ULUSLARARASI SOSYAL ARAŞTIRMALAR DERGİSİ
THE JOURNAL OF INTERNATIONAL SOCIAL RESEARCH

Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi/The Journal of International Social Research
Cilt: 17 Sayı: 110 mart 2024 & Volume: 17 Issue: 110 March 2024
Received: March 01, 2024, Manuscript No. jisr-24-130989; Editor assigned: March 04, 2024, Pre-QC No. jisr-24-130989 (PQ); Reviewed: March 18, 2024, QC No. jisr-24-130989; Revised: March 23, 2024, Manuscript No. jisr-24-130989 (R); Published: March 29, 2024, DOI: 10.17719/jisr.2024.130989
www.sosyalarastirmalar.com ISSN: 1307-9581

Geophysics and Geochemistry: An Interdisciplinary Strategy for Archaeology in Wetland Contexts

Demitrios Liokaft*

Abstract

Wetland environments pose unique challenges to archaeological research due to their waterlogged conditions, which can preserve organic materials exceptionally well but also hinder traditional excavation techniques. In recent years, interdisciplinary approaches combining geophysics and geochemistry have emerged as powerful tools for investigating archaeological sites in wetland contexts. This article explores the integration of geophysical survey methods such as ground-penetrating radar (GPR), magnetometry, and electrical resistivity tomography (ERT) with geochemical analyses including sediment coring and isotopic analysis. By synergistically applying these techniques, researchers can obtain a comprehensive understanding of wetland archaeology, uncovering hidden features, mapping subsurface structures, and elucidating past human activities and environmental conditions. This article discusses the theoretical foundations, methodological considerations, and case studies highlighting the effectiveness of geophysics and geochemistry in wetland archaeology. Furthermore, it addresses the challenges and future directions of this interdisciplinary strategy, emphasizing its potential to reshape our understanding of human history and environmental dynamics in wetland landscapes.

Keywords: Wetland archaeology; Geophysics; Geochemistry; Ground-penetrating radar; Magnetometry; Electrical resistivity tomography; Sediment coring; isotopic analysis.

Introduction

Department of Public Health, Liverpool John Moores University, UK, E-mail: d.liokaft@ljmu.ac.uk

Wetland environments, characterized by waterlogged conditions and high organic content, have long fascinated archaeologists due to their exceptional preservation potential [1]. However, traditional archaeological excavation techniques often encounter difficulties in such settings, leading to the loss or deterioration of valuable cultural materials. In recent decades, the integration of geophysical and geochemical methods has revolutionized the study of wetland archaeology, offering non-invasive approaches to investigate subsurface features and environmental dynamics [2]. This article provides an overview of how geophysics and geochemistry are employed synergistically to advance archaeological research in wetland contexts [3].

Theoretical foundations: Geophysical survey methods, including ground-penetrating radar (GPR), magnetometry, and electrical resistivity tomography (ERT), rely on the detection of contrasts in physical properties within the subsurface [4]. GPR utilizes electromagnetic waves to image variations in material composition and density, while magnetometry detects magnetic anomalies associated with buried features such as ditches, pits, and hearths [5]. ERT measures variations in electrical conductivity, revealing subsurface structures based on differences in soil moisture, compaction, or archaeological deposits. These geophysical techniques complement each other, providing multiple lines of evidence for interpreting archaeological features in wetland landscapes. Geochemical analyses, such as sediment coring and isotopic analysis, offer additional insights into past environmental conditions and human activities [6]. Sediment coring allows researchers to recover stratigraphic sequences from wetland deposits, providing a chronological framework for archaeological interpretations. Isotopic analysis of sediment samples can elucidate changes in vegetation, climate, and land use over time, aiding in the reconstruction of past landscapes and human interactions with the environment [7].

Methodological considerations: The application of geophysics and geochemistry in wetland archaeology requires careful consideration of methodological constraints and site-specific conditions. Factors such as water depth, sediment composition, and vegetation cover can affect the efficacy of geophysical surveys and sediment coring. Specialized equipment and techniques may be necessary to adapt these methods to wetland environments, including amphibious vehicles for accessing remote areas and water-proofing measures for electronic instrumentation. Interpreting geophysical data in wetland contexts also presents challenges due to the complex interplay of natural and cultural processes. Ground-trothing through targeted excavation or coring is essential to validate geophysical anomalies and refine archaeological interpretations. Furthermore, integrating geochemical analyses with geophysical survey results enhances the reliability and comprehensiveness of archaeological interpretations, facilitating a holistic understanding of wetland landscapes and human-environment interactions [8-10].

Case studies

Several case studies illustrate the effectiveness of interdisciplinary approaches in wetland archaeology. For example, a study conducted in a coastal marshland utilized GPR and sediment coring to map prehistoric shell middens and reconstruct past sea-level fluctuations. Another project employed magnetometry and isotopic analysis to investigate Iron Age settlements in a peat bog, revealing evidence of ancient land use practices and environmental change.

These examples demonstrate how geophysics and geochemistry can complement traditional excavation methods, providing valuable insights into the archaeological record of wetland environments.

Challenges and future directions: While geophysics and geochemistry offer significant advantages for wetland archaeology, several challenges remain to be addressed. Methodological standardization, data integration, and interdisciplinary collaboration are essential for maximizing the potential of these techniques. Furthermore, advances in technology, such as multi-sensor platforms and remote sensing technologies, hold promise for enhancing the resolution and efficiency of archaeological surveys in wetland contexts. Future research directions may focus on refining analytical techniques, developing predictive models for site location, and exploring the integration of geospatial analysis with geophysical and geochemical data. Additionally, interdisciplinary training programs and knowledge exchange initiatives can foster collaboration between archaeologists, geophysicists, geochemists, and environmental scientists, promoting innovative approaches to wetland archaeology.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the integration of geophysics and geochemistry represents a powerful interdisciplinary strategy for investigating archaeological sites in wetland contexts. By combining non-invasive survey methods with geochemical analyses, researchers can uncover hidden features, map subsurface structures, and reconstruct past human activities and environmental conditions with unprecedented detail. Despite remaining challenges, the synergy between geophysics and geochemistry holds great promise for advancing our understanding of wetland landscapes and their significance in human history.

References

1. Alsancak F, ve Kutlu İ. (2020). Çifte Mağduriyetin Özneleri Olarak Engelli Mültecilere İlişkin Bir İnceleme. Tokat Gaziosmanpaşa Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Araştırmaları Dergisi. 15 (2): 590-598.
2. Arıkan, Ç. (2002). Sosyal Model Çerçevesinde Özürlülüğe Yaklaşım, Ufkun Ötesi Bilim Dergisi, Türkiye Körler Federasyonu Yayını. 2 (1): 11-25.
3. Babaoğlu, C. (2015). Türkiye'de Engelli Politikaları ve Sivil Toplum Örgütlerinin Kentsel Engelli Politikalarına Etkisi: Ankara Örneği, Doktora Tezi. Hacettepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara.
4. Burcu, E. (2015). Engellilik Sosyolojisi. Anı: Ankara.
5. Buckup, S. (2009). *The price of Exclusion: The Economic Consequences of Excluding People with Disabilities from the World of Work. Employment Sector Working Paper No. 43*, ILO, Geneva.
6. CDC, (2022). Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), Developmental Disabilities.

7. Çakran, Ş. ve Eren, V. (2017). *Mülteci Politikası: Avrupa Birliği ve Türkiye Karşılaştırması",* Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi. 14 (39): 1-30.
8. Çondur, F.; Yenipazarlı, A. ve Cömertler, N. (2020). *Engelli İstihdamının Dünyada ve Türkiye'deki Görünümü*, Avrasya Sosyal ve Ekonomi Araştırmaları Dergisi (ASEAD). 7 (5): 347-362.
9. Deniz, T. (2014). *Uluslar Arası Göç Sorunu Perspektifinde Türkiye.* Türkiye Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi.18:1.
10. DHS, (2022). U.S. Department of Homeland Security. *Refugees and Asylees.*