

ANTHROPOLOGY 445 LANDSCAPE ARCHAEOLOGY

William S. Ayres
Department of Anthropology
University of Oregon

CRN 26961

Instructor: Professor William S. Ayres
email - wsayres@uoregon.edu;
Office Hours: TR 10:30-12:00; after class; and by appointment
Class Meetings: TR 14:00-15:50, 103 Condon Hall

Texts: Handout/Blackboard: Landscape Archaeology, W. S. Ayres.
Selected Readings from:
Handbook of Landscape Archaeology. David, B., and Thomas, J. eds. 2008
Ashmore, Wendy, and E. Bernard Knapp, eds. 1999 *Archaeologies of
Landscape*. Oxford/Malden: Blackwell.
Johnson, Matthew, *Ideas of Landscape*. Blackwell 2007.

Additional reading and/or discussion:

Landscape archaeology and GIS. Chapman, H., Tempus, 2006.
Materiality of Stone. Tilley, C., Berg, 2004
Geoarchaeology: The Earth Science approach to archaeological interpretation. Rapp, G.,
Jr. and C. L. Hill New Haven: Yale U. Press, 1998.
Landscape: Politics and Perspectives. B. Bender, ed., Berg, 1995.
A Phenomenology of Landscape. C. Tilley. Oxford: Berg, 1994.
Space, Time, and Archaeological Landscapes. J. Rossignol and L. Wandsnider,
eds. New York: Plenum, 1992
The Interpretation of Archaeological Spatial Patterning. E. Kroll and T. Price,
eds., Plenum, 1991.

Reserve Reading/Selected books and papers (see below)

Format:

Combination lecture presentation and seminar discussion. Grading will be based on short written assignments, two exams, class participation and a research paper/project. Each participant will prepare a research paper on a topic developed in consultation with the instructor.

Content:

This class focuses on archaeological interpretation of landscapes and related concepts as they are represented in the past and the present. Archaeologists have long focused on spatial relationships, and thus in landscapes in a general sense. Most characteristically, archaeological studies have addressed settlement patterns and other spatial aspects of archaeological data in terms of the ecological parameters of those occupations; as well, geo-archaeological approaches have been incorporated into interpretations. Recently, archaeologists have increased their study

of the socio-symbolic dimensions of landscapes and they are viewed increasingly as entities that exist by virtue of their being perceived, experienced, and contextualized by people. These dimensions of landscape archaeology—that is, geophysical or terrain analysis; patterning in archaeological remains indicative of subsistence and socio-economic connections, and socio-symbolic interpretation of landscapes created by humans form the main thrust of the class.

The following will be addressed: 1) critiques of theoretical and epistemological frameworks that underlie spatial studies; 2) assessments of the utility of different types of landscape research for archaeological interpretation, e.g., for settlement pattern studies or for site formation processes; and 3) case studies of landscape research on particular topics, for example, hunter-gatherers, food producers, and multiethnic urban societies, in different geographical regions. Easter Island evidence will be used to provide a series of detailed examples.

The class will be conducted as a seminar with sets of assigned reading to be found in the two main texts and on reserve/packet. Class time will be a combination of lecture, student-led discussions, and other group Responsibilities for leading discussion of the readings will be rotated among class participants. There will be occasional lectures to offer background on theoretical issues and methodological topics. The quality of your course experience will depend in large part on your reading thoughtfully and on participating actively in class discussions. This course provides a supportive environment in which to practice your skills at written exposition, classroom debate, and public presentations. This is, for the most part, a reading and discussion course intended for students with backgrounds in anthropology, archaeology, and landscape architecture. Previous course work in archaeology or landscape architecture is assumed, along with familiarity with basic archaeological and anthropological concepts.

Learning Objectives:

After successful completion of this course, students are expected to have an understanding of the following key issues in the archaeology of landscapes:

- The basic concepts and aims of studying landscape as an archaeological issue;
- Major trends in how landscapes have been distinguished and interpreted by archaeologists;
- The differences between terms such as landscape, viewscape, seascape, and settlement pattern;
- Variation in landscapes according to environmental context, including biogeography and natural environmental factors;
- Connections between landscape type and societal complexity;
- Contemporary factors related to preservation of indigenous landscapes

Some specific course outcomes include, that by end of the course, students will be able to:

- *. distinguish among types of archaeological landscapes;
- *. describe the key attributes of the landscape types known in prehistory;
- *. identify key case studies of archaeological landscapes;
- *. explain the differences between conceptual, historical, interpretative and other kinds of landscapes;
- *. compare Polynesian cultural landscapes with other linguistic and cultural groups;
- *. recognize phenomenological and other kinds of landscape interpretations;
- *. formulate a model connecting social organization and landscape attributes;
- *. evaluate appropriate field methods for studying archaeological landscapes;

Basis for Evaluation and Grading:

Assessing performance necessary for assigning grades is based on 1) participation in seminar discussions and short written assignments (approximately 20%); 2) two exams (40%); and 3) a reading and research project (40%) developed in consultation with the instructor. This will result in a term paper. The term paper will be based on a topic selected in consultation with me and requires a preliminary outline—to be submitted first—followed by a draft of the paper, and then the final paper turned in at the end of the term. The length of the paper depends on the topic, to some extent, but 10 to 15 pages will probably be adequate.

A research paper based on original analysis or on critical examination of current theoretical positions and specific sites is required. The written paper will be due on the last day of class.

Other Notes:

The UO is committed to providing an environment free of all forms of prohibited discrimination and sexual harassment, including sexual assault, domestic and dating violence and gender-based stalking.

Note: For those needing special assistance with the materials and information presented in class, please see the instructor at the beginning of the term. Documentation of special learning needs is to be established through the Accessible Education Center in Oregon Hall.

Landscape Archaeology

This course material allows us to examine perspective, meaning, and spatial aspects of archaeological data, especially for sites, from several viewpoints. Most important among these are:

- 1) settlement archaeology (including early landscape concepts), intra-site spatial analysis, and contemporary non-site approaches.
- 2) ethnoarchaeological considerations for interpreting spatial significance of archaeological data,
- 3) landscapes and meaning systems, ideology, and social significance.

These research topics are central to much contemporary archaeological interpretation and are embedded in archaeological theory at both general and specific levels. Spatial or distributional relationships have been fundamental to archaeological interpretation of artifact and feature association and stratigraphic differentiation and thus to all chronological, functional or activity and social reconstructions. Landscapes as an avenue for interpreting past and contemporary meanings and ideological relationships of humans and nature, humans and social groups, and humans and political and religious systems represent the primary direction for the class. Fundamental ideas about what archaeologists should try to interpret or explain from the past will be addressed.

Several stages of research into questions related to spatial interpretation and relating systems of meaning to archaeological data can be distinguished over the last several decades as follows:

The initial step leading to the formalization of "spatial analysis" in archaeology came about with increasing recognition of the potential for functional interpretation of spatial associations of artifacts, especially ones identifiable as forming remains of a "living floor" as exposed in archaeological sites. The foundation of most spatial analysis and, most specifically, of intra-site interpretation is analysis of hunter-gatherer, especially of Paleolithic, sites identified as "camps" or "kill sites." Such analyses as Graham Clark's on Star Carr, done in the 1950s, and examinations of spatial layouts of artifacts and faunal material at Olduvai Gorge sites in the 1960s and early 1970s reflect such initiatives. Characteristic of these was the formalization of spatially distributed data in the context of living floors.

An important aspect of the interest in spatial analysis in archaeology is tied to site distribution, that is, inter-site analysis. In the 1950s and 1960s in North America this approach is represented by considerable effort in the area of settlement pattern studies of site distributions across the landscape, for example, Willey's study of the Viru Valley, Peru. In North America, settlement pattern archaeology represented the major new thrust in spatial archaeological interpretation during the 1960s.

An emergent perspective during the 1960s in Britain was the formalization of spatial studies stemming from geographical spatial analysis where more formal mathematical models were applied to archaeological data. At least two distinct lines of thought guided early investigations of spatial study in European (especially British) archaeology. One of these was the concern with site catchment and ecological assessment, perhaps most explicitly represented by research undertaken by Vita-Finzi and Higgs. The second is the application of mathematical descriptions of site distributions, including Central Place analysis and other spatial patterning measurements.

A subsequent stage in the history of spatial archaeology is represented by a series of analytical improvements representing a major step in the 1970s; these include such things as multiple overlay plans and distributional study and re-fitting studies, and specific, detailed application of quantitative techniques for intra-site analysis (e.g., Whallon 1973, 1974). This included an effort to identify non-random associations of artifactual and other materials in archaeological context.

Another development during this later period is seen in a number of attempts to counter some of the unfounded assertions based on visual and mathematical analyses of spatial data; these are represented by the expansion of ethnoarchaeological studies that were directed specifically towards spatial questions.

A more recent, continuing stage of research is concerned with examining the basic assumptions which were held by archaeologists in the 1960s and 1970s underlying spatial interpretation; for example, the concept of "activity area" has been examined in terms of hypotheses rather than accepting the concept (that such areas are expected to be preserved) as an assumption to build testing methods and procedures on. As well, the formulation of statistical methods for defining spatial relationships and patterning has been greatly improved. European efforts include application of such analytical procedures as "correspondence analysis" applied to archaeological data.

Persistent difficulties in interpreting the archaeological record and its landscape implications include the complications in determining site/artifact use or function and identifying tool kits and activity areas; the significance of post-depositional processes is a continuing subject of interest for site interpretations. All these in turn influence how well we can interpret the meaning of identified spatial patterning. Among the efforts to address this question we include discussions labeled "post-processual" archaeology which focus specifically on the multiplicity of meanings assignable to archaeological remains. Central to these discussions, relative to landscapes, is the concern with "social" landscapes, including conceptual and symbolic ones.

Topics for continuing investigation focus on refining efforts to interject meaning into the material record, ethnoarchaeological observation of landscape applications for actualistic context, geomorphological study of landscapes, and fundamental issues regarding what archaeologists can expect to explain from the past or how differing interpretations of the past can be reconciled or accepted.

In brief, landscape refers to in its most basic sense the backdrop against which archaeological remains are positioned. Ecological, economic, political perspectives indicate where resources, refuge, and risks would exist. Recently, the landscape concept is being viewed more from a social or conceptual perspective; in this, landscape is an entity that exists by its being perceived, experienced, and contextualized by people.

Anthropology 445/545 Landscape Archaeology

Selected General BibliographyLandscapes: Historical, Ethnographic, Archaeological

- Antiquity* 73(281), 1999. Special issue on landscape archaeology.
- Anschuetz, K.F., R. H. Wilshusen, and C. L. Scheick 2001. An archaeology of landscapes: Perspectives and directions. *Journal of Archaeological Research* 9(2): 157-211.
- Ashmore, W., and A. B. Knapp, eds. 1999 *Archaeologies of Landscape*. Blackwell. 1999.
- Ayres, William S., and Rufino Mauricio. 1999 "Definition, Ownership and Conservation of Indigenous Landscapes at Salapwuk, Pohnpei, Micronesia." In *The Archaeology and Anthropology of the Landscape: Shaping your landscape*, P. Ucko and R. Layton, eds., pp. 298-321. World Archaeological Congress-3. London: Routledge.
- Balle, William 1998. Historical Ecology: Premises and Postulates, in *Advances in Historical Ecology*, ed. by William Balle, pp. 13-29. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Barrett, J., R. Bradley, and M. Green. 1991 *Landscape, Monuments, and Society: The Prehistory of Cranborne Chase*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bender, Barbara 2007 *Stone worlds: narrative and reflexivity in landscape archaeology* Walnut Creek, Calif. : Left Coast Press.
- Bender, Barbara 1998 *Stonehenge: Making Space*. Berg, Oxford.
- Bender, B. 1995. *Landscape: Politics and Perspectives*. Oxford: Berg.
- Bender, B., S. Hamilton, and C. Tilley. 1997 Leskernick: Stone Worlds: Alternative Narrative; Nested Landscapes. *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society* 63:147-178.
- Bradley, Richard 1995 Symbols and Signposts: Understanding the Prehistoric Petroglyphs of the British Isles. In *The Ancient Mind: Elements of Cognitive Archaeology*. edited by Colin Renfrew and Ezra Zubrow, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 95-106.
- Bradley, R. 1998 *The Significance of Monuments: On the Shaping of the Human Experience in Neolithic and Bronze Age Europe*. London: Routledge.
- Bruno, David, and Julian Thomas, eds 2008 *Handbook of landscape archaeology* Walnut Creek, Calif. : Left Coast Press,
- Cosgrove, D.E. 1997 Inhabiting Modern Landscape. *Archaeological Dialogues* 4:23-28.
- Crumley, Carole and William H. Marquardt 1990 Landscape: A Unifying Concept in Regional Analysis. In *Interpreting Space: GIS and Archaeology*. edited by Kathleen Allen, Stanton Green and Ezra Zubrow, Taylor and Francis, London, pp. 73-79.
- Crumley, C., ed. 1994 *Historical Ecology: Cultural Knowledge and Changing Landscapes*. Santa Fe: SAR Press.
- Deetz, James 1990 Landscapes as Cultural Statements. In *Earth Patterns: Essays in Landscape Archaeology*. edited by William M. Kelso and Rachel Most, University Press of Virginia, Charlottesville, pp. 1-4.
- Denevan, William M. 1992 The Pristine Myth: The Landscapes of the Americas in 1492. *Association of American Geographers* 82(3):369-385.

- Dunnell, Robert C. 1992 The Notion Site. In *Space, Time, and Archaeological Landscapes*. edited by Jacqueline Rossignol and LuAnn Wandsnider, Plenum Press, New York, pp. 21-41.
- Derry, Linda 2000. Southern Town Plans, Story Telling, and Historical Archaeology, in *Archaeology of Southern Urban Landscapes*, ed. by Amy L. Young, pp. 14-29. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.
- Hanks, William F. 1990 *Referential Practice: Language and Lived Space among the Maya*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. PM3669.H36 1990
- Ingold, T. 1993 The Temporality of the Landscape. *World Archaeology* 25(2):152-174.
- Johnson, Matthew 2007 *Ideas of landscape*. Malden/Oxford : Blackwell Pub.
- Killion, Thomas W. 1992 Residential Ethnoarchaeology and Ancient Site Structure. In *Gardens of Prehistory: The Archaeology of Settlement Agriculture in Greater Mesoamerica*. edited by Thomas Killion, University of Alabama Press, Tuscaloosa, pp. 119-149.
- Lawrence, D. S. and S. M. Low 1990 The Built Environment and Spatial Form. *Annual Review of Anthropology*. 19:453-505.
- Mullins, Paul R. 2004. African-American Heritage in a Multicultural Community: An Archaeology of Race, Culture and Consumption, in *Places in Mind: Public Archaeology as Applied Anthropology*, ed. by Paul A Shackel and Erve J. Chambers, pp. 57-70. London: Routledge.
- Price, V.B., and Baker H. Morrow eds. 2006 Canyon gardens : the ancient Pueblo landscapes of the American Southwest. Albuquerque : University of New Mexico Press.
- Rossignol, J., and L. Wandsnider (eds) 1992 *Space, Time, and Archaeological Landscapes*. New York: Plenum.
- Schiffer, M. various. *Advances in Archaeological Method and Theory* CC75.A24.vol
- Stafford, C. Russell 1995 Geoarchaeological Perspectives on Paleolandscapes and Regional Subsurface Archaeology. *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory*. 2(1):69-104.
- Stark, Miriam T. 1998 *The Archaeology of Social Boundaries*. Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press.
- Tilley, Christopher, 1994 *A Phenomenology of Landscape*. Oxford: Berg.
- Toren, Christina 1990 *Making Sense of Hierarchy: Cognition as Social Process in Fiji*. London/Atlantic Highlands: Athlone Press. Monographs in Social Anthro. [spatial behavior].
- Tringham, R. 1994 Engendered Spaces in Prehistory. *Gender, Place, and Culture* 1: 169-203.
- Ucko, Peter, and R. Layton, eds. 1999 *The Archaeology and Anthropology of the Landscape: Shaping your landscape*. World Archaeological Congress-3. London: Routledge.
- Weiner, James 1991 *The Empty Place: Poetry, Space, and Being among the Foi of Papua New Guinea*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press. [spatial behavior] DU740.42.W4 1191

Winterhalder, Bruce 1994 Concepts in Historical Ecology: The View from Evolutionary Biology. In *Historical Ecology: Cultural Knowledge and Changing Landscapes*. edited by Carole Crumley, School of American Research, Santa Fe, pp. 17-41.

Settlement Pattern Archaeology

- Kantner, John (1997). Ancient Roads, Modern Mapping: Evaluating Chaco Anasazi Roadways using GIS Technology, *Expedition* 39(3): 49-62.
- Moore, J. and A. Keene (eds) 1983 *Archaeological Hammers and Theories*. CC75.A64/1983
- Vita-Finzi, C., and E. Higgs. "Prehistoric Economy in the Mount Carmel Area of Palestine." *Proc. Prehistoric Society* 36:1:37.
- Vogt, E. and R. Leventhal. 1983. *Prehistoric Settlement Patterns*. U. New Mexico Press and Peabody Museum. E65.P74 1983
- Willey, G. 1953. *Prehistoric Settlement Patterns in the Viru Valley, Peru*. Bureau of American Ethnology 155. E51.U6 no. 155.

Geoarchaeology and Landscapes

- French, Charles A.I. 2003 *Geoarchaeology in Action: studies in soil micromorphology and landscape evolution*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Rapp, George, Jr., and Christopher L. Hill (1998). *Geoarchaeology: The Earth Science Approach to Archaeological Interpretation* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press).
- Vita-Finzi, C. *Archaeological Sites in Their Settings*. CC81.V57

Spatial Archaeology

- Allen, K., S. Green, and E. Zubrow. 1990 *Interpreting Space: GIS and Archaeology*. New York: Taylor and Francis. CC83.I58 1990
- Ashmore, Wendy. 2002 "Decisions and Dispositions": Socializing Spatial Archaeology. *American Anthropologist* 104(4):1172-1183.
- Blankholm, H.P. 1991 *Intrasite Spatial Analysis in Theory and Practice*. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press.
- Chapman, Henry 2006 *Landscape archaeology and GIS*. Stroud [England] : Tempus;
- Clarke, D. (ed.) 1972 *Models in Archaeology* CC75.C48 1972
- Clarke, D.,(ed.) 1977 *Spatial Archaeology*. CC75.7.S68
- Conolly, James, 2006 *Geographical information systems in archaeology*. Cambridge/ New York : Cambridge University Press.
- Conolly, J., and M. Lake 2006 *Geographical Information Systems in Archaeology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Crumley, C. 1979 Three Locational Models: An Epistemological Assessment for Anthropology and Archaeology. *Advances in Archaeological Method and Theory* 2:141-173.
- Haining, Robert 1990 *Spatial Data Analysis in the Social and Environmental Sciences*. Cambridge/N.Y.: Cambridge University Press HA30.6.H35 1990
- Hietala, H. 1984 *Intrasite Spatial Analysis in Archaeology* CC80.6.I36 1984.
- Hodder, I., and D. Orton. 1976. *Spatial Analysis in Archaeology*. CC75.H57
- Kantner, John 1997 Ancient Roads, Modern Mapping: Evaluating Chaco Anasazi Roadways using GIS Technology. *Expedition* 39(3):49-62
- Kroll, E., and T. Price. 1991 *The Interpretation of Archaeological Spatial Patterning*. New York: Plenum.
- Llobera, Marcos 1996 Exploring the Topography of Mind: GIS, Social Space, and Archaeology. *Antiquity* 70:612-622.
- Maschner, Herbert D. G. 1996 Geographical Information Systems. IN *Oxford Companion to Archaeology*. Edited by Brian Fagan, Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 248-250.
- Madry, Scott and Carole Crumley 1990 An Application of Remote Sensing and GIS in a Regional Archaeological Settlement Pattern Analysis: The Arroux River Valley, Burgundy, France. In *Interpreting Space: GIS and Archaeology*. edited by Kathleen Allen, Stanton Green and Ezra Zubrow, Taylor and Francis, London, pp. 364-380.
- Renfrew, C. 1979. *Transformations: Mathematical Approaches to Culture*. CC75.7.T7
- Rossignol, J., and L. Wandsnider (eds) 1992 *Space, Time, and Archaeological Landscapes*. New York: Plenum.
- Sofaer, Anna 1997 The Primary Architecture of the Chacoan Culture: A Cosmological Expression. . In *Anasazi Architecture and American Design*. Edited by Baker H. Morrow and V. B. Price University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque, pp. 88-132.
- Unwin, D. 1981 *Introductory Spatial Analysis*. G70.23.U58 1981.
- Wheatley, David and Mark Gillings. 2002. *Spatial Technology and Archaeology*. Taylor and Francis.

Cultural Resource Management Aspects of Landscapes

- Ayres, William S., and Rufino Mauricio. 1997 *Pohnpei Archaeology Component: Salapwuk Archaeology: Survey of Historic and Cultural Resources of Pohnpei State*. San Francisco: Micronesian Endowment for Historic Preservation and U.S. National Park Service.
- Cleere, Henry. 1995 Cultural Landscapes as World Heritage. *Conservation and Management of Archaeological Sites* 1:63-68.

Journals/Serials:

Advances in Archaeological Method and Theory (1978-1987)
Advances in World Archaeology
African Archaeological Review
American Archaeology
American Antiquity
American Anthropologist
Annual Review of Anthropology
Ancient Mesoamerica
Antiquity
Archaeological Review from Cambridge
Archaeology
Archaeology in Oceania
Australian Archaeology
Bulletin of the Society for American Archaeology
Cambridge Archaeological Journal
Cambridge Review of Archaeology
Current Anthropology
Geoarchaeology
Geoscience and Man
Historical Archaeology
Internet Archaeology
Journal of Anthropological Archaeology
Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory (since 1994)
Journal of Archaeological Research
Journal of Archaeological Science
Journal of Material Culture
Journal of Field Archaeology
Journal of World Prehistory
Latin American Antiquity
Man
North American Archaeologist
Oxford Journal of Archaeology
Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society
Quarterly Review of Archaeology
The Review of Archaeology
World Archaeology