



UCL INSTITUTE of ARCHAEOLOGY
ARCL0037: Interpreting Archaeological Evidence
Year 2/3, BA/BSc Core Module, 15 credits
2023–24, Term 1
MODULE HANDBOOK



Oseberg ship under excavation, Norway 1904

Deadlines: Essay 1, 8-11-23; Essay 2: 18-12-23

Class Sessions: Thursdays, 9.00–10.00, Rm 612
+ one-hour seminar groups between **11.00–14.00, Rm 410**

Co-ordinator: Dr Stuart Brookes. Email: s.brookes@ucl.ac.uk

Office: 411. Online / Office hours: Tues, 14.00–16.00

Moodle: <https://moodle.ucl.ac.uk/course/view.php?id=38207>

IMPORTANT INFORMATION REGARDING ASSESSMENTS:

The **coursework coversheet** is available on the course Moodle pages and here:
<https://www.ucl.ac.uk/archaeology/current-students> under “Policies, Forms and Guidelines”.

Please enter **your five-digit candidate code on the coversheet and in the subject line** when you upload your work in Moodle.

Please use **your five-digit candidate code as the name of the file** you submit.

Please refer to <https://www.ucl.ac.uk/archaeology/current-students/ia-student-handbook/13-information-assessment>

<https://www.ucl.ac.uk/archaeology/current-students/ia-study-skills-guide/referencing-effectively-and-ia-guidelines>

<https://www.ucl.ac.uk/students/exams-and-assessments/academic-integrity>

<https://library-guides.ucl.ac.uk/referencing-plagiarism/acknowledging-AI>

for instructions on coursework submission, IoA referencing guidelines and marking criteria, as well as UCL policies on penalties for late submission, over-length work, the use of text generation software (AI) and academic misconduct.

Part 1. Summary

1.1 Module Overview

This module gives students experience in interpreting archaeological evidence that will be useful in their own research (eg, BA/BSc dissertations). The module equips you to (1) analyse and evaluate primary evidence; (2) avoid naïve or misguided readings of the record; (3) discern good interpretations from simplistic or untenable interpretations; and (4) develop archaeological sophistication. It helps you address questions such as: How do we reason from evidence to interpretation? How can we assess the reliability of an interpretation? What methods of analysis are common to most archaeological problems? How can we reconstruct a dynamic living system (systemic context) from static archaeological remains (archaeological context)? What biases affect the evidence? How can we decode site formation processes from stratigraphy? How do sedimentary processes preserve or distort the evidence? How do excavation strategies and sampling affect evidence and interpretation? How does dating affect interpretation? How should we interpret site distribution maps, site plans and stratigraphic sections in a sophisticated way? How are artefact assemblages analysed? How do “life histories” of artefacts affect assemblages?

1.2 Aims:

(1) To teach analytical methods (common to all regions, periods & specializations) that underpin interpretations of archaeological data (eg problem orientation, logical reasoning, appropriateness of methods & data, assemblage formation, variation, temporal resolution, units of observation, scales of analysis, classification, sampling). (2) To teach students to criticize & evaluate underlying assumptions, analytical methods & quality of evidence in archaeological writings. (3) To give students practical experience in data analysis & interpretation (eg observation; recording; variables & attributes; classification).

1.3 Objectives:

On successful completion of this module a student should be able: (1) To apply basic methods of analysis that underpin interpretations of archaeological data. (2) To criticize & evaluate underlying assumptions, analytical methods & quality of evidence in archaeological writings. (3) To carry out practical procedures in data analysis & interpretation. (4) To apply the foregoing to new research problems.

1.4 Learning Outcomes:

By the end of the module students should be able to demonstrate: (1) An ability to apply methods of analysis that underpin interpretations of archaeological evidence. (2) An ability to criticize & evaluate underlying assumptions, analytical methods & quality of evidence in archaeological writings. (3) Mastery of basic practical procedures in interpreting archaeological materials and sites. (4) An ability to apply the foregoing to new research problems (eg BA dissertations).

1.5 Methods of assessment – see Part 3

This module is assessed by means of two essays.

Essay 1 is 1200 words in length (40% of final mark).

Essay 1 due date: 8 November 2023

Essay 2 is 1800 words in length (60% of final mark).

Essay 2 due date: 18 December 2023

Some general advice concerning essays will also be uploaded to the Moodle site.

1.6 Communications:

- **Moodle is the main hub** for this module.
- Important information will be posted by staff in the **Announcements Section** of the **Moodle page** - you will automatically receive an email notification for these.

- Please post any general queries relating to the module content, assessments and administration **in the ARCL0037 Moodle forums**. These will be checked regularly
- For personal queries, please contact the co-ordinator by *email*.

1.7 Teaching Methods:

This module is taught face-to-face through:

- 1) a one-hour weekly **lecture** (Thursdays 10.00–11.00, Rm 612),
- 2) followed by one-hour **seminars with discussion** (Thursdays 11.00–14.00, Rm 410). You will be assigned to a seminar group for ONE of the slots Thursday, 11.00–12.00, 12.00–13.00 or 13.00–14.00. Each seminar will involve **short presentations by the teacher as well as detailed consideration of the topic in hand by the students**. Seminars have compulsory readings, which students will be expected to have covered to be able fully to follow and actively contribute to discussion. **For detailed readings – see Part 2**

If you have questions, contact the Module Coordinator, at: s.brookes@ucl.ac.uk.

1.8 Workload

This is a 15-credit module which equates to 150 hours of learning time including session preparation, background reading, and researching and writing your assignments. With that in mind you should expect to organise your time in roughly this way:

20 hours	Staff-led teaching sessions (lectures, seminars, tutorials, discussion-board sessions)
80 hours	Self-guided session preparation (reading, listening, note-taking and online activities), about 4 hours a week
25 hours	Reading for, and writing, the research essay 1
25 hours	Reading for, and writing, the research essay 2

1.9 Prerequisites:

None.

1.10 Attendance:

A minimum attendance of 70% is required in order to pass this module.

Schedule:

Term 1, Thursdays, 9.00-14.00

Week-by-week summary

Week	Date	Topic
1	5 Oct 2023	Introduction: Evidence and Interpretation in Archaeology
2	12 Oct 2023	Geoarchaeology and Human Behaviour, <i>Matt Pope</i>
3	19 Oct 2023	Type Sites
4	26 Oct 2023	How Archaeologists Affect Evidence and Interpretation: Survey and Excavation Methods, Excavation Areas, Sampling, Sample Size
5	2 Nov 2023	Activity Areas, Features, Deposits, Middens, House Floors, Houses
6	9 Nov 2023	READING WEEK
7	16 Nov 2023	Reconstructing Rural Communities
8	23 Nov 2023	Thinking about Towns: Urban Dynamics
9	30 Nov 2023	Interpreting the Living from the Dead—Burial Evidence, <i>Mike Parker Pearson</i>
10	7 Dec 2023	Regional approaches
11	14 Dec 2023	Artefact Assemblages

Part 2: READINGS: GENERAL INFORMATION

General instructions on reading:

This handbook identifies key readings for each session. The most essential readings are marked with an asterisk * Note the specific reading guidelines for each topic.

General Works discuss issues, principles, concepts and terminology. *Case Studies* illustrate how general concepts play out in practice. In Case Studies you want to note how primary evidence is presented and interpreted. YOU ARE NOT EXPECTED TO READ ALL OF THESE ITEMS FOR WEEKLY CLASSES, just sample some: the lists are long to provide you with additional readings to investigate for essays. You will need both kinds of readings to master the skills taught in this course. Some people find it useful to start with case studies, and then turn to general works. For others, it is the reverse. *Further Readings* give you more choices to explore.

You are NOT expected to read everything in the list. Reading lists are lengthy in order to give you a wide choice of possibilities for essays – and to show you other things you might like to explore. *When deciding on what readings to explore for essays, consult this reading list first.* Read as much as you can before class (ideally 5 hours). When in doubt, sample the starred* readings from different sections. For example, the minimum for each class is that you read at least something from the General Works and something from the Case Study sections. How to read: this course is not about memorizing details of individual sites. It's about how archaeologists deal with evidence, in practice. You will need to learn some definitions. *In reading, the most important thing is to relate case studies to general concepts.* You may find it helpful to read a selection quickly at first; and then go back and look at specifics when you have more time.

Accessing readings online:

This Handbook is the Official Reading List for the course. It is also the Online Reading List. It is found here: <https://rl.talis.com/3/ucl/lists/8D5D3CB9-FC8F-7A3E-F76E-4615F552F4AB.html?lang=en-GB&login=1#57a06698-f7a9-4148-ba2a-f8319d65783a>

You may find links to other lists labelled as “online reading lists.” Use those if you have trouble with the links included here – but remember that other lists may not have been updated and are only to help you access individual readings. For essential readings, a link to UCL Explore is usually shown. *The links shown assume that you are logged into UCL Explore with your username and password, with full permissions for access.* If you have trouble accessing links shown in this Handbook, try other online lists or go to UCL Explore and search author and keywords. UCL Explore website: https://ucl-new-primo.hosted.exlibrisgroup.com/primo-explore/search?vid=UCL_VU2
Sometimes, extracts will be available on Moodle. Check Moodle files for each session.

Core Texts

The following are core books. Readings include several chapters from them.

GENERAL

Banning, E. B. 2020. *The Archaeologist's Laboratory: The Analysis of Archaeological Evidence*.

London: Kluwer. Revised edition. <https://link-springer-com.libproxy.ucl.ac.uk/book/10.1007%2F978-3-030-47992-3>

Flannery, K. and Sabloff, J. (eds) 2010. *The Early Mesoamerican Village (updated)*. Walnut Creek:

Routledge. Chapters 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 9, 10, 12. ISSUE DESK FLA 3; DF100 FLA https://ucl-new-primo.hosted.exlibrisgroup.com/primo-explore/fulldisplay?docid=TN_cdi_proquest_ebookcentral_EBC677806&context=PC&vid=UCL_VU2&lang=en_US&search_scope=CSCOP_UCL&adaptor=primo_central_multiple_fe&tab=local&query=any,contains,Flannery%20sabloff%20village&offset=0 *A classic work on evidence and sampling in practice. Humorous, clear.*

GEOARCHAEOLOGICAL SITE FORMATION AND STRATIGRAPHY

- Butzer, K. 1982. *Archaeology as Human Ecology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. AH BUT. <https://www-cambridge-org.libproxy.ucl.ac.uk/core/books/archaeology-as-human-ecology/C7ED4A520324242015F56A2CA8EF6BB7>
- Harris, E. C. 1989. *Principles of Archaeological Stratigraphy*. London: Academic. Second edition. A classic work. <https://www-sciencedirect-com.libproxy.ucl.ac.uk/book/9780123266514/principles-of-archaeological-stratigraphy?via=ihub=> Or via this website: <http://harrismatrix.com/>
- Karkanas, P. and Goldberg, P. 2019. *Reconstructing Archaeological Sites: Understanding the Geoarchaeological Matrix*. Chichester: Wiley. <https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.libproxy.ucl.ac.uk/doi/book/10.1002/9781119016427>
- Westman, A. 1994. *MOLAS Archaeological Site Manual*. London: Museum of London Archaeological Services. *Classic and basic. Moodle extracts.*
- Wheeler, M. 1954. *Archaeology from the Earth*. London: Pelican. AL WHE / See Moodle A classic about good vs. bad excavation - highlights problems of very old excavations.

CULTURAL ASPECTS OF SITE FORMATION AND ASSEMBLAGE FORMATION

- David, N. & Kramer, C. 2001. *Ethnoarchaeology in Action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Chapters 1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 9, 10, 13. ISSUE DESK DAV8; AH DAV <https://www-cambridge-org.libproxy.ucl.ac.uk/core/books/ethnoarchaeology-in-action/8CEB0F56FC4858FFEA906DB000D6BAD2#> *Essential overview of cultural site formation processes (in ethnoarchaeology)*
- Schiffer, M.B. 1996. *Formation Processes of the Archaeological Record*. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press. Revised edition. Chapters 1, 2, 3, 4, 8, 10. AH SCH https://ucl-new-primo.hosted.exlibrisgroup.com/primo-explore/fulldisplay?docid=UCL_LMS_DS51257998100004761&context=L&vid=UCL_VU2&lang=en_US&search_scope=CSCOP_UCL&adaptor=Local%20Search%20Engine&isFrbr=true&tab=local&query=any,contains,schiffer%20formation%20processes&sortBy=rank&facet=frbrgroupid,include,809165349&offset=0 *A classic work on site formation; defines terms and concepts*

SAMPLING

- Orton, C. 2000. *Sampling in Archaeology*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press. AK10 ORT. <https://www-cambridge-org.libproxy.ucl.ac.uk/core/books/sampling-in-archaeology/19EFCC337099150189D34408E56939D2> *Crucial for all archaeologists. Explored more deeply in the Research methods course*

ASSEMBLAGE ANALYSIS

- Banning 2020, above
- David and Kramer 2001, above
- Andrefsky, W. 2005 [1998]. *Lithics: Macroscopic Approaches to Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Chapters 2, 3, 4, 7, 8. *On chipped stone technology* <https://www-cambridge-org.libproxy.ucl.ac.uk/core/books/lithics/1229976A39784B02F6427836936D3944>
- Orton, C. and Hughes, M. 2013. *Pottery in Archaeology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. KD3 ORT *An excellent introduction* <https://www-cambridge-org.libproxy.ucl.ac.uk/core/books/pottery-in-archaeology/7E49063441E63E03630D369A6AC1A572>
- Rice, P. 1983. *Pottery Analysis*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Chapters 5, 7, 8, 9 KD3 RIC; ISSUE DESK IOOA RIC3. *A wonderful book.*

HISTORY OF ARCHAEOLOGY - Theory. Useful, but not core texts for this course

- Eriksen, T. and Nielsen, F. 2001. *A History of Anthropology*. London: Pluto Press.
- Trigger, B. G. 1989. *A History of Archaeological Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.

Week 1 INTRODUCTION: EVIDENCE AND INTERPRETATION IN ARCHAEOLOGY

In this session, we discuss the nature of archaeological evidence and how it has been interpreted. Sophisticated analysis of evidence requires explicit discussion of site formation processes, sampling, stratigraphy and temporal resolution. How do these affect the quality of evidence? Archaeological evidence has been used by scholars in other fields. At times, “big narratives” illustrate the dangers of uncritical use of archaeological evidence. Olduvai Gorge illustrates how evidence travels through time. Key concepts: Pompeii premise, systemic context, archaeological context, site formation, stratigraphy, sampling.

FRAMES OF REFERENCE

- *Flannery, K. (ed) 1976. *The Early Mesoamerican Village*. New York: Academic Press. *Introduction to book: “Research strategy & formative Mesoamerica,” pp. 1-11.* https://ucl-new-primo.hosted.exlibrisgroup.com/primo-explore/fulldisplay?docid=TN_cdi_proquest_ebookcentral_EBC677806&context=PC&vid=UCL_VU2&lang=en_US&search_scope=CSCOP_UCL&adaptor=primo_central_multiple_fe&tab=local&query=any,contains,Flannery%20abloff%20village&offset=0
- *Binford, L. R. 1964. A consideration of archaeological research design. *American Antiquity* 29 (4): 425-441. https://www-jstor-org.libproxy.ucl.ac.uk/stable/277978?refreqid=excelsior%3Ac820485bf840b0975f2a8aba93dfee18&seq=1#metadata_info_tab_contents
- *Binford, L. R. 1987. Data, relativism and archaeological science. *Man* 22: 391-404. [\[www\]](http://www.jstor.org) https://www-jstor-org.libproxy.ucl.ac.uk/stable/2802497?sid=primo&origin=crossref&seq=1#metadata_info_tab_contents
- * Hodder, I. 1991. Interpretive archaeology and its role. *American Antiquity* 56 (1): 7-18. [\[www\]](http://www.jstor.org) https://www-jstor-org.libproxy.ucl.ac.uk/stable/280968?sid=primo&origin=crossref&seq=1#metadata_info_tab_contents

PRIMARY EVIDENCE

- *Banning, E. B. 2020. *The Archaeologist's Laboratory: The Analysis of Archaeological Evidence*. London: Kluwer. 2nd edition. *See Core Texts Page & Moodle*. Chapter 19 (Stratigraphy); Chapter 20 (Chronometric Dating) - focus on 327-338. (*Don't worry if you don't understand everything right away.*)

SOURCE ANALYSIS

- *Binford, L. 1981. Behavioural archaeology & the Pompeii premise. *Journal of Anthropological Research* 37: 195-208. https://www-jstor-org.libproxy.ucl.ac.uk/stable/3629723?seq=1#metadata_info_tab_contents
- *Schiffer, M. 1996. *Formation Processes of the Archaeological Record*. Salt Lake City: University of Utah. Chapter 1, “The Nature of Archaeological Evidence;” 4: “Primary & Secondary Refuse”, 58-64; “Abandonment,” 89-98 https://ucl-new-primo.hosted.exlibrisgroup.com/primo-explore/fulldisplay?docid=UCL_LMS_DS51257998100004761&context=L&vid=UCL_VU2&lang=en_US&search_scope=CSCOP_UCL&adaptor=Local%20Search%20Engine&isFrbr=true&tab=local&query=any,contains,schiffer%20formation%20processes&sortBy=rank&facet=frbrgroupid,include,809165349&offset=0

CASE STUDY 1.1: OLDUVAI GORGE

Primary evidence: initial statements *Read 2*

How was the Homo habilis evidence (site FLK NN I) from Olduvai first reported in 1960-1964? What details were included? What were left out? What was Louis Leakey's interpretation in 1964 ()? Was it an example of “the Pompeii premise” (see Binford 1981)?*

- *Holloway, M. 1994. Mary Leakey interview. *Scientific American*. https://www-jstor-org.libproxy.ucl.ac.uk/stable/24942867?sid=primo&seq=1#metadata_info_tab_contents

- *Clark, J. D. 1961. Sites yielding hominid remains in Bed I at Olduvai Gorge. *Nature* 189: 903-904. <https://www-nature-com.libproxy.ucl.ac.uk/articles/189903a0>.
- *Leakey, Louis, et al. 1964. A new species of the genus Homo from Olduvai Gorge. *Nature* 202: 7-9. (*Louis Leakey's interpretation: section on cultural associations*) <https://www-nature-com.libproxy.ucl.ac.uk/articles/202007a0>
- Leakey, L. 1961. Age of Bed I, Olduvai Gorge, Tanganyika. *Nature* 191: 478-479. <https://www-nature-com.libproxy.ucl.ac.uk/articles/191478a0>
- Leakey, L. 1960. Recent discoveries at Olduvai Gorge. *Nature* 188: 1050-1052. <https://www-nature-com.libproxy.ucl.ac.uk/articles/1881050a0>
- Leakey, M. 1971. *Olduvai Gorge Excavations in Beds I and II, 1960-1963*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (*site report statement of primary evidence; not online*)

Source Analyses. Scan 1 or 2 briefly, noting methods and conclusions. Have source analyses by backed up Louis Leakey's interpretation? The readings are listed in chronological order.

- Isaac, G. 1978. Food sharing and human evolution. *Journal of Anthropological Research* 34:311-325. https://www-jstor-org.libproxy.ucl.ac.uk/stable/3629782?sid=primo&seq=1#metadata_info_tab_contents
- Potts, R. and Shipman, P. 1981. Cutmarks made by stone tools on bones from Olduvai Gorge, Tanzania. *Nature* 291: 577-580. <https://www-nature-com.libproxy.ucl.ac.uk/articles/291577a0>
- Toth, N. 1985. The Oldowan re-assessed. *Journal of Archaeological Science* 12: 101-120. <https://www-sciencedirect-com.libproxy.ucl.ac.uk/science/article/pii/0305440385900561>
- Potts, R. 1988. *Early Hominid Activities at Olduvai*. New York: A. de Gruyter.
- Rose, L. and Marshall, F. 1996. Meat eating, hominid sociality and home bases revisited. *Current Anthropology* 37 (2): 307-338. https://www-jstor-org.libproxy.ucl.ac.uk/stable/2744352?seq=1#metadata_info_tab_contents
- Dominguez-Rodrigo, M. 2002. Hunting and scavenging by early humans. *Journal of World Prehistory* 16 (1): 1-54. <https://link-springer-com.libproxy.ucl.ac.uk/article/10.1023/A:1014507129795>
- Toth, N. 2009. The Oldowan: the toolmaking of early hominins and chimpanzees compared. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 38: 289-305. https://www-jstor-org.libproxy.ucl.ac.uk/stable/20622654?seq=1#metadata_info_tab_contents
- Blumenschine, R. J., et al. 2012. Environments and hominin activities across the FLK peninsula during Zinjanthropus times (1.84 Ma), Olduvai Gorge, Tanzania. *Journal of Human Evolution* 63: 364-383. <https://www-sciencedirect-com.libproxy.ucl.ac.uk/science/article/pii/S0047248411001977>
- Spoor, F. et al. 2015. Reconstructed *Homo habilis* type OH7 suggests deep-rooted species diversity in early *Homo*. *Nature* 519: 83-86. <https://www-nature.com/articles/nature14224>
- Shreeve, J. 2015. Oldest human fossil found, redrawing family tree. *National Geographic* 5 March 2015. <https://www.nationalgeographic.com/news/2015/3/150304-homo-habilis-evolution-fossil-jaw-ethiopia-olduvai-gorge/>
- Dominguez-Rodrigo, M. and Cobo-Sanchez, L. 2017. A spatial analysis of stone tools and fossil bones at FLK Zinj 22 and PTK I (Bed I, Olduvai Gorge, Tanzania). *Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology* 488: 21-34. <https://www-sciencedirect-com.libproxy.ucl.ac.uk/science/article/pii/S0031018216306927>
- de la Torre, I., et al. 2018. The impact of hydraulic processes in Olduvai Beds I and II. *Geoarchaeology* 33 (3). <https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.libproxy.ucl.ac.uk/doi/epdf/10.1002/gea.21629>
- Humphrey, L. & Stringer, C. 2018. *Our Human Story*. London: Natural History Museum, 83-94.

FURTHER READING

- Malinsky-Buller, A., et al. 2011. Making time: Living floors, palimpsests and site formation processes *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* 30(2): 89-101. <https://www-sciencedirect-com.libproxy.ucl.ac.uk/science/article/pii/S0278416510000632>
- Merton, R. 1973. The perspectives of insiders and outsiders. *American Journal of Sociology* 78 (1): 9-47. https://www-jstor-org.libproxy.ucl.ac.uk/stable/2776569?seq=1#metadata_info_tab_contents



Image: The Leakey Foundation. <https://leakeyfoundation.org/about/the-leakey-family/>

Week 2 GEOARCHAEOLOGY AND HUMAN BEHAVIOUR

Stratigraphy is the result of site formation processes, which in turn combines sedimentary and soil formation processes in which humans can be involved. Archaeology is reasoning from stratigraphy encountered in the archaeological context, to the depositional history of the site. Depositional history is how components of a living site become archaeological deposits. Classic site formation process theory posits three phases: a systemic or occupation phase; an abandonment phase; and a post-abandonment phase. Geoarchaeology examines these dynamics from a different perspective: it contextualises the archaeological site as an integral part of the landscape which, as much as it is in constant flux, archives significant signatures of past processes. In this lecture we examine the interplay between archaeological site formation processes and geoarchaeology.

Key concepts: depositional history, alluviation, colluviation, aeolian (wind-blown) deposit, primary refuse, secondary refuse, tertiary refuse, abandonment, taphonomy, stratigraphy, context/unit, stratum, layer, deposit, roof collapse, wall collapse, fill, midden, fill above floor, floor, occupation surface, stratigraphic phase, relative chronology.

CONCEPTS

- *Butzer, K. 1982. *Archaeology as Human Ecology*. Cambridge: CUP. Chapters 4-8. AH BUT <https://www-cambridge-org.libproxy.ucl.ac.uk/core/books/archaeology-as-human-ecology/C7ED4A520324242015F56A2CA8EF6BB7>
- *David, N. & Kramer, C. 2001. *Ethnoarchaeology in Action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (CUP). ISSUE DESK DAV8. Chapter 4, "Human residues." <https://www-cambridge-org.libproxy.ucl.ac.uk/core/books/ethnoarchaeology-in-action/8CEB0F56FC4858FFEA906DB000D6BAD2#>
- *Goldberg, P. 1989. Review of Schiffer: *Formation Processes of the Archaeological Record*. *Geoarchaeology* 4(3): 277-289. <https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.libproxy.ucl.ac.uk/doi/abs/10.1002/gea.3340040307>
- *Karkanas, P. and Goldberg, P. 2019. *Reconstructing Archaeological Sites. Understanding the Geoarchaeological Matrix*. Chichester: Wiley. <https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.libproxy.ucl.ac.uk/doi/book/10.1002/9781119016427>

CASE STUDIES: 2.1

Read 3. How do the studies use the concepts above?

- *Mallol, C., F. W. Marlow, B. M. Wood and C. C. Porter 2007. Earth, wind, and fire: ethnoarchaeological signals of Hadza fires. *Journal of Archaeological Science* 34(12): 2035-2052. <https://www.sciencedirect-com.libproxy.ucl.ac.uk/science/article/pii/S0305440307000313>
- *Villagran, Ximena S., André Strauss, Christopher Miller, Bertrand Ligouis, and Rodrigo Oliveira. 2017. Buried in ashes: Site formation processes at Lapa do Santo rockshelter, east-central Brazil. *Journal of Archaeological Science* 77:10-34. <https://www.sciencedirect-com.libproxy.ucl.ac.uk/science/article/pii/S0305440316300942>

For more on this site, see Strauss and Neves, below. Other rockshelters: Arajo et al.

See also:

- Araújo, A., J. Feathers, M. Arroyo-Kalin and M. M. Tizuka 2008. Lapa das Boleiras rockshelter: stratigraphy and formation processes at a Paleoamerican site in Central Brazil. *Journal of Archaeological Science* 35(12): 3186-3202. https://ucl-new-primo.hosted.exlibrisgroup.com/primo-explore/fulldisplay?docid=TN_elsevier_sdoi_10_1016_j_jas_2008_07_007&context=PC&vid=UCL_VU2&lang=en_US&search_scope=CSCOP_UCL&adaptor=primo_central_multiple_fe&tab=local&query=any,contains,feathers%20lapa%20formation&offset=0
- *Neves, W.A., 2015. The oldest case of decapitation in the new world (Lapa do Santo, East-Central Brazil). *PLoS One* 10, e0137456. https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.ucl.ac.uk/docview/1719304108?rfr_id=info%3Axi%2Fsid%3Aprimo
- *Strauss, A., et al. 2016. Early Holocene funerary complexity in South America: the archaeological record of Lapa Do Santo (East-central Brazil). *Antiquity* 90 (354): 1454-1473. <https://www-cambridge-org.libproxy.ucl.ac.uk/core/journals/antiquity/article/early-holocene-ritual-complexity-in-south-america-the-archaeological-record-of-lapa-do-santo-eastcentral-brazil/03F034C4229E9A77140C431437B0A28D>

Other Case Studies

- Cessford, C. and Near, J. 2005. Fire, burning and pyrotechnology at Çatalhöyük. In Hodder, I. (ed.), *Çatalhöyük Perspectives*. Cambridge: McDonald Institute, pp. 171-182.
- Harrison, K., Martin, V., and Webster, B. 2013. Structural fires at Çatalhöyük. In Hodder, I. (ed.), *Substantive Technologies from Çatalhöyük: Reports from the 2000-2008 Seasons*. Los Angeles: Monographs of the Cotsen Institute of Archaeology, University of California at Los Angeles, pp. 133-143. <https://www-jstor-org.libproxy.ucl.ac.uk/stable/10.18866/j.ctt1pk870v>
- Shahack-Gross, R., Albert, R.-M., Gilboa, A., Nagar-Hilman, O., Sharon, I., & Weiner, S. 2005. Geoarchaeology in an urban context: the uses of space in a Phoenician monumental building at Tel Dor (Israel). *Journal of Archaeological Science* 32, 1417-1431. <https://www.sciencedirect-com.libproxy.ucl.ac.uk/science/article/pii/S0305440305000841>
- Twiss, K., et al. 2008. Arson or accident? The burning of a Neolithic house at Catalhoyuk. *Journal of Field Archaeology* 33, 41-57. https://www.jstor.org/stable/40026664?seq=1#metadata_info_tab_contents

FURTHER READING

- Cordova, C. 2018. *Geoarchaeology: The Human-Environmental Approach*. London: I.B. Tauris & Co.
- Gladfelter, Bruce G. 1977. Geoarchaeology: the geomorphologist and archaeology. *American Antiquity* 42 (4):519-538.
- Goldberg, P., & Macphail, R. 2006. *Practical and Theoretical Geoarchaeology*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Wood, W. & Johnson, D. 1978. A survey of disturbance processes. *Advances in Archaeological Method & Theory*. Vol. 1: 315-81.

Week 3 TYPE SITES

A 'type site' is usually an excavated site or the site of a major discovery, that gives its name to a culture, cultural period, tradition, or artefact type because it provided the first recognized, best studied, or most representative example. For example, discoveries at La Tène and Hallstatt led scholars to divide the European Iron Age into the La Tène culture and Hallstatt culture, named after their respective type sites. While the idea that we can generalize about entire cultures based on the

excavation of single type sites is problematic, the classification and interpretation of all material culture nevertheless depends on our ability to group finds on the basis of consistent clustering of attributes. Ceramic vessels, for example, are said to be of the same type if they are identical in all significant features of form and fabric and not merely similar in general appearance. The same can be said of archaeological sites. In this session we review the basics of classification and its applications.

The case study examines the development of thinking around a particular ‘type-site’: that of the early medieval ‘great hall complex’. The case study is from the history of archaeology (1950s). The choice of this older dataset is deliberate. Why? (1) Archaeological evidence is acquired at specific points in time. The nature of the evidence is a result of the state of archaeology at the time when it was acquired. (2) The site and its dataset remain crucial for many questions. We always have to work with old datasets – as well as information from more recent excavations – and understanding the limitations of older datasets is essential. The Yeavinger example illustrates relationships between evidence and interpretation – and how interpretations change through time. **Key concepts:** type-site; classification; monument and object thesauri; controlled vocabularies; metadata; documentation standards

Skim:

Edis, J., Macleod, D. and Bewley, R., 1989. An archaeologist's guide to classification of cropmarks and soilmarks. *Antiquity* 63:238, 112–26 <https://www-proquest-com.libproxy.ucl.ac.uk/docview/1293795028/fulltextPDF/6A0958DD935F4D1FPQ/9?accountid=14511>
MIDAS Heritage. The UK Historic Environment Data Standard https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/midas-heritage/midas-heritage-2012-v1_1/

CASE STUDY 3.1: RECONSTRUCTING *BEOWULF*'S HALL

In 1949 the first ‘great hall complexes’ were identified from aerial photography at Yeavinger and Millfield in Northumberland. Excavations were subsequently carried out at Yeavinger by Brian Hope-Taylor. Hope-Taylor’s excavations were technically brilliant, heralding a new age of British archaeology, and his interpretation of the site continues to dominate the study of great hall complexes. He identified the site with the royal vill of *Ad Gefrin* described by Bede (*Ecclesiastical History*), and drew heavily on written sources—notably the epic poem *Beowulf*—to interpret the distinctive large halls. Subsequent excavations of other great halls have nuanced the interpretation, notably those undertaken at Cowdrey’s Down, Hampshire, in 1978–81, and currently underway at Lyminge, Kent and Rendlesham, Suffolk. How have the recording techniques of these excavations changed? Can you identify the influence of ‘culture-historical’, ‘processual’ and ‘post-processual’ thinking on the interpretation of these sites? What is the value of ‘type sites’ for interpretation?

Primary Evidence: Hope-Taylor’s recording and interpretation of the great halls, 1952–57

* B. Hope-Taylor, 1977. *Yeavinger: an Anglo-British centre of early Northumbria* [DAA 410 N.7 HOP; <https://www.jstor.org/stable/i.ctvxbph86>], focus on pp. 31–63.

Interpretation of the great hall at Cowdrey’s Down, 1978–81

* M. Millett and S. James, 1983. Excavations at Cowdrey’s Down, Basingstoke, 1978-79, *Archaeological Journal* 140, 151–279, focus on the interpretation of building C12 <www>
James, S., Marshall, A., and Millett, M. 1984. An Early Medieval Building Tradition, *Archaeological Journal* 141, 182–215 <www>

Interpretation of the great hall at Lyminge 2012–

* Thomas, G. 2018. Mead-Halls of the *Oiscingas*: A New Kentish Perspective on the Anglo-Saxon Great Hall Complex Phenomenon. *Medieval Archaeology* 62.2, 262–303 <www>

Further Reading

- Hamerow, H. 2012. *Rural Settlements and Society in Anglo-Saxon England*. Oxford: University Press, pp. 17–53
- McBride, A. 2020. *The Role of Anglo-Saxon Great Hall Complexes in Kingdom Formation, in Comparison and in Context AD500-750*. Oxford: Archaeopress <www>
- Scull, C. 1991. Post-Roman Phase 1 at Yeavinger: a re-consideration. *Medieval Archaeology* 35, 51–62 <www>
- Scull, C. and Thomas, G. 2020. Early Medieval Great Hall Complexes in England: Temporality and Site Biographies. *Anglo-Saxon Studies in Archaeology and History* 22, 50–67

Week 4 HOW ARCHAEOLOGISTS AFFECT EVIDENCE AND INTERPRETATION: SURVEY, EXCAVATION, SAMPLING

Archaeologists' own decisions affect the quality of evidence and interpretations. The archaeological record is a result of how research has been conducted. All archaeological evidence is the result of some sort of sampling strategy. The term "sampling" refers to the collection of any data. It does not merely mean collection of particular types of data, such as soil samples. There are three main types of sampling strategy or data collection strategy: (1) total/ comprehensive (100%); (2) judgement or purposive; and (3) probabilistic (random).

Sites are discovered via survey. To understand a map of site distributions, we need information on the history of fieldwork in a region: the sampling strategies of surveys; how much of a region was surveyed; the survey methods used (extensive, intensive, haphazard); how sites were dated from surface collections; and how site sizes were estimated from surface collections. We will return to survey and regional evidence in a later session.

With evidence from excavation, sampling strategies also have to be investigated. What research questions guided an archaeologist's decisions? How was a site excavated, and how much? We look at various types of trenches and the evidence they produce: large horizontal exposures; grid-squares with baulks; transect trenches; test pits; random sampling techniques. Different trench types affect the kinds of questions that can be answered, eg a narrow trench cannot give us information on a whole neighbourhood. Crucial information for any interpretation of excavated evidence includes (1) excavation area - the absolute area exposed (m^2 = metres squared); (2) the percentage of the total site that was excavated (m^2 or m^3); (3) techniques of excavation and recording; (4) stratigraphy; and (5) sample sizes of what is discovered.

It is usually not possible to generalize about a whole site from the evidence exposed in an excavation trench. Unfortunately, archaeologists often write as if it were possible. Archaeologists often refer to evidence from a "site." What they mean is "evidence from a trench or trenches." The student must be aware of this problem and must investigate excavations on which interpretations are based. This requires you to scrutinize site reports, maps, site plans and stratigraphic sections.

Key concepts:

Judgement Sample, Random Sample, 100% sample; Test pit; Transect trench / step trench; Grid squares with baulks; Area excavations / wide horizontal exposures; Total exposure (m^2 or m^3); Percentage of site excavated; Layers; Arbitrary levels / spits; Plans; Sections; Single-context recording

EXCAVATION

*Flannery, K. (ed) 1976. *The Early Mesoamerican Village*. New York: Academic Press. Re-read Chapter 1, Research Strategies ... *mainly to note RMA's excavation methods* In Chapter 3, read:

*Analysis on the Community Level, pp. 49-51 (Flannery);

- *Excavating Deep Communities by Transect Samples, 68-72 (Flannery) (Case Study);
- *Excavating a Shallow Community by Random Sampling, 62-67 (Winter) (Case Study);
- *Sampling by Intensive Surface Collection, pp. 51-62 (Flannery) (Case Study).

https://ucl-new-primo.hosted.exlibrisgroup.com/primo-explore/fulldisplay?docid=TN_pq_ebook_centralEBC677806&context=PC&vid=UCL_VU2&lang=en_US&search_scope=CSCOP_UCL&adaptor=primo_central_multiple_fe&tab=local&query=any,contains,flannery%20early%20mesoamerican%20village&offset=0

- * Harris, E. C. 1989. *Principles of Archaeological Stratigraphy*. London: Academic. Second edition. Chapters 3, 4, 8, 9 and 11. <https://www.sciencedirect-com.libproxy.ucl.ac.uk/book/9780123266514/principles-of-archaeological-stratigraphy?via=ihub=>

Sandoval, G. 2021. Single-Context Recording, Field Interpretation and Reflexivity: An Analysis of Primary Data In Context Sheets, *Journal of Field Archaeology*, 46:7, 496-512 <www>

Westman, A. 1994. *MOLAS Archaeological Site Manual*. London: Museum of London Archaeological Services. See extracts in Moodle.

Wheeler, M. 1954. *Archaeology from the Earth*. London: Pelican. Chapter 2, pp. 29-37; Chapter 4. ISSUE DESK AL WHE What does he say about old excavations? Note his advocacy of grid squares; what nickname did Flannery give to this kind of excavation? See also comments by Harris on Wheeler Excerpts uploaded to Moodle

SAMPLING

- *Orton, C. 2000. *Sampling in Archaeology*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press. AK10 ORT. Chapter 1, All the world is a sample; Chapter 5, What's in a site? <https://www.cambridge-org.libproxy.ucl.ac.uk/core/books/sampling-in-archaeology/19EFCC337099150189D34408E56939D2>

CASE STUDIES: Look at one case study and answer questions posed.

CASE STUDY 4.1: ROMAN VERULAMIUM

Over the past 100 years there have been many excavations in *Verulamium*, a Roman town to the south-west of the modern city of St Albans in Hertfordshire, England. Some of the town remains unexcavated, being now park and agricultural land or built upon, but many of the main features are accessible and have been explored by archaeological means. The literature is enormous, so only scan these reports quickly; trying to compare investigations from across the last 100 years. What is the purpose of any of these trenches? What is the sample size? Can we generalise from these trenches to the whole site? How do excavation areas, site formation, preservation and sample sizes affect results and interpretations? How have the excavation strategies changed?

EARLY INVESTIGATIONS

Kenyon, K.M. 1935. VIII.—The Roman Theatre at Verulamium, St. Albans. *Archaeologia* 84, 213–61 <https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/archaeologia/volume/A943DEBD96EAEFA08E2C0FFD2A21AD0F>

Wheeler, R.E.M. and Wheeler, T.V., 1936. *Verulamium. a Belgic and two Roman cities* <https://library.oapen.org/handle/20.500.12657/25098>

Richardson, K.M., 1944. III.—Report on Excavations at Verulamium: Insula XVII, 1938. *Archaeologia* 90, 81–126 <https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/archaeologia/article/iiireport-on-excavations-at-verulamium-insula-xvii-1938/3FFF82203EB756A78EFA41AD8C903398>

1970s–1980s

Frere, S. S. 1972. *Verulamium Excavations Vol. I*. <https://library.oapen.org/handle/20.500.12657/37347>

Frere, S. S. 1983. *Verulamium Excavations Vol. II*.

Frere, S. S. 1984. *Verulamium Excavations Vol. III*. Oxford University Committee for Archaeology Monograph No. I. Oxford University Committee for Archaeology, Oxford

- Niblett, R., Manning, W., and Saunders, C. 2006. Verulamium: Excavations within the Roman Town 1986-88. *Britannia* 37, 53–188
https://www.jstor.org/stable/30030518?seq=1#metadata_info_tab_contents
- Rigby, V., Stead, I. 1989. *Verulamium: The King Harry Lane site*, English Heritage (1989)
https://archaeologydataservice.ac.uk/archiveDS/archiveDownload?t=arch-1416-1/dissemination/pdf/9781848022164_ALL_72dpi.pdf

Recent investigations and reappraisal

- Frere, S. S. & P. Witts 2011. 'The saga of Verulamium building XXVII 2.' *Britannia* 42: 212–26.
<https://www.cambridge.org.libproxy.ucl.ac.uk/core/journals/britannia/article/saga-of-verulamium-building-xxvii-2/AD0DD6E40447DF97982A08F44B6A09CC>
- Cosh, S. & D. S. Neal 2015. 'The dating of building 2, Insula XXVII, at Verulamium: a reassessment.' *The Antiquaries Journal* 95: 65–90. <https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/antiquaries-journal/article/dating-of-building-2-insula-xxvii-at-verulamium-a-reassessment/DD727B81931DD1B81AD3FFB467EA9127>
- Lockyear, K. and Shlasko, E., 2017. Under the Park. Recent geophysical surveys at Verulamium (St Albans, Hertfordshire, UK). *Archaeological Prospection* 24.1, 17–36 <https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.libproxy.ucl.ac.uk/doi/10.1002/arp.1548>

CASE STUDY 4.2: PLOUGHSOIL ARCHAEOLOGY

Unstratified finds can play an important role in identifying and characterising archaeological sites, whether as a result of systematic fieldwalking, or unsystematic metal detecting. How can this evidence be used? What are some of the inherent problems with these kinds of data? What are some of the effects of agriculture on the archaeological sample?

- Boismier, W 1991, 'The role of research design in surface collection: an example from Broom Hill, Braishfield, Hampshire', in J Schofield (ed.), *Interpreting Artefact Scatters: Contributions to Ploughzone Archaeology*, 11–25, Oxbow, Oxford
- Diez-Martin, F 2009. Evaluating the effect of plowing on the archaeological record: the early middle Palaeolithic in the river Duero basin plateaus (north-central Spain), *Quaternary International*, 214, 30–43 <www>
- Oksanen, E., and Lewis, M. 2020. Medieval Commercial Sites: As Seen Through Portable Antiquities Scheme Data. *The Antiquaries Journal* 100, 109–140. <www>
- Noble, G., Lamont, P., Masson-Maclean, E. 2019. Assessing the ploughzone: The impact of cultivation on artefact survival and the cost/benefits of topsoil stripping prior to excavation, *Journal of Archaeological Science: Reports* 23, 549–58 <www>

Week 5 SPATIAL & STRATIGRAPHIC EVIDENCE, 1: ACTIVITY AREAS, FEATURES, DEPOSITS, MIDDENS, HOUSE FLOORS, HOUSES

Can archaeologists identify individuals' activities in daily life? What effects do the following have on our ability to reconstruct floors and human activities: primary refuse, secondary refuse, site formation, abandonment, excavation exposure, and dating/temporal resolution? Temporal resolution is crucial in looking at houses and house floors: how much time does a floor assemblage represent? With well preserved floors, we can be tempted to infer activities of individuals. But much depends on site formation and close dating; floor assemblages may not represent primary refuse. Another issue is abandonment. We are looking at floors of abandoned houses. How were they abandoned? Suddenly? Gradually? Ritually? Most crucially: what do we study when we study artifact distributions on floors? Do we study only macro-artefacts (larger items)? Is that enough? Or do we need to look also at micro-artefacts (found in heavy residues in flotation)? Beyond floors, what about middens? How should we study secondary refuse?

Concepts: temporal resolution, abandonment, activity areas, floors, middens, macro-artefacts, micro-artefacts, access analysis, building life cycles

GENERAL

Read the Flannery selections and 1-2 others

* Flannery, K. & Sabloff, J. 2010. *The Early Mesoamerican Village*. Walnut Creek: Routledge.

* Chapter 2, Analysis on the Household Level: Chapter Introduction, pp. 13-16;

* Flannery and Winter, Analysing Household Activities, pp. 34-45 (Case Study)

* Flannery, The Early Mesoamerican House, pp. 16-24 (Case Study)

https://ucl-new-primo.hosted.exlibrisgroup.com/primo-explore/fulldisplay?docid=TN_pg_ebook_centralEBC677806&context=PC&vid=UCL_VU2&lang=en_US&search_scope=CSCOP_UCL&adaptor=primo_central_multiple_fe&tab=local&query=any,contains,flannery%20early%20mesoamerican%20village&offset=0

Originally published in 1976. Do the studies discuss site formation? Micro-artefacts?

* Hayden, B. & Cannon, A. 1983. Where the garbage goes: refuse disposal in the Maya highlands.

Journal of Anthropological Archaeology 2: 117-63. <https://www.sciencedirect.com.libproxy.ucl.ac.uk/science/article/pii/0278416583900107>

Compare insights of this ethnoarchaeology study to case studies, eg Flannery, above

* La Motta, V. & Schiffer, M. 1999. Formation processes of house floor assemblages. In P. Allison (ed)

Archaeology of Household Activities. London: Routledge, 19-29. BD ALL https://ucl-new-primo.hosted.exlibrisgroup.com/primo-explore/fulldisplay?docid=UCL_LMS_DS51231281680004761&context=L&vid=UCL_VU2&lang=en_US&search_scope=CSCOP_UCL&adaptor=Local%20Search%20Engine&tab=local&query=any,contains,allison%20household%20archaeology&offset=0

Access analysis

Cutting, M. 2003. The Use of Spatial Analysis to Study Prehistoric Settlement Architecture. *Oxford Journal of Archaeology* 22.1, 1–21. <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/1468-0092.00001>

Fairclough, G. 1992. Meaningful constructions – spatial and functional analysis of medieval buildings.

Antiquity 66, 348–66. <https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/antiquity/article/meaningful-constructions-spatial-and-functional-analysis-of-medieval-buildings/D7E995641A0E6144FEC4451E0EA81BAE>

CASE STUDY 5.1: WEST STOW

Grubenhäuser or Sunken-Feature Buildings (SFBs) are a distinctive, but difficult to interpret, domestic building type found in early medieval northern Europe. West Stow in Suffolk was one of the first considered investigations of this house type. Look at some of the examples in the original report and read about some of the subsequent interpretations. For each building, evaluate: dating/temporal resolution, site formation, nature of abandonment, primary refuse, secondary refuse, activity areas, floors. How can we identify what deposits belong to the occupation and abandonment phases? How can we reconstruct the superstructure?

* S. West 1985 *West Stow: The Anglo-Saxon Village*. East Anglian Archaeology Report 24. INST ARCH DAA Qto Series EAA 24. OA: <https://eaareports.org.uk/publication/report24/>

Subsequent interpretations:

H. Hamerow 2012 *Rural Settlements and Society in Anglo-Saxon England*, Oxford: Oxford University Press. Chapter 2: Anglo-Saxon buildings: form, function, and social space

M. Welch, *Anglo-Saxon England* (1992/ reprinted 2000) [DAA 180 WEL], pp. 21–8

J. Tipper 2004 *The Grubenhäuser in Anglo-Saxon England*. Yedingham: Landscape Research Centre.

INST ARCH DAA 180 Qto TIP

CASE STUDY 5.2: ÇATALHÖYÜK - NEOLITHIC TURKEY

A pioneer excavation of post-processual archaeology. Read about one or two of the houses. Compare burned vs. unburned; rebuilt vs. not rebuilt. What site formation processes do we see? How are interpretations of this site affected by secondary refuse? How do excavation areas, site formation, preservation & sample sizes (eg, houses) affect results and interpretations?

- *Cessford, C. 2007. Building 1. In Hodder, I. (ed), *Excavating Çatalhöyük*. Cambridge, 405-530. (scan to get a sense of the stratigraphy) <https://www-jstor-org.libproxy.ucl.ac.uk/stable/10.18866/j.ctt1pd2khp>
- *Hodder, I.(ed) 2007. *Excavating Çatalhöyük*. Los Angeles: UCLA. Ch. 1, dating & in-situ activities, 20-24. (to think about Activity Areas, Secondary Refuse, Temporal Resolution) <https://www-jstor-org.libproxy.ucl.ac.uk/stable/10.18866/j.ctt1pd2khp>
- *Regan, R. & Taylor, J. 2014. The sequence of Buildings 75, 65, 56, 69, 44 and 10 & external spaces. In Hodder, I. (ed), *Çatalhöyük Excavations 2000-08*. Los Angeles: UCLA. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.18866/j.ctt1pk872w>
- Shillito, L.-M., et al. 2011. The microstratigraphy of middens: capturing daily routine in rubbish at Neolithic Çatalhöyük. *Antiquity* 85: 1024-1038. <https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/antiquity/article/microstratigraphy-of-middens-capturing-daily-routine-in-rubbish-at-neolithic-catalhoyuk-turkey/6507CBF834739A27F6097A8726A64D37>
- *Twiss, K., et al. 2008. Arson or accident? The burning of a Neolithic house at Çatalhöyük. *Journal of Field Archaeology* 33, 41-57 (on abandonment) https://www.jstor.org/stable/40026664?seq=1#metadata_info_tab_contents

Compare interpretation narratives to site formation and stratigraphic issues seen above

- *Hodder, I. and Cessford, C. 2004. Daily practice & social memory at Çatalhöyük. *American Antiquity* 69 (1): 17-40. (interpretation of Building 1) https://www-jstor-org.libproxy.ucl.ac.uk/stable/4128346?sid=primo&origin=crossref&seq=20#metadata_info_tab_contents
- Bourdieu, P. 1973. The Berber house. In Douglas, M. (ed.), *Rules and Meanings: The Anthropology of Everyday Knowledge*. London: Penguin Education, pp. 98-110. (compare to the above article. *Anthropology/ethnography - practice theory*)

Further reading (useful for essay question 1.6)

- *Martin, L. & Russell, N. 2000. Trashing rubbish. In Hodder, I. (ed.), *Towards Reflexive Method in Archaeology*. Cambridge, 57-70. Note main conclusions https://ucl-new-primo.hosted.exlibrisgroup.com/primo-explore/fulldisplay?docid=TN_cdi_crossref_primary_10_1179_eja_2002_5_2_251&context=PC&vid=UCL_VU2&lang=en_US&search_scope=CSCOP_UCL&adaptor=primo_central_multiple_fe&tab=local&query=any,contains,holder%20toward%20reflexive%20method&offset=0
- Matthews, W. 2005. Micromorphological & microstratigraphic traces of uses & concepts of space. In Hodder, I. (ed), *Inhabiting Çatalhöyük*. Cambridge: McDonald Inst. 355-398.
- Mitrovic, S. and Vasic, M. 2013. An integrated perspective on the uses of materials at Çatalhöyük based on the analysis of heavy residues. In Hodder, I. (ed.), *Substantive Technologies from Çatalhöyük*. Los Angeles: UCLA, pp. 27-50.
- Russell, N., Wright, K. I., Carter, T., Ketchum, S., Ryan, P., Yalman, N., Regan, R., Stevanovic, M., and Milic, M. 2014. Bringing down the house: house closing deposits at Çatalhöyük. In Hodder, I. (ed), *Integrating Çatalhöyük*. Los Angeles:UCLA, 109-121.

Week 6 READING WEEK

Week 7 RECONSTRUCTING RURAL COMMUNITIES

What do site layouts tell us about ancient communities? Can we infer social organization from spatial evidence? How does the physical arrangement of domestic and non-domestic spaces reflect social groupings, hierarchies, political organization?

In anthropology, social organization refers to social units and relationships between them. Such units include kinship groups (eg, nuclear families, lineages); residential groups (eg, households, neighbourhoods); community institutions (eg, assemblies, village halls); and central institutions (eg, temples, palaces) with ideological or coercive power over bounded territories (states). Archaeologists use these concepts freely, in trying to interpret spatial layouts of particular sites (or rather, specific occupation phases of sites). Here we focus on archaeological evidence for households and neighbourhoods in rural settings.

Archaeologists excavate domestic buildings (“houses”). The term “household” is widely used in interpreting domestic buildings; the term emphasizes the fact that we often do not know how such buildings were used, socially, in the systemic context. Neighbourhoods consist of spatially-linked groups of buildings - private or public.

In archaeological approaches a first step is the identification of variations between buildings -- in building forms and layouts (groundplans) and in distributions of features and artefacts. Which buildings stand out as unusual? (Note Flannery and Winter on household activities – universal activities vs. possible household specialization). Some buildings may be obviously large and special; apart from size, what else distinguishes them? Beyond buildings, what are the relationships between indoor and outdoor spaces? How were they used? Where did people interact? Much depends on how wide an area was excavated; what percentage of a site was excavated; how many buildings we know about (sample size); how closely dated the community layout is; and how site formation influences the evidence. Concepts: households, residential groups, domestic cycle, domestic vs. non-domestic space, access analysis, building life cycles, variability, public buildings.

Definitions of anthropological terms *Look up: household, village, chiefdom*

IESBS 2015. *International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioural Sciences*. New York: Elsevier.

Edited by James B. Wright. <[www](#)>

Further reading

Goody, J. 1971. *The Developmental Cycle in Domestic Groups*. London: CUP.

Netting, R. et al. 1984. *Households*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Hansen, M. 2000. *A Comparative Study of Thirty City-State Cultures*. Copenhagen.

Pauketat, T. R. 2007. *Chiefdoms and Other Archaeological Delusions*. Lanham: Altamira.

Service, E. R. 1971. *Primitive Social Organization*. New York: Random House.

GENERAL

*David, N. & Kramer, C. 2001. *Ethnoarchaeology in Action*. Cambridge: CUP. Chapter 9: Site Structures and Activities; Chapter 10: Architecture. ISSUE DESK DAV8; AH DAV [https://www-cambridge-org.libproxy.ucl.ac.uk/core/books/ethnoarchaeology-in-action/8CEB0F56FC4858FFEA906DB000D6BAD2#](https://www.cambridge-org.libproxy.ucl.ac.uk/core/books/ethnoarchaeology-in-action/8CEB0F56FC4858FFEA906DB000D6BAD2#)

*Flannery, K. & Sabloff, J. 2010. *The Early Mesoamerican Village*. Walnut Creek: Routledge. Read all of these selections, noting methods of analysis:

- Flannery and Winter, *Analysing Household Activities*, pp. 34-45

- Winter: *The Archaeological Household Cluster in Oaxaca*, pp. 25-31 (Case Study)

- Flannery: *Analysis on the Community Level*, Introduction, 49-51

- Flannery: *Two Possible Village Subdivisions*, 72-75 (Case Study)

- Whalen: *Zoning within an Early Formative Community*, 75-79 (Case Study)

https://ucl-new-primo.hosted.exlibrisgroup.com/primo-explore/fulldisplay?docid=TN_pg_ebook_centralEBC677806&context=PC&vid=UCL_VU2&lang=en_US&search_scope=CSCOP_UCL&adaptor=primo_central_multiple_fe&tab=local&query=any,contains,flannery%20early%20mesoamerican%20village&offset=0

*Parker Pearson, M. & Richards, C. 1994. Ordering the world. In: Parker Pearson, M. & Richards, C. (eds), *Architecture and Order*. London: Routledge, 1-36. AH PAR

CASE STUDIES 7.1: HOUSEHOLDS IN MINOAN SITES

*Whitelaw, T. 2007. House, households & community at Early Minoan Fournou Korifi: methods & models for interpretation. In: Westgate, R., Fisher, N., & Whitley, J. (eds), *Building Communities: House, Settlement & Society in the Aegean & Beyond*. British School at Athens Studies 15, pp. 65-76. London: BSA. DAG 100 Qto WES <https://www-jstor-org.libproxy.ucl.ac.uk/stable/i40043017>. Note sample sizes, range of formal variation, discussions of domestic cycle & inequality

See also:

Warren, P. 1972. *Myrtos: An Early Bronze Age Site in Crete*. London: Thames and Hudson. DAG 14 WAR

Whitelaw, T. 1983. The settlement at Fournou Korifi, Myrtos and aspects of Early Minoan social organization. In: Krzyszkowska, O. and Nixon, L. (eds), *Minoan Society*. Bristol: Bristol Classical Press, 323-45. DAG 14 MIN

Whitelaw, T. 2014. Feasts of clay? Ceramics & feasting at Early Minoan Myrtos: Fournou Korifi. In Galanakis, Y. et al. (eds), *AΘYPMATA*. Critical Essays on the Archaeology of the Eastern Mediterranean. Oxford: Archaeopress, 247-59.

Further Reading - Households

Allison, P. M. 1999. *The Archaeology of Household Activities*. London: Routledge.

Parker, B. & Foster, C. (eds) 2012. *New Perspectives on Household Archaeology*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

CASE STUDIES 7.2: THE MEDIEVAL ENGLISH VILLAGE

Wharram Percy is a deserted medieval village (DMV) in North Yorkshire, England. It is one of the most intensively studied villages in British archaeology. The site has been subject to archaeological investigations since the 1950s, including earthwork surveys, geophysics, excavation, and standing building recording. The literature is enormous, and includes a series of 13 major reports published between 1979 and 2012, under the overall title *Wharram: A Study of Settlement on the Yorkshire Wolds* (general editor: Stuart Wrathmell) (**located at DAA 410 Y.6 Series WHA 1**). Synthesis of the results—as known at the time—were published in 1984 and 1990:

Beresford, M.W. and Hurst, J.G. 1990 *Wharram Percy: Deserted Medieval Village*, London: Batsford.
Hurst, J, 'The Wharram Research Project: results to 1983', *Medieval Archaeology*, 28 (1984), 77–111
https://archaeologydataservice.ac.uk/archiveDS/archiveDownload?t=arch-769-1/dissemination/pdf/vol28/28_077_111.pdf

Skim across some of the literature to consider how knowledge of landscape theory, agricultural taskscapes, settlement patterns and village life can be woven together to write inhabited landscape archaeologies for medieval rural Britain? What relationships can be reconstructed between buildings, landscape, and material culture?

Further reading – medieval villages

* Historic England 2018 *Medieval Settlements: Introductions to Heritage Assets*. Swindon. Historic England. <https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/iha-medieval-settlements/heag210-medieval-settlements/>

Beresford, M. 1998, *The Lost Villages of Medieval England*, Stroud: Sutton [now outdated in some respects, but a good introduction to the subject, which owes much to early work at Wharram Percy] DAA 190 BER

Dyer, C., Lewis, C. and Mitchell-Fox, P. 2001 *Village Hamlet and Field*, Macclesfield: Windgather Press. DAA 190 LEW

- Milesion, S. 2017. Openness and Closure in the Later Medieval Village. *Past & Present* 234 (1), 3–37. <https://academic.oup.com/past/article/234/1/3/2884444>
- Roberts, B. K., 1996. *Landscapes of Settlement: Prehistory to the Present*. London: Routledge. Chapters 2, 5 and 6. [INST ARCH AH ROB]
- Smith, S, 2009. Towards a social archaeology of the late medieval English peasantry: power and resistance at Wharram Percy, *Journal of Social Archaeology*, 9, 391–416 <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/1469605309338425>
- Taylor, C. 1983 *Village and Farmstead: a history of rural settlement in England*, London: George Philip. DAA 100 TAY
- Williamson, T. 2004. *Shaping Medieval Landscapes: Settlement, Society, Environment*, Macclesfield: Windgather Press. DAA 190 WIL

Week 8 THINKING ABOUT TOWNS: URBAN COMMUNITIES

Archaeologists define settlement types according to range of activities. This results in terms such as “village” or “city.” Definitions of a “village” often emphasize households and a lack of large-scale central institutions. Childe’s classic definition of “city” emphasized high populations, the presence of central institutions, full-time specialists, the presence of monumental architecture, and dependency on food surpluses produced in a surrounding countryside. However, cities also have very different forms, depending on culture.

The archaeology of urban communities can introduce other types of evidence: surviving buildings, streetplans, street- and place-names etc. How can and should these all be integrated to assess how urban communities functioned?

Different approaches to interrogating urban space

Read one. (Though it is worth looking at all three if you are interested in urban archaeology.)

- *Lilley, K. D. 2000. Mapping the medieval city: plan analysis and urban history. *Urban History* 27.1, 5–30. https://www.jstor.org/stable/44614084?seq=1#metadata_info_tab_contents *Useful brief overview of Michael Conzen’s technique of plan analysis*
- *Hillier, B. and Hansen, J. 1984. *The Social Logic of Space*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. *This is for further reading. Written by architectural studies scholars; inspired use of space syntax in archaeology.* <https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/social-logic-of-space/6B0A078C79A74F0CC615ACD8B250A985>
- *Hirth, K.G. 1998. The Distributional Approach: a new way to identify marketplace exchange in the archaeological record. *Current Anthropology* 39, 4, 451-476 https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/204759?sid=primo&seq=1#metadata_info_tab_contents

CASE STUDIES: 8.1 - URBAN HOUSEHOLDS AND NEIGHBOURHOODS AT POMPEII

- *Robinson, D. 1997. The social texture of Pompeii. In: Bon, S. and Jones, R. (eds), *Sequence and Space in Pompeii*. Oxford: Oxbow Books, 135-44. YATES E 22 POM

Note the range of formal variation in houses (size and presence/absence of atrium); note how these relate to location in the city

- *Wallace-Hadrill, A. 1995. Public honour and private shame: the urban texture of Pompeii. In: Cornell, T. and Lomas, K. (eds), *Urban Society in Roman Italy*. London: UCL Press, 39-62. *UCL Explore (locate via Cornell & Lomas)*

See also:

- Allison, P. 2004. *Pompeian Households*. Los Angeles: UCLA. YATES E 22 POM https://ucl-new-primo.hosted.exlibrisgroup.com/primo-explore/fulldisplay?docid=UCL_LMS_DS51321278030004761&context=L&vid=UCL_VU2&lang=en_US&search_sc

[ope=LSCOP_UCL_LMS_DS&adaptor=Local%20Search%20Engine&tab=local&query=any,contains,allison%20pomp
eiiian%20households](#)

Grahame, M. 1997. Public and private in the Roman house. In: Laurence, R. & Wallace-Hadrill, A. (eds), *Domestic Space in the Roman World*. Portsmouth: Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies: 137-164. YATES QTOS K73 LAU

Laurence, R. 1995 The organization of space in Pompeii. In T. Cornell & K. Lomas (eds) *Urban Society in Roman Italy*. London: UCL, 63-78. UCL Explore (locate via Cornell & Lomas)

Laurence, R. 2007. *Roman Pompeii. Space and Society*. London: Routledge. YATES E 22 POM

CASE STUDIES: 8.2 – EXCAVATING BENEATH BRITISH TOWNS

Balancing the concerns of modern property development and understanding the urban past means that archaeology in modern towns is a difficult task. And yet, over the last 50 years archaeology has revolutionised our knowledge of the early history of British towns. This case study considers some of the particular problems faced by urban archaeology. Look at one of the examples listed below and consider: What are the research aims of the project? How are these addressed through the excavation strategy? Do you get a sense of the particular demands of this excavation? What conclusions do they reach about urban settlement?

Killock, D. 2008, *An Assessment of an Archaeological Excavation at Tabard Square, 34-70 Long Lane & 31-47 Tabard Street, London SE1, London Borough of Southwark*

http://archaeologydataservice.ac.uk/catalogue/adsdata/arch-1124-1/dissemination/pdf/preconst1-52476_1.pdf

Perring, D., Roskams, S. and Allen, P. 1991. *Early Development of Roman London West of the Walbrook*, York: Council for British Archaeology CBA Research Report 70

http://archaeologydataservice.ac.uk/archives/view/cba_rr/rr70.cfm Look at one of the excavated sites

Williams, T. 1993. *Public buildings in the south-west quarter of Roman London*. York: Council for British Archaeology CBA Research Report 88

[https://archaeologydataservice.ac.uk/archiveDS/archiveDownload?t=arch-281-](https://archaeologydataservice.ac.uk/archiveDS/archiveDownload?t=arch-281-1/dissemination/pdf/cba_rr_088.pdf)

[1/dissemination/pdf/cba_rr_088.pdf](https://archaeologydataservice.ac.uk/archiveDS/archiveDownload?t=arch-281-1/dissemination/pdf/cba_rr_088.pdf) Look at one of the excavated sites in part 3

Further reading

Biddle, M., & Hudson, D. 1973. *The Future of London's Past: A Survey of the Archaeological Implications of Planning and Development in the Nation's Capital*. London: RESCUE Publication 4 INST ARCH FOLIOS 2 BID

Cessford, C. 2017. Throwing away everything but the kitchen sink? Large assemblages, depositional practice and post-medieval households in Cambridge. *Post-medieval archaeology* 51(1), 164-193. <https://www.tandfonline-com.libproxy.ucl.ac.uk/doi/full/10.1080/00794236.2017.1308155>

Ottaway, P. 1992, *Archaeology in British towns: from the Emperor Claudius to the Black*. London: Routledge. [https://www-taylorfrancis-](https://www-taylorfrancis-com.libproxy.ucl.ac.uk/books/mono/10.4324/9780203990049/archaeology-british-towns-patrick-ottaway)

[com.libproxy.ucl.ac.uk/books/mono/10.4324/9780203990049/archaeology-british-towns-patrick-ottaway](https://www-taylorfrancis-com.libproxy.ucl.ac.uk/books/mono/10.4324/9780203990049/archaeology-british-towns-patrick-ottaway)

Neal, C. 2014. The Potential of Integrated Urban Deposit Modelling as a Cultural Heritage Planning Tool. *Planning Practice and Research* 29:3, 256-267

<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/02697459.2014.929839>

Schofield, J. and Roger Leech, R. (eds) 1987. *Urban Archaeology in Britain* York: Council for British Archaeology CBA Research Report 61. Esp Carver, M.O.H. The nature of urban deposits,

https://archaeologydataservice.ac.uk/archives/view/cba_rr/rr61.cfm

Week 9 INTERPRETING THE LIVING FROM THE DEAD: BURIAL EVIDENCE

Interpretation of burials and mortuary data is a critical aspect of archaeology, and a key element for understanding past and present societies. Tombs are a composite evidence: on the one hand, skeletal remains can inform us on demography of past peoples as well as life expectancy, diseases, dietary habits and interpersonal violence among single individuals. On the other hand, tombs offer useful insights into funerary practices, i.e. cultural treatment of the dead. Disposal and the structural/constructional aspect of tombs helps archaeologists to throw light on underlying aspects of socio-economic organization, and possible cultural values attached to the deceased (such as gender and age distinctions, rank and status, kinship and ancestry). In addition, grave goods associated with human remains give us an idea of the coeval interaction that involved both the dead and its community at local, regional and global level. Tombs constitute a rich body of composite evidence, but not a straight-forward one: archaeologists have to interpret them without being misled by the effects of time and of many human and natural processes. There are a number of approaches to this subject: processual archaeologists focused on general correspondences between treatment of the dead and social organization. Post-processual archaeologists, drawing on rich ethnographic comparisons, argued that burials do not simply reflect the social order: they contribute to its construction. Key concepts: funerary practice, burial, disposal, human remains, demography, population, sex, gender, age, disease, diet, movement of peoples, movement of ideas, structure, landscape, construction, labour, resources, status, rank, kinship, reflexive action, symbols, social dimension, ideology.

GENERAL - Read 2–3

- Duday, H. 2009. *The Archaeology of the Dead: Lectures in Archaeoethnology*. Oxford: Oxbow. JF DUD <https://www-jstor-org.libproxy.ucl.ac.uk/stable/j.ctt1cd0pkv>
- *Giles, M. 2013. Preserving the body. In S. Tarlow & L. Stutz (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of the Archaeology of Death and Burial*. Oxford: Oxford University Press: 475-96. IOA Issue Desk TAR 1 <https://www-oxfordhandbooks-com.libproxy.ucl.ac.uk/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199569069.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780199569069>
- * Parker Pearson, M. 1999. *The Archaeology of Death and Burial* (especially pp. 21-44). Stroud: Sutton. Issue Desk PEA 8
- Scarre, C. 1994. The meaning of death: funerary beliefs and the prehistorian. In A. C. Renfrew & E. Zubrow (eds), *The Ancient Mind*. Cambridge: CUP: 75-82. AH REN <https://www-cambridge-org.libproxy.ucl.ac.uk/core/books/ancient-mind/61F3D31D30ABA1232A1437D95599BD1E>
- Ucko, P. 1969. Ethnography and the archaeological interpretation of funerary remains. *World Archaeology* 1: 262-90. https://www-jstor-org.libproxy.ucl.ac.uk/stable/123966?seq=1#metadata_info_tab_contents

CASE STUDIES: Read 1 or 2 from each section.

Archaeological evidence for death and burial is a product of site formation, stratigraphy, excavation methods, sampling, sample sizes, chronology. Interpretations are affected by frames of reference of interpreters. In case studies, how do these issues play out?

CASE STUDY 9.1: MIGRATION

Charting the migration of past people has been a fundamental concern of archaeology since the cultural historical analyses of the early 20th century. New scientific techniques have given the topic a renewed currency. What are some of the implicit assumptions of these approaches and the limits of interpretation?

- Bentley, R., Wahl, J., Price, T. & Atkinson, T. C. 2008. Isotopic signatures and hereditary traits: snapshot of a Neolithic community in Germany. *Antiquity* 82: 290-304. https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.ucl.ac.uk/docview/217556872?rfr_id=info%3Axri%2Fsid%3Aprimo
- Bickle, P. & Hofmann D. 2007. Moving on: The contribution of isotopic studies to the early Neolithic of Central Europe. *Antiquity* 81: 1029-41. https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.ucl.ac.uk/docview/217570181?rfr_id=info%3Axri%2Fsid%3Aprimo
- *Hills, C., 2011, Overview: Anglo-Saxon Identity. In Hinton, D.A., Crawford, S. and Hamerow, H. (eds) *The Oxford Handbook of Anglo-Saxon Archaeology*. Oxford: OUP. DAA 180 HAM; <www>
- Kristiansen, K. et al. 2017, Re-theorising mobility and the formation of culture and language among the Corded Ware culture in Europe. *Antiquity* 91, 334–347 <www>
- *Leslie, S. et al. 2015. The fine-scale genetic structure of the British population, *Nature* 519, 309–33. <www>

CASE STUDY 9.2: BURIALS AND ELITE STATUS

Archaeologists often talk about elites, when discussing social change and political structure – for example, the emergence of states. How is elite status identified by archaeologists? In burials, it is typically inferred by looking at variables such as tomb location; tomb characteristics; tomb size; body treatment; and grave goods (quantity, diversity, types). “Eliteness” is inferred from unusually elaborate attributes of these variables – eg, special locations; built tombs; large tombs; special body treatment; numerous, elaborate, or prestigious grave goods. Sometimes elite status is obvious, as with sites where all graves were those of elites buried in a special place. At other times, it is much less obvious, and inferences are made according to the range of variation in the attributes of graves and grave goods. In that situation, archaeologists identify distributions of attributes. Some characteristics will be fairly ubiquitous, occurring among nearly all graves (eg, pit burial, plain pots). Against this background, they identify graves with characteristics that stand out (eg, elaborate tombs, exceptional items). Often, we are forced to wonder whether an “exceptional” burial is an accident of discovery – a sampling problem. How can we be sure it isn’t an accident? That is where statistics comes in. Much depends on having a large sample size. Read Orton, C. 2000. Sampling in Archaeology. Cambridge: CUP., Chapter 3: “If this is the sample, what was the population?” In the studies below, what is the sample size? How is status identified?

An archaeologist’s frame of reference affects his or her interpretations of burial evidence; but burials are often the outcome of culturally specific beliefs and ritual practices very different from our own. “Eliteness” or “non-eliteness” is not all that is at work in funerals – not by any means – and does not explain everything we see.

- Brown, J. A. 1981. ‘The search for rank in prehistoric burials’, in R. Chapman, I. Kinnes and K. Randsborg (eds), *The Archaeology of Death* (Cambridge) 25–38
- Harrington, S., Brookes, S., Semple, S., and Millard, A. 2020. Theatres of Closure: Exploring Variability in Inhumation Burial in Early Medieval Britain. *Cambridge Archaeological Journal* 30(3). 389–412. <www>
- *Moorey, P. R. S. 1978. What do we know about the people buried in the Royal Cemetery of Ur? *Expedition* 20 (1): 24-40. <www> An excellent analysis of an old dataset.
- Saxe, A.A. 1971. Social Dimensions of Mortuary Practices in a Mesolithic Population from Wadi Halfa, Sudan. In Brown, J.A. (ed.) *Approaches to the Social Dimensions of Mortuary Practices*. *Memoirs of the Society for American Archaeology* 25, 39–57
- Stevenson, A. 2009. Social relationships in predynastic burials. *The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 95, 175–92. https://www.jstor.org/stable/40645752?seq=1#metadata_info_tab_contents
- *Tainter, J. A., 1978. Mortuary practices and the study of prehistoric social systems, in M. B. Schiffer, (ed.), *Advances in Archaeological Method and Theory* 1 (New York, 1978), 105–41

Week 10 REGIONS

Here we look at regions: surveys, settlement patterns, site resource distributions and how these are used to investigate social or political relationships. We begin by looking at methods of exploring regions – sampling in surveys; dating and estimating site sizes from surface collections; and problems in interpreting site distribution maps. We then look at surveys relating to complexity, cities, states, empires. When we compare settlement patterns and social complexity in different regions – are there common patterns, or not?

SURVEYS: SETTLEMENT PATTERNS, SETTLEMENT SYSTEMS, SITE SIZE, SITE TYPE

- *David, N. & Kramer, C. 2001. *Ethnoarchaeology in Action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Chapter 8: “Settlement: Systems and Patterns” ISSUE DESK DAV8; AH DAV <https://www-cambridge-org.libproxy.ucl.ac.uk/core/books/ethnoarchaeology-in-action/8CEB0F56FC4858FFEA906DB000D6BAD2#>
- *Flannery, K. and Sabloff, J. (eds) 2010. *The Early Mesoamerican Village*. Walnut Creek, CA. Chapter 5: “Sampling on the Regional Level;” introduction to Chapter 5, 131-136. Chapter 3: “Sampling by Intensive Surface Collection” Chapter 6: “Analysis on the regional level”: Flannery, introduction, 161-162; Flannery, “Evolution of Complex Settlement Systems,” 162-173; Chapter 10: “Inter-regional exchange networks”: introduction, 283-286 “Ethnographic Models”, 286-292. ISSUE DESK FLA 3; DF100 FLA https://ucl-new-primo.hosted.exlibrisgroup.com/primo-explore/fulldisplay?docid=TN_pg_ebook_centralEBC677806&context=PC&vid=UCL_VU2&lang=en_US&search_scope=CSCOP_UCL&adaptor=primo_central_multiple_fe&tab=local&query=any,contains,flannery%20early%20mesoamerican%20village&offset=0

CASE STUDIES 10.1: SURVEY METHODS AND DEFINING SITES

Compare survey methods.

- Adams, R. 1981. *Heartland of Cities*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press. Chapter 2: Section on “Major limitations of this study” and other sections (note maps for early periods. DBB 100 ADA *The first known cities in the archaeological record*
- Baird, D. 1996. The Konya Plain survey: aims and methods. In Hodder, I. (ed.), *On the Surface*. Cambridge: McDonald Institute, 41-46. https://www-jstor-org.libproxy.ucl.ac.uk/stable/10.18866/j.ctt1pc5hd3.10?refreqid=excelsior%3A9bcc41eb3a68c94a5bab0c18e82646cd&seq=1#metadata_info_tab_contents
- Balkansky, A.K. 2006. Surveys and Mesoamerican archaeology: the emerging macro-regional paradigm. *Journal of Archaeological Research* 14 (1): 53-95. https://www-jstor-org.libproxy.ucl.ac.uk/stable/41053225?seq=1#metadata_info_tab_contents
- *Flannery (see above) – *Oaxaca*

CASE STUDIES 10.2: MODELLING COMPLEX SOCIETIES

The New Archaeology of the 1960s onwards took great interest in systems and the organisation of complex societies, developing many of the quantitative methods and theories. Recent decades have witnessed a renewed interest, in part because of increasing computing capacity and the influence of Geographical Information Science. By focussing on the role of interactions between people and places, these researches have reconsidered some of the perennial questions about the past, for example: how urban centres arose from scattered settlements? How chiefdoms developed from previously egalitarian social organisation? The influence of climate on the rise and fall of past societies? Scan 1–2 examples from the following to get a sense of the debates, approaches, and models. How do these studies use archaeological data?

- Campagno, M. 2019. Initial urbanization and the emergence of the state in Hierakonpolis (Nile Valley) and Monte Albán (Oaxaca Valley). *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory* 26: 217-246. <https://link-springer-com.libproxy.ucl.ac.uk/article/10.1007/s10816-018-9371-5>
- Covey, R. 2015. Kinship and the Inca imperial core: multiscale archaeological patterns in the Sacred Valley (Cuzco, Peru). *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* 40: 183-195. <https://www-sciencedirect-com.libproxy.ucl.ac.uk/science/article/pii/S0278416515000823>
- Knappet, C., Evans, T. & Rivers R. 2008. Modelling maritime interaction in the Aegean Bronze Age. *Antiquity* 82: 1009-1024. https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.ucl.ac.uk/docview/217577894?rfr_id=info%3Axri%2Fsid%3Aprimo
- Lawrence, D., Palmisano, A., de Gruchy, M.W. and Biehl, P.F. 2021. Collapse and continuity: A multi-proxy reconstruction of settlement organization and population trajectories in the Northern Fertile Crescent during the 4.2kya Rapid Climate Change event. *PLoS ONE* 16.1 https://go-gale-com.libproxy.ucl.ac.uk/ps/i.do?p=AONE&u=ucl_ttda&id=GALE|A648073902&v=2.1&it=r
- Sindbæk, S.M. 2007. Networks and Nodal Points: The Emergence of Towns in Early Viking Age Scandinavia', *Antiquity* 81, 119–32. <www>
- Smith, M. and Montiel, L. 2001. The archaeological study of empires and imperialism in Pre-Hispanic Central Mexico. *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* 20: 245–284. <https://www-sciencedirect-com.libproxy.ucl.ac.uk/science/article/pii/S0278416500903726>

Week 11 ARTEFACT ASSEMBLAGES

Artefact assemblages “travel” from sources to production, use, discard and eventually to archaeological contexts. Assemblages evolve during site formation and taphonomy. The assemblages we find are affected by the ways in which archaeologists sample sites in excavation. An analyst on an excavation is confronted with many bags of finds (eg stone flakes, sherds) and, with luck, whole objects as well. How does one go about analysis? We look at basic procedures: sampling, classification, variables, attributes, and the meanings of typologies. In context analysis, we consider different kinds of contexts from which assemblages derive – and what this might tell us. Assemblage formation is affected by discard practices, refuse disposal and taphonomy. We look at sourcing, technology, function, style and interpretations.

METHODS OF ANALYSIS: BASICS

- *Banning, E. B. 2020. *The Archaeologist's Laboratory: The Analysis of Archaeological Evidence*. London: Kluwer. 2nd ed.
 *Chapter 11: Stone Artefacts, pp. 159-184.
 *Chapter 12: Ceramic Artefacts, pp. 185-210.
 (optional: Chapter 13, Metal Artefacts)
 *Chapter 3: Systematics: Classification and Grouping, pp. 23-42. Note especially: Section 3.6, Practical Considerations (pp. 38-39); Section 3.7, Quality in Typologies (p. 39); Section 3.8, Do typologies have real meaning? (pp. 39-40)
- *David, N. & Kramer, C. 2001. *Ethnoarchaeology in Action*. Cambridge. <https://www-cambridge-org.libproxy.ucl.ac.uk/core/books/ethnoarchaeology-in-action/8CEB0F56FC4858FFEA906DB000D6BAD2#>
 Chapter 6, Studying Artefacts; Chapter 7, Style; Ch. 11, Specialist Craft Production
- Andrefsky, W. 2005 [1998]. *Lithics: Macroscopic Approaches to Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Chapters 2, 3, 4. <https://www-cambridge-org.libproxy.ucl.ac.uk/core/books/lithics/1229976A39784B02F6427836936D3944>
- Rice, P. 1996. Recent ceramic analysis: 1. function, style, origins. *Journal of Archaeological Research* 4 (2): 133-163. <https://link-springer-com.libproxy.ucl.ac.uk/article/10.1007/BF02229184>
- Rice, P. 1996. Recent ceramic analysis: 2. Composition, production, theory. *Journal of Archaeological Research* 4 (3): 165-202. <https://link-springer-com.libproxy.ucl.ac.uk/article/10.1007/BF02228880>

CASE STUDY 11.1: SOURCING

Identifying sources for stone and clay requires specialist geological help and geological maps. In sourcing studies, comparisons are made between samples from geological sources and samples from archaeological sites. Techniques vary, but petrography and chemical composition studies are common. In sourcing studies, much depends on sample sizes. It's especially important to obtain enough samples from a geological source to be sure (if we can) that the geological reference samples represent the full range of possibilities that were available at the source. Generalist archaeologists need to understand the techniques used in sourcing studies. It's helpful to consult a reference work to find out what lies behind a technique.

- *Flannery, K. and Sabloff, J. (eds) 2010. *The Early Mesoamerican Village*. Chapter 10: Exchange Networks - *read the entire chapter, all sections*
- *Pollard, M., Batt, C. Stern, B. Young, S. 2007. *Analytical Chemistry in Archaeology*. Cambridge: CUP. https://ucl-new-primo.hosted.exlibrisgroup.com/primo-explore/fulldisplay?docid=UCL_LMS_DS51220417350004761&context=L&vid=UCL_VU2&lang=en_US&search_scope=CSCOP_UCL&adaptor=Local%20Search%20Engine&tab=local&query=any,contains,Pollard%20Chemistry%20Archaeology&offset=0
- *Chapter 1, "Archaeology and Analytical Chemistry," pp. 3-30.
- *Chapter 2, "An Introduction to Analytical Chemistry," pp. 30-43.
- Chapter 6, Neutron Activation Analysis, pp. 123-136 (*scan, to get a feel for NAA*)
- Goren, Y., et al. 2003. The location of Alashiya: new evidence from petrographic investigation of Alashiyan tablets from el-Amarna and Ugarit. *American Journal of Archaeology* 107 (2): 233-255. https://www-jstor-org.libproxy.ucl.ac.uk/stable/40026076?seq=1#metadata_info_tab_contents
- Parker Pearson, M., et al. 2015 Craig Rhos-y-felin: a Welsh bluestone megalith quarry for Stonehenge. *Antiquity*, 89: 1331–52. <https://doi.org/10.15184/aqy.2015.177>
- Parry, G. 2020. Ceramic hinterlands: establishing the catchment areas of early Anglo-Saxon cremation cemeteries. *World Archaeology* 52.1, 163–82. <https://www-tandfonline-com.libproxy.ucl.ac.uk/doi/full/10.1080/00438243.2019.1741438>

CASE STUDY 11.2: OBJECT BIOGRAPHY

The concept of object biography goes beyond simply provenancing objects. It argues that as people and objects gather time, movement and change, they are constantly transformed. Can archaeologists explore some of the social interactions that people had with objects? How can we identify specialization, or tell the difference between production for use vs. production for exchange? Can an appreciation of context help us to understand the practical vs. social uses that objects played?

- Andrefsky, W. 2009. The analysis of stone tool procurement, production and maintenance. *Journal of Archaeological Research* 17 (1): 65-103. https://www-jstor-org.libproxy.ucl.ac.uk/stable/41053258?seq=1#metadata_info_tab_contents
- *Costin, C. 1991. Craft specialization: issues in defining, documenting, & explaining the organization of production. Schiffer (ed), *Archaeological Method & Theory* 3: 1-56. https://www-jstor-org.libproxy.ucl.ac.uk/stable/20170212?seq=1#metadata_info_tab_contents
- Crown, P. 2018. Drinking performance and politics in Pueblo Bonito, Chaco Canyon. *American Antiquity* 83 (3): 387-406. https://www-cambridge-org.libproxy.ucl.ac.uk/core/services/aop-cambridge-core/content/view/93DD2435534981109BA080C393D452EF/S0002731618000124a.pdf/drinking_performance_and_politics_in_pueblo_bonito_chaco_canyon.pdf
- *David, N. & Kramer, C. 2001. *Ethnoarchaeology in Action*. Cambridge: CUP. Chapter 11, "Specialist Craft Production." ISSUE DESK DAV8 <https://www-cambridge-org.libproxy.ucl.ac.uk/core/books/ethnoarchaeology-in-action/8CEB0F56FC4858FFEA906DB000D6BAD2#>

- Hamilton, S. 2002. Between ritual & routine: interpreting prehistoric British pottery production & distribution. In A. Woodward & J. Hill (eds), *Prehistoric Britain: the Ceramic Basis* 38-53. Oxford. DAA100 Qto WOO
- Rice, P. 1983. Pottery Analysis. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press. ISSUE DESK RIC2; KD 3 RIC. Chapter 7: Vessel function: form, technology & use, 207-243.
- Wright, K., & Garrard, A. 2003. Social identities and the expansion of stone bead-making in Neolithic Western Asia. *Antiquity* 77 (296): 267-284. <https://www-cambridge-org.libproxy.ucl.ac.uk/core/journals/antiquity/article/social-identities-and-the-expansion-of-stone-beadmaking-in-neolithic-western-asia-new-evidence-from-jordan/46A654140104E0798D5BB3E2E2ABC2F8>

END OF COURSE: SUMMARY

Flannery, K. 1976. The Early Mesoamerican Village. New York: Academic. "A prayer for an endangered species," 369-373. ISSUE DESK FLA3; DF100 FLA; ANTHRO TK95 FLA; GEOG WN63 FLA

Part 3 ESSAYS

Each assignment and possible approaches to it will be discussed in class, in advance of the submission deadline. If students are unclear about the nature of an assignment, they should discuss this with the module co-ordinator in advance (via office hours or class Moodle forum). You will receive feedback on your written coursework via Moodle, and have the opportunity to discuss your marks and feedback with the co-ordinator in their office hours.

For more details see the 'Assessment' section on Moodle. The coursework coversheet is available on the course Moodle pages and here: <https://www.ucl.ac.uk/archaeology/current-students> under "Policies, Forms and Guidelines".

Please make sure you enter your five-digit candidate code on the coversheet and in the subject line when you upload your work in Moodle.

Please use your five-digit candidate code as the name of the file you submit.

The [IoA marking criteria](#) can be found in the IoA Student Handbook (Section 13: Information on assessment). The [IoA Study Skills Guide](#) provides useful guidance on writing different types of assignment.

Please note that **late submission, exceeding the maximum word count** and **academic misconduct (unacknowledged use of text generation software and plagiarism)** will be penalized and can significantly reduce the mark awarded for the assignment and/or overall module result. Please do consult

- <https://www.ucl.ac.uk/archaeology/current-students/ioa-student-handbook/13-information-assessment> with sections 13.7–13.8: coursework submission, 13.10: word count, 13.12–14: academic integrity
- <https://www.ucl.ac.uk/students/exams-and-assessments/academic-integrity> for UCL's guidance on academic integrity
- <https://library-guides.ucl.ac.uk/referencing-plagiarism/acknowledging-AI> for UCL's guidance on how to acknowledge the use of text generation software.

General Instructions:

- (1) Emphasis is on close analysis of primary evidence: original data from site reports, or primary evidence presented in articles. Include six illustrations; most should show primary evidence.

- (2) In essays, you will need to be concise. Illustrations and captions are not included in word counts. Therefore, you can use figure captions to make detailed points about primary evidence shown in the figures (a short caption and an explanatory paragraph). In the text, refer the reader to the figure. (3) How many references to cite? It depends. To answer the questions, you will certainly need to explore readings beyond the case study references themselves. In part, the essay is evaluated on your ability to choose relevant references and use them well. Essay 1 is guided and you must choose a topic from the list below; Essay 2 can incorporate case studies of your choosing. Please consult the coordinator well before the submission date, to talk through your approach and to receive specific guidance.
- (3) Provided these are declared on the coversheet, you are allowed to use software for language and writing review (typically Grammarly). You should not use software to generate substantive content (e.g. generative AI such as ChatGPT).

ESSAY 1: 1200 words, 6 illustrations (40%) Readings: choose from Sessions 1-5

Imagine you are writing an article for an issue of a new archaeology journal run by students. The issue title is “Primary Evidence: New Critical Perspectives by Current Students.” Include a brief introduction; a brief conclusion; six figures each with a caption and a paragraph making specific points; and a bibliography.

1.1 Olduvai Gorge: Today’s Perspectives, 60 Years After Discovery

- (i) Purpose, methods, sampling. How was the primary evidence of *Homo habilis* at Olduvai first reported in 1960-1964? What details were included? What were left out?
- (ii) Stratigraphy. In the 1960s, what did Clark and Leakey tell us about the stratigraphy and chronology of Bed I and the different sites in it? What details did they give?
- (iii) Chronology. What is the time span represented by Bed I, and how do we know? What about individual sites within Bed I (find the date range for 1 or 2 of them). Does the time span affect the analysis and interpretations? How does the dating evidence in this site illustrate some of the issues discussed by Banning, concerning chronometric dating (2020, Chapter 20)?
- (iv) Site formation. What was Louis Leakey’s interpretation of these finds in 1964? Was it an example of “the Pompeii premise”? Explain. What general site formation problems arise in evaluating whether Palaeolithic stratigraphic associations represent a living floor? (Malinsky-Buller et al. 2011). What site formation issues have come up in later studies of Olduvai? Have source analyses by others backed up the Louis Leakey interpretation, or not? Discuss two examples. In these examples, what methods were used to investigate the original datasets? What did the analyses show?
- (v) In sum, how do excavation methods, sampling, stratigraphy, chronology and site formation affect results and interpretations of Olduvai?

1.2 Geoarchaeology, Fire and Site Formation: Lapa do Santo Rockshelter

- (i) Purpose, methods, sampling. What was the original purpose of the excavation? What were the excavation methods and how do they relate to the original purposes of the project and to this specialized study? Can you work out trench sizes? What percentage of the site was excavated? What is the sample size of burials?
- (ii) Stratigraphy. What does the article tell us about the overall stratigraphy of the site? Compare this excavation to comments by Banning or Harris, about excavation methods and stratigraphy.
- (iii) Chronology. What is the time span represented by this evidence and how do we know? Does the time span affect the analysis and interpretations? How does the dating evidence in this site illustrate some of the issues discussed by Banning, concerning chronometric dating (2020, Chapter 20)?
- (iv) Site formation. How does the analysis reveal natural vs. human origins of evidence for burning – in the systemic, abandonment and post-depositional contexts? What sampling strategies were used

for the samples for the specialized studies? Can you relate the location from which the samples came, to the overall site stratigraphy? How many samples were taken and analysed? What specific techniques were used for the analysis (explain them clearly and define any technical terms). Compare this study to comments on fire in Karkanas and Goldberg (2019) and Mallol et al. (2007). (v) In sum, how do excavation methods, sampling, stratigraphy and site formation affect the results and the interpretations of this site?

1.3 Developing types sites

How has our understanding of early medieval buildings developed? Concentrate on either post-hole buildings or *Grubenhäuser*. Consider:

(i) What kinds of advances in excavation have occurred in the last 100 years (E T Leeds' excavations at Sutton Courtenay in 1921-22 were amongst the first to identify buildings)? Think about the types of trenches and sampling strategies adopted and the way in which we dig sites.

(ii) Stratigraphy and Relative Chronology. What general site formation problems arise when evaluating whether *Grubenhäuser* had raised or sunken floors? How can we untangle deposits created when the building was occupied from those after the building was abandoned?

(iii) How convincingly can the superstructure be reconstructed?

(iv) In sum, how do excavation methods, sampling, stratigraphy, chronology and site formation affect the results and the interpretations of this site?

1.4 Early Mesoamerican Villages: Social Archaeology in Excavations from the 1970s

Focus on Tierras Largas and Barrio del Rosario, in the Flannery book.

(i) Purpose, methods, sampling. At Barrio del Rosario, what was the purpose of the excavation? What kind of trench was used and why? What percentage of the site was excavated? At Tierras Largas, what was the purpose of the excavation? What kind of trenches were used and why? What were the trench sizes? What percentage of the site was excavated? How were decisions made about where to place trenches? Of the three kinds of sampling strategies, which two are represented here? Compare the strategy to comments by Orton (2000, Chapter 5). Do trench sizes present problems for interpretation? Discuss. (ii) Stratigraphy. In the Flannery book, there are 3 illustrations showing stratigraphic sections. Compare them to comments by Banning or Wheeler or Harris, about recording of stratigraphy, and to sections from Ali Kosh or Jericho. What is your opinion of the presentation of stratigraphy? Does this affect interpretations? (iii) Chronology. How closely dated is Tierras Largas House 1? Can you work this out? How does the dating evidence in this site illustrate issues discussed by Banning, concerning dating (2020, Chapter 20)? (iv) Site formation. Study the floor plan from Tierras Largas House 1; note artifact distributions. Which parts of the floor represent primary refuse? Which do not? Can we tell? How might Hayden and Cannon's ethnoarchaeology study shed light on these distributions? How would abandonment or burning affect what ended up on the floor? In your view, are interpretations of the house floor convincing? Why or why not? (v) In sum, how do excavation methods, sampling, stratigraphy, chronology and site formation affect the results and the interpretations of these sites?

1.5 Çatalhöyük East: Post-Processualism, Site Formation and Excavation, 1995-2018

(i) Purpose, methods, sampling. What was the purpose of this excavation? How did surface collection establish the size of the site in the Neolithic? What guided the decisions to excavate in the South Area and to open up the North Area (=4040)? Why was the excavation of the North/4040 area located where it was? Of the three main kinds of sampling strategies, which one is this? What kinds of trenches were used for excavation?

How large are they? Can we generalize from these trenches to the whole site? Compare these trenches (on the site plan) to the trenches excavated at Ali Kosh (Ali Kosh site plan). Both sites are Neolithic villages. Would it be problematic to compare the results from the two sites?

- (ii) Stratigraphy. Locate and study one section (or any other illustration of specific stratigraphy). Compare this excavation to comments by Banning or Wheeler or Harris, about recording of stratigraphy. Is the stratigraphy presented clearly?
- (iii) Chronology. What is the overall date range at this site, from base to surface? Locate a chart showing that. How closely dated do you think an individual floor is? Do we know precise date ranges for individual houses? How does this case illustrate issues about dating, as discussed in Banning (2020)? (Chapter 20).
- (iv) Site formation. Choose one house and note artifact distributions on a floor plan from it (eg, Building 1). Which parts of the floor definitely represent primary refuse from activities? Which do not? How can we tell? How would the mode of abandonment affect what ended up on a floor? How does burning, or not, affect what is on a floor? Find an interpretation of the house floor you are interested in. Are interpretations of the house floor convincing? Where did rubbish (middens) occur at this site? Can you relate secondary refuse deposition to Hayden and Cannon's ethnoarchaeology study?
- (v) In sum, how do excavation methods, sampling, stratigraphy, chronology and site formation affect results and interpretations from this site? Based on what you have read, do you think that post-processual excavation methods, as illustrated in this project, are different from those of Lapa do Santo Rockshelter or the Duckfoot site (choose one), in terms of basic procedures, or quality and detail in the results?

ESSAY 2: 1800 words, 6 illustrations (60%) Readings: see Sessions 6–10

General instructions:

Discuss your essay with the Coordinator, in advance.

(i) This essay asks for close analysis of two specific case studies relevant to the topic. Choose Case Studies from Sessions 6-10*. In choosing Case Studies, it is recommended that you select two specific works that are substantial, but not too lengthy – for example, a journal article and/or a book chapter. In choosing, there are multiple possibilities; but choose studies that contain specific evidence relevant to the issue. You will need to investigate other works beyond your two core readings; but you are not expected to track down everything ever written about a particular site. Feel free to refer briefly to other case studies and, of course, to general readings.

*Notes on Case Study choices: (a) to prevent overlap of essays and self-plagiarism, choose different sites from the one you studied in Essay 1. (b) If you wish to use a case study not on the list, consult with the coordinator well in advance of the due date. Choices must be in English and from a peer reviewed publication.

(ii) Emphasize primary data (e.g. tables, figures, sample sizes, etc.). Be specific.

(iii) Add six figures to explain points. 'Figure' means a drawing, a photo, a graph, or a table. A figure can come from an article or can be one that you create. Give them Figure Numbers & refer to them in the text. Write captions for each Figure, explaining how the figure illustrates a point made in your essay. Be sure to put in the caption the exact source of the Figure (example: Flannery 1976: 14).

(iv) Original thinking and critical discussion of evidence & interpretation are important.

(v) Make sure you understand proper procedures for in-text references; wherever possible, use page numbers (for example, Banning 2020:6). Use consistent formats for the bibliography. List references alphabetically by author and date.

ESSAY 2: TOPICS

Imagine that you are a friend of the authors of two case studies. They have asked you to read their work and suggest improvements. Compare and contrast two case studies, to show how archaeologists use evidence to address research questions. Discuss how the evidence, analysis and interpretations of the authors are affected by: excavation methods, sampling, stratigraphy,

chronology and site formation. Are the authors clear about these issues, in making their points? Would you suggest changes? What would they be?

2.1. Households

How have archaeologists inferred social variations in households (such as wealth, status, social composition or size of residential groups) from variations in domestic buildings (“houses”) found in archaeological sites? Illustrate with two case studies. In each, what is the evidence and what methods were used to analyse it? How were methods and evidence affected by: excavation strategies, sampling, stratigraphy, chronology and site formation? Are there ambiguities in the evidence? Are interpretations persuasive? What changes would you suggest, to improve the studies?

2.2 Neighbourhoods

How have archaeologists inferred social interactions in neighbourhoods from archaeological evidence? Illustrate with two case studies. In each, what is the evidence and what methods were used to analyse it? How were methods and evidence affected by: excavation or survey strategies, sampling, stratigraphy, chronology and site formation? Are there ambiguities in the evidence? Are interpretations persuasive? Explain. What changes would you suggest, to improve the studies?

2.3 Villages

How have archaeologists inferred village social organization, from excavated evidence? Illustrate with two case studies. In each, what is the evidence and what methods were used to analyse it? How were methods and evidence affected by: excavation or survey strategies, sampling, stratigraphy, chronology and site formation? Are there ambiguities in the evidence? Are interpretations persuasive? Explain. What changes would you suggest, to improve the studies?

2.4 Social Structure of Cities

How have archaeologists inferred social-political organization of cities from archaeological evidence? Illustrate with two case studies. In each, what is the evidence and what methods were used to analyse it? How were methods and evidence affected by: excavation or survey strategies, sampling, stratigraphy, chronology and site formation? Are there ambiguities in the evidence? Are interpretations persuasive? Explain. What changes would you suggest, to improve the studies?

2.5 Elite Status

How have archaeologists inferred “elite status” from archaeological evidence? Illustrate with two case studies. In each, what is the evidence and what methods were used to analyse it? How were methods and evidence affected by: excavation or survey strategies, sampling, stratigraphy, chronology and site formation? Are there ambiguities in the evidence? Are interpretations persuasive? Explain. What changes would you suggest, to improve the studies?

2.6. Urbanization or State Formation

How have archaeologists inferred the emergence of complex societies (cities, or states) from archaeological evidence? Illustrate with two case studies. In each, what is the evidence and what methods were used to analyse it? How were methods and evidence affected by: excavation or survey strategies, sampling, stratigraphy, chronology and site formation? Are there ambiguities in the evidence? Are interpretations persuasive? Explain. What changes would you suggest, to improve the studies?

2.7. Empires

How have archaeologists inferred how empires were formed or run, from archaeological evidence? Illustrate with two case studies. In each, what is the evidence and what methods were used to

analyse it? How were methods and evidence affected by: excavation or survey strategies, sampling, stratigraphy, chronology and site formation? Are there ambiguities in the evidence? Are interpretations persuasive? Explain. What changes would you suggest, to improve the studies?

2.8. Craft specialization

How have archaeologists inferred different forms of craft specialization, from archaeological evidence? Illustrate with two case studies. In each, what is the evidence and what methods were used to analyse it? How were methods and evidence affected by: excavation or survey strategies, sampling, stratigraphy, chronology and site formation? Are there ambiguities in the evidence? Are interpretations persuasive? Explain. What changes would you suggest, to improve the studies?

2.9. Social Contexts of Food Consumption or Feasting

How have archaeologists inferred social practices of dining or feasting, from ceramics and other evidence? Illustrate with two case studies. In each, what is the evidence and what methods were used to analyse it? How were methods and evidence affected by: excavation or survey strategies, sampling, stratigraphy, chronology and site formation? Are there ambiguities in the evidence? Are interpretations persuasive? Explain. What changes would you suggest, to improve the studies?

2.10. Sourcing, Trade, or Transport of Artefacts

How have archaeologists inferred trade or transport of items across long distances, from artifact sourcing evidence? Illustrate with two case studies. In each, what is the evidence and what methods were used to analyse it? How were methods and evidence affected by: excavation or survey strategies, sampling, stratigraphy, chronology and site formation? Are there ambiguities in the evidence? Are interpretations persuasive? Explain. What changes would you suggest, to improve the studies?