

Anthropology 1003: Intro to Archaeology
TR 12:45-2:00 pm
Funger 103

Dr. Eric H. Cline
The George Washington University
Fall Semester 2013

COURSE OUTLINE

DESCRIPTION

This course serves as a basic introduction to archaeological survey and excavation techniques and to laboratory methods of dating and analysis. We will include a brief history of archaeology and discussions of specific sites as case studies. It is divided into two lectures per week, plus one discussion session.

In the first lecture each week we consider how archaeology is actually done. How is the past thought about, how do we frame questions about it, and what techniques do we use to gather evidence with which to answer them? In this course, archaeology is considered a scientific discipline, which investigates the past through framing hypotheses and then collecting data by which to evaluate them. What evidence is available about the past, and how do we go about collecting it? How reliable is that evidence, and what are some of the uncertainties in this investigation? All of these questions are intended to get you to think critically about how knowledge about the past is gained, and which interpretations of archaeological evidence are more or less likely to be correct.

In the second lecture each week, we survey some of the most important sites and artifacts which have been discovered in the past century or more, in essence, a “greatest hits” survey of discoveries, ranging from King Tut to Macchu Picchu to the Uluburun shipwreck, in order to learn what archaeologists have unearthed about the past. While we will cover a lot of ground and time, the focus is to understand the overall patterns in the past. In the most general terms, we are seeking to consider what happened in the past, and how we know that it happened. While we can’t know the past in the same way we know the present, understanding past societies is an important step in providing the cross-cultural perspective that is central to both archaeology and anthropology as disciplines.

The discussion sections will expand and elaborate on the class lectures each week.

TEXTS

Bahn, Paul G. (ed.) 1995. *100 Great Archaeological Discoveries*. Barnes and Noble. (selections will also be posted on BlackBoard)

Fagan, Brian M. 2008. *In the Beginning: An Introduction to Archaeology*. Pearson/Prentice Hall. Twelfth Edition.

The reading assignments are listed according to the dates by which they are to be **completed**. In order for the lectures to be effective, it will be necessary for the student to keep up with the readings and to attend all class sessions. The lectures given by the instructor will amplify and synthesize the material covered in the textbook and will be supplemented by audio/visual aids when appropriate.

GRADING

There will be three exams — two midterms each worth 20 points and a comprehensive final worth 30 points. There will also be writing assignments worth 10 points. Finally, there will be 20 points available in the discussion sessions. The course grade will be determined by combining all possible points, for a total of 100 points.

LEARNING OUTCOMES:

Specific By the end of this course, students should:

- ❖ have a general understanding of the ways that archaeologists collect and interpret physical evidence of past cultures;
- ❖ have a specific understanding of the evidence we have for the past;
- ❖ understand how that evidence has been interpreted to show us what the past was like and how past cultures have changed over time
- ❖ see the connection between anthropological knowledge and the interpretation of the past.

General This course will contribute to student competence in:

- ❖ critical thinking skills, where critical thinking is defined as analyzing and engaging with the concepts that underlie an argument and in which the logic and evidence underlying an interpretation is evaluated in terms of the conclusions reached. Students will be able to analyze and evaluate abstract information; understand and analyze scholarly literature and arguments, and formulate a logical argument based on that analysis.

It will additionally contribute to student competence in:

- ❖ scientific reasoning, in which interpretations that are founded on evidence are understood as distinct from speculation (legitimate or otherwise);
- ❖ cross-cultural perspectives, which are given an important time depth by including knowledge of past societies;
- ❖ creative thinking, in which new scholarly arguments are created which are based on a set of findings;
- ❖ and written expression and communication skills, in which these ideas are communicated in an effective and coherent way.

And finally, it will also provide the student with:

- ❖ cross-cultural perspectives, where international institutions, practices, and sites are analyzed, and the importance of cultural knowledge is emphasized as a fundamental aspect of human nature, as students identify and analyze the impact of diverse experiences and/or cultures upon human behavior, thought, and expression, while also using cultural comparison as a tool for understanding how social, cultural, or economic contexts shape understandings and behaviors.

OFFICE HOURS

Office hours will be held on Tuesdays and Thursdays from 10:30 - 11:30 am in Phillips 302. Messages can be left at (202) 994-0316 or sent via email to ehcline@gwu.edu.

CLASS POLICIES

- Regular class and discussion section attendance is mandatory. For every three unexcused class absences, the final semester grade may be lowered by one full grade (an “A” drops to a “B”) at the discretion of the instructor. Attendance at the discussion sections is mandatory.

- Use of cell phones during class time for any reason is strictly forbidden, whether for calls, texting, games, or anything else. Similarly, use of laptops during class time for anything other than note taking is also strictly forbidden; this includes Gmail, Facebook, chats, games, and anything else that will preclude the user from participating fully in classroom discussions. Violators will have their cell phones and laptops confiscated.
- There will be no makeups given except in extreme emergencies and late assignments will not be accepted for a grade.
- The standard University system will be used to assign letter grades as follows: A = 92-100; A- = 90-91; B+ = 88-89; B = 82-87; B- = 80-81; C+ = 78-79; C = 72-77; C- = 70-71; D+ = 68-69; D = 62-67; D- = 60-61; F = 0-59.

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

I personally support the GW Code of Academic Integrity. It states: “Academic dishonesty is defined as cheating of any kind, including misrepresenting one's own work, taking credit for the work of others without crediting them and without appropriate authorization, and the fabrication of information.” For the remainder of the code, see: <http://www.gwu.edu/~ntegrity/code.html>. It is expected that all graded work products and assignments will be completed in conformance with The George Washington University Code of Academic Integrity.

SUPPORT FOR STUDENTS OUTSIDE THE CLASSROOM

DISABILITY SUPPORT SERVICES (DSS)

Any student who may need an accommodation based on the potential impact of a disability should contact the Disability Support Services office at 202-994-8250 in the Marvin Center, Suite 242, to establish eligibility and to coordinate reasonable accommodations. For additional information please refer to: <http://gwired.gwu.edu/dss/>

UNIVERSITY COUNSELING CENTER (UCC) 202-994-5300

The University Counseling Center (UCC) offers 24/7 assistance and referral to address students' personal, social, career, and study skills problems. Services for students include:

- crisis and emergency mental health consultations
- confidential assessment, counseling services (individual and small group), and referrals
<http://gwired.gwu.edu/counsel/CounselingServices/AcademicSupportServices>

SECURITY

In the case of an emergency, if at all possible, the class should shelter in place. If the building that the class is in is affected, follow the evacuation procedures for the building. After evacuation, seek shelter at a predetermined rendezvous location.

WRITTEN ASSIGNMENTS

The essays for this course are supposed to be “thought” pieces rather than research papers, so they should only be three to four (3-4) pages in length each. The idea is to get you to think critically as well as creatively about archaeology and archaeological theory and knowledge in today’s world, and how our particular cultural perspectives are included in archaeological analysis and its presentation. You must do the first topic (updating “The Golden Marshalltown”) but then may choose which of the other two topics you wish to do. You can approach the topics any way you like. For the second paper, however, I want you to do this by analyzing and evaluating something specific, such as a TV show, a visit to a museum, a book, a survey, a site, etc., and using the analysis of that as the center of the paper. The basic question you are attempting to answer is how does archaeology work, how is archaeological knowledge acquired and conveyed, and what is its impact? For a paper to receive an “A,” it must do an analysis of something specific that stems from an understanding of archaeological issues and avoid superficial discussions of how great archaeology can be; further breakdown of the grading of the paper can be found in the rubric included at the end of this syllabus. The essays should be turned in by the last day of class and will be worth five (5) points each, for a total of ten (10) points:

Mandatory



Kent Flannery’s article, “The Golden Marshalltown” (available on BlackBoard), was written in the early 1980s and features archaeologists from the 1960s and 1970s (as well as the “Oldtimer”). Write, in the same lively manner as the rest of the article, an addendum updating the article and incorporating changes seen in archaeological method and theory since the 1980s. (You may add additional characters from the 1980s, 1990s, and today, or write it in the first person, if desired.)

Choose one of the following



Visit a museum or historical site and look at a specific exhibit (NB: this should be a museum with archaeological things in it, not an art museum). For example, the “Human Origins” exhibit in the Natural History Museum at the Smithsonian contains a number of objects of relevance to, and which will be discussed in, our class this semester, including imprints of the Laetoli footprints (look down at the floor). What are they telling you about the past? Is it slanted in a particular way? What is the specific content of the exhibit and does this have an impact on the general ideas being represented? Why is this information useful/interesting/educational etc.? Is it important or valuable? Is it worth using the taxpayers’ money to support it? Be sure that you analyze the exhibit, not just summarize what is in it.



Watch a TV show about archaeology or read a book (NB: the textbooks for this course don’t count!!) and analyze how archaeology is presented. How is the past being presented? What sorts of interpretations are being offered? What evidence is presented to support them? Do they make sense? Are they slanted in any particular way? Is there anything obvious left out? Why is this information useful/interesting/educational etc.? Is it important or valuable? Be sure that you analyze the show/book/movie, not just summarize what is in it.

~~~~~

While these are short essays, I do expect you to take them seriously and to show indications of critical thinking and communication skills. I will be paying attention to things like typos, grammar, and suchlike, so read it over before you turn it in! An “A” essay will not look like something you spit out last night after midnight and clearly haven’t read over since. The rubric for grading can be found on the last pages of this syllabus (below).

In addition, while these are not research papers, you should provide references if you use a book or other media presentation so that I can look it up if necessary. If you do a survey, please provide me with the “raw data” (i.e. the questionnaires that you used etc.). With other options, just make sure you give me whatever I need to properly evaluate what you have done. If you cite references, make sure that you use some consistent format. I don’t care if you use footnotes or references in the text, but whatever you choose, stick to it.

### LECTURES AND TOPICS

| <u>Date:</u>     | <u>Topics:</u>                                                                                                 |
|------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Aug 27 (T)       | Introduction to Archaeology.                                                                                   |
| Aug 29 (R)       | Egyptology: Pyramids and Mummies; Tut’s Tomb.                                                                  |
| <b>Readings:</b> | Fagan 2008: Chapter 1; Bahn 1995: 28-29, 32-35, 40-41.                                                         |
| Sept 3 (T)       | A Short History of Archaeology and Theory.                                                                     |
| Sept 5 (R)       | <i>No Class – Rosh Hashanah</i>                                                                                |
| <b>Readings:</b> | Fagan 2008: Chaps 2-3.                                                                                         |
| Sept 10 (T)      | Matrix, Preservation, and Archaeological Research.                                                             |
| Sept 12 (R)      | Prehistoric Archaeology: Olduvai Gorge and Lucy; Catal Höyük; Jericho.                                         |
| <b>Readings:</b> | Fagan 2008: Chaps 4-5; (On BlackBoard): Flannery, “The Golden Marshalltown;” Bahn 1995: 17-21, 68-69, 140-141. |
| Sept 17 (T)      | Culture, Assemblages, and Chronology.                                                                          |
| Sept 19 (R)      | Biblical Archaeology: Ur; Megiddo; Dead Sea Scrolls.                                                           |
| <b>Readings:</b> | Fagan 2008: Chaps 6-7; Bahn 1995: 142-145, 159.                                                                |
| Sept 24 (T)      | Intriguing Archaeology: Terracotta Army; Nazca Lines; Pompeii and Herculaneum.                                 |
| Sept 26 (R)      | <i>Review Session</i>                                                                                          |
| <b>Readings:</b> | Bahn 1995: 122-25, 178-179.                                                                                    |
| Oct 1 (T)        | *** <b>FIRST MIDTERM EXAM</b> ***                                                                              |
| Oct 3 (R)        | Recovering Archaeological Data: Finding Sites.                                                                 |
| <b>Readings:</b> | Fagan 2008: Chapter 8.                                                                                         |

|                  |                                                                                                                                                               |
|------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <u>Date:</u>     | <u>Topics:</u>                                                                                                                                                |
| Oct 8 (T)        | Recovering Archaeological Data: Excavating Sites.                                                                                                             |
| Oct 10 (R)       | Preservation Studies: Ötzi the Ice Man; Bog People; Sutton Hoo.                                                                                               |
| <b>Readings:</b> | Fagan 2008: Chapter 9; Bahn 1995: 84-85, 114-115, 128-131.                                                                                                    |
| Oct 15 (T)       | Artifacts and Technology. Looting and Fakes.                                                                                                                  |
| Oct 17 (R)       | Bronze Age Archaeology: Knossos and Santorini.                                                                                                                |
| <b>Readings:</b> | Fagan 2008: Chaps 10-11; Bahn 1995: 92-93, 96-97.                                                                                                             |
| Oct 22 (T)       | Ancient Environments, Subsistence, and Diet. Future Archaeology.                                                                                              |
| Oct 24 (R)       | Underwater Archaeology: Uluburun ship.                                                                                                                        |
| <b>Readings:</b> | Fagan 2008: Chaps 12-13; Bahn 1995: 102-103.<br><a href="http://www.worldwithoutus.com/about_author.html">http://www.worldwithoutus.com/about_author.html</a> |
| Oct 29 (T)       | Analogy, Middle-Range Theory, and Settlement Archaeology.                                                                                                     |
| Oct 31 (R)       | New World Archaeology: Maya sites; Sipan; Teotihuacan; Tenochtitlan.                                                                                          |
| <b>Readings:</b> | Fagan 2008: Chaps 14-15; Bahn 1995: 216-217, 226-227, 228-229, 236-237.                                                                                       |
| Nov 5 (T)        | People of the Past: Trade and Exchange.                                                                                                                       |
| Nov 7 (R)        | <i>Review Session</i>                                                                                                                                         |
| <b>Readings:</b> | Fagan 2008: Chapter 16.                                                                                                                                       |
| Nov 12 (T)       | *** <b>SECOND MIDTERM EXAM</b> ***                                                                                                                            |
| Nov 14 (R)       | Pseudo-Archaeology: From Noah's Ark to the Copper Scroll and beyond                                                                                           |
| <b>Readings:</b> | (On BlackBoard): Cline 2007: <i>Boston Globe</i> article; Holtorf 2005; Fagan and Feder 2006; Fagan, "Basic Principles."                                      |
| Nov 19 (T)       | Cultural Resources: Managing the Past. Public Archaeology.                                                                                                    |
| Nov 21 (R)       | <i>No Class – Instructor out of town (or TA lecture)</i>                                                                                                      |
| <b>Readings:</b> | Fagan 2008: Chapter 18.                                                                                                                                       |
| Nov 26 (T)       | Archaeological Hoaxes. So, Ya Wanna Be an Archaeologist?                                                                                                      |
| Nov 28 (R)       | <i>No Class — Thanksgiving Break</i>                                                                                                                          |
| <b>Readings:</b> | Fagan 2008: Chapter 19; (On BlackBoard): Gugliotta and Sockol; Fagan, "Basic Principles."                                                                     |
| Dec 3 (T)        | <i>No Class (Makeup Day)</i>                                                                                                                                  |
| Dec 5 (R)        | <i>Review for Final Exam [Essays Due]</i>                                                                                                                     |
| Dec xx (T/R?)    | *** <b>COMPREHENSIVE FINAL EXAM</b> ***                                                                                                                       |

NB: The above schedule and procedures in this course are subject to change in the event of extenuating circumstances. In addition to the above, you are also registered in a discussion section which meets once a week; the syllabus and assignments for that are separate.



## Grading Procedures for the Essays:

### **The Way in Which Letter Grades Will Be Assigned (i.e. Rubric)**

#### **Excellent (A/A-)**

*Thesis:* Easily identifiable, plausible, novel, sophisticated, clear.

*Structure:* Evident, understandable, and appropriate for thesis. Excellent transitions from point to point. Paragraphs support solid topic sentences.

*Analysis:* Clearly relates evidence to thesis; analysis of core concepts is exciting, posing new ways to think about course material.

*Logic and argumentation:* Shows strong command of underlying course concepts. All ideas in the paper should flow logically; the argument is identifiable, reasonable, and sound. Counterarguments are acknowledged and where possible, briefly refuted.

*Mechanics:* Sentence structure, grammar, and diction excellent; correct use of punctuation and citation style; minimal to no spelling errors; absolutely no run-on sentences or awkward constructions.

#### **Good (B+/B/B-)**

*Thesis:* Promising, but may be slightly unclear, or lacking in insight or originality.

*Structure:* Generally clear and appropriate, though may wander occasionally. May have a few unclear transitions, or a few paragraphs without strong topic sentences.

*Analysis:* Critical analysis and evidence often related to thesis, though links not always clear.

*Logic and argumentation:* Shows solid command of course concepts. Argument of paper is clear, usually flows logically and makes sense. Some evidence that counter-arguments acknowledged, though not addressed with sufficient rigor.

*Mechanics:* Sentence structure, grammar, and diction strong despite occasional lapses; punctuation and citation style often used correctly. Some (minor) spelling errors; may have some run-on sentences, sentence fragments, or other awkward constructions.

#### **Adequate (C+/C/C-)**

*Thesis:* May be unclear (contain vague terms), appear unoriginal, or offer relatively little that is new; provides little around which to structure the paper.

*Structure:* Generally unclear, often wanders or jumps around. Few or weak transitions, many paragraphs without topic sentences.

*Analysis:* Points often lack supporting evidence, or evidence used where inappropriate (often because there may be no clear point). Quotations or description appear often without critical analysis relating them to thesis (or there is a weak thesis to support), or analysis offers nothing beyond the quotation.

*Logic and argumentation:* Logic may often fail, or argument may often be unclear. May not address counter-arguments. May contain logical contradictions.

*Mechanics:* Problems in sentence structure, grammar, and diction (usually not major). Errors in punctuation, citation style, and spelling. May have several run-on sentences or fragments.

**Inadequate (D+/D/D-)**

*Thesis:* Difficult to identify at all, may be bland restatement of obvious point.

*Structure:* Unclear because thesis is weak or non-existent. Transitions confusing and unclear. Few topic sentences.

*Analysis:* Course concepts are not well understood. Very little or very weak attempt to relate analysis to evidence; may be no identifiable argument, or no evidence to relate it to. General failure to support statements, or evidence seems to support no statement. Little or no use of secondary sources.

*Logic and argumentation:* Ideas do not flow at all, usually because there is no argument to support. Simplistic view of topic; no effort to grasp possible alternative views. Many logical contradictions, or simply too incoherent to determine.

*Mechanics:* Large problems in sentence structure, grammar, and diction. Frequent major errors in citation style, punctuation, and spelling. May have numerous run-on sentences.

**Failing**

Shows minimal effort or comprehension of the assignment.

Very difficult to understand due to major problems with mechanics, structure, and analysis. Has no identifiable thesis or the thesis is incompetent.