

UCL-INSTITUTE OF ARCHAEOLOGY

ARCL0134: THEMES, THOUGHT AND THEORY IN WORLD ARCHAEOLOGY: CURRENT TOPICS

2023-24 Term 2

MA Archaeology Core Module

15 credits

Classes: Tuesdays 11-1 or 2-4

Venue: 11-1: IoA 410

2-4: B13

Co-ordinator: Prof Stephen Shennan

s.shennan@ucl.ac.uk

Office: Room 407, IoA. Tel. 0207 679 4739 (Internal: 24739)

Office hours (in person and online): Wednesdays 11.0-13.0 At other times via the ARCL0134 Moodle Forum (essay/ class-related queries) or email

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 the IoA Student Handbook and IoA Study Skills Guide:

<https://www.ucl.ac.uk/archaeology/current-students/ioa-student-handbook>

<https://www.ucl.ac.uk/archaeology/current-students/ioa-study-skills-guide>

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.

MODULE OVERVIEW

Module description

This module is a continuation of 'Themes, Thought and Theory in World Archaeology: Foundations' providing an intensive graduate-level induction to archaeological theory, research issues and reasoning. Through weekly seminars we discuss the theoretical archaeological literature within some of the currently popular research domains. Our objective will be to examine the assumptions and goals that implicitly and explicitly define these research domains. We will also consider how research domains are related to overarching archaeological frameworks and to each other.

This handbook contains basic information about the content and administration of this module. Further details are provided on the module Moodle, as well as in the MA Archaeology degree handbook, the MA Archaeology Moodle and the IoA Student Handbook: <https://www.ucl.ac.uk/archaeology/current-students/ioa-student-handbook>

Module aims

The module aims to examine key general themes in current archaeology from a theoretical and comparative perspective within a seminar framework based on set readings.

Learning outcomes

On successful completion of this module a student should:

- have an understanding of theoretical issues in a range of central current research domains of archaeology;
- be aware of the reasons for debates about how to approach a particular kind of research and be able to form their own theoretical position;
- be able to use the knowledge to develop an innovative PhD proposal or carry out sound work in their particular field of archaeology.

Methods of assessment

An analysis of an archaeological argument (1000 words, 33%)

A research essay (2000 words, 67%)

Communications

- **Moodle is the main hub** for this course.

- Important information will be posted by staff in the **Announcements section of the Moodle page** and you will automatically receive an email notification for these.
- Please post any general queries relating to module content, assessments and administration in Moodle Q&A (or via email if you prefer). The forum will be checked regularly.
- For personal queries, please contact the co-ordinator by email.

Week-by-week summary

Week	Date	Topic	Lecturers
1	9 Jan	Artefacts: material culture, technology, art	Stephen Shennan
2	16 Jan	A New Materialism in archaeological theory and practice	SS
3	23 Jan	Archaeological reasoning	SS
4	30 Jan	Archaeological science	SS
5	6 Feb	Complex adaptive systems	Mark Lake
6	READING WEEK		
7	20 Feb	Technology and innovation	Miljana Radivojevic
8	27 Feb	Social inequality	SS
9	5 March	Archaeology and identities	SS
10	12 March	Archaeology, politics and the public	Mike Parker Pearson
11	19 March	Art	Jeremy Tanner

Prerequisites

Students planning to take this module will normally be expected previously to have taken *ARCL0133 Themes, Thought and Theory in World Archaeology: Foundations*, which provides relevant background material that will be built upon in this module.

Weekly Module Plan

The module is taught through seminars. You will be required to undertake set readings before the seminars to be able to fully follow and actively participate in the discussion. You are invited to post questions and comments on the Moodle Discussion Board to help inform the live discussions. Seminars take place on Tuesdays 11-1 and 2-4. You must attend one or other of these sessions. Slide presentations for the following week will normally be accessible on the module Moodle by the end of the day on Tuesdays of the week before.

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 (seminars)
80 hours	Self-guided session preparation (reading, lectures and online activities) about 9 hours a week
15 hours	Reading for and writing essay 1
35 hours	Reading for and writing essay 2

ASSESSMENT

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

The **IoA marking criteria** can be found in the online IoA Student Handbook (<https://www.ucl.ac.uk/archaeology/current-students/ioa-student-handbook/13-information-assessment>) and the online IoA Study Skills Guide (<https://www.ucl.ac.uk/archaeology/current-students/ioa-study-skills-guide>) provides useful guidance on writing different types of assignment (links for both above). Specific

guidelines for writing essays for this course are on the module Moodle in the section on the first essay.

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

<https://www.ucl.ac.uk/archaeology/current-students/ioa-student-handbook/13-information-assessment> with sections 13.8: submission deadlines, 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.

IMPORTANT

The use of software to generate research and content is not allowed for marked assessments for this course and will be penalised; the use of software for language and writing review and improvement is permitted, and the software and the way it has been used must be indicated in the relevant boxes on the coursework coversheet. UCL defines language and writing review as checking "areas of academic writing such as structure, fluency, presentation, grammar, spelling, punctuation, and language translation".

The following should not be included in wordcounts for coursework and dissertations: title page, contents pages, lists of figure and tables, abstract, preface, acknowledgements, bibliography, captions and contents of tables and figures, appendices.

However, in-text citations are included

Use of Turnitin

If you are running your work through Turnitin prior to submission, it is best to do this via this link <https://moodle.ucl.ac.uk/enrol/index.php?id=34>, instead of via the relevant submission container.

Extensions to deadlines for coursework

- It is really important for you to check what grounds can be accepted for both self-certified and documented extensions. The link is given below

<https://www.ucl.ac.uk/academic-manual/chapters/chapter-2-student-support-framework/2-short-term-illness-and-other-extenuating#2.5>

- Please note that factors such as a need to spend time preparing grant applications cannot be accepted.
- It is also important to note that self-certified applications must be made in advance of the deadline and are only for one week. Further details are given here

<https://www.ucl.ac.uk/academic-manual/chapters/chapter-2-student-support-framework/2-short-term-illness-and-other-extenuating#2.7>

- Requests for extensions after the deadline should normally be made within one week and must be supported by relevant documentation e.g. a medical certificate pertaining to the period relevant to the claim. This must be uploaded within 4 weeks. In the case of Covid, a screenshot of the positive test next to your student ID card is considered evidence.
- If you are not yet registered with a doctor, please do so with Ridgmount Practice (if you live in the catchment area), as they offer same day walk-in appointments which means students needing documentation can obtain this quickly.

<https://www.ridgmountpractice.nhs.uk/make-and-cancel-an-appointment>

Very few GP practices now offer this level of service.

- Here is the link to detailed instructions for filling in the form:

<https://www.ucl.ac.uk/academic-manual/chapters/chapter-2-student-support-framework/2-short-term-illness-and-other-extenuating-1>

Assessment 1 (1,000 words; due Monday 12th February 2024)

Taking an example of your choice (**not one of those discussed in class**), analyse the process of archaeological inference used by the author(s) to make and substantiate their claims. Produce a diagram analysing their argument following the model shown in fig. 1.2 of Chapman and Wylie (2016), *Evidential Reasoning in Archaeology*, and explain how you constructed it, indicating the aim of the study and the justifications for the claims made. Is the argument convincing? If not, why not?

Assessment 2

For Essay 2 (2000 words; due Friday 26th April 2024), **either** answer one of the discussion questions that are shown for each session **or** develop a question of your own. In either case you **must** send a brief essay plan to the course coordinator for his approval. He will be willing to discuss an outline of your approach; he is not allowed to read full drafts of your essays prior to submission.

Like almost any satisfactory piece of academic writing, your essay should present an argument supported by analysis. Typically, your analysis will include a critical evaluation (not simply summary or description) of concepts relevant to some subset of the theoretical literature. You need to identify and evaluate the principal or most relevant previous ideas and arguments, and develop your own reasoned argument, supporting, critiquing, or combining elements of earlier scholarship, or developing a new perspective or synthesis.

Express your arguments in your own words; your essay is meant to demonstrate **your understanding** of an issue. Some submitted essays are essentially just a string of quotations illustrating what others have said, but this does not demonstrate a critical assessment of

those claims, or a clear understanding of the issues. Second, *do not rely on web sources*. You should be extremely cautious about relying on information from websites, and should not, normally, use them as sources for academic essays. The reliable information in them has almost invariably come from some other source, and if they are academically reputable sites, they should be properly referenced, so you can chase ideas back to their original source.

Resources and Preparation for Class

Preparation for class

You are expected to **read at least one or two of the essential readings** (usually four) **prior to the seminar** each week. There will be a weekly Discussion Board and Hot Questions facility on the module Moodle, to which you can post questions and respond to others' questions or comments. It will be reviewed by the module co-ordinator and help to inform what we address in the seminar. Completing the readings is essential for your effective participation in discussions, and will greatly enhance your understanding of the material covered. A list of further Recommended readings by session is appended to this Handbook for you to get a sense of the range of work on a given topic and for you to draw upon for your assessments.

Online reading list:

<https://rl.talis.com/3/ucl/lists/4DB9B555-40D2-E959-DE0C-825C895CBB9A.html>

Classes

Seminars will be held in the Institute of Archaeology building in room 410 on Tuesdays 11.00-1.00 and B13 Tuesdays 2.00-4.00. If, for a specific week, you cannot attend your session, please join the other one if you can.

SYLLABUS

The *Essential* readings are those necessary to keep up with the topics covered in the module sessions, and ***it is expected that students will have read at least one or two of these prior to the seminar***. Individual articles and book chapters identified as Essential readings are available from on-line journals, or held on-line and can be found by searching online or using the module online reading list via the link shown above. For recent publications among the Recommended readings, if they are not in journals or volumes available online, it is worth looking by author on the www.academia.edu and www.researchgate.net sites, where researchers increasingly make pdfs of their papers available to the public.

Week 1 Artefacts: Material Culture, Techniques, Style

Explaining variation in artefact assemblages is basic to archaeology. Concerns with relative chronology and culture areas were central to the culture-historical approaches of the 1930s-1950s. As you saw last term, with processual archaeology an emphasis on artefact functions and technology was part of a broader concern with functionalism; even styles were often viewed in quite functional terms. Dissatisfaction with these models, particularly as they applied to styles and symbolic meanings of artefacts, was basic to post-processual views. In recent years the ideas of 'materiality' and 'object agency' have become central to artefact studies, linked to frameworks such as Latour's Actor Network Theory.

Discussion questions

Why is object design important in understanding material culture?

How have archaeologists defined and interpreted style?

What do archaeologists mean by “material engagement” and “material entanglement?”

Why do some anthropologists and archaeologists say that things have ‘agency’?

To what extent have different theoretical perspectives converged in their approaches to understanding artefacts?

Essential

General

Robb, J. 2015. What do things want? Object design as a middle range theory of material culture. *Archaeological Papers of the American Anthropological Association* 26: 166–80.

Style

Hegmon, M. 1992. Archaeological research on style. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 21:517-36. TC 1357, SCIENCE: ANTHROPOLOGY Periodicals, eJournals.

Material engagement and entanglement

Hodder, I. 2011. Human-thing entanglement: towards an integrated archaeological perspective. *Journal Royal Anthropological Institute*, 17.1, 154-77. Online (See also the book ‘Entanglement’)

Week 2 A New Materialism in archaeological theory and practice

Recently, there has been an important shift in archaeological theory and humanities academic thinking in general on the part of some scholars. Whereas postcolonialism and feminism in the 1970’s and ‘80’s functioned as critiques against Eurocentric western epistemologies in academia, a more active response has emerged recently, which is often referred to as new materialism, posthumanism, or the ontological turn. These approaches not only criticise western categories but want to take seriously alternative thoughts as equally valid means of knowledge production (ranging from indigenous and non-western knowledge production to black or feminist approaches; frameworks that were formerly known as ‘marginal perspectives’ in scholarship). There are some differences in focus: the ontological turn, perspectivism and New Materialism are decolonizing theories trying to incorporate non-western worlds, whereas posthumanism emerged as a critique against anthropocentrism and humanism aiming to deconstruct hierarchical boundaries between the human and the non-human. What connects these approaches, is that they ask radically new questions about non-western understandings of the world. Although not uncontested, they have opened up new avenues for research in archaeology, museum studies, and heritage, and therefore count as an important current development in scholarship.

Buzzwords: new materialism, ontological turn, perspectivism, decolonization, posthumanism

Discussion questions:

Posthumanism and new materialism had a series of effects on academic practice; whereas in most disciplines it was adopted as a criticism against humanism (colonial Eurocentric, western, male-centred etc.), in archaeology there have been a few scholars who went into a whole other direction and argued that we should adopt ‘a flat ontology’ and ‘symmetrical archaeology’. What does this

mean, and why might this be considered problematic? And where *does* the ‘human’ go in posthumanism?

After reading Marshall, try to think about how indigenous theory informs your own field. First of all, think about this yourself, but also search online for material, how is posthumanism integrated in prehistory?

Decolonization plays a big part of our current academic practices now. The last discussion point is about how you think that archaeological theory can be decolonized, and what role can you play in this yourself?

Essential

Chapman, R. 2023. Chapter 5 (Being in a material world) of *Archaeological Theory – The Basics*. London: Routledge. <https://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/mono/10.4324/9781315657097/archaeological-theory-robert-chapman>. OR <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315657097>

Cilingiroglu, C., and M.B. Albayrak 2022. To Burn the Blanket for a Flea: A Philosophical Response to Object-Oriented Archaeologies. *Archaeologies: Journal of the World Archaeological Congress*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11759-022-09454-1>

Díaz de Liaño, G., & M. Fernández-Götz 2021. Posthumanism, New Humanism and Beyond. *Cambridge Archaeological Journal* 31:3, 543–549.

Fernández-Götz, M. et al. Posthumanism in Archaeology: An Introduction. *Cambridge Archaeological Journal* 31:3, 455–459.

Marshall, Y. 2020. Taking Indigenous theory seriously: whakapapa and chevron amulets, in T. Thomas (ed.), *Theory from the Pacific, the Pacific in Theory: Archaeological perspectives*: 299–328. London: Routledge. <https://www.taylorfrancis.com/chapters/edit/10.4324/9780203730973-14/taking-indigenous-theory-seriously-yvonne-marshall>

Sillar, B. 2009. The social agency of things? Animism and materiality in the Andes. *Cambridge Archaeological Journal*, 19(3), 367-77.

Week3 Archaeological Inference

Much of the debate around processual archaeology, middle range theory and post-processual archaeology has revolved around questions of the validity of making various kinds of inferences from the archaeological record. Last term you looked at this topic programmatically, examining the various viewpoints represented in the literature. The object of this session is to examine the reasoning behind some specific inferences and the foundations on which they are built. This will form the basis of the first assessment for the course.

Essential

Chapman, R. and A. Wylie 2016. *Evidential Reasoning in Archaeology*. Chapter 1. London: Bloomsbury. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5040/9781474219167.ch-001>

Perreault, C. 2023. Guest editorial: Archaeology after the loss of innocence. *Antiquity*, Volume 97, Issue 396, December 2023, pp. 1369 – 1380. <https://doi.org/10.15184/aqy.2023.168>

Roux, V. 2007. Ethnoarchaeology: A Non-Historical Science of Reference Necessary for Interpreting the Past. *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory*, 14, 153-178. DOI: 10.1007/s10816-007-9030-8

Stutt, A., and S. Shennan 1990. The nature of archaeological arguments. *Antiquity* 64, 766-777

Week 4 Archaeological Science

In recent years archaeological science has expanded enormously, in both the number and range of its applications. Whereas in the past it was mainly associated with dating and the analysis of inorganic materials to address such topics as early technologies or the identification of exchange, recently it is the biological sciences that have made the running, especially isotope studies and studies of ancient DNA. In addition, computerised modelling methods based on the ideas of complex adaptive systems and using agent-based modelling have been increasingly employed (see next week's session). 'Big Data' has also become important for the characterisation of large-scale patterns in the archaeological record as large datasets have become increasingly available, together with methods for processing them. One topic where many of these issues have come together is the archaeology of climate change and its human impact. This session looks at the impact of these developments on archaeological theory.

Discussion questions

Are innovations in scientific methods more important than theoretical developments in determining the direction of archaeological research?

Have biologists, especially geneticists, usurped the role of archaeologists in explaining patterns in prehistory?

Does the future of archaeological interpretation lie in the collection and analysis of 'Big Data'?

One aspect of post-processualism was the social critique of archaeological interpretations. How can/should this react to the new developments in archaeological science?

Essential

General

Kristiansen, K. 2014. Towards a new Paradigm? The Third Science Revolution and its Possible Consequences in Archaeology. *Current Swedish Archaeology* 22, 11-34. Plus the commentaries and Kristiansen's reply on the following pages. Online.

Arponen, V. et al. 2019. Between natural and human sciences: On the role and character of theory in socio-environmental archaeology. *The Holocene*. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0959683619857226>

Big data

Bevan, A. 2015. The data deluge. *Antiquity* 89, December 2015, pp 1473 – 1484. Online

<https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2019/nov/12/history-as-a-giant-data-set-how-analysingthe-past-could-help-save-the-future>

Ancient DNA

Reich, D. 2018. Who we are and how we got here: ancient DNA and the new science of the human past. Chapter 1.

Wolinski, H. 2019. Ancient DNA and contemporary politics. *EMBO Reports* (2019) 20: e49507. DOI 10.15252/embr.201949507

Blakey, M. (2020). On the biodeterministic imagination. *Archaeological Dialogues*, 27(1), 1-16. doi:10.1017/S1380203820000021

Booth, T. (2020). Imagined biodeterminism? *Archaeological Dialogues*, 27(1), 16-19. doi:10.1017/S1380203820000033

Week 5 Complexity science in archaeology

'Complexity science' developed in the late Twentieth Century as a means of studying phenomena that are difficult to describe and understand using the mathematical toolkit of conventional science. The subject matter of complexity science includes: emergent phenomena, where a population-level outcome is the result of the actions of individuals in the absence of a coordinating authority (think of a Mexican wave); 'scale-free' distributions that are not usefully described by measures of central tendency such as the mean (consider the global distribution of wealth); and small-world networks which have the special property of connecting distant entities while simultaneously preserving the existence of relatively discrete groups (human social networks are like this). The importance of complexity science is that far from being curiosities, these sorts of phenomena turn out to be commonplace, especially in the biological and human 'sciences'. Of course, that suggests that many of the things studied by archaeologists might profitably be investigated using the computational tools of complexity science. Examples include the use of agent-based computer models for understanding societies ranging from past hunter-gatherer to empires, analysis of frequency distributions to explore wealth inequalities and cultural trait frequencies, and network analysis to explore the robustness of trading networks in the face of natural disaster.

Discussion Questions

What is emergence? Is it a scientific concept, or as one philosopher of science put it, does emergence start "where scientific explanation ends"?

Does understanding long-term change in human societies require the invocation of two-way causality, that is, from individuals to social institutions *and* from institutions to individuals? Can you think of an archaeological example to support your answer?

Which of any agent-based computer models (ABM) you have read about produced archaeologically useful results?

Are models which assume 'zero-intelligence' on the part of humans useful, or do they traduce the essence of humanity?

Can you think of an archaeological distribution which you have encountered that is not usefully described by measures of central tendency (e.g. mean and standard deviation). What kind of process do you think gave rise to that distribution.

What might be some past examples of small-world networks?

Essential

Bentley R.A. & Ormerod P. (2012) Agents, Intelligence, and Social Atoms. In Collard M., Slingerland, E. eds, *Creating Consilience: Reconciling Science and the Humanities*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp 205–222. [DOI:10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199794393.003.0012] [Online via UCL Explore]

Brughmans, Tom. (2012). Thinking through Networks: A Review of Formal Network Methods in Archaeology. *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory* 20 (4): 623–662. [Online] [DOI: 10.1007/s10816-012-9133-8]

Davis, D.S. 2023. Past, Present, and Future of Complex Systems Theory in Archaeology. *Journal of Archaeological Research*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10814-023-09193-z>.

Lake, M. 2020. Spatial agent-based modelling, in M. Gillings, P. Hacıgüzeller & G. Lock (ed.) *Archaeological spatial analysis*: 247–72. Taylor & Francis. <https://doi-org.libproxy.ucl.ac.uk/10.4324/9781351243858>.

Week 6 Reading week No classes

Week 7 Technology and Innovation

What do we consider to be a technological innovation vs technological invention? What prompts inventive behaviour? How do ideas spread, and why? We consider methods to approach the studies of technological invention and innovation in archaeology with a few case studies that investigate the causes and effects of technological change (environmental, evolutionary, social, economic, ideological, etc.) and the degree to which these were directed by conscious choices in the past.

Essential

Fitzhugh, B. (2001). Risk and invention in human technological evolution. *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* 20, 125-167, doi:DOI 10.1006/jaar.2001.0380.

Hayden, B. 1998. Practical and prestige technologies: the evolution of material systems. *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory* 5/1, 1-55. Online

Henrich, J. 2001. Cultural transmission and the diffusion of innovations: adoption dynamics indicate that biased cultural transmission is the predominate force in behavioral change. *American Anthropologist*, 103, pp. 992-1013.

Martinón-Torres, M., Uribe-Villegas, M. A. 2015. Technology and culture in the invention of lost-wax casting in South America: An archaeometric and ethnoarchaeological perspective. *Cambridge Archaeological Journal* 25/1, 377-390. Online

Radivojević, M. 2015. Inventing metallurgy in western Eurasia: a look through the microscope lens. *Cambridge Archaeological Journal* 25, 321-338. Online

Week 8 Inequality and scale in human societies

Archaeology is one strand of a broad inter-disciplinary effort to understand the evolving relationship between scale and inequality in human societies, from human origins to the present day. Research into human cognition has produced a body of theory known as ‘scalar stress’ or ‘group size’ theory, which has been explored in a range of social sciences, extending from anthropology to management theory. Such theories relate to the effect of group size on human social and political organisation,

and also that of other primates. They raise fundamental questions about social evolution, which archaeologists are increasingly engaging with through their own material.

Discussion questions

What is the relationship between scale and inequality in human societies?

Have small-scale societies usually been more egalitarian than large-scale ones in human history?

Are significant levels of social equality only attainable in small groups?

Do modes of subsistence (e.g. farming), and modes of production more generally, have clear evolutionary implications for levels of social inequality?

Does living in cities necessarily require a central decision-making apparatus (e.g. an administrative hierarchy, or hierarchical forms of government)?

Essential (read at least two of the following)

Bird, D.W., R. Bliege Bird, B.F. Codding, D.W. Zeanah 2019. Variability in the organization and size of hunter-gatherer groups: Foragers do not live in small-scale societies, *Journal of Human Evolution*, 131, 96-110.

Feinman, G.M. 2010. Size, Complexity, and Organizational Variation: A Comparative Approach. *Cross Cultural Research* 45 (1), 37-58.

Manzanilla, L.R. 2014. Cooperation and tensions in multi-ethnic corporate societies using Teotihuacan, Central Mexico, as a case study. *PNAS* 112 (30), 9210–9215.

Wengrow, D. 2019. 'Rethinking cities, from the ground up.' *The British Academy* (Essays on Social Cohesion)

<https://medium.com/whose-society-whose-cohesion/rethinking-cities-from-the-groundup-73d92059b15f>

Wengrow, D and D. Graeber. 2015. Farewell to the 'childhood of man': ritual, seasonality, and the origins of inequality. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 21 (3), 597-619.

Essay question

What is the relationship between scale and inequality in human societies? Discuss with reference to at least two archaeological case studies.

Week 9 Archaeology and Identities

Identity has been a central concern in Archaeology throughout much of the history of the discipline. Different approaches have emphasised different aspects of identity, from the sometimes-naïve linkage of patterns and ethnic peoples within culture-history, to processual archaeologists' interest in rank and status, to more recent approaches to situated identities, embodiment and personhood within and beyond post-processual and interpretative archaeologies. The historical aspects of identity construction are now playing at least as significant a role in current identity politics as they did in the nationalism of the 19th century, enhanced by the results of ancient DNA analyses and the increasingly contested idea of 'heritage'. In this seminar we will examine some of these different approaches and

their continuing significance, as well as exploring the similarities and differences between categories of identity, and underlying processes of identity construction and internalisation.

Discussion questions

How have different concepts of identity shaped and been shaped by the history of archaeology?

Are there more or less challenges in reconstructing the details of different categories of identity? Is the distinction between essentialist and constructivist approaches to identity generalizable across different sorts of identity categories?

What kinds of archaeological evidence are involved in talking about identity in the past?

Why has the study of ancient DNA had an impact on studies of ancient identities and their present-day significance?

How can or should archaeologists evaluate and mediate the competing claims of multiple identities, including their own, with respect to the interpretation of the past?

Essential readings

Jones, S. 2008. Ethnicity: theoretical approaches, methodological implications. In R.A. Bentley, H.D.G. Maschner and C. Chippindale (eds) *Handbook of Archaeological Theories*, 321-33. Walnut Creek: AltaMira Press. Adobe Digital Editions, VLE Books, via UCL Explore

Meskill, L. 2002. The intersections of identity and politics in archaeology. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 31:279-301. Science: ANTHROPOLOGY Journals, eJournals.

Reich, D. 2018. *Who We Are and How We Got Here*. Oxford University Press. Chapters 1 and 11. Online through [EBSCOhost Ebooks](#) via UCL Explore.

Voss, B. 2008. Gender, race, and labor in the archaeology of the Spanish colonial Americas. *Current Anthropology* 49(5):861-897.

Wolinski, H. 2019. Ancient DNA and contemporary politics. *EMBO Reports* (2019) 20: e49507. DOI 10.15252/embr.201949507

Week 10 Archaeology, Politics and the Public

Archaeologists are increasingly recognising the importance of the social and political contexts in which archaeological interpretations have been produced in the past, and in the present. They are also increasingly recognising the claims of other groups to the material that they study, and the role of archaeological interpretations and narratives in claiming the past for particular interests. How can or should archaeologists evaluate and mediate the competing claims of multiple interested individuals and groups, with respect to the interpretation of the past?

Discussion questions

Why is the past important today?

Why is it so important to ask who owns the past?

Should Western museums return cultural artefacts to their countries of origin?

In what ways does consideration of the public affect the way we practice archaeology?

Does academic training give archaeologists authority in mediating alternative interpretations of the past?

Can we incorporate multiple perspectives into archaeological interpretation?

How can we evaluate alternative interpretations and claims about the past?

Essential:

Curtoni, R.P. 2014. Archaeology and Politics. In C. Smith (ed) *Encyclopedia of Global Archaeology*. Springer: New York. Online

Kohl, P.L. 1998. Nationalism and archaeology: on the constructions of nations and the reconstructions of the remote past. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 27: 223-46. eJournals.

Leone, M., et al. 1995 Can an Afro-American historical archaeology be an alternative voice? In, I. Hodder, et al. (eds) *Interpreting Archaeology*. London, Routledge, pp. 110-24. TC 3513, Inst Arch AH HOD, Issue Desk HOD 1.

Meskell, L. 2002. The intersections of identity and politics in archaeology. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 31:279-301. Science: ANTHROPOLOGY Journals, eJournals.

Moshenska, G. (ed.) 2017. *Key Concepts in Public Archaeology*. London: UCL Press. Online

Watkins, J. 2005. Through wary eyes: indigenous perspectives on archaeology. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 34:429-449. Science: ANTHROPOLOGY Journals, eJournals.

Week 11 Art

How far are concepts of art and aesthetics valid ones in terms of which to think about the material culture of temporally and culturally different civilizations? What entailments might the classification of an artefact as 'art' have for the ways in which we can or should approach it? By what methods can we recover the 'meanings' of the art of past societies, and what do we mean by meaning? How do the ways in which objects are displayed in museums shape our engagement with them? What do we mean by placing art in its 'context'? We will look at some classic approaches to understanding art – such as iconography and style analysis- as well as more recent approaches including object biographies and concepts of material agency.

For a general overview of main issues:

Corbey, Raymond, Robert Layton and Jeremy Tanner. 2004. "Art and archaeology", 357-379 in John Bintliff ed. *A Companion to Archaeology*. [Online]

Case studies for discussion

Faris, James C. 1988. " 'ART/Artifact': on the Museum and Anthropology", *Current Anthropology* 29 (5): 775-779 (UCL Electronic Pers - JSTOR)

Knight, Vernon James. 2012. *Iconographic Method in New World Prehistory*. Cambridge. Ch. 1: "Preliminaries: an iconography of prehistoric imagery" [Online]

Earle, T. 1990. "Style and iconography as legitimation in complex chiefdoms", pp. 73-81 in Conkey and Hastorf eds. *The Uses of Style in Archaeology*. (IoA AH CON - 4 copies; Issue Desk IOA CON3 - 2 copies)

Layton, R. 1977. "Naturalism and cultural relativity in art", pp. 33-43 in Ucko, P.J. 1977. *Form in Indigenous Art: Schematisation in the Art of Aboriginal Australia and Prehistoric Europe*. Canberra, Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies. (ANTHROPOLOGY SA 63 UCK – 2 copies; ISSUE DESK IOA UCK 8)

Hamilakis, I. 1999. "Stories from stone: fragments of the cultural biography of the Parthenon (or Elgin) marbles". *World Archaeology* 31.2:

Uribe Villegas, M.A. and Martínón-Torres, M. 2012. "Composition, colour and context in Musica votive metalwork (Colombia AD 600-1800)", *Antiquity* 86: 772-91 [Online - UCL Electronic Periodicals]

Bailey, D.W. 2016. "Touch and the cheirotic apprehension of prehistoric figurines". In P. Dent ed. *Sculpture and Touch*. New York: Routledge. 27-44. [ART BE DEN; also available as PDF from his AcademiaEdu page]

Additional Recommended reading, by session.

The Additional Recommended readings are listed as a starting point for students to follow-up particular issues in which they are interested and provide a range of references to start to explore for essay writing.

1. Artefacts, material culture, technology, art etc.

- Adams, W. & Adams, E. 1991. *Archaeological typology and practical reality*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Appadurai, A. 1986. *The Social Life of Things*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Binford, L. 1973 Interassemblage variability - the Mousterian and the functional argument. In, C. Renfrew (ed.) *The Explanation of Culture Change*. London, Duckworth, pp. 227-54. TC 1335
- Braun, D. 1983 Pots as tools. In, J. Moore and A. Keene (eds) *Archaeological Hammers and Theories*. New York, Academic Press, pp. 107-34.
- Clark, J. 1995 Craft specialization as an archaeological category. *Research in Economic Anthropology* 16:267-94.
- Conkey, M. and Hastorf, C. (eds.) 1990 *The Uses of Style in Archaeology*. Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Costin, C. 1991 Craft specialization: issues in defining, documenting, and explaining the organization of production. In, M. Schiffer (ed.) *Archaeological Method and Theory, Vol. 3*. Tucson, University of Arizona Press, pp. 1-56. INST ARCH AH ADV
- David, N., Sterner, J. and Gavua, K. 1988 Why pots are decorated, *Current Anthropology* 29: 365-88.
- DeMarrais, E., Gosden, C. and Renfrew, C. (eds) 2004. *Rethinking Materiality: the engagement of mind with the material world*. Cambridge: McDonald Institute. [ISSUE DESK IOA DEM 1; INST ARCH AH DEM] – chapter by Renfrew
- Dietler, M. & Herbich, I. 1998. Habitus, techniques, style: an integrated approach to the social understanding of material culture boundaries. In M. T. Stark (Ed.), *The Archaeology of Social Boundaries*: 232-263. Washington: Smithsonian Institution. ISSUE DESK STA4; AH STA
- Farbstein, R. 2011. Technologies of art: a critical reassessment of Pavlovian art and society, using *chaîne opératoire* method and theory. *Current Anthropology* 52(3): 401-432.
- Gosden, C. 2005. What do objects want? *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory*, 12.3, 193-211.
- Harris, O. and C. Cipolla 2017. *Archaeological Theory in the New Millennium*. London: Routledge.
- Hodder, I., 2018. *Where Are We Heading? The Evolution of Humans and Things*. Yale UP.
- Ingold, T. 2007. Materials against materiality. *Archaeological Dialogues*, 14.1, 1-16 (plus comments). Online
- Knappett, C. 2005. *Thinking Through Material Culture: an interdisciplinary perspective*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Knappett, C. and Malafouris, L. (eds) 2008. *Material Agency: towards a non-anthropocentric approach*. New York: Springer.
- Knappett, C. 2012. Materiality. In I. Hodder (ed.) *Archaeological Theory Today*, 188-207. Cambridge: Polity Press (2nd edition)
- Latour, B., 2005. *An Introduction to Actor Network Theory*. Oxford Univ Press.

- Miller, D. (ed.) 1998. *Material Cultures: Why Some Things Matter*. London, UCL Press.
- Nelson, M. 1991 The study of technological organization. In, M. Schiffer (ed.) *Archaeological Method and Theory, Vol. 3*. Tucson, University of Arizona Press, pp. 57-100.
- O'Brien, M. J. and R. L. Lyman (editors) 2003. *Style, Function, Transmission*. Univ. of Utah, Salt Lake City.
- Olsen, B. 2010. *In defense of things: archaeology and the ontology of objects*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Petrequin, P. 1993. NORTH WIND, SOUTH WIND Neolithic technical choices in the Jura Mountains, 3700-2400 BC. In P. Lemonnier (ed.), *Technological Choices*. London: Routledge.
- Plog, S. (1983) Analysis of style in artifacts. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 12:125-142.
- Rice, P. 1987. *Pottery Analysis: A Sourcebook*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Rice, P. 1991. Specialization, standardization and diversity: a retrospect. In R. Bishop & F. Lange (Eds.), *The Ceramic Legacy of Anna O. Shepard*: Boulder: University of Colorado Press.
- Rice, P. 1996. Recent ceramic analysis 1. function, style and origins. *Journal of Archaeological Research*, 4(2): 133-163.
- Rice, P. 1996. Recent ceramic analysis 2. composition, production, theory. *Journal Archaeological Research*, 4(3): 165-202.
- Schiffer, M., and Skibo, J. 1997. The explanation of artifact variability. *American Antiquity* 62:27-50.
- Sigaut, F. 1994. Technology. In T. Ingold (ed.), *The Companion Encyclopedia of Anthropology*. London: Routledge: 420-59.
- Sillar, B. and Tite, M. 2000. The challenge of 'technological choices' for material science approaches in archaeology. *Archaeometry* 42.1:2-20. TC 2532, IoA Periodicals,
- Tilley, C. 1989 Interpreting material culture. In, I. Hodder (ed.) *The Meanings of Things*. London, Harper Collins, pp. 185-94.
- Watts, C.M. (ed.) 2013. *Relational Archaeologies: Humans, animals, things*. London: Routledge.
- Webmoor, T. and Witmore, C.L. 2008. Things are us! A commentary on human/things relations under the banner of a 'social' archaeology. *Norwegian Archaeological Review*, 41.1, 53-70.
- Wiessner, P. 1983. Style & social information in Kalahari San projectile points. *American Antiquity* 48:253-76.
- Wobst, H. M. 1977. Stylistic Behavior and Information Exchange. In *For the Director*, edited by C. Cleland, pp. 317-342. Anthropological Papers. vol. 61. University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
- Wright, K. I. & Garrard, A. N. 2003. Social identities and the expansion of stone beadmaking in Neolithic western Asia. *Antiquity*, 77(296): 267-284.

2. A New Materialism in archaeological theory and practice

- Blaser, M. 2014. Ontology and indigeneity: on the political ontology of heterogeneous assemblages.cultural geographies, 21(1), 49-58.
- Braidotti, R., 2013. Ch. 1: Post-Humanism: Life beyond the Self, in R. Braidotti, *The posthuman*, Polity Press, 13-55.

- Cameron, E., de Leeuw, S., & Desbiens, C. (2014). Indigeneity and ontology. *Cultural Geographies*, 21(1), 19-26.
- Gergan, M. D. 2015. Animating the Sacred, Sentient and Spiritual in Post-Humanist and Material Geographies. *Geography Compass*, 9(5), 262-275.
- Hunt, S. 2014. Ontologies of Indigeneity: the politics of embodying a concept. *cultural geographies*, 21(1), 27-32.
- Cipolla, C. 2021. Posthuman Potentials: Considering Collaborative Indigenous Archaeology, *Cambridge Archaeological Journal*, 1-6.
- Crellin, R.L, C. N. Cipolla, L. M. Montgomery, O.J. T. Harris, & S.V. Moore 2021. *Archaeological Theory in Dialogue: Situating Relationality, Ontology, Posthumanism, and Indigenous Paradigms*, New York: Routledge.
- Díaz de Liaño, G. & Fernández-Götz, M. 2021. Posthumanism, New Humanism and Beyond. *Cambridge Archaeological Journal*: 1-7.
- Govier, E. (2022). Pre-critical archaeology. Speculative realism and symmetrical archaeology. *Archaeological Dialogues*, 29(2), 188-199. doi:10.1017/S1380203822000241
- Holbraad, M. & M. Pedersen, 2017. *The Ontological Turn: An Anthropological Exposition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jackson, Z.I. 2013. Animal: New Directions in the Theorization of Race and Posthumanism. *Feminist Studies* 39: 669–85.
- Laluk, N.C. 2017. The indivisibility of land and mind: Indigenous knowledge and Collaborative archaeology within Apache context. *Journal of Social Archaeology* 17(1): 92–112.
- Montgomery, L.M. 2021. Indigenous alterity as archaeological praxis, In Crellin et al. (eds.), *Archaeological Theory in Dialogue: Situating Relationality, Ontology, Posthumanism, and Indigenous Paradigms*: 52-66. New York: Routledge.
- Ribeiro, A. 2022. *Archaeology and Intentionality: Understanding Ethics and Freedom in Past and Present Societies*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Schneider, T.D. and K. Hayes 2020. Epistemic Colonialism: Is it Possible to Decolonize Archaeology? *The American Indian Quarterly*, Volume 44, Number 2, Spring 2020, pp. 127-148
- Todd, Z. 2016, An Indigenous Feminist's Take on the Ontological Turn (blogpost) <https://umaincertaantropologia.org/2014/10/26/an-indigenous-feminists-take-on-the-ontological-turn-ontology-is-just-another-word-for-colonialism-urbane-adventurer-amiskwaci/> (article in *Journal of Historical Sociology* Volume 29, Issue 1 4-22)
- Van Dyke, R., 2021. Ethics, not Objects, *Cambridge Archaeological Journal*, 31(3), 487-493.
- Viveiros de Castro, E. 1998. Cosmological deixis and Amerindian perspectivism. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 4(3): 469–88.
- Viveiros de Castro, E. 2004. Exchanging perspectives: the transformation of objects into subjects in Amerindian ontologies. *Common Knowledge* 10(3): 463–84.
- Viveiros de Castro, E. 2012. *Cosmological Perspectivism in Amazonia and Elsewhere. Four Lectures Given in the Department of Social Anthropology, University of Cambridge. February–March 1998*. Hau Masterclass Series Volume 1.
- Watts, V. (2013). Indigenous Place-Thought and Agency Amongst Humans and Non Humans (First Woman and Sky Woman Go On a European World Tour!). *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society*, 2(1).

Witmore, C. 2014. Archaeology and the New Materialisms. *Journal of Contemporary Archaeology* 1.2, 203–246. DOI:10.1558/jca.v1i2.16661

Wolfe, C. 2010. *What Is Posthumanism?* Minneapolis (MN): University of Minnesota Press, introduction (online)

3. Archaeological inference

Fochesato, M., Bogaard, A., & Bowles, S. (2019). Comparing ancient inequalities: The challenges of comparability, bias and precision. *Antiquity*, 93(370), 853-869. doi:10.15184/aqy.2019.106

Gardin, J.-C. 1980. *Archaeological Constructs*. Cambridge: CUP.

Gardin, J.-C. 1989. The role of 'local knowledge' in archaeological interpretation. In S. Shennan (ed.), *Archaeological Approaches to Cultural Identity*:110-22. London: Unwin Hyman.

Lyman, R.L. 2007. Archaeology's quest for a seat at the high table of anthropology. *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* 26:133-49.

Miller-Atkins, G., & L. S. Premo (2018) Time-averaging and the spatial scale of regional cultural differentiation in archaeological assemblages, *STAR: Science & Technology of Archaeological Research*, 4:1, 12-27, DOI: 10.1080/20548923.2018.1504490

Perreault, C., 2019. *The Quality of the Archaeological Record*. Chicago: Chicago UP

Roux, V. 2013. Spreading of Innovative Technical Traits and Cumulative Technical Evolution: Continuity or Discontinuity? *J Archaeol Method Theory* (2013) 20:312–330. DOI 10.1007/s10816-012-9153-4

Schiffer, M. 1972 Archaeological context and systemic context. *American Antiquity* 37:156-65.

Shott, M. 1998. Status and role of formation theory in contemporary archaeological practice. *Journal of Archaeological Research* 6:299-329.

Shennan, S. 2013. Demographic Continuities and Discontinuities in Neolithic Europe: Evidence, Methods and Implications. *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory* 20, 300-311. DOI 10.1007/s10816-012-9154-3.

Spriggs, M. 2008. Ethnographic parallels and the denial of history. *World Archaeology* 40:538-52.

4. Archaeological Science

Arponen V.P.J., Dörfler, W., Feeser, I., Grimm, S., Groß, D., Hinz, M., Knitter, D., Müller-Scheesel, N., Ott, K. and Ribeiro, A. 2019a. Environmental determinism, and archaeology. Understanding and evaluating determinism in research design. *Archaeological Dialogues*, 1-11. doi:10.1017/S1380203819000059. Plus comments and response.

Bevan, A., S. Colledge, D. Fuller, R. Fyfe, S. Shennan and C. Stevens 2017. Holocene fluctuations in human population demonstrate repeated links to food production and climate. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* Dec 2017, 114 (49) E10524-E10531; DOI: 10.1073/pnas.1709190114

- Booth, T. J. 2019. A stranger in a strange land: a perspective on archaeological responses to the palaeogenetic revolution from an archaeologist working amongst palaeogeneticists. *World Archaeology* <https://doi.org/10.1080/00438243.2019.1627240>
- Eisenmann, S., E. Bánffy, P. van Dommelen, K. P. Hofmann, J. Maran, I. Lazaridis, A. Mitnik, M. McCormick, J. Krause, D. Reich, and P. W. Stockhammer 2018 Reconciling Material Cultures in Archaeology with Genetic Data: The Nomenclature of Clusters Emerging from Archaeogenomic Analysis. *Nature Scientific Reports* 8:13003 DOI:10.1038/s41598-018-31123-z, DOI:10.1038/s41598-018-31123-z
- Frieman, C.J. & Daniela Hofmann (2019) Present pasts in the archaeology of genetics, identity, and migration in Europe: a critical essay, *World Archaeology*, 51:4, 528-545, DOI: [10.1080/00438243.2019.1627907](https://doi.org/10.1080/00438243.2019.1627907)
- Huggett, J. (2020) Is Big Digital Data Different? Towards a New Archaeological Paradigm, *Journal of Field Archaeology*, 45:sup1, S8-S17
- Kintigh, K. et al. 2014. Grand challenges for archaeology. *American Antiquity* 79(1), 2014, pp. 5–24.
- Liden, K., and G. Eriksson 2013. Archaeology vs. archaeological science. Do we have a case? *Current Swedish Archaeology* 21, 11-20. Plus the commentaries and their reply on the following pages. Online.
- Martinon-Torres, M., and D. Killick 2015. Archaeological theories and archaeological sciences. DOI: [10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199567942.013.004](https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199567942.013.004). In book: Oxford Handbook of Archaeological Theory Chapter: Archaeological theories and archaeological sciences Publisher: Oxford University Press. Editors: Andrew Gardner, Mark Lake and Ulrike Sommer
- McCoy, M. D. 2017 Geospatial Big Data and archaeology: Prospects and problems too great to ignore. *Journal of Archaeological Science*:74-94.
- Pollard, A. M., and Bray, P. 2007. A bicycle made for two? The integration of scientific techniques into archaeological interpretation. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 36: 245–259. Online.
- Racimo, F., Sikora, M., Vander Linden, M., Schroeder, H., & Lalueza-Fox, C. Beyond broad strokes: sociocultural insights from the study of ancient genomes. *Nature Reviews Genetics* <https://doi.org/10.17863/CAM.50029>
- Ribeiro, A. 2019. Science, Data, and Case-Studies under the Third Science Revolution. Some Theoretical Considerations. *Current Swedish Archaeology*, Vol. 27, 115-132, <https://doi.org/10.37718/CSA.2019.06>
- Robb, J., and T. Pauketat 2013. From moments to millennia: theorizing scale and change in human history. In J. Robb and T. Pauketat (eds), *Big histories, human lives: tackling problems of scale in archaeology*, pp. 3-33. Santa Fe: School of American Research.
- Veeramah, K.R. 2018. The importance of fine-scale studies for integrating paleogenomics and archaeology. *Current Opinion in Genetics & Development* 53, 83–89.
- Plus, follow up some of the references that interest you in the readings above or browse recent issues of *Journal of Archaeological Science* or *Archaeological and Anthropological Sciences*. If you're thinking of doing your essay on this subject please contact me to discuss identifying particular areas of archaeological science to take as your examples.

5. Complexity Science in Archaeology

- An, L. (2012). Modeling human decisions in coupled human and natural systems: Review of agent-based models. *Ecological Modelling*. 229, 25–36. [Online]
- Altaweel, M. (2015) Settlement Dynamics and Hierarchy from Agent Decision-Making: a Method Derived from Entropy Maximization. *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory* 22 (4), 1122–1150. [Online]
- Angourakis, A., Rondelli, B., Stride, S., Rubio-Campillo, Z., Balbo, A.L., Torrano, A., Martinez, V., Madella, M., and Gurt, J.M. (2014). Land Use Patterns in Central Asia. Step 1: The Musical Chairs Model. *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory* 21: 405–425. [Online]
- Barton, C.M., Ullah, I.I. & Bergin, S. (2010) .Land use, water and Mediterranean landscapes: modelling long-term dynamics of complex socio-ecological systems. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences* 368 (1931), 5275–5297. [Online]
- Batty, Michael. (2006). Rank Clocks. *Nature* 444, 592-596 [Online] [DOI: 10.1038/nature05302].
- Bentley, R.A., Lake, M.W. & Shennan, S.J. (2005). Specialization and wealth inequality in a model of a clustered economic network. *Journal of Archaeological Science*. 32 (9), 1346–1356. [Online] [DOI: 10.1016/j.jas.2005.03.008]
- Bentley, R.A. & Herbert D. G. Maschner (eds.) (2003) *Complex systems and archaeology*. Foundations of archaeological inquiry. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press. [INST ARCH AH BEN]
- Bentley, R. Alexander, Matthew W. Hahn, and Stephen J. Shennan. (2004). ‘Random Drift and Culture Change’. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B* 271: 1443–1450. [Online]
- Bentley, R.A., Ormerod, P., and Batty, M. (2010). Evolving Social Influence in Large Populations. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology* 65 (3): 537–546. [DOI: 10.1007/s00265-010-1102-1][Online]
- Brown, C.T., Witschey, W.R.T. and Liebovitch, L.S. (2005). The Broken Past: Fractals in Archaeology. *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory* 12: 37–78. [Online]
- Brughmans, T. and Poblome, J. (2016). Roman bazaar or market economy? Explaining tableware distributions through computational modelling. *Antiquity* 90: 393-408. [Online]
- Chliaoutakis, A. & Chalkiadakis, G. (2016) Agent-based modeling of ancient societies and their organization structure. *Autonomous Agents and Multi-Agent Systems* 30 (6), 1072– 1116. [Online]
- Crema, Enrico R. (2014). A Simulation Model of Fission-Fusion Dynamics and Long-Term Settlement Change. *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory* 21: 385–404. [Online]
- Epstein, J. M. & Axtell, R. (1996), *Growing Artificial Societies: Social Science from the Bottom Up*, Washington: Brookings Press and MIT Press. [Online via UCL Explore]

- Holland, J. H. (2006). Studying complex adaptive systems. *Journal of Systems Science and Complexity*, 19 (1), pp. 1-8. [Online]
- Janssen, Marco A. (2009). 'Understanding Artificial Anasazi'. *Journal of Artificial Societies and Social Simulation* 12 (4): 13. [Online]
- Knappett, C., ed. (2013). *Network Analysis in Archaeology: New Approaches to Regional Interaction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. [Online via UCL Explore]
- Knappett, C., Evans, T. & Rivers, R. (2011). The Thera Eruption and Minoan Palatial Collapse: New Interpretations Gained from Modelling the Maritime Network, *Antiquity* 85 (329), 1008–1023. [Online]
- Kohler, T.A., Gumerman, G.J., and Reynolds, R.G. (2005). 'Simulating Ancient Societies'. *Scientific American* 293: 76–84. [Online]
- Kohler, T.A & Varien, M.D. (eds) (2012). *Emergence and collapse of early villages: models of central Mesa Verde archaeology*. Berkeley: University of California Press. [Online via UCL Explore]
- Lake, M.W. (2014) Trends in Archaeological Simulation. *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory* 21 (2), 258–287. [Online] [DOI: 10.1007/s10816-013-9188-1]
- Lansing, J.S. (2000). 'Anti-Chaos, Common Property, and the Emergence of Cooperation'. In Kohler, T.A & Gumerman, G.J. eds, *Dynamics in Human and Primate Societies: Agent-Based Modelling of Social and Spatial Processes*, 207–224. New York: Oxford University Press. [ANTHROPOLOGY B 36 KOH]
- Miller-Atkins, G. & Premo, L.S. (2018). Time-Averaging and the Spatial Scale of Regional Cultural Differentiation in Archaeological Assemblages. *STAR: Science & Technology of Archaeological Research* 4, 1–16. [Online] [DOI: 10.1080/20548923.2018.1504490]
- Salgado, M. & Gilbert, N. (2013). Emergence and Communication in Computational Sociology. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour* 43 (1): 87–110. [Online] [DOI: 10.1111/jtsb.12004]
- Sörlin, S., Van der Leeuw, S., Costanza, R., Aulenbach, S., Brewer, S., Burek, M., Cornell, S., et al. (2011). Toward an Integrated History to Guide the Future. *Ecology & Society* 16 (4). [Online] [DOI: 10.5751/ES-04341-160402 10.5751/ES-04341-160402]
- Watts, Duncan J. (1999). *Small Worlds: The Dynamics of Networks between Order and Randomness*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. [COMPUTER SCIENCE G 22 WAT]
- Watts, D.J. & Strogatz, S.H. (1998). Collective Dynamics of 'Small-World' Networks, *Nature* 393, 440-442. [Online]
- Xue, J.Z., Costopoulos, A., and Guichard, F. (2011). 'Choosing Fitness-Enhancing Innovations Can Be Detrimental under Fluctuating Environments'. *PloS One* 6 (11): e26770. [Online]

6. Reading Week

7. Technology and innovation

- Charlton, M. F. et al. 2010. Explaining the evolution of ironmaking recipes – An example from northwest Wales. *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* 29, 352-367. INST ARCH Pers
- Eerkens, J. W., Lipo, C. P. 2005. Cultural transmission, copying errors, and the generation of variation in material culture and the archaeological record. *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* 24, 316–334. Online
- O'Brien, M. J., & Shennan, S. J. (2010). Issues in Anthropological Studies of Innovation. In O'Brien, M. J., & Shennan, S. J. (Eds.), *Innovation in Cultural Systems. Contributions from Evolutionary Anthropology* (pp. 3-17). Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Petrequin, P. 1993. NORTH WIND, SOUTH WIND Neolithic technical choices in the Jura Mountains, 3700-2400 BC. In P. Lemonnier (ed.), *Technological Choices*. London: Routledge.
- Pfaffenberger, B. 1992 Social anthropology of technology. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 21:491-516.
- Roux, V. 2013. Spreading of Innovative Technical Traits and Cumulative Technical Evolution: Continuity or Discontinuity? *J Archaeol Method Theory* (2013) 20:312–330.
- Schiffer, M. (ed.) 2001. *Anthropological Perspectives on Technology*. Albuquerque, University of New Mexico Press.
- Shennan, S. 2013. Long-term trajectories of technological change. In "Cultural Evolution: Society, Technology, Language, and Religion," edited by Peter J. Richerson and Morten H. Christiansen. *Strüngmann Forum Reports*, vol. 12. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
<https://www.researchgate.net/publication/335401856> 8 Long-Term Trajectories of Technological Change
- van der Leeuw S. E., R. Torrence (eds.) 1989 *What's new? A closer look at the process of innovation*. London: Unwin Hyman. INST ARCH BC 100 LEE.

8. Inequality and Scale in Human Societies

- Bandy, M.S. 2004. Fissioning, Scalar Stress, and Social Evolution in Early Village Societies. *American Anthropologist* 106 (2), 322-333.
- Birch, J. (ed). 2013. *From prehistoric villages to cities: settlement aggregation and community transformation*. London: Routledge.
- Blanton, R.E. 1998. Beyond centralisation: steps toward a theory of egalitarian behaviour in archaic states. In G.M. Feinman and J. Marcus (eds.) *Archaic States*. Santa Fe: School of American Research, 135-172.
- Blanton, R.E., et al. 1996. A Dual-Processual Theory for the Evolution of Mesoamerican Civilization. *Current Anthropology* 37 (1), 1–14.
- Dunbar, R. 1996. *Grooming, gossip and the evolution of language*. London: Faber & Faber.
- Dunbar, R.I.M. et al. (eds) 2014. *Lucy to Language. The Benchmark Papers*. Oxford: Oxford University Press (chapter 17, Coward and Dunbar, 'Communities on the edge of civilisation', and 21, Coward and Gamble, 'Big brains, small worlds: material culture and the evolution of mind').
- Fargher, L., Blanton, R., Espinoza, V., Millhauser, J., Xiuhtecutli, N., & Overholtzer, L. 2011.

- Tlaxcallan: The archaeology of an ancient republic in the New World. *Antiquity* 85 (327), 172- 186.
- Fletcher, R. 1995. *The limits of settlement growth: a theoretical outline*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Frangipane, M. 2016. The development of centralised societies in Greater Mesopotamia and the foundation of economic inequality. *Tagungen des Landesmuseums für Vorgeschichte HALLE* • Band 13: 1-22.
- Froese et al. 2014. Can Government Be Self-Organized? A Mathematical Model of the Collective Social Organization of Ancient Teotihuacan, Central Mexico. *PLOS One*.
- Hayden, B. (2014). *The Power of Feasts: From Prehistory to the Present*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CBO9781107337688. Chapter 4, Transegalitarian Hunter-Gatherers.
- Jennings, J. 2016. *Killing civilization: a reassessment of early urbanism and its consequences*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
- Johnson, G.A. 1982. Organizational structure and scalar stress. In C. Renfrew et al. (eds.) *Theory and Explanation in Archaeology*. London: Academic Press, 389-421.
- Mattison, S.M. et al. 2016. The Evolution of Inequality. *Evolutionary Anthropology* 25:184–199. <https://doi.org/10.1002/evan.21491>
- McGuire, R., & Saitta, D. 1996. Although They Have Petty Captains, They Obey Them Badly: The Dialectics of Prehispanic Western Pueblo Social Organization. *American Antiquity* 61 (2), 197-216.
- Social inequality and the transmission of cultural traditions in forager societies . In J. Steele and S.J. Shennan (eds.), *The Archaeology of Human Ancestry: Power, Sex and Tradition*, pp. 365-379. London: Routledge.
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/351579113_Social_inequality_and_the_transmission_of_cultural_traditions_in_forager_societies
- Wengrow, D. 2015. Cities before the state in early Eurasia. Halle: Max Planck Institute. [\[https://ucl.academia.edu/DavidWengrow\]](https://ucl.academia.edu/DavidWengrow)
- Wengrow, D. 2018. 'The origins of civic life - a global perspective.' *Origini* XLII (special issue in memory of Robert McC. Adams): 25-44.
- Yoffee, N. 2005. *Myths of the archaic state: evolution of the earliest cities, states and civilizations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

9. Archaeology and identities

Social identities

- Casella, E.C. and Fowler, C. 2005. Beyond identification: an introduction. In E.C. Casella and C. Fowler (eds) 2005. *The Archaeology of Plural and Changing Identities: beyond identification*, 1-8. New York: Kluwer/Plenum. [INST ARCH AH CAS; <www>]
- Conkey, M. and Spector, J. 1984. Archaeology and the study of gender. In M.B. Schiffer (ed.) *Advances in Archaeological Method and Theory*, Vol. 7, 1-29. New York: Academic Press. [INST ARCH Pers; Science ANTHROPOLOGY C 9 SCH; <www>]
- Diaz-Andreu, M. et al. (eds) 2005. *The Archaeology of Identity*. London: Routledge. [INST ARCH AH DIA] Dowson, T. A. 2000. Homosexuality, queer theory, and archaeology. In J. Thomas (ed.)

- Interpretive Archaeology: A Reader*, 283-89. London: Leicester University Press. [INST ARCH AH THO; <www>]
- Emberling, G. 1997. Ethnicity in complex societies: archaeological perspectives. *Journal of Archaeological Research* 5:295-344. [INST ARCH Pers; <www>]
- Gardner, A. 2002. Social identity and the duality of structure in late Roman-period Britain. *Journal of Social Archaeology*, 2.3, 323-351. [INST ARCH Pers; <www>]
- Gardner, A. 2007. *An Archaeology of Identity: Soldiers and Society in Late Roman Britain*. (Especially Ch. 2). Walnut Creek: Left Coast Press. [INST ARCH DAA 170 GAR]
- Gardner, A. 2011. Paradox and praxis in the archaeology of identity. In L. Amundsen-Meyer, N. Engel and S. Pickering (eds.) *Identity Crisis: Archaeological perspectives on social identity. Proceedings of the 42nd (2009) Chacmool Conference*, 11-26. Calgary: Chacmool Archaeology Association. [INST ARCH BD AMU]
- Geller, P. 2009. Identity and difference: complicating gender in archaeology. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 38: 65-81. [Science ANTHROPOLOGY Pers; <www>]
- Gilchrist, R. 2004. Archaeology and the life course: a time and age for gender. In L. Meskell and R. Preucel (eds) *A Companion to Social Archaeology*, 142-60. Oxford: Blackwell. [INST ARCH BD MES; <www>]
- Graves-Brown, P., Jones, S. and Gamble, C. (eds) 1996. *Cultural Identity and Archaeology: the construction of European Communities*. London: Routledge [INST ARCH DA 100 GRA; ISSUE DESK IOA GRA 4]
- Hales, S. and Hodos, T. (eds) 2010. *Material Culture and Social Identities in the Ancient World*. Cambridge: CUP. [YATES A99 HAL]
- Jenkins, R. 2000. Categorization: Identity, Social Process and Epistemology. *Current Sociology* 48(3): 7-25. [Jenkins, R. 2014. *Social Identity* (4th edition). London: Routledge. []]
- Jones, S. 1997. *The Archaeology of Ethnicity*. London: Routledge. [ISSUE DESK IOA JON 6; INST ARCH BD JON]
- Jones, S. 2000. Discourses of identity in the interpretation of the past. In J. Thomas (ed.) *Interpretive Archaeology. A Reader*, 445-57. London: Leicester University Press. [ISSUE DESK IOA AH THO; INST ARCH AH THO; <www>]
- Joyce, R. 2005. Archaeology of the Body. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 34: 139-58. Online.
- Kohl, P.L. 1998. Nationalism and archaeology: on the constructions of nations and the reconstructions of the remote past. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 27: 223-46. eJournals.
- Leone, M., et al. 1995 Can an Afro-American historical archaeology be an alternative voice? In, I. Hodder, et al. (eds) *Interpreting Archaeology*. London, Routledge, pp. 110-24. TC 3513, Inst Arch AH HOD, Issue Desk HOD 1.
- Meskell, L. 1999. *Archaeologies of Social Life: age, sex, class etc. in ancient Egypt*. Oxford: Blackwell. [EGYPTOLOGY B 20 MES]
- Mizoguchi, K. 2006. *Archaeology, Society and Identity in Modern Japan*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. [INST ARCH DBO MIZ]
- Pierce, E., Russell, A., Maldonado, A. and Campbell, L. 2016. *Creating Material Worlds: the uses of identity in archaeology*. Oxford: Oxbow. [INST ARCH BD PIE]
- Shennan, S. (ed.) 1989. *Archaeological Approaches to Cultural Identity*. London: Routledge. [INST ARCH AH SHE]

- Smith, S.T. 2003. *Wretched Kush: ethnic identities and boundaries in Egypt's Nubian empire*. London: Routledge. [EGYPTOLOGY B 60 SMI]
- Stark, M. (ed.) 1998. *The Archaeology of Social Boundaries*. Washington: Smithsonian. [ISSUE DESK IOA STA 4; INST ARCH AH STA]
- Steadman, S.R. and Ross, J.C. (eds) 2010. *Agency and Identity in the Ancient Near East: new paths forward*. London: Equinox. [INST ARCH DBA 100 STE]
- Thomas, J. 2000. Culture and identity. In G. Barker (ed.) *Companion Encyclopedia of Archaeology*, Vol. 1, 431- 69. London: Routledge. [INST ARCH AH BAR]
- Voss, B. 2008. Sexuality studies in archaeology. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 37(1):317-336.
- Voss B., 2015 What's new? Rethinking ethnogenesis in the archaeology of colonialism. *American Antiquity* 80(4):655-670.
- Wiessner, P. 1989. Style and changing relations between the individual and society. In I. Hodder (ed.) *The Meanings of Things*, 56-63. London: Harper Collins. [ISSUE DESK IOA HOD 3; INST ARCH AH HOD]

Identities and embodiment

- Hamilakis, Y., Pluciennik, M. and Tarlow, S. (eds.) 2002. *Thinking Through the Body: Archaeologies of Corporeality*. New York: Kluwer/Plenum. [INST ARCH BD HAM; ISSUE DESK IOA HAM 4]
- Joyce, R. 2004. Embodied subjectivity: gender, femininity, masculinity, sexuality. In L. Meskell and R. Preucel (eds) *A Companion to Social Archaeology*, 82-95. Oxford: Blackwell. [INST ARCH BD MES; <www>]
- Knapp, A.B. and Meskell, L. 1997. Bodies of evidence in Cypriot prehistory. *Cambridge Archaeological Journal* 7(2): 183-204. [INST ARCH Pers; <www>]
- Meskell, L. and Joyce, R.A. 2003. *Embodied Lives: Figuring Ancient Maya and Egyptian Experience*. London: Routledge. [INST ARCH DFB 100 MES]
- Rautman, A.E. (ed.) 2000. *Reading the Body: Representations and Remains in the Archaeological Record*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. [ISSUE DESK IOA RAU]
- Sofaer, J. 2006. *The Body as Material Culture. A Theoretical Osteoarchaeology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. [INST ARCH AH SOF]
- Whitehouse, R. 2011. Cultural and biological approaches to the body in archaeology: can they be reconciled? In E. Cochrane and A. Gardner (eds.) *Evolutionary and Interpretive Archaeologies. A dialogue*, 227-44. Walnut Creek: Left Coast Press. [INST ARCH AH COC]
- Yates, T. 1993. Frameworks for an archaeology of the body. In C. Tilley (ed.) *Interpretative Archaeology*, 31-72. Oxford: Berg. [INST ARCH AH TIL; <www>]

Personhood and self-identity

- Brück, J. 2001. Monuments, power and personhood in the British Neolithic. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 7: 649-67. [Science ANTHROPOLOGY Pers; <www>]
- Carrithers, M., Collins, S., and Lukes, S. (eds) 1985. *The category of the person: anthropology, philosophy, history*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. [Science ANTHROPOLOGY D12 CAR]

- Fowler, C. 2000. The individual, the subject, and archaeological interpretation: reading Luce Irigaray and Judith Butler. In C. Holtorf and H. Karlsson (eds) *Philosophy and archaeological practice: perspectives for the 21st century*, 107-22. Göteborg: Bricoleur. [INST ARCH AH HOL]
- Fowler, C. 2004. *The Archaeology of Personhood: An Anthropological Approach*. London: Routledge. [INST ARCH BD 10 FOW]
- Fowler, C. 2016. Relational personhood revisited. *Cambridge Archaeological Journal* 26(3): 397-412. [INST ARCH Pers; <www>].
- Gardner, A. 2011. Action and structure in interpretive archaeologies. In E. Cochrane and A. Gardner (eds.) *Evolutionary and Interpretive Archaeologies. A dialogue*, 63-82. Walnut Creek: Left Coast Press. [INST ARCH AH COC; <www>]
- Spriggs, M. 2008. Ethnographic parallels and the denial of history. *World Archaeology*, 40.4, 538-552. [INST ARCH Pers; <www>]
- Treherne, P. 1995. The warrior's beauty: the masculine body and self-identity in Bronze-Age Europe. *Journal of European Archaeology* 3(1): 105-44. [INST ARCH Pers; <www>]
- Watts, C.M. (ed.) 2013. *Relational archaeologies: humans, animals, things*. London: Routledge. [INST ARCH AH WAT]
- Whitley, J. 2013. Homer's entangled objects: narrative, agency and personhood in and out of Iron Age texts. *Cambridge Archaeological Journal* 23(3), 395-416. [INST ARCH Pers; <www>]
- Wilkinson, D. 2013. The Emperor's new body: personhood, ontology and the Inka sovereign. *Cambridge Archaeological Journal* 23(3), 417-32. [INST ARCH Pers; <www>]

10. Archaeology, politics and the public

- Appadurai, A. 1981. The past as a scarce resource. *Man* 16: 201-19.
- Arnold, B. 1990. The past as propaganda: totalitarian archaeology in Nazi Germany. *Antiquity* 64: 464-78.
- Atkinson, J., Banks, I. and O'Sullivan, J. (eds) 1996. *Nationalism and Archaeology*. Glasgow: Cruithne Press.
- Bernbeck, R. and Pollock, S. 2004. The political economy of archaeological practice and the production of heritage in the Middle East. In L. Meskell and R. Preucel (eds) *A Companion to Social Archaeology*. Malden: Blackwell:335-52.
- Bernbeck, R. & S. Pollock 1996. Ayodhya, archaeology & identity. *Current Anthropology* 37 (Supp.): 138-42.
- Champion, T. & M. Diaz Andreu (eds.) 1996. *Nationalism and Archaeology in Europe*. London: UCL Press.
- Chippindale, C. et al. 1990. *Who Owns Stonehenge?* London: Batsford.
- Brophy, K. 2018. The Brexit Hypothesis and Prehistory and responses by other authors. *Antiquity* 92, 1650-1670.
- Clack, T. and Brittain, M. (eds.) 2007. *Archaeology and the Media*. Walnut Creek: Left Coast Press.

- Coombes, A.E. 1994. *Reinventing Africa: Museums, Material Culture and Popular Imagination*.
- Fagan, G.G. (ed.) 2006. *Archaeological Fantasies*. London: Routledge.
- Fforde, C., Hubert, J. and Turnbull, P. (eds.) 2002. *The Dead and Their Possessions: repatriation in principle, policy and practice*. London: Routledge.
- Fowler, D., Jolie, E. & Salter, M. 2008. Archaeological ethics in context and practice. In R.A. Bentley, et al. eds.) *Handbook of Archaeological Theories*. Walnut Creek: AltaMira,409-22.
- Fowler, P.J. 1992. *The Past in Contemporary Society, Then, Now*. New Haven: Yale U.P.
- Gathercole, P. and D. Lowenthal (eds.) 1990. *The Politics of the Past*. London, Harper-Collins.
- Gosden, C. 2001. Postcolonial archaeology. Issues of culture, identity, and knowledge. In I. Hodder (ed.) *Archaeological Theory Today*. Cambridge: Polity Press:241-61.
- Gosden, C. 2004. The past and foreign countries: colonial and post-colonial archaeology and anthropology. In L. Meskell and R. Preucel (eds) *A Companion to Social Archaeology*. Malden: Blackwell:161-78.
- Habu, J., C. Fawcett and J.M. Matsunaga (eds.) 2008. *Evaluating Multiple Narratives: beyond nationalist, colonialist, imperialist archaeologies*. New York: Springer.
- Hingley, R. 2000. *Roman Officers and English Gentlemen*. London: Routledge.
- Holtorf, C. 2005. *From Stonehenge to Las Vegas: archaeology as popular culture*. Walnut Creek: AltaMira.
- Holtorf, C. 2007. *Archaeology is a Brand: the meaning of archaeology in contemporary popular culture*. Walnut Creek: Left Coast Press.
- James, S. 1999. *The Atlantic Celts: ancient people or modern invention?* London: B.M.P.
- Jones, G. & Harris, R. J. 2003. Archaeological human remains: scientific, ethnical and cultural considerations. *Current Anthropology*, 39(2): 253-264.
- Jones, S. 2005. Making place, resisting displacement: conflicting national & local identities in Scotland. In Littler, J. & Naidoo, R. (eds.) *The Politics of Heritage*, 94-114. London: Routledge.
- Kehoe, A.B. 2008. *Controversies in Archaeology*. Walnut Creek: Left Coast Press.
- Kohl, P. & Fawcett, C. (eds) 1995. *Nationalism, Politics & the Practice of Archaeology*. Cambridge: CUP
- Layton, R. (ed.) 1989. *Conflict in the Archaeology of Living Traditions*. London: Unwin Hyman.
- Layton, R. (ed.) 1989. *Who Needs the Past? Indigenous Values and Archaeology*. London: Unwin Hyman.
- Layton, R., Shennan, S. and Stone, P. (eds.) 2006. *A Future for Archaeology*. London: UCL Press.
- Leone, M. and R. Preucel. 1992. Archaeology in a democratic society: a critical perspective. In L. Wandsnider (ed.) *Quandaries and Quests*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois Univ.115-35.
- Lowenthal, D. 1985. *The Past is a Foreign Country*. Cambridge: C.U.P.
- Mandal, D. 2003 *Ayodhya, Archaeology After Demolition*. New Delhi: Orient Longman.
- McGuire, R. 2004. Contested pasts: archaeology and Native Americans. In L. Meskell and R. Preucel (eds) *A Companion to Social Archaeology*. Malden: Blackwell:374-95.
- McGuire, R. 2008. *Archaeology as Political Action*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- McManamon, F. 1991. The many publics for archaeology. *American Antiquity* 56:121-30.

- Merriman, N. 2000. *Beyond the Glass Case*. London: UCL Press (2nd Edition).
- Merriman, N. (ed.) 2004. *Public Archaeology*. London: Routledge.
- Meskill, L. 1998. *Archaeology Under Fire*. London: Routledge.
- Mizoguchi, K. 2006. *Archaeology, Society and Identity in Modern Japan*. Cambridge: C.U.P.
- Moshenska, G. 2009. The reburial issue in Britain. *Antiquity*, 83, 815-820.
- Murray, T. 1993. Communication and the importance of disciplinary communities. In N. Yoffee and A. Sherratt (eds.) *Archaeological Theory: Who Sets the Agenda?* Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press:105-16.
- Parker Pearson, M. and Pryor, F. 2006. Visitors and viewers welcome? In J.R. Hunter and I. Ralston (eds) *Archaeological Resource Management in the UK: an introduction*. Second edition. Stroud: Sutton Publishing. 316-27.
- Ratnagar, S. 2004. Archaeology at the heart of a political confrontation. *Current Anthropology* 45:239-59.
- Reid, D.M. 2002. *Whose Pharaohs?* Berkeley, CA: U.C.P.
- Scarre, C. and Scarre, G. (eds.) 2006. *The Ethics of Archaeology*. Cambridge: C.U.P.
- Schablitsky, J.M. (ed.) 2007. *Box Office Archaeology*. Walnut Creek: Left Coast Press.
- Seidemann, R. M. 2004. Bones of contention: a comparative examination of law governing human remains from archaeological contexts in formerly colonial countries. *Louisiana Law Review*, 64(3): 546-588.
- Silberman, N.A. 1989. *Between Past and Present: Archaeology, Ideology and Nationalism in the Modern Middle East*. New York: Holt.
- Silberman, N. 1995. Promised lands and chosen peoples. In P. Kohl & Fawcett, C. (eds) 1995. *Nationalism, Politics & the Practice of Archaeology*. Cambridge: C.U.P.:249-62.
- Smith, L. 2004. The repatriation of human remains – problem or opportunity? *Antiquity* 78 (300): 404-413.
- Smith, L. 2004. *Archaeological Theory and the Politics of Cultural Heritage*. London: Routledge.
- Tarlow, S. and L. Nilsson Stutz 2013. Can an archaeologist be a public intellectual? *Archaeological Dialogues* 20 (1) 1–5.
- Thomas, D. H. 2000 *Skull Wars: Kennewick Man, Archaeology and the Battle for Native American Identity*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Tilley, C. 1989. Archaeology as socio-political action in the present. In V. Pinsky and A. Wylie (eds.) *Critical Traditions in Contemporary Archaeology*. Cambridge: CUP: 104-16.
- Trigger, B. 1980. Archaeology and the image of the American Indian. *American Antiquity* 45:662-76.
- Trigger, B. 1984. Alternative archaeologies: nationalist, colonialist, imperialist. *Man* 19: 355-70.
- Trigger, B. 1989. Hyperrelativism, responsibility and the Social Sciences. *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 26:776-97. Reprinted in Trigger, B. 2003. *Artifacts & Ideas*. London: Transaction Publishers.
- Trigger, B. 1995. Romanticism, nationalism and archaeology. In P. Kohl and Fawcett, C. (eds) 1995. *Nationalism, Politics and the Practice of Archaeology* . Cambridge: C.U.P.:263-79.
- Ucko, P.J. 1987. *Academic Freedom and Apartheid: The Story of the World Archaeological Congress*.
- Vitelli, K.D. 1996. *Archaeological Ethics*. New York, Altamira Press.

Wylie, A. 1995. Alternative histories. Epistemic disunity and political integrity. In P. Schmidt and T. Patterson (eds) *Making Alternative Histories*. Santa Fe: School of American Research:255-72.

Wylie, A. 2008. The integrity of narratives: deliberative practice, pluralism and multivocality. In J. Habu, C. Fawcett and J. Matsunaga (eds.) *Evaluating Multiple Narratives: beyond nationalist, colonialist, imperialist archaeologies*. New York: Springer:201-12.

Zimmerman, L.J., Vitelli, K.D. and Hollowell-Zimmer, J. (eds.) 2003. *Ethical Issues in Archaeology*. Walnut Creek: AltaMira Press.