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1. Overview

**Short description**
This module covers British and continental European Prehistory from the Neolithic to the Late Iron Age. It aims at an even geographic coverage, but will concentrate on subjects that have figured prominently in recent discussion. This will be a seminar-based module combined with period-specific introductory lectures. It is absolutely essential that students peruse the core reading for the module and also get a good grip on some of the ancillary reading to be able to participate in the discussions.

Obviously, it is impossible to cover the whole breadth of the subject in a half-unit module. The subjects have been chosen to introduce students to some recent controversial discussions and also give them some idea of the research traditions in different parts of Europe. If students wish to consider different/additional subjects, we can discuss this in the first session of the module.

**This handbook**
This handbook contains the basic information about the content and administration of the module. Some lecturers may provide additional subject-specific reading lists and individual session handouts during the module. Do also regularly check the module Moodle.
If you have queries about the objectives, structure, content, assessment or organisation of the module, please consult the Module Co-ordinator.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1/10   | Lecture | Introduction to the module (Mike Parker Pearson)  
What is Europe? Differing Research Traditions (Ulrike Sommer) |
| 1/10   | Lecture | Big questions needs big data: the Neolithisation of Europe (MPP) |
| 8/10   | Seminar | Models for the introduction and uptake of farming in Europe (MPP) |
|        | Lecture | Tells and mega-sites (US) |
| 15/10  | Seminar | Settlement patterns in Neolithic Europe (US, MPP) |
|        | Lecture | Megaliths in Europe (MPP) |
| 22/10  | Seminar | Megaliths, social organisation and society (MPP) |
|        | Lecture | Genes and Neolithic demography (MPP) |
| 29/10  | Seminar | Seminar on genes and language (MPP) |
|        | Lecture | Early metals and social structure (MPP) |
| 5-9/11 | READING WEEK | |
| 12/11  | Seminar | Metalwork, hoards and structured deposition (MPP) |
|        | Lecture | Priests and Warriors of the Bronze Age? (US) |
| 19/11  | Seminar | Bronze Age power structures– the emergence of stratification? (US, MPP) |
|        | Lecture | From barrows to urnfields (US) |
| 26/11  | Seminar | Heroes of the Bronze Age? (MPP,US) |
|        | Lecture | The Early Iron Age in Europe (MPP) |
| 03/12  | Seminar | Iron Age Urbanism North of the Alps? (MPP) |
|        | Lecture | The Late Iron Age in Europe (MPP) |
| 10/12  | Seminar | The formation of European peoples (MPP, US) |
|        | Final discussion (MPP, US) | |
**Communication**

If any changes need to be made to the module arrangements, these will normally be communicated by email. It is therefore essential that you consult your UCL e-mail account and the module Moodle regularly.

**Basic texts**

**General**


**Web-resources**

**British Isles**

http://www.biab.ac.uk/

*British and Irish archaeological bibliography*

Archaeological Site Index to Radiocarbon Dates from Great Britain and Ireland

*The majority of unpublished fieldwork reports in the UK are available through the Archaeological Data Service* (http://archaeologydataservice.ac.uk/archives/view/greylit/index.cfm?CFID=4202259&CFTOKEN=32908391) Access is free

http://finds.org.uk/

*Portable Antiquities scheme, England and Wales*

Excavations Ireland: Irish excavation reports

http://www.excavations.ie/Pages/HomePage.php

Scottish Archaeological Research Framework

*Europe*

http://www.persee.fr/web/guest/home
excellent source for many French publications, including BSPF
http://alephdai.ub.hu-berlin.de/F/7L64G5OHQVHSD1R769A1YGCK2NP4LSC58T6JE3ECTBRCL1LIA-55016?func=option-update-lnq&p_con_lng=eng
Library of the German Archaeological Institute - excellent source for the whole of Central Europe! English search menu.
ArchWEB: archaeology in Poland http://www.archaeolog.ru/?id=22
many Russian Российской Journals (Academy of Sciences), esp. археология

Publications by period

Neolithic


Influential and controversial approach, emphasising the ideological element of the Neolithic


weblinks:
http://www.scottishheritagehub.com/content/neolithic-bibliography
Bibliography for Neolithic Scotland
http://www.jungsteinsite.de/
Information platform on the archaeology of the Neolithic period by the University of Kiel. Some articles in English, English summaries and figure captions available for most German articles.

Bronze Age


Handbook
Earle, T., Kristiansen, K. 2010. Organizing Bronze Age societies: the
Mediterranean, Central Europe and Scandinavia compared. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press. INST ARCH DA 150 EAR


Useful for the Chronology


Weblinks

BM Bronze Age Review
http://www.britishmuseum.org/research/publications/online_journals/bronze_age_review/bar_volume_1.aspx
www.rgzm.de/tomba1/home/frames.htm

Database of Bronze Age burials from Western Europe. Click on the information tree to access - some useful stuff, but very uneven coverage

Iron Age


Methods of assessment

This module is assessed by two pieces of written coursework, (one essay, one research paper), each of 1,900-2,100 words, which will each contribute 50% to the final grade for the module.

Penalties will only be imposed if you exceed the upper figure in the range. There is no penalty for using fewer words than the lower figure in the range: the lower figure is simply for your guidance to indicate the sort of length that is expected.

The topics and deadlines for each assessment are specified below (p. 11). If students are unclear about the nature of an assignment, they should contact the module Co-ordinator, or the lecturer responsible for the specific assessment (indicated in brackets for each essay). If you wish to discuss essay topics or prepare a brief (single-page maximum) outline of how you intend to approach the essay/presentation prior to writing it, the lecturer in question will be happy to discuss this with you.

Teaching methods

The module is taught over Spring Term through weekly two-hour classes. Half of the classes are seminars, organised around a series of essential readings. One hour each week is devoted to a lecture, designed to provide necessary background for the seminars that follow. Seminars have weekly recommended readings, which students are expected to have read and thought about prior to the class.

Workload

There will be 10 hours of lectures and 10 hours of seminars for this module. Students will be expected to undertake around 100 hours of reading for the module, plus 60 hours preparing for and producing the assessed work, and an additional 8 hours on museum visits/fieldwork – either organised or as part of their research. This adds up to a total workload of 200 hours for the module.

The reading week should be used to catch-up with any reading associated with lectures and to research and prepare assessed work. The lectures in this module can only introduce you to some main themes in the discussion of European prehistory, in order to make most of this module, and to acquaint yourself to alternative interpretations, it is absolutely essential to read the material outlined in the reading lists and to find additional material discussing the problems outlined.

Prerequisites

This module does not have a prerequisite; however, if students have no previous background in European prehistory, it would be advisable for them to attend relevant undergraduate modules in World Archaeology to ensure that they have the background to get the most out of the Masters level seminars in this module.
2. Aims, objectives and assessment

**Aims**
The module aims to provide a focus for study of British and continental European later prehistory, organised around thematic topics relevant to large parts of the continent; particular emphasis is placed on comparison between different research traditions and areas which are usually studied in separation. Students will be introduced both to major problems and issues and to the various approaches and methods that have been adopted by British and continental European prehistorians to address these subjects.

**Objectives**
The module will:

- Put the interpretation of British and continental European prehistory in the context of wider theoretical debate within the discipline
- Provide an understanding of the main theoretical approaches adopted by Prehistorians of Britain and continental Europe
- Critically assess interpretations of British and continental European archaeology and put them in a wider context
- Promote an understanding of the main lines of British and continental European prehistory from the Neolithic to the Iron Age
- Facilitate a basic knowledge of the relevant material culture and important sites of British and continental European prehistory from the Neolithic to the Iron Age.
- Elucidate the European context of British prehistory

**Learning Outcomes**
On successful completion of the module students should be able to:

- Analyse archaeological discourse and be able to identify its ideological and theoretical background in its specific research framework
- To participate in general discussion of British and continental European prehistory

and have developed the generic skills of:

- Observation and critical reflection
- Application of acquired knowledge
- Oral presentation skills
- Coursework

**Assessment**
If students are unclear about the nature of an assignment, they should discuss this with the Module Co-ordinator.

Students are not permitted to re-write and re-submit essays in order to try to improve their marks. However, students can, in advance of the deadline for a given assignment, submit for comment a brief outline of the assignment. The Module Co-ordinator is willing to discuss an outline of the student's approach to the assignment, provided this is planned suitably in advance of the
Alternative essay-questions are welcome, but need to be agreed upon by the module-coordinator.

**Essay (assessment 1)**
Standard Essay (1,900-2,100 words) – Choose one essay question to answer from the range of essay questions given below for individual seminars. Work on this essay should involve reasoned and critical assessment of multiple sources and independent research use of library/archival facilities.

**Research Paper (assessment 2)**
(1,900-2,100 words) – isolate and write-up a piece of text- or museum-based research related to one of the seminar topics (chose a different subject and period to that covered in your other piece of ARCL0146 course work (standard essay). Your chosen piece of research **must be approved by the module co-ordinator** and must be related to a topic that can be effectively written up in 1,900-2,100 words. This work should involve reasoned and critical assessment of multiple sources, independent research use of library/museum facilities, and give you experience in the production of graphic presentation and possibly, where relevant, independent problem-solving based on real data sets. Museum and fieldwork could form part of this research.

**UCL-wide Penalties for Over-length Coursework**
For submitted coursework, where a maximum length has been specified, the following procedure will apply:

i) The length of coursework will normally be specified in terms of a word count
ii) Assessed work should not exceed the prescribed length.
iii) For work that exceeds the specified maximum length by less than 10% the mark will be reduced by ten percentage marks; but the penalised mark will not be reduced below the pass mark, assuming the work merited a pass.
iv) For work that exceeds the specified maximum length by 10% or more, a mark of zero will be recorded.

The following should not be included in the word-count: bibliography, appendices, and tables, graphs and illustrations and their captions.

**Submission deadlines:**
You may choose which piece of these two required pieces of work to submit first and which to submit second.

**The submission deadline for the FIRST piece of work is 3/12/2018**

**The submission deadline for the SECOND piece of work is 18/02/2019**

**Submission procedures**
Students are required to submit hard copy of all coursework to the module co-ordinators pigeon-hole via the Red Essay Box at Reception by the appropriate deadline. The coursework must be stapled to a completed coversheet.
(available from the web, from outside Room 411A or from the library). Please note that the hardcopies are not date-stamped!

New, stringent penalties for late submission have been introduced UCL-wide. Late submission will be penalized in accordance with these regulations unless permission has been granted and an Extension Request Form (ERF) completed (including the candidate number!).

Students should put their Candidate Number, not their name (and not their student number), on all coursework. They should also put the Candidate Number and module code on each page of their work (as a header).

_UCL-wide Penalties for Late Submission of Coursework_

i) A penalty of 5 percentage marks should be applied to coursework submitted the calendar day after the deadline (calendar day 1).

ii) A penalty of 15 percentage marks should be applied to coursework submitted on calendar day 2 after the deadline through to calendar day 7.

iii) A mark of zero should be recorded for coursework submitted on calendar day 8 after the deadline through to the end of the second week of third term. Nevertheless, the assessment will be considered to be complete provided the coursework contains material than can be assessed.

iv) Coursework submitted after the end of the second week of third term will not be marked and the assessment will be incomplete.

vii) Where there are extenuating circumstances that have been recognised by the Board of Examiners or its representative, these penalties will not apply until the agreed extension period has been exceeded.

_Timescale for return of marked coursework to students._

You can expect to receive your marked work within four calendar weeks from the official submission deadline. If you do not receive your work within this period or a written explanation from the marker, you should notify the IoA’s Academic Administrator, Judy Medrington.

_Keeping copies_

Please note that it is an Institute requirement that you retain a copy (this can be electronic) of all coursework submitted. After your marked essay is returned to you, you should return it to the marker within two weeks. If the essay is not returned, it cannot be second-marked.

Please put on the title-page of your Turnitin-submission:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>your Candidate Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of the module/year number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and title of submission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>word-count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>any relevant disabilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Turnitin**
The new link to Turnitin is [http://www.turnitinuk.com/](http://www.turnitinuk.com/)

Date-stamping will be via ‘Turnitin’, so in addition to submitting hard copy, students must also submit their work to Turnitin by the midnight on the day of the deadline. Please note that Turnitin can be very busy at certain times, so avoid submitting in the last minute, this can lead to a technically late submission.

Students who encounter technical problems submitting their work to Turnitin should email the nature of the problem to ioa-turnitin@ucl.ac.uk in advance of the deadline in order that the Turnitin Advisers can notify the Module Co-ordinator that it may be appropriate to waive the late submission penalty.

The Turnitin ‘Class ID’ is **3885585** and the ‘Class Enrolment Password’ is **IoA1819** (Capital Letter "I", small letter "o", capital A, numbers 1819) Further information is given on the IoA website. [http://www.ucl.ac.uk/archaeology/administration/students/handbook/turnitin](http://www.ucl.ac.uk/archaeology/administration/students/handbook/turnitin)

Turnitin advisers will be available to help you via email: ioa-turnitin@ucl.ac.uk if needed.

**Timescale for return of marked coursework to students**
You can expect to receive your marked work within four calendar weeks of the official submission deadline if you have submitted on time. If you do not receive your work within this period, or a written explanation from the marker, you should notify the IoA’s Academic Administrator, Judy Medrington.

**Citing of sources**
Coursework should be expressed in a student’s own words giving the exact source of any ideas, information, diagrams etc. that are taken from the work of others. Any direct quotations from the work of others must be indicated as such by being placed between inverted commas. **Plagiarism is regarded as a very serious irregularity which can carry very heavy penalties.** It is your responsibility to read and abide by the requirements for presentation, referencing and avoidance of plagiarism to be found in the IoA ‘Coursework Guidelines’ on the IoA website.

Please follow the IoA referencing guidelines [http://www.ucl.ac.uk/archaeology/administration/students/handbook/referencing](http://www.ucl.ac.uk/archaeology/administration/students/handbook/referencing), inconsistent and incomplete referencing will be penalised.

**Illustrations**
It is good practice to illustrate essays, dissertations and presentations. The illustrations included should be relevant to your argument, not simply nice to look at or easy to find on the net. Captions and tables are not included in the
word-count. Tables and schematic illustrations can strengthen and summarise your argument without inflating the wordcount. Maps, site maps, schematic drawings, diagrams and chronological tables are excellent tools in making your explanations clearer.

Guidelines on illustrations are to be found at: http://www.ucl.ac.uk/archaeology/intranet/students.htm.

Scanners are available in several locations. The primary location for Institute students is in the Library and in the Institute's Photography Lab (Room 405), where tuition and advice on their appropriate use is available. If you are involved in a project that requires large amounts of scanning it may be worth getting access to the scanner in the AGIS Lab (Room 322c, contact Mark Lake, Andy Bevan or Peter Schauer for details of access and training on the use of these scanners). There is another scanner (must be booked) at the ISD Helpdesk in the basement of the Lewis-Building.

Some basic knowledge of Photoshop Elements or a similar graphic program is useful. Make sure your pictures are properly cut, not skewed and of sufficient contrast. Each illustration should be labelled (fig. 1 to #) and referred to by this number in the text. All illustrations need proper captions. Each illustration must be provided with a source, either in the text (short quote) or as a list of illustrations at the end of the essay/research paper (preferred). An illustration without a proper source is plagiarism, even if Turnitin does not highlight it!

3. Schedule and syllabus

Teaching schedule

The seminars will be held 2.00-4.00 on Mondays in Room 412 (term 1).

Syllabus

The following is an outline for the module as a whole, and identifies essential and supplementary readings relevant to each session. Information is provided as to where in the UCL library system individual readings are available; their location and Teaching Collection (TC) number, and status (whether out on loan) can also be accessed on the eUCLid computer catalogue system.

Readings marked with an * are considered essential to keep up with the topics covered in the module. Copies of individual articles and chapters identified as essential reading are in the Teaching Collection in the Institute Library (where permitted by copyright).

Seminar/lecture summaries

The following is a session outline for the module as a whole, and identifies essential and supplementary readings relevant to each session. Information is provided as to where in the UCL library system individual readings are available; their location and Teaching Collection (TC) number, and status (whether out on loan) can also be accessed on the eUCLid computer catalogue system. The recommended readings are considered essential to keep up with the topics covered in the module sessions, and it is expected that students will have read these prior to the session under which they are listed.
Copies of individual articles and chapters identified as essential reading are in the Teaching Collection in the Institute library (where permitted by copyright).

Session 1, 01/10/2018

Introduction
Mike Parker Pearson
We will commence with an introduction to the aims, objectives and methods of the module.

What is Europe? Differing research traditions (Lecture)
Ulrike Sommer
Europe is not a discrete continent or a homogeneous climatic and geographic zone. Its geographic and cultural boundaries and make-up are historically variable. How then can we justify European prehistory as a discipline and what characterises European prehistory as a discipline?

Reading:

Essential reading

Copy available from U. Sommer
*Gramsch, A. 2000. 'Reflexiveness' in archaeology, nationalism, and Europeanism. Archaeological Dialogues 7/1. INST ARCH Pers and NET
*Kristiansen, K. 2008. Do we need the 'archaeology of Europe'? Archaeological Dialogues 15/1, 5–25. INST ARCH PERS, doi:10.1017/S1380203808002419
and other articles in the discussion
Pluciennik, M. 1998. Archaeology, archaeologists and 'Europe'. Antiquity 72, 816-824. INST ARCH PERS and NET
Rowlands, M. 1987. Europe in Prehistory. Culture and History 1, 63-78. Stores
see also:

Numerous articles about various European research traditions
Big questions needs big data: the neolithisation of Europe (Lecture)

Mike Parker Pearson

While the earliest occurrences of farming date back to late 7th millennium cal. BC in the Aegean Sea, the neolithisation of Europe is only completed by the early 4th millennium cal. BC, with the introduction of agriculture in Britain, Ireland, and southern Scandinavia. The question is thus how to account for a phenomenon that stretches over such a long period of time and a large geographical area. Are we dealing with a series of loosely related local events, only linked together by the introduction of new plants and animals, or are they rather deeply-rooted historical forces to be uncovered? The last decade has seen the development of new approaches which tackle these questions at an explicitly large scale, by resorting to the wealth of archaeological data now available. This lecture will review some of recent work, and discuss the methodological challenges ad theoretical questions they raise.

Reading

Overviews


Broad overview of the archaeological facts

Colledge, S., Conolly, J. (eds) 2007. The Origins and Spread of Domestic Plants in Southwest Asia and Europe. Walnut Creek, Left Coast Press. INST ARCH HA COL

Useful up-to date overview of most European countries.


Collected account. Read Chapter 1 (‘Europe’s first farmers: an introduction’) and Chapter 11 (‘Lessons in the transition to agriculture’).

Session 2, 08/10/2018

Models for the introduction of farming into Europe (Seminar)

Mike Parker Pearson

Debate about the beginnings of farming in Europe has focused on the identification of the actors responsible for this process, with some scholars insist upon the role of an incoming farmer population eventually originating from the Near East, and those who alternatively stress the role of indigenous communities. Alternative narratives have also been put forward, so that a wide range of potential mechanisms and causes for the spread of farming in Europe can be found in the literature. This seminar will discuss the factual basis, methodological weaknesses and strengths of some of these models.

Reading

Essential


Demic diffusion

The original presentation of the demic-diffusion model


Most recent collected account and reassessment by Ammerman of his earlier work; read especially the first and last sections. Example of diffusionist view, proposing a model of demic diffusion.


Heavily biased toward demic expansion in the early Neolithic, connected with the spread of mayor language groups. Read chapter 1

Does just what it says in the title.


Prime exponent of the 'indigenous' view. Dated, but worth a look

Hodder, I. 1990. The Domestication of Europe. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press. DA140 HOD

In 1990 an entirely new view of the Neolithisation process, emphasising the importance of conceptual changes in society, over material/economic ones. The whole book develops this view, but a summary relating to the origins of agriculture in particular can be found on pages 289-97.


Recent overview of the evidence with a strong focus on North-Western Europe


Influential model for the acculturation of Mesolithic communities

See also


Recent review of the $^{14}$C record on a European scale


The book that started the discussion on genetics

Regional overviews (list far from complete)


 Discusses the $^{14}$C evidence for the Adriatic and the related diffusion models

*Rather dry reading, but good collection of the basic facts and theories*


*also a good introduction to the whole problem of "Immigration".*


Stevens, Chr. J., Fuller, D. Q. 2012. Did Neolithic farming fail? The case for a Bronze Age agricultural revolution in the British Isles. *Antiquity* 86, 1-16. *Inst Arch PERS and online*


**Genetics**


Essay question
What are the main factors thought to be responsible for the introduction of farming across Europe?
**Tells and mega-sites (Lecture)**

**Ulrike Sommer**

Megaliths are also found in Southeast- and Eastern Europe, but they are mainly of Bronze Age, and even Late Bronze Age date. In this area, we find a different type of monumentality: tightly organised settlements that stay in one place for a long time and thus turn into monuments within their own duration. Tells in Southeast Europe can be up to 10m high and, while not as huge as the Bronze Age townsites of the Near East, form impressive landmarks in the flat landscape of the great river valleys.

In the Steppe area around the Black Sea, the Eneolithic saw the development of the Cucuteni/Tripolye/Tripylla Megaliths: tightly ordered villages that can cover up to 400ha and consist of solid houses with two rooms and sometimes two storeys, arranged in concentric circles. In contrast, evidence for burial is very rare from the whole area. Only at the very end of the Eneolithic (Varna-Karanovo-Bodrogkeresztúr-Horizon) are there large cemeteries with sometimes very rich grave goods.

What were the social structures that gave rise to these types of settlement, and why did the development come to an end?

**Reading**


ancient world. UCLA Cotsen Institute of Archaeology Press, 66 - 89.
see also other contributions in the volume


Reingruber, A. et al. 2010. Monumental living: Pietrele near the lower Danube River in the 5th Millenium BC. In: Kiel Graduate School "Human development in Landscapes" (ed.), Landscapes and human development: The contribution of European Archaeology. Bonn, Habelt, 171-181. -


useful plans

Session 3, 15/10/2018

Settlement patterns in Neolithic Europe (Seminar)

Ulrike Sommer, Mike Parker Pearson

The European Neolithic produced a wide variety of settlement patterns, from long-lived tells to more mobile and transient forms of occupation. Broadly, the further north and west, the more transient and dispersed the settlement pattern. Why was this so? Why was Neolithic Atlantic Europe not full of large villages? Why didn’t dense aggregations of population form on the loess lands of central and western Europe?

Reading
Essay question
To what extent can the Tripillia/Tripolye mega-sites be considered urban?

Megaliths in Europe (Lecture)
Mike Parker Pearson
The appearance of megalithic (colossal stone) architecture in the Neolithic of NW and parts of Mediterranean Europe during the Neolithic has long fascinated scholars. The relationships between monuments built of wood and those built of substantial stone is a matter of debate as are the origins of the megalithic tradition. More recent concerns have been with the social impact of monumental construction and the extent to which megaliths altered places.

Reading

Kinnes, I. 1975. Monumental function in British Neolithic burial practices. World Archaeology 7, 16-29. ARCH periodicals and Online


Session 4, 22/10/2018

Megaliths, social organization and society
Mike Parker Pearson
The megalithic tombs of northern and western Europe have been studied for a century or more and a vast literature exists on them. The approach we have chosen for this seminar is to explore the relationship between monuments and the societies that produced them. Megalithic tombs are ideal for this purpose because they allow archaeologists to find out who was buried in them and with
what grave goods and ceremony, and also to estimate the labour organization and socio-economic support necessary for their construction.

**Reading**
See previous reading list.

**Essay question**
To what extent did the megalithic tradition of building passage tombs in different parts of Europe have a common thread and symbolic meaning?

---

**Genes and Neolithic demography (Lecture)**
Mike Parker Pearson

Over the last three decades, there has been a growing interest amongst archaeologists for genetics. While earlier studies focused on how modern genetic information could be related to potential past events, the development of ancient DNA has revolutionised the field by allowing us to access directly ancient genomes. These new categories of evidence have largely contributed to a renewed interest in demography, and the role of population structure in the making of Neolithic Europe.

**Reading**


**Recent paper on the importance of demography in Neolithic Europe**


Some issues of language (although the seminar will not focus on this):

Although prehistory by definition does not have access to the linguistic identities of past people, the temptation of tracing back the origins of given modern languages has always been strong. Over the last three decades, this debate has been doubled by information about the genetic structure of
modern – and now past – populations, eventually leading to claims of a big synthesis bringing together linguistics, genetics and archaeology. If the big synthesis has not quite delivered up to its expectations, these new questions of categories of evidence have largely contributed to a renewed interest in demography, and the role of population structure in the making of Neolithic Europe.

Reading for those interested in language and demographic spread
Methodologically-focused paper written by a linguist for an archaeological audience
The book that re-ignited the debate

Session 5, 29/10/2018
Genes and language in Neolithic Europe (Seminar)
Mike Parker Pearson
Despite having no direct access to languages, prehistoric archaeologists have often been tempted to identify past linguistic identities, and the origins of known languages. Such work led to attractive, competitive hypotheses regarding the introduction of Indo-European languages in Europe, either linked to Bronze Age horse riders violently introducing new works (Gimbutas, Anthony), or Neolithic farmers peacefully suffusing their languages as they extend their fields across European landscapes (Bellwood, Renfrew). These speculations have since witnessed the addition of genetic data. As part of this seminar, we will review some of the main works linking language and archaeology, as well as the more recent contributions of genetics to our understanding of European Later Prehistory.

Reading


Gimbutas, M., 1979. The three waves of the Kurgan people into Old Europe, 4500-2500 B.C. Archives Suisses d'Anthropologie Générale 43, 113-137.


Essay question
How have genetics informed archaeologists’ understanding of the spread of the Corded Ware and Bell Beaker phenomena during the 3rd millennium BC?

Early metals and social structure (Lecture)
Mike Parker Pearson
Copper metallurgy was first developed in modern-day Serbia at the turn of the 6th and 5th millennia cal. BC, but only reached the Atlantic shores during the 4th and 3rd millennium cal. BC. It is therefore hardly surprising that the cultural and social impact of this new pyrotechnology and of the newly available products remains disputed. For some, this invention was crucial and, along other technical innovations, triggered a new stage in the social evolution of prehistoric societies, marked by increased hierarchisation. Other scholars rather downplay the leading role of metallurgy, and rather insist upon its integration within existing social frameworks. This debate is best epitomised by the changing fate of the corresponding “Chalcolithic” notion, viewed by some as an integral period of European prehistory, and by others as a terminological aberration.

Reading
Collection of essays assessing the role of copper in late 3rd millennium Britain


Kienlin, T., Bischoff, E., Opielka, H., Copper and Bronze during the Eneolithic and early Bronze Age: A metallographic examination of axes from the Northalpine Region. *Archaeometry* 48, 453-468. NET


**Beaker traditions**


*The Crémade-model of Strahm*


**Short overview of the changing interpretations**


*Regional synthesizes for the Northern distribution area*


**Essay question**

Was the innovation and adoption of copper metallurgy in Europe derived from a once-only process of discovery or was it the result of multiple independent innovations?

**Session 6, 12/11/2018**

**Metalwork, hoards and structured deposition (Seminar)**

Mike Parker Pearson

The typological examination of metalwork was instrumental in the creation of modern archaeology, and since has constituted a core practice of the discipline. Grave goods excepted, metal finds were often chance finds and thus had limited archaeological context, hence limiting the range of possible interpretations. Elements of patterning in the association of certain categories of metal artefacts, or their absence in given contexts, were however recognised and led to the concept of structure deposition, i.e. that these metal artefacts were not placed haphazardly but according to some rules. These patterns vary over time and space and allow us to draw some inferences about various facets of social life. For instance, the changing favour of several types of ornaments in graves points to modes of display and, beyond, to questions of gender and identity. With the rise of development-led archaeology and, in England and Wales, of the Portable Antiquities Scheme,
the documentary situation is changing at a fast pace and it now becomes possible to replace hoards and the corresponding concept of structured deposition within a wider landscape setting.

Reading

*Stevens, F. 2008. Elemental interplay: the production, circulation and deposition of Bronze Age metalwork in Britain and Ireland. Word Archaeology 4/2, 238-252. ONLINE

See also
Essay question
How have archaeologists explained the changing patterns of metalwork deposition from the inception of metal artefacts to the end of the Bronze Age? You may illustrate your answer with a regional case study.

Priests and Warriors of the Bronze Age? (Lecture)
Ulrike Sommer
The Bronze Age has traditionally been seen as the period when stable social hierarchies developed, and terms like chieftain and priest are used to describe social roles. This is mainly based on grave inventories and hoards, but also on the appearance of fortified hilltop-settlements. Unfortunately, the settlement evidence has often been neglected in favour of detailed chronologies of Bronze artefacts. In this lecture, I will endeavour to give an overview over the development in North West and Central Europe, as a base for next week's seminar.

Reading
*Vandkilde, H. 2007. Culture and change in Central European prehistory: 6th to 1st millennium BC. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press. INST ARCH DA 100 VAN, ISSUE DESK IOA VAN 4
Session 7, 19/11/2018

Bronze Age power structures– the emergence of stratification? (Seminar)

Ulrike Sommer, Mike Parker Pearson

The Bronze Age in Europe sees the development of salient inequalities in society, manifested archaeologically in a variety of ways in different areas: ‘rich’ burials equipped with prestige grave goods; castle-like fortified settlements; long-distance trade in rare materials and goods etc. Over the last 15 years or so this development has been a major focus of enquiry for European prehistorians. Gilman’s 1981 article is seminal, offering a Marxist analysis that provoked an on-going debate. You should read both the article and the comments by other scholars in the same volume of Current Anthropology. His 1991 article adopts essentially the same stance, but is concerned specifically with the Mediterranean area. The other articles take different standpoints. The aim of this seminar is to assess the different interpretations on offer.

We will also consider how power and elite status is represented, controlled and personified in the European Bronze Age. As part of this, we need to consider the relationships between Britain, Continental Europe and the Mediterranean in elite networks of contact and trade/exchange. In particular, trade/exchange in the European Bronze Age seems to have been very different from that documented for the Neolithic. Prestige materials and artefacts travelled long distances, in some cases linking the far corners of Europe (e.g. amber, originating in the Baltic, which is found from southern England to Mycenaean Greece). Metals - copper, tin and to a lesser extent gold and silver - were traded widely and sometimes in large quantities, from a range of ore sources in different parts of Europe. As well as raw materials, manufactured objects were also traded, particularly in the Mediterranean where Mycenaean pottery vessels (and some other goods) were traded from the Aegean to the central Mediterranean, in exchange, it is usually assumed, for raw materials, especially metal. While many studies concentrate on the trade in specific materials or objects, Sherratt has attempted to define a model for Bronze Age trade in general, based on a version of Wallerstein’s ‘World Systems’ approach and, while this can be challenged, it provides a framework for constructing a broader picture.

Reading

Emergence of social stratification


Sherratt, A. 1994. The Emergence of elites: Earlier Bronze Age Europe. Chapter 7 in Cunliffe, B. (ed.) *The Oxford Illustrated Prehistory of Europe*: 244-76. See also


World systems


Elites


*The original consideration of Bronze Age artefacts as symbols of power.*


*See discussion of Denmark! This situates European Bronze Age studies in a Polynesian context. Other publications by Earle focus on the relationship between Chieftains and property rights: e.g. 1993 chieftdoms: Power, Economy, and Ideology (School of American Research Advanced Seminars), Cambridge, CUP*


*Exchange*


*Metal exchange*


*Chapter 1 for an introduction to the issue, especially pages 8-20.*


*PHYSICAL SCIENCES periodicals; NATURAL SCIENCES periodicals For lead isotope analysis*


*Amber networks*


*NATURAL SCIENCES periodicals The article that started off these studies*


*Mycenaean pottery*


*Especially Chapter 9, ‘The Mycenaean Overseas’, 229-273*


*In Italian, but with useful maps and illustrations*


*Articles by French, Bietti Sestieri, Tusa and Bergonzi*

*Essay question*

What evidence is there for long-distance exchange during the Bronze Age of northwest Europe, and how can such exchange networks be understood?
**From barrows to urnfields (Lecture)**

**Ulrike Sommer**

The change from inhumation to cremation between 1300 and 1200 BC and the appearance of a material culture that shares certain similarities from Romania to Spain used to be explained by "urnfield-migrations", sweeping across the continent and even touching the states in the Eastern Mediterranean, with "Sea-People" threatening Egypt, destroying Ugarit and the Hittite Empire.

Changing theories and better dating have put an end to these population-movements, but alternative interpretations are slow in coming. The problem is acerbated by the changing nature of the sources, cremation leaving fewer remains for archaeologists to find, but deposition in watery contexts reaches an absolute peak. There are also sacrifices on mountains and buildings that have been interpreted as specialised temples. On the other hand, Settlements of this periods are very well known thanks to a number of waterlogged settlements. In the lecture, we will mainly look at materials from South-Eastern and Central Europe.

**Reading**

There is no good English-language overview for this period. Consult the relevant chapters in Fokkens and Harding (2013) and Milisauskas (2002) for a general overview.


**On Britain**

see also


IE-Language and Urnfield migrations


The classic diffusionist view


A detailed look at European weapons and the question on the invasion of the "sea-people":

*Sørensen, M. L. S., Rebay-Salisbury, K. 2008. Landscapes of the body: burials of the Middle Bronze Age in Hungary. European Journal of Archaeology* 11/1, 49-74. ONLINE


The following is a very limited selection of regional overviews, chosen because they are written in English, not necessarily because they are the most relevant or most enlightening. Most are extremely detailed and focused on specific artefacts - but that is a general feature of European Bronze Age studies.


see also

Volcanos and climate-change

also contains contributions in English
The hyperdiffusionist-view!
In cataloguing

Chronology
*Primas, M. 2008. Bronzezeit zwischen Elbe und Po; Strukturwandel in
**Session 8, 26/11/2018**

**Heroes of the Bronze Age? (Seminar)**

Mike Parker Pearson, Ulrike Sommer

Homer’s epics have been used ever since Schliemann’s search for Troy as a means of interpreting archaeological evidence from the Bronze Age. Notions of Homeric heroes such as Achilles and Hector have been used to flesh out concepts of Late Bronze Age warriors both in the Aegean and also as far afield as southern Scandinavia. But how justified are such approaches that attempt to link the two lines of evidence?

**Reading**


**Essay question**
Do Homeric traditions have any value for interpreting the social organization of Bronze Age societies in north-west Europe?

**The Early Iron Age in Europe (Lecture)**
Mike Parker Pearson

The Iron Age sees the first written sources about societies in the West and north of the Alps. Greek and Phoenician settlements are founded in the Western Mediterranean. Traditionally, this is seen as a process of “civilising the Barbarians”, a transfer of cultural values and knowledge from East to West. Ultimately, secondary centres like Rome take over the Role of the original Greek "Colonists". All these concepts have come under heavy criticism in the context of postcolonial studies, and more emphasis has been put on "local" or "indigenous" developments.

In the Early Iron Age, Central Europe may also have seen an influx of eastern ideas, connected with iron smelting, chariots and a more hierarchical society. Cremation is replaced by inhumation under a barrow, and swords, later daggers become the indicators of a warrior-aristocracy. Fortified settlements are linked to rich chariot burials in a zone extending from Hungary and the Czech Republic to Eastern France. Later on, grave goods, including Greek pottery and other luxury items are imported from the Greek colony of Massalia/Marseilles. Big fortified farmsteads typify the rural settlements. Special purpose settlements are connected to iron-smelting and salt-mining, as in the famous Hallstatt mines and cemetery, and there are indications of wide-spread trade.

Is this the continuation of the indigenous development from the preceding Urnfield Period or the result of influences ultimately originating in the Greek world of the Aegean? Who is buried in the so called “princely graves”: local rulers or simply rich farmers?

**Reading**

overviews
**Collis, J. 1984. The European Iron Age. London, Batsford. DA 160 COL still a good introduction**


**Regional syntheses**

Arnold, B. 1996. “Honorary males” or women of substance? Gender, status and power in Iron Age Europe. Journal of European Archaeology 3,


Pare, C. 1989. From Dupljaja to Delphi: The ceremonial use of the wagon in later prehistory. *Antiquity* 63, 80-100.


Catalogues that give a good impression and general overviews, even if they are not always on the cutting edge of recent discussions:
A good synthesis of the traditional, mediterraneocentric view
see also
Mediterranean context
A number of case studies that give a greater time-depth to "culture-contact" and "culture-transfer" in the Northern Mediterranean. Useful introduction.

**Session 9, 03/12/2018**

**Iron Age Urbanism North of the Alps? (Seminar)**

Mike Parker Pearson

In the Mediterranean the development of urban life in the 1st millennium BC is traditionally discussed in terms of the Greek *polis*, and is defined politically, as it was by the ancient historians (Morris 1991). Of course, we also have a good idea of what a classical city should look like, with city walls, a central temple complex, other public buildings and an orthogonal street plan. However, there remain many problems in establishing when this city form emerges, how widely it is adopted and what variations can be identified. Indeed, the key issue to discuss is whether we can in fact conceptualize Mediterranean urbanization in terms of a model or an urban form to be adopted (cf. the introduction in Cunliffe and Osborne) or whether there are new ways of understanding this phenomenon. In broad terms, we see Greek and Phoenician urban centres around the Mediterranean littoral by the 7th century BC (cf. Aubet on Phoenician settlements in Iberia), but urbanisation occurs in Etruria too, and is a concurrent phenomenon to Greek and Phoenician urbanization (cf. Vanzetti 2002). Elsewhere, in the hinterlands of the Greek and Phoenician settlements, indigenous communities developed
quite different urban or proto-urban settlement, which are only now
beginning to attract the attention they deserve (cf. Lomas 1994).
The earliest ‘urban’ sites in Temperate Europe are traditionally termed oppida
(oppidum = Latin for town), after Caesar’s use of the word for sites that he
encountered during his campaigns in Gaul during the 50s BC. Whether the
sites are ‘towns’ in the classical sense is debatable, but they do have
evidence for centralised production, concentration of population, mints, and
access to Mediterranean and internal trading systems. Many of the sites
are enclosed by stone and wood riveted ramparts (e.g. murus gallicus ramparts)
or simple dump linear embankments (the British sites). The earliest sites
which might be considered urban in Temperate Europe appear by c. 200 BC
(La Tène C) and occur in Central Europe, from Eastern France and Spain to
the Czech Republic. Urbanism in Britain is post ca. 30 BC and restricted to
south-east Britain. Oppida are conspicuously larger than any preceding sites
(Manching in Bavaria has an enclosed area of 350 hectares - Roman London
would fit in this area four times over!). Our remit will be to consider the various
frameworks within which urbanism north of the Alps is defined and explained.
Should urbanism in Temperate Europe be considered in its own terms, rather
than as a ‘pale reflection of Mediterranean urbanism’?

Reading

General
University Press. DA 160 Qto COL; ISSUE DESK
Complexity: Centralisation and Urbanisation in Iron Age Europe. Oxbow
Books, Oxford.

Mediterranean: Essential
Aubet, M. E. 1995. From trading post to town in the Phoenician-Punic world in
Iberia. In: Cunliffe, B., Keay, S. (eds), Social complexity and the
development of towns in Iberia. From the Copper Age to the
second century AD. Proceedings of the British Academy 86.
Oxford, Oxford University Press, 47-65. DAP CUN; Main:
HUMANITIES Pers
*Cunliffe, B. W., Osborne R. (eds) 2005. Mediterranean Urbanization 800-600
BC. Oxford, Oxford University Press. DAG 100 OSB; Main:
HUMANITIES Pers
read Introduction and peruse other chapters
A. (eds), City and Country in the Ancient World: 1-24. YATES K
100 RIC; ISSUE DESK
*Vanzetti, A. 2002 Some Current Approaches to Protohistoric Centralization and
Urbanization in Central Italy. In: Attema, P., G. J. Burgers, E. van Joolen,
M. van Leusen, B. Mater (eds.), New Developments in Italian
Landscape Archaeology. British Archaeological Reports, International
Series 1091. Oxford, Archaeopress, 36-51. DAF Qto ATT

Mediterranean: Recommended
comparative study of thirty city-state cultures. An investigation
conducted by the Copenhagen Polis Centre Copenhagen. Royal
Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters, 209-228. IoA: BC 100 Qto
HAN
Lomas, K. 1994. The city in southeast Italy. Ancient topography and the
evolution of urban settlement 6000-300 BC. Accordia Research Papers
4, 63-77. ARCH PERS
Morgan C. 2003 Early Greek states beyond the polis. London, Routledge, IoA:
TC: 3619; Main: ANCIENT HISTORY P 55 MOR Introduction, 1-44.
expansion and colonisation: a non-Greek model of overseas settlement
and presence. In: G. R. Tsatskhladze (ed.) Greek colonisation, an
account of Greek colonies and other settlements overseas. Leiden, Brill,
143-168. Main: ANCIENT HISTORY P 61 TSE
Nijboer A.J. 2004 Characteristics of emerging towns in Central Italy, 900/800
to 400 BC. In: P. Attema (ed.), Centralization, early urbanization and
colonization in first millennium BC Italy and Greece, Part 1: Italy.
Leuven, Peeters, 137-156. IoA DAG 100 ATT
Rasmussen T. 2005 Urbanization in Etruria. In: B. Cunliffe, R. Osborne (eds),
Mediterranean Urbanisation 800–600 BC. Proceedings of the British
OSB; Main: HUMANITIES Pers
van Dommelen P. 1997 Some reflections on urbanization in a colonial
context: west central Sardinia in the 7th to 5th centuries BC. In: H.
Damgaard Andersen, H. Horsnæs, S. Houby-Nielsen, A. Rathje (eds.),
Urbanization in the Mediterranean in the 9th-6th Centuries BC. Acta
Hyperborea 7. Copenhagen, Tusculanum Press, 243-78. IoA: YATES
K 100; online; Inst. Classical Studies ST.1
Vlassopoulos K. 2007. Beyond and below the Polis: Networks, Associations,
and the Writing of Greek History. Mediterranean Historical Review
22/1,11-22. Main: HISTORY Pers and online

Temperate Europe
Journal of Archaeology 8/2, 167-77. ARCH periodicals
Buchsenschutz, O. 1995. The significance of major settlements in European
Iron Age society. In: Arnold, B., Gibson, D. B. (eds.), Celtic Chiefdom,
Collis, J. 1995. States without centres? The Middle La Tène period in
temperate Europe. In: Arnold, B., Gibson, D. B. (eds.), Celtic Chiefdom,
Dietler, M. 1999. Rituals of commensality and the politics of state formation in
the “princely” societies of Early Iron Age Europe. In: Ruby, P. (ed.),
Les princes de la Protohistoire et l’émergence de l’état. Napoli, Cahiers
du Centre Jean Bérard, Institut Français de Naples, 135-152.

and his other articles on alcohol/feasting


**interesting in the light of recent discoveries**


**Iberian Peninsula**


**Britain**


Hill, J. D. 1995. The pre-Roman Iron Age in Britain and Ireland (ca. 800 B.C. to A.D. 100): An overview. *Journal of World Prehistory* 9, 47-98.


Pitts, M. 2010. Re-thinking the Southern British Oppida: Networks, kingdoms
and material culture. *European Journal of Archaeology* 13/2, 32-63.

**Scandinavia**


**Sanctuaries**


**Essay question**

To what extent were the ‘princely’ sites of Hallstatt D north of the Alps truly urban?

**The Late Iron Age in Europe (Lecture)**

Mike Parker Pearson

The Iron Age of Europe is a proto-historic period - contemporary ‘outsiders’ provided a range of texts about Europe that name some of its Iron Age ‘peoples’. To what extent can we isolated coherent ‘peoples’ in the archaeological data and are such attempts worthwhile enterprises? How does this relate to past and present day ideas of ethnicity and to what extent has the Iron Age archaeological evidence been manipulated to justify present day and recent past claims to specific group identities and geographies?

**Reading**

**Ethnic ascription**


**good introduction to the subject**

General


Celts
*Collis, J. The Celts: origins, myths and inventions. Stroud, Tempus. INST ARCH DA 161 COL

The invention of the Celts: history of research

The traditional view


Nice coffee-table book with a good coverage of eastern Central Europe


Others
Díaz-Andreu, M. 1998. Ethnicity and Iberians: The archaeological crossroads between perception and material culture. European Journal of Archaeology 1, 199–218. INST ATCH PERS and Online

See also


Session 10, 10/12/2018

*The formation of European peoples and the birth of nationalism in Europe (Seminar)*

Mike Parker Pearson, Ulrike Sommer

In this seminar we will consider how named Iron Age peoples can be isolated in prehistory and the impact of their traditions of identification on present day concepts of the Iron Age and modern national identities.

**Essay question**

What factors led to the appearance of large-scale nucleated settlements north of the Alps during the La Tène period?

**Final discussion (Seminar)**

The module will conclude with a discussion of the relevance of studies of European prehistory (Neolithic, Bronze and Iron Ages) to present-day issues in Europe and beyond and the contribution of European prehistory to archaeology as a discipline.

4. ONLINE RESOURCES

The full UCL Institute of Archaeology coursework guidelines are given here: [http://www.ucl.ac.uk/archaeology/handbook/common/marking.htm](http://www.ucl.ac.uk/archaeology/handbook/common/marking.htm). The full text of this handbook is available here (includes clickable links to the Moodle and online reading lists if applicable) [http://www.ucl.ac.uk/silva/archaeology/course-info/](http://www.ucl.ac.uk/silva/archaeology/course-info/).

**Moodle**

This module uses a Moodle, see [http://moodle.ucl.ac.uk/course/view.php?id=10423](http://moodle.ucl.ac.uk/course/view.php?id=10423).
5. 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 DMS Watson Building science library (Anthropology section).

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, especially of older publications (and is fun to visit).

If you cannot 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.

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.

Attendance

A register will be taken at each class. If you are unable to attend a class, please notify the lecturer by email. Departments are required to report each student’s attendance to UCL Registry at frequent intervals throughout each term.

Information for intercollegiate and interdepartmental students

Students enrolled in Departments outside the Institute should obtain the Institute’s coursework guidelines from Judy Medrington (email j.medrington@ucl.ac.uk), which will also be available on Moodle.

Dyslexia

If you have dyslexia or any other disability, please discuss with your lecturers whether there is any way in which they can help you. Students with dyslexia should indicate it on each coursework cover sheet.

Marking

Your first essay will be marked and handed back in class a week later on 10 December 2018. Your second assignment will also be marked within a week of handing in, to be collected by email arrangement from Prof. Parker Pearson.
Feedback
In trying to make this module as effective as possible, we welcome feedback from students during the module of the year. All students are asked to give their views on the module in an anonymous questionnaire which will be circulated at one of the last sessions of the module. These questionnaires are taken seriously and help the Module Co-ordinator to develop the module. The summarised responses are considered by the Institute's Staff-Student Consultative Committee, Teaching Committee, and by the Faculty Teaching Committee.

If students are concerned about any aspect of this module we hope they will feel able to talk to the Module Co-ordinator, but if they feel this is not appropriate, they should consult their Personal Tutor, the Academic Administrator (Judy Medrington), or the Chair of Teaching Committee (Dr Karen Wright).

APPENDIX

INSTITUTE OF ARCHAEOLOGY COURSEWORK PROCEDURES
General policies and procedures concerning modules and coursework, including submission procedures, assessment criteria, and general resources, are available on the IoA Student Administration section of Moodle: https://moodle.ucl.ac.uk/module/view.php?id=40867.

It is essential that you read and comply with these. Note that some of the policies and procedures will be different depending on your status (e.g. undergraduate, postgraduate taught, affiliate, graduate diploma, intercollegiate, interdepartmental). If in doubt, please consult your module co-ordinator.

GRANTING OF EXTENSIONS
Note that there are strict UCL-wide regulations with regard to the granting of extensions for coursework. Note that Module Coordinators are not permitted to grant extensions. All requests for extensions must be submitted on a the appropriate UCL form, together with supporting documentation, via Judy Medrington’s office and will then be referred on for consideration. Please be aware that the grounds that are acceptable are limited. Those with long-term difficulties should contact UCL Student Support and Wellbeing to make special arrangements. Please see the IoA Student Administration section of Moodle for further information. Additional information is given here:

http://www.ucl.ac.uk/srs/academic-manual/c4/extenuating-circumstances/