

CAA2014
21ST CENTURY
ARCHAEOLOGY

CONCEPTS, METHODS AND TOOLS

PROCEEDINGS OF THE 42ND ANNUAL
CONFERENCE ON COMPUTER APPLICATIONS
AND QUANTITATIVE METHODS IN
ARCHAEOLOGY

Edited by

**F. Giligny, F. Djindjian, L. Costa, P. Moscati
and S. Robert**

Archaeopress

Gordon House
276 Banbury Road
Oxford OX2 7ED

www.archaeopress.com

ISBN 978 1 78491 100 3
ISBN 978 1 78491 101 0 (e-Pdf)

© Archaeopress and the individual authors 2015

Cover photograph © Cyrille Galinand

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the copyright owners.

Printed in England by Oxuniprint, Oxford

This book is available direct from Archaeopress or from our website www.archaeopress.com



UNIVERSITÉ PARIS 1
PANTHÉON SORBONNE



L'ECOLE
DES HAUTES
ETUDES
SCIENCES
SOCIALES

Institut national
de recherches
archéologiques
préventives

Inrap

MAIRIE DE PARIS



Trajectoires
De la sédentarisation à l'État

UMR 7041
ARSCAN
ARCHÉOLOGIES ET
SCIENCES DE L'ANTIQUITÉ
CNRS - Univ. Paris X
Univ. Paris I - Ministère de la Culture

Contents

Foreword	v
Computers and Mathematics in Archaeology, Anatomy of an Ineluctable Success!	1
François DJINDJIAN	
Chapter 1 Historiography	
Towards a History of Archaeological Computing: An Introduction	9
Paola MOSCATI	
A Retrospective on GIS and AIS Platforms for Public Archaeology in Italy Searching Backward for Roots and Looking Onwards for new Methodological Road-Maps	17
Mirella SERLORENZI, Ilaria JOVINE, Giorgia LEONI, Andrea DE TOMMASI, Andrea VARAVALLO	
Art History of the Ancient Near East and Mathematical Models. An Overview	29
Alessandro DI LUDOVICO and Sergio CAMIZ	
Archaeology and Computer Applications: The Automatic Cataloging of Italian Archaeological Heritage	35
Alessandra CARAVALE	
Chapter 2 Field and Laboratory Data Recording	
Practical Assessment of a Multi-Frequency Slingram EMI for Archaeological Prospection	43
François-Xavier SIMON, Alain TABBAGH, Apostolos SARRIS, Julien THIESSON	
Utilizing Magnetic Prospection and GIS to Examine Settlement Organization in Neolithic Southeastern Europe	53
Alexis NIEKAMP, Apostolos SARRIS	
Historic Forest Change: New Approaches to Land Use Land Cover	65
Charlotte E. STANCIOFF, Robert G. PONTIUS Jr, Scott MADRY, Elizabeth JONES	
Challenges and Perspectives of Woodland Archaeology Across Europe	73
Hauke KENZLER, Karsten LAMBERS	
Archaeological Mapping of Large Forested Areas, Using Semi-Automatic Detection and Visual Interpretation of High-Resolution Lidar Data	81
Øivind Due TRIER, Lars Holger PILØ	
Laser scanning and Automated Photogrammetry for Knowledge and Representation of the Rupestrian Architecture in Cappadocia: Sahinefendi and the Open Air Museum of Goreme	87
Marco CARPICECI, Carlo INGLESE	
Advantages and Disadvantages of Digital Approach in Archaeological Fieldwork	95
Carlo BIANCHINI, Francesco BORGOGNI, Alfonso IPPOLITO	
From Survey to Representation of the Model. A Documentation of Typological and Chronological Sequences of Archaeological Artefacts: Traditional and Innovative Approach	107
Alfonso IPPOLITO, Luca J. SENATORE, Barbara BELELLI MARCHESINI, Gabriella CEROLI	
Archaeology in the Third and Fourth Dimensions: A Case Study of 3D Data Collection and Analysis From Prince Rupert, BC, Canada	115
Alyssa PARKER, Morley ELDRIDGE	
Integrated RTI Approaches for the Study of Painted Surfaces	123
Eleni KOTOULA, Graeme EARL	
Survey, Documentation and Analysis of the Archeological Architecture: the House of the Knights of Rhodes in the Forum of Augustus	135
Carlo BIANCHINI, Gaia Lisa TACCHI	
Digital Research Strategies for Ancient Papyri: A Case Study on Mounted Fragments of The Derveni Papyrus	145
Eleni KOTOULA, Graeme EARL	

Chapter 3. Ontologies and Standards

Towards Linked-Data in Numismatics: How the DIANA Approach can Improve the Diachrony Integrating Heterogeneous Pieces of Data	157
Maria CALTABIANO, Mariangela PUGLISI, Antonio CELESTI, Grazia SALAMONE	
Celtic Coins in Context, a New Database	165
Katherine GRUEL, Agnes TRICOCHÉ, Philippe CHARNOTET	
Uncertainty Handling for Ancient Coinage	171
Karsten TOLLE, David WIGG-WOLF	
Interoperability of the ArSol (Archives du Sol) Database Based on the CIDOC-CRM Ontology.....	179
Emeline LE GOFF, Olivier MARLET, Xavier RODIER, Stéphane CURET, Philippe HUSI	
Find the Balance - Modelling Aspects in Archaeological Information Systems	187
Franz SCHWARZBACH, Felix F. SCHÄFER, Alexander SCHULZE	
Integration of Archaeological Datasets Through the Gradual Refinement of Models	193
Cesar GONZALEZ-PEREZ, Patricia MARTÍN-RODILLA	
Linked Open Greek Pottery.....	205
Ethan GRUBER, Tyler Jo SMITH	
The Digital Archaeological Workflow: A Case Study from Sweden.....	215
Marcus J. SMITH	
Exploring Time and Space in the Annotation of Museum Catalogues: The Sloane Virtual Exhibition Experience	221
Stephen STEAD, Dominic OLDMAN, Jonathan Whitson CLOUD	
Building Comprehensive Management Systems for Cultural – Historical Information.....	227
Chryssoula BEKIARI, Martin DOERR, Dimitris ANGELAKIS, Flora KARAGIANNI	
Managing Time Dimension in the Archaeological Urban Information System of the Historical Heritage of Rome and Verona	235
Alberto BELUSSI, Sara MIGLIORINI, Piergiorgiana GROSSI	
Towards an Archaeological Information System: Improving the Core Data Model	245
Muriel van RUYMBEKE, Cyril CARRÉ, Vincent DELFOSSE, Pierre HALLOT, Michelle PFEIFFER, Roland BILLEN	

Chapter 4. Internet and Archaeology

Archaeological Open Access Journals: The Case of ‘Archeologia e Calcolatori’	257
Alessandra CARVALE, Alessandra PIERGROSSI	
Massive Open Online Opportunity: MOOCs and Internet–Based Communities of Archaeological Practice	265
Jeffrey P. EMANUEL	
Moving Instruction Beyond the Museum’s Walls: Priorities in Online Public Education at the Oriental Institute	271
Kathryn GROSSMAN, Catherine Kenyon, Megaera LORENZ, Brittany HAYDEN	
Crowd- and Community-Fuelled Archaeology. Early Results from the MicroPasts Project	279
Chiara BONACCHI, Andrew BEVAN, Daniel PETT, Adi KEINAN-SCHOONBAERT	
The ACCORD Project: Archaeological Community Co-Production of Research Resources.....	289
Stuart JEFFREY, Alex HALE, Cara JONES, Sian JONES, Mhairi MAXWELL	

Chapter 5. Archaeological Information Systems

12000 Years of Human Occupation, 3 Meters Deep Stratigraphy, 12 Hectares... A Geographical Information System (GIS) for the Preventive Archaeology Operation at Alizay (Normandie, France).....	299
Sylvain MAZET, Cyril MARCIGN, Bruno AUBRY, Isabelle COMTE, Philippe BOULINGUIEZ	
Records and Spatial Representations in the Context of a Rescue Excavation: The Case of Quincieux (Rhône-Alpes, France)	305
Elleboire SEGAIN, Veronique VACHON, Bernard MOULIN, Cécile RAMPONI, Wojciech WIDLAK	

Cartography and Heritage: Past Practice and Future Potential for Mapping Scotland's Cultural Heritage	315
Peter MCKEAGUE	
Visualization Based on the Norwegian University Museum Database	323
Espen ULEBERG, Miekko MATSUMOTO	
An Inventory of Lucanian Heritage.....	333
Alain DUPLOUY, Vincenzo CAPOZZOLI, Alessia ZAMBON	
Integrating Complex Archaeological Datasets from the Neolithic in a Web-Based GIS	341
Kai-Christian BRUHN, Thomas ENGEL, Tobias KOHR, Detlef GRONENBORN	
Enhanced 3D-GIS: Documenting Insula V 1 in Pompeii.....	349
Giacomo LANDESCI, Nicolò DELL'UNTO, Daniele FERDANI, Stefan LINDGREN, Anne-Marie LEANDER TOUATI	
MAPPA Open Data Metadata. The Importance of Archaeological Background	361
Francesca ANICHINI, Gabriele GATTIGLIA	
A Simple Way to Formalize the Dating of Stratigraphic Units.....	365
Bruno DESACHY	
Recognizing Temporalities in Urban Units from a Functional Approach: Three Case Studies.....	371
Julie GRAVIER	
OH_FET: A Computer Application for Analysing Urban Dynamics Over Long Time Spans	381
Laure SALIGNY, Ludovic GRANJON, Thomas HUET, Gaël SIMON, Xavier RODIER, Bastien LEFEBVRE	
An 'Alphabet' to Describe the Spatio-Temporal Dynamics of Settlement Systems: A Relevant Representation of Time?	393
Marie-Jeanne OURIACHI, Frédérique BERTONCELLO, with the collaboration of Pierre NOUVEL, Laure NUNINGER, Elise FOVET, Stephane ALIX	
 Chapter 6. GIS and Spatial Analysis	
ArkeoGIS, Merging Geographical and Archaeological Datas Online	401
Loup BERNARD, Damien ERTLEN, Dominique SCHWARTZ	
Counting Sheep Without Falling Asleep: Using GIS to Calculate the Minimum Number of Skeletal Elements (MNE) and Other Archaeozoological Measures at Schöningen 13li-4 'Spear Horizon'	407
Alejandro GARCÍA-MORENO, Jarod M. HUTSON, Aritza VILLALUENGA, Elaine TURNER, Sabine GAUDZINSKI-WINDHEUSER	
Looking for the Best. A Comparison Between GIS and PageRank Based Algorithms for Preventive Archaeology in Urban Areas	413
Dubini NEVIO, Gabriele GATTIGLIA, Augusto PALOMBINI	
Analyses of Bone Modifications on Human Remains: A GIS Approach.....	423
Elsa CIESIELSKI, Hervé BOHBOT	
Territorial Organisation of the Terramare Culture (Bronze Age, Italy): Use of GIS Methodology to Tackle Societal Issues	431
Julie BOUDRY	
From the Excavation to the Territory: Contributions of GIS Tools to the Study of the Spatial Organization of the Archaeological Site of Argentomagus (France, Indre, Saint-Marcel/Argenton-sur-Creuse)	443
Emeline LE GOFF, Laure LAÛT, Yoann RABASTÉ, Françoise DUMASY	
The Integration of Landscape Processes in Archaeological Site Prediction in the Mugello Basin (Tuscany/Italy)	451
Elmar SCHMALTZ, Michael MÄRKER, Hans-Joachim ROSNER, Adrew-Williams KANDEL	
The Use of Burgundy Stone from Ancient Times to the Present Day.....	459
Stéphane BÜTTNER, Delphine MONTANGE, Laure SALIGNY, Marion FOUCHER with the collaboration of Eric LECLERCQ, Marinette SAVONNET	
Exploring Intervisibility Networks: A Case Study From Bronze and Iron Age Istria (Croatia and Slovenia)	469
Zoran ČUČKOVIĆ	

Chapter 7. Mathematics and Statistics in Archaeology

Intentional Process Modeling of Statistical Analysis Methods	481
Charlotte HUG, Rebecca DENECKÈRE, Ammar AYMEN	
Ancient Mesopotamian Glyptic Products, Statistics and Data Mining: A Research Proposal	489
Alessandro DI LUDOVICO, Sergio CAMIZ	
Intrasite Spatial Analysis Applied to the Neolithic Sites of the Paris Basin: From the Archaeological Feature to Global Analysis	497
François GILIGNY	
Statistical and Mathematical Models for Archaeological Data Mining: A Comparison	509
Nevio DUBBINI, Adam LODOEN	

Chapter 8. 3D Archaeology and Virtual Archaeology

Measuring and Describing 3D Texture	519
Vera MOITINHO DE ALMEIDA, Juan Antonio BARCELÓ	
Old Versus New – Introducing Image-Based 3D Modeling into the General Documentation Workflow of Archaeological Rescue Excavations. Case Studies: the Čachtice and Bratislava castles, Slovakia	529
Jan ZACHAR, Seta ŠTUHEC	
Beyond Spreadsheets: Digitising the Archaeological Artefact Inventory Process	541
Arianna TRAVIGLIA, Stephen WHITE, Andrew WILSON	
Potentialities of 3D Reconstruction in Maritime Archaeology	549
Elisa COSTA, Carlo BELTRAME, Francesco GUERRA	
Cultural Heritage Documentation in Cave Environnement Using Low-Cost Means for Archaeologists. Case Study of the Larchant Caves in the Fontainebleau Forest in France	557
Aurelia LUREAU, Mehdi BELARBI, Pascal RAYMOND, Régis TOUQUET	
Forum Romanum: A 3D Model for Self-Service Educational Purposes	569
Philippe FLEURY, Sophie MADELEINE, Nicolas LEFÈVRE	
The Virtual Reconstruction of a Small Medieval Town: The Case of Briviesca (Spain)	575
Mario ALAGUERO, Andres BUSTILLO, Blanca GUINEA, Lena IGLESIAS	
25 Years of Experience in Virtual Reconstructions - Research Projects, Status Quo of Current Research and Visions for the Future	585
Mieke PFARR-HARFST	
The Archaeological Excavation of the Early Neolithic Site of Portonovo as a Case Study for Testing a 3D Documentation Pipeline	593
Cecilia Conati BARBARO, Eva Savina MALINVERNI, Anna Nora TASSETTI, Chiara LA MARCA	

Chapter 9. Multi-Agent Systems and Complex System Modelling

A Density-Based Simulation Approach for Evaluating Prehistoric Population Fluctuations in Finland	605
Tarja SUNDELL, Juhana KAMMONEN	
Multi-Agent Modelling of the Neolithic LBK	611
Jean-Pierre BOCQUET-APPEL, Richard MOUSSA, Jérôme DUBOULOZ	
Explaining the Adoption of ‘Innovations’ in Western Europe During Bronze Age: Towards an Agent-Based Simulation	623
Juan A. BARCELÓ, Florencia DEL CASTILLO BERNAL, Giacomo CAPUZZO, Berta MORELL, Joan NEGRE	
Spatial Interaction Simulation Methods for Ancient Settlement Distributions in Central Italy	631
Taylor OSHAN, Carson FARMER, Eoin O’DONOGHUE	
Interactions and Network Analysis of a Rock Art Site in Morro do Chapéu, Bahia, Brazil	641
Carlos ETCHEVARNE, Grégoire VAN HAVRE	

Foreword

This volume brings together a selection of papers proposed for the Proceedings of the 42th Computer Applications and Quantitative Methods in Archaeology conference (CAA), held in Paris (France) from 22nd to 25th April 2014.

The conference venue was Paris 1 Panthéon-Sorbonne University, in the main building next to the Panthéon. Workshops were held at the Institute of Art and Archaeology and the EHESS School. This was the first time in 42 years that the CAA had come to France, and we are proud to have hosted this important scientific event in Paris.

CAA2014 welcomed 477 participants from 39 countries. Altogether 397 papers were presented in 26 different sessions. The 5 round tables and 12 workshops also contributed to the success of the conference.

The program was divided into different themes and this structure has been maintained in the arrangement of articles in the various chapters of this book.

We are grateful to the following institutions which made the conference possible and supported it financially. Paris 1 Panthéon-Sorbonne University, the *Mairie* of Paris, the CNRS, the EHESS – Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales, the INRAP – Institut national de Recherches Archéologiques Préventives, the research laboratories from the Maison de l'archéologie et de l'ethnologie, Nanterre – UMR Trajectoires & UMR Arscan. We would also like to thank the staff of the university and the student volunteers.

We hope that the congress participants, the contributors and all people interested in computing in archaeology will enjoy these proceedings.

Computers and Mathematics in Archaeology, Anatomy of an Ineluctable Success!

François DJINDJIAN

Université Paris1 Panthéon-Sorbonne & UMR 7041 Arscan, Paris, France

francois.djindjian@wanadoo.fr

Abstract

Over the last fifty years the use of computer science and mathematics in archaeology has undergone continuous development and to date it has become an almost indispensable tool at any stage of the archaeological procedure: documentation, planning and data recording during surveys and excavations, laboratory studies, landscape analysis, reconstruction of social systems, archiving, mediation within the scientific community and amongst a broader public. New technologies have revolutionised the discipline: archaeological information systems, data retrieval systems, geographic information systems, 3D, the Internet, multidimensional data analysis, mathematical modelling and multi-agent systems. But the most ambitious contribution lies in the field of the formalisation of a general theoretical framework of the discipline, the independence of which from any paradigm and ideology could raise archaeology to the level of the leading scientific disciplines.

Keywords: Computational archaeology, emergence, development, scientific context

1. Introduction

The increasing success over the last fifty years of scientific contributions related to computer applications and quantitative methods in archaeology may now be analysed from different technological and sociological points of view in order to understand the absolute relevance of such contributions to archaeology and the way in which the specialists of computational archaeology could play a major role in the future of modern archaeology.

2. The very beginnings of quantitative and computational archaeology

Several references mark the very beginnings of quantitative and computational archaeology which developed in the 1950s.

The book *'The Application of Quantitative Methods in Archaeology'* edited by R. F. Heizer and S. F. Cook (Heizer & Cook 1960) was the publication of the eponymous Wenner-Gren symposium organised at the Burg Wartenstein conference centre (Austria), from 1st to 9th July 1959, at which participants included J.D. Clarke, A. C. Spaulding, A. C. Blanc, F. R. Matson, H. Vallois and W.W. Howells. The conference officialised the existence of quantitative archaeology, which had emerged about ten years prior, when Brainerd and Robinson published the first algorithm of seriation in 1951 and Spaulding the first statistical method for typometry in 1953.

In 1955 Jean-Claude Gardin, with the assistance of Henri Seyrig, then at the French Institute of Near Eastern Archaeology in Beirut, launched the first application of data retrieval systems in archaeology using mechanographic machines and later an IBM 650 computer. In 1957 he founded the CADA laboratory (*Centre d'Analyse Documentaire en Archéologie*) which set out the famous nine descriptive codes (1957-1969) marking the beginnings of semiotics and data banks in archaeology (Gardin 1956,

1976). From 20th to 30th June 1962 D. Hymes (Indiana University) organised a second Wenner-Gren symposium at the Burg Wartenstein conference centre entitled *'The Use of Computers in Anthropology'* in collaboration with P. Ihm, R. W. Needham, J. Cl. Gardin, S. Ciccato, S. Lamb, Th. Sebeok (Hymes 1965).

3. Naming the discipline

The emergence of a new discipline requires a name. In our case a lot of names were used, following the evolution of computer sciences:

- *quantitative archaeology* (Heizer & Cook, 1960);
- *computer applications and quantitative methods in archaeology* (CAA);
- *data processing and mathematics applied to archaeology* (Djindjian and Ducasse 1982);
- *archaeological computing* (used as the title of the *'Archaeological computing Newsletter'* (1984-2008) published by the Oxford University; this name was used by the University of Southampton for its *'Archaeological computing research group'*; and is also the name of the laboratory created by I. Johnson at the University of Sydney in 1992);
- *computational archaeology* (Wikipedia; seems to replace the previous name or to be specific to computerised mathematical modelling in archaeology);
- *digital archaeology/ digital antiquity* (used unfortunately by the web community for the history of the Internet instead of *'archaeology of the digital'*, but also by the *'digital antiquity service tdar'* (digital archaeological record), by the center of digital heritage (University of York) and by DigAR Lab, the digital archaeology research lab (University of Washington, Seattle);
- *digital applications in archaeology and cultural heritage* (the name is used by the on-line peer review created by B. Frisher (DAACH);

- *archaeoinformatics* (name sometimes used by German speaking archaeologists).

The name ‘*archaeological computing*’ seems to be the most popular although ‘*computational archaeology*’ would be the most appropriate because there are equivalent uses in other sciences. The name ‘*digital archaeology*’ or ‘*digital antiquity*’ is a more recent coining, probably due to the success of the digital revolution in technology, by analogy with ‘*digital heritage*’ and the current development of virtual reality and 3D applications.

4. Positioning the discipline

What is and what could be the academic position of our discipline ?

- A vertical specialty ?

The vertical organisation is the favourite one in the academic world, more particularly at university where the creation of a chair means that a discipline really exists! To my knowledge to date there is not a single chair in computational archaeology at any university in the world. Nonetheless M. Baxter was professor in statistical archaeology at Nottingham University (UK), J. Barcelo is associate professor in quantitative archaeology at the University of Barcelona (Spain) and I hold a chair of archaeological methods and theory at the Paris 1 Pantheon Sorbonne University. I suggest here that it is necessary to create a chair of archaeological methods and theory at all the universities hosting a department of archaeology, which would be in charge of archaeological skills training, and which should be headed by a specialist in computational archaeology.

Computational archaeology research laboratories (general purpose or devoted to GIS, virtual reality, archaeological data banks, etc.) are more frequent. A typical example is the laboratory led by J. Johnson at the Sydney University (see above) or the ‘*Archaeology Data Service*’ at York University (UK) headed by J. Richards. The first was probably Irwin Scollar, head of the department of technical and computer methods in archaeology at the Rheinisches Landesmuseum in Bonn (Germany) from 1971 to 1991.

- A transversal way to improve archaeological knowledge? Obviously the most effective way to develop computational archaeology applications would be to share projects and lectures with all the archaeological specialties which are most often structured according to geographic areas and temporal periods, whether at university or in research institutes. This implies some kind of matrix organisation which theoretically would be well adapted to the integration of a variety of disciplines related to different sciences (physics, geology, zoology, botanic, computing, mathematics, etc.). It is disappointing that this approach was unsuccessful in many conservative countries such as France, Italy and Spain, where the governance is in the hands of influential scholars (in their position or in the commissions they are members of) and does not result from a dialogue between all scientists that aims to define

the global needs and the strategy of a department. Such an organisation, which is so efficient in the very dynamic and competitive world of industry and services, is unfortunately not possible in our academic world. As a consequence the progression of our discipline is slowed down by an institutional and sociological opposition, probably in the same way as for archaeometry.

5. Defining the professional skills and qualification as well as the academic position

Just as for any new scientific discipline, the pioneers of computational archaeology were scientists with a variety of rich backgrounds including hard sciences and human sciences. They trained many students who became the second and third generation of specialists of the discipline, for example John Willcock of the School of Computing at North Staffordshire Polytechnic or myself at the Paris 1 University.

With regard to the scientific production of our colleagues, it is possible to define different profiles of activities:

- Computer scientists or engineers who consider archaeology as a serious hobby. Some of them are very renowned specialists in their own discipline and their research in archaeology reaches a very high scientific level.
- Computer scientists who are interested in archaeology as a field of application for their new computing research. They may have the opportunity to obtain a grant from the European Union or from a national institution and they use archaeology as a display window for their advanced computerised projects. Current applications in digital heritage seem to belong to this category.
- Archaeologists who are involved in quantitative and computational techniques for their research (statistics, mathematical modelling, GIS, 3D, etc.).
- Archaeologists who are using modern archaeological methods (of course using computers).
- Archaeologists who are involved in the production of formalised (and then computerised) archaeological knowledge.

Specialists in computational archaeology occupy very different academic positions, sometimes depending on the sociology of archaeology in the different countries. Among them are:

- Archaeologists using modern techniques, methods and formalisation. In this case they may occupy major academic positions in archaeology, at universities or in research institutes. But they are first of all specialists in an archaeological period and a geographical area, as for instance F. R. Hodson (European protohistory), C. Renfrew, G. Cowgill (Mesoamerica), J. D. Clark (Neolithic), or myself (European Upper Palaeolithic) and many others!
- Technicians working for archaeologists who are not familiar with computational techniques.

A typical case is the French CNRS employing specialists in computational archaeology (for example specialists in archaeological data retrieval systems or geographic information systems) as engineers, technicians or administrative staff (ITA) and not as researchers. This means that the recruitment commissions of the CNRS (sections 31 and 32) reject all the applications with a computational archaeology profile. And as a consequence students do not choose to do a PHD in computational archaeology, because they know they will get a researcher job neither in the CNRS nor at universities (as was also the case for archaeometry). This situation seriously hinders the development of modern methods and techniques in French archaeology.

- A specialised laboratory as part of an archaeological institute

The decision to found a specialised laboratory is linked to major investment (equipment, salaries and office) necessary to its establishment and often results from a long struggle by the pioneer at the creation of the laboratory. By contrast to archaeometry laboratories (for example absolute dating or ceramology or geophysics), nowadays the creation of a laboratory of computational archaeology does not require a major material investment. It should even be stressed that such laboratories existed in France in the 1960s and the 1970s (CADA, LISH) in human and social sciences, but were finally closed. The context of the recent creation of a virtual reality laboratory in Bordeaux by R. Vergnieux (Archéovision) after a long struggle with the Ausonius archaeological institute is symptomatic of these difficulties.

However, multidisciplinary studies carried out in joint projects together with archaeologists are a prerequisite for these laboratories to guarantee their success. This seems to be a major difficulty in countries where the organisation of archaeology is very conservative. Otherwise they are forced to work separately and independently, as was the case for the department of use wear analysis in Saint-Petersburg created by Y. Semenov in the 1950s and it seems to be the case currently with the laboratories of paleogenetics.

-An institution providing specialised services

Examples of private laboratories are rare. Their existence depends on the attitude of governments applying liberal politics in archaeology as for example in rescue archaeology. Start-up companies have been created for 3D processing in archaeology and cultural heritage.

A major topic is the scientific background of students in archaeology. Archaeology is increasingly taught in Humanities, although it is a discipline that uses methods and techniques related to physics, mathematics, computing, earth sciences and others. Such a situation may depress the scientific level of the future generations of archaeologists.

Be that as it may, an archaeologist using computational archaeology will be considered as a statistician or a

computer scientist! That is not news! Remember that A. Glory (a priest studying palaeolithic art) described A. Leroi-Gourhan as a technician in mechanics, because he used punched cards (and knitting needles) to study European Palaeolithic art! So don't worry if your colleagues say you are a system engineer because you are using Powerpoint! Or a driver if you have a driving licence! But this is not a sound reason not to encourage our students to become skilled archaeologists!

6. Academic reviews devoted to computational archaeology

The existence of academic reviews devoted to computational archaeology confirms its status as a scientific discipline. Several of them have disappeared, others still exist:

1965-1976 *Newsletter of Computer Archaeology* (Arizona State University)

1967 *Computers and the Humanities*

1982-1992 *Archéologie et ordinateurs* (CRA CNRS)

1984-2008 *Archaeological computing Newsletter* (Oxford University)

1990 *Archeologia E Calcolatori* (CNR)

Archeologia E Calcolatori has published one volume per year and special issues since 1990.

7. Conferences on computational Archaeology

As mentioned above, the first conferences on computational archaeology were held at the end of the 1950s, notably the Wenner-Gren symposia.

In 1970, the conference of Mamaia (Romania) 'Mathematics in the Archaeological and Historical Sciences' was the place where the most renowned statisticians met archaeology: Rao, Kruskal, Kendall, Sibson, La Vega, Lerman, Wilkinson, Solomon, Doran, Ihm, Borillo, Gower. And where archaeologists demonstrated that they were skilled in the use of statistics: Moberg, Spaulding, Cavalli-Sforza, Hodson, Orton, Hesse, Ammerman, Goldmann.

This conference probably influenced the organisation of the first CAA conference (Computer applications and quantitative methods in archaeology) in Birmingham in 1973. This was the beginning of an annual conference cycle, held for the first time in Birmingham, then elsewhere in the UK, after 1992 in Europe and from 2006 outside Europe. It describes itself as: '*CAA is an international organization bringing together archaeologists, mathematicians and computer scientists. Its aims are to encourage communication between these disciplines, to provide a survey of present work in the field and to stimulate discussion and future progress*'.

During its 1976 world congress in Nice (France) the IUPPS (International Union of Prehistoric and Protohistoric Sciences) decided to create scientific commissions for their inter-congress activities. Commission 4 'Data

management and mathematical methods in Archaeology' was then launched. Over the last 35 years commission 4 organised one or more sessions at each congress every four years as well as inter-congress conferences (Amsterdam, Denver, Sydney, Scottsdale, Paris, Leiden, etc.). At the 2006 conference in Lisbon commission 4 decided to change its name to '*Archaeological methods and theory :formalization, quantification, mathematics and computerization*'.

National conferences on computational archaeology were held, in particular the '*Workshop on Archaeology and Computers*' in Vienna (Austria), organised each year since 1995 by W. Börner and the '*Journées d'Informatique et Archéologie de Paris*' (JIAP) in Paris held biannually since 2008.

CAA also has several national branches organising additional conferences.

Dedicated sessions were also organised at national (for example SAA in the USA) or international archaeological congresses (for example WAC or EAA) and it can be assumed that there is currently no archaeological congress without computational archaeology sessions.

The rapid development of virtual archaeology, for which cultural heritage is a more gratifying market of application than archaeology, prompted the creation of subdivisions in computational archaeology. The 1998 CAA conference in Barcelona gave rise to a separate publication (Barcelo, Forte and Sanders 2000). In 2000, the first VAST conference (International Symposium on Virtual Reality, Archaeology and Cultural Heritage) was organised in Arezzo (Italy) by F. Niccolucci and the 14th international VAST symposium was held in Pistoia (Italy). The biannual 'Virtual Retrospect' conference has been held in Bordeaux (France) since 2003.

Virtual reality (VR) is a very dynamic field of research and its application to cultural heritage is very spectacular. For example, in 2009 as many as five VR conferences on archaeology were held: in Malta, Trento, Paestum, Bordeaux, Seville ('*international charter of virtual archaeology*') as well as over a dozen on general virtual reality! In 2013, all these events converged to become the '*Digital Heritage*' conference in Marseille (France).

The very rapid development of 3D archaeology, which is not only concerned with cultural heritage, may possibly revolutionise field archaeology as well as all data processing that takes place following excavations and surveys, and it could create the conditions necessary for the creation of further subdivisions in computational archaeology.

8. What techniques are used in computational archaeology?

Computational archaeology uses almost all the techniques and tools related to applied mathematics:

- Applied mathematics
- Sampling
- Statistics including graphics, elementary statistics, statistical tests, Bayesian statistics,
- Multidimensional data analysis
- Algorithms
- Graph theory
- Mathematical modelling
- Signal processing
- Image processing
- Multi-agent systems
- Etc.

Computational archaeology also uses almost all the computing applications:

- Semiotics
- Data Retrieval Systems
- Ontologies
- Data Base Management System,
- Archaeological Information System
- Geographic Information Systems
- Virtual Reality
- 3D recording and processing
- Publishing
- CAD (computer-aided design) / CAM (computer-aided manufacturing)
- Internet X.0
- Office automation
- Etc.

All these techniques are of course software programs that the archaeologist has downloaded onto his/her personal computer or workstation, which is powerful enough to run almost all of these applications. The long list reveals the great effort that archaeologists have to put into training in order to be able to use all the software tools. It confirms the need for courses in computing applications very early in academic archaeological training.

9. What archaeological methods use computing tools?

I have frequently pointed out the prime importance of separating the level of techniques (which are steadily improved and often replaced) from the level of methods or best practices (which are only optimised). The techniques are the field of competence of computer scientists or statisticians whereas the methods are the field of competence of archaeologists. For example, it is fundamental to distinguish sample dating (involving a laboratory's competence in radiocarbon dating) from site dating (involving an archaeologist's competence).

The following list of items, which are the chapters of an archaeological textbook, shows the major role of computational archaeology in the process of archaeological investigation (Djindjian 2011):

- Archaeological BPM (business process management)
- Survey

- Excavations
- Stratigraphy
- Sampling for Rescue archaeology
- Typology
- Stylistic analysis
- Seriation
- Culture historical identification
- Intra-site spatial analysis
- Metropolitan spatial analysis
- Archaeology of the construction
- Raw material and manufacturing characterization
- Landscape analysis
- Image processing for special archaeological purposes
- Environmental studies
- Exchange systems
- Virtual Archaeology
- Demography
- Food resource management system
- Transition models
- Collapse models
- Economic models
- Network analysis
- Complex system reconstitution
- Culture Resource Management (CRM)
- Epigraphy
- Etc. !

10. Towards a generalised cognitive framework?

The books ‘Analytical Archaeology’ published by J. D. Clarke (Clarke 1968) and ‘Archaeological constructs’ by J.-C. Gardin (Gardin 1979) reveal that the formalisation of an archaeological construct is also the aim of computational archaeology, just as in the case of artificial intelligence (AI).

Over the last fifty years of archaeology it is possible to distinguish two different approaches with regard to archaeological constructs:

- The constructs are embedded, explicitly or not, in an ideology, a paradigm or a theory (in the Anglo-Saxon sense). In fact, they may be considered as operating an a priori reduction of the range of possibilities: evolutionism, Marxism, Neo-Marxism, functionalism, cultural ecology, gender theory, substantivism, Marrism, Kossinnism, behavioural archaeology, evolutionary archaeology, symbolist archaeology, etc.

Such a reduction may only be useful if it is used not as a dogma (which generally defines an ideology) but rather as a driving force to explore the explanations which were deduced.

- The constructs must be formalised, backed by a cognitive framework (in other words, an epistemology), which is nothing other than a theory of knowledge. An example of this kind

of approach based on Peirce’s logic is my paper ‘*Pour une théorie générale de la connaissance en archeologie*’ (Djindjian 2002).

In such a context the traditional opposition between processual archaeology (New Archaeology) of the 1960s and post-processual archaeology (or symbolist archaeology or post-modern archaeology) of the late 1980s, which is also a classical opposition between structuralism and hermeneutics, appears to be obsolete in comparison with the progress registered in cognitive sciences.

It is important to point out that specialists in computational archaeology have to be considered as being the best contributors to the renewal of the theoretical framework of archaeology.

An example of such a contribution is the topic of the complementarity between the data-oriented approach and process-oriented approach in archaeology. In computer sciences there is a classic complementarity between the data-oriented approach (date bases and data storage), the computation approach (algorithmic) and the process-oriented approach (real time).

Archaeology of the 19th and 20th centuries was mainly a ‘data-oriented archaeology’ following the Montelius typology and the corpus programs, renewed in the 1970s by data retrieval systems (archaeological data banks) and more recently by the Internet, making up the ‘back office’ of archaeology.

The process-oriented approach concerns first the organisation of the archaeological activity (APM or archaeological process management), second the study of the reliability and the representativeness of the archaeological record (taphonomy) and third the systemic reconstruction of past societies (Djindjian, 2014).

11. A charter for ‘21st Century Archaeology’

The goal of computational archaeology is to act as a driving force for the creation of a present archaeology, able to generate improved knowledge and to reconstruct more reliable systems. The following charter of recommendations may illustrate such a programme:

- Relaunch thesaurus and ontology projects in all archaeological fields!
- Create multimedia data bases to save millions of archaeological slides and drawings!
- Write International archaeological standards!
- Start a 3D revolution in Archaeology!
- Think process and systems and renew all archaeological issues!
- Take part in multi-agent system simulations, processes of governance, social organisation, societal behaviours, beliefs, etc.!
- Ignore ideologies, paradigms, theories and the like!

- Carry out real multidisciplinary studies: be inspired by new computerised techniques and integrate but not blindly apply them because of the unreliability of the archaeological record which makes things more complex!
- Ensure high-level academic training for new generations of archaeologists!
- Create specialised laboratories in research institutes!
- Create chairs of ‘ Archaeological Methods and Theory’!
- Etc.

12. Conclusions : the 21st century archaeologist

The 21st century archaeologists are no longer excavators: they integrate other disciplines such as history, epigraphy, geography, anthropology, ethnology, economy, agronomy, physics, chemistry, mathematics, computer science, etc. They shoulder the very difficult task of reconstructing the complex systems of past societies based on partial, biased and meaningless archaeological and epigraphic data. They also play a role in society: knowledge of the past enables them to understand the present and to anticipate the future. They are the only scientists to conceive the depth of the time. Computational archaeology may play a major role in such a challenge, but it needs a proper name, a proper scientific review and a proper conference, well accepted and open to all specialists.

References

- BARCELO, J.A. FORTE, M. SANDERS, DH. (2000). *Virtual reality in Archaeology*, (BAR International series, 843), Oxford: Archeopress.
- BRAINERD, GW. (1951). ‘The Place of chronological ordering in archaeological analysis’, *American Antiquity* 15, pp.293-301
- CLARKE, D. L (1968). *Analytical Archaeology*, Methuen, London.
- DJINDJIAN, F. (2002). Pour une théorie générale de la connaissance en archéologie. XIV^o Congrès International UISPP, Liège Septembre 2001. Colloque 1.3. *Archeologia E Calcolatori* 13, pp.101-117
- DJINDJIAN, F. (2011). *Manuel d’Archéologie*. Paris: Armand Colin.
- DJINDJIAN, F. (2014). Simuler une ‘Artificial Society’: organisation sociale, gouvernance et attitudes sociétales. *Actes des troisièmes journées Informatique et Archéologie de Paris - JIAP 2012*, Paris, Juin 2012. *Archeologia e Calcolatori*, Supplément 5, 2014, pp.18-33.
- DJINDJIAN, F. DUCASSE, H. (edts) (1987). *Data processing and mathematics applied to archaeology. Mathématiques et Informatique appliquées à l’Archéologie*, PACT 16, Conseil de l’Europe.
- GARDIN, JCl. (1976). *Code pour l’analyse des formes de poteries, établi en 1956, révisé en 1974*. Paris: Éditions du C.N.R.S.
- GARDIN, JCl. (1979). *Une Archéologie théorique*, Hachette, Paris
- HEIZER, RF. COOK, SF (eds.) (1960). *The Application of Quantitative Methods in Archaeology*. Chicago: Quadrangle books.
- HODSON, F. R., KENDALL, D. G., TAUTU, P. (eds.) (1971). *Mathematics in the archaeological and historical sciences. proceedings of the Anglo-Romanian conference, Mamaia 1970* / ed. F. R. Hodson, D. G. Kendall, P. Tautu. Edinburgh : Edinburgh University Press
- HYMES, D. (ed.) (1965). *The use of computers in Anthropology*. Studies in general Anthropology, 2, London: Mouton.
- ROBINSON, NS. (1951). ‘A Method for chronologically ordering archaeological deposits’, *American Anthropologist* 15, pp.301-313