



*Stupca, eastern Wielkopolska region, Poland. This aerial photograph shows a fortified settlement from the Early Iron Age period (Hallstatt), located at the bottom of the Mieszna River valley. In the mid 1950s a small dam was built and an artificial lake flooded the site. Only small scale excavations were carried out (by Tadeusz Malinowski) before the flooding. The top of the rampart is above the water level and creates good conditions for trees and vegetation to grow; however, wave action is slowly destroying the rampart's remains. The photograph, by Włodzimierz Rączkowski, was taken for a dating and survey project, led by Anthony Harding, in 2004–2006 (reported by Harding and Rączkowski in *Antiquity* 84: 386–404 (2010)).*



The Late Antique (fifth–sixth centuries AD) monastic settlement of Ganub Qasr al-'Aguz in Bahariya Oasis (Egypt) has been excavated since 2009 by a joint archaeological mission of the French Institute of Oriental Archaeology (Cairo) and Macquarie University (Sydney), directed by Dr. Victor Ghica. Here, assisted by two Egyptian workmen, the archaeologist is photographing graffiti in the troglodytic part of one of the buildings which comprise the settlement. The photograph captures the subtle balance between the fragile desert twilight and the bright lighting of the lamp. Image by Yann Bélier.

EDITORIAL

🍷 In this modern globalised world we are entirely unsurprised to be connected to distant lands and peoples. Our food, our cars, our clothes are often made on the far side of the globe, and newspapers and laptops bring us instant news of happenings many thousands of miles away. It wasn't so in prehistory. Yet the scale and significance of early contact remain a fascinating area of controversy and research. That can include the first settlement of new lands, such as the maritime colonisation of the remote Mariana Islands (Fitzpatrick & Callaghan in *Antiquity* 87: 840–853 (2013)). Or it may take the form of contact between existing established communities, who exchange objects, ideas and, conceivably, people. One of the key ingredients in this mix is the movement of foodstuffs. The meals we eat today combine cultivated plants and animals from many different sources, and provide a snapshot in miniature of the diversity and success of domestication: potatoes from the central Andes, rice from the middle Yangtze, wheat from the Fertile Crescent, tomatoes from highland Mexico, to name but a few. We know the history of some of these exchanges—the Columbian exchange, for example, that brought New World cultigens to Eurasia. For many of the others, however, going further back in time, we are dependent on archaeology to record how they came into cultivation and when and where they spread.

Maize is one of those crops that has made its way around the world and is today consumed by countless millions. Another, more surprisingly, is the sweet potato, that somehow crossed from South America to Oceania in pre-Columbian times. Most likely the Polynesian voyagers in their sophisticated outrigger and double-hulled canoes sailed beyond Rapa Nui to make landfall in Chile or Peru, and then returned with their new crop in hand. Or just possibly, as Thor Heyerdahl argued half a century ago, the connection went the other way, and it was South American voyagers who brought the sweet potato to Polynesia. If so, they left nothing else that archaeologists can trace.

The story of the sweet potato cautions us against assuming that people, plants and other things didn't travel far in prehistory. On the other hand, archaeologists in the twentieth century struggled hard to free themselves from the diffusionist assumptions of earlier generations and quite rightly today they demand secure and reliable evidence before accepting claims of distant contact. And here the development of AMS dating over the past 20 years plays a crucial role. The ability to date seeds and plant fragments directly removes all the potential ambiguity associated with context: the possibility, for example, that tiny seeds may have slipped down through the layers to become lodged among much earlier deposits. That is the story told in this issue of *Antiquity*, in the curious case of broomcorn millet (Motuzaite-Matuzeviciute *et al.*, pp. 1073–85). This nutritious cereal (used today for wild birdseed or animal feed) was first cultivated in northern China some 8000 or 9000 years ago. The early farming village of Cishan in the northern plains had storage pits full of the debris, showing just how important a crop it was. But when did it first appear in Europe? Were there really far-flung connections across the Eurasian steppes to Bandkeramik farming sites in Central Europe, as some earlier studies have suggested? Direct AMS dating of the grains concerned gives a decisive 'no' to that hypothesis, and shows just how easily such small fragments can move between layers. But the movement of plants and animals

from continent to continent is a key ingredient in the formation of the modern world, even if the timings have sometimes to be adjusted.

Prehistory and World Heritage Sites

🏰 The university from which I am writing this editorial has the unique distinction (in the UK at least) of having a World Heritage Site—Durham Castle and Cathedral—at its core. Archaeological sites have featured abundantly on the register of World Heritage Sites set up by the UNESCO Convention since its adoption in 1972. They include Rapa Nui; the Nazca lines; the Maya cities of Tikal, Copan and Palenque; the Giza pyramids and the Abu Simbel temples; and the Palaeolithic painted caves of Lascaux and Altamira. These are all the kinds of places that visitors can see and appreciate: it is fairly obvious why they have been included, and not too difficult to explain why they are important. The aim, of course, is not only to recognise them but to protect and preserve them against inappropriate development or neglect. UNESCO can claim a number of successes to its credit, including the restoration of the Angkor temples in Cambodia in the 1990s. The World Heritage programme itself grew out of the campaign to relocate and rescue the Abu Simbel temples from the rising waters of Lake Nasser in the 1960s.

The Operational Guidelines that support the World Heritage Convention are regularly updated and set out how the objectives of the programme are to be achieved. They have a predictable preoccupation with management and conservation, but research also features in a number of places. How are we to value these sites if we don't understand them? The recent excavations at Lumbini in Nepal were undertaken with this in mind. What were the origins of the major Buddhist shrine developed at the site identified as the birthplace of the Buddha? Investigations by Robin Coningham and his team, reported in this issue (pp. 1104–23) have revealed the humble beginnings in the form of a timber railing surrounding a sacred tree. This is not only important to archaeologists, but also to the thousands of pilgrims who flock to the shrine.

Yet the relationship of archaeology to World Heritage Sites is not without controversy. As UNESCO itself admits, the listings are very unbalanced from country to country: there are, for example, 49 World Heritage Sites in Italy but only three in Iraq. The tension between expert testimony and indigenous communities has recently been pointed out, as well as the political manoeuvrings that afflict any organisation that works through existing national governments. That is no reason, however, not to see the World Heritage Convention as a potential asset in protecting and promoting archaeology throughout the world.

One recent initiative has been the addition of more prehistoric sites to the World Heritage list. The HEADS programme (Human Evolution: Adaptations, Dispersals and Social Development) aims to redress the under-representation of 'properties with strong links to human origins'. The challenge is to determine how the World Heritage Site methodology can best be applied to places that are famous for what has been found at them and what that represents, as much as for what is visibly preserved. A good British example might be Star Carr in Yorkshire. The remains (those that have not been removed to museum displays) are essentially hidden, but that in itself in no way detracts from its importance in the postglacial human settlement of Northern Europe.

The HEADS programme has held a number of meetings to work through these and similar issues. The emphasis is on human evolution, dispersal and important cultural transitions, including the adoption of agriculture, and one of the key objectives, as always, is conservation. Prehistoric sites may require a different kind of management process that more readily allows continuing research. We will also need to explain these sites more fully than would be necessary for an Egyptian temple or a medieval city. Prehistoric sites lack the evident visibility of later remains, but they are exemplars of key processes. So they demand the development of particular kinds of narratives if they are going to be convincing to ordinary citizens. But that surely is the challenge facing the great majority of prehistoric archaeology.

Maize and murals at Tehuacán

The most recent of the HEADS meetings was held in Mexico in the beautiful setting of Puebla. Close by is one of the prehistoric sites being considered for World Heritage



Detail of the mural in the Palacio Municipal, Puebla, Mexico, showing Richard MacNeish (second from left).

status: the Tehuacán Valley, made famous by the excavations of Richard MacNeish and his team in the 1960s. Plant remains preserved in several dry caves in the valley seemed to show hunter-gatherers switching slowly but surely from wild foods to cultivation over thousands of years. Maize cobs—the key staple—grew bigger and bigger over the same period, under human interference, until at last they were large enough to support whole communities. That evidence threw a new and surprising light on the ‘Neolithic revolution’ as it was then understood in the Old World. Could it be that agriculture didn’t happen suddenly, as Childe and others had assumed, but only very gradually? And what was the attraction of some of the early domesticates found in these caves, such as bottle gourds and chilli peppers? They were hardly the way to feed a family.

The dates themselves have since been challenged and defended, but MacNeish (who died in 2001) has become something of a hero figure in the Tehuacán municipality. In the entrance hall of the Palacio Municipal, the rear wall above the stairway is decorated with a large and colourful fresco depicting worthies from Tehuacán’s

distant and more recent past; and there, sure enough, is Richard MacNeish. It can't be very often that archaeologists end up in honorific positions in municipal buildings in this way.

The Shanghai Archaeology Forum

☞ A major event of the summer was the launch of the Shanghai Archaeology Forum headed by Professor Wang Wei, Director of the Institute of Archaeology at the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences. The Forum's key aim is to promote archaeological enquiry of past cultures and civilisations worldwide and the relevance of this research to the contemporary world. It also encourages archaeologists to engage with the wider public on issues such as sustainability and globalisation, and to protect and preserve archaeological resources and cultural heritage.

The Forum is a fitting illustration of the vigour and ambition of current Chinese archaeology. The pace of research and discovery is breathtaking, and it is becoming more widely known beyond China through publication in western academic journals. *Antiquity* has featured a steady stream of Chinese archaeology in recent issues, from the Middle Palaeolithic to the Han period, and from the southern coastlands to the northern frontier. It is excellent to see Chinese archaeology taking its proper place within the broad panorama of archaeology, and reaching out to archaeologists internationally. We are grateful to Colin Renfrew for the following account of the inaugural meeting:

“The first Shanghai Archaeology Forum was held from 22 to 27 August 2013, and proved to be an occasion of considerable significance for world archaeology. For the first time in China, a truly international approach was taken to archaeological research and heritage conservation. Conceived as a biennial event the forum is jointly organised by the Municipality of Shanghai (represented by the Mayor of Shanghai at the opening ceremony) and by the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, specifically the Institute of Archaeology in Beijing, whose director is Dr Wang Wei.

The theme for 2013 was the comparative archaeology of early civilisations. An advisory committee and a selection committee of archaeologists from all continents had chosen a list of ten field projects and nine research findings (out of 99 nominated) and the programme contained a presentation by each, as well as a series of invited presentations from ‘keynote’ speakers, some devoted to public archaeology and heritage conservation.

Meetings were held in the China Art Museum Shanghai (formerly the Expo Shanghai China Pavilion) and were attended by a dazzling array of international archaeologists, including representatives from most of the provinces of China. Further details can be found on the Shanghai Forum website: <http://shanghaiarchaeologyforum.org>. The meeting concluded with an all-day visit to the Late Neolithic site of Liangzhu, west of Shanghai, whose new museum contains an impressive display documenting the walled settlement and its burials, with remarkable and beautifully worked jade objects found in secure archaeological contexts.

Certificates were presented to the 19 nominated projects which ranged widely over the continents, with notable presentations on Angkor; the south Indian historic centre of Kodumanai; Göbekli Tepe; the sacred centre of the first metallurgists of the Urals; settlements near the Pyramids of Egypt; Maya Ceibal in Guatemala; the archaic (Late Neolithic) city of Liangzhu near Shanghai; ancient temples of the Upper Amazon in Peru; monuments in

© Antiquity Publications Ltd.

Tally for 2013, by *Antiquity* period. The paper relating to each topic may be located in the index, using the lead author's name given in brackets.

PLEISTOCENE

1. *Before 100K BP*: a new theory for bipedalism (Winder); small tools in the Levantine Acheulean (Chazan);
2. *100–25K BP*: the social construction of caves and rockshelters (Delannoy); Upper Palaeolithic China (Li); plant foods at Dolní Věstonice (Pryor);
3. *25–10K BP*: Magdalenian colonisation of the Alps (Mevel); raptors and tortoises at Wadi Jilat (Martin); human representations in the Magdalenian (Fuentes);

HOLOCENE

1. *8000–5000 BC*: rock art in Saudi Arabia (Jennings); DNA evidence for barley introductions to Europe (Jones); identifying public spaces at Çatalhöyük (Shillito); rice farmers in China (Zhang); earliest occupation at Dikili Tash (Lespez); a Mesolithic hunter-gatherer cemetery in Latvia (Nilsson Stutz); dating the Initial Neolithic in Greece (Perlès); cycles of change in Jomon settlements (Crema);
 2. *5000–4000 BC*: ‘blubber lamp’ residue analysis (Heron); archaeobotany at an Ubaid house (Graham); rethinking the Copper Age chronology of the Carpathians (Raczky); tin bronzes in Eurasia (Radivojević);
 3. *4000–3000 BC*: animal exploitation in Neolithic Europe (Manning); ‘leopard traps’ in Israel (Porat); isotope analysis of marine consumption in Shetland (Montgomery); ditched enclosures in Iberia (Márquez-Romero); wooden artefacts from the Trans-Urals (Chairkina);
 4. *3000–2000 BC*: rice and millet agriculture in China (d’Alpoim Guedes); olives in the Bronze Age Aegean (Margaritis); rock and cave art in Tennessee (Simek); snow patch bow and arrows from Norway (Callanan); Bronze Age warriors in Sudan (Hafsaas-Tsakos);
 5. *2000–1000 BC*: modelling journeys to the Marianas (Fitzpatrick); Mycenaean influences in Nordic razors (Kaul); an Akhenaten-era cemetery at Amarna (Kemp); dating broomcorn millet in Europe (Motuzaitė-Matuzevičiūtė);
 6. *1000–0 BC*: burial mounds and settlement patterns in Dobrogea (Oltean); Early Horizon soundscapes in Peru (Helmer); rethinking the Heuneburg (Fernández-Götz); Chinese ritual vessel assemblages (Beckman); dating stupas in Sri Lanka (Bailiff); elite tombs in China (Wu); first towns in the central Sahara (Mattingly); terraced agriculture in the Caucasus (Korobov); excavating the birthplace of the Buddha (Coningham);
 7. *AD 0–1000*: megalithic burials in India (Haricharan); an Iron Age tunic from a Norwegian glacier (Vedeler); isotopes and the Romano-British diet (Müldner); Pyrenean pitch production (Orengo); herding cattle in southern Africa (Orton); a Late Antique south Arabian king sculpture (Yule); pubic covers from Brazil (Prous); social change among the Picts (Noble); a Swahili trading village on Pemba Island (Fleisher); feasting in Viking Age Iceland (Zori);
 8. *AD 1000–1500*: a new chronology for Great Zimbabwe (Chirikure); Richard III—the king in the car park (Buckley);
 9. *AD 1500–present day*: Contact-period rock art in Australia (O’Connor); detective work at a colonial cemetery in Guadeloupe (Kacki); protecting cultural heritage in armed conflicts (Stone).
-

Teotihuacan; the Temples of the Sun and Moon at Trujillo (Peru); and the walled settlement of the second millennium BC at Shimao in northern China. The one selected project in Europe was the palatial Mycenaean settlement at Aghios Vassileos, near Sparta. Among the nominated research projects was a remarkable presentation on archaic humans in south-west China, and several on patterned beginnings in early complex societies.

Many of those present felt that this was one of the best organised international conferences in the field of archaeology which they had attended. The Chinese presentations were outstandingly good. For the first time in China the best of Chinese archaeology has been presented in a truly international context. Those privileged to be present look forward with high expectation to the Shanghai Archaeology Forum 2015.”

It will be fascinating to watch how this international programme develops in the coming years.

The year in review

Our tally of articles for 2013 (previous page) demonstrates how widely *Antiquity* has once again ranged across both space and time, from the Acheulean in the Levant to Great Zimbabwe in eastern Africa and Richard III in Leicester. The sheer diversity of archaeological research is both fascinating and challenging. A number of articles have hit the headlines, and have been featured by the mainstream press: Richard III, not surprisingly, and the ongoing controversy over where to re-bury the remains; but also the vestiges released by the melting glaciers of Norway and the leopard traps of the Negev Desert, among others.

This December issue completes the first full year of ‘Durham’ *Antiquity*, and it is a pleasure to record the help, support and good wishes we have received from authors, readers and reviewers. Our aim remains to cover the latest and most significant archaeological research and discoveries throughout the world, and *Antiquity* has been represented during the year at the World Archaeological Congress (January), the annual meetings of the Society for Historical Archaeology (January), Society for American Archaeology (April), the European Association of Archaeologists (September) and (coming soon) TAG-on-Sea at Bournemouth. We’ve a similar programme for 2014 (IPPA, SAA, EAA and TAG), so if you’re attending one of these conferences, do come and meet the team!

Chris Scarre

Durham, 1 December 2013