Identity, Memory, and Landscape
in archaeological theory
Anthrarc 683.002
Winter, 2004
Thursdays 4-7

Norman Yoffee
Office: Frieze Bldg B-188
3065 Frieze Bldg = seminar room
Office hrs: Th 2-4

Provisional syllabus

Description
This seminar situates new concerns in theoretical archaeology in relation to positions and claims in “processual” and “post-processual” archaeology. The construction of social memory in the past existed just as it does in the present. It involved creating links to ancestors and antiquity and often (re-)interpretations of monuments and landscapes. Especially in instances of social change, individuals, who belonged to multiple and overlapping social groups, had to negotiate their economic and social status to the extent possible, exploiting the ambiguities of inherited forms, evaluating their options, borrowing ideas from other groups, and creating new identities to answer to changing circumstances.

Requirements
Students critique weekly readings and write term paper. The papers will be circulated to members of the seminar and discussed by the group.

Suggested pre-seminar readings on the history of theory in archaeology
Matthew Johnson
Bruce Trigger
Gordon Willey and Jeremy Sabloff
Ian Hodder, ed.
Michelle Hegmon
1. Th, Jan. 8  Introductory meeting.


3. Th, Jan. 22 Introductory readings
Lynn Meskell
Ruth Van Dyke and Susan Alcock
A.B. Knapp and Wendy Ashmore
Simon Schama
Keith Basso
1996 *Wisdom Sits in Places*. Albuquerque:Univ of New Mexico Press (read Ch 1)

4. Th, Jan. 29 Chapters from Van Dyke and Alcock, eds. TBA

Dear Seminarians

The division of chs. in Van Dyke & Alcock is as follows:
Meskell--Hemanth
Papalexandrou--Lori
Prent--Cat
Joyce--Laura
Lillios--Lindsay
Pauketat-Alt--Jason
Van Dyke--Adrian
Blake--Sanjaya
Bradley--Seth

It would be good if you could send your "reaction papers" by Wed late to the list. Carla Sinopoli, who will moderate next week's seminar meeting, has been added to the list and will receive them.

May I ask you to write 1 paragraph at the start of your reaction paper that briefly summarizes your views on the materials we've read and the discussions we've had? How do I-M-L studies fit into the landscape of archaeological theory? Is NY right? (as follows): Since we all acknowledge that observations and research
objectives are "theory-laden" and that archaeologists are motivated to investigate the past in light of modern (and personal) interests, intellectual trends, and in the light of modern political uses of the past, in short that identity, memory, and landscape are now part of the standard toolkit of archaeologists, we are all "post-processual plus" (play on Hegmon's we are all processual plus)! (I translated that sentence from the original German). I infer the above from seminarians' remarks on many articles that claim to be doing the newest, cutting-edge theory: "big-deal! Of course, this is what archaeologists now do, and we resent the arrogance of those elitist archaeologists (Hodder, Meskell), who have big bucks and optimum case-studies who are telling us what everyone else should do." The seminar could start out with a discussion of this, and Carla will have valuable observations. (You can bring me up-to-date on this on the following week).

Further observations to our reading of Basso's *Wisdom*. Basso's work is an example of and important reference point to the "linguistic turn" in anthropology and archaeology. (See, Hodder's *Reading the Past*). For Basso, partly in reaction to Netting's cultural ecology approach (which I told you about last time: they argued this in the cultural anthro core course in Arizona), culture is a text. This is certainly ok as an explication of cultural landscapes; indeed, the beauty of his analysis is widely acknowledged. However, it is not an ethnography. Basso does not tell us how Apaches live and work, settle disputes, deal with their own and other officials, conduct ceremonies, use material culture, etc. It's interesting that he (nicely) discusses change over the last decades, and how stories of the landscape are changing. An archaeological reaction is to wonder about changes in the several hundred years before KB got to the reservation. How are other materials used to fashion stories? Is the landscape constituted in other than natural features, but by means of constructions and monuments (as Basso's story about modern houses and neighborhoods at Cibecue has it)? I cited an essay by Kelley Hays, "When is a symbol archaeologically meaningful? meaning, function, and prehistoric visual arts" in *Archaeological Theory: Who Sets the Agenda*, ed. N Yoffee and A. Sherratt, 1993. She argues that it is not necessary to know what the symbols mean exactly in order to study them. FYI.

5. Th, Feb. 5 Chapters from Ashmore and Knapp, eds. TBA

Reactions to reaction papers

I’ll keep this brief; perhaps we’ll resume the discussion a bit this Thursday or/and later in the term. Some of my remarks emanate not only from interest in what you have to say but also from my attempts to gauge what the current jeunesse dorée of grad students in archaeology are thinking about.
Your RPs were, as usual, thoughtful, well written, skeptical. The chapters ranged from enthusiastic usages of (I)M(L), which you tended to criticize, to skeptical usages of same which made you enthusiastic, if dourly. One might conclude that the study of the uses of the past in and by the past is ok, but cuidado! (This is a multi-lingual composition). Past societies, like modern ones, live among monuments and ruins. Archaeologists, thus, have a responsibility to discern, as best they can, how people reacted to and employed things and images. Some pasts were constructed: trash mounds at Chaco (and other places) might well be attempts to convey a longer past than was the case. (This has been said for other sites, too). Sometimes the past was not really past: dead kings (in Peru [Chan Chan] as well as Egypt) were not really gone but parts of everyday life. There were contradictions in the use of the past: while some elements were used, others were torn down. Of course, there is no necessity that the past (in the past) be just one thing, have only one value. It is important to know what is forgot as much as is what is remembered. There is a cottage industry in archaeology that worries about ritual destructions. Maybe there’s a topic for a seminar.

There is a part of social theory (basically functionalism) used by archaeologists that stresses “integration.” Memory is said (by some of the ch authors) to be part of this social integration. Like ritual, memory is employed to bring people together. However, there are studies (drawing from other parts of social theory—Marxism, obviously, but also Weberian thought) that hold that attempts to bring people together are also ways of empowering some over others. Of course some chapters were rather weak: Gegen die Dummheit kaempfen auch die Goetter vergebens. (Even the gods struggle vainly against stupidity).

--ny
2.2.04

Sinopoli in Van Dyke and Alcock, eds.

Richards
Barnes
Brady and Ashmore
Buikstra and Charles
Knapp
Barrett
Crumley
van Dommelen

7. Th, Feb. 19 Readings suggested by Emma Blake

Readings for February 19, 2004: “Constructing and Mobilizing Collective Identities”


Lise Kealhofer (in Ashmore and Knapp, eds)


9. Th, Mar. 11

Readings for March 11

Laura—Soja
Lori—Bradley 02 ch. 3
Seth—Bradley 02 ch 4
Hemanth—Bradley 00 ch. 7
Lindsay?—Bradley 00 ch 3
Cat—Costin
Adrian—Kealhofer
Jason—Hodder and Cessford
Sanjaya--Swanson
(I'll say something, briefly, about Bradley 98, *The Significance of Monuments*)


2-3. from Lori:
Seth and I have selected chapters 3 and 4 from Bradley (2002), The Past in Prehistoric Societies.

Chapter 3, called Entering the Present, is about the immediate past of prehistoric people. It looks at material culture and the biographies of artefacts, especially pottery and metalwork in Scandinavia and the British Isles. The chapter also looks at houses and occupation sites and how buildings were replaced by others during the history of individual settlements. Other examples are drawn from South-west England in the Bronze Age. I'll take this one.

Chapter 4, called Projecting Future Pasts, is about monumental architecture and how monuments influence future memories of later generations. Examples are taken from Scotland, Italy and Northern France. Seth will take this one.

We will make photocopies and have them available at the Kelsey guard's desk

4.-5. from Hemanth:
I have been perusing Bradley's *Archaeology of Natural Places* (2000). This short book (150 pages) deals specifically with how natural places themselves become areas of sacrifice and ritual in the landscape mostly without being altered.

organization of book: Three parts where ethnographic cases are presented in part One (Finland and Minoan Crete in Chap1-2) with theorizing about natural places and their significance in local tradition. Chapter 3 in this part is one that talks of the potential for an archeology of unaltered places: here four elements are isolated which can be amenable to archeological investigation: votive offerings; the presence of 'art' at natural places in the landscape; the use of special locations as production sites; and the recreation of small number of ritually important locations as conventional monuments. This last chap in Part one which has these four elements has been studied in detail as separate chapters in Part two.

PART TWO: More interesting because they are specific archaeological case studies from neolithic and Bronze age Europe (Neolithic Denmark, Iberia and Norway, Crete and Northern Portugal). Bradley is constantly bringing back ethnographic case studies mentioned in the first part of the book to illustrate mechanisms
of interpretation in these chapters.

I suggest that we read Chapter 7 (p. 97-114) from Part Two: The origin of spaces: monuments and the natural topography. (deals with Crete only but draws on ethnographic examples given in Part one)
I suggest that we also read Part One completely to ground us in the context of the book.

The book seems fairly easy to follow and there should not be too much trouble getting through the reading. I could present on one or two sections that I have suggested here depending on if any one else may be interested in presenting something from this book.

Sorry for this long mail,
Hemanth

6. from Cat:

Just so you all know, I've got my reading of choice picked out for next week, and there will be copies at the Kelsey. The article is:


Have fun with it, I haven't read it yet either, so we'll see how it goes!

7. (Adrian) Kealhoffer, Ch. 3 in Archaeologies of Landscape

8. Swanson, Journal of Social Archaeology

9. (Jason) I. Hodder and C. Cessford, American Antiquity 69: 17-40 Daily Practice and Social Memory at Catalhoyuk. (Jason)

Readings will be drawn from the following and/or suggested by seminarians (see bibliography of articles in 4 journals below).

Christopher Tilley
1994  A Phenomenology of Landscape. Oxford: Berg. (see also Julian Thomas’s essay
Barbara Bender, ed.
Journal of Social Archaeology vol. 1, no. 2 “Lebenswelt and Doxa” (Oct, 2001)

Richard Bradley
2000 An Archaeology of Natural Places. London: Routledge

Edward Soja

Rex Koontz, Kathryn Reese-Taylor, and Annabeth Headrick

10. Th, Mar. 18 (fallow; meetings with students + NY)

11. Th, Mar. 25 (presentations of IML dissertation research by Laura and Jason; progress reports on term papers)

12. Th, Apr. 1 (SAA—no meeting)

Dear all

Here's a reminder of the schedule of papers:

Tuesday, April 6: Cat, Sanjaya, and Seth send their papers.
Thursday, April 8: discussion of the papers. Authors will make a few intro comments on the process of their research, 5-10 minutes maximum. Then, the paper is open for discussion of everything: things that are unclear and need explaining, things that are interesting and need debating, things that are wrong and need correcting. Readers should also note what is successful in this paper and what might be studied further.

Tuesday, April 13: Adrian, Hemanth, Lindsay, and Lori send their papers
Thursday, April 15: same format for discussion.

Thursday, April 22: seminar party and my house. 6 pm.

--Norm

13. Th, Apr. 8 Seminar paper discussions: Cat, Seth, Sanjaya (papers to be circulated by Apr. 5
Dear Seminarians

Everyone should have received the three papers we shall discuss this Thursday. Just to remind you, the authors will talk only for 5-10 minutes about their papers, mainly discussing issues of their research (e.g., difficulties in getting and understanding certain data, surprises they may have encountered). Then the papers will be open for discussion. Naturally all seminarians will be given a chance to dissect the papers, interrogate the authors, and otherwise display their acute critical sensibilities as are occasioned by their close reading of the texts. Yum.--Norm

14. Th, Apr. 15 Seminar paper discussions: Lindsay, Hemanth, Lori, Adrian (papers to be circulated by April 12)

Apr. 22 Seminar dinner chez NY?

Biblio prepared by Laura Villamil and Jason Sherman
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