

Integration and Musealisation of Archaeological Heritage on Private Land in Andalusia, Spain

Integración y musealización de patrimonio arqueológico en la propiedad privada en Andalucía, España

Lara DELGADO ANÉS

University of Granada. Faculty of Philosophy and Letters
Dpt. Mediaeval History & Historiographic Sciences and Techniques
ldelgadoanes@gmail.com

Recibido: 23-03-2016

Aceptado: 25-09-2016

ABSTRACT

This article analyses the musealisation of archaeological heritage integrated into private, non-exhibition areas in the provincial capitals of the autonomous community region of Andalusia. These spaces combine their primary function (residence, car park, hotel, etc.) with that of exhibition and display. Therefore it is first necessary to analyse how these musealisations come about. We will then study each case to discover what functions they have as exhibition containers, what the state of conservation of the heritage is like, what model of musealisation has been implemented for it to be integrated, and what communication and information programme has been designed for the general public. This musealisation of urban archaeological heritage has appeared as a mechanism for protection and conservation integrated into contemporary architecture. These integrations are complex and controversial, since they are in private areas not intended for displaying heritage. For this reason, it is worth analysing and reflecting upon these cases, how they are integrated, what the exhibitory result has been, what level of access they allow, what can be improved to develop the relationship between archaeological heritage, society and the urban fabric, etc.

KEY WORDS: *Integration, conservation, musealisation, archaeological heritage, private spaces and communication.*

RESUMEN

Este artículo analiza la musealización del patrimonio arqueológico que se integra en espacios privados no-expositivos en las capitales de provincia de la comunidad autónoma de Andalucía. Estos espacios combinan su funcionalidad primigenia (vivienda, aparcamiento, hotel, etc.) con la expositiva. Para ello es necesario primero analizar cómo surgen estas musealizaciones. Posteriormente estudiaremos cada caso para conocer qué funcionalidad desempeñan esos contenedores expositivos, cuál es el estado de conservación de dicho patrimonio, qué modelo de musealización se ha implementado para su integración y cuál es programa de comunicación e información diseñado para el público. Esta musealización del patrimonio arqueológico urbano nace como mecanismo de protección y conservación que se integra en la arquitectura contemporánea. Dichas integraciones son complejas y controvertidas ya que se sitúan en espacios privados no destinados a la exposición del patrimonio. Por ello mismo, es conveniente reflexionar y analizar estos casos, cómo se integran, cuál ha sido el resultado expositivo, qué grado de accesibilidad permiten, qué se puede mejorar para desarrollar la relación patrimonio arqueológico, sociedad y tejido urbano, etc.

PALABRAS CLAVE: *Integración, conservación, musealización, patrimonio arqueológico, espacios privados y comunicación.*

SUMMARY: 1. Introduction. 2. background. 3. Method. 4. Results. 4.1. Integration and musealisation. 4.2. Communication. 5. Conclusions.

1. Introduction

This study concentrates on the museology of archaeological heritage integrated into a private sphere whose main function is not for exhibition. We shall analyse the different methods applied in these permanent exhibitions located in hotels, car parks, shops, etc. The aim is to draw up the general image in the context of Andalusia, documenting the existence of different models for the integration and musealisation of properties that are a part of the archaeological heritage.

This musealisation, which comes about as a mechanism for conserving archaeological heritage, diverges from the broader concept of a museum, while at the same time it uses the same disciplines for exhibiting. These private exhibition containers show people in general archaeological remains that may be from different periods. Their main activity is combined with this exhibitory function. To sum up, this is archaeological integration into private contemporary architecture.

Musealisation of archaeological heritage in the city itself involves a network of interconnected subject matters at different levels of the process and touches upon different disciplines. As stated by Langois (1982), the stage for this activity is the city, a big urban archaeological site over which different levels of occupation have been superimposed since protohistory until today. In this huge urban archaeological site, archaeological remains bear material testament to life in the city, to the different phases of splendour and decadence, to the contributions from each of the cultures and peoples, the ways of public and private life, the relationships of power and the organisational capacity for work; it is an urban landscape that characterises and identifies a town.

As explained by Teller (2005: 48), the essence of a city is the interdependence of a variety of social, economic and cultural activities, agents and processes. The concept of a city as an ecosystem means that the process of integration and musealisation of archaeological heritage must be analysed within a broader context, especially observing the relationship between an archaeological site and the urban fabric.

The contemporary architecture into which it is integrated serves as protection for its conservation, given the delicate nature of such heritage. For this reason, the intercommunication and coexistence between the two must be fostered without being limited to a micro-spatial concept, but becoming established as the sum total of the urban landscape of the town in question, giving it signage and enabling it to be understood. This is why architecture, beyond its primary function, must study its own conditions for implementation as a container so as not to diminish the archaeological heritage.

2. Background

In Spain in the 1970s, the perception about the need to prevent the loss of archaeological heritage in cities rose. This encouraged intervention from museums as far as it was possible for them to prevent it. The governing administrations got involved, producing brief urban archaeological projects which would later become projects to integrate the archaeological remains into the city.

This rise in urban archaeology in the late 70s and early 80s is linked to the changes that came about via the Ministry of Culture, such as the reform to the Law on National Artistic Heritage of 1933, which in 1985 was replaced by Law 16/1985 on Spanish Historical Heritage. Around that time, the first debates began to arise among the specialists, for example the symposium on "Archaeological excavations and their problems: legislation" held in Zaragoza in 1980, and the public exhibition from the Bill on Artistic-Historical Heritage, "50 years of Protection of Artistic-Historical Heritage 1933-1983".

As of the 1980s, the implementation of urban archaeology became greater, giving rise to tensions when building work was halted due to the need to carry out an archaeological dig. At the same time, a simultaneous debate began between urban renewal and respect for the past. This question remains open (Rodríguez Temiño 2004: 33-335).

The archaeological interventions in the provincial capitals of Andalusia during the years of urban development (1980-2007) increased

mainly due to regulatory imperative, which made it possible to study the discoveries, which in turn meant a significant advance in knowledge about these urban hubs. In terms of methodology, these activities were usually restricted to administrative procedures, given the working conditions in which they were carried out. In other words, a deficit was created in terms of contributing the findings to common academic knowledge, which made it difficult to create a common discourse among the agents intervening about the historical background. Among others, authors who defend Preventive Archaeology models have questioned this problem for urban and in rural contexts in the Spanish case (i.e. o.c. Querol y Martínez: 1996, Querol 2010: 225-227, Martínez y Castillo 2007, Castillo 2010: 253)

The authority to take decisions about the remains uncovered in excavations belongs to the provincial delegate, based on the report from the Andalusian Regional Government (*Junta de Andalucía*)'s corresponding Provincial Department of Culture (*Delegación Provincial de Cultura*). Only on a few occasions has the

owner taken the personal initiative ahead of the competent government administration's decisions to express their wish to display the heritage. The different interpretations made regarding the regulations to be applied lead to arbitrariness about the heritage being displayed or not.

In cases where it is decided to display the heritage to the general public, the following has been taken into account: the state of conservation, the importance of the remains as regards the historical narrative, and their adaptation to the building work project. Léotard (2011: 709) stresses the painstaking attention that must be applied to the structure encompassing the vestiges. He considers that there are numerous cases in which the specific context is not considered and says that in this situation the container acts as a "tight-fitting shoe". One must consider how the exhibition is going to be used and how the archaeological site is going to be equipped (visitor traffic, installation of infrastructure). We must keep in mind that we are dealing with a very fragile good, and that a meticulous study of the exhibitory model is necessary to prevent it from being lost or irrevocably deteriorated.



Figure 1. Punic Graves from the 5th-6th century BC exposed to the open air, whose structures were moved from their original place. Calle Tolosa de Latour, Cádiz. Lara Delgado Anés.



Figure 2. Circular mausoleum dated between the second half of the 2nd century A.D., and the first third of the 3rd century A.D. It was dismantled and moved to a glass-fronted module. Plaza Ivonne Cazenave, Huelva. Lara Delgado Anés.

3. Method

In each case, the search has been carried out through the Andalusian Archaeological Yearbooks (*Anuarios de Arqueología de Andalucía*), published from 1985 to 2006 with collaboration from the staff of the Provincial Department of Culture, municipal archaeologists and the Archaeology Section of the Provincial Professional Association of Doctors and Graduates (*Colegio Provincial de Doctores y Licenciados, Sección Arqueología*). This has enabled us to locate up to 46 [private] exhibitions located in the provincial capitals, except for Jaén where only public spaces were found.

In the reports on management from the Andalusian Archaeological Yearbooks we find few reports published about the action taken to integrate and exhibit, a deficiency which has been a handicap for this study. Furthermore, there are scarce references about the situation of conservation in each province. For example, the report from 2006 for Cordoba says: About the integration or conservation of archaeological remains, one must consider the constant opposition from developers against losing the benefits established within the town planning,

as well as the circumstances by which the PGOU (governmental Land Use and Urban Development Plan) always demands a provision for car parking spaces in the basement, so that the removal of the remains continues to prevail. In order for the body that must decide to be better advised, it is informed by the Provincial Commission on Historical Heritage (*Comisión Provincial de Patrimonio Histórico*) at the end of all archaeological interventions.

When the cases had been selected, information was gathered about each one, the agents involved such as archaeologists, architects, and owners were contacted, and a questionnaire carried out. The exhibitions were visited to get to know how they work, the state of conservation of the heritage, the models of communication to the public, etc.

4. Results

4.1. Integration and musealisation

The characteristics and running of the different musealisations have been studied, enabling a

classification to be established in terms of the type of structure housing it and the model of integration used. The models put forward here are the product of an adaptation to the classification provided by Hernández Hernández (2010), with new contributions.

As for the functionality of the exhibition container, 49% are “commercial”, 36% “residential”, 30% “offices” and 2% “car parks”.

The accessibility of the cases varies greatly, since it depends on the opening hours and the permissiveness of the occupying owners. There is a greater percentage of “commercial” establishments, among which we find the Cathedral Hotel in Almeria, which are more accessible to visitors. This aspect is similar with “car parks”, although the sample in this category is small, an example being given in Paseo del Viólón, Granada.

The index of “residential” spaces, such as the building in the street Calle Solano in Cádiz, and of “offices”, among which the CajaSur bank in Córdoba stands out, together account for 49%, with added difficulties to visit them due to their opening times as well as their functional nature.

As for the location, we have recorded it “*in situ*” (Hernandez Hernandez 2010: 27-28) and

“*ex situ*”. There are 96% “*in situ*”, meaning that the archaeological heritage is displayed in its original place, with examples such as the Sfera shop in Huelva.

The “*ex situ*” category is defined by the good being moved from the place it was found. They are not very common cases since we are dealing with items of buildings and land. For this reason, it depends on the building project and its viability. Most specialists do not agree with this type of intervention, since it implies a modification of the historical context as well as a significant increase in cost. The European Convention on the Protection of Archaeological Heritage of 1992, Article 4.ii, supports the conservation and maintenance of archaeological heritage preferably *in situ*. As an example of “*ex situ*”, two cases have been located: the display located at the building of Avenida Tolosa de Latour, in Cadiz (Fig. 1) and one of the elements of the building in Plaza Ivonne Caze-nave in Huelva (Fig. 2).

We have classified the visibility as “open” or “closed”. The ones known as “open” are a minority—11% of cases. These are ones that are displayed outside the building but within the premises, so that they are in the open air and can be seen without entering the premises,



Figure 3. Roman villa from between the late 3rd and early 4th centuries B.C. Visible from the outside of the property because it is in the open air. Calle Algarrobo, Córdoba. Lara Delgado Anés.



Figure 4. Structure of the Roman port wall and stretch of the wall of the Muslim medina. Visible from the outside although it is possible to take a tour around the elements exhibited. Hotel Vincci Posada del Patio, Málaga. Lara Delgado Anés.

for example the building of residences on the street Calle Algarroba in Córdoba (**Fig. 3**). On the other hand, 89% are “closed”; they are located within the exposition container. We have differentiated between two types within this category:

- a. “Closed I” are exhibits that are still within the building yet visible from the outside, such as the Hotel Vincci Posada del Patio in Málaga (**Fig. 4**).
- b. “Closed II” refers to those that are located in spaces that are not visible from the outside, such as in a basement. Such a case is found in the building in Calle Julio César in Seville (**Fig. 5**).

There are also differences in terms of methods as regards the relationship between the heritage and the onlookers.

The “immersion” category (Hernandez Hernandez 2010: 29-30) accounts for 13% of the cases studied. This implies a tour through the exhibition, as exemplified by the Hotel Vincci Posada del Patio in Málaga, with the good as

the container. We could also note the Tablao Flamenco in Córdoba (**Fig. 6**) or the recuperation of the historical functionality of the building in Calle Mascata in Seville (**Fig. 7**). “Immersion” allows the visitor to become a part of the exhibition, being conveyed to that moment in history via a route among the different elements displayed. Nevertheless, 87% of cases are for “contemplation”, which may be done in various ways: the “window” system consists of a large window through which one may observe the archaeological remains, as in the shop Shana in Granada (**Fig. 8**). There is also the “behind bars” method of fencing off, which protects the remains as in the building in Calle Tamarindos, Cádiz (**Fig. 9**). The “module” is a building structure with a glass-paned zone through which one may view the exhibition such as in the building in Calle San Juan Bautista, Cádiz. In addition, there are the methods we have called “others”, which groups together all those cases that do not have a protective structure around the remains or simply minimal protection to prevent people from entering the exhibition, as in the Bar La Cueva de 1900 in Málaga.



Figure 5. Structure of the Islamic city wall preserved in the building's car park with no protection. Calle Julio César, Seville. Lara Delgado Anés.

4.2. Communication

When the procedure for integration is over, the next step in the intervention project is to implement the function of communication, a necessary task in the process of disseminating the results obtained. The project in terms of archaeological heritage is unfinished if the idea does not materialise of it being visible, accessible, and understandable to the citizens as a whole.

This phase is carried out via processes of information about the heritage, which is a necessary element that defines the last of the steps that make up a comprehensive intervention project. This task is heterogeneous in nature but necessary to achieve the intended purpose, and it must be drawn up by professionals specialising in different fields (Bermúdez *et al.* 2004: 53-62).

In the letter from ICOMOS for the Interpretation and Presentation of Cultural Heritage Sites, the importance of public communication is underlined as a primordial part of a broader conservation process. In this letter, seven principles are established, among which we shall

highlight these: 1-Access and Understanding, 2-Information Sources and 6-Concern for Inclusion and Participation. We highlight these three principles because during the visits to the 46 exhibitory cases we have confirmed the lack of a communication project in most cases. In fact, about transmission of the archaeological heritage displayed in private spaces in provincial capitals to the unspecialised general public, we have documented that in 75% of cases they have no type of information accompanying the exhibition and only 25% have informative posters.

To carry out this type of communication, an analysis of the information that one wishes to offer should be drawn up, as well as the language used and the physical medium that will be most appropriate according to the context. This phase of musealisation is based on facilitating knowledge about the exhibition, since it should not be limited to specialists but must be easy to read for those who have no prior knowledge about the matter. Almansa and Señorán (2005) affirm that on creating posters the content must be considered, as well as the readability, the vi-



Figure 6. Arabic baths from the 10th century. Economic activity is carried out inside this. Tablao Flamenco, Córdoba. Lara Delgado Anés.

sual impact of the texts and the relationship between these media and the informative content, etc, such that they recommend accompanying the text with photographs, sketches, drawings and maps. These support understanding of the texts. The text must be well located, written clearly and concisely, with a narrative that is not excessively technical yet which is strictly scientifically coherent, and short paragraphs with light statements using a clear font of readable size for all.

The models for posters that we have located in the exhibitions studied are based on the classification system drawn up by Almansa and Señorán (2005). The two authors propose the following classification: orientative, explanatory, identificatory-descriptive and didactic. In the subject of our study we have defined 47% of the sample as “explanatory”, such as those used in the building in Plaza Iyonne Cazenave in Huelva. On the other hand, 53% have used the “Identification-description” model, as in the Eurostars hotel in Córdoba. The former has detailed information to interpret the subject in its exhibition context, its relationship with the city’s history, the process by which the good was localised, etc. However, in the latter the

content is more simple and concise, focusing on identification, chronological period and purpose.

Among the media models that we have confirmed, 71% tend to use the “fixed” category, which is a system of posters on a surface near the archaeological remains, as in the Hotel Seises of Seville. In 12% we find the “external” category: structures that are not fixed in the exhibition as a whole, for example in the Hotel Conquistador of Córdoba. In this same percentage, there are cases where different “Combination” models coexist, as for example in the Eurostars Hotel in Córdoba and the building in Plaza Iyonne Cazenave in Huelva. To a lesser extent, 6% use the “internal” classification, meaning texts on vinyl material placed on the wall or windows as in the case of the Proteo bookshop in Málaga.

We have confirmed that there are initiatives to inform about the exhibition created by the very owners of the space housing the archaeological remains. We have found this type of activity in 4% of the sample. The nature of this decision is a personal one; they are not “obliged” to do so to comply with a legal imperative. This type of initiative is restricted



Figure 7. Almoahad courtyard; it has been integrated by recuperating its historical functions. Calle Mascata, Seville. Lara Delgado Anés.

in most cases by a lack of means and resources. Depending on the format and the channel through which this task is promoted, we have created a classification in order to see *grosso modo* the types of initiatives and projects that are being carried out.

Among this type of communication, in addition to the posters associated with the exhibition, we can find leaflets, pamphlets and books. The owner opts for this type of medium to inform clients about the remains that are housed in their establishment. The design with which these are presented is heterogeneous, as is their content. In 2% of the exhibitions, information is given exclusively about the archaeological remains and in another 2% they form part of the establishment's general information. The most significant case due to its complexity is the book entitled *Puerta de Buenaventura* (Gate of Buenaventura) (Hergueta and Mohedano 2004), which includes information about the archaeological remains of the Proteo bookshop in Málaga, the relationship these have to the city's history, the excavation process, the intervention to restore and integrate them, etc. As for the media for publicising the information for clients, we find that 25% are tri-fold pam-

phlets, as in the case of the Proteo bookshop in Málaga; 50% are half-folds as in the San Marco restaurant in Seville; and 25% are A2 leaflets as in the Hotel Catedral in Almería.

We have also been able to show that 45% of the cases we have classified as non-residential give information via their official websites about the archaeological heritage housed in their establishments. We can prove that this fact is related to the results from the surveys carried out with the owners and employees during the fieldwork, since 43% affirm that the clientele know about the existence of the archaeological heritage in the establishment before entering.

As regards the work of dissemination organised by archaeological teams, there are not many initiatives carried out in the provincial capitals of Andalusia in terms of communication about the urban heritage, especially of the private kind. Furthermore, most are temporary.

In Málaga, there is the company CIS Arqueología SL, which promotes and organises a series of themed talks every year aimed at a wide audience. The services they provide are not limited to a specialist audience. The aim is to update and raise awareness about the results of the research and studies being carried out in the



Figure 8. Wall from the 11th century with subsequent modifications. It is visibly preserved underneath see-through glass. Shana shop, Granada. Lara Delgado Anés.

province. This series of talks is accompanied by guided tours, for example a route around archaeological Malaga that takes in exhibitions located in private spaces with displays such as “Malaga: inhabited archaeological sites”. The reason behind this exhibition was to disseminate some of the interventions related to the research and restoration. In the exhibition, we can find a display behind glass aimed at children in general, with Playmobil[®] figures placed to simulate an archaeological dig.

The most comprehensive example today in Andalusia is the agreement for collaboration between the Cordoba City Council Urban Planning Management (*Gerencia de Urbanismo del Ayuntamiento de Córdoba*) and the Cordoba University Sisyphus Research Group (*Grupo de Investigación Sísifo de la Universidad de Córdoba*), entitled “We are all [involved in]

archaeology” (*“Arqueología somos todos”*). The director is Dr Desiderio Vaquerizo, whose aim is to improve and extend archaeological research in the municipal area. The lines of action are: research, interpretation, scientific projection of the site, training for the researchers, work insertion and dissemination. This latter aim has been prepared with an entire range of activities to raise awareness about the heritage located in private and public spaces:

- Talks in cultural centres, associations and local institutions to help interested local people know about the digs being carried out in their own neighbourhoods.
- Routes. These are not the usual tourist itineraries, but a means of dissemination that involves visiting the exhibitory spaces on private properties depending on the disposition of the owners. There are five routes, each one with the name of an illustrious character from Cordoba’s archaeology, and they may be followed by bicycle or on foot.
- Exhibitions and children’s workshops. This initiative is aimed at children from 5 to 10 years of age, to explain what archaeology involves in a fun way and raise awareness about the importance of artistic and historical heritage.
- *Archaeodrome*. This involves a re-creation of an archaeological dig in Cordoba’s Faculty of Philosophy and Letters. A mobile *Archaeodrome* has also been built using a large portable box.
- Mosaic and tiles workshop, ceramics workshop; they explain what it is, what it was for, how it was made, etc.
- Others. Activities and games are also carried out related to writing over time, puzzles, models, puppets, etc.

In both examples (CIS Arqueología SL and “*Arqueología somos todos*”), awareness has been created about heritage located in both private and public spaces. We think that the work “*Arqueología somos todos*” is particularly noteworthy. The participation of the owners in these activities, as far as we have been able to discover throughout the study, is limited to helping visibility. However, they do not partic-



Figure 9. Earth Countermines from the Front from the 18th century. Located in the property's car park and protected by a grate. Calle Tamarindos, Cádiz. Lara Delgado Anés.

ipate actively in disseminating it, nor do they get involved in projects related to urban archaeology.

Via this general review, we have been able to confirm that there are different formats via which the communication projects are channelled. It is true that each one requires a budget and different media, but the purpose is the same. The context where one acts and the goal one has are subordinate to the efficiency. As Nicole Gesché-Koning (2011) states, the success of these programmes is dependent on the meticulousness and scientific quality with which they are carried out. The activities about cultural goods should not be improvised and they should be addressed via continual reflection stemming from the conviction that one can foster the conservation of heritage by getting to know it better.

4.3. Private owners

In carrying out this research, we have been able to get to know the legal imperatives to which the private owners are subjected as regards heritage. The general idea is that archaeological heritage is a good belonging to everybody, but

it may be found within the grounds of private property. For this reason it must be possible to study it and visit it four days a month, etc. It is the owner's responsibility to watch over and maintain said heritage, and any damage that may be done to the remains may be prosecuted. One of the matters put forward *a priori* is whether the legislation allows or accounts for mechanisms to obtain direct economic profit from the goods; in other words, whether a fee can be charged for visiting (Andalusian Historical Heritage Law of 14/2007). The regulations are ambiguous in this respect and lack precise references, possibly due to the fact there are private and public museums that obtain economic profits from visiting citizens. The fieldwork confirms that the exhibitions studied do not occur but for one case (Tablao Flamenco, Córdoba) where a money box is placed for people to deposit money to help maintain the remains as a gesture of "goodwill".

During the fieldwork, surveys and interviews were carried out with the owners, employees and residents of these exhibitions. In fact, we were able to obtain very interesting conclusions. We saw that 71% were satisfied with the exhibitory model, while the other 28% would

change some aspect of it to make possible improvements to the state of conservation, to help the general public see it, or to have a different exhibitory model to take greater advantage of the space. There were also 71% who thought it was positive for the business to house heritage. This kind of response came mostly from hotel chains. However, the residents of exhibits classified as “residential” affirmed that said archaeological heritage should be outside of the private property.

5. Conclusions

Knowledge about each exhibition helps conclusions to be drawn enabling us to confirm that there are different exhibition containers and different approaches to integrating and conserving archaeological heritage.

The first discrepancies we come across appear in the decision-making about the exhibiting it; that is, whether the archaeological heritage should be made into a museum or not. With no clear protocols about the characteristics or conditions that must be present to exhibit, the decision-making in the matter is the responsibility of the provincial delegate based on the report by the technicians from the Andalusian Government’s Provincial Department of Culture, which is to a certain extent subjective. In 98% of the cases in our study sample, the decision about musealisation has been taken by the corresponding Department of Culture. However, in 2% of cases the owner took the personal initiative ahead of the government administration’s decisions, expressing their wish to exhibit their heritage.

We have confirmed that in each city there is a majority tendency towards conservation of goods from a particular chronological period. In Almeria, Granada and Seville, 100% of the cases in the study sample are from the Islamic period. In Malaga this trend is repeated, except in one of the exhibitions where we found, next to the mediaeval heritage, another example from Roman times. On the other hand, interest for the Roman and immediately prior period (Phoenician-Punic) is found to be in Huelva in 100% of cases, Cordoba 70%, and Cádiz 58%. In overall calculations for Andalusia, we see

that half of the cases show a bias towards medieval times, followed by 40% for the Roman times. To a lesser extent, 6% are dedicated to proto-historic times, and lastly 4% to the 18th century.

When the examples have been musealised, we can see a variety of types in terms of accessibility, integration, conservation, etc. For example, exhibition containers classified as “commercial” are more accessible to the general public due to their characteristics as spaces designed for the general public and due to their standard timetable. As regards integration, we have observed different types, for example in the *in situ* and *ex situ* locations. This latter category is controversial due to the disagreement from some of the agents to intervene and because the European Convention on the Protection of Archaeological Heritage of 1992, Article 4.ii, supports the conservation and maintenance of archaeological heritage sites preferably *in situ*. One notable case is that of Plaza Ivonne Cazenave in Huelva, where the circular Roman mausoleum was moved to be displayed within the property but outside its original place. Another problematic intervention in this space was the dismantling of 6.20 m of the length of the Roman aqueduct from the second and third centuries A.D. For the stretch where the aqueduct and imperial premises meet (1st century BC –first half of the 1st century BC), the worst possible solution was chosen: a false impression of historical chronology (De Haro Ordóñez *et al.* 2011). Despite opposition from the team of archaeologists, a vision was created that the aqueduct is older than the wall. We believe that the solutions to these difficulties could be solved with greater dialogue between the different agents intervening, as well as some defined protocols to adapt the container to the content and not vice versa.

As for visibility, we have seen that this is related to the conservation of the good. The exhibitions known as “open” require greater care due to the effects of the weather. Also, in the “closed I” cases, if the musealisation gets damaged then it becomes difficult to see it from the outside. Lastly, we have could confirm that in the “closed II” category, access to them is hindered in the types of container classified as “residential”.

By observing each case, it is easier to study the possible pathologies that come about for each model. Sometimes it is a case of manifestations that become visible in the long term. We see that using glass media may lead to condensation due to the lack of a suitable ventilation system or else there is deterioration of the glass due to its continual use, hindering the view of the remains. In the cases of “immersion” models, they suffer from a lack of protection that may affect the heritage due to activity by some of the onlookers.

The phase that goes with the process of integration is that of communication and dissemination. By visiting the exhibitory models, we could confirm that in most cases the general public, and in some cases the owners themselves, are unaware of the existence of archaeological remains exhibited in these areas. This failing underlines the need to meet the goals of communication. This aspect is related to the fact that over 70% are not visible from the public space. We consider it necessary to stress this situation, because this fact together with a lack of signage outside the building leads to it be “forgotten”. Signage with information helps to conserve and exhibit some archaeological items. There is insufficient communication with citizens about the archaeological vestiges found and the places where they can be visited. The results of the excavations are usually kept within scientific spheres, and for many citizens this lack of dissemination may bring with it the feeling that this heritage is somewhat “separate” from them or that “they’re archaeological things”. The cases that the general public are aware of beforehand are due to the fact that there is information on a local website, information outside the façade, or because they are cases included within the informative tours and tourist routes in the city, such as in Cordoba. We have confirmed that there are alternative ways to effectively communicate the heritage exhibited to the citizens at a cost that is not necessarily excessive to bear for the owner or the public administration (government).

Along the lines of other Spanish authors, Querol and Martínez (1996), Criado Boado, F. (1996) and recently Vaquerizo (2013), we consider that comprehensive management of archaeological heritage must be understood as

a combination of various basic elements, all of which are of similar importance: documentation and intervention; protection and conservation; and research and dissemination. For this reason, as we have seen as a result of this work, the communication phase should not be forgotten. Could we imagine a museum without any kind of information? Nowadays no professional would dream of creating an exhibition space containing only objects, nor would they assume that the objects “speak for themselves”. Thus, we wish to make the point that conservation *per se* is incomplete and that it must be accompanied by a communication project enabling citizens to get to know their heritage and making it easy for them to understand it.

Archaeology, and by extension the agents involved in this activity, must consider the demand arising from the need for the establishment to have more precise protocols for action and to implement parameters, in order to create a more unanimous discourse for dealing with archaeological heritage. There is a lack of comprehension throughout this project that encompasses and affects the archaeological interventions carried out in cities. On the one hand, there are the owners, who in a way feel somewhat “lost” in all of this environment, and who demand attention and help from the government, which they do not feel they receive. On the other, there are the administrations (regional and local governments), who sometimes confront each other. Their role seems to be that of watching over the heritage but not one of a mediator or facilitator of mechanisms that foster such interventions, nor a creator of plans for territorial regulations that might minimise possible conflicts and simplify the procedure for the interventions and knowledge about them for the owner. Another matter that may open up an interesting debate is whether the burden shouldered by the owner as regards archaeological heritage is too heavy, not only in covering the costs for an archaeological dig, but also as regards their responsibility for its maintenance, conservation and access for the general public.

To sum up, the results show us a very broad panorama with huge geographical inequalities, from Jaén where no exhibition was located with these characteristics, to Córdoba with

19 cases. In addition, there are significant deficiencies in terms of their musealisation that we hope can be put right in order to conserve, exhibit and communicate these remains of heritage, since they must be visible, accessible and understandable for citizens on the whole.

Castillo (2013) has published specially about this topic and with similar conclusions. She and her research team questioned the utility of this kind of musealization in the context of World Heritage cities and cited the case of andalusian cities inscribed by UNESCO as Córdoba. Besides, as a part of researches, her team developed a demonstration with mobile technologies to show archaeological heritage in private context like homes, parkings, etc. These examples were made for the cities of Toledo and Cordoba (Castillo 2012: 258).

This musealised heritage forms part of the great archaeological site represented by the urban hub, which suggests that the process of integration and musealisation of archaeological heritage must be analysed within a broader context. In this way, the integration will be prevented from resulting in small archaeological retreats unconnected from the urban fabric, generating an incomplete vision of an ancient city, as we have could see during the field-work. Therefore, as Rodríguez Temiño and Puya García de Leániz (1993: 78-79) affirm, a conservation programme is necessary that can establish a suggestive tale in correlation with the interventions: in other words, a true plan of conservation activity in the city can never be isolated, but must be immersed within a musealisation programme for the ancient city, so that citizens—whether tourists, scientists or locals—may enjoy it.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author of this work is grateful for the collaboration from the different specialists and agents involved in the interventions, especially María Luisa Bellido Gant, José María Martín Civantos and Ignacio Rodríguez Temiño, for the help given to carry out this work. Thanks are also due to all the owners who dedicated some of their time to us; without them, it would not have been possible to complete this work.

REFERENCES

- ALMANSA SÁNCHEZ, J.; SEÑORÁN MARTÍN, J.M. (2005): La cartelería y sus niveles. *Arqueoweb: Revista sobre Arqueología en Internet*, 7.1 (Departamento de Prehistoria, Universidad Complutense de Madrid) [URL: <http://pendientedemigracion.ucm.es/info/arqueoweb/pdf/7-1/almanza.pdf>]. Acceso el 05/09/2015.
- HERGUETA, J.A.; CHACÓN MOHEDANO, C. (2004): *Puerta de Buenaventura*. CEDMA, Málaga.
- BARBA COLMENERO, V.; NAVARRO PÉREZ, M. (2010): La ciudad de la Justicia: hacia una nueva arqueología para todos. *Ciudad de la Justicia de Jaén Excavaciones arqueológicas*. Junta de Andalucía, Jaén: 22-29.
- BERMÚDEZ, A.; VIANNEY, J.; GIRAT, A. (2004): *Intervención en el patrimonio cultural. Creación y gestión de proyectos*. Síntesis, Madrid.
- DE HARO ORDOÑEZ, J.; LÓPEZ DOMÍNGUEZ, M.Á.; CASTILLA REYES, E. (2011): Intervenciones arqueológicas en la plaza Ivonne Cazenave nº1 (Huelva). 6º, 7º y 8º fase de actuación. *Anuario Arqueológico de Andalucía 2006*, Junta de Andalucía, Huelva: 2148-2155.
- CASTILLO, A. (2010): Buscando soluciones sostenibles para un patrimonio frágil el papel de la arqueología preventiva en las ciudades Patrimonio Mundial. *Actas del Simposio Internacional "Soluciones Sostenibles para las Ciudades Patrimonio Mundial"* (Hernández, ed.), Fundación del Patrimonio Histórico de Castilla y León: 251-264.
- CASTILLO, A. (2012): Buenas prácticas para el tratamiento de la dimensión arqueológica en las ciudades históricas. *Actas del II Congreso Internacional de Ciudades Históricas Patrimonio Mundial. 23-26 Abril 2012* (Clemente, coord.), Universidad de Córdoba, Córdoba: 248-261.

- CASTILLO, A. (2013): Reflexiones sobre la “recuperación arqueológica” en espacios históricos y su aportación a la vida ciudadana. ¿un reto o una utopía? *La experiencia del Reuso. Propuestas Internacionales para la Documentación, Conservación y Reutilización del Patrimonio Arquitectónico. C20: 191-198*. Madrid. España.
- CRIADO BOADO, F. (1996): Hacia un modelo integrado de gestión e investigación del Patrimonio Histórico: la cadena interpretativa como propuesta. *PH: Boletín del Instituto Andaluz del Patrimonio Histórico*, 16: 73-78.
- GESCHÉ-KONING, N. (2011): ¿Sensibilizar en patrimonio: pretexto o fin? Los usos didácticos banales del Patrimonio: *E-rph Revista electrónica de Patrimonio histórico*, 8. (Departamento de Historia del Arte, Universidad de Granada) [URL: www.revistadepatrimonio.es/revistas/numero8/difusion/estudios/articulo.php#autor1]. Acceso el 10/03/2015.
- LANGLOIS, C. (1982): Conservation des vestiges et insertion dans le tissu urbain, *Archéologie Urbaine. Actes du Colloque International* (Tours, 1980). Ministère de la Culture, Paris: 163-166.
- LÉOTARD, J.M. (2005): Conservación. *Actas del Coloquio internacional e interdisciplinar. Ciudades del pasado, ciudades del futuro: Dar vida a la arqueología urbana*. APPEAR, Bruselas: 21-24.
- MARTÍNEZ, B; CASTILLO, A. (2007): Preventive Archaeology in Spain. *European Preventive Archaeology. Papers of the EPAC meeting, 2004*. Vilnius (Bozoky, ed.), Ed. Consejo de Europa. Letonia: 187-208.
- NICOLAU I MARTÍ, A. (2005): Excavar, exponer, conservar o reservar. Criterios técnicos para un proceso de decisión. *III Congreso Internacional sobre Musealización de yacimientos arqueológicos. De la excavación al público. Procesos de decisión y creación de nuevos recursos*. Ayuntamiento de Zaragoza, Zaragoza: 17-23.
- NICOLAU I MARTÍ, A. (2005): Interpretación y museografía. *Actas del Coloquio internacional e interdisciplinar. Ciudades del pasado, ciudades del futuro: Dar vida a la arqueología urbana*. APPEAR, Bruselas: 32.
- QUEROL, M.A.; MARTÍNEZ DÍAZ, B. (1996): *La gestión del Patrimonio Arqueológico en España*. Akal Universidad. Madrid.
- QUEROL, M.A. (2010): *Manual de gestión del Patrimonio Cultural*. Akal Universidad Madrid.
- RODRÍGUEZ TEMIÑO, I. (2004): *Arqueología urbana en España*. Ariel, Barcelona.
- RODRÍGUEZ TEMIÑO, Ignacio; Puya García de Leániz, Miguel. (1993): Zonas arqueológicas en ciudades actuales. *Restauración. Casa-palacio de Miguel Mañana*. Junta de Andalucía, Sevilla: 65-85.
- SANTANA FALCÓN, I. (2004): Acerca de la protección de espacios y conjuntos patrimoniales de carácter arqueológico en casos históricos de Andalucía. *Arqueología y territorio medieval*, 11(1): 159-178. <http://dx.doi.org/10.17561/aytm.v11i1.1706>
- TELLER, J. (2005): La integración urbana de los restos arqueológicos. *Actas del Coloquio internacional e interdisciplinar. Ciudades del pasado, ciudades del futuro: Dar vida a la arqueología urbana*. APPEAR, Bruselas: 45.
- VAQUERIZO GIL, D. (2003): *Guía arqueológica de Córdoba. Una visión de Córdoba en el tiempo a través de su patrimonio arqueológico*. Plurabelle, Córdoba.
- VAQUERIZO GIL, D. (2013): Arqueología somos todos. *Arqueología pública en España* (J. Almansa, ed.), JAS Arqueología, Madrid: 221-273.
- MEMORIA RESUMEN ACTIVIDADES ARQUEOLÓGICAS 2006. (2010): *Anuario Arqueológico de Andalucía 2006*. Junta de Andalucía, Córdoba: 709.
- Instrumento de Ratificación del Convenio Europeo para la protección del patrimonio arqueológico (revisado), hecho en La Valeta el 16 de enero de 1992. BOE, núm. 173, de 20 de julio de 2011. Jefatura de Estado, Madrid: 80110-80119
- Ley 14/2007, de 26 de noviembre, de Patrimonio Histórico de Andalucía. BOJA, núm. 248, de 19 de diciembre de 2007. Junta de Andalucía, Sevilla.
- Convenio de Malta. Consejo de Europa. Council of Europe (1992): *European Convention on the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage*. La Valetta.