

ARCL0211, Working with Artefacts and Assemblages

2022/23, Term 1+2
MA Module, 30 credits

Module Co-ordinator: Ulrike Sommer
u.sommer@ucl.ac.uk
Room 409a

Moodle: <https://moodle.ucl.ac.uk/course/view.php?id=403>
Please always check for Moodle for the most up-to date information!



Bronze Age Pot under excavation (Ceahlut-Hajdubagos Culture), Urziceni (Romania) 2023

21/09/2023

ARCL0211, WORKING WITH ARTEFACTS AND ASSEMBLAGES	1
MODULE AIMS	4
LEARNING OUTCOMES	4
SCHEDULE	6
SCHEDULE	6
Additional reading	9
RECOMMENDED BASIC TEXTS AND ONLINE RESOURCES	16
Artefacts:	16
1. INTRODUCTION: ARTEFACTS, ASSEMBLAGES AND MATERIAL CULTURE	17
Recommended Reading:	20
3. EXPLORING THE THAMES SOUTHBANK	21
Medieval/postmedieval pottery	21
Clay tobacco pipes	21
Leather Artefacts	22
Glass	22
5. BIG DATA: THE PORTABLE ANTIQUITIES SCHEME (PAS) IN ENGLAND AND WALES	22
Look over	22
Further Reading	23
6. WORKING WITH COLLECTIONS	23
7. CATALOGUING ARTEFACTS: ARTEFACT DESCRIPTION, RAW MATERIALS AND CLASSIFICATION	24
Essential reading	25
Recommended reading	25
8. DESCRIBING POTTERY I, SHAPES	25
Recommended Reading:	25
9. DESCRIBING POTTERY II, FABRIC AND DECORATION	25
Recommended Reading:	25
Further Reading	26
TYERS, P. 1996. <i>ROMAN POTTERY IN BRITAIN</i>. LONDON, BATSFORD. INST ARCH DAA 170 TYE	26
Weblinks Thesauri:	27
10. TYPOLOGY, SHAPE AND USE	27
Recommended Reading	27

See also	29
11. DRAWING POTTERY	29
Readings:	29
General	30
Terminology	30
Drawing	31
Readings:	31
15. LAYOUT AND THE DIGITAL IMPROVEMENT OF PHOTOGRAPHS	31
Recommended Reading:	32
Databases	32
Recommended Reading:	32
Further Reading:	32
17. CATALOGUING METAL ARTEFACTS	33
Recommended Reading:	34
Browse	34
Recommended Reading:	36
see also	36
20. EXHIBITING ARTEFACTS	36
Recommended Reading	36
Websites	36
ADDITIONAL INFORMATION	37
LIBRARIES AND OTHER RESOURCES	37
Collections	37
SOME USEFUL WEB-SITES:	
37THE PREHISTORIC SOCIETY: HTTP://WWW.UCL.AC.UK/PREHISTORIC/	37
SOCIETY OF MUSEUM ARCHAEOLOGISTS - HTTP://WWW.SOCMUSARCH.ORG.UK/INDEX.HTM	37
SAA - SOCIETY FOR AMERICAN ARCHAEOLOGY: HTTP://SAA.ORG/	37
A.H.R.C: HTTP://WWW.AHRC.AC.UK/	37
ASSEMBLAGE: HTTP://WWW.SHEF.AC.UK/ASSEM/	38
LIST OF ARCHAEOLOGY JOURNALS ON-LINE:	38
HTTP://WWW.LIBRARY.SOTON.AC.UK/INFO/SUBJECTS/2002EJ/	38
BRITISH MUSEUM: HTTP://WWW.BRITISH-MUSEUM.AC.UK/INDEX.HTML	38

Module overview

Module description

This module is a general foundation and introduction for the MA in Artefacts Analysis (for which this is the obligatory Core Module). It is also suitable for all other students working with archaeological finds and museum collections.

The module provides a broad introduction to the collection, classification, recording, analysis, interpretation and publication of artefacts, with a strong focus on current theories and practices in studying the social significance of material culture. A central concern is to consider how to develop the relevance of finds analysis for wider archaeological research questions. Students are asked to consider the significance of artefacts and material culture studies in relation to ethnographic and historical as well as archaeological examples.

The module covers the documentation and interpretation of artefacts and assemblages from archaeological sites and museum collections. Students will be introduced to the skills of finds specialists, practical problems in the professional study of artefacts and major debates about the collection, interpretation, reporting and curation of archaeological materials. This module encourages students to consider how finds specialists select their recording methods in relation to specific research objectives and practical constraints. The module emphasizes the practicalities of excavating, processing, identifying, archiving and publishing archaeological finds and the problems of defining databases and sampling methods. We will also look at the problems of archiving, and at the exhibition and publication of artefacts. The aim is to integrate theoretical and practical aspects of artefact studies and consider how to identify and record the information necessary for a finds report and link this to the formulation of research questions. The course does not teach the identification of artefacts from any particular time or area.

The course normally contains a number of practical exercises on cataloguing, description, drawing, mapping and photography. Depending on the development of the epidemic and IoA guidelines on the use of rooms and collections, some or all of these practicals will have to be adapted to use materials at hand at your place of living or cancelled if the necessary equipment is not available to every student.

Module Aims

This module will introduce students to a wide range of concepts and ideas used in artefact studies, with a strong critical consideration of the academic and theoretical significance of such research, and a concern for the care, preservation and reporting of archaeological materials.

More specifically the module aims:

1. To provide a wide-ranging and challenging introduction to the role of artefact studies in modern archaeology
3. To engage with current debates about the collection, interpretation, reporting and curation of archaeological materials
4. To encourage an interdisciplinary approach to artefact studies which considers how to develop the relevance of artefact studies for wider archaeological research.
5. To consider critically the changing role of 'finds specialists' in relation to commercially funded archaeology, current theoretical debates and research work.

Learning Outcomes

On successful completion of this module a student should:

1. Know how to catalogue and document finds on a professional level, given further practice
2. Be familiar with recent archaeological, anthropological, and theoretical debates about the role of material culture within society
3. Have an overview of practical approaches to the study of artefacts in relation to wider archaeological research questions
4. Be able to debate the role of artefact studies in archaeology including the potential advantages and constraints inherent within different approaches to artefact analysis

The students should have developed the following abilities:

1. independent problem-solving based on real data sets
2. The observational skills needed to identify the material details of an artefact and critically consider what this may mean in relation to the production process or life history of the object
3. to observe, or read about, analytical procedures and critically reflect on how these procedures will affect the recording and interpretation of data
4. to read and listen to a range of different approaches to a topic and to form a reasoned argument as to why they favour one or more of these
5. to identify relevant data and analytical methods with which to address specific research questions.

Communications

- Moodle is the main hub for this course.
- Important information will be posted by staff in the Announcements section of the Moodle page, you will automatically receive an email notification.
- Please post any general queries about module content, assessments in the Moodle Q&A or via email.
- For personal queries, please contact the module co-ordinator by email.
- Online Teaching will mainly be done via MS-Teams

Schedule

The module is taught through lectures, demonstrations and discussions. Students will be required to undertake set readings and complete pre-class activities in order to be able to actively participate in the discussion. They will also need to practice the techniques and methods discussed during the course on their own to achieve the necessary proficiency. I am normally happy to discuss a reasonable number of drawings and photographs with you, for which I will also need to see the original. You will be able to borrow some modern artefacts which you are allowed to take out of the building.

Schedule

Teaching Wednesday 11-13 in term 1, 410
Friday, 9-11 in term 2, 410

no	Date	Subject	Lecturer	UCL-Week
1	04/10/23	Introduction: Artefacts, assemblages and material culture	Sommer	1
2	11/10/23	Excavations and field recording/ Thinking about assemblages – basic data	Sommer	2
3	18/10/23	Exploring finds on the Thames Southbank	Sommer	3
4	25/10/23	Basic sorting: Bulk and small finds Thinking about assemblages – basic data II	Sommer	4
5	1/11/23	Big data: The Portable Antiquities Scheme	Wood	5
		Reading week 6/11/23		6
6	15/11/23	Working with Collections	Stevenson	7
7	22/11/22	Artefact description, raw materials and basic classification	Sparks	8
8	29/11/23	Describing pottery I - shapes	Sparks	9
9	6/12/23	Describing pottery II – fabric, surface treatment and decoration	Sommer	10
10	13/12/23	Typology, shape and use	Sommer	11
		Christmas Holiday 15/12-7/01/24		
11	19/01/24	Drawing Pottery (practical)	Sommer	12
12	16/01/24	Describing and drawing flint	Sommer	13
13	9/02/24	Basic mapping (practical)	Fontana	14
14	26/01/24	Basic photography	Reis	15
15	2/02/24	Digital improvement of photographs, basic layout	Reis	16
		Reading Week 12/02/24		17
16	23/02/24	Databases	Sparks	18
17	1/03/24	Cataloguing metal artefacts	Wood	19
18	8/3/24	The finds report	Marshall	20
19	15/03/24	Putting artefacts into context: when, where, why?	Sommer	21
20	22/03/24	Exhibiting artefacts Final discussion	Schmidt	22

Workload

This is a 30-credit module which equates to 300 hours of learning time, including session preparation, background reading, and researching and producing your assignments. With that in mind, you should expect to organise your time in roughly this way:

40 hours	Staff-led teaching sessions (lectures, seminars, demonstrations, tutorials, discussion sessions)
120 hours	Self-guided session preparation (reading, listening, note-taking, online activities, independent practice), about six hours a week
35 hours	Reading for and writing the essay
35 hours	Research and practical work for the map
70 hours	Research and practical work for the Portfolio

Assessment

Deadlines have been set centrally by the IoA this year in order to spread students' workloads over the term as evenly as possible.

Each assignment and some possible approaches to it are described in detail in this handbook. They will also 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 (during office hours or via the module Moodle forum). They will receive feedback on your coursework via Moodle, and have the opportunity to discuss their marks and feedback with the co-ordinator in her office hours.

Having a third-party or software check areas of academic writing such as structure, fluency, presentation, grammar, spelling, punctuation, and language translation is permissible for the coursework. However, *you* alone are responsible for the content and structure of your submission. If you use any electronic assistance, this must be declared on the coversheet. Be aware that chatbots are unreliable and generally not very good at archaeology. You are not allowed to use a third-party or software to create *content!*

IMPORTANT INFORMATION REGARDING ASSESSMENTS:

The **coursework coversheet** is available on the module 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/ioa-student-handbook/13-information-assessment>
<https://www.ucl.ac.uk/archaeology/current-students/ioa-study-skills-guide/referencing-effectively-and-ioa-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.

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/iaa-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.

As this module is about artefact studies and concerns catalogues and illustrations, I will pay special attention to the quality of your illustrations. Badly exposed and distorted photographs are not acceptable, use a scanner and make sure to correct exposure and eventual colourcasts. Also choose a suitable resolution. Aim for publication quality illustrations.

Assessment 1: Standard Essay

Wordcount 1250 words, 25% of Assessment

Deadline 15/12/2023

Select one of the following topics:

1. **How can the concept of materiality be usefully applied in artefact studies?**

Discuss, using one or several published archaeological studies to illustrate your point. There are several concepts of materiality in use, make sure to be clear which concept you base your discussion on, and give a short summary.

Core reading

*Cooney, D. 2018. Material culture. In: Gardner, A. et al. (eds.), *Oxford Handbook of Archaeological Theory*. Oxford, Oxford University Press. [Online](#)

Cooney, D. et al. 2020. *Cultures of Stone: An Interdisciplinary Approach to the Materiality of Stone*. Leiden, Sidestone Press. [Open Access](#)

DeMarais, E. 2004. The materialisation of culture. In E. DeMarrais et al. (eds), *Rethinking Materiality: The Engagement of Mind with the Material World*. Cambridge, McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research, 11-22. [INST ARCH AH Qto DEM](#)

*Joyce, R. A. 2015. Transforming Archaeology, transforming Materiality. *Archaeological Papers of the American Anthropological Association* 26. Berkeley, University of California Press, 181–191. <https://doi.org/10.1111/apaa.12064>. online

Hahn, H. 2012, Words and things: reflections on people's interaction with the material world. In: Maran, J., Stockhammer, Ph. (eds.), *Materiality and social practice: transformative capacities of intercultural encounters*. Oxford, Oxbow Books, 6-12. [Online](#)

useful for the general background in other disciplines

*Ingold, T. 2007. Materials against materiality. *Archaeological Dialogues* 14, 1-16.

Overmann, K. A., Wynn, Th. 2019, Materiality and Human Cognition. *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory* 26, 457–478. [Online](#)

Rather big claims, but good at explaining the interaction between artefacts/materials and cognition

- Pinney, Chr. 2005. Things happen: Or, from which Moment does that Object come? In: Miller, D. et al. (eds.) *Materiality*. Durham, Duke University Press, 256-272.
- *Rowlands, M. 2005. A materialist Approach to Materiality. In: Miller, D. et al. (eds.), *Materiality*. Durham, Duke University Press. [Online](#)
- Jones, A. 2004. Archaeometry and materiality: materials-based analysis in theory and practice. *Archaeometry* 46/3, 327-338. [Online](#)

Additional reading

There are several edited volumes containing archaeological case studies, which may provide a starting point for your essay:

- E. DeMarrais, et al. (eds) 2004. *Rethinking Materiality: The Engagement of Mind with the material World*. Cambridge, McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research, 11-22.
- Maran, J., Stockhammer, Ph. W. (eds.) 2012, *Materiality and social practice: transformative capacities of intercultural encounters*. Oxford, Oxbow Books. JSTOR Books
- A slightly different understanding of materiality, several case studies*
- Van Dyke, R. M. (ed.) 2015. *Practicing Materiality*. Tucson, University of Arizona Press.
- Several case studies, mainly based on the US.*
- Daniel Miller et. al. (eds.) *Materiality*. Durham (US), Duke University Press. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1215/9780822386711>

2. Given the severe bias in many archived archaeological archives and collections, do we need new excavations to solve new questions?

Readings

There is no core recommended reading, you need to identify research questions and examples yourselves. As a rule, archaeologists simply do new excavations without justifying that. You may want to comment on this approach. A case study would be useful if you use that approach. Looking at government reports on the relation between excavation and archiving may give you a starting point:

PPG16

PPS5

(<https://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20120919201742/http://www.communities.gov.uk/archived/publications/planningandbuilding/pps5>) - replaced by National Planning Policy Framework (2012) which contains only passing reference to archaeology.

(<https://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20120919133846/http://www.communities.gov.uk/publications/planningandbuilding/nppf>)

See also the Reading List for Lecture 2 on “Working with Collections”.

Brown, D. H. 2007. *Archaeological Archives: A Guide to Best Practice in Creation, Compilation, Transfer and Curation*. London: Archaeological Archives Forum.

Jones et al. 2003. *Too much stuff? Disposal from museums*. London, National Museum Directors' Conference, Imperial War Museum. Stores, STORE 18-0730/180

Waterton, E. et al. (eds.), *Archive Archaeology*. In: Skeates, R., McDavid, C., Carman, J. (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Public Archaeology*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 351-367. DOI:10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199237821.013.0019

Mephram, L. 2000. Archive deposition: A united perspective. *Museum Archaeologist* 25, 7-10.

Merriman, N., Swain, H. 1999, Archaeological archives: serving the public interest? *European Journal of Archaeology* 2/2, 249-267.

Museum association 2005: Collections for the Future. [https://ma-](https://ma-production.ams3.digitaloceanspaces.com/app/uploads/2020/06/18145350/policy_collections.pdf)

[production.ams3.digitaloceanspaces.com/app/uploads/2020/06/18145350/policy_collections.pdf](https://ma-production.ams3.digitaloceanspaces.com/app/uploads/2020/06/18145350/policy_collections.pdf)

Museum association, Code of Ethics for Museums

<https://www.museumsassociation.org/campaigns/ethics/code-of-ethics/>

The titles above present the museum perspective. There are very few publications where the value of legacy collection for new research proposals is explicitly considered from an archaeological point of view.

Examples:

di Lernia, Savino 2015. Save Libyan archaeology: until violence eases and fieldwork can resume, fund research in labs, museums and on computers. *Nature* (London), 517 (7536), 547.

more of a stopgap

McAdam, E. et al. (eds.) 2002. *A Research Framework for London Archaeology* 2002. London, Museum of London.

This is a rather random selection, try to find better examples!

Additional reading

Boyle, G. 2022. Unlocking the potential of archaeological archives. In: Stevenson, A. 2022. *The Oxford Handbook of Museum Archaeology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 271.

<https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780198847526.013.39>

Stevenson, A. 2022. *The Oxford Handbook of Museum Archaeology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Swain, H. 2007. *An Introduction to Museum Archaeology*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

3. How should a pottery typology be constructed?

Bibliography

The bibliography below is a selection. Feel free to pick other areas or other examples. There are also national typological traditions that may merit discussion. Given the small wordcount, you will have to stick to essentials. Well selected illustrations are essential.

Adams, W. Y. 2008. Classification and typology. In: Pearsall, D. M. (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Archaeology*. Amsterdam, Elsevier.

Bortolini, Eu. 2016. Typology and classification. In: Hunt, A. (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of archaeological Ceramic Analysis*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 651–670.

<https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199681532.013.38>

Gauß, W., Lindblom, M. 2017. Pre-Mycenaean pottery shapes of the central Aegean: a new resource in development. In: C. Wiersma, S. Voutsaki (eds.), *Social change in Aegean prehistory*. Oxford, Oxbow Books 2017, 1-15.

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt1kw2b8b.6>

Furumark, A. 1941. *The Mycenaean Pottery. Analysis and Classification*. Stockholm, Svenska Institutet i Athen.

as an example of a traditional and widely used pottery classification system

Henry, E. H. et al. 2017. Against typology: A critical approach to archaeological order. *SAA Archaeological Record* 17/1, 28-31.

Hruby, J. 2010, Mycenaean Pottery from Pylos: An indigenous Typology. *American Journal of Archaeology* 114/2, 195-216.

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/25684272>

Salanová, L. 2019, Pottery Technology and identity: Some thoughts from the Balkans. In: S. Amicone et al. (eds.), *Tracing pottery-making recipes in the prehistoric Balkans 6th–4th Millennia BC*. Oxford, Archaeopress 2019, 113-128.

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctvndv954.15>

Sørensen, M. L. S. 2015. 'Paradigm Lost' – on the state of typology within archaeological theory. In: K. Kristiansen, L. Smejda, J. Turek (eds.), *Paradigm found: Archaeological theory - present, past and future. Essays in Honour of Evžen Neustupný*. Oxford: Oxbow Books, 84-94.

Vuković, J. 2019. Technology and function: Performance characteristics and usage aspects of the Neolithic pottery of the Central Balkans. In: S. Amicone et al. (eds.), *Tracing pottery-making recipes in the Prehistoric Balkans 6th–4th Millennia BC*. Oxford, Archaeopress 2019, 172-181.

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctvndv954.19>

Whallon, R. Jr. 1973. A new approach to pottery typology. *American Antiquity* 37/1, 13-33

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/278883>

concentrate on the argument, not so much the maths!

Wheat, J. B. 1991. Ceramic classification: Bradfield and Shepard, types and varieties. In: R. L. Bishop, F. W. Lange (eds.), *The ceramic legacy of Anna O. Shepard*. Niwot, University Press of Colorado, 121-131. INST ARCH KD 3 BIS

Assessment 2: Distribution Map

25% of mark, 1500 words

Deadline 15/03/2024

In consultation with the course coordinator, select a suitable category of finds and study their distribution in a specific region. Discuss and interpret the distribution in time and space. Use tables, figures and maps to illustrate your results.

The Word Limit is 1500 words, there is no lower limit, as a lot of your arguments should be condensed into maps, tables and figures, so do not worry if your project is much shorter!

Explanations

Mapping the distribution of an artefact type should answer a specific question, as outlined in lecture 13 and 19. This could be use, cultural affiliation, chronology or mechanisms of dispersal. Depending on the number of artefacts you identify and select, you may have to define a specific study area. I cannot advice on absolute size, as it depends on the nature of your chosen artefact - rare or very common. You need enough finds to be able to identify patterns in your map, but you cannot deal with thousands of finds either, unless you have a ready made database to work with. Make sure you clearly describe what features you have included in your map and why, and how you have selected your base data.

Ideally, there should already be a database or a catalogue for the artefact type selected, otherwise the data collection will take you far too long. Make sure that the artefact type is clearly defined, and justify your criteria in the essay. Be clear on any problems with your data and describe how you dealt with them. Imperfect data are not a problem, we all have to deal with them, but they should still realistically allow you to address a given RQ.

Create a digital catalogue (normally as a spreadsheet; not included in the wordcount, but should be submitted digitally). What information do you need for this project? Discuss and justify your decision.

Ideally, use a published catalogue or an online database. Do not restrict your research to the UCL OPAC. There are JSTOR, Springerlink, Elsevier, Academia and Research Gate, Google Books, Archive.org and several national databases like ADS, PAS and Persée; the archives of individual periodicals, and online Museum collections (lecture 16), depending on your research area, as well as specialised sites. Make sure you select *reputable* sources or discuss the quality of different sources. Clearly outline which sources you have used; also indicate potentially important sources you could not access. Outline the methods employed, the problems you faced and how you have attempted to deal with them.

The following aspects of your coursework will be marked

1. General, very short introduction to the area and time period, valid and interesting

Research Question

2. selection of suitable objects
clearly outlined reasons for choice, clear criteria for inclusion in the projec
3. Exact definition of the artefact category
4. Quality of research
5. Illustration/description/documentation
6. Quality and suitability of map/s (Lecture 13)
7. Discussion of distribution, awareness of biases
8. Conclusions
9. Form (layout, language, structure etc.)

Assessment 3: Portfolio

50% of Assessment. Mixed media, word-limit of 1500 words for the text alone, excluding recording sheets, catalogue, Bibliography, image captions etc.

Deadline 03/05/2024

Early in term 1 you will receive a list of ten artefacts from the IoA collection. They are either from one area, one specific site or the same time period and will form the basis of your portfolio. You will have to sign for the artefacts with Rachael Sparks (Room 55, basement, please fix a date with Rachael), who will also give you an obligatory introduction to proper artefact handling. You can work on your portfolio in the artefact lab inside the Photolab on the 4th floor. The artefacts have to be kept under lock and key when you are not actually working on them, and **must under no circumstances** leave the lab! Handling rules have to be observed at all times.

We will discuss the access to the finds-lab at the beginning of term, information will also be put on the Moodle.

The following items should be included in the portfolio:

-Titlepage

-Table of contents

-Introduction

1. Description on a finds sheet. You can adapt the MOLAS or ASE-sheets (see Moodle) to your purposes. Remember that this is a quick field report, do a sketch-drawing, not an inked illustration where appropriate. What type of drawing would you need? Do not simply illustrate for form's sake, include relevant details only. Use short notes, not a description in elaborate full sentences. Imagine that **you have 5 minutes maximum for this task and 200 more artefacts are waiting for your attention** (as it is the first time you practice it, it will probably take you longer). Outline how the finds sheet is connected to any further documentation system.
2. A short report on the site or the area of origin, focusing on facts relevant for the interpretation and dating of your artefacts.
Again, this should be no longer than strictly necessary! Maps and chronological tables help you save on words. You may have to construct your own tables, especially if dealing with older excavation or contentious sites. You do not have to resolve contested stratigraphies or chronologies, but should demonstrate awareness of differing interpretations! Make sure you use up-to date literature and up-to date dates.
3. A catalogue of finds, including identification and dating
Take a good look at several existing finds reports, and the prominence given to different types of finds. You would not normally expect several pages of report on an undecorated body-sherd or an iron nail, while a statue or a stamp-seal may merit a much longer comment. Try to comply with common practice in the field, unnecessarily long entries will **definitely not**

gain you a better mark!

Points to cover are type of object (shape), raw material, method of production, date, cultural affiliation, function etc.

Different types of artefacts are subject to different conventions for descriptions. There are not always universal rules on how to describe a specific type of artefact. This is especially true for pottery shapes. Look at a number of publications from the area/time period of your objects to get a feeling for this!

Dating and identification will often rest on identifying similar objects from dated contexts. You need to make clear why you think objects are similar, and what their date-range and distribution is. Again, maps and chronological tables are an important tool - a dot on the map may represent three days of research in the library! Make sure your discussion is properly referenced, and submit the databases your maps are based on. If you arrive at an interpretation or a date by comparison to other, better dated finds, you need to cite the sites and publications in question. Be aware of the fact that research progresses, the dating of the excavator may not be accepted anymore today - try to locate the most recent publications dealing with your site/area!

You can use abbreviations (check with published finds reports), but provide a key.

If you have previous information on provenance, this should be taken account of and also be noted in the catalogue.

A catalogue is not an essay! Avoid subjective statements and wordy descriptions! Be as short and precise as possible, establish a template to follow for all object descriptions! Look closely at a number of published catalogues to see how this is done.

The catalogue should refer to illustrations or include them. Remember that line-drawings are the main means of illustrating artefacts, and that normally shape and especially the profile is more important than texture/surface. If there are relevant details, this may call for detail-photographs or drawings. You can either include your drawings and photographs in the text or add them separately as illustrations or plates and refer to them in the text.

A published catalogue normally contains fairly definite statements: "Rim-sherd of a Dragendorff 36 bowl, barbotine decoration in the form of wine leaves on the upper body, late 2nd century AD." **NOT:** "A kind of orangey-like triangular shard with a really smooth surface, it looks kind of Samian-like maybe but I am not really sure. It is very smooth and cute and I really like it a lot."

Use for a coherent layout. How can you help the reader to easily identify the most relevant information? Which information has always to be included?

The length of the entries should correspond to the importance of the piece and should be comparable to normal catalogues (check some recent excavation reports from the area and time you study). The different parts should work as stand-alone pieces. You can cross-reference them, but each section of the documentation must contain all the facts you deem appropriate for the context and the particular object.

Include page numbers, a list of illustrations and a bibliography. Preface the portfolio with a short introduction outlining your approach. Number the pages consecutively from page one. The Portfolio should include a table of contents (including appendices, tables, graphs and whatever), a bibliography and a list of illustrations.

The earlier you familiarize yourself with your site/area and your artefacts, the better! You cannot put together a portfolio in a night or two. You need practice and time for research, for leafing through books trying to find comparable pieces, and for improving your drawing and photography skills.

Talk to each other, use your colleagues' knowledge! You all specialize in different subjects, there is no reason not to share information! Visit our collection and adjacent museums to look for similar finds, browse through books and catalogues about your site/study area. Check for online information, but be aware that Wikipedia is not a suitable source (it may help you to locate more

suitable sources, though)!

Normally, I would expect you to do the induction to working with finds from the IoA in the week following lecture 7 (Sparks). You should then take some preliminary photographs of your finds and look for similar material that helps you to identify and date them. Read the original site publications, then check if the chronology has changed in the meantime. Start writing the site-report. Also check how catalogues are organised and start to design a template for your own catalogue. It should be clear, coherent and easy to use. Measure and weigh your finds – what data are needed and useful?

Start drawing your finds immediately after lectures 8 and 12, respectively. Take proper photographs after lecture 14, and photoshop them if necessary (lecture 15). Often it is easier to re-take them, though.

Before submission, check that all the parts fit together and form a coherent whole that is easy to use. The Portfolio also needs a detailed and up-to date bibliography.

The following criteria are used for marking:

(* = extra points)

1. Overall cohesion and form

- does the work submitted form a coherent whole?
- justification of the approach chosen
- formatting and aesthetic appeal
- ease of use: how easy is it to find relevant informations, is there a clear and suitable hierarchy of information levels, is it visually clear and coherent?
- clear and concise language

2. description on finds sheet

- was an appropriate sheet used?
- are the entries complete and appropriate?
- are the sketch-drawings appropriate and informative?

3. context: a short report on the site or the area of origin

- quality and completeness of information
- consistency
- conciseness
- use of suitable and up-to date information, breadth of research
- well selected bibliography in proper format (IoA-referencing guidelines)

4. drawing of relevant artefacts

- appropriate selection of artefacts to draw
- drawings technically correct
- *quality of the drawing

This means that you will not be marked down for "ugly" but technically correct drawings, but you will be marked up for beautiful drawings, provided they are technically correct. Some people are already talented draughtspersons, but normally the quality of drawing (especially inking) can only be improved with a lot of practice.

5. photographs of relevant artefacts

- appropriate selection of artefacts, useful views
- technically correct (scale, visibility, lighting, orientation etc.)
- *quality of the photograph

you can use "hybrid techniques" of documentation, for example, combining photographs and a section-drawing, but make sure all formal requirements are met!

6. finds report/catalogue

- appropriate form and length
- core data included
- consistency of entries
- ease of use

*correct identification and dating

This means you will not be marked down for a wrong identification, if it is supported by appropriate research, but you will be marked up for correct identifications

The length of the entries should correspond to the importance of the piece and should be comparable to normal finds-reports (check relevant examples in library!).

There are several possible formats for catalogues. Reflection on which information to include and how to present them in the most effective way are part of your task. I do not provide templates for the portfolio, because reflection on the form is part of your task. Refer to published catalogues for examples.

The arbitrary word limit/page limit set by college means that you may have to economise on space, rather than maximising readability and aesthetics. **I still need high quality images to judge your drawings and photographs.** You could provide examples of the intended layout on a reduced scale, however, provided that I can blow it up to full size without loss of quality.

Access to Findslab and Photolab

The findslab is accessible via the Photolab (4th floor, end of the corridor, to the left as you leave the lift). It is accessible via a number lock during office hours (9-17.00). You can use the lab while teaching is in progress, but please behave in a considerate manner and do not create any disturbance.

There are four workspaces in the finds lab, so not all of you will be able to work at the same time. The teaching materials are kept in a shelf opposite the entrance. Please keep your materials there, unless you are working on them. All boxes with finds need to be labelled with your name and the number of the course. Unlabelled boxes may be discarded without warning. Never leave material on the table, other students will need the space as well.

The find from the IoA collection for your portfolio need to be kept in the locked grey cupboard next to the window. The key is in the numberlock box in front, I will provide you with the number in lecture 1. Always check that the cupboard is properly locked. When you work on the IoA finds, you need to use the foam padding on the table and gloves, which you can only remove when drawing finds. Rachael Sparks (r.sparks@ucl.ac.uk) will give you an introduction to finds handling, date tba. Any problems with the finds should be reported to Rachael immediately.

Photographic equipment can be borrowed from Antonio Reis (a.reis@ucl.ac.uk) or Ken Walton (k.walton@ucl.ac.uk). If you need to use the photolab in order to take photographs, you need to book a slot, link TBA. Both Ken and Antonio will be happy to help you in case of problems. Please let me know if there are any problems with the finds lab. It needs to be kept in good order at all times. In addition, Room 101 is available for work with finds, details tba.

Recommended basic texts and online resources

Core texts

There is no good single handbook for this module. The following books cover some of the subjects that are central to artefact studies;

Artefacts:

*Caple, C. 2006. *Objects: reluctant witnesses to the past*. Abingdon, Routledge. [INST ARCH LA CAP](#)

Ewen, C. R. 2003. *Artifacts*. Archaeologist's toolkit 4. Walnut Creek, Altamira Press.

Henderson, J. 2000. *The Science and archaeology of Materials: an investigation of inorganic materials*. London, Routledge. [INST ARCH JDA HEN](#) and [online](#)

Hodges, H. 1976. *Artifacts: an introduction to early materials and technology*. London, J. Baker.

*Hurcombe, L. 2007. *Archaeological Artefacts as material Culture*. London, Routledge.

[INST ARCH AH HUR](#) and [online](#)

Specific raw materials

Andrefsky, W. Jr. 2005. *Lithics, Macroscopic approaches to analysis*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press (2nd ed.). [INST ARCH KA AND](#)

Bayley, J. et al. 2001. *Archaeometallurgy*. Swindon, English Heritage Centre for Archaeology Guidelines. [INST ARCH KEB Qto BAY](#)

Brézillon, M. N. 1968. *La dénomination des objets de pierre taillée: matériaux pour un vocabulaire des préhistoriens de langue française*. IV^e supplément à Gallia préhistoire. Paris, Éditions du Centre national de la Recherche. [INST ARCH KA BRE](#)

Henderson, J. 2000. *The science and archaeology of materials. An investigation of inorganic materials*. London, Routledge. [INST ARCH JDA HEN](#)

Hurcombe, L. 2014. *Perishable material culture in prehistory: investigating the missing majority*. London, Routledge. [INST ARCH K HUR](#)

Orton, C. 1978, *Pottery archive users' handbook*. London, Museum of London, Department of Urban Archaeology. [INST ARCH KD 3 ORT](#)

Fabric Types

Orton, C. et al. 2013. *Pottery in archaeology* (2nd edition). Cambridge, Cambridge University Press. [INST ARCH KD 3 ORT](#)

Quinn, P. S. 2013. *Ceramic petrography: the interpretation of archaeological pottery and related artefacts in thin section*. Oxford, Archaeopress. [INST ARCH KD 3 QUI](#)

Rye, O. S. 1981. *Pottery technology; Principles and reconstruction*. Manuals on Archaeology 4. Washington, Taraxacum. [INST ARCH KD 1 RYE](#)

Roberts, B. W., Thornton, Chr. P. (eds) 2014, *Archaeometallurgy in global perspective: methods and syntheses*. New York, Springer. [ONLINE](#)

Rice, P. M. 1987. *Pottery analysis: a sourcebook*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press. [INST ARCH IOA RIC 2](#)

Shepard, A. 1956. *Ceramics for the Archaeologist*. Washington, Carnegie Institution. [Online](#)

1. Introduction: Artefacts, assemblages and material culture

Ulrike Sommer

04/10/23

In this session, we will first discuss the structure and assessment of the course, as well as any other questions you may have. In the second part of the session, we will talk about the nature of artefacts, archaeological assemblages, and the contentious concepts of material culture, materiality artefact agency and entanglement.

Readings on materials and materiality in general

- *Appadurai, A. (ed.) 1986. *The social life of things: commodities in cultural perspective*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press. [INST ARCH BD APP](#)
- *Caple, C. 2006. *Objects: reluctant witnesses to the past*. Abingdon, Routledge. [INST ARCH LA CAP](#)
useful overview and reference
- Cooney, G. Material Culture. In: Gardener et al. (eds.), *Oxford handbook of archaeological Theory*.
- De Marais, E. et al. (eds) 2004. *Rethinking materiality: The engagement of the mind with material Worlds*. Cambridge, McDonald Insitute. [INST ARCH AH Qto DEM](#)
- Hicks, D., Beaudry, M. C. (eds.) 2010, *Oxford Handbook of Material Culture Studies*. Oxford, Oxford University Press. [ANTHR C9 HIC and Online](#)
- Hodder, I. 2012. *Entangled: an archaeology of the relationships between humans and things*. Chichester, Wiley/Blackwell. [INST ARCH BD HOD](#), DOI: 10.1002/9781118241912
- *Hurcombe, L. M. 2007. *Archaeological artefacts as material culture*. Abingdon, Routledge. [INST ARCH AH HUR and online](#)
- *Jones, A. 2004. Archaeometry and materiality: Materials-based analysis in theory and practice. *Archaeometry* 46/3, 327–338.
- Kingery, D. W. (ed.) 1996. *Learning from things: method and theory of material culture studies* Washington, Smithsonian Institution Press. [INST ARCH BD KIN](#)
- Latour, B. 1999. *Pandora's hope: essays on the reality of science studies*. Cambridge, Harvard University Press. [HISTORY OF SCIENCE W 5 LAT](#), [ANTHROPOLOGY D 6 LAT](#)
The text starting the discussion about symmetrical archaeology and object agency. Have a look!
- *Lemonnier, P. 1986. The study of material culture today: towards an anthropology of technical systems. *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* 5, 147-86. [NET](#)
- Miller, H. M.-L. 2007. *Archaeological approaches to technology*. London and Amsterdam, Elsevier/Academic Press. [INST ARCH K MIL](#)
- Nanoglou, St. 2008. Qualities of humanness; material aspects of Greek Neolithic anthropomorphic imagery. *Journal of Material Culture* 13/3, 311–334. [INST ARCH PERS and NET](#)
- *Olsen, Bj. 2010. *In defence of things. Archaeology and the ontology of objects*. Lanham, Altamira. [INST ARCH AH OLS](#)
An archaeological take on material culture theory. A good introduction to theoretical approaches
- Schiffer, M. B. 1999. *The material life of human beings: artefacts, behavior and communication*. London, Routledge. [INST ARCH BD SCH](#)
- Sigaut, F. 1994. Technology. In: T. Ingold (ed.), *Companion Encyclopedia of Anthropology*. Routledge, London, 420–459. [ISSUE DESK IOA ING 2](#)
- Tilley, Ch. et al. (eds) 2006. *Handbook of material culture*. London, Sage. [INST ARCH AH TIL](#)
- Thornton, Chr. P. 2009. Archaeometallurgy: Evidence of a paradigm shift? In: Kienlin, T. L.; Roberts, B. W. (eds), *Metals and societies. Studies in honour of Barbara S. Ottaway*. Universitätsforschungen zur prähistorischen Archäologie 169, Bonn, Habelt, 25-33.

Inst Arch KEA QTO KIE

A short history of research in archaeometallurgy, outlining some trends. Useful to consider for other scientific fields as well.

van Gijn, A., Wentik, K. 2013. The role of flint in mediating identities: the microscopic evidence. In: Hahn, H.-P., Weiss, H. (eds), *Mobility, meaning and the transformation of things: shifting contexts of material culture through time and space*. Oxford, Oxbow, 121-132.

General perspectives on material culture, mainly in a modern context

Boivin, N. 2008. *Material cultures, material minds: the impact of things on human thought, society, and evolution*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press. [INST ARCH AH BOI](#)

Conneller, Ch. 2011. An archaeology of materials. *Substantial transformations in early prehistoric Europe*. Abingdon, Routledge. [INST ARCH DA 100 CON](#)

Mainly on Mesolithic materials

Dant, T. 1999. *Material culture in the social world: values, activities, lifestyles*. Buckingham, Open University Press. [ANTHROPOLOGY C 9 DAN](#)

Donald, M., Hurcombe, L. (eds) 2000. *Gender and material culture in historical perspective*. Basingstoke, Macmillan. [ANTHROPOLOGY C 9 DON](#)

Ewen, C. R. 2003. *Artifacts*. Archaeologist's toolkit 4. Walnut Creek: Altamira Press. [INST ARCH AH EWE](#)

Henare, A., Holbraad, M., Wastell, S. (eds) 2007. *Thinking through things: theorising artefacts ethnographically*. Abingdon, Routledge. [ANTHROPOLOGY C 9 HEN](#)

Hallam, E., Ingold, T. (eds), 2014. *Making and Growing: Anthropological studies of organisms and Artefacts* Farnham, Ashgate.

[https://www-dawsonera-](https://www-dawsonera-com.libproxy.ucl.ac.uk/terms/show?dest=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.dawsonera.com%2Fabstract%2F9781409436430)

[com.libproxy.ucl.ac.uk/terms/show?dest=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.dawsonera.com%2Fabstract%2F9781409436430](https://www-dawsonera-com.libproxy.ucl.ac.uk/terms/show?dest=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.dawsonera.com%2Fabstract%2F9781409436430)

Lubar, St., Kingery, W. D. 1993. *History from things: essays on material culture*. Washington, Smithsonian Institution Press. [INST ARCH AH LUB](#) and [ANTHROPOLOGY C 9 LUB](#)

*Meskell, L. (ed.) 2006. *Archaeologies of materiality*. Oxford, Blackwell. [INST ARCH AH MES](#) and [ANTHROPOLOGY C 9 MES](#)

Miller, D. (ed.) 2005. *Materiality*. Durham, Duke University Press. [ANTHROPOLOGY C 9 MIL, Online](#)

2. Excavations and Field Recording/ Thinking about assemblages – basic data

Ulrike Sommer

11/10/2023

This lecture provides a very short overview over the process of excavation and the various methods used. We look at how the excavation methods bias the recovery of finds and methods to deal with this. We then discuss the practicalities of washing, marking and storing finds during excavation. How can fail-safes be established and finds processed as fast as possible?

Normally, archaeologists are not dealing with single finds, but with assemblages, consisting mainly of broken artefacts. We will discuss simple statistics used to describe and compare assemblages from different sites, mainly using Excell spreadsheets. Students interested in the matter should consider taking the course in Quantitative Methods and using either SPSS or R for any in-depth analysis. In the course of this module, there will be practical tasks where you have to apply the analytical steps we have been talking about.

Essential Reading

Barker, Ph. 1993 [1977], *Techniques of archaeological excavation*. London, Batsford. Chapter 9, The recording of pottery and small finds, 193-206. [INST ARCH AL BAR](#)

- Carver, M. O. H. 2009. *Archaeological Investigation*. London, Routledge. Chapter 9, Assemblage, 217-244. ISSUE DESK, AL 10 CAR
- Chadwick, A. 1997. Archaeology at the edge of chaos: further towards reflexive excavation methodologies. *Assemblage* 3.
<http://www.shef.ac.uk/assem/3/3chad.htm>

have a look at:

- Drewett, P. L. 1999. *Field archaeology: an introduction*. London, UCL Press, 145-161. Chapter 8, Post-fieldwork planning, processing and finds analysis. INST ARCH AL 10 DRE
- Museum of London (ed.) 1994. *Archaeological site manual*. London, Museum of London (3rd Edition). Chapters 4.1-4.2. INST ARCH AL WES
- Lucas, G. 2000. Splitting Objects. In: Lucas, G. *Critical approaches to fieldwork: contemporary and historical archaeological practice*. London, Routledge, Chapter 3. INST ARCH AH LUC

Guidelines

- Institute of Field Archaeologists 2000. *Draft standard and guidance for archaeological artefact and environmental collection, documentation, conservation and research*. online:
<http://www.archaeologists.net/modules/icontent/index.php?page=15>
- Darvill, T. C., B. Russel 2002. *Archaeology after PPG16: archaeological investigations in England 1990-1999*. Research Report 10, Bournemouth University. English Heritage
<http://csweb.bournemouth.ac.uk/aip/ppg16/>
- English Heritage 1991. *Management of archaeological projects* (=MAP2 authored for English Heritage by Gill Andrews) London, English Heritage. INST ARCH DAA 100 ENG
also <http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/knowledge/archaeology/map2/index.htm>
- Ewen, C. R. 2003. *Artifacts*. Archaeologist's toolkit 4. Walnut Creek: Altamira Press. Part II – preparing for analysis. INST ARCH AH EWE
- Greene, K. 1984. The Roman fortress at Usk, Wales, and the processing of Roman pottery for publication. *Journal of Field Archaeology* 11, 405-412. INST ARCH Pers.
- Harris, E. C. 1989. *Principles of archaeological stratigraphy* (2nd ed.), New York, Academic Press. INST ARCH AL HAR and <http://www.harrismatrix.com/>
especially chapter 10 and Appendix 1.
- Haselgrove, C., I. et al. 2001. *Understanding the British Iron Age: an agenda for action: a report for the Iron Age research seminar and the Council of the Prehistoric Society*. Salisbury, Trust for Wessex Archaeology. INST ARCH DAA 160 Qto HAS
- Museum of London 2002. *A research framework for London archaeology*. London, Museum of London. INST ARCH DAA 416 Qto MUS
- Society of Museum Archaeologists 1993. *Selection, retention and dispersal of archaeological collections: Guidelines for use in England, Wales and Northern Ireland*. London, Society of Museum Archaeologists. INST ARCH MG 2 SEL
- Westman, A. (ed.) 1990. *Archaeological site manual* (3rd edition) London, Museum of London. INST ARCH AL WES (Online at:
<http://www.molas.org.uk/pages/serviceEx.asp>).

Essential Reading on pottery processing

- Orton, C., P. Tyers, A. Vince 1993. *Pottery in archaeology*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, Chapter 4. INST ARCH KD 3 ORT
- Whittingham, L. 2001. *Minimum standards for the processing, recording, analysis and publication of post-Roman ceramics*. Occasional paper of the Medieval Pottery Research Group 2. London, Medieval Pottery Research Group. INST ARCH KD 3 Qto SLO
<http://www.thamesdiscovery.org/> on the archaeology of the Thames in London
have a quick browse

see also

Bader, B. 2021. From knobbly bits to whole vessels – Information gleaned from Pottery from large disturbed contexts. In: Kilian, A., Zöller-Engelhardt, M. (eds.), *Excavating the Extra-Ordinary. Challenges and Merits of Working with Small Finds*: Proceedings of the International Egyptological Workshop at Johannes Gutenberg-University Mainz, 8–9 April 2019. Heidelberg, Propylaeum, 2021.

<https://doi.org/10.11588/propylaeum.676>

Egyptology, but a useful guide to pottery recording in general.

Arcelin, P., Tuffreau-Libre, M. 1999. *La quantification des céramiques, conditions et protocole*. Collection Bibracte 2. Glux-en-Glenne, Centre archéologique Europeen. [INST ARCH DAC 20 Qto ARC](#)

For an example of very formalised recording systems

David, N. 1982. The design of archaeological processing systems with special reference to that employed at Lake Vouliagmeni, Greece. *Journal of Field Archaeology* 9, 237-241. [INST ARCH Pers](#)

*Medieval Pottery Research Group 1998. *A guide to the classification of medieval ceramic forms*. Occasional paper of the Medieval Pottery Research Group 1. London, Medieval Pottery Research Group. [INST ARCH KD 3 MED](#)

Joukowsky, M. S. 1982. Ceramic processing: an appraisal of the Lake Vouliagmeni recording system and the issues addressed by Nicholas David. *Journal of Field Archaeology* 9, 248-251. [INST ARCH Pers](#)

Shopland, N. 2006. *A finds manual: excavating, processing and storing*. Stroud, Tempus [INST ARCH K SHO](#)

Ambitious but not without problems as highlighted in this review:

Mepham, L. 2006, Review of "Shopland, N. 2006. A finds manual: excavating, processing and storing", *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society* 72.

http://www.ucl.ac.uk/prehistoric/reviews/06_11_shopland.htm

http://www.prehistoricsociety.org/files/reviews/06_11_shopland.htm

Quantification

Recommended Reading:

Baxter, M. J. 2003. *Statistics in Archaeology*. London, Arnold. [INST ARCH AK 10 BAX](#)

Carlson, D. L. 2018. Statistics in Archaeology. In: Varela, S. L. (ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Archaeological Sciences*. Hoboken, John Wiley & Sons.

[DOI: 10.1002/9781119188230.saseas0553](https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119188230.saseas0553)

Drennan, D. 2008. Statistics in Archaeology. In: Pearsall, D. (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Archaeology*. San Diego, Academic Press 2093-2100. [Online](#)

**Orton, C. 1989. An introduction into the quantification of assemblages of pottery. *Journal of Roman Pottery Studies* 2, 94-97.

*Shennan, St. 1996. *Quantifying archaeology*. Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press: 2nd ed. [INST ARCH AK 10 SHE](#)

Still the best introduction

VanPool, L., Leonard, R. D. 2010. *Quantitative Analysis in Archaeology*. Malden/Oxford, Wiley.

There are several introductions to Excell and Spreadsheets. Be aware that the program constantly changes and we will all be probably using different versions, which can be highly confusing. There is good online help available as well. Again, talk to each other, fighting the spreadsheet on your own can be highly frustrating, normally it is a small detail that is holding you back!

3. Exploring the Thames Southbank

Ulrike Sommer

18/10/2022

We will take a look at what items can be found on the foreshore between Tate Modern and Blackfriar's bridge and discuss the date of the finds.

Please wear sensible shoes, I will provide gloves.

See the Moodle for practical details.

See <https://www.pla.co.uk/Environment/Thames-foreshore-permits> for legal and practical details.

Some readings on the finds we can expect:

Medieval/postmedieval pottery

Blackmore, L., Pearce, J. 2010. *A dated type series of London medieval pottery. Part 5, Shelly-sandy ware and the greyware industries*. MOLA Monograph 49. London, Museum of London Archaeology. [INST ARCH DAA 416 Qto BLA](#)

and the other volumes in this series

Brown, D. H. 2002. *Pottery in Medieval Southampton, c. 1066-1510*. Southampton Archaeology Monographs 8, CBA Research Report 133. York, Council for British Archaeology. [INST ARCH DAA Qto Series COU 133](#)

Draper, J. 1984. *Post-medieval pottery, 1650-1800*. Princes Risborough, Shire. [INST ARCH KD 1 DRA](#)

Gaimster, D. 1997. *German Stoneware 1200-1900, Archaeology and cultural history*. London, British Museum. [INST ARCH KD 1 GAI](#)

Haslam, J. 1984. *Medieval pottery*. Princes Risborough, Shire. [INST ARCH DAA 190 HAS](#)

Hurst, J. G., Neal, D. S., van Beuningen, H. J. E. 1986. *Pottery produced and traded in North-West Europe 1350-1650*. Rotterdam Papers. Rotterdam, Museum Boymans-van Beuningen. [INST ARCH KD 3 HUR](#)

*Medieval Pottery Research Group 1998. *A guide to the classification of medieval ceramic forms*. Occasional paper of the Medieval Pottery Research Group 1. London, Medieval Pottery Research Group. [INST ARCH KD 3 MED](#)

Schreg, Rainer 1999. *Keramik aus Südwestdeutschland. Eine Hilfe zur Beschreibung, Bestimmung und Datierung archäologischer Funde vom Neolithikum bis zur Neuzeit*. Tübingen, Verlag des Vereins für Archäologie des Mittelalters.

Dubbe, B. 2012. *Huusraet, Huusraet. Het stedelijk woonhuis in de Bourgondische tijd*. Hoorn, PolderVondsten.

Clay tobacco pipes

Cambridge Archaeology Field Group. November 2012:

<http://www.cafg.net/docs/articles/ClayPipes.pdf>

Oswald, A. 1985. *Clay pipes for the archaeologist*. BAR 14, Oxford, British Archaeological Reports.

See also the numerous volumes on "The archaeology of the clay tobacco pipe" published by BAR

Binford, L. R. 1962. A new Method of calculating Dates from Kaolin Pipe Stem Samples. *Southeastern Archaeological Conference Newsletter* 9/1, 19-21. Reprinted in: Schuyler, R. (ed.) 1978. *Historical Archaeology: A Guide to substantive and theoretical Contributions*. Farmingdale, Baywood, 66-67.

Higgins, D. 2017. *Guidelines for the Recovery and Processing of Clay Tobacco Pipes from Archaeological Projects*. National Pipe Archive, University of Liverpool, Version 1.2 (3 September 2017). <https://historicengland.org.uk/whats-new/research/national-pipe-archive/>

http://www.pipearchive.co.uk/pdfs/howto/Guidelines%20Ver%201_2%20030917.pdf

McMillan, L. K. 2010. Put this in your Pipe and smoke it: An Evaluation of Tobacco Pipe Stem dating Methods. MA dissertation Greenville, East Carolina University.

https://thescholarship.ecu.edu/bitstream/handle/10342/2903/McMillan_ecu_0600M_10211.pdf

Schrire, V. et al. 1990, The Chronology of Oudepost I, Cape, as inferred from an Analysis of Clay Pipes. *Journal of Archaeological Science* 17, 269-300. Online

Leather Artefacts

Volken, M. 2014. *Archaeological footwear; development of shoe patterns and styles from prehistory till the 1600's*. Zwolle, Spa.

Goubitz, O. 1984. The drawing and registration of archaeological footwear. *Studies in Conservation* 29/4, 1984, 187-196.

Glass

Jeffries, N., Major, N. 2015. Mid 17th- and 19th-century English wine bottles with seals in London's archaeological collections. *Post-Medieval Archaeology* 49/1, 131-155, DOI: 10.1179/0079423615Z.00000000075

Baugher-Perlin, Sh. 2014. Analysing glass bottles for chronology, function, and trade networks. In: Dickens, R. S. (ed.), *Archaeology of urban America: The search for pattern and process*. New York, Academic Press, 259-290. [Online](#) and [STORE 17-0505](#)

On the US, but has some useful general information on mould-formed glass.

Pearce, J. 2000. A late 18th-century inn clearance assemblage from Uxbridge, Middlesex. *Post-Medieval Archaeology*, 34/1, 144-186. DOI: 10.1179/pma.2000.004

Case study. Early modern glass is generally understudied

4. Basic sorting: Bulk and small finds/Thinking about assemblages – basic data II

Ulrike Sommer

25/10/2023

We will sort and identify the finds from the Southbank.

How are artefacts identified, selected and recorded? In which categories should finds be divided? We will look at the various ways bulk- and recorded finds are separated and processed and discuss the advantages and shortcomings.

5. Big Data: The Portable Antiquities Scheme (PAS) in England and Wales

Edwin Wood, Kings College

01/11/2023

Finds are not only made in the context of excavations, but also by accident and by laypersons looking for artefacts. Edwin will look at the legal situation in England, its implications for archaeology and the steps taken to ensure that non-excavation finds are recorded and preserved. We will also look at the way post-depositional factors influence finds-distributions on a regional or national scale. The second half of the class will be devoted to exploring the potentials of PAS as a research tool.

Edwin has also worked as a FLO, so he can tell you about the practicalities of this demanding job and possibilities for volunteering.

Look over

Portable Antiquities web-site: www.finds.org.uk

Have a look at the annual reports: <http://www.finds.org.uk/news/annual.asp>

Further Reading

- Bland, R. 1996. The treasure act and the proposals for the voluntary recording of all archaeological finds. In: Denford, G. T. (ed.), *Museums in the landscape: bridging the gap*. *Museum Archaeologist* 23, 3-19. [INST ARCH Pers and Online](#)
- *Bland, R. 2005. A pragmatic approach to the problem of portable antiquities: the experience of England and Wales. *Antiquity* 79, 440-447. [INST ARCH Pers](#)
- Brindle, T. 2014. *The Portable Antiquities Scheme and Roman Britain*. British Museum Research Publications 196. London, British Museum. [INST ARCH DAA 170 Qto BRI and online](#)
- Gaimster, D. 2004. Measures against the illicit trade in cultural objects: the emerging strategy in Britain. *Antiquity* 78, 699-707. [INST ARCH Pers](#)
- Dobinson, C., Denison, S. 1995. *Metal detecting and archaeology in England*. London, English Heritage. <http://www.britarch.ac.uk/detecting/cont.html>
- Gregory, T., Rogerson, A. J. G. 1985. Metal-detecting in archaeological excavation. *Antiquity* 58, 179-184. [INST ARCH Pers and NET](#)
- Harlow, N., 2021. *Belonging and belongings: Portable artefacts and identity in the Civitas of the Icenii*. Archaeology of Roman Britain 4, BAR. British Series 664. Oxford, BAR. [INST ARCH DAA Qto Series BRI 664 and Online](#).
- Hobbs, R. 1999. Finding our past, the Portable Antiquities Scheme in England and Wales. *Museum Archaeologist* 26, 25-31 [INST ARCH Pers](#)
- Robbins, K. 2014. *A Guide for Researchers*. London, Portable Antiquities Scheme/British Museum.
(<http://finds.org.uk/documents/guideforresearchers.pdf>)
- Sussams, K. 1998. Half a million hours: a 20 year archaeological survey of Norfolk. *Museum Archaeologist* 25, 39-44. [INST ARCH Pers and Online](#).
- Worrell, S. et al. (eds). 2010. *A Decade of Discovery. Proceedings of the Portable Antiquities Scheme Conference 2007*. BAR British Series 520. Oxford, Archaeopress. [INST ARCH DAA Qto Series BRI 520 and Online](#).

6. Working with Collections

Alice Stevenson, IoA

15/11/23

In this session, we will consider the sorts of archaeological research that can be conducted using museum collections, how to go about doing archaeological research in museums, and the curatorial decision-making processes that mediate between research demands on the one hand and responsibilities of maintaining object integrity for perpetuity on the other. This includes consideration of issues related to colonial language embedded in museum databases through to destructive and non-destructive sampling for a range of archaeological science projects. We will also evaluate how representative museum collections are of fieldwork and the sorts of biases that are introduced in the processes of transferring finds from excavation site to museum repository that may impact on future archaeological interpretation. In what ways are fieldwork and museum study interrelated? Finally, we will also consider the ethics of working with collections, including private collections.

Essential Reading

- *Stevenson, A. 2022. Introduction: Museum Archaeology. In: Stevenson, A. (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Museum Archaeology*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
Chapters in this volume are also useful for themes of histories and legacies of collections, ethics of working with collections, and the relationships between the field and the museum.

Recommended reading

- Friedman, C., Janz, L. 2018. A very remote storage box indeed: The importance of doing archaeology with old museum collections. *Journal of Field Archaeology* 43/4, 257–268.
- Heitman, C. C. 2017. The creation of gender bias in museum collections: recontextualizing archaeological and archival collections from Chaco Canyon, New Mexico. *Museum Anthropology* 40/2, 128–142.
- King, J. 2016. Comparative colonialism and collections-based archaeological research, Dig less, catalogue more. *Museum Worlds* 4, 4–17.
- Mackenzie, S. et al., 2019. Introduction. In: Mackenzie, S. et al. (eds), *Trafficking culture: New directions in researching the global market in illicit antiquities*. Abingdon, Routledge. [INST ARCH AG 21 MAC](#)
- Shaw, I. Sifting the Spoil: Excavation Techniques from Peet to Pendlebury at El-Amarna. In: Leahy, A., Smith, H. S., Tait, J. (eds), *Studies on ancient Egypt in honour of H. S. Smith*. London, Egypt Exploration Society, 1999, 273-282.
- Sparks, R. 2013. Flinders Petrie through word and deed: re-evaluation field techniques and their impact on object recovery in British Mandate Palestine. *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 145/2, 143–59.
- Stevenson, A. 2014. Artefacts of excavation: the collection and distribution of Egyptian finds to museums, 1880–1915. *Journal of the History of Collections* 26/1, 89–102.
- Villing, A. Reconstructing a 19th-century excavation: problems and perspectives. In: Villing, A. et al. (eds.), *Naukratis, Greeks in Egypt*. London, British Museum, Online Research Catalogues. https://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20190801105436/https://www.britishmuseum.org/research/online_research_catalogues/ng/naukratis_greeks_in_egypt.aspx
- Vitelli, K. D., Colwell-Chanthaphonh, Ch. (eds.) 1984. *Archaeological Ethics*. Walnut Creek, Altamira. [INST ARCH AF VIT](#)
- Voss, B. 2012. Curation as research: a case study in orphaned and underreported archaeological collections. *Archaeological Dialogues* 19/2, 145–169. Online
- Whitley, J. 2016. Discussion and Debate: Fusing the horizons, or why context matters: The interdependence of fieldwork and museum study in Mediterranean archaeology. *Journal of Mediterranean Archaeology* 29/2, 247–261.

see also

- Opgenhaffen, L. 2022. Archives in action. The impact of digital technology on archaeological recording strategies and ensuing open research archives. *Digital Applications in Archaeology and Cultural Heritage* 27, e00231.
- Sparks, R. Digging with Petrie: Gerald Lankester Harding at Tell Jemmeh, 1926–1927. *Bulletin of the History of archaeology* 29/1, 2019. [DOI: 10.5334/bha-609](https://doi.org/10.5334/bha-609)
- Stevenson, A. 2019. *Scattered Finds, Archaeology, Egyptology and Museums*. London, UCL Press.

7. Cataloguing artefacts: Artefact description, raw materials and classification

Rachael Sparks

22/11/23

In this session we will discuss object catalogues: what are they, why do we need them, and where do they fit into the broader scheme of field and museum work. We will then use a series of practical exercises, using material from the Institute of Archaeology Collections to introduce a range of cataloguing skills including observation, description and deduction, focussing on the identification of raw materials.

Essential reading

Collections Trust, 2010. Cataloguing Objects

<http://www.collectionstrust.org.uk>

Museums Australia (Victoria). 2009. The Small Museums Cataloguing Manual:

<http://www.mavic.asn.au/services/small-museums-cataloguing-manual>

Recommended reading

Holm, S. A. 2002. *Cataloguing made easy: how to catalogue your collections*. 2nd ed. Cambridge, MDA. [ME 2 Qto HOL](#)

Lejeune, B. 2007. The effects of online catalogues in London and other museums: A study of an alternative way of access. *Papers from the Institute of Archaeology* S1, 79-97.

<http://pia-journal.co.uk/index.php/pia/article/viewArticle/54>

Thornes, R. et al. 1999. *Introduction to Object ID: Guidelines for making records that describe art, antiques and antiquities*

http://icom.museum/objectid/guide/guide_index.html

Will, L. 2010. *Time taken to create catalogue records for museum objects and archives*

<http://www.willpowerinfo.co.uk/catrates.htm>

8. Describing pottery I, shapes

Rachael Sparks

29/11/23

We will practice describing the shape of pottery vessels. Start at the top, going from the general shape to the details. Nearly every area and era has a specialised terminology, but you can use basic geometric shapes in a more general approach.

Recommended Reading:

See lecture 7

9. Describing pottery II, fabric and decoration

Ulrike Sommer

6/12/23

While we concentrated on the description of shape in the previous session, will now look at the description of fabric, temper, the surface treatment of pottery and the description of colour. In addition, we will discuss problems of pottery terminology and classification. You will also learn how to use a digital microscope, a useful tool for identifying and documenting inclusions and wear traces.

Recommended Reading:

*Medieval Pottery Research Group 2001. *Minimum standards for the processing, recording, analysis and publication of post-Roman ceramics* (compiled by A. Slowikowski, B. Nenck, J. Pearce). London, Medieval Pottery Research Group. [INST ARCH KD 3 Qto SLO](#)

*Orton, C. et al. 1993. *Pottery in archaeology*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, [INST ARCH KD 3 ORT, Issue Desk, Online](#)

Tomber, R., Dore, J. 1998. *The National Roman Fabrics reference collection*. Museum of London Archaeology Service Monograph 2. London, Museum of London. [INST ARCH DAA 170 Qto TOM](#)

Useful tables for the description of inclusions etc.

Whitbread, I. 2016. Fabric Description of archaeological ceramics. In: Hunt, A. *The Oxford Handbook of Archaeological Ceramic Analysis*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 200–216. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199681532.013.13>

Further Reading

Balfet, H., Fauvet-Berthelot, M.-F., Monzon, S. 1983. *Pour la normalization de la description des poteries*. Paris, CNRS.

Fulford, M. G., Huddleston K. 1991. *The current state of Romano-British pottery studies*. Occasional paper 1. London, English Heritage. [INST ARCH DAA 170 Qto FUL](#)

Gibson, A., Woods, A. 1990. *Prehistoric pottery for the archaeologist*. Leicester: Leicester University Press. [INST ARCH KD 3 GIB](#)

overview

Hey, G., M. Lacey 2001. *Evaluation of archaeological decision-making processes and sampling strategies*. Oxford, Kent County Council. [INST ARCH AL 10 Qto HEY](#), http://www.planarch.org/downloads/library/eval_of_arch_decision-making.pdf

Holm, S. A. 1993. *Cataloguing made easy*. Cambridge, Museum Documentation Association. ME 2 Qto HOL

Kunow, J. et al. 1986. *Suggestion for the systematic recording of pottery*. Führer des Rheinischen Landesmuseums 124. Bonn, Rheinisches Landesmuseum. [INST ARCH KD 3 VOR](#)

Millet, M. (ed.) 1979. *Pottery and the Archaeologist*. Occasional Publication 4. London, Institute of Archaeology.

Museum Documentation Association 2007. *SPECTRUM: The UK Museum Documentation Standard* (3rd ed.). Cambridge, Cambridge Museum.

Prehistoric Ceramics Research Group 1995. *The study of later prehistoric pottery: general policies and guidelines for analysis and publication*. PCRG Occasional Papers 1 and 2. Oxford, Prehistoric Ceramics Research Group. [INST ARCH KD PRE](#)

Quinn, P. et al., 2009. *Interpreting silent artefacts: petrographic approaches to archaeological ceramics*. Oxford, Archaeopress. [INST ARCH KD 3 QUI](#)

Scientific methods

Ross, J. et al. 2018. A scanning method for the identification of pottery forming techniques at the mesoscopic scale: A pilot study in the manufacture of Early Bronze Age III holemouth jars and platters from Tell es-Safi/Gath. *Journal of Archaeological Science Reports* 18, 551-561. [Online](#)

Roux, V., Courty, M.-A. 2019. *Ceramics and society: A technological approach to archaeological assemblages*. Cham, Springer. [INST ARCH KD 3 ROU](#), Ebook

Main emphasis on chaîne opératoire and technology

Rye, O. S. 1981. *Pottery technology; principles and reconstructions*. Manuals on Archaeology 4. Chicago, University of Chicago Press. [INST ARCH KD 1 RYE](#)

Tyers, P. 1996. *Roman pottery in Britain*. London, Batsford. [INST ARCH DAA 170 TYE](#)

Schreg, Rainer 1999. *Keramik aus Südwestdeutschland. Eine Hilfe zur Beschreibung, Bestimmung und Datierung archäologischer Funde vom Neolithikum bis zur Neuzeit*. Tübingen, Verlag des Vereins für Archäologie des Mittelalters. [STORE 16-0315](#)

*Szrajber, T. 1997. *The British Museum Materials Thesaurus*. Cambridge, MDA/British Museum. [ME 2 Qto BRI](#)

Thér, R. 2016. Identification of pottery-forming techniques using quantitative analysis of the orientation of inclusions and voids in thin sections. *Archaeometry* 58/2, 222-238

Thér, R. 2014. Identification of pottery firing structures using the thermal characteristics of firing: Identification of pottery firing structures using thermal characteristics. *Archaeometry* 56, 78-99. [Online](#)

Tyukin, I. et al. 2018. Exploring automated pottery identification [Arch-I-Scan]. *Internet Archaeology* 50. [Online](#)

The future?

Samian

de la Bédoyère, G. 1988. *Samian ware*. Princes Risborough, Shire. [INST ARCH KD BED, YATES P 40 DEL](#)

Short popular overview

Webster, P. 1996. *Roman Samian Pottery in Britain*. CBA Practical Handbooks in Archaeology 13. York, CBA. [INST ARCH DAA 170 WEB](#)

You will need to provide some personal details and agree to their terms in order to download the file for reading.

Willis, S. 2004. Samian Pottery, a Resource for the Study of Roman Britain and Beyond: the results of the English Heritage funded Samian Project. *Internet Archaeology* 17, <https://doi.org/10.11141/ia.17.1>

<https://www.rgzm.de/samian/>

<https://potsherd.net/atlas/types/sigillata/gallery>

Weblinks Thesauri:

<http://www.collectionslink.org.uk/discover>

http://www.collectionslink.org.uk/assets/thesaurus_bmm/matintro.htm

British Museum Thesaurus

10. Typology, shape and use

Ulrike Sommer

13/12/2023

For every area and every time period, a separate terminology is used to describe specific artefacts. Often, these terms are not very well defined, sometimes the classification seems to defy logic – but they have been proven useful for the practitioners in the field – or people simply got used to them.

In this session, we are going to discuss why these specialised terminologies developed, and if they are still useful. We are also going to look at archaeological typology, from its evolutionist roots to numeric taxonomy and computer based methods as well as their evolutionist re-incarnation.

You will also have the chance to practice with some artefact illustrations and see if you arrive at the same result as the authors.

Recommended Reading

There is no good modern overview, but a lot of polemics

Adams, W. Y. 1988. Archaeological classification: theory versus practice. *Antiquity* 62, 40-56. [On-Line](#)

Adams, W. Y., Adams, E. W. 1991. *Archaeological typology and practical reality: a dialectical approach to artifact classification and sorting*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press. [INST ARCH AH ADA](#)

Albero Santacreu, D. et al. 2016. Formal Analysis and typological Classification in the Study of ancient Pottery. In A. Hunt (ed.) *The Oxford Handbook of Archaeological Ceramic Analysis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

[DOI: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199681532.013.12](https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199681532.013.12)

Binford, L. R. 1962. Archaeology as Anthropology. *American Antiquity* 28/2, 217-25 [INST ARCH PERS and NET](#)

Binford, L. R. 1968. Archaeological Perspectives. In: Binford, L. R., Binford, S. R., *New perspectives in archaeology*. Chicago, Aldine, 5-32. [INST ARCH AH BIN](#)

Bisson, M. S. 2000. Nineteenth century tools for twenty-first century archaeology? Why the Middle Palaeolithic typology of François Bordes must be replaced. *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory* 7/1, 1-48. On-line

Boozer, A. L. The tyranny of typologies: evidential reasoning in Romano-Egyptian domestic archaeology. In: Chapman, R., Wylie, A. (eds.), *Material Evidence, Learning from archaeological Practice*. London, Routledge, 92-109.

<https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315739274>

- Buck, C. E., Millard, A. R. (eds) 2004. *Tools for constructing chronologies: crossing disciplinary boundaries*. London, Springer. [INST ARCH AK 10 BUC](#)
- Carver, M. O. H. 1985. Theory and practice in urban pottery seriation. *Journal of Archaeological Science* 12, 353-366. [INST ARCH Pers and NET](#)
- Chapman, W. R. 1985. Arranging ethnology: A. H. L. F. Pitt Rivers and the typological tradition. In: G. W. Stocking Jr. (ed.), *Objects and Others, essays on museums and material culture*. History of Anthropology 3. Madison, University of Wisconsin Press, 15-48. [INST ARCH MG 3 STO](#)
- Clarke, D. 1968. *Analytical archaeology*. London, Methuen. Chapter 4 Material Culture Systems; Chapter 5 Artefact Types; Chapter 6 Assemblage and Culture. [INST ARCH CLA 20](#), <https://doi-org.libproxy.ucl.ac.uk/10.4324/9781315748481>
- Cumberpatch, C. G. 1997. Towards a phenomenological approach to medieval pottery. In: C. G. Cumberpatch, P. W. Blinkhorn (eds), *Not so much a pot, more a way of life*. Oxford, Oxbow, 125–152. [INST ARCH KD Qto CUM](#)
- Dunnell, R. C. 1986. Methodological issues in American artefact classification. In: M. B. Schiffer (ed.) *Advances in Archaeological Method and Theory* 9. New York, Academic Press, 149-207. [INST ARCH Pers](#)
- Hayden, B. 1984. Are emic types relevant to archaeology? *Ethnohistory* 31/2, 79-92. On-line
- Hodder, I. 1992. The narrative and rhetoric of material culture sequences. *World Archaeology* 25/2, 268-281. [INST ARCH Pers and NET](#)
- Ingold T. 1990. Society, nature and the concept of technology. In: Schlanger N., Sinclair, A. (eds.) *Technology in the Humanities*. *Archaeological Review from Cambridge* 9/1. [INST ARCH Pers](#)
- Kempton, W. 1981. *The folk classification of ceramics: A study of cognitive prototypes*. New York, Academic Press. [INST ARCH KD 3 KEM](#)
- Klejn, Leo S. 1982. *Archaeological typology* (trans. P. Dole). BAR International Series 153. Oxford, British Archaeological Reports. [INST ARCH AH Qto KLE](#)
- Lemonnier, P. 1986. The study of material culture today: towards an anthropology of technical systems. *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* 5, 147-86. [NET](#)
- Lemonnier, P. 1992. *Elements for an anthropology of technology*. Ann Arbor, University of Michigan. [INST ARCH BD LEM](#)
- Lucas, G. 2000. Splitting Objects. In: Lucas, G. *Critical approaches to fieldwork: contemporary and historical archaeological practice*. London, Routledge, Chapter 3. [INST ARCH AH LUC](#)
- Margolis, E., Laurence, St. (eds.) 2007. *Creations of the mind: theories of artefacts and their representation*. Oxford, Oxford University Press. [MAIN PHILOSOPHY J 165 MAR](#)
- Meskell, L. 2005. Introduction, object orientations. In: Meskell, L. (ed.), *Archaeologies of materiality*. Oxford, Blackwell, 1-17. [INST ARCH AH MES](#); [ANTHROPOLOGY C 9 MES](#); [DOI: 10.1002/9780470774052.ch1](#)
- Miller, D. 1982. Artefacts as products of human categorisation processes. In: I. Hodder (ed.), *Symbolic and Structural Archaeology*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 17-25. [INST ARCH HOD 12](#)
- Miller, D. 1985 *Artefacts as categories: A study of ceramic variability in central India*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press. [ANTHROPOLOGY RA 82 MIL](#)
- Montelius, O. 1899. *Die typologische Methode. Die älteren Kulturperioden im Orient und in Europa I*. Stockholm, Selbstverlag.
- Plog, S., Hantman, J. L. 1990. Chronology construction and the study of prehistoric culture change. *Journal of Field Archaeology* 17, 439-456. [INST ARCH Pers](#).
- Read, D. W. 2007. *Artefact classification: a conceptual and methodological approach*. Walnut Creek, Left Coast Press. [INST ARCH AH REA](#)
- Rice, P. M. 1976. Rethinking the ware concept. *American Antiquity* 41, 538-543. [INST ARCH Pers and NET](#)

Rowley-Conwy, P. 2007. *From Genesis to prehistory: The archaeological Three Age System and its contested reception in Denmark, Britain, and Ireland*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.

INST ARCH AG ROW

Sackett, J., 1982. Approaches to style in lithic archaeology. *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* 1, 59–112.

See also replies by Binford.

Sillar, B., Tite, M. 2000. The challenge of 'technological choices' for material science approaches in archaeology. *Archaeometry* 42/1, 2-20. On-line

*Sørensen, M. L. 2015. 'Paradigm lost' - on the state of typology within archaeological theory. In: Kristiansen, K., et al. (eds.), *Paradigm found. Archaeological theory, present, past and future, Essays in honour of Evzen Neústupný*. Oxford, Oxbow, 84-94.

*Taylor, T. 2015. The demons of comparison: Archaeological classification vs classificatory terminology. In: K. Kristiansen et al. (eds.), *Paradigm Found. Archaeological Theory Present, Past and Future. Essays in Honour of Evzen Neustupný*. Oxford, Oxbow books, 95–105.

White, J. P., Thomas, D. H. 1972. What mean these stones? Ethno-taxonomic models and archaeological interpretations in the New Guinea highlands. In: D. L. Clarke (ed.), *Models in archaeology*. London, Methuen, 275-308. INST ARCH AH CLA

Wylie, A. 2002. The typology Debate. In: Wylie, A., *Thinking from things: Essays in the philosophy of archaeology*. Berkeley, University of California Press, 42-56. INST ARCH AH WYL

A more philosophical approach

See also

Montelius, O. 1903. *Die älteren Kulturperioden im Orient und in Europa*. Stockholm, self-published. STORE FOLIOS 6031

Montelius, O. 1906. *Kulturgeschichte Schwedens*. Leipzig, Seemann. [Online, Archive.org](#)

11. Drawing pottery

Ulrike Sommer

19/01/2023

When dealing with pottery, the most important information is contained in the profile. You will learn how to correctly orient and draw sherds and get some idea about the vessel they belonged to. We will also look at how to create a clean drawing, and how to use shading.

Readings:

Take a look at:

*Adkins, L., Adkins, R. A 1989. *Archaeological illustration*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press. INST ARCH AL 30 ADK

*Collett, L. 2012. *An introduction to drawing archaeological pottery*. IfA Professional Practice Paper 10. Reading, Institute for Archaeologists

[https://nautarch.tamu.edu/class/anth489/501/Analyticalmethods/Readings/Collett%20\(2012\)%20Introduction%20to%20drawing%20archaeological%20pottery.pdf](https://nautarch.tamu.edu/class/anth489/501/Analyticalmethods/Readings/Collett%20(2012)%20Introduction%20to%20drawing%20archaeological%20pottery.pdf)

Revised edition 2017

Dorrell, P. G. 1994. *Photography in archaeology and conservation* (2nd ed.) Cambridge, Cambridge University Press. INST ARCH AL 20 DOR

Griffiths, N., Jenner, A. 1990. *Drawing archaeological finds: a handbook*. London, Archetype. INST ARCH AL 30 GRI

excellent introduction

*Steiner, M. 2005. *Approaches to archaeological illustration: a handbook*. Practical Handbooks in Archaeology 18. York, Council for British Archaeology. INST ARCH AL 30 Qto STE

Case studies, wide range of materials and object types

see also

- Allen, St. J. 1994. The illustration of wooden artefacts, an introduction and guide to the depiction of wooden objects from archaeological excavations. Oxford, Association of Archaeological Illustrators & Surveyors. [INST ARCH AL 30 ALL](#)
- Dillon, B. D. 1981. *The Student's guide to archaeological illustrating*. Los Angeles, Institute of Archaeology, University of California.
- Goddard, S., et al. 1997. *Aspects of Illustration: Prehistoric Pottery*. Association of Archaeological Illustrators and Surveyors Monograph 13. Exeter, Association of Archaeological Illustrators and Surveyors. [INST ARCH KD 3 HUR](#)
- National Pipe archive, no Year. how to ... illustrate a pipe.
<http://www.pipearchive.co.uk/howto/illustrate.html>
- Wendowski-Schünemann, A. 2013. *Archäologisches Zeichnen. Keramik-Metall-Glas*. Oldenburg, Isensee. [INST ARCH AL 30 WEN](#)
- Shirvalkar, P. 2016. Analytical drawing. In: Alice Hunt (ed.) 2016. *The Oxford Handbook of archaeological ceramic analysis*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 217–230.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199681532.001.0001>

12. Flint, description and drawing

Ulrike Sommer

16/01/2023

In contrast to pottery, the terminology developed for the description of chipped stone objects is applicable universally (but there are national differences). In this session, we are going to cover the basic terms used to describe flint objects and practice their use. If you are interested in lithic illustration, it may be useful to take a course in [lithic technology](#) (undergraduate), as it is impossible to draw knapped implements without a basic understanding of the process involved. Chipped stone artefacts cannot be well illustrated by photography, as many technical details do not show up properly, especially with raw materials like obsidian or rock crystal. Drawing lithics relies on a number of conventions and a basic knowledge of lithic technology. We will cover the essentials in this session, and have a short practical: the rest is up to you - lots of practice is needed.

General

- Crabtree, D. 1972. *An introduction to flintworking*. Pocatello, Idaho State Museum. [INST ARCH DE Series IDA 26-29](#)
- Perlès, C. 1992. In search of lithic strategies: a cognitive approach to prehistoric chipped stone assemblages. In: J.-C. Gardin, C. Peebles (eds.), *Representations in Archaeology*. Bloomington/Indianapolis, Indiana University Press, 223-247. [INST ARCH AH GAR](#)
- Whittaker, J. C. 1994. *Flintknapping. Making and understanding stone tools*. Austin, University of Texas Press. [IOA ISSUE DESK; KA WHI](#)
- Waldorf, D. C. 1984. *The art of flintknapping*. Mound Builder Books. [INST ARCH KA WAL](#)

Terminology

- Brézillon, M. 1983. *La dénomination des objets de pierre taillée*. IV^e supplément de Gallia Préhistoire. Paris, Centre National de la recherche scientifique. [DAC Qto Series GAL PRE 4](#)

THE guide to terminology

- Inizan, M.-L., H. Roche, J. Tixier 1992. *The technology of knapped stone: followed by a multilingual vocabulary Arabic, English, French, German, Greek, Italian, Russian, Spanish*. Préhistoire de la pierre taillée 3. Meudon, CREP. [IOA ISSUE DESK; KA INI](#)

extremely useful!

Piel-Desruisseaux, J.-L. 1998/1986. *Outils préhistoriques: forme, fabrication, utilisation*. Paris, Masson. [IOA ISSUE DESK; KA PIE](#)

Piel-Desruisseaux, J.-L. 1998. *Outils préhistoriques. Du galet taillé au bistouri d'obsidienne*. Paris, Dunnod.

Drawing

Addington, L. R. 1986. *Lithic illustration: drawing flaked stone artifacts for publication*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press. [INST ARCH AL 30 Qto ADD, STORE 15-1007](#)

Martingell, H., Saville, A. 1988. *The illustration of lithic artefacts*. Association of Archaeological Illustrators and Surveyors. [INST ARCH KA MAR](#)

*Raczynski-Henk, Y. 2017. *Drawing lithic artefacts*. Leiden, Sidestone. Online, [INST ARCH AL 30 RAC](#)

Very useful

Barone, S. et al. 2018. Automatic technical documentation of lithic artefacts by digital techniques. *Digital Applications in Archaeology and Cultural Heritage* 11, e00087.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.daach.2018.e00087>

I am not convinced....

13. Basic Mapping

Giovanni Fontana, IoA

09/02/2024

Distribution maps are one of the basic tools for archaeologists to make sense of artefacts and assemblages (cf. lecture 19). In this session, we will further discuss how to interpret archaeological maps. Giovanni will then show you how to use free software to produce basic distribution maps, using public domain programs. Download Q-GIS in preparation for the session. See the Moodle for an introduction to basic methods. You may want to print out the instructions. Giovanni will provide a dataset from to play around with and practice.

14. Basic Documentation: photography

Antonio Reis

26/01/2024

The IoA has had a professional photography lab and has employed a professional photographer right from its foundation; as the idea was to educate Field Archaeologists. You will be introduced to the use of a professional camera and we will discuss how to produce a finds documentation of an acceptable standard. This is a skill you will need for any professional work and your portfolio.

Readings:

See lecture 11

15. Layout and the digital improvement of photographs

Antonio Reis, UCL

02/02/2024

If you need publication quality photographs, the best way is to take them properly, as outlined in lecture 14, or to re-take them if they do not fit requirements. However, sometimes you may have to work in sub-optimal conditions, especially on excavations, or you may not be able to return to an archive improve the quality of your work.

Antonio is going to show you how you can use graphic software to improve the quality of your illustrations.

Recommended Reading:

There are several general introductions to photoshop and also very useful internet fora. In addition, there are free programs like GIMP you can use if you cannot afford an Adobe-license after you have finished this module.

16. Databases

Rachael Sparks

23/02/2024

In this session, we will examine the relationship between database design and use, the importance of thesauri and terminology control, and consider examples of both good and bad practice in the professional sector. As part of the session, students will get the opportunity to design their own system and then discuss the results.

Before the session, please have a look at some of the following databases and consider:

- Who seems to be the audience for the database?
- Is the design suited to that audience?
- How user-friendly is it?
- Is the database fit for purpose (e.g: is there too little information provided, or more than is needed)?

Databases

Bridgeman Art Library

<http://www.bridgeman.co.uk/>

British Museum

http://www.britishmuseum.org/research/collection_online/search.aspx and its introductory page

http://www.britishmuseum.org/research/collection_online/about_the_database.aspx

Cambridge Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology Database

<http://maa.cam.ac.uk/maa/category/collections-2/catalogue/>

Grant Museum of Zoology

<http://gmzcat.museums.ucl.ac.uk/>

Pitt Rivers Southern Sudan project database

<http://southernsudan.prm.ox.ac.uk/index.php>

The Griffith Institute:

<http://www.griffith.ox.ac.uk/tutankhamundiscovery.html>

Recommended Reading:

Collections Trust 2006. Terminology Control:

<http://www.collectionslink.org.uk/index.cfm?ct=assets.assetDisplay/title/Terminology%20Control/assetId/190>

De Vorse, K. L., Elson, C., Gregorev, N. P., Hansen, J. 2006. The development of a local Thesaurus to improve access to the Anthropological Collections of the American Museum of Natural History. *D-Lib Magazine* 12/4.

<http://www.dlib.org/dlib/april06/devorse/04devorse.html>

Szrajber, T. 2008. Public Access to Collection Databases: The British Museum Collection Online (COL): A Case Study. 2008 Annual Conference of CIDOC.

<http://www.cidoc2008.gr/cidoc/Documents/papers/drfile.2008-06-18.8280039548>

Further Reading:

Cowgill, G. L. 1990. Artifact classification and archaeological purposes. In: Voorrips, A. (ed.), *Mathematics and information science in archaeology*. Studies in modern archaeology 3. Bonn, Holos, 61-78. [INST ARCH AH VOO](#)

Museum Documentation Association. [INST ARCH ME 2 Qto SPE](#)

17. Cataloguing metal Artefacts

Edwin Wood, Kings College

01/03/2024

The identification of metallic artefacts from either archaeological deposits or unstratified topsoil contexts can often be difficult due to poor preservation, both in terms of completeness and condition. Metal artefacts encompass a huge range of object types manufactured in hugely different ways across prehistoric and historic periods, often with complex typologies and classificatory systems requiring use of specific terminology for different types of objects. As a result of the above, they are arguably some of the most difficult objects to understand as a trainee archaeological finds specialist.

In this lecture we will first discuss the various different types of artefacts that can be encountered as British site finds on a period-by-period basis, providing a basis for the recognition of items from the past that in many cases fulfil similar functions in modern contexts. The second portion of the lecture will focus on how to describe metallic objects, heavily drawing on the written conventions used by the PAS database, and finishing with a practical exercise in artefact description using some basic object types.

All students should consult the PAS database prior to this lecture (www.finds.org.uk) and try to spend at least 10-15 minutes per period (Bronze Age-Post Medieval). Essential readings are marked with an asterisk, for further reading select one publication per period and flick through.

General

*Finds Research group datasheets - there are over 40 published, covering masses of objects from the post-Roman period, but select 2-4 to read according to your interests. [INST ARCH DAA 300 Qto FIN](#)

*For informal guides on recording objects and conventions, have a look on the PAS database - available at the following link:
<https://finds.org.uk/counties/findsrecordingguides/guides-az-by-image/>

Bronze Age and Iron Age

Savory, H, N. 1980. Guide catalogue of the Bronze Age collections of the National Museum of Wales. Cardiff: The Museum. STORE 13-0904 and STORE 14-0805

Savory, H, N. 1980. Guide catalogue of the Early Iron Age collections of the National Museum of Wales. Cardiff: The Museum. INST ARCH DAA 600 SAV

Check out the Later Prehistoric Finds Group website for datasheets on socketed Early Iron Age axes, Early iron Age brooches, and Late Bronze Age spearheads:

<https://sites.google.com/site/lateprehistoricfindsgroup/home/lpfg-datasheets>

Later Iron Age/Roman

Mackreth, D, F. 2011. Brooches in Iron Age and Roman Britain (vols. I and II). Oxford: Oxbow books. [INST ARCH DAA 160 Qto MAC](#)

Students should also have a look through back issues of the journal 'BRITANNIA', especially at the sections concerning PAS round-ups of various objects

Early Medieval (c. 450-1066)

Hammond, B. 2009. British Artefacts, volume I: Early Anglo-Saxon. Witham: Greenlight. [INST ARCH DAA 180 Qto HAM](#)

West, S. 1998. A corpus of Anglo-Saxon material from Suffolk (EAA report no. 84). Ipswich: Suffolk County Council. [INST ARCH DAA Qto Series EAA 84](#)

Williams, D. 1997. Late Saxon stirrup-strap mounts: a classification and catalogue. York: Council for British Archaeology. [INST ARCH DAA Qto series COU 111](#) - online via the ADS library service.

Medieval and Post-Medieval (c. 1066-1500/1500-1800)

Egan, G, and Pritchard, F. 1991. Dress accessories c. 1150-c. 1450. London: HMSO publishing.

[INST ARCH HD EGA](#)

Whitehead, R. 2003. *Buckles: 1250-1800*. Chelmsford: Greenlight.

<http://www.reenactor.ru/ARH/PDF/Whitehead.pdf>

Also relevant FRG datasheets on these periods, and PAS round-ups in the journal Medieval Archaeology.

see also

Heynowski, R. 2012. *Fibeln: erkennen - bestimmen - beschreiben*. Landesstelle für die nichtstaatlichen Museen in Bayern, LVR Landes-Museum Bonn, Archäologisches Museum Hamburg, Landesamt für Archäologie Sachsen. Berlin, Deutscher Kunstverlag.

[INST ARCH DA 300 HEY](#)

Heynowski, R. 2014. *Nadeln: erkennen - bestimmen - beschreiben*. Berlin, Deutscher Kunstverlag.

[INST ARCH DA 300 HEY](#)

PBF, *Corpus Prähistorischer Bronzefunde*. München, Beck. [INST ARCH DA Qto Series PRA](#)
Monographs for most categories of copper alloy finds in central Europe with detailed typology and chronology

Weller, U. 2014. *Äxte und Beile: erkennen - bestimmen - beschreiben*. Berlin, Deutscher Kunstverlag. [INST ARCH HJ WEL](#)

Weller, U. 2022. *Messer und Erntegeräte....* Berlin, Deutscher Kunstverlag.

And further volumes in the series

Weblinks

Portable Antiquities web-site: www.finds.org.uk

Portable Antiquities of the Netherlands: <https://portable-antiquities.nl/pan/#/public>

German Thesauri, Archaeology, folklore and history of art.

www.museumsvokabular.de/node/6

18. Catalogues and Finds Reports

Michel Marshall, MOLA

08/03/2024

In this lecture, we will discuss the presentation and interpretation of artefact assemblages within finds reports in relation to the research objectives of the excavation and the potential of using this information for comparative studies. In preparation for this session, you will be asked to critique some recent catalogues.

Recommended Reading:

Hamilton, S. 1999. Lost in translation? A comment on the excavation report. *Papers from the Institute of Archaeology* 10, 1-8. [INST ARCH Pers](#)

Browse

Crummy, N. 1983. *The Roman small finds from excavations in Colchester, 1971-79*. Colchester, Colchester Archaeological Trust. [INST ARCH DAA 410 E.7 CRU](#)

The Çatalhöyük web site and 1999 Archive Report at: Visit the Çatalhöyük web page

<http://catal.arch.cam.ac.uk/>

http://catal.arch.cam.ac.uk/catal/Archive_rep99/content99.html

Further Reading

- Allison, P. M. 1997. Why do excavation reports have finds catalogues? In: Blinkhorn, P. W., Cumberpatch, C. G. (eds), *Not so much a pot; more a way of life*. Oxbow Monograph 83, Oxford, Oxbow, 77-84. [INST ARCH KD Qto CUM](#)
- Barrett, J. C. 1991. Bronze Age pottery and problems of classification. In: Barrett, J., et al. (eds.), *Papers on the prehistoric archaeology of Cranborne Chase*. Oxbow Monographs 11, Oxford, Oxbow, 201-231. [INST ARCH DAA 410 W.7 BAR](#)
- Barrett, J. C., et al., 2000. *Cadbury Castle, Somerset: the later prehistoric and early historical archaeology*. London, English Heritage. [INST ARCH DAA 410 Qto BAR](#)
- Bishop, M. 1996. *Finds from Roman Aldborough*. Oxbow Monograph 65. Oxford, Oxbow. [INST ARCH DAA 410 Y.6 BIS](#)
- Butterworth, P., Cool, H. E. M., Philo, C. 1998. *Roman Castleford excavations 1974-1985. Vol. 1: The small finds*. Wakefield, West Yorkshire Archaeological Service. [INST ARCH DAA 410 Qto COO](#)
- Cassey, P. J., Hoffman B. 1999. Excavations at the Roman temple in Lydney Park, Gloucestershire in 1980 and 1981. *Antiquaries Journal* 79, 81–143. [INST ARCH Pers](#)
- Cool, H. E. M., Price, J. 1995. Roman vessel glass from excavations at Colchester 1971-85. *Colchester Archaeological Reports* 8. Colchester, Colchester Archaeological Trust. [INST ARCH DAA 410 E.7 COL](#)
- Davies, B. J., et al. 1994. *A dated corpus of early Roman pottery from the City of London*. CBA research report 98. London, Museum of London and the Council for British Archaeology. [INST ARCH DAA Qto Series COU 98](#)
- Wilson, P. R. 2002. *Cataractonium: Roman Catterick and its hinterland. Excavations and research, 1958-1997 Pt 2*. Council for British Archaeology Research Reports 129. York, Council for British Archaeology. [INST ARCH DAA Qto Series COU 129](#)
- Woodward, A., Leach. P. 1993. *The Uley shrines: excavation of a ritual complex on West Hill, Uley Gloucestershire 1977-9*. London, English Heritage with British Museum Press. [INST ARCH DAA 410 G.4 WOO](#)

See also

- Hodder, I. (ed.) 1996. *On the surface: Çatalhöyük 1993-95*. Cambridge, McDonald Institute and British Institute of Archaeology at Ankara. [INST ARCH DBC 10 HOD](#)
- Hodder, I. 1989. Writing archaeological site reports in context. *Antiquity* 63, 268-74. [Online](#)
- Hodder, I. 1999. *The Archaeological process: an introduction*. London, Blackwell. [INST ARCH AH HOD](#)
- Hodder, I. 1997. Always momentary, fluid and flexible: towards a reflexive excavation methodology. *Antiquity* 71, 691-700. [INST ARCH 1607](#)
- *Lockyear, K. 2000. Site finds from Roman Britain - a comparison of techniques. *Oxford Journal of Archaeology* 19, 397–423. [NET](#)
- Price, J., Cottam, S. 1998. *Romano-British glass vessels: a handbook*. CBA Practical handbooks in Archaeology 14. York, CBA. [INST ARCH KL PRI](#)
- Reece, R. 1995. Site-finds in Roman Britain. *Britannia* 26, 179–206. [INST ARCH Pers](#)

19. Putting artefacts into context: when, where and why?

Ulrike Sommer

15/03/2024

Faced with an unknown object, the archaeologist will normally first look at the raw material and will then try a classification by shape - a pot or a quern, for example. In order to date it, you will have to locate similar finds from dated contexts. This may also help to get some ideas on how the artefact was used and will help you to use the correct terminology when describing it. The distribution of specific artefact types delimits a sphere of interaction. These could potentially indicate the customers of a specific workshop, the members of a political community (village, tribe, ethnic group, state) or the extent of a trade network.

With a few exceptions, like mould-formed pottery and tools cast in re-usable moulds, artefacts are rarely identical. So, which criteria have to be met in order to classify artefacts as similar?

Recommended Reading:

see lecture 10

see also

Hodder, I. Orton, C. 1976. *Spatial analysis in archaeology*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

20. Exhibiting Artefacts

Martin Schmidt, Lower Saxon State Museum

22/03/2024

Exhibiting artefacts is more than simply putting them in a showcase and producing a label. This lecture will deal with aspects such as text, light, climate, supports, design and decoration. However, this is only one side of an exhibition. One must also be aware of the ethics, politics, message(s), poetics, context and storytelling surrounding artefacts.

In this section, we will browse through the most important issues to be considered when exhibiting artefacts. We will start with a presentation, followed by a discussion and a practical component. To prepare for this lecture, visit different museum displays and also look at brand or flagship stores, warehouses etc. Compare the exhibition techniques and the openly expressed and underlying messages. For example, an expensive brand store in Bond Street will be exhibiting its "artefacts" quite differently from a Pound-shop in your neighbourhood.

In preparation for this session, take a photograph of a shop-window that you find enticing or interesting and send it to me till Tuesday 19/03/2024.

Recommended Reading

Parman, A., Flowers, J. J. 2008. *Exhibit Makeovers. A Do-IT-Yourself Workbook for small Museums*. Lanham, Altamira Press. [INST ARCH ME 3 PAR](#)

Monti, F., Keene, S. 2013. *Museums and silent objects: designing effective exhibitions*. Farnham, Ashgate. [INST ARCH ME 3 MON](#)

Cameron, D. 1968. A viewpoint: the museum as a communication system and implications for museum education. *Curator* 11/1, 33-40. On-line

Hooper-Greenhill, E. (ed) 1999. *The Educational Role of the Museum* (second edition). London, Routledge, 3-27, chapters 1-4, [INST ARCH MF 4 HOO](#), ISSUE DESK IOA HOO 9

Knez, E. I., Wright, G. 1970. The museum as a communication system: an assessment of Cameron's viewpoint. *Curator* 13/3, 204-212. On-line

Belcher, M. 1991. *Exhibitions in Museums*. Leicester University Press. [INST ARCH ME 3 BEL](#)

Serrell, B. 1996. *Exhibit labels: An interpretive approach*. Altamira Press. [INST ARCH ME 3 SER](#)

Websites

Browse this site: Museum Ideas, www.museum-id.com

Anon 2002 The Exhibition Handbook; A Student Guide for Creating & Presenting Exhibitions, The New School of Northern Virginia, Fairfax, VA, online:
http://www.newschoolva.com/files/Exhibition_Handbook.pdf

Helpsheet; Exhibition and Display Basics,
http://mavic.asn.au/assets/Info_Sheet_11_Display_Basics.pdf

Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa, 2005, Low-cost exhibition display techniques, He Rauemi Resource Guides, October, issue 7, online:

<http://www.tepapa.govt.nz/SiteCollectionDocuments/NationalServices/Resources/LowCostExhibitionTechniques.pdf>

Boylan, P. J (ed), 2004, Running a museum; a practical handbook. ICOM – International Council of Museums, Maison de l'UNESCO. Online

<http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0014/001410/141067e.pdf>

Also browse also through course handbooks of IoA Museum Studies for a critical perspective on exhibition and display.

Additional Information

LIBRARIES AND OTHER RESOURCES

In addition to the Library of the Institute of Archaeology, other libraries in UCL with holdings of particular relevance to this degree are: The Science Library, especially the Anthropology section on the second floor of the DMS Watson Building. The Library of Senate House (<http://catalogue.ulrls.lon.ac.uk/search/>) also hold a very useful collection (and is fun to visit). If you can't locate a book, there is also the British Library (http://catalogue.bl.uk/F/?func=file&file_name=login-bl-list) at King's Cross and the Library of the Society of Antiquaries (very impressive!) <http://sal.ads.ahds.ac.uk/cgi-bin/Pwebrecon.cgi?DB=local&PAGE=First>.

You may also want to consult the Library of the Institute of Classical studies (<http://catalogue.ulrls.lon.ac.uk/search~S7>) or of the School of African and Oriental Studies (<http://lib.soas.ac.uk/>).

Almost all relevant journals can now be accessed on-line, check the OPAC and the online reading-lists.

Collections

The Institute of Archaeology houses a large collection of artifacts from all over the world.

You can find further information about these collections at:

<http://www.ucl.ac.uk/museums/archaeology/>, with a searchable database of some of our holdings available at:

<http://www.ucl.ac.uk/archaeology/ioacollections/site.php>

Anyone interested in viewing specific material should contact the Keeper of Collections to book space in our collections research room (Rachael Sparks at r.sparks@ucl.ac.uk)

Some useful Web-sites:

Societies etc.

Council for British Archaeology - <http://www.britarch.ac.uk/>

Institute of Field Archaeologists: <http://www.archaeologists.net/>

English Heritage: <http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/>

European Association of Archaeologists: <http://www.e-a-a.org/>

The Prehistoric Society: <http://www.ucl.ac.uk/prehistoric/>

Society of Museum archaeologists - <http://www.socmusarch.org.uk/index.htm>

American Anthropological Association: <http://www.aaanet.org/>

SAA - Society for American Archaeology: <http://saa.org/>

Grant giving bodies

A.H.R.C: <http://www.ahrc.ac.uk/>

ESRC: <http://www.esrc.ac.uk/home.html>

Leverhulme Trust: <http://www.leverhulme.org.uk/>

The British Academy: <http://www.britac.ac.uk/>

Libraries and Journals

Assemblage: <http://www.shef.ac.uk/assem/>

Internet Archaeology: <http://intarch.ac.uk/>

Journal of Field Archaeology: <http://jfa-www.bu.edu/>

Library of Congress Home Page: <http://www.loc.gov/>

The Council for Museums, Archives and Libraries: <http://www.mla.gov.uk/>

The British Library: <http://www.bl.uk/>

List of Archaeology Journals On-line:

<http://www.library.soton.ac.uk/info/subjects/2002ej/>

Archaeology Units and Museums etc.

British Museum: <http://www.british-museum.ac.uk/index.html>

Jorvik Viking Centre: <http://www.jorvik-viking-centre.co.uk/>

Museum of London, <http://www.museumoflondon.org.uk/>

National Museums of Scotland: <http://www.nms.ac.uk/>

OASIS: <https://oasis.ac.uk/>

AOC Archaeology Group: <http://www.aocarchaeology.com/>

Cambridge Archaeological Unit: <http://www.arch.cam.ac.uk/CAU/>

Museum of London Archaeology Service: <http://www.molas.org.uk/>

Oxford Archaeology Unit: <http://WWW.oau-oxford.com/>

Pre-Construct Archaeology: <http://www.pre-construct.com/>

Wessex Archaeology: www.wessexarch.co.uk

Archaeology South-East: <https://www.ucl.ac.uk/archaeology-south-east/>

Specialists Finds groups (selection)

Ancient Metallurgy:

<http://www.brad.ac.uk/acad/archsci/depart/resgrp/amrg/amrginfo.htm>

Building materials: <http://www.buildinghistory.org/books/materials.shtml>

British Brick Society: <http://britishbricksoc.co.uk/>

Archaeological Leather Group: <http://www.archleathgrp.org.uk/>

Association for Roman military equipment studies <https://a-r-m-e-s.org/the-association-for-roman-military-equipment-studies/arma/>

Ceramic Petrology Group: <http://www.ceramicpetrology.uklinux.net/index.html>

Finds Research Group AD 700-1700: <http://www.frg700-1700.org.uk/>

International Association for Research on Pottery of the Hellenistic Period:

<http://iarpothp.org/index.html>

Lithic Studies Society: <http://www.britarch.ac.uk/lithics/>

Medieval Dress and Textile Society, <https://www.medats.org.uk/>

Medieval Pottery Research Group: <https://medievalpottery.org.uk/>

Prehistoric Ceramic Research Group: <http://www.pcrgrg.org.uk/>

there are several specialised databases for pottery, for example

<http://apd.farli.org/> (Israel)

Quern Study Group: <http://www.quernstudygroup.org.uk>

Roman Pottery: <http://www.potsherd.uklinux.net/>

Roman Finds Group: <https://www.romanfinds.org.uk/home>

Royal Numismatic Society: <https://numismatics.org.uk/>

Société Française d'Etude de la Céramique Antique en Gaule: <http://sfecag.free.fr>

Society for Clay Pipe Research: <http://scpr.co/>

Study Group for Roman Pottery <https://romanpotterystudy.org.uk/>

Tiles & Architectural Ceramics Society: <https://tilesoc.org.uk/tacs/>

Jobs etc.

British Archaeology Jobs: <http://www.bajr.org/>

CBA guide to UK archaeology On-line: <http://www.britarch.ac.uk/info/uklinks.html>

Museum Jobs: <http://www.museumjobs.com/>

<http://www.collectionstrust.org.uk/>

On-line Collections etc.

-Archaeology Data Service: <http://ads.ahds.ac.uk/>

-Museum of London's ceramics and glass:

<http://www.museumoflondon.org.uk/ceramics>

-Petrie Museum: <http://www.digitalegypt.ucl.ac.uk/>

-Portable Antiquities Scheme: <http://www.finds.org.uk/>