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A Journey in Time

Bodil Petersson & Lars Erik Narmo

ABSTRACT

The research history and conditions in experimental archaeology up until today show a heavy emphasis on technological studies within a hypothetical-deductive theoretical paradigm. How is it possible to enhance the conditions for experimental archaeology so that it can also develop as a humanistic area of research, more closely related to existential perspectives of human life? We argue for the integration of technical, sensory and emotional understandings of the past, so that the notion of being a human in a long-term perspective can be included in the concept of experimental archaeology. A humanistic experimental archaeology is achieved by the development of new methods such as conscious use of anachronisms, renewal of techniques for documenting and communicating experiments, and use of the human body and senses as an experimental field. The success of this approach is dependent upon cooperation between archaeological open-air museums and sites conducting experimental archaeology, and archaeological departments at universities that are willing to maintain, develop and renew research and education in the direction of a humanistic experimental archaeology.

A new approach to experimental archaeology

Experimental Archaeology – Between Experience And Enlightenment is a project aiming at the exploration of senses and emotions beyond the experimental archaeology of today by integrating the experiences gained at archaeological open-air museums and academic departments at universities.

An essential question for understanding the past is: what was it like to be a human in bygone times? In archaeology this question usually focuses
upon everyday practical solutions and rarely on questions of senses and emotions, relations and the meaning of life. We will discuss here the integration of sensory/emotional and technical/practical perspectives aiming at holistic interpretations of human life in the past. Is it possible to develop a humanistic experimental archaeology combining technological, sensory and emotional aspects of human life?

Experiments from processual to post-modern archaeology

Experimental archaeology is often seen and practised as a specific subfield of archaeology similar to building archaeology or maritime archaeology. Experimental archaeology is conceived of as a method of interpretation that gives meaning to the archaeological record. Generating analogy is seen as the essence of experimental archaeology. A couple of books have been published on the character of experimental archaeology in the latter part of the 20th century and the beginning of the 21st century (Ingersoll et al. 1977; Coles 1979; Stone & Planal 1999; Mathieu 2002; Cunningham et al. 2008). To stick with a comparatively recent attempt, James Mathieu offers a 21st-century definition of experimental archaeology:

Experimental Archaeology is a sub-field of archaeological research which employs a number of different methods, techniques, analyses, and approaches within the context of a controllable imitative experiment to replicate past phenomena (from objects to systems) in order to generate and test hypotheses to provide or enhance analogies for archaeological interpretation. (Mathieu 2002:1, his own italics)

New Archaeology in the 1960s and 1970s based its existence on the belief in an objective truth and the active use of hypothetical-deductive methods, where problems are solved by setting up a tentative theory that is either supported or eliminated by falsification (Trigger 1989:301; Olsen 1997:46ff.). This scientific ideal was gradually dismantled by the post-modern or post-processual criticism in archaeology during the 1980s and 1990s (Trigger 1989:386–407; Olsen 1997:59ff.). Anthropology and ethno-archaeology contributed important analogies in post-processual archaeology. The marginal position of experimental archaeology in relation to post-processual archaeology can be seen as a result of experimental archaeology’s close attachment to
the scientific ideals of processual archaeology. The close connection with a positivistic science was probably the reason for the marginalized role experiments came to have within post-processual academic archaeology. Technology was to become a theme of marginal value in post-processual archaeology and thus led to further marginalization of experimental archaeology. Reactions to the lack of academic interest in interpretations of life in the past through experimental archaeology came during the first decade of the 21st century from institutions pursuing living history such as archaeological open-air museums. This resulted, among other things, in lively discussions and projects on the theme (see Pelillo 2009; Schöbel 2009).

Because of this obscure position of experimental archaeology in recent decades, we find it appropriate to ask how a humanistic experimental archaeology can be developed. By posing this question we raise a discussion about the role and perspectives of experimental archaeology in the Nordic area today.

In 1954 Christopher Hawkes discussed fields of increasing difficulty to be studied by archaeology. He pointed out difficulties or impossibilities concerning research on social, religious and existential perspectives (Hawkes 1954). Later generations of archaeologists have criticized Hawkes for his limiting approach (Nilsson Stutz 2004). Experimental archaeology as part of a humanistic research tradition can make good use of a discussion of possible approaches beyond tradition.

**Experimental archaeology from enlightenment to experience**

The “human element” in experiments is handled from two distinct perspectives on methodology and premises that seem hard to reconcile. One dismisses the human element, the other admits it to be present:

> There are further caveats to be aware of in the conduct of experiments, the most important of which is to dismiss the human element. It may seem rather odd to emphasise this point since archaeology is essentially the study of man in the landscape through or at a given time, but it is critical that an experiment is inanimate. No experiment can be designed to enhance our understanding of human motive or emotion in the recent or remote past. (Reynolds 1999:158)
The position of Peter Reynolds is in accordance with Hawkes’s ideas, telling us that experiments cannot enhance our understanding of human motives or emotional perspectives. The experimental archaeologist James Mathieu, opposes the inanimate experiment, proposing instead a typology of experiments named object replication, behavioural replication, process replication and system replication (Mathieu 2002:1–11). In a tree-felling experiment Mathieu and his colleague Daniel Meyer question the inanimate experiment and conclude:

Experimentation provides a better understanding of the context of past human behaviour. By providing an appreciation of past phenomena, their complexity, and the issues that affect them, it allows inferences to be made, which generate hypotheses, theories and interpretations. By allowing the experimenter to potentially put themselves in the shoes of a past person, experimentation lets us confront the world of possibilities as past people may have. (Mathieu & Meyer 2002:76)

Despite the text cited above, and however slightly modified with the turn to the 21st century, earlier ideas of the nature of experimental archaeology are still commonly shared among archaeologists. We shed some light upon this by discussing widespread definitions of experimental archaeology valid at the moment. James Mathieu’s definition of experimental archaeology from 2002 (see the quotation above) combines the idea of analogy with the controllable scientific experiment. Analogy and hypothetical-deductive methods are important here. However, the main focus, as cited by Mathieu, is on control.

The chapter introducing the book Experiencing Archaeology by Experiment, the result of a workshop held at the University of Exeter in November 2007, summarizes a consistent definition of experimental archaeology widespread in England and continental Europe at present:

An archaeological experiment must answer a specific research question. It should have a clear statement of the aims and/or hypothesis, as well as the materials and methodology used so that it is repeatable. All variables should be discussed and as many as possible should be controlled (Outram 2008; Kucera 2004; Reynolds 1999; Traschel & Fasnacht 1996). However, one of the most important aspects of experimental
archaeology is that the data derived from experiments is related back to the archaeological record (Outram 2008; Lammers-Keijser 2005). Without this feedback process, the results will be meaningless. Basic principles like those described by Kelterborn (2005) are encouraged. (Cunningham et al. 2008:v)

This definition might be termed the modified control theory in experimental archaeology.

The above-mentioned definitions of experimental archaeology are basically normative. Experiments that do not meet the proposed standards as cited above are termed by some instead as “experiential archaeology” (Cunningham et al. 2008). Experiential archaeology is considered non-scientific by definition and at its best useful as inspiration for true experiments or serving the needs of public archaeology. (The provocative distinction between experimental and experiential archaeology is further criticized in Narmo 2010:53f.) Our point here is that current definitions of experimental archaeology evidently are in opposition to the debate about and change of archaeology into humanistic research during the post-processual period and after.

Handicraft, action-mediated knowledge and experimental archaeology

One reason to question the scientific ideals of traditional experimental archaeology is the fact that it does not sufficiently integrate sensory and emotional perspectives and experience of the individuals that are performing experiments. A strange thing in the history of experimental archaeology is that on many occasions there is no relation whatsoever to those who actually perform related handicraft. One argument has been that to involve artisans of today would be an anachronism in itself, since today’s handicraft people use techniques strongly influenced by our own time. As an argument this is not very useful, since the archaeologists involved of course are themselves influenced by the technology of our time in every single case. We cannot free ourselves from influence from present times. Therefore we should more consistently involve artisans in our exploration of ancient times. The expertise here lies not in the hands of the archaeologists but in the combination of archaeological expertise with handicraft expertise.
Very often, handicraft is not documented at all, since the people involved are not very interested in writing and publishing; instead they wish to do things with their hands. Here is a huge challenge related to the ongoing discussion of tacit knowledge, action-mediated knowledge and handicraft (cf. Polanyi 1967; Molander 1996; Tempte 1997; Godal 2006; Høgseth 2007).

There is actually a lot of experimental archaeology aiming at action-mediated knowledge outside academia in the Nordic area today (Petersson 2003; Narmo 2010). These activities may contain considerable theoretical and practical obstacles, but this fact should generate more, not less, engagement by academic archaeologists. Archaeologists working within the field of experimental archaeology have to adapt more consistently to the handicraft perspective. Different solutions may be considered in relation to how to integrate the humanistic approach in experimental archaeology. One obvious way to go is to combine ancient techniques with today’s handicraft experience. Defining the whole field of experience and action-mediated knowledge as unscientific is surely not a fruitful perspective.

To conceive of experiments exposed to the public as unscientific is also problematic. In a recent overview of archaeological open-air museums in Europe (Pelillo 2009) it is evident that these museums conduct experimental archaeology in front of the public. They perform historical workshops, handicraft projects and experimental archaeology. The composition of elements at a specific museum is dependent on the context and varies accordingly within each institution. At Lofotr Viking Museum the development from the beginning of the 1990s has been closely related to handicraft projects. The handicraft projects have gradually developed into experimental archaeology in recent years. Our general impression is that archaeological open-air museums put more emphasis on historical workshops to “edutain” the public than they do on performing experimental archaeology in itself. A historical workshop is public by definition. However, using Lofotr Viking Museum as an example, all handicraft and experimental activity is public activity as part of the museum programme every year.

According to previously mentioned definitions of experimental archaeology (Mathieu 2002; Cunningham et al 2008), the public motive alone is sufficient to exclude every effort within the public sphere as experimental archaeology.
Today a great many different groups of people are involved in handicraft in Scandinavia and Europe. They are re-enactors, craftsmen or researchers; they conduct historical workshops, handicraft or experiments. The activity is conducted at a closed site/laboratory, an exposed site/laboratory or in a museum open to the public. We think experimental archaeologists fail when focusing on experimental archaeology as a strictly scientific, closed site/laboratory controllable experiment – variables still considered to be the main formal criteria of experimental archaeology.

The motifs for actively using handicraft within experimental archaeology are more relevant considering what is experimental archaeology with a humanistic touch. A handicraft project displays a skill to the public; however, repeated demonstrations of a skill might just as easily be a part of a falsification process in a formal hypothetical-deductive experiment. Judging motives is problematic because theoretical self-awareness in projects might be low, multiple and implicit. There are obviously methodological challenges and there is a need for more archaeological input into the existing activity; however, a formal definition of experimental archaeology like those above is not the answer to these problems.

The experiments at archaeological open-air museums are typically performed as listed below (as we know them from Lofotr Viking Museum and other archaeological open-air museums and centres):

- the archaeologist conducts an experiment and mediates the result to the public
- the craftsman in costume conducts a craft and mediates the result to the public
- the craftsman in costume conducts a craft and involves the public by doing
- the re-enactors in costume dramatize a living past to the public
- the public are the re-enactors performing the living past in reconstructed settings
- the re-enactors, craftsmen or archaeologists in costume conduct first-person interpretation for the public

These are gradual distinctions ranging from technological to emotional aspects in which there is no consensus about what is considered to be experimental archaeology. It might not be considered experimental
archaeology, either for purely formal reasons such as public exposure or because it is commonly considered as something other than experimental archaeology – for instance a theatre, play, show etc. We do not judge whether this kind of experiment should or should not be considered as experimental archaeology until the self-awareness and motives in the projects are presented, or until relevant methodological aspects are elucidated. However, emotional aspects are essential in a future humanistic experimental archaeology, if we are to move beyond ladders of inference and along the path from enlightenment to experience. We need to free ourselves from the control need, the need for repetition, in favour of individual approaches.

Towards a humanistic experimental archaeology

A close relation to the archaeological record is often mentioned as an important ingredient when conclusions are drawn in archaeology, but most archaeological experiments are in reality plausible without explicit references to the archaeological record or to written historical texts. Archaeological house reconstructions, for instance, are usually based on colour differences in the subsoil interpreted as postholes and wall ditches. Choice of materials, curves and appearance usually are interpretations made by architects and other building experts. They accomplish the building above ground level (Komber 1989; Schmidt 1999; Edblom 2004). Multidimensional full-scale reconstructions are interpretations merging contemporary handicraft experiences and archaeological knowledge about the past. The example of the interpretation of house building shows anachronisms as an already integrated method of understanding and interpreting the past, and we think that this should be considered appropriately. Anachronisms in experiments are a useful complement enabling experience.

The humanistic perspectives try to integrate practical, technological and sensory/emotional aspects as a whole. The existing consensus about ideology and methods in experimental archaeology is primarily dedicated to technical and functional studies. Without further debating the content of experiments (according to e.g. Mathieu 2002 and Cunningham et al. 2008), a development from enlightenment to experience would be to move academic experiments from inside academic departments to archaeological open-air museums like Lofotr Viking Museum in Norway,
Lejre – Land of Legends in Denmark or Foteviken Viking Reserve in Sweden. These public sites and laboratories already present a living past by integrating technological, practical and sensory/emotional perspectives. The archaeological open-air museums in addition need further academic development; and the academic experimenters need to integrate sensory and emotional, personal aspects in their experiments and to develop new ways of documentation and presentation for all senses.

**Alternative narratives**

Textual communication, often with illustrations such as photos, diagrams, and tables, is first and foremost adapted to experiments aiming at achieving academic credit in general and more specifically to archaeological experiments conducted according to scientific standards. The favouring of the hypothetical-deductive method is in obvious opposition to post-modern archaeology and few people today believe their claim to construct true arguments. However, experiments aiming at achieving academic credit are also an important obstacle on an empiric level. In a humanistic experimental archaeology it is necessary to implement narratives relevant to the senses. Artistic interpretation and performance should be part of the accepted ways of understanding the past. Film is an obvious medium here. Such documentation has been restricted because of the lack of funding and knowledge. Today there is cheap access to digital hardware and software of sufficient quality. Films are easily distributed on the Internet, in social media, on web pages or in live 2D or 3D illustrations in any digital text document. Lofotr Viking Museum introduced digital text documentation, which has been accessible on the Internet since 2007. During a project called ARENA in 2009 the museum staff got basic training in making and spreading films through the Internet. The project made the staff aware of the potential of film to document experiments. Films and other documentation are available on the museum website. Film as media is open to further experiments in documentation. A craftsman’s perspective on making a clay pot was given as an example at a session on experimental archaeology at the annual conference of European archaeologists (EAA) held in Malta in 2008. The film came from a head-mounted camera with the same angle as the craftsman’s eye. If the artificial distinction between factual knowledge and senses/emotions is removed, new narratives are
possible. Archaeological open-air museums are suitable future arenas for the development and sharing of these new narratives.

Narratives of the past usually move into the future from a specific point of departure in past times. In the future humanistic perspectives within such narratives should be experimented upon. At Jorvik Viking Centre in York, England, the visitors travel in time the opposite way, from the present to the past. Experimental archaeology is also an alternative narrative perspective. The very existence of experiments with living history and past technologies depends on knowledge about how things work today. From present knowledge we create past experiences based on written sources and archaeological inquiries. The narrative perspective in experiments is dialectic, changing movement in time from the present to the past and back again, creating a holistic and integrated perspective on knowledge and experience, representing both the past and present, i.e. an inherent and useful anachronism.

Experiments at archaeological open-air museums

The meeting between the present and the past may provoke established and widespread ideas about “ancient times”. Such feelings create a deeper understanding of the past, irrespective of whether they are authentic or not. However they create feelings. In society different media are constantly affecting our feelings – and we accept this. Academic archaeology and humanistic research have yet not fully managed to use the potential in the multidimensional communications in our surroundings, for instance the archaeological open-air museums.

Knowledge of modern technology and the combining of present and past technology is a common method for overcoming our lack of knowledge about how problems were solved in the past. The Viking Ship Museum in Roskilde, Denmark, re-creates Viking Age ships sailed by a crew dressed in modern clothes (Fig. 1).

The ambition is to test the character of the ship, but does this fact stop the crew from wondering what it was really like to be in the crew on a Viking warship? Not at all; see the homepage of the crew of the Sea Stallion (Viking Ship Museum website) and a description of a journey written by one of the members of the crew:
For the Viking Ship Museum the boat trip was the first chapter of an outstanding scientific experiment, which will give an answer to thousands of questions that have bewildered historians, archaeologists and shipbuilders for a long time.
For the crew it was the longing for adventure that was the driving force. And in this fact modern man has a lot in common with the Vikings. (Kastoft 2007:10, our translation from Danish)

Another example of humanistic experimental archaeology is the making of leather helmets at Lofotr Viking Museum (Fig. 2). Only one iron helmet, the Gjermundbu helmet, has been found among the 3,796 Viking weapon graves in Norway (Wester 2000). The other helmet from the western Viking world is from York. Helmets are found in Merovingian status graves around the North Sea, helmets occur on Viking iconographic material and they are commonly mentioned in the sagas. Helmets of iron are common on the Bayeux Tapestry, but if helmets were commonly in use before the end of the Viking Age they probably were made of another material. As a test two helmets were made from leather, using the same basic principle as documented by the iron specimens.

The rim and the triangular plates might have different shapes, and two different versions were made inspired by iconographic material. The helmets were coated with multiple layers of liquid, but not boiling, bees-wax. At the end the helmet was turned around next to a fire to give it a glossy finish. Leather helmets are probably easier to penetrate by direct hits from optimal angles/distances, but they are light and comfortable to wear compared to metal specimens. We do not know whether leather helmets were worn during the Viking Age, but the experiments suggest this as a probable solution.

A third example is beer brewing in wooden barrels using heated stones (Nicolaysen 2008). Fire-cracked stones are common in Iron Age settlements, often referred to as “cooking stones”. The stones may have been used for multiple tasks, among them beer brewing. Fire-cracked stones in archaeological settings are sometimes called “brewing stones”. Metal cauldrons for brewing are not known from the Viking Age, and ordinary vessels for cooking made of iron and stone usually were too small to be suitable for brewing. The brewing experiment was conducted using wooden barrels, malt made of local barley and stones heated on the fireplace in the dwelling part of the reconstructed chieftain’s house at Lofotr Viking Museum (Fig. 3). The Norse word for beer brewing is heита, meaning to heat. Among other things the experiment made us understand the importance of stone cooking in the brewing process.
Apart from the addition of hops, instead of bog myrtle, the result was a plausible Viking beer. The experiments were based on knowledge, materials and technology that might have existed. The intended result of the experiments is imaginable and reasonable but not provable according to scientific testing. Instead the experiments offer a holistic view based on knowledge and concepts of the past, where sensory experience as well as technology are important parts of the experiment.

We consider the examples above as important parts of experimental archaeology today. However, many experimental archaeologists probably consider this a risky and speculative outlook with which they are not comfortable. And of course there are people obsessed with maintaining an idea or hypothesis by any means, without reference to any relevant archaeological material or knowledge. Thor Heyerdahl is a world-famous enthusiastic exponent of this problem. His experiments suggest a possibility, but the results are not proven. Some describe Heyerdahl’s ideas as pure speculation (Stalsberg 2005). However, Heyerdahl’s methodological approach to experiments with floating vessels is of interest (Fig. 4).

He uses the experiment as a probability: conceivable, reasonable or actual. Even for those who are not comfortable with Heyerdahl’s approach, we would like to hold up the methodology of experimenting with the probable as interesting. In reality a lot of experiments with the past in this direction are performed at archaeological open-air museums today, creating a great deal of relevant understanding of what it was like to be a human in past times as well as today.

Sensual culture studies

Experimental archaeology as a physical possibility to explore human action through time constitutes a possible methodological alternative. The methodological renewal we seek might be termed experimental archaeology as “sensual culture studies” (Howes 2005:5). During the 1990s archaeologists took increasing interest in the study of past cultures through the body and bodily experience (Shanks 1992; Hamilakis et al. 2002:1ff.). However, emotions were not weighted. Experiments using the body as a communicative arena are exceptions in Scandinavia, but the Danish archaeologist Søren Nancke Krogh tattooing himself as a Scythian warrior on the basis of a grave find is one example. His experiment is
probably unique and also methodologically interesting because it explicitly establishes one’s own body as a field of experiment (Fig. 5a–c).

Sensory and emotional experiences of the past are often viewed as escapism. However, the geographer Yi-Fu Tuan shows escapism as a basic human quality for enhancing empathy (Tuan 1998). Sensory and
emotional experience, as we see it, is a way to transcend the distinction between knowledge and senses/emotions established since the Age of Enlightenment. We should be more humble about categories of knowledge and senses/emotions. However, knowledge generated from sensory and emotional experience and unmapped impressions is commonly considered to belong to another sphere, and categorized as “no knowledge”, or “tacit knowledge”. But impressions mixed with other knowledge give us intuition and lead us beyond explanation. Intuition is also part of knowledge, but it is harder to express and communicate in experiments. Here we have to rely on the humanistic approach and narrative development.

Some archaeologists are well aware of the missing sensory and emotional
perspectives in academic archaeology. Colin Renfrew, for instance, tells us that “too often, in our work as researchers and scholars, we are prone to suppress these immediate sense impressions” (Renfrew 2003:42). If critical inquiries and senses/emotions seem hard to combine with research, it is probably due to the widespread notion of senses misleading reason (Howes 2005:6f.). However, even supposedly inanimate experiments are connected to senses and emotions. One example is habitation experiments in smoky Iron Age houses. The smoke is often felt to be highly disturbing and therefore the reconstructors think of it as a failure to build houses in the right way (Herschend 1982; Edblom 2004:157ff.). The arguments that people would not have lived in smoky houses seem objective enough, but

Fig. 5a. Søren Nancke-Krogh with Scythian tattoos on his own body (Photo ©: Annett Bruhn/Scanpix 2006).
the reasoning is fully dependent on our own accepted standards for modern indoor environments. Immediate emotions are thus transformed into objective arguments. The paradox here is that these arguments are based on a clearly emotional experience, which shows the obvious and inevitable influence that emotions have on our judgements.

Michael Shanks is an early explorer of emotions in archaeology. His views are presented in his book *Experiencing the Past* (1992). He claims that scientific archaeology silences emotional relations to the past, because standards of reliability do not fit the aesthetic and relational perspectives in question (Shanks 1992:12). Shanks discusses different sensory perspec-
tives; however, he values sight more highly than other senses. Sight as the most scientific acceptable sense is criticized in the book *Empire of the Senses* (Howes 2005). The phenomenological direction, as in Christopher Tilley’s *A Phenomenology of Landscape* (1994), is also an archaeology of senses and emotions. He experiences traces of the past by trying to understand how people conceived of their environment (Tilley 1994). The idea that the so-called contemporary archaeology is based on sensory and emotional response is well established (Buchli & Lucas 2001; Burström 2007). Memories of material objects known to us in our time evoke individual emotions. It might be different objects such as dancing grounds, rock festivals, crashed aeroplanes or abandoned nuclear bases (Burström 2008).

Senses and emotions constitute a huge field of research in philosophy and cognitive sciences (de Sousa 2010). In his conclusion about the research history of emotions Ronald de Sousa finds two contrasting trends represented by *the foxes* and *the hedgehogs*:

---

**Fig. 5c.** The original tattoos found on a buried body during archaeological excavations in Altai. Drawings by Sergei Rudenko, 1950s. Permission by the State Hermitage Museum, St. Petersburg.
The foxes are all keen to emphasize the pervasiveness and diversity of what we call emotions. Emotions are multifarious in their causes, in their effects, in their functions, in their roles both within and among social individuals. […] The hedgehogs […] are more interested in parcelling out domains in which reasonably well regimented neuro-psychological entities with clearly identifiable functions can be studied. (de Sousa 2010)

Despite these contrasts de Sousa points to consensus and nine points to be accounted for in an acceptable philosophical theory of emotions:

- emotions are typically conscious phenomena; yet
- they typically involve more pervasive bodily manifestations than other conscious states;
- they vary along a number of dimensions: intensity, valence, type and range of intentional objects, etc.
- they are reputed to be antagonists of rationality; but also
- they play an indispensable role in determining the quality of life;
- they contribute crucially to defining our ends and priorities;
- they play a crucial role in the regulation of social life;
- they protect us from an excessively slavish devotion to narrow conceptions of rationality;
- they have a central place in moral education and the moral life.

(de Sousa 2010)

Each point is of essential relevance to a developing humanistic experimental archaeology, but how senses and emotions are to be integrated in experimental archaeology has to be demonstrated by future humanistic experimenters.

Conclusion

An obstacle to knowing what really happened in the past is that the present is found in every interpretation. There are different ways to deal with this fact, although none is going to be perfect. Instead of expelling the present from experiments we would have to see a higher degree of unlimited
integration of past and present experience in future experiments. Here we present our suggestion for a renewal of experimental archaeology as a humanistic area of research:

- Senses and emotions are effective means for achieving knowledge and understanding of the past as well as the present
- Humanistic experimental archaeology is an excellent arena combining objective experiments and sensual and emotional exploration
- Anachronisms promote experiences of the past; the understanding is developed by clashes between the present and our concepts of the past
- New methods of documentation and communication will develop when anachronisms, the body and the senses are integrated into experimental archaeology
- Cooperation between academic archaeology and archaeological open-air museums and other institutions for live interpretation in experimental archaeology needs to be encouraged
- The ambition to combine technical and sensory/emotional perspectives are crucial for the success for a future experimental archaeology with a humanistic approach

Humanistic experimental archaeology is not dependent upon the archaeological record in all its parts. The possibilities of conducting experiments lie beyond this barrier and should be seen as a possibility, not an obstacle.

The conclusion is that in the context of a humanistic experimental archaeology it is important to dare to fill the knowledge gaps with possible solutions. It is in the encounter between present and past, the mental movement from present times to another time and place, as deeper reflection has a chance to occur. It is in comparison with our time and our own personal experience that we understand the significance of humanistic experimental archaeology. It is important not to leave out any aspect of being human. Personal experiences should come along, and sensory and emotional experience should be broadly communicated.
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