ANTHROPOLOGY 445
LANDSCAPE ARCHAEOLOGY

William S. Ayres
Department of Anthropology
University of Oregon

CRN 26961

Instructor: Professor William S. Ayres
e-mail - 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

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.,
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,

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, archae-
ological 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, seascapes, 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.
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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