

Historical archaeology

© Copyright Bruce Owen 2009

- How is it different from prehistoric archaeology?
 - written records
- Why do it, then?
 - to check and correct historical accounts
 - Battle of Little Big Horn example
 - Plymouth Plantation example, many others
 - to fill in information not recorded in history
 - about poor, slaves, or other people that no one wrote about
 - about aspects of daily life that no one wrote about
 - about things people were not even conscious of
 - examples: Monticello slave quarters, Plymouth Plantation
 - example: ASC Oakland and San Francisco excavations
 - example: the CSS Hunley submarine
 - to check archaeological methods against written records
 - example: ASC Oakland and San Francisco excavations
 - how well does pottery really reflect household wealth or status?
- Some roles or themes of historical archaeology
 - tends to be post-processual, symbolic, emphasizing ideology (or “ideation”: ways of thinking)
 - because it can contrast archaeological evidence of what actually happened
 - with written evidence of how people thought it happened
 - this is particularly good for seeing how ideology masks reality
 - as in oppression of certain classes or ethnicities
 - as in convenient myths that justify behavior or glorify ones’ own group
 - often looks at
 - colonialism
 - especially the reality of the colonized vs. the history written by the colonizers
 - early capitalism, industry, etc.
 - again, reality of plantations, factories, etc. vs. written views of the capitalists
 - slavery and immigrant groups
 - again, reality of these groups vs. written sources at the time
 - also vs. modern “national myths” or “national ideology”
 - as in the “national myth” that the northern US colonies like New York were not built on slavery
 - using critical theory
 - an orientation towards stripping away the self-serving myths of modern ideology of the dominant sectors of society
 - emphasizing how ideology masks exploitation
 - seeking to expose this and to change it