

North and South, East and West

- Archaeology with and without borders

The aim of the session is to critically discuss borders and boundaries in archaeological research and the impact of nationalism on the archaeological mapping of the past. The aim is to contribute to a critical examination of the geographies and cartographies of archaeology, and to explore alternative approaches to the conceptualization and representation of cultures and peoples in the past, such as – possibly – the use of networks, flows and movements, instead of bounded, static and monolithic entities. We thus invite papers discussing archaeological borders in theory and practice, and papers exploring how national boundaries and other kinds of borders on interregional, regional and local levels are constructed, represented and debated in archaeological research.

Examples of relevant themes might include, among many others, Northern Fennoscandia, where the nation-state boundaries have fundamentally formed and delimited the images of prehistory, the divide between “East” and “West” (the “Iron curtain”), which has cut through the political and archaeological landscapes of Europe, or the northern and southern dimensions within Swedish or Norwegian archaeology. We also invite papers examining perspectives that are challenging established borders (but at the same time perhaps creating new borders), such as for instance the geographical, political and ethnic notion of Sápmi, which stretches across the nation-state boundaries in northernmost Europe, or different kinds of ideas and social and cultural movements that are questioning existing boundaries between people.

We welcome papers focusing on different geographical regions, in the Nordic countries, Europe and other parts of the world – a wide range of geographical and temporal themes will be fruitful for the discussions. The focus of the papers might be, among other possibilities, research historical, exploring the historical constructions, re-constructions and de-constructions of borders, theoretical, reflecting upon the conceptualization and impact of different kinds of borders and their interrelations with concepts such as archaeological cultures, identity, ethnicity, nationality, indigeneity and gender, and/or practical, discussing positive as well as negative experiences from cross-boundary approaches or projects in archaeology.

Chair: Carl-Gösta Ojala, Department of Archaeology and Ancient History, Uppsala University
carl-gosta.ojala[at]arkeologi.uu.se

Nationalism in archaeology: on borders and definitions

Research focusing on nationalism in the history of archaeology has been lively but less attention has been paid to concepts and their definitions. This paper will give an overview of these questions.

What are the essential criteria of nationalism as a background factor of archaeology? What is nationalist prehistory and how does it differ from national prehistory? Is there ethnic archaeology without nationalism? Is nationalism a taboo in some histories of archaeology? How can we map the grey area between clearly nationalistic and non-nationalistic prehistories?

East and North European nationalism is generally considered language-based and ethnic in character. Was a state nationalism over language borders possible in the early 20th-century Finland? Is it possible that a scholar has opposed one type of nationalism but represented another one him- or herself?

Is it more nationalistic to write (pre)history and define cultures within nation-state borders or across them? If we accept an expansionist tendency as a sign of nationalism in research, when does an archaeologist cross a state border expansively? Are ethnic connections across the border enough or is something else needed? How about settlement continuation contra immigration?

Defining our concepts is a first precondition for reaching reliable and well-founded research results.

Timo Salminen, Archaeology, University of Helsinki
timo.salminen[at]pp3.inet.fi

Defining Edges and Districts – *ceramiscene* in the territory of Nepi (VT, Lazio, Italy)

Mills and Rajala (2011) introduced the concept of *ceramiscene*, a landscape that is defined by the manufacture, use and discard of artefacts made from fired clay. This is a method of integrating information from ceramic artefacts with landscape elements.

This paper further explores the ways Lynch's (1960) elements of urban form can be used to define rural legibility. The ceramic information associated with these elements is developed to provide hierarchies of nodes and districts and more indirectly pathways and the permeability of boundaries.

This allows an articulation of the change of site type and status within the living landscape, based upon ceramic analysis in terms of date, ware, fabric supply and fineware and functional characteristics (Evans 2001). The results of this pottery analysis can be used to highlight different ceramic distributions and sources of supply. Combined with the computer-assisted analysis of local terrain the integration of landscape and ceramic analysis is found to be a powerful tool in defining Districts.

As a case study we present the ceramiscene of the area around Nepi from c. 3rd BC to 7th century AD. The material analysed was collected during the *Nepi Survey Project* (di Gennaro *et al.* 2002; 2008; Rajala 2006) in the territory of ancient Nepes, modern Nepi, north-west of Rome in 1999 and 2000 under the umbrella of the Tiber valley project.

Bibliography

- di Gennaro, F., Cerasuolo, O., Colonna, C., Rajala, U., Stoddart, S. and Whitehead, N. 2002 The recent research on the city and territory of Nepi (VT). *Papers of the British School at Rome* 70, 29-77.
- di Gennaro, F., Rajala, U., Rizzo, D., Stoddart, S. and Whitehead, N. 2008 Nepi and territory: 1200 BC–400 AD, in Coarelli, F., and Patterson, H. (eds.), *Mercator Placidissimus – The Tiber Valley in antiquity. New research in the upper and middle valley*. Quasar.
- Evans J. 2001 Material approaches to the identification of different Romano-British site types, in James, S., and Millett, M. (eds.), *Britons and Romans: advancing an archaeological agenda*, C.B.A. Res Rept 125, York, 26-35.
- Lynch, K.1960 *The Image of the City*. Methuen.
- Mills, P., and Rajala, U. 2011 Interpreting a ceramiscene landscape – the Roman pottery from the Nepi Survey Project, in D. Mladenović and B. Russell (eds.), *TRAC 2010. Proceedings of the Twentieth Annual Theoretical Roman Archaeology Conference, Oxford 2010*, Oxford, 1-17.
- Rajala, U. 2006 Le ricerche della Scuola Britannica a Nepi: indagini e prospettive, in Francocci, S. (ed.), *Archeologia e Storia a Nepi*, vol. I (Quaderni del Museo Civico di Nepi 1) , 86-94. Museo Civico di Nepi.

Philip Mills, University of Leicester & Ulla Rajala, University of Oulu/University of Cambridge
umr20[at]cam.ac.uk, cbmphil[at]aol.com

Mapping the past in Iranian Archaeology

The Archaeology of Southwest Asia rose as the result of the interest of European and North-American scholars in this region's past. One of the reasons was that Southwest Asia had been considered to hold the roots of Western civilization, which inspired studies in the early development of civilization in the area. By defining different cultural traits and entities as well as their geographical and chronological distributions, archaeologists were also creating borders and mapping the past.

Iran got its share of this interest, and early archaeology in the country was conducted mainly by foreign researchers. These delegations also defined the sites and periods studied as well as

the theories to be formulated and applied. Contrary to the foreign research, Iranians were keen to study historical times and the Iranian elements in the archaeological data.

Mirette Modarress, Archaeology/University of Oulu
mirette.modarress[at]oulu.fi

Viking Age Scandinavia and the Eastern Baltic – societies and communication

Although abundant literature has been written about Viking Age East-West communication and routes over the Baltic Sea, the present Baltic States often seem to have been left out in these discussions. However, the most convenient water routes from Scandinavia towards the East started on these areas, suggesting intensive interaction between the eastern and western coasts of the sea.

The ethnic diversity of the Eastern Baltic was and still is conspicuous in comparison with the rest of northern Europe. The same variability presumably characterised pre-state political systems in this area - or at least our interpretations of them tend to be diverse and dependant on present-day political borders.

The societies in the northern half of the Eastern Baltic region demonstrate very long-lasting traditions of collegial power systems, more egalitarian social systems and gender roles. The southern half, on the other hand, can be characterised as deeply stratified, demonstratively warrior-centralized and male-dominated society.

This paper intends to discuss ethnic questions, how they have been seen in different countries, and how they might have influenced interpretations of Viking Age societies and communication between them.

Marika Mägi, Archaeology, Tallinn University
marika.magi[at]mail.ee

Subsystem at sea - The wooden sailing ship of Scandinavia

The study at hand aims to view the development and morphology of the wooden vessels in Scandinavia. These were used between Sweden and Finland mainly for trade. Evidence in form of a wreck can be found in Tornio that is the northernmost case, the southernmost example in Danish waters. Especially the model of the sailing ship in 16th and 17th Century is of interest in this paper and its hull construction. Evidence used in this study is a) based on pictorial evidence b) based on linguistic evidence c) archaeological material studied with the methods of Marine Archaeology. It can be seen as

a bridge between social sciences and archaeology. The methodology and technology are developing by and by.

The boat's history in Scandinavia has begun from three kinds of making habits. The early development of the bigger merchant ship has evolved of a rural sailing boat used for sailing in peasant trade, the size of which grew. Archaeological remains testify of a sailing tradition crossing the borders of surrounding countries in the waters of the Gulf of Bothnia, the Eastern Sea and the southern parts of the North Sea. A universal Scandinavian type of a sailing vessel is found in this study.

Lilli Nordin, Archaeology, University of Oulu

lnordin[at]mail.student oulu.fi

Archaeology from the Margin – Alaskan archaeology & the boundaries of the 'primitive north'

"The north" has throughout the disciplinary history of archaeology often been portrayed as primitive and primordial; usually in contrast to a culturally more evolved south. The model of a primitive north and civilised south, perceived as dichotomies following different rules in organising their societies, has influenced the archaeological interpretations of the cultures in these areas; one focusing on nature, the other on culture.

Northern indigenous groups are for many a "people without history" and this has long been considered the case for the Yup'ik peoples of southwest Alaska. The Yupiit have been ethnographically well known from the 19th century onwards, yet archaeologically their pre-contact culture is virtually unknown. This has reinforced a popular picture of Yup'ik culture as primordial, unchanging, simple and ruled by the environment. Lack of archaeological investigation and material has allowed prejudicial assumptions about 'northern cultures' to fill in the blanks. Recent finds from Alaska challenge traditional stereotypes of Eskimo/Inuit culture history and suggest a much more complex and nuanced development over time

In cooperation with the Yup'ik village of Quinhagak Alaska the University of Aberdeen, UK has in recent years undertaken one of the largest scale archaeological investigations ever conducted in this area. In this paper we intend to discuss and challenge the notion of the "primitive north" along with the artificial nature-culture dichotomy prevailing in modern archaeology. We will also review and re-examine the culture area boundaries set for the Yup'ik and more southerly Alutiiq by anthropological tradition, which are based on the history of colonial contact and research in defiance of ancient and commonly shared languages and belief systems of the peoples of the Yukon-Kuskokwim Delta, Alaska Peninsula, Kodiak Archipelago, Kenai Peninsula and Prince William Sound.

Charlotta Hillerdal & Rick Knecht, Archaeology, University of Aberdeen
c.hillerdal[at]abdn.ac.uk, r.knecht[at]abdn.ac.uk

East and West, North and South in Sápmi – boundaries and networks in Sámi archaeology

The aim of this paper is to discuss some aspects of the construction of entities, networks and boundaries in archaeological research, focusing on the notions of Sápmi and Sámi archaeology. In the paper, I would like to explore the notion of Sápmi and its historical and contemporary, political and scientific contexts, and its relevance for archaeological and historical studies. How has Sápmi, and the boundaries of Sápmi in time and space, been defined and represented by different actors? How has Sámi archaeology been conceptualized in relation to the national archaeologies in the different states? How have the state boundaries and the nationalist cartographies in Sápmi been challenged within the field of Sámi archaeology, and have any new boundaries and oppositions emerged?

By examining some of the debates and controversies concerning Sámi (pre-)history in the border zones of Sápmi, one might be able to analyze the ways in which identities and cultures in the past and the present have been constructed, and how these areas have been mapped and represented by archaeologists and others. Some examples of border zones could be the South Sámi area in Norway and Sweden, the Tornedalen region in Sweden and Finland, and the White Sea area in Russia. What alternative views on and ways of relating to the past, and archaeology as a subject and practice, have been expressed in these debates? What is the importance of archaeology in Sápmi, and what is the importance of Sápmi for archaeology?

Carl-Gösta Ojala, Archaeology, Uppsala University
carl-gosta.ojala[at]arkeologi.uu.se