UCL INSTITUTE OF ARCHAEOLOGY

ARCL0133:
Themes, Thought and Theory in World Archaeology: Foundations

2023-24: Term 1

MA Core Module
15 credits

Co-ordinator: Todd Whitelaw
Co-ordinator's e-mail address: t.whitelaw@ucl.ac.uk
Office 207
E-mail the co-ordinator to arrange an in-person or on-line appointment.

Contributing staff:
Andrew Gardner (andrew.gardner@ucl.ac.uk)
Office 402
Gabriel Moshenska (g.moshenska@ucl.ac.uk)
Office 322A

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.

1. MODULE OVERVIEW

Module Description

This module provides an intensive graduate-level introduction to fundamental issues in archaeological theory and archaeological interpretation. Set readings will be used to review the modern history of archaeological ideas, and to explore and evaluate major interpretative frameworks developed by different schools of archaeological thought and a range of approaches pursued in studying the archaeological record and material culture, and making inferences to reconstruct and understand past behaviour and cultural change. The course is structured with reference to critical debates about the nature of archaeological data, objectives, and perspectives that particularly characterised Euro-American prehistoric archaeology in the 1960s-90s, because these debates were so explicit, were widely followed and have been very influential elsewhere in the world, developed sets of concepts that are widely referenced in archaeology world-wide, and were explored through an accessible and regularly cited literature. The emphasis of the course is on engaging with these debates to critically consider fundamental issues that are still contentious and debated today and that all archaeologists need to consider and resolve for themselves, not to simply review these debates as an historical episode in the development of Euro-American archaeological traditions.

This handbook contains basic information about the content and administration of this module. Further details are provided on the module Moodle.

Module Aims

The module provides an intensive graduate-level introduction to archaeological theory, research approaches and reasoning, within a seminar framework based on set readings and recorded lectures. It aims to review the recent history of archaeological ideas and to discuss and debate approaches and key general themes in archaeology from historical, theoretical and comparative perspectives.

Learning Outcomes

On successful completion of this module a student should:
- have an understanding of fundamental theoretical debates across a broad range of archaeology;
- understand the nature of the debates as a basis for developing their own theoretical position; and
- be able to use this knowledge to inform their other courses, develop their MA dissertation, design an effective PhD proposal, or carry out critically-informed research in their particular field of archaeology.

Methods of Assessment

This module is assessed by 3,000 words of coursework, divided into two essays, one of 1,000 words (contributing 30% to the overall module mark) and the other of 2,000 words (contributing 70% to the overall mark).

Communications
- **The module Moodle is the main hub** for information and resources for this module.
- Important information will be posted by the module co-ordinator in the **Announcements section of the Moodle page** and you will automatically receive an email notification for these.
- Please send any general queries relating to module content, assessments and administration to the module co-ordinator by e-mail.
- For personal queries, please contact the module co-ordinator by e-mail.

Week-by-week summary

Week	Date	Topic	Staff
1	2-3 Oct.	Archaeology, theory and practice.	T. Whitelaw
2	9-10 Oct.	Culture history: objectives, assumptions and implications.	T. Whitelaw
3	16-17 Oct.	The New archaeology: reconsidering the objectives and potential of archaeology.	T. Whitelaw
4	23-24 Oct.	Processual archaeology: recognising the complexity of the archaeological record.	T. Whitelaw
5	30-31 Oct.	Post-processual archaeology: critique and expanding objectives.	T. Whitelaw
6		READING WEEK (no seminar)	
7	13-14 Nov.	Marxism: social change, power and ideology.	T. Whitelaw
8	20-21 Nov.	Structuralism, Post-structuralism and approaches to meaning.	A. Gardner
9	27-28 Nov.	The diversification of Interpretive archaeologies.	T. Whitelaw
10	4-5 Dec.	Archaeological theory today: diversity, pluralism or chaos?	G. Moshenska
11	11-12 Dec.	Theory beyond academic archaeology and broadening academic interests.	G. Moshenska

Seminar leaders

Todd Whitelaw (module co-ordinator); Andrew Gardner; Gabriel Moshenska.

Weekly Module Plan

The module is taught through recorded lectures and seminars, the latter held in-person at the Institute of Archaeology. Students are required to undertake set readings and view recorded lectures before the seminars to be able fully to follow and actively to participate in the seminar discussion. Students are invited to post questions and comments on the Moodle Discussion Board to help inform the seminar discussions. Seminars are taught through three sessions covering the same material each week on Mondays (11:00-13:00 or 14:00-16:00) or Tuesdays (11:00-13:00). Recorded lectures, Reading Guidance and the Discussion Board for the following week will normally be made available on the module Moodle by the end of the day on Tuesdays.

Workload

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

20 hours	Staff-led seminars.
70 hours	Self-guided session preparation (reading, viewing recorded lectures): about 7 hours per week.
15 hours	Reading for, and writing essay 1.
45 hours	Reading for, and writing essay 2.

2. ASSESSMENT

Each assignment and possible approaches to it will be discussed in advance of the submission deadline. Specific guidelines for writing essays for this course are on the module Moodle in the Assessment section, and sections devoted to each assignment (following the sections for Week 7 and Week 11). If you are unclear about the nature of an assignment, you should discuss this with the module co-ordinator in advance. You will receive feedback on your written coursework via Moodle, and have the opportunity to discuss your marks and feedback with the co-ordinator.

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

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

Please use your five-digit candidate code in the name of the file you submit – e.g. ARCL0133-Essay1/2-CODE.

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

Please note that **late submission, exceeding the maximum word count** and **academic misconduct (use of text generation software** and **plagiarism)** will be penalised and can significantly reduce the mark awarded for the assignment and/or overall module result. Please consult:
- https://www.ucl.ac.uk/archaeology/current-students/ioa-student-handbook/13-information-assessment with sections 13.7–13.8: coursework submission, 13.10: word count, 13.12–14: academic integrity;
- https://www.ucl.ac.uk/students/exams-and-assessments/academic-integrity for UCL's guidance on academic integrity;
- https://library-guides.ucl.ac.uk/referencing-plagiarism/acknowledging-AI for UCL's guidance on how to acknowledge the use of text review software.

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

Assessment 1
For Essay 1 (1,000 words; due Thursday 16 November 2023), answer one of the following questions; be sure to **address both parts of the question**. *Please limit yourself to one point, rather than try to fit in multiple points under a broad heading, so that you have space in such a short essay to demonstrate your understanding of the specific point. Use one specific example to help demonstrate your point. Consider which question you might address for the second assessment, so that you do not submit two assessments that deal with the same subject.*
1. What do *you* consider to be the most important insight of Cultural Historical archaeology, and in what ways is it still relevant to archaeology today? Give one brief example, from archaeology you are familiar with to illustrate the theoretical contribution. (Focus on theoretical underpinnings, not field techniques, which are generic to all archaeology.)
2. What do *you* consider to be the most important new insight developed in the New/Processual archaeology, and in what ways is it still relevant to archaeology today? Give one brief example, from archaeology you are familiar with, to illustrate the theoretical contribution.
3. What do *you* consider to be the most important new insight developed in Post-processual archaeology, and in what ways is it still relevant to archaeology today? Give one brief example, from archaeology you are familiar with, to illustrate the theoretical contribution.

Assessment 2

For Essay 2 (2,000 words; due Thursday 18 January 2024), answer one of the following questions (if a question has multiple components, remember to address all of them). *Please use at least one specific example from archaeology you are familiar with, to illustrate your argument.*
You must not answer a question in a way that overlaps significantly with your first essay.

1. To what extent does the political context of the emergence of archaeology in 19th century Europe still shape the character of the discipline?
2. In what sense(s), if any, is archaeology, conceptually, a science (i.e. *not* simply in the use of scientific techniques)?
3. What do you consider to be the positive and negative aspects of the systemic approaches espoused by New archaeologists, and are these still relevant to archaeology today?
4. Is it possible to develop a Middle Range Theory relevant to cultural meanings, as advocated by Trigger in 1995 (Expanding Middle Range Theory. *Antiquity* 69:449-58)?
5. To what degree did Cognitive-Processual archaeology, as defined by Colin Renfrew, address the Post-processual criticism that Processual archaeology failed to address meanings in the past?
6. What was the role of comparative analysis and generalisation in Processual archaeology? While Post-processual archaeology espoused contextual analysis, was it able to avoid comparison and generalisation?
7. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Marxist approaches to the past? To what degree do elements of Marxist approaches align with and potentially further develop major interpretive interests of Processual *and* Post-processual archaeologies.
8. What were the insights gained from considering 'material culture as text', and to what degree have these enabled archaeologists to identify the meanings understood by people in the past, of the material record they created?
9. How have archaeologists dealt with the relationship between structure and agency in past societies? Is it possible for both Processualist and Post-processualist approaches to contribute to exploring this dynamic relationship?
10. How effectively can archaeologists identify and explore past ideologies through the archaeological record? Illustrate your argument with examples.
11. Is it realistic (i.e. effective, rather than purely idealistic) to advocate plural perspectives for archaeological interpretation? Address in terms of *one* of the following *three* contested perspectives: alternative academic archaeological perspectives (e.g. Processualist, Marxist, Feminist, etc.), *or* the perspectives of different parties/stakeholders concerned with the past (e.g. academics and the general public in the same cultural context), *or* academic archaeological and indigenous perspectives on the past.
12. Are archaeological practices or interpretations of the past inevitably concerned with power relations in contemporary society?

If you are unclear about the nature of an assignment, or whether your interpretation of a question is suitable, you should discuss this with the module co-ordinator. He will be willing to discuss an outline of your approach to an assessment, provided this is planned suitably in advance of the submission date; he is not allowed to read a draft of your essays prior to submission.

3. Resources and Preparation for Class
Preparation for class
You are expected to **read the essential readings** (usually three to four) as well as **watch the pre-recorded lectures available on Moodle prior to the seminar** each week. A recorded lecture is available on the module Moodle for each weekly session, divided into several smaller segments. The Introduction outlines the week's topic and provides context and background. It is recommended that

you watch this first, then do the Essential readings. A second, longer lecture (divided into segments to ease manipulating the files) draws on the readings and much other work, to review a range of important issues and raises questions you should consider, that we will aim to explore further in the seminar discussions. There is a weekly Discussion Board and Hot Questions facility on the module Moodle, to which you can post questions and respond to others' questions or comments, which will be reviewed by the module co-ordinator and help to inform what we address in the seminars.

Watching the lectures and completing the readings is essential for your effective participation in the seminars, and will greatly enhance your understanding of the material covered. If particularly pressed for time in specific weeks, the recorded lectures provide a synthesised overview of each week's topic, while the readings provide more detailed and often differing views on some of the main issues considered. A recorded guide to each week's readings indicates why each is recommended, and prioritises them, in case you are tight for time that week. A list of further Recommended readings by session is provided on the module Moodle, for you to get a sense of the range of work on a given topic and for you to draw upon when researching your assessments.

The online reading list is accessible through the module Moodle, or directly at:
https://rl.talis.com/3/ucl/lists/1C703A3B-51B0-EDA6-3C65-1C0B5C40A2B5.html?lang=en

Classes
The seminars will be held in the Institute of Archaeology building in room 410 on Mondays at 11:00-13:00 and 14:00-16:00, and in room 410 on Tuesdays at 11:00-13:00. You will attend only *one* of these sessions, which will each cover similar material. The multiple sessions are intended to keep the numbers in each seminar low enough so participants feel able to contribute to the discussion.

Please attend your assigned session so we can avoid crowding in the classroom. If, for a specific week, you cannot attend your session, try to attend a different session, since the material we cover is cumulative.

Recommended basic texts
Trigger, B. 2006. *A History of Archaeological Thought* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge: CUP. A solid and insightful history of archaeology, somewhat abbreviated for the late 20th century. Available in IoA Library and on-line through UCL Explore.
Johnson, M. 2010. *Archaeological Theory: An Introduction* (3rd ed.). Oxford: Blackwell. A good introduction, largely paralleling this course, with some pointers to more recently addressed themes. Available in IoA Library and on-line through UCL Explore.
Chapman, R. 2023. *Archaeological Theory: the Basics*. Routledge. A short, sensible introduction to what archaeological theory is, and some themes within it. New book, on order for IoA Library.
Orser Jr, C.E., 2023. *Archaeological Thinking: How to Make Sense of the Past*. London: Rowman & Littlefield. A back to basics introduction to thinking about archaeological data and the process of interpretation. Available in the IoA Library INST ARCH AH ORS.
Gardner, A., M. Lake and U. Sommer (eds) 2014. *The Oxford Handbook of Archaeological Theory*. Oxford: OUP. Individual chapters by specialists; we will dip into it for specific topics. Available in IoA Library and on-line through UCL Explore.
Bentley, R.A., Maschner, H. and Chippindale, C. (eds) 2008. *Handbook of Archaeological Theories*. Lanham: AltaMira Press. Individual chapters by specialists, variable in originality and coverage; we will dip into it for specific topics. Available in IoA Library and on-line through UCL Explore.
O'Brien, M., Lyman, R.L. and Schiffer, M. 2005. *Archaeology as a Process: Processualism and its Progeny*. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press. A contextualised history of the development of

Processual Archaeology, with a critical assessment of its contributions, from a continuing Processual and North American disciplinary perspective. Available in the IoA Library INST ARCH AH OBR.

Hodder, I. and S. Hutson 2003. *Reading the Past* (3rd ed.). Cambridge: CUP. A lively and polemical review of many major perspectives, from a Post-processual/Interpretive archaeological perspective; engaging but unashamedly partisan. Available in IoA Library and on-line through UCL Explore.

Urban, P. and E. Schortman 2012. *Archaeological Theory in Practice.* Walnut Creek: Left Coast Press. A general introduction to approaches to archaeological interpretation, with developed examples. Available in IoA Library INST ARCH AH URB.

Gibbon, G. 2014. *Critically Reading the Theory and Methods of Archaeology.* New York: Altamira Press. A unpolemical critical approach to considering archaeological theory. Available in IoA Library and on-line through UCL Explore.

Chapman, R. and A. Wylie 2016. *Evidential Reasoning in Archaeology.* London: Bloomsbury. An unpolemically thoughtful consideration of archaeological interpretation. Available in IoA Library and on-line through UCL Explore.

Harris, O. and C. Cipolla 2017. *Archaeological Theory in the New Millennium.* London: Routledge. A recent volume which introduces many current theoretical directions in the field. Available in IoA Library and on-line through UCL Explore.

4. SYLLABUS

The *Essential* readings are those necessary to keep up with the topics covered in the module sessions, and ***it is expected that you will have read these prior to the seminar***. Readings are listed in the order that it is recommended you read them, to make most sense. A brief comment on the essential readings will be posted on the module Moodle, particularly to guide those who may be very constrained for time in a specific week to help prioritise their effort. Individual articles and book chapters identified as Essential readings are available from on-line journals, or held on-line (with links from the module On-line Reading List that can be accessed from the module Moodle and directly at https://rl.talis.com/3/ucl/lists/1C703A3B-51B0-EDA6-3C65-1C0B5C40A2B5.html?lang=en. For recent publications among the Recommended readings, if they are not in journals or volumes available on-line, it is worth looking by author on the www.academia.edu and www.researchgate.net sites, where researchers increasingly make pdfs of their papers available to the public. Some may also be available on other academic deposit web-sites and have links if you search for the author and title on http://scholar.google.com.

Week 1. 2-3 October: Archaeology, theory and practice. (T. Whitelaw)
Practical details of the course are reviewed in a recorded *Introduction*, with a second *Lecture* introducing substantive issues to be considered in the seminar discussions, on the module Moodle.

Since this module is focused on theoretical issues in archaeology, we begin by considering what constitutes archaeological theory, the role of theory in relation to archaeological practice, how theory has been produced in archaeology, and the differences in explicit discussions of theory in different sub-disciplines and regional and national traditions in archaeology.

Essential reading:
Johnson, M. 2014. What is theory for? In A. Gardner, M. Lake and U. Sommer (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Archaeological Theory*. Oxford: OUP. [Available as an e-book through UCL Explore]

Johnson, M. 2009. The theoretical scene, 1960-2000. In C. Gosden, B. Cunliffe and R. Joyce (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Archaeology.* Oxford: OUP. [INST ARCH AH CUN (Reference only); available as an e-book through UCL *Explore*]

Meskell, L. 1998. Introduction: archaeology matters. In L. Meskell (ed.) *Archaeology under Fire: Nationalism, politics and heritage in the Eastern Mediterranean and Middle East*. London: Routledge: 1-12. [INST ARCH AF MES; available as an e-book through UCL *Explore*]

Mizoguchi, K. 2015. A future of archaeology. *Antiquity* 89:12-22. [On-line journal]

Week 2. 9-10 October: Culture history: objectives, assumptions and implications. (T. Whitelaw)

Culture historical archaeology is often described (pejoratively) as atheoretical, descriptive and 'normative'. However, much of our enduring knowledge of past societies has been and still is generated within a Culture historical framework, and the majority of archaeological research conducted world-wide has basic Culture historical objectives: determining what happened, when and where, and to recover, document and preserve the relevant archaeological material record. Is this an atheoretical, neutral uncovering of objective facts, or are there implicit theoretical assumptions that require critical consideration? If the latter, archaeologists need to develop a critical understanding of this approach: what constitutes Culture history; what are the goals and assumptions employed by practitioners; what theory is embedded in Culture history; and how are Culture historical and subsequent archaeological frameworks conceptually related? Many assumptions were embedded in the objectives of Culture history during its development in the context of later nineteenth century European nation-building and colonialism, and are still implicit in many of the questions asked, assumptions made and interpretations proposed in archaeology today.

Essential reading:

Webster, G. 2008. Culture history: a culture-historical approach. In R.A. Bentley, H. Maschner and C. Chippindale (eds), *Handbook of Archaeological Theories*. Walnut Creek: AltaMira Press:11-27. [INST ARCH AG BEN; available as an e-book through UCL *Explore*]

Childe, V.G. 1935. Changing aims and methods in prehistory. *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society* 1:1-15. [On-line journal]

Hawkes, C. 1954. Archaeological theory and method: some suggestions from the Old World. *American Anthropologist* 56:155-68. [On-line journal]

Trigger, B. 1984. Alternative archaeologies: nationalist, colonialist, imperialist. *Man* 19:355-370. [On-line journal]

An excellent overview is provided by Trigger's treatment, which would be worth looking at, and returning to if of interest:

Trigger, B. 2006. *A History of Archaeological Thought* (2nd ed.). Cambridge, CUP. (Chapter 6: Culture Historical archaeology; especially 211-61, 290-313) [INST ARCH AG TRI; available as an e-book through UCL Explore]

Week 3. 16-17 October: The New archaeology: reconsidering the objectives and potential of archaeology. (T. Whitelaw)

The beginning of the New archaeology in the early 1960s has come to be regarded by many as the start of the modern era in archaeology because of its strident criticism of Traditional/Culture historical archaeology, its self-conscious concern to integrate archaeology more effectively with anthropology and the wider social sciences, and to develop appropriate, explicit and effective theoretical and methodological frameworks for understanding the past through problematising the investigation and interpretation of the archaeological record. Since the late 1970s its approach has been severely criticised in a variety of ways that we will explore in subsequent sessions. Additionally, in hindsight, many question the degree to which the New archaeology was really all that new. But while some similar questions had been raised earlier, this was a watershed in addressing these concerns effectively and radically expanding the questions asked and the results expected of

archaeological research. The objective of this seminar is to identify and evaluate the key critiques of traditional practices by, and positive insights of, the New archaeology that have had wide relevance within the field, to consider what new opportunities and challenges these opened-up for all archaeological research, and to what extent these are still relevant to archaeology today.

Essential reading:

Binford, L. 1968. Archaeological perspectives. In S. Binford and L. Binford (eds), *New Perspectives in Archaeology*. Aldine:5-32. [On-line reading list; INST ARCH AH BIN]

Clarke, D. 1973. Archaeology: the loss of innocence. *Antiquity* 47:6-18. [On-line journal]

Trigger, B. 1978. Current trends in American archaeology. In B. Trigger, *Time and Traditions*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press:2-18. [On-line reading list; INST ARCH AH TRI]

Redman, C. 1991. Distinguished Lecture in Archaeology: in defence of the seventies - the adolescence of New Archaeology. *American Anthropologist* 93:295-307. [On-line journal]

Week 4. 23-24 October: Processual archaeology: recognising the complexity of the archaeological record. (T. Whitelaw)

If the New archaeology was characterised by extreme optimism and a self-conscious concern with archaeological method and theory, its subsequent development was marked by a more pessimistic, and more critically self-aware concern with the nature of the archaeological record and the challenges this presents for the inferences about past societies that newly ambitious archaeologists wished to make. While New and Processual archaeology refer to the same thing, adopting the latter term recognises that by the late 1970s, the perspective was no longer 'new', and leading developers had widened the approach to address the pragmatic challenges of achieving its early optimistic objectives. The object of this seminar is to examine different views about the nature of the archaeological record and how we interpret it that emerged from these debates. We will consider whether these concerns recognise universal characteristics and problems of working with the archaeological record, or are more or less relevant to the questions asked in different archaeological traditions - and can we ignore these concerns (or leave them to others to address) just because they are not what we are primarily interested in (the nature of past societies), and are also usually pretty boring?

Essential reading:

Clarke, D. 1973. Archaeology: the loss of innocence. *Antiquity* 47:6-18. (assigned for week 3, *review pp. 16-17*.) [On-line journal]

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

Arnold, P. 2003. Back to basics: the middle-range program as pragmatic archaeology. In T. VanPool and C. VanPool (eds), *Essential Tensions in Archaeological Method and Theory*. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press:55-66. [INST ARCH AH VAN]

Trigger, B. 1995. Expanding Middle Range Theory. *Antiquity* 69:449-58. [On-line journal]

Week 5. 30-31 October: Post-processual archaeology: critique and expanding objectives. (T. Whitelaw)

Since the early 1980s, Post-processual approaches have gradually come to dominate theoretical discussions in prehistoric archaeology, in Britain at least, and have had a significant but variable influence in other archaeological sub-fields, often being engaged with selectively. The session will consider the fundamental criticisms which make this approach *post*-processual, its positive claims and insights, the extent to which it can be considered as a unified approach (and whether this matters), as well as the practicality of its critical and more positive challenges and the potential opportunities it opened-up. This and subsequent sessions will consider whether in practice, it lived up to its optimistic rhetoric. This is a question we need to ask of all claimed 'new' perspectives, particularly several

decades later, when the attraction of novelty and the polemical heat has cooled somewhat, and one can actually assess a perspective in terms of its lasting insights and what it has accomplished through applied research, rather than just its original (usually quite optimistic) claims and aspirations.

Essential reading:

Johnson, M. 2019. Chapter 7: Post-Processual and Interpretive archaeologies. In *Archaeological Theory: An Introduction* (3rd ed.). Oxford: Blackwell. [INST ARCH AH JOH; available as an e-book through UCL Explore]

Hodder, I. 1985. Post-processual archaeology. In M. Schiffer (ed.) *Advances in Archaeological Method and Theory*, Vol. 8. New York: Academic Press:1-26. [On-line journal]

Shanks, M. and C. Tilley 1989. Archaeology into the 1990s (with comments and response). *Norwegian Archaeological Review* 22:1-54. [On-line journal]

Preucel, R. 1995. The Postprocessual condition. *Journal of Archaeological Research* 3:147-75. [On-line journal]

Week 6. Reading Week. No seminar.

Week 7. 13-14 November: Marxism: social change, power and ideology. (T. Whitelaw)

The relationship between Marxist thought and archaeology/anthropology is long-standing. Marx and Engels were influenced by contemporary social evolutionary thought in the 19th century, while during the 20th century various schools of Marxism impacted upon the anthropological study of other cultures. The materialist and evolutionary focus of many Marxist perspectives resonated with the ecological materialism of much Processual theorising, though was rarely explicitly acknowledged because of the cold war context of the development in North America of the New/Processual archaeology. While Neo-Marxism provided a foundation for the Post-processual interest in social change, ideology and power in the past, this development was also a reaction to earlier Processual studies of social evolution and change. Marxist thought has also been profoundly influential in non-Western archaeologies, particularly in the Soviet Union, Eastern Europe and China, but also in Japan and Latin America. In this session we will explore a range of aspects of this rich and controversial tradition, particularly focusing on its contributions to studying social change, and inspiration for Post-processual explorations of the relationship between agency and structure, ideology and power, and critical concerns with the social and political contexts of the practice of archaeology.

Essential reading:

Trigger, B. 1993. Marxism in contemporary western archaeology. *Archaeological Method and Theory* 5:159-200. [On-line journal]

Patterson, T. 2004. Social archaeology and Marxist social thought. In L. Meskell and R. Preucel (eds), *A Companion to Social Archaeology*. Malden: Blackwell:66-81. [INST ARCH BD MES; available as an e-book through UCL Explore]

Leone, M. et al. 1987. Towards a critical archaeology. *Current Anthropology* 28:283-302. [On-line journal]

Gardner, A. 2008. Agency. In R.A. Bentley, H. Maschner and C. Chippindale (eds), *Handbook of Archaeological Theories*. Lanham: AltaMira Press:95-108. [INST ARCH AG BEN; available as an e-book through UCL Explore]

Week 8. 20-21 November: Structuralism, Post-structuralism and approaches to meaning. (A. Gardner)

A central strand of theoretical debate within Post-processual archaeology has been the search for the meanings of individuals' actions in the past and the material culture they produce. One of the strongest influences on a range of fields seeking ways of understanding meaning has been the Structuralist tradition. Developed as a theory of language, Structuralism was applied to culture by anthropologists and then imported to archaeology, by which time Post-structuralism was already flourishing in the disciplines of linguistics, literary and cultural studies. These ideas were rapidly introduced into archaeology, followed by the further developments of social theories influenced by a

mixture of Structuralism and Marxism, such as Bourdieu's Theory of Practice and Giddens' Structuration theory. Post-processual archaeologists drew eclectically and often confusingly upon these different traditions, and in this session we will explore some insights of these perspectives, and critically consider how successful these have been for understanding meanings in the past.

Essential reading:
Hodder, I. and Hutson, S. 2003. Ch. 3 'Structuralist, post-structuralist and semiotic archaeologies'. *Reading the Past*. (3rd ed.). Cambridge: CUP:45-74. [INST ARCH AH HOD; available as an e-book through UCL Explore;]
Robb, J. 1998. The archaeology of symbols. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 27:329-46. [On-line journal]
Preucel, R. 2014. Structuralism and its archaeological legacy. In A. Gardner, M. Lake and U. Sommer (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Archaeological Theory*. Oxford: OUP. [Available as an e-book through UCL Explore]

Week 9. 27-28 November: The diversification of Interpretive archaeologies. (T. Whitelaw)
Since the early 1980s, Post-processual theoretical approaches in Britain have come to dominate theoretical debate in prehistoric archaeology, and they have had a significant influence in the archaeology of other periods and regions. Post-processual archaeology encompasses a diversity of ideas and approaches that for the past few decades have more often been grouped under the term 'Interpretive archaeologies', putting the emphasis on interpretation, rather than explanation (as advocated by Processualists). This diversity includes approaches derived from Marxism, hermeneutics, Structuralism, Post-structuralism, phenomenology, gender theory, post-colonial theory and post-modernism, among other sources. At the core of an Interpretive archaeology stance is the view that any understanding of a human society must be sought in the society itself, thereby requiring a culture-specific, contextual perspective to achieve a cultural insider's (emic) understanding. This has led to debates for and against relativist interpretation. Interpretive archaeologies are characterised by consideration of issues such as social power, gender construction, ritual action, personal identity, meaning, agency, and the roles of ideology and cosmology in people's understandings and the conceptual constructions of their worlds. Interpretative archaeologies (plural) claim to recognise and respect the valid, and potentially fruitful, coexistence of multiple/plural interpretive perspectives, though this usually seems to involve a passive agreement to differ, rather than a more fruitful dialogue.

Essential reading:
Hodder, I. 1991. Interpretative archaeology and its role. *American Antiquity* 56:7-18. [On-line journal]
Shanks, M. 2008. Post-processual archaeology and after. In R.A. Bentley, H. Maschner and C. Chippindale (eds), *Handbook of Archaeological Theories*. Walnut Creek: AltaMira Press: chapter 9. [INST ARCH AG BEN; available as an e-book through UCL *Explore*]
Fahlander, F. 2014. Postmodern archaeologies. In A. Gardner, M. Lake and U. Sommer (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Archaeological Theory*. Oxford: OUP. [Available as e-book through UCL Explore].
Renfrew, C. 1994. Towards a cognitive archaeology. In C. Renfrew and E.B.W. Zubrow (eds), *The Ancient Mind: elements of a cognitive archaeology*. Cambridge: CUP:3-12. [INST ARCH AH REN; available as an e-book through UCL Explore]

Week 10. 4-5 December: Archaeological theory today: diversity, pluralism or chaos? (G. Moshenska)
In 1972, Mark Leone, reflecting on the first decade of the New Archaeology, prematurely claimed that 'the rhetorical scene has gone quiet'. Five decades later, there are no longer the polarised shouting matches that characterised most of the 70s through 90s, at least in some quarters. This is certainly not the consequence of any one position 'winning' the 'theory wars', any agreement on a unified perspective, or even the general acceptance of a plurality of theoretical perspectives. Does this decline in explicit debate represent an increasing maturity in discussion and disciplinary development, incompatible divergence, chaos or apathy? Is this decline in explicit debate a good thing or not? In this

session we will consider the current 'state of play' in archaeological theory including how we cope with the ever-increasing diversification of perspectives in the field. Developing from the discussion in the previous session on diversification and plural perspectives in Interpretive archaeologies, we will consider how the different perspectives we have reviewed, from the '60s-'90s, have impacted on the nature of academic archaeology today.

Essential reading:
Hegmon, M. 2003. Setting theoretical egos aside: issues and theory in North American archaeology. *American Antiquity* 68:213-244. [On-line journal]
Kintigh, K. *et al.* 2014. Grand challenges for archaeology. American Antiquity 79:5-24. [On-line journal]
Bernbeck, R. and Pollock, S. 2004. The political economy of archaeological practice and the production of heritage in the Middle East. In L. Meskell and R. Preucel (eds). *A Companion to Social Archaeology.* Oxford: Blackwell:335-352. [INST ARCH BD MES; available as an e-book through UCL Explore]

Remind yourself of relevant reading for session 1: Mizoguchi, K. 2015. A future of archaeology. *Antiquity* 89:12-22. [On-line journal]
And reading for session 2: Trigger, B. 1984. Alternative archaeologies: nationalist, colonialist, imperialist. *Man* 19:355-370. [On-line journal]

Week 11. 11-12 December: Theory beyond academic archaeology and broadening academic interests. (G. Moshenska)
Independent of debates about academic archaeological theory and the increasing diversification of approaches that we considered in the previous two sessions, recognition of the importance of an understanding of the past by non-academic stakeholders, non-Western archaeologists and Indigenous peoples, with often very different interests and objectives, has become increasingly important in the field in practice. The debates about plural academic perspectives opened up a space in theoretical discussion for consideration of such alternative views, which are increasingly recognised and engaged with in academic discussions.

To this, we can add an increasing recognition of the hegemonic role of Western academic practices, including in archaeology, on how archaeology is practiced, and has and continues to develop in other parts of the world. This is relevant to how we regard and pursue archaeological theory, with the added complication that some regional traditions are active in explicitly considering, revising or rejecting Western archaeological theory and developing approaches to better address their own interests in the past, whereas others are largely focused on traditional Culture history. This ties-in with the current interest in developing more actively collaborative research, addressing questions relevant to wider society, developing and communicating research results with non-academic interest groups and audiences, and de-colonising academic teaching.

These are all challenges for academic archaeology, and how archaeology, including archaeological theory, is taught. These challenges can usefully be considered as a retrospective on the approaches and topics considered in this course.

Essential Reading:
Meskell, L. 2002. The intersections of identity and politics in archaeology. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 31:279-301. [On-line journal]
Matsuda, A. and Okamura, K. 2011. Introduction: New Perspectives in Global Public Archaeology. In A. Matsuda and K. Okamura (eds), *New Perspectives in Global Public Archaeology.* London: Springer:1-18. [INST ARCH AF OKA; available as an e-book through UCL Explore]

Wylie, A. 2008. The integrity of narratives: deliberative practice, pluralism and multivocality. In J. Habu, C. Fawcett and J. Matsunaga (eds), *Evaluating Multiple Narratives: beyond nationalist, colonialist, imperialist archaeologies.* New York: Springer:201-12. [INST ARCH AH HAB; available as an e-book through UCL Explore]

Murray, T. 2011. Archaeologists and indigenous people: a maturing relationship? *Annual Review of Anthropology* 40:363-78. [On-line journal]

Nicholas, G. and Watkins, J. 2014. Indigenous archaeologies in archaeological theory. In C. Smith (ed.) *Encyclopedia of Global Archaeology*. New York: Springer:3777-86. [Available as an e-book through UCL Explore]

Remind yourself of reading for session 2: Trigger, B. 1984. Alternative archaeologies: nationalist, colonialist, imperialist. *Man* 19:355-370. [On-line journal]