ANALECTA ARCHAEOLOGICA RESSOVIENSIA
VOLUME 13 RZESZÓW 2018

DOI: 10.15584/anarres.2018.13.3

Michał Pawleta*

The Ludification of the Archaeological Past – Opportunities and Threats

ABSTRACT

Pawleta M. 2018. The Ludification of the Archaeological Past – Opportunities and Threats. *Analecta Archaeologica Ressoviensia* 13, 49–68

The subject of this paper is the archaeologically created past, seen as a reservoir of pleasure. The topic is discussed in comparison with changes of the contemporary man's approach to the past. The organising motif of my reflections is the category of pleasure and different ways of pursuing it by people, mainly by means of broadly understood play. I propose here two theses, namely: (1) in the contemporary world the past, being a point of reference for archaeological investigation, may constitute a source of pleasure or inspiration to search for pleasure; (2) the ways of presenting the past to a certain degree have been subjugated by the rules that have been reserved for the domains of entertainment and consumption. This paper will relate to: (1) the pleasure of exploring of the past; (2) the pleasure of re-enacting and performing the past, and (3) the pleasure of playing with the past during archaeological fêtes.

Keywords: ludification of the past, pleasure, exploring the past, historical re-enactment, archaeological fêtes, commercialisation of the past

Received: 21.12.2018; **Revised:** 28.12.2018; **Revised:** 28.12.2018; **Accepted:** 30.12.2018

Nowadays, the archaeologically created past can be seen as a reservoir of pleasure[1]. I will try to prove this statement by proposing two theses. First, that in the contemporary world the past, being a point of reference for archaeological (and historical) investigation, may constitute a source of pleasure or inspiration to search for pleasure. Second, the ways of presenting the past and consequently the forms of its presence to a certain degree have been subjugated by the rules that traditionally have been reserved to the domains of entertainment and consumption.

* Institute of Archaeology – Adam Mickiewicz University, Uniwersytetu Poznańskiego 7, 61-614 Poznań, Poland; mpawleta@amu.edu.pl

[1] The issue of the ludification of the past has already been the subject of my previous studies and publications and some ideas presented here have appeared elsewhere – see Pawleta 2010; 2011a; 2011b; 2012a; 2012b; 2014; 2016a; 2016b; 2017.

As a consequence, the observable use of remains of past times these days is "a process activated by the logic of entertainment, leisure, and consumerism" (Gil García 2011, 269). The past, presented and received in that way, can thus provide some specific pleasures prepared for the needs of mass tourism and arranged for active participation or entertainment.

The issues forming the keystone of my paper are a reflection of broader changes in the attitude of contemporary people towards the past. They are connected with the so-called historical sensitivity or with the historical culture of contemporary people. According to Andrzej Szpociński (2010, 9) it ought to be understood as

> a collection of ideas, norms, behavioural models, socially respected values, which regulate the way we relate to everything that is recognised as the past (passed, historical) in any given culture, independent of the current state of affairs.

The period after 1989 in Poland was marked by a re-evaluation of the relationship people have with the past and attitudes towards it. This is evident in the diverse forms of the presence and functioning of the past – as relics, reconstructions and narratives – and also in how the past is referred to. One of the main arguments I would like to propose here is that postmodern times are marked by a change in attitudes to the past and a fundamental re-evaluation of the forms in which the past is perceived, made present and/or experienced.

Postmodernity, or rather the nature of the dynamic cultural, social, political, economic and civilisation changes that shape it, is quite a different context for the presence and functioning of the past, including the prehistoric past, in comparison to that of the preceding eras. Sociologists' findings clearly show that the present day has instigated a totally new quality in the ways history and the past are perceived, which I suggest be termed the postmodern attitude towards the past. Four interrelated aspects which constitute the change in modern attitudes towards the past can be listed here, namely: (1) the increasing importance of memory in public life; (2) the privatisation of the past, based on creating personalised visions of the past; (3) the conviction that direct contact with the past is possible through personal and sensuous experience; and (4) the commercialisation of cultural heritage, connected with the transformation of the essence of the past into a marketable product in the form of goods, services or experiences (Szpociński 2007; 2010;

2012; Kwiatkowski 2008, 39–40; 2009, 131–134; Szacka 2009; 2014; Pawleta 2016a, 42).

These aspects constitute the broader context for the tendencies in which the archaeological past is made present today. Thus, I argue that the forms in which the past is here today (including the prehistoric past), how knowledge about it is presented to people, and consequently the methods by which they learn about and/or experience the past are currently influenced by the following: (1) just how sensational an archaeological discovery is, causing other discoveries important in archaeology to be overlooked; (2) reconstructionism, based on recreating the past through physical/virtual reconstructions; (3) how suited the past is to theatricalisation in regard to certain activities from the past being recreated in front of a live audience; and (4) "festivalisation", referring to the organisation of mass events with the past as a theme. The above-mentioned strategies are further connected with some related phenomena, namely: (5) the aesthetisation of the past; (6) the idea of "time travel", and (7) the past as a ludic phenomenon (see Pawleta 2016a, 161–181).

Even though these terms have an external character and I employ them as a strategy for interpreting certain phenomena and trends, they also concern practical aspects. They remain closely related to the attempts to "enliven" the past, by moving away from static forms of presentation (e.g. exhibitions in museums) and making the past more accessible and interactive.

The definition of pleasure

For the purposes of this paper, the definition of pleasure proposed by Marek Krajewski (2003, 35–36) has been adopted:

> pleasure is the state of feelings which is opposite to the sense of unfulfillment, lack, deprivation and pain, and which is also situated between the two different feelings: satisfaction and delight.

Pursuing pleasure is one of the driving forces behind human behaviour, and the available ways of experiencing pleasure are part of broadly understood culture (Grad and Mamzer 2005). In addition, experiencing pleasure is one of the inherent elements of play, which has been stressed in its various definitions (e.g. Caillois 1973; Huizinga 1985).

Referencing the past is a significant part of the present world. The past in its diverse facets is reconstructed, experienced and consumed

in different manners by various audiences. Thus, my next argument is that in a consumer society the past has become just another commodity to be bought and sold (see: Hewison 1987; Bagnall 1996; Rowan and Baram 2004; de Grott 2009; Baillie, Chatzoglou and Shadia 2010; Pawleta 2011a; Kowalczyk and Kiec 2015; Wojdon 2018). It is a commercially driven kind of goods – in its material and social aspects that can be obtained, used and consumed as-wished-for.

I also agree with those scholars who have argued that the culture of our times is distinctly marked by ludic tendencies (e.g. Grad and Mamzer 2004a; 2004b; Kantor 2013). They seem to be closely connected not only with the orientation towards consumerism, but also with the attitudes directed towards searching for pleasure, for fulfilment in the shortest possible time, for the need for entertainment. We can refer here to the idea of "experience economy" (Pine and Gilmore 1999), which stresses that today's businesses must orchestrate memorable events for their customers, and that memory itself becomes the product – the experience. Thus, they have to provide professionally (consciously and purposefully) prepared products, strongly marked with emotions.

From the perspective of the issues raised in my paper, the distinction, proposed by Ryszard Kantor (2010), between "playing with the past" and "playing the past", is rather crucial in determining the different kinds of entertainment based on the past. It is irrelevant whether the past is only imaginary or reconstructed on the basis of scientific knowledge. According to Kantor (2010, 136), "playing with the past" means "the use of props, characters and events from the past with the aim of amusement". Old costumes and clothes used today for fun, historical reconstructions and archaeological fêtes belong to this category. They are purely entertaining performances, a form of passive entertainment, devoid of any educational potential. And "playing the past" has been defined by Kantor (2010, 136) as "a clearly distinct kind of human activity (participatory, active fun), more permanent and deeper". Participation in historical re-enactment movement and other group activities connected with the past is included in this category. Attention to historical accuracy is one of their important features.

I have argued elsewhere that the past, as well as forms of reference to it, is one source of ludic behaviour in modern society (see Pawleta 2011b). Reflections on the function of the past in contemporary popular culture seem to be in accordance with that observation (e.g. Holtorf

2005; 2007). For modern popular culture, the past becomes an element of entertainment and consumption (e.g. Krajewski 2003, 205–245; de Grott 2009; Robinson and Silverman 2015). Often, it refers to mythic archetypes still present in our culture that can be evidenced for example in modern speculative fiction, such as fantasy and alternate histories (e.g. Trocha, Rzyman and Ratajczak 2013) or in the different media such as movies or video games (e.g. Clack and Brittain 2007; Mol *et al.* 2017). From the point of view of the issues analysed here, it is important that the past created archaeologically has also now become the inspiration to pursue pleasure. Thus, pleasure is one of the most popular ways of learning, feeling and understanding the past (Jasiewicz and Olędzki 2005, 183). In this sense, the culture of pleasure can be expressed as a form of attitude towards the fascinating and joyful past, for example in the process of discovering it and learning through fun.

I will now analyse different kinds of pleasure, for which the past can be the source or the inspiration. I will argue that the archaeological past can serve as a point of reference for archaeology, both in the process of the "ludification" of archaeology, which means using archaeological knowledge for ludic purposes, as well as in games and entertainment based on the prehistoric past. Particular aspects will relate to: (1) the pleasure of exploring the past; (2) the pleasure of re-enacting and performing the past, and (3) the pleasure of playing with the past during archaeological fêtes. Due to separate elements mutually overlapping or inter-penetrating, the proposed division is quite arbitrary and my intention is only to signal specific phenomena, not to analyse them in a broad manner.

Pleasure of exploring the past

The first aspect is pleasure derives from the process of exploring and discovering the past, mainly in the course of archaeological excavations, with emphasis on the role of emotions and senses accompanying discoveries. This concerns both professional archaeologists and activities of so-called "detectorists". This is the kind of pleasure which is included in the gradual process of discovering in the course of archaeological excavations. In this regard, I subscribe to the opinion of Łukasz Dominiak (2005), who argues that pleasure, which refers to feelings and intuition, is an extra-epistemological but important

element of archaeological research, taking place especially in the direct experience of the materiality of archaeological sources. Dominiak also lists a number of pleasures, conditioned (among others) by an archaeologist's re-enactment of what had passed or by direct contact with relics of the past.

The pleasures can also result from the methodology of excavations itself. In this respect, one can refer to the original ideas of Michael Shanks (1992), who compared archaeological excavations to striptease. He writes:

> Excavation is striptease. The layers are peeled off slowly; eyes of intent scrutiny. The pleasure is in seeing more, but it lies also in the edges: the edge of stocking-top and thigh. There is the allure of transgression – the margin of decorum and lewdness, modesty and display. The hidden past brought into the stage-light of the present. Audience keeps its distance; the stage is for performer only. The split heightens the enticement. Just as the gap between past and present draws us to wonder in fascination (Shanks 1992, 54).

The pleasure Shanks describes is embedded in the process of discovering, uncovering and revealing past remains. It is the pleasure of gaining knowledge of what is being uncovered in a slow and patient way. Moreover, experience of the past does not really have the nature of a thought process as it amounts mainly to the emotional and bodily spheres. Also, the very act of discovering past remains is important as "it is the performance, the medium of discovery, how we come to see and know" (Shanks 1992, 55). Shanks also points out that archaeological practice contains a form of melancholy, caused by the awareness that so much of the past has been irretrievably lost. Therefore, he proposes developing an approach based on a dialogue with the past, whose constitutive element is the fascination with discovering the otherness of the past (Shanks 1992, 50, 145). According to him, emotions and feelings associated with this very act disappear in the process of interspersing them into scientific procedures.

Both Ł. Dominiak's and M. Shanks' proposals can be interpreted as an expression of a "romantic" view, embedded in the archaeological cognition of the past. I agree with the apt remark of Danuta Minta-Tworzowska (2009, 17), who points out that to some extent they are reductionist: they reduce experience to the sphere of emotions and feelings, at the same time identifying them with pleasure, namely the pleasure of a dialogue with the past, included in its discovery and

cognition. However, emotions and feelings are by no means the only elements of experience, as it consists of a number of other components, such as intellectual ones. What is more, these proposals tend to completely omit negative experiences, resulting from contact with traumatic aspects of the past and material remnants of acts of violence, destruction or the sphere of human mortality (e.g. Zalewska, Scott and Kiarszys 2017). In addition, they reduce experience to the individual feelings of a given researcher, at the same time assuming its ahistoricism and universalism by not taking into account that forms of experience are culturally and historically variable. However, as pointed out by D. Minta-Tworzowska, they have a certain advantage that can be seen in the sensitisation of an archaeologist to the otherness of the past and demanding respect for the past instead of appropriating and colonising it in the name of science. They also allow us to see the role of an important emotional component accompanying all archaeological research, thus restoring to some extent the "romanticism" lost by archaeology.

Pleasure of re-enacting and performing the past

The second aspect discussed in this paper concerns pleasures associated mainly with the phenomenon of historical re-enactment, which are derived both in the course of participating in re-enacting scenes from the past and from watching performances of this type. I understand historical re-enactment as defined by Michał Bogacki (2008, 222), as a collection of

> activities based on the visual presentation of various areas of life in the past by people in costumes using objects relating to the past (replicas or occasionally reconstructions) from a given period, or even original artefacts.

It involves the staging of past events, the aim of which is to present the past based on historical or archaeological facts; it is not a truthful recreation of the past. Two types of historical re-enactment can be named – battle re-enactment, which reconstructs battle scenes; and living history, which recreates aspects of everyday life, presenting either a full picture or only part of it (Goodcare and Baldwin 2002; Radtchenko 2006; Bogacki 2008; 2010a; 2010b; Kwiatkowski 2008, 110–185; 2009, 134–143; McCalman and Pickering 2010; Szlendak *et al.* 2012; Baraniecka-Olszewska 2018). This "recalled past" oscillates

between emotions and the visitor's interaction; the viewer is frequently asked to participate in the events, giving rise to emotions through "sensuous intensification", providing an extraordinary experience. The fact that it is possible to take a look "behind the scenes" at such events is important, as it minimises the distance between the player and the spectator, creating the illusion viewers have of "being in direct contact with the past" (Nieroba, Czerner and Szczepański 2009, 30–33).

Historical re-enactment can provide pleasure in many ways. A distinction should be made between the pleasures of performance participants and of those who observe their actions. In the first case, it is mainly the pleasure of implementing an exciting hobby, a way of spending leisure time, having good fun. So, this is appreciation of all the aspects which constitute the definition of pleasure adopted in the paper. For a large number of re-enactors, re-enactment activities are primarily a form of play or entertainment from which one should derive pleasure. It comes from spending free time and pursuing an enjoyable hobby and it is "therefore a secondary disinterested activity, taken and continued only for pleasure" (Tomaszewska 2017, 214). Some re-enactors are fairly superficially involved in the movement; what is primarily important for them is the participation in tournaments, fun and entertainment (Radtchenko 2006, 139; Kwiatkowski 2008, 126). Ewa Tomaszewska (2017, 217) points out that in the case of many re-enactors, the primary interest in recreating people's lives is related to fun, combined with an earlier fascination, for example with fantasy literature or role-playing games (also Bogacki 2008, 240). The basic idea around which this kind of play is organised consists in imitating the lives of people from past periods – *mimicry*, whereby play is based on the past, which determines its character, guarantees its historical accuracy (through e.g. props, set design, façade) and also provides it with credibility and consistency. What is important in re-enactment is "a certain inclination towards a playful adoption of a new identity, acting, pretending, "moving into" an imaginary world" (Tomaszewska 2017, 217); the opportunity to impersonate alternative characters, dress up, take a different name, etc. Aspects of a direct experience of the past through more modest initiatives, connected with the so-called "journeys into the past", are also significant in this regard (Petersson and Holtorf 2017). Their participants, playing the roles of their ancestors, want to experience personally what life might have looked like centuries ago.

Historical re-enactments can also be the source of unforgettable experiences and a variety of pleasures for their spectators, who find pleasure in participating in re-enactment spectacles, in observing and taking part in such events. Thus, pleasure is part of the formula of historical performances itself, which directly results from the character of re-enactments as spectacles, performances or events, presented and watched mainly for entertainment. They often contain some ways of getting the audience to participate in the presented events, usually in the form of fun, e.g. tournaments, competitions, etc. In this regard, it is important to offer to spectators the possibility of experiencing something personally, and of sensual contact with the recreated past. Entertainment is therefore aimed at satisfying people's needs.

Thus, activities that are part of historical re-enactment meet most of the formal criteria of ludic phenomena, as distinguished by Roger Caillois (1973). For example, they are events set at a specific time and in a particular space and they are accompanied by a sense of a specific "out of ordinary" reality, etc. They also fulfil the criteria for basic categories of games and plays proposed by Caillois. In addition, it is their spectacularity, an inherent feature of play, that largely determines the attractiveness and popularity of recreations of historical events. What one can see during those staged events is the domination of *ludus festivus* – fun, festivals, entertainment, being with other people. Entertainment, play and related pleasures are therefore an indispensable element of such events and at the same time a theme around which they are organised. It is not about approving shallow entertainment and commercialism, but rather about emphasising the role of play as an important cultural element, which can also have an important role in re-enactment activities.

Pleasure of playing with the past during archaeological fêtes

The last discussed aspect concerns archaeological fêtes, recognised from the perspective of pleasures connected with the ways of learning/educating about the past, as well as ludic aspects, which are their crucial element. Archaeological fêtes, also called festivals, markets or family fun days are outdoor events intended to raise awareness and educate people about the past. They usually take place where some connection to the past already exists (e.g. in archaeological open-air museums) or nearby and they present a range of aspects from the material, social

or spiritual world of the past (Chowaniec 2010, 208–210). There are demonstrations of different crafts such as pottery, flint tool making or weaving; it is possible to see a blacksmith, a carpenter, or a bone and horn craftsman at work; old recipes are used to cook traditional dishes; there are scenes from everyday life, warriors in battle, traditional folk music concerts, etc. The demonstrations are given not only by archaeologists or museum workers wearing costumes from the era, but also by living history presenters (see Grossman 2006; Nowaczyk 2007; Brzostowicz 2009; Piotrowski and Zajączkowski 2010). Fêtes attract many visitors, mainly children; their success is measured in visitor numbers, which supposedly prove the past can be presented in a way which contemporary audiences find attractive and engaging.

Despite the fact that organisers of festivals continually highlight their educational and popularisation values (e.g. Grossman 2006, 141; Brzostowicz 2009, 296; Bursche and Chowaniec 2009, 72), festivals do contain elements of entertainment which involves playing the past, a mass open-air pageant, where ludic tendencies dominate, aimed at the attractiveness, spectacularity and memorability of the shows. Often, though, their educational value is minimal and festivals instead become more like family picnics or local markets. Their popularity and the high number of visitors are very desirable from the point of view of the achievement of commercial aims, but this should not be the sole criterion of evaluation of such enterprises.

Archaeological fêtes, creating the illusion of time travel and containing the promise of an extraordinary experience, offer the spectator a number of other pleasant and memorable experiences. First of all, it is possible to find enjoyment not only in the passive observation of the happenings and demonstrations, but also in actively participating in them. Knowledge is transmitted in an interactive way, because fêtes offer contact with the past according to the motto "take a relic in hand, make a copy and feel the history" (Bursche and Chowaniec 2009, 75). Everything can be touched, spectators can often participate in the subsequent stages of an experiment, make some objects by themselves or personally test how they work. It should be noted that the past presented at festivals is usually more aesthetically pleasing; it is a cleaned-up version where only those aspects which can draw in the crowds are shown. It is a specific image, sterilised for the mass audience and served through the lens of entertainment, encouraging participation in the "experience". What is

also characteristic of such events is that they are totally accessible and open: it is not necessary to know anything about history, nor learn anything about it, in order to play it; there are no prerequisites for visitors (Kantor 2010).

Secondly, the way of learning about the past is a pleasant experience in itself. In archaeology, this depends on the skilful combination of entertainment and education, during which abstract content is simplified and undergoes objectification, which is necessary in order for the message to reach the average member of the mass audience. Archaeological fêtes, which are a form of popularising archaeology and knowledge about the past in an accessible and attractive way, pursue the idea mainly through entertainment. We can refer here to the neologism "edutainment" which – according to Tim Edensor (2002, 85) – means:

> a less didactic form of instruction, where affecting, sensual and mediatised stagings combine with a culture of instruction to produce a synthetic form.

Thus, edutainment as a form of entertainment that is designed to educate as well as amuse, is specific to contemporary society and describes a model of gaining knowledge in an attractive way. In a similar vein, many archaeologists have argued that a proper mix of education and entertainment, "hands-on" experience and direct engagement with the past through its reconstructions, re-enacted activities, performances and presentations have a greater impact on people's understanding of prehistory than knowledge gleaned from books (Nowaczyk 2007; Wrzesiński 2008).

Next, pleasure is part of the definition of archaeological fêtes. Fêtes and the games they offer attempt, in a certain way, to relate to elements of the past and in the intention of their organisers contain educational potential, although this is often rather doubtful. Fête organisers provide a whole range of attractions, both in the form of presented entertainment and events in which the public is invited to participate. The first group includes, above all, a whole range of battle re–enactments and warrior and knight tournaments, which are amongst the more spectacular activities and are obligatory at every event of this type. The perfect illustration of the second group of entertainment are plebeian games and individual or team competitions: stamping your own coin, trying your hand at archery, a ribbon-weaving race, or field games based on going around the festival, quizzes, guessing games, charades, art

competitions, games of physical skill based on games once popular in the past. Included here are all the stalls serving beer, chips, sausages, grilled black-pudding and sweet desserts, often under the guise of "ye olde traditional fayre and beverages". This sort of attractions also includes prize draws, temporary "old style" tattoos, bathing in wooden tubs, tug-of-war games, firework displays or being locked into stocks. Folk dance groups and bands playing traditional music of the epoch, souvenir stalls or those selling toys for children, such as plastic swords, bows and arrows or helmets, and stands with handicrafts and organic food complete the whole.

Last, but not least, the achievement of commercial aims, increasing the attractiveness of the shows and avoiding repetition, requires a formula such as the one used in the annual Biskupin fêtes, where each year has a different culture as its theme (e.g. Indian, ancient Egyptian, Japanese) for the festival which takes place within the reserve. In this case, however, there are context issues in regard to the chronology and location of the shows, which some archaeologists and also third-party observers criticise quite strongly. For instance, Sylwia Czubkowska (2006, 11) equates the festivals in Biskupin with a "prehistoric Disneyland" or a "cross between a family fun-day, barbecue in the park and a market".

Let me say it again, festivals are proof of the fact that the product archaeology offers can indeed be packaged in an attractive way. They are also a good example of how to adapt to the needs of contemporary consumers, the demands of free market economy, or how to receive sponsorship for undertaking archaeological ventures. The fact that archaeological fêtes and shows, workshops, demonstrations, etc. which disseminate knowledge about archaeology and the past in an accessible and attractive way are addressed mainly to children does not mean that adults do not find them equally enjoyable.

Wojciech Piotrowski (2008, 322), however, indicates that entertainment, as part of the convention of fêtes, and thereby connected to commercialism, is a threat since

> uncontrolled, it introduces a holiday atmosphere and becomes grist to the mill of supporters of so–called "pure" archaeology and enemies of mass events, which outdo science in popularising knowledge of the past.

I agree with the above statement and, in my opinion, the obvious element of entertainment frequently leads to commercialisation and

increasingly banal displays. It also leads to fêtes being excessively focused on market needs, where practically anything can be shown and sold, if it can only be made interesting enough for the visitors, which in consequence inevitably results in a reformulation and loss of meaning of the past (Jasiewicz and Olędzki 2005, 203). Such a form of education and dissemination of knowledge of the past responds in part to the challenge of the contemporary world and consumer culture in which one immediately receives whatever one desires, even knowledge (for a critique on this topic see Postman 2006, 202–218). The message must therefore be readable and clear, featuring experiences and emotions transmitted in attractive, media-friendly and spectacular ways (Kowalski 2007, 34–37). However, the accepted formula for presenting knowledge of the past, as realised by archaeological fêtes, often leads to the domination of form over content, spectacularity and attractiveness over scientific reliability. In consequence, educational ideas are lost in favour of fast development and shallow information, accompanied by teaching which demands no effort of the participants. Therein lies the real danger, especially for unprepared spectators, who may well end up creating a false image of the past based on the information received. It can also pose a threat to archaeology itself, as the results of scientific archaeological reconstructions of the past can become in general public perception either trivialised or redefined by a perpetual round of entertainment (e.g. Brzeziński 2000, 153; Dominiak 2004; Nowaczyk 2007, 507; Brzostowicz 2009, 295–297; Pawleta 2010, 65–74). Although commerce is unavoidable at such events, it is necessary to achieve a good balance and to pay attention to the scientific accuracy and credibility of the transmission (Piotrowski 2005, 26).

Concluding remarks

Broadly understood ludic phenomena denote not only the ways in which people relate to the past, but also the change in the context of the functioning of the past, history and archaeology and the knowledge they generate, as well as possible ways of employing, making use of and "consuming" historical/archaeological heritage. They illustrate a shift in emphasis: from the past that is important to the one that belongs to the "Rhetorical Man"; looking into the past in order to get to the truth about it is now replaced by a wish to understand it, think about

it or experience it, which is manifested e.g. in re-enactment spectacles, archaeological fêtes or historical theme parks (Minta-Tworzowska 2012, 1095). It is important to emphasise again that the ludic aspect of the discussed phenomena in no way discredits them; it only demonstrates play as their inalienable element.

I am quite aware of the fact that reducing multiple forms of its presence, ways of presenting, receiving or experiencing the past in the contemporary world only to the aspects of entertainment, fun, recreation, ludic elements and perception of the past as a source of pleasure, is a rather one-sided approach to the subject. However, it seems rather obvious to me that an educational paradigm alone

> is not able to do justice to the full range of phenomena in which the past receives meaning in the present. Playing games and having fun about the past cannot be reduced to whether or not you learn any history in the process (Holtorf 2012, 198).

In my opinion, entertainment is a meaningful, sometimes dominant, aspect with important social implications. Through it, many people nowadays have contact with the prehistoric past and archaeology. Usually, it is not about specific events from the past, but only about using archaeological and/or historical knowledge in a general way. "Reliving" the past using theatrical designs (costumes, props, etc.) is beneficial to explaining the past reality in a more precise and vivid way. These vibrant, dynamic, lively reconstructions show a completely different – although to some extent fictional – image of the past in comparison with the image created by archaeology as a field of science. Most credible to people are those visions of the past that resemble what we already knew beforehand (Holtorf 2012, 200). However, there is justified concern about increasing commercialisation of these visions and taking interest mainly in making profits, about a certain latitude and bending of recreated images to pander to popular tastes, about the degree of their accuracy, reliability or compliance with scientific knowledge, and about the loss of educational or popularising functions in favour of their attractiveness and being a source of entertainment.

The dissemination of knowledge of the past is inseparable from the commercialisation of science and the transformation of research results into a commercial product. Commercialisation, in my opinion, is an unavoidable process, which demands not so much a diagnosis

but the inclusion of its elements into the strategy of how archaeology functions in today's world, though I am quite aware of the difficulties of reconciling cultural activity with gaining funds or business. As an upside of commercialisation, it is necessary to mention the presentation of archaeology and its achievements in a more accessible and interesting way for the audience, a deciding factor in the commercial attractiveness of archaeology. Ways of guaranteeing access to a larger number of people are most certainly affecting the growing interest in archaeology and social awareness regarding, for example, the necessity to protect archaeological heritage (Deskur 2009, 288–290). Commercialisation also has its negative points, such as bending scientific truth only in order to interest the viewer/tourist, manipulation and simplification, a lack of scientific rigour or being dependant solely on the imagination of the creators of commercial initiatives. In this way, the commercialisation of archaeological knowledge can lead to confusion, to the "Disneyfication" of the past, by academia and amateurs alike (Kobyliński 2009, 121). It is necessary for both sides to cooperate and consult in order to guarantee a high standard of presentation and historical accuracy and to avoid mistakes. This postulate has already been put into practice, which can for example be observed in the joint initiatives of archaeologists and historical re-enactors (e.g. Górewicz 2009). At the same time, this challenge could serve to accomplish archaeology's mission in the contemporary world – the creation of the true image of archaeology, in which archaeology and heritage are important elements of culture and the modern world (Deskur 2009, 290–291). Thus, it is necessary to ensure that the form of transmission does not overshadow the content or that profits do not eclipse other aspects when the product relating to the past becomes one of many available on the market, banal and multiplied, as offered by the contemporary culture industry.

References

Bagnall G. 1996. Consuming the past. In S. Edgell, K. Hetherington and A. Warde (eds.), *Consumption matters: the production and experience of consumption*. Oxford: Willey-Blackwell, 227–247.

Baillie B., Chatzoglou A. and Shadia T. 2010. Packaging the past. The commodification of heritage. *Heritage Management* 3 (1), 51–71.

Baraniecka-Olszewska K. 2018. *Reko-rekonesans: praktyka autentyczności. Antropologiczne studium odtwórstwa historycznego II wojny światowej w Polsce*. Kęty: Wydawnictwo Marek Derewiecki.

Bogacki M. 2008. Wybrane problemy odtwórstwa wczesnośredniowiecznego w Polsce. In M. Bogacki, M. Franz and Z. Pilarczyk (eds.), *Kultura ludów Morza Bałtyckiego,* vol. II. *Nowożytność i współczesność*. Toruń: Wydawnictwo Adam Marszałek, 219–269.

Bogacki M. 2010a. 'Wżywanie' się w przeszłość – odtwórstwo historyczne a nauka. In K. Obremski and J. Wenta (eds.), *Recepcja kultury średniowiecznej w humanistyce*. Toruń: Wydawnictwo Adam Marszałek, 153–196.

Bogacki M. 2010b. O współczesnym „ożywianiu" przeszłości – charakterystyka odtwórstwa historycznego. *Turystyka Kulturowa* 2/2010, 39–62.

Brzeziński W. 2000. Muzea jako instytucje ochrony i prezentacji dziedzictwa archeologicznego. In K. Gutowska (ed.), *Problemy zarządzania dziedzictwem kulturowym*. Warszawa: Res Publica Multiethnica, 147–156.

Brzostowicz M. 2009. Imprezy historyczne – edukacja czy rozrywka? Kilka refleksji z doświadczeń Festiwali Kultury Słowiańskiej i Cysterskiej w Lądzie nad Wartą. *Fontes Archaeologici Posnanienses* 45, 293–300.

Bursche A. and Chowaniec R. 2009. Festyn archeologiczny w Biskupinie: komercyjny odpust czy promocja dziedzictwa archeologicznego. In B. Kaim (ed.), *Blisko i daleko. Księga Jubileuszowa Instytutu Archeologii Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego*. Warszawa: Instytut Archeologii Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, 69–77.

Caillois R. 1973. *Żywioł i ład*. Warszawa: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy.

Chowaniec R. 2010. *Dziedzictwo archeologiczne w Polsce. Formy edukacji i popularyzacji*. Warszawa: Instytut Archeologii Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego.

Clack T. and Brittain T. (eds.) 2007. *Archaeology and the media*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

Czubkowska S. 2006. Nasz narodowy kicz. *Przekrój* 32, 6–11.

Deskur K. 2009. Idea *public archaeology* – edukacja archeologiczna i popularyzacja archeologii. *Fontes Archaeologici Posnanienses* 45, 283–292.

Dominiak Ł. 2004. Zabawa w przeszłość. Festyn archeologiczny jako forma karnawału. In J. Grad and H. Mamzer (eds.), *Karnawalizacja. Tendencje ludyczne w kulturze współczesnej*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM, 81–86.

Dominiak Ł. 2005. Opis archeologiczny jako problem reprezentacji rzeczy na przykładzie zabytków kultury pomorskiej. In M. Fudziński and H. Paner (eds.), *Aktualne problemy kultury pomorskiej*. Gdańsk: Muzeum Archeologiczne, 297–301.

Edensor T. 2002. *Tożsamość narodowa, kultura popularna i życie codzienne*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.

Gil García F.M. 2011. Archaeological ruins: spaces of the past, expectations of the future. Tourism and heritage in Nor Lípez (dpt. of Potosí, Bolivia). In C. Gnecco and P. Ayala (eds.), *Indigenous peoples and archaeology in Latin America.* London, New York: Routledge, 269–288.

Goodcare E.J. and Baldwin G. 2002. *Living the past. Reconstruction, recreation, re-enactment and education at museums and historical sites*. London: Middlesex University Press.

Górewicz I. 2009. Profesjonalizacja odtwórstwa historycznego. In M. Bogacki, M. Franz and Z. Pilarczyk (eds.), *Gospodarka ludów Morza Bałtyckiego,* vol. I. *Starożytność i średniowiecze*. Toruń: Wydawnictwo Adam Marszałek, 341–365.
Grad J. and Mamzer H. (eds.) 2004a. *Ludyczny wymiar kultury*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM.
Grad J. and Mamzer H. (eds.) 2004b. *Karnawalizacja. Tendencje ludyczne w kulturze współczesnej*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM.
Grad J. and Mamzer H. (eds.) 2005. *Kultura przyjemności. Rozważania kulturoznawcze*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM.
Grossman A. 2006. Biskupińskie festyny w kraju i za granicą. *Z Otchłani Wieków* 61/3–4, 130–142.
de Grott J. 2009. *Consuming history*: *historians and heritage in contemporary popular culture*. London, New York: Routledge.
Hewison R. 1987. *The heritage industry: Britain in a climate of decline*. London: Methuen Ltd.
Holtorf C. 2005. *From Stonehenge to Las Vegas: archaeology as popular culture*. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.
Holtorf C. 2007. *Archaeology is a brand! The meaning of archaeology in contemporary popular culture*. Oxford: Archaeopress.
Holtorf C. 2012. The past as carnival. *Time and Mind: The Journal of Archaeology, Consciousness and Culture* 5(2), 195–202.
Huizinga J. 1985. *Homo ludens. Zabawa jako źródło kultury*. Warszawa: Czytelnik.
Jasiewicz K. and Olędzki Ł. 2005. Od nostalgii do fascynacji – doświadczanie przeszłości. In J. Grad and H. Mamzer (eds.), *Kultura przyjemności. Rozważania kulturoznawcze.* Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM, 183–208.
Kantor R. 2010. Zabawa przeszłością – zabawa w przeszłość. Historia uludyczniona. *Annales Universitatis Paedagogicae Cracoviensis. Studia Sociologica* III, 134–149.
Kantor R. 2013. *Zabawa w dobie społeczeństwa konsumpcyjnego. Szkice o ludyzmie, ludyczności i powadze, a w istocie o jej braku*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.
Kobyliński Z. 2009. Archeologia wobec wyzwań współczesności. In M. Brzostowicz (ed.), *Archeologia polska i jej czasy*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Poznańskiego Towarzystwa Przyjaciół Nauk, 103–131.
Kowalczyk I. and Kiec I. (eds.) 2015. *Historia w wersji popularnej*. Gdańsk: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Katedra.
Kowalski P. 2007. *O jednorożcu, Wieczerniku i innych motywach mniej lub bardziej ważnych*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.
Krajewski M. 2003. *Kultury kultury popularnej*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM.
Kwiatkowski P.T. 2008. *Pamięć zbiorowa społeczeństwa polskiego w okresie transformacji*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Scholar.
Kwiatkowski P.T. 2009. Czy lata III Rzeczypospolitej były „czasem pamięci". In A. Szpociński (ed.), *Pamięć zbiorowa jako czynnik integracji i źródło konfliktów*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Scholar, 125–166.
McCalman L. and Pickering P.A. (eds.) 2010. *Historical re-enactment. From realism to the affective turn*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Minta-Tworzowska D. 2009. Do kogo 'należy' przeszłość Biskupina? *Przegląd Archeologiczny* 57, 7–22.

Minta-Tworzowska D. 2012. Przeszłość w relacji do współczesności. In S. Tabaczyński, A. Marciniak, D. Cyngot and A. Zalewska (eds.), *Przeszłość społeczna. Próba konceptualizacji*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Poznańskie, 1087–1096.

Mol A.A., Ariese-Vandemeulebroucke C. E., Boom K.H.J. and Politopoulos A. (eds.) 2017. *The interactive past. Archaeology, heritage and video games*. Leiden: Sidestone Press.

Nieroba E., Czerner A. and Szczepański M.S. 2009. Między nostalgią a nadzieją. Dziedzictwo kulturowe jako dyskursywny obszar rzeczywistości społecznej. In E. Nieroba, A. Czerner and M.S. Szczepański (eds.), *Między nostalgią a nadzieją. Dziedzictwo kulturowe w ujęciu interdyscyplinarnym*. Opole: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Opolskiego, 17–36.

Nowaczyk S. 2007. Archeologia festynowa – pomiędzy eksperymentem naukowym a przedstawieniem parateatralnym. In M. Bogacki, M. Franz and Z. Pilarczyk (eds.), *Wojskowość ludów Morza Bałtyckiego*. Toruń: Wydawnictwo Adam Marszałek, 501–508.

Pawleta M. 2010. Encounters with the past: the significance of archaeological festivals in contemporary Poland. In A. Arnberg and T. Stjärna (eds.), *Communicate the past – ways to present archaeology to the public*. Västerås: Stiftelsen Kulturmiljövärd Mälardalen, 57–76.

Pawleta M. 2011a. 'The past industry': selected aspects of the commercialisation of the past and products of archaeological knowledge in contemporary Poland. *Sprawozdania Archeologiczne* 63, 9–54.

Pawleta M. 2011b. Przeszłość jako źródło przyjemności. *Przegląd Archeologiczny* 59, 27–54.

Pawleta M. 2012a. Rekonstrukcje i inscenizacje przeszłości w perspektywie turystyki archeologicznej w Polsce. In J. Gancarski (ed.), *Skanseny archeologiczne i archeologia eksperymentalna szansą na rozwój turystyki*. Krosno: Muzeum Podkarpackie w Krośnie, 364–387.

Pawleta M. 2012b. The archaeological fete in ludic space. In R. Chowaniec and W. Więckowski (eds.), *Archaeological heritage: methods of education and popularization*. Oxford: Archaeopress, 133–140.

Pawleta M. 2014. Rola zabawy jako czynnika kształtującego świadomość konieczności ochrony dziedzictwa archeologicznego we współczesnej Polsce. In B. Szmygin (ed.), *Nauczanie i popularyzacja ochrony dziedzictwa*. Warszawa: Polski Komitet Narodowy ICOMOS, Politechnika Lubelska, 215–227.

Pawleta M. 2016a. *Przeszłość we współczesności. Studium metodologiczne archeologicznie kreowanej przeszłości w przestrzeni społecznej*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM.

Pawleta M. 2016b. Festyny archeologiczne: pomiędzy edukacją, popularyzacją a komercjalizacją. *Raport* 11, 257–275.

Pawleta M. 2017. Theatrum archaeologicum: staging the past via archaeological fetes and historical reenactment. *Sprawozdania Archeologiczne* 69, 33–53.

Petersson B. and Holtorf C. (eds.) 2017. *The archaeology of time travel. Experiencing the past in the 21st century*. Oxford: Archaeopress Publishing Ltd.

Pine J. and Gilmore J. 1999. *The experience economy. Work is theater & every business a stage*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business School.

Piotrowski W. 2005. Doświadczenia z rezerwatem archeologicznym w Biskupinie – między nauką a komercją. In E. Urbańczyk (ed.), *Poszerzenie Unii – szansą dla miast Europy: samorząd, rozwój, integracja europejska*. Kalisz: Wydawnictwo Uczelniane Państwowej Wyższej Szkoły Zawodowej, 21–32.

Piotrowski W. 2008. Biskupin – nagroda Europa Nostra i festyny. *Wielkopolskie Sprawozdania Archeologiczne* 9, 315–323.

Piotrowski W. and Zajączkowski W. 2010. Archaeological festivals at Biskupin. In G. Schöbel (ed.), *Living history in archaeological open-air museums*. Unteruhldingen: LiveArch, 25–33.

Postman N. 2006. *Zabawić się na śmierć. Dyskurs publiczny w epoce show-businessu*. Warszawa: Warszawskie Wydawnictwo Literackie Muza.

Radtchenko D. 2006. Simulating the past: reenactment and the quest for truth in Russia. *Rethinking History* 10 (1), 127–148.

Robinson M. and Silverman H. (eds.) 2015. *Encounters with popular pasts. Cultural heritage and popular culture*. New York: Springer.

Rowan Y. and Baram U. (eds.) 2004. *Marketing heritage: archaeology and the consumption of the past*. Walnut Creek: Altamira Press.

Shanks M. 1992. *Experiencing the past. On the character of archaeology*. London, New York: Routledge.

Szacka B. 2009. Zmiany stosunku do przeszłości po przeobrażeniach ustrojowych 1989 roku w Polsce. *Przegląd Filozoficzno-Literacki* 4 (25), 415–427.

Szacka B. 2014. Stosunek do przeszłości i jej przeżywanie w ponowoczesnym świecie popkultury. In E. Domańska, R. Stobiecki and T. Wiślicz (eds.), *Historia – dziś. Teoretyczne problemy wiedzy o przeszłości*. Kraków: Universitas, 173–185.

Szlendak T., Nowiński J., Olechnicki K., Karwacki A. and Burszta W.J. 2012. *Dziedzictwo w akcji. Rekonstrukcja historyczna jako sposób uczestnictwa w kulturze*. Warszawa: Narodowe Centrum Kultury.

Szpociński A. 2007. O współczesnej kulturze historycznej Polaków. In B. Korzeniewski (ed.), *Przemiany pamięci społecznej a teoria kultury*. Poznań: Instytut Zachodni, 25–43.

Szpociński A. 2010. Współczesna kultura historyczna. *Kultura Współczesna* 1 (63), 9–17.

Szpociński A. 2012. Widowiska przeszłości. Pamięć jako wydarzenie. In E. Hałas (ed.), *Kultura jako pamięć. Posttradycjonalne znaczenie przeszłości*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Nomos, 63–75.

Tomaszewska E. 2017. Rekonstrukcja historyczna w przestrzeni muzeum na wolnym powietrzu. *Kielecka Teka Skansenowska* III, 212–225.

Trocha B., Rzyman A. and Ratajczak T. (eds.) 2013. *In the mirror of the past: of fantasy and history*. New Castle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Wrzesiński J. 2008. Archeologia: poznanie – popularyzacja – turystyka. In H. Machajewski (ed.), *Wielkopolska w dziejach: archeologia o regionie*. Poznań: Stowarzyszenie Naukowe Archeologów Polskich, 173–184.

Wojdon J. (ed.) 2018. *Historia w przestrzeni publicznej*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

Zalewska A.I., Scott J.M. and Kiarszys G. (eds.) 2017. *Materiality of troubled pasts. Archaeologies of conflicts and wars*. Warszawa, Szczecin: Department of Archaeology, Szczecin University, Roadside History Lessons Foundation.