

Seeing Heritage through the Lens of Landscape – New Approaches in Landscape Archaeology Based on the Fusion of Heritage and Landscape

Graham Fairclough

McCord Centre for Landscape, University of Newcastle (UK), CHeriScape (www.cheriscape.eu),
email: graham.fairclough@newcastle.ac.uk

Bas Pedroli

Wageningen University (NL), CHeriScape (www.cheriscape.eu),
email: bas.pedroli@wur.nl

Niels Dabaut

University of Newcastle (UK), CHeriScape (www.cheriscape.eu),
email: niels.dabaut@ugent.be

Abstract

This paper explains the genesis of the *Seeing heritage through the lenses of landscape* session organised at the LAC 2014 conference by the CHeriScape network. It introduces seven papers presented at the conference (and summarises three others), contextualising them in the symbiotic relationship between landscape and heritage within modern European society, and drawing from them, under the general themes used in the CHeriScape network, a series of common threads and conclusions that contribute to CHeriScape's agenda. The discourse is located within the frame of three recent European policy documents, the *European Landscape Convention*, the *Faro Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society* and the ESF/COST *Science Policy Briefing* on landscape. The conclusions form part of the process of increasing the social relevance of landscape archaeology and its potential contribution to the grand challenges commonly identified in current policy-making debates.

Keywords: CHeriScape, Landscape and Heritage, European Landscape Convention, Faro Convention, Landscape SPB

“CHeriScape” – Combining Landscape and Heritage

The LAC3 session *Seeing heritage through the lenses of landscape* was organised under the aegis of the CHeriScape project, *Cultural Heritage in Landscape* (www.cheriscape.eu), a three year network funded by the European “Joint Programming Initiative” on Cultural Heritage and Global Change (JPI-CH) (<http://www.jpi-culturalheritage.eu/>). The JPI-CH promotes the importance and value of all aspects – tangible, intangible and digital – of cultural heritage in European society. In particular it explores ‘the relationship between the protection of cultural heritage and its cultural uses by society i.e. the transformational challenge of cultural heritage’, a challenge which cannot be solved solely at the national level. CHeriScape, one of the first ten projects funded through the JPI-CH, is distinctive in using the modern, inter- (and trans-) disciplinary idea of landscape to look at the role of heritage; it is a landscape-focussed network working within a heritage context.

The combination of heritage and landscape allows CHeriScape to speak directly to all the aims and aspirations of the JPI and its “Strategic Research Agenda”. Above all, it sees heritage and landscape both as a democratic process capable of transformative power in many important fields

of European life. This takes it beyond questions of monument protection or tourism potential into the sphere of the “ordinary”: the commonplace but essential everyday life and interactions of citizens everywhere. CHeriScape is concerned with neither “heritage landscapes” nor “landscape heritage”; but with what happens when these two concepts are aligned and harnessed to the same goals, informing and strengthening each so that what may be challenges, problems and opportunities suddenly look different when viewed through new lenses and from the other side of the mirror.

CHeriScape is a network of seven partners with some in universities and others in government heritage agencies. We are located in five countries (the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, Belgium, Norway and Spain) but our connections and conversations extend widely across Europe and furthermore spread into many of the disciplines that engage with the concept of either landscape or heritage. We work through the medium of interactive exploratory conferences, five in our three year life, which are set in an “active listening mode”. We invite outside speakers from a diverse array of disciplines, circumstances and experience, we make space for them and their audiences to debate and discuss, and we listen and learn. Our aim is to produce science and policy briefings as well as a range of examples of the practical interplay of landscape and heritage in European policy, research and practice.

Landscape Archaeology and the Convergence of Heritage and Landscape

The LAC conferences are a natural home for the ideas of CHeriScape to be discussed, debated and expanded. Landscape archaeology is itself an integrative fusion of heritage and landscape, as well as (reaching across the Humanities and Sciences divide) the various disciplinary perspectives and worldviews that the two concepts recognise. Landscape archaeology appears to be an all-encompassing field of study but beyond its borders are many other closely related, and more impor-

tantly symbiotic, disciplines and practices. When a session at the first LAC conference in 2010 debated the future direction of landscape archaeology, many participants (including one of the present writers, Fairclough, 2012) identified the need for ever-widening interdisciplinary connections and integration. If landscape archaeology is to demonstrate its full social relevance to civil society and policy-makers, it will need to operate much more actively within the broader field of interdisciplinary landscape studies of which it is a natural and necessary member and to which it can contribute much. In this context, landscape archaeology should look to the integrative and widely-socially relevant field of landscape research delineated in the ESF/COST policy document *Landscape in a Changing world* (Bloemers *et al*, 2010).

First it is necessary to note that new ideas about heritage and landscape arose in parallel with the appearance of other concepts and structures in other disciplines and fields of practice. These other paradigms also seek to be integrative, unifying and far ranging in their contribution to social and environmental global challenges. They are characterised by integrating forces and frames and include concepts such as “place”, ecosystems, political ecology. Like heritage and landscape, these are powerful ways of seeing and understanding the world.

The increasing sophistication over the past few decades of landscape archaeology (to whose maturity the LAC series testifies) has also been accompanied by the evolution of new forward-looking paradigms in both landscape and heritage scientific practice. Common to all of them is a search for a tool that is democratic, capable of being shared with others, addresses complex problems by integrating environmental (so-called natural) drivers with human drivers and most of all adopts a collective, reflective view of society and culture. All this connects CHeriScape with another major integrative concept, sustainability – and in particular the still-emerging people-centred approaches of cultural sustainability explored by the recent COST Action *Investigating Cultural Sustainability* (Dessein *et al*, 2015). A CHeriScape session

at this Action's final conference in 2015 reinforced the connections.

The paradigm shift that the processes and aims of heritage have undergone has transformed the perception of heritage. It emphasises its inclusivity and relationship to communities and participative democracy; it is coming to be seen as much a matter of everyone's everyday heritage as a top-down selected canon of special protected sites. This applies equally to archaeology increasingly relating itself to heritage as much as to science (if the two can ever be separable). This shift has accelerated since the 1990s from a slow start in the 1960s (a similar date to the beginnings of modern, self-conscious landscape archaeology). It can be seen as being represented by the codifying influence of the Council of Europe's Faro Convention (COE 2005) and more recently, of UNESCO's HUL recommendation (UNESCO 2011), by the debates circling around the banner of "critical heritage" or simply by the new ways of doing heritage. Its key challenge is to make heritage more reflective and, above all, people-centred rather than object-focused; a key principle is recognising that heritage values are not intrinsic to the object but are attributed by people, a more constructive and instrumentally-useful approach. It is an approach that brings heritage into close alignment with landscape, 'an area as perceived by people' in the words of the European Landscape Convention's definition (Council of Europe 2000, article 1).

It is possible of course to treat landscape as a sub-category of heritage but doing so misses the point. Landscape is different from many other categories of heritage in that a living landscape without people involved in it cannot persist. Landscape is a dynamic concept, as well as being an expression of a vast collection of archaeological, historical and present-day phenomena, both tangible and intangible. It represents place as well as space: distinctive places tied to specific cultural manifestations at specific points in time and that can be characterised by a specific atmosphere offering a range of representations. However, place and space may have different meanings for people living in different parts of Europe. In some tradi-

tions, the concept of landscape is not the externalised and distanced perception of post-medieval western society, but rather a space within which inhabitation brings responsibilities of participation and involvement, because the work of memory, and hence people's sense of continuity with their own past, is intimately tied to their experience of particular locales. Managing our landscape heritage is thus a challenge, not only because of the impracticality of protecting something without retaining the operations that support its functioning but also because the values attributed to it may change depending on local cultural traditions.

The idea and (increasingly) the practice of landscape have undergone an equally significant paradigm shift during the same period as the new ideas of heritage have emerged. The Council of Europe's European Landscape Convention has codified these new attitudes (COE 2000). The changes have brought landscape and heritage even closer together, and it is this interface, indeed reciprocity, that CHeriScape investigates and develops. The ELC likewise changes the idea of landscape from being an object or a thing to being a people-centred arena for discussion, debate and participation: 'landscape is an area as perceived by people', it insists. Landscape and heritage theory now share similar intellectual and philosophical positions – people-focused, inherited from the past but equally (and necessarily) transmittable to the future; the "possession" of or access to heritage and landscape being a human right (Egoz, Makhzoumi & Pungetti, 2011) but of course one that carries responsibilities towards other people's heritage and landscape. This takes the discussion into the realms of intra-community harmony (or conflict) and of migration and mobility that have become so topical in Europe, as referenced by the Faro Convention. Additionally, in another major CHeriScape theme, landscape allows major environmentally-based and -related issues such as responses to environmental and climate changes to be discussed in a people-centred and socially relevant way; this is another critical area – the human/nature/environment relationship into which landscape archaeology can give such deep, time-embedded insight.

Through the Lens of Landscape

Bearing all the above considerations in mind, we brought CHeriScape to the LAC conference in Rome by means of a session entitled *Seeing heritage through the lens of landscape*. Our session, from which this collection of papers arises, was inspired by the recognition that landscape is not merely a category of heritage, or a sub-field of archaeological research, but a global frame within which archaeology can be carried out and heritage could be differently understood, cherished and protected. It often seems that policymakers and civil society do not fully appreciate the impact and social value of archaeological research and we argue that landscape offers ways to underline its contribution and to draw greater social, economic and environmental benefits from both. Seeing heritage through the lens of landscape allows heritage to be a solution not a problem in the face of significant environmental and social change. Our session aimed to deepen the exchange of research results and insights on the natural connections that exist between the domains of landscape and heritage, both in research and policy terms. We hoped to illustrate some of the ways in which they align with and support each other, often in the interlocking spaces between the two Council of Europe conventions already mentioned, the European Landscape Convention and the Faro Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage to Society. In addition, the session sought to use the rich concept of “landscape” as a laboratory to closely examine the nature and potential of “heritage”, particularly heritage that is explored archaeologically, in terms of its three overlapping and complementary manifestations, the tangible, the intangible, and increasingly, the digital and virtual.

The present publication contains seven of the twelve contributions to the session in Rome. Time constraints at the conference allowed the oral presentation of only four papers with the others discussed in poster form. After the conference, we invited both poster authors and oral presenters to submit a full paper for this publication. Not all accepted the challenge but the selection of

seven papers published here, along with our own summaries of three of the posters (identified as A-C below) represents the range of the session. Our selection offers a broad sweep across many of archaeology’s current engagements with the heritage / landscape complex:

1. Archaeological and Ethnographic Survey in the Paikuli Area (Iraqi Kurdistan); Julian Bogdani, Luca Colliva and Camilla Insom
 2. Connecting the Museum with the Landscape: a Geographical Solution for the Pigorini Museum, Rome; Arjuna Cecchetti
 3. The Landscape of Ancient Caere through Historic Air Photographs; Patrizia Tartara,
 4. Appalachian Landscape and Architecture through the Lens of Extraction ; Peter Butler and Charlie Yuill
 5. 3D Laser Recording and the ‘Naturalised’ Urban Landscape of Göreme, Kapadokya, Turkey; Carmela Crescenzi, Marcello Scalzo and Giorgio Verdiani
 6. Soundscape, Landscape and Cultural Heritage: a Case Study in Proto-Historic Italy; Sonia Modica
 7. Citizen Participation and Heritage Management in Rural Landscape Contexts; Jose M. Señorán Martín
- A. Marco Nebbia: Landscape Studies in Libya: Protecting and Preserving Early Arab Archaeology
B. Matthew Fitzjohn & Gianna Ayala: Cartography of Criminality: Creating a Virtual Landscape of Cultural Heritage and Crime in Palermo, Sicily
C. Felicity Winkel: The Phenomenology of Metal Detecting: Insights from a Unique Type of Landscape Experience

We will not summarise here the seven papers published below; they can speak for themselves. We will later in this introduction try to identify some common threads by way of general conclusions. Some of those threads run through presentations contributed in Rome that are not published here, so to provide a more comprehensive platform for the discussion that follows we must first briefly summarise the three papers that were orally presented in Rome but which have not been able to find a reflection in this publication:

A. Landscape Studies in Libya: Protecting and Preserving Early Arab Archaeology

Marco Nebbia (Durham University, also on behalf of Libyan and German colleagues) talked about the results of a joint archaeological project (see e.g. Leone, 2013). Due to the imposing Roman remains, as for instance in the coastal cities of Sabratha and Lepcis Magna, the major focus of past research in Libya has been the Roman period rather than the early Arab and Medieval periods, whose structures have mostly been destroyed during excavations in the Colonial period. The landscape of Tripolitania, however, still preserves a large quantity of settlements and forts that would be essential to record, preserve and fully integrate into the heritage of the Libyan territory. A combination of remote sensing analysis and occasional fieldwork aimed to provide a full comprehensive record of these remains. The project conceived the landscape of Lepcis Magna as a complex system which encompassed not only the imposing long-term occupied urban site (from the pre-Roman period to at least the tenth century) but also structures (e.g. sites of different functions) and infrastructures (e.g. routes) present in the surrounding territory.

B. Cartography of Criminality: Creating a Virtual Landscape of Cultural Heritage and Crime in Palermo, Sicily.

Matthew Fitzjohn (University of Liverpool, also on behalf of Gianna Ayala, University of Sheffield) presented an extremely interesting paper on the examination, through a landscape frame, of the archaeological traces of acts of criminality by the Sicilian mafia and the physical manifestation of legal responses to these actions. The paper placed emphasis on the materiality of criminal activity and the responses to it in the realm of discourse about legality, identity and the construction of cultural heritage (Ayala & Fitzjohn, 2013). The research focussed on the Sack of Palermo (1956-1963) and other associated acts of criminal violence that have become an integral part of the matrix of

Palermo's (and Sicily's) identity and heritage. The open-access web-based maps used in the project visualised changing spatial and temporal patterns of mafia domination through control of the construction industry and influence on local politics regarding urban planning. This reconstruction of the architectural history of the urban environment aids in discussions of criminality, conflict and in the rehabilitation of Sicilian identity.

C. The Phenomenology of Metal Detecting: Insights from a Unique Type of Landscape Experience

Felicity Winkley (University College London) showed in her paper that metal detecting in the United Kingdom is a distinctive way of experiencing the historic landscape, allowing many amateurs to access heritage and landscape hands-on in a way that would otherwise be impossible. With a conservative estimate of 15,000 people currently detecting in the UK, and nearly one million objects recorded on the official Portable Antiquities Scheme database since its inception in 1997, England's historic places are being walked, searched and mapped by more people than ever (see also Brindle, 2013). With a strong attachment to their home area and a good understanding of local history, the conscientious amongst the detectorists have been searching the same regions for decades. Research shows that through metal detecting, they generate a unique attachment to the landscape through which they search, producing links between their own experienced version of the landscape and their perceived version of how it was experienced in the past, thus creating a very particular type of place-making (see also Robbins, 2013).

The CheriScape Rome Session – Common Threads and Conclusion

The session in Rome demonstrated that even after all these decades of "landscape archaeology",

the landscape dimension within archaeological research continues to increase in importance. It does so over a wide range of geographical environments and time-periods, from the pre-Roman Iron Age in Italy to the twentieth century coalfields of the Appalachian Mountains in the eastern USA. The lens of landscape seems indeed to give archaeology an added value, in the sense that it provides an interdisciplinary focus and a public-friendly narrative that is well appreciated in the societal arena following (and funding) archaeological research. This applies especially to the detectorists' research (C) and the participative exercise in Spain (7) (see list above for numbering) but it runs as a thread through many of the papers.

Using the lens of the landscape can also provide new and sometimes better explanations of the finds in archaeological excavations and sites (e.g. in the Caere paper, 3), and can reconnect finds back to their original geographic locations and places, thus to "their" community (as in the case of the Pigorini Museum, 2). Landscape broadens the archaeological view chronologically by way of its ability to transcend time (as in Libya, 1). It creates new contexts and improves the understanding of specific sites by placing them into their wider functional landscapes, as in the West Virginia coalfields (4). It also improves the predictability of potential further archaeological evidence, as e.g. in Cappadocia (5) and Libya (A). Landscape also offers a frame through which heritage can begin to address wider contemporary problems such as crime (B) and conflict (1). Through new "scape"-concepts, we begin to see the landscapes within past peoples' mentality and experience, as in the example of the soundscape paper (6). In summary, landscape locates archaeological remains in a present day context; through landscape the term "the past in the present" comes alive in the perceptions and embodiment of actually-existing landscape.

We can point to other more detailed examples of the use of the landscape lens in archaeological research by drawing out some common threads from the seven papers published below and from the three summaries offered in the previous

section. We do so loosely (but not exclusively) within the framework of the CHeriScape project itself which, as explained earlier has organised five conferences to examine with a wide range of experts and practitioners the relationship between heritage and landscape using five sub-themes: policy, research, community, global change and future visioning and imagination. In this way, too, the LAC session becomes another contribution to the overall CHeriScape outputs.

Policy

Several of the papers in our session demonstrate the use of the idea of landscape to pull heritage and archaeological research into a much closer connection with policy but also with politics. At a simple level, the landscape approach in the Appalachian coalfields (4) allows the bare bones of industrial monuments to be clothed in the lives and experience of their workers, adding richness to the valuations and arguments that underline their protected status and guide strategies for management. With the Palermo project (B), we go further, and begin to see archaeology used to address real-life problems of criminality and justice; in this project landscape meets the developing fields of contemporary archaeology that focuses on the interaction between material culture and human behaviour (e.g. Harrison & Schofield, 2010). The paper on fieldwork in Kurdistan (1) goes further again, bringing archaeology and landscape into the realm of present-day fundamental conflict, war and displacement. Here there are echoes of the Faro Convention's aspiration for heritage to become a tool of identity and of reconciliation. It connects as well to contemporary archaeology of conflict including work that reveals the overlapping and entangled landscapes of recent (even ongoing) violence, occupation and resistance, painful memory, commemoration and aftermaths (e.g. Auclair & Fairclough, 2015; Forbes, Page & Pérez, 2009; Schofield, Klausmeier & Purbrick, 2006). Studies presented at the CHeriScape session thus demarcate a new area of study within landscape

and archaeological research that has the potential to contribute greatly to the lived heritage and identity of people and places that have been and continue to be afflicted by crime and conflict.

Research

All the papers in our session arise from strong archaeological research. All engage with the materiality (and incompleteness) of inherited remains and with their interpretation, a prerequisite of any further valuation. It is particularly notable that the focus on landscape tends to encourage novel approaches and new methods. The recourse to new methods ranges from the solidly landscape-as-perception and -as-embodiment approach of the soundscape paper (6) to the technological methods that allow new perspectives to be taken on past landscapes, as in the papers on Caere (3) and the Pigorini Museum's GIS (2) and to an even greater extent in the paper on Göreme (5). As with all research, but in some sense exacerbated by the plurality, open-endedness and inherent dynamism of landscape, few of our papers reach interpretative closure; all find new questions and map out new directions of investigation.

Community

This is an idea, which occurs explicitly or implicitly in all the papers. In some cases, this is the study of past communities, such as the mining communities of West Virginia and their relationship to the land (4), or of Kurdistan (1). The Caere project (3) is beginning to resurrect the visibility in landscape of past communities. The soundscape paper (6), an inspiring attempt through the interpretation of found evidences of music making to elucidate some of the social atmosphere of ancient civilisations, is concerned with the interaction of people with each other within bounded communities, for example through ritual and behavioural patterns. In many others of the papers, however, the landscape lens reveals present day communities. The

re-connection of museum objects back to their geographic location (2) is an attempt to recreate something of a community of place defined by its history; like the Caere and Kurdistan projects it is trying to reconstruct the environment of ancient communities and thus arrive at spatial configurations that are interpreted in terms of landscapes. Our papers however also show us communities being active in relation to their heritage as seen through landscape. Metal-detecting is most often seen as a form of discovery, or even simply treasure hunting, but it can also be seen as a phenomenological construction of landscape; the action of being in landscape, of embodying landscape, even of place-making, which is also not wholly individual but constructive of a 'heritage community' in the Faro Convention's definition sense of the term. There is more than one way to "do" archaeology (cf. Fairclough, 2015), as demonstrated by the paper on citizen participation in Spain (7) which describes projects where local people initiate, design (or sometimes co-produce with "experts") and carry out archaeological research leading among other things to the strengthening and modification of identity based in landscape.

Global Change and Future Visioning and Imagination

Our papers are more concerned with landscape than with environment, although some illustrate the extent of past human induced environmental change, for example in the coal-mining regions of West Virginia (4). Global change concerns more than environmental change, and precisely because they are looking through the lens of landscape, each of our papers, at some level, carries a sense of the future as well past change. There are behavioural changes that render the churches of Cappadocia a subject of archaeological study; there is the overlay of two thousand years of landscape change, which renders the prehistoric cemeteries of Caere largely invisible without its "resurrection" by specialist, in this case air photographic techniques; there is the impact of capi-

talism and disempowerment (7). The process of looking backwards to identify past change, and the roads that have been followed to reach the present day inevitably turn our gaze forward. Heritage and landscape are both essentially ways of seeing the world but more specifically they are concerned with legacy as well as inheritance and with how the transition from past to future is managed. The important interface is not past to present, but past to future, which is the crucial interface that landscape bridges. Archaeology helps us understand the past, heritage explains its role in the present and (like it or not) makes us its executors, and the lens, or the frame, of landscape helps us to envisage future landscapes. The future, therefore, hides in all these papers.

Individual disciplines and distinct communities see different things, however, and use very, different approaches. Our session at LAC 2014 not only covered a wide range of landscapes, periods, and techniques but it brought together a rich range of disciplines and perspectives. The papers show us how different disciplines look differently towards the research questions posed within landscape archaeology. Expert-based views can be supported by bottom-up approaches (or/and vice versa) to better explain the human-centred aspect of both the landscape and heritage concept. While using our communities to see how to deal with landscape as heritage today and while unlocking the potential of democratic participation, experts can help by setting different interpretations. Our joint imagination of the future and the past can widen up the discussion and might involve more people in the debate, as the SPB on Landscape suggests (Bloemers et al, 2010). Landscape is one of the great integrative forces in culture and science but it sets a great challenge, that of forging truly interdisciplinarity and transdisciplinarity understanding. Understanding the different disciplines and their approaches, as we began to do in this session, is an essential first step in meeting the challenge.

References

- COE 2000: European Landscape Convention, Treaty Series Nr. 176, Council of Europe, Strasbourg, Council of Europe.
- COE 2005: The Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society, Treaty Series Nr. 199, Council of Europe, Strasbourg, Council of Europe.
- UNESCO 2011: Historic Urban Landscape declaration (HUL). http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.phpurl_id=48857&url_do=do_topic&url_section=201.html
- Auclair E & G Fairclough (ed.) 2015: Theory and Practice in Heritage and Sustainability: Between Past and Future. Studies in Culture and Sustainable Development, Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group: Earthscan, London.
- Ayala G & M Fitzjohn 2013: The archaeology of the mafia: a material investigation of extortion, justice and reprisal in Palermo, Sicily (1982-2012), *World Archaeology*, 45(5), 816-31.
- Bloemers T, S Daniels, G Fairclough, B Pedroli & R Stiles (eds.) 2010: Landscape in a changing world, Bridging Divides, Integrating Disciplines, Serving Society, Science Policy Briefing nr 41, Strasbourg / Brussels, ESF-COST, <http://www.esf.org/publications/science-policy-briefings.html>
- Brindle T, 2013: Making the Most of PAS Data: Macro- and Micro-level Studies of Romano-British Settlement, *Landscapes*, 14(1), 73-91.
- Dessein J, K Soini, G Fairclough & L Horlings (ed.) 2015: Culture in, for and as Sustainable Development. Conclusions from the COST Action IS1007 Investigating Cultural Sustainability. University of Jyväskylä, Finland, <http://www.culturalsustainability.eu/>
- Egoz S, J Makhzoumi & G Pungetti (ed.) 2011: The right to landscape: contesting landscape and human rights, Burlington, Ashgate.
- Fairclough G, 2012: Look the other way - from a branch of archaeology to a root of landscape studies, in Kluiving SJ & Guttmann-Bond E (ed.), *Landscape Archaeology between Art and Science: From a Multi- to an Interdisciplinary Approach*, Proceedings of First Landscape Archaeology Conference: 471-83. Amsterdam University Press, Amsterdam.
- Fairclough G, 2015: 'I wanted to be an archaeologist' - A 21st-century crisis of confidence?, in Schut,

- PAC, Scharff D & de Wit L (eds.), LC 2015, Setting the Agenda: Giving New Meaning to the European Archaeological Heritage: proceedings of the International Conference, Amersfoort, The Netherlands, 20-22 March 2014: 37-44. European Archaeological Council, Belgium.
- Forbes N, R Page & G Pérez (eds.) 2009, Europe's Deadly Century: Perspectives on Twentieth Century Conflict Heritage, English Heritage, Swindon.
- Harrison R & J Schofield 2010: After Modernity, Archaeological Approaches to the Contemporary Past, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Leone A, 2013: The End of the Pagan City. Religion, Economy and Urbanism in Late Antique North Africa, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Robbins KJ, 2013: Balancing the Scales: Exploring the Variable Effects of Collection Bias on Data Collected by the Portable Antiquities Scheme, Landscapes, 14(1), 54-72.
- Schofield J, A Klausmeier, L Purbrick 2006: Re-mapping the Field: New Approaches in Conflict Archaeology, Westkreuz-Verlag, Berlin.

