

The Open Digital Archaeology Textbook Environment

Shawn Graham, Neha Gupta, Michael Carter, & Beth Compton

2017-02-14

Contents

notice	5
About the Authors	7
Getting Started	9
How to use this text	9
How to contribute changes, or make your own version	9
How to access and use the computational environment	9
Colophon	9
Welcome!	11
1 Going Digital	13
1.1 So what is Digital Archaeology?	13
1.2 Project management basics	16
1.3 Github & Version control	18
1.4 Open Notebook Research & Scholarly Communication	22
1.5 Failing Productively	23
1.6 Introduction to Digital Libraries, Archives & Repositories	23
1.7 Command Line Methods for Working with APIs	23
1.8 The Ethics of Big Data in Archaeology	24
2 Making Data Useful	25
2.1 Designing Data Collection	25
2.2 Cleaning Data with Open Refine	25
2.3 Linked Open Data and Data Publishing	25
3 Finding and Communicating the Compelling Story	27
3.1 Statistical Computing with R and Python Notebooks; Reproducible code	27
3.2 D3, Processing, and Data Driven Documents	27
3.3 Storytelling and the Archaeological CMS: Omeka, Kora	27
3.4 Web Mapping with Leaflet	28
3.5 Place-based Interpretation with Locative Augmented Reality	28
3.6 Archaeogaming and Virtual Archaeology	28
3.7 Social media as Public Engagement & Scholarly Communication in Archaeology	28
4 Eliding the Digital and the Physical	29
4.1 3D Photogrammetry & Structure from Motion	29
4.2 3D Printing, the Internet of Things and “Maker” Archaeology	29
4.3 Artificial Intelligence in Digital Archaeology	29
5 Digital Archaeology’s Place in the World	31
5.1 Marketing Digital Archaeology	31

5.2 Sustainability & Power in Digital Archaeology	31
6 On the Horizons: Where Digital Archaeology Might Go Next	33
References	35

notice

This volume goes hand-in-glove with a computational environment built on the DHBox.

THIS IS A DRAFT VERSION



Figure 1: A word cloud image of the original ODATE proposal, arranged to mimic a photograph of the temple of Athena Pronaos at Delphi



The online version of this book is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

About the Authors

Shawn Graham

At Carleton etc

Neha Gupta

blah

Michael Carter

blah

Beth Compton

blah

Editorial Board

Katharine Cook, University of Victoria

Ethan Watrall, Michigan State University

Daniel Pett, The British Museum

Eric Kansa, Open Context & The Alexandria Archive Institute

Kathleen Fitzpatrick, Modern Language Association

Getting Started

How to use this text

yadda

How to contribute changes, or make your own version

bigglybeep

How to access and use the computational environment

link to site, instructions, also repo, also dhbox-on-a-stick

Colophon

how this site was made

Welcome!

Digital archaeology as a field rests upon the creative use of primarily open-source and/or open-access materials to archive, reuse, visualize, analyze and communicate archaeological data. This reliance on open-source and open-access is a political stance that emerges in opposition to archaeology's past complicity in colonial enterprises and scholarship; digital archaeology resists the digital neo-colonialism of Google, Facebook, and similar tech giants that typically promote disciplinary silos and closed data repositories. Specifically, digital archaeology encourages innovative, reflective, and critical use of open access data and the development of digital tools that facilitate linkages and analysis across varied digital sources.

To that end, this document you are reading is integrated with a cloud-based digital exploratory laboratory of multiple cloud-computing tools with teaching materials that instructors will be able to use 'out-of-the-box' with a single click, or to remix as circumstances dictate. Part of our inspiration comes from the 'DHBox' project from CUNY (City University of New York, [link](#)), a project that is creating a 'digital humanities laboratory' in the cloud. While the tools of the digital humanities are congruent with those of digital archaeology, they are typically configured to work with texts rather than material culture in which archaeologists specialise. The second inspiration is the open-access guide 'The Programming Historian', which is a series of how-tos and tutorials ([link](#)) pitched at historians confronting digital sources for the first time. A key challenge scholars face in carrying out novel digital analysis is how to install or configure software; each 'Programming Historian' tutorial therefore explains in length and in detail how to configure software. The present e-textbook merges the best of both approaches to create a singular experience for instructors and students: a one-click digital laboratory approach, where installation of materials is not an issue, and with carefully designed tutorials and lessons on theory and practice in digital archaeology.

Chapter 1

Going Digital

Digital archaeology should exist to assist us in the performance of archaeology as a whole. It should not be a secret knowledge, nor a distinct school of thought, but rather simply seen as archaeology done well, using all of the tools available to and in better recovering, understanding and presenting the past. In the end, there is no such thing as digital archaeology. What exists, or at least what should exist, are intelligent and practical ways of applying the use of computers to archaeology that better enable us to pursue both our theoretical questions and our methodological applications. (Evans and Daly 2006)

While we agree with the first part of the sentiment, the second part is rather up for debate. Digital tools exist in a meshwork of legal and cultural obligations, and moreso than any other tool humans have yet come up with, have the capability to exert their own agency upon the user. Digital tools and their use are not theory-free or without theoretical implications. There is no such thing as neutral, when digital tools are employed.

In this section, we suggest that digital archaeology is akin to work at the intersection of art and public archaeology and digital humanities. We then provide you the necessary basics for setting up your own digital archaeological practice.

1.1 So what is Digital Archaeology?

If you are holding this book in your hands, via a device or on paper, or looking at it on your desktop, you might wonder why we feel it necessary to even ask the question. It is important at the outset to make the argument that digital archaeology is not about ‘mere’ tool use. Andrew Goldstone in *Debates in the Digital Humanities* discusses this tension (Goldstone 2018). He has found (and Lincoln Mullen concurs with regard to his own teaching, (Mullen 2017)) that our current optimism about teaching technical facility is misplaced. Tools first, context second doesn’t work. Alternatively, theory first doesn’t seem to work either. And finally, for anything to work at all, datasets have to be curated and carefully pruned for their pedagogical value. We can’t simply turn students loose on a dataset (or worse, ask them to build their own) and expect ‘learning’ to happen.

Our approach in this volume is to resolve that seeming paradox by providing not just the tools, and not just the data, but also the computer itself. Archaeologically, this puts our volume in dialog with the work of scholars such as Ben Marwick, who makes available with his research the code, the dependencies, and sometimes, an entire virtual machine, to enable other scholars to replicate, reuse, or dispute his conclusions. We want you to reuse our code, to study it, and to improve upon it. We want you to annotate our pages, and point out our errors. For us, digital archaeology is not the mere use of computational tools to answer archaeological questions. Rather, it is to enable the audience for archaeological thinking to enter into conversation with us, and to *do* archaeology for themselves.

Digital archaeology is necessarily a public archaeology. This is its principal difference with what has come before, for never forget, there has been at least a half-century of innovative use of computational power for archaeological knowledge building.

1.1.1 Is digital archaeology part of the digital humanities?

The Computer Applications in Archaeology Conference has been publishing its proceedings since 1973. Archaeologists have been running simulations, doing spatial analysis, clustering, imaging, geophysicing, 3d modeling, neutron activation analyzing, x-tent modeling , etc, for what seems like ages.

Surely, then, digital archaeologists are digital humanists too? Trevor Owens, a digital archivist, draws attention to the purpose behind one’s use of computational power – generative discovery versus justification of an hypothesis (Owens, Trevor 2012). Discovery marks out the digital humanist whilst justification signals the humanist who uses computers. Discovery and justification are critically different concepts. For Owens, if we are using computational power to deform our texts, then we are trying to see things in a new light, to create new juxtapositions, to spark new insight. Stephen Ramsay talks about this too in *Reading Machines* (Ramsay 2011, 33), discussing the work of Samuels and McGann, (Samuels and McGann 1999): “Reading a poem backward is like viewing the face of a watch sideways – a way of unleashing the potentialities that altered perspectives may reveal”. This kind of reading of data (especially, but not necessarily, through digital manipulation), does not happen very much at all in archaeology. If ‘deformance’ is a key sign of the digital humanities, then digital archaeologists are not digital humanists. Owen’s point isn’t to signal who’s in or who’s out, but rather to draw attention to the fact that:

When we separate out the the context of discovery and exploration from the context of justification we end up clarifying the terms of our conversation. There is a huge difference between “here is an interesting way of thinking about this” and “This evidence supports this claim.”

This is important in the wider conversation concerning how we evaluate digital scholarship. We’ve used computers in archaeology for decades to try to justify or otherwise connect our leaps of logic and faith, spanning the gap between our data and the stories we’d like to tell. A digital archaeology that sat within the digital humanities would worry less about hypothesis testing, and concentrate more on discovery and generation, of ‘interesting way[s] of thinking about this’.

1.1.2 Archaeological Glitch Art

Bill Caraher is a leading thinker on the implications and practice of digital archaeology. In a post on archaeological glitch art (Caraher 2012) Caraher changed file extensions to fiddle about in the insides of images of archaeological maps. He then looked at them again as images:

The idea ... is to combine computer code and human codes to transform our computer mediated image of archaeological reality in unpredictable ways. The process is remarkably similar to analyzing the site via the GIS where we take the “natural” landscape and transform it into a series of symbols, lines, and text. By manipulating the code that produces these images in both random and patterned ways, we manipulate the meaning of the image and the way in which these images communicate information to the viewer. We problematize the process and manifestation of mediating between the experienced landscape and its representation as archaeological data.

Similarly, Graham’s work in representing archaeological data in sound (a literal auditory metaphor) translates movement over space (or through time) into a soundscape of tones (Graham 2017). This frees us from the tyranny of the screen and visual modes of knowing that often occlude more than they reveal (for instance, our Western-framed understanding of the top of the page or screen as ‘north’ means we privilege visual patterns in the vertical dimension over the horizontal (Montello et al. 2003)).

1.1.3 The ‘cool’ factor

Alan Liu (Liu 2004) wondered what the role of the arts and humanities was in an age of knowledge work, of deliverables, of an historical event horizon that only goes back the last financial quarter. He examined the idea of ‘knowledge work’ and teased out how much of the driving force behind it is in pursuit of the ‘cool’. Through a deft plumbing of the history of the early internet (and in particular, riffing on Netscape’s ‘what’s cool?’ page from 1996 and their inability to define it except to say that they’d know it when they saw it), Liu argues that cool is ‘the aporia of information. . . cool is information designed to resist information [emphasis original]. . . information fed back into its own signal to create a standing interference pattern, a paradox pattern’ (Liu 2004, 179). The latest web design, the latest app, the latest R package for statistics, the latest acronym on Twitter where all the digital humanists play: cool, and dividing the world.

That is, Liu argued that ‘cool’ was amongst other things a politics of knowledge work, a practice and ethos. He wondered how we might ‘challenge knowledge work to open a space, as yet culturally sterile (coopted, jejune, anarchistic, terroristic), for a more humane hack of contemporary knowledge?’ (Liu 2004, 9). Liu goes on to discuss how the tensions of ‘cool’ in knowledge work (for us, read: digital archaeology) also intersects with an ethos of the unknown, that is, of knowledge workers who work nowhere else somehow manage to stand outside that system of knowledge production. (Is alt-ac ‘alt’ partially because it is the cool work?). This matters for us as archaeologists. There are many ‘cool’ things happening in digital archaeology that somehow do not penetrate into the mainstream (such as it is). The utilitarian dots-on-a-map were once cool, but are now pedestrian. The ‘cool’ things that could be, linger on the fringes. If they did not, they wouldn’t be cool, one supposes. They resist.

To get that more humane hack that Liu seeks, Liu suggests that the historical depth that the humanities provides counters the shallowness of cool:

The humanities thus have an explanation for the new arts of the information age, whose inheritance of a frantic sequence of artistic modernisms, postmodernisms, and post-postmodernists is otherwise only a displaced encounter with the raw process of historicity. Inversely, the arts offer the humanities serious ways of engaging – both practically and theoretically- with “cool”. Together, the humanities and arts might be able to offer a persuasive argument for the humane arts in the age of knowledge work. (Liu 2004, 381).

In which case, the emergence of digital archaeologists and historians in the last decade might be the loci of the humane hacks – if we move into that space where we engage the arts. Indeed, the seminal anthropologist Tim Ingold makes this very argument with reference to his own arc as a scholar, ‘From Science to Art and Back Again’:

Revisiting science and art: which is more ecological now? Why is art leading the way in promoting radical ecological awareness? The goals of today’s science are modelling, prediction and control. Is that why we turn to art to rediscover the humility that science has lost?

We need to be making art. Digital archaeology naturally pushes in that direction.

1.1.4 Takeaways

- Digital archaeology is a public archaeology
- Digital archaeology is more often about deformation rather than justification
- In that deformative practice, it is in some ways extremely aligned with artistic ways of knowing
- Digital archaeology is part of the digital humanities, and in many ways, presaged current debates and trends in that field.

All of these aspects of digital archaeology exist along a continuum. In the remainder of this chapter, we discuss the necessary skills to get you to the point where you can begin to wonder about deformation and the public entanglement with your work.

1.2 Project management basics

A digital project, whether in archaeology or in other fields, iterates through the same basic steps. There is

1. finding data
2. fixing data
3. analyzing the data
4. communicating the story in the data

Eighty percent of your time on any digital project will be invested in cleaning up the data and documenting what you've done to it. But in truth, a digital project begins long before we ever look at a data set (or are given data to work with, if we're part of a larger project). How do we formulate a research question or our exploration more generally? How do we translate a gut feeling or intuition or curiosity into something that is *operable*? REF Moretti on operationalizing things

Firstly, we have to develop some basic good habits.

1. separate what you write from `_how_` you write it.
2. keep what you write under version control.

Have you ever fought with Word or another wordprocessor, trying to get things just right? Word processing is a mess. It conflates writing with typesetting and layout. Sometimes, you just want to get the words out. Othertimes, you want to make your writing as accessible as possible... but your intended recipient can't open your file, because they don't use the same wordprocessor. Or perhaps you wrote up some great notes that you'd love to have in a slideshow; but you can't, because copying and pasting preserves a whole lot of extra gunk that messes up your materials.

The answer is to separate your content from your tool. This can help keep your thinking clear, but it also has a more nuts-and-bolts practical dimension. *A computer will always be able to read a text file.* That is to say: you've futureproofed your material. Any researcher will have old physical discs or disc drives or obsolete computers lying around. It is not uncommon for a colleague to remark, 'I wrote this in Wordperfect and I can't open this any more'. Graham's MA thesis is trapped on a 3.5" disc drive that was compressed using a now-obsolete algorithm and it cannot be recovered. If, on the other hand, he had written the text as a .txt file, and saved the data as .csv tables, those materials would *continue* to be accessible.

(a .txt file is simply a text file; a .csv is a text file that uses commas to separate the text into columns. Similarly, a .md file is a text file that uses things like `#` to indicate headers, and `_` to show where italicized text starts and stops.)

As you work through this book, we encourage you to write your thoughts, observations, or results in simple text files. You can always open a text file in the latest version of Word; sometimes, you can't open old Word files in the latest version of Word! We will discuss more about this below, where we will have you do some exercises in marking up a text file with 'markdown'.

The four steps we identified above are cyclical; at any one time you might be at a different stage of the process. Indeed, those four steps could easily be subsumed under what Simon Appleford and Jennifer Guiliano of devdh.org identify as the 'Best Practice Principles Of Designing Your First Project.' For Appleford and Guiliano, the outline of a project involves figuring out:

1. the question, problem, or provocation
2. sources (primary, secondary)
3. analytical activity
4. audience
5. product

Note that 4, audience, comes before 5, product. You must think of your reader/user!

Let us imagine that we were inspired by Allison Mickel's piece, 'Tracing Teams, Texts, and Topics: Applying Social Network Analysis to Understand Archaeological Knowledge Production at Çatalhöyük'.

We could frame a question: ‘What role do social networks play in the development of knowledge production at my site?’

We could frame a problem: ‘Mickel’s exploration of social networks considered x, but not y.’

We could frame a provocation: ‘Social Network Analysis promises to revolutionize our knowledge of the social contexts that underpin archaeological fieldwork, putting this power in the hands of everyone from the site director on down.’




Figure 1.1: Creating and/or refining your research question, per DevDH.org

Following Appleford and Guiliano, we can refine our question, or our problem, or our provocation down to its essence in order to figure out the next parts of the the process. Knowing exactly what kind of question, problem, or provocation we’re after, we then have a better sense of what to do when confronted with a mass of data (for instance, the excavation diaries from Kenen Tepe held in OpenContext.org, deposited by Parker and Cobb, 2012). Once the question is well-drawn out, questions 3 and 4 take care of themselves.

One other element that we might add is ‘collaboration’. How do you plan to collaborate? While many digital archaeology projects are done by a single individual working in the quiet of their own space, most projects require many different skill sets, perspectives, and stakeholders. It is worth figuring out at the outset how you plan to work together. Will you use email? Will you use a private slack or messaging client? What about Kanban boards? (A Kanban board can be as simple as a whiteboard with three columns on it, marked ‘to do’, ‘doing’, and ‘done’. Tasks are written on post-it notes and moved through the columns as necessary. A popular software implementation of a Kanban board is Trello.) We would also recommend that you write down the ideal division of labour and areas of responsibility for each of the participants, *along with a mechanism for resolving disputes*.

Finally, how much time would you have to work on your digital archaeology project? All of us have multiple demands on our time. Let’s be realistic about how much time you have available. How many hours, total, do you spend in class, at work, asleep, and socializing? Add that up for a week, then multiply by the number of weeks in your term. There are 384 hours in a 16 week term. Subtract to find out how many ‘spare’ hours you can devote to homework, this project, or a hobby.

Divide that by the number of weeks your course runs. That’s how many hours per week you can spend on all your non in-class course work. Then, divide those hours by the number of courses you have.

Assuming that this textbook is being used for one of those courses, that's how much time you would have to spend on a digital archaeology project. It's not an awful lot, which means that the more energy you put into planning, the more effective your labour is going to be.

1.2.1 Take-aways

- Separate your *content* from your *presentation*
- future-proof your materials through the use of simple text formats wherever possible
- be explicit about how collaboration will be managed
- be explicit about how your research goals intersect with your audience
- be brutally honest about your time and guard it jealously

1.2.2 exercises

1. (to be refined) Open a new textfile in the Archaeobox. Call it 'initial-project-idea.md'. Using # to indicate headings, sketch out a question, problem, or provocation of your own that occurs to you as you browse the Kenen Tepe materials housed at OpenContext.org. Save that file.
2. create a project management plan. (to be fleshed out in more detail)

1.3 Github & Version control

It's a familiar situation - you've been working on a paper. It's where you want it to be, and you're certain you're done. You save it as 'final.doc'. Then, you ask your friend to take a look at it. She spots several typos and that you flubbed an entire paragraph. You open it up, make the changes, and save as 'final-w-changes.doc'. Later that day it occurs to you that you don't like those changes, and you go back to the original 'final.doc', make some changes, and just overwrite the previous version. Soon, you have a folder like:

```
| -project
|   |- 'finalfinal.doc'
|   |- 'final-w-changes.doc'
|   |- 'final-w-changes2.doc'
|   |- 'isthisone-changes.doc'
|   |- 'this.doc'
```

Things can get messy quite quickly. Imagine that you also have several spreadsheets in there as well, images, snippets of code... we don't want this. What we want is a way of managing the evolution of your files. We do this with a program called Git. Git is not a user-friendly piece of software, and it takes some work to get your head around. Git is also very powerful, but fortunately, the basic uses to which most of us put it to are more or less straightforward. There are many other programs that make use of Git for version control; these programs weld a graphical user interface on top of the main Git program. It is better however to become familiar with the basic uses of git from the command line *first* before learning the idiosyncracies of these helper programs. The exercises in this section will take you through the basics of using Git from the command line.

1.3.1 The core functions of Git

At its heart, Git is a way of taking 'snapshots' of the current state of a folder, and saving those snapshots in sequence. (For an excellent brief presentation on Git, see Alice Bartlett's presentation [here](#); Bartlett is a senior developer for the Financial Times). In Git's lingo, a folder on your computer is known as a **repository**. This sequence of snapshots in total lets you see how your project unfolded over time. Each time you wish to

1. Tell the story of your project
2. Travel back in time
3. Experiment with changes
4. Back up your work
5. Collaborate on projects

Figure 1.2: Alice Bartlett's summary of what Git does

take a snapshot, you make a **commit**. A commit is a Git command to take a snapshot of the entire repository. Thus, your folder we discussed above, with its proliferation of documents becomes:

```
| -project
|   |- 'final.doc'
```

BUT its commit history could be visualized like this:



Figure 1.3: A visualization of the history of commits

Each one of those circles represents a point in time when you the writer made a commit; Git compared the state of the file to the earlier state, and saved a snapshot of the **differences**. What is particularly useful about making a commit is that Git requires two more pieces of information about the git: who is making it, and when. The final useful bit about a commit is that you can save a detailed message about *why* the commit is being made. In our hypothetical situation, your first commit message might look like this:

Fixed conclusion

```
Julie pointed out that I had missed
the critical bit in the assignment
regarding stratigraphy. This was
added in the concluding section.
```

This information is stored in the history of the commits. In this way, you can see exactly how the project evolved and why. Each one of these commits has what is called a **hash**. This is a unique fingerprint that you can use to ‘time travel’ (in Bartlett’s felicitous phrasing). If you want to see what your project looked like a few months ago, you **checkout** that commit. This has the effect of ‘rewinding’ the project. Once you’ve checked out a commit, don’t be alarmed when you look at the folder: your folder (your repository) looks like how it once did all those weeks ago! Any files written after that commit seem as if they’ve disappeared. Don’t worry: they still exist!

What would happen if you wanted to experiment or take your project in a new direction from that point forward? Git lets you do this. What you will do is create a new **branch** of your project from that point. You can think of a branch as like the branch of a tree, or perhaps better, a branch of a river that eventually merges back to the source. (Another way of thinking about branches is that it is a label that sticks with these particular commits.) It is generally considered ‘best practice’ to leave your **master** branch alone, in the sense that it represents the best version of your project. When you want to experiment or do something new, you create a **branch** and work there. If the work on the branch ultimately proves fruitless, you can discard it. *But*, if you decide that you like how it’s going, you can **merge** that branch back into your master. A merge is a commit that folds all of the commits from the branch with the commits from the master.

Git is also a powerful tool for backing up your work. You can work quite happily with Git on your own machine, but when you store those files and the history of commits somewhere remote, you open up the possibility of collaboration *and* a safe place where your materials can be recalled if -perish the thought- something happened to your computer. In Git-speak, the remote location is, well, the **remote**. There are many different places on the web that can function as a remote for Git repositories. You can even set one up on your own server, if you want. One of the most popular (and the one that we use for ODATE) is Github. There are many useful repositories shared via Github of interest to archaeologists - OpenContext for instance shares a lot of material that way. To get material *out* of Github and onto your own computer, you **clone** it. If that hypothetical paper you were writing was part of a group project, your partners could clone it from your Github space, and work on it as well!

You and Anna are working together on the project. You have made a new project repository in your Github space, and you have cloned it to your computer. Anna has cloned it to hers. Let’s assume that you have a very productive weekend and you make some real headway on the project. You **commit** your changes, and then **push** them from your computer to the Github version of your repository. That repository is now one commit *ahead* of Anna’s version. Anna **pulls** those changes from Github to her own version of the repository, which now looks *exactly* like your version. What happens if you make changes to the exact same part of the exact same file? This is called a **conflict**. Git will make a version of the file that contains text clearly marking off the part of the file where the conflict occurs, with the conflicting information marked out as well. The way to **resolve** the conflict is to open the file (typically with a text editor) and to delete the added Git text, making a decision on which information is the correct information.

1.3.2 Key Terms

- repository: a single folder that holds all of the files and subfolders of your project
- commit: this means, ‘take a snapshot of the current state of my repository’
- publish: take my folder on my computer, and copy it and its contents to the web as a repository at `github.com/myusername/repositoryname`
- sync: update the web repository with the latest commit from my local folder
- branch: make a copy of my repository with a ‘working name’
- merge: fold the changes I have made on a branch into another branch (typically, either master or gh-pages)
- fork: to make a copy of someone else’s repo
- clone: to copy a repo online onto your own computer
- pull request: to ask the original maker of a repo to ‘pull’ your changes into their master, original, repository
- push: to move your changes from your computer to the online repo
- conflict: when two commits describe different changes to the same part of a file

1.3.3 Take-aways

- Git keeps track of all of the differences in your files, when you take a ‘snapshot’ of the state of your folder (repository) with the **commit** command

- Git allows you to roll back changes
- Git allows you to experiment by making changes that can be deleted or incorporated as desired
- Git allows you to manage collaboration safely
- Git allows you to distribute your materials

1.3.4 Further Reading

We alluded above to the presence of ‘helper’ programs that are designed to make it easier to use Git to its full potential. An excellent introduction to Github’s desktop GUI is at this Programming Historian lesson on Github. A follow-up lesson explains the way Github itself can be used to host entire websites! You may explore it here. In the section of this chapter on open notebooks, we will also use Git and Github to create a simple open notebook for your research projects.

You might also wish to dip into the archived live stream from the first day of the NEH funded Institute on Digital Archaeology Method and Practice (2015) where Prof. Ethan Watrall discusses project management fundamentals and, towards the last part of the stream, introduces Git.

1.3.5 exercises

1. How do you turn a folder into a repository? With the `git init` command. At the command line (remember, the `$` just shows you the prompt; you don’t have to type it!):
 - a. make a new director: `$ mkdir first-repo`
 - b. type `$ ls` (list) to see that the director exists. Then change directory into it: `cd first-repo`. (remember: if you’re ever not sure what directory you’re in, type `$ pwd`, or print working directory).
 - c. make a new file called `readme.md`. You do this by calling the text editor: `nano readme.md`. Type an explanation of what this exercise is about. The `.md` signals that you’re writing a text file that uses the markdown format of signalling things like headings, lists, tables, etc. (A guide to markdown syntax is here). Hit `ctrl+x` to exit, then `y` to save, leave the file name as it is.
 - d. type `$ ls` again to check that the file is there.
 - e. type `$ git init` to tell the Git program that this folder is to be tracked as a repository. If all goes correctly, you should see a variation on this message: `Initialized empty Git repository in /home/demonstration/first-repo/.git/`. But type `$ ls` again. What do you (not) see?

The changes in your repo will now be stored in that *hidden* directory, `.git`. Most of the time, you will never have reason to search that folder out. But know that the config file that describes your repo is in that folder. There might come a time in the future where you want to alter some of the default behaviour of the git program. You do that by opening the config file (which you can read with a text editor). Google ‘show hidden files and folders’ for your operating system when that time comes.

2. Open your `readme.md` file again with the nano text editor, from the command line. Add some more information to it, then save and exit the text editor.
 - a. type `$ git status`
 - b. Git will respond with a couple of pieces of information. It will tell you which **branch** you are on. It will list any untracked files present or new changes that are unstaged. We now will **stage** those changes to be added to our commit history by typing `$ git add -A`. (This adds any new, modified, or deleted files to your commit when you make it. There are other options or flags - the bit that says `-A` - where you add *only* the new and modified files, *or* only the modified and deleted files)
 - c. Let’s check our git status again: type `$ git status`
 - d. You should see something like this:

```
On branch master
Initial commit
Changes to be committed:
```

```
(use "git rm --cached <file>..." to unstage)
new file:   readme.md````
```

- e. Let's take a snapshot: type `$ git commit -m "My first commit"`. What happened? Remember, Git keeps track not only of the changes, but *who* is making them. If this is your first time working with Git in the Archaeobox, Git will ask you for your name and email. Helpfully, the Git error message tells you exactly what to do: type `$ git config --global user.email "you@example.com"` and then type `$ git config --global user.name "Your Name"`. Now try making your first commit.
- f. The command above represents a bit of a shortcut for making commit messages by using the `-m` flag to associate the text in the quotation marks with the commit. Open up your `readme.md` file again, and add some more text to it. Save and exit the text editor. Add the new changes to the snapshot that we will take. Then, type `$ git commit`. Git automatically opens up the text editor so you can type a longer, more substantive commit message. In this message (unlike in markdown) the `#` indicates a line to be ignored. You'll see that there is already some default text in there telling you what to do. Type a message indicating the nature of the changes you have made. Then save and exit the text editor. DO NOT change the filename!

Congratulations, you are now able to track your changes, and keep your materials under version control!

3. Go ahead and make some more changes to your repository. Add some new files. Commit your changes after each new file is created. Now we're going to view the history of your commits. Type `$ git log`. What do you notice about this list of changes? Look at the time stamps. You'll see that the entries are listed in reverse chronological order. Each entry has its own 'hash' or unique ID, the person who made the commit and time are listed, as well as the commit message eg:

```
commit 253506bc23070753c123accbe7c495af0e8b5a43
Author: Shawn Graham <shawn.graham@carleton.ca>
Date:   Tue Feb 14 18:42:31 2017 +0000
```

Fixed the headings that were broken in the about section of `readme.md`

- a. We're going to go back in time and create a new branch. Here's how the command will look: `$ git checkout -b branchname <commit>` where `branch` is the name you want the branch to be called, and `<commit>` is that unique ID. Make a new branch from your second last commit (don't use `<` or `>`).
- b. We typed `git checkout -b experiment 253506bc23070753c123accbe7c495af0e8b5a43`. The response: `Switched to a new branch 'experiment'` Check git status and then list the contents of your repository. What do you see? You should notice that some of the files you had created before seem to have disappeared - congratulations, you've time travelled! Those files are not missing; but they *are* on a different branch (the master branch) and you can't harm them now. Add a number of new files, making commits after each one. Check your git status, and check your git log as you go to make sure you're getting everything. Make sure there are no unstaged changes - everything's been committed.
4. Now let's assume that your `experiment` branch was successful - everything you did there you were happy with and you want to integrate all of those changes back into your `master` branch. We're going to merge things. To merge, we have to go back to the master branch: `$ git checkout master`.
- a. Now, we merge with `$ git merge experiment`. Remember, a merge is a special kind of commit that rolls all previous commits from both branches into one - Git will open your text editor and prompt you to add a message (it will have a default message already there if you want it). Save and exit and ta da! Your changes have been merged together.

1.4 Open Notebook Research & Scholarly Communication

- in this section, discuss people like caleb mcdaniels, lincoln mullen, ben marwick, other archaeologists,
- develop exercise to use lincoln's framework for simple notebooks, Ben's examples for complex notebooks

- discuss the role of blogging in this, and how a blog doesn't necessarily have to be reflective or narrative, brings back to original roots of the term, web log.
- discuss the dangers inherent in doing this kind of thing in the open, especially given hot mess that the web is
- be as open as it is safe for you to be. one could set up an owncloud via reclaim hosting, and push materials there in both open and closed versions: here at least you've got LOCKSS
- Ben Marwick's demo repos for archae projects

1.4.1 discussion

1.4.2 exercises

1.5 Failing Productively

- video from msudai ?

1.5.1 discussion

1.6 Introduction to Digital Libraries, Archives & Repositories

yadda

1.7 Command Line Methods for Working with APIs

yadda

1.7.1 Working with Open Context

yadda

1.7.2 Working with Omeka

yadda

1.7.3 Working with tDAR

yadda

1.7.4 Working with ADS

1.7.5 Exercises

yadda

1.8 The Ethics of Big Data in Archaeology

Ethics! Lots of Ethics!

1.8.1 discussion

1.8.2 exercises

Chapter 2

Making Data Useful

blah blah introd

2.1 Designing Data Collection

yada yada

2.1.1 discussion

2.1.2 exercises

2.2 Cleaning Data with Open Refine

blahde blah blah

2.2.1 discussion

2.2.2 exercises

2.3 Linked Open Data and Data Publishing

yargble blarble floss

2.3.1 discussion

2.3.2 exercises

Chapter 3

Finding and Communicating the Compelling Story

blah blah blah

3.1 Statistical Computing with R and Python Notebooks; Reproducible code

blah

3.1.1 discussion

3.1.2 exercises

3.2 D3, Processing, and Data Driven Documents

blerg

3.2.1 discussion

3.2.2 exercises

3.3 Storytelling and the Archaeological CMS: Omeka, Kora

blargle

3.3.1 Omeka

bla

3.3.2 Kora

3.3.3 Exercises

3.4 Web Mapping with Leaflet

...I wonder if we should talk about GIS & Pandas, etc... or in R?

3.4.1 discussion

3.4.2 exercises

3.5 Place-based Interpretation with Locative Augmented Reality

yep.

3.5.1 discussion

3.5.2 exercises

3.6 Archaeogaming and Virtual Archaeology

yay archaeogaming

3.6.1 discussion

3.6.2 exercises

3.7 Social media as Public Engagement & Scholarly Communication in Archaeology

boo socmed

3.7.1 discussion

3.7.2 exercises

Chapter 4

Eliding the Digital and the Physical

crazytown

4.1 3D Photogrammetry & Structure from Motion

vsfm

4.1.1 discussion

4.1.2 exercises

4.2 3D Printing, the Internet of Things and “Maker” Archaeology

yay

4.2.1 discussion

4.2.2 exercises

4.3 Artificial Intelligence in Digital Archaeology

4.3.1 agent models

blah

4.3.2 discussion

blah

4.3.3 exercises

blah

4.3.4 machine learning for image captioning and other classificatory tasks

blah

4.3.5 discussion

blah

4.3.6 exercises

Chapter 5

Digital Archaeology's Place in the World

blerg

5.1 Marketing Digital Archaeology

blag

5.1.1 discussion

5.1.2 exercises

5.2 Sustainability & Power in Digital Archaeology

the big ticket item.

5.2.1 discussion

5.2.2 exercises

Chapter 6

On the Horizons: Where Digital Archaeology Might Go Next

blargble

References

- Caraher, William. 2012. "Archaeological Glitch Art." *The Archaeology of the Mediterranean World*. <https://mediterraneanworld.wordpress.com/2012/11/21/archaeological-glitch-art/>.
- Evans, Thomas Laurence, and Patrick Daly, eds. 2006. *Digital Archaeology: Bridging Method and Theory*. Psychology Press.
- Goldstone, Andrew. 2018. "Teaching Quantitative Methods: What Makes It Hard 9in Literary Studies)." In *Debates in the Digital Humanities*.
- Graham, Shawn. 2017. "Cacophony: Bad Algorithmic Music to Muse To." <https://electricarchaeology.ca/2017/02/03/cacophony-bad-algorithmic-music-to-muse-to/>.
- Liu, Alan. 2004. *The Laws of Cool: Knowledge Work and the Culture of Information*. 1 edition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Montello, Daniel R., Sara Irina Fabrikant, Marco Ruocco, and Richard S. Middleton. 2003. "Testing the First Law of Cognitive Geography on Point-Display Spatializations." In *International Conference on Spatial Information Theory*, 316–31. Springer. http://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-540-39923-0_21.
- Mullen, Lincoln. 2017. "A Confirmation of Andrew Goldstone on 'Teaching Quantitative Methods'." *The Backward Glance*. <http://lincolnmullen.com/blog/a-confirmation-of-andrew-goldstone-on-teaching-quantitative-methods/>.
- Owens, Trevor. 2012. "Discovery and Justification Are Different: Notes on Science-Ing the Humanities." *Trevor Owens*. <http://www.trevorowens.org/2012/11/discovery-and-justification-are-different-notes-on-sciencing-the-humanities/>.
- Ramsay, Stephen. 2011. *Reading Machines: Toward an Algorithmic Criticism*. 1st Edition edition. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Samuels, Lisa, and Jerome J. McGann. 1999. "Deformance and Interpretation." *New Literary History* 30 (1): 25–56. doi:10.1353/nlh.1999.0010.