

AARGnews 19

**CONTENTS**

Editorial	3
AARG working groups	5
Chairman's Piece <i>by</i> Cathy Stoertz	6
Professor Barri Jones <i>appreciations by</i> Bob Bewley and David Kennedy	7
Power of image: some ideas on post-processual aerial archaeology <i>by</i> Włodzimierz Raczkowski	10
Rowy sa czerwone: Poland – well, Poznan – from the ground <i>by</i> Rog Palmer	15
Books of interest?	18
List of Contributors	22
Notes for Contributors	inside back cover

**Woops.....** Re: Ditches are red, **AARGnews 19**

I can be a silly sod at times. Of course, my Danebury ditches are black, the banks are red. How did I let the RCHME get away with that? Hell, did I start this silly colour reversal...?

RogEd

## Editorial

It looks as if I've got my millennium verticals of Britain (see Editorial, *AARGnews* 15). Maybe even two sets...? The April 1999 issue of *Mapping Awareness* noted that Ordnance Survey will be photographing the country to provide data for the remapping of Britain under the National Interest Mapping Service Agreement (no, I've never heard of it either...). The August issue identified what seems to be another project – this one a joint venture by Simmons Aerofilms and NRSC – to photograph the UK at 1:10000 in 1999 (find out more at [www.ukperspectives.com](http://www.ukperspectives.com)). The latter project is clearly aimed at the GIS market and aims to create 'rectified orthophoto maps' by 2001. What, no stereo pairs? An air photo layer in GIS may provide an attractive visual feature but is of little use for anyone who wants to interpret the photos. Regardless of whether any of these new photographs have been taken at appropriate archaeological times, we are now assured of another country-wide time slice to add to that taken in the immediate post-war years. If OS continue their current policy in which they seem to hold on to their material for about 20 years before unloading it at NMRAP we only have to wait until 2020 for the stereo cover.

Continuing with acquisition of useful photography, I recently learned that there is a major survey taking place, or soon to take place, over 'eastern Europe'. Unfortunately this seems to have military connections so the photographs may never be available for local archaeologists to study. If any AARG members over there know more about this – and especially if there is any likelihood of access to the pictures – I'll be interested to be told any further news (please).

Continuing the theme of map revision reminds me of an unanswered question that arose when chatting recently to David Hall. Now that all OS work appears to be digital, what happens to previous editions when changes are made? For his medieval studies, David needs access to old maps like we need heaps of photos – and it was with future historians in mind, who will want to document change, that the point arose.

I haven't got a clue what happens, but maybe OS themselves (members of AARG so possibly readers of *AARGnews*?) would care to answer. It would be unfortunate if we suddenly end our 1000 years of map-making tradition simply because we have gone digital. I suppose we could logically extend the question to those who map from APs. Do you (and I) retain earlier editions of mapping? What will happen to the first edition NMP when (?if) their programme of revision and updating begins? But perhaps if everything – our work and OS surveys – are based on APs then any early editions can be reconstructed in the future by working with photos (but not with the contemporary knowledge) taken up to the date in question.

### **New words for the 'aerial archaeologist'?**

A recent note by Jaromir Kovarnik included use of the term 'vegetation symptoms' for you-know-what (*CIRA Bulletin* 22-1999, 41). Jaromir was one of the students on our Hungarian training week and it would be nice if the ground school teachers could take credit for introducing such an appropriate phrase. Unfortunately not, and it is more likely a blur in translation although it does seem a much more appropriate name for what is observed and photographed than the usually-used expression.

### **Recent research: new films**

From emails:

**RP to PH:** "Was in a photo shop yesterday and saw a heap of that SFX film. Did you ever try flying with it? If so, any comment for *AARGnews*? It's obviously not v popular as the heap was remaindered!"

**PH to RP:** "We've certainly flown with it - I keep meaning to take it out of the pocket of the camera bag and actually put it in a camera one day!"

This aside, I would expect some of you to be interested in evaluating new films and associated materials – or that if you do so already, you would be willing to share information with others. SFX, for those of you who don't know, is an Ilford black and

white 200 ISO film with extended red sensitivity. The blurb claims that it has a peak red sensitivity at 720nm and extended red sensitivity up to 740nm. Conventional film reaches about 650nm while the curve for Kodak Technical Pan show that it can reach 690nm. A slight problem may occur when exposing SFX as Ilford seem only to give a rough guide which is 'bracket exposures by  $\pm 2$  stops from the TTL reading' – not necessarily a convenient thing to do in the air although expensive cameras can be set to do this automatically while you keep changing films!

For those of you who use 4-seat aircraft, this is surely where the back seat passenger comes in useful. Not to change films, but to be given the task of evaluating almost any new film. Photographs taken in parallel with the front-seat observer will provide a useful comparison of known film and new. To some extent this is what I did when back-seating with RCHME – but they seem to have stopped giving me lifts now. The airborne of you need to keep abreast of change, just as we on the ground have exchanged our proportional dividers for computers. Or perhaps I'm just imagining that you are all still on automatic pilot as set in the 1930s....

### **ER Mapper 6.0**

Follows nicely from the above as another in the compendium of computer programs designed to broaden use of aerial photographs and mapping. Davy Strachan pointed ER's sales director, Dominic Cuthbert, in my direction as they thought that AARG members may be interested. A telephone conversation resulted in a pack of leaflets and a trial CD thumping through the letterbox a few days later. I've not had time to try to CD or fully read the leaflets but, from the quoted prices, this is obviously aimed at corporate users rather than the odd Rog. Reading around the glossy brochure-talk, I get the impression that ER Mapper helps insert layers of aerial photos in GIS. Once there you can mosaic and superimpose photos of different dates, add maps, colour-classify parts of images, contour, make prespective views (the illustrations of which all appear to have standing buildings and upright trees –

which is clever), etc. All ways of creating visual (?rather than interpreted) versions of your data. I don't intend to dismiss the program this lightly, but will have a proper look at what I've been sent before (hopefully) it goes out of date. ER Mapper is already in use at Northamptonshire County Council and Davy may later come up with some Essex views. If any of you want to find out for yourselves the web page is [www.ermapper.com](http://www.ermapper.com) or I can provide addresses and phone numbers for the technologically retarded.

### **Ditches are red – or should be**

In England, there has been an unofficial colour coding used in AP mapping which has been used consistently by RCHME and others for more than 25 years. In stratigraphical order we've had the RCHME publications – Cathy's *Wolds*, Rowan Whimster's *Emerging Past*, my *Danebury*, and the non-RCHME *Thames Valley* series (and going back to the 1930's Allen's maps in *Oxoniensia*) – which maintained a consistent 'ditches are red' convention. It came as something of a surprise to be shown some of EH's digital NMP files in which they had reversed the convention. Their on-screen maps show ditches as green (traditionally 'banks') which had to be explained to me before the maps made any sense. Without being too rude (sorry boss!), this seems somewhat daft.

It ought to be easy to make a global colour change so that the rest of us can understand the maps - or at least they could chose colours that don't already have accepted meaning. Of course, I might have got things wrong and these may only be on-screen colours to match the black background they draw on. Maybe when they print on white paper the colours also reverse...? I've tried to find out what, if anything, the two Commissions use – but silence so far. Does this means that it is time for another Guide to drawing conventions as was published in *Aerial Archaeology* 11, especially if we are now considering (at least) Euro-wide collaboration.

**Grotty 1999?**

Various emails and conversation with the airborne contingent shows it to have been a poor year for vegetation symptoms. It is almost as if there is a line of latitude south of which the crops have been a write off, north of which things were better – although Bob Bewley told me they had found some good areas in the south of England. Elsewhere in the south, Derek Edwards said that things were abysmal in Norfolk, Chris Cox made a flight along the Thames from Oxford to the millennium dome (somewhere in east London I think) and saw virtually no archaeological stuff. Toby Driver noted that: “Wales has been getting good now as far as cropmarks are concerned, or at least, marks in grass (which are still crops, I know). The cereal crops have shown virtually nothing this year, but the low-lying hills have been showing some really good grassmarks in the last few days. The borderlands are also getting busier now, especially over the gravels, but I'm not sure how this rain will effect things.” (3 August: about the time that Anthony Crawshaw said similar things about England north of the Wash.) And, of course, the following few days gave us lots of rain – so goodbye parch marks.

Otto Braasch sent me the following general picture of Europe: “The recent summer was extremely wet in the south of Germany and in Hungary, as well in Austria. I was in Hungary twice and found vast areas flooded and many surviving crop marks had become ‘unreadable’ by rain and storm. It looked much better in northern Germany and in some spots of eastern Poland. I would grade conditions as being ‘good to very good’ north of a line Frankfurt - Berlin - Leszno.” Ioana Oltean (working with Bill Hanson: see *AARGnews* 18, 15-17) said of Romania (the Mures valley area): “I just came back to Cluj after this year’s session of flights. The weather was great, except for the May when, obviously it rained a lot and destroyed again most of the chances for cropmarks.”

**Think about it...**

One for the aerial photographers. The theme of the Remote Sensing Society 1999 conference (which you have just missed) is ‘Earth observation: from data to information’.

**‘Obliques or Vertical?’ AARG working party: fourth note**

Nothing has happened. CUCAP were too busy (or were somewhere else) to fit in cover of one of our 5 x 5 km blocks. With David Wilson no longer there to prompt the flying crew I wonder whether they will always be too busy....

## Chairman's Piece

Cathy Stoertz

There is no significance whatever in the fact that my last Chairman's Piece is also the last of the Millennium (according to the popular definition), except that the coincidence provides a flimsy excuse for a few reflections on AARG as I have seen it over the past three years, and as I hope to see it in the future.

During my time as Chairman, Rog Palmer and I have occasionally had discussions that begin "What is aerial archaeology, anyway...?" These are always inconclusive because, of course, aerial archaeology is many things to many people. The subject, and the Research Group, balances – or juggles – a wide range of contrasting, although not (I believe) conflicting, interests: management/theory/politics and grass roots practice; flying/photography and interpretation/mapping; in-depth research and rapid assessment; development of underlying philosophy and active teaching and recruitment. Inevitably, individuals may have a preference for a particular facet of our collective specialism, but AARG has room for the whole spectrum of interests. The great strength of this group is that it allows proponents of all aspects of aerial archaeology to meet and exchange views, and perhaps even learn from each other.

My own belief is that AARG is at its best when it combines theory and practice, words and action, as demonstrated by recent endeavours. Especially in Europe, AARG members have increasingly played an "ambassadorial" role, promoting the awareness of our specialist field amongst cultural resource policy-makers, lobbying for the provision of funds and the development of survey programmes where none had previously existed. We are extremely fortunate to have members possessed of considerable diplomatic skills, as well as members who are able to follow up those initiatives with practical teaching courses and tangible encouragement for those who will do the work day to day.

At a more theoretical level, AARG provides a forum for necessary discussions of the "why are we here and where are we going?" variety: there are still very real problems to be addressed. Questions about how best to collect and analyse data, how to present and test interpretations, even how to persuade other archaeologists to use "our" information to best advantage – all have been under discussion as long as I have been in this business, and will probably never be answered, because the answers are always changing.

But even if we never succeed in answering the questions, AARG will continue to thrive as long as it – we – can continue bring new people into the discussion, and can renew our own enthusiasm by making new contacts. As I have said several times in these essays, communication and outreach is the key to the past and future success of AARG, even if the question "What is aerial archaeology, anyway?" has as many answers as the group has members.

It has been a great privilege – and also lots of fun – to serve as AARG Chairman for the past three years. My sincere thanks go to the rest of the Committee, and to everyone else who has given so much support and assistance in recent projects: I wish my successor a similarly happy experience.

## Professor Barri Jones

Many readers will have heard of Barri Jones' untimely death on July 16<sup>th</sup> this year, whilst walking in the Welsh hills. Barri should be remembered by AARG members in a variety of ways - not least for three decades of research using aerial photographs but also more recently for his attendance at the Chester AARG meeting in 1996. Barri understood the value of aerial photography and photographs and applied this knowledge in more parts of the Roman Empire than any other archaeologist I can bring to mind.

The broadsheet newspapers carried full obituaries so this short piece is meant to be a personal tribute, especially as he introduced me to aerial photography. As a schoolboy I remember a telephone conversation with Barri (who was trying arrange a flight with my father over the Solway Plain) in which he convinced me that Ancient History and Archaeology at Manchester University was a much better idea than the course I had chosen at Liverpool. (So it's Barri who is responsible for showing me the path which has led to my current position!) This concern to help young would-be archaeologists will be one of Barri's lasting testaments for our generation. He took the time to educate, encourage and enthuse. Why else did we spend wet week-ends digging on the Stainmore signalling system or putting another trench across the western extension of Hadrian's Wall?

It has been said that Barri was "driven" but this was not a selfish obsession – he was always wanting to share the experiences with others; he was the founder of the magazine *Popular Archaeology*. One story which takes us back to Beacon Hill in Penrith on a warm Saturday morning in 1975 sums up his abilities to popularise but also to conjure up a workforce out of nothing. The local paper had published one of Barri's aerial photographs on the front page – allegedly a site with 90 or so Iron Age hut circles which Barri was proposing as his excavation (although I had been taken on to supervise on a site 5 miles away). In the paper Barri had asked for volunteer diggers to meet on the field of the supposed Iron Age site and sure enough over 25 locals arrived. Hanging on Barri's every word they were soon educated in the ways of air photo interpretation with the revelation that these hut circles were in fact fairy rings and that the site we would be excavating was indeed 5 miles down the road. No one demurred and Barri had his workforce for the "real" site.

Not long after that, as student in Manchester it was clear that Barri's "following" knew no boundaries of age, class or race. People from all walks of life and many different countries were either enrolled on one of his courses or were just "there". He rarely talked of politics but led by example and was at home in any company and could mix with (and mix together) builders and labourers from one country and royalty from another; he was able to find a common bond, usually via archaeology, but his gift was that of humility. He appreciated how privileged he was to be a Professor of Archaeology and when he told his mother he had been promoted she said (in a Welsh accent) "Oh, Barri, when are you going to get a proper job!"

In anticipation of his retirement in September 2000 Nick Higham had been arranging a three-day event to celebrate Barri's life and achievements and in my mind I had been thinking about what aspect of his contribution to archaeology would I focus on. I was coming to the conclusion that the title of the piece should be 'Barri – the teacher'. For me it was his ability to communicate his knowledge and enthusiasm for his subject, in the classroom, in the field and even in the air, that was an inspiration. His course on Aerial Archaeology which he ran

every other year from the mid-70s onwards was probably the only course I have attended where all of us in the classroom felt we wanted more. Because of the paucity of publications on the subject in 1976 we all read all the books, articles and obscure references. Barri introduced us to the work of Antoine Poidebard, the airborne Jesuit priest in Syria, and Jean Baradez in North Africa – surveys which have not yet been surpassed but which have been the foundation for so many others, including Barri’s work in Libya.

As with all those who teach they can do so in two ways – by good example, inspiration and guiding the pupils along the right path or by showing how *not* to do something. I have already referred to Barri’s skill as teacher and in the field he was always ready to explain to the young and inexperienced what the day’s events and discoveries meant for the excavation in terms of interpreting the site. He was, of course, capable of the teaching by the other method.

As an example, one of his excavation legacies (which I have had in my study for many years awaiting publication) is a site discovered by aerial photography, almost in the right place to be a Roman signal station but which was, on excavation (as some had predicted), a Bronze Age barrow. This prehistoric diversion did not deter Barri in his quest for more information about the western extension of Hadrian’s Wall, but it does highlight a tendency to act first and think later; time and money (and not a little angst) could have been avoided had more preparation been done. Whilst some may not have always agreed with his interpretations his desire for knowledge and new information drove him on as well energising all those around him.

An example of a small, simple mistake also highlights his desire to please and care for his workforce. One year in Cumbria he purchased two dozen half-baked croissants for his digging team’s Sunday breakfast. This was a kind and thoughtful gesture but these delights required an oven for re-heating; camping on the edge of a raised bog with only single-burner gas stoves meant that Barri had a month’s supply of croissants which no-one could eat.

Nobody starved and the compassionate and helpful side of Barri was always near the surface; without this help my own PhD would not have been possible. This desire to help did mean that he was difficult to keep up with as he was always treble booked and meant to be in at least two places at anyone time. As David Mattingly wrote in his obituary (*Independent*, 23 July) Barri was “a better starter than a finisher” and “he did not live life the easy way”. Anyone who flew with him on a productive cropmark day will never forget the flurry of activity with cameras being handed over for loading or repair, films being tossed back or requested and shrieks of delight first one side of the aircraft and then the other as another “incredible” site had been spotted. In the air and on the ground the discoveries were always of the “utmost importance” and although this was very good for the morale of all those working for him, as they felt part of a great adventure, it was not always true!

He was no doubt looking forward to a retirement where the completion of those unfinished projects would be a priority. His archives of photographs and reports, as well as his books and magazines will stand testament to his successful life’s work, and I hope he will be remembered for his energy, enthusiasm and sense of adventure throughout the Roman empire.

Bob Bewley

Although I had not seen Barri since before I moved overseas a decade ago I kept in touch and remained grateful for his continued interest in and support of my research. I reminded him on a number of occasions that a major factor in my focus on the Roman army in the Near East had been his loaning me his copy of Poidebard's *La Trace de Rome*. Having since acquired my own copy of that book I realise how generous he had been to someone who was no more than one of many undergraduates. I doubt if I would loan my copy to anyone. But the gesture was typical of the man. I regret I left Manchester before Barri's course in Aerial Archaeology began. However, he routinely included aerial material in his lectures and the enthusiasm of his classes in general and ability to stimulate the interest of students, certainly played a part in my own later choices of areas of specialization.

David Kennedy

*Geraint Dyfed Barri Jones was born in St Helens, Lancashire 4 April 1936; studied Greats at Oxford University followed by a PhD on Italy (from 1959 to 1963); Lecturer, Manchester University 1964-1971, Professor of Archaeology 1971-1999.*

Selected publications:

- 1975 Higham N.J. and G.D.B. Jones. Frontiers, Forts and Farmers: Cumbrian Aerial Survey 1974-5. *Archaeological Journal* **132**, 16-53
- 1976 The western extension of Hadrian's Wall. Bowness to Cardurnock. *Britannia* **7**, 236-243
- 1977 The Colchester and Ipswich Aerial Survey. *Aerial Archaeology* **1**, 23-25
- 1979 Aerial Photography in the North. In Higham N.J. *The Changing Past*. Manchester, 75-86
- 1979 Aerial Photography in North Wales 1976-77. *Aerial Archaeology* **4**, 58-64
- 1980 Il Tavoliere romano. L'agricoltura romana attraverso l'aerofotografia e lo scavo. *ArchCI* **32**, 85-107
- 1982 The Solway Frontier: Interim Report 1970-81. *Britannia* **13**, 283-297
- 1983 Higham N.J. & Jones G.D.B. The excavation of two Romano-British sites in northern Cumbria. *Britannia* **14**, 45-72
- 1984 *Past Imperfect. The story of Rescue Archaeology*. Heineman, London
- 1987 *Apulia, Neolithic Settlement in the Tavoliere*. Reports Research Committee of the Society of Antiquaries, London **44**
- 1990 Jones B. and Mattingly D. *An Atlas of Roman Britain*. Blackwell, Oxford

## Power of image: some ideas on post-processual aerial archaeology

Włodzimierz Raczkowski

Aerial archaeology came into existence during the period dominated by positivist oriented diffusionism and newly born cultural-historical, functional and neo-evolutionist approaches. This was reflected in questions archaeologists directed to aerial photographs and in ways they used them. As theoretical options in archaeology began to change, the questions addressed to aerial photographs were also modified. In the 70's and 80's aerial photographs were used mainly to solve problems (often related to the question of landscape), specifically within the confines of cultural-historical and processual approaches.

In the middle of the 80's archaeology took interest in post-modern philosophy. Postmodernism is represented in various philosophical works in different forms but generally all share the following general assumptions (Giedymin 1994, 42):

- rejection of philosophical tradition seeking the true image of the world and absolute values
- cognitive relativism, i.e. lack of absolute criteria of truth, rationalism, reality etc.
- textualism denoting the omnipresence of language in human culture.

The interest taken by archaeologists in post-modern philosophy has led to the questioning of traditional archaeological thought and to the creation of a new platform for discussion known as post-processual archaeology. New areas of scientific research have been introduced and traditional questions have been shown in a new light (Hodder 1985; Shanks & Tilley 1987a; 1987b). Has aerial archaeology been affected by these changes?

Examining the works of leading post-processual archaeologists, such as Ian Hodder, Michael Shanks, Christopher Tilley, Julian Thomas or Chris Gosden, one can hardly find any reference to aerial archaeology though the scholars many a time relate to space visualisation and its role in creating the social world. Has aerial archaeology lost its influence and become anachronistic in this altered theoretical reflection? Is it so that moving

the stress to social theory and the analysis of world construction phenomena from the perspective of a human (a matter-of-fact type of man) will lead to eradication of aerial archaeology within the confines of this trend? Will the fact that aerial photographs show landscape from a distance, and tend to dehumanise it (Glasscock 1992, 9), result in rejecting them on the grounds that they cannot contribute to the studies of individual experiencing of space?

It seems as though aerial archaeology has not yet found its position within post-processual archaeology although it has already developed features that may be given new and interesting interpretation within modern and newly conceptualised categories. The subjects to be discussed might be, among others, the questions of aerial photographs as the source of information about the past, the character of photographs as archaeological record, the role of aerial photography in creating the narrative of the past, studies on cultural landscape and in formulating alternative visions of the past as well as the social role of knowledge produced by archaeology.

One of the most discussed problems in post-processual archaeology is that of power. Reflection on the role of power dates back to Karl Marx. It is no wonder that the archaeology based upon Marxist theory of historical process was focused on the problem of power. Michel Foucault added a new dimension to the reflection on power. In several historical studies Foucault (cf. 1973; 1987; 1993) showed the social conditions of power and the wide semantic spectrum of the notion. For Foucault (1980) power is not an institution, structure or strength that people are equipped with. Power is relevant to complicated relations in society and it cannot be reduced to individuals or social groups within specific fields of activity, such as economics or politics. Power may take different forms and shapes. The relationships of power are interrelated and entangled depending on differentiated social practice. They may be

related to the interests of individuals and social groups involved at both ends of the processes of exploitation, domination or submission. Power is present in all social relations because all members of a given community are, more or less, involved in relations with material (technology, raw materials) and immaterial (knowledge, information, skills) cultural resources. Power is in dialectical relation to these cultural resources. It also results in asymmetric distribution of these resources (Shanks & Tilley 1987b, 72-73).

One of the most important aspects of power discussed by Foucault is the power-knowledge relationship. From the point of view of archaeology this relationship is of paramount importance since it is related to the 'archaeologist context' and the influence on the created narratives about the past and their social consequences. Knowledge is constructed within a specific social system and it is dependant on the conceptual patterns prevalent in the system. On the other hand knowledge contributes to the strengthening of these patterns and to the change of relations and contexts. In this way knowledge is present within the system of relations which encompasses social experience of power. Knowledge is a way of legitimising the existing social order and as such is involved in the processes of strengthening the mechanisms of power. There is a widespread belief that knowledge is connected with truth. According to Foucault, if the power-knowledge relationship is identified there is no autonomy of truth. Consequently truth is connected with power. Truth is created in the tangle of knowledge and power (Zybertowicz 1995, 180-181).

The power-knowledge relations can be found on different levels of social structure. The effects of having or lacking knowledge may be far-reaching. Social inequalities might be created, strengthened or deepened due to differentiated access to knowledge. Aspects of knowledge and ways of interpreting the world may be imposed on certain groups and give rise to the control of people's behaviours and interpretations. In such a context knowledge in connection with power turns into ideology (Zybertowicz 1995, 182-183).

Thus, the knowledge about the past created by

archaeologists is encompassed into the relations of power functioning within a given society. The truth created about the past and its ideological overtone is connected with this power. Within this connection novel research trends and interpretations are introduced, both knowingly and unknowingly, which will in turn prove the validity of new categorisations and conceptualisations.

It may be assumed that image has always been present in the social creation of power. Since the second half of the 19th century photography participated in the process though its importance dates back to the 1930's when the development of new technologies such as new cameras, film stock and means of mechanical reproduction became more accessible (Tagg 1988, 13). Simultaneously, the changes of social mechanisms of spreading ideas made it possible for images (photographs) to influence societies in a new way, and influencing societies is a form of wielding power (Champion 1997, 213). At the same time the use of photography was broadened to include aerial pictures of archaeological sites. Hence aerial archaeology as a form of social practice from the very beginning has been entangled in the power-truth relation and photography was its main tool. The question is: In what aspects of social life does aerial archaeology experience power?

It seems that the key issue for the discussion of the relationships between power and aerial archaeology is the question of truth. The fact that aerial archaeology came into existence during the dominance of positivistic paradigm left its stamp on the way photography is looked upon in the context of truth. These basic assumptions are, more or less knowingly, accepted in aerial archaeology (Barthes 1996; Barry 1995; Jenks 1995), 1) the camera does not lie; 2) photography (re)presents reality; 3) image is a fact; 4) what can be seen is true (also in the photograph); 5) 'pure' perception of an image exists. Since Crawford, it was deeply believed in aerial archaeology that a photograph tells the truth about the past. This approach represents one of the aspects of power in aerial archaeology - the dictate of 'the truth of a photograph'. In a way an aerial archaeologist subordinates himself to what he sees in the picture.

The conviction that truth is accessible or that it can be revealed makes the question of truth in aerial archaeology even more complicated. Two aspects of the question may be considered: 1) the relationship between aerial archaeology and academic archaeology, and 2) the relation between aerial archaeology and the public.

As far as the first relationship is concerned, in the struggle between aerial archaeology and academic archaeology the latter is better off. Academic archaeology imposes general knowledge of the past, verifies the usefulness of methods, has a wider scientific spectrum at its disposal, constitutes the 'ultimate' criterion of truth and has vast institutional backup. Aerial archaeology supplies academic archaeology with information in forms of aerial photographs, site sketches and maps. It can be argued that without the 'demand' from academic archaeology aerial archaeology would lose its *raison d'être* but paradoxically the relationship is reversed. By supplying information, aerial archaeology appropriates a certain competence range and the right to decide the truth about the past in the context of aerial photographs. Controlling the truth, though very limited, requires that within aerial archaeology several mechanisms are developed which prevent others from interfering with this competence. In times when only a limited number of photographs were taken, aerial archaeology could easily wield its power. But since large collections of photographs were made accessible to the public, the control of truth exerted by aerial archaeology was 'threatened'. The need for a new ideology and new tools that would secure the 'interest' of aerial archaeology emerged. These were found in the interpretation of aerial photographs. It needed to be proved that not everyone was able to interpret photographs correctly and effectively. Thereby, the basic assumptions of the existence of 'pure' cognition were challenged, though not repealed, but lead to the emergence of the first so-called experienced observers. In aerial archaeology this approach was represented for example by Jim Pickering (1980; 1983) in the beginning of the 80's. Since then academic archaeology has been obliged to consult a specialist when interpreting aerial photographs. The range of power wielded by aerial archaeology was secured. This also applies

to the creation of maps based on aerial photographs - few archaeologists doubt nowadays that only specialists are capable of drawing reliable maps. The relationship between aerial archaeology and academic archaeology, though asymmetric, was preserved.

Modern times constitute a new threat to these relations. Post-modern reflection questioning the concept of truth abolishes the fundamental assumptions accepted in aerial archaeology from the very beginning. The photograph loses its theoretical neutrality and capability to represent (past) reality. Loss of the ability to control truth is associated by loss of the tool to exert power (even within a very limited range). Chris Tilley's *A Phenomenology of Landscape* (1994), which does not make use of maps (e.g. based on aerial photographs) in the studies of landscape, is a splendid example. Can aerial archaeology cope with the problem? Is the persuasive strength of an aerial photograph a sufficient argument to allow aerial archaeology to participate in the social game of power?

There is yet another area of experiencing power in aerial archaeology - the relation between aerial archaeology and the public. It seems that the possibility of exerting power by means of offering truth about the past is unlimited. Many books have been published with aerial photographs which pretend to tell story about the past (Christlein and Braasch 1990; Watson and Musson 1993; Shepherd and Greig 1996; Strachan 1998) but the book by Chris Musson *Wales from the Air* (1994) (a popular science book) should be mentioned as a different and special one. The writer aims at presenting a concise history of Wales from the early farmers to modern times. The history is told entirely through pictures - colour, black-and-white, vertical and oblique aerial photographs. The pictures themselves tell a story which is amplified by the text. Both together combine as a narrative which moves around districts chronologically and is easy to follow. The aim of the book is to influence the reader, mostly through the pictures and to some extent through words, to accept the key role played by aerial archaeology in the understanding of the past. Consequently the reader is referred to other sources and encouraged

to an independent analysis of aerial photographs. The pictures are accompanied by the text, general information on the region, period or historical process and the captions. The captions are complex and they supplement the narrative based on the pictures. They explain what can be seen in the pictures and serve the task of facilitating the process of reading and interpreting.

The work offers 'air travel' in time and space. The pictures are not a mere means of illustration, as in the majority of such books, but they build the narrative. Using certain techniques, which may be called rhetoric, though related to the pictures, the writer tries to convince the reader of his narrative and to focus his interest both on the whole book and every detail. The choice of specific sequences of photographs, on the one hand dramatic on the other hand calm and peaceful, realistic yet romantic, is a sort of photographic equivalent to rhetorical tropes.

The construction of the work seems to be very persuasive. The picture pretends to be neutral and objective, it represents reality and to the reader it is past reality (Topolski 1998, 30; Shanks 1997, 80-83). As a sort of archaeological record it offers metaphorical contact with past reality. The detail and context in a photograph produce a 'reality effect' that can give the viewer a sense of 'touching' the past. If such persuasiveness is shared by many readers the outline of Welsh history sketched in the book will be socially accepted and the author's objective will be fulfilled.

I think aerial archaeology is a very persuasive discipline. The beauty and mystery of pictures, their romanticism or realism will always fascinate the recipient (the Spectator of Roland Barthes - 1995). The recipients, unknowingly accepting the common-sense belief of the neutrality and truthfulness of photographs, will not even notice that they have been manipulated into believing in the truth suggested by the aerial archaeologist. They will be convinced that it is their truth since they themselves have interpreted the pictures! Aerial archaeology will experience power even more effectively.

Another aspect of the relationship between aerial archaeology and the public is the question of contacts with developers. In such a case aerial archaeology assists state or local administration and becomes its tool of exerting power. On the other hand aerial photographs may be important in negotiating rescue excavations or amending investment projects (cf. Pryor & Palmer 1980). The argument of 'objective' aerial photographs 'representing' reality is irrefutable.

It seems that aerial archaeology has quite a definite field of experiencing power. Nevertheless if the problem is looked upon from Paul Ricoeur's (1989) perspective it becomes an illusion. Articles, books, pictures, maps produced within the relation of power pass into the hands of a recipient. The author (aerial archaeologist) loses control over them, the control is taken over by the recipients (whoever they are). They will interpret the work, draw from it, see it in the context of their own experience and their view of the world. To what extent will the author's intentions be deciphered and accepted? It will always remain a mystery because there is no point of reference to make such an evaluation possible.

Summing up I would suggest that aerial archaeology is being pushed onto the periphery of archaeology and limited to the problems of the protection and maintenance of archaeological heritage. It seems though that aerial archaeology has a potential for wider participation in scientific discussion. Post-modern reflection has revealed a lot of interesting problems in aerial archaeology that are worth closer attention. Aerial archaeology must take stand on issues which post-processual archaeology is focused on - the question of a picture being a text, the language of aerial archaeology, the problems of power or phenomenological concept of landscape.

#### References:

- Barry, A. 1995. Reporting and Visualising, in Chris Jenks (ed.) *Visual Culture*, Routledge: London. 42-57.
- Barthes, R. 1995. *Image-Music-Text*. Hill & Wang New York.
- Barthes, R. 1996. *Swiatło obrazu. Uwagi o fotografii*. Wydawnictwo KR: Warszawa.

- Bradford, J. 1957. *Ancient Landscapes. Studies in Field Archaeology*. Bell & Sons: London.
- Champion, T. 1997. The Power of the Picture. The image of the ancient Gaul, in Brian Leigh Molyneaux (ed.) *The Cultural Life of Images*. Routledge: London. 213-229.
- Christlein, R. and O. Braasch. 1990. *Das unterirdische Bayern*. Konrad Theiss Verlag: Stuttgart.
- Foucault, M. 1973. *The Birth of Clinic: An Archaeology of Medical Perception*. Tavistock: London.
- Foucault, M. 1980. *Power/Knowledge. Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977*, Colin Gordon (ed.). The Harvester Press: Brighton.
- Foucault, M. 1987. *Historia szalenstwa w dobie klasycyzmu*, Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy: Warszawa.
- Foucault, M. 1993. *Nadzorowæ i karæ. Narodziny wiezienia*. Aletheia: Warszawa.
- Glasscock, R. 1992. Introduction, in Robin Glasscock (ed.) *Historic Landscapes of Britain from the Air*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge. 9-14.
- Giedymin, J. 1994. Czy warto przyjac propozycje tekstualizmu?, in Teresa Kostyrko (ed.) *Dokad zmierza wspolczesna humanistyka*. Instytut Kultury: Warszawa. 41-59.
- Hodder, I. 1985. Postprocessual Archaeology, in Michael Schiffer (ed.) *Advances in Archaeological Method and Theory*, vol.8. Academic Press: New York. 1-26.
- Jenks, C. 1995. The Centrality of the Eye in Western Culture: an Introduction, in Chris Jenks (ed.) *Visual Culture*. Routledge: London. 1-25.
- Musson, C. 1994. *Wales from the Air: Patterns of Past and Present*. RCAHMW: Aberystwyth.
- Pickering, J. 1980. Pickering's Piece - a comment column 'Interpretation versus Plotting'. *Aerial Archaeology* 6, 50-52.
- Pickering, J. 1983. A Survey of Current Air Reconnaissance: the achievement, the failure, in Gordon S. Maxwell (ed.) *The Impact of Aerial Reconnaissance on Archaeology*. Council for British Archaeology: London. 1-4.
- Pryor F. and R. Palmer. 1980. Aerial Photography and Rescue Archaeology - a Case Study. *Aerial Archaeology* 6, 5-8.
- Ricoeur, P. 1989. *Jzyk, tekst, interpretacja*. Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy: Warszawa.
- Shanks M. 1997. Photography and Archaeology, in: *The Cultural Life of Images. Visual Representation in Archaeology*, ed. by Brian Leigh Molyneaux. London: Routledge, 73-107
- Shanks, M. and C. Tilley. 1987a. *Re-Constructing Archaeology: Theory and Practice*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.
- Shanks, M. and C. Tilley. 1987b. *Social Theory and Archaeology*. Polity Press: Cambridge.
- Shepherd A.G. and M.K. Greig. 1996. *Grampian's Past. Its Archaeology from the Air*. Grampian Regional Council: Aberdeen.
- Strachan D. 1998. *Essex from Air. Archaeology and History from Aerial Photographs*. Essex County Council: Chelmsford.
- Tagg, J. 1988. *The Burden of Representation. Essays on Photographies and Histories*. Macmillan Education: London.
- Tilley, C. 1994. *A Phenomenology of Landscape: Places, Paths and Monuments*. Berg: Oxford.
- Topolski, J. 1998. *Wprowadzenie do historii*. Wydawnictwo Poznaskie: Pozna.
- Watson M. and C. Musson. 1993. *Shropshire from the Air. Man and the Landscape*. Shropshire Books: Shrewsbury.
- Zybertowicz, A. 1995. *Przemoc i poznanie. Studium z nie-klasycznej socjologii wiedzy*. Uniwersytet Mikolaja Kopernika: Torun.

## Rowy sa czerwone: Poland – well, Poznan – from the ground

Rog Palmer

I'm not sure, but I think I invited myself to Poznan rather than being asked to go. My main interest was to examine some of the photos taken during the 1998 training week at Leszno (see various bits in *AARGnews 17*) to get an idea of what the airborne component had achieved. The way that flying and ground school were separated in 1998 made it difficult to know what was going on in the air, and you know that I like to try and keep the photographers under control (or over control points?).

Whoever the invitee, I was welcomed there by Wlodek Raczowski. Accommodation had been arranged by the Institute of Prehistory and I received a fee for giving a lecture and seminar. This year I found a commercial flight from London via Warsaw to Poznan. I agree that it is not the most direct route, but it gave me four traverses across much of the width of Poland and so a chance to look at the ground and search for control points. From the point of view of aerial reconnaissance much of the land looked difficult, being farmed as narrow strips with assorted crops (much as Michael Doneus flew me over SE of Vienna). The few large fields were mostly under oilseed rape. Many strip systems were obviously long-established as roads and railways cut through them with the only visible curved boundaries being those that edged water courses. I believe that Wlodek said that some strips were of medieval origin. About half way between Warsaw and Poznan is a turquoise blue lake (presumably full of vileness?) near to a spread of open-cast mining. From this point to the west there was an increase in trees, turning to quite extensive woods closer to Poznan. Fields were still mainly strips, but appeared to be a little wider. They became even larger about 10-15 km east of Poznan. Fortunately our choice of Leszno (about 1 hour – by train – south of Poznan) for the 1998 training week put us in the area of larger fields.

Wlodek and the girls – Aga, Jola and Lidka – have been very busy in their spare time, and 30 films (out of 108) have been fully sited (with GPS readings converted to accurate map co-ordinates) and linked to AZP numbers. This serves to combine the photos with field-walked data and use of colour shading on 1:10000 maps indicates the degree of overlap of each source. New AZP numbers (temporary I think) have been given to those sites recorded only on APs. I do not know whether a count has been made of the number of new sites, but it will be high and show the value of aerial survey in the Leszno area. We also talked about the possibility of future field-walking over AP-only sites.

I examined a sample of 30 films (say 25%) mainly for reasons that don't concern the massed *AARGnews* readership. What may be of interest is that these films held 819 pictures which recorded 356 separate archaeological targets. (Note separate targets, not different, as aircraft were flying with two or three student photographers and sometimes repeating visits to a site.) Film economy varied from (almost) one frame per target to 3-4. As in Britain, if a site looked good it was photographed more times than a poor one – just the reverse of the interpreters' requirements! Also it was proved convincingly that zoom lenses (or at least, the one used by Rimantas Zvirbilis) took very poor pictures at longer focal lengths. Why, I wonder, bother to zoom in to record detail that will be visible on the photographs anyway? It would be much more useful in these areas of large fields and scanty mapped information, to zoom out and photograph as large a patch of country as possible – complete, if unavoidable, with bits of aircraft. If control information is not recorded at the time of visit it will not be found lurking in the pictures at a later date, whereas detail can often be seen under slight magnification or by careful printing or digital enhancement (see Doneus, *AARGnews 15*, 23-27). Future teaching (anywhere) may benefit from

illustration using 'working' photos rather than being a showplace for our 'best' artistic slides.

Anyway, enough grumbles – which means that I won't be saying anything more about the poor control information!

In an attempt to keep me out of the bars Wlodek asked me to help him with the mapping of three sites for which I'd taken over a copy of the latest version of **AirPhoto**. We installed this on one of the machines in the Institute and were able to scan material thanks to Andrzej Prinke at Poznan Museum – a pleasant 15-minute walk away. The biggest problem – and this is relevant to any of you who are going to play with images – was the memory: 16MB, in Wlodek's computer. Here I use 128MB and even that can be slow with big images, so anyone thinking of buying **AirPhoto** or **AERIAL 5** may need to upgrade memory at the same time (relatively cheap and easy to install yourself). We spent the time (which seemed like 20-30 minutes to load each image) talking, getting on with the next thing, looking at photos, or drinking coffee. It is a bit frustrating after working the computer flat out to produce a single transformation in a day – but we completed the three sites. Wlodek was quite taken by my 'scan the interpretative overlay' method (see *AARGnews* 18, 3) and that was the way we produced the finished plans. We hit a slight snag with pits but I think there are ways of persuading the raster-to-vector converters to cope with these.

One of the mapped sites was a stronghold photographed last winter on a flight by Andrzej and Wlodek. They had hoped for light snow conditions but by the time things were organised the snow had been replaced by slight flooding. As it turned out this enabled them to take some excellent illustrative photographs (most of which had control points too!) and they have a number of examples where the floodwater shows past use of topography and the relationship of strongholds to local terrain.

Andrzej Prinke was one of the students on the Leszno training week and, although not new to aerial work, he has been a fervent campaigner for it in the past year through lectures, presentations, and by including aerial survey in some of his work. He showed me some of his computer presentations which use Microsoft *Power Point* to change slides and/or text at pre-set intervals and are ideal to leave lying around at meetings. It was Andrzej who showed me some of the Biscupin photos (see *Books*, this issue) which live in the museum at Poznan, but best of all was when he took me on a mystery trip in his car. We drove out to the north edge of town and then away from the civilised bits along an unloved road. After a bit of bumping around we came to a fenced area within which were a few service-type buildings and a brand new shining showpiece of the type that prestigious architects may have as offices. In England we would trudge over to the most derelict hut and find within excavation records from past generations, but in Poland we went the other way. The new building had been built by the University Foundation – a commercial organisation – to be rented in order to earn money to support scientific research. In Poland, archaeologists do both and the Foundation realise that there is money to be made from commercial archaeology and they want their cut. The result is that four local institutions have appointed delegates to form a consortium to work from one floor of this air-conditioned luxury. Unlike England, where the 'best' building would most likely be commandeered as a prestige suite for management and suchlike, the Polish delegates are active field archaeologists and so are able to talk to one another and work more efficiently to plan and undertake projects. To make progress in understanding the past requires interaction between those directly in touch with it, not their organisers. Commercial archaeology has to work at, or beyond, the forefront of certain kinds of research and, to me, the Foundation enterprise seems to reflect some kind of Utopian ideal. It was good to see archaeology getting such a boost (hopefully matched by funds for equipment, etc???) and it was easy to visualise how well it might work. I want one!

Back in the land of aerial photos, I had been working with Wlodek using Polish 1:10000 maps which are not bad, but much less informative than I was used to back in Britain. This is partly because the modern Polish arable landscape is itself less permanently defined than in Britain with most of the field divisions being those farmer-agreed edges of crops which, as here, are not surveyed and mapped. The other useful maps are the series of 1:100000 sheets that are almost completed for the country. I bought the sheets relevant to flights I had made during the 1998 training week and, with the help of a few scrawls on my UK-bought map of Poland and a scanty GPS listing that Otto kindly sent me, managed – to my surprise – to get most of my APs precisely located. The 1:100000 series really are good detailed maps, certainly adequate (with the help of slight magnification at my age) for first-stage siting and probably for flying. At slightly over £1 for a conveniently-sized area of 70x35 Km they seemed surprisingly inexpensive.

One of the Wlodek's achievements has been to generate student interest in aerial matters. His original student trio had one new member (Lidka2) at the time of my visit. I am unaware of such a high following anywhere else in the world. The problem though is to establish what can be done archaeologically with the existing photos as the majority of recorded sites are pit clusters. There is a limit to the theoretical analysis that can be applied to pits – there are big ones, small ones and groups of varying size and content – which may well be why Martin Gojda tries to field walk all of his. It is difficult to think of any reasonable approach to studying such sites but unless this can be done I imagine that student interest may wane, especially as some of them were hoping to use the Leszno photos as the basis of research projects.

A mixture of Wlodek's theoretical interests plus a level of silliness allowed us to develop a model of past behaviour that may provide an explanation for the plethora of pits in central Europe and the predominance of ditched sites in Britain. The background is

the flow of people following (or making) the arrows on the old distribution maps who were all busy diffusing to the north-west. This left them little time to dig ditches, so at each stop they would dig a few pits – all they had time to do – before moving on. By the time they got to France (or the Atlantic coast) they had slowed down a bit and could dig ditches around sites while they invented sailing and made boats. Then over to Britain they came, only to find that there was nowhere else to go and nothing to do *except* dig ditches. Well...?

I must also note a present-day curiosity. I didn't drink a huge amount of beer but it was usually enough to put me to sleep until the morning ritual of 'throw the dustbin'. This happened daily at about 5 am, after which there was relative quiet for an hour or so. I never actually worked out what 'throw the dustbin' really was, but it did sound as if someone had a big and empty steel vessel which they hurled from a passing lorry down a flight of steps. Any explanation of this obviously symbolic occurrence would be welcome.

Acting the occasional diplomat my official thanks have been returned to the Head of the Institute of Prehistory, Prof dr hab Hanna Kocka-Krenz, whose generosity helped the financial side of my trip. Here I repeat my thanks to Wlodek Raczkowski, Agnieszka Dolatowska, Jolanta Goliasz and Lidka Zuk – not only for help at the Institute, but for giving up a lot of their free time to keep me occupied in the evenings. Andrzej Prinke seems to live at the Museum and was always willing to help, talk, and allow us use of his computer. Andrzej also sent me corrections of fact to my paragraph on the University Foundation establishment. Thanks too for a social evening to Jacek and Izabela Nowakowska and the opportunity to hear of Jacek's progress since Leszno 1998. Finally, thanks for email help with my Polish to Katarzyna Goliasz and who is no longer threatened by a jar of Marmite. As ever, I am grateful to Air Photo Services (Cambridge) for generously allowing me time off work to take this holiday!

## Books of interest?

C. Ampe, J. Bourgeois, L. Fockedeey, R. Langohr, M. Meganck and J. Semey, J. *Cirkels In The Land. Een inventaris van de cirkelvormige structuren in de provincies Oost- en West-Vlaanderen*. Volume 1. Archaeologische inventaris Vlaanderen. Buitengewone reeks, 4. 1995. ISBN D/1995/3877/1.

**and**

J. Bourgeois, M. Meganck and J. Semey. *Cirkels In The Land. Een inventaris van de cirkelvormige structuren in de provincies Oost- en West-Vlaanderen*. Volume 2. Archaeologische inventaris Vlaanderen. Buitengewone reeks, 5. 1998. ISBN D/1998/3877/1.

[The cost of each volume (including postage and packaging) is 800 Belgian Francs<sup>1</sup>, which is around £13.50. When Volume 3 appears at the end of the year, all three volumes will be available at 2000 BEF (the costs of transmission included), which is around £33.]

Unlike most neighbouring countries, aerial archaeology has only recently been employed as research strategy in Belgium. While Charles Leva carried out much of his pioneering work in the south of the country, it was not until the Research Unit for Aerial Photography (RUAP) was founded at the University of Ghent in the early 1980s that this imbalance was addressed for the Flemish landscape of the north. Since then, RUAP have amassed a collection of over 35,000 colour slides, requiring a computerised inventory system. In 1992, a project was designed incorporating researchers from various disciplines which plans to study both the natural cropmark features in addition to the archaeological and historical ones.

These two volumes, published by Ghent University, Belgium, relate to this study of ring-ditch sites in the provinces of East and West Flanders. The project area is divided into three parts, two of which are covered by the above volumes while the third area will be covered by the forthcoming volume 3. While this stage of project deals only with ring-ditch sites, the detailed methodology of the project includes the

study of pedology, geomorphology, site morphology, three dimensional position and inter-visibility. Development has resulted in the excavation of a number of sites and these results are incorporated into the wider landscape study.

The study concentrates on 'clusters' of enclosures (barrow cemeteries) which appear to predominately date to the Early and Middle Bronze Age. For example, the first study area contained 257 ring-ditches, including 126 cemeteries, with simple enclosures (averaging 20-25m in diameter) having a frequency of 89%, while 11% were multiple-ditched examples. A typology of cemeteries is proposed, with the most common type being groups with only 2-3 three enclosures. Cemeteries were found to be organised either in clusters or in alignments with topography being a determinant factor. Quite often cemeteries give the impression of being dominated, or designated, by the presence of one or two double monuments, frequently on the periphery of the cluster. Cemeteries were found to be around 1-2kms apart, with the exception of one concentrated area. The results of the project have radically altered the understanding of the scale and distribution of prehistoric funerary monuments in the country.

As academic reports, these are substantial volumes and they are lavishly reproduced. The quality of photographic reproduction is good, and the distribution maps (red cropmarks on black base) are also very clear. Interestingly, schematic 'plots' at a scale of 1:50,000 are used to illustrate morphological distributions over large landscape areas, while plots of 1:5,000 are used to illustrate individual barrow cemeteries. The methodology adopted for this study illustrates the value of the analysis of cropmark landscapes when accompanied by an integrated programme of excavation, and statistical appraisal of the site type in relation to other data-sets, such as topography and pedology. While the above volumes are in Flemish (which is surprisingly easy to 'guess-at' for English-speakers) those involved in aerial mapping would still gain a lot from the photography, maps and general presentation. Those interested in the results in more detail should consult 'The Circular View: Aerial photography and the discovery of Bronze

<sup>1</sup> Copies from: Archeologische Inventaris Vlaanderen, Woeringestraat 81, 9000 Gent, Belgium

Age funerary monuments in East- and West-Flanders (Belgium)' in the journal *Germania* (74, 1996, 1).

Davy Strachan

...and from our continental correspondent:

*Enclos Gaulois et Gallo-Romains en Armorique. De la prospection aerielle a la fouille entre Blavet et Mayenne.* Documents archeologiques de l'Ouest. 1999. Prix: 280 F. ISSN 0767 - 709x.

I enjoyed looking at the photographs and plans(!) – however I cannot read much French, so I am missing most of what the authors wish to tell us in addition.

Otto Braasch

[Remaining comments by Rog Palmer]

Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments of Scotland. *Scotland from the Air 1939-49. Volume 1. Catalogue of the Luftwaffe Photographs in the National Monuments Record of Scotland.* 1999. £3.50 (plus postage<sup>2</sup>). ISBN 1-902419-05-7.

The first sentence in this volume states that it is, '...the first in a series ... intended to publicise the importance and potential uses of part of the collections of aerial photographs in NMRS.' It does this by way of an introduction that outlines Luftwaffe activity over Scotland, a list of those photographs held, plus two indices and a location maps. The meat [or in this ridiculous PC world ought that now to be vegetable?] of the volume is the descriptive gazetteer which includes translations of all the accompanying text (the interpretations identifying targets) and copies of many of the photographs with their original German annotations.

I would expect this volume to lead to increased local interest in the collection and it also offers a useful compendium of WW2 sites for those whose interests extend to that period. A tantalising paragraph at the end of the Introduction notes the one-time existence of much more Luftwaffe cover of Scotland and

<sup>2</sup> Copies from: RCAHMS, 16 Bernard Terrace, Edinburgh, EH8 9NX, UK. postmaster@rcahms.gov.uk

northern England (identified on distribution maps held by NMRS) which, I hope, is currently being hunted down by Chris Going.

A good idea, well and simply presented at a very good price and with a cunningly clever cover. I look forward to other *Catalogues* in the same series.

L Krzyzaniak and W Smigielski (eds), *Nauki Przyrodnicze i Fotografia Lotnicza w Archeologii. Bibliotheca Fontes Archaeologici Posnanienses Volume 9.* 1998. 30 Z (plus postage<sup>3</sup>). ISBN 83-907529-1-3, ISSN 0208-4988.

This volume is a collection of papers including 5 on aerial photography and its uses, two on geomorphology and many others on scientific applications (such as used for dating and in analysis of fauna and flora). Almost all have English and German summaries but the main text is in Polish. The aerial papers show some of the applications that are being pursued and documents the work and thinking that was being applied in the first years after the fall of the Iron Curtain (papers appear to be dated 1993).

'The use of aerial photography for interpreting prehistoric settlement processes' (by Ostoj-Zagorski) extends aerial photography from a mere record of discovery to a source of information that includes data on past environmental conditions and their exploitation. The first part of '...Some remarks on the method' (by Okupny and Smigielski) outlines the history of Polish archaeological aerial photography. Early photographs were often from balloons and the paper includes a few examples from the spectacular series taken of the Biscupin excavations in the 1930s [The book contains a few from the large collection held at Poznan Museum which is probably the most comprehensive aerial record of any excavation. But there are no postcards or any other conveniently acquired copies either at the museum or Biscupin.] Other illustrations are mostly records of known sites (such as strongholds). Part two of this paper brings us up

<sup>3</sup> Copies from: Muzeum Archeologiczne w Poznaniu, ul Wodna 27, 61-781 Poznan, Poland. A special arrangement for AARG members without convenient ZI is to send \$20 to Andrzej Prinke at the above address.

to date and shows the use of helicopters for survey (including vertical photography – which surely must raise costs astronomically?). There is also comment on the foundation of their photo interpretative processes (based on Riley's 1946 paper) and the successes achieved when field checking and integrating the aerial record with AZP records. [Poland's AZP is equivalent to UK's NMR/SMR. For a description (in English) see Andrzej Prinke (1999): 'Can developing countries afford national archaeological records? The Polish answer' in Hansen and Quine (eds) *Our Fragile Heritage: documenting the past for the future.*]

Another historical summary, but with much modern information, is in the paper by Zurawski on prospecting in Sudanese Nubia 1913-1993. It deals mainly with photographs obtained from kites. These have been used to record excavations and their environs and I remember a certain amount of concern at the display of this work at Kleinmachnow in 1993 when the author showed us how he had blended adjoining images and, on at least one occasion, 'rubbed out' a spoil heap from a previous season's excavations so as to show the extension of work that, inevitably, went under the heap. "Dear, dear," said some. "Ought we to tamper with things as sacred as aerial photographs...?" But this was before we all had computers and software that made such things easy, and – often – led to easier understanding. Use of aerial photography to assist monument protection (by Stepien) includes illustration of the role of photography to document sites and record change. As elsewhere, many of their earthwork sites are adjacent to, and threatened by, modern cultivation so aerial survey is an effective way of monitoring adherence to protection boundaries. The final aerial contribution (by Los) notes the uses of photogrammetry to provide metrical data from aerial and ground photographs.

The geomorphological papers also offer interesting approaches. One (by Nowaczyk) covers changes in dunes and rivers [the latter akin to the paper given at AARG 1998 by Andy Howard] and uses aerial photographs as sources of data for this work. The other (by Smigielski) describes a method of defining geographical microregions which may help understanding of former exploitation.

For Polish-speaking students this book would appear to offer useful comment on a range of survey and analytical techniques. It reminds me somewhat of parts of Brothwell and Higgs (ed) *Science in Archaeology* which set a similar scene for English speakers in 1963 and, incidentally, cost about the same!

D Edwards (photog), P Wade-Martin (ed). *Norfolk from the Air, Volume 2*. Norfolk Museums Service. 1999. £15.95 (plus £3.75 postage<sup>4</sup>) ISBN 0 903101 68 8.

*Norfolk 2* is a paperback volume that includes 46 colour and 90 mono aerial photographs – most of which have been taken by Derek Edwards. All pages have been printed using colour, if only for the little title panel which includes NGR, north point, and notes whether sites are open to the public. These panels are also colour-coded by 'chapter' which may help those unable to read words or understand English.

The layout is similar to *Norfolk 1*, with a page split between photo and text and, as also in *Norfolk 1*, the text written by specialists – *Norfolk 2* having a choice from 49. This – if nothing else – makes the Norfolk volumes stand out from the rest, and suggests that we are being given the best available information. After a one-page general introduction there is a map showing places illustrated and an introduction to Derek Edwards. The latter may seem a bit strange (by which I mean the introduction!) but Derek has been at it since 1973 and deserves the recognition: this 'human interest' is so often lacking in our academic publications. From this point we are taken through a series of 'chapters' or sections that mix topography and environment with the usual period pile, but do so in an interestingly different way.

As a county to illustrate, Norfolk has several advantages – a coastline and the Broads, some reasonable standing buildings and more than a few nice earthworks – and these do feature as 'chapters'. More interesting (to me), or more different, are the 'subject' themes which follow,

<sup>4</sup> Copies from Sales Department, Castle Museum, Norwich NR1 3JU, UK (01603 493628)

perhaps, from the Watson and Musson *Shropshire from the air* concept. For example, the topics in 'the farming scene' include water meadows, one of those radial pig units that leave such interesting crop marks (see Crawshaw, *AARGnews* 9, 20) and stooks from a field harvested in 1995 for thatching straw. A section on 'new impacts on the landscape' shows that not all modern development is ugly – although the Norwich southern bypass (which gets two pages to itself) shows the usual sweep of devastation that our cars require (or should that read, 'that our towns require to escape the cars of their neighbours'..?). The largest section in *Norfolk 2* is on market towns and Norwich. Rightly so if you consider that many people who may buy the book are from Norfolk and that the majority of them probably live in the towns illustrated – this has to be an important sales consideration. The Norwich pages offer an unusual sequence which shows the market place and its environs on dates from 1921 to a few days after the library fire in 1994. Are there many other towns in England that could offer such a broad time span?

I would expect this book to be popular with Norfolk residents. The traditional archaeological 'crop marks' are small in number and include a few of Derek's most spectacular discoveries and, from there on, the locals may begin to understand the pictures. For once in my life I admit that one of those 'site-to-crop-mark' sequences of drawings would be useful, and wonder how many 'normal' people (ie non-archaeologists) will make the jump from picture to text in some of those pages. That, curiously, is my main niggle – perhaps I'm ill? Another mild complaint is that some of the mono pictures seem slightly 'muddy' although in general the photographs have been printed very well and with very fine screening that allows 2x magnification with a not too distracting dot effect. I would have liked the title panels to include the date of photography (appended, with sources, at the back of the book) which is relevant in some cases and would avoid misunderstanding. The best (or worst) example being Tasburgh fort (27) which shows a knackered rampart under cereal followed by text that begins, 'Tasburgh hill fort is a successful conservation project...' Eh..? The back of the book shows that the photo was taken in 1989; reading further into the text we discover that the field was not put down to grass until 1994. An

immediately visible date would, at least, have avoided the 'eh..?'

Derek Edwards told me that *Norfolk 2* began to sell well immediately on its publication and that it also boosted sales of *Norfolk 1*. It's appeal is in the breadth of its illustration and it covers the county from pingos to oil rigs and from barrows to city. In keeping with the times, there is a certain amount of environmental comment – from coastal erosion to wind farms and the EcoTech centre – which can be well illustrated from the air. It emphasises the message to all air photographers that so much of what we see from above and dismiss as 'ordinary' is only ordinary today and that there is much that we ought to record as well as the crop marks. Many of you, I know, do this anyway and several of the photos in *Norfolk 2* show how useful such pictures can be.

*Actes du colloque international d'archéologie arienne AMIENS, 15-18 octobre 1992. Revue Archeologique de picardie No spécial 17. 1999. Price before 30 September 1999: 320FF or 49€, otherwise 390FF or 60€<sup>5</sup>.*

I've only seen the blurb for this, but it includes a contents list showing that most papers are in French with a bit of now-ancient history contributed by the Brits (for more immediate conference 'reviews' see *AARGnews* 6, 14-17). Perhaps this gives you all a chance to use your Euro accounts. Reviews for a future *AARGnews* by any French-literate readers may be welcomed.

*La Prospection. 1998. 170F (+ 10F postage)<sup>6</sup>. ISBN 2 87772 160 4.*

Another blurb only. This time for a collection of five ?papers forming a 'manuels d'initiation' – one of a series which seem to be under the general editorship of Alain Ferdire. Two of the papers seem to have an aerial bias: prospection from low altitudes [just what we need!!!] and photo- and carto-interpretation. Buy a copy if you want to know how to do it in French.

<sup>5</sup> Copies from: Revue Archéologique de Picardie, 5 rue Henri Daussy, F-80 000 Amiens. Cheques payable to: Revue Archéologique de Picardie.

<sup>6</sup> Copies from: Epone, 7 rue Jean-du-Bellay, 75004 Paris. archeoli@club-internet.fr

## List of contributors

Bob Bewley  
Aerial Survey  
English Heritage  
NMRC  
Kemble Drive  
Swindon SN2 2GZ  
UK

[bob.bewley@rchme.co.uk](mailto:bob.bewley@rchme.co.uk)

David Kennedy  
Classics and Ancient History  
University of Western Australia  
Perth, WA 6907  
AUSTRALIA

Włodzimierz Rączkowski  
Institute of Prehistory  
Adam Mickiewicz University  
ul. Św. Marcin 78  
61-809 Poznań  
POLAND

[wlodekra@amu.edu.pl](mailto:wlodekra@amu.edu.pl)