizable package of materials and customs to its conquered subjects, but these artifacts were not adopted in a predictable fashion. Being Roman seems to have encompassed a great variety of behaviors and experiences, and it is often difficult to see how these could be connected as parts of a greater structure (Roth 2007: 8). Nevertheless, allowing for regional variation and projecting elite identity, a malleable cultural package was formed, drawing upon art, architecture, language, urban space and dress or personal appearance, something that is a shared imperial experience. This package varies over time and space but stays recognizably “Roman” to its users and its observers (Revell 2009: 191-194).

One categorical division that is somewhat unhelpful in material culture is that between Roman and Native, since this is a distinction that is very rarely purely applicable after the initial period of colonization. In colonial encounters, material culture tends to assume traits from both (or all) surrounding cultures, leading to an amalgamation of features and influences. Later research has adopted the term hybridization to describe this process - a term borrowed from linguistics but applicable to material culture as well (Woolf 1998, van Dommelen 1997: 309, van Dommelen 2001: 81, Mattingly 2004). This means that we should not expect to follow the spread and adoption of Roman artifacts contra the replacement and disappearance of local material culture over the Empire as a simple unilateral process; what happens in the material world is more nuanced. What we see is a deconstruction of “Roman” material culture: provincial types featuring new styles but using local knowledge and materials. They are called “Roman” in the archaeological record despite their local production and native character (Hingley 2005: 45).

Thus, labeling such phenomena as Roman is an oversimplification in the sense that the objects would originate in Rome and/or replace local traditions: these objects cannot merely be viewed as representing native acceptance of Roman civilization (Hingley 2005: 45). To make sense of the material remains in such
circumstances, we should not spend time trying to identify the original elements of a bipartite culture, but rather look at the logic by which the pieces were combined (Gosden 2005: 209). In general, even in the Italian mainland, we lack a “Roman” material cultural complex, which was constantly redefined from both outside and inside and which expressed also other aspects of identity like wealth and status. Therefore there is no original immutable package that can be used as an easy countermeasure of the degree of Roman-ness of the material assemblage of any given part of the Empire, even if some features remain more common than others. What matters is that this complex remained readable and recognizable to its users, who in this way participants of the negotiations (Grahame 1998: 175–176, Alcock 2001: 228, Revell 2009).

One point to remember is that changes in material culture would be meaningless, if they were motivated only by pragmatic reasons. We know that is not true, and we know that there are many more reasons for changes in the material culture, since it also carries with it various meanings. It is obvious that even when pragmatism can be a big factor in defining how the material package was formed at any given time, it is not the only factor, and not always a decisive one.

Material culture is a medium through which people create and negotiate social roles, as culture operates through material dimensions. Material items can thus carry social meanings, messages about status, gender, class, and identity. In the Roman context, such messages were embedded, for example, in the physical settings of the urban context, and people learned about politics, religion, and culture from the messages conveyed by material objects. These ideas were part of the knowledge of how to act in a Roman way (Hingley 2005: 47). What can be used in a simplified form is the term signifier, a loan from semiotics, in the sense of something that conveys a meaning. The use of this term in archaeology builds on the concept of objects as carriers of meaning, signifying things.

Material culture is also relatively long-lasting, and people are socialized into particular material worlds that exist prior to their birth. The forms that objects take in terms of morphology and decoration are crucial to the influences they have on people (Gosden 2005: 197–198). This also allows us as archaeologists to study, through our subject matter of the past material worlds, questions concerning identity and the role objects have in this discourse.

A number of studies connected to Romanization have explored the ways in which certain forms of expression (including architecture and buildings) operated effectively as part of the Roman imperial discourse. The monuments, buildings, inscriptions, statues, and coins that drew upon this “empire imagery” provided
influential provincials who could read the messages with a sense of being involved in a wider imperial world and also provided the shared idea of Roman-ness. They were the physical manifestations of the repeated social actions that helped to define what it was to be Roman. Different social groups negotiated their identities in urban and other civic contexts. The creation and maintenance of political power and social relationships, so crucial in the Roman society, was managed in local communities through the material world in buildings for politics, religion, entertainment, and bathing (Keay 2001: 123, Grahame 1998, Hingley 2005: 81, Revell 2009: 3, 78–79, 191–193). This process operated in a colonial setting, in which the material culture could reflect the responses of the local inhabitants to such a situation (van Dommelen 1997). The width of material culture also allows a mechanism through which progressive Romanization of the less wealthy and powerful could occur and can be studied (Revell 2009: 191–194).

An important part of the material culture involved in the discourse described above consists of Roman building practices and materials. The dates of diffusion of specific features, such as the use of tile and brick, are known (see e.g. Macready & Thompson 1987, Dodge 1990, Yegül 1991) but the processes and motivations are only yet guessed at. The importance of this discourse to me lies in the realization that tile is one of the materials recognized as “Roman”, as part of the cultural package, despite its manifest variations in different parts of the Empire. This opens up the possibility of considering building materials in all those processes of Romanization described above as a part of the vocabulary of being Roman.

6. How to stay “Roman”?

Since roof tiles are a long-lived phenomenon, in use for most of the Roman, late Roman, and early Byzantine periods and experiencing a slow but steady mutation of their own, an important question to ask is what happens when the colonization period is over and the need to negotiate identity shifts to new kinds of needs connected to status and other factors. Lately Louise Revell has stressed that the important factor of Roman-ness is not “becoming” but “staying” Roman. Being Roman is an ongoing discourse at the local level, supported by the active agency of the people involved and continued after the initial transformation period (Revell 2009: 191–194).

By the 2nd century AD, the transitional period of empire-building was over, material culture stabilized and formed and the process of negotiating a ‘Roman’ identity was already visible in the Empire. In AD 212, the Edict of Caracalla gave
all free men in the Roman Empire full Roman citizenship, which so far had been reserved only for a limited number of provincials. Roman tastes and values had been regionally assimilated and regional elites had, in effect, become Roman. This does not, however, mean that the discourse of being Roman ended, only that it shifted focus from relating to an alien invader to the regional development of culture, and that Roman values were internalized (Woolf 1998: 202–205, 247). This was not a question of a thin Roman cultural veneer, as might be suggested, to be discarded after a passing period of alien domination, but a genuine transformation of local societies to new entities. At the end of this transformation, we meet, for instance, the Greek-speaking Christians in Byzantium who defined themselves as Roman (Alcock 1993, Alcock 1997a: 113, Woolf 1998: 242, 247, 249).

In the material culture, this is reflected in a slow transition from conscious display to adopted taste. It is difficult to see this as a statement of specifically Roman identity any longer. Instead, the material world makes other kinds of statements related to status, gender, or class - but all of these within the sphere of Roman culture, owing their history and genealogy to it and impossible to separate from it. As for tiles, they remain in use in all kinds of public buildings, usually not limited to any specific contexts. Their frequency and styles display the local variations that are the trademark of the Roman Empire.

7. The importance of the ordinary

Coming back to the specific group of material that I study, it is worth pointing out that tiles are, in the end, a different type of material than fine pottery or precious metal objects. Roof tiles are a local to semi-local, semi-domestic product requiring moderate but not excessive manufacturing skills. These features set it apart from luxury items or imports, which are commonly used as evidence in the debate on identities. This puts the focus of research on something else than the elite, which, in the predominant discourse, is seen as the key to cultural change. In the Roman Empire, the lives of millions consisted primarily of the daily reproduction and development of local social relations with little reference to Rome, through long-established local frameworks (James 2001: 103). It is difficult to see other groups in the archaeological record, but roof tiles allow this to a certain degree, and in this way may tell us something about the non-elite in the Roman Empire and cultural processes taking place in it.

It is central to my research that aspects of material culture form a part of the ongoing discourse of expressing and maintaining identities. The realization that
architecture and public building are inseparable parts of this discourse is of equal importance. What seems to me evident is that Roman roof tiles in the Eastern Mediterranean are a hybrid form of material culture, at the same time connected to both native and Roman traditions. They are not something that appears from Rome exactly at one point in time (conquest) and replaces local (inferior) traditions. Instead, roof tiles arrive in a diffused manner and turn into new, locally specific and endlessly if minutely varied products whose purpose and use are similar but forms context-specific. The forms they take and the way they are used is a result of the Romanization mechanisms described above at work, and this is how they can be interpreted both in Greece and in Arabia.

This form of narrative is not a conscious choice made at one point in the production chain, but a non-deliberate expression of identity in a material form, both expressing and maintaining the context-specific and mutable identities at the same time. It is too simplistic to see tiles (or any other similar category of objects) generically as a by-product or a gauge of the level of Romanization, when in fact they form a group of objects assuming multivariate local forms and expressions, just like public building in general.

It should be strongly emphasized that it is not sustainable to use only one category of material as an indicator or measure of the degree of Romanization in any given area, nor am I presenting roof tiles as such. Instead, it is only by combining results from different spheres of civic life, from material culture as well as religious life, literature, and linguistics, that any general conclusions should be attempted (for a selection of contributions in my areas of interest, see Alcock 1993, Alcock 1997b, 1997c, Goldhill 2001, Keller & Grawehr 2006, Cloke 2007, de Jong 2007, Mattingly 2010). Societies could also react and respond in contradictory ways to Roman imperialism in different aspects of life: in Athens for example, depending on the area of civic life, its effects were either welcomed or rebuffed while at the same time an ongoing maintenance of Athenian cultural identity is evident (Woolf 1994, Alcock 1997b: 5). These words of warning remind us how complicated the question of cultural identities and material culture is, and why it should be approached with and justified through an understanding of the underlying social mechanisms and processes.

To me, approaching a fairly simple material group such as roof tiles from this angle serves as a reminder not to take for granted assumptions about homogeneity, or, for that matter, meaninglessness that sometimes are connected out of long habit to certain source materials. Local variations and specific contexts are our key to understanding the meaning and significance of the details that we see in any group of remains.
It is of great importance for research to recognize this meaning in society, and not to be limited to the technical details. We can study tiles as a group of objects, measure them, describe them and analyze their technical and chemical components. In addition to this, we need to assess why they have been chosen to be used in their particular form or context, to know their genealogy (Gosden 2005: 203). The Nabataeans covered their most important public buildings with tiled roofs, since this was a part of the material reality of the world inexorably approaching them and to which they wanted to show affinity. This was done in a style mostly but still not completely Roman, fusing cultural influences and traits to a context-specific message. In Greece, tile roofing, a traditionally employed building method, continues as a practice, but at the same time assumes features from the Roman world in a context where this has previously been deemed unnecessary or even rejected.

These are some of the social meanings we can give to Roman roof tiles in the Eastern Mediterranean. Since many of the ideas presented here are still preliminary and much more work needs to be done, in the end we may be left with almost no other answers, and need to accept that expressions of identity remain outside our research options. However, this should not deter us from understanding the processes connected to the formation of identities or from applying them to our research. What needs to be rejected is the notion of a non-mutable, monolithic, and omnipresent Roman material culture; instead we need to pay attention to the variations on the theme that can be found even in such materials as roof tiles.

We can test the assumptions put forward in this paper by asking two questions and seeking the answers in the light of the framework presented here. First, would the architectural landscape, particularly the tiled roofs, have looked the way it did in Greece and in Arabia in the Roman period without the expansion of the Roman Empire? I see clear influences of this expansion in the tile material of both areas, and would not hesitate to say that the Roman conquest did have a clear impact on the architectural landscape in this respect. Second, does the use of roof tiles form a part of the “Roman” vocabulary of communities? As outlined above, there seems to be good reason to believe so. I would be hesitant to argue this strongly without further studies, to be substantiated with parallel investigations in other material groups, but these remain outside the scope of this paper.

This paper does not aim to challenge or refine concepts like Romanization, Roman identity, or the transformation of material culture, but to adapt and to use them to explain phenomena in the material, as well as to add to our information about regional variability and culture at a non-elite level of society within the confines of the Roman Empire. I have argued that in their respective ways, either
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by displaying hybrid features or by being a conscious choice of a non-local type of material, how roof tiles are present in the archaeological material in these different areas of the Roman Empire also explains this empire from a social angle and shows the potential of material culture in this kind of research. This is not simply a question of cataloguing naturally occurring local influences, but a desire to understand how and why the changes happen and what each instance tells us.
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Changing times, continuing traditions: the transfer of religious traditions at Jabal Harun

Paula Kouki

1. Introduction

Jabal Harun is situated at the eastern edge of Wadi Arabah, ca. 4 km to the southwest of the ancient city of Petra, Jordan (Figure 1). Known as the burial place of Moses’s brother Aaron, the mountain is a sacred site for Muslims, Christians and Jews alike, and it has been a focus for pilgrimage through several centuries. On the northeast summit of the mountain there is a 14th century Muslim shrine to Prophet Harun, built atop the ruins of an earlier church (Wiegand 1920: 136–145). As the highest point in the landscape in the Petra area, Jabal an-Nabi Harun (lit. “the mountain of prophet Aaron”) is a landmark that can be seen from a great distance, both from the bottom of Wadi Arabah and from the edge of the eastern highlands. Its silhouette with a flat high plateau topped with a double peak of precipitous cliffs is distinctive and easy to recognize (Figures 2–3).

The Finnish Jabal Harun Project (hence the FJHP) has been excavating the ruins of a Byzantine church and monastic complex (FJHP site 1), identified as the Monastery of Aaron, on the top plateau of Jabal Harun since 1998. In conjunction with the excavation, an intensive, multi-period archaeological survey was carried out in the immediate area surrounding the mountain between 1998 and 2005 (Figure 1). (E.g., Frösén et al. 1998, 1999, 2000, 2003, 2004, Fiema & Frösén 2008, Laveno et al. 2007.) The excavations have revealed that there has been a substantial Nabataean building on the high plateau of Jabal Harun, parts of which were later incorporated into the fifth-century Byzantine monastic complex (Fiema 2004: 133). This so-called “Western building” appears to have been a Nabataean cultic structure, which existed from the first to the fourth century AD (Lahelma & Fiema 2008: 201–204).

The Old Testament mentions that Aaron, Moses’ brother, died on a mountain at the borders of Edom and was buried there (Num 20.22–28). The tradition that links Mount Hor, the burial place of Aaron, to the vicinity of Petra can be traced back in the classical sources to the late first century AD historian Flavius Josephus (Josephus, Antiquitates Judaicae 4.82–84), whose writing is roughly contemporary with the first archaeological evidence suggesting that Jabal Harun was considered...
a sacred site. Two hundred years later, Eusebius repeats the information provided by Josephus, adding that the miraculous spring where Moses struck water from stone is located on the same mountain (Eusebius, *Onomasticon* 176.7). In the fifth century, a monastery dedicated to Aaron was established on Jabal Harun, and the site became a focus of Christian pilgrimage (Fiema 2004: 130). After the Islamic conquest, the tradition that identified the mountain as the burial place of Aaron was adopted by Muslims, and during the Mamluk reign in the 14th century, an Islamic shrine was erected on the mountaintop. However, while studying the historic phenomena of Muslim pilgrimage to Jabal Haroun, P. Miettunen came across a curious tradition involving women’s processions to the mountain and prayers to Amm al-gheth, “the Mother of Rain”. In the local tradition Haroun is also associated with agriculture and fertility. In her opinion, these could be the remnants of a much older, pagan tradition, the origins of which have been lost. (Miettunen 2008: 42.) Consequently, it has recently been suggested by A. Lahelma and Z. T. Fiema (2008) that the mountain was originally associated with the cult of a female Nabataean deity probably related to fertility. Thus the prayers to “the Mother of Rain” may represent a tradition that has survived for more than two thousand years.
Figure 2. Jabal Harun seen from south. The Islamic shrine on the summit. Photo: Paula Kouki.

Figure 3. Jabal Harun seen from Jabal ash-Sharah in southeast. Photo: Paula Kouki.
Many still extant sacred sites in the Near East show a long continuity of religious use from pre-Hellenic times into Hellenic, Christian and Muslim periods (Trombley 1993: 151–152). The transformation from pagan to Christian often included also the translation of ritual to overcome the population’s resistance to religious change, in a process of intentional religious syncretism where the original deity was associated with a suitable Christian saint and the ritual was given a new, Christian content, sometimes with relatively minor changes (see Trombley 1993: 147–168). There are also many examples of shrines, which are venerated by both Christian and Muslim populations (Haddad 1969: 21–22). In these respects, therefore, Jabal Harun is by no means unique. However, if we accept that the prayers to the ‘Mother of Rain’ are the surviving traces of a former cult of a fertility goddess, this suggests a remarkably long continuity of not only the beliefs related to agriculture and fertility, but also the oral tradition.

In this article I will consider the mechanisms behind the continuity of tradition related to Jabal Harun through changes in both religion and political situation – the annexation of the Nabataean kingdom by Rome in AD 106, the introduction of Christianity in the fourth century, and the Muslim conquest of the area in AD 630 together with the subsequent spread of Islam. In all these situations, the change was imposed on the population of the Petra region from the outside, no matter whether it included also the political colonization of the area or only the active propagation of a new religion within the existing political setting (as in the case of Christianization). The potential survival of the tradition related to Jabal Harun through these changes suggests that it can be useful to approach the question of continuity by considering the influence of these changes in terms of syncretism and conversion (Insoll 2001: 19–23). Neither of these processes can be viewed as a simple, one-way process of acceptance or rejection. Instead, they involve complex negotiations between the ruling and/or religious elite and the local population, including elements of both resistance and accommodation. Nor should this dialogue be seen as unproblematic, since it involves power relations which are never neutral. (See Lane 2001: 153–159, Webster 1997: 326–332.)

First I will briefly illustrate the Nabataean period in Petra and the changes in religious life brought about by the Roman annexation. Then I will discuss the archaeological and literary evidence of cultural continuity from the Nabataean period onwards in the Petra region in general as evidence of the possible identities of the local population. Finally I will consider the archaeological evidence for continuity and change in the ritual use of Jabal Harun and how these translate into religious syncretism and/or conversion. I will concentrate on two aspects – the
changes instigated from the outside and the responses of the local population – and on how the interplay between these two agencies both transformed and transferred the tradition.

2. Petra from the Nabataeans to the Romans

The Nabataeans were an Arab tribe that lived in the area of modern Jordan, Syria and Saudi Arabia. They are mentioned in ancient written sources for the first time in the late fourth century BC (Diodorus 19.94–95), when they appear to have been nomadic pastoralists and tradesmen. However, by the first century BC there was already a considerable sedentary population in the area (Schmid 2001: 367–371). At its broadest extent, the kingdom of the Nabataeans stretched from southern Syria to northern Saudi Arabia and the Negev and possibly also to Sinai (Kennedy 2000: 34, Hammond 1973: 30–40). Rather than a kingdom in the western sense, it was most likely a confederation of tribes under the rulership of one tribe – the Nabataeans – and it was not ethnically or culturally homogenous (Knauf 1986, Graf 2004). The city of Petra, which was established at the crossroads of several caravan routes, was the seat of the Nabataean kings. There is some archaeological evidence of settlement in Petra already in the third century BC (Graf 2007a, Mouton et al. 2008), but the distinctive Nabataean pottery and monumental architecture, which combines Hellenistic and eastern influences, do not emerge before the first century BC (Schmid 2001: 367).

Because of the lack of written sources, the Nabataean belief system is not very well understood, although there are numerous cultic sites and a number of deities are known from inscriptions and sculptures. The Religion of the Nabataeans: A conspectus by J. Healey (2001) is the most recent summary of what is known about Nabataean religious life. R. Wenning (1997) has discussed the evidence and role of religious societies in Nabataean religion, and L. el-Khoury (2007) has recently examined the archaeological evidence of Nabataean pilgrimages.

The Nabataeans seem to have associated their deities with their presence at landforms and certain locations, such as the chief deity, Dushara, “the one of [Lord of] the Sharah (mountains)” (Starcky 1982, Healey 2001: 87). Dushara was also the god of the Nabataean royal house, and the king had an important role in the religion (Healey 2001: 13, 92–93, 154). In addition to this “state cult”, private cults or religious societies formed around a family or an occupational group were apparently also an important aspect of Nabataean religion (Wenning 1997: 181–183, Healey 2001: 147, 165–169). The Nabataean religion is considered to
have originally tended towards aniconism, but there is ample evidence that the Nabataeans also assimilated foreign deities and influences into their belief system. Hellenistic representations of deities appear side by side with the aniconic ones, and it is generally thought that syncretism prevailed between Nabataean and Hellenistic gods already before the annexation (Starcky 1982, Healey 2001: 185–189, however, cf. Wenning 1997: 196–197).

At the latest by the 4th century BC, the Nabataeans came in touch with the Hellenistic world and subsequently with the expanding Rome. The former Seleucid Empire (Syria) was annexed in 64 BC, which made Nabataea the neighbor of the Roman imperium. It was also in the interest of Rome to pacify the governments of the neighboring regions. Judaea became a client kingdom a year later, and it seems that the king of the Nabataeans likewise became one of these so-called friendly kings. (Bowersock 1996: 30–31, 54–56.) Contacts with Rome are more evident in the archaeological material from Petra after 63 BC (Schmidt 2001: 390). However, although there are elements reminiscent of the Roman cultural sphere in Petra, such as the first-century AD Nabataean villas, which closely resemble the Roman villa urbana, excavated both in Petra (Kolb 2001) and in its suburbs (‘Amr et al. 1997, ‘Amr & al-Momani 2001: 266–267), the residents of Petra were selective in their choice of influences to replicate. Although Judaea was annexed in AD 6, Nabataea remained a client kingdom for another century, benefitting from the caravan trade from the Arabian subcontinent to the Mediterranean.

Nabataea was annexed by Rome in AD 106, probably after the death of king Rabbel II. After the annexation Petra continued its existence as a major economic and political centre of the Roman province of Arabia, its wealth apparently undiminished for a long period of time (Graf 1992: 256–259, Fiema 2003: 47–50). Traditionally, the annexation of Nabataea has been thought to have occurred peacefully, but some scholars have disputed this, presenting possible evidence of opposition rather than peaceful succumbing of the local population under the new rule (Bowersock 1996: 79–82, Freeman 1996, Schmidt 2001: 401–402).

It has been argued that the Roman policy in areas newly incorporated into the empire was for active religious syncretism, that is, the association of foreign deities with Roman ones (Webster 1997: 331–332). The Nabataean deities already had existing associations with Hellenistic ones, which probably made their inclusion into the Roman pantheon easier. There is literary and numismatic evidence for the survival of the cult of Dushara into the 4th century (see Graf 2007b: 184), although it is impossible to say how much resemblance it bore to the “classical” Nabataean cult beyond the name. Healey (2001: 13–14) has suggested that the loss
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of the king as a head of the cult may have caused repercussions in the Nabataean religious life. It is also postulated that the Roman regulation of private gatherings, and particularly Trajan’s edicts against voluntary societies (Plinius minor Epistulae 10.33–34, 10.92–93, 10.96, see Cotter 1996), effectively ended the activities of religious societies in Petra.

3. Cultural continuity in the Petra region from the Nabataean to the Islamic period

There is no evidence of significant population changes in the Petra region related to the Roman annexation. The archaeological record does not reveal any large-scale disruptions of the landholding system at the time of the annexation (see Kouki 2009: 45–46). The evidence of pottery production techniques and styles points towards the longevity of the Nabataean cultural traditions up to the sixth century (‘Amr 2004: 237–38).

Some apparently post-annexation inscriptions from Petra suggest that although the Nabataean script was replaced by Greek and Aramaic in official documents after the annexation (see Yadin 1962), it continued to be used in the Petra region after the establishment of the Roman province (Graf 2004: 148). Moreover, some of the personal names in the 6th-century Petra Papyri are still Nabataean, like Obodianos son of Obodianos (Lehtinen 2002, Gagos & Frösén 1998: 476–477), suggesting that these people identified themselves with their Nabataean ancestors. Furthermore, although the papyri are written in Greek, the local place names (excepting the cities or towns) in the papyri are in pre-Islamic Arabic (Koenen 1996: 187–188, Daniel 2001), which indicates that it was the spoken language of the population in the area (Fiema 2002: 4).

The Muslim conquest of southern Jordan in AD 630 does not appear to have caused any immediate changes in the population or the cultural traditions of the Petra region. The continuity of the monastic community on Jabal Harun, as well as excavated artefacts and the possible existence of a church in Kirbet an-Nawatā (the modern Wadi Musa area) from the Late Byzantine to the Early Islamic period (‘Amr et al. 2000: 241), suggest that Christianity continued rather undisturbed among the local population into the Early Islamic period as it did elsewhere in Transjordan (see also the discussion concerning Muslim presence in southern Jordan in Schick 1994: 147–148). The first mention of Jabal Harun in the Arabic sources is made in the 10th century by the historian Al-Mas‘ūdī, who noted that the mountain was in the possession of Christian Melkites (al-Salameen & al-Falahat 2007: 258).
Muslim literary sources and inscriptions on the mountain provide evidence that by the 13th century at the latest, Jabal Harun was also venerated by Muslims as a holy site (al-Salameen & al-Falahat 2007: 258–61). Likewise, the earliest documented evidence of Jewish pilgrimage to the mountain dates no earlier than the Middle Ages (Peterman & Schick 1996: 478). It seems plausible that the local Christian population gradually diminished over the period of Islamic rule\(^1\). However, a monastic community still existed on Jabal Harun when the crusaders invaded the Petra region in the early 12th century (Fulcheri Carnotensis 2.5.9), testifying to the longevity of local Christian tradition.

4. Continuity and change in the religious use of Jabal Harun from the Nabataean to the Islamic period

Although there is a Nabataean shrine on the high plateau of Jabal Harun, it is probable that the original focus of ritual on Jabal Harun has been the high northeast summit of the mountain (Fiema personal communication). Leading up to the steep northeast summit of the mountain is a series of rock-cut steps (FJHP Site 6, Frösén \textit{et al.} 2004: 111–112) most likely related to Nabataean cultic activities on the mountaintop, where the cave believed to be the tomb of Aaron is located.

At present the cave is architecturally enhanced and its walls are whitewashed, which makes it impossible to tell whether it was originally a natural cavity in the bedrock. Whether natural or man-made, the cave under the \textit{weli} is likely to be part of the Nabataean cultic installations on the mountaintop. Any other installations have been obliterated by the construction of the church and the Islamic shrine. The only visible marks of Nabataean ritual activity on the summit remaining today are large cup-marks on the bedrock near the \textit{weli} (Figure 4, cf. Dalman 1908: 225–226).

In Nabataean times, Jabal Harun was the centre of a cultic landscape dotted with small sites, most probably related to ritual processions to the mountain (Lindner 1997: 291–292, Lahelma & Fiema 2008: 209) (Figure 5). Although the shrine on Jabal Harun seems to have been functioning until the 4th century AD (Lahelma & Fiema 2008: 204), the pottery finds point towards discontinuity at the smaller cultic sites located in the surroundings of Jabal Harun around the time of the annexation or soon after it. Similar evidence has been found also at other sites surrounding Petra, such as the so-called Obodas chapel (Tholbecq \textit{et al.} 2008: 238–239).

\(^1\) A Greek building inscription from ar-Rabba points to the transfer of the metropolitan see from Petra to ar-Rabba in 687 (Schick 1994: 142).
Figure 4. Cupmarks in the bedrock near the well. Photo: J. Vihonen.

Figure 5. Nabataean cultic sites in the surroundings of Jabal Harun.
Considering the role of the king in Nabataean religion, it can be postulated that the end of the royal house might have resulted in a breakdown of the Nabataean ritual practices (Healey 2001: 13). As noted above, Roman rule opposed private societies, which apparently played a considerable role in Nabataean religious life. It can be further suggested that it was in the interest of Romans to discourage rituals reminiscent of the Nabataean royal house. Put into this context, the abandonment of the small cultic sites in the surroundings of Jabal Harun, which seems to closely follow the annexation, may be explained.

Christianity began to spread in the Near East in the 4th century after being recognized as a religion by Constantine the Great (Lane 2001: 162). From contemporary sources we know that the Christianization of the Empire did not happen without resistance. The persistence of pagan cults in Petra is well attested in the 4th century sources (e.g., Epiphanius, Panarion 51.22.8–11). There is evidence of the conversion of the monumental tombs into churches in Petra itself in the 5th century (Brünnow & Domazevski 1909: 345), which can be seen as the intentional appropriation of the previously existing monuments and evidence of the contest between the old beliefs and the Christian faith.

Jabal Harun is another case in point. The building of a church on top of Jabal Harun and the establishment of a Christian monastery at the site of the former Nabataean shrine is by no means a neutral act. It can be questioned whether this originally symbolized the religious identity of the local population or whether it was rather an act of dominance over the majority of the population who stuck to their pagan beliefs and practices. Although the world of the sixth-century Petra Papyri is definitely Christian (Koenen 1996: 183), it can be questioned to what degree the populace of the region – especially the mobile population likely to have been present also in the Byzantine period (Schick 1994: 147) – actually became Christianized.

Active syncretism took place during the Christianization of the Empire, when the attributes of former pagan deities were associated with Christian saints and their rituals were given a new Christianized meaning to overcome the resistance of the local populace (Trombley 1993: 147–168). A hint of the transfer of the fertility-related beliefs into Christian context may be found in an inscription found at the excavation of the monastic complex on Jabal Harun. A fragment of a table slab bears the carving ΑΓΙΕΓΕ[, probably meaning Αγιε Γεωργι (St. George) (Frösén et al. 2008: 274). St. George has been a very popular saint in the Levant, identified with the Muslim Khidr and often venerated in the same places (Haddad 1969: 21).

---

2 G. Bowersock (1988: 51–52) has suggested that lack of mentions of the former Nabataean kingdom in the contemporary written sources may be an unofficial damnatio memoriae of the Nabataean royal house.
H. S. Haddad (1969) has argued that St. George/Khidr is associated with many locations that were originally sacred to a fertility god. It can be hypothesised that St. George might have been introduced to Jabal Harun in order to accommodate and “Christianize” the fertility aspects of the former Nabataean deity. This does not explain, however, the prayers to the ‘Mother of Rain’. Therefore the continuity of the tradition related to the ‘Mother of Rain’ can be seen as the refusal of the locals to give up their beliefs. Two alternative scenarios can be suggested: either the prayers gained a veneer of Christianity, or they were kept alive by a portion of the population who never adopted the Christian faith.

Like elsewhere in the Petra region, there was no immediate change in the ecclesiastical use and religious significance of Jabal Harun after the Muslim conquest, but the ecclesiastical use of the church and the chapel continued at least to the 8th century (Fiema 2004: 137). The last mention of monks on Jabal Harun dates to the early 13th century (Magister Thetmarus), while the first securely dated Islamic inscription on the mountain is dated to the end of the same century (al-Salameen & al-Falahat 2007: 260). The site is mentioned in the account of Sultan Baybars’s travel from 1276, but religious structures or the existence of a monastic community are not mentioned (English transl. in Zayadine 1985: 173). It is possible that the Christian community had already disappeared by then.

The tradition that related Aaron to Jabal Harun was probably transferred from Christians to Muslims already in the Early Islamic period while the mountain was still in Christian hands. An Arabic inscription on the mountain, dated to the 8th to 9th centuries on palaeographical basis, may indicate that also Muslim pilgrims visited the site already in the Early Islamic period while it was still occupied by Christians (al-Salameen & al-Falahat 2007: 260). The veneration of Aaron in both religions and the cultural continuity from Christianity to Islam in the region would have enabled the transfer of the religious traditions related to the mountain amongst the local population.

By that time, the origin of the prayers for the ‘Mother of Rain’ was probably already long lost in the mists of time, becoming mixed in the popular cult of Aaron.

In the mid 14th century, the Islamic well dedicated to prophet Harun (Aaron) was raised on top of the mountain as a part of a building program for enhancing religious sites by the Mamluk Sultans (Walmsley 2001: 533–538, al-Salameen & al-Falahat 2007: 259). Although the replacement of a Christian church by an Islamic monument may also be seen as an act of dominance, the situation in other respects was very different from the introduction of Christianity and the installation of a male Christian saint in the place of a female pagan deity. By then, seven centuries after the Muslim conquest, Islam was most probably the religion of the majority of the
population in the region. Unlike the Christian introduction of Aaron, the veneration of Prophet Harun already had a long tradition in the Petra area. The new shrine on the mountaintop can be seen as acknowledging the sacred site and affirming its religious importance for the local population, while at the same time enhancement of the site also served to legitimate the new rulers, namely the Mamluk sultanate.

5. Conclusion

The abandonment of many small Nabataean cultic sites after the Roman annexation suggests some interference in the local tradition, probably related to the breakdown of ritual practices due to the loss of the king as the head of the cult and the Roman prohibition of private societies. After the adoption of Christianity in the Byzantine period, this interference becomes pronounced through the building of a church and a monastery on Jabal Harun and the installation of a male Christian saint in the place of a female pagan deity. The resilience of the Nabataean cultural identity among the local population through the Roman annexation and the introduction of Christianity, as evidenced by the continuing pottery tradition and the Nabataean names in the 6th-century Petra Papyri, suggests a degree of resistance to these changes.

The longevity of the religious traditions and practices related to Jabal Harun stems from the dialogue between these two elements. The one representing continuity is the resilience of the local cultural identity amongst the population of the Petra region, while the other is formed by the changes introduced by the contemporary secular and/or religious powers who appropriated the sacred site of Jabal Harun for new ideologies. It is suggested that the contestation and accommodation of the religious meaning of Jabal Harun resulted in active syncretism, which enabled the transfer and survival of the tradition over the religious changes. It is likely that the tradition related to the ‘Mother of Rain’ was kept alive by the locals alongside the official Christian and Islamic interpretations and over time it became mixed with the more canonical tradition.

Acknowledgements

This research has been carried out under the Academy of Finland Centre of Excellence in Research ‘Ancient Greek Written Sources’. I am grateful to Dr. Z.T. Fiema for his invaluable comments. My thanks belong also to Mr. J. Vihonen for his help with the Latin texts and to Ms. Sarianna Silvonen for proofreading. All mistakes are, of course, my own.
Kouki: Changing times, continuing traditions

Bibliography

Sources
The Bible. English Standard Version. URL: http://www.biblegateway.com/

Research literature
Archaeology of Social Relations - Ten Case Studies by Finnish Archaeologists


Textile-making and religion in central Tyrrhenian Italy

Sanna Lipkin

In central Tyrrhenian Italy, textile tools have been found in three different kinds of contexts: settlements, burials and sanctuaries. Thus the implements represent the fact that textile-making was present in many aspects of life.

In this article, I will concentrate on textile-making as a part of religious ritual in central Tyrrhenian Italy. In the region, textile tools have been found both in votive deposits¹ and scattered in sanctuary areas.² As I will attempt to show, the two kinds of contexts may indicate different rituals related to textile-making.

Religion is the thoughts, beliefs, actions and materials that are defined by rules and set into action in public. In central Italy, religion was about traditional rituals and offerings made to the goddesses and gods worshipped in the sanctuaries. The archaeological reconstruction of these rituals is primarily based on the extant material culture, and because of the state of preservation of the findings, the religious and social meaning of the rituals is not always clear. Crucial artefacts may not have necessarily survived or were not left at the scene of ritual in the first place.

Understanding ancient religion is difficult, but religion can be seen as a part of the community and its morals, and for this reason it is in every way social (Durkheim 1972 [1912]: 224). Cult places and sanctuaries, usually situated within the settlement sites, are important social factors. Even though in many respects rituals may change over time (location, meaning, performance and content), ultimately they should be regarded as traditional and repetitive. This produces the patterns in the archaeological record. (Marcus 2007: 46.)

When attempting to understand ritual, it is important to explore the context but also reconstruct the act. To accomplish this, the ritual must be placed in the wider religious framework (Insoll 2004: 12). In the case of central Tyrrhenian Italy, rituals can be posited based on the mythology and pantheon represented in Etruscan, Latin and later Roman iconographic and literary sources.

Several assumptions regarding the purpose of textile tools as votive offerings have been given: "they may have been attached to textiles given to the divinity; ¹ I will use the term votive deposit for all assemblages with votive gifts. For further information on the terminology see Bouma 1996: 43–50. ² Numerous loom weights have been found also in foundation deposits of sacred and non-sacred structures. So far, most of these have been found in Sicily. (Gleba 2009: 74–76.)
they may have marked a sacred area; they are thought to have closed the bags that contained the sacrificial meal; they may have been given for protection over textile craft; and they may have symbolised the work of married women” (Mingazzini 1974: 204–206; the quotation is from Bouma 1996: 392). Most commonly, textile tools are seen as offerings to the goddesses related to protecting women or domestic activities, especially spinning and weaving. In central Italy, offerings were made to the goddesses Minerva, Juno, Diana and Mater Matuta (in Etruscan Menerva, Uni, Artumes and Thesan). Offerings may also have been made to Hercules (Hercle) because of his pastoral activities. (Ferrandini Troisi 1986: 97.)

Some inscriptions name the recipient of the offering. These were usually made before firing and indicate that the tool was intended for dedication. Such inscriptions are common in south Italy, where Athena is the most commonly invoked goddess, either by inscription of her name or her attribute, an owl decoration (Gleba 2009: 72–73). Only two inscribed deity names have been found at central Tyrrhenian Italy. One is from Roselle, where a fragment of a loom weight bears the name vei (Veia/Ceres, earlier than c. 300 BC, van der Meer 1987: 113, Ambrosini 2000: 158–159, Gleba 2009: 73). The other one is in the Civic Museum at Viterbo (without a provenance) and bears the inscription ait, which may mean either “mother” or Mater Matuta. (Ambrosini 2000: 159, Gleba 2009: 73.)

Even though textile tools have been found at the sanctuaries, it does not mean that they automatically represent a sacred meaning. Some dedications were possibly reused, recycled or used in a secular context inside the sanctuary (Warden 2009: 107–108).

The meaning of sanctuaries for the participants changed due to social, economic and political changes in their society. At any rate, in any period, the sanctuaries were places for meeting and places of social competition and displaying of high status. The elite proclaimed their leadership status through valuable gifts such as terracotta votives or large bronze statues (Becker 2009: 87). The textile tools found in the votive deposits are made of clay, and as such do not have any economic value. Their value in the sanctuaries needs to be seen as either symbolic (a votive gift) or practical (a tool used in the sanctuary) (Lipkin in press a: Chapter 4.2.2).

1. Textile tools as offerings during the Iron Age

In comparison to the Bronze Age cult manifestations that occur in caves and incineration burials, and later on during the final Bronze Age mainly in open air shrines, the early Iron Age religious activities took place in huts (Guidi 2009).
Huts containing probable textile tools have been found in the southwest side of the Palatine in Rome (the layers under the temple of Victoria, Rossi 2001, Falzone 2002, Pensabene et al. 2005: 97, Pensabene 2006) and the temple of Stimmate in Velletri of Etruria (Ghini & Infarinato 2009: 313–314, Fig. 8). Even though the huts in which the tools were found had a sacred meaning, it is possible that the textile tools in the Iron Age layers do not have any sacral meanings but were used instead to weave textiles in a household context.

The huts are, however, the first examples of a civic religion, and during the early Iron Age there is also the first evidence of the burial of priests and priestesses (Guidi 2009: 145–147). The formation of huts as cult places is strongly connected with the urbanisation process that was developing from the final Bronze Age onwards (For example Pacciarelli 2000).

Until the late 7th century the individual tombs were also important places of offering (Bouma 1996: 186). The most common textile tools found in the burials are spindle whorls, found attached to decomposed wooden sticks. The spindle can be regarded as a symbol of the feminine sphere of life. Nevertheless, there is evidence that some men took part in textile-making (see for example Vida Navarro 1992: 95, Toms 1998: 171–174, Lipkin in press a: Chapter 4.1.2.3, Lipkin in press b). Working with textiles was something women were expected to do: it was a woman’s virtue (Livy, Ab Urbe Condita 1.57–60, writing 59 BC–AD 17). It is likely that most women must have learned the skills of spinning and weaving at some degree. Many of the female burials in central Italy contain a single spindle whorl, and it is likely that these women learned basic textile-making techniques (Lipkin in press a: Chapter 4.1.2.4, Tables 4.6, 7). The burial material also indicates that specialisation in textile techniques and preliminary professionalism had already occurred during the early Iron Age and that skilled children and adolescents had an important role in textile craft, at least as active learners (Lipkin in press a: Chapters 4.1.2.1, 4.1.2.2. See also Bietti Sestieri 1992: 109–116).

2. Changing society, changing offerings – from the Archaic period to the Republican period

At latest from the late 7th century onwards, cult places became monumentalised. At least in Rome, the display of aristocratic status and economic competence changed from the private to the public sphere (Bartoloni 1991: 759, Bouma 1996: 186–187).³

³ See also Becker 2009 for the importance of display within the sanctuaries.
During the Archaic and the Republican periods, the textile tools in votive deposits are numerous in Rome. For example, in the sanctuary found below S. Omobono, two wooden spindle shafts, spindle whorls, a spool and a loom weight were deposited as votive offerings (Enea nel Lazio 1981: 147, C 63-64). In the Palatine, one spool made of red tufa has been found in connection with the Archaic circular *ipogea* under the temple of Victoria. The spool seems to have been sacred in character: tufa is an unusual material for spools and this particular spool is unusually large, *monumental* (length 11.5 cm and diameter of ends 7.5; Falzone 2001: 184, Table 20.100, Falzone 2002: 19, Pensabene *et al.* 2005: 102, Pl. III.b, Pensabene 2006: 48, I.3.). An example of a foundation ritual is found in the area of Meta Sudans. A loom weight was found at the site along with two miniature *kyathoi* of bucchero in a ditch. The foundation is estimated to have taken place in 570/560 BC. The gifts themselves are dated to the period from the end of the 7th century to the first part of the 6th century BC (Zeggio 2005: 67, note 47, Panella 2006: 90, I.60).

Furthermore, in Roman contexts, spindle whorls, spools and loom weights have been found in the Republican period votive deposit layers of *Clivus Capitolinus* (Albertoni 1990: 74, Fig. 3.6, Cristofani 1990: 68, Sciortino 2005: 91-92), the Palatine (Scordia 2001: 245, Tables 70.309–311, 71.312–314) and the *area sacra* of Largo Argentina (Andreani *et al.* 2005: 116, 119).

In comparison to terracotta statues and pottery, the spinning and weaving materials are not as numerously found in the sanctuaries. Their amount is, however, comparable to those found at the settlements. For this reason, it is possible that some textile tools found scattered around the sanctuary were in fact used within it. (Lipkin *in press a*: Chapter 4.2.2.)

According to Jelle Bouma, the textile tools found in the votive deposits are, in addition to vases related to personal care, inconstant and non-traditional votive gifts in Latin votive religion. Their amount decreases in the course of the 6th century in many Latin cult places and they are completely absent from the early 5th century until they reoccur from approximately 450 BC onwards. Bouma states that the warring society did not allow for homely activities (Bouma 1996: 152, 167–168). However, it is quite unlikely that clothes were not made for 50 years (Lipkin *in press a*: Chapter 4.2.1). Moreover it needs to be questioned whether the time period between 500-450 BC was more unstable than the previous or the later periods, because it is clear that Latin society was similarly engaged in warfare before and after this period (see Forsythe 2006: 97-98, 238–239). For some unknown reason the textile implements were not deposited during this period of time. Also in Falerii (Celle), in the Faliscan
region, there is a gap in offering textile tools during the 5th and 4th centuries BC, but during the end of the 4th century BC they reappear in Celle as well as in Vignale and Sassi Caduti. In Celle changes also occur in other offering materials. (Benedettini et al. 2005: 222, Pls. II & III.) Such development would imply a changing function of the sanctuary rather than changes in textile-making or the offering of textile implements (Lipkin in press a: Chapter 4.2.1). In the votive deposits of Monte Li Santi – Le Rote in Narce, there is no gap in offering textile tools, and they are present from the 5th century until the 2nd century BC, during the entire span the sanctuary was in use (Benedettini et al. 2005: 222, Pls. II & III).

The discontinuity of the votive religion during the Late Archaic period is further emphasised through the disappearance of the majority of the Archaic cult sites in the Pontine region (the southern part of Latium vetus) and the foundation of sacred places in different locations after 500 BC. This has been explained by the breakdown of the Archaic system, in which settlement and cult were tightly interwoven. (Attema & Bouma 1995: 122, 136–139, 148–149.)

Changes in society during the Roman colonisation are also clearly visible in the type of votive gift materials. Previously the offerings were collective, whereas during the Republican period they become individual, reflecting individual needs. Bouma (1996: 207, 249–250, 268–269) sees this in association with the change of the cult from nature to society.

In this point of view, offering textile implements during the Iron Age and Archaic period was a shared activity of the community, but during the Republican period, offering implements became an individual matter. Previously, loom weights, spindle whorls and spools were quite equally distributed in the sanctuaries or specifically in the votive deposits, but from the Republican period onwards loom weights become the most common textile tool offerings both in Latium and Etruria, which supposedly had some kind of individual symbolic meaning. However, a loom weight is not a personal object like a spindle is; it may symbolise the whole loom or the craft. None of the gifts were personal during the Republican period, which is also suggested by the furnaces near the temples. Those have been found at Satricum (Bouma 1996: 176–177, Nijboer 1998: Fig. 19), Lavinium (Nijboer 1998: 95, Somella 1972: 278) and Narce (Monte Li Santi – Le Rote, Benedettini et al. 2005: Pl. IIIa). It is possible that the offerings were acquired to be subsequently offered to the worshipped goddess (Bouma 1996: 176–177).

4 Celle was in use from the 6th century to the Imperial period, Vignale from the 5th century until the late 4th century and Sassi Caduti 4th century BC.
5 Small bronze objects was the only group that remained to be deposited during the changes.
As single objects the offerings tell us more about the donor than the divinity, but the secondary offerings, such as a singular loom weight among other materials, reveal more about the belief system than the motives of the individual (Comella 2005: 51, Warden 2009: 108.). Textile tools were offered to gain protection for domestic activities, likely textile work in specific, or for the donor’s profession. The devoters were mostly women and the purpose for offering the tools depended on time, occasion and region.

At any given time, many phases of textile production require help from other workers. The change in the belief system from collective offerings to individual offerings goes hand in hand with the economic situation in the society. During the Bronze and Iron Ages and the Archaic period, textile-making was mainly a home-based craft, and the aid during the weaving process was provided by the family. During the Republican period, however, clothes were also made in workshops in which co-workers helped each other in the phases of textile production that are not easy to accomplish alone. It seems possible that the communal offerings were replaced by individual ones at the same time as the importance of family-centred textile work decreased. The change is the most evident in urban centres, whereas in the farmsteads home-made textiles remained important for a longer period of time. (Lipkin in press a: Chapters 4.2, 5.4.)

3. Textile-making as a religious ritual

Many textile implements are found scattered around the sanctuaries (similar to findings in settlements). This speaks for their use as textiles making sites. Occasionally, spinning and weaving in the sanctuaries is mentioned in written sources. For example, Pausanias (3.16.2; 5.16.2-3; 6.24.10) records cloth weaving for cult statues. In Olympia, Hera received a robe every fourth year, and Apollo at Amyklai received a chiton in Sparta every year. It was an honour of Arrhephoroi, two or four 7–11 years old girls selected from respected Athenian families, to take part in weaving the peplos for Athena Polias (Paulys: “Errhephoroi”, Gleba 2008: 184, see also Pausanias 1.27.3 and Parker 2005: 221–223 for the other duties of Arrhephoroi as servants of the goddess). 6

As no surviving examples of textile tools were left at the scene of activity in the sanctuaries in central Tyrrhenian Italy, such as loom weight rows, it is difficult to say definitely that textile work occurred there. On the other hand, if implement

---

6 Presumably they are depicted in the central scene from the east frieze of the Parthenon along with Panathenaic peplos and ceremonies connected to its offering (Bundrick 2008: 325, Fig. 16.)
concentrations exist in particular spaces, it is likely that such spaces was assigned for spinning and/or weaving activities. When a large amount of textile implements is found in a sanctuary and many of are not found in votive deposits, it is possible that the textiles were produced in that particular sanctuary. Textiles may have been made, for example, in the following sanctuaries: Ardea (Casarinaccio, 37 loom weights, Piergrossi 2005), Cerveteri (Vigna Parocchiale, 77 loom weights, 2 whorls, 15 spools, Moscati 1992), Pyrgi (Santa Severa, 42 loom weights, 1 whorl, 1 spool, Bartocci 
ci et al. 1959: 147–148, Pyrgi 1970), Tarquinia (“the sacred area”, 60 loom weights, Santori 2001) and Veii (Portonaccio, 28 loom weights, Martelli & Martelli 2002). The clearest examples of possible sanctuaries where textile production may have occurred are two sanctuaries at Anagni and a sanctuary at Lavinium. The numbers of textile tools found there is fairly large.

At Anagni, around 200 spindle whorls have been found in the Archaic sanctuary of S. Cecilia, and spindle whorls (the 7th and 6th centuries BC) and loom weights have also been found in the sanctuary of Osteria della Fontana (Gatti 1996: 135–138, Gatti 2004). In Lavinium, spindle whorls and more than 350 loom weights have been found (Enea nel Lazio 1981: 218–219, Fenelli 1991: 494–495, 500–501). Margarita Gleba (2008: 187, 2009) has proposed that in Lavinium the producing of sacral clothing was an important matter. Such may apply also to Anagni (Lipkin in press a: Chapter 4.2.2).

The evidence for sanctuary weaving is clear in a few sacred locations in southern Italy. In the Weaving Hut at Francavilla Marittima (the second half of the 9th and the 8th century BC), loom weights decorated with meander and labyrinth patterns were found in situ in a row at a spot where the loom had stood (Kleibrink 2001: 49, Gleba 2008: 185). Numerous loom weights have also been found in later contexts in two sanctuaries at Paestum. In the Sanctuary of Santa Venera (the late 5th century and the 4th century BC), which was dedicated to Aphrodite-Hera, loom weights were found scattered around the Oikos and the Rectangular Hall, some of them (47 pieces) in one group. It has been suggested that these loom weights were votive offerings, but as they were not found in a votive deposit it seems more likely that they were used for weaving at the site. (Suggestion of votive deposit: Pedley 1990: 140, 148, Pedley 1993: 19, 118–120; suggestion of sanctuary use: Greco 1997, Gleba 2009.) The second shrine at Paestum, in the area of the Heraion at Foce del Sele, also yielded loom weights. In particular, a large number of loom weights (300) has been found in the Square Building (the late 4th–early 3rd century BC). It has been suggested that this building, with at least three large looms, was used as a sanctuary weaving workshop (Greco & de La Genière 1996: 225, Greco
4. Textile-making as a performative action in ritual

As none of the textile tools in central Tyrrhenian sanctuaries were found in situ, it is difficult to reconstruct the acts of the rituals concerning the spinning or weaving. As an act, weaving at sanctuaries must have been in many ways similar to how it was performed in the households and workshops. The difference was perhaps only in the function of the finished textile. The purpose for producing textiles in the sanctuary areas are manifold: they may have been used for sacred libri lintei ("Linen books", See Livy 4.20.8, 10.38.6) as the one in Zagreb (Roncalli 1980, van der Meer 2007), for dressing the participants of the ritual (on the types of sacral dresses see Bonfante 2009), or the textiles may have been offerings themselves or used for dressing the statues. Concerning the latter suggestion, two written sources from the Imperial period provide an example: in the time of crisis (in 125 BC), on the order of an oracle a richly decorated article of clothing was woven by the women of Elis and was offered to Proserpina to end the misfortunes (Pausanias 5.16.5–6). A palla with golden threads was also offered to Juno by Roman matrons during the Second Punic war (Silius Italicus, Punica 7.77–83).

Producing textiles with complex patterns requires the skill of envisioning the finished textile in its finished form. This may have been aided through rhythm, songs or other memorised calculations. The existence of such has been proposed by Lise Ræder Knudsen (2004: 121–124), who has distinguished various kinds of defects in tablet woven patterns. These are due to the weaver having skipped line or two. Moreover, Anthony Tuck (2006) suggests that counting and singing during the weaving process may have been the source of rhythmic or metrical narratives in Indo-European poetry. At very least, singing and weaving are strongly related in several Indo-European poem collections, such as Rig Veda and the Homeric poetry. Such weaving songs are described, for example, in the poetry of Homer (Odyssey 5.59–62 for the chants of the nymph Calypso; 10.220–228 for the songs of Circe).

Also Franz Boas (1927: 40) talks about rhythmic repetition that produces regularity in the form of the products. However, textile-making cannot be seen as a simple method of implementation of complex structures, but rather as a form-giving potential of a complex process (see further on the idea Rubin 1988: 375,
Textile-making includes constant learning of the techniques and becoming more skilled at each time. These are complex processes that are also influenced by social factors, such as expectations relating to gender, age and status given to the spinners and weavers. For example, not everyone was expected to become a textile professional, but such was possibly expected of the skilled and diligent persons (Lipkin in press a: Chapter 4.1.1).

It is easier to suggest that ritual weaving occurred in the sanctuaries (as the archaeological evidence speaks for it strongly) than to posit the purpose of the textiles and the kinds of textiles made. In neither case is there any clear written, iconographic or other sources to testify to who made textiles in the temples and shrines. It may be that the priestesses took care of these duties, or that some girls or women renowned for their skills (possibly aristocratic) were chosen for the work every year. It could be supposed that the textiles offered to the deity (as an offering or a cloth to be worn) were of fine quality and made with techniques not familiar to the society at large. Furthermore, completing such clothes would have required participation on a daily basis for a long period of time (Lipkin in press a: Chapter 5.3). For these reasons, there must have been some kind of systematic religious framework for making the textile production possible.

5. Conclusion

Textile-making is closely connected to social relationships which may have been forged among the members of the family or co-workers in the workshops. These relationships affected how the textile implement offerings for gaining protection for the household or the textile craft itself were made in the sanctuaries. During the Iron Age and Archaic period the offerings were communal in nature, whereas during the Republican period the offerings assumed an individual character. The changes in the type of offering and social relationships among the textile workers are closely related to the political changes in the society.

The receivers of the textile tool offerings were different goddesses (Minerva, Juno, Diana and Mater Matuta, but occasionally also Hercules), but these same divinities may have also received textile offerings or their statues may have been dressed in sacred clothes during the ceremonies. The archaeological evidence suggests that the production of sacral clothes or clothing, as well as other sacred textiles such as linen books, may have occurred inside the sanctuary areas. If so, the acts of spinning and weaving may have been religious rituals.
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A walk through the valley of death: The evolution of the Etruscan concept of the afterlife

Juha Tuppi

1. Introduction

During the late Iron Age, the Etruscan culture began to receive influence from the east and the south: contact with Greek and Phoenician colonies resulted in an exchange of ideas and artefacts. This can be seen, for example, in the influx of imported objects and Oriental motifs in Etruscan material culture (e.g. Buchner 1979, Rathje 1979, Haynes 2000: 15, Bartoloni 2003: 196–201, Marini 2010: 7), the evidence of Etruscan banquets (e.g. Pieraccini 2000, Bartoloni 2003: 195–209), or, at a later stage, the amalgamation of the Hellenic deities to the Etruscan pantheon (e.g. Pallottino 1984: 328–329, Krauskopf 1997). Along with developments in the structure of society and the consequent rise of aristocracy, Etruscan burials became more complex compared to the simple Iron Age *pozzo* or *fossa* burials, and evolved through distinguishable phases all the way to the Roman conquest in the 4th century BC. At the same time, urbanization, along with a notable population increase in central Italy, led to increased regional traffic and, subsequently, to the emergence of road cuttings typical to southern Etruria (Potter 1976: 81, Cifani 2002, Martinelli & Paolucci 2006: 116–117). Although originally constructed for logistical and practical purposes, the road cuttings became in many cases associated also with Etruscan necropoleis (Figure 1) not later than from the 6th century BC onwards (e.g. Oleson 1976: 211, see also Steingräber 1996: 92).

Much is known of the Etruscan burials and related rituals through extensive research on the subject (e.g. Prayon 1991, 1997, Steingräber 1997, Pieraccini 2000, Leighton 2005, Bonfante 2006, Krauskopf 2006, Izzet 2007, Steingräber 2009a, Warden 2009a), although interpretation of the archaeological evidence in order to trace the mental landscape behind the Etruscan rituals is – due to the scarcity of written Etruscan sources – a challenging task. The point has already been well established that the extant written sources concerning Etruscan rituals are mostly from Greek and Roman authors, and, as such, do not necessarily reflect the Etruscan point of view (e.g. Rathje 2005: 25, Krauskopf 2006: 66, MacIntosh Turfa 2006: 62, Thomson de Grummond 2006: 1, Izzet 2007: 10-15, see also Lundeen 2006: 58).
In this paper an attempt is made to formulate a hypothesis outlining the evolution of the Etruscan concept of the afterlife from the Iron Age to the Archaic period based on the archaeological evidence, and subsequently reflect on the function and role of the road cuttings in the necropolis contexts.

2. The evidence of the concept of an afterlife in the Iron Age and Orientalizing period

The emergence of anthropomorphic representations in central Italy in the 10th/9th centuries BC, in the form of terracotta figurines, pottery decoration and other artefacts, tells us – if not of a new awareness of the specialty of human features and thought – then at least of a new way of expressing and emphasizing them in prehistoric Italy (e.g. Damgaard Andersen 1993). Damgaard Andersen (1993: 15) agrees with Colonna (1974: 290–291) and Bartoloni (1989) that the terracotta figurines found in tombs represented the deceased (cf. Riva 2010: 128). The burial practice of cremation, witnessed in the Iron Age cinerary urns in pozzo burials
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(e.g. Bartoloni 2003: 45-46, Leighton 2005: 366, 372-373, Figs. 1a-c, 3-4), became less favoured in comparison to inhumation in southern Etruria in the end of the 8th century BC with the fossa burials (Berardinetti & Drago 1997, Haynes 2000: 13-14, Bartoloni 2003: 44), although the practice of inhumation was not uniformly adopted (e.g. Krauskopf 2006: 66-67). Nevertheless, the increased popularity of inhumation could also be seen as a sign of a change in the perception of death and subsequent events: the earlier significance of cremation was now, at least within certain contexts, replaced by inhumation of the intact body. The new approach or emphasis on the dead was developed further in burials in the Orientalizing period, witnessed in the evolution from the Iron Age pozzo or fossa burials to the chamber tombs (Figure 2) under burial mounds (tumuli) (e.g. Barker & Rasmussen 1998: 123, Bartoloni 2003: 57-63, Izzet 2007: 91-92, Marini 2010: 4). The emergence of tumuli was the result of multiple practical factors, such as the urbanization of Etruscan culture, Orientalizing contacts, architectural development and changes in socio-political relations (Roth-Murray 2005: 186, Izzet 2007: 87, Marini 2010: 3); these advances provided the organized labour force, centralized leadership, technical knowledge and motivation necessary to construct monumental burial mounds. The tumuli created a landscape of power, reinforcing the ruling elite’s ownership of its surroundings (e.g. Torelli 1980: 50, 54-55, Haynes 2000: 72, Riva 2010: 125–126). In addition, the form and design of the burial mound went far beyond that of a mere honorific memorial for the deceased members of the aristocracy; it was firmly rooted in the Etruscan religion, reflecting in its plan the
complex cosmological system of the Etruscan “heaven” (Prayon 1991, id. 1997, Simon 2006, Stevens 2009) as well as representing the realm of the dead where the deceased were thought to abide (e.g. Zifferero 2006: 194–196, see also Marini 2010: 4). In addition, the sudden abundance of grave goods in the Orientalizing period could also be interpreted as supporting the assumed change reflected in the burial practices, although they probably are more directly related to the status of the deceased (Barker & Rasmussen 1998: 118, Perkins 2005: 114, Riva 2010: 32–35).

3. Interpreting the tumulus

Before moving on to the developments of Etruscan tomb architecture and their implications, the tumulus warrants closer inspection. The burial mound can be seen as symbolizing the three-fold Etruscan axis mundi, as defined by Edlund-Berry (2006: 120): the upper sphere (the heavens), middle sphere (the earth) and lower sphere (the underworld). The specific features of tumulus under scrutiny here are its structure and entrance corridor (often referred as dromos).

3.1 The structure of the tumulus

Izzet mentions that the Iron Age burials at Cerveteri (ancient Caere) developed from pozzi and fosse to pseudo-vaulted tombs covered by mounds of earth, which were surrounded by rings of stones for stability (see also Riva 2010: 112-113). At the end of the 8th/beginning of the 7th century BC, the tumuli at Cerveteri contained a rectilinear burial chamber enclosed by a circle of containing blocks (Figure 3). By the 7th century BC, many tumuli were surrounded by a trench cut into the tuff bedrock (Torelli 1980: 76, Izzet 2007: 91–92, Marini 2010: 5, see also Zifferero 2006: 202–203, 206, Fig. 27), and the burial chamber, placed in the centre of the mound, was accessible via a corridor (e.g. Izzet 2007: 93, Marini 2010: 8). The border around the burial, fashioned of stones, blocks or by digging a trench, possibly had a specific function in addition to its structural aspect: similar stone circles delimiting burial mounds have been discovered, for example, in the Poggio dell’Impiccato necropolis at Tarquinia and Poggio alla Guardia necropolis at Vetulonia (Torelli 1980: 276, Haynes 2000: 14–15, Zifferero 2006: 177–178, Riva 2010: 30–31, see also Bruni 2009: 75–76). Zifferero (2006: 177–193) proposes that

---

1 Since the term dromos (Lat. drōmos, Gr. ὁδός) originally means, according to Lewis & Short (1879) and Liddell & Scott (1940), mainly a place for running, a race-course or a public walk, in order to avoid confusion in this paper the term will not be used to designate the entrance corridor to the burial.
during the Iron Age the stone circle denoted a burial place reserved for a certain *gens* (see also Riva 2010: 122–123), whereas from the mid-8th century BC the stone circle marked the burial of an individual or a family unit (see also Haynes 2000: 14–15); a noteworthy difference between the aforementioned Iron Age and Orientalizing period stone circles is that the former were not completely enclosed (*circolo di pietre interrotte*), rather reminiscent of the letter “C”, whereas the latter were complete circles (see also Torelli 1980: 276). According to Marini (2010: 5) and Zifferero (2006: 202–203), the space concretized in the burial mound and delimited on the exterior space by the trench and on the interior space by the circle of containing blocks was considered to be consecrated (see also van Kampen 2009: 152, Prayon 2010: 75). In this light, it would be justifiable to assume that the change from the partly open circle to the closed one reflects a certain change in the way the Etruscans perceived and thought about the *tumulus*: the clear boundaries that separated the sacred from the secular were important (see Edlund-Berry 2006: 116), but there had to be a way to cross that border safely2. Thus, in the

---

2 A partly open stone circle enclosing a probable altar or *cippus* place was discovered on top of a *tumulus* from the 6th century BC at Terrone necropolis in Blera (Steingräber 1996: 92, id. 2002: 134, Zifferero 2006: 202, Steingräber 2009b: 132, Prayon 2010: 79, Steingräber & Menichelli 2010: 63). This find demonstrates that the opening in the circle was not just a structural feature or tied to the Iron Age, but came from the need to have access to the sacred circle; the significance of the opening in the circle can also be witnessed in the originally Etruscan ritual of *pomerium*, as described by Plutarch (*Rom.* 11); see also Varro (*Ling.* 5.143).
Iron Age burials the circle was left open to allow access into the circle, whereas in context of the tumuli during the Orientalizing period, the entrance corridor came to mark the place of transition between the spaces (e.g. Haynes 2000: 99, Zifferero 2006: 208, 210, n. 35). In addition, Prayon (2010: 75) suggests that the ramps at the base of the tumuli, as seen for example at the 7th century BC Tomba della Capanna in Cerveteri and 6th century BC Tomba Melone II del Sodo in Cortona, had a similar transitive function, keeping the surrounding trench uninterrupted. This could possibly also explain the stone slab steps discovered in context with bases of tumuli at Monterozzi necropolis in Tarquinia and Banditaccia necropolis in Cerveteri (e.g. Prayon 2010: 78–79): even though the construction was still underway, the consecrated space of the tumulus – already marked by its circular base – could be accessed only through the specific point of entrance marked by the stone steps. Later, when the tumulus was completed, the transition into the consecrated space, and consequently to the burial chamber, happened via the entrance corridor.

3.2 The entrance corridor

Bietti Sestieri (1992: 119–120) hypothesizes the lack of full-size functional weapons in the Osteria dell’Osa Iron Age burials as resulting from the ancient community’s precautions during the liminal period (the certain period of time during which the spirit of the deceased was considered to be on its way to the realm of the dead and still capable of causing harm among the living). Izzet (2007: 93–95) suggests that this concept of liminal period, in the context of Etruscan burial mounds, is concretized as mediative distance3 in the form of the entrance corridor: the earliest appearances of this feature at Cerveteri can be witnessed in the Regolini-Galassi tomb and Tomba della Capanna, both dated roughly to the first half of the 7th century BC (see Marini 2010: 8–9). A long entrance corridor appears to be typical to the early Etruscan tumuli: if we accept the function of the corridor suggested by Izzet, the entrance corridor now not only mediated between the consecrated space of the tumulus and its surroundings, but also between the land of the living outside the tomb and the burial chamber that presumably represented the realm of the dead (Figure 4). Although Jannot (2000) argues that it is impossible to understand how the Etruscans imagined and perceived the Etruscan realm of the dead because there are no iconographic representations or written descriptions available that evidence

---

3 The term “mediative distance”, adapted from Izzet (2007: 91), is used to define the space that mediates between outside and inside of the tomb and consequently between the realms of the living and the dead.
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it (see also Scheffer 1994), there is, however, one attribute that can arguably be
deduced from the existing evidence: demonstrably during the Orientalizing and
Archaic periods, and possibly beginning as early as the late Bronze Age, the realm
of the dead was considered to be located underground, at least in a symbolical sense.
This assertion is attested in the natural cavities, volcanic fissures and artificial wells
found at Tarquinia, Punta della Vipera near Cerveteri, Veii, Mount Soracte
and Poggio Colla in northern Etruria that were often the focus of cultic activity (e.g.
Haynes 2000: 27–28, 45, 127, 176, 184, 206, Colonna 2006: 132–133, 145, Edlund-
In this light, the concept of a symbolic descent into the realm of the dead through
the corridor seems plausible. As the circular plan of the tumulus represented the
sky, which was divided between the Etruscan deities (Prayon 1997: 368, Zifferero
2006: 202), the orientation of the entrance corridor could have had significance for
honouring a certain deity/deities, denoting further the symbolic descent into the
underworld or, perhaps, gaining assistance for the spirit’s transition to the realm of
the dead (Prayon 1975: 85–87, Pallottino 1984: 334–337, Fig. 13, Colonna 1986:
367, Prayon 1991, 1997: 357–360, Fig. 1–2, Haynes 2000: 73, Stevens 2009, Riva
2010: 124, see also Edlund-Berry 2006: 117–118). In addition, Steingräber (1997:
100, 2002: 134–135) has suggested that some cultic or ceremonial activities took
place in the entrance corridors, related either to the cult of the dead or funerary
rituals (see also Buranelli et al. 1997: 77, 79, Haynes 2000: 74, 81, Steingräber

Figure 4. a) Symbolic boundaries concerning the tumuli, b) boundary transitions (shaded).
In some cases, such as the Tomba della Capanna and Tomba dei Dolii e degli Alari at Cerveteri and Tomba Campana at Veii, statues were positioned at the entrance of the corridor or inside it. These statues, depicting lions or sphinxes, have been proposed to have an apotropaic or psychopompic function (Izzet 2007: 93, van Kampen 2009: 136–139, see also Haynes 2000: 151, 164, 170 and van Kampen 2007 on the Vulci stone sculptures, cf. Warden 2009a on the animal imagery in the Etruscan funerary art), supporting the interpretation of the entrance corridor as a transition space.

4. Late Orientalizing and Archaic changes at the burial grounds and their implications

A new type of rock-cut tomb emerged in southern Etruria alongside the burial mounds around the second quarter of the 6th century BC (Steingräber 2009a: 64). At the end of the 6th century this trend was adopted at Cerveteri, where the size and construction of the tombs also took a turn from the massive burial mounds into side-by-side cube tombs (tombe a dado) cut into the tuff and partly built from tuff blocks (Prayon 1997: 360, Barker & Rasmussen 1998: 131, Haynes 2000: 142, 144, Izzet 2007: 95–96, Steingräber 2009a: 65). These tombs appear to be separated from the earlier supposed linkages of the tumuli with the Etruscan celestial space and, in a certain sense, the underworld: the tomb façades and doorways became oriented towards the sepulchral roads and the settlement (Haynes 2000: 145, Izzet 2007: 117, Steingräber 2009a: 66, see also Steingräber & Menichelli 2010: 60–61) and the entrance corridor, theoretically signifying the mediative distance, diminished gradually, according to Izzet (2007: 96–97, see also Prayon 1975: Pl. 85 on tomb plans at Cerveteri), down to next to nothing at Cerveteri, Volterra, Populonia and Tarquinia. The tomb plan also underwent a number of changes: the former focus on the burial chamber at the end of the entrance corridor was now moved closer to the entrance as the internal space of the tomb began to be divided. The beginning of this development can be seen in the emergence of the so-called vestibule tomb at Cerveteri around 630 BC, where the structural focus of the tomb shifted from the burial chamber to the central chamber (now equal to the maximum width of the tomb) from which doorways lead to the smaller, uniformly sized chambers. (Izzet 2007: 102–106, Marini 2010: 7.) (Figure 5) In the second half of the 6th century BC the burial places became more organized: the rock-cut burials at Blera, Norchia and Castel d’Asso and cube tombs in the Banditaccia necropolis at Cerveteri, San Cerbone necropolis at Populonia and Crocifisso del Tufo at Orvieto were arranged
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Figure 5. The development of the tomb plan at Cerveteri (adapted from Prayon 1975: Pl. 85).

according to the street layout of the necropolis (e.g. Prayon 1997: 360, Izzet 2007: 115–119, Steingräber 2009a: 64, 66) (Figure 6).

The roads began to be cut into the tuff bedrock where necessary in southern Etruria during the 7th and 6th centuries BC, when the use of quarried stone in buildings and public construction was introduced and the former roads proved to be less than adequate for the heavily-loaded carts as well as the increased traffic, spurred by the growth of population and trade (e.g. Potter 1976: 81, Cifani 2002, Martinelli & Paolucci 2006: 116–117). However, in the context of necropoleis, the road cuttings possibly also had non-logistical functions as well, which will be discussed later in this paper.

These changes in tomb architecture and organization seem to imply a significant change in the concept of the afterlife and associated rituals and beliefs: if we assume that the former theory about the function of the entrance corridor is correct, this would either mean that the burials were no longer associated with the underworld – which obviously cannot be the case – or that the realm of the dead was now just a step away from the land of the living! In addition, regarding the postulated connection of the tumuli with the Etruscan “heaven” and the orientation of the entrance corridor, the rearrangement of the burials would thus mean that the deities (or at least their celestial aspects) were no longer associated with burial. As Riva (2010: 124) points out, the earlier monumental mounds practically dictated the spatial organization of the cemeteries, whereas now, after the above described changes, the plan of the necropolis determined the arrangement of the tombs. Even though the aforementioned changes could be explained, at least partially, by practical and socio-political reasons such as diminishing burial space (Oleson 1976: 218, Colonna 1986: 447) or increased equality in the Etruscan social hierarchy (e.g.
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Izzet 2007: 87–88), the apparent impact of the changes on the Etruscan concept of the afterlife needs to be explored further.

5. Interpreting the change

The awe and prestige instilled by the massive burial mounds was not lost in the cube tombs but rather refined: Steingräber (2009a: 64, 66) stresses the apparent attention that was given to the façade of the tomb and its outward appearance, especially in the 5th century BC (e.g. Izzet 2007: 111). As the internal focus of the tomb shifted to the increasingly pronounced central chamber, the tomb began to assume more house-like qualities in addition to the features apparent already in the 7th century BC burials such as the Tomba della Capanna or Tomba dei Leoni Dipinti at Cerveteri. The new emphasis was reflected also in architectural decoration and paintings, which now focused primarily on the central chamber.

Figure 7. The road cuttings of the necropoleis around Cerveteri.
Figures 8–9. The Via degli Inferi road cutting leading to Banditaccia necropolis, Cerveteri.
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of the tomb, as seen in Tarquinia, San Giuliano, Blera and Cerveteri. (e.g. Izzet 2007: 108, 110–111, see also Marini 2010: 5–6 and Riva 2010: 115–125 on the 7th century tombs.) The worship of the dead began to be practiced more outside the tumuli at Etruscan necropoleis in Cerveteri, Viterbo, Tarquinia, Vulci, San Giuliano, Blera and Vetulonia, where altars and “cult theaters” used by the cults of the dead or ancestors were constructed (e.g. Damgaard Andersen 1993: 52–53, Steingräber 1997, 2002: 134–135, Colonna 2006: 138, 152, Zifferero 2006: 199–202, Steingräber 2009b: 125–132, Marini 2010: 8–9). In addition, the thrones carved into the tuff outside the tombs at the necropoleis of Tarquinia, Monterano, Narce and Gabii in Latium suggest – since they are often too small for any practical use and found in locations difficult to access (Steingräber 1997: 108) – that the spirits of the ancestors were thought to roam the necropoleis and, since the thrones faced the settlement, keep vigil over the living (Damgaard Andersen 1993: 52, Steingräber 1997: 106, 108, see also Riva 2010: 130). The themes portrayed in the tomb paintings which now filled the walls of the tomb’s central chamber consisted mostly of games and banquets presumably held in honour of the deceased (e.g. Haynes 2000: 221–239, 243–248, Pieraccini 2000, Steingräber 2002: 138, Naso 2005: 26, 29–31, 38–41, 44–46, Fig. 13, 16, 22–24, 27–28, K rauskopf 2006: 73). Krauskopf (2006: 78) has suggested that these funeral festivities were thought to ensure the safe passage of the deceased to the underworld and also enable them to return under certain circumstances. In this light, it appears plausible that the deceased were assumed to be present in the tomb also in some form (see also Jannot 2000: 88–89, Steingräber & Menichelli 2010: 55).

It seems that the most relevant change is related to the realm of the dead, apparent in the orientation of the tomb and the diminishing entrance corridor. The reverence for the celestial aspects of the Etruscan deities was still manifested in the orientation of the sanctuaries and temples during the Archaic period, as demonstrated in the Portonaccio temple at Veii, Belvedere temple and Cannicella sanctuary at Orvieto, Fontanile di Legnisina temple at Vulci and the northern sanctuary at Pyrgi (e.g. Stevens 2009: 161–162, see also Prayon 1991, id. 1997: 360–367). However, since the symbolic descent into the realm of the dead in the form of an entrance corridor was now absent from the context of the tomb, the significance of its orientation was obsolete as well. As the organization of the burial grounds with streets, piazzas and house-like tombs produced literal “cities of the dead” for the deceased ancestors, it also redefined the burial grounds in a symbolic sense: if the whole burial ground was now considered to belong to the realm of the dead (see Oleson 1976: 211 on the necropoleis of Cerveteri, Orvieto and Tarquinia), the liminal space
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would no longer be manifested in the entrance of the tomb - thus explaining the disappearing entrance corridor - but rather in the entrance to the necropolis. The emergence of the realm of the dead into the land of the living might still be reflected - albeit chronologically much later - in the context of late Etruscan iconography, as demonstrated by Scheffer (1994): the doorways depicted in artworks represent doorways to the tomb, whereas the entrances to the underworld remain absent. In addition, the interpretation proposed by Jannot (2000), that the actual realm of the dead was never depicted in Etruscan iconography, would mean that the banquets, feasts and games portrayed in the tomb paintings were considered to take place in the tomb or in its vicinity. Assuming that the realm of the dead was concretized in the necropolis as postulated above, the tomb would thus be the final destination of the deceased, and, consequently, the journey to the underworld often portrayed in the iconography could possibly be manifested in the funeral procession to the necropolis and related rituals preceding the burial. The establishment of the city of the dead, or more importantly of ancestors, close to the settlement can be linked to the urbanization processes; the continuity of ancestral worship was an important factor in upholding and reinforcing the centralized authority of the ruling elite (e.g. Steingräber 1996: 82, Riva 2010: 136–140), and in that sense, the necropolis functioned as an active visual and ritual reminder of the justification of that authority in addition to the older tumuli.

6. The role of the road cuttings

As noted above, the fashioning of the road cuttings in central Italy was primarily a response to the need for roads with better logistical qualities. There is no reason to believe that this was not the case also in the context of the necropoleis; the relocation of the debris produced by digging the foundations of the burial mounds could be effected by using it to construct the mound on top of the burial, but the removal of the by-product rubble became more problematic with cube tombs (see Oleson 1978: 297, Cifani 2008: 240–243). As the introduction of the cube tombs

---

4 This interpretation appears to conflict with the tomb paintings from the last half of the 4th century BC in Tomba dell’Orco at Tarquinia; although the green-black clouds framing the banquet participants do not necessarily imply that the banquet takes place in the underworld, but rather denote that the people in question are spirits of the deceased and not living persons, the scene with three-faced Geryos in front of Persephone and Hades is quite impossible to place anywhere else than in the underworld. However, since the scene with Geryos involves no humans, and paintings in Tomba dell’Orco also depict other mythical scenes, the problematical scene could be seen to represent Hellenic mythology rather than the afterlife of the Etruscan deceased, and as such, not cause any discrepancy with the proposed hypothesis that the tomb was regarded as the final destination of the deceased.
happened roughly at the same time as did the emergence of the road cuttings in necropolis contexts – i.e. during the 6th century BC – it seems plausible that the road cuttings were dug in order to be utilized by wagons for removing the debris. However, since some of the road cuttings found in necropolis contexts, such as the Annunziata cutting at Pitigliano (narrowest width 1.3 m), Plan Cerese cutting at Cerveteri (width 1.5 m) and Grotta Porcina and Fosso Caprari cuttings at Blera (narrowest passages 1.5–1.55 m), were too narrow to allow wheeled traffic or made it very difficult (see Tuppi 2011), providing logistical benefits could not have been their sole function.

The road cuttings, being deep, rock-cut passages of monumental proportions, resembled the entrance corridors to burial mounds on a larger scale, and thus could have inherited their function as a ritual place in the funerary proceedings. Since Etruscan road cuttings rarely go in straight lines, but rather follow the contours of the topography – which is practical considering the vast amount of work needed to construct a road cutting – their orientation apparently was not important: the former significance of the orientation of the entrance corridor, which probably stemmed from the aristocracy’s aspiration to indicate their connection to the divine, dwindled as the more numerous cube tombs replaced the burial mounds and the practice of ancestor worship became increasingly emphasized in the funerary context. However, the outward appearance of the road cuttings without a doubt inspired awe and reverence during the Orientalizing and Archaic periods, as they do today, thus providing a solemn atmosphere to the funeral processions. In this light, the peculiar narrowness of some cuttings in connection to burials could be explained as an intentional feature with the aim of restraining or altogether prohibiting secular traffic in order to retain their sanctity (see Losacco 1969: 940, Oleson 1976: 215–216). In addition, if the burial grounds are considered to represent the realm of the dead, the road cuttings functioned – as the entrance corridors assumedly did in context of the Etruscan tumuli – as monumental markers of the transition from the secular to the consecrated ground and possibly also as the setting for the funeral procession, symbolizing the journey to the afterlife.

7. Conclusions

When chronologically examining the Etruscan burials from the Iron Age to the Archaic period with the point of view that the apparent changes in funerary material culture reflect changes in Etruscan society – especially in the political, hierarchical and ritual spheres – the development of the Etruscan concept of
events concerning and following death can be outlined to a certain extent. The first signs of a new approach to death can be witnessed in certain 9th–8th century BC burials at Poggio alla Guardia necropolis in Vetulonia, where the fossae were surrounded by an incomplete circle of stones, apparently marking the border of the consecrated ground reserved for a certain gens. The emergence of anthropomorphic representations in the 10th/9th centuries BC in central Italy denotes a new emphasis on the special character of humanity, which developed further into social inequality and establishment of hierarchy. These ideas, as can be witnessed in the case of Poggio alla Guardia necropolis above, inevitably also affected the Etruscan concept of the afterlife. In the mid-8th century BC even individual elite burials were surrounded by the circle of stones, indicating special, hallowed space and, consequently, the status of the deceased.

This approach to death continued to develop through funerary architecture: in the end of 8th/beginning of the 7th century BC the elite were buried in chamber tombs, covered by a burial mound that monumentalized the final resting place of the deceased. The former practice of encircling the burial with stones continued, now with a closed circle, and was augmented by surrounding the tumulus with an external trench, in effect consecrating the whole mound. The significance of the boundaries and the openings to the Etruscans is echoed in Plutarch’s description of the ritual of pomerium, in which the plough used to mark the city borders had to be lifted in order to leave the intended locations of the city gates intact, so the sacred borders would not be crossed. This notion makes the closed stone circle in the context of the tumuli very interesting: the burial chamber was now reached via the entrance corridor that apparently could enable the safe crossing of the sacred boundary. This interpretation, if accepted, implies that the mound was considered to represent another world, assumedly the realm of the dead confined within the surrounding trench, and the entrance corridor functioned as a transition space between the realms. The emphasis placed on the corridor, apparent in the specific orientation according to the Etruscan “heaven” and the cultic platforms, altars and statues found in it, support the proposed interpretation. In this light, with the monumental burial mounds the aristocracy secured both their afterlife and the continued reign (of their descendants) on Earth: the final resting place resided in the realm of the dead, inviolable in the confines of the sacred circle, whereas the tumulus functioned as a place for ancestor worship and a visual reminder of their ownership of the land.

The disappearance of the entrance corridor from the tomb structure and the organization of the necropoleis in the 6th century BC mark a significant change in
the concept of the afterlife. Although the *tumuli* were replaced by the cube tombs, the new tombs still functioned as places of ancestor worship and displayed the status and wealth of the deceased on their façades. The material manifestation of ancestor worship in the forms of tomb paintings, open-air cultic areas, cippi, altars and thrones in the context of the necropoleis appears to increase as a sign of a growing emphasis on ancestors. The movement towards more house-like tomb structures and the arrangement of the necropoleis created literal "cities of the dead": the deceased ancestors were thought to inhabit the tombs and roam the streets and piazzas of the necropoleis. In a political sense, this reinforced and upheld the authority of the leading elite. However, since the necropoleis now represented the realm of the dead, they had to be separated from the land of the living: the sepulchral roads and entrances to the necropoleis were in many cases marked by deep and monumental road cuttings, which appeared in the context of the necropoleis not later than in the 6th century BC, coinciding roughly with the emergence of the cube tombs. In this sense, the cuttings inherited the transitional function of the entrance corridors, denoting the crossing between secular and sacred. In some cases, the road cuttings also restricted traffic with their intentional narrowness, protecting the sanctity of the burials, and possibly provided a setting for the funeral procession, symbolizing the journey of the deceased to the realm of the dead.
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Style as distinction – burials reflecting distinction and the development of social stratification of the Iron Age elites of Southern Ostrobothnia, Finland

Jari-Matti Kuusela

1. Introduction

Material culture can be viewed from many different angles, but to me the most intriguing angle is to view it as a form of social communication (see Morris 1995: 419, Kuusela 2009, Kuusela et al. 2010). In this paper I will examine, with the aid of a theoretical framework heavily influenced by Pierre Bourdieu’s work, the manner in which material culture has been used as a way of creating distinction amongst the elite members of society from the Pre-Roman Iron Age to the Merovingian Period (500 BC – 800 AD) in Ostrobothnia, Finland and how this distinction reflects the development of social stratification and power structures of the elite. The study area includes sites from the present municipalities of Isokyrö, Kriistinankaupunki, Kruunupyy, Laihia, Maalahti, Närpiö, Oravainen, Pedersöre, Uusikaarlepyy, Vähäkyrö and Vöyri-Maksamaa (Figure 1). As the Finnish Iron Age chronology may not fully correlate with the chronologies of neighbouring areas, it is presented below in Table.

The author is not, by any means, the first archaeologist to adapt social theories to archaeological research, quite the contrary. The practice has been fairly popular (see e.g. Shanks & Tilley 1987, Pihlman 1990, Kristiansen 2006), but it may be put to question whether social theories formed while studying modern societies are valid in the study of the past. However, social theory is not interested so much in temporality as it is in the function of human societies, and the basic mechanisms of how human societies function have not been so different in the past as they are now. This is not to claim that, for instance, sociological theories are applied as they are to archaeological material, but rather that the general theory is used in, and adapted to, the interpretation of prehistoric archaeological record. This is necessary because archaeological record is dead of concepts and therefore the social meanings of the remains are gone and must be reconstructed via archaeological analysis which necessarily means interpretation (Kaliff 1997, Kaliff 2004). Without the aid of a theoretical framework based on a
real society, interpretations are in danger of becoming rationalised analyses of fragmented events and features effectively disconnected from the reality of a human society (Elias 1983, Bourdieu 1990a: 14–15).

2. Material culture and social status

The link between material culture and social status is a phenomenon which I believe to be universal, although this statement must not be taken at face value. I maintain that status is invariably always linked to material reality and hence to material culture. In prehistory this is especially true because in an illiterate society material culture acts as a way to communicate personal aspects and roles immediately without the need of a verbal exchange, and this becomes more important as the hierarchical structures of the
society become more complex and more roles are introduced into the social space of the society (Morris 1995: 431, Neitzel 1995: 396). Material culture is then used, among other things, as a symbol of rights belonging to a given social group and owning material capital appropriate to the group may become a duty and a prerequisite for membership within the group (Elias 1983: 53). If and when this happens, material capital turns into symbolic capital and is not wealth in the economic sense of the word. To maintain their status agents have to own appropriate material capital and also use it according to their status. In such a case wealth and especially its use is not a matter of free will. (Elias 1983: 53, 63, 67) This results in a recurrent pattern in the archaeological record which can be studied and linked to the social complexity of society.

3. Basic assumptions

Before beginning I must make explicit some basic assumptions that I will follow throughout this paper. First I assume that burial remains, being under scrutiny in the present paper, are manifestations of only a part and not the whole society (Pihlman 2004, Asplund 2008: 355), and when such is the case it is a plausible assumption that the represented part is the elite stratum. The second assumption is that stylistic differences and variations in the use of material culture are linked to social status and stratification (Pylkkänen 1956, Elias 1983, Morris 1995, Roe 1995, Kuokkanen et al. 2009). It is worthwhile to accentuate that in this paper I define “style” as the way in which material culture is used and not the artefact-specific properties such as typological features. I also closely link style with distinction and in fact I hold style to be distinction’s most obvious manifestation in the archaeological record. The third assumption is that stylistic traits reflecting status may increase in scale as the stratification within a society’s elite stratum proceeds. Here I follow the reasoning of Elias (1983) who has noticed such a phenomenon in his analysis of the royal court society of the French Ancien Régime. Regarding the present study, the increase in scale is especially evident in the NAT (Number of Artefact Types) analyses of the Iron Age burials discussed later in this paper. As the reason for this change in scale and style is somewhat significant for the understanding of the
process under study, some time will be dedicated to exploring the phenomenon before turning to the archaeological evidence at hand. In order to understand the way in which style is used in distinction, it is necessary to understand the structure of the social space of which distinction is an elemental part.

4. Social space and fields

This study views society through the idea of the social space constructed from social differentiation (Bourdieu 1989: 16, Bourdieu 1998: 9, 31-34). This space is populated by fields, which are social constructs encompassing a specific area of action (see Bourdieu 1985: 69-70). Within these fields, agents hold a relational position determined by the volume of field-specific capital they hold (Bourdieu 1984, Bourdieu 1985: 69-70). To simplify – a very good farmer holds a significant volume of “farming capital” and occupies a corresponding position in the corresponding field.

The fields themselves exist relationally to each other and this relationality of fields I refer to as field configuration. The field capital’s yield of symbolic capital corresponds with the field’s position in the field configuration. Symbolic capital is simply all other capitals once they are perceived and given recognition by the agents of the society, also as it is linked to all the other capitals it either increases or decreases based on how the other capitals are used (Bourdieu 1977: 183, Bourdieu 1989: 17, Bourdieu 1990c: 118–119, Bourdieu 1998: 48, 102). Through symbolic capital, that is from the interplay of all the fields of the social space and their capitals, agents form the field of power (Bourdieu 1996: 264–272) whose capital Bourdieu calls statist capital (Bourdieu 1998: 41–42), but which could also be called power capital. To simplify then – those having a significant amount of capital in fields, perceived and recognised as important, meaningful and prestigious by the agents of the society, hold an equally significant volume of symbolic capital giving them an advantageous position in the social space. Thus they have the potential of gaining a favourable position in the field of power and converting their symbolic capital to power capital. In other words, it is the configuration of different fields at given points in time that determine the structure of the social world of the society including its power structures (Bourdieu 1986: 242).

5. Habitus and distinction – reification of a social position

Position in social space is reflected through habitus, an enduring disposition agents possess determining the possibilities and impossibilities of social reality, i.e. the
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taken for granted aspects of the world. In other words it is a sense of one's place as well as a sense of the place of others in the world and the “law” of the social world conditioned into each agent since the beginning of their lives (Bourdieu 1977: 72, 81, Bourdieu 1984: 170–175, Bourdieu 1989, Bourdieu 1990b: 4–5, Bourdieu 1990c: 55–56). Habitus is the operator of distinction which in turn is the reification of an agent’s social position. Practices, manners, tastes and goods are associated with different positions in the social space and agents choose from the available goods the ones that suit their own social position, i.e. those that occupy a corresponding position in the social space. (Bourdieu 1984, Bourdieu 1989: 19, Bourdieu 1998: 8–9.) Distinction both emphasises an agent’s belonging to a group as well as their distinction within the group (Simmel 1986: 22) and thus variance and regularities amongst distinctive features can reveal both inter- and intra-group dynamics.

An important outcome from the above is that agents in similar positions in the social space are subjected to similar conditioning and thus their habitus is also likely to be similar. In other words, they potentially hold a uniform outlook on the social world and hold the same kinds of interests, while on the other hand they are less likely to share similarities with those occupying a different social position. (Simmel 1986: 26-27, Bourdieu 1989: 17.) This aspect of social space creates the potential for agents occupying similar or neighbouring positions in the social space to form networks with each other and via these networks create groups whose members share the same kind of habitus. Due to similarities in the habitus it is likely that the distinctive features, including stylistic features displayed through the use of material culture, within this group are uniform to a degree.

Distinctive features do not inherently possess a social position; instead they are relegated to one by the agents themselves (Bourdieu 1989: 9). It is equally likely that a distinctive feature will, in the course of time, “trickle downwards” in the social space as it is assumed by agents occupying lower social positions (Simmel 1986: 26, Bourdieu 1998: 4–5). When this happens, those occupying a higher social position will likely assume new distinctive features or alter the old ones in order to retain their distinctiveness or they may even try to prevent the lower social strata from assuming distinctive markers of the higher strata. The latter method is well attested from historical times (Pylykkänen 1956, Elias 1983) but such practices may have been in use already during prehistory though this, of course, is speculation. The change in distinctive features may also signal a changing field configuration and/or the attempt of agents occupying a lower position in the social space to attain a more central position. This process of change and the innovation of
new distinctive features during the Iron Age can be observed in the archaeological record by studying the stylistic characteristics of burial remains.

6. Burials representing social position

Social roles of the living affect the structures of their society and through this they affect the rituals performed by, and within, the society including burial and death rituals (Trinkaus 1995: 54). Burials are related to religion and although it is unlikely that institutionalised religions, such as contemporary Christian religion, existed during the Iron Age, it is still justifiably to refer to Iron Age burial practices as religious. Religion and religious activities, or activities with religious connotations, are closely related with institutions of political nature, i.e. institutions of power (Lewellen 2003: 65–66). Thus burial grounds have the potential to reflect social power structures. Burial grounds and permanent burial monuments, such as cairns, are concrete symbols clearly defined in space. By identifying with these kinds of symbols, those in power are able to strengthen and legitimise their position in a society (Okkonen 2003: 215–226). This is because such monuments represent, among other things, the stability and endurance of the society and help to strengthen the identity of the society and its agents (Kertzer 1988: 18). Changes in these monuments are signals of changes behind the rituals and ideology that are in turn behind the building of such monuments and therefore warrant special interest whenever perceived.

7. Burial practices in the study area during the Metal Ages

During the studied period a burial in a cairn or a stone setting was the prevailing burial form in the research area. Cremation burial was predominant but occasionally inhumation occurred. Two inhumation cemeteries are the famous Leväluhta lake cemetery in Isokyrö and its less well-known equivalent from Käldamäki in Vöyri-Maksamaa (see Wessman 2009 with references). In addition to Leväluhta and Käldamäki, inhumation has been encountered occasionally from cairns together with cremation burials. From the study area such a case would be the cairn cemetery of Latjineliden in Vöyri-Maksamaa where both inhumation and cremation burials have been found (Tegengren 1936). The co-existence of these two burial forms is certainly an interesting feature and would warrant a more detailed study but this falls beyond the scope of the present paper and will merely be mentioned here.

Cairn burial survives in the current research area throughout the period of study but it is superseded to a degree during the Merovingian Period (600–800 AD) by
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a distinctive and collective burial form known as the cremation cemetery below ground level. These almost featureless cemeteries are curious in that they are without individual burial structures, such as cairns, although sometimes older burial cairns may be present on the site of a cremation cemetery signifying a long use of the site (see Appendix 1). The only burial structure often present in a cremation cemetery below ground level is a low stone setting, almost imperceptible to the eye when covered with turf, though in some regions even this is missing (Wessman 2010: 19–21 with references). Burials have been conducted by evidently scattering the ashes and burnt bone from the pyre, as well as any grave goods, in-between the stones. Individual burials cannot thus be identified from a cremation cemetery. The internal structure of these cemeteries is still poorly understood mainly due to a lack of interest in their study, though lately this has been somewhat rectified with important studies pertaining to these distinctive cemeteries (see Mäntylä-Asplund & Storå 2010, Wessman 2010).

8. Late Bronze Age and early Iron Age – changing burial monuments

As the Stone Age ends and the Bronze Age begins (around 1500 BC) a curious twist occurs in the Finnish archaeological record. Whereas plenty of known and studied dwelling sites from the Stone Age exist while very few burial places are known, the opposite is true of the Metal Ages. However, it is exactly the burials of the Metal Ages that signal the existence of elites as likely only some members of the society were granted an archaeologically visible burial (Miettinen 1998: 64, Mägi 2002: 11, 74, 123, Pihlman 2004, Lang 2007: 224, A splund 2008: 355). At first the burials occurred in one or a few cairns, sometimes very large, which likely functioned as a collective burial site for a single household, but this changed by the end of the late Bronze Age and the beginning of the early Iron Age (800–500 BC).

At the end of the Bronze Age the tradition of large single cairns started to be replaced with the building of cairn fields consisting of many relatively small cairns of varying shapes (Meinander 1977: 22–23). This change is uniform across the whole Finnish side of the Bothnian bay coastline as demonstrated by Jari Okkonen in regard to Middle and Northern Ostrobothnia (Okkonen 2003: 140) and by Figure 2 in regard to the present area of study. The data presented in Figure 2 is collected from the register of antiquities of the National Board of Antiquities (2011) and therefore contains a margin of error concerning the site’s elevation above sea level, though this is unlikely to be more than a metre or two at most. Also the data concerning the sites themselves may be of varying quality due to the level of accuracy maintained by the individual archaeologists conducting the surveys. In some cases amateurs
have solely been responsible for the surveys leaving the nature of the sites, and especially the number of individual cairns, suspect. However as the aim of Figure 2 is merely to demonstrate a general correlation between the number of cairns and elevation above sea level, the margin of error is within acceptable limits.

In Figure 2, the elevation above sea level is used as a rough dating factor, due to the isostatic land uplift affecting the study area (see Appendix 2 for a rough shoreline displacement chronology; for a recent discussion concerning the shoreline displacement in the study area see Holmblad 2010: 42–48) but it must be remembered that it is far from 100% accuracy as, especially during the later Iron Age, burial sites on elevations higher than contemporary shorelines occur. Such known sites are not included in the statistics presented in Figure 2. Furthermore, the sites between 15–20 m a.s.l. contain a few cremation cemeteries below ground level and for the purposes of the statistics they are counted as a single cairn as they, although distinctive from the cairn burials, can be called a single burial structure. I will not focus on the change from individual cairns to the cremation cemeteries as I have examined this phenomenon before regarding the study area (Kuusela 2009: 42–43, 47–49). In Figure 2 the elevations of 21–30 m a.s.l., corresponding with the shorelines of the late Bronze Age and early Iron Age (see Appendix 2), a marked rise of individual cairns within a site is observed. On the other hand, the increase in sites, though clear, is not as marked. Even with the assumption that many cairn sites may contain cairns that are not burials, Figure 2 is still likely a reflection of a true phenomenon as this development is in line with a contemporary development observed in Sweden (Thedeen 2004: 170, Feldt 2005, Arnberg 2007: 175).
change might seem to indicate that the society has become more egalitarian as more people were now granted a visible burial than previously. Another explanation might be a change in the beliefs of afterlife reflecting on burial practices and thus the phenomenon might not have anything to do with social structures pertaining to power. Of these arguments the former I view as overly simplistic but the latter warrants more detailed consideration. I interpret burial places, especially those with solid structures, as places of importance to the society that built them (see Kuusela et al. 2010) and such places are, in my view, inevitably connected with power. As burial places are, by their nature, places pertaining to rituals, it is important to keep in mind that it is through ritual that the elite of a society legitimise their position within a society (Kertzer 1988: 13–14, 29, 38, DeMarrais et al. 1996: 15–17, Earle 1997: 144, Bayman 2002: 77–78). Thus places of importance pertaining to rituals will inevitably be controlled by the social elite of the society and by burying their dead in these places of importance, the social elite strengthens and legitimises their social position in society. This of course does not exclude the possibility of changing beliefs of the afterlife. To the contrary, a changing belief concerning the afterlife is in the end reflected in changing social structures, power structures included, and therefore these two may well go hand-in-hand.

Based on the reasoning presented above I interpret the change in the cairn tradition during the late Bronze Age and early Iron Age from the perspective of changing power structures. Even though the cairn fields might seem like a chaotic collection of cairns of various shapes and sizes, there is an inner structure to them and they are not randomly formed entities isolated from social factors, as I and others have demonstrated with a case study of the cairn field of Viirikallio in Laihia. There we noted that stratification within a cairn field may be observed with a positive correlation between larger cairns and a dominant topographical position (Kuusela et al. 2009, Kuusela et al. 2010). In addition to this, the Pre-Roman cairn fields in the study area often contain a distinctive stylistic feature of one, often the largest, cairn covered with red sandstone slabs. These cairns often hold a central position within the cairn field further implying intra-site stratification. (Miettinen 1986, Miettinen 1998: 67, Holmblad & Herrgård 2005: 134). This tendency of one cairn dominating a Pre-Roman cairn field is common not only to Finland but also to Sweden and Estonia (Thedeen 2004: 170, Feldt 2005, Arnberg 2007: 175, Lang 2007: 226–227).

Then what does the change from single dominating cairns to several smaller cairns signify if not an egalitarian society or a change in the views of the afterlife? It signifies a change in the field configuration connected with burial rituals and also a “trickling down” of a stylistic trait previously acting as a distinctive feature – burial
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in a cairn. Whereas such a burial was still likely granted to only a part of the society, this part may have now been wider, hence the larger number of smaller cairns within a site. This results in a new method of distinction which is manifested in the stylistic characteristics of the cairns, mainly the size differences between the burial monuments and the positive correlation between the largest cairns and dominating positions within the site as well as the red sandstone slabs covering the largest burials.

It is interesting to note that this age of cairn fields does not last very long. The climax seems to be situated between 25 and 26 m a.s.l., corresponding roughly with the shorelines of the very late Bronze Age and the beginning of the Iron Age. After this the building of many small cairns and stone settings wanes and the following cemeteries of the Iron Age consist of fewer cairns, in some cases very large ones. Furthermore another distinctive burial feature starts to make an appearance nearing the end of the Pre-Roman Iron Age – grave goods.

9. Grave goods reflecting social position

Very recently several Finnish archaeologists, myself included, have been chastised for placing too much attention on grave goods with the expense of other burial factors, such as the grave itself and its construction (Wessman 2010: 13). Whereas it is undeniably true that grave goods have played a major part in Finnish burial studies it cannot be denied that they are a significant part of the burials and thus cannot be ignored. Furthermore, as I argue, they hold a key position in understanding the social power structures behind the burials. This is, of course, not to claim that they should take precedence over other factors, such as morphological features of the burial site itself, but rather that these elements should be combined in the final analysis. Unfortunately accurate morphological data to enable such an analysis is not available to me at the time of the writing of this text and thus I will make a conscious choice to focus on a single, available, feature in the burials of the Iron Age periods after Pre-Roman times – grave goods.

The assumption that grave goods reflect social position and power structures is of course relatively common in archaeological research (Ucko 1969, Binford 1972, Chapman 1977). Whereas this relationship might not be as straightforward as sometimes may have been believed (Hedeager 1992: 32), grave goods are still the starting point for an analysis of a society’s political, and more importantly, social structures as they are a form of social communication, or dialogue, between the ones conducting the burials and the rest of society (Hedeager 1992: 93–94). As burials are closely linked with ideology and ritual, the dominant group will try to influence
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and legitimate their status through them (Hedeager 1992: 94, K uusela 2009). This also implies that rituals, burial rituals included, are not passive but active features in a society's social world and they are varied and manipulated by those who are in a position to do so in order to further their own cause (Hedeager 1992: 94).

When studying burial goods it should be remembered that an important part of their ritual use has been their display during the burial (Halsall 2010: 208–210). This means that they have been chosen on ideological grounds and are thus likely a normative, and not a chaotic, ensemble of artefacts (Halsall 2010: 208–209). However, through display the burying group can either bend and/or exaggerate the norms thus sending an ideological message that not only are they capable of burying their dead according to what is proper, but that they are also able to go above and beyond the call of duty in doing so. Such an act in the ideological field will likely spark a reaction in the form of imitation from others occupying a similar social position in the social space of the society. This reaction occurs so that the social peers of the provocateurs will not be granted second place in this competition via ritual and thus lose symbolic capital. That this reaction is likely to happen amongst social peers is stipulated by the concept of the habitus as it determines the social impossibilities and possibilities of the world (Bourdieu 1977: 183, Bourdieu 1989: 17, Bourdieu 1990c: 118–119, Bourdieu 1998: 48, 102).

Therefore those that react to the ideological provocation are those who deem such a reaction as being within their accepted means of acting and they either hold a similar position as the original provocateurs and/or those who believe they have the means to occupy such a position. Alternatively, the original provocateurs may themselves be upstarts who are vying for a central position in the social field and perceive this position to be within their grasp.

The above implies three things. Firstly, if ideological provocation in the form of bending or exaggerating the norms takes form in burials, it should in some manner be visible in the archaeological record, and secondly it is likely to be directly reflected in the distinctive, or stylistic, features of the burials, such as grave goods. Thirdly – and this is important in light of the social power structures of the society – it implies that should this exaggeration be perceived continuously it implies that power relations within the society are likely uncertain and open for competition and must be recurrently renegotiated (Halsall 2010: 208–113), which excludes the possibility of any form of a centralised and institutionalised government beyond the local level.
10. Changes from the Roman Iron Ages to the end of the Merovingian Period in the study area

The process of distinction via grave goods can be studied via an archaeological analysis technique called an NAT analysis, or number of artefact types analysis. In this analysis, burials are allocated an NAT score based on the types of artefacts the burial contains. In other words, if a burial contains, for example, two spearheads, 30 glass beads, 3 knives and 4 bronze brooches, the NAT score for the said burial would be 4. The NAT analysis can be conducted on intra- and inter-site levels. The first is a burial-level analysis where each individual burial is allocated an NAT score separately and the second is a site level analysis where the whole burial site is allocated a single NAT score. The former is useful for an intra-site analysis but its weakness is that it requires an intact and undisturbed context. The second is useful in comparing different settlement units with each other and can be used for the study of large areas and this form of NAT analysis makes it possible to include burials that may have been disturbed as inter-site NAT operates on a rougher and larger scale than the intra-site NAT. (Hedeager 1992: 103–105, Lang 2007: 226, Mägi 2002: 115–116.)

I have analysed the dated burials of the study area utilising the inter-site NAT. Inter-site NAT is useful only when enough contemporary sites exist in the same area, as only then can comparisons be made. Because of this the NAT becomes truly useful in the study area only from the Late Roman Iron Age onwards as dated burials of the Early Roman Iron Age are few. Nevertheless I have also included the burials of the Early Roman Iron Age for reference. It is possible that many findless cairns from Early Roman elevations may actually be from this period but without dating this cannot be said with certainty. Furthermore, even the dating of the burials with grave goods must be treated with caution as basically, all are dated based on typology and not with absolute methods. Nevertheless, I believe it is possible to utilise a rough analysis technique, such as the NAT, with the archaeological evidence at hand despite the, admittedly severe, dating problems.

Altogether 54 burial sites (see Appendix 1) in the study area have been dated to the Early Roman Iron Age – Merovingian Period (1–800 AD) with several sites including burials of more than one period. Five sites in all are included in the NAT of the Early Roman Iron Age, ten sites in that of the Late Roman Iron Age, 35 in that of the Migration Period and 24 in that of the Merovingian Period. It is clear that the sample size is very small leading to the conclusion that any statistical results gained from the material do not bear a heavy weight of evidence and must be used and interpreted as indicative results. The finds of the analysed sites have been
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referred from the main catalogue of the National Board of Antiquities. Only sites that have been excavated, or from where a significant amount of stray finds have been recovered, are included in the analysis. The excavations of the included sites have been carried out in many cases well before modern documentation standards were assumed, but because in this case only the number of find types is of interest the sometimes relatively poor level of documentation is not an issue.

Attention must be paid to the fact that high NAT scores may in fact correlate either with the sample size or the number of buried individuals. The former correlation can be verified by comparing the NAT scores with either the total amount of finds or the number of burials within a site. Comparing the NAT scores with the total find amount is however problematic as fragmentation prevents establishing the actual
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Figure 3. NAT-scores of cairn sites in relation to excavated cairns.
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Figure 4. NAT-scores of cremation cemeteries in relation to the area of the cemetery.
amount of complete artefacts within the assemblages and thus leaves room for considerable interpretation. Therefore comparing the NAT scores with the number of burials seems to be the better option, but this is problematic because the actual amount of burials in a single cairn may vary and one cairn may contain burials of

Figure 5. NAT-scores of the Early Roman Iron Age.

Figure 6. NAT-scores of the Late Roman Iron Age.
several individuals (see e.g. Hirviluoto & Vormisto 1984). However, because cairns are individual burial structures, they are treated here as single burials in order to verify whether high NAT scores of sites correlate with a high amount of excavated cairns. The results are seen below in Figure 3. The scattered distribution of the NAT scores of the Migration Period is shown in Figure 7, and the scores of the Merovingian Period are depicted in Figure 8.
scores in relation to excavated burial cairns seems to indicate that NAT scores are not dependent on the amount of excavated cairns. Therefore NAT scores can be used to compare cairn sites with each other.

Cremation cemeteries pose a problem for a similar test as that conducted with cairn sites above. Not having individual burial structures and burials, a similar verification as with cairn cemeteries is not possible. I have opted, in the case of cremation cemeteries, to use the area of the cemetery as defined in the online map-application of the register of antiquities of the National Board of Antiquities (National Board of Antiquities 2011) for comparison with the NAT scores. The area defined in the register does not always correlate with the excavated area or the true size of the cemetery meaning that this test is likely to suffer from a margin of error, but as the original excavation reports are not available during the time of the writing of this article, the error must be accepted. It should be noted that the sites of Heikmokullen, Soldat-Stomparen, Kopparbacken, Mahläistentönkkä and Alhonmäki-Pahamäki are not included. Heikmokullen and Soldat-Stomparen are

Figure 9. Analysed sites of the Early Roman Iron Age in relation to shorelines of ca 100 AD.

Figure 10. Analysed sites of the Late Roman Iron Age in relation to shorelines of ca 300 AD.
missing the required area data and the areas of Kopparbacken, Mahlaistentönkkä and Alhonmäki-Pahamäki are defined as being so large that they would make the resulting Figure 4 somewhat difficult to read. Like with cairn cemeteries, it appears that the NAT scores are not dependent on the size of the cemetery.

As to the possibility of a high NAT score correlating with the number of buried individuals, very little can be said with the material available. However, it is probable that the number of buried individuals does not correlate with the amount of grave goods as is indicated by the cairn burial of Kethoka 2 in Salo, South-West Finland where at least 19 individuals were found to be buried in the same cairn but where the amount of grave goods were not consistent with what would be expected in relation to the number of buried individuals (Hirviluoto & Vormisto 1984, Schauman-Lönnqvist 1989: 44–47). If this is the case, then NAT scores should not be dependent on the number of individuals buried in a single grave or cemetery.

The NAT scores of individual sites can be seen in Figures 5–8 and the geographic distribution of the analysed sites in relation to the shorelines of 100 AD, 300 AD, 450 AD, and 700 AD.
When observing the development of the NAT scores from the Early Roman Iron Age to the Merovingian Period, the trend of increasing differences seems to be evident, especially between the Migration Period and Merovingian Period. This can be verified by calculating the coefficient of variation, or CV, for each period dividing the standard deviation with the average of the NAT scores for each period and then comparing them to each other (see, e.g. Ranta et al. 1989: 39–40). The resulting Figure 13 shows the increase in variation especially between the Migration- and Merovingian Period, though between the Early Roman Iron Age and Migration Period the change is not as evident, with the Early Roman Iron Age actually having a higher CV than the following periods. It must be remembered, however, that before the Migration Period the number of sites is very small which inevitably affects the results of any statistical computations.

I interpret the development of diversity in burial assemblages as an ongoing process of distinction and it is similar in mechanism to the one observed earlier between the Bronze Age cairns and the Pre-Roman Iron Age cairns. Around the beginning of the 1st century AD grave goods began to be used in signalling a social position of the group conducting the burials, but this practice became more common as the Iron Age progressed. If we treat the practice of using grave goods as a stylistic feature, we may interpret the phenomenon using the theoretical framework presented earlier in this paper. Therefore it appears that the stylistic trait of grave goods trickled downwards to lower strata of the elite. They began to follow the same habit as they strived for a better position in the social space of the society by identifying their burial practices with those in central positions in the social space. When this occurred, the elite holding a central position developed

Figure 13: Coefficient of variation (CV) of the NAT-scores of Early Roman Iron Age, Late Roman Iron Age, Migration Period and Merovingian Period.

450 AD and 700 AD in Figures 9–12, respectively.
alternative methods of distinction and in this case it seems that they followed the philosophy of “the more the merrier” resulting in increased ritual consumption of material capital reflected by more varied assemblages of grave goods.

11. Some conclusions

During the Merovingian Period the differences between the burial sites are more pronounced than before. However, the sites with the highest NAT scores are not distributed equally over the study area but are mainly clustered in Vähäkyrö and Vöyri-Maksamaa, though it must be remembered that this may in part be due to excavations having been focused unequally over the area of study. However even in Vähäkyrö and Vöyri-Maksamaa, the sites with the highest NAT scores are not located immediately adjacent to each other, as the closest burial site or sites often have clearly lower scores. This indicates two things. On the one hand it indicates centralisation of power on a local scale (Kuusela 2009) and on the other hand that the area, on a larger scale, did not have dominating central areas but rather several, likely independent, communities controlled by their own stratum of social elite. That these communities were aware of and interacted with each other and that this interaction likely took many forms, from cooperation to competition, is beyond reasonable doubt. That the elites of the Iron Age communities of the study area competed with each other through burial rituals is attested by the NAT analysis.

The conclusions of this paper are interesting considering that the archaeological record from the younger Iron Age, from the Viking Age onwards, seems to indicate that the area under study went through considerable changes perhaps resulting in the, at least partial, depopulation of the area (Meinander 1950: 156–162). However, the analysis of the Iron Age burials, presented in this paper, up until the end of the Merovingian Period, indicates that the centralisation of power was in progress through the Iron Age and that it is reflected in the archaeological record through burial remains. The elite stratum became ideologically egalitarian during the Pre-Roman Iron Age when the cairn fields appear, but that this egalitarianism likely remained on an ideological level is reflected by both the observed signs of stratification within the cairn fields themselves as well as the fact that the tradition of these cairn fields was given up relatively quickly corresponding roughly with the appearance of grave goods. The development in the differentiation in grave goods, demonstrated by the NAT analyses, implies further stratification of the elite stratum up until the Merovingian Period. However this development never reaches the point where a single community may be said to have gained a clearly superior position beyond a localised level.
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**APPENDIX 1: Sites used in the NAT-analyses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>NAT ERIA</th>
<th>NAT LRIA</th>
<th>NAT MIG</th>
<th>NAT MER</th>
<th>Total cairns</th>
<th>Excavated cairns</th>
<th>Cem bgl.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Isokyrö</td>
<td>Niemenmaanmäki</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isokyrö</td>
<td>Kaaminmäki/Hiisimäki</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isokyrö</td>
<td>Leväluhta</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>See bel.*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isokyrö</td>
<td>Rinta-Ulvinen</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isokyrö</td>
<td>Puikkila</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Y*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laihia</td>
<td>Kalliolaakso/Klimakangas</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laihia</td>
<td>Vuoruseenmäki</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laihia</td>
<td>Käppäläinen Palomäki</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laihia</td>
<td>Kiviniemenmäki</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laihia</td>
<td>Mujavanoinen-Hietaanmetsän alue</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laihia</td>
<td>Karjarhanmäki länsi</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laihia</td>
<td>Nuorisseuratalo</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Y*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maalahti</td>
<td>Nissashaga S</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maalahti</td>
<td>Junkarsbrännö</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maalahti</td>
<td>Lillelsar</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maalahti</td>
<td>Langerskogen</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maalahti</td>
<td>Kopparbacken</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Y*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mustasaari</td>
<td>Sulva Lassmaberget</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Närtöö</td>
<td>Edshacken</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Närtöö</td>
<td>Övermark-Frönasudden</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Other Attributes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedersöre</td>
<td>Esse-Lillmossbacken</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedersöre</td>
<td>Esse-Högbacken</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uusikaarlepyy</td>
<td>Helgabacken</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vähäkyrö</td>
<td>Palomäki</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vähäkyrö</td>
<td>Ainmaa-Palolakso</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vähäkyrö</td>
<td>Vällinmäki</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vähäkyrö</td>
<td>Esantönnikkä-Kurkunmäki-Mäkihaka</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vähäkyrö</td>
<td>Ojamäki</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vähäkyrö</td>
<td>Kullahanmäki-Heikinluhdanmäki</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vähäkyrö</td>
<td>Linnanpello</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vähäkyrö</td>
<td>Altomäki-Karpinnäki</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vähäkyrö</td>
<td>Koppelomäki</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vähäkyrö</td>
<td>Pajunperkiönmäki</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vähäkyrö</td>
<td>Pettoisenmäki</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vähäkyrö</td>
<td>Höysälänmäki</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vähäkyrö</td>
<td>Mahlaistentönnikkä</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vähäkyrö</td>
<td>Kirstinnäki</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vähäkyrö</td>
<td>Pääkköönmäki-Vuorenmaa</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vähäkyrö</td>
<td>Alhonmäki-Pahamäki</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vähäkyrö</td>
<td>Kaavontönnikkä</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vähäkyrö</td>
<td>Kotsalonmäki</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vöyri-Maksamaa</td>
<td>Sandbacka-Lågpeld</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vöyri-Maksamaa</td>
<td>Latjineliden</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vöyri-Maksamaa</td>
<td>Mustamäki</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vöyri-Maksamaa</td>
<td>Viskusbacken 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vöyri-Maksamaa</td>
<td>Lågpektlangs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vöyri-Maksamaa</td>
<td>Kungas</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vöyri-Maksamaa</td>
<td>Soldat-Stompanren</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vöyri-Maksamaa</td>
<td>Guolyynt</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Kuusela: Style as distinction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Cemetery</th>
<th>NAT ERIA</th>
<th>NAT LRIA</th>
<th>NAT MIG</th>
<th>NAT MER</th>
<th>Cem blg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vöyri-Maksamaa</td>
<td>Pörnullbacken</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vöyri-Maksamaa</td>
<td>Kaparkullen</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vöyri-Maksamaa</td>
<td>Tunis</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vöyri-Maksamaa</td>
<td>Heikmokullen</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vöyri-Maksamaa</td>
<td>Lövbacken</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NAT ERIA = NAT-score of Early Roman Iron Age  
NAT LRIA = NAT-score of Late Roman Iron Age  
NAT MIG = NAT-score of Migration Period  
NAT MER = NAT-score of Merovingian Period  
Cem blg = Cemetery below level ground. Those marked with * are used in the NAT-analysis.

**NOTES**

Leväluhta cemetery is an exceptional case because it is an inhumation cemetery where burials have been made on a pond or a lake (see Wessman 2009 with references for a recent discussion concerning the site).

Lågpeltkangas was excavated by bank director Jakob Tegengren during the course of several years in the 1920's and 1930's (see Tegengren 1929, 1934, Baudou 1987). Tegengren interpreted the cemetery as consisting of a few cairns and several low stone settings and conducted his excavations accordingly, but due to the proximity of the “stone settings” to each other and their irregular form, it is likely that Lågpeltkangas is a cremation cemetery below level ground (see Meinander 1950: 181–182).
APPENDIX 2: Shoreline chronology for the study area
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1. Introduction

What can the past teach us about the present and the future? In current discussions on global social and environmental changes, only a small part of the scholarly literature deals with the role of past change in helping us understand current and future change (Carpenter et al. 2001). On the contrary, our knowledge of current change is frequently used to study past change. Redman (2005) argues that the long-term and deep time perspectives of archaeology are crucial to understanding adaptation to change. But this deep time perspective of archaeology is seldom used as a tool to study current changes or to make predictive models for future change, it usually remains an end in itself.

As one of the few relevant theoretical frameworks within archaeology, Global-Change archaeology seeks to document and apply historical knowledge of past human–environmental interactions to the understanding of contemporary environmental problems and management and planning for future sustainability. It takes place within an interdisciplinary research structure and is situated within the explanatory contexts of historical science and humanistic history with close links to historical and political ecology (Hardesty 2007). History, human decision making, and human agency play an important role in Global-Change archaeology. This is in contrast with earlier forms of “environmental archaeology” considering environment as a background or stage for human action.

1.1 A social panarchy

Global-Change Archaeology can be used in conjunction with resilience theory. This concept originates in ecological research and describes adaptation to change, including ecological and climate change, as well as human impacts on ecological niches, etc. It is used in research on current and future ecological changes like global warming and hazards (Adger 2005). The theory has also been used in archaeological research to describe socio-ecological transformations in past social
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systems (Redman & Kinzig 2003). Resilience theory presents a comprehensive framework for the temporal, organizational and spatial distribution of change in socio-ecological systems (Peeples _et al._ 2006). Resilience theory is valuable for archaeologists as a way of structuring descriptions of dynamics in complex systems. Archaeology is valuable for resilience theory because of its unique long term perspective on change in socio-ecological systems.

The most crucial element in resilience theory for archaeologists is the idea of the panarchy. The panarchy describes a socio-ecological system as continuously changing system across a whole number of interconnected spatial and temporal scales. Over long time periods the stress in a socio-ecological system changes position across scales. People, members of the panarchy change their dominating identity to different scales at different times. This is related to the shifts in the system as we see them also in the archaeological material.

The idea of a social panarchy is one of the frameworks we can use in studies of long term social change in prehistory. But the concept as used in resilience theory misses a social factor, a human aspect. Crucial for change in a social system in the long term is the change of the focus of identification in a society. People take up several identities as part of different scales of a society. One or a few of these identifications are on a larger social scale central for a longer period. “Successful” change in a society is related to a change of the central identity.

Prehistoric Finland is a mosaic of social groups and ecological systems. All these groups and systems are interrelated on different scales with each other and with larger entities. In the long term we find some recurrent patterns in the socio-ecological dynamics of prehistoric Finland. In this article I will discuss the panarchy between 6500 and 4000 cal BP at the Bothnian Bay coast. This case study shows how the stress, the centrality on the social scale, shifts between the individual and large trade systems. These shifts are the confirmation of changes at different levels of the system.

The changes suggested by the archaeological record of the Kierikki area in the period 6500–4000 cal BP are a microcosm of the transition to greater social complexity in northern Finland and probably in northernmost Europe in general. They show that over time, populations increased their investment in residential sites, and that sites became functionally more specialized. In the early part of the transition, sites were fairly homogeneous in their structure and artifactual content. By the end of the period, they were diverse and formed complex, coherent systems of economically interdependent settlements.

The most archaeologically visible indicator of this complexification in northern Finland is the presence of the monuments locally known as _jätinkirkko_, literally,
Giants’ Churches. They are enclosures delimited by a low wall of piled boulders and can be as large as 70 meters by 40 meters. The earliest ones appeared around 5500 cal BP on the Ostrobothnian coast, and their chronological distribution peaked between 5000 and 4000 cal BP. Along with the Giants’ Churches, we find substantial settlements composed of clusters of semi-subterranean dwelling depressions associated with groups of stone cairns, usually interpreted as burials. One of the largest of these clusters, and the one by far with the richest known assemblage of imported flint and amber, is the village site at Kuuselankangas, one of the Kierikki area’s component sites.

2. Environmental Context

The study of hunter-gatherer social organization in Ostrobothnia (Finland) necessarily starts with the environmental framework in which the social processes occurred. The most significant element which influenced Stone Age hunter-gatherers in coastal Finland has its origins in the retreat of the glacier after the Last Glacial Maximum. Ever since, the Finnish coast has been scene of continuous change due to post-glacial isostatic land-uplift. The centre of this uplift is located in the Bothnian Bay, the northern part of the Gulf of Bothnia. The uplift caused continuous regression at the concave coastline of the Bothnian Bay. The regression in turn resulted in the reduction of the coastline.

2.1 Shoreline reduction and coastal variability

The effect of this reduction on human population has been intensified by the variability in shoreline displacement due to differences in local topography. Land-uplift in flat regions frees more land from the sea and thus causes more displacement of the coastline. The effect of the slowing down of the land-uplift around 6000–5500 cal BP has been neutralized. The period around 5000 cal BP is the period with the highest rate of coastal displacement because of the flat topography of the coastal zone during that time. More specifically the peak period of shoreline displacement happened between 5700 and 2800 cal BP (Núñez & Okkonen 1999). During the same period there is a peak in variation of coastal displacement between the different river estuaries of the Finnish Bothnian Bay coast. Some rivers were very stable, their river mouths did not migrate much. Other river mouths on the contrary were very unstable and migrated a lot, causing much of change in the local environment.
2.2 Population aggregation and decreased mobility

The reduction of the coast resulted in increasing population density, even without increase of population. The variability in river estuary stability, i.e. the amount of displacement due to the land-uplift, resulted in the aggregation of population at the most stable river estuaries, seeking predictability in their environment. The heavy concentration of occupation sites in stable river mouths might be partly due to the lack of migration and the closeness between different ancient shorelines. But the archaeological material also indicates that the concentration of sites at the stable river estuaries resulted in much richer (abundant exotic goods) assemblages, such as the prehistoric villages of Yli-Ii (Iijoki) and Kauinen (Perhonjoki-Lestijoki).

I propose that increasing population density and increasing contact between groups at the major river mouths were made possible by the reduction in length of the coastline in Ostrobothnia between 8000 and 5500 cal BP and the high variability in river estuary stability during that period (Vaneeckhout 2008). Higher population densities are not caused by environmental changes but they would have been unlikely without those changes. In combination with the concentration of resources during a period of climatic and environmental stabilization (Núñez 2009), the higher population density allowed decreases in population mobility in Ostrobothnia around 6500–5500 cal BP.

3. Polarization in the aggregation community of Kierikki

The river Iijoki, one of the most stable rivers between 6000 and 5000 cal BP, contains one of the largest concentrations of prehistoric remains in Finland. Over 300 house depressions and other pit features are known from the ancient estuary.

Figure 1. Overview of archaeological remains at Kierikki
Figure 1 is an overview of the sites situated on the ancient river mouth of the Iijoki river. There are more numerous and larger identified sites on the north side of the river. Past research revealed changes in architecture over time, and clear differences in the remains between the north and the south bank. The first dwelling depressions can be found between 70 and 60 m above sea level and are organized in semi-circular formations. The find assemblages at those elevations are those of residential structures: quartz from tool making and tool use, burnt bone, and ceramics. The dwelling depressions are homogeneous in shape, size and content.

The dwellings at Kierikin Sorakuoppa are dated to 6200–5600 cal BP. Figure 2 uses shoreline chronology to give an idea of the changes in population density over time. The density of clusters gradually increases between 75 and 60 m above sea level. There is a first clear concentration of clusters of house depressions around the 60 m elevation. This corresponds with dates around 5500 cal BP, the period of aggregation at stable river mouths. This period is also a turning point in the prehistory of the Iijoki river.

Before 5500 cal BP the archaeological remains on both sides of the river are very similar. There is an evolution from simple find scatters on the highest terraces to the first semi-circular clusters of dwelling depressions a bit lower. This corresponds with the period of increased sedentism and concentration of population on the river mouths. Around 5500 cal BP, settlement at the Iijoki river mouth intensifies, there appears a differentiation between the occupations on the north bank and the south bank of the river. From this period we find the first signs of social differences and economic specialization.

At Kuuselankangas, on the north bank of the river, 24 house depressions have been identified. Most of these have been (partly) excavated. There is a core of large depressions on the western end of Kuuselankangas and a second group of smaller depressions at the eastern end. Excavation indicates that there is a positive correlation between the size of house depressions and the wealth of the find assemblages as measured by abundance and diversity. The concentration of exotic goods corresponds with the core of large house depressions. Amber, flint and innovative asbestos tempered pottery are concentrated in the area with the large depressions. Radiocarbon dates indicate that most of the house depressions have been occupied roughly contemporaneously. The dwellings at Kuuselankangas were likely used as residential structures.

Figure 2. Density of dwelling depression clusters set against elevation above sea level
The south bank Kotikangas complex on the contrary contains at least 12 house depressions spread out over the 1,500 meter length of the paleopeninsula. The depressions tend to be clustered in groups of three, some of the large ones stand alone. Excavation revealed a very interesting pattern indicating economic specialization at the different structures. The house depressions are large and rectangular with similar internal structure and size. They contain two hearths on the long axis, an entrance at the western end and a midden at the eastern end of the dwelling. Similar houses have been described for Arctic Norway, Sweden and south-eastern Finland. In the dwellings at Kierikki, the find assemblages are very variable, both in terms of their contents and their spatial distribution. One dwelling is strongly dominated by lithics, including flakes and worn tools of at least half a dozen different raw materials. The material is fairly evenly distributed over the whole structure. A second dwelling contains mostly ceramics, its density clearly increasing towards the midden (eastern) end. Only one amber bead and one flint arrowhead have been uncovered from the Kotikangas.

The remains at Kuuselankangas provide the argument that justifies the critical assumption in this discussion. There is a clear relationship between architectural change and social development. Space has a social logic. It is known from

Figure 3. Evolution of cluster formation at five sites from Kierikki.
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ethnographic and archaeological examples (Samson 1990, Blanton 1994, Carsten & Hugh-Jones 1995) that there is a correlation between the size of houses and the status of their occupants, whether it is a reflection of the size of the group occupying a house or of its social status. Houses with a larger group of occupants have more opportunity to accumulate higher prestige and rank simply by their longevity and their increased presence in the community. Ames (2006: 31) discusses how larger houses would be more successful in managing demographic cycles of households and in managing risk, both in terms of the costs of failure and in the outcome of resource procurement. The accumulation of prestige and rank will in turn lead to more successful recruitment of members and labour organization. Household studies on the American Northwest Coast, suggest that prestige and rank will be communicated through size and elaboration of houses. This is what Blanton (1994: 9) calls indexical communication.

Eventually, clusters of house depressions in the Kierikki area reliably consisted of a core of large house depressions and a second group of smaller depressions. The distribution of house depression size reveals a clear pattern of two size groups, especially for Kierikinkangas and K orvala. At Vuornos, the youngest phase in the occupation of the river mouth, the pattern is different. There is one particularly big house depression and a large group of smaller ones. After Vuornos there are no dwelling depressions or other residential structures known.

This increasing polarization corresponds with the evolution of house size. Figure 3 shows the exponential growth in variation of dwelling depression size set against elevation above sea level as a rough temporal scale. This pattern of change in house size intensifies when specific patterning is taken into account. Throughout the occupation, house depressions are clustered in smaller clusters of three or four house depressions. A division or clustering in three at houses and villages in ethnographic and archaeological contexts usually has a functional explanation (Darvill & Thomas 1996, Rapoport 1990). Plotting the size of clusters against elevation shows a similar exponential growth in variation through time.

Over time, increasing axiality in the building pattern creates more distance between clusters of houses. In the earliest clusters like Kierikin sorakuoppa, house depressions are situated in semi-circles creating a central common space. The pattern is repeated at Kierikinkangas and K uselankangas. At Kierikinkangas we also spot the first row-structured clusters of dwelling depressions. At Voima-Kuusela, a row house was built, creating a common, or less private, dwelling and at the same time creating distance between the different ‘rooms’, due to its axial structure (Figure 4). At Vuornos distance is created by building the dwellings further apart.
It should be noted that the average area per dwelling and per cluster increases towards lower elevations (Figure 5). The graph presenting the average dwelling area shows that two sites, both located on the south side of the river, seem to differ from the others. In terms of area, three sites differ from the rest. Two of these are the same sites on the southern side of the river, while the third is Kierikkisaari, the island in the middle of the river.

4. Discussion

Increasing social complexity and inequality at Kierikki are triggered by aggregation of population due to environmental circumscription caused by a shortening coastline and compressed distances between major river mouths. These factors are themselves the result of shoreline regression caused by isostatic land uplift following the disappearance of the Fennoscandian ice mass. Initially, circumscription allows increased sedentism. Further population growth leads to the organization of Houses. Successful Houses take the lead in hunting, fishing and long-distance exchange. Patron-client relations are established. Patrons from successful Houses need people to joint the House to be able to keep up high hunting and fishing quotas. Clients, from less successful Houses, seek protection and predictability in resource acquisition. In the long run, the House Society at Kierikki consists of a core of large successful Houses and a second group of smaller less successful Houses. These differences are visible in the differences between their estates. At the beginning group strength seems to increase resulting in multi-room structures and the use of inter house space for activities.

5. Conclusion

Explaining the origins and evolution of permanent social inequality remains a great challenge to archaeologists. Only archaeologists can accomplish this, although we must draw on theory and evidence from a variety of places. In many cases the archaeologist is confronted with the issue whether permanent inequality and
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In archaeology it is essential to use as many lines of evidence as possible. These lines of evidence are to be found in the archaeological (material) record. Multiple lines of evidence are likely to yield contradictory evidence and different techniques might yield different results. It is crucial for archaeologists to understand that the absence of evidence of ranking is not evidence of absence. Conversely, some evidence for wealth is not by itself evidence for permanent inequality (Ames 2008). Positively demonstrating that a prehistoric society in question was ranked or egalitarian can only be done from a long term perspective (Morrison 2002). Morrison (2002: 15) points out that the study of “long-

Figure 5. Evolution of average area per dwelling and per cluster at Kierikki set against elevation above sea level.
term patterns of adaptation, adaptation to environment, to polity, to power, and adaptation of these same forces” is necessary to transcend the current debate of hunter-gatherer studies.

In his article *The archaeology of rank* Kenneth Ames (2008) introduces different aspects of the archaeological study of permanent social inequality. One important aspect missing is the comparison of social development at different temporal, spatial and social scales. The focus of studies on social inequality in archaeology lies on a specific set of scales while linking the different cross-scale developments seems forgotten. A model derived from ecology uses the concept of panarchy to discuss a multi-scale world view in order to understand change in ecological adaptive systems. For the concept to be useful in social (and socio-ecological) systems we need to introduce different social scales in a system and which is the central scale in a society.

The recent publication of the radiocarbon record of Eastern Fennoscandia indicates that the period between 6500 and 4000 cal BP was a time of relatively high population numbers. Especially in central Finland there has been an increase in hunter-gatherer population during the period in which the effect of the shoreline changes was at its largest. The period following this population growth was a

![Figure 6. Schematic overview of the social changes in Kierikki between 6500 and 4000 cal BP.](image)
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period of abundance: large settlements, monumental stone structures and extensive trade systems.

A number of shifts in the system can be identified. These shifts indicate changing “tightness” between the different parts of the system. The first clear shift is the tendency towards more sedentism and the organization of individual households in villages. This shows a change in the central social unit of the system: from individual households to village like organizations (Figure 6). The intensification of trade and long distance contact enforces this community spirit as a buffer against “acculturation” from the south. The villages become tight into a larger system with similar (temporally and culturally) development across the Bothnian Bay coast.

During the peak period it seems the villages at the Bothnian Bay coast identified themselves with larger entities roughly spread across Northern Europe. Indications for this are the widespread building patterns and pottery types. Along with these material phenomena did the communities also spread social knowledge.

Soon after the period in which the central social unit of the system was at its widest, individual households started identifying themselves with their own household and families again. The increasing privatization of village patterns at the river Iijoki is a good indicator. The privatization at the river Iijoki and across the Bothnian Bay comes to a peak with the disappearance of visible structures. There are some indications that this is only half of the truth. The changes at the end of the Stone Age seem to include a polarization in the social system. Some people remain sedentary, founding large residential structures, and change into a more individualist social system. This individualism is indicated in the appearance of cairn burials. A second part of the society goes back to a more mobile way of living.
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The past and present archaeological research in Iran – Development and some ethical questions

Mirette Modarress

Traditionally, archaeology in many parts of the world has been dominated by European and North American researchers. Since the 19th century, when the first “scientific” archaeological excavations started, western countries have done much research, and many field projects of western countries have gone on all around the world (cf. Daniel 1981, Ucko 1995, Meskell 1998), particularly in developing countries where there is a rich archaeological cultural heritage. Besides the “scientific” interest to explore other cultures and compete to find fabulous archaeological artefacts for new museums in European capitals the commencement of archaeology has been connected to the economic and political expansionism of European and North-American countries. A brief review of the history of archaeology in Western Asia and other neighbouring regions attests to this. (See e.g. Seeden 1994, Padayya 1995, Bahrani 1998, Knapp & Antoniadou 1998, Özdoğan 1998, Matthews 2004, Goode 2007, Mourad 2010.)

In Iran archaeological fieldwork began more than 160 years ago. Most of the excavations were carried out by foreign researchers until the Islamic revolution in 1979. The 1960s and 1970s were very active time in terms of fieldwork, especially in western Iran. At the same time research by Iranians was increasing but it never reached the level of foreign investigation. After the 1979 Islamic revolution, foreigners were no longer allowed to carry out archaeological excavations in the country. As a result Iranian archaeology has been left outside the archaeological discourse in western countries. Foreign researchers transferred their projects to neighbouring countries (Potts 1999: 442, Pollock 2001: 185) and Iranian archaeology was forgotten.

When browsing through the fairly recent English language literature on Iranian excavations and archaeology, there is hardly any mention of or reference to research done by Iranians. This fact compelled me to look more closely at the archaeological research that had been done in Iran.¹ In this paper I examine the developments in archaeological research, especially fieldwork, carried out in Iran.

¹ Years ago when I was intensely browsing through the literature of Iranian archaeology, I noticed the strange fact that there was hardly any mention or any sources of research done by locals. That sent me on this course of finding out about the archaeological fieldwork and research done in Iran by Iranians themselves (see Modarress-Sadeghi 2007).
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from the middle of the 19th century until the end of the 20th century, concentrating particularly on the period from 1960 to 1998. This represents a period of about twenty years before and twenty years after the Islamic revolution, a time that was incredibly important in the development of archaeological activities in the country. The present study deals with what has been excavated, where, and by whom, and it looks into research ethics concerning the use of archaeological data and knowledge. Furthermore, it examines the manner in which local archaeology was affected by foreign excavations and research and whether there were any changes after 1979. The term *foreign* is used here mainly for western European and North American researchers and projects and the term *local* for Iranians. My intention here is to reveal and highlight Iranian views and research which are exceedingly scant in foreign literature regarding Iranian archaeology.

1. Early archaeological research in Iran (pre-1900)

Since ancient times European travellers and diplomats visiting the east have brought back home descriptions of intriguing places and fascinating monuments of those faraway places. As for Iranians, the remains had been there for the ages; they were a part of recognized landscape, a reminder of the distant past, and often linked to the traditional legends of ancient Iran (see e.g. Shahbazi 1999).

One of the earliest archaeological endeavours by European scholars in Iran was carried out by Carsten Niebuhr. He copied the cuneiform inscriptions and reliefs of Parsa (Persepolis) in 1765 (Niebuhr 1992 [1778]). More than a half century later during the 1830s and 1840s Henry Rawlinson studied the Bisotun (Behistun) reliefs and inscriptions. However, it was not until William K. Loftus' excavations in the 1850s in Shush (Susa) in south-western Iran (Figure 1) that "scientific" field archaeology and large scale excavations started in earnest. These British excavations lasted only for a few years, since the researchers thought there were not any valuable finds left after Loftus excavations (Curtis 1993: 15). Three decades passed before research in Shush was taken up once again, this time by the French. These French investigations were to become the longest period of research to be conducted at a single site in Iran to the present day.

---


3 John Curtis sees the decision to stop excavating in Shush as a misjudgement (Curtis 1993: 15).
At the end of the 1890s, Jacques de Morgan, a mining engineer, who had gained experience with archaeological excavations in Egypt, had been invited to direct the French investigations. By the turn of the 20th century the French had succeeded in acquiring a monopoly on all Iranian archaeology. In 1900 a Délégation Scientifique Française en Perse was created by the French government, with generous funding for archaeology in Iran. The main excavation activities remained nevertheless centred on Shush (Figure 2) and only minor research was conducted in other parts of Iran.

During the first decades of the 20th century Europeans and Americans were actively competing for political and economical influence in Western Asia, and this also impacted archaeology in Iran. The French monopoly, their competition for excavation permits with German and American scholars, and the growing foreign character of fieldwork portrays the archaeology of the 1930s. Along with scientific endeavours, the discovery of treasures for western museums was one of the main interests of the excavations. (cf. Mousavi M 1990, Malek-Shahmirzadi 2003, Majd

4 De Morgan’s first project was to erect a castle for the French team over the ancient hill of Shush, justified by security reasons, but in the centre of the archaeological site. Some ancient bricks with inscriptions were also used as building material.
As a consequence research ethics were ignored, and excavated materials were removed to foreign museums and collections both with and without the permission of Iranian authorities (e.g. Mousavi M 1990, Majd 2003). Regrettably, the methods of early excavators would have been more suited for mining than for scientific archaeology. Ancient mud-brick constructions were not recognized and, as happened in Shush, much of the architectural remains of earlier periods were destroyed without recording the information they could have provided (e.g. Mousavi A 1992, Mousavi A 1996, see also Carter 1992: 21-22 and notes). Sometimes the early excavators mention more ambitious goals for their excavations, like de Morgan who hoped to find remains of ancient civilization of Elam. In fact, he ended up destroying the very remains with his “mining-archaeology” (see Mousavi A 1996).

Shush and Takht-e Jamshid (ancient Parsa, called Persepolis by the Greeks) were by far the most important Iranian archaeological sites. Since Shush (Figure 2) was in the hands of French researchers, Takht-e Jamshid (Figure 3) became the main focus of interest for both Iranians and Americans.

---

5 See Majd (2003) and Goode (2007) for a comprehensive account of the politics and competition of excavations and antiquities in Iran during the first decades of the 20th century.
In 1931, Ernst Herzfeld, a German scholar, started excavations at Parsa on behalf of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago. A few years earlier, in 1927, the French monopoly had been revoked and in compensation, the French architect André Godard was chosen director to two newly established institutions, the Antiquities Service (Edare Koll-e Atighat) and the Iran National Bastan Museum (Muuze-ye Iran-e Bastan). Godard held a high position in these institutions for nearly thirty years. (Cf Mousavi M 1990.) Together with Herzfeld and the American Arthur Upham Pope, Godard was one of the most influential persons in Iranian Archaeology during the early decades of the 20th century. However, many local archaeologists share the opinion that Godard was preventing Iranian archaeologists from advancing and developing an indigenous archaeology (see

6 Ernst Herzfeld had already earlier got the opportunity to survey Iranian sites during his stay in Iran.
7 Godard also designed the museum in compliance with the old traditional architecture of Iran.
8 Arthur Upham Pope was a controversial figure in Iranian archaeology. One of his merits is the publication Survey of Persian Art from Prehistoric times to the Present (first in 1938, 6 volumes) which he produced together with his wife Phyllis Ackerman.
9 Godard was considered as secretive, uninformative and, contrary to the agreement, he did not school Iranian archaeologists and did not want to employ them either.
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Mousavi M 1990: 13, Negahban 1997: 58, Kambaks Fard 1995: 17). Archaeology, as we know it, is a western import into Iran and according to Ali Mousavi (2003), it was institutionalised with strong foreign influence. There had been interest and effort on the part of Iranians to preserve antiquities and to enhance the knowledge of their heritage. One of these undertakings was Society for National Heritage (Anjoman-e Asar-e Melli) founded by Iranian intellectuals in 1922. Unfortunately these early activities did not last very long, (Abdi 2001: 56–57.) For the Iranians carrying on and preserving the cultural heritage seems to have been more in the realm of language: poetry and ancient stories (historic narratives), than of material remains.

Iranian archaeologists made their first attempts at scientific excavations during World War II, at a time when foreign archaeologists halted their work in Takht-e Jamshid. The Archaeological Service of Iran took over the research in 1939 and during the following decades, Ali Sami, Isa Behnam and a few other Iranian archaeologists conducted excavations at ancient Parsa. However, foreign field-activity increased again once the war was over, with Iranians conducting only a few excavations. (Mousavi M 1990: 12–16, Abdi 2001: 65.) There was also some controversy regarding the issue of excavation permits. One such case was the Iron Age site of Tappeh Hasanlu, where Iranian archaeologists Ali Hakemi and Mahmud Rad had carried out preliminary excavations in 1949–1950. They were keen to continue the investigations but the Archaeological Service of Iran handed the excavations over to Americans. The Hasanlu project was directed by Robert Dyson on behalf of the University of Pennsylvania Museum. The matter caused a rift in the co-operation between local representatives and the foreign researchers during the Hasanlu excavations. (See Mousavi M 1990: 12, Negahban 1997: 127.)

4. Western research 1960–1978

After the French period and, especially, the Second World War there were numerous foreign research projects in Iran. The most active time was in the late 1960s, when foreign excavations were conducted at about sixty major sites by some twenty


11 Erich F. Schmidt had continued Herzfeld’s work during 1934–1939.

12 The Hasanlu project, which included several smaller sites, turned out to be a long project, the excavations lasted until 1978. The famous Hasanlu gold bowl, found in the excavations, is kept in Iran National Bastan Museum.
different foreign institutions from the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Canada, Germany, Italy, Belgium, Austria, Denmark and Japan. North Americans took over the leading role in Iranian Archaeology with Americans working on about twenty sites and Canadians at four. Next came the British with thirteen sites and, then the French with eight (see Modarress-Sadeghi 2007). One pioneer project in launching multi-disciplinary research in Iranian field archaeology was Robert Braidwood’s *Prehistoric Iran* in 1959 (Braidwood 1961). Due to political unrest in Iraq, Braidwood was unable to continue his work at Jarmo, Iraq, and instead decided to move to Iran and study the prehistoric sites of Tappeh Sarab and Asiab, in central western Zagros. Braidwood was interested in the early development of agriculture and sedentarism (Braidwood 1961: 3), but at the same time he wanted to test the prevailing theories about early agriculture. Braidwood’s anthropology oriented and multidisciplinary approach was much appreciated by the local archaeologists (e.g. Niknami 2000: 13–17, Abdi 2003: 88, Malek Shahmirzadi 2003: 155). Braidwood’s research was continued by Kent Flannery and Frank Hole, who surveyed and excavated several prehistoric sites to learn about settlement patterns and socio-economic developments in the area (Hole 1987, Abdi 2003: 88, Malek Shahmirzadi 2003: 155). In those days the “New Archaeology” was the main trend in North American archaeology, and this also influenced Iranian projects. The aims of the New Archaeology were to have an objective and a scientific approach to create some universal laws and widely adaptable models of cultural systems and processes (see e.g. Binford 1962, 1983, also Trigger 1996: 626–627). Western Iran and the Zagros mountains, which are situated on the eastern edge of the so-called Fertile Crescent, were considered ideal for research on the early domestication of cereals and ovis-caprids. Southwest Iran was considered suitable for studying the urbanization process, since it lay next to ancient Mesopotamia – modern Iraq – where early civilization and urbanization are considered to have their roots. To the attraction of Iranian sites was added the fact, mentioned by Frank Hole (1987: 14), that foreign research teams were given free rein to conduct new experiments in archaeological methods and theory. As a consequence, most excavations were concentrated in western Iran. Thirty-nine (64.9%) of the 60 major excavation were in the western parts of Iran (Figure 4).

---

13 The statistical material regarding excavations, excavation sites and excavated periods etc., is based on information from Iran’s Cultural Heritage Organization. Collected from Negahban (1997), Elima & M oretzai (2003) and the Iran and Mirath-e Farhangi Journals. (cf. also Modarress-Sadeghi 2007.)

14 E.g. Childe’s Oasis-theory (Childe 1954: 25).
In addition to the activities of North American archaeologists in southwest Iran, the French continued their excavations in Shush and nearby areas. In the first half of the 1960s, Roman Ghirshman,\textsuperscript{16} director of the French project, was interested in the historical periods of Shush and excavated the Achaemenid remains (Figure 2). During 1951–1962 he concentrated on excavating the early historic site of Chogha Zanbil, an Elamite centre some 30 km west of Shush (e.g. Carter 1992: 22–23, Matheson 2001: 80).

German teams were also working in western Iran, on both historical and early historical\textsuperscript{17} sites like Takht-e-Suleiman (e.g. Huff 1970) and Bastam (Kleiss 1970). Belgian excavations concentrated on the Lorestan area, where Louis Vanden Berghe and his team investigated the Bronze and Iron Age graves for almost two decades. They were looking for the origin of looted bronze artefacts which had been for sale, and very much sought after in European antiquities markets for decades. (Vanden Berghe 1971, also Chegini 1994, Modarress 2010.) British

\textsuperscript{15} The map (after Modarress-Sadeghi 2007) is based on different provinces and geographical areas of Iran. The idea for division is from Malek Shahmirzadi (2003), though it has been modified to suit present use.

\textsuperscript{16} Ghirshman was the director of French excavations project in 1946–1966.

\textsuperscript{17} In this study the chronology of Iranian archaeology is roughly divided in prehistoric (before c. middle of 4th millennium), early historic (c. middle of the 4th mill.–7th century BC), historic (equal with the time of the Persian empires c. 7th century BC–7th century AD) and Islamic (after 7th century AD) periods. Bronze Age and Iron Age are included in the early historic period.
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research was more diverse in terms of distribution of excavation sites and periods. The British excavated, among others, the Iron Age site of Tappeh Nousijan (e.g. Roaf & Stronach 1973) in western Iran, the historical site of Shahr-e Qomes (e.g. Matheson 2001: 105–106) in northern Iran and the Bronze Age site of Tappeh Bampur (e.g. De Cardi 1968) in southeastern Iran. One of the best known British-Canadian research sites was Siraf, an Islamic seaport town in the Persian Gulf (Whitehouse 1970, Niknami 2000: 22–23).

When discussing the preferences and research practices of Europeans in Iran or other parts of Western Asia, one should also bear in mind that research traditions in different European countries have varied a great deal. Apart from the North-American experiments with new methods and theories, more traditional approaches were also visible in the archaeology practised by different European countries in Iran. It is worth mentioning that, with few exceptions, foreign archaeologists did not pay much attention to the eastern part of the country (Figure 4) or to the Islamic or historic periods (Modarress-Sadeghi 2007, 2008: 6, see also Niknami 2000: 22).

5. Ethical considerations – archaeology for whom?

Johan Galtung (1970: 296) has defined scientific colonialism as a “process whereby the center of gravity for the acquisition of knowledge about the nation is located outside the nation itself. There are many ways in which this can happen. One is to claim the right of unlimited access to data from other countries. Another is to export data about the country to one’s own home country for processing into “manufactured goods” such as books and articles”.

One of the questions asked when conducting archaeological excavations should be for whom and to what ends the research is being made. Generally archaeological sites and artefacts and the information obtained from them, are understood to be part of the cultural heritage of the nation, the people, and of the area within whose borders the excavations are made (exceptions exist). When past foreign

---

18 Siraf was excavated by William Whitehouse on behalf of British Institute of Persian Studies and Royal Ontario Museum.
19 In British Archaeology, even thought cultural-historical in the main, theory building and discussions of different theoretical stands have for long been an integral part of archaeological endeavour, whereas, according to Härke (1995) German archaeological research has been more concerned with methods and their refinement, positivist in nature but still not processual. French archaeology also differs from Anglo-American practices and has been closely connected to the research tradition of history (Olivier & Coudart 1995).
20 Some notable excavations carried out by foreign archaeologists in eastern part of the country: American research (University of Harvard) in Tappeh Yahya (e.g. Lamberg-Karlovsky & Potts 2001) and Italian excavations (Istituto Italiano per ll Medio ed Estremo Orient) at Shar-e Sukhteh (Tosi 1970).
archaeological activities in Iran are examined from this viewpoint, there are certain ethical observations to be made.

How were the data collected and the results of excavations dealt with? Many, if not all, excavations conducted by foreign projects were done jointly with local archaeologists. But often the co-operation was limited merely to the presence of a representative of the Iranian Service of Archaeology at the excavations.\(^{21}\) Sometimes there were also other Iranian archaeologists and/or archaeology students taking part in the excavations (e.g. Negahban 1997: 80, Niknami 2000: 39) but they had little to say in the research itself. The research was done and the excavations directed by foreign archaeologists and, as a result, they also received sole recognition for merits of the research (see Sumner 2000: 48–50).\(^{22}\) According to Niknami (2000: 49) the locals continued to have only an organizing role in the excavations and that sometimes language or ideological and political differences acted as barriers to better co-operation.

It seems that Iranian sites were used as practical training-grounds by foreign archaeologists to experiment with their methods and theory building. A more or less similar phenomenon is clearly evident in other West Asian countries (see e.g. Meskell 1998, Matthews 2004). Besides from the dubious export of archaeological heritage in form of excavation finds and the exploitation of archaeological data, the feedback from the archaeological projects to the local specialists was rather poor. When foreign archaeologists moved away to work on other countries after 1979, many of the final excavation reports were left unwritten (see e.g. Potts 1999: 443, Niknami 2000: 22, 172–174). Most, if not all, of the reports, books and articles written concerning excavations, and Iranian archaeology in general, were in English or other European languages, and very little was available in Persian. One of the most fundamental requirements of the ethics of research and excavations conducted abroad should be that reports and results are made available also in native languages. Publications in Persian would be direly needed, since in Iran foreign literature was, and still is, hard to access (see Sajjadi 1997: 38, Niknami 2000: 41). Another matter concerning the foreign literature about Iranian archaeology is that references to research conducted by Iranians are very few indeed. This is also connected to the language issue and the availability of publications, both in Persian

\(^{21}\) Representatives of Iranian archaeologists were sometimes called “inspectors” by the foreign researchers, which they felt to be rather insulting. (Mousavi M 1990: 33, note 11).

\(^{22}\) See Tappeh Malayan excavations: Sumner 2000, 48–50. From the archaeological materials and data collected from Tall-e Malayan excavated by W. Sumner in the 1970s, nine PhD were completed by foreign students in different US and Canadian universities during 1971–1988. There are no mention of studies done by Iranians, were there any?
and other European languages apart from English. Some foreign researchers have taken no notice of research by Iranians (e.g. Dyson 1989)\(^\text{23}\) or publications in Persian, and Iranian archaeologists have not published very much in foreign languages. The latter is at least partly due to western publishing conventions, which are rather difficult for someone outside of Europe or America to comply with (e.g. Niknami 2000: 195, see also Olsen 1991 and Archaeologies 2008 for a debate on the importance of language in archaeological research). Another reason is simply that both locals and foreigners have left some of the research unpublished (Niknami 2000:172, Malek Shahmirzadi 2003: 236).


The 1960s saw a new beginning for local archaeological research in Iran, with the most active period during the 1970s. As often happens with archaeology, there were some central figures whose efforts form the basis for future research. In Iranian archaeology, two of these individuals were Ezat O. Negahban and Firouz Bagherzadeh. Both had completed their post-graduate studies abroad, as at that time it was still not possible to conduct PhD studies in Iran. Negahban, whom Iranians have called “the Father of Iranian Archaeology,” had acquired his PhD degree at the University of Chicago, and after returning to Iran in the late 1950s, he worked hard at actively promoting local archaeology (e.g. Mousavi M 1990: 14–15, Negahban 1997, Abdi 2001: 66, Malek Shamirzadi 2003: 52–54, Elima & Mortezaei 2003: 37). In 1970 Negahban inaugurated the annual field-school of Tehran University at the Dasht-e Qazvin sites of Tappeh Zagheh, Tappeh Sagzabad and Tappeh Ghabrestan. Field-school excavations and research at Dasht-e Qazvin are still ongoing today. At the outset they were among the few prehistoric excavations done by Iranians (see Modarress-Sadeghi 2007, 2008: 6).

Bagherzadeh had been educated in France, and he became the head of the newly-founded Centre for Archaeological Research (Peshoshkadeh-ye bastan shenasi) in 1972,\(^\text{24}\) which was a part of the Archaeological Service of Iran. Bagherzadeh started to arrange annual seminars where all Iranian and foreign archaeologists met to discuss together the fieldwork of the current season and published also short reports of the field-work (see Bagerzadeh 1974, Mousavi M 1990:16, Abdí 2001: 67, 23  In his article Rediscovering Hasanlu Dyson (1989) does not mention the earlier excavations done by Iranian archaeologists Hakemi and Rad in 1950, but he mentions surveys made by British A. Stein in the 1930s.

Malek Shamirzadi 2003: 47–48, 52, Elima & Mortezai 2003: 74). Bagherzadeh, and also Negahban, worked for prohibiting the exportation of excavation finds, which despite of being part of the Iranian national cultural heritage, had previously been transferred with little or no restrictions to western countries (see e.g. Mousavi M 1990: 19, Kaboli 1991, Malek Shahmirzadi 2003: 48).

Even in the most active years, local excavations did not reach the levels of foreign fieldwork. Iranians conducted less than half the number of excavations done by foreigners during the period 1960–1978 (Figure 5). Negahban (1997: passim) describes how local archaeologists continued to negotiate for their rights to conduct excavations. During the 1970s the growth of field activity is clearly noticeable, reaching to some kind of balance between foreign and Iranian excavations (Figure 5).

During 1960s and 1970s the number of local archaeological projects grew considerably. Iranians studied mostly historical times, studies on Persian Imperial periods being particularly encouraged by the government (see Niknami 2000: 39, 172, Abdi 2001: 67). However, it should be pointed out that although the latest methods and theories were practised in research and excavations by foreign archaeologists, there was a lack of local resources for the work (Negahban 1997: 204–205).

Nevertheless Negahban saw it necessary to have foreign researchers excavating in Iran, especially in the 1960s, because there was too few local educated archaeologists and other resources for the work (Negahban 1997: 204–205).

Figure 5. Comparison of the main archaeological excavations carried out in Iran during the 1960s and 1970s.
archaeologists in Iran, local research was not much influenced by these trends, and locals still applied more traditional methods. Their analyses were simply descriptive and lacked clear theoretical approach, whereas foreigners were working freely in all kinds of new research methods and theories. (Niknami 2000: passim.) Another reason for the use of more traditional methods was probably the lack of proper communication between the local archaeologists and their western counterparts.

7. Independence of Iranian Archaeology

After the 1979 revolution foreign fieldwork ceased, but Iranians continued their excavations and research. They faced many difficulties, partly due to lack of resources but particularly because of the Iran–Iraq war (1980–1988). Archaeological work did not completely grind to a stop but, given the prevailing conditions, it was certainly not a top priority. Not until after the war ended did archaeological activity begin to grow once more. The greatest increase was in the amount of surveys and related activities (Figure 6). Large areas of the country had not yet been surveyed and there was a need for the authorities to define archaeological sites so that decisions for future research and protection could be made (Mirathe-e Farhangi 1997: 94–95). Probably another reason was that surveying fieldwork demanded less funds and manpower. (Modarress-Sadeghi 2007: 39.)
There were also some changes in the locations preferred for excavation. Previously many excavations had been carried out in southern Iran, but during 1980–1998 excavation activity increased in central Iran: from the 56 excavated sites, 23 (41 %) were in central Iran. In addition, a few excavations were also carried out in the eastern and western parts of the country (Figure 7). Some of the excavations that had previously been conducted by foreign archaeologists were resumed by local researchers, like at Shahr-e Sukhteh (Sajjadi et al. 2003) and Shush (Kaboli 2000). Among Iranian academics a sense of history has always been strong (Niknami 2000: passim, Abdi 2001) and this factor combined with strong research traditions was probably the reason why Iranians continued to excavate historical period sites. Bruce Trigger (1996: 619) has seen Iranian archaeology turn to the research of Islamic period after the revolution. However, this is not visible with respect to the amount of conducted excavations, since the Iranians were keen to research Islamic periods even before revolution. The change was more noticeable as a negative general attitude towards kingship and imperial history, which for a brief period was reflected in the choice of the archaeological sites.

A part from an increasing amount of fieldwork, and its concentration in central Iran, there were no significant changes in local research methodologies. Archaeology, as is the case in many countries all over the world, is done more or less based on

---

26 A mount per cent of excavations on mainly Islamic periods during 1960–1978 was 26 % and 1980–1998 it was 25 % (Modarress-Sadeghi 2007: 33 Fig. 3, 42 Fig. 6, and Appendix 4).
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the existing western-based models (e.g. Özdoğan 1998: 111). Even in Iran, leading archaeologists had been educated in western universities (see Negahban 1997: 87–89) and thus followed western research practices. Nevertheless, as mentioned earlier, the new foreign research methods and theories were slow to spread in the archaeology conducted by Iranians.

After 1980 Iranian archaeology gained independence, even if at the same time Iran was practically left outside of the archaeological discourse in the international domain. As mentioned earlier, one of the reasons for this was that, until very recently, many of the excavations done in the 1960s and 1970s remained unpublished and the final reports were unwritten (e.g. Lamberg-Karlovsky & Potts 2001, Danti 2005). In the 1980s and 1990s the amount of publications dealing with Iranian archaeology fell dramatically (see Yule 1998: 828, Potts 1999: 443, Abdi 2001: 51). Iranian archaeology was seldom represented in the publications concerned with West Asian archaeology, and Iranian excavations and studies were seldom used as case-studies with the excuse of too little information and research (see e.g. Gates 2003, Maisels 2001). Yet Iranians did conduct research with a mean of ten excavations per year during 1988-1998 (Modarress-Sadeghi 2007: 39). One gets the impression that local studies were often ignored and that only western-directed excavations were taken into account and referred to, a matter which can hardly be regarded as ethical (see also Healy 1984). The issues of whose knowledge is valued and whose research is referred to are deeply connected to power relations and power balance in research. It forms part of a broader phenomenon of scientific research that is connected to colonial and imperial practices. The centre of accepted and valued knowledge are in the hands of west European and North American research institutions and academics. (See e.g. Olsen 1991, Preucel & Hodder 1996, Trigger 1996, Nicholas & Hollowell 2010.)

During the past ten years the excavations conducted by Iranians in Iran have continued with a quickening pace and greater diversity than before (e.g. Fahimi et al. 2004, Etemadi 2006). The Palaeolithic period is being studied (e.g. Roustaei et al. 2002) and eastern Iran has been incorporated better to areas of archaeological interest (e.g. Majidzadeh 2008). Foreign teams have slowly started their fieldwork in Iran once more, but now in full co-operation with their Iranian colleagues. One

27 This is easily seen by browsing any of the publications of international archaeology in the 1980s and 1990s.
28 Especially in the Jiroft area, there are numerous newly found Bronze Age settlements and burials, which give quite a new picture of the past of the area. (See Majidzadeh 2008, Azarnoush & Helwing 2005.) Earlier Shahdad had been the only main site in Eastern Iran excavated by Iranians, A. Hakemi in the 1970s and M. Kaboli in the 1990s.
of the first new joint-excavations was carried out during 2000-2004 in Arisman (Figure 8), Central Iran, where, in comparison to earlier foreign excavations, a more equal participation and co-operation between local and foreign researchers was established. (see Azarnoush & Helwing 2005: 208–209.)

In particular, the urgent need for large-scale rescue excavations linked to new dam and other construction projects has given impetus to renewed international co-operation in archaeological fieldwork and research (see e.g. Fazeli Nashli 2009).

8. Afterword

As in many other West Asian countries, Iranian archaeology during the 19th century and for the most of the 20th century remained mainly in the hands of European, North American or other foreign researchers. Much of the archaeological heritage of the country was transferred to foreign museums and collections. Even though many excavations and surveys were carried out, there is still a rather fuzzy view of the Iranian past. Perhaps partly due to the fact that after 1979 foreign archaeologists moved away to work in other, often neighbouring, countries and that, until recently, many of field reports had not been written and excavations had been left unpublished. This is maybe the reason why interpretations of the Iranian past tend to be rather conventional and grounded on old views and evidence. This has also contributed to the Iranian past being sidelined in archaeological discussions in the international domain.

The Iranians’ own archaeological research increased during the 1960s. Their excavation interests differed from those of the foreigners, especially North-Americans, who were not interested in the Iranian past per se. Instead they were mainly preoccupied with prehistoric and early historic sites, looking for information more connected to western civilization and their own interests and past. Both before and after the revolution, and until quite recently, Iranians have preferred to excavate historical sites themselves. However, during the last decade Iranian research has broadened its scope immensely and nowadays all periods are being studied.

Iran’s archaeological heritage is huge, and the resources for archaeological fieldwork are rather limited. Protection and conservation of the sites are needed, as in other countries with modern developments, urbanization, and construction projects, all of which pose a threat to archaeological sites, which are also being

29 Arisman excavations were conducted jointly mainly with Iranian Cultural Heritage Organization and Deutsches Archäologisches Institut and directed on Iranian side by N. Chegini and on Germans behalf by B. Helwing. Particularly, the 4th millenium mining and metallurgy was studied. (Azarnoush & Helwing 2005: 208–209.)
rapidly destroyed by looting. Archaeology is not a discipline that can flower in exclusion: co-operation and interaction are vital to increasing knowledge and preserving material and cultural heritage. During the last decade many European and North American researchers have returned, or are planning to return to work in Iranian archaeology. Now, excavations and research are expected to be done in full co-operation – as Massoud Azarnoush from the Iranian Archaeological Research Centre expressed – on an equal fifty-fifty basis (in Lawler 2003). Moreover it seems that the newest publications and reports have indeed been prepared by foreign and Iranian teams together (e.g. Etemadi 2006, Potts et al. 2005). Hopefully, the new co-operation will bring forth higher ethical considerations for the benefit of all partners: equal participation in research, appreciation of native research, publishing also in local language and greater involvement of local people in all aspects of archaeological projects. Publishing in the native/local language(s) of researched area, should be a part of every project, so that archaeological information will be distributed also at public level. The reward of these considerations, I believe, will be a better understanding of the past of the studied area for all concerned, be they foreign or local, laypersons or academics.

With the new projects in Iran there is the possibility of realizing the much discussed post-colonial and multi-vocal archaeology. Western Asian Archaeology has been compared to a mosaic, in which every part is important (Potts 1999: 443). Every new research carried out and published, I believe, is a piece of this mosaic, improving our understanding and the picture of the past of a place and its surroundings, and of humankind itself.

Figure 8. The site of the joint German–Iranian excavations in Arisman (off excavation season). Photo: Mi-rette Modarress 2002.
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Some thoughts on the workshop and Social Archaeology in Finland

Milton Núñez

In November 2009, the workshop On the use and critique of Social Archaeology was organized by the postgraduate archaeology students of the University of Oulu. I had made sure I had time to attend, not only because I was the department head, but also because I had a special interest in Social Archaeology. For the same reasons, I half volunteered and half was asked to write this overview. I thank the organizers for the privilege and for their fine organizing work.

The Oulu workshop was successful in achieving its goals. It created a venue for archaeology students and teachers from all Finnish universities to meet and discuss their views and research. The workshop offered an invited keynote by Timothy Insoll (2010) from the University of Manchester on his African research, Talensi animal sacrifice and its archaeological implications, and there were presentations by ten postgraduate students from all three archaeological institutes in Finland. These ten presentations covered a geographical area from the Circum-Baltic in the north to the Circum-Mediterranean in the south, and from Fennoscandia in the west to Iran and Siberia in the east. Chronologically, they spanned a range of time from the Middle Neolithic to the 20th century. All contributing students dealt with aspects of their own doctoral research, adapted to fit under the common umbrella that they felt the label “Social Archaeology” stood for. Their topic choices and contributions in the workshop bring us to the question of what Social Archaeology is today.

Social Archaeology

The term Social Archaeology was coined by Colin Renfrew in his inaugural lecture at the University of Southampton in 1973. Although I never had the opportunity to read the lecture, I imagine that it summarized the method and theory applied in Emergence of Civilization (Renfrew 1972). It could be said that Social Archaeology was in the air in the 1970s. Three years earlier, James Deetz (1970) had written an article entitled Archaeology as a Social Science, and a book bearing the same title in Spanish, La Arqueología como Ciencia Social, was published by Luis Lumbreras (1974) in Peru a year after Renfrew’s lecture. They were soon followed by a collection
of articles in *Social Archaeology: Beyond subsistence and dating* (Redman et al. 1978). Finally Renfrew came out with his book *Approaches to Social Archaeology* in 1984. The archaeology of society, which had seen its first light in the works of Gordon Childe and Grahame Clark decades earlier (e.g., Childe 1936, 1950, 1951; Clark 1939), had been baptized. Obviously Childe’s archaeology, which was influenced by Marxist theory, differed somewhat from Renfrew’s systemic approach, but they were both nevertheless archologies of society. Renfrew (1984: 4) sought to study “issues basic to our understanding of early human social institutions and the changes taking place within them”. In a way, Renfrew was calling for attention to some aspects of society that had been partly neglected in the processual movement (cf. Redman et al. 1978; Hodder 1982a, 1982b).

Although the society-oriented Social Archaeology of the 1970s and the early 1980s was clearly connected with the “New Archaeology”, the well-founded postprocessual critique eventually led to the incorporation of new issues and values into the realm of Social Archaeology. As a consequence, today one can observe the existence of two kinds of social archaeologies: the original one concerned with the structure of past societies and its changes, and a new one that seeks in addition to understand social issues in past societies and in archaeological research. Both bear the same name, but the first is more concerned with the societal and the latter with the social. Obviously, one could also claim that since humans are social creatures and their culture is socially transmitted, just about everything related to human culture, past and present, would qualify as social, as stated by one of the workshop contributors invoking Schiffer. If so, however, the term social would be somewhat redundant.

Fortunately the societal and social trends seem to be gradually merging as bridges are built between the processual-postprocessual poles (cf. Schiffer 2000; Hodder 2001; Renfrew & Bahn 2008; Shanks 2008; Johnson 2010). Both the societal/social dichotomy and the trends uniting them are palpable in the archaeological literature of the past decade (see the *Journal of Social Archaeology*) and, to a certain extent, in the papers presented at the Oulu workshop.

**Social Archaeology in Finland**

The workshop suggests that Social Archaeology is alive and well in Finland today, but this has not always been the case. In point of fact, Social Archaeology has been a fairly slow and late comer to Finland. There are no Finnish publications dealing with anything resembling the social approach of Childe and Renfrew prior
to the 1980s. Admittedly, some Finnish scholars had touched certain aspects of prehistoric society (e.g., Kivikoski 1939, 1955; Meinander 1954, 1961; Salo 1968, 1972), but the theory is superficial, the discourse descriptive, and the interpretations very ad hoc. In general there seems to be more preoccupation with settlement and chronology as suggested by finds and sites than with the structure of the society or its reconstruction; in other words, with cultures rather than societies. Not even Ella Kivikoski, who was a staunch Childe admirer (personal communication), comes close.

As far as I can tell, the first close encounter of Finnish archaeologists with Social Archaeology was in 1974, when Barry Cunliffe gave a lecture on Britain’s Iron Age society at the Helsinki Archaeology Department. He showed Thiessen polygons applied to the study of hillforts. It felt new and exciting, and some months later I was visiting British universities to learn about new methods in Archaeology. My intention was to learn about David Peacock’s petrographic ceramic studies, but there was also something unexpected. Mentioning my interest in the spatial relationships of Finnish Iron Age sites prompted “Social Archaeology”. It was, after all, less than two years after Renfrew’s inaugural lecture. Renfrew was unfortunately abroad then, but the other staff members made my visit very worthwhile. I returned to Helsinki with a suitcase bursting with literature, a head full of new ideas and a name for the kind of research I wanted to do.

It had to wait for the completion of my FL thesis in Geology (Núñez 1978), however. Then I went to work at the University of Calgary, Canada, where computer access was much easier. In spring 1980, the preliminary results of the analysis of Finnish Iron Age sites were ready, but although interesting they were not quite as expected. Neither sites nor hillforts were evenly distributed: the first were associated with waterways, the latter with abrupt topography. This work was interrupted by the prospect of a full PhD grant in Archaeology at Calgary (1984). Like Jesse Jennings (1994) and probably many more in our profession, I had become an accidental archaeologist. Moreover, the responsible “accident” was closely connected with Social Archaeology. Even if I do not see myself as a true social archaeologist, much of my work has been within the realm of Social (societal) Archaeology (e.g., Núñez 1993, 1995, 2004, 2009; Núñez & Okkonen 1999, 2005).

Things had begun to happen in Finland during my stay in Canada. The first Finnish publication that can be regarded as a serious attempt to “socially” interpret Finnish prehistoric society was the article *On the structure and emergence of*
Bronze Age society in coastal Finland, a systemic approach by the late Tapio Seger (1982). Seger frequently cites Renfrew and was clearly influenced by him. By the late 1980s, postprocessual issues had begun to permeate through in Finland, and this is observable in the 1990s. The development is obvious from the topic of the 4th Nordic Tag Symposium, held in Helsinki in 1992: The archaeologist and his/her realities (Tusa & Kirkinen 1995). In the following year, Jyri Kokkonen (1993) wrote the article Archaeology goes postmodern, which acknowledges the advent of the new postprocessual ideas. Furthermore, the last two decades have seen a gradual but ever-increasing interest in the societal and/or the social aspects of archaeology in Finland (e.g., Pihlman 1990, 1995, 2004; Söyrinki-Harmo 1992; Paavola 1995, 1998; Costopoulos 1999; Núñez & Okkonen 1999; 2005; Tuovinen 2002; Okkonen 2003; Herva 2004; Maaranen 2004; Mäntylä 2007; Ylimaunu 2007; Mannermaa 2008; Kiusela & Tiilikka 2008; Lahelma 2008; Puputti 2009; Vaneeckhout 2009a, 2009b; Äikäs et al. 2010; Wessman 2010; Nurmi 2011). This is also reflected by two recent events devoted to Social Archaeology, namely the Arkeologipäivät (Archaeology days) meeting of 2008 (Mökkönen & Seppälä 2009) and the Oulu workshop in 2009.

Heritage, ethics, gender

These central elements to the newer social brand of Social Archaeology deserve special treatment. The protection and preservation of ancient monuments has a long tradition in Finland. The current ancient monument legislation (63/295), with a few modifications and additions, stems from 1963. It is actually based on a previous legislation from 1883, but the earliest of such ordinances goes back to a 1666 royal decree promoting the preservation of old monuments from heathen times in the Swedish Kingdom. The 1883 law was closely connected with a movement to create a national identity against the impending threat of assimilation by the Russian Empire. Although national romantic feelings burned high then, they nevertheless waned a few decades after Finland gained her independence in 1917. The 1883 and 1963 legislations were successful in protecting many ancient monuments, but to many firms and business people they were, and still are, a nuisance. Yet, even if the law-afforded protection was good in comparison with many other countries, it was far from perfect. Regrettably, archaeologists’ complacency about the existing situation may have prevented improvement during the 1970s and 1980s. Fortunately, a renewed interest in CRM and efforts to promote the preservation of Finland’s cultural heritage seems to have developed in tact with other Social Archaeology
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issues in the past two decades (e.g., Asplund & Tiitinen 1994; Maranen 1997, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2008; 2010; Seppälä 2006; Kirkinen 2008; Niukkanen 2009). However, even if today the interest in preserving ancient monuments and heritage seems to stand at its highest in the last 80 years, the current threats are also more formidable. The current legislation has become somewhat out of date and there are continuous infringements from both the private and official sectors. As blatant examples of the latter, we can cite the recent disregard for historical remains in some Finnish cities and the auction of 180-year-old champagne from a shipwreck in 2011 (http://www.champagne.ax/).

Finnish archaeologists have also gone beyond the country’s borders to be involved in CRM and heritage protection projects abroad (e.g., Lönnqvist et al. 2006, 2007, 2011; Fiema & Fröösén 2008; Pellinen & Moustafa 2009). Moreover, some have become interested in the ethical issues of archaeological colonialism and the ownership of the past in former colonies and/or developing countries (e.g., Laulumaa 2008; Modarress 2009, 2010; Rissanen 2010). However, despite the awareness of these pressing problems abroad, Finnish archaeologists have done little with respect to the situation at home. I am referring to Fennoscandia’s own and Europe’s only indigenous people, the Sámi and their prehistory. The Sámi are generally regarded to be the earliest or among the earliest of Fennoscandia’s postglacial inhabitants, which is supported by various types of evidence (e.g., Voionmaa 1945; Saarikivi 2011; Sajantila 2011), but they play a minimal role, if any, in 20th-century reconstructions of Finland’s prehistory or early history. Less than 5 % of the pages in textbooks on Finnish prehistory deal with the Sámi (Tallgren 1931; Kivikoski 1964, 1967; Huurre 1979; Laaksonen et al. 1984; Edgren 1993) and they play an even lesser role in books on Finland’s history.

“It was not until the beginning of the Christian era that the Finns moved into Finland, replacing thus the former Germanic settlement and the wandering Lapps inland” (Jaakkola 1940: 8)."

“The Lapps ... apparently had been wandering in the territories to the north of the Finnish tribes for centuries” (Jutikkala & Pirinen 1966: 15)."

“There were only wandering Lapps here [Finland]” (Juva & Juva 1964: 45)."

The Sámi were seen by 20th-century Finnish historians much in the same manner as Aborigines were seen by British settlers in the 18th and 19th centuries.
They regarded Australia as “deserted and uninhabited” with a only few wandering Aboriginals (c. 750,000) and declared it Terra Nullius (Banner 2005: 112; Lindqvist 2005). Especially the statement by Juva & Juva (1964) is close to a Terra Nullius declaration in retrospect. As in the case of many indigenous groups around the world (e.g., Mamami Condori 1989), the Sámi seem to have been forgotten when the writing of Finland’s prehistory and history took place. There is an interesting and rare paradox with the Sámi in Finland's Archaeology. On the one hand, most scholars agree that they were the country’s original or very ancient inhabitants (e.g., Carpelan 1985), but there are very few mentions linking them or their ancestors with Finland's prehistoric record. This contrasts with the more liberal tendency of connecting artefacts and sites with the ethnic Finns (e.g., Hackman 1905; Kivikoski 1967; Meinander 1973, 1980; Luho 1976; Huurre 1998: 345–346; Carpelan 2001). Instances suggesting Sámi-artefact connections tend to be brief and cautious (e.g., Tallgren 1931: 150; Huurre 1979: 151, 1998: 348–350; Carpelan 1984, 2006a, 2006b; Halinen 2011). I have blamed all this on “cultural blindness” elsewhere (Núñez 2011), but in this forum I should perhaps refer to it as doxa; a Classic concept redefined by Pierre Bourdieu in 1972. Bourdieu’s (1977: 159–171) doxa refers to an established set of ideas that are perceived as self-evident and natural, thus remaining unchallenged. Things have certainly improved in the last 20–30 years, but the unintentional doxic effects seem to linger on. In a recently published book with a collection of 14 essays on various aspects of research on the Sámi today (Seurujärvi-Kari et al. 2011), many of the authors are not ethnic Sámi. To sum up, a distorted interpretation of Sámi history/prehistory exists and requires correction. As Inga-Maria Mulk and Inger Zachrisson (1999: 379) put it in connection with Sweden: “The history of the Sámi has for too long been ignored and an erroneous historical interpretation has been presented.”

Another typically doxic example concerns the issue of gender, or lack of it, in 20th-century Finnish archaeology. The earliest serious attempt is a 1982 PhD thesis by Pirkko-Liisa Lehtosalo-Hilander, who dealt with social differentiation and, particularly, the role of women in Finnish society c. 800–1200 AD. Since this work precedes most of the early postprocessual and gender archaeology publications, she may have been influenced by the gender awareness that rose during the 1970s in Scandinavia and/or by its archaeologist pioneers on the subject (e.g., Rydh 1926; Dommasnes 1976). Otherwise the few references to the roles of women and men in prehistoric Finland reflect traditional early 20th-century values: men went out to hunt, women stayed close to the home and gathered. This can be seen in Säkari Pälsi’s (1916) Stone Age reconstructions of 95 years ago, but also more
recently in the suggestion that small (<10 cm) battle axes are “boys’ toys” and the illustrations of two semipopular books by archaeologists (Huurre 1998; Purhonen & Miettinen 2006; see however Leskinen & Pesonen 2009: 115). Admittedly this is a global phenomenon (e.g., Burt 1987; Gifford-Gonzalez 1993), but in Finland’s case there is evidence suggesting the opposite in rock art (Sarvas 1969) and early historical documents (e.g., Tacitus, Germania: 140–141; Olaus Magnus, Historia de gentibus septentrionalibus: 193; Tegengren 1965). Nevertheless, the question of gender is beginning to be addressed by some of the younger generation of Finnish archaeologists (e.g., Kuokkanen 2006, 2008a, 2008b, 2009; Lipkin 2010).

The workshop contributions

One of the reasons why I was interested in this workshop was my curiosity about the nature of what the younger generation of Finnish archaeologists regarded as Social Archaeology. Since the contributors had begun their studies after the advent of postprocessualism, I wanted to see how much was societal, which was originally part of the “New Archaeology”, and how much had to do with the social aspects that may have developed as a result of postprocessual influences. There are ten contributors, six women and four men, and, as mentioned earlier, their papers vary greatly in both geography and chronology. There is also the factor of the researchers’ experience. When the workshop was held, some of the contributors were close to their respective PhD disputation dates (Salmi (Puputti) 2009; Vaneckhout 2009; Immonen 2010; Lipkin 2010), while others had barely begun their PhD research (Lehtola). In other words, some were quite familiar with their data and had concrete results to present, whereas others were still at various stages of the process of organizing, delimiting and studying their material. Bearing this in mind, let us briefly look into the ten contributions.

There is a more or less continuous spectrum going from the more processual societal approach of Vaneckhout’s paper at one end to the fully social topic of Modarress’s at the other. Kuusela’s paper is also clearly societal, though is not as ecologically oriented as Vaneckhout’s, and he draws abundantly on Bourdieu’s ideas. Similarly, the topic of Lehtola’s paper appears to be close to that of Modarress, though the actual aims of her research are still vague at the start of her research. Immonen’s interesting and highly theoretical paper on defining the medieval is in turn difficult to place. Although it definitely deals with societal/social issues, the fact that less than one-third of the works cited concern archaeology places it, in my opinion, closer to postmodern historical discourse than archaeology. The remaining
five articles serve as a bridge between the societal and social ends of the spectrum, even if I found it very difficult to rank their societal/social orientations. Though dealing mainly with society, some choices and arguments of these five contributors place them within the social sphere associated with the postprocessual movement.

Kouki, like Vaneeckhout, deals with resiliency, but she refers to the survival of religious elements and not to the ecological concept of resiliency used by Vaneeckhout. The papers by Kouki, Lipkin and Tuppi observe the development and change of certain features related to ritual/religion through time, which can be seen as a processual aspect. On the other hand, Hamari and Kouki address domination-resistance issues, the ability of subjugated groups to preserve their identity despite their subordinate position in society (Miller et al. 1995), which is a more postprocessual topic. This also applies to Lipkin’s attempt to connect some forms of cloth weaving with ritual. Hamari and Lipkin also seek the social significance of “low level” artefacts (roof tiles, loom weights) that are often ignored by archaeologists. Salmi’s paper stands alone in seeking the obscure beginnings of pet-keeping in North Finnish early urban centres, but it is clearly anchored in the new Historical Archaeology approach. A surprising and somewhat disappointing point is that gender is not addressed in these ten studies. Lipkin touches the subject of cloth manufacture by women, but this is rather superficial and does not go as deep as in her PhD thesis (Lipkin 2010).

All the workshop papers deal with past/present societal/social phenomena and, consequently, may be seen as Social Archaeology. With the exception of Vaneeckhout’s strong societal-processual orientation and, perhaps, Immonen’s highly postmodern discourse, all other authors show a healthy mixture of processual and postprocessual aspects in their work. By this I am referring to a middle ground that exploits useful elements from both approaches. In other words, based on their topic and arguments, this collection of papers bridges not only the societal with the social, but also the processual with the postprocessual.

Final remarks

I have already expressed my satisfaction with the workshop and the contributions. As can be expected, there are certain points that could be questioned or contested. I have chosen not to do that, but I wish to address what may be a source of worry for the future. Despite the long-established affiliation of Social Archaeology with theory, the proportion of theoretical discussion in some workshop papers is not very high. This may well be because they are only dealing with some aspect(s) of
the authors’ PhD research, the theoretical discussions being left to the theses.

On the other hand, Finnish Archaeology is known for not being very explicit about theory. This certainly applies to the older generations of Finnish archaeologists, but hopefully not to the younger and future ones. Nevertheless, there is something very familiar - *déjà vu* - like in the lack of discussion about method and theory in some of the workshop papers. In some cases theoretical support is sought almost ad hoc from one of the theory “gurus” (Binford, Bourdieu, Hodder, Preucel, Schiffer), but the actual discussion about the choice of method and theory and their application is minimal. I may be seeing ghosts but cannot help wondering: is this another case of *doxa*?
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