

Introduction

Ben Ford

Landscape in Archaeology

In order to fully understand maritime cultures, maritime archaeology must pursue all aspects of the maritime past. The broader and more inclusive these pursuits, the more fodder there is for the development of sound theories and for crosspollination with anthropology, geography, and other fields. One way to approach the inclusive study of maritime archaeology is to view the maritime past through a broad and geographically oriented landscape perspective.

Landscape exists at the intersection of culture and space. As such, it falls neatly within and between the disciplines of history, geography, and archaeology; disciplines that have strong methodological and theoretical associations (Sauer 1941, p. 6; Jackson et al. 1970; Cronon 1983; Ashmore and Knapp 1999; Head 2000, pp. 52–54; Baker 2003). Geographical studies tend to focus on the question of “where,” while archaeological and historical projects often ask “when” or “how” and hopefully “why.” Inquiries that ask all of these questions exist where anthropology and geography overlap and are known alternately as cultural geography or landscape archaeology. The intersection of space and culture within landscape, however, is more than an artifact of academic disciplines; it is fundamental to the very nature of space and culture. Space is a medium for human activity and does not have cultural significance apart from that activity. Space is always present, but until humans use or acknowledge a particular space and make it a place, it does not exist anthropologically. Similarly, space provides the context for culture; places are everywhere that culture is. Both place and culture are part of human experience, “a person is ‘in place’ just as much as she or he is ‘in culture’” (Tilley 1994, p. 18). Furthermore, time plays a role as cultures and spaces change with time. Thus, places are culturally determined and cultures are strongly influenced by their spaces, all of which shift through time forming culturally distinct and frequently

B. Ford (✉)
Department of Anthropology, Indiana University of Pennsylvania,
McElhaney Hall, Room G-1, 441 North Walk, Indiana, PA 15705, USA
e-mail: ben.ford@iup.edu

B. Ford (ed.), *The Archaeology of Maritime Landscapes, When the Land Meets the Sea 2*,
DOI 10.1007/978-1-4419-8210-0, © Springer Science+Business Media, LLC 2011

overlapping landscapes, often within a single geographic region. The perception of a landscape in turn influences the actions of those who inhabit it, which in turn have implications for their culture and the physical environment both in the immediate present and in the future. There is no way to separate culture, time, and space from the landscape.

For example, the battlefield at Gettysburg, Pennsylvania, existed before the American Civil War; it existed before humans inhabited North America. Before human contact, it was a space, but once people began to interact with this space it became a place, which was viewed largely from an economic perspective, first by hunter-gatherers and later by agriculturalists. The perceptions of the space briefly shifted to strategy and tactics in 1863. In the modern era, the place is preserved and treated as a memorial space. Both the 1860s and modern perceptions drew on previous uses of the places, and thus current perceptions are strongly influenced by past perceptions and uses. This is only one example of national significance, but similar junctures of culture, time, and environment occur daily at both societal and personal scales.

The relationship between people, place, and landscape can range from reciprocal to dialectical, but the physical environment and human social activity are always kept in focus. Neither the environment nor the people are passive; both function to construct and reconstruct the other (Welinder 1997, p. 88; Head 2000, p. 8; Cassell and Stachiw 2005, p. 1; Taska 2005, pp. 9, 11–12). The landscape is made up of multiple environmental features, such as the climate and the locations of water, arable land, fuel, and raw materials, as well as social, political, and ideological components, all of which are interrelated and cannot be understood without reference to each other (Meinig 1979; Samuels 1979; Westerdahl 1992; Welinder 1997; Martin 2000, p. 39; Jones 2006, p. 523; Meier 2006). Furthermore, each landscape is best understood in the context of its neighbors and the landscapes that preceded it and are expected to follow. From a practical perspective, a landscape includes the space that a person can see or perceive; it includes smells or noises that are perceptible beyond the line of sight, as well as adjacent places that one can see in the mind's eye and connect to one's current viewscape (i.e., if someone can imagine the space over the next hill, then it is part of the effective landscape). However, the current landscape is seen and perceived based on past experiences so that the landscape is constructed of all past personal encounters in this particular space, the stories about the space, the current status of the space, and the perceived possible future uses of the space. The landscape is thus constantly being constructed and altered. It is culturally dynamic and a force of cultural construction that coevolves with culture (Tilley 1994, p. 23; Welinder 1997, p. 96; Dyson-Bruce 2003; Ash 2005, p. 3; Cassell and Stachiw 2005, p. 3).

The fact that landscape is a part of a society's material culture makes it attractive to anthropologists. Hoskins (1955, p. 14) has described landscape as "the richest historical record we possess," whereas Anschuetz et al. (2001, p. 190) use the analogy of "a mirror of a community." Regardless of whether the landscape is viewed as a document or a mirror, culture is alive in place and written on space. In ways large and small, the landscape stores and conveys culture.

The archaeological landscape, however, is difficult to reconstruct and is never completely knowable, due both to a lack of data and to the breadth of information that must be considered. So much of what makes up a past landscape has been lost to time and change that all archaeological landscapes are in a sense prehistoric, in which the best method to approach them is through physical investigation supplemented by anecdotes and analogies (Ascher 1968; Fairclough 2006, p. 209). We have, more often than not, lost the "skin" of the land (the trees, flowers, people, perishable structures, noises, smells, and so forth) and are left with merely the "bones" (rocks, hills, valleys, structural remains, archaeological deposits, etc.). These remaining data only lend themselves to a coarse interpretation of the past, but it is what we have to learn from (Tilley 1994, p. 73). Lost, then, are most of the myths, individual daily activities, the short-term sense of time, and most of the other ephemeral events and thoughts that define a space for most people. The presence of these aspects of past landscapes need to be remembered at all times and analyzed whenever they are available. The purpose of archaeology, after all, is to study past culture, not simply past debris.

The landscape perspective lends itself to a balanced approach to the past, one that is informed by the current inhabitants, as well as historic documents and the archaeological record. Such multi-vocal data help to combat the biases inherent in every archaeological study (Ash 2005, p. 66). This approach is not, however, without problems. The reconstructed landscape is often not a map of the "real world," a world that an historic person who lived in it would recognize. It instead tends to capture a particular interpretation at a particular scale. This peculiarity occurs because of data missing from the historical record, but it is also inherent in maps and theory. Both maps and theories exist to streamline perception and understanding. Maps simplify or eliminate some aspects of the world to demonstrate others more clearly, while theories emphasize particular aspects of human thought and physiology to explain specific behaviors. Archaeology cannot function without maps and theories because humans cannot grasp everything at one time. Yet, maps, theories, and reconstructed landscapes all hinge on what is deemed important to show at a given moment. What remains in the archaeological and historical record often determines the focus of a reconstructed landscape, as it does in the rest of archaeology. Artifacts, sites, features, and material culture serve as touchstones of the past. They form the physical foundation of what can be told. The story and the landscape are nearly always larger than the artifact, but the artifact serves to focus the archaeologist's attention on particular aspects of a knowable past.

In addition to the archaeologist's own biases as to what is knowable and what is important, which should be in part mitigated by the multitude of data available in any given landscape, issues of dynamism and causation are also concerns. It is easy to record the various aspects of a landscape and mark them on a map, but it is difficult to reconstruct the vitality that the landscape had for those who inhabited it (Welinder 1997, p. 96). Even when the various aspects of a landscape are sorted into occupation periods and events, the small daily activities of a group are conflated. At best the archaeologist can attempt to parse the features of the landscape into temporal packets that are as small as possible and yet still retain meaning, then look

for evidence of stability and change between the periods. It is also important not to conflate correlation with causation. The form of a place may have multiple causes, not all of which will be readily perceptible (Sauer 1941, p. 7; Jones 2006, p. 525). Simply because a story fits the evidence does not mean that the story is "true." Here, again, the multiple lines of evidence that construct and bind the landscape offer some hope that reasonably accurate interpretations will surface.

In summary, we can define a landscape as the physical environment perceptible to an individual and his or her perception of that environment. This landscape is linked to adjacent contemporaneous landscapes and overlapping past landscapes to form an individual's world. From an archaeological perspective, these landscapes are made up of both the residues that individuals left behind during their inhabitation and use of the physical environment, and the effects that the landscape had on their culture, which are tenable through other forms of historical, ethnographic, and archaeological evidence. These cultural data can then be interpreted using any applicable theoretical perspective.

Landscape in Maritime Archaeology

Two major landscape concepts, "seascape" and "maritime cultural landscape," have developed out of the study of landscapes in maritime archaeology. A true seascape is constructed of the factors that allow an individual to perceive his or her location out of sight of land. These factors can include stars, currents, swells, birds, winds, clouds, and phosphorescence (such as the *te lapa* of the Pacific Islanders; Lewis 1994, p. 253). These factors allow navigators to place themselves on a mental map containing cultural constructs, such as routes, and unseen but known locations, which then become part of the seascape. Technology further develops the seascape through navigation instruments that supplement the natural factors and refine the navigator's mental map. Just as on land, the perception of such factors are influenced by culture and are in turn fed back into the culture as charts, stories, and so on.

Some scholars (McNiven 2003; Breen and Lane 2004) use the term "seascape" to describe any landscape viewed from the sea and so include seamarks, harbors, reefs, islands, shallows indicated by changes in water color, and other land-based phenomenon in this concept. These factors, however, are derived from land, exposed or submerged, and therefore can be considered part of the original term, "landscape." This distinction is bolstered by the understanding that the shore is a continuum from the uplands to the continental shelf, which has been variously submerged and exposed through time. It is, however, useful to consider how the same landscape changes when perceived from the water rather than from the land, a perspective that rests comfortably within the term "maritime cultural landscape."

Maritime cultural landscapes combine physical aspects of landscape and seascape to analyze the culture of maritime peoples within a spatial context, while retaining the recursive culture-nature relationship of landscape study. The term was first used in English by Christer Westerdahl during the early 1990s and has since

been championed by him and others (Westerdahl 1992, 2003, 2006, 2011; Parker 1999, 2001; Aberg and Lewis 2000; Reinders 2001; Flatman 2003, 2009b; McErlean et al. 2002; O'Sullivan 2004, 2005; Busch 2006; O'Sullivan and Breen 2007; Rönby 2007).

Within the maritime cultural landscape approach, maritime history and ethnography are integrated with the physical residue of past maritime systems, including shipwrecks, ports, harbor, roadways, rail lines, modified rivers, villages, cottages, fortifications, shipyards, chandlers, warehouses, custom houses, commodities, insurance companies, lighthouses, and regulations. All of these features, and others, are interpreted within the maritime landscape to explore "how people perceived and understood the sea and used this knowledge and understanding to order and constitute the landscape and societies that they live in" (O'Sullivan and Breen 2007, p. 15). Therefore, the study of maritime cultural landscapes extends the focus of maritime archaeology beyond the ship. Shipwrecks are unarguably important to maritime archaeology: they form the foundation of the subject through the number of sites that have been excavated, the amount of cultural data that are produced by each shipwreck, and through the important roles that vessels played in maritime cultures. Similarly, vessels are fundamental to nearly all maritime lifeways, but they are merely one of many artifact classes that define a maritime culture. Sailors spent only a portion of their lives on the water and they were integrated in a diverse community that depended on, supported, or profited from maritime commerce, warfare, and resources, but which, in many cases, never left the land.

Similar to landscapes in general, this understanding of the maritime landscape is not limited to only sites or sights but includes a wide range of interrelated and often ephemeral phenomena. Some of these phenomena, such as when navigational lights were erected in a specific location, can be gleaned from the historical record, but many, such as sounds and smells, are nearly always lost. Others, such as perceived distances or places of danger and safety, can only occasionally be reconstructed (Pott 1994; Hardesty 2000, p. 175; Russell et al. 2004, p. 101). One avenue by which to explore these perceptions is presented by place names. Place names have been part of maritime cultural landscape studies since early on and are important because they transform physical and geographical reality into something that is historically and culturally experienced (Westerdahl 1992; Tilley 1994). Similar to human alterations to the environment, place names are culture laid directly onto space to form a landscape.

Archaeologies of Maritime Landscape

The chapters in this volume all begin with these ideas of landscape and maritime cultural landscape but reach a range of conclusions by applying them differently within diverse theoretical, spatial, historical, and environmental contexts. The objective of the book is not to present the study of the maritime landscape as a unified field; it clearly is not. Rather, the intent is to showcase the diversity of applications

and results as an argument for the utility and productivity of this approach. To that end, the chapters assembled here range in their discussions from landscapes more than 10,000 years old to less than a decade old; landscapes that have lasted millennia and those that lasted no more than a few months; landscapes that span hundreds of square kilometers and others that engage a single site; and landscapes that are approached from a management perspective and those analyzed in an attempt to access the minds of past peoples. Among the authors are scholars who have fully adopted a maritime cultural landscape approach and others who are experimenting with it within an existing research agenda. Despite this breadth, still other perspectives could have been included; what is presented here is merely a sample.

This diversity of approaches, however, is unified by a focus on how humans interact with the water, how those interactions shape both culture and landscape, and how those interactions manifest themselves in material culture broadly defined. The authors are also united in approaching the question of human/water interaction from a spatial perspective, taking the site as the minimum unit of investigation. The landscape perspective is not new to maritime archaeology but it has received increasing attention in recent years alongside site-specific studies. One of the underlying arguments of this volume is that both generalizing and particularistic endeavors have a place in maritime archaeology and there is a recursive relationship between these types of studies. Particularistic excavations provide the data that form the foundations of more holistic surveys, while the wider surveys generate additional research questions and broader historical contexts for future excavations. Healthy archaeology depends on the pursuit of both objectives.

As aforementioned, in addition to placing sites within a geographic context, landscape archaeology can incorporate deeply diachronic perspectives, taking into account changes in environment, use, and perception over expanses of time. For this reason, several chapters discuss prehistoric landscapes, significantly removed from modern shorelines by rising or falling water levels. These chapters are different from many of the others in that they focus on the importance of the environment in landscape. The environment is the always present and always changing physical tapestry that is imbedded with meaning by humans. However, it is often difficult to identify meaning, or even archaeological sites, in these landscapes where the archaeological record is buried or inundated, and there are no documents and few recorded place names. In many ways the condition of prehistoric maritime landscape studies parallels the argument that Bass (1983) once made for shipwrecks: we need more data before we can discuss patterns of culture. However, with each new discovery the dataset grows, and as the dataset grows our ability to generalize about use increases, and with an increasing understanding of use it may become possible to discuss meaning, which may in turn help to find additional sites and better explain patterns of use. Several of the chapters show steps along this continuum and the continued attempts by archaeologists to find meaning in the landscape bodes well for anthropological maritime archaeology.

Among the most theoretical of the contributors is Christer Westerdahl, whose work has inspired the majority of chapters in this book. His chapter also very honestly traces the development of the concept from a management to interpretative tool

over the past two decades. This development is not unilinear, with one approach replacing the next. A management approach is often interested in quantifying and synthesizing the sites within a given area, and this synthesis can lead to a discussion of process, which will eventually lead to an attempt at explanation and interpretation. Interpretations from a single region can be compared with interpretations of other times and places to conduct maritime ethnography. The resulting improved understanding of maritime culture can advance the management of maritime sites. These patterns reflect the diversity of approaches to archaeology in general and are evident here in the varying applications of the maritime cultural landscape concept. It is worth noting that the chapter by Joe Flatman, which engages one of the most current theoretical concerns, human agency in the archaeological record, was prepared by an archaeologist also deeply involved in the management of maritime sites (Flatman 2009a).

Whether they take a management, interpretative, or combined approach, the authors included here attempt to view the landscape holistically, including all available aspects of culture and environment to reconstruct the landscape and to chart landscape change. This practice mirrors the belief that anthropology is a holistic social science, taking into account all aspects of humanness. This is one of the strengths of the landscape approach and why the study of maritime landscapes has the ability to contribute to underwater archaeology, historical archaeology, and anthropology.

It is my sincere hope that you will fully participate in reading these chapters; that they will inspire you to think about ways to approach the landscape, and that you will find ideas to challenge and ideas that challenge. As David Stewart notes in the Preface, we are still in the formative stages of studying maritime landscapes, and the methods, scope, and contributions of this field are yet to be fully determined. The surest way forward is through reasoned application of a landscape approach to a wide variety of maritime cultures, using multiple theoretical perspectives, and intelligent debate of the outcomes. The reader is encouraged to contribute to every part of this discussion. If we all put our shoulder to the wagon, it may result in a productive trip.

References

- Aberg, Alan, and Carenza Lewis (editors) 2000 *The Rising Tide: Archaeology and Coastal Landscapes*. Oxbow Books, Oxford, UK.
- Anschuetz, Kurt, Wilshusen Richard, and Cherie Scheick 2001 An Archaeology of Landscape: Perspective and Directions. *Journal of Archaeological Research* 9(2):157–211.
- Ascher, Robert 1968 Time's arrow and the archaeology of contemporary community. In *Settlement Archaeology*, K. C. Chang, editor, pp. 43–52. National Press Books, Palo Alto, NM.
- Ash, Aidan 2005 *A Nice Place for a Harbour Or Is It? Investigating a Maritime Cultural Landscape: Port Willunga, South Australia*, Maritime Archaeology Monograph and Report Series, No. 4. Flinders University, Adelaide, South Australia.
- Ashmore, Wendy, and A. Bernard Knapp 1999 *Archaeologies of Landscape*. Blackwell, Malden, MA.
- Baker, Alan R.H. 2003 *Geography and History: Bridging the Divide*. Edited by Alan R.H. Baker, *Cambridge Studies in Historical Geography*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.

- Bass, George 1983 A Plea for Historical Particularism in Nautical Archaeology. In *Shipwreck Anthropology*, Richard A. Gould, editor, pp. 91–104. University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque, NM.
- Breen, Colin, and Paul J. Lane 2004 Archaeological approaches to East Africa's changing seascapes. *World Archaeology* 35(3):469–489.
- Busch, Mette 2006 The Danish coastal landscape, fishery and transport, 1050–1700. In *Fishery, Trade and Piracy: Fishermen and Fishermen's Settlements in and Around the North Sea Area in the Middle Ages and Later*, Marnix Pieters, Frans Verhaeghe and Glenn Gevaert, editors, pp. 195–206. Flemish Heritage Institute, Brussel, BE.
- Cassell, Mark S. and Myron O. Stachiw 2005 Perspectives on Landscapes of Industrial Labor. *Historical Archaeology* 39(3):1–7.
- Cronon, W. 1983 *Changes in the Land: Indians, Colonists and the Ecology of New England*. Hill and Wang, New York, NY.
- Dyson-Bruce, Lynn 2003 Historic Landscape Assessment: The East of England Experience. Paper Product to GIS Delivery. *Journal of GIS in Archaeology* 1:63–72.
- Fairclough, Graham 2006 Large Scale, Long Duration and Broad Perceptions: Scale Issues in Historic Landscape Characterisation. In *Confronting Scale in Archaeology, Issues of Theory and Practice*, Gary Lock and Brian Molyneaux, editors, pp. 203–215. Springer, New York, NY.
- Flatman, Joe 2003 Cultural biographies, cognitive landscapes and dirty old bits of boat: 'theory' in maritime archaeology. *International Journal of Nautical Archaeology* 32(2):143–157.
- Flatman, Joe 2009a Conserving Marine Cultural Heritage: Threats, Risks and Future Priorities. *Conservation and Management of Archaeological Sites* 11(1):5–8.
- Flatman, Joe 2009b Wetting the Fringe of Your Habit: Medieval Monasticism and Coastal Landscapes. In *Landscape Archaeology*, S. Semple, editor. British Archaeological Reports British Series, Oxford, UK.
- Hardesty, Donald L. 2000 Ethnographic Landscapes, Transforming Nature into Culture. In *Preserving Cultural Landscapes in America*, Arnold R. Alanen and Robert Z. Melnick, editors, pp. 169–185. John Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, MD.
- Head, Lesley 2000 *Cultural Landscapes and Environmental Change*. Arnold, London, UK.
- Hoskins, W. G. 1955 *The Making of the English Landscape*. Hodder and Staughton, London, UK.
- Jackson, J. B., P. F. Lewis, D. Lowenthal, D. W. Meinig, M. S. Samuels, D. E. Sopher, and Y.-F. Tuan (editors) 1970 *The Interpretation of Ordinary Landscapes*. Oxford University Press, New York, NY.
- Jones, Eric E. 2006 Using Viewshed Analysis to Explore Settlement Choice: A Case Study of the Onondaga Iroquois. *American Antiquity* 71(3):523–538.
- Lewis, David 1994 *We, the Navigators: The Ancient Art of Landfinding in the Pacific*. Second ed. University of Hawaii Press, Honolulu, HI.
- Martin, Colin J.M. 2000 A Maritime Landscape in East Fife. In *The Rising Tide: Archaeology and Coastal Landscapes*, Alan Aberg and Carenza Lewis, editors, pp. 39–50. Oxbow Books, Oxford, UK.
- McErlean, Thomas, Rosemary McConkey, and Wes Forsythe 2002 *Strangford Lough: An archaeological survey of the maritime cultural landscape*. Northern Ireland Archaeological Monographs No. 6. Environment and Heritage Service, Built Heritage. Blackstaff Press, Belfast, IE.
- McNiven, Ian J. 2003 Saltwater People: spiritscapes, maritime rituals and the archaeology of Australian indigenous seascapes. *World Archaeology* 35(3):329–349.
- Meier, Dirk 2006 *Seafarers, Merchants and Pirates in the Middle Ages*. Boydwell Press, Woodbridge, UK.
- Meinig, D. W. 1979 The Beholding Eye. In *The Interpretation of Ordinary Landscapes*, D. W. Meinig, editor, pp. 32–48. Oxford University Press, New York, NY.
- O'Sullivan, Aidan 2004 Place, memory and identity among estuarine communities: interpreting the archaeology of early medieval fish weirs. *World Archaeology* 35(3):449–468.
- O'Sullivan, Aidan 2005 *Foragers, Farmers and Fishers in a Coastal Landscape*, *Discovery Programme Monographs No. 5*. Royal Irish Academy, Dublin, IE.

- O'Sullivan, Aidan, and Colin Breen 2007 *Maritime Ireland: An Archaeology of Coastal Communities*. Tempus, Gloucestershire, UK.
- Parker, A. J. 1999 A maritime cultural landscape: the port of Bristol in the Middle Ages. *International Journal of Nautical Archaeology* 28(4):323–342.
- Parker, A. J. 2001 Maritime Landscapes. *Landscapes* 1:22–41.
- Pott, Kenneth 1994 Hauling Wind and Heaving Short: Language of the Lakemen. *Anchor News* 25(2):28–33.
- Reinders, Reinder 2001 The Coastal Landscape Between Thermopylai and Demetrias from a Maritime Point of View. In *Tropis VI*, Harry Tzalas, editor, pp. 457–492. Hellenic Institute for the Preservation of Nautical Tradition, Athens, GR.
- Rönby, Johan 2007 Maritime Durées: Long-Term Structure in a Coastal Landscape. *Journal of Maritime Archaeology* 2:65–82.
- Russell, Matthew A., James E. Bradford, and Larry E. Murphy 2004 *E.C. Waters and Development of a Turn-of-the-Century Tourist Economy in Yellowstone National Park*. *Historical Archaeology* 38(4):96–113.
- Samuels, M. S. 1979 The Biography of Landscape. In *The Interpretation of Ordinary Landscapes*, D. W. Meinig, editor, pp. 51–88. Oxford University Press, New York, NY.
- Sauer, Carl O. 1941 Foreword to Historical Geography. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 31(1):1–24.
- Taska, Lucy 2005 The Material Culture of an Industrial Artifact: Interpreting Control, Defiance, and Everyday Resistance at the New South Wales Eveleigh Railway Workshops. *Historical Archaeology* 39(3):8–27.
- Tilley, Christopher 1994 *A Phenomenology of Landscape, Explorations in Anthropology*. Berg, Oxford, UK.
- Welinder, Stig 1997 The Stone Age Landscape of Coastal Southeast Sweden at the Neolithic Transition. In *The Built Environment of Coastal Areas During the Stone Age*, Danuta Król, editor, pp. 87–97. The Archaeological Museum in Gdańsk, Gdańsk, Poland.
- Westerdahl, Christer 1992 The maritime cultural landscape. *International Journal of Nautical Archaeology* 21(1):5–14.
- Westerdahl, Christer 2003 Maritime culture in an inland lake? In *Maritime Heritage*, C.A. Brebbia and T. Gambin, editors, pp. 17–26. WIT Press, Southampton, UK.
- Westerdahl, Christer 2006 The Relationship between Land Roads and Sea Routes in the Past – Some Reflections. *Deutsches Schifffahrtsarchiv* 29:59–114.
- Westerdahl, Christer 2011 Maritime Cultural Landscape. In *Oxford Handbook of Maritime Archaeology*, Alexis Catsambis, Ben Ford, and Donny Hamilton, editors. Oxford University Press, New York, NY.