
OUTPUT 3.2.1



Expert workshop-definition and conceptual approach

Sonja Jilek

Institut für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung

sonja.jilek@aon.at



EUROPEAN UNION
EUROPEAN REGIONAL
DEVELOPMENT FUND



1CE079P4 / Danube Limes - UNESCO World Heritage Project

"This project is implemented within the CENTRAL EUROPE Programme co-financed by the ERDF"

Agenda

Tuesday 4 November

10.15–10.45

Introduction to the WHS-Project “Frontiers of the Roman Empire”
(speaker: Andreas Schwarcz, Sonja Jilek)

10.45–11.30

The UNESCO criteria for river frontiers and the listing in the national „Tentative Lists“
(roundtable)

11.30–12.15

The nomination process: the Antonine Wall WHS
(speaker: David Breeze, Historic Scotland, UK)

12.15–13.00

The nomination process: the Obergermanisch-Raetische Limes
(speaker: Stephan Bender, Museum Aalen, Limes-coordinator of Baden-Württemberg, D)

14.30–14.50

Presentation of the Danube-Limes DVD (Boundary Productions)

14.50–17.00

Discussion on the nomination criteria of river frontiers.
Presentations by Zs. Visy, University Pecs and colleagues from D, SK and AT.

Wednesday 5 November

10.00–12.00

Visit to the new museum exhibition on the legionary fortress of Vindobona,
1010, Hoher Markt 3, opening hours 9.00-18.00, www.wienmuseum.at

14.00–18.00

Workshop “Limes Danuvius”, 13th Cultural Heritage and New Technology
Conference 2008,
Viennese Town Hall, Room 319

Minutes

Tuesday 4 November

1. Greetings of the participants by the Director of the Institute, Univ.-Prof. Dr. Karl Brunner
2. Presentation of the status quo of the World Heritage Project “Frontiers of the Roman Empire” by Andreas Schwarcz and Sonja Jilek. All the frontier sections so far nominated and accepted as part of the multinational ‘Frontiers of the Roman Empire World Heritage Site’ are artificial frontiers, which are defined by military installations linked by an artificial barrier. But in most countries in Europe however, the frontier followed natural boundaries like rivers such as the Rhine and the Danube. In contrast to artificial barriers such as the Upper-German Raetian Limes, which underwent several changes in advancing lines, the river frontiers of the Roman empire in Europe established by the first century AD remained rather static.
3. Sonja Jilek lectured about the UNESCO criteria for river frontiers and the listing in the national „Tentative Lists“. There is a great chance for the large Roman river frontiers to survive inside a potential and unifying ‘Frontiers of the Roman Empire WHS’. Common standards to the definition, recording and protection are asked by UNESCO and would support the individual efforts. Appropriate legal protection and management arrangement are necessary to be installed and harmonized. If the sites along river frontiers are reduced to individual sections, the whole system loses authenticity and breaks up the unique feature of the monument: the continuous frontier. According to the experiences of the former WHS applications this fragmentation could easily lead to differing standards of monument preservation and further on to less well-protected areas suffering long-term damage. The aim, therefore, should be to have all the surviving remains of the ancient frontier installations accorded World Heritage status, if possible.
4. Presentation of the nomination process of the Antonine wall WHS by David Breeze, Historic Scotland, UK. In 2004 the Scottish Ministry of Culture and the Ministry of Culture, Media and Sports in London made final decisions to nominate the Antonine wall for World Heritage. They gave authority to the relevant governmental authorities in Scotland to start and co-ordinate the preparatory work for the UNESCO

application(s). The location of the Antonine Wall has ensured that it is prey to the development and extension of several towns and villages, including Bo'ness, Falkirk, Bonnybridge, Castlecary, Kirkintilloch, Bearsden, Duntocher and Old Kilpatrick. Today only 40km (25 miles) out of the original 60km (37 miles) of the Wall survive unencumbered by modern development. In addition, agriculture has taken its toll. The Wall is clearly visible for about a quarter of its original length. Today, the most highly visible surviving feature is the ditch; only for about 3.5km (2 miles) at Rough Castle and Seabegs Wood can both rampart and ditch be seen. In several places the line of the Wall itself is not known. Only two forts may be said to be visible today – Rough Castle and Bar Hill – and only one – Castlehill – out of the known complement of 16 or 17 appears to have never been built on or excavated in post-Roman times. The only visible fortlet is that at Kinneil, excavated and laid out for public inspection. Six “expansions” are visible –all that are certainly known – but none of the 21 known temporary camp, six of which have been partially or completely built over. The Military Way can only be seen east and west of Rough Castle and in Seabegs Wood. Virtually nothing is known of civil settlements which are believed to have existed outside forts, nor of the cemeteries which will also have lain there.

The nomination process included the definition of the monument. This was aided by the mapping of the Wall currently being undertaken by the Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments of Scotland: this is based upon a complete re-survey of the Wall undertaken by the Ordnance Survey in 1980. Buffer zones to protect the Wall were defined and a Management Plan prepared. This considers all aspects of the management of the archaeological remains, including visitor management and the better provision of facilities for visiting members of the public. At present, while information boards have been erected at those parts of the Wall in either central or local government care, there is little linking of these sectors in order to provide an integrated view of the Wall. A web-site provides further information.

5. Presentation of the nomination process: the Obergermanisch-Raetische Limes by Stephan Bender, Museum Aalen, Limes-coordinator of Baden-Württemberg, D. The inscription of the German Limes as a World Heritage Site in 2005, joining Hadrian's Wall on the WHS List, was an important step towards the creation of a new trans-boundary Frontiers of the Roman Empire WHS. Such a Site might in time encompass

all surviving sections of the frontiers of the Roman empire. The nomination of any monument as a World Heritage Site is a complex process. It was not envisaged that the appropriate documentation for the ORL was completed before 2005, while work started in 2000. Thereafter, the proposal was evaluated by international experts before being submitted to the World Heritage Committee of UNESCO for approval. Whereas only 8% of the Upper German-Raetian Limes WHS lies in settled areas (and this is similar to the percentage recorded on Hadrian's Wall or the Antonine Wall), many segments of the river lines are situated in intensively used (urban) areas.

6. Presentation of a CD about the Danube-Limes from Bavaria to the Black Sea by Erik Dobat and Sandra Walkshofer from Boundary Productions.

7. Discussion on the definition of river frontiers and the nomination criteria of river frontiers. Harmonization of nomination criteria in HU and SK. Presentations by Zs. Visy, University Pecs and colleagues from D (Peter Henrich), SK (Jan Rajtar, Jarka Schmidtova, Katarina Haymadova) and AT (Sonja Jilek).

Zs. Visy speaks about a chain of fortifications, which is the concept of frontiers as a demarcation line. Some features might have been taken over from the Chinese Wall. In Europe the biggest part of the frontier was built along the great rivers. Also Hadrian's wall and the Antonine wall have parts of a natural defence line along the coasts. Rhine and Danube are dividing lines across Europe. Where possible Romans tried to use natural defence lines instead of artificial lines (also in the Middle East and North Africa). Question of natural obstacles, how the Romans used them. Changes of the river flow with several arms. It is difficult which one of the most important one in Roman times. Difficult territory was strongly fortified. Watchtowers are more densely built in these areas. So we have to accept that there are different arms we can not always identify clearly. Difficult river situation for instance at the Iron gate. The Romans had to build special roads for drawing ships. In many situations there are Loess plateaus where forts were built. The opposite side beyond the frontier often is flat land. In Dobruza the situation is different. Right hand side is rocky, the other flat. One of the main intentions was to have a traffic line along the border, possibly the shortest way. Other features which were important to them were to have a quite clear demarcation line. They decided for permanent occupation so they had to build military installations of different kinds. They not only wanted to mark the line by rule

and control the river and even a stripe on the opposite side. The Romans built bridges to cross smaller rivers along the frontier. And there are other installations (bridgeheads) across the river frontier which belong to the fortification system. Map of Marsigli shows the very many arms of the Danube. Some military places are not on the bank but totally away from the river nowadays. We need to try to find the river bed for the Roman times. In the end of the 19th century there was huge rebuilding work on the Danube bed. Some settlements still represent the structure of the Roman fortifications. Many places in Hungary have changed and are covered since 1940. Many sites have been free of settlements before but are no longer visible. Only a few places are free to present and conserve. Rivers are much more populated areas. During the project we have to defend everything which is still existing. Maybe we do have to make compromises, but we have to try very hard to defend the last resorts where the Roman heritage is still existing. If we want to nominate a river line what do we do? We have a natural obstacle but this can not be part. The main features are the Limes road, which is much more important here than along artificial lines. Otherwise all other military installations should be included as far as possible. State of conservation along the river frontiers is often very different from what we recognize from artificial barriers. We don't have to change our nomination criteria. During the discussion about the nomination criteria D. Breeze suggests to concentrate on the military installations, the river is a connecting element anyway. In B. Ringbeck: very clear description published most recently defines what protection goals you have. Limes road is a military structure. But the protection goals for such a feature is very difficult. S. Jilek asks about the old river beds? Can we include this? Th. Often suggests that yes, in principal we can nominate such areas. Zs. Visy mentioned that the Romans used the river, significance is obvious, of course in the nomination we have to describe the role of the river. In the nomination we have to use the Limes road if we know where it was. Where it is built over we can create a buffer zone. Agree not to promote the Limes road as the most important feature but include it in the system. K. Behrbohm asks the outsider question: what have the monument preservation institutions in mind? What do they think? Zs. Visy says that it is no problem with UNESCO to nominate invisible monuments. There needs to be compromises and maybe we have to leave out some places. Lot of questions what to nominate in politics and modern development. K. Behrbohm asks again after the

identity criterion and if monuments are inside or outside the WHS. D. Breeze mentions that the last nomination, the Antonine wall is not a good example. Germans moved us forward with decision to include everything in the nomination. St. Bender mentions that the knowledge of the Limes road in Germany is not wide either. A. Schwarcz suggests to: take the example of the Main river to which St. Bender replies that the Limes road is not known in the Main frontier. Th. Otten suggests that we should nominate the known places. We should concentrate what we want to do with these monuments. L. Pincikova suggests to concentrate on the best example, it is impossible to protect all. Zs. Visy suggests that a special management centre should be created to look after the new WHS. L. Pincikova says that in Slovakia they have only two sites and they can not protect more. J. Rajtar: how do you think you can protect a line of a road in a field? Zs. Visy: Why should it not be possible to nominate it? We will give the information where the line is. In Hungarian law it is not necessary to protect the site by law, it is okay if it is part of the WHS. Th. Otten is not convinced that we should really go forward with parts of monuments which we can not be protected on a long term view. Zs. Visy says that all places can be nominated but we should nominate when we know it will survive. D. Breeze says that it was impossible to protect the whole line of the AW. It will cut out sometimes. What level of destruction is acceptable? L. Vagalinski means that because of legislation and the practical reasons you can not protect this line, we can just focus on separate sites. M. Szabo asks if people will understand if we do not use the road? S. Jilek says that roads and urban areas are not so very different. We should concentrate how to protect the places. We need to talk about planning and to get our monuments into the development plans of governments. Zs. Visy suggests that protection should be decided after long discussion about individual sites. Visibility is not a criterion. In the case of Budapest several forts are still under the city. Visible, accessible and known places. Th. Otten: sites are very dominated by the cities. At the end of our documentation we can name some places which we think we can protect in a long term view. Ch. Farka: we can not protect most of the areas of many forts. Is it enough to protect the visible archaeology/known archaeology? A. Schwarcz: suggests that it is necessary to go forward step by step. You can only protect what is under legal protection. First you have to know what is there. And then you decide what you take in the applications. Zs. Visy says that national heritage protection is not compulsory

to give a nomination. It will not be asked if it is under protection, just guarantee the survival. K. Behrbohm asks if it is necessary to have one common approach or can we have different strategies? D. Breeze replies that we already have different approaches with the existing WHS. A. Schwarcz suggests just to do what is feasible in your own country. K. Behrbohm asks if UNESCO will accept this view. D. Breeze says that his understanding is that there is no comparison. L. Pincikova wants to set an emphasis on important parts of monuments.

All participants agreed to the following criteria for the definition of Roman river frontiers:

- The very essence of a linear frontier system is that it forms a continuous line
- Problems to demonstrate this linearity along river frontiers because river frontiers lack those most obvious connecting elements
- Forts along the Rhine and Danube frontiers are 10 to 30 km apart, and inter-visibility does not often exist.
- A most distinctive feature of river frontiers of course is the river itself. But over the last 2000 years the river beds often changed over longer distances and are now threatened by water power stations, dams and reservoirs
- A distinctive feature of river frontiers are bridgehead fortifications
- The Limes road linked the individual military installations and other ancillary features and runs in general well behind the course of the river, dictated by the terrain
- The nature of river frontiers also promoted the development of urbanisation particularly in the very centre of Europe. This is a major problem, when it comes to record and protect the monuments
- A solution for the future lays in better prevention activities, such as the establishment of archaeological cadastres

Wednesday 5 November

7. CE Project “Danube Limes UNESCO World Heritage”

- Project management
- Partner contracts
- Fine-tuning of the project activities (month 1-18)
- General project communication strategies

7A. K. Behrbohm refers to the CE project progress, wait for grant contract by monitoring committee. The general rules of reporting and expenditures will be send out by Klaus Behrbohm soon. In the end of January 2009 there will be a workshop organised by the JTS for the programme rules. He recommends that each partner send at least one of his administrator(s).

After contract:

Nomination of the responsible person into the project committee

Schedule of meetings and workshops

To Do list until the next project meeting

- Discuss / prepare contracts:
 - grant contract KÖH – JTS
 - partner contracts KÖH und project partners
- Planning of the expected expenditures:
 - 1.10.-31.12.08
 - forecast 1st half 2009
 - forecast 2nd half 2009
- Distribution of forms and tools
 - staff project time forms
 - logo of the CE programme
- Rules (preliminary)
 - for regular staff (definition of responsibilities, time records, recruitment)
 - contracting of experts
 - tender procedures
 - specific expenditures (e.g. catering)

- Documentation
 - work record, results
 - meetings
 - dissemination
 - expenditures
- Reporting and financial matter
- others??

According to the instructions of the JTS (see on page 8 of the file annexed), the domain should be www.limes.eu or www.danube-limes.eu (we may also think to make reservation in the national language version, e.g. www.romai-limes.eu , www.donaulimes.eu etc.)

7B. Partner contracts can not be set up before the Subsidy contract with the EU is not signed. The forms of the Subsidy Contract are delayed and have not been sent out by the JTS.

7C. Fine-tuning of project activities. During the project the relevant sites in Hungary and Slovakia will be identified and selected. If necessary some research of individual sites will be completed. One essential element of the nomination documents is the management plan, in which will be defined how to protect and sustainably utilise the heritage in future. It also implies a systematic involvement of the local, national and cross-border authorities, the public and also the experts during the preparation phase. Selected sites will be prepared for a better public access through signposting and info-panels. In all other Danube Limes countries the project will foster an opinion forming process and provide expertise and present best practise from the different countries.

7D. General project communication strategies. During the last decade one can recognize a massive interest at the communal level for an increased use of the monuments. It is understandable that communities now want to benefit from this huge archaeological potential. The main target group beside cultural resource managers (monument preservation institutions, research and university institutions, museums) are the policy makers, the regional and local authorities administering and

living within the distinctive archaeological area. They are involved in spatial planning and guarantee the sustainable development based on cultural and economic considerations. This group consists of policy makers from various institutions (protection of cultural landscape, planning authorities, rural development, regional management and agriculture) in different administrative levels (EU-wide, national, regional, local, owners of property). Among the many objectives of an enlarged World Heritage Site into the Danube Limes countries is the intention to optimise all available resources.

All partners agreed to produce

- General project publications (organised by the Polish partners). This also includes PR materials for international conferences and other gatherings
- National project publications (info-folders, video, guides) organised by the individual partners

8. Participation at the 13th Cultural Heritage and New Technology Conference 2008, Project presentation “Limes Danubius”, Viennese Town Hall, Room 319, see conference map

Workshop “The Limes Danuvius – chances for the UNESCO World Heritage Site”,

13th Cultural Heritage and New Technology Conference 2008, Viennese Town Hall,

Room 319, see conference map

Lectures:

Máté Szabó/H, New Possibilities for aerial archaeology along the river border called “ripa Pannonica”

Ioana Oltean – Ovidiu Tentea/RO, Aerial Survey along the Lower Danube Roman limes in Dobrogea, Romania

Katarina Haymadyová – Jaroslava Schmidtova/SK, Limes Romaus in Slovakia

Piotr Dyczek – Martin Lemke – Janusz Reclaw/PL, New Research in Novae, Bulgaria

Martin Mosser/A, Vindobona Fortress excavations and 3D-reconstructions

Hans-Peter Jeschke/A, The Cultural Landscape Maintaining System for the historic landscape zone of the frontiers of the Roman Empire

Erik Dobat – Sandra Walkshofer/A, Das internationale Film-/Multimedia-/DVD-Projekt “Römische Grenzen” und Vorstellung der DVD “Der Donaulimes – Landschaft und Geschichte”