

CREATION
COMMUNICATION
CIRCULATION
CONSUMPTION



VISUALISATION IN ARCHAEOLOGY: **WORKSHOP**
UNIVERSITY
OF
SOUTHAMPTON
21-22 OCTOBER
2010



PROGRAMME

Wednesday 19 October 2010

Evening meal

Thursday 21 October 2010

08.00 – 09.00 Registration and coffee

09.00 – 09.15 Welcome: Professor Stephanie Moser

09.15 – 09.30 Opening Address: Sara Perry

09.15 – 10.30 **Session One**

Refreshments

11.00 – 12.30 **Session One**

Lunch

14.00 – 15.30 **Session Two**

Refreshments

16.00 – 17.30 **Session Two**

19.00 Evening meal

Friday 22 October 2010

08.00 – 09.00 Registration and coffee

09.00 – 10.30 **Session Three**

Refreshments

11.00 – 12.30 **Session Three**

Lunch

14.00 – 15.30 **Session Four**

Refreshments

16.00 – 17.30 **Session Four**



Organising Committee

Professor Stephanie Moser, University of Southampton

Garry Gibbons, University of Southampton

Dr Simon James, University of Leicester

Professor Sam Smiles, University of Plymouth

Sara Perry, University of Southampton



ENGLISH HERITAGE

Visualisation in Archaeology

funded by

English Heritage

under the HEPP scheme

SESSIONS & POSITION STATEMENTS

THURSDAY 21 OCTOBER 2010

Session One

CREATION

Chair: **Dr Simon James**

Simon James
University of Leicester, Leicester, United Kingdom

Introduction

Kelvin Wilson
Archaeological Illustrator and Visual Consultant, The Netherlands

This Is Not Archaeology

Nessa Leibhammer
Johannesburg Art Gallery, South Africa

Position Statement

Angela Piccini
University of Bristol, Bristol, United Kingdom

Visualisation and Materiality

Kate Giles and Anthony Masinton
University of York, York, United Kingdom

Position Statement

Jason Quinlan
Çatalhöyük Project Team

Position Statement



Session Two

COMMUNICATION

Chair: **Professor Sam Smiles**

Sam Smiles
Emeritus Professor of Art History, Tate Research Fellow 2009-12

Introduction

Sudeshna Guha
Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, University of Cambridge, United Kingdom

Archaeology, Photography and Communicating Histories

Gemma Tully
Department of Archaeology, University of Southampton, United Kingdom

Reconfiguring the Past: Contemporary Art as Archaeological Interpretation

Timothy Webmoor
Institute of Science, Innovation and Society, Said Business School, University of Oxford, United Kingdom

Fixing Evidence: Coordination Work and Visual Ontologies

Ian Russell
John Nicholas Brown Center for Public Humanities and Cultural Heritage, Brown University/Humanities Institute of Ireland, University College Dublin

Contemporary Antiquarianism

SESSIONS & POSITION STATEMENTS

FRIDAY 22 OCTOBER 2010

Session Three

CIRCULATION

Chair: **Professor Stephanie Moser**

Stephanie Moser

Department of Archaeology, University of Southampton, United Kingdom

Introduction: Journeys of the Archaeological Image

Andrew Jones

Department of Archaeology, University of Southampton, United Kingdom

Re-envisioning the Archaeological Report

Helen Wickstead

Kingston University, London, United Kingdom

art+archaeology: Starting with Drawing

Martyn Barber

English Heritage, United Kingdom

Aerial Visions: New histories of aerial archaeology

John Swogger

Archaeological Illustrator, United Kingdom

Frontiers of Engagement: Communicating Archaeology through Comics.

Janet Hodgson

Film Maker, United Kingdom

A Rather Brief Unity in Time...

Sara Perry

Department of Archaeology, University of Southampton, United Kingdom

The Rewards of Archaeological Visual Media: Founding London's Institute of Archaeology

Session Four

CONSUMPTION

Chair: **Dr Graeme Earl**

Graeme Earl

University of Southampton, Southampton, United Kingdom

Introduction

Konstantinos (Costas) Papadopoulos

University of Southampton, Southampton, United Kingdom

Virtual (Re)Constructions: Embedding Visualisation in the Interpretative Process

Alice Watterson

Glasgow School of Art, Glasgow, United Kingdom

Visualising the Ceremonial Complex at Forteviot

Tom Frankland

University of Southampton, Southampton, United Kingdom

Reception of Different Stylistic Representations of Archaeological Sites

Justine Wintjes

University of the Witwatersrand, South Africa

The eBusingatha Puzzle: The Digital Restoration of a Painted Rock Shelter

SESSION 1: CREATION

THURSDAY 21 OCTOBER 2010

Simon James

University of Leicester, Leicester, United Kingdom

Introduction

An important thread running through the VIA seminars has looked beyond consideration of the multiple ways in which visualisation facilitates transmission of archaeological data, knowledge and ideas. It has also examined how visualisation techniques and processes may be integral to the creation of data and knowledge, to the generation of ideas, and to the conduct of archaeological discourse and debate. These aspects remain to be fully explored, and are themes which will be further illuminated in this session which spans a broad range of traditional and still-developing visualisation media. The view of visualisation as comprising active, reactive and interactive processes integral to the doing of much archaeology raises further questions, which touch on matters of responsibility for those commissioning and creating imagery. There are pretty clear rules—more accurately, accepted practices—surrounding composition and deployment of verbal or written discourse in archaeology, which even after 30 years of post-processualism, still generally eschew the emotive. But are we as clear about the responsible, even ethical, use of visual images, which besides transmitting information processed discursively, also work subliminally, bypassing discursive consciousness and appealing to the emotions? How do we deal with these matters, in a discipline which remains strongly 'text-bound', but which operates in a world of proliferating, new visualisation media?



SESSION 1: CREATION

THURSDAY 21 OCTOBER 2010

Kelvin Wilson

Archaeological Illustrator and Visual Consultant, The Netherlands

This Is Not Archaeology

I am an archaeological reconstruction artist. My public role is to provide images that explain the science. However, should the discussion come to the responsibility of such images, I will play the devil's advocate and shrug that I am-, and always was an artist first: the way I view my job is to communicate ideas, and to use every means possible. And yes, that is including those perhaps irresponsible yet proven to be effective... To maintain my attachment to the wonderful practice of archaeology, though, I shall set out how this unfortunate misunderstanding has come about. I shall explain why images are made, how they should be read, and then, how easily the context to understand this is lost in reproduction. Finally I hope to open up an unexplored vista for archaeological imagery; for if reconstruction art has hitherto been one-tracked on archaeology, seeing it as primarily a method of communication can perhaps open up many fine new ways of expression.



SESSION 1: CREATION

THURSDAY 21 OCTOBER 2010

Nessa Leibhammer

Johannesburg Art Gallery, South Africa

Position Statement

My involvement with archaeological illustration has two foci – my work on images associated with the archaeological excavation at Çatalhöyük, Turkey in 1997/8 and an ongoing interest in rock art images from southern Africa. As the curator of the traditional (also referred to as anthropological or ethnographic) art at the Johannesburg Art Gallery, these two foci fall within my larger interest in the (re)presentations of cultures that are not in a position to represent themselves either because they no longer exist or because they are not in a position to mobilise the necessary resources to do so.

In these three fields the recognition of 'artifice' in the production of knowledge through pictographic languages, and those of display, are well established. However, while conventions of pictographic images that assert 'certainty' are well established in archaeological imaging, it remains to be debated how, and if, registers of 'uncertainty' and 'creativity' can be meaningfully exploited. It is in these spaces that the imaginary and the emotive are most active. My work explores representational modes beyond the 'technical' and reflects on whether any of these are useful for thinking about archaeological imaging.

SESSION 1: CREATION

THURSDAY 21 OCTOBER 2010

Angela Piccini

University of Bristol, Bristol, United Kingdom

Visualisation and Materiality

In addition to important questions about the ways in which visualisation technologies produce archaeology as knowledge, as subject, as discipline we might consider the transmediality of the encounter between archaeological events and media.

Moreover, while much research in this area has focused on the liquidity of visualisation, the non-materiality of digital media, newer scholarship in media studies and science and technology studies has begun to point towards the materialising practices of digital technologies. What happens if we begin to consider visualisation as another process of mattering? How can we, as archaeologists, account for the range of materialities involved in the production and distribution of visualisation? Such an account would span investigation of the activities of teams working together to produce visualisations; the materialising activities of distribution and reception events; and the processes of mattering assembled on screen and via networks.



SESSION 1: CREATION

THURSDAY 21 OCTOBER 2010

Kate Giles and Anthony Masinton
University of York, York, United Kingdom

Position Statement

Our contribution will return to the theme presented in my contribution to last year's ViA conference – namely the potential of visualisation to be used as a research tool, particularly within the fields of buildings and historical archaeology. The paper will argue first, that this potential can only be realised, first, if visualisations are based upon, and informed by, archaeological knowledge and training and second, if the paradata on which such models are based, is included within, or made accessible to, the users of such visualisations as part of the ethical and intellectual responsibility of researchers. A series of examples of recent projects by colleagues in the Department of Archaeology at York/Heritage Technology will be used to illustrate these points. However, as well as seeking to highlight the potential of visualisation, the paper will also highlight some concerns about the way in which new technologies such as laser scanning and/or VR modelling are increasingly being used within my own discipline as a new form of 'preservation by record'. Without relevant archaeological input, there is a risk that such technologies simply produce unwieldy and expensive models, which are of limited use to heritage professionals. The paper will conclude by emphasising the need for the ViA's future framework to revisit/reaffirm key principles, such as those of the London Charter, but also to seek to engage with wider heritage discourses, about how visualisation can enhance our understanding of the significance and value of cultural heritage, in meaningful ways.



SESSION 1: CREATION

THURSDAY 21 OCTOBER 2010

Jason Quinlan
Çatalhöyük Project Team

Position Statement

Putting theory into practice in archaeological photography inevitably leads to adjustments and compromises when faced with the daily realities of site documentation. While trying to stay true to theoretical principles, limitations in time and resources often dictate the limits of what is achieved. After a decade of documenting a large project, I am interested in an exchange of insights dealing with the practicalities and impracticalities of implementing theoretical approaches to site documentation and its further dissemination to diverse audiences.

SESSION 2: COMMUNICATION

THURSDAY 21 OCTOBER 2010

Sam Smiles

*Emeritus Professor of Art History, Tate Research Fellow
2009-12, United Kingdom*

Introduction

This session asks us to consider how archaeological images communicate ideas, knowledge and emotion, and how authorship and history affect these communicative processes. Any enquiry into the relationship between archaeological enquiry and the imaging process needs to question the naive distinction between content (data) and form (representational conventions), as though the latter were merely a passive method of transmission. Instead, the significance of the imaging function as constitutive of knowledge is now increasingly recognised. Enquiries into iconology and semiosis have made clear that the meaning that is conveyed cannot be absolutely distinguished from the means of communication; neither can the means of communication be reduced to merely technical explanations. Images are not merely passive transmitters of data; in many cases they comprise a form of knowledge that cannot be articulated in any other way. This has been recognised from at least the early eighteenth century, but the development of new digital technologies has given the idea of what we might call sensuous cognition a renewed prominence. Visual communication uses a very wide array of media, operates in very different environments (excavation reports, museum displays, reconstructions, documentaries etc.) and addresses numerous audiences. It is characteristically implicated in wider discourses: it bears the traces of its social, cultural and ideological matrix and, unless it is positioned as an oppositional practice, tends to reinforce the prevailing episteme. The task today is to analyse existing examples of archaeological visual presentation and to outline possible future possibilities that can develop a self-reflexive and critical imaging practice for archaeological benefit.



SESSION 2: COMMUNICATION

THURSDAY 21 OCTOBER 2010

Sudeshna Guha

*Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, University of
Cambridge, United Kingdom*

Archaeology, Photography and Communicating Histories

I draw attention to the creation of archaeological knowledge through photographs and photographic archives. Photography's major contribution to the archaeological episteme has been within the realms of establishing the force of analogy as logic, and archaeology's visual histories inform of the ways in which field sciences establish the presence of a non-present past. By inevitably drawing us into historiographical issues, archaeology's visual communications encourage us to engage with ideational notions, such as cultural traditions and civilisational ethos that archaeology creates as material facts, and analyse more broadly and in-depth archaeology's evidentiary terrains.

SESSION 2: COMMUNICATION

THURSDAY 21 OCTOBER 2010

Gemma Tully

Department of Archaeology, University of Southampton, United Kingdom

Reconfiguring the Past: Contemporary Art as Archaeological Interpretation

The power of contemporary art as an interpretive tool is gaining recognition beyond traditional boundaries. Across the sciences and humanities practitioners are beginning to acknowledge the potential of contemporary art to reframe research questions and reveal new channels of meaning for both 'expert' and 'public'. In terms of archaeological interpretation, contemporary art is being increasingly used to create a dialogic relationship with past people, places and artefacts in the museum context. Linking past and present, Egypt and West, I aim to explore this concept in relation to the representation of ancient Egypt through the imagery of contemporary Egyptian artists who address stereotypes and draw modern agendas into Egyptological debate.

SESSION 2: COMMUNICATION

THURSDAY 21 OCTOBER 2010

Timothy Webmoor

*Institute of Science, Innovation and Society, Said Business
School, University of Oxford, United Kingdom*

Fixing Evidence: Coordination Work and Visual Ontologies

At the heart of archaeological representation is the conundrum of how to document an event. This happened here - whether a soil stain in a floor plan, a fracture on a flint, or a feature in a Landsat image. If we think for a moment through the analytical dimensions of an image, we might say that its status as evidence — epistemic issues — involves ‘axes of trust’. Trust in the generating technology – think 14C calibration debates – and trust in authorship – the archaeologist’s skill with instruments as a craftsman. Though often tacit, we coordinate these ‘trusts’, these x- and y-axes, to position our relative confidence in the image. Such epistemic coordination work also presents a third dimension that is often the subject of commentary in fields like semiotics and photography: an orthogonal dimension that extends between image and viewer. It is a causal and mechanistic ‘thereness’. What it is and how it came to be there involve the other axes of trust, but that something is manifest we are certain. While the ‘flat’ coordinates explicitly – though not exclusively – involve epistemic matters, this z-axis moves out from the image to connect the user/viewer and image in an ontological relation. A consideration of imagery, therefore, presents at least three (visual) vortices which begin to blur the epistemic and ontological. Digital imagery dissolves the distinction further due to its unique ‘infraphysics’, or the interoperability of mathematized bits/bytes. Digital information both ‘flattens’ the analytical dimensions onto a horizontal plane of inter-connected networks and augments the ontological relation through the capacity to act with dynamic visualizations. How we as archaeologists decide that an event is adequately documented, whether in analog or digital formats, is therefore determined by how we ‘fix’ these various coordinates together. It is also about how these coordinates ‘fix’ us. That is, while a trade-off of this Euclidean style of image analysis is simplification, a gain is its reflective capacity. Coordination work is as revealing about the practitioners – why and how they prioritize certain axes and not others – as it is the image.



SESSION 2: **COMMUNICATION**

THURSDAY 21 OCTOBER 2010

Ian Russell

John Nicholas Brown Center for Public Humanities and Cultural Heritage, Brown University/Humanities Institute of Ireland, University College Dublin

Contemporary Antiquarianism

Often the image of the archaeological past is seen as static, fixed or, at best, the logical outcome of scientific progress and interpretation yielding a succession of images, each perfecting the next. In my work as an art curator, I endeavour to undercut the paradigm of archaeological progress, and I posit the importance of transgression as a means for cutting across rigid systems of archaeological knowledge and linear time. Exploring heritage spaces as heterochronic spaces, I work to create opportunities for contemporary artists to creatively respond to the images of archaeology and heritage. Offering counterpoint to the often rigid visualizations of archaeological science, I endeavour with artists to articulate the value of rigorous yet undisciplined archaeological imaging in the form of contemporary antiquarianism.

SESSION 3: CIRCULATION

FRIDAY 22 OCTOBER 2010

Stephanie Moser

Department of Archaeology, University of Southampton, United Kingdom

Introduction: Journeys of the Archaeological Image

This session concerns the circulation of archaeological and archaeologically inspired images both within and outside the bounds of the discipline. It has already been shown that the dissemination of visual media relating to archaeology have had an important impact on conceptions of the past. However, in addition to discussing to the distribution of 'didactic' images which convey the findings of our research, such as the visual codification of archaeological reports, aerial photography, and the host of graphic 'tools' used to advance disciplinary autonomy, we are interested in exploring how other visual media, including art installations, comics, and films contribute to the formation of ideas about the past. The ways in which this diverse range of imaging practices travel beyond the terrains of archaeology to capture different audiences and challenge common assumptions about the enterprise of archaeology is a key question to be addressed.



SESSION 3: CIRCULATION

FRIDAY 22 OCTOBER 2010

Andrew Jones

Department of Archaeology, University of Southampton, United Kingdom

Re-envisioning the Archaeological Report

Archaeological reports constitute the primary source of archaeological data. Yet, the textual and visual nature of archaeological reports is typically rather dull, and consequently lacking in communicative impact. This paper will briefly consider how archaeological reports came to adopt a particular visual language. Drawing on the literature on visualisation in science studies this paper will argue for the urgent need for alternatives to the present situation if archaeologists are to improve communication amongst themselves as well as their wider public. Finally, the paper will showcase my own attempts to reconsider visualisation in the context of the publication of an excavation and field survey project associated with rock art sites in the Kilmartin region of Argyll.



SESSION 3: CIRCULATION

FRIDAY 22 OCTOBER 2010

Helen Wickstead

Kingston University, London, United Kingdom

art+archaeology: Starting with Drawing

'art+archaeology' creates visual art residencies on excavations, in museums and laboratory spaces. Working with curators, we also support exhibitions and gallery talks. Recent projects supported by art+archaeology explored drawing - a realm of activity shared by archaeologists and artists. Showing selected works from recent residencies, I reveal how artists use archaeology to extend the boundaries of drawing research and re-circulate its practices.



SESSION 3: CIRCULATION

FRIDAY 22 OCTOBER 2010

Martyn Barber

English Heritage, United Kingdom

Aerial Visions: New Histories of Aerial Archaeology

Aerial archaeology is often misrepresented as a specialised form of survey concerned with creating maps from aerial photographs. In fact it is – and always has been – an assemblage of disparate elements whose individual trajectories merged fitfully over a long period. Some of these elements pre-date not just aeroplanes, but the camera too. Few are reducible to mapping. This paper emerges from research leading to a (shortly to be published) book and a series of journal articles (with Helen Wickstead) on the history of aerial archaeology. At a time when attention is increasingly focused on non-photographic and virtual forms of remote viewing, it is worth remembering that aerial archaeology has always been heavily reliant on virtuality and hallucinations.



SESSION 3: CIRCULATION

FRIDAY 22 OCTOBER 2010

John Swogger

Archaeological Illustrator, United Kingdom

Frontiers of Engagement: Communicating Archaeology through Comics

Archaeological illustration lies in a zone midway between the expectations of academia and the demands of public interaction. Both traditionally make use of radically different modes of expression in visual imagery. I would argue, however, that there is great potential for the expanded use of the conventions of graphic narrative as a tool for bridging this divide. I will use as an example a current project from the Caribbean which will use comics in local newspapers to communicate to a wide and culturally diverse audience. The project has been designed to address not only issues of communication but also wider issues of access to archaeology and heritage.

SESSION 3: CIRCULATION

FRIDAY 22 OCTOBER 2010

Janet Hodgson

Film Maker, United Kingdom

A Rather Brief Unity in Time...

How might research and visualisation practices circulate between artists and archaeologists? A visual artist and film-maker, I have worked with archaeology through public art projects and residencies for around a decade. Residencies created by art+archaeology allowed me to sustain and develop this direction in my work. My experiences transformed my working processes; increasingly exploratory and contingent, my films became, more than ever, excavations into the fabric of time.



SESSION 3: CIRCULATION

FRIDAY 22 OCTOBER 2010

Sara Perry

Department of Archaeology, University of Southampton, United Kingdom

The Rewards of Archaeological Visual Media: Founding London's Institute of Archaeology

Archaeologists have long scrutinised the relationship of images to knowledge creation, but only minimal thought has yet been given to archaeological visual media as physically-productive tools. Visualisations work to make things possible—*income, infrastructure, status, security*—and their savvy application has significant consequences for disciplinary development and conceptual/methodological florescence. Drawing upon my PhD research into the establishment of the Institute of Archaeology (IoA) in London in the mid-20th century, I propose that graphic tools are critically linked to the solidification of academic archaeological practice, with organisations like the IoA exploiting multiple forms of imagery (oftentimes simultaneously, in combination, or through recombination) to assemble intellectual and material wealth. I am interested here in so-called “polymedia” and their interplay with what media anthropologists speak of as “media rewards.” As I see it, strategic mobilisation of such resources can allow practitioners to push forward not only knowledge-making, but concrete institutional change in archaeology.



SESSION 4: CONSUMPTION

FRIDAY 22 OCTOBER 2010

Graeme Earl

University of Southampton, Southampton, United Kingdom

Introduction

In my presentation I will provide some thoughts on the issue of 'authenticity' surrounding the reception of archaeological visualisations. I will consider the arguments against the use of photorealistic graphics - potent devices for deceiving the unsuspecting. I shall consider the extent to which the authenticity debate has run its course, and where the technologies and theories of authentication have left us.

SESSION 4: CONSUMPTION

FRIDAY 22 OCTOBER 2010

Konstantinos (Costas) Papadopoulos

University of Southampton, Southampton, United Kingdom

Virtual (Re)Constructions: Embedding Visualisation in the Interpretative Process

Virtual reconstructions were always used for the presentation and dissemination of archaeological knowledge. In the last years, it has become apparent that these methodologies can be fruitfully used by professionals to answer questions that by other means are difficult or even impossible to approach. Referring to specific examples I will outline the benefits of computer-generated reconstructions in archaeology and their potential to move one step further archaeological research practices.



SESSION 4: CONSUMPTION

FRIDAY 22 OCTOBER 2010

Alice Watterson

Glasgow School of Art, Glasgow, United Kingdom

Visualising the Ceremonial Complex at Forteviot

The media with which we choose to represent our reconstructions should never be considered a passive device (Smiles and Moser 2005), but to what extent does this notion affect an audiences' interpretation and engagement with a site?

This paper will consider a series of reconstructions produced using a range of mediums over the course of excavations at a prehistoric ceremonial complex at Forteviot in Prethshire, Scotland. Building upon the author's experience as an archaeological illustrator and digital artist the reconstructions will be evaluated from a critical perspective.

SESSION 2: **COMMUNICATION**

THURSDAY 21 OCTOBER 2010

Tom Frankland

University of Southampton, Southampton, United Kingdom

Reception of Different Stylistic Representations of Archaeological Sites

This paper outlines a study which aimed to evaluate whether 'non-photorealistic rendering' (NPR) could address archaeologists concerns with photorealistic styles of depiction, and examined the other potential benefits of using NPR to present digital reconstructions. The latest multi-disciplinary research in computer graphics and psychology is described and contrasted with the results of an online survey, which assessed viewer's perceptions of archaeological reconstructions depicted in both photorealistic and non-photorealistic styles.

SESSION 4: CONSUMPTION

FRIDAY 22 OCTOBER 2010

Justine Wintjes

University of the Witwatersrand, South Africa

The eBusingatha Puzzle: The Digital Restoration of a Painted Rock Shelter

I will present my site-specific study of eBusingatha (also known as Cinyati and uMhwabane), a partially collapsed cave containing hunter-gatherer paintings in the northern Drakensberg (KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa). I examine the scattered and fragmentary historical record that tracks its demise, in documents and images, since the 1920s. I show how proponents of rock art studies have removed the paintings from the shelter – literally and through the production of copies – in order to protect, exhibit and study them. I then demonstrate how I am attempting to put this ‘exploded’ shelter back together digitally, to return the paintings to a context that approximates the original.