

Annual Review of Anthropology Current Digital Archaeology

Colleen Morgan

Department of Archaeology, The University of York, York, United Kingdom; email: colleen.morgan@york.ac.uk

ANNUAL CONNECT

www.annualreviews.org

- Download figures
- Navigate cited references
- Keyword search
- Explore related articles
- Share via email or social media

Annu. Rev. Anthropol. 2022. 51:213-31

First published as a Review in Advance on July 26, 2022

The Annual Review of Anthropology is online at anthro.annualreviews.org

https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-anthro-041320-114101

Copyright © 2022 by Annual Reviews. All rights reserved

Keywords

archaeology, virtual reality, posthumanism, materiality, ethics, craft

Abstract

Digital archaeology is both a pervasive practice and a unique subdiscipline within archaeology. The diverse digital methods and tools employed by archaeologists have led to a proliferation of innovative practice that has fundamentally reconfigured the discipline. Rather than reviewing specific technologies, this review situates digital archaeology within broader theoretical debates regarding craft and embodiment; materiality; the uncanny; and ethics, politics, and accessibility. A future digital archaeology must move beyond skeuomorphic submission and replication of previous structural inequalities to foment new archaeological imaginaries.

INTRODUCTION

Digital archaeology is a vibrant subdiscipline within archaeology. Operating as a collective term for many kinds of practice, digital archaeology has been used to describe methods and theory that stem from the use of digital technology to investigate and communicate the past. Though at first primarily technological and skeuomorphic in practice and intent, digital practice has encouraged creativity, empathy, examinations of power and structural abuse, investigations of design, and posthumanism and transhumanism and has fundamentally reconfigured practice and the understanding of craft within archaeology. Digital archaeology is at once both highly visible as a practice and increasingly invisible as archaeologists become accustomed to using digital tools. Morgan & Eve (2012) wrote, "[W]e are all digital archaeologists" (p. 523), whereas Huvila (2018) posited, "[T]here is no digital archaeology" (p. 1) and one could argue convincingly from either position (see also Huvila & Huggett 2018).

The porous and shifting nature of digital archaeology is evident throughout this article. Indeed, the range available for deploying digital tools contributes to ongoing boundary reclassification and neologisms to describe the field. Digital archaeology has at times been termed "cyber-archaeology" (Forte 2011) or "virtual archaeology" (Reilly 1990) with an emphasis on virtual reality and "phygital archaeology" (Reilly et al. 2021) or "cyborg archaeology" (Morgan 2019) to highlight mixed digital/physical experiences and interventions in archaeology. There is some discussion and unpacking of these terms by Tanasi (2020) and of the relationship of archaeology within the larger digital humanities (see also Watrall 2016). Tanasi (2020) further provides a useful snapshot of the discourse and distribution of degree programs in digital archaeology and the differences between disciplinary categorization in North America and Europe. For example, academic positions for digital archaeologists are advertised in Europe, whereas in North America digital specialists are associated with a broad range of disciplines such as history, world heritage, and classics and are instead classed as digital humanities positions (Tanasi 2020, p. 33). As a subdiscipline, it has been subject to what is called an "anxiety discourse," wherein the "identity, nature and academic legitimacy of archaeological computing was questioned and concerns expressed about its theoretical core, the rigour and relevance of its methodologies, the value of its outputs, and the extent to which its contributions were recognised as having any significance to the broader field" (Huggett et al. 2018, p. 43). This discussion is taken up again in the Conclusions section, but the recent and ongoing growth in digital archaeology has resolved some anxieties regarding its durability, usefulness, and significance within archaeology and larger debates in anthropology and digital humanities.

A burgeoning practice within digital heritage also emphasizes the creation of interpretive materials, the curation and documentation of objects, and the examination of the digital reception of heritage, particularly through social media. Indeed, many important contributions to digital archaeology and digital heritage have manifested as digital ephemera in blogs and Twitter conference presentations (for example, Delgado Anés et al. 2017). That this review focuses primarily on academic, peer-reviewed contributions may therefore be considered a weakness to a fulsome understanding of the subject. Beyond a focus on presentation and reception are highly technical discussions within digital heritage as well; for example, the *Journal of Cultural Heritage* regularly features complex analyses of digitization of museum objects with regard to research and preservation (e.g., Melendreras Ruíz et al. 2022) and ephemera (e.g., Tuno et al. 2022). Cutting-edge visualization practice is reported in professional conferences such as the internationally renowned 2and3D Photography conference hosted by Rijksmuseum in the Netherlands in cooperation with the Association for Historical and Fine Art Photography in the United Kingdom. For example, in 2021 Kurt Heumiller discussed his work with the Museum of Modern Art in capturing Van Gogh's *Starry Night* in 3D.

It is perhaps unsurprising then to note that describing the entirety of practice within digital heritage and digital archaeology is outside the scope of this article. Happily, several scholars have published useful overviews of many topics, including remote sensing (Casana 2021), computational archaeology (Grosman 2016), and high-density survey and measurement (Opitz & Limp 2015). There are excellent discussions of the development of techniques in spatial analysis and geographical information systems (GIS) (Earley-Spadoni 2017, Gillings et al. 2020, Gupta & Devillers 2017, McCoy 2020, McCoy & Ladefoged 2009, Wheatley & Gillings 2013), social network analysis (Brughmans 2013, Brughmans et al. 2016, Peeples 2019), and agent-based modeling (Romanowska et al. 2021). This field has an incredible culture of sharing and engagement with open science (Marwick et al. 2017, but see Fredheim 2020) and collaborative digital pedagogical approaches (Cobb et al. 2019, Graham et al. 2019). These reviews reveal the extent of digital practice but also the characterization of digital archaeology as individual skills or techniques in service of particular fields of inquiry. Rather than review a set of skills or techniques, I instead discuss digital archaeology as a site to think with and theorize from. As such, some of these subjects appear as interwoven into broader themes that can illuminate current and future developments within digital archaeology as a site of critical inquiry.

In this review, I discuss digital archaeology along four interlinked themes with considerable and inevitable crossover between them. These themes—craft and embodiment, materiality, the uncanny, and ethics, politics and accessibility—demonstrate how digital archaeology is responding to and reconfiguring broader debates within archaeology and anthropology at large. In identifying these themes, I have unmoored practice from specific technologies and situated individual methods in broader political and theoretical debates. I therefore situate digital archaeology within practice-based research, defined as a "principled approach to research by means of practice in which the research and the practice operate as interdependent and complementary processes leading to new and original forms of knowledge" (Candy et al. 2021, p. 2). Practice-based research emphasizes the "way the making process itself leads to a transformation of ideas," centering the creation of "artifacts" or objects and the communication of this new knowledge to others (Candy et al. 2021, pp. 29-30). While this method has been the largely unstated approach of some practitioners (e.g., Ferraby 2017, Graham 2020b, Hacıgüzeller 2017, Morgan & Eve 2012, Reilly et al. 2021, Watterson et al. 2020), engagement with the robust literature supporting practice-based research would alleviate some of the conceptual crises as previously delineated within digital archaeology (Huggett et al. 2018). Finally, a focus on these themes describes a digital archaeology that explores ways to prefigure a better future through our investigation of the past. Prefigurative practice, as drawn from anarchism, is the understanding that the "means create the end" (Borck 2019, p. 231) and resonates with a focus on practice-based research. Considerable issues have come up in digital archaeology with regard to access and inequality, deskilling, reproduction of corrosive and oppressive narratives of the past, boosting late capitalism and contributing toward the impact of climate change. I discuss these issues throughout the text, through the costs and affordances of digital archaeology.

CRAFT AND EMBODIMENT

Using computing technologies to gather, manipulate, and store data has been central to the development of digital archaeology. Researchers have provided several accounts of the history and trajectory of digital archaeology (Beale & Reilly 2017, Evans & Daly 2004, Huggett 2015, Lock 2003); one particularly compelling example is the autobiographical account given by Tringham (2015), who describes her use of punch cards, hypertext, websites, and database narratives to create recombinant histories of Neolithic people. Through the many technologies used by archaeologists, it has become increasingly clear that archaeological practice is changing. This

shift is demonstrated in the account of archaeological visualizers offered by Opgenhaffen (2021a) who draws on her experience as an archaeological illustrator to determine the *chaîne opératoire* of digital 3D visualization (see also Opgenhaffen 2021b, Perry 2015). This change has generally been heralded as providing great savings in time and cost and as contributing toward democratizing knowledge production (Roosevelt et al. 2015, Taylor et al. 2018). Of particular note is the volume *Thinking Beyond the Tool: Archaeological Computing and the Interpretive Process* (Chrysanthi et al. 2012), which positions the tools used for digital archaeology as prosthetic extensions of self and contains insightful investigations of analytical and visualization strategies in archaeology. Others, notably Caraher (2019), have been more critical, even proposing "slow archaeology" in reaction to neoliberal pressures that plagued the discipline and protesting the perceived loss of autonomy and the erosion of enskillment through the use of digital tools. Furthermore, the use of digital tools has provoked an investigation of analog or by-hand methods in archaeology, including map making (Flexner 2009), photography (Morgan 2016, Shanks & Svabo 2013), and illustration (Morgan & Wright 2018, Morgan et al. 2021), and their roles in archaeological knowledge production.

Digital technologies have also changed how archaeologists embody their craft, how they perceive the bodies of past people, how they delegate perception of archaeological evidence, and how archaeological interpretations are disseminated. Taylor & Dell'Unto (2021) note that while skeuomorphic emulation of analog tools by digital technologies socializes these technologies and makes them more likely to be incorporated into practice, this emulation may inhibit truly transformative uses of these technologies. One of the first observations that members of the Aide Memoire project made, in conducting research on digital drawing and craft in archaeology, was of the awkward, uncomfortable stance that archaeologists took while drawing archaeological remains on a tablet (Morgan et al. 2021). This observation was followed by several more that showed how digital tools acted to distance archaeologists from their observed subject and subsequently led to insights into mental model creation in support of archaeological interpretation. Drawing is a "forcing function" (sensu Van Meter & Firetto 2013); the drawing cannot progress until the subject of the drawing, the archaeological remains, is fully understood, causing the person to exercise meta-cognitive awareness and control (Morgan et al. 2021, p. 616). The Aide Memoire project survey of archaeologists found social and political ramifications in the change to digital recording in archaeological fieldwork. These manifested primarily in a resistance to digital tools that echoed Caraher's (2019) perception of erosion of enskillment and that mourned the loss of by-hand drawing as a way to reflect on and engage with archaeological remains (Morgan et al. 2021). Yet Sapirstein (2020) found that the greater efficiencies allowed by the use of digital recording allowed engagement with a more thoughtful recording process (see also Danis 2019).

Digital technologies have changed not only how archaeologists embody our craft but also how we imagine past embodiment. Dead Man's Eyes, a project by archaeologist Stuart Eve, provides an augmented reality overlay that simulates past vision and viewsheds (Eve 2014, 2018). This work accompanies auditory projects that reconstruct past soundscapes that are acoustically accurate (e.g., Cooper 2019) as well as augmented olfaction (Eve 2017). The integration of multisensorial approaches is perhaps a reaction against the early dominance of the visual within digital archaeology through GIS and persisting through photogrammetry and 3D laser scanning (Eve 2018; see also Frieman & Gillings 2007, Wickstead 2009). Archaeological entries into multisensorial transhumanism verge on the uncanny, which is further described below, but I have argued (Morgan 2019) for the creation of a cyborg archaeology that integrates posthuman principles to create a viable interstitial space where things from the past and from the present can commingle in commensurate space. This approach draws from posthumanist feminists such as Haraway (1985, 2016), Barad (2003), and Braidotti (1997, 2013) and runs parallel to ongoing materialist and ontological discussions among archaeologists [for example, in the issue on "Debating Posthumanism in

Archaeology" in Cambridge Archaeological Journal (Gardner et al. 2021)]. The contribution of digital methods and artifacts to these discussions has heretofore been limited but compelling. For example, Stobiecka (2020b) discusses an advertising campaign that equipped ancient sculptures with 3D-printed artificial limbs to argue for a prosthetic archaeology that promotes a "materially oriented digital practice" (p. 336). Engagement with feminist posthumanism and understanding the past through digital embodiment has manifested in OTHER EYES, a project that creates mixed-reality avatars based on bioarchaeological data from Romano-British human remains. OTHER EYES explores the digital embodiment of past people to evoke empathetic responses from present people, a proposition that is both uncanny and ethically fraught (C. Morgan, M. Alexander, A. Parker, L. Hampden, M. Holst, Z. Kamash, E. Drew, and M. Carroll, forthcoming). Avatars can lend feelings of immersion and copresence (for further discussions of presence in heritage, see Pujol & Champion 2012), a form of self-expression in our deserted digital archaeological ruins. One of the past people selected for the project has altered mobility, which decenters normative, able-bodied perceptions of the experience of past personhood.

Finally, there has been some experimentation with the algorithmic delegation of archaeological investigation, interpretation, and dissemination. For example, Opitz created a digital environment with a model of Knowth, a Neolithic passage site in Ireland, and found that the rock art associated with the passage was not necessarily important to the visual experience of the place, a view that runs counter to the received interpretations of archaeologists (Opitz 2017, p. 1220). There has also been work on the detection of archaeological sites by combining remote-sensing techniques with machine learning (e.g., Davis et al. 2021). The ArchAIDE project developed a workflow and an app that uses automated image recognition to identify and classify ceramic sherds (Anichini et al. 2020). Another team designed a chatbot, ChatÇat, to interact with users from the Çatalhöyük Facebook page to provide automated answers but also to attempt to challenge the assumptions of people interacting with the bot (Roussou et al. 2019). I have characterized this technological delegation of archaeological work as part of a cyborg archaeology (Morgan 2019; cf. Stobiecka 2020b); such transhuman interventions can also be linked to the concept of the extended mind (Clark & Chalmers 1998) and as part of digital cognitive agency in archaeology (Huggett 2017, Rabinowitz 2016).

An emphasis on craft and embodiment within digital archaeology brings a satisfying fleshiness to methods that have been used with relatively little consideration of their construction of the lived experiences of people in the past or of their impacts on the bodies of people living today. Posthuman feminist scholars have noted the particular importance of embodiment in the context of virtual, dematerialized futures (Hayles 1993, p. 14), and I have echoed these in discussions of a posthuman digital archaeology (Morgan 2019). An empathetic understanding of both would encourage a more thoughtful and nuanced understanding of the past and more solidarity with the current crippling labor conditions and alienation of commercial archaeologists. More experimentation with the expressive, fleshy affordances of experiencing the past beyond the boundaries of the human would be welcome. Posthuman approaches to digital archaeology have great imaginative potential.

Materiality

That the digital is material is well established; archaeologists have been exploring the boundaries of this materiality, mixing media archaeologies with archaeological methods to understand computing assemblages, video games and virtual environments, and 3D printing. Media archaeology focuses on understanding media culture through methods inspired by the archaeologies of power and knowledge of Michel Foucault and "excavations" of modernity by Walter Benjamin (Parikka 2012). Piccini (2015) notes that media archaeology and archaeology as such share "concerns with

dismantling and reconstructing media technologies in order to reveal secret histories and lost lineages" (p. 5), yet archaeology as such has relatively little impact on scholarship regarding the materiality of digital media (p. 3). In the same dedicated forum on media archaeologies in the *Journal of Contemporary Archaeology*, media archaeologist Jussi Parikka (2015) outlines a program of shared research interests in abandoned hardware and digital waste and the profusion of digital objects and the curation crisis (p. 13). Indeed, archaeologists have been intervening in this digital—material space for some time, and this review focuses primarily on case studies generated from archaeologists.

Most discussions of archaeologists examining digital artifacts begin with Finn's early "excavation" of Silicon Valley (Finn 2002) and survey of computer collections (Finn 2003) which heralded the superabundance of material waste that is a marker of late capitalism. Various computing materials have been investigated through archaeological methods. Moshenska (2014) uncovered a USB drive during a community excavation in London and described the exterior condition of the drive as well as the contents, which revealed an assemblage of schoolwork, MP3s, and MPEG movie files, including some adult content. Beale et al. (2019) examined the computer mouse as a means to challenge technological determinism at the moment of obsolescence. Perry and I (Perry & Morgan 2015) excavated a hard drive, during which we found the application of archaeological methods to a digital context both absurd and illuminating, and noted the interplay of Foucauldian media archaeologies, forensic digital archaeology (recovering data from dead drives), and digital archaeology.

Within these digital archaeologies, cell phones are a particular locus of interest. Archaeologists have been working toward using tablets and smartphones for archaeological recording, citing paperless workflows as important to innovations in fieldwork (e.g., Ellis 2016). The earliest examination of the cell phone as a digital artifact is Newland's (2004) Master's dissertation on the archaeology of mobile phones. Newland combined approaches from science and technology studies with fieldwork such as an urban walking survey to identify and photograph types of base stations, documenting a protest and the destruction of a mast, which has resonance in the 2020-2021 protests rooted in the misidentification of 5G cell phone service as a cause of the spread of COVID-19. Maxwell & Miller (2013) discuss the utopic and dystopic aspects of cell phones, alluding to their ability to "deliver happiness, development, and revolution" as well as increased social fragmentation, alienation, and environmental destruction. Robb (2021) discusses the materiality of cell phones through a fictional plenary address to a material culture conference in the future. He traces familiar archaeological tropes regarding innovation and the use of technology, noting the future as being characterized by "obligate symbiosis" and a "new integrality between things and the people they make" (Robb 2021). Finally, I have noted the utility of by-hand drawing of cell phones using archaeological recording standards to support archaeological pedagogy, in terms of both teaching detailed, professionalized observation of artifacts and exploring the cell phone as our most intimate artifact and emotional connection to objects (C. Morgan, forthcoming).

The above excavations focused primarily on the broader social context, the hardware, or the user interface and generally did not include an examination of code. Reilly et al. (2016) performed such an investigation, recovering the earliest animated virtual tour of a cultural heritage reconstruction, the Old Minster in Winchester, United Kingdom (Burridge et al. 1989). During this investigation, Reilly's team managed to convert the code and modernize the models, eventually creating a 3D print, but cautioned that 3D models "have a very limited shelf-life" and may prove inaccessible to future historians and curators (Reilly et al. 2016, p. 39); other uses of these models are described below. Similarly, computer scientist John Aycock (2021) implored archaeologists to prepare for the profusion of digital "things" and identified archaeogaming as a particular nexus of interest for such investigations. Archaeogaming explores video games, coding, and

virtual environments, encompassing creation, representation, and dissemination of archaeological interpretations (cf. Reinhard 2018). There is a large and thriving archaeogaming community with a burgeoning list of publications. Pertinent to this discussion of digital materiality, Reinhard (2018) discusses the use and adaptation of the Harris matrix for software stratigraphy of the video game *No Man's Sky*. He concludes that archaeological visualization techniques are useful for documenting software development. In my response to Aycock's invitation to explore digital things as archaeologists, I drew from an artifact, flint, in the popular *Minecraft* sandbox video game to examine Deleuzian notions of repetition and interplay between the concept of flint and the code manifestation of such (Morgan 2021a). Another intervention in this area is Mol's (2019) "In Gold: A Materiality Simulator," a playful take on Ingold's (2007) request at the beginning of *Materials Against Materiality* to find a stone and immerse it in water. In Mol's video game you must try to read Ingold's entire article while keeping the stone wet. The stone refuses to obey, jumping out of the bowl of water, and the text subsequently fades from view, resulting in a hilarious, playful, and frustrating experience that perhaps mirrors the encounter with Ingold's text.

Digital materiality is also the subject of an important, recent issue of Museum & Society (published in 2021); the contributions of these papers speak directly to challenges in archaeological interpretation of digital objects, covering affordances, assemblages, provenance, copyright, and embodiment (Arvanitis & Zuanni 2021, p. 143). Ireland & Bell (2021) examine low-performance digital things as "weak surrogates," to "creatively interrogate the conditions of the 'in-between' of physical and digital forms" (p. 150; cf. Morgan 2019). Through the village of Asinou in the Troodos foothills in Cyprus (unphotogenic, mundane yet affective) and a model created through Agisoft PhotoScan, the author explores the potential for reflexive engagement grounded in practice-led methods. Jeffrey et al. (2021) build on Jeffrey's (2015) past consideration of authority and authenticity in digital objects to understand the agency of digital objects through a virtual reality exhibit, the Digital Laocoön Immersive, a response to the 2014 and 2018 fires at the Mackintosh Building of the Glasgow School of Art. It offers a digital replica of a plaster replica of Laocoon, a marble classical statue (itself likely a replica of a bronze statue) that was badly damaged and restored in 2014. The digital version remained the only version of the statue left after the next fire completely destroyed the plaster replica in 2018 (Jeffrey et al. 2021, p. 167). The authors call on assemblage theory and the extended object (Deleuze & Guattari 1987) to shuffle through this elaborate versioning, connecting to authenticity as determined by creator communities. Finally, they make kin between and with the objects by likening the assemblage of Laocoön replicas to a family (Jeffrey et al. 2021, p. 178). Exploring digital artifacts and places, people, and things through relationships (eschewing networks) helps dismiss a perceived and misconstrued immateriality of digital things.

Finally there is a broader and arguably more urgent discussion in the materiality of digital things, which is the climate impact of digital archaeology. Climate impact is a broad-ranging concern in terms of resources used to create digital things, the mining of rare earth materials to create hardware and its eventual disposal, and the maintenance and cost of our digital archives. Taffel (2015) approaches electronic waste as a media archaeologist, noting the particular violence of material encounters with digital detritus, earning low wages "while conducting work whose numerous harms are not understood by the laborers themselves, and who often lack any formal education and are often children" (Basel Action Netw. & Silicon Valley Toxics Coalit. 2002, p. 26; cited in Taffel 2015, p. 83). The pace and proliferation of digital artifacts are mentioned by Aycock (2021), and while these present exciting opportunities for archaeological investigation, I cautioned that "a full preservation and documentation effort would increase our own participation in the mass extinction event currently occurring under 'Empire,' what Bergman & Montgomery term as the 'organised destruction under which we live'" (Bergman & Montgomery 2017, p. 25; Morgan 2021b). Although there has been continuous encouragement for the evaluation of the appropriate

use of digital technologies for archaeology (Beacham et al. 2006), a more active proscription against using resource-heavy digital tools and an encouragement toward degrowth principles (e.g., Flexner 2020) would temper the impact of burgeoning technological growth in archaeology.

The Uncanny

The Digital Laocoön Immersive includes a haunting visual: a legion of Laocoöns, digital, physical, some emerging from the dark, some retreating from view (Jeffrey et al. 2021). This visualization is perhaps unsurprising, as Jeffrey (2015) has previously described the past as a "very weird place" and the digital object as having a strange immateriality (pp. 145-46). This sense of weirdness or the uncanny that can occur in digital archaeology is worth further investigation. In his discussion of the uncanny, or the Unheimlichen, Freud (1957) links the concept to novelty, unfamiliarity, and intellectual uncertainty. He cites Jentch in identifying that the feeling manifests in particular with respect to "doubts whether an apparently animate being is really alive; or conversely, whether a lifeless object might not be in fact animate" (Freud 1957, p. 226). Freud notes that "an uncanny effect is often and easily produced when the distinction between imagination and reality is effaced, as when something that we have hitherto regarded as imaginary appears before us in reality" (p. 244); he notes a particular link to past ideas that are not commensurate with modern understanding of causality. Finally, he identifies the important association to a setting perceived as real as opposed to that which is perceived as fiction. Moshenska (2006) notes that "archaeology is an inherently uncanny subject" (p. 91) in his discussion of the spectacle of anatomical dissection and the archaeological gaze, as it "brings dead people, dead places and dead things into the world of the living" (p. 98). He argues that the uncanny spectacle of archaeology as mediated through popular culture contributed to the alienation of the public audience from archaeological practice. Other contemporary archaeologists have strived to make the familiar strange through disassociation (Buchli & Lucas 2001, Graves-Brown 2011). It is similarly reflected in Lowenthal's (1985) use of the L.P. Hartley quote, "The past is a foreign country," to describe the reception of heritage.

Linking to the digital, Mori et al. (2012) draw from Freud in their discussion of the famed "uncanny valley" in which increased verisimilitude of robotic near-humans provokes unease in the human audience. Digital resurrection of the dead has increasing jus in popular culture, from dead movie stars appearing in new films to a deep fake of Lewis Binford singing "Copacabana" created by archaeologists using an app. Does approximating past people, places, and things through digital technology thrill us through a sense of power over and control of these things, or is it the frisson of recognition, entering what I have characterized as an "interstitial space" where digital present and digital past dwell in commensurate space (Morgan 2019)? Graham characterizes this phenomenon as "practical digital necromancy" wherein archaeologists are creating "zombies," resurrected partial people "animated by a limited set of appetites and urges and responding to its wider environment in limited or particular ways" (Graham 2020b, p. 11; cf. Hertz & Parikka 2012). He is speaking particularly about agent-based modelling which he specifies is "not to try to justify stories of the past, but to generate new stories" (Graham 2020b, p. 14). Tringham (2019) notes elements of the surreal in her work with prehistoric speech and ASMR in the "spirit of playfulness, subversion, and participatory exploration" (p. 350). Mol (2020) discusses "dark phenomenology" in her exploration of animism in Roman cults and virtual reality with the Iseum Campense Virtual Histories Project. I have written more broadly about the digital monsters created by archaeological interventions, in that they "should not be a seamless, transhuman integration of machine and body to transmit ideas about the past, but should invoke a monstrous disruption, interfering with both our understanding of the past and current sense of self" (Morgan 2019). Digital monsters are created by synesthetic interventions and failure that begets creativity (sensu Graham et al. 2019; Ireland & Bell 2021).

Ethics, Politics, and Accessibility

Digital archaeology has long been the domain of white men, though like the early histories of both computing and archaeology, there have been significant and unrecognized contributions from others. More recently, the field has had greater participation and attending critique from white women, but it has a long way to go before being able to serve as a more inclusive subdiscipline in archaeology. Digital archaeology and computational archaeology are viewed as more objective and scientific, with masculinist overtones, whereas digital heritage is associated with outreach and museums and is arguably feminized. Boundary-keeping regarding who is a digital practitioner within archaeology can be divisive; there are those who are skilled specifically in certain technologies or visual production and those who can creatively rethink or critique the use of these technologies, but these qualities are rarely imbued in the same people and are often subject to differing rewards (Perry 2015). With the burgeoning pace of innovation, even those who were once skilled can be rapidly left behind.

Digital technologies and online access are still unequally distributed across the world, and there are growing indications that digital tools contribute to intensive resource exploitation and degradation, climate change, and adverse mental health outcomes. Structural inequalities and white privilege and power that are still central in archaeology can be compounded through practices in digital archaeology such as unequal access to digital resources, the choice of subjects to digitize, and the retention and maintenance of digital archaeological data. Rico (2017) discusses the many drawbacks that come with the adoption of digital technologies, noting that increased adoption of technology "contributes to the perpetuation of a culture of expertise that is embedded in the dominant heritage paradigm" (p. 218). Bonacchi et al. (2018) reveal how depictions of the past on social media directly contribute to the construction of political identities. The COVID-19 pandemic has shown us how useful it is to have access to digital archives, artifacts, and even entire sites. There are immense digital archives of cultural materials, but these are far from universal or secure. Which materials are deemed important enough to digitize, to make available, and to maintain in perpetuity? Which parts of our past are thus made obscure, inessential, invisible? It is therefore welcome that attention to harm reduction and accessibility within digital archaeology is growing, which I discuss in terms of ethics and politics.

Investigators have been developing ethical frameworks for digital archaeology and heritage. A relatively early intervention by Colley (2015) outlined many of the pertinent issues, including uneven distribution and exclusion, deceptive claims of democratization, data standards, authenticity and authority in 3D audiovisual simulations, privacy standards and social media, and indigenous critiques. Richardson (2018) expands this discussion to examine ethical standards around digital public archaeology and data collection from digital media. Graham (2020a; see also Dennis 2016, Khunti 2018) situates ethics in archaeology as applicable in archaeogaming, also making a parallel argument to Brazelton's (2020) examination of *Minecraft* as operating within a settler-colonial framework. The most nuanced case studies are identified by bioarchaeologists who have discussed the particular ethical problems presented by the display of human remains on websites and the sharing of osteoarchaeological digital data (Hassett 2018, Huffer et al. 2019, Ulguim 2018). Finally, Dennis (2020) discusses the "failures" in ethics in digital archaeology with regard to codes of conduct, with a lack of institutional oversight combined with a lack of "consensus-led ethical guidelines" (p. 212). These concerns are mirrored in the 2018 Computer Applications and Quantitative Methods (CAA) statement on ethics (Brughmans et al. 2018).

In this discussion of ethics, it is worthwhile to revisit the discussion of deontological codes, ethics, and politics set forth by González-Ruibal (2018). In his review, González-Ruibal (2018) notes that ethics and its association with "morals, virtuous behavior and policy" is in contrast

to politics, which invokes "equality, enfranchisement, conflict, power asymmetries, social justice, political economy, and capitalism" (p. 346). In my previous work, I have emphasized a political and ethical engagement with digital archaeology rooted in feminist epistemology and emancipatory archaeology (Morgan 2012) and formed an early intervention in the documentation and display of digital archaeological data captured from human remains [Boutin & Morgan 2013 (2009)]. This early intervention relied on ethical codes that were formed through state or institutional power, so this statement could come under critique as another set of ethical principles without particular engagement with political action. In the process of forming ethical principles for the Other Eyes project, we used a consensus process based on anarchist principles, with advocacy for the dead, and participation of representative stakeholders (C. Morgan, M. Alexander, A. Parker, L. Hampden, M. Holst, Z. Kamash, E. Drew, and M. Carroll, forthcoming).

Though ethical discussions in digital archaeology are ongoing, political engagements are only beginning to proliferate. There has heretofore been relatively little engagement with the greater political ramifications of digital archaeology, including questions about the privileging of state societies or institutional power through the continual reconstruction of churches and castles or the potential for the use of digital archaeology for prefiguration of more egalitarian futures (but see Perry & Taylor 2018). Some excellent projects have addressed accessibility and decolonization within digital archaeology, particularly within virtual reality and 3D reconstruction. Ongoing research and work by González-Tennant (2013) in the Virtual Rosewood research project has demonstrated the ability for 3D reconstruction and virtual reality to create impactful interventions for social justice (**Figure 1**). Cook (2019) created *Built on Bones*, an augmented reality skeletal overlay for architecture, revealing buildings that are related to colonial legacies. Perhaps the most fully realized collaborative project is Nunalleq, Stories from the Village of Our Ancestors, a digital educational resource for children in the Yukon-Kuskokwim region on Alaska's Bering Sea coast (**Figure 2**; Watterson & Hillerdal 2020). The project is codesigned between academic



Figure 1

Rosewood: An Interactive History (RAIH), a digital simulator using gaming technology to explore Rosewood, Florida, an African American town destroyed during a 1923 race riot. Image provided by Digital Heritage Interactive, Diana Gonzalez-Tennant, and Edward González-Tennant.



Figure 2

Nunalleq: Stories from the Village of our Ancestors is an interactive educational resource for children which tells the story of the archaeological excavations of a precontact Yup'ik sod house in Quinhagak, Alaska. Image provided by Alice Watterson, John Anderson, and Tom Paxton in collaboration with the Nunalleq Archaeology Project, University of Aberdeen, and Qanirtuuq Incorporated in Quinhagak, Alaska.

researchers and a wide consortium of indigenous community members and combines archaeological data with contemporary indigenous knowledge to create an interactive resource to empower children to "take ownership of their history and heritage" (Watterson & Hillerdal 2020, p. 222).

Interventions are not always limited to 3D reconstruction within digital archaeology. An insightful issue on mapping and historical archaeology in the *International Journal of Historical Archaeology* features GIS used to map power and resistance, including the 1733 St. Jan Slave Rebellion in the Danish West Indies (Norton 2020), experiences of suffering and death surrounding undocumented migration (Gokee et al. 2020), and indigenous uses of space through radical placemaking (Townsend et al. 2020). Also notable is the Mukurtu content management system, which "empower[s] communities to manage, share, narrate and exchange their digital heritage in culturally relevant and ethically-minded ways" (https://mukurtu.org/about; Christen 2011). These are a few examples of projects that show the potential for restorative justice work with digital technologies in archaeology.

Perhaps the most controversial political intervention with subsequent discussions surrounds Oxford's Institute for Digital Archaeology 3D modeling and reconstruction of the triumphal arch from Palmyra. The arch was met with general plaudits from popular media and condemnation from archaeologists who were concerned with the funding, symbolism, lack of stakeholder consultation, and disconnect from critical heritage discourse by the creators of the model (Khunti 2018, Rico 2020, Stobiecka 2020a). In particular, Yazdi & Massoudi (2017) note that "there are no traces of blood stains in the reconstruction site" (p. 451). Kamash (2017) led an intervention that productively queried the model by conducting place-based research while the model was located

in Trafalgar Square. She and a team of students invited responses on postcards from visitors to the site; these responses highlighted the alienation of the model to colonial surroundings and positioning of the uprooted arch.

3D printing has also been explored by others as a way to more widely distribute artifacts and skeletal remains, for replacement after repatriation, and for interpretive displays. 3D-printed objects are archaeological artifacts themselves, of course, and archaeologists have been exploring how they evoke emotional responses as interpretive materials (Di Giuseppantonio Di Franco et al. 2018, Galeazzi 2018). Digital reproductions and 3D printing have been used by artists to protest colonialism in what is known as the Nefertiti Hack, wherein a 3D scan of the iconic Nefertiti bust held in the Neues Museum in Berlin was purportedly clandestinely created and then used to print a 3D copy (Geismar 2018, p. 111). It was later understood that this hack was actually a leak of an existing 3D scan. Isaac (2015) discusses indigenous repatriation of artifacts and the power that 3D reproductions can have to transform relationships through coproduction. Through consultation with clan members, the National Museum of Natural History created a 3D replica of a Tlingit Dakl'aweidi clan killer whale crest hat or Kéet S'aaxw. This replica then became an important site of cultural and clan memory (Hollinger et al. 2013) and demonstrates digital archaeological practice in service to restorative justice principles. Isaac (2021) further notes that "through the creation of these digital/object/beings these projects have given the Tlingit more agency in formalizing their expectations about the responsible or moral treatment for these, as well as for their 'kin' or other related object/beings in museums."

CONCLUSIONS

Although digital archaeology has been primarily a method and is emerging as a theory, it has been discussed as a continual process of becoming (sensu Lock 2003, p. xiii). Technological vanguardism is celebrated within the community of digital archaeologists as we continue to experiment with digital methods to investigate the past. These methods are then absorbed into general practice or set aside as they prove to be too unwieldy or outmoded. Some have argued to "stop talking about digital archaeology" in order "to continue doing archaeology digitally" (Costopoulos 2016, p. 1), and much technologically aided practice is tedious and menial and does not necessarily contribute to furthering the discipline at large.

Some digital methods increase divides in practice, contribute to deskilling, and reduce the legibility and sustainability of the archive (Morgan et al. 2021). As such, I have tried to select the transformative aspects of digital archaeology, ones that broaden our metaphors, change our objects of investigation, and reveal our practices of knowledge production. In bringing together this work, I offer a moment of reflection in the fast-paced and often near-future-seeking subdiscipline of digital archaeology. There is incredible joy and creativity to be found in working with digital technology in archaeology; to shape this use into the service of prefiguration and the imagining of better futures is key and should inform all current and future practice.

Huggett et al. (2018) considered several potential futures for digital archaeological knowledge. Through a scenario analysis, they identified change as being driven by relative openness, innovation, centrality, and state/institutional affiliation and encouraged building a "high-level digital disciplinary architecture—a consensus model of what archaeology does as a whole" to determine areas of innovation and address deficiencies (Huggett et al. 2018, p. 51). There is relatively little reflexivity within this particular exercise; that the path has been determined primarily by established, white British men working with a few others in Europe is not acknowledged as a significant detriment, though the authors have made significant contributions toward increased diversity in other contexts. To contrast with this scenario analysis, the most intriguing work that pushes the discipline lies at its intersections, when digital archaeology allies with political interventions

such as decolonization and in playful conversation with analog methods, as demonstrated within this review. Prefigurative, collaborative practice-based research animates digital archaeology and mobilizes it to critically engage with contemporary, political issues in the field (cf. Rabinowitz 2016).

There is a further productive parallel development in anthropology with the recent reframing of "visual anthropology" to "multimodal anthropology." This move acknowledges the broadening of media practice within anthropology and in collaboration with communities within which they work, emphasizing a field "encapsulated within the numerous visual, aural, and tactile media that anthropologists produce, post, and share" (Collins et al. 2017, p. 142). An excellent example of this practice is in Danis's (2019) discussion of her collaboration with students and indigenous people as creating "casual cyborgs" who move freely between "real and virtual." She found that using digital recording in archaeology freed up time, allowing "a new form of local, intergenerational knowledge production between myself, Abiquiú youth interns, and their families" as they created analog collages and zines alongside digital records of archaeological remains (Danis 2019, p. 388). Multimodality also has resonance with practice-based research and the continual discussions regarding technologies and creative practice (Beale & Reilly 2017) and in cocreation (Di Giuseppantonio Di Franco et al. 2019) and enchantment (Perry 2019); as such, archaeologists could join what is already a vibrant discussion in anthropology.

Archaeology is the collective, deep chronological documentation of the capacity of humans to imagine different ways to live. Digital archaeology—so often cast as seductively simple, as normative, as deskilling, and as automating—should instead encourage joyful practice and animate the wild splendor and diverse and outright strange ways that people have lived in the past. The Industrial Workers of the World, an international labor union, have a commitment to "forming the structure of the new society within the shell of the old" (https://www.iww.org/preamble/). A prefigurative digital archaeology means that we must stop building empty 3D castles and temples and focus on the labor of the people who built them. We must understand the waste generated by mining for materials to create digital infrastructure and the exploitative practices of tech companies who create our tools. We must engage with Caraher's "slow archaeology," which queries the methods that we use to record archaeology at the cost of skilled craftspersonship and the acceleration strategies of late capitalism. We must rethink intellectual property and museum practice to address structural oppression and colonialism. Digital work within archaeology must move beyond skeuomorphic submission and replication of previous structural inequalities to foment new archaeological imaginaries.

DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

The author is not aware of any affiliations, memberships, funding, or financial holdings that might be perceived as affecting the objectivity of this review.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author thanks an anonymous reviewer for useful suggestions and comments, which have improved this article. Thanks also go to the editorial team, including an excellent, thorough copyeditor for their edits and suggestions.

LITERATURE CITED

Anichini F, Banterle F, Buxeda i Garrigós J, Callieri M, Dershowitz N, et al. 2020. Developing the ArchAIDE application: a digital workflow for identifying, organising and sharing archaeological pottery using automated image recognition. *Internet Archaeol.* 52. https://doi.org/10.11141/ia.52.7

- Arvanitis K, Zuanni C. 2021. Digital (and) materiality in museums. Mus. Soc. 19(2):143
- Averett EW, Gordon JM, Counts DB, eds. 2016. Mobilizing the Past for a Digital Future: The Potential of Digital Archaeology. Grand Forks: Digit. Press, Univ. N. D.
- Aycock J. 2021. The coming tsunami of digital artefacts. Antiquity 95(384):1584-89
- Barad K. 2003. Posthumanist performativity: toward an understanding of how matter comes to matter. *Signs* 28(3):801–31
- Basel Action Netw., Silicon Valley Toxics Coalit. 2002. Exporting harm: the high-tech trashing of Asia. Rep., Basel Action Netw., Seattle, WA. https://svtc.org/wp-content/uploads/technotrash.pdf
- Beacham R, Denard H, Niccolucci. 2006. An introduction to the London Charter. London Charter. https://www.londoncharter.org/fileadmin/templates/main/docs/beacham-denard-niccolucci_intro.pdf
- Beale G, Reilly P. 2017. Digital practice as meaning making in archaeology. Internet Archaeol. 44:62
- Beale G, Schofield J, Austin J. 2019. The archaeology of the digital periphery: computer mice and the archaeology of the early digital era. J. Contemp. Archaeol. 5(2):154–73
- Bergman C, Montgomery N. 2017. Joyful Militancy: Building Thriving Resistance in Toxic Times. Chico, CA: AK Press
- Bonacchi C, Altaweel M, Krzyzanska M. 2018. The heritage of Brexit: roles of the past in the construction of political identities through social media. *J. Soc. Archaeol.* 18(2):174–92
- Borck L. 2019. Constructing the future history: prefiguration as historical epistemology and the chronopolitics of archaeology. J. Contemp. Archaeol. 5(2):229–38
- Boutin A, Morgan C. 2013 (2009). The Dilmun bioarchaeology ethics statement (reposted). *Colleen Morgan Blog*, Oct. 24. https://colleen-morgan.com/2013/10/24/the-dilmun-bioarchaeology-ethics-statement/
- Braidotti R. 1997. Mothers, monsters, and machines. In Writing on the Body: Female Embodiment and Feminist Theory, ed. KCN Medina, pp. 59–79. New York: Columbia Univ. Press
- Braidotti R. 2013. The Posthuman. Cambridge, UK: Polity
- Brazelton B. 2020. On the 10-year anniversary of Minecraft: two interventions in extractive colonialism. *Cult. Geogr.* 27(3):491–97
- Brughmans T. 2013. Thinking through networks: a review of formal network methods in archaeology. *J. Archaeol. Method Theory* 20(4):623–62
- Brughmans T, Collar A, Coward F. 2016. The Connected Past: Challenges to Network Studies in Archaeology and History. Oxford, UK: Oxford Univ. Press
- Brughmans T, Corley H, Dennis LM, Ellenberger K, Foreman P, et al. 2018. Ethics policy 1.1. Computer Applications & Quantitative Methods in Archaeology. https://caa-international.org/about/ethics-policy
- Buchli V, Lucas G. 2001. The archaeology of alienation: a late twentieth-century British council house. In *Archaeologies of the Contemporary Past*, ed. V Buchli, G Lucas, pp. 158–67. London: Taylor & Francis
- Burridge JM, Collins BM, Galton BN, Halbert AR, Heywood TR, et al. 1989. The WINSOM solid modeller and its application to data visualization. *IBM Syst.* 7, 28(4):548–68
- Candy L, Edmonds E, Vear C. 2021. Introduction to the handbook. In *The Routledge International Handbook of Practice-Based Research*, ed. C Vear, L Candy, E Edmonds, pp. 1–24. New York: Routledge. 1st ed.
- Caraher W. 2019. Slow archaeology, punk archaeology, and the "archaeology of care." Eur. J. Archaeol. 22(3):372–85
- Casana J. 2021. Rethinking the landscape: emerging approaches to archaeological remote sensing. Annu. Rev. Anthropol. 50:167–86
- Christen K. 2011. Opening archives: respectful repatriation. Am. Arch. 74(1):185–210
- Chrysanthi A, Murrieta Flores P, Papadopoulos C. 2012. Thinking Beyond the Tool: Archaeological Computing and the Interpretive Process. BAR Int. Ser. 2344. Oxford, UK: Archaeopress
- Clark A, Chalmers D. 1998. The extended mind. Analysis 58(1):7-19
- Cobb PJ, Sigmier JH, Creamer PM, French ER. 2019. Collaborative approaches to archaeology programming and the increase of digital literacy among archaeology students. *Open Archaeol.* 5(1):137–54
- Colley S. 2015. Ethics and digital heritage. In *The Ethics of Cultural Heritage*, ed. T Ireland, J Schofield, pp. 13–32. New York: Springer N. Y.
- Collins SG, Durington M, Gill H. 2017. Multimodality: an invitation. Am. Anthropol. 119(1):142-46

- Cook K. 2019. EmboDIYing disruption: queer, feminist and inclusive digital archaeologies. Eur. J. Archaeol. 22(3):398–414
- Cooper C. 2019. The sound of debate in Georgian England: auralising the House of Commons. *Parliam. Hist.* 38(1):60–73
- Costopoulos A. 2016. Digital archeology is here (and has been for a while). Front. Digit. Humanit. 3:4
- Danis A. 2019. Augmented, hyper-mediated, IRL. Eur. J. Archaeol. 22(3):386-97
- Davis DS, Caspari G, Lipo CP, Sanger MC. 2021. Deep learning reveals extent of Archaic Native American shell-ring building practices. *J. Archaeol. Sci.* 132:105433
- Deleuze G, Guattari F. 1987. A Thousand Plateaus. Minneapolis: Univ. Minn. Press
- Delgado Anés L, Romero Pellitero P, Richardson L-J. 2017. Virtual archaeology through social networks. The case of the I Public Archaeology Twitter Conference. In *III Congreso de La Sociedad Internacional Humanidades Digitales Hispánicas: Sociedades, Políticas, Saberes (Libro de Resúmenes)*, ed. N Rodríguez Ortega, pp. 293–98. Madrid: Soc. Int. Humanid. Digit. Hisp.
- Dennis LM. 2016. Archaeogaming, ethics, and participatory standards. SAA Archaeol. Record 16(5):29-33
- Dennis LM. 2020. Digital archaeological ethics: successes and failures in disciplinary attention. *J. Comput. Appl. Archaeol.* 3(1):210–18
- Di Giuseppantonio Di Franco P, Galeazzi F, Vassallo V. 2018. *Authenticity and Cultural Heritage in the Age of 3D Digital Reproductions*. Cambridge, UK: McDonald Inst. Archaeol. Res.
- Di Giuseppantonio Di Franco P, Winterbottom M, Galeazzi F, Gogan M. 2019. Ksar Said: building Tunisian young people's critical engagement with their heritage. *Sustainability* 11(5):1373
- Earley-Spadoni T. 2017. Spatial history, deep mapping and digital storytelling: archaeology's future imagined through an engagement with the digital humanities. *J. Archaeol. Sci.* 84(Suppl. C):95–102
- Ellis SJR. 2016. Are we ready for new (digital) ways to record archaeological fieldwork? A case study from Pompeii. See Averett et al. 2016, pp. 51–75
- Evans TL, Daly P. 2004. Digital Archaeology: Bridging Method and Theory. New York: Routledge
- Eve S. 2014. Dead Men's Eyes: Embodied GIS, Mixed Reality and Landscape Archaeology. BAR Br. Ser. 600. Oxford: UK: Archaeopress
- Eve S. 2017. A dead man's nose: using smell to explore the battlefield of Waterloo. In *Designing with Smell*, ed. V Henshaw, K McLean, D Medway, C Perkins, G Warnaby, pp. 211–18. New York: Routledge
- Eve S. 2018. Losing our senses, an exploration of 3D object scanning. Open Archaeol. 4(1):114-22
- Ferraby R. 2017. Geophysics: creativity and the archaeological imagination. Internet Archaeol. (44):571
- Finn C. 2002. Artifacts: An Archaeologist's Year in Silicon Valley. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press
- Finn C. 2003. Bits and pieces: a mini survey of computer collecting. Ind. Archaeol. Rev. 25(2):119-28
- Flexner J. 2009. Where is reflexive map-making in archaeological research? Towards a place-based approach. Archaeol. Rev. Camb. 24(1):7–21
- Flexner JL. 2020. Degrowth and a sustainable future for archaeology. Archaeol. Dialogues 27(2):159-71
- Forte M. 2011. Cyber-archaeology: notes on the simulation of the past. Virtual Archaeol. Rev. 2(4):7-18
- Fredheim LH. 2020. Decoupling "open" and "ethical" archaeologies: rethinking deficits and expertise for ethical public participation in archaeology and heritage. Nov. Archaeol. Rev. 53(1):5–22
- Freud S. 1957. The "uncanny." In *The Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*, Vol. 17, ed. J Strachey, pp. 218–53. London: Hogarth Press
- Frieman C, Gillings M. 2007. Seeing is perceiving? World Archaeol. 39(1):4-16
- Galeazzi F. 2018. 3-D virtual replicas and simulations of the past "real" or "fake" representations? *Curr: Anthropol.* 59(3):268–86
- Gardner A, Fernández-Götz M, Díaz de Liaño G, Harris OJT, eds. 2021. Debating posthumanism in archaeology. Camb. Archaeol. 7. 31(3)
- Geismar H. 2018. Museum Object Lessons in the Digital Age. London: UCL Press
- Gillings M, Hacıgüzeller P, Lock G. 2020. Archaeological Spatial Analysis: A Methodological Guide. New York: Routledge
- Gokee C, Stewart H, De León J. 2020. Scales of suffering in the US-Mexico borderlands. *Int. J. Hist. Archaeol.* 24(4):823–51
- González-Ruibal A. 2018. Ethics of archaeology. Annu. Rev. Anthropol. 47:345-60

- González-Tennant E. 2013. New heritage and dark tourism: a mixed methods approach to social justice in Rosewood, Florida. *Herit. Soc.* 6(1):62–88
- Graham S. 2020a. An approach to the ethics of archaeogaming. *Internet Archaeol.* 55. https://doi.org/10. 11141/ia.55.2
- Graham S. 2020b. An Enchantment of Digital Archaeology: Raising the Dead with Agent-Based Models, Archaeogaming and Artificial Intelligence. New York: Berghahn Books
- Graham S, Gupta N, Smith J, Angourakis A, Carter M, Compton B. 2019. The Open Digital Archaeology Textbook. https://o-date.github.io/draft/book
- Graves-Brown P. 2011. Touching from a distance: alienation, abjection, estrangement and archaeology. Nor. Archaeol. Rev. 44(2):131–44
- Grosman L. 2016. Reaching the point of no return: the computational revolution in archaeology. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.* 45:129–45
- Gupta N, Devillers R. 2017. Geographic visualization in archaeology. J. Archaeol. Method Theory 24(3):852–85
 Hacıgüzeller P. 2017. Archaeological (digital) maps as performances: towards alternative mappings. Nor.
 Archaeol. Rev. 50(2):149–71
- Haraway D. 1985. A manifesto for cyborgs: science, technology, and socialist feminism in the 1980s. Soc. Rev. 80:65–108
- Haraway DJ. 2016. Staying with the Trouble: Making Kin in the Chthulucene. Durham, NC: Duke Univ. Press
- Hassett BR. 2018. The ethical challenge of digital bioarchaeological data. Archaeologies 14(2):185-88
- Hayles NK. 1993. The materiality of informatics. Configurations 1(1):147-70
- Hertz G, Parikka J. 2012. Zombie media: circuit bending media archaeology into an art method. *Leonardo* 45(5):424–30
- Hollinger RE, Edwell J Jr., Jacobs H, Moran-Collins L, Thome C, et al. 2013. Tlingit-Smithsonian collaborations with 3D digitization of cultural objects. *Mus. Anthropol. Rev.* 7(1–2):201–53
- Huffer D, Wood C, Graham S. 2019. What the Machine Saw: some questions on the ethics of computer vision and machine learning to investigate human remains trafficking. *Internet Archaeol.* https://doi.org/ 10.11141/ia.52.5
- Huggett J. 2015. A manifesto for an introspective digital archaeology. Open Archaeol. 1:86-95
- Huggett J. 2017. The apparatus of digital archaeology. Internet Archaeol. 44. https://doi.org/10.11141/ia.44.7
 Huggett J, Reilly P, Lock G. 2018. Whither digital archaeological knowledge? The challenge of unstable futures. 7. Comput. Appl. Archaeol. 1(1):42–54
- Huvila I. 2018. Archaeology and Archaeological Information in the Digital Society. New York: Routledge
- Huvila I, Huggett J. 2018. Archaeological practices, knowledge work and digitalisation. J. Comput. Appl. Archaeol. 1(1):88–100
- Ingold T. 2007. Materials against materiality. Archaeol. Dialogues 14(1):1-16
- Ireland T, Bell T. 2021. Chasing future feelings: a practice-led experiment with emergent digital materialities of heritage. *Mus. Soc.* 19(2):149–65
- Isaac G. 2015. Perclusive alliances. Curr. Anthropol. 56(S12):S286-96
- Isaac G. 2021. Digital/object/beings and 3D replication in the intercultural museum context: Have you socialized your clones? In *Museums, Societies and the Creation of Value*, ed. H Morphy, R McKenzie. New York: Routledge
- Jeffrey S. 2015. Challenging heritage visualisation: beauty, aura and democratisation. *Open Archaeol.* 1(1):144–52
- Jeffrey S, Love S, Poyade M. 2021. The digital Laocoön: replication, narrative and authenticity. Mus. Soc. 19(2):166–83
- Kamash Z. 2017. "Postcard to Palmyra": bringing the public into debates over post-conflict reconstruction in the Middle East. World Archaeol. 49:608–22
- Khunti R. 2018. The problem with printing Palmyra: exploring the ethics of using 3D printing technology to reconstruct heritage. *Stud. Digit. Herit.* 2(1):1–12
- Lock GR. 2003. Using Computers in Archaeology: Towards Virtual Pasts. New York: Routledge
- Lowenthal D. 1985. The Past Is a Foreign Country. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press
- Marwick B, d'Alpoim Guedes J, Barton CM, Bates LA, Baxter M, et al. 2017. Open science in archaeology. SAA Archaeol. Record 17(4):8–14

- Maxwell R, Miller T. 2013. The material cellphone. In *The Oxford Handbook of the Archaeology of the Contemporary World*, ed. P Graves-Brown, R Harrison, A Piccini, pp. 699–712. Oxford, UK: Oxford Univ. Press
- McCoy MD. 2020. The site problem: a critical review of the site concept in archaeology in the digital age. 7. Field Archaeol. 45(Suppl. 1):S18–26
- McCoy MD, Ladefoged TN. 2009. New developments in the use of spatial technology in archaeology. J. Archaeol. Res. 17(3):263–95
- Melendreras Ruíz R, Marín Torres MT, Sánchez Allegue P, Martínez Reyes J. 2022. The sculpture of the Christ of the blood: structural mechanical analysis based on 3D models and video techniques for the study of recurrent pathologies. *J. Cult. Herit.* 54:59–67
- Mol A. 2019. In gold: a materiality simulator. Shores of Time. https://www.shoresoftime.com/in-gold/
- Mol E. 2020. Roman cyborgs! On significant otherness, material absence, and virtual presence in the archaeology of Roman religion. Eur. J. Archaeol. 23(1):64–81
- Morgan C. 2012. Emancipatory digital archaeology. PhD Thesis, Univ. Calif., Berkeley
- Morgan C. 2019. Avatars, monsters, and machines: a cyborg archaeology. Eur. 7. Archaeol. 22(3):324-37
- Morgan C. 2021a. An archaeology of digital things: social, political, polemical. Antiquity 95(384):1590-93
- Morgan C. 2021b. Save the date for future mourning: prefiguration and heritage. Forum Krit. Archäol. 10:1-5
- Morgan C, Eve S. 2012. DIY and digital archaeology: What are you doing to participate? *World Archaeol.* 44(4):521–37
- Morgan C, Petrie H, Wright H, Taylor JS. 2021. Drawing and knowledge construction in archaeology: the Aide Mémoire Project. *J. Field Archaeol.* 46(8):614–28
- Morgan C, Wright H. 2018. Pencils and pixels: drawing and digital media in archaeological field recording. *J. Field Archaeol.* 43(2):136–51
- Morgan CL. 2016. Analog to digital: transitions in theory and practice in archaeological photography at Catalhöyük. *Internet Archaeol.* 2(42):50
- Mori M, MacDorman KF, Kageki N. 2012. The uncanny valley [from the field]. *IEEE Robot. Autom. Mag.* 19(2):98–100
- Moshenska G. 2006. The archaeological uncanny. Public Archaeol. 5(2):91-99
- Moshenska G. 2014. The archaeology of (flash) memory. Post-Medieval Archaeol. 48(1):255-59
- Newland C. 2004. A historical archaeology of mobile phones in the UK. MA Thesis. Univ. Bristol, Bristol, UK
- Norton HK. 2020. Finding the spaces betwixt and between: GIS of the 1733 St. Jan Slave Rebellion. *Int. J. Hist. Archaeol.* 24(4):803–22
- Opgenhaffen L. 2021a. Tradition in transition: technology and change in archaeological visualisation practice. *Open Archaeol.* 7(1):1685–708
- Opgenhaffen L. 2021b. Visualizing archaeologists: a reflexive history of visualization practice in archaeology. *Open Archaeol.* 7(1):353–77
- Opitz R. 2017. An experiment in using visual attention metrics to think about experience and design choices in past places. J. Archaeol. Method Theory 24:1203–26
- Opitz R, Limp WF. 2015. Recent developments in high-density survey and measurement (HDSM) for archaeology: implications for practice and theory. Annu. Rev. Anthropol. 44:347–64
- Parikka J. 2012. What Is Media Archaeology? Cambridge, UK: Polity Press
- Parikka J. 2015. Sites of media archaeology: producing the contemporary as a shared topic. *J. Contemp. Archaeol.* 2(1):8–14
- Peeples MA. 2019. Finding a place for networks in archaeology. J. Archaeol. Res. 27(4):451-99
- Perry S. 2015. Crafting knowledge with (digital) visual media in archaeology. In *Material Evidence: Learning from Archaeological Practice*, ed. R Chapman, A Wylie, pp. 189–210. London: Routledge
- Perry S. 2019. The enchantment of the archaeological record. Eur. 7. Archaeol. 22(3):354-71
- Perry S, Morgan C. 2015. Materializing media archaeologies: the MAD-P hard drive excavation. *J. Contemp. Archaeol.* 2(1):94–104
- Perry S, Taylor J. 2018. Theorising the digital: a call to action for the archaeological community. In *Oceans of Data: Proceedings of the 44th Conference on Computer Applications and Quantitative Methods in Archaeology*, ed. M Matsumoto, E Uleberg, pp. 11–22. Oxford, UK: Archaeopress
- Piccini AA. 2015. Media-archaeologies: an invitation. 7. Contemp. Archaeol. 2(1):1-8

- Pujol L, Champion E. 2012. Evaluating presence in cultural heritage projects. *Int. J. Herit. Stud.* 18:83–102 Rabinowitz A. 2016. Response: Mobilizing (ourselves) for a critical digital archaeology. See Averett et al. 2016, pp. 493–520
- Reilly P. 1990. Towards a virtual archaeology. In *Computer Applications in Archaeology*, ed. S Rahtz, K Lockyear, pp. 132–39. Oxford, UK: Br. Archaeol. Rep.
- Reilly P, Callery S, Dawson I, Gant S. 2021. Provenance illusions and elusive paradata: when archaeology and art/archaeological practice meets the phygital. *Open Archaeol.* 7(1):454–81
- Reilly P, Todd S, Walter A. 2016. Rediscovering and modernising the digital Old Minster of Winchester. *Digit. Appl. Archaeol. Cult. Heritage* 3(2):33–41
- Reinhard A. 2018. Archaeogaming: An Introduction to Archaeology In and of Video Games. New York: Berghahn Books
- Richardson L-J. 2018. Ethical challenges in digital public archaeology. J. Comput. Appl. Archaeol. 1(1):64-73
- Rico T. 2017. Technologies, technocracy, and the promise of "alternative" heritage values. In *Heritage in Action:*Making the Past in the Present, ed. H Silverman, E Waterton, S Watson, pp. 217–30. Cham, Switz.: Springer

 Int
- Rico T. 2020. The second coming of Palmyra. A technological prison. Archaeol. Dialogues 27(2):125-26
- Robb J. 2021. The mobile phone in late medieval culture. *Internet Archaeol.* 56. https://doi.org/10.11141/ia. 56.7
- Romanowska I, Wren CD, Crabtree SA. 2021. Agent-Based Modeling for Archaeology: Simulating the Complexity of Societies. Santa Fe, NM: SFI Press
- Roosevelt CH, Cobb P, Moss E, Olson BR, Ünlüsoy S. 2015. Excavation is destruction digitization: advances in archaeological practice. *J. Field Archaeol.* 40(3):325–46
- Roussou M, Perry S, Katifori A, Vassos S, Tzouganatou A, McKinney S. 2019. Transformation through provocation? In *CHI '19: Proceedings of the 2019 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, pp. 1–13. New York: Assoc. Comput. Mach.
- Sapirstein P. 2020. Hand drawing versus computer vision in archaeological recording. *Stud. Digit. Heritage* 4(2):134–59
- Shanks M, Svabo C. 2013. Archaeology and photography: a pragmatology. In *Reclaiming Archaeology: Beyond the Tropes of Modernity*, ed. A González-Ruibal, pp. 105–18. New York: Routledge
- Stobiecka M. 2020a. Archaeological heritage in the age of digital colonialism. *Archaeol. Dialogues* 27(2):113–25 Stobiecka M. 2020b. Towards a prosthetic archaeology. *J. Soc. Archaeol.* 20(3):335–52
- Taffel S. 2015. Archaeologies of electronic waste. 7. Contemp. Archaeol. 2(1):78-85
- Tanasi D. 2020. The digital (within) archaeology. Analysis of a phenomenon. Historian 82(1):22-36
- Taylor J, Dell'Unto N. 2021. Skeuomorphism in digital archaeological practice: a barrier to progress, or a vital cog in the wheels of change? *Open Archaeol.* 7(1):482–98
- Taylor J, Issavi J, Berggren Å, Lukas D, Mazzucato C, et al. 2018. "The rise of the machine": the impact of digital tablet recording in the field at Çatalhöyük. *Internet Archaeol*. 94(47):57
- Townsend R, Sampeck K, Watrall E, Griffin JD. 2020. Digital archaeology and the living Cherokee landscape. Int. J. Hist. Archaeol. 24(4):969–88
- Tringham R. 2015. Creating narratives of the past as recombinant histories. In *Subjects and Narratives in Archaeology*, ed. RM Van Dyke, R Bernbeck, pp. 27–54. Boulder: Univ. Colo. Press
- Tringham R. 2019. Giving voices (without words) to prehistoric people: glimpses into an archaeologist's imagination. *Eur. J. Archaeol.* 22(3):338–53
- Tuno N, Mulahusić A, Topoljak J, Đidelija M. 2022. Evaluation of handheld scanner for digitization of cartographic heritage. 7. Cult. Herit. 54:31–43
- Ulguim P. 2018. Models and metadata: the ethics of sharing bioarchaeological 3d models online. *Archaeologies* 14(2):189–228
- Van Meter P, Firetto CM. 2013. Cognitive model of drawing construction. In *Learning Through Visual Displays*, ed. G Schraw, MT McCrudden, D Robinson, pp. 247–80. Charlotte, NC: IAP Inf. Age
- Yazdi LP, Massoudi A. 2017. The consumptive ruins archaeology of consuming past in the Middle East. Archaeologies 13(3):435-59
- Watrall E. 2016. Archaeology, the digital humanities, and the "big tent." In *Debates in the Digital Humanities* 2016, ed. MK Gold, LF Klein, pp. 345–58. Minneapolis: Univ. Minn. Press

- Watterson A, Anderson J, Baxter K. 2020. Designing digital engagements: approaches to creative practice and adaptable programming for archaeological visualisation. In *Proceedings of the EVA London 2020*, pp. 66–72. Swindon, UK: BCS Learn. Dev.
- Watterson A, Hillerdal C. 2020. Nunalleq, stories from the village of our ancestors: co-designing a multi-vocal educational resource based on an archaeological excavation. *Archaeologies* 16(2):198–227
- Wheatley D, Gillings M. 2013. Spatial Technology and Archaeology: The Archaeological Applications of GIS. Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press
- Wickstead H. 2009. The Uber archaeologist: art, GIS and the male gaze revisited. J. Soc. Archaeol. 9(2):249-71