

# Introduction - HUMAN-ENVIRONMENT INTERFACES: ASSESSING THE USE OF PALAEOENVIRONMENTAL INFORMATION IN MEDITERRANEAN LANDSCAPE ARCHAEOLOGY

Kevin Walsh, Tony Brown, Tymon de Haas

## Introduction

The last ten years has seen an enormous increase in the quantity of Mediterranean palaeoenvironmental data from lake archives as well as terrestrial sedimentary archives, (pollen, chemical/elemental/isotope data). This increase in data is partly explained by the development and application of new techniques such as OSL and cosmogenic dating (Brown 2011, Walsh 2014) which allow non-organic archives to be used. However, more often than not, the narratives produced by practitioners in these research specialisms are understandably limited in their engagement with detailed and complex archaeological evidence. An obverse situation characterises “cultural” archaeology, where research is dominated by investigations of monuments and artefacts, or at best, landscape surveys that emphasise the waxing and waning of site numbers; effectively employing these data as proxies for regional economic and demographic cycles. Also, a recent trend has seen the combination of environmental data and basic demographic and site data in the construction of models of environmental change (Roberts et al. 2011; Walsh 2014). Few projects, including such modelling projects, attempt a full integration of environmental evidence within frameworks that identify the “natural” world as an integral element in the construction of, and changes in, culture. In this volume, the authors have reflected on these issues and produced syntheses that try to give equal weight and attention to palaeoenvironmental and cultural-archaeological evidence.

## Rationale for This Special Issue

The publications in this special issue are the product of a session held at the European Association of Archaeologists annual conference held in Istanbul in 2014. The aim of the session was to create a forum where we could discuss recent developments in Mediterranean palaeoenvironmental research, but more specifically, how this research is integrated with archaeological evidence. In some ways, we might conceive of this as the point at which these different forms of data allow us to identify human practices and the concomitant development of environmental knowledge that emerges as mitigation strategies for changes in the environment in the past. By practices and environmental knowledge, we can encompass technologies in their broadest sense, from tools through to landscape management strategies, such as terracing or lake drainage, to mobility and changes in settlement location.

This special issue of JAS Reports presents extended versions of seven of the papers presented in this session. They deal with the full range of Mediterranean landscape-types and time

periods ranging from early prehistory to the Medieval period; they cover a range of related issues from broad-scale climatic processes, down to individual landscape or site-based assessments of human-environment interaction. While the papers may thus seem disparate regarding chronological and geographic scope, data sources and approaches, as a set they illustrate how in very different ways, we can try to integrate environmental and archaeological data to understand the reciprocal links between cultural and environmental change. In this introduction, we will first highlight the variability in data sources and analytical methods that are represented in the papers and then move on to consider some of the key issues in bringing together palaeoenvironmental and cultural-archaeological evidence.

#### Human-environment interactions: Sources and methods

As a first stage in the execution of a geoarchaeological or landscape project, many of us quite justifiably emphasise the importance of well-tested mapping and macro-scopic methodologies: basic landscape description and recording are crucial, especially in areas that have not seen much palaeoenvironmental work. Then, we need to consider landscape-scale taphonomic processes. An important part of any geoarchaeological work should be the elucidation of taphonomic processes with a view to facilitating comprehension and interpretation of sites and landscapes (see Attema this volume). The above work should form the basis for more targeted palaeoecological and/or geoarchaeological research strategies. The study of human relationships with vegetation via pollen, non-pollen palynomorphs (e.g. fungal spores), and charcoal analyses constitute a set of key methodologies and concomitant research issues with which we engage. Compared with more temperate zones, Mediterranean palaeoecological archives are often relatively impoverished due to the semi-arid climate and prevalence of limestone bedrocks. However, there are of course high-quality palynological archives in some Mediterranean environments, and recent research has benefited from the development of relatively cheap chemical and micro-biological techniques to analyse these records.

Several papers in this special issue clearly illustrate the potential offered by these techniques. Revelles discusses the domestication of arable plants and the impact of Neolithic people on surrounding vegetation using palynological evidence from across several associated cores from the Lake Banyoles area (Iberian Peninsula). Glais et al. present palynological and charcoal data from the landscape within which the tell site Dikili Tash (Eastern Macedonia, Greece) is located; and Walsh et al. present an analysis of coring and analytical data from the lake at Stymphalos. Although having a relatively restricted pollen record, in combination with XRF analysis it does provide good insight into the development of the lake and the surrounding landscape which can and were interpreted in a framework aiming to understand the myths associated with the landscape.

Mediterranean landscapes are often susceptible to soil erosion and comprise highly variable topography, for these reasons, the study of changes in topography and sedimentary histories are essential to the investigation of the history of Mediterranean landscapes (Bintliff, 2002; Butzer, 2008; Butzer, 2011; Vita-Finzi, 1969; Walsh, 2014; Brown and Walsh, 2016). The fundamental importance of geoarchaeological approaches to study processes of erosion and

sedimentation in understanding taphonomy, as championed by Karl Butzer (Cordova et al., 2016) is indeed central to Peter Attema's argument, which builds on extensive programs of coring in the coastal plains of the Pontine Region and the Sibaritide in central and Southern Italy. Many of the contributions to this issue (Corrò, De Haas, Krahtopoulou, Walsh, et al.) include some geoarchaeological data, usually acquired through coring programs carried out in collaboration with physical geographers or geologists. Krahtopoulou and Veropoulidou present fieldwork from northern Pieria, Macedonia, Greece, demonstrating the utility of geoarchaeology in reconstructing past coastal configurations, as well as its capacity for informing our understanding of the development ecological niches/habits for certain resources, in this case, marine molluscs. Of particular importance in the contributions by Walsh et al., Corrò and De Haas are the efforts to reconstruct changing hydrological structures, which profoundly affected the development and exploitation of landscapes in positive ways. Cartographic and remote sensing data (followed up by geoarchaeological investigations on the ground) can provide valuable source of information for such reconstructions, which can in turn also help understand how environmental knowledge was used to deal with environmental change.

While a large variety of palaeoenvironmental data are used, the archaeological evidence that the papers draw on is arguably less varied. Some of the papers draw on detailed stratigraphic data from excavations at a single site (e.g., Corrò's discussion of the stratigraphy of Hadria; Walsh et al.'s discussion of Stymphalos), others primarily use either field survey data or regional inventories of (excavated) sites that provide rough chronological and typological information (e.g. de Haas). Mostly, these data are used to relate general settlement developments (e.g., location and number of settlements; extent and layout of cities) to environmental developments with varying degrees of success (e.g. Weiberg et al. 2016). The degree to which such data allow us to go beyond general correlations between palaeoenvironmental and archaeological data is very much dependent on the spatial scale and temporal resolution that both types of data can achieve (see below; cf. Lawrence et al. 2015; Contreras 2017). Extremely useful additional information, often neglected, can be drawn from written sources – either 'historical' or 'mythical'. Although such data should be used with caution, some papers (e.g., Walsh et al., De Haas) clearly show how they may inform us on the mythology, perceptions and knowledge of past landscapes. For historical periods, these are clearly underused sources (cf. Traina 1988).

Integrating environmental and archaeological data: spatial and temporal Scales

One methodological, or strategic issue that we all have to engage with is that of scale: i.e. the spatial and temporal scales at which our data operate. A frank assessment of these scales is fundamental if our aim is to integrate different palaeoenvironmental data with archaeological evidence. At a temporal scale, all of the papers adopt a long-term perspective and consider phases of environmental processes or human activities (in a generic-sense) rather than events; even those focusing on a specific period (e.g., Revelles on the Neolithic, De Haas on the Roman Republican period) still discuss data that represent developments that span centuries if not millennia. The spatial resolution of our different data have the potential to become precise and corroborative if we can directly correlate an environmental phase with

an archaeological event (i.e. an archaeological context such as the construction of flood defence feature, or the movement of a site away from a zone that became susceptible to flooding). At the same time, some of the papers show that the chronological resolution of both environmental and archaeological phases is increasing, so that settlement phases and environmental changes can be pinpointed in time, as is the case for the hydrological changes to the Pontine plain as discussed by De Haas. Equally, environmental data as analysed through ITRAX/XRF scanning also has the potential to look at change and variability at a very fine-grained scale although its ultimate resolution is still limited by the dating method used. Nonetheless, this technique offers the possibility to combine assessments of long-term developments with short-term events and look at the interactions between processes working on different time scales.

With regard to the spatial scale, we can equally note that the papers address issues operating at different scales, from local to global. Thus, several papers (Walsh et al., Corrà and Mozzi, Glais et al.) explore human-environment interfaces at a local landscape scale (e.g., in the context of a single site and its direct surroundings), where the nature and scale of human manipulation of the environment is all the more intense and complex. Others explore regional (De Haas, Revelles, Krahtopoulou) and supra-regional (Attema) contexts.

The issue of scale-transfer, or more specifically up-scaling, where data derived from a local context (e.g. a specific lake or site) are employed in or integrated with broader scale micro-regional analyses is one topic that is addressed. The relationship between long-term settlement strands and changes vis a vis environmental processes is dealt with by Corrà & Mozzi in their study of the city of Adria (Po Delta, Italy) and relationships with changes in palaeohydrographic processes, in particular, alluviation. The need for local, archaeological site-orientated geoarchaeology and palaeoenvironmental work is recognised as key for the investigation of spatially and temporally specific forms of environmental knowledge, and some of the papers in this issue engage with this issue (e.g. de Haas). Whereas some papers consider long-term processes, others consider quite specific locales and aim to assess temporally focused phenomena (e.g. Brown and Walsh, Attema). Unsurprisingly, much of research takes place in rural areas (for a number of reasons), however, ever-increasing urbanisation underpins the story of Mediterranean civilisations. Nevertheless, some contributions address the issue of environmental processes in urban contexts (Corrà & Mozzi). Integrating different scales and data, Glais et al. demonstrate the importance of comparing off-site palynological and charcoal evidence with on-site archaeobotanical data. This approach allows them to consider the patchy or mosaic nature of activities across a landscape over time. The papers here take different approaches to integrating data scales from multiple sites and areas to more detailed process-related interpretation.

Frameworks of integration: degradationism, stability and sustainability

Thankfully, we appear to have moved away from simplistic degradationist and catastrophist narratives (see Morhange, 2013 for a useful discussion), and now explicitly consider cycles of human-environment interactions. However, many of us almost intuitively look for periods of change – environmental, societal etc. This theme or narrative is in some ways linked with

mono-causal deterministic 'grand' narratives (which have worryingly become fashionable once again in certain quarters). However, while the study of *changes and ruptures* is essential, we should also be looking to assess periods of stability explicitly, and the associated forms of environmental knowledge and management; the exploitation of coastal plains as discussed by both Attema and De Haas is a good example of how exceptional such phases of stability can actually be. Although we might want to question current trends in popular environmental discourse, the notions of *sustainability*, *resilience* and *persistence* can contribute to a useful theoretical framework that allows us to address the development of different societies' environmental knowledge and environmental mitigation strategies. Historical Ecology, via all of its various constitutive threads (including political and social ecology) provides a framework that facilitates the integration of cultural and environmental evidence with a view to investigating the ways in which environmental and socio-cultural processes interact. Ultimately, our aim is to move beyond mere descriptions of exploitation patterns or human/climatic impact on a landscape, but assess how political, cultural, mythological phenomena all influence, or are influenced by our relationship with the environment. As noted above, our ability to do this is often controlled by the temporal and/or spatial resolution of our data, but also by our willingness to move beyond traditional or established discourse and narratives. As argued earlier, as well as assessing periods of change and rupture (e.g. points in our records where we see a change in settlement pattern, a change in erosion or a change in vegetation, we should also discuss periods of stability). If we accept Balée's postulate that historical ecology can be compared with nonequilibrium dynamic theory (Balée, 2006), then this fits with our notion that a diachronic perspective of human-environment relationship should consider the fluctuations in environmental and societal processes that in many instances will constitute forms of resilience and in some instances, offer examples of sustainable practices. Sustainable implies that a form of steady-state can be maintained, while resilience acknowledges that a system (or set of socio-ecological processes) comprises elements that fluctuate, but that the overall system can manage such fluctuations or disequilibrium; i.e. the capacity of a system to adjust to fluctuations, but still remain productive (Gunderson and Holling, 2002; Walker et al., 2004). Sustainability can take many years/generations to develop as it is underpinned by appropriate and successful forms of environmental knowledge (Tainter, 2006). Therefore sustainability does not just take the form of adequate net primary production (NPP) of a system, but all its economic and sociocultural constitutive elements, as an emphasis on NPP (cf. Fischer-Kowalski and Haberl, 2007) produces a reductionist and functionalist approach to past human societies based on a false analogy with human metabolism. Alternatively we can consider the development of persistent artificial niches (Laland and O'Brien, 2010; McClure, 2015; Odling-Smee et al., 2013; Brown et al., 2017) which can have selective advantage and so be related to eco-cultural change. If justification for the full integration of archaeological-historical-social evidence with palaeoenvironmental data is still required, we should remember that resilience wains as societies apply notionally optimal management strategies to a landscapes. Such rigidity can render a system susceptible to shocks and disturbances (Walker and Salt, 2006). Therefore, the only legitimate approach to the study of human-environment interactions is that which

combines palaeoenvironmental and archaeological evidence with a view to assessing activities and practices (Redman, 2005).

One approach might be to consider whether we can identify different "stakeholders" in the past, i.e. groups of people with different interests in an environment. For example, pastoralists might not be worried that the waste produced by their herds feeds into a lake, while fishermen would find this problematic should eutrophication occur. Different parts of the environment and their management are linked via socio-economic structures, if not every, but many clouds do have silver linings! Resilience will suffer if a socio-economic and ideological system becomes too monolithic (Scheffer et al., 2002). Can we see variation in evidence for activities and even practices across similar environment types within a region, and might this suggest forms of local knowledge that are an integral element in a resilient socio-ecological system (Berkes and Folke, 2002). For example, certain humanly-created ecological niches, such as Mediterranean cork oak woodland, require continued human input to maintain them, (Bugalho et al., 2011) and these may have long histories. A similar example is Dehesa pasture; an excellent example of a sustainable resource that has its origins dating back many centuries (Stevenson and Harrison, 1992).

## Conclusion

The set of papers published in this special issue, although disparate in their approaches, provide useful case studies that illustrate various potential approaches to integrating of palaeoenvironmental and archaeological data at different spatial and temporal scales. They highlight how by incorporating more traditional and new research techniques, recent research offers increasingly fine-grained insight into the interplay between archaeological and environmental datasets, and we feel that this integration still holds much potential to answer existing questions and pose new ones. Taken together these papers show how new questions are being asked of the data in addition to the more traditional or commonly addressed issues across the Mediterranean; a set of unique socio-cultural landscapes where the richness of our datasets provides us with the potential to engage with some of the more complex issues. In particular, we hope that colleagues will engage with some of the notions outlined above relating to Historical Ecology and evidence for resilience and sustainability, for multiple complex forms of human-environmental interactions that were not mere responses to the vagaries of the natural world, but socio-ecological configurations that were the product of complex understandings of the environment founded on economic imperatives as well as political, cultural and ideological frameworks.

## References

- Balée, W., 2006. The Research Program of Historical Ecology. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 35, 75-98.
- Balossi Restelli, F, L Sadori and A Masi, 2010. Agriculture at Arslantepe at the end of the IV millennium BC. Did the centralised political institutions have an influence on farming practices? Economic centralisation in formative states. *The archaeological reconstruction of the economic system in 4th millennium Arslantepe. Studi di Preistoria Orientale (SPO)* 3:103-118.

Berkes, F., Folke, C., 2002. Back to the Future: Ecosystem Dynamics and Local Knowledge, in: Gunderson, L.H., Holling, C.S. (Eds.), *Panarchy: Understanding transformations in human and natural systems*. Island Press, Washington, pp. 121-146.

Bintliff, J., 2002. Time, process and catastrophism in the study of Mediterranean alluvial history: a review. *World Archaeology* 33, 417-435.

Broodbank, C. 2013. *The Making of the Middle Sea: A History of the Mediterranean from the Beginning to the Emergence of the Classical World*. Oxford University Press, Incorporated.

Brown, A.G. 2011. Dating of surfaces and sediments. In K. J. Gregory and A.S. Goudie (Eds.) *SAGE Handbook of Geomorphology*, SAGE London, 192-209.

Brown, A. G. and Walsh, K. 2016. Societal Stability and Environmental Change: Examining the Archaeology – Soil Erosion Paradox. *Geoarchaeology* 32, 23-35.

Brown, A. G., Basell, L. S. and Farbstein, R. 2017. Eels, beavers and horses: Human niche construction in the European Late Upper Palaeolithic. *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society* 87 (in press)

Bugalho, M.N., Caldeira, M.C., Pereira, J.S., Aronson, J., Pausas, J.G., 2011. Mediterranean cork oak savannas require human use to sustain biodiversity and ecosystem services. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment* 9, 278-286.

Butzer, K.W., 2008. Challenges for a cross-disciplinary geoarchaeology: The intersection between environmental history and geomorphology. *Geomorphology* 101, 402-411.

Butzer, K.W., 2011. Geoarchaeology, climate change, sustainability: a Mediterranean perspective. *Geoarchaeology, climate change, and sustainability. Geol Soc Am Special Paper* 476, 1-14.

Contreras, Daniel. 2017. *The Archaeology of Human-Environment Interactions: Strategies for Investigating Anthropogenic Landscapes, Dynamic Environments, and Climate Change in the Human Past*. Routledge

Cordova, C., Brown, A.G. and Rosen, A. 2016. Geoarchaeology, Environment, and Societal Stability: Karl W. Butzer's Legacy *Geoarchaeology* 32, 2-5.

Ejsmond, Wojciech 2013. Some remarks on topography of Gebelein archaeological site complex in Pre-and Early Dynastic Period. *Göttinger Miszellen: Beiträge zur ägyptologischen Diskussion* (239):31-42.

Fischer-Kowalski, M., Haberl, H. (eds.). 2007. Socioecological Transitions and Global Change. Trajectories of Social Metabolism and Land Use. In "Advances in Ecological Economics," series editor: Jeroen van den Bergh. Edward Elgar, Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, USA.

Gunderson, L.H., Holling, C.S., 2002. Panarchy: Understanding transformations in human and natural systems. Island Press, Washington.

Laland, K., O'Brien, M., 2010. Niche Construction Theory and Archaeology. *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory* 17, 303-322.

Lawrence, D., Philip, G., Wilkinson, K., Buylaert, J., Murray, S., Thompson, W., Wilkinson, T. 2015. Regional power and local ecologies: Accumulated population trends and human impacts in the northern Fertile Crescent. *Quaternary International* [doi [10.1016/j.quaint.2015.06.026](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.quaint.2015.06.026)]

Masi, Alessia, Laura Sadori, Francesca Balossi Restelli, Ilaria Baneschi and Giovanni Zanchetta, 2013. Stable carbon isotope analysis as a crop management indicator at Arslantepe (Malatya, Turkey) during the Late Chalcolithic and Early Bronze Age. *Vegetation History and Archaeobotany*:1-10.

McClure, S.B., 2015. The Pastoral Effect: Niche Construction, Domestic Animals, and the Spread of Farming in Europe. *Current Anthropology* 56, 901-910.

Morhange, C., Marriner, N., Bony, G., Carayon, N., Flux, C., Shah-Hosseini, M., 2013. Coastal geoarchaeology and neocatastrophism: a dangerous liaison? *BYZAS, DAI, Istanbul*.

Odling-Smee, F.J., Laland, K.N., Feldman, M.W., 2013. *Niche Construction: The Neglected Process in Evolution (MPB-37)*. Princeton University Press.

Panagiotakopulu, Eva, Thomas Higham, Anaya Sarpaki, Paul Buckland and Christos Doulas, 2013. Ancient pests: the season of the Santorini Minoan volcanic eruption and a date from insect chitin. *Naturwissenschaften* 100(7):683-689.

Redman, C.L., 2005. Resilience Theory in Archaeology. *American Anthropologist* 107, 70-77.

Roberts, N, Eastwood, W.J., Kuzucuoglu, C., Fiorentino, G., Caracuta, V. 2011. Climatic, vegetation and cultural change in the eastern Mediterranean during the mid-Holocene transition. *Holocene* 21, 147162.

Scheffer, M., Westley, F., Brock, W.A., Holmgren, M., 2002. Dynamic Interaction of Societies and Ecosystems - Linking Theories from Ecology, Economy and Sociology, in: Gunderson, L.H., Holling, C.S. (Eds.), *Panarchy: Understanding transformations in human and natural systems*. Island Press, Washington, pp. 195-239.



Stevenson, A.C., Harrison, R.J., 1992. Ancient forests of Spain. A model for land-use and dry forest management in south west Spain from 4000 AD to 1900 AD. *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society* 58, 227-247.

Tainter, J.A., 2006. Social complexity and sustainability. *Ecological Complexity* 3, 91-103.

Traina, Giusto 1988 *Paludi e bonifiche del Mondo Antico*, Rome.

Vita-Finzi, C., 1969. *The Mediterranean Valleys: Geological Changes in Historical Times*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Walker, B., Holling, C.S., Carpenter, S.R., Kinzig, A., 2004. Resilience, Adaptability and Transformability in Social-ecological Systems. *Ecology and Society* 9, 5-5.

Walker, B.H., Salt, D.A., 2006. *Resilience Thinking: Sustaining Ecosystems And People in a Changing World*. Island Press, Washington D.C.

Walsh, Kevin 2014 *The Archaeology of Mediterranean Landscapes: Human-Environment Interaction from the Neolithic to the Roman Period*. CUP.

Weiberg, E., Unkel, I., Kouli, K., Holmgren, K., Avramidis, P., Bonnier, A., Dibble, F., Finné, M., Izdebski, A., Katrantsiotis, C., Stocker, S.R., Andwinge, M., Baika, K., Boyd, M., Heymann, C., 2016. The socio-environmental history of the Peloponnese during the Holocene: Towards an integrated understanding of the past. *Quaternary Science Reviews* 136, 40-65.