INTRODUCTION

Is archaeological theory in the public eye? This chapter seeks to identify where archaeological theory and moving images intersect. Such a deceptively simple task requires a little unpacking. As ‘theory’ is the concern of the present volume it is a good place to begin. While scholarship on the relationship between archaeology and the media has tended to focus on questions of accuracy (see Chambers, 1999; Clack and Brittain, 2007; Jordan, 1981; Norman, 1983; Schablitsky, 2007), archaeologists have also pointed towards the absence of ‘archaeological theory’ across a range of media (e.g. Shanks and Tilley, 1987a; Piccini 1996; Shanks 2007; Taylor 2007). They point to the absence of explicit reference to processualism, post-processualism, feminism, phenomenology, systems theory or materiality in media that attempt to communicate archaeological information to non-specialists. More significantly, they critique archaeologists for not involving themselves in the production of popular media that enact rather than simply represent theoretical concerns. Given theory’s central role in how the discipline performs itself on the academic world stage – from its position in undergraduate curricula to its status at conferences - readers might expect that publicly accessible archaeological media would attempt to communicate questions of theory.

Karol Kulik’s groundbreaking doctoral research produced a typology of broadcast media archaeologies: backstage, detective, expository, essay, reconstruction and how-to formats (2005: 177-78). Yet, amongst the skeletons and pyramids she could find no evidence of ‘archaeological theory’ on television. If we conclude, with Kulik, that there are no attempts to communicate archaeological theory via the media, does it follow that archaeological theory does not inform and shape media archaeologies? That is, is it valid to suggest that without an explicit articulation of theoretical discourse in archaeological media – here is a documentary about Marxist approaches to archaeology - archaeological theory is invisible and inaccessible to critical discussion?

In addition to explicit discussion I suggest that there are three additional registers in which archaeological theory might be discussed. First, there are the latent theoretical assumptions that underpin the processes and decisions comprising the archaeology that is represented on-screen. Archaeologist X is a well-known environmental determinist and is the main expert contributor to a programme about Neolithic landscapes. Archaeologist Y focuses on experiential, phenomenological understandings of place and is the main expert contributor to another programme about Neolithic landscapes. Each programme will enact
different archaeological theories, although these remain implicit. Secondly, the praxes of programme-making also carry latent theoretical assumptions that find their echoes in archaeological work. An observational documentary takes a specific stance in relation to knowledge production that relies on assumptions about scientific objectivity and the primacy of the camera’s gaze while a presenter-led, expository programme may privilege the importance of narrative and interpretation. Production teams collectively and individually enact their assumptions about archaeology. Finally, there are attempts to understand archaeological moving images by using archaeological methods and theoretical tools. In this way, all moving image material can be activated within a productive framework of archaeological theory (Morgan, 2012; Piccini, 2009) in order to consider media archaeologically, as a gathering of human and non-human practices, materialities and processes of mattering (Barad, 2007; Roe, 2010) rather than solely as representational text. In short, when considering the presence of archaeological theory in the media the question might be framed in terms of 1) its explicit presence as narrative focus; 2) its implicit presence within the research practices that are the focus of a particular programme; 3) the echoing of theoretical approaches to archaeological understandings of past human activities and the theories implicit in specific modes of image making; and 4) the potential for thinking through archaeological media as itself a theoretical praxis, which sets out the potential for an archaeological approach that foregrounds the intra-activity of the moving image and archaeology as phenomena (Barad 2007; Bennett 2010; Kember 2006).

The four registers of theoretical practices outlined above concern questions of representation – archaeological theory on screen – and of performativity – the extent to which archaeological theory is produced by screen media. They also illuminate the dynamism of all boundary-making practices. Sara Perry writes eloquently about a problem familiar to many archaeologists, that of the disciplinary limits of ‘real’ archaeology (http://saraperry.wordpress.com). I faced similar challenges from supervisors and colleagues alike as a doctoral student in the 1990s. And in the discussions I had with colleagues about this present chapter, I faced the productive challenge of having to think more carefully about what might be included in and excluded from this box marked ‘archaeological theory’. In the (overly) lengthy period between drafts I turned to Karen Barad’s writings on materiality and posthumanist performativity (2007).

Discussing the work of physicist Niels Bohr, Barad rejects the ‘assumption that there are determinate objects with determinate properties and corresponding determinate concepts with determinate meanings independent of the necessary conditions needed to resolve the inherent indeterminacies’ (italics in the original 127). She moves from a detailed explication of Bohr’s rejection of the idea of bounded objects as ‘ontologically basic entities’ (138) to consider phenomena as entangled ‘intracting “agencies”’ (139) and proposes an understanding of reality as neither ‘things-in-themselves’ nor ‘things-behind-phenomena’ but as ‘things-in-phenomena’ (140). If phenomena as relationalities are the primary ontological
units, then it cannot hold that there is a fixed ‘archaeology’ or ‘archaeological theory’ to which we can refer. Rather, ‘material-discursive practices’, of which this event of writing is an example, are the means by which ‘boundaries are constituted’ (142). In this chapter, therefore, I aim to explore the enmeshed, reflexive implications and multiple registers of theoretical issues in archaeological media as phenomena through which we produce disciplinary boundaries.

There is, however, a further set of knotted issues that requires some attention. I have used terms such as media, moving image, screen media, TV documentary, factual programme. Exactly what forms of archaeological media am I talking about here? What are the boundary-making practices here and why might some media be included or excluded? In her thesis on emancipatory digital archaeology, Morgan (2012) takes a practice-as-research approach (Allegue, et al, 2009) to limit archaeological media to archaeologists' moving image practices that seek to extend research-driven agendas. Perry (2011) provides a rigorous historical account of the participation of archaeologists in visualisation practices, including those of early television, to argue that visualisation lies at the centre of the institutionalisation of archaeological knowledge. Yet, archaeology performs publicly in other highly visible venues, including the Hollywood film and video gaming industries and in the art market. Raiders of the Lost Ark (dir. Steven Spielberg, 1981) or Lara Croft: Tomb Raider (dir. Simon West, 2001) might legitimately be defined as archaeological media but should audiences be looking for archaeological theory in these films or are they mainly about archaeology as brand (Holtorf, 2007)? Should audiences demand archaeological theory from their video games (Gardner, 2007)? Artist film and video has a long history of touching on archaeological themes via critically situated image-making. A list of relevant artists working with the moving image and archaeology - from material trace to ruin to heritage re-enactment - would include, but not be limited to, Janet Hodgson, Jeremy Deller, Louise K. Wilson, Pil & Galia Kollectiv, Richard Long, Antonio Reis and Margarida Cordeiro, Hito Steyerl, Chris Marker, Patrick Keiller, Gordon Matta-Clark, Haroun Farocki. How might readers resolve the presence of archaeological theories of materiality, entanglement, narratology, performativity and phenomenology in their works? These artists do archaeological work by generating analyses through assembling material traces of past human activities and they may also self-consciously reference the role of the archaeologist trying to make sense of messy artefacts, traces, remains. Although out of the scope of this chapter, the institutional specificities of and differences between Hollywood films, gallery installations, the games industry and archaeologically situated media practices are important to consider in any discussion of how the four registers of archaeological theory might appear.

Instead, readers of the present chapter might understandably assume that by referring to moving image media I am referring to television archaeology. They might approach a chapter in a handbook on archaeological theory already knowing what archaeology media look like. So, let us focus on television. But even that is complicated. In a context of ubiquitous, convergent media, I might
ask where television itself begins and ends (Hartley, 2008; Bratslavsky and Wasco, 2012). Is it only the scheduled broadcast or is it also the on-demand-view? Is it television that is being watched when an old episode of *Time Team* appears on YouTube or is downloaded illegally via peer-to-peer sharing? Are the series-associated websites supported by broadcasters also television? Or the fan-based discussion boards (Monaco 2010)? The proliferation of digital media platforms, players and interfaces create a much-expanded field of television (see Krauss 1979).

If the boundaries of what is and is not television are always in process, so too are the boundaries of what might be archaeological television. On television, is it archaeology only if it is advertised as such? Or if it involves archaeologists as presenters? Or as producers? Is it archaeology if it focuses on archaeological monuments or only if it profiles archaeological processes? Such questions led to my adopting the term ‘archaeo-historic’ television (Piccini 2007b). However, if I juxtapose the four registers of archaeological theory with television, then programmes that both represent and enact archaeological motifs come into focus. Standalone documentary film within BBC4’s Storyville strand may have more in common with theoretical approaches in archaeology than does *Time Team* (C4, 1994-2012), *Digging for Britain* (BBC, 2010) or even BBC Radio 4’s *History of the World in 100 Objects* (2009-date). *Sync or Swim* (dir. Dylan Williams, 2010), about an all-male, amateur Swedish synchronised swimming team, and *My Beautiful Dacia* (dir. Stefan Constantinescu and Julio Soto Gurpide, 2009), an artefact biography of the Dacia car that analyses Romania’s transition to neo-liberal capitalism, explore entanglements of materialities, human practices and processes of mattering, all of which are key contemporary concerns in archaeological theory and the debates around its ability to make sense of data.

Highly diverse moving image practices thus intersect with archaeology and are implicated in the processes by which people come to understand archaeology. Attending to that diversity is itself an important task to undertake and can contribute to an understanding of the boundary-making practices that ‘distribute the sensible’ (Ranciere, 2004) of archaeology: that is, the forms and practices that render media recognisably archaeological. More than this, if we follow Jacques Ranciere’s radical politics of the aesthetic, the very act of recognising one media practice as archaeological while another is not is itself a political act that carries with it a range of assumptions, assumptions similar to those that archaeological theories attempt to challenge in order to resist understanding the world as given rather than in process. The act of image-making is a framing that includes and excludes; it is also a practice of making the world intelligible. To return to Barad (2007) these are things-in-phenomena, a process of assembling (Harrison 2011). In sum, even where ‘theory’ does not announce itself to be present, publicly accessible media archaeologies are the apparatus (Barad 2007: 141-46) that necessarily express specific structures of assumptions about reasons for social change and the nature of the relationships between the
archaeological record and past human behaviours.

Given that what Ranciere terms the distribution of the sensible enacts a politics, restricting the field of study to that of factual television, to television that audiences might recognise in terms of archaeological documentary, is a useful direction to take at this point. Assumptions about what constitutes archaeology are the products of ongoing negotiations between archaeology as an academic discipline and what is acceptable to executive producers, commissioners, directors and producers. Beyond assumptions about the nature of archaeology, however, are the distributions of the sensible surrounding nonfiction moving image as a form. It is to those assumptions that I turn in order to ground the suggested four registers of archaeological theory within a discussion of the moving image.

EXPLICIT ARCHAEOLOGICAL THEORY ON SCREEN
With reference to Karol Kulik’s doctoral research I suggested above that there were no examples of explicit archaeological theory on television. However, there are significant exceptions from the British context. While the Frank Delaney presented series *The Celts* (BBC, 1986) did not reference archaeological theory per se, it adopted a self-consciously postmodern aesthetic, staging prehistoric ritual as New Romantic club night (Piccini, 1996), and also foregrounded the multivocality of academic debate in the form of a roundtable discussion at the end of the series to highlight questions of cultural construction and performative identity. The series collided a familiar presenter-in-the-landscape mode with heightened theatrical reconstructions and juxtaposed expert talking heads with local community expertise and even foregrounded the filmmaking process itself in a unique instance of archaeology’s experimentation with arts and culture programme-making styles (see Wyver, 2007).

British Classicist Bettany Hughes’ work on gender and archaeology is significant in the field of television archaeologies for her explicit articulation of feminist theory. *Helen of Troy* (C4, 2005), *Daughters of Eve* (C4, 2010) and *Divine Women* (BBC, 2012) undertake an established feminist project of making visible the hidden histories of women. From an archaeological perspective, this work sits squarely within the feminist scholarship established by archaeologists working within the American tradition (eg Gero and Conkey, 1991; Wilkie and Hayes, 2006). Hughes’ significant broadcasting career is unique in so far as it presents a deliberate politics in its construction of archaeological knowledge. Although the politics affecting the production and preservation of the archaeological record are not absent from television screens - Dan Cruickshank’s *Lost Treasure of Kabul* (BBC, 2002) and Gus Casely-Hayford’s *Lost Kingdoms of Africa* (BBC, 2010) are two examples – the politics of archaeology as a practice that renders subjects sensible are clear only in Hughes’ work.

Elsewhere, in 2007, BBC4’s *Timeshift* series produced *Digging the Past*, a trawl through the BBC archives and interviews with archaeologists and programme-
makers about the trends in archaeological programming and the impact of the media on how archaeology is understood. Largely historical in focus, the programme sketched out the different formats of archaeological television and attempted to discuss those formats in the context of the status of archaeological knowledge production. While archaeological theory is not mentioned as such, historical reflections on how archaeology was done in the past flagged up important theoretical differences between now and then. Rather than focusing on thematic or spatial or temporal periodisation and sequence, here the subject is the popular production of archaeological knowledge as such. The archive material clearly signals what is intelligible (or not) to contemporary audiences while also making what were perfectly acceptable practices of archaeology at the time strangely alien. The programme actively configures archaeological matter as other than simply the 'passive product of discursive practices'; it is instead intra-actively agential (Barad 2007: 151). That is, the relationship between archival material and the interviews, a relationality enabled through a complex apparatus of film production team, cameras, edit suites, broadcasters and so on, highlights the dynamism of this mattering, which is 'always already an ongoing historicity; [it is] a doing, a congealing of agency' (italics in the original Barad 2007: 151). In short, the programme explicitly, if unintentionally, enacts the material-discursive practices of archaeology that it claims to represent.

**IMPLICIT ARCHAEOLOGICAL THEORY ON SCREEN**

Implicit archaeological theory is everywhere on screen. Shanks and Tilley (1987: 42) told us that all archaeology is 'theory-laden' and this assertion is repeated throughout the archaeological literature such that Drewett suggests that all fieldwork is similarly 'theory-laden (2011: 10). The assertion, while epistemically attractive, is deeply problematic. Not only does the idea of a theory-laden archaeology suggest that an *a priori*, theory-free archaeology might be possible but it also seems to undermine the power of archaeology to think beyond simple human agency. Archaeology does not exist as a bounded object, passively awaiting the application of theory by its human masters. Rather, as material-discursive practice archaeology is an assemblage, an intra-active relational apparatus that comprises, but is not limited to, 'theoretical' discourse.

The relative absence of explicit archaeological theory on screen, particularly in the light of the centrality of 'explicit theory' to academic archaeological practices, exposes an implicit assertion that theory is a mere add-on. The assertion, in which otherwise intelligent and nuanced archaeological practitioners are implicated, is that there exists somewhere a pure, theory-free archaeology that can be represented fully. Television archaeologies present the past as given rather than emergent, rendered intelligible to audiences through a mix of both scientific positivism and Romanticism.

Cornelius Holtorf has comprehensively discussed Romantic archaeological tropes in popular culture (2005; 2007) and the implicit theoretical contexts for archaeology as detective story or treasure hunt or heroic adventure (often all
three) still pertain. National Geographic’s *Diggers* (2012) and The History Channel’s *Digging for the Truth* (2005-07) suggest that archaeology simply awaits the grand reveal. Other articulations of the Romantic take shape in the traditions of the walking archaeologist, from Michael Wood’s *In Search of the Trojan War* (BBC, 1985) to Tony Robinson’s ‘everyman’ role on *Time Team* (C4).

Scientific positivism (Shanks and Tilley, 1987: 29-45) and processualism are the other dominant, if implicit, theories at play in television archaeology. Processualism may be seen to combine evolutionary ecology, behavioural archaeology and evolutionary archaeology (Hegmon, 2003: 214). It characterises long-running series such as *Time Team* and more recent series such as the BBC’s *Digging for Britain* (2010-11) and *Origins of Us* (2011). Here, data awaits interpretation and ‘science’ becomes a powerful tool to explain human behaviour in terms of responses to the environment and economy. Rather than the archaeologist-as-hero, the archaeological subject is the hero at the mercy of climate change and crop failure in an evolve-or-die scenario. The heroic protagonists in science-driven narratives are always at the whim of larger (natural) forces. Moreover, they are subject to the narrative demands of the Aristotelian arc of exposition, climax and resolution, that dominant dramatic form across both fiction and non-fiction television (Tim Taylor, pers comm., 2009).

Matthew Johnson has written of the ‘organisational, practical and conceptual apparatus’ of archaeology that ‘grinds [agency] into dust under its weight’ (2006: 123). The fact that broad-based processual archaeologies underlie much of television archaeology would appear to support his assertion. Further research into the implicit theoretical approaches shaping television archaeologies is necessary in order to track long-term trends and identify the entry points of academic knowledge production into media cultures. However, while TV archaeologies enact implicit theoretical assumptions there remains the question of how this happens. It is to these processes that I now turn.

TELEVISION INDUSTRY ASSUMPTIONS ABOUT ARCHAEOLOGY

Along with Mortimer Wheeler, Glyn Daniel and David Attenborough, producer Paul Johnstone was at the centre of archaeology’s first major television appearances. He and Daniel worked on the BBC’s *Animal, Vegetable, Mineral?*, the main premise of which was borrowed from the 1951 US CBS programme *What in the World?* (Vogt, 1955: 365). Johnstone then developed one of dominant forms of TV archaeology: location-based programmes focusing on the processes of excavation. Both Johnstone and Daniel were passionate about archaeology’s appropriateness for television and their *Buried Treasure* series first aired in 1954. Stuart Piggott and Richard Atkinson’s excavations at West Kennett marked the first time that an excavation was filmed for television (Johnstone, 1957: 58). In his account of the production process Johnstone focuses on the pleasures of excavation and filming – from the beer at a pub in Avebury to listening to archaeologists discussing artefacts and testing their role as evidence, which ‘made the best detective story tame in comparison’ (ibid.: 59-62). At the
same time, he writes of ‘blushing’ at what he inflicted on the excavation:

the masses of cars, the vans, the aerials and the lights, the crowds held back by policemen, the staging for the cameras over the excavation, the generator humming, and even a camera trundling along the passage of the tomb itself. As one harassed archaeologist said, it only needed a steam organ to make it more like a fair than an excavation. (ibid.: 63)

This early programme embodies most of Kulik’s formats (2005: 177-78). The backstage workings of an excavation were presented, with a problem defined in the language of a detective story, with two key presenters providing both debate and expository commentary. Other Buried Treasure programmes, such as ‘Piltdown Man’ and ‘Stonehenge’, focused on the ‘how to’ of experimental archaeology. Yet, Johnstone’s commentary suggests an awareness of the implicit and explicit assumptions about archaeological practices as they collide with the practices of television production, even though the emotional affectivity, desire and pleasure that Johnstone describes are seen as improper ‘from the archaeological point of view’ (Johnstone, 1957: 63). What Johnstone’s account clearly illustrates is that programme makers bring with them their own understandings of the proper role of archaeology in society and assumptions about the nature of archaeological thought.

The pleasures of making TV archaeology continue to shape production practices. In a 2007, I spent three weeks as an ethnographer at Picture House, the London-based production office on Goldhawk Road in Shepherd’s Bush. This was a pilot project that aimed to focus on the production practices of Channel 4’s long-running series, Time Team (1994-2012). I followed pre-production for a multi-period site at Lellizzick, in Cornwall. The creative handling of material evidence and dialogic production of archaeological knowledge that Johnstone celebrates in the 1950s characterises Time Team practices, too. At the same time, just as Johnstone remarks on the impropriety of showing enthusiasm for the practices of archaeology, Time Team devotes significant effort and technological resource to concealing the production mechanisms that make the site archaeological in the first place: the hours spent researching and poring over reports and archives; the availability of digging crews and heavy machinery; the site visits and pubs; the regulation shaping marine insurance; the office-based debates between the director, assistant producer, researcher and series editor; the choices made based on the vision and drive of the core archaeological team, the series producer, Tim Taylor, and executive producer, Phillip Clarke. These complex material-discursive practices echo John Ellis’s discussion of television documentary as a practice of working through (1999) and also Roger Silverstone’s emphasis on the importance of rhetoric, play and performance in the production of factual television (1999) as unseen processes.

In my second week in the office Ben the researcher and James the assistant producer began looking at aerial photos that James brought from the National
Monuments Record office in Swindon. They were investigating comparative sites to contribute to director Laurence Vulliamy's scripting process:

**Ben:** Look at this ridge here, that’s what I’ll be interested in. It’s bounded by streams, so it might have been a floodplain.

**James:** We’ll need to investigate.

**Ben:** But, remember how hard the ground was?

(James asks Ben to compare the 1947 and 1971 aerial photographs to investigate encroachment of the sandbank. Ben reminds James that tidal change could account for this.)

**James:** And by the 1980s you’ve got vegetation on the sand. In the space of a generation it’s changed completely.

**Ben:** There’s a scene right there. So we can ask the environmental guy ‘so why are you looking at this?’.

**James:** John Norden’s 1650 map is interesting because it points out St Xavier’s chapel. You know, at the Country Record Office they said St Xavier’s but on the map it says St Samson’s….

**Ben:** This might be a re-assignment. We need to find out more about Samson and Xavier.

**James:** Lellizzick comes from Liz, which is a dangerous bit of water between two arms of land. Remember that Lel can mean enclosed church land. I think this has to do with enclosed chapel land between these two bits of sea.

**Ben:** Great, another scene!
The invitation to ‘look at this ridge here’ accompanied by a gesture of pointing followed by a further invitation to both ‘investigate’ and to ‘remember how hard the ground was’ and subsequent projection into a spatialised future with ‘there’s a scene right there’ echoes Paul Johnstone’s feverish passion for the working through that the production of TV archaeology provides. Ben and James continually produce and refine a potential site archaeology, built on the understandings they have of the character of archaeological knowledge. Ben is an archaeologist while James has a history background. Both easily imagine how the programme will look and sound (‘there’s a scene!’). They call up previous programmes – those dealing with same area, same time period, same experts – and mobilise those memories in the production of the current work. They imagine how the county archaeologist will behave, how the core team interrelates.

The production team is also in an entangled relationship with office space, books, reports, surveys, photographs, OS maps, books, charts, and so on, which are cognate with the material encounters of the field archaeologists at site. It is that relationship, rather than any conscious control or manipulation of the evidence, that produces the scripting process, the computer graphics, the shoot. Out of this relationship emerge archaeological evaluations that incorporate site background, aims and objectives, methods, resources and programming, bibliography, maps,
staff lists, figures. Materials and practices congeal in the form of a production bible with site details, contacts, production details, contributors, local diggers and metal detectorists, permissions, post-exavation plans, locations. Where James and Ben tell me that they are just making programmes to the best of their abilities, and that there is not much in the way of choice, clearly they are implicated in a specific assemblage. Their process, just like the resulting programme, is an implicitly processual archaeology that assumes the archaeological record can be directly read and that historical documents serve as evidence for environmentally-determined social change. This provides further support for Matthew Johnson’s assertion that the apparatus of archaeology works against the possibility of other archaeologies (2006: 123).

APPROACHING TELEVISION THROUGH ARCHAEOLOGICAL THEORY
I turn, finally, to consider the fourth register of archaeological theory, which involves activating television archaeology as a site for working through critical concerns. As Karen Barad suggests, ‘[a]ll bodies, not merely "human" bodies, come to matter through the world’s iterative intra-activity – its performativity’ (2007: 152). That is, television programmes, the archaeological record and archaeologists are intra-active in a dynamic and relational process of worlding. Elizabeth Cowie has argued that the recorded moving image is a time-based art that ‘makes every recorded "then" a "now" in the experience of viewing’ (2010: 178) and that documentary, broadly defined, ‘constitute[s] a "procedure of truth" that "throws us outside of ourselves"’ (ibid.). As such, television archaeologies constitute a heightened performative framing through which we might consider the complexities of material-discursive practices without reducing these to mere representationalism.

Georgio Agamben’s discussion of gesture (1993), Jacques Ranciere’s notion of the ‘distribution of the sensible’ (2004) and Karen Barad’s posthumanist performative account of the entanglement of matter and meaning (2007) can help the reader to work through television archaeology as material-discursive phenomena and thus recover these media archaeologies as sites of ‘proper’ archaeological discussion. Agamben suggests that ‘gesture rather than image is the cinematic element’ (1993: 138) and argues that this element is action, action without an envisioned end beyond itself. The temporality of that action returns to Cowie’s formulation of the iterative ‘now’ of the television event. It is also action that can restore a sense of phenomena, specific intra-action, rather than bounded discrete object as referent. In other words, the iterative ‘now’ of the televisual archaeological gesture maintains the event of things-in-phenomena (Barad 2007: 140), which is the key intellectual goal of theoretical archaeologies.
Take *Who Were the British*, Brian Hope-Taylor’s six-part series for Anglia TV (1966). If approached via theories of performative materialities, the programme’s participation in specific and contingent practices of worlding becomes clear. In ‘The Investigators’ episode, Hope-Taylor introduces the work of archaeologists. Black-and-white television and the limitations of outdoor recording were feared to render archaeology completely invisible (Daniel, 1954). Archaeology’s reliance on subtle changes in soil colour and texture and its often-remote sites far from any practical electricity sources made its televisual transformation a tricky affair. The introductory soundtrack dissolves between the sounds of waves against the British shores to the audio traces of workers scraping surfaces and we hear Hope-Taylor instructing his excavators to clean out the trench so that it can be photographed. He points, squats, touches and traces the soil as he asks whether they can see any changes of colour. He reaches out into the post-hole and then back again to the large site plan that he holds. His gestures move from the event of the trench to its inscription on paper and then beyond to the unseen, yet
assumed, ‘gap in the wall’, indicated by a sweeping movement over empty space. Hope-Taylor’s gesturing body is assembled with site, soil, camera technologies to enact and spatialise the past in the present. Here, the archaeologist points to that over-, up-, down-, in- there but rather than this constituting a gesture of meaning-making, it is a boundary-making practice, a co-production of what becomes intelligible and sensible as archaeology. Moreover, due to the repetition afforded by the recorded image – the repeated ‘now’ - those gestures iterate the performative assembling of things-in-phenomena through which archaeology congeals as an activity.

The phenomenon of archaeology extends beyond the production and transmission of the televisual ‘now’ to the act of perception. Viewing is an intra-active material-discursive relation assembling the apparatus of archaeological measurement, television production and the viewing screen. Writers such as Amelia Jones (2008) and Laura U Marks (2000; 2002) have attempted to move beyond the screen as mere representational frame to consider the screen as textural, haptic and performative. For Jones, ‘the video screen presents bodies through an electronic (or, as McLuhan puts it, “electric”) texture’ (2008: 303). Cuts between shots show expansive sweeps of the arm while cutaways offer close-ups of fingers tracing the edges of worked flint and shots of diggers in their holes touching, scraping, slapping, encircling the soil. Amelia Jones’s idea of ‘televisual flesh’, the collapsing of distance to deliver ‘bodies and subjects, through the tangible text of its intimate screen’ (2008: 314) highlights the expanded field through which the boundary-making practices of archaeology take place. The insistent touch of these archaeological gestures enact entanglements of different bodies and problematise assumed boundaries seen to constitute human and non-human. Moreover, the tangibility of the screen extends that entanglement to the event of viewing such that the implication of audiences, screens, living rooms in the material-discursive practices that assemble as archaeology becomes clear.

CONCLUSION
In a British living room, I flick on the switch at the plug socket and push a power button on my set-top digital box and one on my TV remote. This is just one of the ways in which I interact with the electrical currents and screen technologies that occupy and intervene in what I narrowly view as my domestic space. I select a channel and my small, 14” cathode ray tube (CRT) television crackles into life. It is a Tuesday evening in the summer of 2010 and I remember the trailers that I have seen all week for Domesday, a major new BBC Normans series. My partner and son resist sitting down with me as this counts as work and so my relationship to the normative pleasures of TV is complicated (Barthes, 1976; Johnson, 2007). They grit their teeth and get ready for more archaeology. All three of us cuddle on the sofa, which is just a bit too far away from our small screen. The design of contemporary, wide-screen, HD television works against the capacities of my CRT set while the television set itself undermines the promises of lifelike representation offered by broadcasters.
Across Britain other viewers are watching this programme. Some are alone, some sit with friends and others semi-watch it with family members. They all have different experiences, different thoughts and conversations. Sometimes audiences watch the same programme at the same time as the broadcast transmission. Sometimes audiences watch programmes online. Some audiences are keen enough to download series via peer-to-peer sites. Other audiences watch programmes on CRT monitors like mine or on energy-hungry flat screens mounted prominently over the mantle as TVs move from the corner of the living room to pride of place. Audiences watch on computer screens in the office, at home, in the coffee shop and on the move on smartphones and tablets. Some audiences even watch this programme in hospitals, prisons, student halls and homes for the elderly. A 2010 Radio Times survey found that 92% of us watch live TV; 49% watch recorded programmes; 34% use online catch-up or on-demand service; 17% watch DVD boxed sets; and 12% use catch-up or on-demand services via their TVs.

*Domesday* is, therefore, not a singular, bounded object, nor is it fully rendered meaningful via human engagements with it. Its almost limitless viewing circumstances — on hard drive recorders, VHS, in the dust that collects on the TV screen, in our memories - constitute a complex, messy phenomenon of plastics and glass, light-emitting diodes (LED), scrapped scripts, catering waste, junked mobile phones being scavenged for heavy metals by children in far-flung landfills and the apparatuses that produced and transmitted it. It also transmits through time the competition between TV pioneer John Logie Baird’s mechanical image scanning device, which produced a 30-line picture demonstrated at Selfridges in 1925, and the 405-line American electronic image scanning process, which became the norm after the 1936 launch of the first British television service (Crisell, 2006: 17-20). *Domesday* is only possible because of Bain’s 1842 device for transmitting pictures with electrical wires, Blackwell’s 1847 copying telegraph, Braun’s cathode ray tube of 1897 and the Rosing cathode ray receiver of 1907 (Williams and Williams, 2003: 10). Yet, this does not even begin to approach the complexity of historic and immanent relations that condition the coming into being of these programmes and the agential capacities that condition the possibility of anthropocentrically reductive claims to functionality.

TV archaeology is not what happens after the serious business of ‘pure’ archaeology. It is part of an extended apparatus implicated in material-discursive practices that enact ‘archaeology’ and, with it, ‘archaeological theory’. As Raymond Williams argues:

> Many people seem to assume as a matter of course that there is, first, reality, and then, second, communication about it. We degrade arts and learning by supposing that they are always second-hand activities: that there is life, and then afterwards there are these accounts of it. Our commonest political error is the assumption that power – the capacity to
govern other men – is the reality of the whole social process, and so the only context of politics….The struggle is not begun, at second-hand, after reality has occurred. It is, in itself, a major way in which reality is continually formed and changed (1976: 10-11)

TV archaeologies are central to the discipline of archaeology and provide publicly accessible arguments in support of the ongoing funding of archaeology. Academic archaeologists are right to demand television archaeologies that more explicitly discuss theory. Yet, echoing Shanks and Tilley some twenty-five years ago (1987) theoretical concerns will only appear when archaeologists produce their own media and seek senior management positions in broadcasting.

Moreover, shifting political and economic concerns and ongoing inequalities grounded by archaeological practices would seem to demand that archaeologists communicate a more explicitly theoretical archaeology. When commissioners such as Ralph Lee at Channel 4 actively seek contributions from archaeologists by asking ‘what’s the next big idea?’ (pers. comm.), and ask filmmakers to ‘think big and “doc of the week”’ and to ‘bring new names - whether up-and-coming experts and presenters or known provocateurs with something to say’ (Parker, 13 May 2010) it would seem that there might be an increasing appetite for programmes that focused on archaeological theory explicitly. So far, that hasn’t been the case. Instead, the material-discursive practices by which archaeology becomes visible to the public eye are complex and extended. Television is a schedule-driven commissioning environment (Crisell, 2006: 45) while for broadcasters, ‘individual programmes matter less than the integrity and the identity of the channel’ (Ellis, 2002: 134). Put another way, television must fulfil its role as a ‘care structure’, so that broadcasters can ‘produce and deliver an all-day everyday service that is ready-to-hand and available’ that “work” every time so that audiences will see them as a ‘natural, ordinary, unremarkable, everyday entitlement’ (Scannell, 1996: 145-6). While archaeologists must continue to work with broadcasters to press for the political and creative relevance of archaeological theory to television, the other three registers of archaeological theory that are available to critical discussion present a powerful argument for the centrality of television archaeology in the ongoing, emergent practices of archaeology ‘proper’. Theory in the public eye is not a marginal activity, an add-on to the serious business of fieldwork. Television is a highly significant apparatus involved in intra-active agential relations that produce the things-in-phenomena that emerge as archaeology. By attending to television as a site of both explicit and implicit archaeological theory, we can generate new understandings of archaeology’s specific material-discursive practices and thus liberate the moving image from a sterile representationalism that fails to account for the lively performativity of media as they co-produce the discipline.
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