Anth 551: Strategies in Archaeology – Fall 2014

**Course Meetings:**

Wednesdays, 9:40-12:40, Science I, Room 143

**Instructors:**

Randall McGuire, Distinguished Professor

email: rmcguire@binghamton.edu phone: 607-777-2100 (voicemail only)

office: Science I Room 228, office hrs: M 10:00-11:00 am, T 2:00-3:00 pm,

or by appointment

**Course Prospectus:**

*Strategies in Archaeology* introduces students to the major theoretical frameworks shaping anthropological archaeology. The course emphasizes current issues and debates in the discipline rather than a comprehensive historical overview. However, the early weeks of the course will be devoted to a consideration of the historical foundations of major trends in the field. Following this introductory section, we will intensively survey current theoretical positions and issues that are having significant impacts on the practice of archaeology today.

A central theme guiding the course is that of the archaeological research design. Throughout the semester we will address the nature of archaeological enquiry by “taking apart” case studies to get at their objectives and the underlying structure of the research design used to address their goals. Issues raised through readings and related discussions will resurface throughout the course as we examine the underpinnings of various perspectives and the attempts by archaeologists to articulate theory and practice.

Some of the major topics we will be examining are processual archaeology (which characterizes much of North American archaeology) and Marxist, feminist, postprocessual, postcolonial, and collaborative approaches. In addition to addressing the concepts that these various perspectives bring to bear on research design, we will be concerned with critically evaluating how researchers’ perceptions are affected by the dialectical relationship between theory and data.

**Course Format and Requirements:**

The format of the course is a three-hour seminar. Some material will be presented in a lecture style, but most meetings will be discussion-based. Regular, informed discussion is expected of all students in a seminar, and you should come to each session prepared to talk about any and all of the readings. Lack of participation in class discussions will have a negative effect on your grade and on your learning.

**Course Materials:**

There are two required texts that can be obtained at the University bookstore or though online booksellers.

Required Texts

Trigger, Bruce (2006) *A History of Archaeological Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Johnson, Matthew (2010) *Archaeological Theory: An Introduction.*  2nd edition, Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Trigger provides a comprehensive overview of historical developments in archaeology, and you will read most of it over the course of the semester. Johnson provides an overview of contemporary theory in archaeology.

**Other readings**: Most of the readings for the course will come from journal articles and book chapters. These can be found on electronic reserve in “Course Reserves” on our course Blackboard site.

**Grades**

This is a graduate level course. Grades are based on your annotations, class participation, midterm essay, research design, and final essay, as follows:

Annotations: 30%

Participation: 15%

Midterm Essay: 15%

Research Design: 25%

Final Essay: 15%

**Annotations (30%)**: Annotations are capsule summaries that are descriptive and critical. Over the semester you will write annotations following the framework below. You must submit an annotation of one work for at least 10 class meetings. We will assign a letter grade to each annotation. Please do not annotate readings from your textbooks (Trigger & Johnson)–these readings are descriptive and synthetic and thus are not suitable for annotation. Also, very short reading excerpts are not suitable for annotation. Each annotation must be submitted at the class for which the reading is assigned. No late annotations will be accepted.

The annotations are aimed at facilitating your efforts to “take apart” scholarly works to get at the researcher’s objectives and the underlying structure of the research design used to address their goals. The emphasis is on thinking critically and reflectively on the readings, not simply summarizing them.

**Annotation Template:** Each annotation should be approximately 2 double-spaced pages in length. Address the following questions in essay format.

1. What three quotes capture the critical import of the text?
2. What is the main argument of the text?
3. Describe at least three ways that the main argument is supported.
4. Describe the main literatures that the text draws on and contributes to.
5. Describe at least three of the text’s themes or topics that are of significance to our understanding of the theory and practice of archaeology.
6. Are there ideas in the text that you can apply to your own research? If so, explain how. If not, provide a justification.

**Participation (15%):** All students are expected to have completed the readings prior to class meetings and come prepared to synthesize and discuss them in depth. This requires that you come prepared with something to stimulate and contribute to conversation (e.g., cross-cutting themes, questions, or critiques). Because this is a small seminar, it is even more important that students come to class ready to participate in discussion. You will be evaluated on the quality of your contributions.

**Midterm Essay (15%):** The midterm will consist of a take-home essay exam that will cover the course material up to the date of the midterm. You will receive the question(s) for the midterm no later than 1 week before the exam is due. ***Due in class on October 22***

**Final Essay (15%):** The final will consist of a take-home essay exam that will cover the course material from the second half of the semester. You will receive the question(s) for the midterm no later than 1 week before the exam is due. ***Due by 12 noon on December 17***

**Research Design (25%):**  The research design consists of a paper of approximately 12-15 pages (12 pt. font, double-spaced, 1” margins), in which you present a specific research problem, linked to a particular theoretical and/or methodological framework, and a plan for investigating the problem. This research design may form the core of your research proposal when you take Anth 592 (Proposal Writing). ***Due by noon on November 26***

The specific topic for the research design is at your discretion. However, you are advised to choose a subject and study area with which you already have some familiarity and/or which you may choose for your MA or PhD research. It is to your benefit to choose a topic relatively early in the semester so that you can begin your research as soon as possible. As you begin to think about your topic, please come speak to me and your advisor about it so we can offer guidance. We will be talking about research design throughout the semester, but we will devote a portion of one class, on **October 8**, to a specific discussion of some of the nuts and bolts of putting a good research design together. You should come prepared to discuss the topic and direction of your research design.

General grading detail for written and oral assignments and participation:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Letter Grade &Numeric Equivalent | Comments |
| A (95) | Excellent. Well-written/clearly communicated, demonstrates a clearunderstanding of material and shows critical and creative thinking. Forparticipation, consistently strong and productive contributions withoriginal or creative insights. Always prepared for discussion. |
| B/B+/A-(85/88/91) | Good to very good. Fulfilled the assignment, with a fewimprovements suggested. Shows understanding that goes beyond simpledefinitions. For participation, generally strong and productivecontributions. Consistently prepared for discussion. |
| C/C+/B-(75/78/81) | Basically completed the assignment as required, but little more. Generalunderstanding demonstrated. For participation, some substantivecontributions, but little more than minimum expectations met.Occasional lateness, missed class, or lack of participation. |
| D/C-(65/71) | Content missing and limited demonstration of understanding.Consistently lacking in participation. |
| F(0-60) | Missing significant content or did not follow guidelines. Majoromissions and no understanding demonstrated. Multiple absences and/or no participation in discussions. |

Final Course Grade Letter/Numeric Conversion:

A = 92.5 and above

A- = 89.5 and above

B+ = 86.5 and above

B = 82.5 and above

B- = 79.5 and above

C+ = 76.5 and above

C = 72.5 and above

C- = 69.5 and above

D = 62.5 and above

F = 62.4 and below **Course Schedule and Readings**

**September 3 - Introductions**

Trigger, Chapters 1, 2, 3, & 4

Johnson, Preface & Chapter 1

Read before the first class meeting.

**September 10 - Culture History**

Trigger, Chapters 5 & 6

Johnson, Chapter 2

Steward, Julian (1942) The Direct Historical Approach to Archaeology. *American Antiquity* 7(4):337-343. **Practice Annotation**

Rouse, Irving (1960) The Classification of Artifacts in Archaeology. *American Antiquity* 25(3): 313-323.

Childe, V. Gordon (1929) “Chapter IV: Danubian I.” In *The Danube in Prehistory*, pp. 36-47*.* Oxford: Clarendon.

**September 17 - New and Processual Archaeology**

Trigger, Chapters 7 & 8

Johnson, Chapters 3, 4, 5, & 6

Flannery, Kent (1968) Archaeological Systems Theory and Early Mesoamerica. In *Anthropological Archaeology in the Americas*, B.J. Meggers (ed.), pp. 67-87. Washington, D.C.: Anthropological Society of Washington.

Steponaitis, Vincas (1978) Location Theory and Complex Chiefdoms: A Mississippian example. In *Mississippian Settlement Patterns*, edited by Bruce Smith, pp. 417-453. New York: Academic.

Binford, Lewis R. (1962) Archaeology as Anthropology. *American Antiquity* 28(2):217-225.

Yesner (2004) Optimal Foraging Theory and Technoeconomic Evolution among Northern Maritime Hunter-Gatherers. In *Hunters and Gatherers in Theory and Archaeology*, edited by George M. Crothers, pp. 258-275. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

**September 24 – The “Post-Processual Turn”**

Trigger, Chapters 8 & 9

Johnson, Chapter 7

Hodder, Ian (1985) Postprocessual archaeology. *Advances in Archaeological Method and Theory* 8:1-26.

Kohl, Philip (1993) Limits to a Post-Processual Archaeology (Or, the Dangers of a New Scholasticism). In *Archaeological Theory: Who Sets the Agenda?*, edited by Norman Yoffee and Andrew Sherratt, pp. 13-19. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hodder, Ian and Lynn Meskell (2001) A Curious and Sometimes a Trifle Macabre Artistry: Some Aspects of Symbolism in Neolithic Turkey. *Current Anthropology* 52(2):235-263.

Shanks, Michael (2004) Three Rooms. *Journal of Social Archaeology* 4(2):147-181.

Hill, James N. (1991) Archaeology and the Accumulation of Knowledge. In *Processual and Postprocessual Archaeologies: Multiple Ways of Knowing the Past*, edited by Robert W. Preucel, pp. 42-53. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Çatalhöyük Research Project website: <http://www.catalhoyuk.com>

Remixing Çatalhöyük: <http://okapi.berkeley.edu/remixing/mainpage.html>

 **October 1 – Agency & Practice (Siobhan Hart)**

Webb, Jen, Tony Schirato and Geoff Danager (2002) Cultural Field and the Habitus. In *Understanding Bourdieu*, pp. 21-44. London: Sage.

Dornan, Jennifer L. (2002) Agency and Archaeology: Past, Present and Future Directions. *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory* 9:303-329.

Pauketat, Timothy (2000) The Tragedy of the Commoners. In *Agency in Archaeology*, edited by Marcia-Anne Dobres and John E. Robb, pp. 113-129. London: Routledge.

Silliman, Stephen (2001) Agency, Practical Politics, and the Archaeology of Culture Contact. *Journal of Social Archaeology* 1(2):190-209.

Gell, Alfred (1992) The Technology of Enchantment and the Enchantment of Technology. In *Anthropology, Art, and Aesthetics*, edited by J. Coote and A. Shelton, pp. 40-67. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

**October 8 – Marxism, Time & History**

**NOTE:** Come prepared to discuss your ideas for your research design.

Trigger, pp. 322-353; 486-496

Johnson, Chapters 9, 10, & 11

Van Dyke, Ruth M. (2008) Temporal Scale and Qualitative Social Transformation at Chaco Canyon, New Mexico. *Cambridge Archaeological Journal* 18(1):70-78.

Lull, Vicente (2000a) Death and Society: A Marxist Approach. *Antiquity* 74:576-580.

Lull, Vicente (2000b) Argaric Society: Death at Home. *Antiquity* 74:581-590.

Patterson, Thomas (2014) Shell-Bead Money and the Mission Period Economy of Alta California. *Journal of Social Archaeology* 14(1):112-127.

**October 15 - Analogy and Ethnoarchaeology/Research Design**

Gould, Richard A. and Patty Jo Watson (1982) A Dialogue on the Meaning and Use of Analogy in Ethnoarchaeological Reasoning. *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* 1:355-381.

Kramer, Carol (1979) An Archaeological View of a Contemporary Kurdish Village: Domestic Architecture, Household Size, and Wealth. In *Ethnoarchaeology: Implications of Ethnography for Archaeology*, edited by Carol Kramer, pp. 139-163. New York: Columbia University Press.

McGuire, Randall H. and Elisa Villalpando (2014) War and Defense On Cerros De Trincheras In Sonora, México. Article Submitted to *American Antiquity.*

Ware, John (2014) *A Pueblo Social History: Kinship, Solidarity and Community in the Northern Southwest.* Santa Fe: SAR Press. **READ** Chapters 1 & 8.

Fowles, Severin M. (2013) *An Archaeology of Doings: Secularism and the Study of Pueblo Religion.* Santa Fe: SAR Press. **READ** Chapters 2, 3, & 7

**October 22 – Technology and Style**

**MIDTERM ESSAY DUE IN CLASS**

Dobres, Marcia-Anne (1991) Technology’s Links and Chains: The Processual Unfolding of Technique and Technician. In *The Social Dynamics of Technology: Practice, Politics, and World Views*, edited by Marcia-Anne Dobres and Christopher R. Hoffman. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institute Press.

Spielmann, Katherine, Jeannette Mobley-Tanaka, and James Potter (2006) Style and Resistance in the Seventeenth-Century Salinas Province. *American Antiquity* 71:621-647.

Weissner, Polly (1983) Style and Social Information in Kalahari San Projectile Points. *American Antiquity* 48(2):253-276.

Sackett, James R. (1985) Style and Ethnicity in the Kalahari: A Reply to Weissner. *American Antiquity* 50(1):154-166.

Thomas, T. (2009). Communities of Practice in the Archaeological Record of New Georgia, Rendova and Tetepare. In Sheppard, P., Thomas, T., and Summerhayes, G., Eds. Lapita: ancestors and descendants. NZAA Monograph 28. New Zealand Archaeological Association: Auckland

**October 29 – Space, Place, & Landscape**

Bradley, Richard (2000) *An Archaeology of Natural Places*, Chaps. 1 and 3. New York: Routledge.

Inomata, Takeshi (2006) Plazas, Performers, and Spectators: Political Theaters of the Classic Maya. *Current Anthropology* 47:805-842.

Tilley, Christopher (2004) Chapters 1 & 2*.* In *The Materiality of Stone: Explorations in Landscape Phenomenology 1*. Oxford: Berg.

Ashmore, Wendy (2002) “Decisions and Dispositions”: Socializing Spatial Archaeology. *American Anthropologist* 104(4):1172-1183.

Van Dyke, Ruth M. (2004) Memory, Meaning, and Masonry: The Late Bonito Chacoan Landscape. *American Antiquity* 69(3*)*:413-431.

Gallivan, Martin D. (2007). Powhatan’s Werowocomoco: Constructing Place, Polity, and Personhood in the Chesapeake, C.E. 1200 – C.E. 1609. *American Anthropologist* 109(1):85-100.

**November 5 – Materiality (Ruth Van Dyke)**

Alberti, Benjamin, Severin Fowles, Martin Holbraad, Yvonne Marshall and Christopher Witmore (2011) "Worlds Otherwise": Archaeology, Anthropology, and Ontological Difference. Current Anthropology 52(6):896-912.

 Gell, Alfred (1992) The Technology of Enchantment and the Enchantment of Technology. In Anthropology, Art, and Aesthetics, edited by J. Coote and A. Shelton, pp. 40-67. Clarendon Press, Oxford.

Ingold, Tim et al. (2008) Materials against Materiality. Archaeological Dialogues 14 (1):1-38.

Latour, Bruno (1994) Pragmotagonies: A Mythical Account of How Humans and Nonhumans Swap Properties. American Behavioral Scientist 37(6):791-808.

**November 12 – Collaborative & Indigenous Archaeologies**

Parker Pearson, Mike and Ramilisonina (2004) Public Archaeology and Indigenous Communities. In *Public Archaeology*, edited by Nick Merriman, pp. 224-239. London: Routledge.

Atalay, Sonya (2006) Indigenous Archaeology as Decolonizing Practice. *American Indian Quarterly* 30(3 & 4):280-310.

McGhee, Robert (2008) Aboriginalism and the Problems of Indigenous Archaeology. *American Antiquity* 73(4):579-597.

Atalay, Sonya (2012) A Sustainable Archaeology (Chp 1) and Origins of Community-Based Research in Archaeology (Chp 2). In *Community-Based Archaeology: Research with, by, and for Indigenous and Local Communities*, pp. 1-54. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Zorzin, Nicholas (2014) Heritage Management and Aboriginal Australians: Relations in a Global, Neoliberal Economy—A Contemporary Case Study from Victoria. *Archaeologies* 10(2):132-167.

**November 19 – Social Memory & the Politics of Archaeology**

Johnson, Chapter 12

Bernbeck, Reinhard and Susan Pollock (2007) ’Grabe wo Du stehst!’ An Archaeology of Perpetrators. In *Archaeology and Capitalism: From Ethics to Politics*, edited by Yannis Hamilakis and Philip Duke, pp. 217-234. Walnut Creek: Left Coast Press.

Gassiot Ballbé, Ermengol and Dawnie Wolfe Steadman (2008) The Political, Social and Scientific Contexts of Archaeological Investigations of Mass Graves in Spain. *Archaeologies* 4(3):429-444.

Alcock, Susan E. (2002) Archaeologies of Memory. Chapter 1 in *Archaeologies of the Greek Past: Landscapes, Monuments, and Memories*, pp. 1-35. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Collwell-Chanthaphonh, Chip and T.J. Ferguson (2006) Memory Pieces and Footprints: Multivocality and the Meanings of Ancient Times and Ancestral Places Among the Zuni and Hopi. *American Anthropologist* 108(1):148-162.

Franklin, M. (1997). "Power to the People": Sociopolitics and the Archaeology of Black Americans. *Historical Archaeology* 31(3): 36-50.

Van Dyke, Ruth M. (2011) Ideology and Social Memory. In *Ideologies in Archaeology*, edited by Reinhard Bernbeck and Randall H. McGuire, pp. 233-253. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

**Research Design Due November 26 by noon**

**November 26: - Representations of Archaeology**

Trigger, Chapter 10

Johnson, Chapter 13

Moser, Stephanie (1998) *The Scientific Vision of Prehistory in Ancestral Images*, pp. 107-145. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

**December 3 - Feminisms and Sexualities (Kathleen Sterling)** (Kathleen)

Johnson, Chapter 8

Conkey, Margaret W. and Joan M. Gero (1997) Programme to Practice: Gender and Feminism in Archaeology. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 26: 411-437.

Pollock, Susan (1991) Women in a Men’s World: Images of Sumerian Women. In *Engendering Archaeology: Women and Prehistory*, edited by Joan Gero and Margaret Conkey, pp. 366-387. Oxford: Blackwell.

Joyce, Rosemary A. (2000) A Precolumbian Gaze: Male Sexuality Among the Ancient Maya. In *Archaeologies of Sexuality*, edited by Robert A. Schmidt and Barbara L. Voss, pp. 263-283. New York: Routledge.

Rubin, Gayle (2000) Sites, Settlements, and Urban Sex: Archaeology and the Study of Gay Leatherman in San Francisco. In *Archaeologies of Sexuality*, edited by Robert A. Schmidt and Barbara L. Voss, pp. 62-88. New York: Routledge.

Voss, Barbara L. (2006) Sexuality in Archaeology. In *Handbook of Gender in Archaeology*, edited by Sarah M. Nelson, pp. 365-400. Lanham, MD: AltaMira.

**Dec 10 - Archaeology of the Contemporary**

Harrison, Rodney (2011) Surface Assemblages: Towards An Archaeology in and of the Present. *Archaeological Dialogues* 18 (2):161–164.

Voss, Barbara L. (2010) Matter Out of Time: The Paradox of the “Contemporary Past”. *Archaeologies* 6(1):181-192.

Yazdi, Leila Papoli (2010) Public and Private Lives in Iran: An Introduction to the Archaeology of the 2003 Bam Earthquake. *Archaeologies*. 6(1):29-47.

De León, Jason (2012) Better to Be Hot Than Caught: Excavating the Conflicting Roles of Migrant Material Culture. *American Anthropologist* 114(3):477-495.

McGuire, Randall H. (2013) Steel Walls and Picket Fences: Rematerializing the U.S. - Mexican Border in Ambos Nogales. *American Anthropologist* 115(3):466-480.

**FINAL ESSAY DUE Wednesday, December 17, noon, Sci 1 - 228**