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It is at a rather unusual time in *The Post Hole*’s calendar that I find myself addressing you in my final editorial. This unconventional timing is the result of many events, including dissertations, flat relocations, being away from the world of 21st century communications for four months, and a rather disagreeable piece of technology upon which Issue 45 was stored! As a result, this issue has been produced by the 2014-2015 team, but will be published by the 2015-2016 team, who I will come back to later.

Firstly, I would like to reflect on the time I have spent as Editor-in-Chief of *The Post Hole*. Over the past year we have achieved a lot in terms of public outreach and accessibility. Our social media numbers have soared, particularly impressive are the number of Facebook likes, which have increased by a huge 244% from July 2014 to mid-October 2015. This was a fabulous platform for us to advertise the main focus of our launch of TPHExtra, TPHmeets (theposthole.org/tphextra). This video interview series is a real high of the year and I would like to thank everyone involved, particularly Zack Ferritto Goodall, who contributed greatly to this feature. If you still have not seen the interviews I strongly recommend you visit *The Post Hole*’s YouTube channel (youtube.com/channel/UCV5_rJO0pg3z7Dt4YOtXu1w) and take a look. Some of the interviewed archaeologists include Paul Pettitt, Jane Grenville and Barry Taylor. Another high point was the website redesign and the re-launch which corresponded with the first issue this team put together. This was facilitated by Pat Gibbs, I would like to personally thank Pat for all the amazing work he does to help all of the ever changing faces of *The Post Hole*!

Secondly, on the theme of thanking people, Jessica Hand and Alexandra Drosinaki graduated, along with myself, this July and will therefore be leaving *The Post Hole* team. I would like to thank them both. Jess worked hard (sometimes tirelessly) as Submissions Editor to complete the first edit of article, as well as being the main correspondent with our authors. Alex has been *The Post Hole*’s Web Assistant for the past two years and has worked closely with Pat to ensure each issue is correctly formatted and appears on *The Post Hole*’s website. I would like to thank them both for their contributions and wish them all the best for their future endeavours.

Next, I would like to introduce you to the new Editor-in-Chief of *The Post Hole*, Freya Lawson-Jones. Freya is a third year reading for a BA in Archaeology and has been a member of the team for over a year now. I have every faith she will continue the more interactive elements of *The Post Hole* which we have worked on over the past year, whilst maintaining the journals academic reputation. Freya was an ideal candidate for the position as she has been an editor and has also

www.theposthole.org
worked with the interview team, meaning she has a broad and thorough understanding of the workings of *The Post Hole*. I would like to wish her every success in this new role.

As is always customary, I shall move on to the summary of the articles featured in Issue 45.

The first article is a submission from our regular contributor, **Arnaud F. Lambert**. In this article, Lambert examines the art visible at the site of the Cauadzidziqui rock shelter. The article contains incredible images which show the fabulous mural and rock painting which can be seen at this unusual site in the Mexican state of Guerrero.

This Issue release is quite a special one for me, not only because it is my last, but because it includes a contribution from my Father, **Jeffery Green**, who has supported me immensely over the three years of my undergraduate degree and continues to as I begin my Master's course. This article demonstrates how one small find and a spark of enthusiasm can lead to a wealth of information of archaeological interest. The article concerns yellow bricks which can often be found off the coastline of Staithes, North Yorkshire, and attempts to tell the story as to how they came to be washed up on the beach. The cover of this issue designed by Alicyn Murphy is based around this article.

The next article comes from a number of researchers hoping to examine the potential of coastal archaeology to increase understanding of the sustainability of artisanal fisheries in Brazil. **Andre C. Colonese et al.**, hope to include the local fishing communities to assess the impact of fish traps on a coastal community.

**Sophia Calugay** questions the justification of excavation in her article ‘The destructive nature of archaeology’. Calugay uses examples to show that the information gained by archaeological excavation is worth more than the destruction wreaked. A discussion of the wealth pre-excavation techniques follows.

Have you ever wondered what it is like to take part in an archaeological field school? Well, the next article is an honest and personal account of the time **Ashely Green** spent at the Black Friary in Trim, Ireland. The piece contains specific site descriptions and interpretations.

Finally, **Alexandra Drosinaki** has compiled the excavation experiences of three students from the University of York who had the incredible opportunity to work on an archaeological dig in Sicily with Professor Martin Carver, well known for his direction at Sutton Hoo. Each account gives a different take on the month spent in Sicily and once again shows that archaeology is never experienced in the same way by different people.
And so with that I would like to urge you all to continue supporting *The Post Hole* by sending in your articles to submissions@theposthole.org and I bid you all a fond farewell. Last, but not least, I would like to thank everyone in the 2014-2015 team for their support, creativity, commitment and enthusiasm while I have been Editor-in-Chief (Fig. 1). Good luck to those continuing next year.

Figure. 1. (Most of) The Post Hole team 2014-2015.

All the best,
Eleanor Green.
Editor-in-Chief
editor@theposthole.org
Abstract
Since Samuel Villela first documented the rock paintings of Cauadzidziqui in 1989, a number of scholars have examined the site and its rock art, with particular emphasis on its Olmec-style paintings (Gutiérrez 2007, 2008, Gutiérrez and Pye 2007, 2008). This paper revisits the Cauadzidziqui rock shelter in order to examine two new sections of non-Olmec-style rock art which, to my knowledge, have not been previously documented by earlier studies.

Introduction
The Cauadzidziqui rock shelter, locally known as the “Cueva del Diablo”, is a shallow limestone cavern situated in the mountainous eastern end of the Mexican state of Guerrero, near the Oaxaca border (Figure 1). The site is approximately two hours south of the city of Tlapa, between the towns of Ocotepec and Ocoapa. The large opening to the rock shelter is visible from the unpaved road which leads to these towns, as well as the surrounding slope and the nearby archaeological site of Ocuapan (Gutiérrez 2007) (Figure 2). About 30 meters to the west of the entrance there is a large spring runoff zone which creates a small waterfall during the rainy season.

Figure 1. The mountainous terrain of eastern Guerrero as seen from Cauadzidziqui. (Image Copyright: Arnaud F. Lambert).
In addition to its well-known Olmec-style mural (Gutiérrez and Pye 2008, 24-26; Villela 1989, 38-42) (Figure 3), the rock shelter boasts a palimpsest of red, orange, black and white non-Olmec-style rock paintings. All of the rock paintings occur in a single large panel, measuring approximately 27m in length and 5m in height (maximum), on the southwestern wall of the shelter (Figure 4). Gutiérrez and Pye (2008, 21-23) argue that the non-Olmec-style paintings date to the Late Archaic or Early Formative period (3000-2000 BC). This is based on comparisons with the rock art of eastern Guerrero and Morelos (e.g. Apostolides 1987, Oettinger 1983) and their superimposition by the Middle Formative period Olmec-style rock paintings.

Figure 2. The entrance to the Cauadzidziqui rock shelter. (Image Copyright: Arnaud F. Lambert).

Figure 3. The Olmec-style mural at Cauadzidziqui. (Image Copyright: Arnaud F. Lambert).
The non-Olmec-style rock paintings feature both geometric and biomorphic subjects. The geometric figures are characterised by cruciform designs, rectangles with lines, denticulated designs, circular or ovoid designs, dots, star-shaped designs and arrangements of three-to-five vertical lines. The biomorphic images include anthropomorphic designs, hand prints, zoomorphs and vegetal designs. Most of these paintings occur in small groupings or sections throughout the panel.

Figure 4. A full view of the painted panel at Cauadzidziqui. (Image Copyright: Arnaud F. Lambert).

Figure 5. The new sections of rock paintings in relation to other parts of the painted panel. (Image Copyright: Arnaud F. Lambert).
The New Rock Paintings at Cauadzidziqui

The new sections with which this paper is concerned are located on the western end of the painted panel, next to a section containing several vegetal designs and a polychromatic comb-like design painted in red, orange and black paint (Gutiérrez and Pye 2008, 21-22, Figures 2 and 6) (Figure 5). The two new groupings came to light after a re-examination of field notes and photographs taken by the author at Cauadzidziqui in January and March of 2010. They contain a total of twelve red painted figures (Figures 6 and 7). Most of the shapes are geometric but there are a few biomorphic designs.

The first group of paintings, tentatively designated as “Section A”, consists of five separate images. The uppermost figure (Painting A-1) is a circular or ovoid design with a cleft on the top, measuring approximately 4-5 cm in width. In terms of its overall morphology, it is similar to a larger painted square-shaped cleft mark from Cerro Tlapacoya, México, dated to the Early Formative period (1250-800 BC) (Lambert 2013, 177). The other four rock paintings are located further below. These are smaller in size, averaging 2-3 cm in width. In this sub-grouping, the top image (Painting A-2) appears to be a stick figure depicting a quadrupedal zoomorph with antlers or erect ears, possibly a deer or canid. Analogous forms have been recorded in the North Shelter 2 locale at Chalcatzingo, Morelos (Apostolides 1987, 181, Figure 12.24). Below this figure is a
vegetal design (Painting A-3) with bud-like or leaf-like extensions situated along a diagonal stem measuring about 7 cm in length. This type of painting is fairly common at Cauadzidziqui, and has been documented in many other sections of the painted panel (Gutiérrez and Pye 2008, 21, Figure 2). It is followed by a triangular geometric figure (Painting A-4) and a V-shaped linear design (Painting A-5).

The second group of rock paintings, identified as “Section B”, consists of seven different figures. On the eastern periphery of the section, there is another V-shaped linear design (Painting B-1). The ends of this 3 cm wide figure are marked by two triangular forms. One of the triangles contains transverse lines; the other has a forked line. Just below this painting, there is an oval shape with transverse lines (Painting B-2). It measures approximately 6-7 cm in length. This type of image is ubiquitous at the site; Gutiérrez and Pye (2008, 21-22, Figures 3 and 4) documented two dozen similar paintings. To the west of these two figures, there is a sub-grouping of five paintings. From the top to the bottom, these consist of a 7 cm wide group of dots (Painting B-3), a 12 cm long curvilinear vegetal form (Painting B-4) with bud-like projections, and three V-shaped designs (Paintings B-5, B-6, and B-7) measuring about 6 cm, 10 cm, and 5 cm in width respectively. Unlike Paintings A-5 and B-1, these three V-shaped paintings are characterised by
circular elements appearing either on the ends of the figures (Paintings B-5 and B-7) or on their vertices (Painting B-6). Even though they are clearly important, we can only speculate on the significance of the V-shaped paintings as a class. One intriguing possibility is that the creation of these bracket-like images in a cave-like context may have alluded to the fertility of the earth (Gay 1972, 26, Villela 1989, 43). The repetitive nature of plant-like motifs at Cauadzidziqui is also noteworthy and may symbolise themes related to germination and fertility (Villela 1989, 42).

Table 1 provides a useful summary of the different types of images present in the new sections. Of the twelve new rock paintings, the most frequent designs fall within the geometric category (74.98% of all the new paintings). These include the five V-shaped linear designs, the circle with a cleft mark, the oval with transverse lines, the triangle and the group of dots. The remaining images (24.99%) belong to the category of biomorphic motifs, such as the quadrupedal zoomorph and the two vegetal designs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Images</th>
<th>Number of Examples:</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Circle with cleft mark</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoomorph (quadrupedal)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oval with transverse lines</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V-shaped linear designs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triangular design</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetal designs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group of dots</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. – Major themes in the new rock paintings of Cauadzidziqui

Discussion
The characterisation of Cauadzidziqui, along with the painted caves of eastern Guerrero (Juxtlahuaca and Oxtotitlán), as sanctuaries or cult sites has a long history in Mesoamerican archaeology (see Gay 1967, Grove 1970, Villela 1989). Much of this view is based on the extrapolation of Classic and Postclassic period Mesoamerican worldviews from the Olmec-style rock paintings at these sites. While there is no doubt that the cave symbolism underlying the rock art at some of these sites enjoyed a great deal of chronological and inter-regional continuity (Lambert 2014; Stone 1995), when dealing with paintings dating to the Late Archaic and Early Formative periods (3000-2000 BC), it is crucial to examine the rock art on its own terms.

As a step towards this goal, the purpose of this paper was to provide information for several previously undocumented non-Olmec-style rock paintings at Cauadzidziqui. A total of twelve new
rock paintings were added to the corpus of rock art at the site recorded by Villela (1989), Gutiérrez (2007), and Gutiérrez and Pye (2008). Although some preliminary interpretations and comparisons were attempted, they should be treated as tentative ideas until a more thorough investigation of the Late Archaic and Early Formative period rock art of these sites is completed.
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This story begins with the chance find of two bricks in a rock-pool on Penny Steel, east of the village of Staithes in North Yorkshire, UK. The two firebricks, one marked E & M and the other V & D (Figs. 1 and 2) were part of a mixed cargo, including coal and animal hides, on board the *SS Princesse Clementine* when she ran aground at Penny Steel on the 19th November 1924 (The Times, 1924a). The *SS Princesse Clementine* was a Belgian managed (L. Dens and Co., Antwerp) cargo ship of 2,785 tons built in 1909 by the Tyne Iron Shipbuilding Co. Ltd. (established 1867) in Willington, North and South Shields. The Tyne Iron Shipbuilding Co. Ltd. was perhaps not the most fortunate of shipwrights; of the first 50 vessels they built, only 3 reached the breakers yard after providing their owners with the expected period of service; the remainder, including the *SS Princesse Clementine*, were lost at sea.

![Figures 1 and 2. Examples of firebricks marked E & M or V & D found on Penny Steel, Staithes, North Yorkshire, UK. Author’s own. Photographs taken 14th August 2014.](image)

The *SS Princesse Clementine* pld her mostly uneventful trade between the river Tyne, UK, and Naples, Italy. However, a voyage that ended in Naples on 7th April 1912 was notable because *en route* a crew member afflicted with small pox was landed in Palermo (Port of London Sanitary Committee, 1912). Thankfully, the ship was fully disinfected and no further cases of this, now eradicated, disease were reported. Twelve years later, the *SS Princesse Clementine* and her crew of 19 under Captain J. Baneux once again left the river Tyne bound for Naples, but shortly after departing she ran aground on Penny Steel rocks (The Times, 1924a). At first it was thought likely that the steamer could be refloated at high tide and assistance was refused. However, it soon became clear that she was leaking badly and an S.O.S was sent at 12:35 pm on 19th November 1924 with a request for a ‘strong tug’ (The Times, 1924b). The *Clementine’s crew*
were taken to safety by the Runswick, UK, lifeboat, but Captain Banneux stayed aboard his ship in the hope that she might be saved; a photograph published on 24\textsuperscript{th} November 1924 shows the grounded vessel upright approximately 500 m off-shore (Daily Mirror, 1924). A ‘no cure, no pay’ contract was instigated and a salvage vessel departed from Sunderland, UK, with the intention of beginning to off-load the \textit{SS Princesse Clementine}’s cargo on 21\textsuperscript{st} November (The Times, 1924c). However, one week after running aground, the weather deteriorated and as gales battered his ship Captain Banneux sent up a distress signal. The Runswick lifeboat attended and, in spite of the atrocious conditions, Captain Banneux leapt from his ship to the safety of the lifeboat. The courage and bravery of two members of the lifeboat crew, Coxswain Andrew Tose and Second Coxwain Thomas Patton, in completing this rescue were recognised by the award of Royal National Lifeboat Institution bronze medals on 18\textsuperscript{th} December 1924 (RNLI Medals Awarded to Inhabitants of Whitby (1830-1996)).

The Lloyds insurance market reflected the initial optimism that the \textit{SS Princesse Clementine} might be saved and a reinsurance rate of 30 Guineas per cent was quoted the day after the shipwreck, but this increased to 60 Guineas per cent by Saturday 6\textsuperscript{th} December 1924 (The Times, 1924d) and the \textit{SS Princesse Clementine} became uninsurable when the salvage contractor declared the case ‘hopeless’ (The Times, 1924e). Today, rusting fragments of the \textit{SS Princesse Clementine} can be found trapped in the rocks of Penny Steel (Figs. 3 and 4) and, at the lowest of tides, the location of her boiler can be discerned, marked by a forest of kelp just off-shore (Fig. 5).

But what of the bricks? William Cochran Carr of Blaydon, UK (born 30\textsuperscript{th} August 1815, died 26\textsuperscript{th} October 1889) was listed in the 1841 UK census as a farmer, but by 1850 his commercial interests had expanded to include firebrick making as well as farming. In 1854 he acquired the South Benwell brickworks (South Benwell, UK) from Emerson and Milner (E & M) firebrick and steel makers (The National Archives, 2014). William’s businesses were successful; by 1871 he had become a farmer (employing 6 men), a firebrick maker (employing 35 men and 40 boys) and
a colliery owner (Charlotte pit, Benwell, employing 264 men and 59 boys). After his death, William was succeeded by his widow (Isabella) who ran the business until 1905, when the company William Cochran Carr Ltd., headed by their son (also William), was formed. The company successfully traded its firebricks in Italy, as evidenced by a 1912 Anglo-Italian brochure advertising E & M firebricks (The National Archives, 2014), and the brick shown in Figure 1 was presumably destined for, but never reached, the Italian market.

The second brick has stronger Italian connections. Giuseppe Verzocchi was born in Forlì, Northern Italy in 1887 (died 1970 in Milan). At the age of 19 Giuseppe emigrated to England and found himself in Newcastle upon Tyne where, while suffering from peritonitis, he was assisted by Count Ottavio de Vittoro Romano, an Italian mining executive (Nardelli, 2009). After Giuseppe recovered, he and Ottavio started the business ‘Verzocchi and de Romano’, which began manufacturing firebricks with the V & D logo in Newcastle for export to Italy. In the years that followed, the business expanded to include a refractory brick factory in La Spezia, Italy. During the 1920’s Verzocchi became a leading Italian industrialist and a wealthy man. His wealth allowed him to indulge his interest in art, and the V & D trade catalogue of 1924 contains artworks by eminent Italian artists commissioned by Verzocchi (Verzocchi, 1924). Two conditions were placed upon the artists: (i) that all the illustrations must depict the theme of industry; and (ii) that they must include a representation of a V & D brick (e.g. Figure 6; Arthur, 2010). Verzocchi’s artistic legacy was secured by his donation of a collection of 70 artworks, all with the V & D logo, to his home town of Forlì in 1961.

To conclude, a chance find of two bricks in a rock pool led...
discovery of tales concerning international entrepreneurs, shipwreck, heroism and twentieth century Italian art; a minor example of the fascinating stories associated with the everyday items that can be found in very disturbed archaeological sites.
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Introduction

What is the role of cultural heritage for poverty alleviation in the coastal areas of Latin America? Artisanal fisheries are a traditional and crucial source of food and livelihood for thousands of people along the coastline of Brazil (Begossi, 2010). Brazilian coastal communities efficiently integrate modern small-scale fishing techniques with pre-colonial indigenous knowledge, as a “neotraditional mix” (Begossi, 1998). In the coastal areas of Maranhão, one of the poorest regions of Brazil (World Bank, 2004), this culminates in the use of archaeological fish traps (locally denominated Camboas). The traps are intertidal structures consisting of walls built from minerals (plinthite and petroplinthite) available on site. Tidal oscillation (around 7 meters) is the driving force to entrap fish between high and low tide. Although their age is uncertain, 17th century European writers documented the use of similar structures by indigenous people in usually very rich and productive ecotones (e.g. d’Abbeville, 1632; Evreux, 1964).

Despite their importance as maritime cultural heritage in lowland South America, these fish traps have received little public or scientific attention (da Silveira et al., 2012). Their impact on local fisheries resources, along with their economic and social relevance in fisheries-based livelihoods has remained undocumented; their preservation and potential to support resilient community development have never been assessed. The study of the “mysterious” heritage and complex nature of the interactions of these fishing societies with their environment calls upon the integration of archaeological, social and environmental sciences perspectives which are rarely, if ever, brought together in Brazil. With the support of the British Academy Newton Mobility Grants (2015), a collaborative partnership was established between archaeologists, human ecologists and economists of the University of York (UK), Universidade Santa Cecilia (UNISANTA),
Universidade Estadual de Campinas and the Fisheries and Food Institute (FIFO) (Brazil) for assessing the economic and social contribution of archaeological fishing methods to modern artisanal fisheries management in Brazil.

Figure 1. – (A) archaeological fish traps (or camboas) in northern Brazil (Maranhão), source: ©Google Earth. Early Europeans (17th century) who visited the region described the use of similar structures by local indigenous groups. The local communities today attribute them to past indigenous populations, however their chronological and cultural attribution is unknown; (B-C) Fish traps are made of locally available minerals (plinthite and petroplinthite). Tidal oscillation (around 7 meters) entraps fish between high and low tide. (D) Local people also build fish traps using organic materials (fibres, wood).

Objectives
The project is based on a mobility and knowledge co-production approach revolving around (i) a series of seminars in Brazil and the UK in 2015 on coastal archaeology and archaeological science, and on the integration of coastal zone management and poverty alleviation (livelihood, vulnerability, resilience studies in coastal contexts, participatory approaches); (ii) a field school at São Luis (State of Maranhão), with the participation of the fishing communities, to assess the socio-economic importance of fish traps to small-scale coastal communities. This field school will be developed using a participatory and collaborative approach to elicit indigenous knowledge on coastal resource usage and management with communities, enabling mutual learning for fishing communities and the researchers.
**Expected outcomes**

A salient aspect of the project is the impact of coastal archaeology in bridging past and modern artisanal fisheries in Brazil as a pathway to increase our understanding about their sustainability. Fish traps are a singular feature of coastal landscapes and their heritage significance is evident. Thus new economic opportunities may be explored for combating the dual problems of heritage’s conservation and food security in the poorest area of Brazil. The understanding of fisheries management and the role of cultural heritage to poverty mitigation is of general resonance for policy making, and for the resilience of coastal socio-ecological systems in other parts of Brazil and Latin America.
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The term ‘excavation’ came from the Latin word *excavare*: ex- ‘out’ and cavare - ‘to make or become hollow’. The dictionary definition of the act of excavating is one which digs, extracts, or removes materials from the ground in order to find remains. Excavation is the main tool of the archaeologist in learning about the past. Without it, only a small portion of the human past would be recovered and studied through history books (Champion 1980, 43), alternatively archaeology can examine the everyday lives of ordinary people. According to Barker it is “almost the only source of information… [that] provides evidence where the documents are silent or missing… [However] it is always destructive” (1993, 13).

The aim of an excavation is to “identify, define, uncover, date, and – by understanding transformation processes – interpret each archaeological context on a site” (Drewett 1999, 107). This is achieved by carefully recording what is in the ground, considering spatial organization and stratification which enables archaeologists to theorize the site purpose (King 2005, 71-72). The interpretive nature of the analysis of archaeological discoveries means different people have alternative ideas about the conclusions drawn after an excavation, this often stems back to the original purpose and aims of an excavation. There are three main reasons for conducting an archaeological excavation:

1. salvage, or rescue archaeology: sites are excavated to save and record any information that will not be available in the future. Such sites are those that are vulnerable to natural erosion or urban developments, e.g. road systems, housing, dams etc. (Champion 1980, 43; Drewett 1999, 107; King 2005, 33 and 61; Renfrew and Bahn 2008, 75; Walker 2001).
2. Research projects: Excavating to expand the knowledge of the past (King 2005, 28-29).
3. Conservation: For purposes of cultural and heritage sites by interested organisations (King 2005, 87; Renfrew and Bahn 2008, 75).

Excavation, extracts everything that is known leaving little original evidence of the site (Barker 1986, 71). Barker argues further that the terrain containing the material remains plays a major part in human development (1993, 14), making the study of landscape a recent and growing sub discipline of archaeology (Renfrew and Bahn 2008, 77). Furthermore, in recent years archaeologists have considered how ‘off-site’ or ‘non-site’ areas may have also affected human development, especially where people are leading a mobile life leaving few remains, resulting in a
sparse archaeological record which needs to be documented and carefully analysed rather than being excluded from the main excavation site (Renfrew and Bahn 2008, 77). However, exclusion is often the case as the “very faint scatters of artifacts… might not qualify as ‘sites’… Nevertheless [they] represent significant human activity” (Renfrew and Bahn 2008, 77) and so should be recorded.

There are a number of writers and scholars who refer to excavation being destructive, but specific examples or case studies of such sites are seldom mentioned. Perhaps because the importance of the discoveries tends to outweigh the destruction caused by the excavation. The notion that the excavation process itself is a destructive one is self-explanatory (Barker 1986, 73-99); “Whether on a small or massive scale, [it] involves the destruction of the primary evidence, which can never be recovered nor repeated since no two sites are identical” (Champion 1980, 43). In response to this, if excavation is never undertaken with reference to the three main purposes of excavation above, then human knowledge of the past will never be expanded or included in our archives. King described sites as ‘non-renewable resources’ because they can never be returned to an undisturbed state after archaeological interference, he stresses the importance of an archaeologists appreciation of a site which they may be the last to study before it is destroyed (2005, 60-61). By this King could mean that archaeologists should recognise that excavation is disrupting the resting place of antiquities. So, when excavating, archaeologists should maximize their time to attain the greatest information they can in order to outweigh the destruction it can bring.

Although, there is not a single scholarly book based solely around the notion that excavation is non-destructive; non-destructive methods which may limit the need for excavation are frequently referred to. For instance, ground survey, with the help of technology, outlines the geological and geographical layout of the landscape, enabling archaeologists to have an idea of the site context in a wider landscape. Egyptologist Mark Lehner used Geographic Information Systems (GIS) in the Giza Plateau to expose the “vast urban centre attached to the pyramids, sometimes known as ‘The Lost City of the Pyramid Builders’” (Renfrew and Bahn 2008, 92). The technology was also used to compile all the data they had, including digital photographs, notebooks, forms and artifact records into a single information source enabling them to map spatial patterns of architecture, burials and artifacts (Renfrew and Bahn 2008, 92).

The discovery of so called ‘Japanese Atlantis’ at Yonaguni proved to have shed light into the archaeological evidences of ‘pyramids’ and somehow brought legendary stories, which have been passed down through generations in the Ryukyu Islands, back to life (Journeyman Pictures 2008). Masaaki Kimura, a marine geologist from the University of Ryukyu, believes that a 5,000 year old city lies below the surface of the water at Yonaguni “based on dates of stalactites found inside underwater caves…ruins of a castle, a triumphal arch, five temples [and] one large stadium” (Ryall 2007). In this case, the knowledge attained from excavating the ruins at Yonaguni
is immensely valuable, and the destruction caused by excavation was deemed appropriate due to the value and of the data obtained: an unknown city preserved by the water. Despite the excavation at Yonaguni being underwater, the processes involved are similar to ground excavations but, the scale and type of destruction may differ. For instance, “shifting vast quantities of sediment [and] removing bulky objects” from the ocean floor to the surface may mean that some materials are lost; the conservation of such artefacts which have survived in a waterlogged environment will also be very different (Renfrew and Bahn 2008, 109).

Methods such as ‘non-destructive’ or ‘pre-excavation’ techniques are increasing in popularity as alternatives to traditional excavations. These methods are often employed together as non-destructive methods are, in effect, pre-excavation techniques (Greene 2002, 50). Roskams stated that these techniques, either way you term them, are used “to give knowledge of sites prior to full excavation” (2001, 48). One such technique is reconnaissance survey from the air and the ground (Renfrew and Bahn 2008: 74, 79, 95, 99). This non-destructive technique began as a preliminary inquiry of an area of interest, but has developed into an important source of information in its own right, producing very different data to digging (Renfrew and Bahn 2008, 77).

Aerial reconnaissance is commonly known as ‘aerial photography’ and consists of different sub strategies which assist in locating and acquiring information from sites (Greene 2002, 62). For example, the use of oblique and vertical photographs have drawbacks and advantages that consequently affect the way interpreters and archaeologists decipher sites (Renfrew and Bahn 2008, 83). Other techniques used are analysing crop marks, soil marks and earth works in the landscape because they reveal where materials have been buried. For instance, crop marks can clearly exhibit where archaeological remains are since “buried features either enhance or reduce the growth of plants.” (Greene 2002, 63-64; Roskams 2001, 44). These abnormalities can be detected using aerial photography and are used to assess sites in order to gain information or to help prepare for excavations, by indicating potential trench locations. In recent decades, technological advancements have also provided useful and valuable tools to improve the reliability of aerial photography. These include, infrared and radar photography, satellite images, digital terrain modelling, computer enhancement etc. (Renfrew and Bahn 2008, 86). Such additions can be used to critically reveal landscape and geological features and also improve the sharpness and contrasts of photos making differences in the crop easier to identify.

Aerial photography inevitably has pros and cons. The main advantage is that the identification of archaeological sites becomes easier and more time efficient as researchers do not have to rely on analysing ancient documents and maps to locate sites. For example, Father Antoine Poidebard in Syria has “discovered many new forts and roads [showing] that underwater sites could be detected from the air, revealing for the first time the ancient harbor beneath the sea at Tyre, Lebanon” (Renfrew and Bahn 2008, 79). According to Greene the use of aerial photography has “made the greatest single contribution to archaeological fieldwork and recording” (2002, 57)
and is continuously used to map and document sites. Despite aerial photographs revealing the potential location of a site, most are far more complex than the impression given from how they look from the air (Barker 1986, 58). This means that excavation is still required if there is the need for further research. Aerial photography is a useful tool for locating, mapping, and documenting sites, however to gain a comprehensive interpretation of a site or in cases where further research is required, excavation is still the most useful method.

Likewise, ground reconnaissance is another key non-destructive method utilised regularly by archaeologists. The main advantage of using this method is that the whole landscape of the site can be mapped using three types of geophysical sensing: resistivity, magnetometry, and radar transmission (Greene 2002, 73; Roskams 2001, 52). When combining aerial and ground reconnaissance into a 3-D model, the results are immensely detailed; therefore the need to excavate can be carefully considered and questioned (Roskams 2001, 56).

In summary, excavation is said to be ‘destructive’ because of the process of removing remains from the ground, as stated by Barker (1986), Champion (1980) and King (2005). However, it is generally agreed that the scale of discovery and knowledge gained from the thorough excavation of a site outweighs the destruction it brings. With reference to examples mentioned, such as the Japanese Atlantis and the lost city of pyramid builders in the Giza Plateau, excavation expands our knowledge of the human past. It is the means to an end when it comes to further research on sites. ‘Non-destructive’ methods are known as ‘pre-excavation’ techniques because they are used to attain as much information as they can before resolving into excavation. Pre-excavation methods are especially useful when they combine aerial and ground survey techniques, as this can reliably indicate potential trench locations or possibly omit the need for excavation altogether.
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Abstract

In 2014, I participated in a multidisciplinary field school course at the Black Friary in Trim, Co. Meath, Ireland. Excavations, with a focus on community driven archaeology, have been conducted at this 13th century Dominican friary for the past five years, under the direction of Finola O’ Carroll and Dr. Denis Shine. The project is run by the Irish Archaeology Field School (IAFS), which offers courses in both archaeology and bioarchaeology. These are taught by staff specializing in, amongst other things, medieval masonry, paleopathology, architecture, trauma and community archaeology. Students of all skill levels and educational backgrounds are welcomed and get to experience Irish archaeology through onsite teachings and lectures, as well as by touring archaeological sites throughout Ireland. In this paper I outline the history of the Black Friary and the excavations taking place on the site, while reflecting on how my participation in IAFS’ 2014 season helped broaden my archaeological skill set and inform my current postgraduate studies.

Introduction:

Why Ireland? Why Meath?

Ireland is a must visit destination for anyone with even a passing interest in heritage. While the country is small (approximately 84,000 km²), its low population density has contributed to the preservation of numerous upstanding archaeological sites, dating from the Irish Mesolithic (Middle Stone Age) (c. 9,000 ybp) through to the modern era. Though beautiful monuments survive throughout the country, County Meath is frequently considered to be the heritage capital of Ireland due to the density and importance of its upstanding archaeological remains.
Meath, situated less than a thirty minute drive from Dublin International Airport, is home to beautiful heritage towns and a stunning rural archaeological landscape. Nestled within this rural landscape is the Boyne Valley, a river valley housing world-renowned archaeological and heritage sites such as the UNESCO World Heritage Site of Brú na Bóinne (Newgrange, Knowth and Dowth) and the Hill of Tara. At the western limit of the Boyne Valley lies the medieval town of Trim, a town named from the Irish “Ath Truim,” meaning “the ford of the elder tree” (Herity 2001). Trim was established by Hugh de Lacy during the 12th century Anglo-Norman conquests. Subsequently, the town developed into one of the primary medieval centers in Ireland, partly due to its strategic location on the River Boyne. While archaeological evidence indicates the presence of a monastic site within the town from the 6th century (Kieran 2009; Potterton 2005; Potterton and Seaver 2009), Trim is best known today for its high medieval landscape (c. 12th century on) (Potterton 2005, 2009). The town still contains an intact medieval street layout and is home to the largest conserved Anglo-Norman castle in Ireland, Trim Castle. Within modern Trim, just outside the original medieval town limits, is the Black Friary, a 13th century Dominican friary that is home to the current IAFS excavations.
The Black Friary

The Black Friary, named for the black robes preferred by the Dominican order, overlooks the River Boyne and is located approximately 200m northeast of St. Patrick’s Cathedral (the probable location of the early monastic site of Trim). The friary is situated within a field approximately six acres in area, delineated by modern housing to the north, east, and west, and a supermarket to the southwest. The friary was extensively quarried in the mid-18th century and today is visible on the surface only as a series of grassy hummocks. A bank and ditch runs north-south through the center of the site, dividing the friary precinct (to the west) from friary fields or orchards (to the east). Although the topsoil contains remnants of illegal rubbish dumping, the archaeology has suffered from little disturbance since the 18th century quarrying.

The Black Friary was founded in 1263 by Geoffrey de Geneville and is one of several Dominican houses founded in Ireland after the order arrived in 1224 (Flynn 1993; Ó Clabaigh 2012). De Geneville, a French nobleman serving Henry III, was Lord of Trim during the 13th century – after gaining his title by marrying Matilda, a granddaughter of Walter de Lacy (Potterton 2005). As the Lord of Trim, de Geneville controlled an area known as the ‘Liberty of Trim’. After the death of Matilda, de Geneville lived at the friary and was interred there after his death in 1314 (Potterton 2005; Potterton and Seaver 2009).
The Black Friary, thought to be dedicated to Saint Mary of the Assumption, was of considerable importance during the medieval period (Hennessey 2004). It served as the location of an assembly of Irish bishops in 1291, as well as Parliamentary meetings in 1446 and 1491 (Hennessey 2004). After its suppression in 1540, the friary was re-established for a brief period in 1630, only for the friars to be transferred to Donore prior to 1713 (Hennessey 2004). During the 18th century the ruined buildings of the Black Friary were demolished for their limestone (Conwell 1878). Consequently, by the time the Ordnance Survey was conducted in the mid-19th century, only scattered pieces of displaced masonry, such as portions of the bell tower and one of the friary wells, were visible above ground. Despite the destruction of the friary, the site continued to hold significance within the community as a burial ground, particularly for unbaptised children.

**Excavations at the Black Friary**

Since 2010, archaeological excavations have clarified the outline of the friary buildings and helped elucidate their construction methodology. Excavations have also investigated the burial customs at the site and started to examine agricultural practices in the lands surrounding the friary precinct.

![Excavation Map](image)

Many of the structures to the south of the friary, including the church, the belfry tower and sections of the cloister garth have been excavated since 2010. Excavations to date have also exposed the limits of the northern and western ranges of buildings, located in Cutting 7 (Fig. 3). Most recently, during the 2014 excavations, a substantive excavation was undertaken within the eastern range of buildings located in Cutting 6 (Fig. 3). This cutting exposed more of the cloister...
garth, a section of ambulatory and masonry from the eastern range, including a set of stone steps.

Most of my excavation experience took place in Cutting 6, where I was paired with a supervisor who had very different research interests to my own (his being medieval masonry and mine being biological anthropology). Such a pairing provided an opportunity to learn new archaeological skill sets and, while I arrived on site with no knowledge of masonry and architecture, I soon acquired the skills to excavate and record masonry and architectural detail. During my time on site, archaeological test trenching was also conducted to the east of the precinct boundary, providing the first evidence of a medieval field system, as well as a probable medieval enclosure (which may have contained an orchard or livestock).

Numerous artifact types have been recovered throughout the five seasons of excavation, including pottery, building materials, coins, and metal artefacts. Common finds in the 2014 season, when I was onsite, included medieval potsherds (most of which were found in Cutting 6), post-medieval potsherds, and building materials (i.e. stained glass, nails, floor tiles, and stone architectural fragments). A large amount of human and non-human skeletal material was also found, most frequently within the church.

Bioarchaeology

As of the end of the 2014 excavation season, 93 individual burials have been excavated. Burial excavations are conducted under the supervision of Dr. Rachel Scott, Associate Professor of Anthropology at DePaul University, and the IAFS site directors. Prior to IAFS excavations at the Black Friary, a series of burials were excavated from the laneway located along the western boundary of the site (Seaver et al. 2009; Mandal and O’Carroll 2011). Based on current archaeological knowledge, the boundaries of the cemetery are thought to be delimited by the modern ‘Kells Road’ (which is part of the town’s medieval road network) at their western extent. The eastern extent of burials is not yet understood. However, the absence of human remains during archeological testing east of the precinct appears to confirm that burials did not extend past the precinct boundary in this direction (Shine per. comms. 20 November 2014). It has not yet been determined exactly how near burials came to this boundary. Burials, recovered as of 2014, date from the medieval period until well after the mid-16th century dissolution of Irish monasteries. The high prevalence of sub adult remains (n=27/66 as of the 2013 excavation season) could likely be attributed to the site’s religious significance post destruction (c. mid-18th century). In this period, the site is thought to have been used as a burial ground for individuals who may not have been permitted burial in consecrated ground elsewhere, such as unbaptised children and infants (O’Carroll 2014).
To date, burials pre-dating the dissolution have been found in the cemetery, to the south of the church, as well as in the church itself, the cloister garth and the ambulatory. Burial in these discreet locations would have been decided based on a person’s standing; i.e. if they were a member of the Dominican community or a member of the laity with sufficient social standing and wealth to afford burial within the nave of the church (Lagan 2013; O’Carroll 2014).

While complete biological profiles are not yet prepared for each individual, preliminary skeletal indicators of pathological conditions are regularly noted and discussed with students throughout the bone washing process. In my time washing burials, I noted skeletal markers for osteoarthritis and common dental pathologies such as antemortem tooth loss (ATL) and dental caries, as well as evidence for trauma. Bone washing allowed me the opportunity to use training from my previous paleopathology coursework, and was a great addition to the two-week bioarchaeology course I completed in Cutting 10 (Fig. 3), where I helped locate and lift a burial after a pedal phalanx was initially recovered during excavation.

Community Driven Archaeology

In addition to archaeology and bioarchaeology courses, students are also frequently expected to contribute to IAFS’ programme(s) of community outreach. IAFS hosts numerous community events each season, including onsite family days, walking tours, school visits, exhibitions, and community lectures. As the field school has expanded, community investment in the Black Friary has also grown, resulting in considerable improvements to the site itself, such as the installation of a community garden inspired by medieval horticulture. More recently, a programme of landscaping works have been developed by IAFS and Meath County Council (the local governing authority), which will be executed by local people to further improve the Black Friary as a community resource in coming seasons. This community aspect of the Black Friary is one that made the dig so enjoyable. Throughout my time on site camaraderie was developed between students, staff, volunteers and community members (all of whom are able to participate in the excavations), leading to an open learning environment that extends beyond just archeological training.

A personal reflection

In total, I attended two sessions with IAFS during their 2014 excavation season. Although my first session lasted only two weeks (their minimum short course), I was instructed in several of the broad suite of techniques used on an archaeological excavation. My second session was significantly longer, lasting approximately eight weeks. Participating in a longer session allowed for a more in-depth experience of both excavation and post-excavation strategies. As an American student preparing for a course at an English institution these sessions, being taught...
predominantly by Irish archaeologists, provided much better preparation for my studies in England than I could have experienced at an American field school.

During my sessions I worked in three different archaeological cuttings (Cuttings 5, 6 and 10) – each with their particular challenges – and conducted post-excavation activities in IAFS’ off-site facilities. IAFS expects students (especially those on a long stay) to contribute to all facets of the project, rather than limiting themselves to a particular task or ‘area of interest’. Such an ethos means expanding your skill set and professional experience. Thus I was taken out of my niche of bioarchaeology, spending as much time planning masonry and excavating structural remains as I did excavating/processing burials, whilst working alongside both expert archaeological staff and local community volunteers with varying levels of archaeological experience.

I think this unique mix of people and archaeology is what made me want to return for my second session so soon after the first, and is what is currently driving me to use the Black Friary as a case study for my postgraduate dissertation. I will be returning to the site in 2015 to conduct research as part of my MSc. As part of this research, I aim to use ground-penetrating radar (GPR) to identify sub-surface features (especially individual graves) that have not been recognised during previous surveys (see for example Kennedy 1989). Results from this method of survey could have significant implications for designing future excavation strategies at the Black Friary in detecting mass graves within Europe.
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For those of you who have had the pleasure of participating in archaeological excavations, you will agree that it is a unique experience filled with excitement, making friends and testing your limits. It also involves a lot of hard work but, looking back on our experiences, we realise that it was all definitely worth it.

Excavations are an inseparable part of the discipline of archaeology, and they provide young students with invaluable knowledge and experience. When an email came through about an excavation opportunity available to only four students from the University of York, it was unsurprising that we all applied straight away. The opportunity was for a month on a site in Sicily, alongside Professor Martin Carver, an internationally renowned archaeologist and director of the excavations at Sutton Hoo from 1983 to 1993. The excavation took place in central Sicily, two hours from Palermo. It involved the investigation of a Byzantine fortress, as well as uncovering evidence of the Byzantine-Islamic transition, as this was the first season of the excavation.

It has more often than not been taught in the school of archaeology that no single account of the past can present it fully or objectively. As such, here are three separate accounts from students that took part in the excavation in Sicily who were willing to share their experiences.

**Dan Miller, post-graduate student at the University of York**

After previously excavating at Harewood House (Leeds) and Songo Mnara (Tanzania) this excavation in Sicily was a completely different kind of experience. Only in its first season, the excavation located at Castronovo di Sicilia in central Sicily was a collaboration between the University of Rome and the University of York. We stayed at a nunnery in the heart of the town, where we each took turns to cook a communal meal, mainly cooked by the much more culinarily talented Italian students.

Under the leadership of Martin Caver (of Sutton Hoo fame) the team were split into two groups, the top site (excavating around a stone wall of a hill top fort) and the bottom site (excavating around a suspected settlement). I was working on the bottom site, where we uncovered two stone-lined child’s tombs, two hearths, and a dried river bed. Although the bottom site showed
significantly fewer finds, the enlightening conversations (mainly concerning Mamma Mia) made it a thoroughly enjoyable experience.

On my final day, the results of the excavation were presented to an audience in the centre of Castronovo. Seeing the genuine interest and enthusiasm from the local community filled us with pride about what we had achieved. Excavating abroad is something I feel that everyone should experience. It gives you a chance to make friends with students from other universities, to experience the local culture and heritage, and most importantly to pack the Hawaiian Tropics and top-up on that much needed sun tan.

Jasmine Lundy, undergraduate at the University of York

When I first heard about the excavation in Sicily, I jumped at the opportunity. I saw it as a great chance to gain valuable experience in a real working environment, something that I was lacking and eager to gain. And Sicily too, what a great place to visit!
During my four weeks, I learned so much more than I had expected to. Through the first year of my degree I had learnt the basics of field archaeology, but learning on the job and being able to use these skills in a hands-on way really is incredibly useful and something I would recommend to anyone. At first I was concerned that I didn't know enough, but I had the chance to do GIS surveying with Helen Goodchild, spent ten days excavating a grave, and of course got to handle the infamous Italian zaper – great anger management.

Alongside the great set of skills I have gained, working with the Sicily team has been a once in a lifetime experience, and I have met so many amazing people – Italian and English! I would love to go back and work there again, as this experience has really given me the bug to continue excavating at home and abroad. I would definitely encourage anyone to give it a go, regardless of your level of experience.

Figure 2. The view from the top site. Image provided by Alexandra Drosinaki
“In archaeology the main thing is to gain as much experience as you can”. This is a phrase often heard from professionals when offering advice for a successful career in the field of archaeology.

When the opportunity arose to dig in Sicily, I applied without giving it a second thought. In my mind I imagined good weather, good food and a trip to an island of Italy I had never visited before. However, I came to the realisation very quickly that this wasn’t a holiday. There was a lot of work to be done, and many things to learn.

There had been various problems with the location of the excavation for different reasons. Permission to excavate on someone’s land is not always easily attained. It was evident that, for a successful excavation, an archaeologist needs to have certain other abilities, such as legal knowledge and people-skills, in order to deal with this and other tenuous issues. I also noticed an understanding of the common language was desirable, if not essential, to go through with any research. Fortunately, the project leaders possessed all these qualities and were able to manage difficult situations, teaching us a lot from both within and outside the sphere of archaeology.

Ultimately, the experience you gain isn’t limited to the dos and don’ts concerning the process of the excavation. It can also teach you a great deal about the use of other, different kinds of skills. Archaeology is not just excavation. And excavation is not just digging.

The experience was unique, and taught me many things needed in the real working field of archaeology which I couldn’t have learnt in a lecture theatre.
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