

ARCHAEOLOGY 451

INTRODUCTION TO ARCHAEOLOGICAL METHOD AND THEORY

Winter 2010

Instructor: Gerald (Gerry) Oetelaar
Office: ES 862
Phone No.: 220-7629
E-Mail: gaoetela@ucalgary.ca
Office Hours: TWR 11:00 - 12:00 or by appointment
Lectures: TR 9:30 - 11:00
Room: ENC 127

Course Objectives:

The main objective of this course is to introduce students to some of the major theoretical trends in North American Archaeology over the past century. Although the roots of European archaeology are often associated with history and/or the natural sciences, those of American archaeology tend to be tied to ethnology. As a result, archaeology in the Americas is generally taught in departments of anthropology. To a great extent, these different historical trajectories reflect the nature of the data. That is, European archaeologists study the lifestyles of their ancestors while American scholars attempt to reconstruct the lifestyles of Native populations whose cultures differ radically from their own. Despite these differences, there is, in fact, a substantial degree of congruence between developments in European and American archaeology, particularly during the early years. Thus, beginning with early ideas about the antiquity of human beings and their place in the natural world, we will trace the development of contemporary methods and theory in archaeology. Further, these developments often reflect changes in the social contexts and personal experiences of individual scholars. Thus, we will examine how events in society and theoretical developments in other disciplines relate to the changes in theoretical paradigms adopted by archaeologists.

Required Texts:

Hodder, I. 2001 *Archaeological Theory Today*. Polity Press, Cambridge, UK.
Trigger, B. 2006 *A History of Archaeological Thought*. 2nd edition. University of Cambridge Press, Cambridge.

Additional books on the topics discussed in class:

Preucel, R., and I. Hodder 1996 *Contemporary Archaeology in Theory: A Reader*. Blackwell Publishers, Oxford.

Trigger, B. 1989 *A History of Archaeological Thought*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Johnson, M. 1999 *Archaeological Theory: An Introduction*. Blackwell Publishers, Malden, Mass.

Jones, A. 2002 *Archaeological Theory and Scientific Practice*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Gibbon, G., 1989, *Explanation in Archaeology*, Basil Blackwell Ltd, Oxford.

Lyman, R.L., M.J. O'Brien, and R.C. Dunnell 1998 *The Rise and Fall of Culture History*. Plenum Press.

Willey, G.R., and P. Phillips 1958 *Method and Theory in American Archaeology*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Willey, G.R., and J.A. Sabloff 1980 *A History of American Archaeology*, Second Edition, Thames and Hudson Ltd., London.

Class Mechanics:

There will be a mid-term exam worth 30% of the final grade on or about February 23, 2010. The scheduled final exam, in turn, will be worth 40% of the final grade. In addition, students will be asked to submit a short (ca 10-15 pages) research paper dealing with one of the theoretical perspectives presented in Hodder's book, *Archaeological Theory Today*. The paper must include a summary of the theoretical framework proposed by the author, a discussion of the historical roots for the theory, and a critique of the perspective presented in the paper. This paper will be worth 30% of your final grade. Topics must be approved by the instructor and students will be asked to submit a bibliography for their paper on or before March 16, 2010. This is to help ensure that everyone is on the right track in developing their paper. The paper is due NO LATER than April 15, 2010.

Grade Scale: A+ 95-100; A 90-95; A- 85-90; B+ 80-85; B 75-80; B- 70-75; C+ 65-70; C 60-65; C- 55-60; D+ 50-55; D 45-50; F <45

Lecture Schedule

Week 1: Early Approaches to Science and Archaeology

Week 2: Classical Evolutionism

Week 3: Diffusionism

Week 4: The Beginnings of Scientific Archaeology

Week 5: Culture-History and Archaeology

Week 6: Reading Week (February 16 - 23) No Classes!

Week 7: Structural Functionalism

Week 8: Neo-Evolutionism and the New Archaeology

Week 9: Systems Theory and Evolutionary Ecology

Week 10: Criticisms of Processual Archaeology

Week 11: The Rise of Post-Processual Archaeology

Week 12: Post-Processual Approaches in Archaeology

Week 13: Criticisms of Post-Processual Archaeology

INTELLECTUAL HONESTY GUIDELINES

Intellectual honesty is the cornerstone of the development and acquisition of knowledge. Knowledge is cumulative and further advances are predicated on the contributions of others. In the normal course of scholarship, these contributions are apprehended, critically evaluated and utilized as a foundation for further inquiry. Intellectual honesty demands that the contribution of others be acknowledged.

Essentially, plagiarism is a form of cheating that involves submitting or presenting work in a course as if it were the student's own done expressly for that particular course when, in fact, it is not. Most commonly **PLAGIARISM** exists when:

- (a) the work submitted or presented was done, in whole or in part, by an individual other than the one submitting or presenting the work (this includes having another person impersonate the student or otherwise substituting the work of another for one's own in an examination or test)**
- (b) parts of the work are taken from another source without references to the original author**
- (c) the whole work is copied from another source and/or**
- (d) a student submits or presents work in one course which has also been submitted in another course (even though it may be entirely the work of that student) without the express consent of the instructors of the courses concerned**

While it is recognized that scholarly work often involves reference to the ideas, data and conclusions of other scholars, intellectual honesty requires that such references be explicitly and clearly noted. Plagiarism is an extremely serious academic offence.

The elementary rules of quotation and paraphrase are given below. There are further details and conventions of punctuation that you may need to look up in a manual of style, but observance of these rules should assure compliance with contemporary standards of intellectual honesty.

- 1. If you use more than four words from any source, put them in quotation marks and identify the source with a reference**

EXAMPLE

It has been observed that 'many tribes are, in a sense, ethnographic fictions'
(Leach 1954: 291).

- 2. If your direct quotation is more than three lines long, put it in blockform, that is, left- and right-indented and single-spaced, without quotation marks and with a reference**

EXAMPLE

Malinowski thought of tribes as social systems with well defined boundaries.
This conception of tribe was later to be challenged by one of his students,
who observed that:

the ethnographer has often only managed to discern the existence of 'a tribe' because he took it as axiomatic that this kind of cultural entity must exist (Leach 1954: 291).

- 3. To paraphrase the work of another means to present the same train of thought and evidence, but rephrased into your own words. Whenever you do this, you must include a note or reference to the source. A common mistake is to break up an author's words, and rearrange them slightly, passing them off as your own. This is wrong, even if you include a note or reference to the source. To do this for more than a few words is to commit plagiarism**

Below are three passages. The first is an excerpt from E. A. Leach, *Political systems of highland Burma*. The second is an improper paraphrase of the passage that would be considered plagiarism. The third is a proper paraphrase.

EXAMPLES

(1)

It is largely an academic fiction to suppose that in a 'normal' ethnographic situation one ordinarily finds distinct 'tribes' distributed on the map in orderly fashion with clear-cut boundaries between them. I agree of course that ethnographic monographs frequently suggest that this is the case, but are the facts proved? My own view is that the ethnographer has often only managed to discern the existence of 'a tribe' because he took it as axiomatic that this kind of cultural entity must exist. Many such tribes are, in a sense, ethnographic fictions (Leach 1954: 290-1). [SOURCE]

(2)

It is an academic misconception to think that in a typical ethnographic situation tribes with clear-cut boundaries can be found distributed in an orderly fashion on the map. Ethnographic monographs often imply that this is so, but what are the facts? The ethnographer is often able to find a 'tribe' only because she takes it for granted that this kind of group must exist. Many tribes are figments of the anthropologist's imagination. [PLAGIARISM]

(3)

Ethnographic monographs often suggest that it is normally the case that there exist in the real world contiguous tribes with clearly discernible boundaries; however, it is Leach's view that such units are found only because the ethnographer has taken their existence for granted (Leach 1954: 290-1). [PROPER PARAPHRASE]

* * *