

Deposit modeling for archaeological projects: methods, practice and future developments

Chris Carey¹, Andy J. Howard^{2,3}, Jane Corcoran⁴, David Knight⁵, Jen Heathcote⁶

¹ School of Environment and Technology, University of Brighton, Lewes Road, Brighton, BN2 4GJ, United Kingdom

² Landscape Research & Management, Stanmore, Bridgnorth, WV15 5JG, United Kingdom

³ Department of Archaeology, University of Durham, South Road, Durham, DH1 3LE, United Kingdom

⁴ Jane Corcoran, Historic England, 195-205 High Street, Eastgate Court, Guildford, GU1 3EH, United Kingdom

⁵ David Knight, Trent & Peak Archaeology, York Archaeological Trust, 47 Aldwark, York, YO1 7BX, United Kingdom

⁶ Jen Heathcote, Historic England, The Engine House, Fire Fly Avenue, Swindon, SN2 2EH, United Kingdom

Abstract: This paper considers the application of deposit modeling within archaeological projects, summarizing the results of a Historic England funded project aimed at developing ‘good practice’ for the application of these techniques within terrestrial environments. It provides an overview of what deposit modeling is, the environments where it can be used and the methods most commonly employed. The paper identifies a series of issues and challenges in using deposit models within archaeological investigations, such as the archiving of geotechnical data, the testing of deposit models against the distribution of archaeological sites and features, and integrating sediment stratigraphies derived from deposit modeling with post-excavation records. We argue that deposit modeling is a valuable tool for archaeologists to employ and can be used to design appropriate excavation strategies to target sites and features, thereby increasing the information yield of a

1
2
3 project. In this sense deposit modeling can be used as a framework for archaeological projects that
4
5 are investigating sediment sequences in complex geomorphological environments, starting with pre-
6
7 evaluation data gathering, through to focusing excavation strategies, and within post-excavation
8
9 analysis. Whilst this paper is focused upon the terrestrial archaeological record, the themes
10
11 discussed have resonance for archaeological records across the globe, including the offshore zone.
12
13
14
15
16

17 **KEY WORDS** deposit modeling, geoarchaeology, sediment stratigraphy, archaeological mitigation
18
19
20
21
22

23 **Introduction**

24
25

26 Deposit modeling is a term that is familiar to both archaeologists and geoarchaeologists alike,
27
28 however, what deposit modeling actually is within an archaeological project and which techniques
29
30 and methods are suitable, as well as data requirements, have witnessed little debate both within the
31
32 practitioner and research communities (Carey et al. 2018). This is a curious situation, given that
33
34 most archaeological remains (sites, features and artefacts) are stratified within and beneath
35
36 sedimentary deposits that have accumulated through a combination of anthropogenic and natural
37
38 processes (Barker, 1993, Price et al., 2011;). The deposition of these sediment contexts can occur
39
40 over a range of timescales and across numerous geomorphic terrains (aeolian, colluvial, alluvial),
41
42 often resulting in highly complex, deeply stratified sequences (e.g. Howard et al., 2003, and papers
43
44 therein, Schott 2017). Therefore, understanding the spatial distribution and preservation potential
45
46 of archaeological remains requires knowledge of the 3-dimensional geoarchaeological sediment
47
48 architecture of sites, which can only be visualized and achieved through some form of deposit
49
50 modeling.
51
52
53

54 From an archaeological perspective, deposit modeling is one of the more commonly utilized
55
56 methodological approaches undertaken by geoarchaeologists. These approaches have been
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 developed for archaeological applications, but derive from the principles of stratigraphic analysis
4
5 developed in the geological sciences by pioneers such as William Smith (1769-1839), and are now
6
7 utilized at much larger scales in the oil and gas industries (e.g. Nwankwo, et al. 2014), although
8
9 refined for modeling of sediment bodies deposited within the Quaternary (e.g. Brown et al. 2015).
10
11 In archaeological projects, the application of deposit modeling has been utilized within terrestrial
12
13 (e.g. Champness 2018), intertidal (e.g. Krawiec 2018) and marine environments (e.g. Bicket and
14
15 Tizzard, 2015). Within a UK context the application of deposit modeling is increasing, especially
16
17 associated with developer-funded archaeological projects (see Burton et al., 2011, Carey et al., 2017;
18
19 Carey et al., 2018 and articles therein). Likewise, there are multiple examples of deposit models
20
21 published internationally often to provide the wider landscape context of significant archaeological
22
23 sites (e.g. Pastre et al., 2014, Ames & Cordova, 2015, Ayala et al., 2017), or to advance aspects of
24
25 heritage management (Amato et al., 2018; Mozzi et al., 2018), although they can be referred to as
26
27 landscape evolution models or geological models, rather than deposit models *per se*. Given this
28
29 increasing application of geoarchaeological deposit modeling within archaeology, either for research
30
31 driven projects or as part of mitigation and heritage management frameworks, it is timely to review
32
33 what deposit modeling is, the practices and methods being utilized, the challenges ahead and to
34
35 consider what is 'good practice' and to promote the development of this technique.
36
37

38
39 The themes explored in this paper derive from a Historic England funded project entitled '*Deposit*
40
41 *Modeling for Archaeological Projects*', which sought to bring together an invited group of modeling
42
43 practitioners and other key stakeholders with a vested interest in the methodologies, for example,
44
45 archaeological consultants and heritage managers; to this end, a workshop was held in London in
46
47 the summer of 2016. The workshop sought the views, experiences and methodologies used by
48
49 invited delegates with the data captured through a series of presentations and roundtable
50
51 discussions. Points raised in the discussions are synthesized here but it is not the intention of this
52
53 paper to focus on individual sites and detail of their methodologies since these aspects are covered
54
55 by the technical monograph edited as part of the project (Carey et al., 2018); rather this paper
56
57 aims
58
59
60

1
2
3 to horizon-scan to bring deposit modeling to the fore in order to promote discussion regarding its
4 application and consider the challenges ahead. Furthermore, with funding from Historic England
5 and the remit of the project, the focus of the workshop was unavoidably focused on England and
6 deposit modeling practices in terrestrial environs. However, the issues, principles and experiences
7 described here have generic relevance for archaeologists seeking to apply deposit modeling
8 methodologies across the globe, including offshore submerged landscapes.
9
10
11
12
13
14
15

16 At the outset of this paper, it is worth considering that whilst it may not be obvious,
17 geoarchaeologists and archaeologists take different, but complimentary approaches to site
18 investigation. At a broad level geoarchaeologists study the formation of sediments, landscape
19 evolution and the role of anthropogenic and natural drivers of environmental change (Howard and
20 Macklin, 1999, Canti et al., 2015), whereas archaeologists study sites, features and artefacts to
21 elucidate the dynamics of past societies. Part of the reason for the limited application of deposit
22 modeling within archaeological projects is likely to be at least partly a function of this divide and the
23 contrast between the approach of the arts and the sciences to the study of the record, and the
24 scales at which geoarchaeologists and archaeologists investigate; with the exception of
25 micromorphologists, the former tend to work at the meso- and macro-scale (i.e. landscape evolution
26 and drivers of environmental change) whereas the latter work typically work at a smaller scale,
27 including the microscale (i.e. site-, to feature-, to context-scale). It is inescapable that any
28 archaeologists during an excavation must recover artefacts from within a sediment unit (Renfrew,
29 1976), whether this is anthropogenically derived (e.g. a fill or a deposit) or naturally deposited (e.g.
30 alluvium). This difference in the scales and types of approaches has previously led to some
31 difficulties in stitching together these two ends of the archaeological spectrum, an issue explored
32 further below. Furthermore, deposit modeling is a process that can inform the interpretation of
33 excavated deposits and from the outset provides a framework for site investigation strategies,
34 particularly in environments that have deep vertical or laterally accreted sediments (>1m) of
35 Holocene and Pleistocene age (Sidell et al., 2000, Passmore et al., 2006, Carey et al., 2017).
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Deposit modeling: a definition

Deposit modeling is not a new technique and builds upon well-established techniques used by the wider geological science community. Within the Historic Environment sector, it has been applied to further understand archaeological records within a variety of terrestrial environments including peatlands (Chapman & Gearey, 2013), river valleys (Bates & Bates, 2000, Brown et al., 2005, Bates & Stafford, 2013) and urban settings (Neal, 2014, Amato et al., 2018, Mozzi et al., 2018), although in some investigations the analysis and visualization of sedimentary sequences is not directly referred to as an archaeological deposit model. They also form a staple part of the corpus of data produced by marine archaeologists during the investigations of now submerged landscapes both in northern Europe (e.g. Bicket and Tizzard, 2015) and more globally (Bailey et al., 2015). Whether on land or beneath the sea, the principle aim of these models is to characterize sub-surface sediment stratigraphy in order to understand geomorphological landscape evolution and to elucidate archaeological sites and their records. From a heritage management perspective, this allows an inference to be made about archaeological potential based on a sound knowledge of the sub-surface topography and sediment architecture, depositional environments and patterns of erosion and sedimentation.

From this viewpoint deposit modeling must make a prediction of the sub-surface environment using more than one piece of data or single data point (Figure 1). For example, deposit models will commonly model a sediment unit or bounding surface using multiple data points derived from borehole logs or geophysical data. These data points provide a discontinuous spread of information across a given study area, but can be correlated and extrapolated so that key sediment units or surfaces can be interpolated from the known points. Whilst such an approach has applicability in a variety of depositional environments, it is most commonly applied in situations where thick (>1m) sediment sequences have formed (see Carey et al. 2018).

1
2
3 Geoarchaeological deposit models in both terrestrial and marine environments can range in
4 application and complexity. They can be as simple as identifying areas of a site with different
5 sediment characteristics or determining the relationship between two stratified deposit sequences.
6
7 At the opposite end of the spectrum, complex deposit models have been developed, utilizing
8
9 purposive boreholes, sometimes coupled with airborne and/or terrestrial remote sensing
10
11 technologies to identify patterns of sedimentation, landform evolution, paleo-landsurfaces, where
12
13 cultural or environmental archaeological remains may be preferentially preserved, for example
14
15 within and at the margins of paleochannels, within or upon buried gravel islands and elevated
16
17 terrace surfaces (e.g. Carey and Knight 2018). However, whilst geoarchaeological deposit models are
18
19 inherently grounded in conventional archaeological approaches (primarily understanding
20
21 stratigraphy), their full potential has yet to be realized in either commercial or research spheres.
22
23 Importantly, terrestrial deposit models are often seen as additional to an archaeological project,
24
25 rather than the underlying framework through which to design evaluation and mitigation strategies
26
27 and decision making. This observation, drawn for terrestrial environments, is in contrast to the
28
29 marine environment where mapping key landform assemblages and the internal stratigraphy and
30
31 hence cultural and environmental potential provide the starting point for any subsequent
32
33 archaeological investigations (Cowrie, 2011), due to the inherent difficulty in accessing these
34
35 sediment sequences and their associated archaeological records.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 **Where should a deposit model be constructed within the archaeological process?**

45
46
47 Deposit modeling provides an understanding of site stratigraphy and landscape evolution, and in
48
49 turn, allows an assessment of the probable distribution and preservation potential of archaeological
50
51 remains before costly and intrusive excavations take place. Such knowledge is an essential
52
53 prerequisite to any project design, informing the scale and type of resources needed; therefore, it
54
55 has the potential to reduce overall financial costs, both to archaeologists and funders. Deposit
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 models can guide the investigation strategy at an individual site-scale, or, can make sense of larger
4 datasets and disparate data, illustrate archaeological potential and provide a context for
5 archaeological remains within a wider area. Therefore, a deposit modeling framework should be
6 seen as the first step within the archaeological investigation, ideally initiated at desk-based
7 assessment (DBA) stage, but something that can utilized throughout the life cycle of a project,
8 providing a framework for pre-evaluation, excavation and post-excavation stages (Figure 2).
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17

18 **Depositional and erosional environments, and the archaeological process**

19
20
21 All archaeological projects, whether undertaken in the commercial or research sector start with the
22 same fundamental question: 'where are the archaeological sites and features located within the
23 study area?' (Chapman, 2006, 10). In terms of archaeological site investigation strategies, a
24 simplified but useful way to envisage the housing of archaeological resources is within two different
25 types of environment: those where sediments are built up primarily through vertical and lateral
26 accretion and hence archaeology is usually buried either as *in-situ* (primary) or secondary remains,
27 and; those which erode, with archaeology located as primary remains directly on an eroded
28 landform or preserved within cut features. Whilst this simple division has significant ramifications
29 for archaeological preservation and site investigation strategies, the archaeological reality of this
30 division is not always recognized.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 The ability to identify archaeological sites located within generally erosive environments, which are
44 geologically simple terrain units and landforms such as calcareous bedrock (the classic dryland
45 context), or incised terrace surfaces, has witnessed a long history of archaeological development and
46 investigation. A variety of airborne and terrestrial geoprospection techniques have been applied in
47 such environments that can detect archaeological remains upon or close to the modern ground
48 surface beneath shallow soils. For many decades vertical and oblique photography formed the
49 backbone of airborne techniques (e.g. St Joseph, 1977), but in recent years lidar together with a
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 suite of multispectral and hyperspectral remote sensing technologies have come to the fore (Challis
4 and Howard, 2006; Rowlands and Sarris, 2007; Donneus et al., 2014). These airborne techniques
5 have been allied with the development of ground-based prospection techniques such as
6
7 gradiometer survey, earth resistance survey (Gaffney, 2008; David et al. 2008) and higher frequency
8
9 ground-penetrating radar (Conyers, 2004). Within the terrestrial sphere, such geophysical
10
11 techniques can be considered shallow prospection methodologies, with a limited depth penetration
12
13 beneath the current ground surface (of c. 1m). Whilst they have an undoubted proven track record
14
15 for detecting archaeological sites and features beneath shallow soils, cut into or on the surface of
16
17 bedrock and erosional landforms, they cannot be used to detect archaeological remains greater than
18
19 1m depth.
20
21
22
23

24 Deposit modeling then, is an approach that is applicable to these accreting depositional
25
26 environments where sediments build up including urban areas, floodplains, inter-tidal and offshore
27
28 submerged landscapes, and can aid prediction of where archaeological remains will occur, both
29
30 spatially and temporally (Howard et al., 2008). In turn, this can inform the assessment of
31
32 preservation potential both from a physical (Howard and Macklin, 1999) and geochemical
33
34 perspective (Holden et al., 2006, De Beer and Seither, 2015, Malim et al., 2016). In this case, sub-
35
36 surface investigation strategies such as borehole logging and deep geophysical survey techniques
37
38 (electromagnetic conductivity surveys, electrical resistivity surveys, cone penetration tests, lower
39
40 frequency ground penetrating radar, sonar), analyze the stratigraphic and topographic variation of
41
42 the sub-surface sediment architectures. The analysis of these datasets allows key geomorphological
43
44 features to be modeled, such as paleochannels, buried gravel islands and elevated terraces
45
46 (Passmore et al., 2002), and sub-surface interfaces, such as paleo-landsurfaces and paleosols (e.g.
47
48 Chapman et al., 2009) and an appreciation of the depositional environments at the transition of
49
50 drylands and wetlands in terrestrial contexts (e.g. French 2003, 7). Likewise, in marine contexts the
51
52 available geophysical tools afford a significant depth penetration and hence capability for
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 geoprosection to identify major landform assemblages and map paleo-landscapes (e.g. Gaffney et
4
5 al. (eds) 2007; Ward 2015).
6
7
8
9

10 **Methods and approaches to deposit modeling**

11
12
13
14 In both terrestrial and marine environments, the methods used to investigate sub-surface
15
16 stratigraphy can usefully be divided into techniques that sample and log the sediments directly
17
18 (boreholes and gouge augering) and those that provide proxy measurements of the sub-surface
19
20 sediment architecture and stratigraphy (geophysical survey methods). Such proxy measurements of
21
22 the subsurface sequence, by phenomena such as conductivity or resistivity, require a two stage
23
24 interpretative process. Firstly, the measured property has to be interpreted as a sediment type and
25
26 landform (e.g. a gravel terrace, fine-grained sediment infilling a paleochannel), and these interpreted
27
28 units have to be integrated within the wider deposit model. Conversely, with boreholes and gouge
29
30 augering the sub-surface sediments are directly sampled and described, and these sediment units
31
32 are placed into a wider stratigraphical framework for the study area.
33
34

35
36 In terrestrial environments, methods that have been applied to directly investigate vertically and
37
38 laterally accreted sediment stacks to elucidate their archaeological potential include cone
39
40 penetration testing (e.g. Bates et al., 2007), electromagnetic conductivity surveys (e.g. Verhagge et
41
42 al., 2017), borehole surveys (e.g. S e et al., 2017), electrical resistivity surveys (Ellwood et al., 1993)
43
44 and ground penetrating radar surveys (Carey et al., 2006). In addition high resolution
45
46 geomorphological mapping has been used to characterize landform assemblages at the current
47
48 ground surface, which in turn, can be related to sub-surface landform architecture (Passmore et al.,
49
50 2002). It is critical that the methods applied are sympathetic to the environments in question, such
51
52 as the depth penetration of a given technique, or the amount of time required for capture data.
53

54 However, in all cases it is recommended that any geophysical survey of the sub-surface environment
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 is complemented by the analysis of purposive boreholes (Figure 3). These boreholes, which might
4
5 have been commissioned especially for the project or derived from older archived geological records
6
7 (for example, the BGS GeoIndex [<http://www.bgs.ac.uk/geoindex/>]) will allow refinement of the
8
9 interpretation of the geophysical data sets and increase the confidence of the deposit model.
10

11 12 13 14 15 **Key issues with using deposit models**

16
17
18 As discussed, the current project brought together geoarchaeological deposit modeling practitioners
19
20 from across England, to discuss the use and application of deposit modeling. Whilst the results are
21
22 derived from the perspective of geoarchaeologists who work in England within primarily terrestrial
23
24 and inter-tidal environments, the issues raised have applicability to any archaeologist undertaking
25
26 deposit modeling.
27

28 29 *1. Archiving geoarchaeological data generated by deposit modeling*

30
31
32 Borehole information is the most commonly used data type for construction of deposit models,
33
34 whether in commercial or research spheres. Part of the reason for this is the availability of pre-
35
36 existing geotechnical data, freely available via open-access repositories such as the National
37
38 Geoscience Data Centre of the British Geological
39
40 Survey(<http://www.bgs.ac.uk/data/boreholescans/home.html>). However, there is no mandatory
41
42 requirement or, perhaps more significantly, culture, of geoarchaeological contractors and
43
44 researchers working within the terrestrial sphere of archiving their records with the BGS or indeed
45
46 other central repositories collating data relating to the historic (geological) environment, for
47
48 example local authority Historic Environment Records (HERs) and the Archaeological Data Service
49
50 (ADS). Consequently, failure to encourage geoarchaeologists to directly deposit their archives with
51
52 established organizations and the lack of a bespoke central repository or database for
53
54 geoarchaeological site investigations, including deposits models, means that many new studies are
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 taken without, or with limited knowledge of previous investigations. Such a data repository could be
4 digital, holding the paper records of the sediment logs for any boreholes from terrestrial
5 archaeological projects and their xyz location. In contrast, archaeologists working in offshore
6 environments participate in the Marine Environmental and Information Data Network (MEDIN;
7 http://www.oceannet.org/data_submission/ads/), which provides a framework and conduit for the
8 archiving of geoarchaeological datasets. Closer collaboration between terrestrial and marine
9 workers could provide a starting point for discussion of a similar framework for land-based
10 interventions. The lack of using such a central repository within terrestrial environments is
11 problematic when geoarchaeologists move beyond the site scale, into looking at wider deposition
12 patterns and processes, e.g. floodplain evolution and alluvial deposition across river reaches. Often,
13 the value of an archaeological site can only be appreciated when it is witnessed in context of its
14 wider depositional and archaeological environment, and if the data sets to construct such models
15 are not accessible then such opportunities are lost or limited.

2. *Variable uptake of deposit modeling across the archaeological sector*

36 Beyond the marine environment, there has been a variable uptake of deposit modeling in terrestrial
37 environments across the archaeological community, part of which is a consequence in differences in
38 archaeological traditions between countries and regions. For example, the Netherlands have a
39 tradition of using statistical predictive modeling techniques to investigate archaeological
40 distributions across landscapes (Verhagen and Whitley, 2012), whilst in the UK, geoarchaeologists
41 have developed approaches to infer the distribution of deep, accreted sediments and
42 geomorphological categorization of study areas (e.g. Passmore et al., 2002). Within England, which
43 has an established tradition of geoarchaeological practice, our project demonstrated that there has
44 been a variable uptake in deposit modeling, with the majority of collated case studies coming from
45 the south-east of the country. Part of this pattern can be explained by the distribution of
46 individuals

1
2
3 with key skill-sets and experience of deposit modeling and the presence of large archaeological
4
5 consultancies with specialist geoarchaeological teams (with experience of deposit modeling), which
6
7 in turn, helps to shape curatorial knowledge and inform the drafting of Written Schemes of
8
9 Investigation and project briefs (e.g. Sidell et al., 2000, Bates & Stafford, 2013); furthermore, the
10
11 pace of development in the south-east where large-scale construction projects allied to major
12
13 regeneration schemes are in progress, for example the area of Nines Elms of south London where
14
15 the new American Embassy has been built, undoubtedly provide large budgets that allow innovation
16
17 thinking (Stevenson, 2018).
18
19
20
21
22

23 *3. Integrating deposit models into archaeological excavation protocols*

24
25

26 Within archaeological projects there can be difficulty in integrating data derived from the
27
28 geoarchaeological analysis of landforms and sedimentary sequences (within a deposit model), to the
29
30 often narrower focus of the area of archaeological intervention. The degree of difficulty is a product
31
32 of multiple factors, but the scale of the archaeological excavation and the complexity of the
33
34 geomorphological evolution in the study area are critical factors. Interestingly, there has been very
35
36 little specifically published on this subject, (although of course there are many archaeological
37
38 publications that include a geoarchaeological landscape analysis), and this could be can be taken as
39
40 an indication of limited integration between the two different fields of study. Related to this, many
41
42 field archaeologists are often unaware of how the results from a deposit model feed into the
43
44 recording of excavation data. In this situation it is essential for the constructor of the deposit model,
45
46 usually a geoarchaeologist, to work directly alongside an excavation team in recording the
47
48 contextual data; this provides an opportunity for the deposit model to be refined in the light of
49
50 excavation data, and feed into the interpretation and recording of archaeological contexts.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 However, there are also more technical issues to integrating deposit modeling data further into
4 archaeological excavation recording. Many of the sediment units recorded by geoarchaeologists are
5 diachronous in their formation and can often form over long time periods, in some cases, thousands
6 of years. These form the physical matrix that human activities are played out on and ultimately
7 encased within, and are also the processes that bury and preserve these archaeological sites.
8
9 Conversely, archaeologists are generally dealing with sediment deposits that have formed over
10 much shorter time periods, such as pit cuts and fills. These two different timescales meet when the
11 shorter-lived human contexts (events, e.g. a pit cut and fill sequence) interact within the longer
12 forming diachronous sediment units (e.g. alluvium). Consequently, archaeologists and
13 geoarchaeologists who are investigating the same site are approaching the investigation of sediment
14 architecture and stratigraphy from opposing ends of a chronological spectrum. Given the longevity
15 of the formation of some sediment units, they can often cause a stratigraphic inversion of the
16 archaeological Harris Matrix, when they are modeled together, and this provides a barrier to a
17 seamless integration of both data types. A hypothetical example of this would be a homogeneous
18 thick alluvial unit, which is cut by a Neolithic pit in one part of a study area, but buries a Bronze Age
19 house in another part of the study area, causing a stratigraphic inversion on a single site matrix.
20
21 Delegates at the deposit modeling workshop were unified in the need for geoarchaeologists and
22 archaeologists to improve dialogue over the scales of the investigation they are working at and the
23 methods that can be used to further integrate different recording techniques. Likewise, there was a
24 perceived need for the promotion of the principles of geoarchaeology within UK degree programs
25 and to consider not only how these relate to archaeological site formation, but how it be integrated
26 into archaeological field excavation protocols.
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 *4. Evaluation of techniques that have been applied to construct archaeological deposit models*
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Although many techniques and methods had been utilized to construct deposit models, there has
4
5 been little evaluation of the techniques within a deposit modeling context, and this lack of rigorous
6
7 review leads to confusion. For example, curatorial archaeologists who attended the workshop
8
9 commented that when drafting a project brief for a terrestrial development-led archaeological
10
11 investigation, they could not specify which was the most appropriate deposit modeling methodology
12
13 to be used since this information is currently not available, although within England (Historic
14
15 England) regional science advisors can be consulted. Within an English context, since most deposit
16
17 models are often constructed as part of a planning process, there are not sufficient resources to
18
19 collect multiple data sets for comparative purposes, within a competitive tendering environment.
20
21 Ultimately, this comparison of techniques must be driven from a research perspective, in order to
22
23 compare the efficacy of different methods and approaches within different depositional
24
25 environments.
26
27
28
29
30

31 *5. Lack of reporting of deposit models against archaeological realities*

32
33 Allied to the previous point, there has also been a lack of reporting of the results of deposit models
34
35 against excavated (archaeological) realities. As previously discussed, although deposit models are
36
37 being increasingly utilized within archaeological investigations, the success of such approaches is
38
39 rarely reviewed in the context of subsequently excavated sites. The publication of a deposit model
40
41 tested against evaluation trenching at a quarry site on the valley floor of the River Lugg
42
43 Herefordshire (Carey et al. 2017) provides one of the few examples prior to the Historic England
44
45 funded project; now, additional case studies are provided by individual chapters within the
46
47 accompanying technical monograph (Carey et al., 2018). However, the papers described above
48
49 should be seen as the starting point for a developing critique of deposit models, which includes a
50
51 greater assessment of both successes but also failures, so that confidence can be placed in their use
52
53 and methodologies further refined.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Outputs from deposit models

Deposit models collect data using a range of methods, but also utilize a variety of softwares and techniques to interrogate and finally display these data sets. Illustrations that demonstrate the relationship of sedimentary units to each other can take the form of cross sections, analogous to more conventional archaeological sections drawings. Such sections can be drawn in bespoke software such as Rockworks or within illustration packages from hand drawn versions (e.g. Illustrator). Likewise, illustrations from the deposit models are often plan based showing modeled surfaces or thickness of deposits and these are often formed within a GIS based system (e.g. ARCGIS) or bespoke modeling software (e.g. Rockworks).

A section demonstrates a two dimensional representation of sediment stratigraphy over the site and can be used to represent the thickness of any unit represented in the section (Figure 4); comparatively, a surface produced within a GIS based system models the interfaces between two or more surfaces, e.g. the top of the river terrace gravel, and as such define the surface or interface of a sediment body as height below ground level or as an interpolated unit thickness (Figure 5).

However, both methods are effectively a 2D reconstruction of sub-surface environments.

A general consensus reached during the workshop was for any reporting on the deposit model must include plans and identify key surfaces but also to provide a representative cross section. Key sediment units require definition and description and are essential in the reporting stage, with the data included as an appendix. This allows not only the graphical representations to be viewed, but also the interpretation of the key surfaces and how they have been derived from the original data, and the results to be reproduced if desired.

The future of deposit modeling

1
2
3 It is clear that deposit models are a useful part of the archaeological process and an essential tool of
4 the archaeologist. With any archaeological project that is investigating complex sedimentary
5 environments, a deposit model is an essential first step in the project that will allow resources to be
6 focused on the areas of highest archaeological potential. In the post-excavation stages they provide
7 the wider landscape narrative of the site and its evolution, and in this sense provide the vehicle for
8 the context and framework for the whole archaeological process. Consequently, a deposit model
9 should ideally be one of the first considerations in any archaeological project.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17

18 With a deposit model in place archaeological resources can be directed to where they are most
19 needed. Without a deposit model, designing evaluation trenching strategies is problematic and can
20 often dig 'blind', in order to test if archaeology is present in the study area. The percentage of the
21 land take used for the evaluation strategy is often 5% within a UK planning process context, based
22 on simulation approaches of remodeling existing archaeological data sets (Hey and Lacey 2001). In
23 the archaeological world, where money and resources are often limited, evaluation trenching is best
24 used to evaluate what archaeology is present in areas of significant potential, rather than testing
25 whether any archaeological remains are present (Carey et al., 2017). Deposit modeling allows a first
26 approximation of archaeological distribution to be tested and in doing so reduces the burden of
27 evaluation trenching and allows a greater focus on mitigation excavation. This not only saves time
28 and money but it also increases the archaeological product from any project. With deposit modeling
29 increasing in its application and scale, there is a further need to assess the methods used in
30 archaeological deposit modeling, to investigate the successes or otherwise of the practices
31 undertaken.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 With continuing advances in archaeological scientific methods being reported in journals such as
49 'Journal of Archaeological Science' and 'Geoarchaeology', it is clear that there are increasingly
50 sophisticated suite of techniques that are being used to investigate the richness of the
51 archaeological record. Geoarchaeological approaches are particularly well-suited to this task, as
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 techniques can be targeted to different spatial and temporal scales, providing an integrated or
4
5 nested analysis of the archaeological remains and its environs. These techniques are working from
6
7 the macro-scale (landscapes), through to the site scale (*in-situ* measurements and analysis) through
8
9 to the micro-scale (micromorphology, artefact analysis, etc). In this sense deposit modeling is an
10
11 approach that we consider to be integral to allowing these different scales of investigation to be
12
13 drawn into a more seamless whole, and provide an overall context for the investigation of the
14
15 archaeological record within archaeologically-rich, but geomorphologically complex, deep
16
17 sedimentary systems.
18
19
20
21
22

23 **Acknowledgements**

24
25
26 The concept of this paper and much of its content is derived from the Historic England sponsored
27
28 project awarded to the authors entitled 'Deposit modeling for archaeological projects: a review of
29
30 good practice' (Project Number 7257); the authors gratefully acknowledge the support of Historic
31
32 England throughout the process and in particular, Dr Jane Sidell and Hannah Fluck as 'critical
33
34 friends'. The authors also wish to thank all of the archaeologists who attended the project workshop
35
36 in London (June 2016) and contributed their views and experiences to the discussions. Finally, the
37
38 authors acknowledge the comments of Dr Andrew Bicket and two other anonymous referees whose
39
40 reviews improve the revised manuscript.
41
42
43
44
45

46 **Bibliography**

47
48 Ames, C. J. H. and Cordova, C. E. 2015. Middle and Late Pleistocene Landscape Evolution at the
49
50 Druze Marsh Site in Northeast Jordan: Implications for Population Continuity and Hominin Dispersal.
51
52 *Geoarchaeology*, 30:4, pp. 307 – 329.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Amato, V., Ciarcia, S., Rossi, A. and Santoriello, A. 2018. The urban geoarchaeology of Benevento,
4 southern Italy: Evaluating archaeological potential. *Geoarchaeology*, 33, pp. 100–111.
5
6
7
8 Ayala, G., Wainwright, J., Walker, J., Hodara, R., Lloyd, J. M., Leng, M. Doherty, C. 2017.
9
10 Palaeoenvironmental reconstruction of the alluvial landscape of Neolithic Çatalhöyük, central
11 southern Turkey: the implications for early agriculture and responses to environmental change.
12
13 *Journal of Archaeological Science*, 87, pp. 30-43.
14
15
16
17 Bailey, G. N., Devès, M. H., Inglis, R. H., Meredith-Williams, M. G., Momber, G., Sakellariou, D.,
18
19 Sinclair, A. G. M., Rousakis, G., Al Ghamdi, S. and Alsharekh, A. M. 2015. Blue Arabia: Palaeolithic and
20
21 underwater survey in SW Saudi Arabia and the role of coasts in Pleistocene dispersal. *Quaternary*
22
23 *International*, 282, pp. 42–57.
24
25
26
27 Barker, P. 1993. *Techniques of archaeological excavation*. Routledge: London.
28
29
30
31 Bates, M. and Stafford, E. 2013. *Thames Holocene: A geoarchaeological approach to the*
32
33 *investigation of the river floodplain for High Speed 1, 1994–2003*. Oxford Wessex Archaeology
34
35 monograph, Oxbow: Oxford.
36
37
38
39 Bates, M. R., Bates, C. and Whittaker, J. E. 2007. Mixed method approaches to the investigation and
40
41 mapping of buried Quaternary deposits: examples from southern England. *Archaeological*
42
43 *Prospection*, 14, pp. 104 – 129.
44
45
46
47
48 Bates, M. R. and Bates, C. R. 2000. Multidisciplinary approaches to geoarchaeological evaluation of
49
50 deeply stratified sedimentary sequences: examples from Pleistocene and Holocene deposits in
51
52 Southern England, United Kingdom. *Journal of Archaeological Science*, 27, pp. 845 – 858.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60 Bicket, A. and Tizzard, I. 2015. A review of the submerged prehistory and palaeolandscapes of the
British Isles. *Proceedings of the Geologists' Association*, 126 (6), pp. 643-663.

1
2
3 Brown, A. G., Bassel, L. S. and Toms, P. S. 2015. A stacked Late Quaternary fluvio-periglacial
4 sequence from the Axe valley, southern England with implications for landscape evolution and
5 Palaeolithic archaeology. *Quaternary Science Reviews*, 116, pp. 106-121
6
7

8
9
10 Brown, A.G., Hatton, J., Pearson, L. Roseff, R. and Jackson, R. 2005. The Severn-Wye revisited:
11 Lateglacial-Holocene floodplain palaeoenvironments in the Lugg Valley, in Smith, D.N., Brickley, M.B.
12 & Smith, W. (eds). *Fertile Ground: Papers in Honour of Susan Limbrey. Symposia of the Association*
13 *for Environmental Archaeology no 22*, pp. 16-29. Oxbow Books: Oxford.
14
15
16

17
18
19 Burton, E., Corcoran, J., Halsey, C., Spurr, G. and Burton, P. J. 2011. *Mapping Past Landscapes in the*
20 *Lower Lea Valley*. MOLAS: London.
21
22

23
24 Canti, M., Corcoran, J., Ayala, G., Heathcote, J., Usai, R. and Sidell, J. 2015. *Geoarchaeology - Using*
25 *Earth Sciences to Understand the Archaeological Record*. Historic England: London.
26
27

28
29 Carey, C., Corcoran, J., Howard, A., Knight D. and Heathcote, J. (eds). 2018. *Deposit modeling for*
30 *archaeological projects*. Short Run Press: Exeter.
31
32

33
34 Carey, C. J. and Knight, D. 2018. Grove Farm, Nottingham: modeling the alluvial sequence of the
35 Middle Trent Valley, in C Carey, J Corcoran, A Howard, D Knight and J Heathcote, (eds), *Deposit*
36 *modeling for archaeological projects*, pp. 69-84 Short Run Press: Exeter.
37
38
39

40
41 Carey, C., Howard, A., Jackson, R. and Brown, A. 2017. Using geoarchaeological deposit modeling as
42 a framework for archaeological evaluation and mitigation in alluvial environments. *Journal of*
43 *Archaeological Science: Reports*, 11. pp. 658-673.
44
45
46

47
48 Carey, C. J., Brown, A. G., Challis, K. C., Howard, A. H. and Cooper, I. 2006. Predictive modeling of
49 multiperiod geoarchaeological resources at a river confluence: a case study from the Trent–Soar, UK.
50 *Archaeological Prospection*, 13:4, pp. 241 – 250.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Challis, K. and Howard, A. J. 2006. A review of trends within archaeological remote sensing in alluvial
4 environments. *Archaeological Prospection*, 13, pp. 231 – 240.
5
6

7
8 Champness, C. 2018. Bexhill to Hastings link road, East Sussex: a geoarchaeological deposit model
9 on the Comve Haven and surrounding valley sequences, in, C Carey, J Corcoran, A Howard, D Knight
10 and J Heathcote, (eds), *Deposit modeling for archaeological projects*, pp. 53-66. Short Run Press:
11
12
13 Exeter
14
15

16
17 Chapman, H. 2006. *Landscape archaeology and GIS*. Stroud: Tempus.
18

19
20 Chapman, H.P. and Gearey, B.R. 2013. *Modeling Archaeology and Palaeoenvironments in Wetlands*.
21
22 Oxford: Oxbow Books.
23

24
25 Chapman, H., Adcock, J. and Gater, J. 2009. An approach to mapping buried prehistoric palaeosols
26 of the Atlantic seaboard in Northwest Europe using GPS, geoarchaeology and GIS and the
27 implications for heritage management. *Journal of archaeological Science*, 36, pp. 2308 – 2313.
28
29

30
31 Conyers, L. B. 2004. *Ground penetrating radar for archaeologists*. California: Left Coast Press.
32
33

34
35 Cowrie, 2011. *Offshore Geotechnical Investigations and Historic Environment Analysis: Guidance for*
36
37 *the Renewable Energy Sector Final Report January 2011*. Cowrie.
38

39
40 David, A., Linford, N. and Linford, P. 2008. *Geophysical survey in archaeological field evaluation*.
41
42 Swindon: English Heritage.
43

44
45 De Beer, H. and Seither, A. 2015. Groundwater balance, in J Rytter and I Schonhowdl (eds),
46
47 *Monitoring, Mitigation, Management: The Groundwater Project – Safeguarding the World Heritage*
48
49 *Site of Bryggen in Bergen*. Oslo: Riksantikvaren
50

51
52 Doneus, M., Verhoeven, G., Atzbergerd, C., Wess, M. and Ruš, M. 2014. New ways to extract
53
54 archaeological information from hyperspectral pixels. *Journal of Archaeological Science*, 52, pp. 84-
55
56 96.
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Ellwood, B. B., Harrold, F. B., Petruso, K. M. and Korkuti, M. 1993. Electrical resistivity surveys as
4 indicators of site potential: Examples from a rock shelter in Southwestern France and a cave in
5 Southern Albania, *Geoarchaeology*, 8:3, pp. 217 – 227.
6
7

8
9
10 French C. 2003. *Geoarchaeology in Action*. Chapter 7 The Fengate Shore, Lower Nene Valley and
11 Flag Fen basin, Cambridgeshire, England. Routledge: London.
12
13

14
15 Gaffney, C. F. 2008. Detecting trends in prospecting for the past: fifty years of geophysical survey.
16 *Archaeometry*, 50, pp. 313-336.
17
18

19
20 Gaffney, V., Thomsen, K. and Fitch, S. (eds) 2007. *Mapping Doggerland: The Mesolithic Landscapes*
21 *of the Southern North Sea*. Archaeopress: Oxford.
22
23

24
25 Hey, G. and Lacey, M. 2001. *Evaluation of archaeological decision-making processes and sampling*
26 *strategies*. Kent County Council: Kent.
27
28

29
30 Holden, J., West, L. J., Howard, A. J., Maxfield, E., Panter, I. and Oxley, J. 2006. Hydrological controls
31 of in situ preservation of waterlogged archaeological deposits. *Earth-Science Reviews*, 78:1-2, pp.
32 59-83.
33
34

35
36
37 Howard, A., Brown, A., Carey, C., Challis, K., Cooper, L., Kinsey, M. and Toms, P. 2008. Archaeological
38 resource modeling in temperate river valleys: a case study from the Trent Valley, UK. *Antiquity*,
39 82:318, pp. 1040-1054.
40
41

42
43
44 Howard, A.J., Macklin, M.G., Passmore, D.G. (Eds). 2003. *Alluvial Archaeology in Europe*. Balkema:
45 Abingdon.
46
47

48
49 Howard, A.J. and Macklin, M.G. 1999. A generic geomorphological approach to archaeological
50 interpretation and prospection in British river valleys: a guide for archaeologists investigating
51 Holocene landscapes. *Antiquity*, 73: 281, pp. 527-541.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Krawiec, K. 2018. Medmerry managed realignment scheme, West Sussex: a Holocene deposit
4 model of a coastal environment, in C Carey, J Corcoran, A Howard, D Knight and J Heathcote,
5 (eds), *Deposit modeling for archaeological projects*, pp. 149-158. Short Run Press: Exeter.
6
7
8

9
10 Malim, T., Swain, M., and Panter. I. 2016. Monitoring and Management options in the preservation
11 of urban waterlogged deposits, Nantwich, UK. *Conservation and Management of Archaeological*
12 *Sites*, 18 (1–3), pp. 139–55.
13
14
15

16
17 Mozzi, P., Ferrarese, F., Zangrando, D., Gamba, M., Vigoni, A., Sainati, C., Fontana, A., Ninfo, A.,
18 Piovan, S., Rossato, S. and Veronese, F. 2018 The modeling of archaeological and geomorphic
19 surfaces in a multi-stratified urban site in Padua, Italy. *Geoarchaeology*, 33, pp. 67–84
20
21
22

23
24 Nwankwo, C. N., Anyanwu, J., and Ugwu, S. A. 2014. Integration of seismic and well log data for
25 petrop[ysical modeling of sandstone hydrocarbon reservoir in Niger Delta. *Scientia Africana*, 13 (1),
26 pp. 186-199.
27
28
29

30
31 Neal, C. 2014. The potential of integrated urban deposit modeling as a cultural heritage planning
32 tool. *Planning practice and research*, 29:3, pp. 256 – 257.
33
34
35

36
37 Passmore, D.G., Waddington, C. and van der Schriek, T., 2006. Enhancing the evaluation and
38 management of river valley archaeology: geoarchaeology, in the Till-Tweed catchment, northern
39 England. *Archaeological Prospection*, 13, pp. 269-281.
40
41
42

43
44 Passmore, D. G., Waddington, C. and Houghton, S. J. 2002. Geoarchaeology of the Millfield basin,
45 Norther England; towards an integrated archaeological prospection, research and management
46 framework. *Archaeological Prospection*, 9, pp. 71 – 91.
47
48
49

50
51 Pastre, J.-F., Leroyer, C., Limondin-Lozouet, P., Antoine, P., Chaussé, C., Gauthier, A., Granai, S., Le
52 Jeune, Y., and Wuscher, P. 2014. The Holocene evolution of the Patis Basin (France). Contribution of
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 geocology and geoarchaeology of floodplains, in Arnaud-Fassetta, G. and Carcaud, N. (Eds.) 2014.

4 *French Geoarchaeology in the 21st Century*. CNRS Editions, Paris, pp. 87-104.

6
7
8 Price, S., Ford, J., Cooper, A., and Neal, C. 2011. Humans as major geological and geomorphological

9 agents in the Anthropocene: The significance of artificial ground in Great Britain. *Philosophical*

10 *Transactions of the Royal Society A*, 369, pp. 1056–1084.

11
12
13
14 Renfrew, A. C. 1976. Introduction, in Davidson, D. A., and M. L. Shackley (eds), *Geoarchaeology*.

15 *Geoarchaeology: Earth Science and the Past*. Duckworth: London.

16
17
18
19 Rowlands, A. and Sarris, A. 2007. Detection of exposed and subsurface archaeological remains using

20 multi-sensor remote sensing. *Journal of Archaeological Science*, 34, pp. 795-803.

21
22
23
24 Schott, A. M. 2017. Site Formation Processes and Depositional Environment of a Fine-Grained

25 Alluvial Floodplain at La Playa Archaeology Site, Sonora, Mexico. *Geoarchaeology*, 32:2, pp. 283 –

26
27
28
29
30 301.

31
32
33 Sidell, J. Wilkinson, K., Scaife, R. and Cameron, N. 2000. *The Holocene Evolution of the London*

34 *Thames*. Museum of London Archaeology Monograph 5, London.

35
36 Sjøe, N. E., Odgaard, V. B., Hertz, E. and Holst, M. K. 2017. Geomorphological setting of a sacred

37 landscape: Iron age post battle deposition of human remains at Alken Enge, Denmark.

38
39
40 *Geoarchaeology*, 32 (5) , pp. 521 – 533.

41
42
43 Stevenson, M. 2018. A planning development management perspective: deposit modeling in south

44 London, in C Carey, J Corcoran, A Howard, D Knight and J Heathcote, (eds) , *Deposit modeling for*

45
46
47 *archaeological projects*, pp. 205-218. Short Run Press: Exeter.

48
49
50 St Joseph, J. K. S. 1977. *Uses of air photography*. A & C Black Publishers Ltd: New York.

51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Verhagge, J., Saey, T., Van Miervenne, M. and Missiaen, T. 2017. Reconstructing Early Neolithic
4
5 Paleogeography: EMI-Based Subsurface Modeling and Chronological Modeling of Holocene Peat
6
7 below the Lower Scheldt Floodplain in NW Belgium. *Geoarchaeology*, 32 (2), pp. 159 – 176.
8
9

10 Verhagen, P. and Whitley, T. G. 2012. Integrating archaeological theory and predictive modeling: a
11
12 live report from the scene. *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory*, 19, pp. 49 – 100.
13
14

15 Ward, I. 2015. Depositional Context as the Foundation to Determining the Palaeolithic and
16
17 Mesolithic Archaeological Potential of Offshore Wind Farm Areas in the Southern North Sea.
18
19 *Conservation and Management of Archaeological Sites*, 16 (3), pp. 212-235.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 1: An example of a deposit model, showing below ground surface sediment deposits of a River Valley, modeled as pseudo 3D solid units using Rockworks.

161x125mm (300 x 300 DPI)




Figure 2: Position of deposit modeling within the archaeological process.

174x156mm (300 x 300 DPI)




Figure 3: Chertsey Abbey Meads survey on the River Thames floodplain, showing electrical conductivity data collected using an EM31, and location of the purposive boreholes conducted for the deposit model, to ground truth the conductivity variations evident.

210x148mm (300 x 300 DPI)




Figure 4: Two cross sections from deposit models. Top: Heslington East Deposit Model, York, UK, modeling a set of complex Holocene deposits above Pleistocene sands, derived from powered terrier cores and
 Bottom: Lanacombe Deposit Model Exmoor, UK, mapping a paleosol and Pleistocene Head deposits underneath the current peat deposits, derived from gouge core data.

207x144mm (300 x 300 DPI)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 5: Deposit model at Grove Farm Nottingham, located on the River Trent floodplain showing, Top: Upper surface of the modeled River Terrace Sands and Gravels showing a lower area centre/right of surface (paleochannel), and bottom: the upper surface of fine grained, organic rich, paleochannel sediments infilling this depression in the River Terrace Sands and Gravels.

297x420mm (300 x 300 DPI)