

Dear editors and referees,

I have read the references and thank you very much. I would also like to send my sincere thanks to Ulrich Veit, Martin Heinz and Artur Ribeiro for their attention to my work (with very useful suggestions) and even to the anonymous reviewer who found real flaws. Unfortunately, I had assumed that the text, deliberately provisional, would be submitted for online discussion not traditional referencing. The fact that I had gone too far in citing my own work was due to the fact that I assumed them to be unknown to English-speaking readers, whereas it seemed unnecessary to cite authors universally known to all specialists in the subject.

Given the relevance of the criticism, I list what I have done.

Modified title and abstract as usefully suggested.

I have included adequate bibliographical references with particular reference to those traditions of study not always taken into account.

I have modified the Introduction to specify that the work depends on a personal observation: there are, in my opinion, two archaeologies. One is the one that reasons about maximum systems and, often, deals with the quotations of others (e.g. the thousand nuances of cognitive archaeology). The other is the one that studies materials, stratifications, archaeological sites and constructs typologies that must work. My trivial approach tries to establish a link between essential readings and reflections and concrete cataloguing. Obviously these are personal opinions, perhaps wrong and not shareable, but not modifiable.

In section 2, I have maintained a 'trivial' approach because I believe it should be emphasised for its usefulness in doing history.

The example of the monastery has been developed in paragraph 3 as proof of what was written earlier and to give material consistency (the finds, the layering, the site) to otherwise meta-archaeological discourses. Various figures have been included by translating each word into English.

In paragraph 4 I mention issues that I had overlooked however universally known and I have included the required bibliographical references.

In paragraph 5, with more clarity than before, I present some personal views on the importance of reasoning not only about types but about variants; of the need to reason not only about agency but about habitus in order to move from the discussion of single objects to the reconstruction of more general histories; of an operational definition of material culture that is of practical guidance in the study of artefacts (things) and not just reflection for its own sake.

I have eliminated almost all bibliographical references to my publications, keeping only those necessary to refer to broader formulations of what is summarised here.

Thank you for your attention

Enrico Giannichedda